

LAGHUVĀSUDEVA MANANAM

Translation by

SWAMI TAPASYANANDA

LAGHUVĀSUDEVA MANANAM

Translation
By
Swami Tapasyananda



Sri Ramakrishna Math
Mylapore, Madras 600 004

Published by :
© The President,
Sri Ramakrishna Math,
Mylapore, Madras 600 004.

All Rights Reserved
First Edition
I-2M 2C-6-92
ISBN 81-7120-629-8

Printed in India at
Sri Ramakrishna Math Printing Press,
Mylapore, Madras 600 004.

Preface

The story is told of a dowager who attended a talk and came out muttering, 'Mesopotamia, Mesopotamia.' She was in ecstasy. When a friend questioned her what Mesopotamia was, she blithely answered, 'I do not have the ghost of an idea, but the word Mesopotamia sounds so soothing.' Advaita is Mesopotamia to many of us. We hail it as the acme of philosophic thinking, we call it revolutionary, we term it sublime. But, if pressed, we have to admit that we have only a very hazy notion about its profound implications, not only as theory but also as a practical guide in the odyssey of life.

Sri Sankaracharya's Bhashyas and Prakaranas are, no doubt, masterly expositions of this grand perspective of Reality, but his language is so mellifluous and alluring that we are lulled into a complacency that we have understood where we have not. The beauty veils the truth. It is in this predicament that *Laghu Vasudevamananam* comes to our rescue. It takes us by the hand and leads us step by easy step to the very summit.

As the name implies, *Laghu Vasudevamananam* is the condensation of a larger treatise *Vasudevamananam* attributed to one Vasudeva Yati who is said to have lived some three centuries back on the banks of the Narmada. But nothing

definite is known about this sage. Nor is the text of his treatise now available. Fortunately, another great soul, out of compassion for us, has taken the trouble to epitomize the work, himself remaining anonymous. Greatness is often enshrined in anonymity in Indian tradition. Do our masterpieces of painting and sculpture carry the master's signature?

Laghu Vasudevamananam is indeed a *vade mecum* of Advaitic metaphysics. The analysis is thorough, neat, precise. The cause of all human misery is traced, stage by stage, to Ajnana or ignorance. And it is underlined that no word or deed can exorcise Ajnana which vanishes in toto only when supreme knowledge dawns. The desiderata for the seeker of knowledge are then specified and the technique of investigation is described. The distinction between self and non-self, the nature of superimposition, the nexus between Jivatman and Paramatman, the three states of consciousness, the five sheaths, the three bodies, are all explained clearly. How the Mahavakyas like *Tat tvam asi* are to be interpreted and how Brahman is to be realized as Sat-chit-ananda are next elucidated. The logic is razor-sharp and no loose ends are left anywhere. So when the author concludes with the challenging declaration, 'There is nothing more to be said or heard', we gladly nod assent.

A melancholy interest attaches to this English translation of *Laghu Vasudevamananam* in that it was the last scholarly work of Revered Swami Tapasyanandaji Maharaj, who has enriched our religio-philosophic literature with so many admirable

translations and critical notes during his long dedicated life of nearly nine decades.

PUBLISHER

Sri Ramakrishna Math
Mylapore
Madras-600 004

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
1	1
Liberation only through knowledge - superimposition - creation - subtle universe - the gross universe - Jiva and Isvara - veiling power - negation.	12
2	12
The four requisites of a book - discrimination between eternal and temporal - dispassion towards enjoyment of fruits, here and hereafter - the six virtues - the thirst for liberation - attaining the Guru.	17
3	17
The two universes - Atman, anatman, sentient, non-sentient, image worship, the one Atman in different bodies - the non-difference between Isvara and the imagined Jiva - the three classes of Jiva - the real, the empirical, the reflected.	22
4	22
Misery alien to Jiva - cause of misery - the four grades of liberation - deep sleep is not liberation - liberation with and without body - cause of embodiment - Knowledge destroys the fruits of Karma.	

Three types of action - virtuous, sinful, mixed. Who is the agent? - superimposition - the agency of the triple instruments - the need for enquiry - Atman neither an agent nor a prompter. It has no relation with good and bad - obstacles to self-knowledge - doubts, fixing the meaning from introduction, conclusion, repetition, uniqueness, result, eulogy and example. The Jivanmukta.

The sixteen modes beginning with love and hate - the mental mode - the cause of indiscrimination and ignorance - the nature of ignorance - the modes of knowledge and ignorance. The mode of knowledge destroys the mode of ignorance and both vanish.

The nature of Atman and anatman - the Jiva and Isvara - the individual and the collective - the three states of Jiva - the three relatives, appositional, definitive and connective - the literal and indicative imports of Tat tvam asi.

The four characteristics of Atman - distinct from the three bodies, distinct from the sheaths, its apparent attribute as witness and its essential nature as Sat-chit-ananda. The gradual creation, the simultaneous creation, the subtle body, the organs of knowledge and action, the five Pranas - the inner instrument, the causal body - the nature

of Atman - the difference between Atman and Anatman - Sat-chit-ananda.

9

103

The three states of consciousness - the Atman their witness, the characteristics of a witness, the proof for Atman's witnesshood.

10

112

The separateness of Atman from the five sheaths the inseparable and contactual relations - the mutual superimposition, its cause.

11

123

That Sat, Chit and Ananda characteristics of Atman - the experiential proof.

12

139

Atman indivisible, unaffected by time, space and matter - not marked by differences arising from similar entities, dissimilar entities or internal parts. Atman non-dual.

LAGHU VASUDEVA MANANAM

1

*Sarva-tantra-svātantrāya sadātma-advaita-vādinē
śrīmate śaṅkarācārya vedānta-gurave namaḥ.*

Salutations to Thee, O great Acharya Sankara, the Supreme teacher of Vedanta, who was the master of all Sastras and was specially the protagonist of the eternal non-dual Atman.”

Human life becomes fruitful through the attainment of certain values, which are known as the four Purusharthas. These are Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha.

Dharma (sometimes translated as religion, duty, morality etc.) is the satisfaction that man derives from the discharge of all his duties as the member of a society. Dharma must guide man's activities

for the achievement of the next two forms of satisfactions — Artha and Kama, which are fundamentally individual.

Artha is the satisfaction derived from attainment of power and wealth. These help one to attain the third Purushartha, Kama which means pleasure derived from enjoyments of all good things of life.

The last one, Moksha, means liberation from the clutches of Nature which is involving one in repeated births and deaths resulting from the effects of one's actions. Dharma is the link between the individual satisfactions of Artha and Kama on the one hand, and the transcendental satisfaction of Moksha on the other.

Of these Moksha is called the ultimate end — Paramapurushartha for that alone is permanent. In this connection the *Chandogya Upanishad*, 8.5.1 says: *na ca punar āvartate na ca punar āvartate*, there is no return to Samsara for one who has attained liberation. The other three Purusharthas are not like that. They are ephemeral. Says *Chandogya Upanishad*, 8.1.6: *yad yatheha karma-cito lokāḥ kṣīyate evam ev'āmutra puṇya-cito lokāḥ kṣīyate*, just as the benefits attained in this world by one's actions get exhausted, so also the benefits got in the world beyond as a result of one's actions, get exhausted. But liberation can be attained only by the knowledge of Brahman and not by any actions. *Svetasvatara Upanishad*, 6.5 says, *tam eva viditvā atimṛtyum eti n'ānyaḥ panthā vidyate ayanāya*, by knowing Him alone the Jiva transcends death.

There is no other way for this. In *Taittiriya Upanishad* 2.1, also it is said, *brahma-vid āpnoti param*, a knower of Brahman attains the Supreme state.

SUPERIMPOSITION AND SUBLATION

This Brahman can be understood through the doctrines of superimposition (Adhyaropa) and the sublation (Apavada) of the superimposed perception. It is only when the object superimposed is sublated (denied through discrimination) that the basis (Adhithana) of the superimposed perception can be realized. *Kaivalyopanishad* says: *adhyāropa apavādābhyām jñatavyastattva nirṇayah*, by an understanding of superimposition and sublation the determination of Truth becomes possible. So one who wants to attain liberation should certainly know about the doctrines of superimposition and sublation. Therefore a description of these two is attempted in the beginning itself.

In a dim light one gets false perceptions of nacre as silver, a piece of rope as a snake, and a wooden post as a man. The same is the case with the perception of this changeful world (Prapancha) in the Atman. For it, (the changeful world), does not actually exist in the Atman. This is superimposition. It is because of the lack of knowledge of the basis of perception which is Atman, that this superimposition of the changeful world on Atman takes place. This absence of knowledge of Atman is what is known by such terms as ignorance (Avidya), darkness (Tamas), infatuation (Moha), root-nature which is the source of evolution (Mula prakrti), original state (Pradhana),

balanced state of the Gunas (Gunasamyā), the unclear (Avyakta), illusion (Maya) etc. No one can know the cause of this ignorance because it is beginningless.

The concept of the Mula-prakṛti is to be understood as the intertwined state of the three Gunas of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, just like a rope made by the intertwining of three threads of white red and dark colour. The cessation of this intertwined state of Mulaprakṛti is known as Maha-Sushupti, the deep sleep of the Totality. Before the creative cycle starts, an unlimited number of Jivas remain imperceptibly embedded in a state of latency, as countless particles of gold dust can remain in a mass of wax. This can be experienced by all in their own state of deep sleep.

Owing to the maturing of the Karma-potencies of the Jivas at the beginning of the cycle of creation, the Mulaprakṛti gets divided into three viz, Maya, Avidya and Tamas. In Maya, the element of pure Sattva (Suddhasattva) predominates. When pure-Consciousness (Brahma-Chaitanya) which is prior to the cycle of creation, reflects in Maya constituted of pure Sattva, that reflection is called God. This reflection is also known as Avyakṛta (the Unevolved) and Antaryami (In-dweller, Pervader). This God is the creator of the universe. He has in Him the full reflection of pure Consciousness. But when He comes to be qualified by Tamas, He becomes also the Upadanakarana, the material cause of the universe. But because of His own plenitude, He is the Nimitta-karana (causal agent) of creation. It is through adjuncts

that He becomes also the material cause, though He is in Himself pure Consciousness. Just as a spider produces from itself the threads with which it makes its web, God, associated with Tamoguna, creates the universe from Himself.

CREATION OF THE UNIVERSE

How does God create the world?

The Avidya dominated by Rajas is characterised by diversity and infinitude. The Jivas are points of consciousness reflected in this aspect of Avidya. They are numerically infinite. In the Jivas, individual Avidya becomes their causal body, so also Mula-prakrti is the causal body of Isvara. Their state of being centred in their causal bodies is the state of deep sleep. Their causal bodies are called the Ananda-kosa. (sheaths of Bliss). Thus has originated the Karana-prapancha, the multiplicity in the causal state.

SUBTLE UNIVERSE

Next, by the will of God, the Tamas-dominated aspect of Prakrti bifurcates into two, namely, Avarana-sakti (the power of veiling) and Vikshepa-sakti (the power of projection). Of these two, from Vikshepa-sakti evolved Sukshma-akasa (subtle space). From Akasa, Vayu (air) evolves. Out of Vayu, Agni (fire); out of Agni, Jala (water) and out of Jala, Prthivi (earth) - thus originated the fivefold Tanmatras (the subtle state of elements) out of which the world of multiplicity issued.

As they are produced from the causal state of Mula-prakrti, they also share the characteristics of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas which are the three constituents of Mulaprakrti. Out of the above mentioned subtle Akasa, Vayu, Agni, Jala and Prthivi have evolved in that order, the five organs of knowledge — Srotra (hearing) Sparsa (touch), Chakshus (sight), Jihva (taste), Ghrana (smell).

Antahkarana (the inner organ or the mind) is the product of the collectivity of Sattva part of Akasa and the other elements. The Antahkarana has four aspects — Manas (mind), Buddhi (intellect), Ahankara (ego-sense) and the Chitta (mind-stuff). Though there are these four aspects for Antahkarana, Ahankara is involved in Buddhi and Chitta in Manas.

In the same manner, out of the Rajasa aspect of Akasa and other elements, powers of speech, handling, locomotion, excretion and reproduction arise in the five organs of action (Karmendriyas).

The cosmic expression of Rajoguna, is known as Prana. Prana functions in the body as Prana, Apana, Samana, Udana and Vyana.

The combination of all the above mentioned seventeen items — namely, the five organs of knowledge, the five organs of action, the five Pranas, Manas and Buddhi — forms the Sukshma-sarira (subtle body) also known as Linga-sarira. This Linga-sarira is the medium through which enjoyments and sufferings take place. The state in which the Jiva and Isvara dwell in this Sukshma-sarira is called the dream state. Vijnanamaya-kosa (knowledge sheath),

Manomaya-kosa (mental sheath) and Pranamaya-kosa (vital sheath) are formed out of the above-mentioned factors.

GROSS UNIVERSE

Next out of the Tamas-dominated aspect of the Tanmatras of Akasa and the like, the gross elements came into being by the process of what is called Panchikarana, The process of Panchikarana is as follows: first divide each subtle element into two equal halves. Then divide one half of each into four. Now combine the undivided half of each element with one-eighth part of each of four other elements. Thus each gross element will consist of half of the corresponding subtle element and four fractions from the other four subtle elements. It will have a fivefold composition. Thus is accomplished Panchikarana or five-foldment.

Only when this five-foldment takes place, the subtle elements become gross elements capable of being perceived by the senses.

It is with these gross elements, generated by the above-mentioned process of five-foldment that the Brahmanda (the cosmic shell), with its fourteen Lokas (spheres) is formed. Not only that, the gross bodies of all beings inhabiting these Lokas and the food and other materials required for supporting their bodies are formed of these five gross elements. With these same gross elements the gross bodies of Isvara and the Jivas too are formed. The Jivas and Isvara identifying themselves with their gross bodies is called Jagrat or waking state. This gross

body is also known by the name Annamaya kōsa or food-formed sheath. Thus is described the formation of the gross world.

JIVA AND ISVARA

The causal body, the subtle body and the gross body have their Vyashti (individual), and Samashti (collective) aspects. For example tree, house etc. can be called individual aspect. Forest, village etc, are their corresponding collective aspect. In the same way each body separately is the individual aspect, and all bodies put together is the collective aspect. Pure Consciousness with the limiting adjunct (Upadhi) of the Samashti is known as Isvara and with that of a Vyashti is known as Jiva.

In the state of deep sleep, pure Consciousness stays in the causal body as his Upadhi. He is then known as Isvara. When pure Consciousness stays in deep sleep with the individual aspect as the Upadhi, then he is known as Prajna. In the dream state, pure Consciousness stays in the subtle aspect of collectivity and is then called Hiranyagarbha; pure Consciousness in the subtle aspect of Vyashti as Upadhi is known as Taijasa. In the waking state, pure Consciousness stays in gross aspect of collectivity as Upadhi, when he is known Vaisvanara. When Consciousness abides in the gross aspect of individuality as Upadhi he is called Visva. These are the differences between the concepts of Isvara and Jiva.

Isvara performs the creation, sustentation and destruction of the worlds as Brahma, Vishnu and

Rudra assuming the Gunas Sattva, Rajas and Tamas respectively. Of these, Brahma is involved in Virat-purusha (cosmic man), Vishnu in Hiranyagarbha; and Rudra in Isvara. Such is the origin of this manifold universe. It is the same as superimposition which is the effect of the projecting power.

VEILING POWER

Like dense darkness, the Avarana-sakti (veiling power) has hidden or covered up the awareness of the distinction between Atman and the five-fold sheaths of the Atman in the cases of all, except those of Isvara and of enlightened souls (Atma-jnanis). The veiling power has two aspects. The first called Asattvavarana (complete hiding), makes one convinced of the absolute non-existence of Truth. The second called Abhanavarana (partial hiding) makes one feel that the Truth is there but does not reveal itself clearly.

It is the veiling power and not the projecting power (Vikshepa-sakti) that is the root cause of the tree of Samsara (the cycle of births and deaths and all that is involved in it). It is also the cause of the attainment of release (Moksha). By the knowledge of Truth (Tattva jnana) both these aspects of the veiling power can be destroyed.

Tattva-jnana has also two aspects — Paroksha or indirect knowledge, and Aparoksha (intuitive or direct knowledge). By hearing the scripture properly explained by a competent teacher Asattvavarana gets destroyed. This is Paroksha-jnana.

By the combined effect of Sravana (hearing), Manana (cogitation) and nididhyasana (contemplation) all doubts and contrary understandings are destroyed. When this comes to full maturity one gets the unshakable conviction that one is not the body. This is intuitive understanding. Thus through Paroksha and Aparoksha such feelings as 'Brahman does not exist' or 'Brahman cannot be clearly understood' get eliminated, and that results in the removal of all pain and the attainment of unalloyed bliss. This is accomplished in seven stages — ignorance, covering up, projection, knowledge by instruction, intuitive knowledge, removal of sufferings and attainment of unobstructed bliss.

This is the description of superimposition, the imaginative attribution of the multifarious universe on pure Consciousness, which is in reality free of all impurity like the cloudless sky.

REMOVAL OF THE SUPERIMPOSED

There is no effect completely different from the cause. Similarly, just as there is no silver in the nacre and no snake in the rope, though, falsely perceived as such, there is no multiplicity in Brahman. This denial of multiplicity is Apavada. From the word-meanings of *yā mā, sā māyā*, what is not, that is Maya; and *yā na vidyate, sā avidyā*, that which is non-existent is Avidya, it is understood that what is denoted by these terms is the imaginatively ascribed, i.e. what is superimposed. Nothing exists apart from Brahman. So to be established, through the discriminative process, in the intuitive knowledge that 'I am Brahman' is

the way to be a Jivan-mukta (one free in the embodied state itself). This is the final conclusion of Vedanta.

2

The topic of the second chapter is the fourfold related headings that should be found in a scriptural text. These are: the main topic of discourse, purpose, relation and competency to study. The topic of discourse of Vedanta is Brahman; its purpose is Moksha. Relation is the connection between the topic of discourse and the conviction derived therefrom. And competency rests in one who is endowed with the fourfold qualifications (Sadhana-chatushtaya).

Just as for the performance of sacrifice relating to Brhaspati (Brhaspati-yaga) a Brahmana alone is competent, and just as for the performance of Rajasuya sacrifice a Kshatriya alone is competent, so also only one with the fourfold qualifications is competent to study the Vedanta.

The fourfold qualifications are now described:

1) Nityanitya-viveka: It is the conviction derived through the study of scriptures like the Vedas and Puranas that Brahman alone is unchangingly permanent and the world of multiplicity is momentary and impermanent.

2) Ihamutra phalabhoga-viraga: It consists in a thorough change in the mode of valuation of objects of enjoyment. Objects of enjoyment like good food, garments, sex etc., in this world or in the life hereafter, for which all living beings long, should be felt by an aspirant as abhorrent like the food vomitted by a dog or like the filth coming out of the body. A person with this kind of changed attitude of valuation towards what worldly men value greatly is the person endowed with Ihamutra-phalabhoga-viraga.

3) Samadhi-sadka-sampatti: It consists of a group of six virtues - These virtues are Sama, Dama, Uparati, Titiksha, Samadhana and Sraddha:

Sama is the capacity to turn the mind away from the objects of the five senses and focus it on the Atman, which one is required to hear about, think about and contemplate upon.

Dama means controlling the functionings of the organs of knowledge and organs of action.

Uparati means performing actions without any desire for fruits, or abstinence from all worldly actions or taking to the life of a Sannyasin.

Titiksha consists in the capacity to bear without reaction heat and cold and all such sufferings caused by one's past deeds (Prarabdha Karmas).

Samadhana means fixing the mind on things and ideas favourable for spiritual practice.

Sraddha is unshaken faith in the instructions of the Guru and the teachings of Vedānta.

Having all these qualifications is the attainment of **samadhi-sadka-sampatti**.

4) **Mumukshutva** is the eagerness for Moksha. A person who is in a house that has caught fire runs out to escape, abandoning all his relatives within the house. Abandoning, in the same way, all the objects of desire in the world that only cause intense suffering to one, and seeking relief in unity with Brahman — such an attitude of an aspirant is **Mumukshutva**.

In the world one can find some with the power of discrimination between the permanent and the impermanent but who are yet devoid of renunciation (**Vairagya**). Hence the insistence on having no desire for any worldly or heavenly enjoyment. Even when these two qualifications are present, it is found that some who are looked upon as great sages are subject to anger, sorrow, etc. That is why there is this insistence on the six virtues beginning with **Sama**. Even after having all these there are some aspirants who practise communion with **Isvara** with great devotion. They, too, are devoid of competency for knowledge of unity with Brahman. For, communion with **Isvara** requires a sense of duality. So **Mumukshutva** is insisted upon.

An aspirant with the above-mentioned qualifications should approach a spiritually

enlightened teacher. (Sadguru), holding in his hand sacrificial firewood as a symbolic present. Approaching him and prostrating before him in all humility and with perfect faith in him he should question the teacher: "O holy and all-knowing one, who is the living being (Jiva)? Who is the Lord (Isvara)? What is the nature of this changing world of perception (Jagat)? Whence did all these three arise? In the end where will they dissolve?"

The way in which a disciple should approach a teacher is described in the *Mundaka Upanishad* 1.2.12, as follows—

*Parīkṣya lokān Karmacitān brāhmaṇo
nirvedam āyānn 'āsty' akṛtaḥ kṛtena;
tad vijñānārtham sa gurum ev' ābhi-gacchet
samit-pāṇiḥ śrotriyam brahma-niṣṭham.*

—A Brahmana, after carefully examining all the worlds attainable through the performance of Karma and realizing their impermanence — as the eternal cannot be attained through worlds — and thereby becoming fired with the spirit of renunciation, should approach, with sacrificial fuel in hand, a teacher who is full of learning and devoted to Brahman, in order to know the truth about these matters.

The *Bhagavad Gita* 4.34, also exhorts in the same strain:

*Tad Viddhi pranipātena paripraśnena sevayā
upadeśyanti te jñānam jñāninaḥ tattva darśinaḥ.*

—Learn that from knowing ones, prostrating before them in all humility, serving them and putting them questions.

