

Discourses on
P A Ñ C A D A Ś Ī
Vol : III

by
Swami Anubhavananda

15

१५

पञ्चदशी

Central Chinmaya Mission Trust
Bombay-400 072.

Discourses on

P A Ñ C A D A Ś Ī

Vol: III

(Chapter VII --- Tṛpti dīpa prakaraṇam)

by

Swami Anubhavananda



Central Chinmaya Mission Trust
Bombay 400 072.

© Central Chinmaya Mission Trust

1994-First Edition. 3000 Copies

SAT BHAVANA TRUST

104, Siddheshwar 'A' Khot Gully, Shivaji Park,
Mahim, Mumbai - 400 016, India. ☎ +91-22-446-9924
Email : anubhavananda@yahoo.com

For more details
Pramodinee Madkalkar ☎ +91-22-446-7025
Email : pramodinee@india.com

Printed by :

Priya Graphics

E-127 Ansa Industrial Estate,
Saki Vihar Road, Saki-Naka,
Bombay-400 072. Ph.: 578 0517/807 8360

Publisher's Note

There was a constant demand for publication, from our side, of *Pañcadaśī* on the lines of Chinmaya tradition. This need was long felt. Br. Sudhanshu Chaitnaya, now Swami Anubhavānanda delivered lectures on *Pañcadaśī* during his stay at Chinmaya Mission, Delhi, which is the base of the present publication.

In this book, diacritical marks are used for transliteration of *saṁkṛta* words in the verses and commentary. Non-English words have been italicised. This will help readers to identify and pronounce the words correctly.

This English plural sign's has been added to untranslated *saṁkṛta* words after a hyphen (-) to show that it is not elemental to the words e.g. *Mantra-s*, *Veda-s*, *Ṛṣi-s* etc.

A key to the transliteration and pronuciation has been added in the beginning of the book.

Param Pūjaniya Gurudev Swami Chinmayananda has blessed this book to be used by all the sincere seekers of *Vedānta* in our Mission and elsewhere. We expect that this commentary will fulfil the long felt need of a publication in our list of earlier published works on *Vedānta*. The present volume contains the seventh chapter.

Publishers
Central Chinmaya Mission Trust

Place: Bombay

Date: 29th August 1994

TRANSLITERATION GUIDE FOR SAṂSKṚTA WORDS

a as <i>o</i> in son	अ*	r as <i>r</i> in Kṛṣṇa	ऋ
ā as <i>a</i> in master	आ (ॠ)*	ś as <i>sh</i> in shut	श
b as <i>b</i> in book	ब	ṣ as <i>sh</i> in show	ष
c as <i>ch</i> in check	च	s as <i>s</i> in sit	स्
d as <i>d</i> in father, then	द	t as <i>t</i> in french sound	त्
ḍ as <i>d</i> in do	ड	ṭ as <i>t</i> in touch	ट
e as <i>a</i> in evade	ए (ॡ)*	u as <i>u</i> in full	उ (ॣ)*
g as <i>g</i> in good	ग	ū as <i>oo</i> in boot	ऊ (।)*
h as <i>h</i> in hard	ह	v as <i>w</i> in want, avert	व
ḥ as <i>h</i> in oh!	:	y as <i>y</i> in yak	य
i as <i>i</i> in if	इ (०)*	ai as <i>y</i> in my	ऐ (१)*
ī as <i>ee</i> in feel	ई (१)*	au as <i>ow</i> in now	औ (२)*
j as <i>j</i> in jar	ज	bh as <i>bh</i> in abhor	भ
k as <i>k</i> in kite	क	ch as <i>chh</i> in catch him	छ
l as <i>l</i> in Lord	ल	dh as <i>theh</i> in breathe	ध
m as <i>m</i> in man	म	ḍh as <i>dh</i> in godhood	ढ
m̐ as <i>m</i> in simple, hum	(ॢ)	gh as <i>gh</i> in ghost	घ
n as <i>n</i> in nose	न	jh as <i>dgeh</i> in hedgehog	झ
ṇ as <i>n</i> in monkey	ण	kh as <i>kh</i> in khāki	ख
ñ as <i>n</i> in lunch	ञ	ph as <i>ph</i> in photo	फ
ṇ as <i>n</i> in under (hard)	ण	th as <i>th</i> in thumb	थ
o as <i>o</i> in over	ओ (०)*	ṭh as <i>th</i> in ant-hill	ट
p as <i>p</i> in put	प	' as unwritten 'a' sound	ऽ
r as <i>r</i> in run	र	" as - do - 'aa' sound	ऽऽ

Also letters ḷ and ṛ represent ल* and ऋ* respectively and F, Q, W, X and Z are not called to use.

In *saṁskṛta*, consonants represented with a stroke below e.g. as in क् cannot be pronounced except in conjunction with a vowel marked * e.g. क्(k) + अ(a) = क(ka).

For easy pronunciation while reading or reciting, in some publications, the break-up of the transliteration is based on the phonetic sounds and not on the basis of *saṁskṛta* grammar rules or words.

No day passes
without your reading
5 pages.

11.9.83

Upanayanam.

With his blessings we continue.....



DEDICATED TO
THE EVER SHINING PRESENCE OF
PUJYA GURUDEVA



CHINMAYA MISSION®

Swami Tejomayananda

San Jose
Sept. 29, 1993



Ashirvachan

“Panchadashi” of Swami Vidyananda Muni is one of the most profound works on Advaita-Vedanta. It is indeed a treat to study and teach this text. The author, in his inimitable style expounds all aspects of Vedanta in a manner that leaves nothing to be desired. All possible questions and doubts get clarified while studying this book. It is a must for all serious students of Vedanta.

I am pleased to see the work of Brahmachari Sudhanshu Chaitanya. He has written a short commentary on this voluminous book in English, giving word for word meaning of each verse. This will certainly help seekers of knowledge. Brahmaleen Pujya Gurudev had seen his work and blessed it. I wish him every success in his life.

With Love

Tejomayananda

INTRODUCTION

Pañcadaśī is a book of categories dealing with the different aspects of *Vedāntik* philosophy. The major emphasis of this book is to help the sincere seekers in getting the perfect vision of the Truth without any doubt whatsoever, in the philosophical aspects of the Truth. The author indicates very distinctly in the beginning of his composition, that this text is composed for the sincere seekers of Truth, who have pure minds with single-pointed devotion for knowing the Truth. Any student of *Vedāntik* philosophy is incomplete in his studies without a thorough study of *Pañcadaśī*.

There are many commentaries in different languages on this text. However, the commentary of *Śrī Rāmakrishna* is considered to be most authentic and to the point. *Śrī Rāmakrishna* was a direct disciple of the two authors of *Pañcadaśī*, namely *Śrī Vidyāraṇya Svāmī* and his *guru Śrī Bhāratī Tīrtha*.

The scheme of the thought presentation is divided under three types namely:

1. Chapters dealing with discrimination.
2. Chapters dealing with illumination.
3. Chapters dealing with bliss.

The first five chapters mainly deal with the discrimination predominantly on 'Sat' aspect of the Truth. The second five chapters deal with the 'Cit' aspects of the Truth while the remaining five chapters deal with the 'Ānanda' aspects of the Truth.

In the above classification, there is no exclusion of the other two aspects of the Truth, while dealing with predominantly a particular aspect of the Truth.

It is believed by the different commentators that the first six chapters were written by *Śrī Vidyāranya Svāmī* and were presented to his *guru*, *Śrī Bhārati Tīrtha* and the latter added the remaining nine chapters to make it into a volume of 15 chapters. Hence the name *Pañcadaśī*.

The present publication on *Pañcadaśī* is brought out in the Chinmaya style of commentaries wherein the original *śloka* or verse is followed by transliteration, word-to-word meaning, running translation of the *saṁskṛta śloka* and a short commentary on different words and thoughts. We have used the international transliteration symbols for writing the *saṁskṛta* words in Roman script. However, the splitting of the transliteration is strictly on the basis of the phonetic sounds rather than the breaking of *saṁskṛta* words as per the grammar rules. This was done to facilitate students, who are not able to read *devanāgarī* script is able to join the chorus chanting along with other students who are chanting the original text in a *Vedāntik* class-room. This has been the tradition of imparting knowledge in our Chinmaya style wherein every verse is chanted by the teacher first, followed by the students chanting of the same verse in chorus.

The present book is an outcome of the grace of *Param Pūjya Gurudev (Swāmī Chinmayānanda)* who encouraged me in many ways and also blessed the commentary that was shown to him during Dehra Dun *Yajña* in October 1992.

This book is the result of sincere efforts put forth by the students at Delhi Chinmaya Mission who were very regular in attending the classes in spite of many difficulties. The lectures were recorded, transcribed, edited and finally given the shape of a book. Those who were involved in the preparation of the manuscript need special thanks, without whose untiring efforts this book would never have come out. To name them, I remember the following with special reverence Mrs. Sarasvati Doraisvāmī and Mrs. Gāyatri Bālasubramaniām and Ms. Sarita Ohri affectionately called 'Dolly'. The students who were instrumental in encouraging

me to take up this text need and deserve my foremost appreciation.

The computer composition of the entire text was done by Mrs. Uma Kumar (Delhi), *Śrī Gopalkrishnan* (Bombay) and staff of CCMT. The proof-reading was rendered by *Śrī Vishwamitra Puri* with meticulous care. I record my appreciation for his valuable suggestions for simplification of expressions to enable even a casual reader to understand the *vedāntik* concepts. To speed up the publication of this volume, he ably assisted *Sri Anil Chaudhary* of CCMT in carrying out corrections as well as page formatting on computer. The beautiful get up of this volume is the result of their, full dedication and devotion.

Param Pūjya Swāmī Tejomayānanda was kind enough to go through the manuscript and suggested some changes which has given the book a better look. His blessing is a continuation of *Param Pūjya Gurudev's* '*saṁkalpa*' for the completion of this book. I have no words to express my gratitude for His encouraging suggestions and guidance.

This commentary was designed to be brought out in three volumes. The first volume includes the first five chapters of *Pañcadaśī*. To avoid bulkiness of each volume, chapters VI and VII have formed separate volumes II and III respectively, volume IV will comprise of chapters VIII to X, while the last chapters from XI to XV will form volume V. Thus the total commentary of the text will, now, run into five volumes.

Krishna Janmashtami Day
Bombay,
August 29th 1994.

Swami Anubhavānanda
(formerly Br. Sudhanshu Chaitanya)
Sāndīpany Sādhanaḷaya
Bombay 400 072.

Abbrevation used in this volume

Ait.Ā	Aitareya Āraṇyaka
Anu.G.	Aṇu Gītā
Apb.	Aparokṣānubhūti
B.G.	Bhagavad Gītā
Bj.G.	Bhaja Govindam
B.G.B.	Śaṅkara's Bhagavad Gītā Bhāṣya
B.S.	Brahma Sūtra
B.U.	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad
C.U.	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
G.D.S.	Gautama Dharma Sūtra
I.U.B.	Śaṅkarācārya's Īśāvāsyā Upaniṣad Bhāṣya
Jal.U.	Jābāla Upaniṣad
K.U.	Kaṭha Upaniṣad
Kai. U.	Kaivalya Upaniṣad
Ke.U.	Keṇa Upaniṣad
Manu.	Maṇu Smṛti
M.B.	Mahābhārata
M.U.	Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad
Mk.U.	Muktikopaniṣad
Nar.Pari.U.	Nārada Parivrājaka Upaniṣad
Nrpt.U.	Narsimha-purvatāpaṇi Upaniṣad
P.U.	Praśna Upaniṣad
R.V.	Ṛg Veda
Śānti	Śāntiparva
S.U.	Śvetaśvatara Upaniṣad
Sk.	Skandha
T.A.	Taittirīya Āraṇyaka
T.B.	Taittirīya Upaniṣad Bhāṣya of Śaṅkara
T.S.	Taittirīya Saṁhitā
T.U.	Taittirīya Upaniṣad
Vana	Vanaparva
V.P.	Viṣṇu Purāṇa
V.C.	Vivek-cūdāmaṇi

7

15

CHAPTER VII

TRPTI DĪPA PRAKARAṆAM
or
LIGHT OF CONTENTMENT

Most of the *vedāntik prakriyā-s* i.e. thought processes that lead to the correct understanding of the Self were discussed upto the sixth chapter. It is believed that *Svāmī Vidyāraṇyājī* showed his thesis to his *Guru mahāraj Svāmī Bhāratī Tīrthajī*. The teacher was very happy on the work of the desciple. To apply the *vedāntik* thought process for correct understanding of the *upaniṣadik* statement, a

mantra from *Bṛhadāraṇyaka upaniṣad* is taken for enquiry, so that we can know the art of application of *vedāntik* thought process to other *mantra-s* also.

This chapter begins with the most famous and important statement of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka upaniṣad* (4-4-12).

आत्मानं चेद्विजानीयादयमस्मीति पूरुषः ।
किमिच्छन्कस्य कामाय शरीरमनुसंज्वरेत् ॥१॥

Ātmānaṁ cet vijānīyāt ayam asmīti pūruṣaḥ
Kimicchan kasya kāmāya śarīram anu sanjvaret (1)

पूरुषः = an individual entity (the *jīva*); आत्मानम् = real nature of the self; अयम् अस्मि = this I am; चेत् = in this way; इति = if; विजानीयात् = comes to realise; किम् इच्छन् = desiring what; कस्य कामाय = for whose sake; शरीरम् अनु = after the body; संज्वरेत् = struggles with worries.

When an individual comes to realise that, I am the Self, will he ever desire anything and for whose sake? Will he ever struggle and worry after the body? (1)

In this *Tṛpti Dīpa Prakaraṇa*, the teacher takes up the theme of *Tṛpti* or the state of perfect contentment - *a state of fulfilment where whatever is to be achieved in life has been achieved; where there are no regrets or demands; and where there is nothing to be gained through activities*. The chapter starts with a statement from the *Bṛha. upaniṣad* (4.4.12), serving as an axiomatic declaration. All the 297 *śloka-s* that follow constitute an in-depth analysis and explanation of this statement. Three issues are raised in the *upaniṣadik* statement: What is that because of which man suffers? What is that because of which man comes out of this suffering? And what is that by which one can attain the state of Absolute Bliss, even while living in this world, as a *jīvan mukta*?

The *Puruṣa* or *jīva* comes to realise its own essential nature (*ātmānam*) namely, 'This I am' (*ayam asmi iti*) by a process of rejecting everything that is not-self (not this, not this). That which illumines and gives existence even to the absence, is the nature of the *puruṣa* or the *jīva*.

This absolute presence is the essential nature of *jīva*. When this knowledge 'This I am' takes place without the help of any medium or instrument (*vijānīyāt*), he cannot have any desire for *anatma vastu* or worldly objects (*kim ichhan*). Just as the dream-state has no validity in the waking-state, the latter loses its hold in the dawn of self-realisation, the waking-state world is not taken seriously. There cannot be any *kartṛtva abhimāna* i.e. that he is a doer, nor can he have *bhokṛtva abhimāna*, i.e. the sense of being the enjoyer. Once he understands that the sense of doership and enjoyership are in Him, but he is not in them, then will he be agitated or disturbed by the sufferings of the gross body? He will not identify himself with the gross body which is limited in time, space and object, and thus will not become prey to desires for the body and will not suffer the miseries that afflict the body.

This statement from the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka upaniṣad* is taken for explanation in this chapter. The teacher now declares his commitment to discuss exhaustively this statement along with its purpose ---

अस्याः श्रुतेरभिप्रायः सम्यगत्र विचार्यते ।
जीवन्मुक्तस्य या तृप्तिः सा तेन विशदायते ॥२॥

Asyāḥ śrute rabhi prāyaḥ samya gatra vicāryate
Jīvan muktasya yā tṛptiḥ sā tena viśadāyate (2)

अत्र = in this chapter; अस्याः श्रुतेः = of this *upaniṣad* declaration; अभिप्रायः = the essential and purposeful meaning;

सम्यक् = exhaustively; विचार्यते = is being enquired; तेन = by this enquiry and the knowledge; जीवन् मुक्तस्य = of the man of liberation (while living); या तृप्तिः = that fulfilment; सा = that; विशदायते = will be revealed.

In this chapter the essential meaning and the purpose of the *upaniṣad* statement (referred in the first *śloka*) is being enquired exhaustively. This exhaustive enquiry and the knowledge born out of this, will reveal the fulfilment and bliss that is enjoyed by the man of liberation while living. (2)

The student of *vedānta* needs to study every scriptural statement, analytically and exhaustively, in depth, following the six steps referred to in Chapter VI (*śloka* 195) viz (*śada vidha liṅga nirṇaya*). This will help him, to arrive at a clear understanding of the essential Truth or (*tātparya*) referred to as *abhiprāya* in this *śloka*. By such an enquiry it will be possible to understand how a *jīvan mukta*, while living in the body, remains in the glory of this own Eternal Being, in full contentment and joy. The sufferings of the *jīva* due to its identification with and attachment to the body and the desires that arise as a consequence, cease to exist for a *jīvan mukta*.

- i) *Upakrama* - *Upasamhāra ekatā* - oneness of the postulate and the conclusion
- ii) *Abhyāsa* - Emphasis of the topic in different words, in and through the text
- iii) *Apūrvatā* - Uniqueness of the subject is, that it can be authoritatively determined through *upaniṣadik* study only. *Vedānta* is the final authority of this knowledge.
- iv) *Phala* - The purpose of the subject presented in the text.
- v) *Arthavāda* - The words of praise in favour of the absolute and words of censure in favour of the relative.

- vi) *Upapatti* - Essential identity between the 'relative' and 'the Absolute', through logical illustrations and examples.

To explain the meaning of the word *puruṣa* in this statement, the teacher first introduces the concept of associated factors like '*māyā*', '*jīva*' and '*Īśvara*' used in the *vedānta*---

मायाभासेन जीवेशौ करोतीति श्रुतत्वतः ।
कल्पितावेव जीवेशौ ताभ्यां सर्वं प्रकल्पितम् ॥३॥

Māyā bhāseṇa jīveṣau karotīti śrutatvataḥ
Kalpita veva jīveṣau tābhyāṁ sarvaṁ prakalpitaṁ (3)

माया = the material cause of this world; आभासेन = consciousness conditioned by the *māyā*; जीवेशौ = the *jīva* and the *Īśvara*; करोति = is conceived; इति = thus; श्रुतत्वतः = is heard in the *veda*-s; जीवेशौ = the *jīva* and the *Īśvara*; कल्पितौ = are imagined; एव = merely; ताभ्याम् = by them; सर्वम् = the whole world; प्रकल्पितम् = is conceptually imagined.

The consciousness conditioned by *māyā* (which is the material cause of the world) creates the concepts of *jīva* and *Īśvara*, is declared in the *Vedā*-s. These *jīva* and *Īśvara* are therefore, merely concepts. This whole world is a projection by them. (3)

The word *puruṣa* is now taken up. How is the world created? The *upaniṣad śruti vākya* says that *māyā* is the imaginary power of the Lord, which is the material cause of the world. *Māyā* with the help of the reflection *ābhāseṇa* of the Pure Consciousness (*Parabrahma Paramātmā*) creates two types of *Cidābhāsa*: the *jīva* (individuality) and *Īśvara* (totality). In reality, these are imaginary and not existing, hence - *kalpita eva jīveṣau*. Thus, are created the relative existence known as the governed (*jīva*) and that which governs (the *Īśvara*!); the created and the creator; the limited and the unlimited; the little knower (*alpajña*) and

the omniscient (*sarvajña*); the less powerful (*alpa-śaktimān*) and all powerful (*sarva-śaktimān*) etc. All these pairs of qualities are with reference to conditionings - i.e. conditioning of limitations as well as of no-limitations. An ignorant man considers the limited, as perfection. The seeker imagines perfection in the limited, whereas the man of wisdom, knows that in the infinite, the finitude is imagined.

There are thus three stages in understanding the world:

1. Considering the limited as perfect, is being in the world of ignorance *jīva-bhāva*
2. Considering himself to be the incomplete, but the *Guru* to be complete; - is being a seeker
3. Considering that in the Infinite or Absolute which is all completeness, the limitations are imagined.

The first understanding is bondage. The second one is also a bondage, but leads to liberation; while the third transcends both, and is freedom.

In the Absolute, the *jīva* and *Īśvara* are imagined; each generates its own series of imaginations: *jīva* imagines its world of miseries and tragedies; and *Īśvara* imagines another world of no misery and no tragedy (*prakalpita*). According to *vedānta śāstra*, *māyā-prakṛti* or *jīva-Īśvara* are superimposed on the Absolute, where there is neither *jīva* nor *Īśvara*, neither *māyā* nor *prakṛti*. For the Absolute is one-without-a-second.

Differentiation of the projected world on the basis of their source i.e. *jīva* or *Īśvara*, is explained---

ईक्षणादिप्रवेशान्ता सृष्टिरीशेन कल्पिता ।
जाग्रदादिविमोक्षान्तः संसारो जीवकल्पितः ॥४॥

Īkṣaṇādi prave śāntā sṛṣṭir īśena kalpitā
Jāgradādi vimokṣāntaḥ saṁsāro jīva kalpitāḥ (4)

सृष्टिः = the creation; ईक्षणादि प्रवेशान्ता = that begins from the conceptualisation to entry; ईशेन = by the *Īśvara*, कल्पिता = is conceived or projected; जाग्रदादि विमोक्षान्तः = beginning from the waking state to liberation; संसारः = the world; जीव कल्पितः = is projected by the *jīva*.

The part of creation that begins from the conceptualisation upto the entry of the creator in the creation, is attributed to the projection by the *Īśvara*. The world that includes the waking state upto liberation from these limitations, is attributed to the projection by the *jīva*. (4)

Īśena Kalpitā sṛṣṭiḥ - The world which is the imaginary creation of the *Īśvara* is created by the power of *māyā*. Then the Lord entered the world, and became the *jīva*. From the point of creation (*īkṣaṇa*) upto this entry (*praveśāntā*), is (*Īśvara sṛṣṭi*) creation of the Lord.

Jāgradādi vimokṣāntaḥ - From this point onwards the *jīva* enters the various planes of consciousness: *jāgrat*, *svapna* and *suṣupti avasthā* (waking, dream and deep sleep states). The *jīva* becomes waker in the waking state, dreamer in the dream state, and deep sleeper in the deep-sleep state. Thus he goes on migrating from one plane of consciousness to another, and suffers or enjoys as if he is in bondage. When the *jīva* comes to realise that 'it is I alone who am in the different states of consciousness, they all come out of me, but I am not affected', then the *jīva* achieves liberation i.e. *Kaivalya Mukti*.

The *jīva* seeking *mukti* is as much an illusion as the bondage of *saṁsāra* imagined by it, in the first place. Thus the teacher tries to establish with emphasis again and again, the imaginary nature of the world (*kalpita eva jīveṣau*). This is called *prakriyā*. The wrong imagination is corrected by right imagination in the light of the scriptural statements. Thereafter, both imaginations are removed and what remains is the substratum, which is supporting both

the right and wrong imaginations. In other words, understanding imagination to be an imagination, is the only way to go beyond imagination.

In the light of this background, the teacher takes up the definition of *Pūruṣa* in a scientific manner. The above explanation is essential to understand the correct meaning of the word '*pūruṣa*' in the *Vedik* statement. Understanding of the 'conditioned consciousness' without the 'conditionless consciousness' leads to incomplete knowledge about the word '*pūruṣa*'.

Hence ----

भ्रमाधिष्ठानभूतात्मा कूटस्थासङ्गचिद्वपुः ।
अन्योन्याध्यासतोऽसङ्गधीस्थजीवोऽत्र पूरुषः ॥५॥

Bhramā dhiṣṭhāna bhūtātmā kūṭasthā saṅga cidvapuḥ
Anyonā dhyāsato 'saṅga dhīstha jīvo'tra pūruṣaḥ (5)

कूटस्थ असङ्ग चिद्वपुः = of the nature of the consciousness that is immutable, unattached; भ्रम अधिष्ठान भूतात्मा = the substratum of the delusion of the conditionings of body, senses, etc; अन्योन्य अध्यासतः = by the mutual superimposition of their qualities on each other; असङ्ग = unattached; धीस्थ जीवः = conditioned by the intellect, the *jīva*, अत्र = in this *vedik* statement; पूरुषः = is referred by the word '*pūruṣaḥ*'.

The consciousness, which is the substratum of the imagined conditioning of the intellect etc., and therefore, in no way connected with the intellect; having reflected in this conditioning and mutual transfer of their qualities, has come to be a '*jīva*'. This is what is meant by the word '*pūruṣa*' in this statement of the *upaniṣad* under discussion. (5)

The meaning of *pūruṣa* in the original *vedāntik* text-*śruti vākya* is now discussed. It means the *Kūṭastha*, the

substratum called the consciousness, on which there is a delusion that the consciousness although supporting the conditioning, thinks that it has become conditioned. Actually the support is never influenced by the supported, but when it imagines that it is, that condition is called the *jīva*. In other words, when the absolute consciousness starts imagining that 'I am the body, mind, intellect, etc.' that imaginary non-existing condition of the consciousness is called *jīvātmā*. Thus the limitations which are not real are taken to be real, the consciousness which is *kūṭastha* unchanging, is caught up in the conditionings.

Asaṅga - Kūṭastha caitanya is not influenced by any limitations, *dhīstha jīva* while *cidābhāsa* is all the time under the influence of limitations. When these come together, in this *śruti*, *pūruṣaḥ* means the *jīva* who is the amalgam of matter and consciousness.

With this definition, if *śloka-1* is read again, it will be clear that when the conditioned consciousness or *jīva* comes to realise that the conditions are supported by it and that it is totally unattached (*asaṅga*), it will no longer be disturbed by the conditionings. In the Absolute, problems can never be. The only way to get out of the problems is to develop a thinking pattern from the Absolute point of view and not from the relative stand-point. When the individuality is surrendered to the totality with unwavering faith, one develops a beautiful vision, whereby one is not affected by whatever happens in life. This is called *jīvan mukti*.

Normally the students of *vedānta* in their initial days of studies do this error of understanding the concept of the illusion called 'the *jīva*'. Therefore, it is essential to know that the illusion cannot exist without its substratum.

This point is made clear in the following----

साधिष्ठानो विमोक्षादौ जीवोऽधिक्रियते न तु ।
केवलो निरधिष्ठानविभ्रान्तेः काप्यसिद्धितः ॥६॥

*Sādhiṣṭhāno vimokṣādaḥ jīvo'dhikriyate na tu
Kevalo niradhiṣṭhāna vibhrānteḥ kvāpya siddhitaḥ* (6)

जीवः = the *jīva*, अधिक्रियते = is considered to exist and qualify; विमोक्षादौ = for the liberation etc.; साधिष्ठानः = along with its substratum, the pure consciousness; न तु केवलः = not independently alone; निरधिष्ठान विभ्रान्तेः = (because) the existence of the illusion without its substratum; क अपि = anywhere; असिद्धितः = is not known.

The 'jīva' which is a concept of an illusion is considered qualified and existent for the purpose of liberation etc. along with the substratum of 'Pure Consciousness' and not independently. Because, the illusion is not known to exist without the support of the substratum. (6)

The question is then raised: Do we have to bring the consciousness with reference to the conditioning?... 'cannot it be said directly that the reflection of consciousness is called *jīvātmā*'. The teacher replies 'that understanding the *jīvātmā* without reference to the substratum - the *kūṭastha caitanya*, is incomplete, because 'the existence' of the *jīvātmā* is borrowed from the *kūṭastha caitanya*. Without the substratum the super-imposition cannot exist.

The *jīva* or *pūruṣa*, the conditioned consciousness therefore, becomes qualified (*adhikāri*) for seeking liberation etc. only with reference to the substratum, (*sādhiṣṭhāna*). Without the reference of the substratum the illusion cannot exist independently (*na tu kevalam*). Just as there can be no reflection without the object that is being reflected. *Bhrāntiḥ* or delusion cannot thus be talked about without the substratum. Furthermore, the reflection in the mirror looks distorted when there is distortion in the reflecting medium, but the reflection cannot

have liberation from the medium because it has no independent existence. The illusion of the snake cannot exist without the substratum of the rope. Similarly, it is not possible to talk of liberation for the *jīva* without reference to the *kūṭastha caitanya* (*Nir-adhiṣṭhāna vibhrānteḥ kvāpi asiddhitaḥ*). The substratum is the reality, while the illusion is a contrary perception of the substratum.

From the above it is to be understood that this limited and unhappy individual is supported by something which is neither limited nor unhappy. After having known this, the question of the *pūruṣa* being unhappy or desiring for the body does not arise (*śloka* 1). Every *śloka* thus leads to this conclusion.

Thus the *jīva* must be understood along with the *kūṭastha caitanya* for the purpose of liberation or bondage in spiritual *sādhana*.

This thought is further explained in the next few *śloka*-s.

This principle of the possibility of liberation of the '*jīvātmā*' when considered along with the substratum and not independently, is shown in the following two *śloka*-s---

अधिष्ठानांशसंयुक्तं भ्रमांशमवलम्बते ।
यदा तदाऽहं संसारीत्येवं जीवोऽभिमन्यते ॥७॥

*Adhiṣṭhānāṁśa saṁyuktam bhramāṁśam avalambate
Yadā tadā'haṁ saṁsārīti evaṁ jīvo'bhimanyate* (7)

यदा = when; जीवः = the *jīvātmā*, अधिष्ठानांश संयुक्तम् = along with the substratum of pure consciousness; भ्रमांशम् = the illusory aspect of the conditioning of the mind etc.; अवलम्बते = takes to be its essential nature; तदा = then; अहम् संसारी = I am a *saṁsārī*; इति एवम् = in this way; अभिमन्यते = imagines to be.

When the 'jīva' alongwith its substratum of 'pure consciousness', takes the illusory aspect of the conditionings to be its real nature, then he comes to suffer the imagination that 'I am a *saṁsārī*' etc. (7)

How does *jīva* take place or how conditioned consciousness is born? The *jīvātmā* which has the *kūṭastha* as its substratum (*adhiṣṭhāna*), due to delusion (*bhramāṁśam*), imagines that the conditionings are real and comes to believe that 'I am the *saṁsārī*'. Thus the *jīva* exists only in illusion and delusion. It exists only in its own absence. In spite of the knowledge that it is the result of delusion, it continues to be, like the blueness of the sky. This non-existing entity called the '*saṁsārī*' is the *jīva*. The thought that 'I am a *saṁsārī*' arises out of a false notion of bondage, of false identification with the limitations that constitute the world. Thus, when the Absolute gives importance to the conditions, it becomes 'conditioned'.

Contrary to this erroneous identity when----

भ्रमांशस्य तिरस्कारादधिष्ठानप्रधानता ।
यदा तदा चिदात्माहमसङ्गोऽस्मीति बुद्ध्यते ॥८॥

Bhramāṁśasya tīraskārāt adhiṣṭhāna pradhānatā
Yadā tadā cidātmāham asaṅgo 'smīti buddhyate (8)

यदा = when; तिरस्कारात् = the rejection of the; भ्रमांशस्य = the illusory aspect of the conditioning; अधिष्ठान प्रधानता = by the acceptance of the substratum to be the reality; तदा = then; अहम् चिदात्मा = I am consciousness; असङ्गः अस्मि = unattached I am; इति बुद्ध्यते = in this way comes to realise.

When the '*jīva*' rejects the imagined conditioning of the illusion and accepts the substratum as its real nature, then he comes to realise that 'I am consciousness, I am unattached'. (8)

What is the remedy out of this situation? 'I', the *kūṭastha caitanya* must understand that the *jīvātmā* or conditioning on me is only imaginary and not real. This understanding itself is rejection of the delusion (*bhramāṁśasya tīraskārāt*). Once this is done, then I see who I am viz. I am (*adhiṣṭhāna pradhānatā*) - the *kūṭastha caitanya*. By living every moment like *kūṭastha caitanya*, one learns to live like a human being.

Rejection of delusion is achieved by developing non-attachment (*asaṅgatā*). *Possession is bondage, belonging is liberation. By constant practice and purification of one's being, one begins to identify oneself with the kūṭastha caitanya*, and drops the belief that one is a *saṁsārī*. The result is that the reactions lose their value and strength. Non-attachment (*asaṅgatā*) is achieved every moment. And finally one realises that one is of the nature of pure consciousness (*tadā cidātmā-aham*).

A possible doubt is raised about the above statement----

नासङ्गेऽहंकृतिर्युक्ता कथमस्मीति चेच्छृणु ।
एको मुख्यो द्वावमुख्यावित्यर्थस्त्रिविधोऽहमः ॥९॥

Nāsaṅge 'hankṛtir yuktā kathām asmīti cet śṛṇu
Eko mukhyo dvāva mukhāv ityārtha strividho 'hamah (9)

असङ्गे = in the unassociated consciousness; अहंकृतिः = "I am"-ness; न युक्ता = cannot be considered right; कथम् = how; अस्मि = I am consciousness; (इति जानियात् = thus come to know;) चेत् = if one doubts; शृणु = then listen; एकौः = one; मुख्यः = main meaning; द्वौ अमुख्यौ = two secondary; इति = in this way; अहमः = of the *aham*; त्रिविधः अर्थः = three ways is understood.

How can the consciousness, that is not associated with the conditioning (of the body etc.), come to realise that 'I

am the consciousness'? It cannot be considered as correct. If this is the doubt, listen to the answer. The word 'aham' has three meanings, a primary and two secondary. (9)

The question is raised as to who can say that 'I am *kūṭastha caitanya*'? The *kūṭastha caitanya* cannot say this of itself because it is not correct to associate the *aham-bhāva* that I am *cidātmā* (*aham kṛtūḥ*) with it. *Jīvātmā* also cannot say this because the *kūṭastha caitanya* has forgotten its real nature. Then who is saying '*aham asmi*'. The teacher replies: 'Listen, I will tell you'. There are three meanings to the word 'aham'. Out of these three, one is primary (*mukhya*) and the other two are secondary (*amukhya*).