When the disciple approaches an enlightened teacher in this way, then the merciful teacher,

by instructing how the living being, the Lord and the universe are produced through the substance – qualities of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, reveals to him, to his complete satisfaction, the real nature of the Atman. A person competent to receive this knowledge is the one who has the fourfold qualifications described earlier, which is the result of virtues acquired by him in innumerable past births and of the grace of God. A teacher who gives enlightenment in this way should be looked upon as God himself. By being enlightened by the teacher about the non-duality of living being and God one attains release.

3

How many types are included in this world of multiplicity?

Two types are included in it: 1) Atman, 2) non-Atman.

How can the Atman, which transcends multiplicity be included as a type in the world of multiplicity?

There is no mistake in doing so. For, in this world of multiplicity sentient and insentient entities are included. The sentient entity is the Atman. If there were no Atman, multiplicity would not have a 'being' at all. So one can say that the Atman is included in the world of multiplicity.

If this be the case, how do you distinguish the sentient from the insentient?

What is moving (Jangama) is sentient. What cannot move by itself or is in a fixed position (Sthavara) is insentient.

We find several kinds of sentient and insentient entities. Why then do you say that multiplicity includes only two types?

Yes, your question is relevant. Non-Atman is one only. But when it is in effect-condition, it manifests itself as many. Atman has only one form, When, however, it is in contact with limiting adjuncts formed of the effect condition of non-Atman, it appears to be many — many living beings, many gods etc.

But God is only one. How can you speak of Him as many?

I speak so because in holy temples, in villages and in houses, He is worshipped as many deities like Siva, Vishnu etc.

How can Godhood be entertained with regard to these images made of stone, metal or earth?

It can be entertained. For, it is found that those who have faith in our scriptures, adore these images with holy ablutions, worshipping with flowers and offering tasty food, spending even huge sums of money for this. You cannot take into consideration the views of unbelievers in image worship. It is those of earnest faith who count. If the body, which is a combination of all kinds of dirty stuff, can be considered as Atman by people, what wrong is there in accepting Godhood in the very pure and holy images of divinities?

Is there any example to illustrate the theory that the one non-Atman becomes many in its effect-condition and that the only Atman becomes many through the adjuncts formed of the effects of that one non-Atman?

The same earth is found in its effect-condition taking the shape of mountain, trees, towers, walls, houses, mud vessels, jars etc. Similarly Mula-prakrti becomes many in its effect-condition. Space is only one single whole. But when it enters into several adjuncts and appears as space in the pot (Ghatakasa), space in the house (Mathakasa), etc., it appears as many. In the same way, the one and only Atman appears to be manifest in several bodily adjuncts. Then it is called celestial, man, Rama, Krishna, Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaisya, Sudra, animal, bird, worm etc. This is an example in the light of the theory of Avacchinna i.e. division into many through Upadhis or dividing barriers.

There is another theory known as the reflection (Pratibimba) theory. The same water presents itself as ocean, river, well, lake, jar-water etc. The same one sun that is reflected in all these receptacles of water is seen as many. In the same way, the same Atman is reflected as many in bodies having inner organ or mind. These are examples according to the two ways of thinking.

The coldness, movement and such other characteristics of water are present only in the water that forms the reflecting medium. They do not affect the sun that is reflected in water. In the same way the mental dispositions like agency

and enjoyership are of the medium in which the Atman is reflected and do not affect the Atman.

So, just as the space in the jar and pure unrestricted space are essentially only one, similarly Jivatman is the same as the Supreme Atman i.e. Paramatman and vice versa, the Paramatman is the Jivatman Himself.

The Jivatman is an imaginative ascription and therefore a superimposition. All that is superimposed is false. How then can one assert the non-dual unity of such a false entity with the absolutely real Paramatman?

Jivatman has three states — Paramarthika (metaphysically or truly real), Vyavaharika (relatively real i.e. real for practical purposes), and Pratibhasika (momentarily real). These states are identifiable in the states of deep sleep, waking and dream states in that order. Waves in water and foam in waves are falsely seen as modes separate from their basis. In the same way in the Paramarthika, the Vyavaharika is falsely ascribed; and in the Vyavaharika, the Pratibhasika is falsely ascribed. Taste, liquidity and coolness are the properties of water. But when water takes the form of waves and foam, those properties are falsely ascribed to those formations themselves. In the same way Sat (Existentiality), Chit (Consciousness), and Ananda (Bliss), which are the characteristics of Kutastha-Chaitanya (unchangeable, unaffected absolute Consciousness) which is the same as Paramarthika — these characteristics of Kutastha-Chaitanya are ascribed to the Vyavaharika and the Pratibhasika. Without waves there can be

no foam and without water there can be no waves. The implication of this analogy is that water, which stands for Paramarthika alone is absolutely real, while the waves which stand for the Vyavaharika and foam which stands for the Pratibhasika, have their existence only in the Paramarthika. In absolute reality the space in the pot is one with the universal space. Just as the space in pot limited by its pot-boundary is one with the universal space, so also the Jiva-chaitanya, limited by the boundary of body-mind, is one with Kutastha-chaitanya when the boundary of body-mind is eliminated. This Kutastha-chaitanya is the same as Paramatman. Such is the doctrine of Vedanta.

In this way through the process of Neti, Neti (not this, not this) an aspirant has to eliminate the five Kosas constituted of body, mind etc., forming the barriers or adjuncts which seem to generate manifoldness in Kutastha-chaitanya. Through such a process of elimination with the help of scripture and reasoning, the aspirant should realize *aham brahmāsmi*, I am Brahman. One who has had the complete realization of the Truth is not affected by merits and demerits. All the Upanishads speak in the same strain.

4

In this world of multiplicity, the Jiva is ordinarily found to have misery, birth, Karma, evils like attachment, hate, etc., sense of ego, indiscrimination and ignorance. Among these what is said first in order, is the effect of what is mentioned next. It means misery arises from birth; birth from Karma; Karma from attachment and hate; attachment and hate from egoism; egoism from indiscrimination; and indiscrimination from ignorance. This chapter and the next deal with the first four items beginning with misery.

Is misery natural to the Jiva or incidental? Is it innate or is it something acquired by contact with other entities?

Misery is not natural to the Jiva. It is acquired. There are many objections to considering misery as natural to the Jiva.

What are those objections?

If misery were natural to the Jiva, there can be no end to it. No one can have happiness in that case. No one would try to overcome misery and attain happiness. No one would engage himself in good works, devotional practices, meditation, spiritual communion, etc. Thereby the Vedas, Puranas, Itihasas etc., would become superfluous and meaningless.

Let us take for granted that misery is natural to the Jiva. In that case also why should not one try to save oneself from it?

The essential characteristic of an entity is identical with the entity itself. If its essential characteristic is destroyed, the entity itself is destroyed. Who will strive for one's own destruction! If the very form of the Atman is destroyed, who will remain to attain the four ultimate values of life? No one.

What is the justification for your statement that the essential characteristic of an entity is identical with the entity itself?

Sweetness is the essential characteristic, the very nature, of sugar. Disappearance of sweetness from sugar means the destruction of sugar. In the same way, if misery is the essential nature of the Jivatman, its elimination would be the destruction of the Atman itself. But it is accepted that the Atman has no destruction. The Upanishads maintain that the Atman is eternal and indestructible. It is said in *Brhadaranyaka Upanishad* 4.5.14, *avināśi*

vā are' ayam ātmā, O Maitreyi, there is no destruction for the Atman. Again, *ākāśavat sarva-gataś ca nityaḥ*, The Atman is all-pervading and eternal as space. The *Katha Upanishad* 2.18 says:

*Na jāyate mryate va vipāścīt
n'āyam kutaścīn na babhūva kaścīt
ajo nityaḥ śāśvato'ayam purāṇo
na hanyate hanyamāne śarīre.*

—This Atman is never born. It never dies. Nor has it been non-existent anywhere at any time. It is birthless. It is eternal and changeless. It precedes creation. It is not killed when the body is killed.

This is what the various Vedic texts say about the Atman. So misery can never be natural to the Atman, it is incidental.

Why can't you accept that the essential characteristic of a thing can be destroyed without the thing being destroyed? Heat is an essential characteristic of fire. This heat can be removed with the help of magical stones (Mani), magical formula (Mantra), etc. But even when the essential characteristic heat is thus eliminated, fire is not destroyed. Fire also thereby gets an alien characteristic — coolness. In the same way even if the essential characteristic of the Atman is misery, it can be overcome by the force of virtuous deeds, spiritual communion, etc., and the Atman can thereby attain happiness.

Your assumption is not valid. That overcoming of the heat of fire that you refer to, is temporary and not eternal.

Why do you say so?

Whatever is produced by action is subject to destruction. Let us take for granted your contention that magical gem, Mantra etc., can overcome the heat of fire in the example cited by you. But when the magical gem, Mantra, etc., are removed, the coolness produced by them also ends and the heat of fire is again felt. In the same way the happiness got by the Jiva through virtuous acts also disappears when the effects of these acts terminate. The sense of freedom of the Jivas, if it is similar to the example cited by you, will be temporary and not the eternal freedom not subject to rebirth.

Moreover, if freedom is something produced, it ceases to be eternal and therefore is impermanent. It will contradict the Vedic statement about the eternity of Mukti, *na punar āvartate*, one is never again subject to rebirth. It will also contradict the Vedic statement about Atman, *akhaṇḍam ānandasvarūpam adbhutam*, indivisible, blissful, wonderful.

If misery were the inherent characteristic of the Atman, misery alone would have been the experience in deep sleep, inactivity and Samadhi. This is not the case. For, when we awake from these states, our memory about the experience in them is one of happiness. From all this it can be concluded that the natural and inherent characteristic of the Atman is happiness, and that misery is only a temporary and passing experience.

How then does misery overcome the Atman?

The Atman, which is blissful by nature, comes to experience a state of misery because of its association with a body. *Yatra yatra śarīra pari-grahaḥ tatra tatra duḥkham*, whenever there is association with a body, there is misery. This is an accepted criterion.

Do kings and wealthy men experience misery because of having bodies?

Yes, they have experience of the misery arising from the fear of enemies, the burdens of administration, decline of prosperity, death of relatives, old age, the thought of one's own death, etc. It is a mere illusory fantasy to say that 'some in this world are always happy'

How can mere fantasy make one feel misery as happiness?

The following examples will show how this happens. A labourer engaged to carry a huge load, runs with the load on his head even long distances. He does so and suffers all the consequent physical exhaustion, in the hope that he will thereby gain something. A farmer engages himself in agriculture day and night with the same motive. Workers get immersed in arduous tasks. Thus all engage themselves in difficult and painful tasks due to their false fantasies that these experiences are enjoyments. You will thus see that misery can be felt as joy because of fantasy.

Then do enlightened men with power of discrimination also feel the misery of embodiment?

Yes, they too feel misery from hunger, thirst, cold, heat, illness, etc., and also from the fear of lions, snakes, scorpions etc.

Then what is the difference between such enlightened men and ignorant persons?

You will not see any difference in their external behaviour. But in their internal behaviour (experience) there is difference. An enlightened Mahatma knows: 'The Atman is Existence-Knowledge-Bliss-Absolute. It has no connection with the false, inert and misery-experiencing Antahkarana.' He has thus become a Sthitaprajna (one of unruffled consciousness) with the help of scriptures, reasoning, and experience. *Brhadaranyaka Upanishad* 4.3.15 says, *asaṅgo hy ayam puruṣah*, this conscious being is without any attachment. This statement of the scripture is supported by reasoning such as that the Atman is without parts and that it is true. It is further supported by the experiences of deep sleep, silence and Samadhi.

But an ignorant man without the power of discrimination does not understand the real nature of the Atman. He considers the body itself as the Atman, through superimposition. He superimposes the nature of the non-Atman on the Atman and the Sat-chid-ananda nature of the Atman on the body. As a result of it, he spends his time, thinking, 'I am a man or Deva; I am a person of Tamil Nadu, of Andhra, of Kerala; I am a Brahmana, a Kshatriya, a Vaisya; I am a householder, or Sannyasin, etc. He identifies his

'I-sense' with one or more of all the above categories. In this way, there is a vast difference between an enlightened and ignorant one.

But if you scrutinize it very deeply, you will find there is a difference in their external behaviour too. An enlightened man, whose body is maintained by his Prarabdha, understands that the whole world is false and feels all these experiences as similar to those in dream. To the ignorant man this world of multiplicity seen in waking state is real. The happiness and misery he feels in it are also real to him. Thus you will see in what sense the bodily life causes sufferings to an enlightened man.

The Devas also have bodies, as could be concluded from Vedic statements such as *vajra-hasthaḥ purandaraḥ*, Purandara or Indra has the thunderbolt as weapon in his hand. So they also have to face sorrows, such as those arising from mutual conflicts, anger and curses, the fear of attacks by Asuras and Rakshasas, and above all from the fear of their downfall from heaven when the merits of their virtuous deeds are exhausted through enjoyment.

Then how is it that men worship such heavenly beings who are subject to sorrow and downfall? How do those beings have the power to bestow boons on their worshippers?

In this respect their power is like the power of kings, who are themselves subject to sorrows but have the power to protect those who are their dependants. The Sruti says: *deva-loke devā ānanda-rupās tiṣṭhanti*; in heavenly regions the Devas stay in a blissful state. The meaning is that they

enjoy the bliss of the Atman so long as their life-span in heaven lasts. The statement of *Aitareya Upanishad* 2.1. like *tā etā devatāḥ sṛṣṭā asmin mahatyarnave prāpatan*, the Devas, who are created beings, fell into this ocean of Samsara of repeated births and deaths, shows that embodiment leads to sufferings to Devas also.

So all should aspire for Videha-mukti (liberation from every kind of body.)

Then why is that men say that some of the stars seen traversing the sky are free or liberated beings; for they have a form?

I'll tell you. Listen. Liberation is of four types — Salokya (attaining the same world), Samipya (attaining closeness), Sarupya (attaining the same form), and Sayujya (attaining oneness). For these attainments the means consist of Charya (proper attitude), Kriya (proper action or rituals), Yoga (meditation) and Jnana (knowledge of unity), respectively.

Charya consists in cultivating the attitude that one is the servant of God and His service is one's duty. Kriya is the ritualistic worship of deities like Vishnu, Siva, etc. Yoga is the practice of Ashtanga-Yoga (Yoga with eight steps) consisting of Yama, Niyama, etc. Jnana is the experiencing of the unity or non-separateness or Jivatman and Paramatman.

As the first three forms of liberation can end in Punaravṛtti (return to the embodied state), they are of secondary importance. Real liberation is

only Sayujya, in which there is no coming back. The statement 'by Yoga one attains Sayujya' relates only to the Yoga or union with Nirguna Brahman (Brahman, the Absolute who has no limitations). That no one sees a Videha-mukta anywhere as one might see a Jivan-mukta, should not make one think that there is no Videha-mukti. For in the case of these Videha-muktas, only their bodies are destroyed. The bliss, which is their nature, is never destroyed. As that bliss is enjoyed without a body just like the bliss of deep sleep, it can be perceived only by oneself and never by an outside observer.

If deep sleep is similar to Videha-mukti, why not consider the former itself as liberation without body?

No, that would not be correct. Though in both the states the bliss is similar, ignorance is still present in deep sleep; for, one awakes from deep sleep and ignorance is still found to persist in him. In liberation both these are absent i.e., there is no presence of ignorance and there is no return from it (as in coming back to waking state from deep sleep). So it cannot be said that deep sleep is liberation. For this very reason, even the state of cosmic dissolution is not considered Mukti. Just as in the bliss of deep sleep there is self-awareness, so also in the bliss of Mukti too there is self-awareness (Sva-samvedya). This being so, Mukti is an experience; it is not a void (Sunya).

What then differentiates Jivan-mukti (liberation in embodied state) from Videha-mukti (disembodied liberation)?

The difference consists, as said earlier, in absence of ignorance and absence of return to embodied state. [What was said earlier about the difference is this: There are four kinds of liberation—Salokya, Samipya, Sarupya, and Sayujya. In the first three, due to the presence of ignorance, Prarabdha is still there. As a consequence, there is embodiment and possibility of fall. In Videha-mukti there is neither Karma of any nature nor any body.]

Thus according to scriptures and reasoning, it is clear that disembodied liberation is supreme bliss, and embodied states lead to sufferings.

From experience also we can come to this conclusion. In deep sleep as there is no awareness of body, there is absence of all suffering. On the contrary, in the waking state and the dream state, where there is awareness of body, all experience sufferings. Therefore we get the major premise that whenever there is embodiment, there comes suffering. So we can conclude that embodiment is the reason for the suffering befalling the inherently blissful Atman. Suffering is never the inherent nature of the Atman.

What is the cause of embodiment?

The body is produced when the five-fold elements (Panchikrta-bhutas) are combined with the past Karma efficiencies. It would not be correct to say that the elements alone are responsible for the production of bodies. These elements are everywhere, but we do not find bodies everywhere.

We find from observation that, only when the five elements that have formed into the male and female germ cells come together, bodies are produced. Therefore is it not reasonable to hold that these germ cells are by themselves capable of forming bodies?

It would not be a correct inference. We find bodily reproductive cells of males and females often go without producing bodies. Only when these female and male cells are mingled with Karma are bodies produced. The five elements and space and time exist everywhere uniformly. So diversity of Karma alone can account for the varieties of bodies that are produced. As an example to illustrate this, let us take mud which exists everywhere alike. From mud, pots, pans, jars, etc are made. This variety in form is caused by the skill of the hands of the potter. In this example we find that mud is the material cause and the potter's skill is the instrumental cause of pots, pans, jars, etc.

In the same way, the five-folded gross elements are the material cause and Karma the instrumental cause of the bodies of all beings. So wherever there is Karma capable of producing enjoyment and suffering, these bodies occur. As there is Karma present in the waking state and dream state, there are bodies in these states. If there is no Karma, there will be no body. Because there is no Karma in deep sleep, there is no body in that state. Even if there is mud, if there is not present the skill of the potter's hand, there will be no production of mud pots, pans, jars, etc. In the same way, even in the presence of

the five elements created by God, if Karmas are annihilated by the knowledge of Atman (Atma-jñana), the enlightened one (Atma-jñani) can have all his Karmas annihilated. He will then have no body and will have no further embodiment.

In the scriptures relating to Karma, it is said that we have to suffer or enjoy the fruits of all the sinful and virtuous acts we have performed. It is said in the following verse that even after lakhs and lakhs of aeons the results of Karma will not be annihilated without enjoying and suffering them:

*Avaśyam anubhoktavyan kṛtam karma śubhāśubham
n' ābhuktam kṣīyate karma kalpa-koti-satair āpi.*

On the other hand, in the knowledge-scriptures it is said that the fire of knowledge reduces all Karmas to ashes:

*Jñānāgniḥ sarva-karmāṇi
bhasmasāt kurute tathā*

Which of these contradictory statements shall we accept?
How is it to be decided?

Scriptural texts are of two kinds — strong statements (Prabala-vakya) and weak statements (Durbala-vakya). The final conclusion is the strong statement and the prima facie view is the weak statement. The strong statement overrules the weak one. For example there is: *ahimsā parāmo dharmah*, non-killing is the greatest virtue. Though this may be considered a strong statement, it is invalidated by a stronger statement: *yajñe paśu-vadhaḥ kartavyaḥ*, in sacrifice animals can be killed. In the same way, the statement *avaśyam anubhoktavyam*, the fruits of Karma have certainly to be enjoyed or suffered, is overpowered by the stronger statement: *tapasā kilbiṣam hanti*, by austerity sins are atoned.

Similarly even if the stored-up Karmas (Sanchita-karmas) are countless, they are all annihilated by the knowledge of the Atman. If there is no Karma there is no birth. If there is no birth there will be no suffering. If there is no suffering, the inherent bliss of the Atman manifests. Such is the conclusion of the Vedanta.

5

It was said that the Jiva's sufferings arise from the fact of being a possessor of body and that the Jiva gets a body due to Karma. Are there divisions or types of Karma and if so, how many of these are there?

Karmas are mainly of three types — virtuous deeds, sinful deeds, and hybrid deeds mixed with virtuous and sinful elements. The bodies of Devas are the result of virtuous deeds, of birds and animals are of sinful deeds; of men are of mixed deeds, i.e., of a mixture of virtuous and sinful Karmas.

In each of the above types, there are subdivisions such as excellent, middling and ordinary. In accordance with these types of Karmas, beings are born with different types of bodies.

For example, Hiranyagarbha (collectivity of Jivas) gets embodiment due to virtuous deeds classified as of excellent. The bodies of Indra and other Devas are born of Karmaṣ classified as of middling virtue. The bodies of Yakshas, Rakshasas and Pisachas (various kinds of goblins) are born of Karmas classified as of ordinary virtue.

The bodies of various kinds of beings that cause harm to others; for example, tigers, serpents, scorpions, mosquitos, thorny trees, poisonous trees, etc., are born of Karma classified as highly sinful.

The bodies of useful beings like buffaloes, pigs, asses, camels, mango trees, jack trees, banana plants, coconut trees, trees that yield useful fruits, flowers and leaves — these are born of Karmas classified as of middling sins.

The bodies of banyan trees, Tulasi, Vilva, bovine animals, horses, etc., are bodies born of Karma that are classified as ordinarily sinful.

The bodies of men by which through various stages of disciplines like motiveless actions, the fourfold means of advancement, the attaining of a competent teacher, hearing of the great statements of Vedanta, contemplating on them, realization of the Atman, attainment of the state of freedom with the body itself, and disembodied freedom — these are the result of Karmas that can be described as superior Karmas of a mixed nature.

The bodies of men fit for the performance of tasks appropriate for each stage of life belong to the middling, mixed category.

The bodies of untouchables, forest tribes, those beyond the pale of civilization, etc., are born of Karmas that can be classified as ordinarily mixed.

Therefore men with proper discriminative power pondering well over the distinctions of the various ascending and descending scale of Karma, should perform duties pertaining to their respective Varnas and Ashramas without desire for the fruits but only with the idea of dedicating them all to Isvara, and seek liberation through the final stage of discriminative contemplation on the Atman. This is the view of the great Acharya (i.e. Sri Sankara).

Who performs these three kinds of works?

They are performed by the three-fold organs viz. mind, speech and body.

In this world we feel 'I do, I do.' When we feel like that, our idea is that the Atman represented by the 'I', is identical with the body. So instead of saying that the performer of actions is the 'I' identified with the body, how do you attribute the agency of action to the three-fold organs? Your statement contradicts our experience.

Now hear the reply. The Atman is changeless (Nirvikara), inactive (Nishkriya) and without another as a second anywhere. So you cannot attribute agency to the Atman.

Everyone feels that the Atman is the doer. What is more, we do not see any other doer.

It is because of superimposition that we get the feeling that the Atman is the doer. Agency is not innate for the Atman. Were it innate then

no one would unnecessarily strive, thinking, 'I must get rid of this sense of agency through Vedantic enquiry, as the bondage of Samsara will be destroyed only if the sense of agency is eliminated'.

What harm is there in accepting that agency is natural to the Atman? Is it not possible to destroy this sense of agency by special removal of it from the Atman?

If a certain characteristic is natural to an entity, i.e., its very nature (Svarupa), who will make special effort to destroy that nature, as it will involve self-destruction? For then none will be left to enjoy the fruits of such an effort. If a Jivan-mukta is not accepted as being in an embodied state without any feeling of agency, then there will be no Vedantic tradition and the succession of teachers and disciples. Not only that, Vedic passages which state that the Atman is non-agent (Akarta), witness (Sakshi), attributeless (Nirguna), changeless (Nirvikara), etc. will become meaningless. The following are examples of such passages: *niṣkalam, niṣkriyam, śāntam, niravadyam, nirañjanam, (Svetasvatara Upanishad, 6.19.) sāksī cetā kevalo, nirguṇaś ca. (Svetasvatara Upanishad, 6.11.)*

Besides, in the state of deep sleep, though the Atman is present, it is devoid of the nature of an agent (Karta). If the nature of an agent (Karttrva) is natural to the Atman, just as heat is natural to fire, then we must find this nature in the Atman always. This is not the case. So, for all these reasons, agency cannot be accepted as natural to the Atman.

Agency can still be accepted as natural to the Atman, but only suspended for the time being in deep sleep, just as work is suspended by workers like carpenters, blacksmiths, etc. when they bathe, sleep, eat, etc. In the same way the organs do not work in deep sleep and so the Atman remains workless for the time being only. The Atman starts working later. Why not accept this position?

When one observes silence, though the inner organ is in union with all organs, still no work is done. For all these reasons agency (the state of being a worker) is not natural to the Atman. It is therefore surely due to superimposition.

What is meant by superimposition?

Superimposition is finding or imposing the nature of one entity on another. The following may be cited as an example: When we go in a boat through a channel or river, we experience that all the trees on the banks are moving and that boat is stationary. But in fact trees are stationary, what is moving is the boat. In this example, we say that the movement of the boat is superimposed on the trees and the stationary nature of the trees on the boat. In the same way, the activities of the three organs (mind, speech and body) are superimposed on the Atman and the non-agent nature of the Atman on the organs. This is the result of ignorance. This is why it is said that it is due to superimposition that the Atman is experienced as an agent.

As the three organs are inert, they cannot think or move. How can such organs become agents of work? So if

these organs work, it must be by the force of some other agent. What or who is that agent?

In this world we find that inert powers like air are able to uproot trees and throw them a long distance away. So also flowing water can do the same thing, i.e., carry away a tree to a long distance. None of these are done by any living agent but only by inert forces. In the same way the three organs, though inert, can move things by themselves. So, there is nothing wrong in assuming that the three organs have power of movement by themselves.

What are the kinds of actions done by the three organs?

Thoughts on virtuous subjects (Savishesha-chinta), avoidance of worldly thoughts (Nirvishesha-chinta), thoughts about heaven and such matters relating to life hereafter (Paraloka-chinta) and thoughts on devotion and knowledge — these turns of mind are virtuous actions by the mind. Thoughts on purely worldly matters, thoughts about doing harm to others, thoughts critical of the validity of Vedas and Sastras, thoughts denying any distinction between Dharma and Adharma — these turns of mind are sinful actions by the mind. When the two above-mentioned types of thoughts, the virtuous and the vicious, are intermingled in one's thoughts — that is called mixed.

Chanting of the Vedas, study of the Sastras, routine reading of the Gita, chanting of Sahasranama, speaking the truth, repetition of Mantras like Panchakshari, hymning the Lord's names, talk about

unselfish service to others, courteous, pleasing and useful speech — these are virtuous actions by speech. The vicious actions by speech are condemnation of holy texts like the Vedas, speaking insultingly about deities, uttering falsehood, rough speaking, ridiculing others, etc. Intermingling both these types of speech is mixed actions by words.

Virtuous actions by the body are taking bath in holy rivers, prostrating before Devas and elders, circumambulating in temples, worship of deities, meeting holy men, travelling for doing good to the world — these are virtuous actions by the body. Doing violence to others, adultery stealing, association with wicked men — such actions are sinful actions with the body.

Depriving others to get the means for feeding holy men, plundering the wealth of others to build temples, arranging for free distribution of cool water on hot days without paying the workers engaged for it — such actions are classified as bodily actions with a mixture of activities of both virtuous and vicious nature. One has to discriminate properly between these three types of actions with the three-fold organs.

What is gained by such discrimination?

For all actions there are two types of results — direct or principal and indirect or secondary. This will now be clarified. All the kinds of actions described before are done by the three organs. The Atman is pure Consciousness, unaffected like space, without parts, full and non-dual. So the

Atman can never be the agent of these three types of actions. So it is said:

*Yac c'āpnoti yad ādatte yac c'ātti viṣayān iha
yac c'āśya santato bhāvas tena c' ātmeti kīrtyate.*

—That which contacts objects, receives and enjoys objects but yet does not in the least change its nature — that is what is called the Atman:

That being the nature of the Atman, no action can affect or change its nature as pure Consciousness (Chid-akasa). To be established in the intuitive conviction of this nature of the Atman is the direct and principal result of discrimination mentioned before.

The indirect and secondary result of this discrimination is the resolve that, even after attaining the knowledge of Brahman, one would live engaging the three organs — mind, speech and body — in virtuous deeds only and, when that is not possible in its fullest sense, engaging them in mixed deeds, but never in vicious actions. This can be illustrated by the following example: a cultivator tends a banana grove. It is done for its direct result of getting the fruits. The leaves, flowers and the core of the stem of those plants are only of secondary consideration. In the same way a proper discriminative understanding of the actions of the three organs, yields two kinds or result — one direct and principal, and the other secondary.

A man of knowledge is said to be untouched by any action just like a lotus leaf in water. He is only the uninvolved witness of actions without any purpose to gain

from them. For this reason, he is not bound by any positive or negative injunctions regarding actions that should or should not be done. In such a circumstance, how can you say that, like an ignorant man, the knower also is bound by a positive injunction to do virtuous actions only?

There is some substance in your objection. A man of wisdom is one who has accomplished every purpose that could be had through actions. There is no doubt about this. But there are the following distinctions among men of wisdom according to the degree of their knowledge. These are Brahmaavid (a knower of Brahman), Brahmaavid-vara (a great knower of Brahman), Brahmaavid-variyan (a still more accomplished knower of Brahman), Brahmaavid-varishta (one who has attained the highest peak of the knowledge of Brahman). Among these, only the last, Brahmaavid-varishta, is liberated without body consciousness. He has no Vrtti, i.e., mental modes or waves of thought. He alone is not subject to any injunctions to do right actions or abstain from wrong actions. The other three, too, are not subject to injunctions due to the greatness of the knowledge of Brahman. But they have mental modes; they live in the relative world, with bodies and mental modes. As they have to teach the world by setting an example of right conduct, such conduct is natural to them. It is not an injunction, an 'ought' which brings sin for not obeying. So a man of wisdom, when he is in the midst of persons subject to actions, performs actions like them to set an example of right conduct.

But when he is in the midst of enquirers after the knowledge of Brahman (that is, those who seek wisdom alone and not any worldly purpose), he discards action and teaches that Brahman alone is eternally true, all else is false.

But in this context the question that was being discussed is not this. It is that agency rests with the three organs and not in the Atman.

Are the three organs working by themselves or under the inducement of something different from them?

They become active not by themselves but when they are under the influence of passions like love and hate. When love and hatred are present, the three organs act. When the former are absent, the latter do not work. This inference through Anvaya and Vyatireka (contrast by presence and absence) of our experience makes it clear that love and hatred alone are the inducements that make the three organs act.

When we say, for example, that 'I get a temple built or get a tank dug,' etc. we have the feeling that the Atman is doing or getting these things done. Can we not therefore say on the evidence of this experience that the Atman is the inducer or propeller?

This is not correct. The Atman is changeless and has no feelings. Such an entity cannot be the inducer of any action.

Then how do we feel that the Atman is inducing?

Just as the reflection of the redness of a hibiscus flower is projected on a crystal placed near it

and the crystal looks red. In this sense impulsion of love and hatred is something projected or superimposed on the Atman due to ignorance. If love and hatred were in the very nature of the Atman, no one would try to get rid of them. The nature (Svabhava) and the form (Svarupa) of a thing are identical. If the nature of a thing is somehow destroyed, it amounts to the destruction of the thing itself. If you accept 'agency' for Atman, then the Vedic passages that deny attachment, action or inducement to action in the case of the Atman will become meaningless. Such a Vedic passage (*Mandukya Upanishad*, 7) runs as follows:

*adr̥ṣtam avyavahāryam agrāhyam,
alakṣaṇam acintyam ekatma-pratyaya-sāram:
prapañcōpaśamam śāntam śivam advaitam caturtham
manyante sa ātmā sa vijñeyah.*

—The Atman is unseeable, unspeakable, unthinkable without any signs for recognition, understandable only through non-dual self-intuition, without any trace of multiplicity, absolutely peaceful due to absence of attachments and aversions, pure, and one without a second. Know this Pure Consciousness as the Atman, the fourth state.

Besides, the state of being an inducer is something originated. The Mukti deriving from any kind of induction (Karayitrtva) will also be something originated. Not only that, for the state of deep sleep also we shall have to see an inducer. We do not find any such thing. It comes naturally. So the state of being an inducer is not natural to the Atman. It is only something external that comes to be associated with the Atman from an

external source like the redness of a crystal placed in front of a hibiscus flower, as shown before.

It is not correct to say that, because in deep sleep there is no inducing, the Atman too cannot be an inducer. As an illustration of this argument, we can show that when disciples are not near a teacher, his teacherhood is not evident. His teacherhood is then in an unperceivable manner. In the same way, because of the absence of connection with the three organs, the existing inducership is not perceived. In the waking and dream states the existing connection with the three organs is perceived clearly. Is this not a plausible explanation? The principle involved in this explanation is that non-perception of a thing is not itself a conclusive proof of the non-existence of that thing.

This inference is not correct. This can be understood from the following fact. In the waking state one may be sitting lazily without doing anything. There is connection with the three organs of body, mind and speech. Still there is no agency in them, as made evident by quietness. So we have to say that inducership is not something natural but a derivative from some external factor.

We find that factor in superimposition also. When a long piece of iron is heated, it becomes red-hot. Redness and heat are not natural to iron. They are superimposed on the iron. Similarly the fire on the iron gets the length and other dimensions of the iron. These are not natural to fire but are superimposed on it. In the same way it is due to ignorance that the inducership, natural to attachment and aversion, is seen superimposed on

the Atman, and the non-inducership of the Atman is seen superimposed on attachment and aversion.

How can agency be possible for inert entities like attachment and aversion? An inert thing like a pot does not act as an agent prompting another pot, which too is an inert entity.

There is some truth in what you say. But in special contexts inert entities also can become prompters. When that special context is absent, the inert entity cannot become a prompter. An inert entity like heat in a context arising by the combination of it with sulphur, carbon etc., propels shells from cannons and causes the destruction of traditional armies with their four divisions (of infantry, cavalry, elephant regiment and array of chariots with archers). Take another instance. A dead body is inert. But it prompts the relatives of the man to perform the obsequies. In the same way though attachment and aversion are inert, they can none the less be prompters of action.

Then what is meant by the doctrine that the Atman is the lord of the senses and the indweller of everything?

It means that just like the sun, the Atman, by its mere presence makes every activity possible. The presence of the Atman makes it possible for all living beings to act.

Then the Atman will derive the fruits of the meritorious and sinful actions of all beings, as it is the Atman that makes it possible for them to do those actions.

No, the Atman will not be deriving the fruits of those actions, It is true that it is the sun,

who by his mere presence, makes it possible for all beings to do virtuous and sinful acts. Still their actions do not affect the sun. This is the case with the Atman too.

Then am I to understand that the Atman will not be responsible at all for the meritorious and sinful actions of living beings and thus be subject to their fruits?

This does not happen just as the virtuous and sinful deeds of beings and their fruits do not affect the sun whose presence makes them possible. Another illustration can be found in a magnet. In its presence pieces of iron move, but the magnet is not affected by these movements. In the same way the Atman's non-contactuality and unchangeableness are not affected in the least.

The conviction regarding this well-known nature of the Atman does not arise in our minds in spite of the instructions of the Guru, because of three obstacles. These are — Samsaya-bhavana, Asambhavana and Viparita-bhavana. Samsaya-bhavana consists in the doubt that just as there are different versions of rites like Upanayana and others prescribed in different branches of Rigveda, in the same way there may be different philosophies about the nature of the Atman in the doctrines taught in different branches of Rigveda. This doubt can be destroyed by the hearing of all the teachings of Vedanta.

Asambhavana consists in the persistence of the doubts that even though the ultimate authority (Pramana) regarding Vedanta avers that non-dual Brahman is the final conclusion of all Vedanta,

still, when we actually perceive the yawning differences between the Jivas, the Jagat and Isvara, how can this non-dualism (Advaita) be true? This is overcome by cogitation consisting in comparing the experiences of the three states, waking, dream and deep sleep.

Viparita-bhavana is the persistence, due to the oppressive influence of beginningless ignorance (Anadyavidya), of the conviction that this perceived world is real, in spite of all the teaching heard and cogitated upon. That can be destroyed by the concentrated meditation (Nididhyasana) taking the form of a continuous and unbroken flow of thought on Brahman as the only reality.

Unless these three obstacles are overcome, the flame of knowledge, being hindered by these obstacles, will not be able to burn away ignorance and its products. As an example of this may be cited how fire, naturally capable of burning everything to ashes, will not be able to destroy even a blade of dry grass, if it is obstructed by the power of magical gem, or incantations, or certain potent drugs (Mani-Mantra-Aushadha). When the above-mentioned obstacles to the dawn of knowledge are eliminated, then, just as fire, freed from the influence of Mani, Mantra and Aushadha destroys a heap of grass immediately, knowledge destroys ignorance and all its products.

To determine the central purport of the revealed scripture, there are six criteria (Lingas): 1. Introduction and conclusion (Upakrama and Upasamhara); 2. repetition (Abhyasa); 3. rarity

(Apurvata); 4. result (Phala); 5 demonstration (Upapatti) and 6. indirect assertion through exaggeration (Arthavada). The above-mentioned criteria are now explained one after another.

1. Upakrama & Upasamhara or introduction and conclusion: The *Chandogya Upanishad* 6.2.1 begins with the introduction *Sad eva somy' edam agra āsīt ekam eva advitīyam*, O dear one, in the beginning this multiplicity, being one without a second, was only Sat — Being or is-ness, and concludes in 6.8.7 with *aitad ātmyam idam sarvam, tat satyam*, all that is seen is only Atman; this is the truth. Thus, in the same way as it introduces, it concludes also with that 'all this is essentially non-dual.' This identity in Upakrama and Upasamhara is one criterion.

2. Abhyasa or repetition: *Chandogya Upanishad*, 6.8.7 repeats *Tat tvam asi*, Thou art That nine times. This is Abhyasa.

3. Apurvata or rarity: It is the acceptance that the perfection of Brahman cannot be fully understood by the usual standards for deriving knowledge like sense perception, inference, etc.

4. Phala or result: *Chandogya Upanishad* 6.14.2 says, *tasya tāvad eva ciram yāvan na vimokṣe atha sampatsye*, so long as Prarabdha-karma remains, there is no liberation. When that is exhausted, there is immediate liberation. The sentences that reveal that non-dual experience gives liberation when Prarabdha is exhausted, form the fourth criterion.

5. Upapatti or proof through example: *Chandogya Upanishad* 6.1.4 states, *Yatha somya ekena mr̥tpiṇḍena sarvam mr̥ṇmayam vijñātam syāt*, O dear one! Just as by one lump of clay one can understand all the modifications of clay. Finding examples like this is Upapatti.

6. Arthavada or indirect assertion through exaggeration: This has seven divisions: a) Srshti (creation); b) Sthiti (sustentation); c) Pralaya (dissolution); d) Pravesa (entry); e) Samyamana (control); g) Tat-tvam padartha parisodhana (enquiry into the implications of 'That' and 'Thou'); phala-pradipadakam (discussion about the result). These will now be explained.

Taittiriya Upanishad, 2.1 says, *Tasmād vā etasmād atmana ākāśaḥ sambhūtaḥ.*, out of this Atman was generated Akasa. Srutis of this kind illustrate Arthavada relating to Srshti etc. Akasa and other entities are not only generated but also sustained by Brahman and dissolve in Brahman. This is analogous to the fact that pot, etc. generated from mud are sustained in mud and finally dissolve into mud. Thus just as the pot, etc. are not in any way different from mud, so also all that is generated from Brahman is Brahman Itself. Such explanatory passages elaborate only the non-duality of Brahman stated very briefly in Mahavakyas like *Tat tvam asi*.

Next take passages like the following: *Sa etam eva sīmānam vidārya etayā dvārā prāpadyata*, breaking this barrier, It entered through that breach (*Aitareya Upanishad*, 1.3.12); *Tat sṛṣṭvā tad eva anuprāviśat*,

after creating it, It entered into it; (*Taittiriya Upanishad*, 2.6); *Anena jīvenātmanā anupraviśya nāma-rupe vyākaraṇāni*, entering into the shape of Jivatman, it became various entities with name and form (*Chandogya Upanishad*, 6.3.2). Such Vedic passages show that it is Brahman alone that has assumed the form of Jiva.

Take the example of a man A, who is standing outside his house. When he enters into the house, he is the same A who has till then been standing outside the house. Mahavakyas show in a similar way, the identity of the Jiva with Brahman. Take the Sruti passage: *Yah pṛthivyām tiṣṭhan pṛthivyā antaro yam pṛthivī na veda, yasya pṛthivī śarīram yaḥ pṛthivīm antaro yamayatyēṣa sa ātmā antaryāḥmyamṛtaḥ*, the Atman is stationed in the earth (body) and dwells within it, but the earth cannot know Him. This being who has the earth as body and who controls the earth is the Atman who is immortal and who dwells in you (*Bṛhadaranyaka Upanishad*, 3.7.3). This kind of Sruti also, though apparently showing the relation of controllership and the controlled, thus asserting their complete difference, is really a denial of such a relation and difference and therefore shows only the non-dual identity of the Jiva and Brahman. In the same way: *Sa vā eṣa puruṣo anna rasamayāḥ*, He alone is the Puruṣa made of the essence of food (*Taittiriya Upanishad*, 1.1); *Yad agne rohitam rūpam*, what is red like the form of fire (*Chandogya Upanishad*, 6.4.1) — such Sruti passages that examine the real meaning of the words of the Mahavakya ‘Tat’ and ‘Tvam’, also show the non-dual unity

of Isvara and Jiva through the denial of the apparent contradictory features of Isvara and Jiva. Other Sruti passages like *Brahmavid āpnoti param*, the knower of Brahman attains the supreme state (*Taittiriya Upanishad*, 2.1) and *Amrtah samabhavat*, he became immortal — also show non-duality, revealing the unparalleled fruit got through the knowledge of non-duality.

Thus by the exposition of the six criteria mentioned at the beginning of this section, inclusive of the seven kinds of Arthavadas, the undisputable non-duality of the Supreme Being is established. This same conclusion is applicable to all other sentences of the upanishads. So this is a directive applicable in interpreting all the Mahavakyas, which are short (ie. not explanatory) sentences conveying the non-duality of the Supreme Being.

Pray! What is the real topic of discussion in this context?

Hear. First understand, through thinking and discriminating deeply in this way, that the three organs, namely, body, speech and mind, do the three kinds of action impelled by love and hate. When an army has a victory in war, the king, superimposing on himself the victory, says, 'I have won the battle,' in accordance with the report of his Commander. In the same way the Jiva superimposes on himself the prompting of attachment and aversion, and feels 'I love, I am angry,' etc. In reality the Atman has neither agency nor the promotership of the sense of agency in anyone. He in whom this consciousness is firmly established is a Jivan-mukta.

6

In the fourth chapter seven items beginning with misery were mentioned. It was also stated that in the case of the first four — namely, misery, body, action, attachment-cum-aversion — misery results from the body, the body from Karma, and Karma from attachment and aversion. Here in the sixth chapter will be described first the different aspects of attachment-cum-aversion and, next, egoism, indiscrimination, and ignorance. The mental modes, numbering sixteen, are as follows: Raga, Dvesha, Kama, Krodha, Lobha, Moha, Mada, Matsarya, Irsya, Dambha, Asuya, Darpa, Ahamkara, Iccha, Bhakti and Sraddha. These are described below:

Raga means sexuality. Dvesha is revengefulness. Kama is the desire to acquire wealth, house, land,

etc. **Krodha** is the aversion and displeasure one feels against those who stand in the way of our getting the above. **Lobha** is the unwillingness to give away one's acquired wealth even to good persons. **Moha** is the attitude of indifference about what one should do and one should not do, out of overpowering pride arising from one's great wealth. **Mada** is the feeling that one is very rich and for that reason there is nothing that one cannot do or acquire. **Matsarya** is the antagonistic attitude on seeing any one as rich as oneself. **Irsya** is the ill-feeling on seeing another not being subjected to the same sufferings as oneself. **Asuya** is the feeling arising in the mind on seeing that another has got the same enjoyment and happiness that oneself has got. **Dambha** is the feeling that by one's acts one should become famous. **Darpa** is the feeling that there is none equal to oneself. **Ahamkara** is inordinate desire for having everything for oneself. **Ichha** is the desire to avoid forbidden foods and all evil. **Bhakti** is the extreme respect towards one's teacher, holy men and deities. **Sraddha** is faith in Yagas and other sacred rites, in the scriptures and in the instructions given by one's teacher. These are the sixteen mental modes beginning with **Raga**.