The primary meaning of the word 'aham' is explained----

अन्योन्याध्यासरूपेण कूटस्थाभासयोर्वपुः ।
एकीभूय भवेन्मुख्यस्तत्र मूढैः प्रयुज्यते ॥१०॥

Anyonyā dhyāsa rūpeṇa kūṭasthā bhāsa yorvapuḥ
Ekī bhūya bhaven mukhyas tatra mūḍhaiḥ prayujyate (10)

कूटस्थ आभासयोः वपुः = the qualities of the consciousness and the conditioned consciousness; अन्योन्याध्यास रूपेण = by mutual transfer of their qualities; एकीभूय = appear to be one; मुख्यः = the primary; भवेत् = is understood; तत्र = in this sense; मूढैः = by the ignorant; प्रयुज्यते = is referred.

Identity between the *kūṭastha* and *cidābhāsa* because of mutual super-imposition is the primary meaning of 'aham'. This is employed by the ignorant, when they refer to the word 'aham'. (10)

To the ignorant man, the main meaning of 'aham' is that it is the amalgam of *kūṭastha caitanya* (the consciousness) and the conditioned consciousness (*cidābhāsa*) like the man and the father. Conditioned

existence is relative existence. When the point of reference is denied, the relative existence comes to an end. The ignorant (*mūḍhaiḥ*) are unable to discriminate between the absolute consciousness and relative existence, and hence suffer. The suffering ends when he becomes a seeker to choose the Absolute.

The secondary meaning of the word 'aham' as applied by the man of knowledge is----

पृथगाभासकूटस्थौ अमुख्यौ तत्र तत्त्ववित् ।
पर्यायेण प्रयुङ्क्तेऽहंशब्दं लोके च वैदिके ॥११॥

Prthagā bhāsa kūṭasthau amukhau tatra tattva vit
Paryāyeṇa prayuṅkte 'ham śabdāṁ loke ca vaidike (11)

आभास कूटस्थौ = of the reflected/conditioned consciousness and consciousness; पृथक् = separate; अमुख्यौ = secondary; लोके वैदिके च = in the worldly and the religious fields; तत्र = there; तत्त्ववित् = the wise one; अहम् शब्दम् = the word *aham*; पर्यायेण = is differently; प्रयुङ्क्ते = is applied.

The wise use the secondary meaning of the word 'aham' in its secondary meaning to indicate separately the consciousness with conditionings (*jīva*) or the pure consciousness (*kūṭastha*), in the worldly or the religious fields of their involvement. (11)

The wise man who knows the Truth, knows how to discriminate the *kūṭastha caitanya* from the *cidābhāsa*. This is the secondary meaning of the word 'aham', as understood by the wise man. He uses the word 'aham' in the philosophical sense with reference to the *kūṭastha caitanya*, and in the material sense with reference to the various roles that he has to assume in life. In his heart of hearts, he knows that he is the *kūṭastha caitanya*.

For example----

लौकिकव्यवहारेऽहं गच्छामीत्यादिके बुधः ।
विविच्यैव चिदाभासं कूटस्थात्तं विवक्षति ॥१२॥

Laukika vyavahāre 'ham gacchāmī tyādike budhaḥ
Vivicaiva cidā bhāsaṁ kūṭasthāt taṁ vivikṣati (12)

बुधः = the wise one; अहम् गच्छामि = 'I go'; इत्यादिके = in this way; लौकिक व्यवहारे = in the worldly matters; चिदाभासम् = the conditioned consciousness; कूटस्थात् = from the pure consciousness; विविच्य = having separately understood; तम् एव = the conditioned consciousness alone; विवक्षति = (the word 'aham') is meant.

In the worldly matters when the wise say, 'I go', he means the conditioned consciousness (*jīva*) separated from the pure consciousness. In this way the word 'aham' ...'I', is used by the wise to mean the *jīva*. (12)

This *śloka* explains further the statement in *śloka* 11 as to how the wise man is able to discriminate the 'aham' in the sense of the *kūṭastha caitanya* from the *cidābhāsa*. When he says 'I go for a walk', he knows that the statement is only with reference to the *cidābhāsa* or conditioned consciousness - and with reference to a worldly transaction (*vyavahāra*) and that the real *aham* or Self is not affected by any of these transactions. The *kūṭastha caitanya* neither comes nor goes - it has nowhere to go and nowhere to come from.

The other secondary meaning of the word 'aham' is ---

असङ्गोऽहं चिदात्माहमिति शास्त्रीयदृष्टितः ।
अहंशब्दं प्रयुङ्क्तेऽयं कूटस्थे केवले बुधः ॥१३॥

Asaṅgō 'ham cidātmāham iti śāstrīya dṛṣṭitah
Ahaṁ śabdāṁ prayuṅkte 'yaṁ kūṭasthe kevale budhaḥ (13)

बुधः = wise ones; शास्त्रीय दृष्टितः = because of their understanding born of *vedānta*; केवले = with reference to the pure consciousness; कूटस्थे = of the *kūṭastha*; अहम् असङ्गः = "I am unattached"; अहम् चिदात्मा = "I am *cidātmā*", इति = in this way; अयम् अहम् शब्दम् = this 'aham' word; प्रयुङ्क्ते = is employed.

The wise ones employ this word 'aham' with reference to the pure consciousness when they say, 'I am unattached', 'I am *cidātmā*' etc. because of their understanding born out of the study of the scriptures. (13)

Firmly established in the scriptural wisdom that 'I am totally unattached', that 'I am the *kūṭastha caitanya*', and that 'none of the conditioning can affect me', the word 'aham' is used by the wise only with reference to the *kūṭastha caitanya*.

To Summarise:

'Aham' - the consciousness, supports the conditionings. When the consciousness arises from deep sleep and becomes aware of, and identifies with the body, the waking world acquires existence and meaning. But the consciousness is not conditioned by the gross body. When it is misunderstood that 'I' the consciousness is limited by the gross body, the separateness from other things and beings results. This distorted idea of 'aham' is upheld by the ignorant man. To him 'aham' means this body, as distinct from other bodies. Thus the Absolute Consciousness suffers the limitations of the body, and hence the accompanied bondage and suffering of relative existence begins. Although, the consciousness is supporting all the limitations and can never be conditioned by any limitations, yet, when consciousness and conditioned

consciousness start existing together that is called 'aham' by the ignorant man.

The wise man, on the other hand, is able to discriminate the conditioned consciousness from the pure consciousness as seen from the absolute standpoint for the purpose of conducting in worldly affairs (*vyavahāra*) like an actor not identifying himself with the role he is playing. In the worldly matters (*vyavahāra*) he talks the language of the world, knowing fully well his role like an actor. From the real knowledge point of view 'aham' means 'I am Pure Unattached Consciousness, Existence' (*asaṅgo'ham cidātmāham*). The wise man thus does not get confused and confounded in his identity, as to who he is, with reference to any particular point.

The consciousness is the container while the mind is the contents. Empty the mind. Mind devoid of contents, is consciousness.

A wise (*tattvavit*) comes to mean 'I am' as the *kūṭastha caitanya* the effortless conscious existence without entitification.

This being the case i.e. the meaning of the word is used by the ignorant and the wise in different ways and that the word can also mean the pure consciousness, the *jīva* can make the pure consciousness as the object of knowledge, thereby knowledge of the pure consciousness can take place.

How can the 'conditioned consciousness' which is totally dependent on the 'pure consciousness' come to know, both the conditioned and the pure consciousness belonging to different degrees of reality? To put it in other words, how can the dream wealth make a waker rich?

ज्ञानिताज्ञानिते त्वात्माभासस्यैव न चात्मानः ।
तथा च कथमाभासः कूटस्थोऽस्मीति बुद्धयताम् ॥१४॥

*Jñānitājñānīte tvātmā bhāsaśyaiva na cāt manah
Tathā ca kathamā bhāsaḥ kūṭastho 'smīti buddhyatām* (14)

ज्ञानिता = knowingness; अज्ञानिते = not-knowingness; तु = indeed; आत्माभासस्य = belong to the 'conditioned consciousness'; एव = alone; न च आत्मनः = not to the pure consciousness; आभासः = 'conditioned consciousness'; कूटस्थः अस्मि = I am pure consciousness; इति = thus; तथा = this being so; कथम् बुद्धयताम् = will come to know?

Knowingness or not knowingness belongs to the 'conditioned consciousness', while the pure consciousness does not become the object in the category of known or unknown or the knower --- wise or the not-knower --- the ignorant. In this condition how, 'conditioned consciousness' will be able to know the Pure One? (i.e. the pure consciousness can never become the object of knowledge or ignorance). (14)

The student raises a question: Without the pure self supporting the *jīva*, there can be neither knowledge nor ignorance. Therefore, knowledge and ignorance are, in fact attributes of the *jīva*, the conditioned consciousness and not the absolute consciousness. Is it not? If so, how is it possible for the conditioned consciousness to know that it is of the nature of the *kūṭastha caitanya*? Just as conditioned hall space cannot realise that it is in reality unconditioned space; nor the conditioned wave know what the ocean is. The wave-ness is the *jīvātmā* and ocean-ness is the *kūṭastha caitanya*.

This doubt is answered----

नायं दोषश्चिदाभासः कूटस्थैकस्वभाववान् ।
आभासत्वस्य मिथ्यात्वात्कूटस्थत्वावशेषणात् ॥१५॥

*Nāyam doṣaś cidā bhāsaḥ kūṭasthaika svabhāva vān
Ābhāsatva sya mithyā tvāt kūṭasthatvā avāśeṣaṇāt* (15)

अयम् दोषः न = this doubt is not valid; चिदाभासः = the 'conditioned consciousness'; कूटस्थ = the 'pure consciousness'; एक स्वभाववान् = are essentially of the same nature; आभासत्वस्य = the conditioning of the 'conditioned consciousness'; मिथ्यात्वात् = being an illusion (having known thus); कूटस्थत्व अवशेषणात् = pure consciousness remains.

The doubt raised in the above *śloka* is not valid, because, the essential nature of the conditioned consciousness is 'pure consciousness'. The conditioning of the 'conditioned consciousness' being an illusion (having known thus), what remains is pure consciousness. (15)

The teacher clarifies: "What you have pointed out in my statement is not really a flaw." For, in essence, *kūṭastha caitanya* and *cidābhāsa* cannot be separate. They appear to be two, because the conditioning (mind) which has created the illusion of the conditioned consciousness, is only an appearance (*mithyā*). The consciousness which is supporting the conditioning of time, space and object, cannot itself be conditioned by these three. Once it is understood that the conditioning of the unconditionable consciousness is imaginary (*mithyā*), and once the illusory walls creating the hall space are pulled down, the hall space becomes total space. To know this, one need not pull down the walls. Similarly, to drop the conditionings of time, space, and object, it is not really necessary to destroy the body, mind and intellect. Understanding the conditioning as conditioning, is the only way to go beyond conditioning. The doubt arose because, one is trying to understand the *cidābhāsa* without reference to

the *kūṭastha caitanya*. Once the illusoriness (*mithyā pratyaya*) is understood, the Reality reveals itself.

(We have seen in earlier pages that the error we generally commit in understanding the '*jīva*', is that we try to look at it as an independent entity without reference of its substratum 'the pure consciousness'. No illusion can be correctly referred without its substratum that is supporting it).

Accepting this error, yet another doubt is raised----

कूटस्थोऽस्मीति बोधोऽपि मिथ्याचेनेति को वदेत् ।
न हि सत्यतयाभीष्टं रज्जुसर्पविसर्पणम् ॥१६॥

*Kūṭastho'smīti bodho'pi mithyā cenneti ko vadet
Na hi satyatayā bhīṣṭam rajju sarpa visarpaṇam* (16)

कूटस्थः अस्मि = 'I am pure consciousness'; इति बोधः अपि = this knowledge also; मिथ्या = is illusion; चेत् = if doubted; न इति = not so; कः वदेत् = who will say; हि = as; रज्जु सर्प विसर्पणम् = the movement of the snake imagined in place of a rope; सत्यतया = to be taken real; न अभिष्टम् = cannot be accepted.

If the knowledge 'I am pure consciousness' is also considered to be an illusion (because the knower is an illusion), who will not agree? Because the movement of the illusory snake on the rope, cannot be accepted to be real. (16)

The student raises another doubt: This knowledge that "I am *kūṭastha caitanya*" - the unconditioned consciousness is being claimed by the *cidābhāsa* i.e. the *jīva*. But the *jīva* itself is an illusion. Therefore, this knowledge itself must also be considered as an illusion.

The teacher readily agrees that the knowledge is an illusion. The movement of the snake on the rope (*rajju*) perceived by me under delusion as a snake is an illusion, undoubtedly.

If this knowledge is an illusion, then by this illusory knowledge, there cannot be negation of the world of sorrows----

तादृशेनापि बोधेन संसारो हि निवर्तते ।
यक्षानुरूपो हि बलिर्इत्याहुर्लौकिका जनाः ॥१७॥

Tādṛśenāpi bodhena saṁsāro hi nivartate
Yaksā nurūpo hi balir ityāhur laukikā janāḥ (17)

तादृशेन बोधेन = by the type of knowledge referred in the above *śloka*, अपि = also; संसारः = the world of sorrows; हि निवर्तते = is certainly negated; हि = it is indeed; यक्षानुरूपः = according to the spirit to be propitiated; बलिः = offering; इति = is; लौकिकाः जनाः आहुः = is said by the worldly people.

By the knowledge, that is considered to be illusory in the above *śloka*, also the world of sorrows is negated (because the world that is negated is also an illusion), as it is said in the world that, as is the status of the deity to be propitiated, so is the offering made. (17)

The offering (or present or bribe in the modern day language) given to someone from whom a favour is sought, should be such that it pleases him by meeting his expectation. Similarly, *saṁsāra* is an illusion. Man suffers not because of God's creation, but because of *jīva*'s creation.

To remove the problems of the illusory world - the *saṁsāra* - it is necessary to have real knowledge. Dream hunger can be satisfied only by dream food; to come out of a bad dream, a more frightening dream experience is needed. Similarly, to wake up to our real nature, the experiences of this world, illusory as they are, will alone help us. Although, the knowledge gained by the *jīva* is not real knowledge, this illusory knowledge alone can help in coming out of the illusion - the *saṁsāra* - that the world is. (This is called *Arjuna Viśāda Yoga* in *Bhagavad*

Gītā). Out of the many experiences in the waking state, some experience makes us 'wake up' depending on one's sensitivity (like *Siddhārtha*). Others continue to be buried in the *saṁsāra*. The illusory nature of the *saṁsāra* can be known only by analysing the illusory experiences. There is no other way.

What is meant by the teacher in the above *śloka* is, even when we consider the knowledge of the world by an illusory entity the '*aḥam*', it has the ability to help in awakening to the Reality, as we all know that the dream experience which is necessarily an illusory experience, does have the ability to awaken to the 'waking' state. In short, when the 'conditioned consciousness' accepts the conditionings to be mere conditionings and not the reality in itself, one has gone beyond the state of 'being a conditioned consciousness'.

In the following *śloka*, the teacher concludes the topic of the meaning of the word '*puruṣaḥ*' referred in the original *Vedāntik* statement in the first *śloka* of this chapter---

तस्मादाभासपुरुषः सकूटस्थो विविच्य तम् ।
कूटस्थोऽस्मीति विज्ञातुमर्हतीत्यभ्यधात् श्रुतिः ॥१८॥

Tasmā dābhāsa puruṣaḥ sakūṭastho vivicya tam
Kūṭastho'smīti vijñātum arhatī tyabhyadhāt śrutiḥ (18)

तस्मात् = therefore (with reference to all the discussion in the above pages); आभास पुरुषः सकूटस्थः = the conditioned consciousness referred by the word *puruṣaḥ* has to be understood along with pure consciousness; तम् = to that Pure Consciousness; विविच्य = having discriminated; कूटस्थः अस्मि = 'I am Pure Consciousness'; इति = in this way; विज्ञातुम् अर्हति = is correctly to be understood; इति = is what; श्रुतिः अभ्यधात् = meant by the *Vedānta* statement.

(With reference to all the above discussion) Therefore, the word *puruṣa* is used to indicate the 'conditioned consciousness' along-with the substratum 'pure consciousness'. By discriminating this pure consciousness from the 'conditioned consciousness', one comes to realise that 'I am the pure consciousness'. This is what the word '*asmi*' i.e. 'I am pure consciousness' is meant by the above referred *upaniṣadik* statement. (18)

Therefore, the meaning of '*puruṣa*' is (in the *śruti vākya* referred to in first *śloka*), the *cidābhāsa* along-with the substratum, the unconditioned consciousness or the *kūṭastha caitanya*. To avoid confusion and resultant suffering due to erroneous identity, one should be able to recognise one's own true identity with the pure self. Problems arise because of identity crisis. (Like one understanding oneself only as a father, forgetting that one is first a man with many other functions to be a full human being). Freezing in one identity, like an ice-cube, causes suffering and prevents one from living the life of a full personality.

Therefore, it is necessary to learn to discriminate the illusory identity from the true identity - the *cidābhāsa* from the *kūṭastha caitanya*. How to discriminate? By understanding that the *cidābhāsa* is merely *cidābhāsa* because of the *kūṭastha caitanya* staying as the substratum. This understanding is called discrimination - between the conditioned consciousness and the consciousness which cannot be conditioned. This is what *Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa* means when he says: *sarva dharmān parityajya.....* here renunciation refers to the renunciation of all conditionings by realising that you are the substratum and that the conditioning is imposed upon you, and that one need not carry the 'load' of these conditionings. Knowing that conditioning, 'as conditioning' and not giving value to the conditioning, itself constitutes renunciation --- of all problems of the body, mind, and intellect. And once you succeed in separating the *cidābhāsa* from the *kūṭastha caitanya*, you come to realise that 'I am *kūṭastha caitanya*'. (*kūṭastha asmi*).

In the following *śloka* the word '*ayam*' referred in the above *Upaniṣadik* statement is explained ----

असन्दिग्धाविपर्यस्तबोधो देहात्मनीक्ष्यते ।
तद्वदत्रेति निर्णेतुमयमित्यभिधीयते ॥१९॥

Asandigdha viparyasta bodho dehātmanī kṣyate
Tadva datreti nirṇetum ayamitya bhidhī yate (19)

देहात्मनि = as 'I am the body' notion; बोधः = knowledge; असन्दिग्ध = doubtless; अविपर्यस्त = without any other possibility; इक्ष्यते = is seen; अत्र = in this (pure self); तद्वत् = similarly; इति निर्णेतुम् = thus arriving at; अयम् इति = the word '*ayam*'; अभिधीयते = is meant for.

As the knowledge (for the ignorant one) 'I am the body', is without any doubt and without any other possibility; is seen (in the world), similarly, to arrive at this type of firm conviction, the word '*ayam*' is used by the *upaniṣad* in the above statement (to mean 'I am the pure consciousness'). (19)

Having clarified and established the meaning of the word '*puruṣa*', the word '*ayam*' in the *Upaniṣadik* statement under discussion (*śruti vākya*) is taken up next. The ignorant man (*laukika puruṣa*) is firmly convinced that the word *ayam* means 'this body'. This knowledge is so firmly fixed in his mind, that (a) there is absolutely no doubt about it (*asandigdha*), and (b) there is no possibility for anyone to create any doubt about it in his mind (*aviparyasta*).

Similarly, the wise man is just as firmly convinced, without any trace of doubt, that he is the unconditioned absolute consciousness or *kūṭastha caitanya*. To come to this stage of knowledge and understanding, the word '*ayam*' is used.

The above thought is supported by quoting *Bhagavān Śaṅkarācārya*----

देहात्मज्ञानवज्ज्ञानं देहात्मज्ञानबाधकम् ।
आत्मन्येव भवेद्यस्य स नेच्छन्नपि मुच्यते ॥२०॥

Dehātma jñāna vajjñānaṁ dehātma jñāna bādhakam
Ātmanyeva bhavedasya sa necchannapi mucyate (20)

देहात्म ज्ञानवत् = as the 'I am the body notion'; देहात्मज्ञान बाधकम् ज्ञानम् = the knowledge contrary to this notion; आत्मनि एव = in the pure Self; यस्य भवेत् = he who has; सः = he; न इच्छन् अपि = although not desiring; मुच्यते = is liberated.

When the knowledge 'I am the pure consciousness', which is the opposite of the notion 'I am the body', becomes firm, such a person, although not desiring, is liberated (from the bondage of relative existence). (20)

At present the knowledge is very firmly fixed that 'I am the body'. When this false knowledge (*ajñāna*) is destroyed by the clear and correct knowledge of the truth that 'I am not this body; but I am the *Sat-Cit-Ānanda śuddha caitanya* (*ātmanyeva sa bhavet*)'; at that time, even if he does not desire it, *mukti* or liberation will come to the wise man.

What is the meaning of 'liberation'? Who is desirous of liberation? He who had formerly considered himself to be limited, and who has now come to realise that the limitations are in him but cannot bind him, he will not think of liberation. For, the thought of liberation falls in the purview of ignorance, not of wisdom. Who has got the clear knowledge of his own true nature, liberation dawns upon him, without any effort on his part, because the very basis for the illusion of bondage has been negated by the knowledge that 'I am the *kūṭastha caitanya*'. He has already attained the state of 'liberation', without desiring for it.

Another possibility of using the word '*ayam*' can be, to indicate Self in an objective way. This is denied ----

अयमित्यपरोक्षत्वमुच्यते चेत्तदुच्यताम् ।
स्वयंप्रकाशचैतन्यमपरोक्षं सदा यतः ॥२१॥

Ayamityā parokṣa tvam ucyate cetta ducyatām
Svayaṁ prakāśa caitanyam aparokṣaṁ sadā yataḥ (21)

अयम् इति = by the word '*ayam*'; अपरोक्षत्वम् = an objective knowledge; उच्यते = is meant (as we say this is pot); चेत् = if this doubt is raised; तत् उच्यताम् = let it be so; यतः = because; स्वयम् प्रकाश चैतन्यम् = the pure consciousness being of the nature of pure knowledge (i.e. does not depend on any means of knowledge); सदा = all the time; अपरोक्षम् = is the subject.

If one doubts that the word '*ayam*' is used in the above *upaniṣadik* statement to indicate the 'objectiveness' of the Self (as we refer 'this is a pot' by the word 'this' in case of objective knowledge), let it be so. Because the 'pure self being of the nature of consciousness' is always 'the subject' (i.e. even we do not accept the use of the word '*ayam*' to mean 'the subject', it does not matter, because the pure consciousness is always 'the subject'). (21).

Another important aspect of the word '*ayam*' is now taken up. The student raises a strange doubt: When '*ayam*' is used like in 'I am *kūṭastha caitanya*', it appears to be *aparokṣa* or direct knowledge. But when it is said that 'This is *kūṭastha* or *ātmā*', or 'This I am', are we not objectifying 'This', and separating the 'I', from 'This'? 'This' in this usage has become an object of my knowledge because it is associated 'with 'This', 'That' etc. Then it has become indirect or *parokṣa* knowledge. If this is not so, then why use the word '*ayam*' at all? Since we know that it is *svayaṁ prakāśa caitanya*, the word '*ayam*' would appear to be redundant.

The teacher says: consciousness is *svayam prakāśa caitanya*. Therefore it is always *aparokṣam*. To know the consciousness, no other conscious is required. However, both *parokṣa* and *aparokṣa jñāna* can take place at the same time and about the same thing.

If the pure self is always the conscious being, how can we accept that the same thing can be a subject and an object or knowledge and ignorance can be associated simultaneously?

How this can happen is explained further ----

परोक्षमपरोक्षं च ज्ञानमज्ञानमित्यदः ।
नित्यापरोक्षरूपेऽपि द्वयं स्याद्दशमे यथा ॥२२॥

Parokṣa maparokṣam ca jñāna majñāna mityadaḥ
Nityā parokṣa rūpe'pi dvayam syād daśame yathā (22)

परोक्षम् अपरोक्षम् च = the objectiveness and subjectiveness;
ज्ञानम् अज्ञानम् = knowledge and ignorance; इति अदःद्वयम्
= these two pairs; नित्य अपरोक्ष रूपे अपि = in spite
of being the eternal subject; स्यात् = can be; यथा = as
seen; दशमे = in the story of ten fools.

The indirect (*parokṣa*) and direct (*aparokṣa*) knowledge, the knowledge (*jñānam*) and ignorance (*ajñānam*) and similar pairs of opposites are possible to exist (simultaneously) in the external direct Self, as revealed in the story of the tenth man. (22)

The *kūṭastha caitanya* is *svayam prakāśa*. Therefore, the knowledge that I am the substratum of everything and that this is my real nature, is *aparokṣa jñānam* about myself. It does not need any other proof. Even so, *parokṣa* and *aparokṣa* knowledge, *jñāna* and *ajñāna* - these pairs of opposites are possible in me.

To illustrate this point, the classical example of the story of the tenth man is given. Ten men cross a river,

and on reaching the other bank, each one counts to check if all have reached safe. Each one counts only nine, and they begin to weep for the tenth man who they think has drowned in the river and is lost. A wise man comes along and learns of their problem. He first reassures them and tells them that they are all safe. They feel comforted and stop crying, taking his assurance as the truth.

This is *parokṣa jñānam* - that is, knowledge based on indirect source. The wise man then proceeds to show them how each one has forgotten to count himself, and in reality each one is the tenth man. 'You are the tenth man' (*Tat Tvam Asi*). When each one finds out that 'I am the tenth man', that becomes his *aparokṣa* knowledge.

Similarly, so long as I imagine myself to be the conditioned consciousness, I am unhappy. But the scriptures say that I am other than this body, mind and intellect. This is *parokṣa jñāna*. Once I myself realise my true nature of being the unconditioned *kūṭastha caitanya* (*aparokṣa jñānam*), I am free from the bondage. Thus both *parokṣa* and *aparokṣa* knowledge are possible at the same time.

In this story how is it possible to see, the subject and object or knowledge and ignorance to exist together although in one subject ----

नवसंख्याहतज्ञानो दशमो विभ्रमात्तदा ।
न वेत्ति दशमोऽस्मीति वीक्ष्यमाणोऽपि तान्नव ॥२३॥

Nava saṅkhyā hṛta jñāno daśamo vibhramāt tadā
Na veti daśamo'smīti vīkṣya māṇo'pi tān nava (23)

नव संख्याहतज्ञानः = the one who is unable to know the error of counting the 'nine'; दशमः = the tenth; तदा = that very time; वीक्ष्यमाणः अपि = although seen; तान्

नव = to those nine; विभ्रमात् = due to delusion; दशमः अस्मि = I am the tenth; इति = in this way; न वेत्ति = does not know.

The one, under the spell of delusion, unable to know his error of counting nine (in place of ten), although himself 'the tenth' being very much present, did not know that 'I am the tenth'. (In this way, the tenth person although 'being himself', had ignorance about himself, can be seen). (23)

In the above story, the number nine had become such a fixation in their minds, because of delusion, that their wisdom was veiled. The one who was saying the tenth man was lost, believed that he (being the 10th man himself) had been destroyed, although he was present. This is called ignorance. It is the first stage in falling a prey to worldly problems. Ignorance has no cause. But because of ignorance reasoning comes up, to find out the cause, to establish the cause-effect relationship.

After showing the ignorance about the tenth man, its effect, the *āvaraṇa* or veiling is shown ----

न भाति नास्ति दशम इति स्वं दशमं तदा ।
मत्वा वक्ति तदज्ञानकृतमावरणं विदुः ॥२४॥

*Na bhāti nāsti daśama iti svaṁ daśamaṁ tadā
Matvā vakti tadjñāna kṛtam āvaraṇam viduḥ* (24)

तदा = because of the ignorance; दशमः = the tenth one; स्वम् दशमम् = the 'himself being the tenth'; न अस्ति = is not; न भाति = not seen; इति मत्वा = thus imagining; वक्ति = says so; तद् = to such a dealing; अज्ञानकृतम् = the effect of the ignorance; आवरणम् = veiling; विदुः = known by the wise.

Because of this ignorance, the one who was counting and being the tenth himself, says that the tenth is not (i.e. lost)

and he is not seen. Such a dealing is the effect of ignorance, thus say the wise. (24)

After this ignorance, caused by delusion, although he himself is the tenth man, he starts thinking that there is no tenth man among us, because he is not seen anywhere. The first stage is ignorance, as a result of which the second stage of *āvaraṇam* occurs. Not only is the tenth man not here, he is also not seen anywhere. Thus the ignorance becomes stronger and he gets confirmed in the erroneous belief. This kind of fallacious understanding is called the veiling of wisdom or *āvaraṇam*.

The other effect of ignorance viz. the projection is ----

नद्यां ममार दशम इति शोचन्प्ररोदिति ।
अज्ञानकृतविक्षेपं रोदनादिं विदुर्बुधाः ॥२५॥

*Nadyām mamāra daśama iti śocan praroditī
Ajñān kṛta vikṣepam rodanādīm vidur budhāḥ* (25)

दशमः = the tenth one; नद्याम् ममार = has died in the river; इति = thus; शोचन् = grieving; प्ररोदिति = cried aloud; बुधाः = the wise; रोदन आदिम् = crying etc.; अज्ञान कृत = born out of ignorance; विक्षेपम् = projection; विदुः = know.

'The tenth person died in the river', thus grieving (for the loss of the tenth) he cries. This expression of the crying etc. is called 'the projection' by the wise. (25)

Each one of the ten foolish men thinks, "poor fellow the tenth man is no more". He has been swept away by the river. Thus each of them although alive, starts grieving for the tenth man. In fact tenth man is each one of them. If everyone of them is dead, how can they grieve? Now they start crying and expressing all other symptoms of grief that accompany it - anxiety, frustration, promising propitiation to the Gods, for the

remedy of an imaginary grief. This is called projection or *vikṣepa*, and is the third stage of the delusion.

Of the two effects of the veiling viz. (i) the non-existence of the tenth person and (ii) the tenth person is not seen, the former is removed by the statement of fact from the wise man. This type of knowledge about the existence of the tenth person on the basis of the faith in the words of the wise is called indirect knowledge. ----

Therefore ----

न मृतो दशमोऽस्तीति श्रुत्वाप्तवचनं तदा ।
परोक्षत्वेन दशमं वेत्ति स्वर्गादिलोकवत् ॥२६॥

Na mṛto daśamo'stīti śrutvāpta vacanam tadā
Parokṣa tvena daśamaṁ veti svargādi lokavat (26)

दशमः न मृतः = the tenth one is not dead; अस्ति = but exists; इति = in this way; आप्तवचनम् श्रुत्वा = hearing from the well wisher; तदा = that time; दशमम् = to the tenth one; परोक्षत्वेन = indirectly; वेत्ति = one knows; स्वर्गलोकादिवत् = as one knows about the heaven etc.

The deluded one comes to know from the word of a well wisher that the 'tenth person does exist'. This knowledge is called 'indirect knowledge', as one knows about the heaven etc. (26)

Āpta vacanam refers to the statements of saints, sages or the scriptures, in whom we have implicit faith (*śraddhā*), because we believe that they will never say anything to mislead us. The scriptures tell us to do certain good deeds to go to *svarga* and to avoid doing certain bad things, that will take us to *naraka* and we believe these injunctions although no one has seen *svarga* or *naraka*.

When the wise man heard the problem of the ten foolish men, he immediately understood the situation. He has seen the tenth man, and knows that everyone of them is the tenth man. So he proceeds to pacify them and then to make them see the truth, in stages. First he tells them: Stop crying. Rest assured that the tenth man who you think is dead, is very much alive. The ten foolish men stop crying on hearing his re-assuring words. They do not know yet where the tenth man is, but they have faith in the words (*āpta vacanam*) of the wise man, and therefore, believe that the tenth man is somewhere, safe and alive.

This is called *parokṣa jñānam*, that is knowledge based on what someone else has seen or heard or says. This is the fourth stage.

The second aspect of the effect of the veiling indicated above is removed by the direct knowledge ----

त्वमेव दशमोऽसीति गणयित्वा प्रदर्शितः ।
अपरोक्षतया ज्ञात्वा हृष्यत्येव न रोदिति ॥२७॥

Tvameva daśamo'sīti gaṇayitvā pradarśitaḥ
Aparokṣa tayā jñātvā hr̥ṣyatyeva na roditi (27)

गणयित्वा = on counting (correctly by the wise man); त्वमेव = you yourself; दशमः असि = are the tenth person; इति = thus; प्रदर्शितः = having shown; ज्ञात्वा = and having known; अपरोक्षतया = directly (that he himself is the tenth person); हृष्यति एव = he rejoices; न रोदिति = and does not cry (thereafter).

After having shown by correct counting to the person who was counting (and he himself being the tenth person) and showing him that 'You are the tenth person', thus knowing himself to be the tenth one directly, he rejoices and cries not thereafter. (27)

The wise man next admonishes them for being foolish and tells each one of them: You are the tenth man. Begin counting from yourself. Don't start from the others; that way you will never get to know the truth.

Thus he shows them beyond doubt that they are indeed ten. Each one of them has now realised that he himself is the tenth man. Once this *aparokṣa* knowledge takes place, they are all happy and satisfied, and stop crying and grieving. They are even able to laugh at their own foolishness.

This parable applies to each one of us as we tread the spiritual path. First: spirituality should begin from oneself. For, each one of us is the tenth lost man. Before we try to make others wise, let us get rid of our own delusion. Second, the true student of *vedānta* does not grieve for anything in life, because he knows that nothing deserves that much seriousness. He stays unattached (*asaṅgo-aham*).

There are seven stages that the *jīva* has to go through to come to realise its own nature in a direct (*aparokṣa*) way. This is the meaning indicated by the word '*ayam*'.