The subject of discussion is the Atman. What is the use and relevancy of thinking about the modes of mind in such a context?

The use and relevancy is that all beings are in bondage or liberation on account of these modes of mind and not by anything else.

How is it so? Please explain.

The mind is naturally pure. Bondage overtakes it when it is affected by impurities. When it becomes pure, it gains release. The first fourteen modes described above are impure. The last two, Bhakti and Sraddha, are pure. The first thirteen modes occur in men again and again without any effort and they prompt men to do sinful acts. Those who allow themselves to be subjected by them get degraded and never get uplifted. On the other hand, those who ward off these thirteen impure modes and cultivate the two pure modes of Bhakti and Sraddha and perform actions prompted and coloured by them, will gradually evolve and get liberation in stages. So a man who has his own good in view should make every effort in his command to be free from these impure modes of mind and to cultivate the two pure modes of Bhakti and Sraddha and thereby gain purity of mind. As regards the fourteenth Vrtti, Iccha, it is impossible to eliminate the bodily instinctive actions like appeasing hunger and thirst, urination, evacuation, etc. as long as the body lasts. No merit or demerit is gained by these acts, but, on the other hand, misery will result if they are not attended to.

In the waking and dream states, the modes of mind like attachment and aversion are present and therefore there are actions prompted by them. But in the states of deep sleep, Samadhi, swoon and silence, the modes like attachment and aversion are not present and so there is no action in these states. Thus by comparison and contrast we

can come to the conclusion that the modes of mind like attachment and aversion are the cause of all activities.

Then how do we come to have these mental modes like attachment and aversion?

They befall us because of Abhimana. If you ask: has this Abhimana got so universal a coverage, the answer is 'yes, it has'. So long as a woman thinks 'I am a woman', she will do with attachment all works like attending on her husband, taking care of the house and children, cooking, etc. So long as a man thinks 'I am a man,' he will look upon a woman as wife and engage himself in agriculture, trade etc., to earn a livelihood for himself and his family. All men, according to their identification with their Varna and Ashrama, perform actions prompted by attachment and aversion. So Abhimana is the cause of Raga and Dvesha and other mental modes.

What do we gain by this way of thinking?

A person who aspires for liberation should give up his identification with caste, class, livelihood, age, status etc. If he abandons identifications with the above, there will be nothing to bind him in life. So long as he has identification with them, he will be subject to the sixteen mental modes described before. Where there is Abhimana, Raga etc. will be present. Where the former is not present, the latter also will be absent. You come to this conclusion through comparison and contrast (Anvaya-Vyatireka).

How do you know this?

In the waking and dream states a person has identification with his class and state in life, and so the sixteen modes of the mind are present there and actions ensue. In deep sleep and complete relaxation such identification is not there, and as a consequence there are none of the sixteen mental modes in those states. Due to their absence, there is no action in deep sleep.

In that case how do we come to have this feeling of identification or sense of 'I' with regard to the mental modes mentioned above?

It is because of the lack of discriminative power. Though the Jiva is by nature quite different from the body, because of lack of discrimination the Jiva thinks, 'I am a Brahmana' 'I am a Kshatriya', 'I am a Vaisya', 'I am a Sudra', 'I am a Brahmacharin, 'I am a house-holder', 'I am a Sannyasin', 'I am a man', 'I am a woman' and so on and so forth. Except the sense of identification with them, there is no other cause for these feelings. This sense of identification arises from lack of discrimination. If you say that it is only due to the possession of a body and not due to want of discrimination, then a woman can feel she is a man, a Brahmacharin can feel he is a householder, etc. Such feelings and behaviour are not seen. So identification through the sense of 'I' is not merely on account of the body. It is due to lack of discrimination.

Can it not be said that one feels 'I am a Brahmana' because he wears a sacred thread and a ceremonial tuft,

and a Sannyasin feels 'I am a Sannyasin' because he wears an ochre cloth and has a waterpot?

Sacred thread is worn by Vaisyas and some artisans. Some ascetics belonging to the Sudra caste are also found with ochre cloth and the ceremonial waterpot. If your presumption is right, then the latter (i.e., the Vaisyas and Sudras described) should also have the feeling that they are Brahmanas or Sannyasins. If you say that the difference in their 'I-sense' is due to difference in the formation of the body as is the case with man and woman, we say that all the above-mentioned persons have no such difference in the formation of their bodies. Next, you may say that the difference between them is based on their heredity from parents of great character that also will not be correct, because there must then be difference of Brahmana, Sudra etc. in respect of their hair, teeth, nails, excretion, etc. These should also then reflect their caste and class differences. This is not the case. So even the creator Brahma cannot find any other reason than lack of discrimination as the cause for the sense of 'I' of which we have been speaking.

If we think deeply and systematically about this question, we can find a solution in the following fact; In this world combinations of various individuals into single units are treated together and these combinations are known by single terms as in the case of army, marriage party, festival party, assembly, etc. In the same way, in this world of Maya, which cannot be categorised as real or unreal, we find combinations of organs to form bodies. We give these bodies varying names such

as Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaisya, Sudra, man, woman, eunuch, Keralite, Andhra, TAMILIAN, Dikshita, Saiva, Vaishnava, servant, master, king, minister, Guru, Sishya, etc. Though this device may serve worldly purposes, it cannot be applied to the Atman who is without any name and form in the past, present or future. The incapacity to analyse and think in this way is what is called lack of discrimination. It is because of this lack of discrimination that people attribute to the Atman, the 'I-sense' regarding Varna, Ashrama etc.

Why does this indiscrimination overpower us?

Ignorance has, from time without beginning, hidden the Atman, whose nature is pure Consciousness. Only the realization of the Atman can remove this covering caused by ignorance. Indiscrimination is caused by this covering power of ignorance. It is this ignorance that makes one say, "I do not know 'myself'". You may object: Who, except a deluded person, would say this, that he does not know 'himself'? But the truth is that everybody in this world is deluded in this way. It is by this false delusion that people of the world speak of themselves as, 'I am a Brahmana', 'I am a Kshatriya', 'I am a Vaisya', 'I am a Sudra' 'I am a Brahmacharin', 'I am a householder', etc. having in their mind only their body-mind complex. None of these know that the Atman is distinct from the body. It is for this reason that we say that everyone in this world is under delusion.

But is it not a fact that there are learned scholars who consider the Atman to be distinct from their bodies and

the body itself an unconscious entity like a wall or a pot? Then how do you say that no one knows the Atman?

Even such learned men do not know the metaphysically real Atman. What they denote as the Atman is the Jivatman who is only a reflection of the metaphysically real Atman and who is relevant only in the practical world. It is only this Jivatman that considers himself finite and as the doer and enjoyer of actions and for this reason transmigrates in this cycle of births and deaths. But the metaphysically true Atman is without any limitation of Upadhis, and is not an actor or an enjoyer, is changeless and is of the nature of pure Sat, Chit and Ananda. None of the scholars you have in mind know this metaphysically real Atman.

How does this ignorance come about? And what causes it?

This ignorance is without a beginning. It is clearly mentioned in the Vedas and other scriptures. You cannot know the cause of it. That is, you have to accept its existence on the authority of the scriptures.

That which is without a beginning must be without an end. So if ignorance is without a beginning, it will surely have no end i.e., it will persist endlessly. Then alas! the Jiva can never get release from ignorance!

It is not so. Though ignorance has no beginning, it has an end. There are examples of entities that have no beginning but have an end and there are others with a beginning but no end.

How can this be so? It seems illogical.

No. There are examples to prove this. Antecedent non-existence (Prag-abhava) of an entity, though beginningless, can end when that entity comes into existence. For example, a pot did not exist from beginningless time but its non-existence ends when the pot comes into existence. When it is destroyed as an entity it is destroyed for ever and is never seen. This is called eternal non-existence after destruction (Pradhvamsābhāva) as distinguished from antecedent non-existence. Of these entities, the first can have no beginning but has an end, while the latter has a beginning, but ends in eternal non-existence. Besides, there are many diseases whose real cause is not known, but are cured by proper treatment. In the same way even if we do not know the root cause of ignorance, experience proves that it can be effaced by the illumination that is gained through the teachings of Vedanta.

What is the inherent nature (Svarupa-lakshana) of this ignorance?

This cannot be determined exactly. For it is not real nor unreal, nor a combination of reality and unreality. It is not with parts, nor without parts, nor a combination of part and partlessness. It is not different, nor non-different, nor a combination of difference and non-difference. It is indeterminate (Anirvachaniya), something that cannot be defined in any way.

How and why is it so?

It is not real because it is destroyed by the knowledge of Truth. It is at the same time not

untrue like objects denoted by expressions like a hare's horn, a man's horn, sky-flower etc. Still all men feel that they are not ignorant. As these two apprehensions, non-knowledge and knowledge, are contradictory, you cannot call it a combination of both these.

The gross sky is subtle (invisible); subtler still is the sky not fivefolded (Apanchikṛta-akāśa); yet subtler are the three Guṇas of Prakṛti; still more subtle is ignorance. As it is the cause of the most subtle entity (i.e. the three Guṇas), ignorance cannot be conceived as having parts. But you cannot say it is partless, as it evolves into this gross universe with innumerable forms of objects. As partlessness, subtlety and gross objectivity are contradictory, one cannot say ignorance is a combination of imperceivable subtlety and gross objectivity.

If you say that ignorance is different from the Atman, such a statement would contradict the Sruti; which sets forth non-duality. As there can be no existence-consciousness apart from the Atman, who covers all existence, ignorance cannot be different from the Atman. But if it is stated that ignorance is not different but one with the Atman, it will contradict Srutis like, *parā asya śaktir vivīdhaiva śrūyate*, Its supreme power is varied. If ignorance is considered as not different from Brahman, i.e. is one with Brahman, then inertness becomes the characteristics of Brahman, and sentiency of Maya. You will have to say that terms like Avidya denote the Atman and Atman which is generally accepted as Existence-Knowledge-Bliss, will become the seat

of untruth, inertness and misery. So ignorance cannot be non-different, i.e., it will have to be accepted as identical with Atman. As it would be a contradiction to say that ignorance is both identical and different from the Atman, such a concept also cannot be adopted. For all these reasons ignorance cannot be described in any way. It is Anirvachaniya — indescribable by any word or concept.

From this beginningless ignorance have come, successively, indiscrimination, 'I-sense' and passion; from these, action; from action, the body; and from the body, misery. So the misery of the cycle of births and deaths attributed to the Atman springs from the above-described chain of causes and effects.

When will this misery be effaced?

When the body ceases to be, misery will be effaced; when Karmas are exhausted, the body will be effaced; Karma ceases to exist, when passion, anger and the like are overcome; when the 'I-sense' is annihilated, there will be no more passion and anger; when indiscrimination ceases, the 'I-sense' also will cease; when ignorance is overcome, indiscrimination also will disappear. The only way to efface ignorance is the firm establishment in the conviction regarding the non-dual Brahman, which means the conviction, *aham brahmāsmi*, I am Brahman or *Tat Tvam Asi* Brahman is myself. Through the hearing and cogitation of these Mahavakyas of the Upanishads knowledge dawns and ignorance disappears, just as darkness disappears spontaneously with the dawning of the sun. There is no other way to overcome ignorance.

The grave sins arising from the murder of holy men, etc., are effaced by the performance of the proper expiatory rites (Prayaschittas). Similarly is it not possible to overcome this ignorance, which is petty and false by the power of very potent expiatory rites?

No, this is not possible. Because there is no opposition between Karma and ignorance. Karma only enhances ignorance, just as the intense darkness of the last day of the dark fortnight is only made more intense by dark clouds. Only the dawning of the sun can remove it. Just like that, it is only the dawn of the sun of knowledge that can eliminate the darkness of ignorance. No Karmas like expiatory or other rites can do this.

You have said that the three-fold organs are the source of all actions. Knowledge is also caused by movements of the mind, which too is action. How can it destroy ignorance? For, these movements of the mind are action only and can only enhance ignorance, if your argument is correct.

In a way, yours is a legitimate objection. A movement of the mind is an action. But it is only an intervening means (Upadhi) for Jnana to destroy Ajnana just as the eye is for grasping forms. The forms are really grasped by the mind and not by the eyes. The eye is only an intermediary factor. We can understand this from the fact that even if the eye is receiving impressions, no perception takes place if the mind is not attached to the instrument (here, the eyes) but engaged elsewhere in some fanciful thoughts. In the same way, Jnana alone can efface ignorance and not any Vritti by

itself. For Vrtti here is only an instrument like the eye as in the illustration mentioned above.

Jnana is of two kinds — immediate and intuitive knowledge (Svarupa-jnana) and knowledge got through mental movements (Vrtti-jnana).

What sheds light on the ignorance of the state of deep sleep, which we feel on waking as 'I knew nothing', is Svarupa-jnana for, there is nothing else in that state except the light of the of the Atman. But the knowledge that reveals objects in the states of waking and dream is Vrtti-jnana.

As an example to illustrate these two kinds of knowledge, take the sunlight that reveals a wall. That light is the true light of the sun. Here the sunlight is comparable to Svarupa-jnana. Suppose on the wall there is also a mirror. The mirror reflects the light that falls on that part of the wall and gives out apparently different rays. But they are not really different from the sun's rays falling on the wall. For, without these sunrays, there cannot be any ray from the reflecting mirror. In the same way, it is the Vrtti-jnana that is seen in the waking and dream states, while the knowledge that reveals ignorance in deep sleep is Svarupa-jnana.

Is there no Svarupa-jnana at all in waking and dream states, and if so, why?

The Svarupa-jnana is present in all states. But there are no mental movements in deep sleep, as all Vrttis are movements of the mind. Jnana, however is the very nature of the Atman without

the presence of any Vritti to reveal it. So we distinguish it by the term Svarupa-jnana without of any mental mode as a mediating factor. When that knowledge-nature of the Atman enters into the mental modes and becomes one with them; they become capable of producing knowledge, just as the mirror on the wall becomes capable of emitting light when the sun's light enters into it. So we say that mental modes cannot by themselves destroy ignorance. Ignorance of the Atman is destroyed only by the light of the Atman that has entered into the mental mode that has taken the shape of the Atman. It is not a result of any mode of the intellect or the mind by itself.

Even thousands of actions which are produced by the three organs cannot destroy the ignorance about the Atman. Just as a good deed effaces sin, the Vritti-jnana removes sin. A ruby is only a stone, but because it shines it is called a jewel-lamp. Similarly though Vritti-jnana is only a mental mode because of the Svarupa-jnana that pervades it, the term 'Jnana' is applied to it. It cannot be called action.

You say that in deep sleep Svarupa-jnana reveals ignorance. So in this case there is no contradiction between ignorance and knowledge according to you. If so, how can knowledge destroy ignorance, which is possible only if there is a contradiction in their coexistence?

The Svarupa-jnana, i.e., the knowledge-nature of the Atman in itself has no opposition to ignorance. But the knowledge reflected in a Vritti is opposed to ignorance.

The Jnana that has entered into a Vrtti of the mind and become one with it, is identical with Svarupa-jnana; the former Jnana is not different from the latter. How then can there be opposition between them, as you say?

I shall make it clear by an example. The light of the sun fosters the growth of grass. But the same sunlight, when it passes through a powerful lens, can burn it. So sunlight, though not opposed to grass, becomes opposed when it passed through the medium of a lens. Though the light is the same, there arises opposition between them in these different conditions. Similarly, though the Svarupa-jnana in itself has no opposition to ignorance, there arises opposition between them when the Svarupa-jnana enters into Vrttis and becomes one with them.

Then there arises this difficulty. You say that by Vrtti-jnana ignorance and its products are destroyed. Vrtti and the knowledge that has entered into it and produced Vrtti-jnana must exist as two different entities. Will this not contradict non-duality itself. For, by accepting that the Vrtti-jnana continues to exist, you admit that a second factor continues to exist. This will be detrimental to non-duality.

Vrtti-jnana, after completing its work of destroying ignorance and its results, disappears and ceases to exist. An example will clarify this. To clarify water you put alum in it. When the water has become clear the alum also dissolves and disappears. Only pure water remains. In the same way, the Vrttis destroy themselves after doing their work, and the knowledge element in them reemerges in the Svarupa-jnana. Then there is only non-duality. In this way knowledge destroys ignorance.

This supreme illuminating knowledge is attained only through inner cogitation. Neither Karma, nor Yoga, nor Bhakti can do this. For Jnana is Vastu-tantra, i.e. self-existing and not brought into being by any outside factors. So it cannot be produced, destroyed or changed by any one. Yoga, Upasana, etc., on the other hand, are accomplished through human effort (Purusha-prayatna). So you can do them or not do them or do them in other ways. At the most you can gain the concentration of mind or psychic powers through them. You cannot get knowledge through them. Both Yoga and Upasana are activities of the mind accomplished through human effort. So what is obtained through them are technically known as Purusha-tantra and not Vastu-tantra. So we say that no action can produce something that is self-existent, only self-intuition transcending thought is the means for it.

The genuineness of Saligrama (a kind of stone considered sacred) is known from the signs imprinted on it; of gems by appropriate tests; and of gold by friction on a touchstone. It is certain that you cannot know the genuineness of any of these by ceremonial baths, Sandhyavandana or Pranayama. In the same way Atma-jnana can be had only through the discriminative cogitation on the difference between Atman and non-Atman and never by worship and the like. So one who is after liberation should abandon all work and be engaged in discriminative cogitation on the Atman and non-Atman through the hearing of the scriptures and deep reflection on the meaning of Vedantic

passages. All Vedantic texts give the assurance that one who follows this instruction will attain liberation from Samsara now itself and be a Jivan-mukta and a Videha-mukta. Dear one, understand all these instructions with unshakable faith, and try to be immersed in perfect spiritual consciousness (Jnana-svarupa). Never be devoted to work which is invariably accompanied by a sense of agency.

7

In this seventh chapter the topics that are to be discussed are — the discriminative reflection on the difference between the Atman and non-Atman, the resulting knowledge of the Atman and the consequent absorption in Brahman.

You say that Atma-jnana can be had by the discriminative reflection on the difference between the Atman and non-Atman. What is the Atman? What is Its nature?

The Atman is what is distinct from gross body, subtle body and causal body. It is the witness of the waking, dream, and deep sleep states. This means that the Atman never identifies itself with any of these states. It is distinct also from the five Kosas known as Annamaya, Pranamaya, Manomaya, Vijnanamaya, and Anandamaya. Its hallmarks are existence, knowledge and bliss.

What is non-Atman? What are its hallmarks?

All the three bodies mentioned above - the gross, the subtle and the causal - come within the category of non-Atman. Their nature consists in unreality, inertness, and misery,

These bodies have two aspects — individual (Vyashti) and cosmic (Samashti). Their indicating signs have already been taught in the first chapter. Here it will again be repeated. In the analogy of tree and forest, tree, when looked upon individually, is Vyashti, forest, which is a conglomeration of trees, is Samashti.

Similarly the three bodies described above, have their individual and cosmic aspects.

How am I to understand it? Please explain their nature.

To explain, let us first take samashti. These are:

1. Samashti-sthula-sarira, the collective gross body.
2. Samashti-suksma-sarira, the collective subtle body and
3. Samashti-karana-sarira, the collective causal body.

Next let us take the Vyashtis. These are:

1. Vyashti-sthula-sarira, the individual gross body;
2. Vyashti-sukshma-sarira, the individual subtle body and.
3. Vyashti-karana-sarira, the individual causal body.

In this way there are six kinds of bodies. When the Atman is associated with the Upadhi of a collective body, It is called Isvara, and when It gets an Upadhi of the individual body, It is called a Jiva. But, this division is not ultimately true. The Atman is always non-dual. When that non-dual Atman is associated with the adjunct of Maya, It gets the status of Isvara. When It is associated with the adjunct of Avidya, It is called Jiva. As long as one thinks that the associations of the Atman with Maya and Avidya are absolutely real, so long there is no release for one from bondage. All the Srutis, which are like mother to an aspirant, declare in one voice, Maya and Avidya are self-created; Isvara and Jiva are only reflections.

Why is it that Isvara has no identification with the cosmic causal body?

When the cosmic deep sleep takes place the 'I-sense' which causes identification, itself gets dissolved and then there is nothing to get identified with. Isvara with this kind of identification is known also as the Unmanifested and Indweller. It is this Isvara with the Upadhi or the collective causal body that great devotees adore with loving devotion. For those who cannot rise to this level of devotion, the Vedas prescribe the adoration of Isvara with the collective subtle body as Upadhi. Isvara in this state is called Hiranyagarbha (golden-egg), Sutratma (subtle pervader) and Maha-prana (immense Life-force).

Has Isvara as Hiranyagarbha got or not got identification with a subtle body?

No, for the following reason: The agent 'I-sense' for causing identification is no doubt present. But being in the dream state, Isvara as Hiranyagarbha does not enter into the gross body. For this reason Isvara as Hiranyagarbha has no identification with the subtle body also just as He has no identification with the gross body. For those who are unable to practise devotion to Isvara in this state (i.e. as Hiranyagarbha), the Vedas prescribe the adoration of Isvara identified with the adjunct of collective gross body, who is then known as Virat, Vairaja and Vaisvanara.

Has Isvara got or not got identification with the collective gross body?

Even here such identification is not possible. It is by the cumulative assembling of the gross bodies of all Jivas that the collective gross body is formed. There cannot be a second there, to be excluded from that collectivity to have 'I-sense'. The idea is that there must be present a 'you' as a second to feel 'I' in distinction.

For those aspirants who have not the capacity to adore Isvara in these three kinds of collective bodies, the Vedas have presented the same Isvara in the form of three deities — Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra associated with Rajasa, Sattvika and Tamasa natures respectively. They are doing the three functions of creation, sustentation and destruction of the universe. Isvara in the role of sustentation assumes embodiment also as various

Incarnations like Fish, Tortoise, etc. The adoration in these functional forms is also prescribed.

When Isvara assumes these forms, has He got identification with them?

Yes, He has got identification. Without such identification He cannot perform the functions of creation etc., through these divine forms.

If Isvara has also got identification with form, just like the Jiva, how does He differ from the Jiva?