These are the seven stages that the *jīva* has to go through in his journey from his limited and conditioned existence to the Absolute Existence ----

अज्ञानावृतिविक्षेप द्विविधज्ञानतृप्तयः ।
शोकापगम इत्येते योजनीयाश्चिदात्मनि ॥२८॥

Ajñānā vṛti vikṣepa dvividha jñāna tṛptayaḥ
Sokāpagama ityete yojanīyā ścidātmani (28)

अज्ञान = ignorance; आवृति = veiling; विक्षेप = projection; द्विविध ज्ञान = two types of knowledge; तृप्तयः = contentment; शोक अपगमः = removal of misery; इति एते = these (seven); चिदात्मनि = in the pure Self; योजनीयाः = should be applied.

The ignorance, veiling, projection, indirect knowledge, direct knowledge, contentment and removal of misery are the seven aspects to be applied in case of the pure consciousness. (28)

This *śloka* concludes the discussion on the seven stages in realising spiritual *aparokṣa* knowledge. These seven stages are: ignorance or *ajñānam*, veiling or *āvaraṇam*, projection or *vikṣepam*, indirect knowledge or *parokṣa jñāna*, direct knowledge or *aparokṣa jñāna*, happiness and satisfaction or *tṛpti* and relief from grief or *śoka apagama*.

These seven steps are to be applied in our conscious living with reference to the absolute *kūṭastha caitanya*, in our journey from our present state of ignorance (and consequent unhappiness) till we acquire *aparokṣa* knowledge and realise total satisfaction. This is the meaning of the word '*ayam*' in the scriptural statement (*Śruti Vākya*) in *śloka* 1.

These seven aspects are described in the Self----

संसारसक्तचित्तः संश्रिदाभासः कदाचन ।
स्वयंप्रकाशकूटस्थं स्वतत्त्वं नैव वेत्ययम् ॥२९॥

Samsārā sakta cittāḥ sanś cidā bhāsaḥ kadācana
Svayaṁ prakāśa kūṭasthaṁ svatattvaṁ naiva vettyayam (29)

अयम् चिदाभासः = this *jīva*; संसारसक्तचित्तः सन् = being attached to the world; कदाचन = never before; स्वतत्त्वं = his own essential nature; स्वयम् प्रकाश कूटस्थम् = the self-effulgent substratum; न एव = never; वेत्ति = knows.

The *jīva* (conditioned consciousness), before the exposure to the scriptures, being attached to the world, never knows its essential nature, which is self effulgent consciousness. (This is the first aspect called 'ignorance') (29).

The *cidābhāsa* or *jīva* is so excessively attached to the world, that it firmly believes that he is the body. Because of this wrong perception, the illusion appears

real, and the substratum supporting the illusion appears to be an illusion. In such a state of over-involvement and absorption in the world, the *jīva* is unable to conceive any other possibility of its existence (*svatattvam*). He does not even suspect that its essential nature is one of conscious immutable existence. This ignorance (*ajñānam*) about its own nature is the first stage in the *jīva*'s evolution to self-knowledge.

The veiling and projection are----

न भाति नास्ति कूटस्थ इति वक्ति प्रसङ्गतः ।
कर्ता भोक्ताहमस्मीति विक्षेपं प्रतिपद्यते ॥३०॥

Na bhāti nāsti kūṭasthaḥ iti vakti prasāṅgataḥ
Kartā bhoktā hamasmīti vikṣepaṁ prati padyate (30)

प्रसङ्गतः = with reference to subject matter; कूटस्थः = the pure consciousness; न अस्ति = is not; न भाति = is revealed not; इति वक्ति = says so; (as a result of veiling of wisdom due to ignorance); अहम् = I; कर्ता = doer; भोक्ता = enjoyer; अस्मि = am; इति विक्षेपम् = this projection; प्रतिपद्यते = superimposes.

(As a result of the ignorance) when the topic of pure consciousness is taken up; the individual (i.e. *jīva*) says that neither there is pure consciousness nor is it revealed. Therefore, 'I am the doer, I am the enjoyer' (and this alone is true); is the projection of erroneous identity. (30)

The word *prasāṅgataḥ* also can be read as due to firm attachment to the conditioning of body etc. This meaning will lead to a little different approach that the firm attachment is due to erroneous notion about one's real nature. The *jīva* asserts that neither there is pure consciousness nor can it be experienced (this is called veiling) and therefore, I am the doer-enjoyer (*vikṣepa*).

Because of this excessive attachment to the world, the ignorant man does not know of this existence of *kūṭastha caitanya*, nor does he readily accept its existence. His ignorance becomes the yardstick for wisdom. When this happens it is called *āvaraṇam*. The truth is veiled off from the *jīva*. (This is the second stage).

Having veiled itself off from the truth by the thought that: 'I do not know, and therefore *kūṭastha caitanya* does not exist' the *jīva* gets firmly entrenched in the belief that it is the do-er (*kartā*) and the enjoy-er (*bhoktā*). The eagerness to enjoy the wordly acquisitions and the ambition to achieve its desires makes the *jīva* project itself as a separate entity in the phenomenal world. The 'doership' (*kartṛtva bhāva*) and the 'enjoyership' (*bhoktṛtva bhāva*) make the *jīva* associate itself with the gross and subtle bodies and consider them real. This projection of the *jīva* with erroneous identity with the world is called *vikṣepa*. This is the third stage.

The next stages of indirect (*parokṣa*) and direct immediate (*aparokṣa*) knowledge are discussed----

अस्ति कूटस्थ इत्यादौ परोक्षं वेत्ति वार्तया ।
पश्चात्कूटस्थ एवास्मीत्येवं वेत्ति विचारतः ॥३१॥

Asti kūṭastha ityādaḥ parokṣaṁ vetti vārtayā
Pāścāt kūṭastha evāsmi tyevaṁ vetti vicārataḥ (31)

आदौ = initially; कूटस्थः अस्ति = the pure consciousness exists; इति = thus; वार्तया = heard from the discussions in *satsaṅga*; परोक्षम् वेत्ति = knows about the pure consciousness, indirectly; पश्चात् = later; विचारतः = by proper reflection etc.; कूटस्थः = pure consciousness; एव अस्मि = I am certainly; इति एवम् = in this manner; वेत्ति = knows.

Initially, the *jīva* comes to know indirectly, about the possibility of existence of pure consciousness from the words of the master

and scriptures (in *satsaṅga*). Later, through the process of reflection and contemplation, comes to gain his direct personal experience that 'I am The Pure Consciousness'. (31)

Such a *jīva*, who has been veiled from the Truth, and is deeply involved in the illusory world, by the Lord's grace and the words of the *guru* and/or scriptures, comes to get the first glimpse of a different interpretation of existence. What had hitherto seemed to be real and infallible, begins to appear not so real and not so complete.

Based on the words of the *guru*, he begins to accept the possibility of the existence of *kūṭastha caitanya*, although he himself does not know anything about it.

This is *parokṣa jñāna* - the fourth stage. Gradually the *jīvātmā* gets weaned away from material existence, begins contemplation on the *parokṣa jñāna* to yield a subjective experience. A new vista of rich and joyful existence opens up before him. In due course, through spiritual *sādhana*, he comes to realise his essential nature-*Svatattva* - now I know that I am the absolute consciousness - the *kūṭastha caitanya*. Thus is revealed to him the knowledge of his own real nature through direct experience of conscious blissful existence. This is *aparokṣa jñāna* or *anubhūti* - (the fifth stage).

The last two stages of evolution viz. removal of grief and attainment of fulfilment are----

कर्ता भोक्त्येवमादि शोकजातं प्रमुञ्चति ।
कृतं कृत्यं प्रापणीयं प्राप्तमित्येव तुष्यति ॥३२॥

Kartā bhokte tyeva mādi śokajātaṁ pramuñcati
Kṛtaṁ kṛtyaṁ prāpaṇīyaṁ prāpta mityeva tuṣyati (32)

कर्ता = 'I am doer'; भोक्ता = 'I am enjoyer'; इति एवम् = thus this; आदि = etc; शोक जातम् = the total grief; प्रमुञ्चति = rejects totally; कृतम् कृत्यम् = the duties

are done; प्रापणीयम् प्राप्तम् = the life is fulfilled; इति एव = in this manner; तुष्यति = is fully contented.

(Having realised that I am pure consciousness); The cause of misery beginning from doership and enjoyership, being totally rejected (is freed from misery. This is sixth stage). (Similarly); The duties are done and the life is fulfilled; Thus attains fulfilment. (This is the seventh stage). (32)

The reflection and contemplation that led to *aparokṣa jñāna* makes it clear that all misery in life begins with the doership (*kartṛtva*) and enjoyership (*bhoktṛtva bhāva*). With the vision of absolute consciousness or *kūṭastha caitanya*, that all the roles one assumes in life are discovered as superimpositions, thereafter, all unhappiness comes to an end. This freedom from misery (*śoka mokṣam*) is the sixth stage.

The *jīva* now reaches a stage of *tṛpti* or contentment. Life becomes an experience of total fulfilment, based on a detached sense of having done one's best, and accepting and enjoying whatever life offers. There is no more 'want' for 'want' itself is poverty and misery.

Such absolute fulfilment cannot be in the relative existence. It can happen only when the *jīva* is one with the absolute. This is the seventh and final stage.

These seven stages belong to *jīva* is further emphasized----

अज्ञानमावृतिस्तद्वद्विक्षेपश्च परोक्षधीः ।
अपरोक्षमतिः शोकमोक्षस्तृप्तिर्निर्दुःखा ॥३३॥

Ajñāna māvṛtiḥ tadvad vīkṣepaśca parokṣa dhīḥ
Aparokṣa mātīḥ śoka mokṣa tṛptir niraukṣā (33)

अज्ञानम् = ignorance; आवृतिः = veiling; तद्वत् = similarly; च = and; विक्षेपः = projection; परोक्षधीः = indirect knowledge; अपरोक्ष मतिः = direct experience; शोक मोक्षः = freedom from grief; निर्दुःखा तृप्तिः = unconditioned bliss.

This śloka summarises the seven stages of the *jīva*'s evolution. They are: *ajñānam* (ignorance), *Āvṛti* (veiling), *Vikṣepam* (superimposition or projection), *Parokṣa dhīḥ* (indirect knowledge), *Aparokṣa matiḥ* (direct knowledge), *Śoka mokṣam* (freedom from grief) and *Nirañkuṣa Trptiḥ* (total contentment). (33)

The teacher now proceeds to enquire into the question: Are these seven stages with reference to the *cidābhāsa* or *kūṭastha caitanya*? To which are they attributed? If attributed to the *kūṭastha caitanya*, then the latter becomes a *vikāri*, i.e. subject to modifications. That which is subject to modifications cannot be the Truth. The *cidābhāsa* also cannot have these attributes, just as a reflection in the mirror cannot have the problem of birth, death etc.

Therefore----

सप्तावस्था इमाः सन्ति चिदाभासस्य तास्विमौ ।
बन्धमोक्षौ स्थितौ तत्र तिष्ठो बन्धकृतः स्मृताः ॥३४॥

Saptā vasthā imāḥ santi cidā bhāsasya tās vimau
Bandha mokṣau sthitau tatra tiṣṭho bandha kṛtaḥ smṛtāḥ (34)

सप्तावस्थाः = seven steps; इमाः = these; चिदाभासस्य सन्ति = belong to *cidābhāsa* (*jīva*); तासु = in these seven stages; इमौ = these; बन्धमोक्षौ = the bondage and liberation; स्थितौ = are included; तत्र = of these seven; तिष्ठो = the three; बन्ध कृतः = creating bondage; स्मृताः = are considered.

These seven stages (viz. ignorance, veiling, projection, indirect knowledge, direct experience, freedom from grief, and unconditioned bliss) belong to the *cidābhāsa* (the *jīva*), which include, both the bondage and liberation. Of these, the first three viz. ignorance, veiling and projection are responsible for creating bondage (34).

These seven stages belong to the *cidābhāsa* or *jīva* or *puruṣa*. These seven stages are sandwiched between bondage at one end and *mokṣam* or liberation at the other. Of these seven, three are the cause of bondage viz. ignorance, veiling and projection.

The nature of the first three stages that lead to bondage are explained alongwith the nature of bondage, they create.

First, it is ignorance----

न जानामीत्युदासीन व्यवहारस्य कारणम् ।
विचारप्रागभावेन युक्तमज्ञानमीरितम् ॥३५॥

Na jānāmī tyudāsīna vyavahārasya kāraṇam
Vicāra prāga bhāvena yukta majñāna mīritam (35)

विचार प्रागभावेन युक्तम् = that state which exists before the enquiry of Self; उदासीन = indifference; व्यवहारस्य = of the response; कारणम् = cause; न जानामि = 'I don't know'; इति = object of such a nature; अज्ञानम् = ignorance; ईरितम् = is called.

The stage before the enquiry of Self, viz. an indifference to the response of the possibility of Self; and, 'I do not know the Self' is the expression; when the **ignorance** is the object of experience. (35)

Ignorance or the status of 'I do not know' (i.e. non-apprehension of real nature) is the cause for the *jīva*'s indifference to the Absolute. This is the state before enquiry starts. Just as darkness disappears, the moment light is introduced to investigate it; so also when enquiry starts into the nature of ignorance, it disappears.

The veiling and its effects are----

अमार्गेण विचार्यथ नास्ति नो भाति चेत्यसौ ।
विपरीतव्यवहृतिरावृतेः कार्यमिष्यते ॥३६॥

*Amārgēṇa vicāryātha nāsti nobhāti cetyasau
Viparīta vyavahṛtir āvrteḥ kārya miṣyate* (36)

विचार्य = having enquired; अमार्गेण = according to fallacious logic, unlike the scriptural declarations; अथ = thereafter; न अस्ति = the pure consciousness is not; नो भाति च = and nor is it experienced; इति = in this manner; असौ = 'This; विपरीत = contrary; व्यवहृतिः = understanding and dealings; आवृतेः = of the veiling; कार्यम् = effect; इष्यते = is called.

When enquired (about the pure Self), by fallacious logic unlike the scriptural declarations and thereafter (concluding that); 'neither there is' anything like pure consciousness 'nor it is experienced', this type of contrary declaration is the effect of 'veiling'. (36)

The ignorance causes the *jīva* to use erroneous logic with reference to the nature of the Self. His enquiry, therefore, takes a wrong course leading to wrong conclusions such as: there is nothing like *ātmā* or *paramātmā* or *kūṭastha caitanya*, and I do not know anything about it. Thus ignorance leads to *āvaraṇam*, which obscures the Truth.

What is the nature of the third stage viz projection and its effect?

देहद्वयचिदाभासरूपो विक्षेप ईरितः ।
कर्तृत्वाद्यखिलः शोकः संसाराख्योऽस्य बन्धकः ॥३७॥

*Deha dvaya cidābhāsa rūpo vikṣepa īritah
Kartṛ tvādyā khilah śokaḥ saṁsārā khyo'sya bandhakaḥ* (37)

देहद्वयचिदाभासरूपः = the conditioned consciousness along with the conditioning of gross and subtle body; विक्षेपः = projection; ईरितः = is called; बन्धकः = cause of bondage; संसाराख्यः = known as *saṁsāra*; कर्तृत्वादि अखिलः = all such as doership etc.; शोकः = grief; अस्य = of this conditioned consciousness; (कार्यम् = is the effect).

The consciousness conditioned by the gross and subtle bodies and identified with them, thus resulting in the bondage called as '*saṁsāra*' that includes everything from doership, misery etc. is the effect of this projection. (37)

Although one is essentially of the nature of the *kūṭastha caitanya*, because of ignorance and the veiling, one thinks first: that I do not know about the *kūṭastha caitanya*, and second, due to wrong logic, that, there is no such thing as *kūṭastha caitanya*.

If I am not the *kūṭastha caitanya*, then who am I? From this question arises the notion that 'I am the doer; I am the enjoyer'. So begins the conditioning of the unconditioned consciousness. That phase, where conditioning is accepted as the reality, is called *vikṣepa*. It is at this stage that the *jīva* is born. *Vikṣepa* is the wrong identification of the *kūṭastha caitanya* with the gross and subtle bodies, to produce the erroneous notion that 'I am these two bodies'. This conditioning creates the whole world alongwith the sense of bondage. Therefore, *vikṣepa* or *jīvātma bhāva* is the cause of the sense of being a limited entity.

This is explained here----

अज्ञानमावृतिश्चैते विक्षेपात्प्राक्प्रसिद्धयतः ।
यद्यप्यथाप्यवस्थे ते विक्षेपस्यैव नात्मनः ॥३८॥

*Ajñānam āvṛtiś caite vikṣepāt prāk prasiddhyataḥ
Yaddya pyathā pyavasthe te vikṣepa syaiva nātmanah* (38)

अज्ञानम् आवृतिः च = the ignorance and veiling; एते = these two; यद्यपि = although; विक्षेपात् प्राक् = before projection; प्रसिद्धयतः = are known to be; अथापि = even though; ते = these two; अवस्थे = stages; विक्षेपस्य एव = of the projection only; न आत्मनः = do not belong to the pure consciousness.

Although the two earlier stages viz. ignorance and veiling are known to be before the *jīva* (i.e. before projection), they belong to the *jīva* and not to the pure consciousness. (38)

The student now raises the doubt: Sir, you said that the *jīva* is born in *vikṣepa* (Śl. 37). Does it not mean that the first two stages of *ajñānam* and *āvaraṇam* belong to someone else?

The teacher replies that even though *jīva* is stated to start its existence only in *vikṣepa*, the first two stages do belong to *jīva* and not to *ātmā*.

How can this be possible?----

विक्षेपोत्पत्तिः पूर्वमपि .विक्षेपसंस्कृतिः ।
अस्त्येव तदवस्थात्वमविरुद्धं ततस्तयोः ॥३९॥

*Vikṣepot pattitah pūrvam api vikṣepa sanskṛtiḥ
Astyeva tada vasthātvam aviruddham tatas tayoh* (39)

विक्षेप उत्पत्तिः पूर्वम् = before the formation of the *jīva* at the stage of projection; अपि = even then; विक्षेप संस्कृतिः = the *jīva* in the form of subtle unmanifest impression; अस्ति एव = certainly is; ततः = therefore; तयोः = of the ignorance and veiling; तद् अवस्थात्वम् = the stages of the conditioned consciousness; अविरुद्धम् = is not contrary.

Although the ignorance and veiling are the stages before the projection (resulting in *jīva*'s formation) belong to the *jīva*, as they certainly are inherent in him in the form of subtle unmanifest potentiality. Therefore, it is not wrong to attribute them to the *jīva*. (39)

The teacher explains further: *vikṣepa* or projection cannot come out of nothing. Before the manifestation of *vikṣepa*, or *jīvātmā bhāva*, there has to be, necessarily, the field for projection. There can be no effect without a cause, even if the cause cannot be immediately known or seen.

The effect of *vikṣepa* is, therefore, preceded by the two causes: *ajñānam* and *āvaraṇam* which were there in seed form. They were dormant till they were ripe for expressing themselves as *vikṣepa*. (Further, the *vikṣepa* or *jīva* must not be taken into account without its association with the gross and subtle bodies.) Therefore, both *ajñānam* and *āvaraṇam* belong to the *jīva* as much as the subsequent five stages.

Instead of imagining the ignorance and veiling to be in unmanifest seed form, why not consider them to belong to *Brahman*?

Because----

ब्रह्मण्यारोपितत्वेन ब्रह्मावस्थे इमे इति ।
न शङ्कनीयं सर्वासां ब्रह्मण्येवाधिरोपणात् ॥४०॥

*Brahmanyā ropita tvena brahmā vasthe ime iti
Na śaṅka nīyam sarvāsām brahmaṇye vādhi ropañāt* (40)

ब्रह्मणि = in the total substratum called *Brahman*; आरोपितत्वेन = being superimposed; इमे = these two; ब्रह्मावस्थे = are the conditions of *Brahman*; इति = in this way; न शङ्कनीयम् = should not be doubted; सर्वासाम् = all the

seven of them; ब्रह्मणि एव = on *Brahman* alone; अधिरोपणात् = are superimposed on *Brahman*.

Why not we attribute these two stages viz. ignorance and veiling to *Brahman*? Such a doubt should not be entertained, because for that purpose, all the seven stages are superimposed on *Brahman*, why these two only? (40)

The teacher continues: Why should it be insisted that these two stages belong to the *jīva*? Why not to the pure consciousness? Because, the *jīvātma bhāva* is a superimposition on the *Parabrahma Paramātmā*.

On the substratum called *Parabrahma Paramātmā*, nothing can be superimposed in this way. In *Vedāntik* thought, imagination or *kalpitam* forms a basic component. These are superimposition *prakriyā*. In the *prakriyā* we take certain things as imaginary. When the *prakriyā* is over, the imagination is cast aside, because it has served its purpose in understanding the problem.

By the same token these seven stages should not be taken as really existing. Consciousness can never be conditioned by *jīvātma bhāva* or anything else. So also, existence cannot be limited, but the limitation can be imagined on Existence. Once it is understood that the limitations are imaginary, the consciousness can no longer be conditioned, as *jīva*.

Similarly, when the *jīva* understands that ignorance or *ajñānam* is a condition supported by it, making it assume 'I do not know', ignorance has already become an object of its knowledge - and ceases to exist.

Therefore, *ajñānam*, *āvaraṇam* etc. belong to the *jīva* and not to the *Parabrahma Paramātmā*.

How can one accept that all the seven stages belong to the *Brahman*

Because ---

संसर्गहं विबुद्धोऽहं निःशोकस्तुष्ट इत्यपि ।

जीवगा उत्तरावस्था भान्ति न ब्रह्मगा यदि ॥४१॥

Samsārya haṁ vibuddho 'haṁ niḥśoka stuṣṭa ityapi
Jīvagā uttarā vasthā bhānti na brahmagā yadi (41)

अहम् संसारी = I am a doer, enjoyer etc; विबुद्धः = I am enlightened one; निःशोकः = I am devoid of sorrow; तुष्टः अपि = and I am fully content also; इति अहम् = Thus I am; उत्तरा अवस्था = the later stages; जीवगा भान्ति = belong to *jīva*; न ब्रह्मगा = not in *Brahman*; यदि = if this way one objects?

I am the doer, enjoyer etc., fully enlightened one, devoid of sorrows, and am contented; 'Thus am I'; these later stages belong to *jīva* and never can be to *Brahman*; if one objects? (41)

The above argument is accepted to establish that the earlier two stages viz. ignorance and veiling also belong to *jīva*-

तर्ह्यज्ञोऽहं ब्रह्मसत्त्वभाने मददृष्टितो न हि ।

इति पूर्वे अवस्थे च भासेते जीवगे खलु ॥४२॥

Tarhyajño 'haṁ brahma sattva bhāne maddṛṣṭito na hi
Iti pūrve avasthe ca bhāsete jīvage khalu (42)

तर्हि = In that case; अहम् अज्ञः = I am ignorant; ब्रह्म सत्त्वभाने = the existence and experience of *Brahman*; मद दृष्टितः = from my vision; न हि = is not indeed; इति = thus; पूर्वे अवस्थे = the earlier two stages; च = also; जीवगे = belong to *jīva*; खलु = essentially; भासेते = seem to be.

In the light of above logic, 'I am ignorant', the existence and experience of *Brahman*, does not seem to be, from my

vision; thus, the earlier two stages (viz ignorance and veiling) also seem to belong essentially to the *jīva* only (and not to *Brahman*). (42)

A doubt is raised. If all the seven stages from ignorance (*ajñāna*) to contentment (unconditioned bliss) belong to the *jīvātmā*, how is it that the great sages declared that the *Brahman* is the substratum of ignorance as well as that of everything else? There appears to be a contradiction in the thoughts.

The answer is---

अज्ञानस्याश्रयो ब्रह्मेत्यधिष्ठानतया जगुः ।
जीवावस्थात्वमज्ञानाभिमानित्वादवादिषम् ॥४३॥

Ajñāna syāśrayo brahmeti adhiṣṭhān tayā jaguḥ
Jīvā vasthātvam ajñānā bhimā nītvā davā diṣam (43)

अधिष्ठान तया = being the substratum; इति = thus; ब्रह्म = the *Brahman*; अज्ञानस्य = of the ignorance; आश्रयः = substratum; जगुः = was declared; अज्ञान अभिमानित्वात् = being conditioned by ignorance; जीव अवस्थात्वम् = the ignorance belong to *jīva*; अवादिषम् = was said by me.

The *Brahman* is the substratum of the ignorance, was certainly declared by great sages. What is declared by me is that being conditioned by ignorance, the ignorance belongs to *jīva*. (Therefore, where is the contradiction?) (43)

Adhiṣṭhāna tayā: The whole world of names and forms (i.e. effects of ignorance), is supported by the *Parabrahma Paramātmā*, as a substratum.

Ajñānasya Āśraya: Therefore it is said that the *Parabrahma Paramātmā* is the substratum of ignorance also, and not conditioned by ignorance.

Ājñāna Abhimānitvāt: When a person says, 'I am ignorant, he becomes the upholder or 'owner' of the ignorance, as if it is a possession belonging to him like other objects such as house etc. For example, when a person knows an object, he becomes a '*jñāni*' of the object. When he does not know, he becomes '*ajñāni*', because he has identified himself with knowledge or ignorance (refer to *śloka* 40).

Jīva avasthātvam avādiṣam: Because of this ownership of ignorance, the *jīvahood* and all the states of *jīvātmā* are supported by the *Parabrahma*. They are all superimposed on the reality, but themselves are not real. Till such time that the ownership is not accepted, *jīva* is not born. When the imaginary ownership that 'ignorance' belongs to me, and that 'I do not know' is experienced, the story of the *jīvātmā* starts. When the same *jīvātmā* is able to detach itself from this ownership syndrome, and recognizes that 'ignorance is in me, but I have not become ignorant', that marks the discovery of its own real nature viz. the *kūṭastha caitanya*.

This entire doubt has arisen because of misunderstanding the *prakriyā*, the methodology of communication of knowledge, of how the infinite is discovered inspite of the finitude imposed on the infinite through imagination.

The earlier three stages viz. ignorance, veiling and projection (*jīvahood*) are the causes of bondage. What can lead to liberation?

To explain this the teacher says--

ज्ञानद्वयेन नष्टेऽस्मिन्नज्ञाने तत्कृतावृत्तिः ।
न भाति नास्ति चेत्येषा द्विविधापि विनश्यति ॥४४॥

Jñāna dvayen naṣṭe'sminn ajñāne tat kṛtāvṛtiḥ
Na bhāti nāsti cetyeṣā dvividhāpi vinaśyati (44)

ज्ञान द्वयेन = by the two types (indirect and direct) knowledge; अस्मिन् अज्ञाने नष्टे = when the ignorance is destroyed; तत्कृतावृत्तिः = the effect of ignorance viz veiling; न भाति = is not experienced; न अस्ति = does not exist; च = and; इति एषा = thus; द्विविधा = both types; अपि = also; विनश्यति = are destroyed.

When the ignorance is destroyed by the two types (indirect and direct) of knowledge, the effect of ignorance viz. veiling, which also appears in two ways viz. (i) the *Brahman* is not and (ii) it is not experienced; also get destroyed. (44)

Jñāna dvayen - The two types of knowledge are indirect knowledge (*parokṣa jñānam*) and direct knowledge (*aparokṣa jñānam*). *Parokṣa jñānam* is based on the words (*āpta vacanam*) of the teacher or the scriptures. It is not direct experience. It is based on what someone, in whose authority and authenticity, one has faith and trust, has said. *Aparokṣa jñānam* is the translation of *parokṣa jñānam* into one's own direct and immediate experience, after deep contemplation and reflection.

Asmin ajñāne naṣṭe - When ignorance is destroyed by the two types of knowledges - *parokṣa* and *aparokṣa*, *Tat kṛtāvṛtiḥ* - the effect of ignorance or *ajñānam* is *āvṛti* or *āvaraṇa* the veiling, are also destroyed as explained further.

Na asti - The nature of *āvaraṇam* expresses itself in two ways. (i) to deny the existence of Absolute Consciousness as expressed by the statement '*Na asti*' - there is nothing like *kūṭastha caitanya*, such a thing does not exist etc. *Na bhāti* - (ii) to substantiate and reinforce the first, namely, I do not believe *kūṭastha caitanya* exists, because I cannot see it or experience it.

Dvividhā api vinaśyati - These two states of ignorance are removed by the destruction of ignorance. The *jīva* then comes to realise 'Now I have understood'.

In the *Kenopaniṣad* (II-1), the teacher, sensing the over-confidence and smugness in the pupil that 'he has understood the *ātmā*', gives a word of warning.

Yadi manyase suvediti dabhramevāpi nūnam
Tvaṁ vettha brahmaṇo rūpam
Yadsya tvaṁ yadasya deveṣvatha nu
Mimānsya-meva te manye viditam

If you think that you have understood the *ātmā* very well, I must caution you. You have understood very little. If you think you can know the consciousness through the sense organs, you are on the wrong path. Go and reflect again.

The student goes back and reflects long and deep. After some time he comes back and declares: 'Now I understand.' Both times he uses the same words 'I understand'. The first time the teacher rejected his claim, the second time he accepts it. This is because formerly it was *parokṣa jñānam*, now it is *aparokṣa jñānam*. By *parokṣa jñānam* only *ajñānam* or veiling is removed and the seeker comes to the stage when he drops his earlier statement *na asti* and comes to accept the existence of *kūṭastha caitanya* (*asti*). This is only an intellectual acceptance, he has not experienced it himself (*na bhāti*). This is because the Truth has been veiled or hidden from the view of experience - *svānubhūti*. When this *āvaraṇam* is removed, he gains *aparokṣa jñānam*. In spiritual unfoldment, therefore, what happens is not the dawn of some new knowledge which did not exist before, but the removal or unveiling of ignorance which had been hiding the true knowledge of the self.

The two aspects of veiling viz. (i) The *Brahman* does not exist and (ii) It is not experienced; are destroyed by two aspects of knowledge --

परोक्षज्ञानतो नश्येदसत्त्वावृतिहेतुता ।
अपरोक्षज्ञाननाश्या ह्यभानावृतिहेतुता ॥४५॥

Parokṣa jñānato naśyet asattvā vṛti hetutā
Aparokṣa jñāna nāśyā hyabhānā vṛti hetutā (45)

परोक्षज्ञानतः = by indirect knowledge; असत्त्वावृतिहेतुता = the cause for the 'non-existenceness' aspect of veiling; नश्येत् = is destroyed; अभानावृतिहेतुता = the cause for the 'non-experienceness' aspect of veiling; अपरोक्ष ज्ञाननाश्या = is destroyed by direct knowledge; हि = indeed.

The cause for the first aspect of veiling viz. 'the *Brahman* does not exist', is destroyed by indirect knowledge, while the second aspect viz. 'the *Brahman* is consciousness is not experienced by me', is destroyed by direct knowledge. (45)

Asattvāvṛti hetutā - The result of veiling is the belief that *kūṭastha caitanya* does not exist (*na asti*). The Truth is that Absolute Consciousness or *kūṭastha caitanya* always exists as the self-effulgent 'I', is not realised because of two aspects: (a) due to ignorance or *ajñānam* because of which is the thought 'I do not know that such a thing called *kūṭastha caitanya* exists at all', and (b) *abhānāvṛti hetutā* - The non-experience aspect of veiling, the thought 'I cannot see it or experience it, so it cannot exist' results.

These two aspects are dealt with separately in spiritual rediscovery, in two stages. *parokṣa jñānataḥ naśyet* - 'The *Brahman* does not exist' state of veiling (*na asti*) is removed by indirect knowledge or *parokṣa jñānam* gained through the words of the *guru*, study of the scriptures etc. However, this can only provide assurance of the *kūṭastha caitanya* on the basis of the experience of others and accepted on trust and faith.

Aparokṣa jñāna nāśyā The second aspect 'I cannot see *kūṭastha caitanya*', is not within the comprehension of my experience. It can be removed only by one's own

direct experience or *aparokṣa jñānam*. The pure consciousness then reveals itself to itself in *Aparokṣa anubhūti*.

The result of direct knowledge is the last stages viz. (i) removal of sorrows and (ii) unconditioned bliss.

The first is explained in the following *śloka*---

अभानावरणे नष्टे जीवत्वारोपसंक्षयात् ।
कर्तृत्वाद्यखिलः शोकः संसाराख्यो निवर्तते ॥४६॥

Abhānā varāṇe naṣṭe jīvātvā ropa saṁkṣayāt
Kartṛtvā dyakhilāḥ śokaḥ saṁsārākhyo nivartate (46)

अभान आवरणे नष्टे = When the 'I do not experience' aspect of the veiling is destroyed; जीवत्व = the *jīvahood*, आरोप संक्षयात् = having removed the super-imposition; कर्तृत्व आदि = the doership, enjoyership etc; अखिलः = totally; संसार आख्यः = known as the *saṁsāra*, शोकः = the sorrow; निवर्तते = are removed.

When the 'I do not experience' aspect of the veiling is destroyed, the imagined limitations of veiling are removed. The result is that the *saṁsāra* that includes, the doership, enjoyership etc. and sorrows etc. is fully removed. (46)

Abhānā āvarāṇe naṣṭe - How, 'I do not experience the *Brahman*' aspect of the veiling, is destroyed? Removal of veiling means the realisation that one was conditioned by all the conditions of the body, mind and intellect, and that all these conditionings are created and supported by me. The joys and sorrows will be encountered by us in our lives. We don't have any control over them as to, when and how long, they will occur. But we do have control on whether we allow them to overpower us and make us joyful or miserable.

Jīvatva āropa saṁkṣayāt - The *jīva*'s identification with the conditioning is the cause of the ego or *jīvātma bhāva*. We become owners of ignorance and victims of identification with ignorance. Thus begins the process of suffering, because we try to own something that does not belong to us.

Kartṛtva ādi akhilaḥ - When this identification with the conditionings is destroyed, the doership and enjoyership are also removed, and all the miseries caused by them cease. To know that 'I AM', no conditioning is needed. The result of the removal of veiling is the realisation of one's own pristine glory, of unconditioned happiness - that 'I am *Sat-Cit-Ānanda-Svarūpa*'.