There is a difference. Jivas have always identification with their bodies - the feeling of I and mine. This identification in his case is one of bondage over which he has no control. But the identification of Isvara with the three forms is caused by His mercy for the beings in bondage and these forms are only assumed by Him for the time being for accomplishing certain purposes. When an actor comes on the stage to play the role of a certain dramatic person, he identifies himself with that person. When the drama is over, he has no more identification with that form. This is the great distinction between the elective identification of Isvara with form, and the compulsive identification of the Jiva with the body.

For those who are incapable of worshipping Isvara even with forms referred to above, the scriptures have prescribed the worship of images made of stone or metals representing the deity. That is why some worship images as 'Isvara'. The one Isvara makes His presence as the In-dweller in divine forms and divine images, and gives the

fruits of worship to those who commune with Him through those forms. Ignorant people do not understand that Isvara is the pervader of all (i.e. His Sarvatmakatva), So they dispute and fight among themselves assuming that there are many divinities and that the form that one worships alone is the true divinity and that of others are false. On the other hand all these divinities are true, as the same Isvara resides in all these forms.

If Isvara is the same everywhere, why have the scriptures prescribed different ways of worship of these various divinities that are adored?

Most people are capable only of seeing the external. They are extroverts (Bahir-mukha). They have gradually to be turned into introverts (Antar-mukha). They have to be guided step by step to the ultimate goal - the knowledge that the Paramatman alone is the Jivatman and that this knowledge alone will help them to get liberation in the true sense. So the scriptures accept the sense of difference that is ingrained in all from time immemorial. Those who have this obsession of duality differ in their attitudes and ways of thinking and to suit their varying needs and capacities, the scriptures have prescribed different ways of worship. They are accepted as true only temporarily and not ultimately. Thus the Paramatman by assuming these three collective bodies as adjuncts, becomes Isvara in the different aspects described before.

Now we shall see how the same non-dual Paramatman gets the status of Jivas when He assumes the adjuncts of individual bodies. When He assumes

the individual causal body, the Paramatman is known as Prajna, Paramarthika (ultimately true) and Avidya-avacchinna (circumscribed by Avidya). When He assumes the individual subtle body as adjunct, the Paramatman is called Taijasa, Svapna-kalpita (one perceived as dream state), and Pratibhasika (falsely perceived). When He assumes the individual gross body as adjunct, the Paramatman is known as Visva, Vyavaharika (relatively true), and Chidabhasa (reflected consciousness).

What purpose or use is served for the Jiva by having these three bodies?

Yes, all these three serve certain purposes special to them. The Jiva is the reflected image of the Atman, in the mind. For, the Jiva, first of all requires the subtle body to be a reflector of the Atman in the mind. Then he must also have the gross body to perform actions. Both these bodies are the effects of their cause, the causal body. Both the gross body and the subtle body can come into being only if their common cause, the causal body, exists. So if the Jiva is to come into being, all these three kinds of individualized bodies are necessary.

Has the jiva got identification through 'I-sense' with these three bodies, i.e., the gross body, the subtle body and the causal body?

Surely it has this sense of identification. For, the Jiva performs actions and has the feeling that he is doing the actions. Unless the Jiva has identification with the body, he cannot feel he

is the agent and such actions are his. Without such identification, there cannot be a living body at all. Without a living body, there cannot be Jivahood at all.

In the way described above, the one non-dual Paramatman, by assuming individual and collective adjuncts gets the status of Jivas and Isvara respectively.

Is there any example to illustrate this point?

Yes. The same man becomes the father of many sons and the grandfather of many grandsons, all having different bodies. In the same way the one non-dual Atman in the Upadhi of Avidya is called Jiva, and in the Upadhi of Maya is called Isvara.

This example may be sufficient to explain how the two names, Isvara and Jiva, come into being. It is just a verbal difference and nothing more than that. But what is the clear and complete example explaining how the Jiva has only very limited knowledge and Isvara is all-knowing?

There are examples to illustrate this also. A huge collection of water in a lake, can meet the needs of a whole village of many people. It has the capacity to do this. But a small quantity of that water capable of filling a pot can meet the needs of one house only. Its capacity is very, very limited. Fire, when it lights a huge torch, is capable of illuminating a large area. But the fire from a small wick can only illumine the inside of a small house. Similarly when the same Atman,

when it has got the all-cause Maya as adjunct, is the all-knowing Isvara, and when it has the very insignificant effect-condition known as Avidya as adjunct, appears to be the little-knowing Jiva. Thus there are no two Atmans, one all-knowing and the other of limited knowledge. It is for this reason that Vedantic scripture, by giving three different ways of connection (Sambandha) for Tat and Tvam in the Mahavakya *Tat Tvam asi*, shows the non-duality of the Atman.

What are these three ways of connection or Sambandha?

These are:

- 1) Coordinate relation (Samanadhikaranya) between the terms in a sentence;
- 2) The relation of qualifier and qualified between the terms;
- 3) The relation of the terms of their meaning as directly denoting (Lakshya) the all-pervading Atman (Pratyagatman) or indirectly denoting (Lakshana) their meaning.

As an example of this, we may take the sentence, *sah ayam devadattah*, that is this Devadatta. In this sentence as shown below, there are all the three above-mentioned relations:

- 1) The terms: *sah* and *ayam*—; 'that' and 'this' denote a single person, i.e., Devadatta. As these two terms denote the same individual (Devadatta), they mean the same person and so they are in coordinate relation. In the same way in the sentence *Tat tvam asi* the term 'tat' and 'tvam' denote the same consciousness. So likewise they have the same relation of identical denotation.

2) The terms have also the Viseshana-viseshya or (qualifier and the qualified) relation. Here the term 'Sah' qualifies Devadatta as the one seen in a particular place and at a particular time, and 'ayam' (this) qualifies the same Devadatta seen in a different place and at a different time. As they deny any difference in the person through the qualifications regarding the place and time of seeing the same Devadatta, the terms have the relation of the qualifier and the qualified.

In the same way the word 'tat,' indicates the identity of the Chaitanya having entirely different qualifications like omniscience, omnipotence, etc., as God, and 'tvam' as the identical Chaitanya as Jiva with the qualifications of very limited knowledge, body consciousness, etc. Here the identity of the entity, the qualified, is shown through varying qualifications or attributes as in 'this' is 'that' Devadatta, referred to above.

3) Lakshya-lakshana-bhava-sambandha: In the sentence *sah ayam devadattah*, That is the same as this Devadatta, you may mistakenly take 'Sa' and 'Ayam' as indicating Devadatta in his complete personality. You realize the mistake of doing so, as these two terms 'that' and 'this' are about Devadatta in different situations, and therefore your understanding of the meanings of the terms are contradictory. So you eliminate the contradictory aspects of your first understanding of the two 'terms', and when this is done there is identity of reference in the essential parts of the 'terms' as indicating the real Devadatta. Similarly there

will be contradiction if you accept the meanings of Tat and Tvam as indicating exclusively the Existence-knowledge-bliss Absolute. For the Jiva also is included in it. So you leave aside the parts that cause the contradiction and take only Chaitanya that will not involve contradiction. Then you get what is called Lakshya-lakshna-bhava-sambandha (relation of identity between the direct and indirect meanings of the words). This kind of relation is also known as Bhagatvaga-lakshana and Jahad-ajahad-lakshana.

For understanding the meanings of sentences of scriptures three ways are adopted — Mukhya-vrtti or Vachyartha (primary or direct meaning), Guna-vrtti (attributive meaning) and Lakshana-vrtti (secondary or implied meaning).

‘The King is going’ is an example of the first (i.e., Mukhya-vrtti), as only the direct meaning of the words are taken.

‘The blue lotus’ is an example of the second (i.e. Guna-Vrtti), as one identifies the flower by its attribute of blueness.

Coming to Lakshana-vrtti, there are three types of it known as: a) Jahal-lakshana, b) Ajahal-lakshana, and c) Jahal-ajahal-lakshana.

a) ‘The shepherd’s hut is in the Ganga’ is an example of the first. For it would be absurd to take the direct meaning, because it implies only that the hut is somewhere on the bank of the Ganga and not in the water, though the sentence appears to mean so, when literally understood.

But there is no absurdity if you give up the primary meaning of Ganga and only take its secondary meaning, the bank of the Ganga. This is Jahal-lakshana.

b) 'Red is running'. This is absurd if literally understood. It can only imply that something with red colour, say a horse, is moving. We get this meaning in the light of the-purport of the sentence. This is an example of Ajahal-lakshana.

c) 'This is that Devadatta', 'This' refers to Devadatta seen at Madras in a sick condition, living in a poorly-lighted room. 'That' refers to the same Devadatta seen as a healthy person in a well-furnished room at Bombay. The primary meaning is preserved here. By rejecting incongruous elements, we arrive at the identity of the person referred to. The rejected portions are the differing conditions in which Devadatta was in the two situations. This is an example of Jahal-ajahal-lakshana. In all these we are justified in taking the implied meaning and rejecting the direct meaning of the words of the sentence.

What are the direct or literal and indirect or implied meanings of the words 'Tat' and 'Tvam' in the Mahavakya
tat tvam asi?

The direct and literal meaning (Vachyartha) of 'Tat' is the combination of Maya, Brahman who is the basis of Maya, and the reflection of Brahman in Maya. The indirect and implied meaning (Lakshyartha) of the word is only Brahman. Avidya, the witness-consciousness which forms the basis of Avidya and the reflection of the witness

consciousness in Avidya — the combination of them is the direct meaning of the word Tvam. The witness-consciousness, and the unchanging-consciousness (Kutastha-chaitanya, another term for Brahman indicating 'unchangeability') form the indirect or implied meaning of the word 'you'. If you accept the direct meanings of the words Tat and Tvam for Isvara and Jiva respectively, there will be contradiction. For, Isvara, the creator of the universe, can never be the insignificant Jiva indicated directly or literally by *tat tvam asi*. So you have to abandon the contradictory portion in the direct meaning, and take only what is left, these being Brahman-consciousness and the witness-consciousness. For both of these are one and the same, the difference mentioned being merely verbal.

Let us take an example. When the limiting adjuncts in son and grandson (as he is denoted by persons related in this way) are removed in referring to a person named Devadatta, then only the man Devadatta remains. He is the entity identical in both contexts. When the adjuncts of lake and pot are moved, only water with the characteristics of liquidity, sweetness, etc. remains as one entity. All the differences in the contents made by the two adjuncts of lake and water are gone. A torch light and a wick light get their difference due to the adjuncts in which they are seen. When these adjuncts are eliminated, only fire, common to both with the characteristics of light and heat, remains. In the same way when the adjuncts of

Maya and Avidya are eliminated, only the Supreme Consciousness, the Existence-knowledge-bliss Absolute, remains. That is, the consciousness of the Jiva is found to be identical with the Absolute Consciousness.

The really great man is the one liberated by constant rumination of this truth and realizes, 'Perfect and Supreme Consciousness is my real nature. I am Brahman. I am nothing short of the being of Brahman.' He is the one who has attained life's ultimate fulfilment. He is the true Brahmana. All the Vedas and other Sastras proclaim this with one voice.

8

What is going to be described in the next four chapters are the four distinguishing features of the Atman:

1) The Atman is different from the gross body from the subtle body and from the causal body.

2) The Atman is different from the five 'sheaths' (Kosas), these being Annamaya, Pranamaya, Manomaya, Vijnanamaya, Anandamaya. They are called 'sheaths', because the subtler ones seem to be enclosed in the grosser ones, just as a sword is encased in its sheath.

3) The Atman is the witness of the three states of waking, dreaming and deep-sleep.

4) The nature of the Atman is Sat, Chit, and Ananda.

Of these four distinguishing features of the Atman, the first two are features obtained through elimination (Vyavrtti-lakshana); the third is the contiguous feature (Tatastha-lakshana) and the fourth is the direct feature (Svarupa-lakshana).

The method of elimination is rejection of all objective substances (Dr̥sya) from Akasa down to the three bodies and all other objects, as 'not this, not this' and realizing what is left as the Atman. The border-line feature is realizing that the unchanging basis of the changing objects is the Atman. The direct feature is the realization that the Atman is of the nature of Sat, Chit, Ananda, eternal and complete without anything to be added to It (Purna).

In this eighth chapter we are going to show that the Atman is different from the three bodies. To understand this difference, we have to know in the first place what these three bodies are. So we are first describing these three bodies. They are the gross body, subtle body and causal body. The gross body with limbs like hands, legs, head, etc., is known to all without any special explanation. The subtle body has seventeen parts. The causal body is ignorance. These have come to be known 'Sarira' from the meaning of their root *śirṇa* — that which gets dissipated.

To explain: the gross body gets thin and decays if there is no food to maintain it. Even if there is plenty of food to eat, it can decay due to disease and old age. As for the subtle body, it is like a tender leaf. Under certain conditions,

it gets augmented and in some others, shrinks. Passions and anger and similar developments in the mind augment it. In their absence it shrinks. The causal body gets augmented when there is the confirmed feeling, 'I am a Jiva or individual consciousness, and it decays with the firm conviction 'I am Brahman'. The augmentation of the subtle and gross bodies is seen in all ignorant persons and their decay in enlightened ones. These three bodies are known as 'Sarira' because they are subject to augmentation and decay. They are also called 'Deha' the root meaning of *dahyate*, that which is burnt. These bodies are going to be burnt in fire.

In this world gross bodies can be burnt. This is evident to all of us. But the subtle and causal bodies are never burnt. How then have they got the name Deha?

Agni has got as its characteristic heat, called 'Tapa'. There are three kinds of Tapa which are hotter than the Agni known ordinarily by this name. These three Tapas or forms of heat are — Adhyatmika, Adhibhautika and Adhidaivika. Adhyatmika means that which is caused by spiritual sources. Adhibhautika means those that are caused by material causes which are very well-known. Adhidaivika means those caused by unknown factors. All bodies suffer from the intense heat of these factors. So there is nothing wrong in calling them Deha — that which is subject to heat. The gross body is called so because it is clearly tangible to us like a pillar. The subtle body is not so gross and tangible to us, because it is composed of subtle elements. Besides the designation of

Sukshma, it has also the name Linga-sarira. For, it carries on the latent impressions till its final dissolution on the attainment of liberation. The causal body is called so because it is the ultimate cause of the other two bodies.

Revered Sir, you said at first that the gross and subtle bodies originated from the five elements. Now you say that they originated from the causal body. How am I to understand these different statements?

In describing creation from the point of view of superimposition it was said that the bodies arise from the five elements. This is quite correct. But from the point of view of Yugapat-srshti, it is said that the cause of the Atman having bodies is ignorance. So, it is also said that ignorance is the cause of bodies. There are thus two points of view regarding creation — Krama-srshti and Yugapat-srshti.

What are the meanings of these two terms — Krama-srshti and Yugapat-srshti?

Krama-srshti means the gradual evolution of the multiplicity known as the universe in the succeeding order of Mula-prakrti, Maya, Avidya, Avarana, Vikshepa, Akasa, Vayu, Agni, Ap and Prthivi. Yugapat-srshti is the doctrine that the very idea of creation is the result of ignorance about the Atman (It means, in reality there is no creation at all).

There is no doubt concerning the gross body, as it is visible outside to the eye. But the subtle body cannot be seen in this way. How then are we to know of its existence?

We can infer the existence of the subtle body from the effects caused by the seventeen organs that constitute the subtle body.

Is it not possible to know the effects of these seventeen organs with the help of the gross body itself?

In deep sleep, in swoon and in death, the gross body is present but we do not see the activity of these seventeen organs. In the states of waking and dream we perceive the activity of these seventeen organs. From this we can infer that, there is a subtle body, as distinguished from the gross body, with these seventeen organs or functions.

We do not find this subtle body acting when the gross body does not exist. So is it not better to conclude that the functions like seeing, hearing, etc. are done by the combination of the gross and subtle bodies?

That is not correct. If you carefully analyse the situation, you will find that all these functions like seeing, hearing, etc. are based exclusively on the subtle body and not on the gross body. For example fire burns with firewood as its base and cooks food and gives heat and light. If there is no firewood there is no fire to do this work. Yet the functions of burning, heating, boiling, etc. are the direct effects of fire. They are not done by firewood. In the same way the effects of seeing, etc. are done exclusively by the subtle body, though

it is based on the gross body. Though based in it, these effects are not produced by the gross body. So it was said that we can infer from effects like seeing, hearing, etc., that there is a subtle body with seventeen organs. These organs are: 1) the five organs of knowledge (Jnanendriyas) 2) the five organs of action (Karmendriyas) 3) the five energising factors (Pranas) 4) mind (Manas) 5) intellect (Buddhi).

Coming to the details of their numbers and functions:

1. Jnanendriyas — They are a) Srotra (organ of hearing), b) Tvak (organ of external feeling identified with skin), c) Chakshus (organ of sight enabling us to see, colour, etc.) d) Jihva (organ of taste), e) Ghrana (organ of smell). The objects, of which the above-mentioned organs give us knowledge, are mentioned in brackets. Being the products of Sattvaguna, which gives knowledge and happiness, they have got the capacity to give knowledge.

2. Karmendriyas: These are — a) Vak (Power of speaking), b) Bahu (hand with the power of giving and taking) c) Pada (leg with the power of walking) d) Payu (power of excreting) e) Upastha (power of sexual enjoyment). They are called Karmendriyas, because they do the functions or actions mentioned in brackets. They are the products of the constantly moving and impure Rajoguna.

3. The five Pranas are: a) Prana, b) Apana, c) Samana, d) Udana, e) Vyana. They are called Pranas, because they support and strengthen the

body by breathing air in, breathing it out, and by other vital functions for sustaining the vitality of the body. Being the products of Rajoguna, they have the power to fulfil these functions.

4. Manas: It is the mind. Its function is to create doubts.

5. Buddhi: Its function is to clear the doubts created by the mind and settle the meaning of all things.

These are the seventeen organs of the subtle body.

In the world there are three ways to understand things. These are Uddesa, Lakshana and Pariksha. Mere naming of a thing is Uddesa. The grasping of the form or nature of a thing is Lakshana. Thinking again and again over the form and nature of a thing is Pariksha.

By mentioning the names of the seventeen organs, as we have done already, we have given the meaning of Uddesa. Now we shall speak about Lakshana and Pariksha. Lakshana is a description of a thing without the three following defects: Avyapti, Ativyapti and Asambhava. The meaning of these three terms can be understood from the three descriptions of a cow.

Avyapti: 'A cow is black.' It is an inadequate description of a cow, as there are cows of other colours. This description has the defect of Avyapti, i.e., inadequacy of the description, as it does not allow us to understand the object intended to

be pointed out. So this is not a correct Lakshana or description.

Ativyapti: 'A cow is four-legged.' This expression 'four-legged' can be applied to other animals and even to inanimate objects, like tables and chairs. This description is too extensive. It is therefore vitiated by the defect of Ativyapti and it is not correct Lakshana or description.

Asambhava: It is a description that is never found in the object intended. For example: 'A cow is a creature with one hoof.' You cannot see any cow with only one hoof anywhere. So it is a totally wrong description of a cow. It is vitiated by Asambhava and is not a correct Lakshana.

But when you say, 'The cow has dewlap' — your description is without any of these defects; for this is a universal feature of cows. It is an example of correct Lakshana or description.

Following the elucidation in the above paragraphs, we shall now study the distinguishing signs or the organs of knowledge one after another, along with their presiding deities.

1. **Srotrendriya** or power of hearing: The presiding deity is **Dik** (Quarters). Induced by this deity and stationed close to the sky adjoining it, the Srotrendriya enables one to hear the Vedas, scriptures and various languages. Testing is as follows: If the sky contiguous to the ear is by itself sufficient to hear, it is contradicted by the fact that in sleep, swoon, etc. we do not hear,

though all the conditions described above are present. So the Srotrendriya is different from its external setting.

2. Tvak or power of feeling touch identified with skin: Its presiding deity is Vayu. Induced by this deity and pervading all over the skin, it enables us to feel various sensations like heat, cold, soft, hard, rough, etc. But you cannot say that for this reason skin is the organ that enables us to feel all these sensations when you do testing. For, in sleep, swoon, etc. though the skin is present, we do not feel these sensations. So the skin is not the organ of sensation.

3. Chakshus or organ of vision by which we see forms, colours, etc: Its presiding deity is the sun. Induced by this deity, the eye enables us to see forms, various colours, dimensions, etc. But when you test this power, the eye is there even when you are sleeping or absent-minded, in which states you do not see even though the eye is present. So the eye in itself is not the organ of sight.

4. Jihva or organ of taste identified with tongue: Its presiding deity is Varuna. Induced by this deity, the tongue enables us to know tastes like sweet, bitter, sour, salty etc. But if you apply test, by placing such substances on the tongue during sleep, one does not feel their taste. So you cannot say that the tongue is the organ of taste.

5. Ghrana or the sense of smell identified with the nose: The presiding deity of it is Asvinidevas. Prompted by these deities, the sense of smell

enables us to know fragrance and bad smells. But if you apply test you will find that even if you place fragrant or bad smelling things near a sleeping man's nose, he does not feel them. So the nose is not the organ of smell.

Such are the distinguishing features of the organs of knowledge. Now we shall take up the features of the organs of action.

1. Vak or power of speech: The presiding deity of it is Agni. Prompted by this deity, this power enables us to speak with the help of teeth, lips, throat, etc. All these accessories are present even when one sleeps. But if we apply test, we find one cannot speak in sleep. So these are not the real organs of speech.

2. Bahu or hand: Indra is the presiding deity. Prompted by the deity, the hands are able to give, take, etc. But when you apply test, you find that even though the hands are present in a sleeping person, he cannot give or take with the hands. So you cannot say that the hand is the organ that does these works.

3. Pada or leg: Its presiding deity is Upendra. Prompted by this deity, the legs are able to walk, run, etc. But when you apply the test, you find that even though the legs are present, a sleeping man is not able to walk or run. So you cannot say that the leg is the real organ of walking, etc.

4. Payu or excretory organ like the anus: The presiding deity of this organ is Mrtyu or Lord

of death. Prompted by this deity, the anus excretes faeces. But if you apply the test, you will find that even though anus is present in sleep, it does not function. So anus is not the organ Payu.