The last stage viz. unconditioned Bliss is explained ---

निवृत्ते सर्वसंसारे नित्यमुक्तत्वभासनात् ।
निरङ्कुशा भवेत्तृप्तिः पुनः शोकासमुद्भवात् ॥४७॥

Nivṛtte sarva saṁsāre nitya muktatva bhāsanāt
Niraṅkuṣā bhavet tṛptiḥ punaḥ śokā samudbhavāt (47)

निवृत्ते सर्व संसारे = when the total world of pain and sorrows is negated; नित्य मुक्तत्व भासनात् = having realised that 'I am eternal and free'; निरङ्कुशा = supreme and unlimited; तृप्तिः = contentment; भवेत् = is attained; पुनः = thereafter again; शोक असमुद्भवात् = sorrow is not experienced.

When there is a complete negation of the world of sorrows and having realised that 'I am eternal and ever free', supreme unlimited contentment is attained. Thereafter, the sorrows are no more experienced. (47)

The above discussion involving the seven stages beginning from ignorance and culminating in unlimited contentment are related to the *jīva*, which is referred as '*pūruṣa*' in the original statement of the *upaniṣad* taken for discussion.

Therefore ---

अपरोक्षज्ञानशोकनिवृत्त्याख्ये उभे इमे ।
अवस्थे जीवगे ब्रूते आत्मानं चेदिति श्रुतिः ॥४८॥

Aparokṣa jñāna śoka nivṛttyākhye ubhe ime
Avasthe jīvage brūte ātmānam cediti śrutiḥ (48)

अपरोक्ष ज्ञान शोक निवृत्ति = The direct knowledge and removal of miseries; इति आख्ये = called thus; इमे उभे = these both; अवस्थे = stages; आत्मानम् चेत् इति श्रुतिः = in the *upaniṣadik* statement viz. '*ātmānam cet*'; जीवगे = belong to *jīva*; ब्रूते = are called.

The two stages viz. direct knowledge and denial of misery, both belong to the *jīva*, is thus referred in the *upaniṣad* statement - '*Ātmānam cet*' (which is taken for discussion in this chapter). (48)

The discussion in this chapter started with the *Śruti Vākya*:

आत्मानं चेत् विजानीयात् अयमस्मीति पूरुषः ।
किमिच्छन् कस्य कामाय शरीरम् अनुसंज्वरेत् ॥

The analysis began with the word *pūruṣa*. Why then was the subject of the seven stages of the *jīva*- experience, from ignorance to *niraṅkuṣā tṛptiḥ* introduced in this discussion. It appears to be an unnecessary diversion from the main issue.

It is explained that what appears to be a digression is indeed of very pertinent relevance to the main subject.

Aparokṣa jñānāt śoka nivṛtṭiḥ iti ākhye, ubhe ime jīvage brūte - The two stages or *avasthā*-s viz. direct experience (*aparokṣa anubhūti*), and the release from all pains and sorrows, are with reference to the *jīvātma*. If as stated in the *Upaniṣadik* statement (*Śruti Vākya*)

the *jīva* comes to directly realise the *aparokṣa* experience or *jñānam* that 'I am the Pure Self', only then, there is release from sorrows (*śoka nivṛtti*) and the *jīva* will be free from the afflictions of the body limitations (*śarīra*).

[Note: This kind of recall of the *Upaniṣadik* statement (*śruti vākya*) at intervals is a technique used to bring the focus of the discussion back to the main theme. In the course of discussion and explanation, it is unavoidable that the discussion may seem to have moved away in other diversionary directions. But in reality these apparent digressions are deliberately planned in order to elucidate the minutest of doubts that may have arisen or arise in the student's mind. In order, however, that the main focus may not be lost, the attention of the student is drawn, at intervals, to the main *Upaniṣadik* statement (*śruti vākya*) which was the starting point for the study. This is called *abhyāsa* i.e. deliberate repetitions.]

After the seeming digression of seven stages, the theme of '*ayam*' referred in *śloka* 21 is again taken for further elaboration. The *Ātman* being always experienced, can become the subject of direct experience - this can be accepted. How can the *Ātman* be the object of contemplation and knowledge?

The answer is ---

अयमित्यपरोक्षत्वमुक्तं तद्विविधं भवेत् ।
विषयस्वप्रकाशत्वाद्विषयाप्येवं तदीक्षणात् ॥४९॥

Ayamitya parokṣatvam uktam tad dvividham bhavet
Viśaya svaprakāśatvāt dhiyā pyevam tadīkṣaṇāt (49)

अयम् इति = by the word '*ayam*'; अपरोक्षत्वम् = direct experience; उक्तम् = was declared; तत् = that; द्विविधम् भवेत् = is of two types; विषय स्वप्रकाशत्वात् = the object of knowledge i.e. *Ātmā* being self-illuminated; धिया अपि = by the intellect; एवम् = also; तदीक्षणात् = the self is experienced.

In the statement under discussion, 'direct experience' was declared by the word '*ayam*'. The direct experience is of two types on account of (i) the object of experience being self illumined and (ii) by the intellect also, the self illumined *Ātman* is experienced. (49)

In the 21st *śloka*, it was stated that by the word '*ayam*', in the main *śruti vākya*, was meant to indicate the *aparokṣa śuddha caitanya*.

It was further said in *śloka* 45, that by the *parokṣa jñāna*, the ignorance that 'I do not know that *Parabrahma* exists', was removed, although without understanding, what it was. Through *aparokṣa jñānam* came the realization that the *Parabrahma Paramātmā* is one's own real nature.

The question now raised is: How can that which is *aparokṣa* become *parokṣa*? That which is the very core of one's own being, that which does not require any medium to know, how has that become *parokṣa*?

This subject, of 'how it is possible for *parokṣa* and *aparokṣa jñāna* to exist in the same *jīva* simultaneously', is now taken up for examination. *Ayam iti aparokṣatvam uktam* - The meaning of the word '*ayam*' in the *śruti vākya* does refer to the direct experience that 'I am' that 'Pure Self' *Ayam Asmi* and not to the conditions called the body, mind and intellect by which one considers oneself as the conditioned *jīva*.

Dvividham Bhavet - this *aparokṣatā* is of two types. *Viśaya svaprakāśatvāt* - one kind of *aparokṣatā* is where consciousness is of the nature of Self-illumination. One does not require another light to see light. Similarly I know I am conscious because my conscious existence is (*svaprakāśa*) self illumined.

Dhiyā api evam tad-īkṣaṇāt - the second is perceiving consciousness as the self through the intellect. I am someone who can watch and understand all the modifications of the intellect - whether it is dull or sharp, whether it

comprehends or not, whether it is agitated or quiet etc. Through such a process one can arrive at the direct knowledge of 'I am that Consciousness', which even illumines the instrument of knowledge called intellect. *Parokṣa jñāna* becomes *aparokṣa jñāna* when all the data are provided for proper enquiry. When everything fits perfectly, *parokṣa jñāna* which was based on the faith and belief in the statements of others (teacher, *śruti*) becomes *aparokṣa jñānam*. Here faith is transformed into conviction born out of proper and systematic enquiry.

After having explained that the direct experience is of two types; now the teacher explains how can the same object of knowledge be both *parokṣa* (indirect and unexperienced) and *aparokṣa* (directly experienced) ---

परोक्षज्ञानकालेऽपि विषयस्वप्रकाशता ।
समा ब्रह्म स्वप्रकाशमस्तीत्येवं विबोधनात् ॥५०॥

*Parokṣa jñāna kālē'pi viṣaya svaprakāśatā
Samā brahma svaprakāśam astī tyevam vibodhanāt (50)*

परोक्ष ज्ञान काले अपि = even when one has indirect knowledge; विषय स्व-प्रकाशता समा = the 'self illumined nature' is similar; स्व प्रकाशम् = self-illumined; ब्रह्म अस्ति = is *Brahman*, इति एवम् = thus; विबोधनात् = is specifically known from the scripture.

Even at the time of indirect knowledge the 'self illumined nature' of the *Brahman* remains the same. In acquiring the indirect knowledge, the scriptures specifically declare that the *Brahman* is self-illumined. (50)

This *śloka* explains how even during the stage of *parokṣa jñāna*, the self illumined consciousness exists. In the beginning the *jīva* does not know its own real nature, namely that 'I am *Sat-Cit-Ānanda Svarūpa*', I am not limited by the body, and that everywhere 'I alone am'.

Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa says:

'Know that I am the Knower in all the Fields, O' *Bharata*, and only the knowledge of the Field and its Knower do I regard as true knowledge'. ---- *Gītā XIII-2*

However, at this stage the *jīva* does not understand this statement. But he is willing to accept it since the *guru* says so, the scriptures say so, and they all cannot be wrong. This is *parokṣa* or indirect *jñānam*.

Parokṣa jñāna kālē api viṣaya sva-prakāśatā samā -. Although knowledge at this stage is of a *parokṣa* or indirect nature, the *ātmā* continues to be the same self illumined consciousness. Whether it is a man of ignorance or a man of wisdom, whether he is aware of it or not, whether he denies it or accepts only on the basis of faith, the consciousness is the same, eternal presence. Not believing in consciousness is also validated and supported by the strength of the consciousness alone. Even to say 'I do not believe in consciousness' requires the presence of consciousness in us.

Therefore, even at the time of *parokṣa jñāna*, the self-illumined nature of the consciousness is not denied. Whether the *jīva* 'sees' it or not, makes no difference to the existence of consciousness.

Brahma Svaprakāśam asti evam vibodhanāt - Therefore, in *parokṣa jñānam*, it is brought to the cognition of the student that 'there is something called *Parabrahma*, which does not depend on anything else and which does not change with reference to the relative existence. It is self-illumined and self-existent. The question raised at the start of the discussion was how can the object of *aparokṣa jñānam* be *parokṣa jñānam*? How can the same self-illumined, eternal, unchanging *ātmā* come under the purview of two types of knowledge? The teacher is proving

that it is possible, although the *jīva* does not know of the existence of *Parabrahma* but accepts it on faith that the consciousness exists all the time - through ignorance as well as through knowledge.

The error in understanding this doubt is, that the existence of indirect and direct knowledge is considered to be simultaneous. But it is sequential. First one knows about the *Brahman* indirectly and it is called *parokṣa jñānam*. This forms the basis for the direct experience i.e. *aparokṣa jñānam*. Therefore, there should not be any doubt as such. In the event of identity between *Brahman* and the *ātmā*, should we say that the 'indirect knowledge' is in fact an erroneous knowledge?

The answer is ---

अहं ब्रह्मेत्यनुल्लिख्य ब्रह्मास्तीत्येवमुल्लिखेत् ।
परोक्षज्ञानमेतन्न भ्रान्तं बाधानिरूपणात् ॥५१॥

Ahaṁ brahme tyanullikhya brahmā sūtyeva mullikhet
Parokṣa jñāna metanna bhrāntaṁ bādhānirūpaṇāt (51)

अहम् ब्रह्म = I am *Brahman*; इति अनुल्लिख्य = not having experienced thus; ब्रह्म अस्ति = 'the *Brahman* is'; इति एवम् = in this manner; उल्लिखेत् = one objectively understands without experience; एतत् = this; परोक्ष ज्ञानम् = indirect knowledge; भ्रान्तम् न = is not erroneous knowledge; बाध = denial; अनिरूपणात् = is not possible.

When one gathers only objectively that *Brahman* is, and does not have direct experience that 'I am the *Brahman*', it is called indirect knowledge. It cannot be referred as erroneous knowledge, because it is not known to be cancelled (contradicted). (51)

A new doubt is raised regarding the illusion of knowledge and real knowledge. Taking the classical snake - rope example, at first the knowledge is that, it is a snake. After right enquiry, the snake is denied and one comes to realise that it is a rope. Therefore, the earlier knowledge that it is a snake turns out to be an illusion. That was knowledge, no doubt but it was illusory knowledge. The real knowledge is that "it is a rope". If *parokṣa jñānam* about - *Parabrahma* 'that *Brahman* is' is an illusion, the result should be that '*Brahman* is not'! Thus the *aparokṣa jñāna* stated in the *upaniṣad* seems to be contradicted. On the contrary, the knowledge that '*Brahman* is' is strengthened and established in the *aparokṣa jñānam*. Therefore, *parokṣa jñānam* about *Parabrahma* is not an illusion.

This thought is explained in this *śloka*

Ahaṁ brahma iti anullikhya - at the stage of *parokṣa jñānam* we are told that there is *Parabrahma* and that '*Parabrahma* I am'. But we do not realise this, because our knowledge at this stage is objective, as if *Parabrahma* is something other than us. This distance that we create between the *Parabrahma* and ourselves is the biggest obstacle in the spiritual path.

The term '*bādhā anirūpaṇāt*' meaning there is no possibility of negation of the *parokṣa jñānam*, is explained ---

ब्रह्म नास्तीति मानं चेत्स्याद्बाध्येत तदा ध्रुवम् ।
न चैवं प्रबलं मानं पश्यामोऽतो न बाध्यते ॥५२॥

Brahma nāstīti mānaṁ cet syāt bādhyet tadā dhruvam
Na caivaṁ prabalaṁ mānaṁ paśyāmo'to na bādhyate (52)

ब्रह्म न अस्ति = '*Brahman* is not'; इति चेत् = in this way; मानम् स्यात् = is the knowledge; तदा = in that case; ध्रुवम् = certainly; बाध्येत् = is negated; एवम् = of this

type; प्रबलम् मानम् = stronger authority of knowledge; न च पश्यामः = we do not see (come across); अतः = therefore; न बाध्यते = the indirect knowledge is not negated.

If the *parokṣa jñānam* were of the nature that 'the *Brahman* is not', then it would certainly be negated. But we don't see any stronger authority of knowledge that can support this nature of *parokṣa jñānam*. Meaning, the *parokṣa jñānam* is not negated (in the wake of *aparokṣa jñānam*). (Therefore, the *parokṣa jñānam* is not erroneous knowledge as proposed). (52)

Brahma na asti iti cet - The essential nature of erroneous knowledge is that, it is negated on enquiry, as we have explained earlier with the help of 'snake and rope' example. The only possibility of the *parokṣa jñānam* belonging to this category is if it were of the nature that 'the *Brahman* is not'. On enquiry the 'non-existenceness' of the *parokṣa jñānam* would be negated, and therefore, it will certainly be of the nature of erroneous knowledge.

Evam prabalaṁ mānaṁ na paśyāmaḥ - We do not come across any authoritative statement in the scriptures, wherein this view of negation of *parokṣa jñānam* is supported. Therefore, the *parokṣa jñānam* cannot be accepted as belonging to the category of erroneous knowledge.

In the absence of the knowledge regarding the identity between *ātmā* and *Brahman*, we can always say that the mere knowledge about *Brahman* is an erroneous or illusory knowledge!

The teacher explains---

व्यक्त्यनुल्लेखमात्रेण भ्रमत्वे स्वर्गधीरपि ।
भ्रान्तिः स्याद्व्यक्त्यनुल्लेखात्सामान्योल्लेखदर्शनात् ॥५३॥

*Vyaktya nullekha mātrena bhramatve svarga dhīrapi
Bhrānti syāt vyaktya nullekhāt sāmānyo llekha darśanāt* (53)

व्यक्त्यनुल्लेख मात्रेण = on account of the absence of the knowledge that 'I am *Brahman*'; भ्रमत्वे = the *parokṣa jñānam* is erroneous knowledge; (सति = if this is the criteria); स्वर्गधीः अपि = the knowledge about 'heavens'; भ्रान्तिः स्यात् = should be an erroneous knowledge; व्यक्त्यनुल्लेखात् = because one has not seen heaven; सामान्य उल्लेख दर्शनात् = in either case non-experience of the *parokṣa jñānam* is common.

Only because one has not experienced the *parokṣa jñānam* does not qualify it to be an erroneous knowledge. With this criteria as logic, even the *parokṣa jñānam* about heaven will also be erroneous one; because one (who is talking about heaven on the basis of scriptures) has not seen the heaven. In either case the 'non-experience-ness' of the *parokṣa jñānam* is common. (53)

Vyakti anullekha mātrena - If the criteria of not having experienced the *parokṣa jñānam*, is taken to declare that it is erroneous knowledge, and the authority of the scriptures in this case is overlooked, it will lead to additional discrepancies, such as the validity of heaven etc. Because, although we often talk of heavens, on the authority and authenticity of scriptures, this very authority will suffer doubt, because we have not experienced the heavens mentioned by the scriptures. In this way one error about *parokṣa jñānam* will lead to another. Therefore, one cannot accept that the *parokṣa jñānam* is erroneous knowledge.

That which is one's own essential nature, when taken to be indirect knowledge can as well be labelled as erroneous knowledge. If we put it this way---

अपरोक्षत्वं योग्यस्य न परोक्षमतिभ्रमः ।
परोक्षमित्यनुल्लेखादर्थोत्पारोक्ष्यसंभवात् ॥५४॥

*Aparokṣatva योग्यस्या na parokṣa matir bhramah
Parokṣa mityanu llekhāt arthāt pāroksya sambhavāt* (54)

अपरोक्षत्व योग्यस्य = the *Brahman* that should have been known directly as one's own nature; परोक्षम् इति अनुल्लेखात् अर्थात् = because one has not directly experienced this; परोक्ष मतिः = the indirect knowledge and understanding; भ्रमः न = is not considered as an illusion; पारोक्ष्य संभवात् = the indirect knowledge is possible.

Therefore, the *Brahman* which is one's own essential nature should be experienced so. However, one has not (yet) directly experienced. On the strength of this failure of direct experience, the indirect understanding cannot be called to be an illusion. The indirect knowledge (without being fructified as direct experience) is possible. (54)

The mistake in the understanding of the student is mixing up the terms, indirect knowledge and illusion. The indirect knowledge is about something that exists although not experienced. The erroneous knowledge is about something which appears to exist, but is certainly negated on proper enquiry.

Therefore, 'The *Brahman* is', is indirect knowledge, pending experience, of being one's own real nature. 'I am body' etc. is erroneous knowledge although seems to be real, but is negated on proper enquiry.

The direct knowledge in fact involves two aspects viz. - (i) the *Brahman* is and (ii) that '*Brahman* I am'. To talk of only the first aspect as indirect knowledge, is itself an error. Therefore, incompleteness of the knowledge itself is an erroneous knowledge!

The fallacy in this logic is explained---

अंशागृहीतेभ्रान्तिश्चेदघटज्ञानं भ्रमो भवेत् ।
निरंशस्यापि सांशत्वं व्यावर्त्यांशविभेदतः ॥५५॥

*Aṁśa gṛhīte bhrānti ścet ghaṭa jñānaṁ bhramo bhavet
Niraṁśa syāpi sāṁśatvaṁ vyāvartyaṁśa vibhedataḥ* (55)

अंशागृहीतेः चेत् = on account of part knowledge of the *Brahman*, भ्रान्तिः = is erroneous knowledge; घट ज्ञानम् = the knowledge of a pot; भ्रमः = erroneous knowledge; भवेत् = will be called; निरंशस्य अपि = of the partless *Brahman*, सांशत्वम् = association with limitations of part; व्यावर्त्य अंश विभेदतः = having negated the limitations of parts on the partless.

If the part knowledge of *Brahman* is the criterion for calling the indirect knowledge as erroneous knowledge, in that case the knowledge of pot will also be an erroneous knowledge, the pot being a part of total mud. Further, an aspect of the knowledge, indirect knowledge is that leads to direct knowledge, when the limitations of part are negated. (55)

Aṁśa aghṛīte bhrāntiḥ cet - The fallacy in this doubt is that part knowledge is considered as erroneous knowledge. As a pot of mud is made up of a part of total mud, this does not prevent one from knowing that the pot is made up of mud. In knowing 'the mud' in the pot, what is needed is negating the particular limitation of name and form of the pot, and know it to be mud. Similarly, knowing that 'the *Brahman* is', although one has not experienced this to be his own nature, should be called as indirect knowledge, which will lead to the direct knowledge when the partial aspect of the knowledge is negated by experiencing that 'the *Brahman* that is, is my own nature'! Therefore, part knowledge of *Brahman* cannot be considered as erroneous knowledge, as argued.

If the *Brahman* is without parts, how do we say in the above *śloka* that after negating the part of conditioning,

one comes to know the remaining part of the direct knowledge? --- meaning how part knowledge is referred to about the *Brahman* which is partless ?

The answer is --

असत्त्वांशो निवर्तेत परोक्षज्ञानतस्तथा ।

अभानांशनिवृत्तिः स्यादपरोक्षधिया कृता ॥५६॥

Asattvāṁśo nivarteta parokṣa jñānata stathā
Abhānāṁśa nivṛtṭiḥ syāt aparokṣa dhiyā kṛtā (56)

परोक्ष ज्ञानतः = by indirect knowledge; असत्त्व अंशः = 'The *brahman* is not', aspect of veiling; निवर्तेत = is negated; तथा = similarly; अपरोक्ष धिया = by direct knowledge; अभान अंश निवृत्तिः = there is negation of non-experience aspect of veiling; कृता स्यात् = takes place.

The first aspect of veiling viz. 'the *Brahman* is not' is negated by indirect knowledge, and the second aspect of 'I have no experience' aspect of veiling is removed by direct knowledge. (56)

Asattva aṁśa nivarteta parokṣa jñānataḥ - In śloka 45, it was explained how (*āvaraṇa*) veiling that '*Brahman* is not' (*na asti*) is removed by *parokṣa jñānam*; and the *jīva* comes to accept that '*Brahman* is'. The process of analysis about reading direct knowledge began at śloka No. 46, and here we have come to know that 'non-existence-ness' aspect of veiling is removed by *parokṣa jñānam*.

Abhāna aṁśa nivṛtṭi - The knowledge that the *Parabrahma Paramātmā* is my own real nature is attained by direct knowledge. Then I realise that the *Brahman* is Myself.

Each one of us is the hero of the story of *aparokṣa jñāna*, of self, realisation. Therefore, it is called *adhyātma*

śāstra - a science where 'I' is the subject of analysis and study. In the pursuit of spiritual path, therefore, the question of 'improving others' etc. has no validity. In the enquiry of the 'I', 'otherness' disappears. Then who will improve whom? When this perception of 'non-otherness' in the presence of 'seeming otherness' gains strength, one's attitude to life undergoes a sea change. We do not take the blue-ness of the sky seriously; we do not shed tears when waves break because we know, nothing is lost. Similarly, from the Absolute standpoint when one's essential nature is realised, all problems cease to exist. Just as *Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa* could maintain a smile on his face in and through the *Kurukṣetra* battle and even deliver a philosophical exposition, so will we be able to go through life without likes and dislikes (*rāga-dveṣa*) and in a spirit of (*avirodh*) spontaneous effortless natural Being.

To establish that the subject of direct knowledge can also be in the perview of indirect knowledge and this indirect knowledge is not an erroneous knowledge is illustrated through the famous story of 'ten persons', often referred in *Vedāntik* texts --

दशमोऽस्तीति विभ्रान्तं परोक्षज्ञानमीक्ष्यते ।

ब्रह्मास्तीत्यपि तद्वत्स्यादज्ञानावरणं समम् ॥५७॥

Daśamo'stīti vibhṛāntaṁ parokṣa jñāna mīkṣyate
Brahmā stītyapi tadvat syād ajñānā varaṇaṁ samam (57)

दशमः अस्ति = the tenth person is; इति = thus; परोक्ष ज्ञानम् = the indirect knowledge; विभ्रान्तम् = not an erroneous or illusory; ईक्ष्यते = is known to be; ब्रह्म अस्ति = 'The *Brahman* is'; इति अपि = this also; तद्वत् स्यात् = is similar i.e. not an erroneous knowledge; अज्ञान आवरणम् = the veiling due to ignorance; समम् = is of similar nature.

It is observed that in the story of ten persons, 'the tenth person is', is an indirect knowledge and not an erroneous one. Similarly, 'the *Brahman* is' is an indirect knowledge. In both these situations, the ignorance about the truth (viz. the tenth man or the *Brahman*) is of a similar kind. (57)

Having established that knowledge of the Self takes place in two stages - indirect (*parokṣa*) and direct (*aparokṣa*) - the example of the ten fools who crossed the river (ref. *śloka* 22 to 27) is recalled to reinforce the statement that *parokṣa jñānam* and *aparokṣa jñānam* constituted the only way to know the true nature of the Self.

Daśamaḥ asti iti - When ten fools were weeping that the tenth man was lost, the wise man, having understood the nature of their problem, first pacifies them, and then tells them, 'the tenth man about whom you are crying is not really lost. He is'.

Parokṣa jñānam vibhāntam, ikṣyate - The ten men accept this statement and felt reassured that there is no need for grieving. Thus through the trustworthy words (*āpta vacanam*) of the wise man, *parokṣa jñānam* is gained and the delusion, from which they had been suffering, ceases.

Brahma asti iti api tad vat syād - In the same way, the teacher says 'your bemoaning that you are an unhappy miserable *jīvātmā* is *bhrānti* or delusion. You are not the miserable person you imagine yourself to be. 'Then what am I?'. 'You are *Brahma Svarūpa*'. Through such trust-worthy words (*āpta vākya*), the teacher tries to create in the mind of the student the possibility that there *is* something called *Brahman*.

Ajñānam āvaraṇam samam - In both cases - in the example of the ten foolish men and the student - the veil of ignorance is of the same nature. The tenth man although not lost, seems to be lost under the influence of ignorance. So the gain of the tenth man is not the

gain of a non-existing tenth man, but of an existing one. This is called *prāptasya prāptih* meaning the gain of the already gained --- discovering something that is already there. In the same way, *Parabrahma Paramātmā* is not newly created by the enquiry of the Truth. It always has been, is and shall ever be.

If the statement of trustworthy teacher or scripture creates the indirect knowledge, what establishes the direct knowledge? ---

आत्मा ब्रह्मेति वाक्यार्थे निःशेषेण विचारिते ।

व्यक्तिरुल्लिख्यते यद्वदशमस्त्वमसीत्यतः ॥५८॥

Ātmā brahmeti vākyaārthe niḥśeṣaṇa vicārite
Vyakti rulli khyāte yadvad daśama stvama sītyataḥ (58)

आत्मा ब्रह्मेति = This *ātmā* is *Brahman*, वाक्यार्थे = the meaning of this great statement; निःशेषेण = exhaustively and logically; विचारिते = having enquired; व्यक्तिः उल्लिख्यते = the identity of *ātmā* and *brahman* is attained; यद्वत् = as that of; दशमः त्वम् असि = 'you are the tenth person'; इत्यतः = from this statement.

When the great statement like 'This *ātmā* is *Brahman*' is exhaustively and logically enquired into, the direct knowledge of this truth is revealed, as one realises the statement 'you are the tenth person', by proper enquiry. (58)

Ātmā brahmeti vākyaārthe - In chapter V, the four *mahāvākya*-s were dealt with. One of them is *Ayam Ātmā Brahma*. This *mahāvākya* is referred to here. *Niḥśeṣaṇa vicārite* - The student must enquire into and contemplate on the meaning of this great statement (*mahāvākya*) fully and exhaustively. What is the technique of this enquiry? This self is *Brahman*? Who is this Self? The clothes one wears? No. This body? No. This mind? No. The

five *koṣā-s*? No. Because every one of them is conditioned by time, space and object; and *ātmā* is beyond conditioning. In this way, step by step, layer by layer, the enquiry should proceed systematically, steadily and clearly by the process of the discrimination of five sheaths (*pañca koṣa viveka* vide chapter III).

Vyaktiḥ ullikhyate - Through such an enquiry, one comes ultimately to the direct, personal and immediate experience of one's own being - the *Parabrahma Paramātmā*.

Yadvad daśamaḥ tvam asi ityataḥ - When the wise man told each one of the ten foolish men, 'you are the tenth man,' each man understood very clearly 'I am the tenth man'. Although the *upadeśa* is 'you are the tenth man', the understanding is not 'you are the tenth man' but 'I am the tenth man'. Similarly, when the *mahāvākya* says (*Tat Tvam Asi*) the knowledge that takes place is not *Tat Tvam Asi* but '*Aham Brahmasmi*'. This is the basic difference between *parokṣa jñānam* and *aparokṣa jñānam*. In *parokṣa jñānam* 'Brahman (that) exists', i.e. *Brahman* is talked about as an object of knowledge. In *Aparokṣa jñānam*, on the other hand, 'That-ness of *Brahman* disappears, and *Brahman* becomes the very subject of our being - I am that *Brahman*.

How the enquiry of *mahāvākya* - the source of *parokṣa jñānam*, leads to *aparokṣa jñānam* is explained ---

दशमः क इति प्रश्ने त्वमेवेति निराकृते ।

गणयित्वा स्वेन सह स्वमेव दशमं स्मरेत् ॥५९॥

Daśamaḥ ka iti praśne tvame veti nirākṛte
Gaṇayitvā svena saha svameva daśamaṁ smaret (59)

दशमः कः = who is the tenth person?; इति प्रश्ने = when, thus enquired; त्वम् एव = Thou art that; इति निराकृते = having thus replied; स्वेन सह गणयित्वा = counting

that includes oneself; स्वम् एव = self; दशमम् स्मरेत् = comes to understand, that the tenth is he himself.

When enquired (by one of the ten fools), who is the tenth person, he is told, you are the tenth person. This person again when recounts the total number; that includes himself in the counting, comes to realise that he is the tenth one. (59)

How the *parokṣa jñāna* becomes *aparokṣa jñāna* is explained in another way citing the story of the tenth man. *Daśamaḥ kaḥ* - having accepted the wise man's *āpta vacanam* that 'the tenth man is not lost. He exists', the ten foolish men stop grieving. But they are still bewildered not being able to understand where the tenth man could be. 'Sir, you said the tenth man is not lost and that he is, where is he? *Iti praśne tvam eva iti* - When asked this question, the wise man tells each of the ten foolish men: 'You are the tenth man'. So the first stage is *parokṣa jñāna* when they are told 'the tenth man you are crying about does exist. He is not created nor added from outside. He is there already. You are the tenth man.

Nirākṛte - When this is said, the earlier problem or doubt about the tenth man is solved. How? *Sven saḥ gaṇayitvā* - When each of them starts counting and includes himself, *svam-eva daśamaṁ smaret* - he realises 'Yes, now I see that the tenth man is not lost, because he is none other than me.'

Thus in *parokṣa jñāna* there is no *vicāra* or enquiry. The student accepts the statement from the sources in whose authority he has faith and trust. This *śraddhā* is the first armour for a student treading upon the spiritual path. *Śāstrasya guru vākyasya satya budhyāvadhāraṇā*: What is said by the scriptures or the teacher has to be correct, whether we understand it or not. Then alone one can apply enquiry to establish the Truth or to deny it.

The direct knowledge that follows the enquiry of the *mahāvākya* is devoid of any further doubt ---

दशमोऽस्मीति वाक्योत्था न धीरस्य विहन्यते ।
आदिमध्यावसानेषु न नवत्वस्य संशयः ॥६०॥

Daśamo'smīti vākyotthā na dhīrasya vihanayate
Ādi madhyā vasāneṣu na navatvasya saṁśayaḥ (60)

दशमः अस्मि = 'I am the tenth'; अस्य = of this tenth man; इति धीः = this knowledge; वाक्योत्था = following the enquiry of *mahāvākya*; न विहन्यते = is never negated; आदि मध्यावसानेषु = even when counting is from first, middle or the end; नवत्वस्य = the notion of being the ninth; संशयः न = is not doubted.

Following the enquiry of the *mahāvākya*, the direct knowledge, that 'I am the tenth', never gets negated. When the counting is done again beginning from first, middle or end, the illusion of being the ninth never overtakes by doubt. (60)

Asya vākyotthā - This tenth man having been told (by the wise) that 'You are the tenth man, now comes to realise that 'I am the tenth' man'. *Navatvasya saṁśayaḥ na* : a direct (*aparokṣa*) experience, will never be lost again. That man will not ever again be confused by the term 'tenth man' whether he starts counting from the beginning or from the middle. He has understood that the imaginary loss of the tenth man was not the truth, it was only an error in counting.

Similarly, when the student (seeker) is firmly established in his *aparokṣa* knowledge that he is the *Sat-Cit-Ānanda Svarūpa*, nothing can shake him from that position. Whatever devious arguments (*kutarka-vāda*) are raised to confound him, he will have no doubt whatsoever, that the *Parabrahma Paramātmā* or Pure Consciousness which he had formerly thought did not exist, **not only is but is none other than himself**. *Saṁśaya* or doubt cannot exist in *aparokṣa jñānam*.

The conclusion drawn from above discussion is thus ---

सदेवेत्यादिवाक्येन ब्रह्मसत्त्वं परोक्षतः ।
गृहीत्वा तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्याद्व्यक्तिं समुल्लिखेत् ॥६१॥

Sadeve tyādi vākyena brahma sattvaṁ parokṣataḥ
Gṛhītvā tattva masyādi vākyāt vyaktiṁ samullikhet (61)

सद् एव = The *Sat* alone; इत्यादि = etc; वाक्येन = from the statement; ब्रह्म सत्त्वम् = the existence of *brahman*; परोक्षतः = indirectly; गृहीत्वा = having accepted; तत्त्वमस्यादि वाक्यात् = from the *mahāvākya*-s like *Tat Tvam Asi*; व्यक्तिम् समुल्लिखेत् = 'I am *Brahman*', thus direct knowledge takes place.

The 'existence of *Brahman*' is initially accepted as an indirect knowledge from the statements of *upaniṣad* like, *Sat eva* (*saumya idam agre āsīt*) etc. Later, from the *mahāvākya* like 'Tat Tvam Asi' one comes to realise his identity with the *Brahman*. (61),

In the *Chāndogya upaniṣad* (6.1.2; 6.1.3; 6.2.1) *Śvetaketu* is sent by his father *Āruni* to *gurukul* to study. The boy returns after completing his *gurukula vāsa* for 12 years. He is proud of his own achievement and gets conceited and arrogant. He stands before his father with no sense of humility befitting a person of true learning. For, wisdom is gloried in humility. Observing his son, the father asks him: Have you completed your studies? The boy says 'yes'. Then the father asks:

Yenaśrutam śrutam bhavatyamatam
Matama ajñātam vijñātam iti, katham nu
Bhavataḥ sa ādeśo bhavati iti

Have you studied that, having known which nothing remains to be known?

Śvetaketu replies 'Probably my teacher did not know this, so he did not teach me'. But that question sets him thinking, so he goes back to his father, this time with absolute humility. 'Sir, I do not know the answer

to your question, but I want to know. Please teach me. I am ready to accept disciple-ship under you'.

The father says:-

'*Sadeva somya idam agre āsīt, Ekameva advitīyam ---*'

'In the beginning Existence alone was, one only, without a second'. This statement *Sadeva iti* is referred to in this *śloka*. *Sadeva ityādi* - through such a statement, the student gets *parokṣa jñānam* - that there is *Brahman*, by knowing which everything becomes known. *Gṛhītvā* - Having accepted what the *guru* is saying, as correct, thereafter. *Tat Tvam Asi*: the teacher-father tells the student-son not once but nine times. (*Chāndogya upaniṣad* 6.8.7, 6.9.4., 6.10.3.)

Śvetaketu! you are that *Sat*. I am not talking about a *Brahman* or *Sat* which does not include you. The student goes on enquiring into and contemplating upon this *Sat*. That *Sat* which is not denied in the three periods of time is, according to my father-*guru*, me. In the past *I was*, in the present *I am*, and the future has meaning only with reference to me. If I am not there whose future is being considered? Therefore I am never denied. **I have to be that *Sat*.** *Vyakti Samullikhet* - Thus he gets *aparokṣa jñānam*. The *upadeśa* was *Tat Tvam Asi*. The knowledge gained is *Aham Brahmāsmi*. The experience, that the *Brahman* is my own self, takes place.

Once this knowledge *Aham Brahmāsmi* takes place, there is no falling back. That knowledge which is gained through the intellect is *Vṛtti jñānam*. It is thought knowledge. It requires frequent repetition in order that it is not forgotten. But *Brahma jñānam*, which is *aparokṣa jñānam* is never forgotten - whether there is memory or no memory. I, the Pure Self, the illuminator of memory is always present. The *Aham Brahmāsmi* knowledge is never lost. In *Vṛtti jñānam*, knowledge-thought is born with the birth of the mind. With the death of the mind as in deep-sleep, all

knowledge is forgotten. But the knowledge about one's own conscious blissful Existence, there is no fear of loss. (*Chāndogya upaniṣad* 6.1.2., 6.1.3., 6.2.1., 6.8.7., 6.9.4., 6.10.3.,)

आदिमध्यावसानेषु स्वस्य ब्रह्मत्वधीरियम् ।
नैव व्यभिचरेत्तस्मादापरोक्ष्यं प्रतिष्ठितम् ॥६२॥

Ādi madhyā vasāneṣu svasya brahmatva dhīriyam
Naiva vyabhi caret tasmāt āparokṣyam prati ṣṭhitam (62)

इयम् = this; स्वस्य ब्रह्मत्व धीः = the knowledge that 'I am *Brahman*'; आदि मध्यावसानेषु = in all three periods or stages of consciousness; न एव = never; व्यभिचरेत् = gets negated; तस्मात् = therefore; आपरोक्ष्यम् = the immediate direct knowledge; प्रतिष्ठितम् = is well established and firm.

This direct knowledge - 'I am *Brahman*' - is never negated in all the periods of time and states of consciousness. Therefore, this direct immediate knowledge is stabilized and firm. (62)

Ādi madhyā vasāneṣu - The same phrase was used in *śloka* 60 to explain how the tenth man would never revert to his former erroneous counting, whether he began counting from the beginning or from the middle. In our own personality, refer to the five *kośā*-s. Whether I am in the *Annamaya kośa*, *Prāṇamaya kośa*, *Manomaya kośa*, *Vijñānamaya kośa* or *Ānandamaya kośa*, once *aparokṣatva* takes place, *Svasya brahmatva dhīḥ iyam* - I know that I am the substratum of these five *kośā*-s. The five *kośā*-s are because of me and I am not because of them. *Na vyabhicaret* - there cannot be any change in this knowledge - that I am *Sat-Cit-Ānanda*. There can never again be a repetition of the earlier confusion, that I am sometimes that Pure Self, at others I am the body and at still others, I am unhappy etc. The ultimate knowledge is unconditioned by time-space-object, although it supports all three conditions.

Aparokṣyam pratiṣṭhitam - Pratyak rūpeṇa tiṣṭhati, Aham rupeṇa tiṣṭhati, iti pratiṣṭhitam; Aparokṣa jñānam takes place. The truth or *Brahman* is no more *parokṣa*. It is *aparokṣa*. *Tat Tvam Asi* knowledge becomes *Aham Brahmāsmi* experience (*Anubhūti*).

The authority to support the above view viz. - the indirect knowledge transforms into direct immediate knowledge on proper contemplation, is quoted---

जन्मादिकारणत्वाख्यलक्षणेन भृगुः पुरा ।
परोक्ष्येण गृहीत्वाथ विचाराद्व्यक्तिमैक्षत ॥६३॥

Janmādi kāraṇa tvākhya lakṣaṇena Bhṛguḥ purā
Pāroksyeṇa grhītvātha vicārāt vyakti maikṣata (63)

पुरा = in earlier days; भृगुः = the sage *Bhṛguḥ*; जन्म आदि कारणत्व आख्य लक्षणेन = knowing *Brahman* to be the cause of creation, etc.; परोक्ष्येण = indirectly; गृहीत्वा = accepting; अथ = thereafter; विचारात् = by discrimination (of five sheaths); व्यक्तिम् = the witness that *Brahman* is; ऐक्षत = came to directly realise.

In earlier days the sage *Bhṛguḥ*, having accepted *Brahman* being the cause of the creation, maintenance and dissolution etc., and thereafter, having discriminated from the five sheaths, came to realise the *Brahman* to be his essential nature, directly. (63)

In *śloka* 61 the teacher quoted the authority of *Chāndogya upaniṣad* in support of his statement that knowledge of the Self takes place in two stages: (1) *Parokṣa jñānam* based on scriptures and *guru vākya* whereby *Brahma sattvam parokṣataḥ* --- the *ātma tattva* is discovered by the statement 'There is' (*asti iti*). (2) *Aparokṣa jñānam* is gained by proper *vicāra* or enquiry and contemplation on *Tat Tvam Asi*, and the realisation is *Aham Brahma Asmi*.

In *śloka* 63, the teacher quotes from *Taittirīya upaniṣad* to establish another interesting and beautiful aspect of the process of gaining *aparokṣa jñānam* - namely, that it is not even necessary to be told *Tat Tvam Asi*, if the student is helped to follow the path of enquiry systematically.

In the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, the student-son *Bhṛgu* *Maharṣi* approaches his father-guru *Varuṇa* and asks him:

Bhṛgur vai vāruṇiḥ varuṇam pitaram upasasāra
Adhīhi bhagavo brahmeti. Tasmā etat provāca. (III-i-1)

Kindly tell me what *Brahman* is. The father-teacher says:

Yato vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante.
Yena jātāni jīvanti.
Yat prayantya bhi samviśanti.
Tat vijijñāsasva. (III-i-1)

That which is the cause for the birth of the whole creation, that in which the whole world is maintained and that in which the whole world goes back, is *Brahman*.

Bhṛguḥ contemplates on this statement, but fails to understand. So he asks his father again to explain. The teacher starts giving him some specific guidelines as to some place or location, where he can discover *Brahman*. So begins the step-by-step process of *pañca koṣa viveka*.

Annam Brahmeti vyajānat.
Annaddhyeva khalvimāni bhūtāni jāyante. (III-ii-1)

All beings are born out of *anna* (food). Food is taken by parents. That forms the seed. The foetus in the womb takes food from the mother. And throughout life, food sustains life. So *annam* (food) is *Brahman*.

Bhṛgu goes back to contemplate on this statement and concludes that *Annam* cannot be *Brahman*, because it putrifies and is subject to modification. So he asks his father again to explain.

Varuṇa says:

Prāṇo Brahmeti vyajānat.

Prāṇādhyeva khalvimāni Bhūtāni jāyante (III-iii-1)

Prāṇa is *Brahman*, for it is only because of *prāṇa* going in and out that life is possible.

Lakṣaṇena parokṣyeṇa gṛhitvā atha: In this way the student (*Bhṛgu Maharṣi*) is guided to contemplate on the *Brahma-lakṣaṇa* explained by the *guru* and accepted by him in *parokṣa jñānam*.

Vicārāt - The student carries out a systematic, logical and unbiased enquiry on each of the (*lakṣaṇa-s*) pointers indicated by his father - 'can the mind be *Brahman*, can *vijñāna* be *Brahman*' etc. until, *vyaktim aikṣyataḥ* he comes to the realisation that 'Ha, what father - my *guru* - has been talking about is me, my real nature! and I have been searching the whole world!'

At no time throughout this process of teaching-learning, does the teacher ever say directly 'You are *Brahman*'. He adopts the technique by which the student is led to pursue relentless, dispassionate enquiry on basis of the pointers provided by the teacher regarding the nature of *Parabrahma Paramātmā*. For *parokṣa jñānam* no enquiry is needed. But for gaining *aparokṣa anubhūti*, enquiry is the only way.

In the above enquiry by *Bhṛgu*, he was never told 'You are *Brahman*'. How such knowledge can take place, without being told? ---

यद्यपि त्वमसीत्यत्र वाक्यं नोचे भृगोः पिता ।
तथाप्यन्नं प्राणमिति विचार्य स्थलमुक्तवान् ॥६४॥

Yadyapi tvamasītyatra vākyaṁ noce bhṛgoḥ pitā
Tathā pyannam prāṇamiti, vicārya sthala muktavān (64)

यद्यपि = although; भृगोः पिता = the father of *Bhṛguḥ*; अत्र = in this context; त्वम असि = you are (*Brahman*); इति = thus; वाक्यम् = statement; न उचे = never said; तथापि = however; अन्नम् प्राणम् इति = food, *prāṇa* sheath etc; विचार्य स्थलम् = the places of investigation and pointers; उक्तवान् = did mention.

Although, in this context, the father of *Bhṛgu* did not make any statement like 'you are *Brahman*' etc., he did mention the places for enquiry, about *Brahman*. (Therefore, *Bhṛgu* could have direct knowledge although not being told directly). (64)

Yadyapi Bhṛgoḥ pitā etc. --- Throughout the father-son dialogue, the father did not make a statement 'you are that *Brahman*'. *Tathā api annam* --- *uktavān* : However, what he did was to provide his son with the 'data' needed to help him discover *Brahman* by his own efforts, through proper *vicāra* or enquiry. The 'data' consisted of suggestions on the locations (*Vicāra sthalam*) where he could search for *Brahman*. *Annam brahmeti vyajānāt* etc. - *Annam, Prāṇam, manah, vijñānam*, etc.

When the father *Vārūṇi* was pointing out the *Brahman* with reference to conditionings like body etc., the student *Bhṛgu* must get the knowledge of conditioned *Brahman*.

This doubt is cleared that the *Brahman* itself is Self (*ātman*). Therefore, it is possible ---

अन्नप्राणादिकोशेषु सुविचार्य पुनः पुनः ।
आनन्दव्यक्तिमीक्षित्वा ब्रह्मलक्ष्माप्ययुजत् ॥६५॥

Anna prāṇādi koṣeṣu suvicārya punaḥ punaḥ
Ānanda vyaktim īksitvā brahma lakṣmāpya yūyujat (65)

अन्न प्राणादि कोशेषु = with reference to the food, vital air sheath etc; सुविचार्य = having discriminated; पुनः पुनः = again and again; आनन्द = the blissful; व्यक्तिम् =

The Pure Self; ईक्षित्वा = having directly experienced; ब्रह्म लक्ष्म अपि = the indicative definition of *Brahman*, अयूयुजत् = was employed.

Bhṛgu employed the indicative definition of *Brahman*, to the pure Self, repeatedly by proper discrimination of the Self from the conditionings like food sheath, vital sheath etc. and arrived at his own blissful nature. (65)

Anna prāṇādi koṣeṣu etc. - The quality of the mind is to constantly entertain different themes. It cannot stay still in the same theme. Mind exists, survives, and maintains itself only in shape formation. The usual attempt to feed the mind with good thoughts to replace the bad ones, still maintains relative thinking. Therefore, it is better to get out of this vicious circle by contemplating on the nature of the *Parabrahma Paramātmā*.

The great scriptures provide material for such contemplation as for example in the *Bhagavad Gītā*:

Kavim purāṇam anuśa sitāram
Aṇor aniṣṭam samanū smared yaḥ
Sarvasya dhātāram acintya rūpam
Āditya-varṇam tamasaḥ parastāt (VIII-9)

He who meditates on the omniscient and primal Being, the Ruler, the Dispenser of all, who is subtler than the subtlest, whose form is beyond comprehension, and who is glorious as the sun, is beyond all darkness. Again:

Āścarya vat paśyati kaści denam
Āścarya vat vadati tathaiva cānyaḥ
Āścarya vaccai namanya śṛṇoti
Śrutvā pyenam veda na caiva kaścit (II-29)

One looks upon Him as a marvel, another likewise speaks of Him as a marvel, another hears of Him as a marvel; and even after hearing, one never knows Him.

In this way, such a theme is provided to the mind by contemplating on which the mind is not allowed to

die, and yet it does not get fixed to a particular shape. Attainment of shapeless existence of the mind is spiritual *sādhana*. Such a mind is tranquil, yet alert, vigilant and dynamic. It is total potentiality.

Recognising this nature and capability of the mind, the teacher *Varuṇa* instead of telling his son *Bhṛgu* 'You are that *Brahman*', says, 'Here are avenues of enquiry, which you can pursue - *Brahman* with reference to food (*annam*); with reference to the vital air (*prāṇam*); with reference to the mind (*manas*) etc. Think what is the indications of each of these *sthala*-s or locations. Does it fulfill the definition of *Brahman*? That, it is that in which the whole world is created and maintained, and to which the world returns? Contemplate on each of these locations, again and again'.

Ānanda vyaktim īksitvā - Following his teacher's instructions *Bhṛgu Mahārṣi* after long contemplation came to realise that this *Ānanda* is my real nature.

Ānando brahmeti vyajānāt
Ānandā dhyeva khalvimāni bhūtāni jāyante etc....

Taittirīya upaniṣad 3.6

For the sake of bliss, out of bliss we come; in the bliss we are maintained; all our existence and efforts are only to be blissful, not miserable.

Brahma lakṣma api ayūyujat - There are two qualities associated with everything - one is *svārūpa lakṣaṇa* or essential quality; the other is *Taṭastha lakṣaṇa* or non-essential quality. This far the teacher has indicated the *Taṭastha lakṣaṇa* of *Parabrahma Paramātmā* i.e. referential knowledge of the *Brahmaan*; the frame of reference being the world which is of direct meaning to the student initially. Using these points of reference, the student comes to understand the *Svarūpa lakṣaṇa* and ultimately to realise 'This *Brahma* is ME'.

How can one apply the indicative pointers relating to *Brahman*, such as *satyam*, *jñānam* etc. to Self? The teacher quotes the authority (*taittirīya upaniṣad* : 2-i-1) to that effect ----

सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं चेत्येवं ब्रह्मस्वलक्षणम् ।
उक्त्वा गुहाहितत्वेन कोशेष्वेतत्प्रदर्शितम् ॥६६॥

Satyam jñānam anantam ceti evaṁ brahma svalakṣaṇam
Uktvā guhāhitvena, koṣeṣu etat pradarsitam (66)

सत्यम् ज्ञानम् अनन्तम् च = The *Brahman* is *Satyam jñānam* and *anantam*; इति एवम् = in this way; ब्रह्म स्वलक्षणम् = the essential nature of *Brahman*; उक्त्वा = having declared; एतत् = this *Brahma*; कोशेषु = in the five sheaths; गुहाहितत्वेन = being the core or substratum; प्रदर्शितम् = is specially declared to be one's own nature.

Having spelt the essential nature of *Brahman* to be *Sat*, *Cit* and *Ananda*, which was declared to be the essential nature of the pure Self, hidden in the five sheaths at the core as the substratum is declared to be one's own Self. (Therefore, one can deduce the identity of *Brahman* and *ātman*). (66)

Satyam, jñānam etc.: Having indicated *Brahman* through its *lakṣaṇa vṛtti* or indicative nature, the teacher proceeds to explain the essential nature (*svarūpa lakṣaṇa*) of *Brahman*.

The *Veda-s* describes *Brahman* as *Satyam, jñānam, anantam brahma, yo veda nihitam guhayām*. He who realises *brahman* attains the Supreme, which has been declared as *Satyam* (Existence), *jñānam* (Consciousness) and *Anantam* (Infinitude). *Satyam* is that which is not denied in the three periods of time. *jñānam* is that which is of the nature of consciousness. *Anantam* is that which is not conditioned by anything. Absence of conditioning is *anantam*. *Satyam, jñānam, anantam Brahma* does not mean that there is an entity called *Brahman*, who has three separate qualities called *satyam, jñānam* and *anantam*.

If proper enquiry is done, it will be realised that *satyam* alone is *jñānam* because if it is not, then *Sat* should be *acit*. *Acit* is inert and that which is inert is subject to modifications. Therefore, *Sat* cannot be *Acit*. Similarly *Cit* (*jñānam*) cannot be *Asat* (non-existent). If consciousness is *Asat*, then who will know it. This line of enquiry leads to the conclusion that *Sat* is not conditioning the *Cit*. *Sat* is *Cit*, and *Cit* is *Sat*. The absence of difference between *Sat* and *Cit* is *Anantam* or *Ānandam*. This is *Brahma svalakṣaṇa*. This *Brahma svalakṣaṇam* is my own essential nature. *Guhāhitvena uktvā koṣeṣu etat pradarsitam*. The original *śruti vākya* says:

Yo veda nihitam guhayām parame vyoman
So 'śnute sarvān kāmān saha.

(*Taittirīya upaniṣad* (2-i-1))

He who realises *Brahman* treasured in the cave as pure consciousness has all desires fulfilled.....

Guhā is a technical term indicating all the five sheaths. So none of the five sheaths can illumine the *Parabrahma Paramātmā*.

Uktvā guhāhitatvena koṣeṣu etat pradarsitam: He who realises the *Brahman* after having discarded all the (*taṭastha lakṣaṇa*) i.e. all the indicative meaning of *Brahman* mentioned in *śloka* 65, (*Anna prāṇādi koṣeṣu* etc.) and disrobed oneself of all the five sheaths, what remains in the *guhā* or heart-cave, is that which cannot be denied - the Absolute 'I' - the *Parabrahma Paramātmā*. In this way, the student has converted *parokṣa jñāna* into *aparokṣa anubhūti*.

The above procedure of enquiry is based on *Taittirīya upaniṣad*. Now, the teacher quotes *Chāndogya upaniṣad* (8.7.1-3) to establish the same truth ---

पारोक्ष्येण विबुध्येन्द्रो य आत्मेत्यादिलक्षणात् ।
अपरोक्षीकर्तुमिच्छंश्चतुर्वारं गुरुं ययौ ॥६७॥

*Pāroṣṣeṇa vibudhyendro ya ātmetyādi lakṣaṇāt
Aparokṣī kartum icchan ścatuṛ vāraṁ gurum yayau* (67)

इन्द्रः = *Indra*; पारोक्ष्येण = indirectly; यः आत्मा = this Self; इत्यादि लक्षणात् = by such and such nature; विबुध्य = having known; इच्छन् = desiring to know; अपरोक्षी कर्तुम् = directly; ययौ गुरुम् = approached the teacher; चतुर्वारम् = four times.

Indra (student) having learnt indirectly that the *ātman* is of such and such nature, approached his teacher four times, desiring the direct immediate experience of the same. (And thus converted the *parokṣa jñānam* into *aparokṣa jñānam*). (67)

Having given the example of *Bhṛgu Mahārāja* from the *Taittirīya upaniṣad* in *śloka-s* 65-66, the teacher now gives another example from *Chāndogya upaniṣad*. *Indra*, king of the *Devā-s* and *Virocana*, king of the demons approached *Prajāpati*. Stayed 32 years in *tapasyā* and said:

That Self which has no sin, no decrepitude, no death, no sorrow, no hunger, no thirst, has unfailing desire, unfailing will, is to be known. That is to be enquired into, for realisation. He, who having known this Self, makes it an object of his realisation, attains all the worlds and all the enjoyments. We have stayed with the desire for knowing That. The teacher then told them that the *ātmā* is *niṣpāpa*, *amara*, *ajara*, *śoka-rahita*. He asked them to adorn themselves and look at their own reflections in a plate of water. He told them that this was *Brahman* and sent them away.

Virocana was quite satisfied. He thought that this body is *Ātmā* and did no further enquiry into the *parokṣa jñānam*. *Indra*, on the other hand, was not satisfied. How

could the reflection of this body be *ātmā* - the *ajara*, *amara* etc. - one without any modifications, without birth and death? *Aparokṣi kartum caturvaram gurum yayau* -- So he went back to the *guru* and presented his doubt. *Śarīrasya nāśamān veśa naṣyati, Nāham atra bhogyaṁ paśyāmīti* (Ch. up.VIII 9.1)

In accordance with the destruction of this, it also gets destroyed. I do not find any benefit in this. So the teacher made him do *tapasyā* again for another 32 years. In this manner, *Indra* went back to the teacher four times before he could succeed in converting *parokṣa jñāna* into *aparokṣa jñāna*.

This example is to illustrate (a) that unless *parokṣa jñāna* is accepted, there is no possibility of *aparokṣa jñāna*, (b) that unless *parokṣa jñāna* is properly enquired into and established beyond doubt, it cannot be converted into *aparokṣa jñāna*.

Such an enquiry requires a highly contemplative mind, detachment from the world's problems - big and small, - and a rigorous pursuit of reflective enquiry that will go deeper and deeper into the inner layers of thought, combined with the spiritual courage to discard what 'appears' to be the Truth to search anew for the true Self.

Yet another authority from *Aitareya upaniṣad* is quoted to support the thesis, that 'on proper enquiry on the indirect knowledge (*parokṣa jñānam*) the direct experience (*aparokṣa anubhūti*) results.

आत्मा वा इदमित्यादौ परोक्षं ब्रह्म लक्षितम् ।
अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म दर्शितम् ॥६८॥

*Ātmā vā idam ityādaṁ parokṣam brahma lakṣitam
Adhyā ropāpa vādābhyāṁ prajñānam brahma darśitam* (68)

आत्मा वा इदम् इति आदौ = (before the creation) the *ātman* alone was etc; परोक्षम् = indirectly; ब्रह्म लक्षितम् = *Brahman* was pointed; अध्यारोप अपवादाभ्याम् = by the method of superimposition and de-superimposition; प्रज्ञानम् ब्रह्म = the conscious Self is *Brahma*; दर्शितम् = was revealed.

[In *Aitareya upaniṣad*] The *Brahman* was pointed indirectly by statement like - 'In the beginning, before the creation, *Ātman* alone was'. (Thereafter), by the process of superimposition and de-superimposition, the conscious Self was revealed to be *Brahman*. (68)

(*Ātmā va* etc.---) The *Aitareya upaniṣad* (1-i-1) starts with the statement: (*Ātmā vā idameka evāgra āsīt*) - In the beginning verily *ātman* (Self) alone was. By this statement only *parokṣa jñānam* was gained by the student. *Adhyāropa apavādābhyām*: After a long description of how the world was created, the *upaniṣad* concludes with the *mahā vākya*: *Prajñānam Brahma* - Consciousness is *Brahman*. (Ibid III 1.3)

By the method of superimposition and de-superimposition, consciousness as *Brahman* is revealed (*Ātmā va idam*) is *parokṣa jñānam*. The student follows this up through *vicāra* or enquiry in a systematic manner and comes to the conclusion that the conscious Self is the substratum of the entire world of matter and energy.

In this way, the *parokṣa jñāna* becomes direct (*aparokṣa*) experience by the method of *adhyāropa apavāda* - that *Ātmā* is not somewhere, but that it is our own real nature.

The above discussion is thus concluded ---

अवान्तरेण वाक्येन परोक्षा ब्रह्मधीर्भवेत् ।
सर्वत्रैव महावाक्यविचारादपरोक्षधीः ॥६९॥

Avāntāreṇa vākyaena parokṣā brahma dhīr bhavet
Sarvatraiva mahāvākya vicārā daparokṣa dhīḥ (69)

सर्वत्र = in all (the *upaniṣad*-s); अवान्तरेण = by the secondary; वाक्येन = statements; परोक्षा = indirect; ब्रह्मधीः भवेत् = knowledge of *Brahman* is gained; महावाक्य विचारात् = by contemplation and enquiry on *mahā vākya*; एव = alone; अपरोक्षधीः भवेत् = the direct knowledge takes place.

By the secondary statement (that declares the existence of *Brahman*), indirect knowledge is gained. By the contemplation on *mahāvākya* (i.e. the statement that establishes the identity between *Ātmā* and *Brahman*) the direct experience takes place. (69)

Avāntareṇa vākyaena parokṣa brahma dhīḥ bhavet -- Indirect knowledge or *parokṣa jñānam* that '*BRAHMAN IS*' is obtained through the secondary statements of *guru*, scriptures etc. There are two types of statements in *vedānta*: *Avāntara Vākya* and *Mahāvākya*. *Avāntara Vākya* is that secondary statement which provides facts that point or indicate the Truth; while *Mahāvākya* is that pronouncement which extracts and establishes the Truth that was indicated by the *Avāntara Vākya*. For example, in *Kenopaniṣad* (1-6) the following statement is given:

Yan manasā na manute, yena āhur mano matam
Tadeva brahma tvam viddhi nedaṁ yadidaṁ upāsate

What cannot be felt with or controlled by the mind, but because of which they say that the mind feels, know that alone as *Brahman* and not this, which people worship here.

In this statement, (*Tadeva brahma tvam viddhi*) is the *Mahāvākya*. The earlier part is *Avāntara Vākya* which can lead only to *parokṣa jñāna*. *Sarvatraiva mahāvākya* etc.... - Following the *parokṣa jñāna*, the student has to make his own efforts through proper enquiry, in order

to experience himself what has been stated in the *mahāvākya* of the *upaniṣad*.

The enquiry and contemplation on *mahāvākya* leads to direct knowledge is shown by *Bhagavān Śaṅkarācārya* in his *Vedānta prakaraṇa viz. Vākya Vṛtti*

ब्रह्मापरोक्ष्यसिद्ध्यर्थं महावाक्यमितीरितम् ।
वाक्यवृत्तावतो ब्रह्मापरोक्ष्ये विमतिर्नहि ॥७०॥

Brahmā parokṣya sidhdyarthyaṁ mahā vākya mīti rītam
Vākya vṛttā vato brahmā parokṣye vimatir na hi (70)

ब्रह्म अपरोक्ष्य सिद्ध्यर्थम् = for attaining direct experience of *Brahman*, महावाक्यम् इति = the *mahāvākya* is the cause; वाक्यवृत्तौ = in the book called *Vākya vṛtti*; ईरितम् = is said by *Śrī Śaṅkarācārya*; अतः = therefore; ब्रह्म अपरोक्ष्ये = with regards to direct knowledge of *Brahman*, विमतिः = न हि = there are no two opinions.

In this *Vedāntik* text *Vākya Vṛtti*, *Bhagavān Śaṅkarācārya*, has shown that enquiry into the meaning of the *mahāvākya* is the only way, to realise the meaning of *Brahman*. There are no two opinions with regard to direct knowledge of *Brahman*. (70)

In the previous *śloka*, the two kinds of scriptural statements were explained: *Avāntarā Vākya* or secondary statement of the scriptures through which the possibility of the *Parabrahma Paramātmā* and its existence is initiated for the first time in the understanding of the spiritual seeker; after that first stage, comes the *mahāvākya* or primary or essential statement which goes to establish the one-ness of the limited and the unlimited - *Brahmātma-aikya-bodha*.

Brahma aparokṣya etc.- For realising *aparokṣa jñānam* of the *Brahman*, the seeker must enquire into and

contemplate on *mahāvākya* such as *Tat Tvam Asi - Vidyāraṇya Svāmī* quotes the authority of *Bhagavān Śaṅkarācārya's Vākya vṛtti* - a very important treatise on *Vedāntik* philosophy in support of this statement - that the conversion of *parokṣa jñānam* into *aparokṣa jñānam*, cannot take place unless this enquiry is made.

This shows the humility of the great masters. They never claim the credit for their statements of wisdom for themselves. Knowledge is attributed only to the Lord and is never given as from one individual to another individual. In this knowledge transfer, both the teacher and the student play their respective roles - the one who gives and the one who receives the knowledge. But both of them are the same Truth. In reality there is no one who is giving the knowledge and no one who is taking it.

The following eight verses are from *Vākya Vṛtti* (Nos. 44/45/46/48/38/39/40/41, *seriatum*), explaining the above point ----

आलम्बनतया भाति योऽस्मत्प्रत्ययशब्दयोः ।
अन्तःकरणसंभिन्नबोधः स त्वंपदाभिधः ॥७१॥

Ālambanatayā bhāti yo'smat pratyaya śabda yoḥ
Antaḥ karaṇa sambhinna bodhaḥ sa tvam padābhidhaḥ (71)

यः = The Pure Consciousness; अस्मत् प्रत्यय शब्दयोः = referred to as I; अन्तःकरण संभिन्नबोधः = in association with the inner equipment; आलम्बनतया भाति = is therefore, a dependent entity; सः = this (later); त्वम् पदाभिधः = is the word meaning of *Tvam*.

The Pure Consciousness referred by 'I' is the substratum for the word used to mean 'I' in association with the inner equipment. This dependent entity is the word meaning of the word '*Tvam*' in *Tat Tvam Asi mahāvākya* (71).

The word meaning of 'Tat' is given below:

मायोपाधिर्जगद्योनिः सर्वज्ञत्वादिलक्षणः ।
पारोक्ष्यशबलः सत्याद्यात्मकस्तत्पदाभिधः ॥७२॥

Māyopādhir jagadyoniḥ sarva jñātvādi lakṣaṇaḥ
Parokṣya śabalaḥ satyādya ātmakas tat padābhidhaḥ (72)

माया उपाधिः = associated with *māyā*, जगद् योनिः = cause of the world; सर्वज्ञत्व आदि लक्षणः = with attributes like omniscient, omnipresent etc; पारोक्ष्यशबलः = with indirect attributes; सत्य आदि आत्मकः = of the nature of *Satya* etc; तत् पद अभिधः = is the word meaning of 'Tat'.

The *Brahman* is of the nature of existence, knowledge, bliss. When referred indirectly in association with the attributes of *māyā*, being the cause of the world, omniscient, omnipresent etc. is the word meaning of 'Tat' referred in '*Tat Tvam Asi mahā-vākya*' (72)

In Chapter V where the four *mahāvākya*-s, one from each *Veda* was analysed, the *mahāvākya Tat Tvam Asi* was studied exhaustively. There it was explained that *Tat* refers to the Absolute and *Tvam* to the Relative, and *Asi* is the identity between them. Absolute entertains the imagination of the Relative. But the Relative can never be without the Absolute. In this way, *Brahma-Ātma-Aikya-Bodha* was indicated.

Māyā upādhi etc.: As *jīva* is the conditioning of the individuality, *Īśvara* is the conditioning of the totality. The same consciousness with the conditioning of the totality known as *māyā*, is called *Jagat yoniḥ* - the creator of the whole world and *Sarvajña* - knower of every thing, omniscient. In this way, two causations: *Jagat yoniḥ* is the material cause and *Sarvajña* is the efficient cause. These two causations are superimposed on the Absolute with reference to the conditioning of the totality.

Pāroṣa śabalaḥ etc. - Because of the qualities associated with *pāroṣatā* referential mention, although *Īśvara* is the controller of *māyā*, creator of the world and omniscient, it is difficult to imagine that *Īśvara* can be *Sat* i.e. existence because the attention seems more drawn to the conditioning of the totality.

Therefore, to convert *parokṣatā* into *aparokṣa jñānam*, the seeker has to launch an enquiry and find one-ness in spite of many-ness. The method of enquiry is to contemplate on the *mahāvākya - Tat Tvam Asi*.

The direct 'word meaning' of *Tat* and *Tvam* seem to contradict their identity. Hence ---

प्रत्यक्परोक्षतैकस्य सद्वितीयत्वपूर्णता ।
विरुध्येते यतस्तस्माल्लक्षणा संप्रवर्तते ॥७३॥

Pratyak parokṣatai kasya sadvitīyatva pūrṇatā
Virudhyete yatas tasmā llakṣaṇā saṁpra vartate (73)

एकस्य = of the same thing; प्रत्यक् परोक्षता = being self as well as other; सद्वितीयत्व पूर्णता = entertaining duality and non-duality; यतः = because; विरुध्येते = contradict; तस्मात् = therefore; लक्षणा = meaning by implication; संप्रवर्तते = has to be resorted to.

If we accept the word meaning of the *Tat* and *Tvam*, the contradicting attributes like, being self and indirect; being dual and non-dual etc. simultaneously, does not seem possible. Therefore, the method of arriving at the correct meaning by implication has to be resorted to. (73).

Pratyak parokṣatā - *Pratyak* is *aparokṣatā* which is the very essence of my Being. *Parokṣatā* is something away from the real me, subject to time, space and object conditionings. How can the same thing (*ekasya*) be both *aparokṣa* and *parokṣa* at the same time?