5. Upastha or power of sexual enjoyment: The presiding deity of it is Prajapati. Prompted by this deity, the sexual organ functions. But even though the sexual organs of man and woman are present in sleep, they do not function then. So Upastha is not the real organ that goes by that name. Now we shall take up the subject of the five Pranas.

1. Prana: Its presiding deity is Visishta. Presiding in the heart and prompted by it, the vital power pushes the breath out.

2. Apana: Its presiding deity is Visvasrashta. Prompted by this deity and residing in the anus, it draws the breath in.

3. Vyana: The presiding deity of it is Visvayoni. Prompted by this deity and residing inside and outside the body, it gives strength to the body and its organs.

4. Udana: Its presiding deity is Aja, residing in the throat. Prompted by this deity, it performs the following functions: a) In deep sleep it dissolves the sense organs in their causal state; b) On waking it restores the powers of the organs to their respective centres and c) At the time of death, it carries the powers of all the organs to the realm beyond death.

5. Samana: Its presiding deity is Jaya. Its place of residence is about the navel. Prompted by this presiding deity, Samana digests all the types of food that enter into the stomach. It is the fire of digestion that maintains and increases the strength of the body.

There are also five subsidiary Pranas which are included in the five main Pranas described above. These five subsidiary Pranas are: Naga, Kurma, Krkara, Devadatta, and Dhananjaya. Of these, Naga functions as the power of vomiting, Kurma as the power of closing and opening the eyes and as the power to open and close the lips, Krkara as the power that causes hunger, Devadatta as the power of yawning, and Dhananjaya as the power that fattens the body.

We shall now consider Antahkarana or the inner organ: Antahkarana is composed of four aspects: Manas, Buddhi, Chitta and Ahankara.

Manas: Manas has got as its presiding deity moon. Its seat is the neck. Its work consists in creating doubts through Sankalpa (pros) and Vikalpa (cons or opposite).

Buddhi: Its presiding deity is Brahman. Its seat is the face. Its function is to produce firm determination.

Ahankara: Its presiding deity is Rudra, and seat, the heart. Its function consists in generating the sense of 'I' and 'mine' with regard to objects.

Chitta: Its presiding deity is Vishnu who is Kshetrajna (Field knower). Its seat is the navel. It generates faith.

In this way, according to many Vedic passages, the subtle body is made of sixteen categories. Antahkarana is treated as a single body according to this theory. Some other Srutis which hold that these categories forming the subtle body are seventeen in number, consider Antahkarana as consisting only of two aspects — Manas, and Buddhi, all others being included in these two. There are still other Srutis which hold that the subtle body consists of nineteen aspects. According to them Manas, Buddhi, Chitta, and Ahankara are all to be counted separately. The subtle body is identified in this way.

Is there any proof for all this?

Yes, there is. The Sruti says its proof is ignorance. From the results you can infer their cause. All feel 'I am ignorant'.

When you were questioned 'What is the Atman?' you said it is different from the three bodies and gave the signs or attributes of these three bodies, by which they could be recognised. In the same way can we not determine the Atman from its positive signs or attributes?

Brahmán infills everything, and in fact there is nothing except Brahman. That Brahman Himself is the Atman of everything and everywhere (i.e., as Pratyagatman) according to all Upanishads. Thus Brahman and the Atman being the same, the Atman can be understood as of the nature of Sat, Chit, and Ananda.

What are these three: Sat, Chit, and Ananda? How are we to recognize them?

Sat is that which is never destroyed. Chit is what is self-revealed (Svayam-prakasa), i.e., which requires nothing other than itself to reveal it. For example, an ordinary thing cannot reveal itself, without a light. The Atman is not like that. It is being revealed to Itself by Itself. Ananda is the endless joy of being self-revealed as an indestructible entity. In contrast to the Atman of this nature, the non-Atman is what is untrue (Asatya), inert (Jada), and miserable (Duhkha-svarupa).

How can we know this difference between the Atman and Anatman?

Sat, Chit, and Ananda are the characteristics of the Atman. Untruth, inertness and misery are the characteristics of non-Atman. Just as the characteristics of a woman are not in man nor of a man in woman, you do not find the characteristics of Sat in Asat, and of Asat in Sat. Next, you do not find the characteristics of light in darkness and of darkness in light. In the same way you do not find the characteristics of Chit in Jada and vice versa. The characteristic of moonlight will not be seen in the heat of the sun, or the coolness of the latter in the former. So also the characteristics of Ananda will not be seen in a state of misery and vice-versa.

I would like to hear a more elaborate description of the characteristics of Sat, Chit, and Ananda as against their opposites Asat, Jada and Duhkha.

Sat is that which exists without any change in the three periods of time, past, present and future. Asat is that which is false in the three periods of time and yet is felt as if it were existent. On proper discrimination it is found to be non-existent. For example, in dim darkness a rope is experienced as a snake, a garland, a stick or line of water, though the snake etc. are not actually there. By the delusion caused by dimness, the snake is felt as existing there in place of the rope. But this does not change the rope in the least. During the time of delusion, the snake is there for the deluded man, but when the light of discrimination comes to be cast on the apparent snake, the understanding that the snake was never there dawns on the person experiencing this. (This is technically known as Badha, sublation). He feels fully convinced that the snake was never there, as the characteristics of the snake are not in the rope, or of the rope in the supposed snake.

In this way there is a five-fold contradiction in this experience. These are in respect of Sabda (sound or name), Artha (actuality), Lakshana (characteristic), Pratiti (experience), and Vyavahara (understanding for the time being). In the same way, the characteristic of Sat is not there in what is Asat. So also the characteristics of Asat is not in Sat. Therefore there exists between them the five-fold contradiction mentioned earlier in the context. Discriminating in this way, you have to understand the difference between Sat and Asat.

Next, we shall take up the difference between Chit (self-awareness) and Jada (inertness). Chit is

what reveals itself without the help of any external light like that of the sun or fire. On the other hand, it reveals the inert objects like the body superimposed on it. It is the light of this self-aware entity that reveals even the light of the shining sun as also inert entities like stone, earth, etc., which have no luminosity. In contrast Jada has no power to reveal itself or reveal other objects. As for example, take sunlight. Without the help of any other worldly light it illumines itself and with its light reveals inert objects like a stone, earth etc. Chit is similar to this. A pot, a stone, etc., cannot reveal themselves nor reveal other objects. That is the nature of Jada. Just as there is the five-fold difference like Sabda, Artha etc., between the sun and inert objects like pot, there is this five-fold difference between Chit and Jada.

What is the good of knowing all this?

The purpose is true Jnana that the Atman does not undergo any of the transformations that are found in Its adjuncts like bodies which It reveals. Take the example of a pot with a hole, whose inside the sun's light illumines and reveals. Changes in the hole, like being made smaller or bigger or partially obstructed do not affect the sun whose light illumines and reveals the pot and its inside. In the same way the Atman is not affected in the three periods of time by the features of Its adjuncts like name, form, Jati, Varna, commands and prohibition. Changes in respect of birth, functioning, growth, transformation, decay and death, old age, disease, sorrow, hunger, thirst do not affect It. So too, It is not concerned

with the possession of the sheaths which are grouped into three bodies. Similarly blindness, skill and ineptitude do not affect It. The purpose of Jnana is to be established in the consciousness that the changes in the Atmañ do not affect the Atman. This helps you also to understand the difference between Chit and Jada.

Now I shall show the difference between bliss and sorrow. Ananda is characterised by unlimitedness (Nirupadhika), unsurpassableness (Niratisayatva) and permanence (Nityatva). Nirupadhika means its regeneration requires the help of no other factor. Niratisaya means what cannot be surpassed by any other joy different from it. Nitya means everlasting. Such joy is called Ananda. In contrast to this, is sorrow. Sorrow is what hurts the mind. It is also the experience of frustration felt when one's desire conflicts with another's desires. This is of three kinds — Adhyatmika, Adhibhautika and Adhidaivika. Adyatmika means those sorrows caused by one's bodily diseases resulting from the decay and degeneration of one's physical organs. Adhibhautika means sorrows caused by external material elements and by dangerous creatures like tigers, serpents, etc. Adhidaivika means sorrows caused by divine factors like excessive rainfall, insufficient rainfall, thunder, lightning, etc.

Are there example of bliss and sorrow?

Amrta (nectar) is of the form of happiness and will give happiness to all who drink it. On the other hand, the deadly poison known as Kala-kuta is of the very form of sorrow and causes

sorrow to any one who takes it. Between Amrta and Kala-kuta there are five forms of differences in their name and effect. In the same way the nature of bliss is not present in the sorrow caused by the three-fold miseries mentioned above and these three-fold miseries are not present in the blissful Atman. From this you should understand the difference of bliss and sorrow in their name and form.

The irrefutable conclusion that comes from this reasoning and example is this: the Atman is of the nature of existence as the rope in the rope-snake example. It is of the nature of Chit, spiritual luminosity, as sun in the pot-and-sun example. It is of the nature of bliss like nectar in the nectar-and-poison example. But the 'I' consciousness that is falsely identified as the Atman in all these is as false as the snake seen in the rope, as inert as the pot seen in the pot-and-sun example and as harmful as the poison in the nectar-poison example. The Atman is thus of a contrary nature from the 'I' sense, from the body-senses complex and the world that accompanies the 'I' sense. He who knows this truth from the teachings of a competent teacher becomes unattached. He becomes conscious that he is the Atman and Atman alone, and not anything of an opposite nature. Such a person has fulfilled the object of life, he is the liberated one. This is the essential purport of all Vedanta.

9

In the eighth chapter we stated the characteristics for the Atman — that the Atman is of a nature contrary to the three bodies, that the Atman is the witness of the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep, that the Atman is distinct from the five sheaths and that the Atman is Sat-chit-ananda. Of these doctrines, we discussed in detail the subject of the Atman being different from three bodies — the gross body, the subtle body and the causal body.

Now in this ninth chapter we shall discuss in detail the topic of the Atman being the witness of the three states. The mind is constituted of the three Gunas of nature (Prakrti) — Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. But the Sattva-guna can have a dominant position in mind. Only a mind that is Sattvika

can be helpful in knowing the Atman, not one dominated by the other two Gunas. The Sattva-guna is extremely subtle, Rajo-guna makes the mind fickle, i.e., unsteady by attracting it to all external objects. Tamo-guna is extremely gross and makes the mind dull. A subtle entity can penetrate any subtle region, but gross object like a pillar cannot penetrate such regions. In a wavering or unsteady light, subtle states cannot be perceived, as can be done in a steady flame. In the same way neither a mind characterised by grossness on account of the domination of Tamas, nor an unsteady mind characterised by the domination of Rajas can be helpful in gaining the knowledge of the Atman. Only a Sattva-dominated mind, characterised by steadiness, unfailing vigilance and extreme subtlety, can be helpful in this. So hear with attention what I am going to say.

What are the three-fold states (Avastha-traya)?

Waking, dreaming and sleeping are these three states. When all the senses have awareness of external objects, one is in the waking state. The dream state is the state of the mind when the impressions in the mind made by experience of the waking state take the form of both the seer and the objects seen. Deep sleep is that state in which the entire gross world and the subtle world, including the senses and all impressions, caused by them are absorbed in their cause, ignorance. The witness-consciousness alone then remains as the witness of ignorance. These are the three states.

Can the Atman be a witness of the three states?

We say yes, because we perceive the characteristic of a witness in the Atman.

What are these characteristics of a witness?

To take an example from the world, the state of a witness is that in which one sees, without any perturbation or inclination or impression in any way, the various movements of one's own body and mind as also those of others. But though we have stated above 'to take an example from the world', we are aware that no example of such a kind can be found among ordinary men in this world. Only a Sthitaprajna as described in the *Bhagavad Gita*, can ever be an example. A Sthitaprajna of this description can remain unmoved by all scenes of the outside world that come before him or even affect his body. In the same way the Atman sees or witnesses unmoved the three states of the Jiva, their activities and the Jivas themselves.

I shall illustrate this witness-hood with another example. The waking state is like a great city. The dream state is like the outhouses (Prakaras) of the palace in that city. The deep sleep state is like the central palace of that city, where the king of the city lives. The king has the feeling that all these — the palace, the building and the whole city — belong to him. The Jiva with identification with the three states is like this king. The king goes out of the palace into the city and meets with many enjoyments and sufferings

in the city. Then he enters into some of the outhouses and there also he is subjected to enjoyments and sufferings. Then he returns to his main palace and there gets complete peace and rest.

In the same way, the Jiva enjoys and suffers in the waking state by the operations of his three-fold organs: mind, speech and gross body. When the Jiva is in this waking state, it is known in the Vedantā as Visva. Then the Jiva enters into the subtle body in the dream state. There also he enjoys and suffers in the dream body and its threefold organs. In the dream state the Jiva is known as Taijasa. Next the Jiva assumes the causal body, withdrawing all the three organs into their causes and finds himself in dreamless sleep. He is then perfectly happy. Then the Jiva is known as Prajna.

In this way the Atman, who is always aloof and unchanging (Kutastha), remains unaffected like the sky and as the witness of the Jiva who assumes varying attributes in the states of waking, dream and deep sleep. This is the conclusion arrived at by the proofs given by scriptures, reasoning and experience. The scripture says, *sākṣī ceta kevalo nirguṇāś ca*, the Atman is the witness consciousness, aloof and without any defining attributes. The reasoning regarding this is seen in the examples of the city and sky. We remember our experiences of daily waking, dreaming and sleeping states. Remembrance or memory can be had only of what we have experienced. From this fact we can understand that the experiencer of these must be

eternal and deathless. Thus it is proved that the Atman is the witness of the three states.

One can understand how witness-hood is possible for a person about his own experience of the three states. How can you say from this that one person can be the witness of the experience of another also?

Listen to the explanation. The one who experiences the three states is only the reflection of consciousness in the Antahkarana. That reflected consciousness is only a superimposition and therefore false. It is this reflected consciousness that is called the Jiva.

In deep sleep the mind gets dissolved and disappears. How can there be then a reflection as Jiva as stated by you? If there is no reflector, there can be no reflection. The Jiva is therefore non-existent. How can a non-existent Jiva be a witness of the state of deep sleep?

According to the rule or proposition that the witness should be the same for all three states, it is the same Atman, the original witness of all the three states, that is the real witness of all the three states. It is easy for you to understand that one and the same Atman is the witness of waking and dream states. As the Jiva has growth and subsistence, the state of witness-hood cannot be attributed to the Jiva, as the witness should be unchanging. The Atman is unchanging, without growth or decay. So only the Atman can be the witness of all the states.

Why is it said that the Jiva is changing i.e. has growth and decay?

The Jiva, getting identified with the mind feels 'sometimes I am in a sorrowful state and sometimes in the joyful state'. Thus the Jiva become one with or is submerged in the changing conditions of the mind. So the Jiva is called changeful.

What is that Atman which is witness and distinct from the Jiva? What is the proof of such an Atman's existence? What are its signs? What is the way to know it?

A witness is one who is unchanging and movementless. The Atman alone satisfies these conditions. This Atman is all-pervading like the sky. It is Sat-chit-ananda. It is this all-pervading Atman alone that is called Jiva when it pervades the mind as a reflection in it. It is this reflected consciousness called the Jiva that is involved in repeated births and deaths. The proof of the existence of such an unchanging and uninvolved pure Consciousness known as the Atman is the statements of the texts of the Vedanta.

It is the reflected consciousness that is subject to the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep. It is this reflected consciousness called the Jiva who is sometimes in a happy state, sometimes in a sorrowful state and sometimes in a state of indifference. The pure Consciousness is the witness uninvolved in any change, or the changes of the Jiva in waking, dream and sleep.

How can we know the unchangeableness of the Atman?

One cannot see the beauty of one's own face by oneself. But one can see it with the help of a mirror where one's face is reflected. In the

same way the unchangeableness of the Atman can be understood through the reflection of the Atman in the reflector called Antahkarana. The reflecting mirror and the reflected image of the face in the mirror cannot see the original of which it is the reflection. In the same way though the original, the Atman, is always presented unchanging, the reflecting medium, the Antahkarana and the reflected image, the Jiva, do not know the existence of the original, the Atman.

Then, who is it that knows such an Atman?

No one can see the Atman. All that can be seen belong to the category of Drsya, the seen and the seeable. The Atman is the Drk, the seer. It is understandable to itself by self-intuition, it being the guarantee of the existence of all that is seen. An object like a pot cannot see the subject who sees it. That seer does not require another seer to reveal himself. The seer knows himself by intuition i.e., without the aid of any other. It is Svayam-prakasa, self-revealing. Ten friends crossed a river. On the other bank they counted themselves. The man who counted, only counted the other nine. He left out himself. The others who counted also did likewise. So they all came to the conclusion that the tenth man was drowned. They set up a wail. Then a passerby pointed out that the man who counted was the tenth man, who was feared to have drowned. It was the man who counted who gained this realisation. Likewise, the Atman has to be realized through one's own experience. It cannot be known through another's experience.

What is the Pramana (authority) for this?

There are four criteria of knowledge: sense-perception (Pratyaksha), inference (Anumana), analogy (Upamana) and scriptural authority (Sabda). Besides these, there are also the criteria of knowledge called presumption (Arthapatti), probability (Sambhava), tradition (Aitihya), and rarity (Anupalabdhi). Some think that the last-mentioned four are included in the first mentioned four. Some Vedantins think that there are six criteria. Their characteristics require very wide and elaborate description. We shall therefore confine ourselves to those that are necessary for our purpose.

Aksha in the word Pratyaksha means the sense orifice. The knowledge that is got through the senses is known as Pratyaksha. The knowledge gained, of the existence of invisible fire from the smoke seen on a hill, through a middle term, is Anumana. The knowledge got through the resemblance of an unknown object to a thing known to us is Upamana. To presume a certain thing even without any of the above to explain something is Arthapatti. For example, we find a man is not eating or drinking during the day. Still we find him fat and healthy. As an explanation of this unseen and uninferred phenomenon, we have to presume that he is eating at night. Such a way of knowing is Arthapatti. Sabda is what is testified by an Apta or one who has realised the truth and is therefore truthful and can be accepted without questioning on matters that cannot be known by any of the above-mentioned ways of knowing. The Atman cannot be known by

Pratyaksha. As the Atman is without parts and is all-fullness (Purna), it cannot be a subject of Anumana. As the Atman is one without a second, it cannot be understood through Upamana. So in regard to the Atman, Sabda alone is the way of knowing it. Sabda is the word of Aptas. Of all Aptas, only God is all-knowing. What is called Sabda is the very word or revelation of God. This Sruti is the one and only unfailing authority on the Atman.

Having answered the question regarding the Pramanas about the Atman, let us go back to the real subject — the witness-hood of the Atman in all the three states.

We have mentioned the example of an all-renouncing Sannyasin who cannot be affected, i.e. will not be moved, by the mental agitations, the physical activities induced by these agitations, and by their virtuous and vicious acts. In the same way the Atman is only a witness or unconcerned seer of all the three states and all the occurrences and virtues and vices observable in these states. The fortunate one who realizes himself through the Sruti to be one with the Atman who is only the pure Consciousness, the unconcerned and unaffected witness of the states is the Jivan-mukta. So you, the earnest enquirer about Truth, must have full faith in the Vedanta texts (which is the essence of the Sruti) and try to realize the Atman whom this scriptural text describes as the witness of the three states.

10

The subject of discussion in the 10th chapter is that the Atman is to be distinguished from the Pancha-kosas, Viz., Annamaya, Pranamaya, Manomaya, Vijnanamaya and Anandamaya Kosas.

The Annamaya-kosa is formed of the essence of food, developed by food in six stages and is visible as the gross body. The six stages referred to above are birth, existence, growth, transformation, decay and death.

The Pranamaya-kosa is the vitality expressed as the organs of action. The Manomaya-kosa is composed of the organs of knowledge. The Vijnanamaya-kosa is composed of Manomaya-kosa, with the addition of Buddhi. Anandamaya-kosa is ignorance, which can be analysed into Priya, Moda, and Pramoda. Priya is the joy on 'seeing a dear

object. Moda is the satisfaction on getting it. The joy on enjoying it is Pramoda.

The five sheaths have been described above. These are called sheaths, because they cover the Atman, just as a sheath covers a sword, or a metal case covers a Sivalinga or the rind covers a fruit, or a coat covers the body of a man.

The sword and its sheath and the coverings of other objects mentioned above have identities different from the objects they ensheath or cover. But we do not find such distinct identities between the Atman and the sheaths which are said to cover the Atman. Since they are thus different from ordinary sheaths how do you say they cover the Atman?

The clouds are formed out of the rays of the sun and they cannot have an identity different from the sun. Yet the clouds are seen to cover the sun in the rainy season. Smoke originates from fire and has therefore no different identity from fire. Yet smoke is seen to hide fire with which it is one. In the same way, though the five Kosas have no different identity from the Atman, they can cover the Atman like sheaths. In other words, a completely different identity from the object it covers, as required for a sword and its sheath, is not required for the Atman and the Kosas that cover the Atman, though the Kosas have no existence of their own apart from the Atman.

Next we shall describe how the Atman is different from the five Kosas. Though the sword is different from its sheath, when the sword is in the sheath they are in one form and are sometimes described

as one. In the same way, though the Atman is described as non-different from the Kosas the Atman is really different from them.

In regard to the Atman and the Kosas, which are ordinarily described as one, there must be some relation between them and the Atman. But it is also said that the Atman is not related to anything. The Atman is for this reason described as unattached and unstained. How are both these possible at the same time?

Listen. Relation is of many kinds. In the science of logic there are two kinds of relations described, known as Samavaya and Samyoga. The Samavaya relation is integral, i.e. a relation that cannot be separated — as for example, that between an organ and organism, between attributes and the substance in which they inhere, between movements and that which causes them (Kriya and Kriyavat) between species and individuals forming it and between eternal substances and their qualifications. The relation between the Atman and the five sheaths does not come under any of these. So there is no Samavaya relation between them. Then there is a temporary relation, as for example a drum and the stick with which it is sounded. For this, the Atman must be a Dravya, something having dimensions. The Atman is not a Dravya, and so there cannot be this kind of relation also in regard to the Atman.

Then what kind of relation exists between the Atman and the Kosas, without which we cannot understand how we feel them as one?