Sadvitūyatva pūrṇatā - The *parokṣatā* is associated with duality whereas *aparokṣatva* is not associated with duality. It is complete without blemish --- one without a second. But the teacher has said that 'That' meaning *Parokṣa* and 'This' meaning *aparokṣa* are one. It seems to be a contradiction in terms. *Virudhyete!* If it is one, where is the question of 'This' and 'That'? It was also said that *parokṣa* was omniscient (*sarvajña*), omnipotent (*sarva-śaktimān*), creator of the universe (*jagat yoni*); and that *pratyak* (*aparokṣa*) is limited by the inner instrument (*antaḥkaraṇa*). So how is it possible that same one truth (*ekasya*) can be both *pratyak* and *parokṣatā*, *dvitūyatā* and *pūrṇatā*? These pairs of opposites are incompatible.

Tasmāt lakṣaṇā sampravartate - Therefore, the answer to this dilemma lies in the technique adopted in making this enquiry. That is, in interpreting those words, the direct meaning should be discarded and the specific meaning should be discovered by a specific method called *lakṣaṇā vṛtti* - meaning by implication.

It will be seen that *jñāna sādhanā* is not a time-scheduled scheme with well defined do's and don'ts. It is a process of enquiry and discovery, a process of unfolding, process of information leading to transformation to be lived every moment.

The implied meaning is derived by partial retention-rejection technique ---

तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येषु लक्षणा भागलक्षणा ।
सोऽयमित्यादिवाक्यस्थपदयोरिव नापरा ॥७४॥

Tattva masyādi vākyeṣu lakṣaṇā bhāga lakṣaṇā
So'ya mityādi vākyastha padayoriva nāparā (74)

सः = That; अयम् = This; इत्यादि = etc; वाक्यस्थ = in the sentence; पदयोः = of the words; इव = like; तत् त्वम् असि = 'That thou art'; आदि = etc; वाक्येषु = in

the great statements; लक्षणा = the implied meaning; भाग लक्षणा = partial retention rejection method; अपरा = any other; न = not.

As the meaning of the words in statement like 'He is That *Devadatta*', is understood by partial retention and partial rejection method. Similarly, in the great statements like '*Tat Tvam Asi*', the same method is employed to understand the identity of *Tat Tvam* and there is no other way to get the knowledge. (74)

Understanding of a statement is arrived at by :

(1) *Vācyārtha*: Accepting the statement at face value i.e. the meaning is taken to be what the statement conveys directly without any alteration.

(2) *Lakṣārtha*: What is said need not be meant, partially or fully. *Lakṣārtha* is of three types:

(a) *Jahat Lakṣaṇā* - What is said is totally rejected and the meaning implied behind the statement is arrived at e.g. 'he is a lion'. Here it is not meant that he is an animal, but he is brave like a lion. The word lion is fully dropped.

(b) *Ajahat Lakṣaṇā* - Something needs to be added to what is said to arrive at the right meaning e.g. '*Māruti* was standing at the door'. Apparent meaning of *Māruti* is *Hanumānji*, but what really meant was a *Maruti* Car. Thus by adding the word car, the meaning becomes complete.

(c) *Bhāga Lakṣaṇā* - Here a part is retained and a part is rejected e.g. *Kṛṣṇa* - the butter thief in gokul; *kṛṣṇa* - sporting the *Rāsa līlā* in *Vṛndāvana*; and *kṛṣṇa* - the philosopher of *Gītā* on the battle field of *Kurukṣetra*, could be understood to be one and the same Lord, if we retain Him and overlook his different roles that He played in his life at different times and at different places etc.

Tattvam asi Vākya ādi etc. - Similarly, if the conditioning of the *Antahkaraṇa* with reference to *jīva*, and the conditioning of *māyā* with reference to *Īśvara* can be dropped, it will be seen that the conditioned consciousness with reference to *jīva* and *Īśvara* is the same. In the same manner, in the *mahāvākya* '*Tat Tvam Asi*' 'That Thou Art', the *Vācyārtha* or direct meaning will be: *Tat* is *Īśvara*, and *Tvam* is *jīva*. These two could be one, when it is understood that the *Jīvatva* and *Īśvaratva* are both because of conditioning. When the two conditionings of consciousness - (a) of the limitations called *jīvatva* and (b) of the un-limitations called *Īśvaratva*, are rejected, what remains is *Śuddha Caitanya*-Pure Consciousness, our essential nature.

Saḥ ayam etc. - *So'yam* stands for *Ayam Devadattaḥ*. It is a standard example given in the scriptures. It means *Saḥ*-that, *ayam*-this *Devadatta*. This is that *Devadatta* 'This' and 'That' are both used to indicate *Devadatta* 'That' is used to particularise that *Devadatta* who can be identified from the various descriptions in time, space and *vṛtti* that establish his identity. All these identifying characteristics are in reality conditionings of 'This' and 'That'. They are all rejected once the identification is done and that which supported those conditionings is the Reality.

Similarly, in the contemplation of *mahāvākya* such as *Tat Tvam Asi* or *Aham Brahma asmi* etc. the only method to be adopted is *Bhāga tyāga lakṣaṇā*, by which a part of word meaning is rejected and a part of the word is accepted. Only then can two impossible opposites be seen in their true perspective. The impossibility of reconciling the two opposites was only because more attention was given to the conditioning than to the conditioned. In this way, by the *bhāga lakṣaṇā*, the *parokṣa jñānam* is converted into *aparokṣa jñānam*.

Why should one leave the direct word meaning of the *mahāvākya* like *Tat Tvam Asi*, and understand it strangely?

The reason is ---

संसर्गो वा विशिष्टो वा वाक्यार्थो नात्र सम्मतः ।

अखण्डैकरसत्वेन वाक्यार्थो विदुषां मतः ॥७५॥

Saṁsargo vā viśiṣṭo vā vākyaārtho nātra sammataḥ
Akhaṇḍaika rasatvena vākyaārtho viduṣāṁ mataḥ (75)

अत्र = in this *mahāvākya*, संसर्गो = related; वा = or; विशिष्टो वा = specific; वाक्यार्थः = meaning of the statement; न = not; सम्मतः = is accepted; अखण्ड = without parts; एक रसत्वेन = being one homogeneous; वाक्यार्थः = the meaning of the statement; विदुषाम् मतः = is accepted by the wise.

The wise do not accept the word to word or any specific meaning with reference to *mahāvākya*. The purpose of reading the *mahāvākya* is to establish one without a second, blissful homogeneous, *Brahman*, as the implied meaning. (75)

Saṁsargo vā etc. - The question is raised as to why the teacher is making the argument so complicated? Why cannot a simpler and straight-forward method of explanation be adopted instead of *Bhāga-tyāga lakṣaṇā so'yam devattaḥ*. *Saṁsargaḥ* means with reference to something. *Viśiṣṭa* means qualified. Talking of something with reference to its association is not meant here. For example, *Vivekānanda* was a disciple of *Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahansa*. (This is his special-*viśiṣṭa* - quality).

Vākyaārtho nātra sammataḥ - The teacher explains that this is not the way *mahāvākya*-s are enquired into by wise people. They do not accept such an approach. And the *upaniṣadik* statements - *śruti vākya* should be understood as it is accepted by wise people.

Akhaṇḍa eka etc. - For the wise people the *mahāvākya* *Tat Tvam Asi* means *akhaṇḍa ekarasaṭva*. Although, in

explaining *Tat* and *Tvam*, *Īśvara* and the *jīva* are discussed as if they are opposites; *Īśvara* the controller, the creator, omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient and *jīva*, the controlled, the created, the limited with reference to time, space, knowledge and strength --- the purpose is not to focus our attention on apparent and visible contrariness of *Īśvara* and *jīva*, but it is to focus the attention on their one-ness (*ekatva*). The purpose of this line of enquiry is not to complicate the issue, but to discover the *akhaṇḍa eka rasatva vākyārthaḥ* to realise directly that one's essential nature is *Sat-Cit-Ānanda Svarūpa*. That means the *Sat svarūpa* cannot be denied and the *Cit svarūpa* cannot end and therefore *ānanda svarūpa* follows.

The meaning of *mahāvākya* is to establish *akhaṇḍa eka rasatva*. How?---

प्रत्यग्बोधो य आभाति सोऽद्वयानन्दलक्षणः ।

अद्वयानन्दरूपश्च प्रत्यग्बोधैकलक्षणः ॥७६॥

Pratyag bodho ya ābhāti so 'dvayā nanda lakṣaṇaḥ
Advayā nanda rūpaśca pratyag bodhaika lakṣaṇaḥ (76)

यः प्रत्यग् बोधः = that pure immediate consciousness;
आभाति = shines; सः = that; अद्वय आनन्द लक्षणः = is
of the nature of non-dual bliss; अद्वय आनन्द रूपः च =
and that which is non-dual bliss; प्रत्यग् बोधैक लक्षणः =
is pure immediate individual consciousness.

The pure immediate consciousness that shines is of the nature of non-dual bliss. And that which is non-dual bliss of immediate pure consciousness is the individual Self. (76)

The same thing is said from both *anvaya* and *vyatireka* angles like saying *Tat Tvam Asi* and *Tvam Tat Asi*

Pratyag bodha ya ābhāti - What is the nature of this absolute, individual, personal, unconditioned Consciousness that I am?

Sa ādvaya Ānanda lakṣaṇaḥ - The nature of *pratyag bodha* is *advaya* - non-duality one without a second, where the difference between the knower and the known does not exist any more. *Dvaita* begins at the first point as cleavage between the knower and the known. When this gap is obliterated, then *Sat*, the known and *Cit*, the knower are not two, but one, without a second.

This knowledge that there is no difference between the knower and the known is *Ānanda*. *Ānanda* is the absence of any conditioning. As was said earlier is *śloka* 66, *Satyam jñānam anantam ca iti*, *Sat*, *Cit* and *Ānanda* are not three separate qualities 'qualifying' the one Truth, but are only three arrows --- pointers for the cognition of the Truth. When the cloth is described as 'red, cotton cloth', red and cotton are adjectives qualifying the cloth. But 'cloth' can exist without the redness and cotton-ness. It is not so in the case of the Truth. In *Sat*, *Cit*, *Ānanda* there is no such relationship of *Viśeṣya* (qualified) and *Viśeṣaṇa* (quality). 'I' the absolute consciousness is *Sat svarūpa*, *Cit svarūpa* and *Ānanda svarūpa* - one without a second - and that I am.

Advayānanda rūpaś ca pratyag bodhaika lakṣaṇaḥ - In the *Taittirīya upaniṣad* (II-1) the teacher says, *Satyam jñānam anantam brahma, yo veda nihitam guhāyām, Parame vyoman*.

The *lakṣaṇa* of *Parabrahma Paramātmā* is Existence (*satyam*), Knowledge (*jñānam*) and Bliss (*anantam*). Thus, he who has rejected the conditioning of the *Īśvaratva* and of the *jīvatva*, and focuses his attention on the *advaya ānanda lakṣaṇaḥ* as his own essential nature, succeeds in converting *parokṣa jñāna* into *aparokṣa anubhūti*.

The above enquiry leads to the non-dual nature of self thus ---

इत्थमन्योन्यतादात्म्यप्रतिपत्तिर्यदा भवेत् ।
अब्रह्मत्वं त्वमर्थस्य व्यावर्तेत तदैव हि ॥७७॥

*Ittha manyonya tādātmya prati patir yadā bhavet
Abrahmatvaṁ tvamarthasya vyāvarteta tadaiva hi* (77)

इत्थम् = as explained above; अन्योन्य तादात्म्य प्रतिपत्तिः = the direct experience of oneness of *Ātmā* and *Brahma*; यदा = when; भवेत् = takes place; तदा एव = then and there; त्वम् अर्थस्य = of the meaning of the word *Tvam*; अब्रह्मत्वम् = being limited; व्यावर्तेत = is negated; हि = indeed.

When the direct experience of identity between *Ātmā* and *Brahman* takes place, the error of understanding in the meaning of the word '*Tvam*' (i.e. *Ātmā*), as limited being is negated, then and there. (77)

Anyonya tādātmya pratipattiḥ yadā bhavet - When by the process of *Bhāga-tyāga lakṣaṇā*, the identity between the relative and the absolute is established, the relative problems of desire etc. end. Wherever there is a sense of incompleteness, desire arises. From the relative standpoint, problems of life will never cease. From the Absolute stand point, problems never arise. Therefore, the solution is (*tvamarthasya abrahmatvam*) to get out of the relative existence. When the nature of the *Kūṭastha Caitanya* - the *sākṣī* - the witness, the one - who is not influenced by any conditioning - who is of the nature of *Brahma-svarūpa* - one without a second; is discovered, then all problems cease because there are no problems. For if 'I' is not there, there will be no problems.

Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa says: Everywhere I am, among the mountains I am the *Himalayas*, among the trees I am *Aśvattha*, among the *Pāṇḍavā-s* I am Arjuna... (*Bhagavad Gītā* Ch. X, 20 - 39.) In the problem I am, in the solution I am. I am the one who is supporting the problem and

the solution. Therefore, (*Abrahmatvaṁ tvamarthasya vyāvarteta*) it is impossible to continue to maintain one's individuality and attain spiritual growth. The relative entity must be de-entified.

Similarly, the *parokṣa jñānam* about the word, *tat* in *Tat tvam asi mahāvākya* is converted into *aparokṣa jñānam*.

What purpose is achieved by this? ----

तदर्थस्य च पारोक्ष्यं यद्येवं किं ततः शृणु ।
पूर्णानन्दैकरूपेण प्रत्यग्बोधोऽवतिष्ठते ॥७८॥

*Tadarthasya ca pāroksyaṁ yadyevaṁ kiṁ tataḥ śṛṇu
Pūrṇānan daika rūpeṇa pratyag bodho 'vatiṣṭhate* (78)

तद् अर्थस्य = of the meaning of the word *tat*; पारोक्ष्यम् = the indirectness of the knowledge; च = and; यदि = if; एवम् = in this way; ततः किम् = so what? i.e. what is gained?; शृणु = listen; पूर्ण आनन्दैक रूपेण = of the nature of unconditioned unlimited bliss; प्रत्यग् बोधः = one's own Pure Conscious being; अवतिष्ठते = is attained.

What is the loss if we accept the indirect meaning of the word '*tat*'? (or in other words, what is gained by knowing the direct meaning of the word '*tat*' to be *Brahman*?). Listen... the one infinite Bliss is revealed as one's own being. (78)

Parokṣyam Tad-arthasya - The question raised was: why should we be concerned about *tat* because in the *mahāvākya Tat Tvam Asi* in *parokṣa jñānam* '*tat*' is taken to mean 'that' - a sense of otherness i.e. *Satcitānanda svarūpa* is other than me, I consider myself to be *asat* (non-existent), *ajñāna* (inert), *duḥkha svarūpa* (sorrowful).

Therefore, unless there is perfect, absolute, unconditional, natural identity achieved between '*tvam*',

the relative, unhappy being and 'tat', the absolute being, the *Brahmātma-aikya* experience of being of the nature of *Brahman* cannot be realised.

Pūrṇānanda eka rūpeṇa pratyag bodha avatiṣṭhate - The Absolute Bliss is not other than one's own Being. The two must go together. The purpose of the enquiry is not only to understand 'who am I', but also to find out the nature of this Self (*pratyak*), to realise that the nature of *Paramātmā* and that my nature, is but one. When it is realised that 'tat' or the (*Pūrṇānanda eka rūpam*) is in reality Myself (*Pratyag bodhaḥ*), the *aparokṣatā* disappears. 'That' and 'This', the unlimited and the limited, the Absolute and the Relative - are experienced as one, just as there is no difference between gold (representing 'tat') and the ornament representing 'tvam'. Gold is unconditioned, on which ornamentation is superimposed. Even when ornamentation is absent, gold is still present.

Thus, who do not know this fact, and argue that the *mahāvākya* can give only *parokṣa jñāna*, deserve, only sympathy----

एवं सति महावाक्यात्परोक्षज्ञानमीर्यते ।
यैस्तेषां शास्त्रसिद्धान्तविज्ञानं शोभतेतराम् ॥७९॥

Evam sati mahā vākyaāt parokṣa jñāna mīryate
Yaisteṣāṃ śāstra siddhānta vijñānam śobhate tarām (79)

एवम् सति = although it is so; (i.e. as explained in above *śloka-s*); यैः = by those; महावाक्यात् = from the *mahāvākya*; परोक्षज्ञानम् = the indirect knowledge; ईर्यते = is accepted; तेषाम् = their; शास्त्र सिद्धान्त विज्ञानम् = knowledge about the principles of scriptural knowledge; शोभतेतराम् = is worthy of praise (i.e. they know nothing in fact).

Although, we have established above, that the *aparokṣa jñānam* results from *mahāvākya* enquiry, but those who accept

that only indirect knowledge can take place; their wisdom (i.e. ignorance) is worthy of praise (pity). (79)

Evam sati etc. - Even after hearing the above explanation some still say that by the study of the *mahāvākya*, only *parokṣa jñānam* is gained. To them (*teṣāṃ*) the teacher gives the reply in a sarcastic vein. *Śāstra siddhānta vijñānam śobhate tarām* - Their understanding of the *śāstra* is indeed wonderful!

All the scriptures seek to establish that, 'through the *mahāvākya* alone self-realisation (*svātma anubhūti*) is possible'. This bent of misinterpretation results when *vedānta jñāna* remains at the level of the intellect only. It is as good as no knowledge. In other words it is ignorance. When *vedānta jñāna* percolates and goes beyond the conditioning of the intellect, then *parokṣa jñāna* becomes *aparokṣa jñāna*. Material knowledge gained about the world is always *parokṣa*. In the statement 'There is a book', the knowledge is also that 'This is a book' and that, the book is other than me. The knowledge gained is at the same level and in the same degree of reality in which it is imparted.

In the case of *ātma-jñāna* on the other hand, although the teacher says 'You are That', (*Tat tvam asi*), the knowledge gained is not 'Thou art that', but it is 'I am That' (*Aham Brahmasmi*). The knowledge is pure subjectivity without a trace of objectivity.

The objectification - which is the basis of material knowledge - when applied to *ātma-jñāna* is the cause of the misconception such as 'only *parokṣa jñāna* can be gained through the *mahāvākya*'.

Yet another doubt is raised, to prove this stand that from *mahāvākya* only *parokṣa jñāna* takes place, as seen from inferential knowledge----

आस्तां शास्त्रस्य सिद्धान्तो युक्त्या वाक्यात्परोक्षधीः ।
स्वर्गादिवाक्यवन्नैवं दशमे व्यभिचारतः ॥८०॥

*Āstām śāstrasya siddhānto yuktyā vākyāt parokṣa dhīḥ
Svargādi vākya vannaivam daśame vyabhi cārataḥ* (80)

शास्त्रस्य सिद्धान्तः = the declaration of scripture; आस्ताम् = let there be; वाक्यात् = from the *mahāvākya*; परोक्षधीः = there is indirect knowledge; युक्त्या = by inference can be proved; स्वर्गादि वाक्य वत् = like the statement referring to the existence of heaven etc; एवम् न = No, it can't be so; दशमे = in the example of ten persons; व्यभिचारतः = does not fit fully.

One may argue, that let there be the declaration of the scriptures in its place (i.e. let them say that from *mahāvākya* the *aparokṣa jñānam* takes place); we can prove by inference that indirect knowledge alone takes place, as in case of heaven etc. No! One can't say so. Because in case of the example 'You are the tenth person! - there is direct knowledge and not indirect. Thus, your argument based on inference, is not valid. (80)

Āstām śāstrasya etc. - The student says: 'Let the doctrine of scriptures be in its own place. *Yuktyā vākyāt parokṣa dhīḥ* - but my conclusion is that the logic applied in the enquiry and analysis of the *mahāvākya* gives only *parokṣa* knowledge and not direct experience. *Svargādi vākya* - for example, the *śāstra vākya* says: 'If you do good deeds, you go to heaven'. By this statement one understands that 'there is heaven' although one has not gone there. In the same way, by the *mahāvākya Tat Tvam Asi*, only indirect knowledge is gained and not *aparokṣa jñāna*.

Na evam - The teacher says: No, no, you are giving a wrong example to derive a wrong conclusion and you are getting lost. The right example is: *daśame vyabhicārataḥ*

the story of the ten fools. When the tenth man was found to have excluded himself from the counting, the *parokṣa vākya* given by the wise man was 'Don't worry, the tenth man is there'. This was the first step. Then the wise man tells him: You (*tvam*) are the tenth man (*tat*). The tenth man who till now had believed that he was lost, now realises that he himself is the tenth man. This is *aparokṣa jñānam*.

Thus, in the correct enquiry of the *mahāvākya (Aham brahmāsmi/Tat Tvam Asi* etc.) they are essentially *aparokṣa jñāna* provided *ittham anyonya tādātmya*, the mutual identification of the *jīvatva* and *Paramātmā* is understood... (Ref. *śloka* 73 - 77)

Thus, in *śloka* 79 and 80 the contrary logic of the student in refusing to accept that a proper enquiry of the *mahāvākya* leads to *aparokṣa jñāna* is refuted by sarcasm and ridicule. This method is called *arthavāda*, meaning, that something is praised or indicated (through sarcasm). The aim is not to praise for the sake of praise or censure for the sake of censure but to bring to the cognition of the student what should be the correct interpretation.

The possible fear of loss of individuality of the *jīva*, in the wake of *aparokṣa jñānam*, that 'I am *Brahman*' is ridiculed -----

स्वतोऽपरोक्षजीवस्य ब्रह्मत्वमभिवाञ्छतः ।
नश्येत्सिद्धापरोक्षत्वमिति युक्तिर्महत्यहो ॥८१॥

*Svato 'parokṣa jīvasya brahmatva mabhi vāñ chataḥ
Naśyet siddhā parokṣa tvam iti yuktir mahatyaho* (81)

ब्रह्मत्वम् = The *Brahmanhood*; अभिवाञ्छतः = desiring; स्वतः = essentially; अपरोक्ष जीवस्य = the *aparokṣa jīva's*; सिद्ध = already established; अपरोक्षत्वम् = the *aparokṣa*

nature; नश्येत् = will be destroyed; इति = thus; महति युक्तिः = great (foolish) logical argument; अहो = alās.

The one desiring to attain the realisation of one's own nature, which is essentially of the nature of *Brahman*, is afraid of the destruction of already existing *jīvatva*, after realisation. What a great (foolish) logic one has thought of! (81)

In this and the next *śloka*, the teacher continues to expose the lopsided logic of the student in the same sarcastic vein.

Jīvasya svataḥ etc. - *Brahmatvam* is *jīva*'s essential nature and the *jīva* is, therefore, always trying to liberate itself from the bondage of conditionings of time, space and objects and directly experience its own true identity.

Naśyet siddham etc. - But now because of your wonderful way of thinking and perfect logic, even this direct knowledge is destroyed and although the essential nature of the *jīva* is *Sat-Cit-Ānanda svarūpa*, because of your logic you have concluded that the *jīva* is otherwise. It is a strange logic that defeats the very purpose of the study of the scriptures i.e. to de-superimpose the conditionings and reveal the one-ness of the *jīva* and the *Paramātmā*.

This thought is continued in the following verse---

वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि नष्टमितीदृशम् ।
लौकिकं वचनं सार्थं सम्पन्नं त्वत्प्रसादतः ॥८२॥

Vṛddhi miṣṭavato mūlam api naṣṭa mitī dṛśam
Laukikam vacanam sārtham sampannam tvat prasādataḥ (82)

वृद्धिम् इष्टवतः = one desiring the multiplication of his capital; मूलम् अपि = even the original capital also; नष्टम् = is lost; इति = thus; ईदृशम् = in this way; लौकिकम् वचनम् = the popular proverb; त्वत् प्रसादतः = by your

grace (of wrong logic); सार्थम् = is justified; सम्पन्नम् = is proved.

Your erroneous logic is just like the popular proverb in the world, that a person wanted to multiply his capital and in the end he lost, even the original capital. (82)

Tvat prasādataḥ - By the graciousness of your wonderful logic! *Laukikam vacanam sārtham sampannam* - we have gained the understanding of the meaning of the popular proverb *Vṛddhim iṣṭavataḥ mūlam api naṣṭam* - 'He who wanted to multiply his capital and invested it, not only lost the interest but also the capital'.

Similarly this poor *jīva*, before starting this enquiry into the *mahāvākya Tat Tvam Asi*, was at least able to enjoy the world, uninhibited by the thoughts of *jīvatva*, conditionings, *Brahmatva* etc.! But now after investing time and effort in the study of the *mahāvākya-s*, he can no more go back to that pattern of life - and all that he is left with is the *parokṣa jñānam* (!!).

A spiritual seeker has more responsibility than a non-spiritual person, both towards others and towards himself. He is looked upon as an example of faith, wisdom and *śraddhā*. So it is essential that his faith is sustained and his efforts are directed steadily to the goal of *aparokṣa jñāna*. Therefore, all that has been said by the teacher in the last four *śloka-s* is to show that the study of the *mahāvākya* is not to give *parokṣa jñāna*, but when properly enquired and practised, to lead to *aparokṣa anubhūti*.

A doubt is raised, in the following *śloka* and answered in the next. The doubt is with reference to presence and absence of conditionings for *jīva* and *Brahman*---

अन्तःकरणसंभिन्नबोधो जीवोऽपरोक्षताम् ।
अर्हत्युपाधिसद्भावात् न तु ब्रह्मानुपाधितः ॥८३॥

Antaḥkaraṇa sambhinna bodho jīvo 'parokṣatām
Arhatyupādhi sadbhāvat natu brahmā nupādhitaḥ (83)

जीवः = The *jīva*; अपरोक्षताम् = the direct knowledge;
अर्हति = is possible; अन्तः करण संभिन्न बोधः = the
consciousness in association with the conditioning of
inner instrument; उपाधि सद्भावात् = due to the existing
conditioning; न तु = not indeed; ब्रह्म = the *Brahman*;
अनुपाधितः = being devoid of any conditioning.

jīva being the consciousness in association with the
conditioning of inner instrument can be understood to have
direct experience, due to the conditioning of the instrument
of knowledge. But it is not possible with reference to *Brahman*,
the latter being devoid of any means or instrument of
knowledge! (83)

Another line of thought is taken up for analysis
in the form of a question (doubt) and answer.

Jīvaḥ aparokṣatām arhati - One can understand
that the *jīva* becomes qualified to discover its essential
nature which is (*pratyag bodha ānanda svarūpa*)
immediate conscious bliss. *Antaḥkaraṇa sambhinna*
bodho: the *jīva* is in association with the conditioning
of mind, body, intellect, time, space etc. By the denial
of these existing conditionings *upādhi-sat bhāvāt*, the
jīva has the possibility of knowing its own *sat-cit-ānanda*
svārūpa.

Brahma anupādhitaḥ - On the other hand, the
Parabrahma Paramātmā is that upon whom there is
no conditioning. Then how is it possible for the *jīva*
with conditioning to have *aparokṣa jñānam* of *Paramātmā*
with no conditioning?

The fallacy in this line of thinking lies in the undue
importance given to the 'conditioning' - its presence in
the *jīva* and its absence in the *Paramātmā*. The reality
is that both the presence and absence of conditioning
is conditioning itself as for example, he is a car-owner,
or he is not a car-owner; she is worried because of
her son, or she is worried because of the absence of
a son etc.

The meaning of absence of conditioning is itself a
conditioning. Therefore, how can one say that *Brahman* is
without conditioning? ---

नैवं ब्रह्मत्वबोधस्य सोपाधिविषयत्वतः ।

यावद्विदेहकैवल्यमुपाधेरनिवारणात् ॥८४॥

Naivam brahmatva bodhasya sopādhi viṣayatvataḥ
Yāvad videha kaivalyam upādhera nivāraṇāt (84)

एवम् न = No! such a doubt can't be raised; ब्रह्मत्व
बोधस्य = the knowledge that *jīva* is of the nature
of *Brahman*, सोपाधि विषयत्वतः = this itself is the conditioned
knowledge; यावद् = until; विदेह कैवल्यम् = the liberation
from body identification; उपाधेः = of the conditioning;
अनिवारणात् = being not negated.

No! Such a doubt cannot stand logic. So long as the conditioning
of body is not negated totally, until the body identification
is fully dropped; the knowledge that 'the *jīva* is of the nature
of *Brahman*', is itself a conditioning. (84)

Evam na - The teacher replies, 'No, No, this is wrong
thinking - that *jīva* is with conditioning and *Brahman*
is without conditioning.' *Brahmatva Bodhasya* - Even when
the *jīva* comes to realise its essential nature, (*Sa upādhi*
viṣayatvataḥ) it does not deny the imagination of the
relative conditioning. The knowledge of *Brahman* - that
it is the Self - does not deny the conditioning. But it

knows all the time that 'the conditioning is not the reality, and that I am the Real One supporting the conditioning'.

As for example, after the knowledge has taken place that the ornament's essential nature is gold, the ornament does not cease to be an ornament, or again, after understanding that the sky is not blue in reality, the sky does not stop appearing blue.

Yāvad videha kaivalyam etc. - Till the gross body is alive, all the modifications will be there. It is not that after realising one's essential nature, that the *mahātmā*-s should not have ailments of the body, or should not have thoughts in the mind. All these are conditionings and will continue to exist along with the awareness of the Self.

It is, therefore, erroneous to think that unless the *Upādhi* is denied, *ātma-jñāna* cannot be acquired.

The nature of the conditioning of *jīva* and *Brahman* is----

अन्तःकरणसाहित्यराहित्याभ्यां विशिष्यते ।
उपाधिर्जीवभावस्य ब्रह्मतायाश्च नान्यथा ॥८५॥

Antaḥkaraṇa sāhitya rāhityābhyām viśiṣyate
Upādhir jīva bhāvasya brahma tāyāśca nānyathā (85)

जीव भावस्य = of the *jīva*hood; उपाधिः = the conditioning is; अन्तःकरण साहित्य = is presence of inner instrument; ब्रह्मतायाः = of the *Brahman*hood; अन्तःकरण राहित्य = absence of inner instrument; आभ्याम् = in this manner; विशिष्यते = they are different with respect to conditioning; च = and; न अन्यथा = not in any other way.

The presence and absence of inner instrument for the *jīva* and *Brahman*, is the only difference with reference to conditioning, and not in any other manner (i.e. both *jīva* and *Brahman* are associated with conditions). (85)

What is then the difference between the *jīvatva* and *Brahmatva*? *Antaḥkaraṇa sāhitya* - the difference lies in the presence of the association with the *antaḥkaraṇa* as the conditioning. (*antaḥkaraṇa* includes the mind, body, intellect complex and the *cidābhāsa*); and (*antaḥkaraṇa rāhitya*) in the absence of the association with the *antaḥkaraṇa viśiṣyate* - This is the specific quality that distinguishes the two. *Upādhiḥ jīva bhāvasya brahmatāyāśca* - The presence of the conditioning (the *antaḥkaraṇa*) is the characteristic of the *jīva* and its absence, that of *Brahman*. *Na anyathā* - There is no other difference.

How can the absence of conditioning be a conditioning?

यथा विधिरूपाधिः स्यात्प्रतिषेधस्तथा न किम् ।
सुवर्णलोहभेदेन शृङ्खलात्वं न भिद्यते ॥८६॥

Yathā vidhi rūpādhiḥ syāt prati ṣedhas tathā na kim
Suvarṇa loha bhedena śṛṅkhālā tvam na bhidyate (86)

यथा = as; विधिः = presence; उपाधिः = conditioning; स्यात् = is considered; तथा = similarly; प्रतिषेधः = absence; किम् = why; न = not; सुवर्ण लोह भेदेन = on account of difference due to gold or iron; शृङ्खलात्वं = the chainness i.e. binding property; न भिद्यते = is not different.

Just as the presence of conditioning (here, the inner-instrument) is a limitation, so also why its absence is not a limitation? The difference on account of gold or iron notwithstanding, the binding ability of the chain continues to be! (i.e. presence or absence of gold in a chain, does not make any difference). (86)

Yathā vidhi upādhiḥ etc. - Just as the association with presence of the *antaḥkaraṇa* is a conditioning, so also association with its absence is also conditioning.

When a man is bound with a chain of gold or the other by that of iron *Suvarṇa loha bhedena śṛṅkhalatvam*

na bhidyate - both are chained and both suffer in the same manner. Similarly, in life whether we suffer because of a possession or because of its absence, the misery is the same. Therefore, presence or absence, both are conditioning. So long as we give value to the conditioning, we consider ourselves in a relative state of existence. There cannot be true enduring happiness, without *aparokṣa jñānam*.

The teachers of *vedānta* have therefore, utilized both, the affirmative and negative ways for indicating *Brahman* to the students ----

अतद्व्यावृत्तिरूपेण साक्षाद्विधिमुखेन च ।
वेदान्तानां प्रवृत्तिः स्याद्विधेत्याचार्यभाषितम् ॥८७॥

*Atad vyāvṛtti rūpeṇa sākṣāt vidhi mukhena ca
Vedāntānām pravṛttiḥ syāt dvidhe tyācārya bhāṣitam* (87)

अतद् = the 'not-self'; व्यावृत्ति रूपेण = by negating; साक्षात् = the essential self; विधिमुखेन = by affirmative indication; वेदान्तानाम् = in the statements of *upaniṣad*; द्विधा = in two ways; प्रवृत्तिः = exposition; स्यात् = is seen; इति = thus; आचार्य भाषितम् = is declared by the teacher.

The self is indicated in the statements of *upaniṣad* by two methods viz. by the negation of 'not-self' and assertion of essential nature of the self. Thus, has been declared by *vedānta* teachers. (87)

Vedāntānām pravṛttiḥ dvidhā syāt - There are two ways in which knowledge is transferred in *vedānta śāstra*. *Iti ācārya bhāṣitam* : - So say the great *ācārya*-s many times. *Atad vyāvṛtti rūpeṇa* :- The first is by negating what *Brahman* is not. In the *mahāvākya* 'Tat Tvam Asi', *Tat* is the Absolute. What is not the Absolute is *Asat* (*anātma*). That is, the conditionings are denied - you are not the body, mind, intellect etc.

Sākṣāt vidhi mukhena ca : - The other way is affirmation of what *Brahman* is - you are *Sat-Cit-Ānanda-Svarūpa*. Thus, the knowledge is imparted from the negation point of view and from the affirmation point of view to make the total picture clear.

Thus, to summarise the trend of arguments in the last five *śloka*-s: The teacher took up the doubt that can arise in the mind of the student about the enquiry into the words *Tat* and *Tvam* in the *mahāvākya*. It was said that by removing/denying the *upādhi* or limitations the *Brahmatva bhāva* can be realised. This raises the question: How is this possible? Because the *jīva* has the *upādhi* but *Brahman* has no such association. The reply was given: To have a condition and not to have a condition are both a condition. *Antaḥkaraṇa sāhitya* and *rāhitya* - to have *antaḥkaraṇa* and be a *jīva*, and not to have *antaḥkaraṇa* and remain *Īśvara* - both are conditionings.

It was then explained how knowledge is gained in two ways - by negation and by affirmation, what *Brahman* is not and what *Brahman* is (*Neti* and *Iti*).

If the 'not-self' is negated to attain the *Brahma jñānam*, even the 'I am *Brahman*' knowledge cannot take place, because the 'I' is also negated? The answer is ----

अहमर्थपरित्यागादहं ब्रह्मेति धीः कुतः ।
नैवमंशस्य हि त्यागो भागलक्षणयोदितः ॥८८॥

*Aham artha parityāgāt ahaṁ brahmeti dhīḥ kutaḥ
Naivam aṁśasya hi tyāgo bhāga lakṣaṇa yoditaḥ* (88)

अहम् अर्थ = the meaning of 'Aham'; परित्यागात् = when fully rejected; अहम् ब्रह्म = 'I am *Brahman*'; इति = thus; धीः = knowledge; कुतः = how can be; एवम् = in this way; न = should not be; हि = thought of; अंशस्य = of the part; त्यागः = rejection; भागलक्षणा = by *Bhāga lakṣaṇā*; उदितः = is already said earlier.

How can one have the knowledge - 'I am *Brahman*', if the 'I' (i.e. *aham*) is negated? Such a doubt should not be entertained, because, we have already referred earlier, the negation is in part i.e. the conditionings and not the conditioned (refer *śloka* 74). (88)

Aham artha parityāgāt etc. - The doubt raised is: when I was thinking *Aham jīvo'smi*, that was called conditioning. Now when I start thinking *Aham Brahmasmi*, that is also called conditioning. If the *aham* 'I' - word is rejected, then who will have the knowledge 'I am *Brahman*'? (*Brahmeti dhīh kutaḥ*?)

Amśasya hi tyāgaḥ bhāga etc. - Your interpretation is not correct. As earlier advised, adopt the principle of *bhāga lakṣaṇā*, reject the conditionings which seem to condition the Truth.

In the *mahāvākya Tat Tvam Asi*, for *Tvam*--- the *jīva*, the conditionings are of limitations and for *Tat*--- the *Brahman*, the conditionings are the non-limitations. Hence, misunderstanding such as: *jīva* is the controlled, *Īśvara* is the controller; *jīva* is limited in knowledge and *Īśvara* is omniscient; *jīva* is limited in space, *Īśvara* is all pervading etc.

In this way on the same *Parabrahma Paramātmā*, two conditions are superimposed - one that of limitation and the other of the absence of limitations. The reality in the *Tat Tvam Asi mahāvākya upadeśa* is that, we have to reject the conditionings of both - (i) the conditioning of the *jīva* and (ii) the conditioning of the *Īśvara*. In this way, both *ajñāna* and *māyā* are rejected. The *jīva* does not become *Īśvara*, but comes to realise its own state of unconditioned consciousness which is neither *jīva* nor *Īśvara*.

The conclusion is that the total *aham* should not be rejected but only a part. *Jīva* is not taken as reflected consciousness without reference to the *kūṭastha caitanya*, just as one cannot talk of a reflected image in a mirror

without reference to the object reflected. Similarly, in describing the *jīva* as conditioned consciousness, the conditioning becomes secondary and the consciousness which is creating the illusion of being conditioned is the Reality. *Jīvatva bhāva* cannot be understood without reference to the *kūṭastha caitanya* just as the illusion of the snake on the rope cannot be properly understood without reference to the rope. Therefore, the *kūṭastha caitanya* together with an imaginary conditioning of limitation superimposed on it, constitutes the *jīvatva bhāva*. And hence the advice.

Evam amśasya hi tyāgaḥ bhāga lakṣaṇayā uditāḥ - Consciousness is not inert, while the conditioning is inert; but because of this impossible amalgam of these two opposites, it appears as if the conditions have become enlivened. Just as the hand which by itself is inert, because of its identification with consciousness, appearing as if conscious.

Further more, the consciousness, which is functioning through this body, looks as if it is limited to this particular gross body and beyond this body there is absence of Consciousness. Therefore, the teacher says that this (*jaḍa amśa*) - the inert part, the conditioning which are seemingly conditioning the consciousness is the part to be rejected in *bhāga lakṣaṇā*.

How this 'inert aspect' of '*aham*' is negated ---

अन्तःकरणसन्त्यागादवशिष्टे चिदात्मनि ।
अहं ब्रह्मेति वाक्येन ब्रह्मत्वं साक्षिणीक्ष्यते ॥८९॥

Antaḥkaraṇa santyāgāt avāśiṣṭe cidātmani
Aham brahmeti vākyaena brahmatvaṁ sākṣiṇī kṣyate (89)

अन्तःकरण सन्त्यागात् = by negating the inner instrument totally; अवशिष्टे चिदात्मनि = and having arrived at the

consciousness; साक्षिणि = which is the witness; ब्रह्मत्वम् = the nature being that of *Brahman*; अहम् ब्रह्म इति = 'I am *Brahman*' thus; वाक्येन = by the statement; ईक्ष्यते = is experienced.

When the conditioning of inner instrument is totally rejected, and thus having arrived at the witnessing pure consciousness, the 'I am *Brahman*' knowledge takes place, by realising the nature of *sākṣī* to be *Brahman*, by the enquiry of *mahāvākya* 'Tat Tvam Asi'. (89)

This *śloka* describes the last leap that the seeker takes from the conditioned state to the unconditioned consciousness. It is a steady process, taken step by step, each step having specific goal. *Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa* in *Gītā* (V-27) explains the preparatory steps lucidly:

*Sparsān kṛtvā bahir bāhyān ścakṣuś cai vāntare bhruvoh
Prāṇāpānau samau kṛtvā nāsābhyantara cāriṇau*

Shutting out all external objects, fixing the gaze between his eyebrows, equalising the inward and outward breath moving in the nostrils.

For the seeker sitting on the seat of contemplation, the first preparatory step is to reject the gross world, and not allow it to enter through the senses. The next step is to observe the body. The moment the body becomes the point of observation, it becomes still. When one is identified with the body and made to stay still, under compulsion, there is numbness in the legs, pain etc. But in the motionless-ness of the body achieved while observing the body in meditation, there is no tension and no numbness (sleeping) of the legs.

Now follows the next step of observing the respiration. (*Nāsābhyantara cāriṇau*). In normal respiration, inhalation and exhalation takes place only through one of the nostrils. But when one begins to observe one's own respiration: (a) respiration starts flowing through both nostrils; (b) respiratory movement seems as if it is within the

space of the nostrils, and not beyond, nor inside. When this stage is reached, the student has to a great extent rejected the *jaḍa aṁśa*.

Antaḥkaraṇa santyāgāt - The student now starts the observation of the mind: this takes place in two stages - the first is to observe the content of the mind - i.e. the thought. Gradually, the thoughts get reduced in frequency and intensity; the second stage is to observe the mind, not the content. This is the state called witness or *sākṣī*.

When the seeker becomes perfectly one with the *sākṣī*, comes the last step - the enquiry into the nature of the *sākṣī*. As one begins focussing attention on the essential nature of the *sākṣī*, the contents of the mind and the thoughts are completely dropped. The *sākṣī* is able to focus its attention, away from the mind and its contents, on its own essential nature. When this happens, *sākṣī* ceases to be a *sākṣī*. It is now the *Cidātmani avasiṣṭe* - the *Parabrahma Paramātmā* shines, in whom all difference such as the knower-known, witness-witnessed; conditioning-conditioned etc., end. I know I am the observer and the observed.

When this happens, the '*aham brahmāsmi*' knowledge dawns upon the witnessing consciousness - that it is one without a second and infinite. In short it is the nature of witness.

The *jīva* can never become *Brahman* for the simple reason it is not a reality. *Jīva*, like a *vandhyā putra* (barren women's son), does not exist.

Thus, it will be seen that progressing up to the level of *sākṣī* is not the end of meditation... *sādhana*. One must go beyond, to find the nature of the *sākṣī* - that it is *Satyam, Jñānam, Anantam* (*śloka* 66).

Therefore, *Aham Brahmāsmi* is not meant for the conditioned consciousness, but for that consciousness which has separated itself from the conditioning.

How does one know whether that stage has been reached? That one has got established in that experience?

- The *Bhagavat Gītā* defines the *sākṣī* in three places viz. (i) Man of steady wisdom - Ch II (ii), a devotee - Ch XII and (iii) *Guṇātīta puruṣaḥ* - Ch XIII.

The nature of *Aham Brahmāsmi* knowledge is ---

स्वप्रकाशोऽपि साक्ष्येव धीवृत्त्या व्याप्यतेऽन्यवत् ।

फलव्याप्यत्वमेवास्य शास्त्रकृद्भिर्निवारितम् ॥९०॥

Svapra-kāśo'pi sākṣyeva dhī vṛtṭyā vyāpyate 'nyavat
Phala vyāpyatva mevāsya śāstra kṛtbhir nivāritam (90)

धीवृत्त्या = by the intellect; साक्षी = the witness; स्व प्रकाशः अपि = although self-effulgent; अन्यवत् = like any other object; व्याप्यते = is known; एव = indeed; अस्य = of this Pure Self; फल व्याप्यत्वम् एव = the identification with the fruits; शास्त्रकृद्भिः = by the teachers; निवारितम् = is negated.

Although, the witness is self-effulgent, it is known with the help of the intellect, like any other object. However, the *phala vyāpti* in case of this 'knowing' is negated by those who declared the Truth. (90)

A major obstacle in taking that last plunge into self-realisation is now taken up, namely, the inability of the spiritual seeker to drop the objectification of the subject. For example, when pursuing meditation, the tendency is to classify the meditation experience as good or bad as expressed by others such as 'I enjoyed meditation today' or 'I did not enjoy it'. Therefore, I become the enjoyer and meditation, the object of enjoyment. The seeker gets locked up in the condition of the mind and is far from the Truth. Meditation has become a *bhoga*--- a matter of enjoyment and not a *yoga*. It is essential, therefore, to drop this tendency to objectify the subject in spiritual enquiry, only then will the subject reveal itself.

Vyāpti is identification. There are two types of *vyāpti* - *Vṛtti Vyāpti* and *phala vyāpti*. Knowledge of an object takes place in the *antaḥkaraṇa* or the mind in two stages: the first is when the mind takes the shape of the object (book, chair etc.). The adaptation of the mind to the shape of the object of knowledge is *vṛtti vyāpti*.

The knowledge has not yet completely taken place. This happens in the second stage when 'I know that this is a book'. This is *phala vyāpti*. When in the 'shaped mind', the thought of being 'the owner of the knowledge' takes place.

Sva-prakāśaḥ api sākṣī etc. - When the *sākṣī* is trying to observe the modifications of the mind, i.e. when the *sākṣī* starts objectifying itself, it has made the object as the subject. In the enquiry of the nature of the *sākṣī*, the *sākṣī* is trying to reflect on itself, in the sense to find its own source. In other words, the objectification is being subjectified.

Phala vyāptatvam eva asya etc. - Just as the light of a candle which is useful in the darkness, but becomes almost totally non-existent in the flood of sun's light, so also when the witness or *sākṣī* makes 'its own nature' the object of its enquiry, the *sākṣī* *bhāva* or the limited existence, the limitations disappear and existence alone remains. Existence is one where there are no limitations - this is *Sat-Cit-Ānanda-Brahman*.

In the words of the scriptures, in *śāstrīya* language, when *sākṣī* enquires itself there is only *Vṛtti vyāpti*, but no *phala vyāpti*. There is de-shapification of the mind. In other words the mind becomes the knower (*aham vṛtti*) as well as the known (*idam vṛtti*)

[Note: In *Upadeśa Sāram* of *Ramaṇa Maḥarṣi*, it is said that the mind is the thought. Thoughts are divided into two categories: *idam vṛtti* and *aham vṛtti*. Formation of *idam vṛtti* is called *vṛtti vyāpti*, and acceptance of that knowledge by another thought known as *aham vṛtti* is called *phala vyāpti*]

When the *sākṣī* starts to reject the conditioning and starts asking 'Who am I', in that enquiry the limitations of being a *sākṣī* disappear. So one can never know the subject objectively.

[Note: *Rāmākṣṣṇa Paramahansa* gives the example of a doll made of salt entering the sea to measure its depth, ceases to be and never returns.]

Where Knower (*sākṣī*) becomes Being (*Brahman*); where knower-known difference is absent; where *Sat* and *Cit* are one without a second - that is described as there being no *phala vyāpti*.

The *ṛtti* and *phala vyāpti* is required in case of an objective knowledge ----

बुद्धितत्स्थचिदाभासौ द्वावपि व्याप्नुतो घटम् ।
तत्राज्ञानं धिया नश्येदाभासेन घटः स्फुरेत् ॥९१॥

Buddhi tatstha cidābhāsau dvāvapi vyāpnuto ghaṭam
Tatrājñānaṁ dhiyā naśyet ābhāseṇa ghaṭaḥ sphureṭ (91)

बुद्धि = the thought; तत्स्थ चिदाभासौ = the reflected consciousness therein; द्वौ अपि = both also; घटम् = the pot; व्याप्नुतः = are involved in; तत्र = thereafter; धिया = by the knowledge thought; अज्ञानम् = the ignorance (of the pot); नश्येत् = is destroyed; आभासेन = by the reflected consciousness; घटः = the pot; स्फुरेत् = is known.

In knowing an object - say a pot - both, the *ṛtti vyāpti* and *phala vyāpti* are involved. By the *ṛtti vyāpti* the ignorance of the pot is destroyed and by *phala vyāpti* (i.e. by the ownership of the knowledge by the *cidābhāsa*) the pot is known. (91)

Buddhi tatstha cidābhāsau dvau api vyāpnuto ghaṭam: In gaining knowledge about an object (pot etc.) the thought modification according to the shape of the object and the *cidābhāsa* reveals the knowledge of the object. Thus both *vyāpti*-s are involved.

Tātra ajñānam dhiyā naśyet ābhāseṇa ghaṭaḥ sphureṭ: By this process of gaining the knowledge of the object, two things have happened: a) the *ajñānam* - ignorance is removed by *ṛtti vyāpti*. The mind has taken the shape of the object of knowledge; b) and by the reflected consciousness, in the conditioning of the mind, 'I know it is a pot' etc. In other words, *phala vyāpti* takes place as the ownership of the shape of the mind.

Thus *ṛtti vyāpti* is not associated with knowership of the knowledge. In case of self-knowledge, there is knowledge without the knower-known differentiation.

The above mentioned speciality of self-knowledge is explained in the following *śloka*----

ब्रह्मण्यज्ञाननाशाय वृत्तिव्याप्तिरपेक्षिता ।
स्वयंस्फुरणरूपत्वान्नाभास उपयुज्यते ॥९२॥

Brahmaṇya jñāna nāśāya ṛtti vyāpti rapekṣitā
Svayaṁ sphuraṇa rūpatvāt nābhāsa upayujyate (92)

ब्रह्मणि = in case of *Brahman*; अज्ञान नाशाय = for the destruction of ignorance; वृत्ति व्याप्तिः = 'I am *Brahman*' thought; अपेक्षिता = is essential; स्वयम् स्फुरण रूपत्वात् = the *Brahman* being of the nature of self-effulgence; आभासः = the *cidābhāsa*, to know and own the knowledge; न = not; उपयुज्यते = is essential.

With reference to the knowledge of *Brahman*, the 'I am *brahman*' thought (*ṛtti vyāpti*) is certainly required. However, the - 'I know that I am *Brahman*' - owner of the knowledge---*phala vyāpti*---is not expected, the *Brahman* being of the nature of self-effulgence. (92)

Brahmaṇi ajñāna nāśāya etc.: Contrary to the objective knowledge, subjective knowledge of *Parabrahma* takes place by the removal of ignorance. When the witness (*sākṣī*)

focusses its attention on its own source, *ṛtti vyāpti* occurs. *Brahman* being of the nature of consciousness, who will know whom?

Svayam sphuraṇa rūptvāt ābhāsa na upayujyate - The witness or *sākṣī* will have to shed its ownership of being knower; because knower and known difference is a result of conditioning. When the *sākṣī* enquires into 'Who am I?' it comes to the point when he realises that I am the one who is supporting all the conditioning and yet never get conditioned.

This knowledge is called *vikṣepa*. The conditioned consciousness or *cidābhāsa* can never know its own source objectively, because the source cannot become the object of knowledge.

As the *Brahman* does not become an object, the *cidābhāsa* also fails to become a subject that needs an object for its existence. Hence, in *Brahma jñāna*, there is knowledge without the difference of knower and known. It is objectless awareness.

An example is quoted ----

चक्षुर्दीपावपेक्ष्यते घटादेर्दर्शने यथा ।
न दीपदर्शने किन्तु चक्षुरेकमपेक्ष्यते ॥९३॥

Cakṣur dīpāva pekṣyete ghaṭāder darśane yathā
Na dīpa darśane kintu cakṣu reka mapekṣyate (93)

यथा = as in case of; घटादेः = of the inert object like pot; दर्शने = for seeing them; चक्षुः दीपौ = both the eyes and the lamp; अपेक्ष्यते = are essential; न = not; किन्तु = but; दीप दर्शने = for seeing the lamp; एकम् = only one; चक्षुः = the eye; अपेक्ष्यते = is enough.

As in case of seeing an inert object like pot etc., one requires, both a lamp to illumine the pot and the eyes to

see it. However, for seeing a lamp only eyes are required and not the lamp (the latter being already illumined by its own light). (93)

To see a gross object like a pot or a paper weight, eyes and external light like a lamp are needed. But to see the light itself, only the eyes are needed. Similarly, *śuddha caitanya* or *kūṭastha caitanya* or pure consciousness being of the nature of absolute knowledge, needs no other consciousness to know itself. It is *svayam prakāśa*.

Therefore, the statement, 'I know *Para-brahma Param-ātmā*' as well as the statement 'I do not know' *Para-brahma Paramātmā* are both, right and wrong. In fact they are not applicable. Any language used in the absolute is incomplete. Therefore, when I the knower (i.e. *cidābhāsa*) try to focus my attention towards my own being, in an attempt to objectify (*ṛtti vyāpti*) there is no objective comprehension possible, because the *Brahman* is of the nature of the infinite, absolute consciousness. At this point the knower and known division disappears. This disappearance of the knower and the known is called the absence of *phala vyāpti*, with pure knowledge being left alone!

The reflecting medium called, 'thoughts', and the reflected consciousness called '*cidābhāsa*' always exist simultaneously. Therefore, how can we justify absence of *phala vyāpti* in *Brahmajñāna*?---

स्थितोऽप्यसौ चिदाभासो ब्रह्मण्येकीभवेत्परम् ।
न तु ब्रह्मण्यतिशयं फलं कुर्याद्घटादिवत् ॥९४॥

Stitho'pyasau cidābhāso brahma ṇyekī bhavet param
Na, tu brahmaṇya tiśayaṁ phalaṁ kuryāt ghaṭādi vat (94)

चिदाभासः = the reflected consciousness; स्थितः अपि = although reflected in thought (in 'I am *Brahman*' thought); असौ = this; ब्रह्मणि = in the *Brahman*, एकी भवेत् =

attain non-differentiation; परम् = however; ब्रह्मणि = in case of *Brahman*; अतिशयम् फलम् = the objectification of consciousness; न = not; तु = indeed; कुर्यात् = do; घट आदि वत् = as is required in case of objective knowledge of a pot etc.

Although it is true that the reflected consciousness (*cidābhāsa*) and the thought co-exist. However, in case of 'I am *Brahman*' thought, the *cidābhāsa* attains non-differentiation and does not result in the knower-known differentiation as in case of objective knowledge, like that of pot etc. (94)

Sthitah api asau cidābhāsaḥ etc. - The illumination from an ordinary lamp when placed in bright sunlight has no separate existence, since its light becomes one with the sun's light. Similarly, when the *cidābhāsa* or reflected consciousness focusses its attention on itself, it becomes de-conditioned, and loses its separate existence apart from the *Brahman*, the Absolute.

Na tu brahmaṇi atīśayam phalam kuryāt etc. - As the knowledge of an object (*ghaṭādi-vat*) is objective knowledge, i.e. keeping the subject separate from the object, knowledge of the Self cannot take place. In the same way the *cidābhāsa* dependent on the *Parabrahma* as its substratum, cannot have the *Paramātmā* as the object of knowledge. The mind can know everything except the mind. The *cidābhāsa* can observe everything except its own source. The knower can never become the known. When the knower (in case of *Brahma jñāna*) tries to objectify the known (the *Brahman*)-the source of one's own being, the knower loses its identity. Objective knowledge of the subject is an impossibility. For 'being' no effort is needed. Effortless Conscious Existence, is our natural being. Hence, *phala vyāpti* is not possible in *Brahma jñāna*.

The possibility of *vr̥tti vyāpti* in case of *Brahman* is authenticated from *upaniṣadik* source ---

अप्रमेयमनादिं चेत्यत्र श्रुत्येदमीरितम् ।
मनसैवेदमाप्तव्यमिति धीव्याप्यता श्रुता ॥९५॥

Aprameya manādim ceti atra śrutye damī ritam
Manasai veda māpta vyam iti dhī vyāpyatā śrutā (95)

श्रुत्या = like the statement of *upaniṣad-s*; अप्रमेयम् = cannot be an object of knowledge; अनादिम् च = and without beginning etc.; इति = thus; अत्र = in these words; इदम् = the absence of *phala vyāpti*; ईरितम् = is mentioned; मनसा एव = by mind alone; इदम् = *Brahman*; आप्तव्यम् = be known; इति = thus; धी व्याप्यता = *vr̥tti vyāpti*; श्रुता = is known.

While pointing *Brahman*, the statement containing the words like, unknowable, beginningless, etc. the absence of *phala vyāpti* is meant. While by words like-by mind alone *Brahman* can be known - *vr̥tti vyāpti* is declared. (95):

The teacher is now quoting the scriptures to substantiate the statement made in the previous *śloka* that knowledge of the Self cannot be gained by objectifying the Self. (*Amṛta Bindu Up-9, Katho Up-4.11, Muṇḍaka-3.1.7-9, Br Up-4.4.9*)

Aprameyam: The Truth is described as that which cannot become the object of knowledge. *Pramāta* is the knower, *pramā* is knowledge, *prameya* is the known. Therefore, *aprimeyam*, the subject can never become the object.

Anādim: It is without beginning. In case of objective knowledge, knowership in the form of the objective knower is always with reference to a relative conditioning of the object to be known. Truth being *aprimeya*, it is also *anādim* that is, it is not a conditioning created with reference to an object.

Thus, there is no possibility of *phala vyāpti*, the subject cannot become an object, is declared by the *upaniṣad*.

Manasā eva idam avāptavyam: The mind should lose its 'mind-ness', it should lose its shape-formation with

reference to the objects. The moment the mind focusses on itself, i.e. on its source, it ceases to be mind. Paradoxically, it is through the mind alone the Truth is to be known, yet when the mind is focussed on the Infinite, it ceases to be a mind. It is its own absence. In the Infinite, there is no difference between the instrument of knowledge, the knowledge of the object, object of the knowledge and the knower of the knowledge of the object.

When the seeker reaches the level of the witness (*sākṣīva*), he is still at the level of the mind, wherein, one aspect of the mind is 'the knower' and the other aspect is 'the known'. Becoming witness or *sākṣī* means that the contents of the mind are no more able to influence the mind.

By the eyes one can see everything, except the eyes themselves and when the attention of the eyes is focussed on the eyes, the objects illumined by the eyes are also dropped. So also by the mind we can see everything except the mind, and when the mind is investigating its own source, the mind disappears. That is, the subject - object difference ceases. Therefore, there is only *ṛtti vyāpti* and no *phala vyāpti*.

In worldly knowledge, the knower remains different from the object of knowledge. In the case of Self-knowledge (*aparokṣa anubhūti*) 'the knower' disappears in 'the knowledge'. In other words, knowledge without the knower is Self knowledge, or the knower without the known.

The original *upaniṣadik* statement under discussion deals with the *aparokṣānubhūti* and removal of the misery.

The portion dealing with *aparokṣa jñānam* is discussed ----

आत्मानं चेद्विजानीयादयमस्मीति वाक्यतः ।

ब्रह्मात्मव्यक्तिमुल्लिख्य यो बोधः सोऽभिधीयते ॥९६॥

*Ātmānam cet vijānīyāt, ayam asmīti vākyataḥ
Brahmātma vyakti mullikhya, yo bodhaḥ so'bhidhiyate* (96)

यः = that; बोधः = knowledge; ब्रह्मात्म व्यक्तिम् = establishing identity between *ātma* and *Brahman* (by *Aham Brahmasmi* thought); सः = that knowledge; आत्मानम् चेत् विजानीयात् अयम् अस्मि इति = (*ātmanam cet vijānīyāt ayam asmi iti*) this I am, thus; वाक्यतः = from the part of the statement; अभिधीयते = is declared.

The knowledge establishing the identity between *ātman* and *Brahman*, born as a result of *Aham Brahmasmi* thought, is declared in the original statement: *Ātmānam cet vijānīyāt* etc. by the part viz. *Ayam Asmi iti*. (96)

Ātmānam cet vijānīyāt etc. - In earlier *śloka* 47-48, the two main aspects of *śruti vākya* discussed were that:

- (i) through direct experience (*aparokṣa anubhūti*) alone one realises one's identity with the *Brahman*, and
- (ii) once that state is reached (*kim-icchan* etc.) desires do not remain anymore.

Brahma ātmā vyaktim ullikhya - Ātmā-Jīva-Pūruṣa is essentially of the nature of *Brahman*. When this subject is made object of investigation the '*Aham jīvo'smi*' perception i.e. I am a limited *jīva* gets transformed into *Aham Brahmasmi* knowledge or *ṛtti*---that I am not the mind or the body or the *jīva* but I am *Brahman*. This is direct or *Aparokṣa jñānam*. This *Aparokṣa jñānam* indicated by the *śruti vākya* is responsible for the removal of the miseries of limited existence called *saṁsāra*.

Although, the direct experience of the Self takes place proper enquiry, it is essential to practice this knowledge (called as *abhyāsa*) for firm abidance ----

अस्तु बोधोऽपरोक्षोऽत्र महावाक्यात्तथाप्यसौ ।
न दृढः श्रवणादीनामाचार्यैः पुनरीरणात् ॥९७॥

*Astu bodho 'parokṣo'tra mahāvākyaāt tathā pyasau
Na dṛḍhaḥ śravaṇā dīnām ācāryaiḥ puna rīraṇāt (97)*

महा वाक्यात् = by proper enquiry of *mahāvākya*; अपरोक्षः = the direct knowledge; अस्तु = let it be so; अत्र = in this regards; तथापि = however; असौ = this direct knowledge; दृढः न = is not firm; आचार्यैः = by the *Vedānta* teacher; श्रवण आदीनाम् = the practice of listening etc; पुनः = repeatedly; ईरणात् = is emphasized.

Although it is true that by enquiry on the *mahāvākya* one attains *aparokṣa jñānam*. However, the *Vedānta* teachers emphasize that one must repeatedly practice listening, etc., for the *aparokṣa jñānam* is not firm (initially). (97)

Mahāvākyaāt:- By the study of the *mahāvākya* and by listening to the teachings on the *mahāvākya*, the knowledge does take place that 'I am *Brahman*' (*Aham Brahmāsmi*).

Tathāpi asau na dṛḍhaḥ:- However, this knowledge has not yet become firmly established as part of us without doubt. We may appreciate the knowledge (*Aham Brahmāsmi*) intellectually, but intellectual appreciation is not *aparokṣa anubhūti*.

In the *Kenopaniṣad*, it has been said that the intellect cannot really function in Self-knowledge. When the student says 'I have understood' the teacher gets vexed and sends him back for more reflection. Ultimately, the student comes to realise that 'he understands that it cannot be understood'. This may be conceptual understanding but not as experience or *anubhūti*, not as one's own being.

Śravaṇādīnām ācāryaiḥ punaḥ īraṇāt- Therefore, it is essential that the seeker does practice (*abhyāsa*) again

and again - that he listens to expositions and studies and reflects over and over again.

To support his view, the teacher quotes *vākya vṛtti* (Verse-49) of *Bhagavān Śaṅkarācārya* ---

अहं ब्रह्मेतिवाक्यार्थबोधो यावददृढीभवेत् ।
शमादिसहितस्तावदभ्यसेच्छ्रवणादिकम् ॥९८॥

*Aham brahmeti vākyaarth bodho yāvad dṛḍhī bhavet
Śamādi sahita stāvad abhyaset śrava ṇādikam (98)*

अहम् ब्रह्म = 'I am *Brahman*'; इति = this; वाक्यार्थ बोधः = meaning of this statement; यावत् = until; दृढी भवेत् = becomes firm; तावत् = till then; शमादि सहितः = along with *śama* etc; श्रवण आदिकम् = the listening etc; अभ्यसेत् = one should practice.-

Until, the meaning of the statement 'I am *Brahman*' becomes fully firm, one should practice listening to scriptures etc; along with the disciplines of self-restrain etc. (i.e. six fold inner wealth). (98)

How long should this repeated practice *abhyāsa* be done, is answered in this *śloka*. The answer is, as long as it takes '*Aham Brahmāsmi*' knowledge to become one's own personal, direct and undoubted experience, the *sādhana* must continue.

The subject of *Aham Brahmāsmi* can be understood objectively and one can even expound on it beautifully and convincingly. *Brahma vidyā* can become a part of one's store of general knowledge. But *Brahma vidyā* as a subject of direct, personal experience is an altogether different state, where *Aham Brahmāsmi* is experienced subjectively.

Śamādi Sahitaḥ:- The external and inner disciplines like self-restrain etc. must be practised at every moment

of our lives. In addition to practising all the prescribed virtues i.e. self-control and disciplines like *śama*, *dama* etc., a *Vedāntin* should listen, reflect and contemplate on what he has heard or understood.

The reasons for unstable knowledge are indicated ----

बाढं सन्ति ह्यदार्ढ्यस्य हेतवः श्रुत्यनेकता ।
असम्भाव्यत्वमर्थस्य विपरीता च भावना ॥९९॥

*Bāḍhaṁ santi hyadār dhyasya hetavaḥ śrutya nekatā
Asambhā vyatva marthasya viparītā ca bhāvanā* (99)

अर्थस्य = of the *Brahman*; हि = indeed; श्रुति अनेकता = varied statements of the *upaniṣad*-s; असम्भाव्यत्वम् = being impossible; विपरीता भावना = contrary perception; च = and; अदार्ढ्यस्य = of the instability; हेतवः = reasons; बाढम् = always; सन्ति = are seen.

The reasons for instability of the knowledge of the Pure Self are (i) varied descriptions by different *upaniṣadik* statements (ii) seemingly impossible proposition, and (iii) contrary perception of one self. (99)

Why is this knowledge so unstable? Why is it not firm (*dr̥ḍhaḥ*)? Why does it lack conviction? There are three major causes for this weakness:

(1) *Śruti anekatā*-Multiplicity of *śruti* statements. Because of the many statements and many ways of presenting the same Truth, the student may get many doubts. For example, creation is explained as a sequential event in one place and a simultaneous 'big bang' event in another or again, the *Taittirīya upaniṣad* talks of *pañcīkaraṇam*, while the *Chāndogya upaniṣad* talks only of *trīkaraṇam* etc. Thus the student is lost in the maze of the many voices of the scriptures.

(2) *Asambhāvyatā*-Imagination of impossibility i.e. imagination that it is impossible to accept that 'I am *Brahman*'.

(3) *Viparītā bhāvanā*-Understanding exactly the opposite of what is intended e.g. the rope is understood to be the snake. One considers one-self to be limited, conditioned individual entity.

The first obstacle of 'multiplicity of *upaniṣadik* statement is removed by ----

शाखाभेदात्कामभेदाच्छ्रुतं कर्मान्यथान्यथा ।
एवमत्रापि मा शङ्कीत्यतः श्रवणमाचरेत् ॥१००॥

*Śākhā bhedāt kāma bhedāt śrutam karmānya thānyathā
Evam atrāpi mā śaṅkīti ataḥ śravaṇam ācaret* (100)

कर्म = the action; अन्यथा अन्यथा = different; श्रुतम् = is known to be declared; शाखा भेदात् = on account of different branch of *Veda*-s; काम भेदात् = on account of differences in desires; एवम् = similarly; अत्र अपि = with regards to *Brahman* described in *upaniṣad*; मा = do not; शङ्की = suspect; इति अतः = therefore; श्रवणम् = listening; आचरेत् = take refuge to.

As we observe differences in 'karma' on account of the branch of *Veda*-s and desires prompting them, may you not suspect that different *Brahman* is indicated in different *upaniṣad*-s. Therefore, take refuge to *Vedānta* listening again and again. (100)

Having listed the main reasons which prevent the knowledge of '*Aham Brahmāsmi*' from becoming firmly rooted, the teacher now proceeds to explain how to overcome them.

Śākhā bhedāt kāma bhedāt etc. - Taking the first cause, namely *śruti anekatā* the differences on account of the multiplicity of *veda*-s and *Vedik* injunctions, it is explained

that this variety in approach is adopted to meet the different desires to be fulfilled through various *karma kāṇḍa-s*. Man's desires are many and actions associated with the fulfilment of those desires are also equally varied. Hence, the apparently conflicting statements of different *Veda-s*. But the wise student must come out of this (*atra api mā śaṅkī*) apparent confusion. But do not misunderstand that the *Brahmātma aikya bodha*-the knowledge about the oneness of *Brahman* is different from individual to individual or from *śruti vākya* to *śruti vākya*.