The relation between the Atman and the Kosas is what is called Adhyasa or superimposition, falsely imposing some relation between two percepts. As examples of this kind of superimposed relation can be given that which exists between a snake and a rope on which the former is perceived, the nacre and silver with which it is wrongly identified, between the stump of a tree and a man which are mistakenly identified. The relation between the Atman and the Kosas is of this kind. It is Adhyasa. If it is asked whether it is mutual superimposition i.e., superimposition between two existing things, the reply is that it is a mutual superimposition; for we feel no separate identities for the 'I sense' and the Atman.

What is the nature of the mutual superimposition between the Atman and the gross physical body?

All of us feel: 'I am a celestial, I am a man, I am a woman, I am born, I live, I am growing, I am weak, I am changing, I am old; I shall die, I am a child, a youth, an old man. I belong to this caste, community or country; I am a Brahmachari, Grihastha or Sannyasin; I am Ramā or Krishna; I take food' — all these feelings appertain to the gross body and they are superimposed on the Atman. The Atman's characteristics—existence, self-consciousness, and bliss are superimposed on the physical body. This is the nature of the mutual superimposition between the gross body and the Atman.

What is the nature of the mutual superimposition between the Pranamaya-kosa and the Atman?

All of us feel: 'I am hungry, I am strong, I am possessed of potentiality, I am working, I am dumb, I am lame, I am impotent — all these feelings appertain to the Pranamaya-kosa. They are superimposed on the Atman. The Atman's characteristics, existence, knowledge and bliss, are superimposed on the Pranamaya-kosa in the form of 'I live, I flourish, I like' etc.

What is the nature of the mutual superimposition between the Atman and Manomaya-kosa?

We superimpose on the Atman such feelings as 'I resolve, I doubt, I am sorrowful, I am infatuated, I am lustful, I am miserly, I am capable of hearing, I am capable of seeing, I am capable of speaking and tasting, I am deaf, I am blind,' etc. These are conditions caused by the Manomaya-kosa, and these are superimposed on the Atman. And in the process of mutual superimposition the characteristics of the Atman, Sat-chit-ananda, are superimposed on the Manomaya-kosa as the feelings, 'I have a mind, my mind is clear and enlightened, I am capable of loving', etc.

Next, what is the nature of the mutual superimposition between the Vijnanamaya-kosa and the Atman?

We feel: 'I am an agent, I am wise, I am good at argument, I remember what I have heard once, I transmigrate to different world-systems, I am capable of loving, I am capable of hating, I know the Vedas, I have renounced, I have devotion, I am an enlightened person' etc. Such capacities belong to the Vijnanamaya-kosa. and these are superimposed on the Atman. And in turn

Sat-chit-ananda, the characteristics of the Atman, are superimposed on the Vijnanamaya-kosa in the form, 'I have intelligence, I know myself, I love myself', etc.

What is the nature of the mutual superimposition between the Atman and Anandamaya-kosa?

We feel: 'I am the enjoyer, I am happy, I am satisfied, I am a Sattvika, I am a Rajasika, I am a Tamasika, I am without consciousness, I am a fool, I am cruel, I am infatuated, I have no discrimination. I am a mad man'. All these qualities belong to the Anandamaya-kosa. These are superimposed on the Atman. The characteristics of the Atman, Sat-chit-ananda, are superimposed on the Anandamaya-kosa in the form 'I am ignorant', I have knowledge, I have joy' etc.' This is the nature of the mutual superimposition between the Atman and the Anandamaya-kosa.

We have described above the nature of the mutual superimposition between the Atman and the five Kosas.

How does this mutual superimposition arise?

It has arisen because of inadequate power of discrimination to distinguish between the Atman and the five Kosas.

How are we to distinguish between the Atman and the Kosas?

In this world we know particular cattle, son, relatives, wife, house, property, etc. as our own. In the same way we feel that this is my body,

this is my vital power, this is my mind, this is my intellect, this is my ignorance etc. By merely feeling in this way that these faculties are 'mine', as objects that are known, they do not become one with you. In the same way by merely because we take these five Kosas as 'mine', they cannot become one with the Atman. Just like cattle and other objects mentioned above, they are Anatman i.e. entities separate from the Atman. It is reasonable in this way to distinguish Atman from Anatman in respect of the Atman and all the Kosas. The Srutis describe the Atman as having no body. You know from experience that changes occurring in cattle, house, relative, etc. that are seen do not affect their seer. In the same way the changes occurring in the five sheaths do not affect the Atman who is their seer. For the seen is always different from its seer. This is how to distinguish between the Atman and the five Kosas.

Revered Sir, the objects you have shown as examples and the exemplified entities are absolutely contradictory and therefore fail absolutely in helping one to understand your position. The animals, pots, etc. which you have cited as examples of objects seen before our eyes are objective i.e., things that could be seen as separate from oneself as standing before us. But the Kosas of which they are given as examples are absolutely internal, not objects that one could see as separate from oneself. On the other hand, just as a fire is seen as one with the red hot iron piece though different from it, they (the Kosas) appear to be one with me. This is how there is a contradiction between the example and the exemplified in the explanation you gave about the Atman

and the Kosas. Such being the case, how can we distinguish these Kosas from the Atman by self-reflection?

The gross external objects like the cow, pot, etc. are seen by the eye which has got the power of seeing only gross objects. But there is in every one Buddhi, a power by which one can recognise even subtle internal objects that cannot be seen by the eye. From external objects like the strings of a musical instrument, music is produced. From hot water heat is felt. From a flower, fragrance can be smelt. None of these (musical sound, heat and fragrance) can be perceived differently from their respective seats by external perception. But the Jnanendriyas which are the seat of Buddhi, can know their distinction, because of the capacity of these organs to perceive subtle objects. These organs can understand 'This is a string, different from music. This is water, different from heat. This is flower, different from fragrance. It is said that swans can easily distinguish between water and milk when they are mixed, something all of us find impossible to do. In this way though merely gross-sighted people cannot distinguish between the Atman and the five Kosas, it is possible for those endowed with subtle perception.

Now I would like to point out the ultimate truth as taught in the Vedanta. Till now I have spoken of the distinction between the Atman and the five Kosas as can be understood by people with tendencies acquired in course of time (Kalavasana) and who can therefore understand the world only as an object seen by them, externally. But according to those who know the ultimate

truth (Paramartha), these five sheaths do not at all exist in the Atman.

Then how is it that this talk about the five sheaths has arisen at all?

People, under delusion, see serpent in the rope, silver in nacre, man in a stump of a tree and blueness in the sky. None of the entities seen as existing under peculiar circumstances are actually there. In the same way, the five Kosas are also superimposed on the Atman and are not actually in the Atman. For, whatever is superimposed has no reality in the past, present, or future. They are like the two moons seen by a person with diseased eye. In the same way the five Kosas are also false as they are mere superimpositions, or appearances without real existence where they are seen.

When we know the substratum on which the superimposition has been made, the illusory appearance immediately vanishes and only the substratum is left. For example, when the illusion of the snake on the rope is dissipated in clear light, the rope is immediately revealed and the snake disappears. But the five Kosas are seen to exist even after knowledge of the Atman is gained. Under this circumstance, how can you say that they are only superimposed and do not actually exist.

Reality has three tiers, namely, what is created by man, what is created by God and what is uncreated and eternal. The significance of these expressions are stated below:

1. **Pratibhasika reality:** This denotes the man-made momentary perceptions of a purely illusory nature like the snake seen on the rope, whose existence is sublated the moment light dawns on it and disappears without leaving any residue of the snake seen till then.

2. **Vyavaharika reality:** This is not produced by man but by God; it is analogous to the rope that remains and is seen even long after the snake has disappeared and therefore lasts for much longer period of time than the purely illusory perceptions.

3. **Paramarthika reality:** The basic reality underlying God's creation is Brahman which is uncreated and is eternal.

The distinction between these three tiers of reality is clear from this. The Paramarthika is ever-lasting; the Vyavaharika is relatively real, i.e., lasts longer or as long as the distinction between Isvara and Jiva lasts, i.e., in place of being momentary it subsists for a much longer duration than the Pratibhasika which is momentary or lasts only till the illusory perception is recognised by the perceiver. There is really no difference between the Pratibhasika and Vyavaharika in that both of them are superimpositions. In point of their ontological status, the Pratibhasika and Vyavaharika are poles apart. The former lasts for just a moment while the latter lasts for an immense period of time, i.e., so long as the creator and the created last. If it is granted that on the dawn of knowledge the Vyavaharika disappears as the Pratibhasika, then there can be no Atma-jnanis and Jivanmuktas. As

a consequence there will be none left to instruct the ignorant on Advaita doctrine. Then there will be no succession of teachers and disciples of the Advaita tradition. So we accept the survival of Atma-jnanis till their Prārabdha is exhausted and their bodies perish. As examples can be given the cases of the potter and a burnt rope. As long as the potter's wheel revolves, so long pots will be produced. When he stops his skilled activity and his wheel stops, no more pots will be produced. In the case of the burnt rope, it still appears like a rope, but it will not bind anything like the unburnt rope. In the same way, the five Kosas which are only superimposed on the Atman will disappear when the Atman which is their basis is understood.

Why speak more about this! The doctrine of the Vedānta is this! When the name and shape of an earthen pot are sublated, only the clay on which these were superimposed, remains as the unsublatable reality. In the same way, the five Kosas which are only superimposed on the Atman, will be sublated when illumination dawns on the aspirant. Only the Atman, which is Sat, Chit Ananda and which, is the basis of all entities superimposed on it, will be found to be the changeless absolute reality that remains. It is he who is enlightened in this way, that can be called a true Atma-jnani, a true Brahma-jnani. Only such a one will have Videha-mukti (liberation after the dissolution of the subtle body that carries the Jiva in Samsara). All the Upanishads proclaim this.

11

In this 11th chapter the topic of discussion is the fourth characteristic of the Atman. In this context we shall describe in succeeding order the three characteristics of Atman — namely, Sat, Chit and Ananda.

The characteristic of Sat is that it remains unchanged and unsublated in all the three periods of time — past, present and future. This unchangeability and unsublatability is found in respect of the Atman only.

What is the proof of this?

The Vedantic texts say that before the projection of the universe, the Atman alone existed. Such a text is, *Ātmanaḥ ākāśaḥ sambhūtaḥ*, Akasa came out of the Atman. Akasa is sometimes translated

as 'sky' and sometime as 'ether'. Moreover the experience of people also justifies this. People think of themselves and others as rich, poor, worker, devotee, liberation-seeker, etc.

How can the experiences of such people become valid proof?

The rich man experiences: "In my past births I had given gifts to worthy persons. So in this birth I am born as a rich man. I have therefore got an opportunity to give gifts in this birth. If I use this opportunity properly, I am sure to be born as a rich man in my next birth also." The pauper experiences: "In my last birth I had done no charities. So I am born in this birth as a pauper without anything to give in charity. Therefore in my next birth also I am sure to be born very poor." A worker of good deeds (i.e. of ritualistic rites of the Vedas) experiences: "In my past birth I had performed many good deeds. Owing to the impression left by them, I am doing good deeds in this birth also. So in my next transmigration, I shall be a Deva in the world of Indra."

A devotee experiences: "In my past birth I had worshipped God. So in this birth also I have developed devotion to God and am performing His worship. Because of this I shall in future attain Vaikuntha and various stages of liberation attainable there like Salokya, Sarupya, etc". The Mumukshu experiences: "I have done all my works as worship of God. As a result, I have obtained in this life the fourfold qualifications (Sadhana-chatustaya) required for an aspirant for

Advaitic realisation. I have for this reason also a competent teacher and opportunity to have Sravana (hearing Vedantic texts from a competent teacher), Manana (repeatedly thinking of them in mind) and Nididhyasana (getting absorbed in contemplation) of the Vedantic truths heard and thought about. So I have got the knowledge of the Atman. I shall not have any more birth. I have attained to the highest possibility of human life.”

Thus in respect of past, present and future, every one experiences ‘I am’. Only they misunderstand the body for the Atman, and it is the body that meets with destruction and not the Atman. Thus, as the Atman remains the same in the past, the present and the future, as understandable from the persisting ‘I-sense’, the Atman is Sat.

From experience I now understand that the Atman is Sat. But can you convince me of this by reason (Yukti)?

It is possible to do so. If we think over whether or not we are living in this world, we will be convinced that we are living, for it is the experience of all ‘I am here’. If we again ponder over whether we have really got a body or not, we will feel convinced that we have bodies.

Then if we continue to think how we have got the bodies, we shall find that it is due to our Karmas. Is this Karma our own or of any one else? It must be our own. For one’s Karma, another can never get the fruit, be it heaven or hell. If the fruits of one’s Karma go to another, then we have to say that the merits of a Brahmana’s

Vedic sacrifices can go to a Sudra who cannot do them. It is said that Suka-brahmarshi had Samadhi naturally; that does not mean that all of us can have it in the same way. This proves to the hilt that our bodies are the result of our Karmas.

If we further investigate, if the Karma that has brought about the present body owes its origin to this birth or to past births of ours, we are forced to conclude that it belongs to past births. For, unless the body existed before, the Karmas of our present body cannot arise. If we ask whether 'I' existed when 'my' Karmas of previous birth existed, we have to say that the 'I' existed. For, if one did not previously exist, one cannot have Karma. So if we reflect in this way, whether we had bodies or not, we shall come to the conclusion that we had bodies. For if there was no body, no Karma could be performed. If we consider whether that body with which we performed Karmas was with the body of previous life or with the body of this life, we have to say that the former is the case. If we think deeply in this way, we find that Karma and body are an unbroken flow of one succeeding the other from eternity. The Atman that is accepted as the basis of this continuity in an unaffected manner is like the sky through which clouds pass without affecting it. The Atman has got to be accepted if this reasoning is correct. In this way is established through reasoning that the Atman has existence in the past and in the present.

Now the existence of the Atman for all future time can also be established by reasoning. It is because we did not perform the Sravana and Nididhyasana of the Vedantic Maha vakyas, but on the other hand engaged ourselves in performing Karmas, that we have got this birth and this body. The Karmas that we do in this life are bound to result in another birth. If we think in this way, we find that the continuous flow of Karma and body has no end in the future also.

But when, by the knowledge of the Supreme Truth (Tattva-jnana), Karma is completely effaced, bodies also cease to be born.

Thus the Atman is required as the basis for both Karma and body. Until the knowledge of Brahman arises, the Atman which is connected with body and Karma, is subject to birth and death relating only to the bodies with which it is associated. So long as the Atman gets bodies, it enjoys and suffers, going to higher worlds and lower worlds, i.e. upto the world of Brahma and down to an inanimate nature. But it is never destroyed in all these transmigrations. When the knowledge of truth dawns, and ignorance, desire and Karmas are effaced, there is no more cause for any kind of misery. Then, immersed in the blissful nature of the Self, one attains Videha-mukti. So the Atman can never be destroyed in the future also, even as it existed in the past and exists in the present. Thus is proved through reasoning the eternal existential nature of the Atman.

The existentiality of the Atman is established by the three following reasons:

- 1) It remains the same in all the three periods of time, past, present and future.
- 2) It is never subject to sublation, and
- 3) It is non-dual in an ultimate sense.

In this way in the light of the authority of the Sruti and reasoning, it is established, that even in the never-ending cyclic succession of creation and dissolution the Atman is never destroyed. The cycles of creation and dissolution are in respect of the universe only; they leave the Atman unaffected. So understand that the Atman is pure existence without any change or sublation at all times.

The Atman is thus proved to be Sat. Next can you convince me that the Atman is Chit?

The Atman shines - shines by itself even in pitch dark without the help of any other light. Some external light is required to reveal substances round about, but this external light is not revealed to itself because it is unconscious. The Atman being self-conscious, reveals itself intuitively and it is only the Atman's self-revealing capacity that reveals external light and the substances that the external light illumines by its light. Besides, all the various bodily states like childhood, boyhood, old age, etc. which have been superimposed on the Atman are known by the Atman without the aid of anything other than itself. This proves that the Atman is of the nature of consciousness.

As we are not all-knowing, how can we know that the Atman can reveal everything?

The world has two aspects - internal and external. We reveal both these aspects and we are not revealed by them.

The reply is not clear. Please clarify it.

The external world consists of the following:

- 1) The five elements: earth, water, fire, air and ether.
- 2) The five subtle elements: sound, touch, form, taste and smell.
- 3) The five-folded gross elements (Panchikrta).
- 4) The cosmos (Brahmanda) formed out of the elements.
- 5) The fourteen worlds.
- 6) The four forms of the gross body.

This external world is based on numerous substances indicated by such names and forms. We know all these with our various powers of knowing. They do not know us. If you bestow deep thought on this truth, you will understand thereby the Atman's capacity of revealing all that is external.

How are we to know the Atman's power of revealing the internal world?

The internal world consists of the following:

- 1) The five Kosas - Annamaya, Pranamaya, Manomaya, Vijnanamaya and Anandamaya; 2) The three bodies - Sthula-sarira, Sukshma-sarira and Karana-sarira; 3) Shad-bhava-vikara (six emotions); 4) Shad-urmi (six stages); 5) Andyam, Mandyam (dullness); 6) Samarthyā (cleverness); 7) Raga, dvesha (attachment and hate); 8) Trividha-karana (the threefold organs); 9) Avastha-traya (the three

states of waking, dream and sleep; 10) The five Karmendriyas; 11) The five Jnanendriyas 12) The five Pranas (vital powers); 13) The five Upa-pranas (subsidiary vital powers); 14) Manas (mind); 15) Buddhi (intellect); 16) Chitta (mind-stuff); 17) Ahankara (ego); 18) Sankalpa (doubt); 19) Nischaya (resolution) 20) Abhimana (I-sense); 21) Visva (Jiva in waking state); 22) Taijasa (Jiva in dream state); 23) Prajna (Jiva in sleep); 24) The three tiers of reality - the Pratibhasika (momentarily true); Vyavaharika (relatively true), and Paramarthika (absolutely true), 25) The three Gunas of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas; 26) Sukha (happiness); 27) Duhkha (suffering); 28) Jnana (knowledge); 29) Ajnana (ignorance); 30) Priya (sense of dearness); 31) Apriya (not being dear); 32) Upeksha (negligence); 33) Sadhana-chatushtaya (the four-fold competency for Advaitic discipline; 34) Maitryadi-chatushtaya (four virtues beginning with friendship); 35) Ashtanga-yoga (the Yoga with eight parts); 36) Sravana (hearing of scriptures); 37) Manana (mental reflection and reasoning); 38) Nididhyasana (deep concentrated meditation); 39) Samadhi (spiritual absorption in non-duality); 40) Pramana (criterion of truth); 41) Prameya (proposition to be proved); 42) Pramatr (person attempting to prove); 43) Tapatraya (three types of suffering). 44) Adhi (mental worry); 45) Vyadhi (disease); 46) Arogya (health); 47) Bhakti (devotion); 48) Vairagya (spirit of renunciation); 49) Sagunopasana (devotion to a personal deity); 50) Manonasa (dissolution of the mind); 51) Vasana-kshaya (destruction of all tendencies); 52) Videhamukti (liberation without body);

53) Jivan-mukti (liberation with body); - thus goes on the manifoldness of names and forms according to the power of our internal perception. We are able to distinguish all these from one another through our internal perception. But this internal perception cannot know us, the knowers. If we think deeply over this, we find that the internal world is known by us, but the internal world does not know us. This is the proof of the Atman being pure Chit.

You say that the Atman, who is of the form of Chit, cannot be known by anything. We know everything by our mind. Can we not know the Atman also with the same mind?

Mind is something which is subject to origin and dissolution. Its nature is image-forming and retaining it (Sankalpa-rupa). Its scope is limited to certain things only. It is an object (Karya) made of the five elements, just like a mud pot and similar material things. It is infilled and discoloured by various passions. Remembrance and forgetfulness are characteristic of it. For these reasons, the mind is inert (Jada). It has in itself no power to shine or illumine. Its existence itself is known by Chit. How can the mind subject to all such limitations know the Atman of the nature of pure Consciousness (Chidatma), which can shine by itself? It is impossible for the mind to do so.

Then what can be the meaning of the Upanishadic sentence, *manasaiva' anudraṣṭavyam* - by the mind alone is it to be known?

We say generally that when gold is heated in fire, gold shines. This does not mean that fire produces a lustre that was not already in the gold. The fact is that when gold is heated in fire all impurities that have gathered in gold are burnt and destroyed. The resulting lustre of gold is not something newly-produced, but only a manifestation of its pre-existing lustre, revealed when its covering is destroyed. Its lustre is not newly-produced. If you say that the lustre is newly produced in heated gold, then an earthen pot heated in fire should also shine while in fire and when taken out of fire. This is not the case. So the explanation of the Upanishadic passage quoted is this: When the mind covers the Atman, the mind gets a reflection of the Atman which it covers. Then the light of the Atman reflected in the mind, destroys the false and beginningless ignorance that had overcome it. When ignorance is destroyed, the natural luminosity of the Atman reveals itself. This is the purport of the Upanishadic passage quoted. So it is not that the mind knows the Atman, but that the Atman knows the mind i.e. the Atman endows the power of knowing on the mind.

Can you make this clearer with another example?

When darkness is dispersed by a lighted lamp, there are present the following factors: oil-holder, oil and wick. Even when all these are present, by themselves they cannot disperse darkness. But when fire begins to burn at the end of the wick, that fire in the form of the lighted lamp disperses

darkness. Here it is the fire through the medium of the oil and wick that disperses darkness, and not the media, (oil-holder, oil and wick,) which have in themselves no power of illumining. You can apply this example to illustrate the point at issue. The body is the oil-holder, the Karma of the individual is the oil, the mind is the wick and fire is the Atman. This fire of Atman gets united with the wick in the form of mind, and the mind thereby looks as if it were the light of fire that is Atman. The mind, on getting oneness with the Atman, is called a Jiva. Thus the Jiva, with the mind shining with the reflected light of the Atman, disperses the darkness of ignorance from objects. Just as the oil holder, light etc., together reveal themselves and disperse darkness, the Atman illumines the objects within and without. In this way, just as the light reveals itself and reveals everything that comes within its purview, the Atman, through the medium of Antahkarana, reveals things external and internal. This makes it clear how the Atman is of the nature of pure Consciousness or is of the form of knowledge itself.

What about the blissful nature of the Atman?

Ananda means happiness that is eternal, unlimited and unsurpassable by any other form of happiness. But as far as the Atman is concerned, it is inherent in it and constitutes its very form (Svarupa). The happiness got from external enjoyable things is temporary, outside oneself and can sometimes be more and sometimes less. Such happiness is not

the inherent bliss of the Atman. So the Svarupa of the Atman is bliss described earlier.

How can we be sure of this?

In the bliss of deep sleep you get an indication of the blissful nature of the Atman. In that state we can understand that bliss is Atman itself.

In deep sleep we experience the absence of any suffering. We do not feel any indication of bliss in that state. So from the experience of deep sleep, how can we get any idea or indication of bliss? Surely one cannot experience what is not present to be experienced.

One can remember or have memory only of what one has experienced. This universal proposition is true in regard to our experience of deep sleep also. For, when we wake up from sleep, we say, "I slept happily till now." We do not, on the other hand, say "I slept without any suffering". So the experience that all get in deep sleep is one of happiness.

How can we prove that the bliss we get in deep sleep has the three characteristics you mention - permanence, unlimitedness and unsurpassableness?

First take 'unlimitedness'. The joy we get from all external objects like food, fragrance, sexuality, etc., are limited by the objects that give such joy. When they are withdrawn, one feels deprivation. In deep sleep there are no such limiting adjuncts, which on withdrawal, give a sense of deprivation. Happiness alone is the experience one gets in deep sleep. So that joy has no limitation or adjunct.

What about its unsurpassableness?

Take the highest joy possible for a man as a unit, multiply it by hundred, multiply that again by hundred. Thus multiply to the power of eleven. This enables one to have an inkling of the bliss of Hiranyagarbha, the first manifested being. Each of these stages is limited by what is below it and what is above it. But Brahmananda alone, on the other hand, has no limitation, as all joy is included in it and as Brahman, being one without a second, there is nothing else to limit Brahman and Its Ananda feature. This Brahmananda is the same as the Ananda of Sushupti. From this the unlimitedness of the joy of deep sleep is proved. For in deep sleep there is nothing to limit the experience in it.

From experience all men can understand that real joy is what is got in deep sleep and not what is got from enjoyment of external objects. So discarding the joy from wife and children, they acquire, even with difficulty, a soft bed and other things favourable for falling into deep sleep. If in deep sleep a man is awakened, be it even by his beautiful wife, he will be inclined to thrash her and go to sleep again, remembering the undisturbed enjoyment he was having. So understand that the bliss of sleep is unsurpassable.

What about its permanence?

The happiness enjoyed in waking and dream take many forms under the stimulation of different objects. One feels the differences between these various quanta of enjoyment. So they are limited

by each of these quanta. These units are also incomplete. But the joy of deep sleep is uniform, complete and natural without the stimulation of anything external. So the permanence of it is assured.

If the joy of deep sleep is permanent, why is it that we experience it only 'in deep sleep and not in waking and dream?

That same joy is also present in the waking and dream states. Only it is hidden by differences of Vrttis (mental modifications). Hidden by these Vrttis, the presence of the same joy is not perceived by ignorant men.

Ananda in this case is the cause. Vrttis are the effects of it. How can these mental modifications which are effects, hide their cause, namely, Ananda?

The sun is hidden by clouds. Smoke is hidden by fire. The rope is hidden by the snake which, through superimposition, has the effect of the rope. In all these cases the effects hide the cause. In the same way the mental modifications, though they are effects, hide Brahmananda. In the eyes of ignorant children, the sun is hidden by clouds and fire is hidden by smoke and ashes. It appears as not only hidden, but also as non-existent. But those who have the power of discrimination do not see them as hidden but as existing even when hidden. In the same way, it is the ignorant men who are extroverts, who do not experience the happiness of deep sleep in the waking and dream states. Not so in the case of wise men who are introverts, as such wise men have realized identity of all the states with Brahmananda. They experience

Brahmananda in all the periods of time, past, present and future. So the happiness of deep sleep, which is in no way different from Brahmananda, is proved.

The three characteristics of Brahmananda - unlimitedness unsurpassableness, and eternity - are present in us also. From experience it can be found that blissfulness is also present in us. Thus from Sruti, reasoning and experience it is found that the characteristics Sat, Chit and Ananda are present in us. So we have to conclude that the Self in us is also inherently Brahman, the Sat-chit-ananda.

How can we experience the Self in us a Sat-chit-ananda?

First you have to hear from the scriptures with their six characteristics from a competent teacher. Then that which you have heard must be deeply reflected on. Next, you have to be plunged for long in meditation on the truths heard and thought about. By this long practice of meditation you will have the firm conviction 'I am Brahman, the Sat-chit-ananda'. This is only indirect knowledge (Paroksha-jnana).

One who has reached this state of Paroksha-jnana has to abandon once for all such egoistic ideas as 'I am an agent', 'This work is mine', 'I belong to this caste', etc. and feel established always in the Truth: 'I am Brahman, Brahman is the same as what is ignorantly referred to as I'. When such experience becomes effortlessly natural, as silence in sleep and salt dissolved in water, the mind gets dissolved or becomes one with Brahman effortlessly and without any distraction. In such

a great soul, attributeless non-duality is experienced as the natural condition - not acquired, but eternally and inherently present. This is direct experience (Aparoksha).

When one is established in this experience, he naturally becomes the very form of Ananda. The nature and intensity of his bliss can be known to him only and not to any one else. Even the Vedanta Sastra which speaks of it does not know it, nor can it describe it. Just as a person cannot describe his bliss of sleep but only experience it internally, even the realised soul who experiences it cannot describe what he is experiencing. It cannot even be recollected in order to give an approximate description. So, my boy, you too can understand it only internally when it becomes a matter of experience for you. Even your teacher, who is none other than Iswara who has come to you in His infinite compassion, cannot describe it. So even when you come to experience that bliss intuitively, live as the form of bliss, keeping silence over it, as if you have not realized.

12

In this twelfth chapter the topic discussed is the indivisible (Akhandā) and unitary (Eka) nature of the Atman. Though this is an esoteric secret, it is revealed here out of compassion for the aspirants of Vedānta.

By hearing the truths discussed in the former eleven chapters the feeling of 'I' and 'mine' in respect of the five sheaths, beginning with the gross body, must have disappeared. The understanding that one is Brahman, the Sat-chit-ananda, must have been established. Though all doubts have been cleared, yet one remains. May I mention it?

Yes, what is it?

It has been said that the Atman is Sat, Chit and Ananda. These three distinctive terms seem to indicate or imply

three different meanings. From this it appears that the Atman has three different forms. Does this not militate against the statement that the Atman is indivisible and unitary?

The meaning of Akhanda is this: an entity so described cannot be subject to the three limiting conditions - space (Desa), time (Kala) and matter (Vastu).

Then why are these three distinct terms applied to such an indivisible and unitary entity?

As Akasa is all-pervading it is not subject to the limitation of space. But (according to Indian cosmology) space originates and dissolves, so it is subject to time. Hence to avoid over-inclusion (Ativyapti) in description, time is specified along with space. Time is not limited by space. Nor is it limited by time, as an entity cannot be limited by itself. But it is limited by matter. A substance present in one period of time may not be present in another period. To avoid this over-inclusion Atman is said to be not limited by matter also. Atman alone is characterised by non-limitation by space, time and matter. Hence the specification of the three characteristics.

If the Atman alone is indivisible and unitary, one must be able to see all these characteristics together in a single apprehension. But one does not see so. I feel that I am standing in this place and not in that place. So the Atman cannot be said to have no limitation of space. The perception I have got that I was born ten years ago and I shall be dying ten years after now, proves that the Atman has limitation of time. When I

have the feeling that I am a Brahmana and not a Kshatriya how can you deny that limitation of individuality in the Atman? Since all these differences are there how can I accept that the Atman is without any limitation?

In the 11th chapter the characteristics of Atman and non-Atman have been stated as follows: Atman is without any internal or external limitations while Anatman has got all kinds of limitations. It was also said there that whatever is seen in the Atman is not actually there but only superimposed on it. What is superimposed on anything has no actuality even when the superimposition is perceived during any period of time. In spite of this knowledge, you are again asking the characteristic of the Atman to be described. This befits only an opponent determined to defeat another in argument by fair means or foul and not honest enquirer whose intention is to learn.

The intention of this questioner is not to win through specious arguments. The intention is only the clearing of a doubt.

Then understand what is said hereafter. The three limitations of time, space and individuality are present only in the body and not in the Atman. The all-inclusiveness and unlimitedness of the Atman who is all-pervading has none of these limitations.

How can we know that Brahman who is said to be identical with this Pratyagatman is without the above mentioned limitations?

The pot is real, the cloth is real, the wall is real, the earth is real, water is real, fire is

real, air is real, sky is real. All these varied objects which are elements and made of elements are considered by us as real. From this itself the reality (Sattatmikatva) and all-pervasiveness (Vibhutva) of the Atman become clear. Such all-pervading Atman cannot be limited by space. For the same reason the Atman is eternal (Anadi). What is eternal cannot have the limitations of time, of which we think in terms of past, present and future. It means that the Atman is beyond time; in the same way that it is beyond space. That is the meaning of being Anadi.

This part of the doubt is answered. How are we to know that the Atman is without Vastu-pariccheda (limitation by identical things).

As the Atman is all-pervading, it cannot have limitation by identical things. Things are differentiated by three kinds of limitations - Sajatiya (limitation by things of its own nature), Vijatiya (limitation of things different from it), and Svagata (internal differences). The difference of one tree from another tree is Sajatiya difference. The differences between a tree and other substances like stone, mud, etc., are Vijatiya differences or the difference between objects. When the differences within the tree itself, i.e. between its flowers, fruits, branches, trunk etc., are taken into account, we are referring to Svagata-bheda or internal differences. As none of these differences are possible regarding the Atman, we have to conclude that the Atman is without any kind of differentiation.

How can this principle be correct with regard to the Atman? For, you have said that the same Chaitanya exists as Brahma-chaitanya, Isvara-chaitanya, Kutastha-chaitanya, and Jiva-chaitanya. Is this not Sajatiya-bheda, i.e. difference between entities of a similar nature? Next as there are two — Brahman on the one hand and Atman and the unconscious world outside on the other — there is Vijatiya difference or difference between two different kinds of entities. Thirdly, in Brahman Itself there are three entities called Sat, Chit and Ananda. This is internal difference - Svagata-bheda. So how can you say that the Atman is without the three kinds of differences?

To the same sky is attributed various divisions according to the Upadhis, associated with it - Mahakasa (sky that is one expanse), Meghakasa (sky seen against cloud), Ghatakasa (sky seen within a pot), Jala-pratibimbakasa (sky reflected in water). It is, however, the same sky that is seen differently according to the limitations imposed by Upadhis. The difference is only in the adjuncts and not in the sky. In the same way it is the same consciousness that is called Brahman and Isvara when it is seen with the adjunct of Maya. The same consciousness is called as Kutastha and Jiva, when it is seen with the adjunct of Avidya. Thus the differences are in the adjuncts and not in the Atman. So the Atman is without Sajatiya difference.

How can we know that there is no Vijatiya difference?

Without the rope, there can be no snake on it. Without the sky, there cannot be any colouring on it. In the same way without the Atman, there cannot be Anatman. Without a basis, what is

superimposed on it cannot have any existence, even temporarily. All such objects superimposed are Mithya — false. Mithya means absolutely non-existent in the past, present or future, like a barren woman's son (Vandhya-putra), the horns of a hare (Sasa-vishana) etc. In the same way, as the Anatman does not actually exist, it cannot limit the Atman. So the Atman has no Vijatiya-bheda.

Next how can you prove that there is no internal difference or Svagata-bheda in Consciousness?

The Atman is witness, unchanging and ultimately true. Consciousness, Brahman, Sat, Chit, Ananda, and Nitya (eternal) single, perfect — these are the positive descriptions of the Atman. There are also negative descriptions like immaterial (Asthulam), endless (Ananta), non-dual (Advaita), unthinkable (Achintya), unchanging (Avikari), indestructible (Avinasi), non-actor (Akarta), etc. All these indicate the Atman to be without any qualification and part. None of these justify one's understanding the Atman as endowed with different forms. For this reason there cannot be any internal difference in the Atman.

Terms like Sat, Chit and Ananda, which are applied to the Atman, have difference of meaning and are not mere synonyms. They are like Hasta, Kara and Pani applied to the hand. We speak of a tree as consisting of parts like leaves, flowers, branches etc., all of which are parts within a tree. All these different terms about the parts of the body and trees are examples of internal differences. This can be applied to the Atman also.

Lohitoṣṇa-prakāśo dīpaḥ the lamp is one with brightness, red and heating. You cannot say that because there are three different terms used in the case of the flame of the lamp, there are internal differences in the flame. In the same way there are no internal differences when the Atman is described as Satchidananda-svarupa.

Will this not amount to admitting there is no internal difference (Svagata-bheda) in the case also of a tree which is described as having leaves, flowers and fruits?

No, The question is out of place. In the case of the tree, it is not said that the 'whole tree' is of the nature of leaf or flower or branches. What is said is that some parts of it are leaves, some parts are flowers, some parts are fruits, etc. So there is obviously internal difference in the case of the tree. But in regard to the Atman, when it is said that the Atman is Sat-chit-ananda, what is said is that the Atman is without any distinction of parts, Sat-chit-ananda is its entirety. This is so in the case of the light also when it is said that light is hot, brilliant, red-coloured, etc. This light cannot be divided into hot part, brilliant part and red part. The description is of the whole light. In the same way there is no internal difference for the Atman.

If it is so, why is it that the Upanishads speak repeatedly and one after the other that the Atman is Sat, the Atman is Chit, and the Atman is Ananda? If it is described even once, one can understand the nature of the Atman. Why then this repetition?

I shall give in brief why the Upanishads resort to this repetition which you think is unnecessary. On account of ignorance are superimposed the existentiality of the Atman on the world of perception, the conscious nature of the Atman on inert things like Buddhi and the blissfulness of the Atman on one's relatives like wife and children. Contrarily the ignorant person superimposes on the Atman the falseness of the world of perception, the inertness of Buddhi and such other categories and the misery-inflicting nature of relatives like wife and son. As a consequence of this mutual superimposition ignorant persons are deluded that the world of perception is real, the Buddhi and such other categories are conscious and that misery-inflicting relatives like wife and sons are bliss-giving. The result of this mutual superimposition is that the ignorant person is agitated, thinking, "I am subject to death, I am ignorant, I am subject to misery." To efface once for all this delusion-causing ignorance, the Sruti which is like a mother to one in ignorance, declares repeatedly, "O Jivas, you are of the nature of Sat-chit-ananda." The Atman is by nature real (i.e. not false), is conscious (i.e. not inert), is blissful (i.e. not subject to misery) This is said positively and negatively time and again only to efface once for all the infatuation caused by ignorance. It is not meant, as you doubt, to show that Sat, Chit and Ananda of the Atman are separate.

In this world there are some controversialists who argue thus: "Existentiality is the nature of the Atman. But consciousness and blissfulness are

attributes of the Atman. So the Atman cannot be described as Sat-chit-ananda." Such a wrong implication must be overcome by describing the Atman repeatedly and specifically as Sat-chit-ananda."

How can one ascertain with certainty that this is the object of this repetition by the Sruti.?

There are six signs (Lingas) like introduction (Upakrama), conclusion (Upasamhara), etc., which show that the object of the Sruti is to establish the inseparable non-duality (Akhandartha) of Atman.

The non-duality of the Atman has been established by you on the authority of Vedic passages. Can you show that this can be established by reasoning also?

The following is the answer according to reasoning. Is Sat self-revealing? Or is it being revealed by the light of any other thing? If it is self-revealing, Sat will itself be Chit or consciousness. If on the other hand, it is said that Sat is revealed by the light of something else, that other shining substance will be synonymous with Sat. If it is said it is a 'different aspect' of Sat, then that aspect will be a non-existent fiction like the horns of a hare. For there is no difference between Sat and this falsely assumed 'aspect'. Being non-existent, it cannot reveal Sat. If you say that this 'aspect' is entirely different from Sat, you have to doubt whether this 'aspect', being different from Sat, can reveal itself or not, or requires the help of another enlightening factor.

If you answer that it reveals itself, then that supposed 'aspect' must be the same as Chit or

consciousness itself and not different from it. If the second alternative (i.e. this 'aspect' is different) is preferred, the earlier doubt will again remain. So by introducing a different factor from Sat to reveal Sat, numerous logical fallacies will result. These are Atmasraya-dosha, Anyonyasraya-dosha, Chakrakapatti-dosha, and Anavastha-dosha. So we have to conclude that Sat is self-revealing. What is self-revealing is identical with Sat. They are not different. So Sat is Chit and Chit is Sat. The Vedas do not mention any existence other than Sat.

Accepting that Sat and Chit are identical, how can we arrive at the conclusion that the entity so indicated is also bliss?

If Sat is accepted as non-dual, its blissful nature is also included in it. Ananda is always full. In what is small, there is no fullness. Fullness is understandable only in non-dual Sat. In duality there can be no fullness.

How can we say that Sat is non-dual?

Sat cannot have a second by its side. For, then you will have to explain whether that 'second' is another similar entity or one of a different category. If you say that it is another similar entity, that will go against scripture, reason and experience. If you say it is an entity of another category it will be a fictitious non-entity like the horn of a hare. So neither of the two alternatives of the 'second' is applicable to Sat. There is no alternative other than the two mentioned above. So Sat, which can only be one without a second,

is Advitiya (non-dual). From this its 'fullness' is established. As the self-effulgent Sat alone is Ananda, we have established the unitary meaning (Akandartha) of the term Sat-chit-ananda through reason.

How can we know or verify this unitary meaning on the basis of experience?

The answer to this question has already been given in the eleventh chapter. Yet for confirmation of that answer, I shall repeat it. In deep sleep all experience the same happiness. That happiness has no differences in quality and variation from person to person, as is the case with happiness experienced in the waking and dream states. So we have to conclude that the happiness experienced in deep sleep does not require the help of any external factor to become manifest. So that bliss, being self-effulgent, must necessarily be Chit.

Where is the proof for accepting that the bliss of sleep is self-manifest?

When one awakens from deep sleep, one says from memory, "All this time I slept happily" Memory is possible only of an experience. The usual experiences of waking and dream are given by the organs of knowledge in their gross or subtle forms. Such organs are not there to give experience in deep sleep. This proves that the experience of happiness in sleep is self-manifest.

In the memory from experience of deep sleep, memories of both happiness and ignorance are present. Of these two, is it happiness or ignorance that is self-manifest?

It is happiness alone that is self-manifest. Ignorance, being of the nature of a covering, cannot shine or manifest itself. So the bliss of deep sleep is the same as the bliss of the Atman. The Atman is self-luminous by nature. It is the self-luminosity of the Atman that is self-manifest. It is that self-luminosity of the Atman that gives awareness to ignorance. That awareness of ignorance is superimposed on the Atman. What is only superimposed is not actually there. So on the basis of experience also we can conclude that the Atman is self-luminous. Thus we come to the conclusion that the term Sat-Cit-Ananda is indivisible.

In this way the scriptures, reason and experience prove that in the Atman there are no internal differences nor external differences with similar objects. For this reason the Atman has no limitation from other objects and from space and time. Being of this nature the Atman is Paripurna (complete to the fullest degree) and Akhandakara-rasa (the essence of indivisibility).

Unhappiness or misery is only accidental (Agantuka) for the Atman who is paripurna. It is, on the other hand, not natural to the Atman. Misery has arisen from the body, the body from Karma, Karma from attachment and hate, attachment and hate from ego or the 'I-sense', the 'I-sense' from lack of discrimination and the lack of discrimination from ignorance. You have to destroy that ignorance by knowledge. Knowledge will arise only through deep discriminative cogitation. It consists in constant contemplation that the Atman is Satya-jnana-ananda-svarupa (truth, consciousness

and bliss by nature), the world consisting of the body and the rest is untrue and non-existent (Anrta), and that this untrue and non-existent world is superimposed on the Atman. By such constant contemplation, the sense of the terms *Tat* and *Tvam*, will become firm in the mind. By that, the understanding of 'I am Brahman' (*aham brahmāsmi*) will dawn on the mind. This is indirect knowledge. By intensifying this, it will become Aparoksha knowledge, i.e. real and unalterable knowledge. "Let one who has such knowledge be of untouchable caste or a Brahmana, he is my Guru," is the declaration of Sri Sankara. Such a person is more worshipful than Sannyasins who are known by such terms as Kutichaka, Bahudaka and Hamsa. He is a Paramahamsa (one beyond all rules, injunctions and classifications). You also attain realisation through Sravana, Manana and Nididhyasana. Remain in the consciousness that you are the non-dual Brahman, who is Nitya-mukta-buddha-svarupa (one by nature eternally free and awakened). This is all that the teacher has got to impart and what a disciple has to hear. There is nothing more than this to teach or to hear. May good befall you!

ISBN 81-7120-629-8

BOOKS BY SWAMI TAPASYANANDAJI

Biographies

Sri Ramakrishna: Life and Teachings
Sri Sarada Devi: Life and Teachings
Swami Vivekananda: His Life and Legacy
Sri Sarada Devi, the Holy Mother
Swami Ramakrishnananda

Studies

Bhakti Schools of Vedanta
The Four Yogas of Swami Vivekananda
The Nationalistic and Religious
Lectures of Swami Vivekananda
The Philosophical and Religious
Lectures of Swami Vivekananda
Sri Ramakrishna Math and Mission
Preguntas y Respuestas
["Pariprasna" in Spanish]
Spiritual Quest (Questions & Answers)

Translations

Srimad Bhagavata (4 volumes)
Srimad Bhagavad Gita (Economy Edition)
Bhagavad Gita (Pocket Edition)
Adhyatma Ramayana
Sundara Kandam
Narayaneeyam
Bhakti Ratnavali
Sri Vishnu Sahasranama
Sri Lalita Sahasranama
Saundarya Lahari
Sivananda Lahari
Aratrika Hymns and Ramnam
Stotranjali
Sankara Digvijaya
Kapilopadesha
Prasnottara-ratna-malika

Laghuvasudeva Mananam Rs. 15. 00