For, in the case of *Brahma jñāna*, unlike *karma kāṇḍa*, there is only one desire. Because the desire is only for 'the one without a second --- *brahman*'. Even that one desire disappears because of Self-realization.

Anything that exists in illusion must have movement. The whole world---whether it is an atom or the cosmos cannot be referred to without movement---movement in time, space and in the stages of existence (childhood, youth, old age etc.). This movement itself is an illusion. The moment movement stops, the illusion ends. The beautiful images created by the sequential movement of neon lights illustrates the illusion of movement. Similarly, because there are different types of actions for different types of objects desired, there are different types of knowledge in the *karma kāṇḍa*.

But in the case of *Ātma jñāna* - Self-knowledge, where desire is for the *only one*, the illusion of movement in the mind disappears and the mind itself disappears in its own substratum called consciousness.

When many thoughts of one species are established as in *Japa Sādhana*, then one thought of one species results in due course. Then, the mind ceases to be, since the life of the mind depends on the illusion of movement, and there is no movement in the one thought-one species state.

Therefore, (*evam atra api mā śaṅkī*) do not be misled by what seems to be conflicting and contradictory in the *śruti vākya-s*. This misunderstanding, itself becomes the first obstacle in understanding of the *Brahmātma-aikya-bodha*. When it comes to *ātmā jñāna* all *śruti vākya-s* say the same thing. An intelligent student knows how to extract the one Truth from the many statements. That is why he has to study the various aspects of this one Truth from the various *upaniṣad-s* again and again.

Ataḥ śravaṇam ācāret: Therefore, all possibilities of enquiry should be made. This is achieved in the *Brahma sūtrā-s*. Although, there are several hundred *sūtrā-s* (555 to be precise), they all establish that different statements about the Truth which seemingly look different from each other, point to the same Truth. It is like having different views of a person from different angles. So also in the enquiry of the Truth all possible angles need to be exhaustively explored in order to arrive at a total and complete picture.

Therefore, the meaning of *śravaṇam* for the *Vedāntin* is the development of the understanding, that whatever is said by the *śruti mātā* is meant for the establishment of the oneness of the *Paramātmā*.

The nature and procedure adopted in the study of *Vedānta*, called *śravaṇam* is indicated ----

वेदान्तानामशेषाणामादिमध्यावसानतः ।

ब्रह्मात्मन्येव तात्पर्यमिति धीः श्रवणं भवेत् ॥१०१॥

*Vedāntānām aśeṣāṇām ādi madhyā vasānataḥ
Brahmātma nyeva tātparyam itī dhiḥ śravaṇam bhavet* (101)

अशेषाणाम् = including all; वेदान्तानाम् = the statements of *upaniṣad*; आदि मध्यावसानतः = by the method of beginning,

middle, end etc; ब्रह्मात्मनि = in establishing oneness of *Brahman* and *ātman*; एव = indeed; तात्पर्यम् = conclusion; इति = this; धीः = understanding; श्रवणम् = listening; भवेत् = is called.

Listening *vedānta* means arriving at a firm understanding about the oneness of *ātman* and *Brahman* from all the *upaniṣad* statements by the method of study involving beginning, middle, and end (i.e. six aspect technique). (101).

Dhīḥ: The knowledge, understanding, the conviction that 'is to be attained through *śravaṇam* and *abhyāsa* (repetition of *śravaṇam*) is about one thing and nothing else.

Vedāntānām aśeṣeṇa brahma ātmani tātparyam: The purpose of the study of *śruti* is not to be told that I am the body, the body is born and it dies etc. The study should lead to only one goal- that I---the consciousness- is not limited and different from body to body.

It is not difficult to understand that I am someone other than the body. No *sādhana* is required to understand that 'I am consciousness'. The real *sādhana* begins when one tries to understand that this consciousness is not different from individual to individual.

In the *Bhagavad Gītā* (XIII-2), *Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa* says:

क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि सर्व क्षेत्रेषु भारत ।

Kṣetrajñāṁ cāpi mām viddhi sarva kṣetreṣu Bhārata

The knower in this body is this Consciousness (*Kṣetrajñā*). Although the bodies are many, the embodied Consciousness is one. The embodied is only one and is none other than I. It is at this point that the real struggle starts for the seeker.

Brahmātmāni eva tātparyam iti dhīḥ śravaṇam bhavet: Whatever is said in the scriptures in the beginning,

middle and end; in other words, in the whole of the scriptures, throughout, only one thought is sought to be established: the *ātmā* which is considered to be limited by a particular equipment called the body, mind and intellect is not limited.

It is one common substratum supporting all the bodies, all the equipments, all the minds and all the thoughts. It is *Brahma-svarūpa*. The *Brahma Sūtra-s* faithfully reflect this one-pointedness with reference to this fact. The different aspects that need to be studied for arriving at oneness of consciousness, are listed below:

(1) *Upakrama-Upasamhāra* i.e. Oneness of the proposition and conclusion:- The ONE *BRAHMAN* is declared in the beginning of the *upaniṣad* and the same is finally concluded through the technique of superimposition and de-superimposition.

(2) *Abhyāsa*-i.e. Repetition of ONE-NESS of *Brahman* inspite of superimposition during discourse.

(3) *Apūrvatā*-The uniqueness of this knowledge is that the authoritative means of knowledge of *Brahman* is *Veda-s* alone, and nothing else.

(4) *Arthavāda*-Comparative study---Establishment of greatness of *Brahma jñāna* by its praise over other knowledge, at times ridiculing or censuring them.

(5) *Phalam*---the purpose-The discussion regarding the purpose of *Brahma-jñāna* such as freedom from miseries and attainment of unlimited bliss.

(6) *Upapatti*-Logic---Logic employed for the establishment of oneness of *ātman* and *Brahman* and demonstrating it through appropriate and adequate illustrations and examples etc.

One can discover this type of treatment to the theme of *Brahma jñāna* in *Brahma Sūtra-s*----

समन्वयाध्याय एतत्सूक्तं धीस्वास्थ्यकारिभिः ।

तर्कैः सम्भावनार्थस्य द्वितीयाध्याय ईरिता ॥१०२॥

Saman vayā dhyāya etat sūktam dhī svāsthya kāribhiḥ
Tarkaiḥ sambhā vanār thasya dvitīyā dhyāya īritā (102)

एतत् = This (meaning of *śravaṇam*); समन्वय अध्याये = in the chapter entitled '*Samanvaya adhyāya*' (First chapter of *Brahma Sūtra*); सूक्तम् = is clearly described; धी स्वास्थ्य कारिभिः = by those who mean healthy growth of intellect; तर्कैः = by proper logic; अर्थस्य = of the correct meaning of *Brahman*; सम्भावना = of the reflection; द्वितीय अध्याये = in the second chapter (namely *Avirodha adhyāya*); ईरिता = is explained.

This meaning of *śravaṇam* (as defined in above *śloka* No. 101) is very well explained by proper logic, that leads to healthy evolution of enquiry in the first chapter of *Brahma Sūtra*, entitled - '*Samanvaya adhyāya*'. In the second chapter (namely - *Avirodha adhyāya*), the reflection of *Brahman* is explained in detail. (102)

This *śloka* deals with how to overcome the second obstacle of *asambhāvanā* i.e. doubt about the impossibility of accepting the truth. Many doubts, big and small, assail the mind and hinder its quietude.

Samanvaya adhyāya etat sūktam : Bringing every statement of the *śruti* to bear on the establishment of the *Brahmātma aikya bodha*. The first chapter of the *Brahma Sūtra-s* deals with how this is to be done and how this is the only purpose of the scriptures.

Tarkaiḥ sambhāvanā arthasya dvitīyā dhyāya īritā - In the second chapter entitled *avirodha* deals with how to remove doubt by proper logic as indicated by the scriptures, to establish *Brahmātma aikya bodha*. Any logic that establishes one-ness is healthy logic (*svasthya kāribhiḥ*)

and any logic that strengthens individuality, is unhealthy. Establishment of differences is not considered wisdom; discovery of one-ness inspite of differences is considered to be wisdom. *Asambhāvanā* can thus be removed by proper reflection on what is said in the scriptures under the guidance of healthy discussion or logic. This is the purpose of the '*śruti*'. In this way the *Vedānta grantha*, the *Brahma Sūtra-s* deal with the chapter dealing with obstacles (*Avirodha adhyāya*).

Having given solution for the removal of the *asambhāvanā*, by the technique of reflection, as declared in *Brahma Sūtra-s*, the third obstacle in the knowledge stability viz. *viparītā bhāvanā* is now taken for treatment ----

बहुजन्मदृढाभ्यासादेहादिष्वात्मधीः क्षणात् ।

पुनः पुनरुदेत्येवं जगत्सत्यत्वधीरपि ॥१०३॥

Bahu janma dṛḍhā bhyāsāt dehādi śvātma dhīḥ kṣaṇāt
Punaḥ punaru detyevam jagat satyatva dhīrapi (103)

देह आदिषु = in the body etc; आत्म धीः = I-ness notion; क्षणात् = very quickly; बहु जन्म दृढ अभ्यासात् = as a result of this notion consistently nurtured during many past lives; पुनः पुनः = again and again; उदेति = comes up; एवम् = similarly; जगत सत्यत्व धीः = the notion that the world is real; अपि = also.

'I am the body etc.' notion comes up very quickly, as a result of this notion being nurtured consistently over many past lives. So is true with reference to the notion about the world being real. (103)

Why does this *viparītā bhāvanā* come again and again? The answer is - *Bahu janma dṛḍha abhyāsāt dehādiṣu ātma dhīḥ punaḥ punaḥ udeti*: Because of our *abhyāsa* over innumerable past lives, that (a) 'I am the body' (erroneous identity) (b) *jagat satyatva dhīḥ api* : the world is real

(erroneous understanding), we normally think that the world or *jagat* is real and is other than us.

The *jagat* really begins from the mind. Thus, the *viparītā bhāvanā* or misunderstanding is the result of a combination of two levels of errors---error in identity (*dehādiṣu ātma dhiḥ*) and error in the understanding of the world (*jagat satyam*) and its validity. (Ibid; *Śloka* 99.)

How can this error of identity and understanding be removed?-

विपरीता भावनेयमैकाग्र्यात्सा निवर्तते ।
तत्त्वोपदेशात्प्रागेव भवत्येतदुपासनात् ॥१०४॥

Viparītā bhāva neyam aikāgryāt sā nivartate
Tattvo padeśāt prāgeva bhava tyeta dupāsa nāt (104)

इयम् = this; विपरीता भावना = erroneous notion; सा = that; ऐकाग्र्यात् = by single pointedness; निवर्तते = is negated; एतत् = this single pointedness; तत्त्व उपदेशात् प्राग् एव = before the instructions of *mahāvākya*; उपासनात् = by *upāsana* of form; भवति = is attained.

This is the nature of erroneous notion (as explained in above *śloka* No. 103). It is negated by the *upāsana* (contemplation with devotion) on *Brahman* with form before the instruction of *mahāvākya* (104)

This *śloka* deals with how to remove the *viparītā bhāvanā* resulting from the two errors, erroneous identity and erroneous understanding.

Iyam viparītā bhāvanā sā aikāgryāt nivartate: *Viparītā bhāvanā* is removed by fixing the mind on the Self. At present our *ekāgratā* (conviction) is very strong on the notion that 'I am the body' and that 'the world is real'. This is so single-pointedly accepted, that nothing is able to change that conviction.

Tattva upadeśāt prāg eva upāsanaṁ bhavati: It is, therefore, necessary to discard this erroneous *ekāgratā* and develop *ekāgratā* on the Self. Before the student is exposed to the *Vedāntik* doctrine, he should adopt the technique of *upāsana*. This *upāsana* is beautifully defined by Lord *Kṛṣṇa*:

Yat karoṣi yad aśnāsi yaj juhoṣi dadāsi yat
Yat tapasyasi Kaunteya tat kuruṣva mad-arpaṇam
(*Gītā* IX-27)

Whatever you do, eat, offer, give away or practise, offer it to only one person called 'I' or *Bhagavān*. Every activity - material or spiritual, religious or contemplative, direct everything towards one goal.

There may be multiplicity of activity but the object of devotion is one. This is *ekāgratā* in *upāsana*.

Just, as one person may have *ekāgratā* for collecting wealth, another for a specific object of interest and will do so to the exclusion of all other thoughts or interests, the student of *Vedānta* when he does *upāsana* towards the Truth, develops single-pointedness of mind towards the highest thing called *Brahman* or *Paramātmā*.

The importance of the single-pointed devotion-called *upāsana* is emphasized in *Vedāntik* texts----

उपास्तयोऽत एवात्र ब्रह्मशास्त्रेऽपि चिन्तिताः ।
प्रागनभ्यासिनः पश्चाद्ब्रह्माभ्यासेन तद्भवेत् ॥१०५॥

Upāstayo'ta evātra brahma śāstre'pi cintitāḥ
Prāga nabhyā sinaḥ pascāt brahmā bhyāseṇa tad bhavet (105)

अत एव = Therefore; अत्र = here; ब्रह्म शास्त्रे अपि = in *upaniṣadik* declarations; उपास्तयः = meditations or *upāsana*-s; चिन्तिताः = are discussed; प्राग् = prior; अनभ्यासिनः = those who have not practiced *upāsana*; पश्चात् =

later; ब्रह्म अभ्यासेन = by the practice of 'I am *Brahman*'; तद् = that single-pointed; भवेत् = is attained.

Because, the single-pointedness is attained by *upāsana*, we see the declaration about *upāsana* for in the *upaniṣadik* literature for those who have not practiced *upāsana* prior to *mahāvākya* initiation. In later stages (the same seeker) is advised the practice of *Brahmābhyāsa* i.e. 'I am *Brahman*' contemplation. (105)

Ata eva: With reference to the single-pointedness of the mind by *upāsana*, *Atra brahma śāstre api*: in the study of the *vedānta śāstra* also, *upāstayaḥ cintitā* - this point is taken into consideration in a very exhaustive manner and ways of achieving it, are explained.

Prāg anabhyāsinaḥ: What about those who have never done *upāsana* before and have not gained *ekāgratā* (single-pointedness)? How will they get it?

Brahma abhyāsa tad bhavet-Such persons have no need for concern. Even if there is no *ekāgratā* now, let them go on studying the scriptures. As the study deepens and matures, slowly and steadily, the material thoughts along with their frequencies and their impact on the mind will decrease to a minimum. What is achieved by doing individual *sādhana* for several years can be achieved in a much shorter time by intense *Vedāntik* study. When, intense study of *Vedānta* is undertaken and the meaning of the words is followed clearly, gradually the words get dropped and the meaning grips the mind. Spirituality is not mimicry. There is no need to imitate any model. There are as many paths to the Lord as there are individuals. *Bhakti mārga*, *jñāna mārga* etc., are only gross classifications.

Therefore, the teacher says that, those who have never done *upāsana* earlier, need not get discouraged. All they need to do now is to do intense and sincere *Brahmābhyāsa*. They are sure to attain *ekāgratā*. By this *ekāgratā*, the *viparītā bhāvanā* or erroneous perception of one's own identity will be totally rejected.

The nature of *Brahma abhyāsa* is quoted from *Yoga Vāsiṣṭha - Utapatti Prakaraṇa 22.24* ----

तच्चिन्तनं तत्कथनमन्योन्यं तत्प्रबोधनम् ।
एतदेकपरत्वं च ब्रह्माभ्यासं विदुर्बुधाः ॥१०६॥

Tat cintanam tat kathanam anyonyam tat prabodhanam
Eta deka paratvam ca brahmā bhyāsam vidur budhāḥ (106)

तत् चिन्तनम् = contemplating on the *Brahman*; तत् कथनम् = speaking of that; अन्योन्यम् = among others; तत् प्रबोधनम् = discussing to know that; च = and; एतद् एक परत्वम् = to be totally involved in *Brahman*; बुधाः = the wise; ब्रह्माभ्यासम् = the practice of *Brahma jñāna*; विदुः = is considered.

Constant contemplation on *Brahman*, talking about it, and discussing it among each other, thus a total involvement in *Brahman* at the exclusion of others, is considered as practice of *Brahma jñāna* by the wise. (106)

Brahma abhyāsam vidur budhāḥ-*Brahma abhyāsa* means a constant practice to associate our thought, mind and our whole being, with the theme of the Absolute. For example attending *satsaṅga* is a part of *Brahma abhyāsa*. *Satsaṅga* means being in the company of *sat vastu*. *Sat vastu* is nothing other than *Parabrahma Paramātmā*. According to the wise, *Brahma abhyāsa* has four main components:

(i) *Tat cintanam*-continuous contemplation about the Absolute. *Ātma cintanam* means absence of *anātmā cintanam* i.e. thoughts other than of Self or *Brahman*. The moment there is *anātmā cintanam*, the mind forms a shape. When there is *ātma cintanam* two things happen: either the mind gets absorbed i.e. *mano-laya*; or the mind is able to maintain its existence, without the content-i.e. an empty

mind as distinguished from a vacant mind. (A vacant mind is a confused mind).

As long as, one is able to sustain the empty-ness of the mind, so long we are having *ātma cintanam*.

On the other hand, *anātma cintanam* means going away from our own being, in the imaginary conceptual conditioning of time and space. Instead, the *sādhaka* must start thinking about the world in such a manner that he finds out the *tattva* or essence behind every situation. For example, when the thought of an object leads to frustration or depression, that is *anātma cintanam*. If the same object is thought about in such a way that both the object and the thought disappear, and only 'I' remains, it is called *ātma cintanam*. If this line of analysis is pursued it will lead to withdrawal from *anātma vastu* and ultimately take one to one's own Being. Such an analysis should be vigilantly applied to everything conditioned by time and space so that the same conclusion is reached repeatedly. 'I' cannot be conditioned by time and space because I am the one who is supporting both. 'I' myself do not have a shape nor am 'I', subject to modifications etc.

(ii) *Tat kathanam*-Talking about *Vedāntik* subjects with like-minded persons, and eschewing all the subjects which are not concerned about *ātma cintanam* (*Anyā vāco vimuñcatha - Muṇḍaka Up. II-5*). Since, conversation needs to be made with a variety of people on a variety of subjects, the *sādhaka* should maintain just the minimum of interest required and not get involved too seriously or intensely.

(iii) *Anyonyam tat prabodhanam*-Mutual transfer of *Ātman-Brahman* knowledge during discussion or conversation.

(iv) *Etad eka paratvam*-Nothing other than the single-pointed theme for the mind, is entertained.

The mind is not allowed to entertain any *anātma vicāra* i.e. thoughts other than the Self. If such thoughts do rise, the *sādhaka* should be able to pull back the mind to the Self. That alone becomes the theme of our total life. Everything else is secondary.

Such a single-minded enquiry of the Truth with reference to the *śruti vākya* is called *Brahma abhyāsa* or enquiry of the Truth.

Upaniṣadik statements (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up. 4.4.21; Muṇḍaka Up. 3.1.4.*) are quoted in support of the need of 'single-pointed' theme of the *Brahman*----

तमेव धीरो विज्ञाय प्रज्ञां कुर्वीत ब्राह्मणः ।

नानुध्यायाद्बहूञ्छब्दान्वाचो विग्लापनं हि तत् ॥१०७॥

Tameva dhīro vijñāya prajñāṁ kurvīta brāhmaṇaḥ
Nānu dhyāyāt bahūñ-chabdān vāco viglāpanaṁ hi tat (107)

धीरः = a seeker practicing self-restrain; ब्राह्मणः = wise; तम् एव = Pure Self; विज्ञाय = having known firmly; प्रज्ञाम् = contemplate single-pointedly; कुर्वीत = should attempt; बहून् शब्दान् = literature dealing with non-spiritual theme; न = not; अनुध्यायात् = study and reflect; हि = because; तत् = that (study etc.); वाचः = of the speech and mind; विग्लापनम् = waste of energy.

A wise seeker endowed with spiritual discipline, should contemplate single-pointedly for knowing the *Brahman* firmly. All other literature dealing with non-spiritual theme should not be studied and contemplated upon, because such a study is merely a waste of energy of speech and mind. (107)

Dhīraḥ Brāhmaṇaḥ: He who is engaged in the enquiry of *Parabrahma Paramātmā*. The word *Brāhmaṇaḥ* as used

here does not refer to the *Varṇāśrama dharma* of *Manu Smṛti*. In *vedānta śāstra Dhīraḥ Brāhmaṇaḥ* means *Dhīraḥ Puruṣaḥ*, one leading his life according to the understanding developed in the light of scriptures.

This *Dhīra Puruṣaḥ* is defined by Lord Kṛṣṇa in *Gītā* (II-15) thus:

*Yam hi na vyathayanty-ete puruṣam puruṣa ṛṣabha
Sama duḥkha sukham dīram so'mṛtatvāya kalpate*

He who is not disturbed by *sukha* and *duḥkha* (pleasure and pain) and he who keeps himself totally in equipoise, such a person is called *Dhīra Puruṣaḥ*. He alone is qualified for knowing his immortal Being.

Thus *tam eva dhīraḥ brāhmaṇaḥ*, the student who is committed to *Brahma abhyāsa*, and who pursues the thought '*Brahman* is my nature', with all the qualities of *śama*, *dama*, etc. required for undertaking such a discipline, *viññāya* one who comes to realise this thought that 'I am *Brahman*' not as a mere thought, but as his own Being. *Prajñām kurvīta*:- The seeker should keep this 'I am *Brahman*' thought. *Bahūn śabdān na anudhyāyāt*-The seeker should not waste his time on *Anātma śāstra-s*-those words which take him away from the Truth and from the contemplation of the Truth. Once interest in *Vedāntik* pursuit deepens and matures, interest in other subjects will decline on their own.

Vācaḥ Viglāpanam-It is a waste of energy and only increase the wordly themes as the content of the mind.

The importance of single-pointedness is now emphasised----

अनन्याश्चिन्तयन्तो मां ये जनाः पर्युपासते ।
तेषां नित्याभियुक्तानां योगक्षेमं वहाम्यहम् ॥१०८॥

*Ananyā ścinta yanto mām ye janāḥ paryu pāsate
Teṣāṃ nityā bhīyuktānām yoga kṣemaṃ vahāmyaham* (108)

ये जनाः = those devotees; अनन्याः = with non-dual identity; माम् = to me; चिन्तयन्तः = contemplate; पर्युपासते = meditate in all places; नित्य अभियुक्तानाम् = ever united with me; तेषाम् = to them; अहम् = I; योग क्षेमम् = needs and protection; वहामि = I take care.

Those devotees who are ever united with me in non-dual contemplation in all places and times; I grant all their needs and protection. (108)

This is a quotation from the *Bhagavad Gītā* (IX.22) to support the same point the importance of single-minded *Brahma abhyāsa* and to define the qualities of those engaged in *Brahma abhyāsa*. When this statement is understood from the *Vedāntik* point of view, it reveals deeper meaning aimed at by the Lord.

Three characteristics distinguish the *Brahmābhyaśī* student:

1. *Ye janāḥ paryupāsate*-Wherever (any place) they go, they talk about *Brahman* (God, *Bhagavān*). In other words they go beyond the limitations of space (*deśaḥ*) for being one with Him.
2. *Teṣāṃ nitya abhiyuktānām*-Whenever (any time) they talk, they talk only about *Bhagavān* i.e. they go beyond the limitations of time (*kālāḥ*). *Nitya abhiyuktā* is possible only when we do not separate ourselves from ourselves. Gross body or mind is not with us all the 24 hours. But 'I'-the Absolute is all the time with us.
3. *Ananyāḥ cintayantaḥ*-Their talking about the *Paramātmā* is not as if they were talking about an object (*vastu*) but (*ananya*) about their close personal self. Thus, they go beyond the conditioning of object (*vastutaḥ*)

In this way they have rejected all the three conditionings of *deśa*, *kāla*, *vastu* (space, time and object) and through

ekāgratā-single pointedness, *viparītā bhāvanā*-erroneous notion is overcome.

Yogakṣemam Vahāmyaham-The Lord is committed to take care of the well being of such individuals who have surrendered all their worries to His contemplation. So the *Brahmābhyāsī* is not concerned about the maintenance of his own life. His sole concern is only about the Truth.

The conclusion of above discussion is ---

इति श्रुतिस्मृती नित्यमात्मन्येकाग्रतां धियः ।
विधत्ते विपरीताया भावनायाः क्षयाय हि ॥१०९॥

*Iti śruti smṛtī nityam ātman yekāgratām dhiyaḥ
Vidhatto viparītāyā bhāvanāyāḥ kṣayāya hi* (109)

इति = thus; श्रुति स्मृती = the words of *upaniṣad*-s and *Gītā* both; विपरीतायाः भावनायाः = of the contrary identity; क्षयाय = for the destruction of; हि = indeed; आत्मनि = in the Self; नित्यम् = always; धियः = of the intellect; एकाग्रताम् = single-pointedness; विधत्तः = is emphasized.

Thus, (it is clear) both the *upaniṣad* and *Gītā* etc., emphasize the single-pointedness of the mind in contemplation on the Self, for the destruction of contrary identity. (109)

Iti śruti smṛtī nityam ātmani ekāgratām dhiyaḥ etc. - In this way, the *Veda*-s, *Bhagavad Gītā* etc. stress the need for constant single-pointed attention on the pure Self (*ātman*!).

Viparītāyā Bhāvanāyāḥ Kṣayāya-Such one-pointed contemplation (*ekāgratā*) on the Self will result in the decline of the obstacles called *Viparītā bhāvanā*.

The nature of *viparītā bhāvanā* is ---

यद्यथा वर्तते तस्य तत्त्वं हित्वान्यथात्वधीः ।
विपरीता भावना स्यात्पित्रादावरिधीर्यथा ॥११०॥

*Yadyathā vartate tasya tattvaṁ hitvā nyathā tvadhīḥ
Viparītā bhāvanā syāt pitrādā vari dhīr yathā* (110)

यद् = an object; यथा = as; वर्तते = exists; तस्य = its; तत्त्वम् = real nature; हित्वा = rejecting that; अन्यथात्व-धीः = the understanding it to be other thing; विपरीता = contrary; भावना = understanding; स्यात् = is; यथा = as; पित्रादौ = in the parents; अरि-धीः = the notion of an enemy.

Viparītā bhāvanā i.e. contrary understanding is mistaken identity about a thing which is quite opposite to the nature of that object; as one mistakes the parents etc., to be enemy due to mistake. (110)

What is the nature of this *viparītā bhāvanā* (erroneous understanding) which is a great obstacle in *Brahma abhyāsa*?

Yad yathā vartate tasya tattvaṁ hitvā anyathātvā dhīḥ: Instead of perceiving things as they are with reference to their essential nature, sometimes opposite perception of contrary essence is perceived. This is *viparītā bhāvanā*.

Pitrādau ari dhīḥ-The example given is that of a son who, when his father admonishes him, considers him his enemy. The essential nature of the father is concern for the good of his child. But this is rejected by the child, having come under the influence of unwanted (*anya*) factors. So the father is understood to be the opposite of what he really is! In this way the reality becomes secondary and what is projected or imagined becomes the reality.

The *viparītā bhāvanā* and its impact as a potent obstacle for knowing the Self is ---

आत्मा देहादिभिन्नोऽयं मिथ्या चेदं जगत्तयोः ।

देहाद्यात्मत्वसत्यत्वधीर्विपर्ययभावना ॥१११॥

Ātmā dehādi bhinno'yaṁ mithyā cedam jagattayoḥ
Dehādyā tmatva satyatva dhīr viparyaya bhāvanā (111)

अयम् = this; आत्मा = Self; देह आदि भिन्नः = is other than body etc; च = and; इदम् = this; जगत् = world; मिथ्या = is an illusion; तयोः = of these two; देहाद्यात्मत्व = being body etc; सत्यत्व = reality; धीः = understanding; विपर्यय भावना = is erroneous understanding.

In reality, the Self is other than the body etc., and the world is an illusion. However, when the Self is taken to be body etc., and the world is considered to be real, it is called as *viparītā bhāvanā* (111)

Ayam ātmā dehādi bhinnah idam jagat ca mithyā-The *śruti mahāvākya* says *Ayam Ātmā Brahma* (*Māṇḍūkya Up.-2*). The *ātmā* referred to is our own essential nature, and it is different from our three bodies---the gross, the subtle and the causal and not just the gross body. This world is *mithyā*-an illusion. *Mithyā* does not mean 'absence'. Absence is *asat*. We need not worry about that which is absent. On the other hand, *mithyā* is that which is not but appears to be. The *jagat* is constantly changing. What is constantly changing cannot be the reality. At the same time none of the changes can exist without some unchanging substratum. This unchanging substratum of the world is the Reality, and the appearance of the changing world is *mithyā*. How can the same thing simultaneously be changing and unchanging?

Lord Kṛṣṇa in *Bhagavad Gītā* (IV-6) says:

Ajo'pi sann avyayātmā bhūtānām īśvaro'pi san
Prakṛtiṁ svām adhiṣṭhāya sambhavāmya ātma māyayā

Although I am unborn, I appear to have been born, although there are no modifications in me; unless there are modifications there cannot be birth; although I am not a doer, yet I am called *īśvara*, the creator of the world.

In this way birth etc. are superimposed on 'I' the Absolute. This is called the *jagat mithyā*.

Dehādi ātmatva satyatva dhīḥ viparyayā bhāvanā-Although what has been stated above is the Truth, namely, *ātmā* is other than the three bodies and the world is *mithyā*, however, due to erroneous perceptions-*viparītā bhāvanā*-just the opposite convictions are held, namely the body is the Self and the world is real. Thus, what was stated in the previous *śloka* (110) is borne out - *Yadyathā vartate tasya tattvam hitvā anyathātvā dhīḥ*-that erroneous conviction out of misconstruing a subject to be the opposite of what it really is !

Therefore, whenever *viparītā bhāvanā* arises in the *Sādhaka's* mind, it is important to bear the above analysis in mind.

These two types of erroneous notions are negated by single-pointedness in enquiry----

तत्त्वभावनया नश्येत्साऽतो देहातिरिक्ताताम् ।

आत्मनो भावयेत्तद्वन्मिथ्यात्वं जगतोऽनिशम् ॥११२॥

Tattva bhāvanayā naśyet sā'to dehati riktatām
Ātmano bhāvayet tadvat mithyātvam jagato'niśam (112)

तत्त्व भावनया = by constant practice of contemplation on one's essential nature; सा = the *viparītā bhāvanā*; नश्येत् = is negated; अतः = thereafter; आत्मनः = of the Self; देह अतिरिक्ताताम् = otherness than the body etc; तद् वत् = similarly; जगतः = of the world; मिथ्यात्वम् = illusory nature; अनिशम् = constantly; भावयेत् = one should contemplate.

- This *viparītā bhāvanā* (erroneous perception) is negated by constant contemplation on the essential nature of the Self. Therefore, one should practice contemplation on the fact that the Self is other than the body etc., and the world is an illusion. (112)

Sā tattva bhāvanayā naśyēt-This *viparītā bhāvanā* is destroyed by the *tattva bhāvanā*--contemplation on the true essence; namely, I am not the body but I am the supporter of the body. *Ātmanaḥ dehāt atiriktatām*-I am other than the body. Similarly, (*tadvat*) in the same way (reflection on) *jagataḥ mithyātvam*-that the world is *mithyā*, it is only an appearance (illusion) and is not to be taken seriously. The world can be defined as acceptance of duality to be real i.e. the separateness between the knower and the known. Till this difference exists, the three problems---of desire, anger and fear---will be there. Whenever, there is something other than me, one will have desire for or against that object; if there is something other than me and if there is an obstacle in the fulfilment of my desire, there will be anger; and if there is something other than me there is always fear either of losing it or of being destroyed by it. In this way, the root cause of all the problems of the mind is this sense of separate-ness between the knower and the known called the *jagat* or the world!

Aniśam Bhāvayet-In this way, the seeker should go on reflecting on these two thoughts continuously. This is the highest *sādhana*-to keep these two thoughts constantly nourished and nurtured and not allowing them to die.

How is this to be done? By a very simple method of not taking events and individuals in life seriously; by doing our best and never looking back; by living wholly and totally in the present and not allowing oneself to be fractionalised either by memories of the past or projections for the future. It is the 'inability to be in the present' that does not allow us constant *tattva cintanam*.

Tattva bhāvanā means reflection again and again on the meaning of these two thoughts, analysing every situation and experience in the light of these two thoughts. Thus, at each step constant *cintanam* should be practiced - *aniśam bhāvayet*--until the conviction that I am other than this body is firmly established.

Similarly, when one thinks again and again about the illusory nature of the world, the trials and tribulations lose their potency and ability to cause pain. Intense reaction to pains and pleasures indicate that we still believe the world is real. When this intensity of reaction to the world declines, it is a sign that one is entering the arena of *jagataḥ mithyātvam*--the discovery about the illusory nature of the world.

To develop a state of mind which is constantly established in the twin thoughts of 'I am other than this body' and 'this world is *mithyā*' is to be a *sthīta prajña* of *Gñā* (II-56).

*Duḥkheṣu anudvignamanāḥ Sukheṣu vigatsprhaḥ
Vīta-rāga-bhaya-krodhaḥ Sthīta-dhīr muni rucyate*

He whose mind is not perturbed by adversity, who does not crave for happiness, who is free from desire, fear and anger, he is a contemplative Seer of firm understanding.

He is the one who is practising *jagataḥ mithyātvam*.

In the *Muṇḍaka Up.* (I-II-12) it is stated:

Parīkṣya lokān karma citān brāhmaṇaḥ nirvedam āyāt

When the experience associated with action is analysed it will lead to dispassion, for the futility of activity and its gain or loss is understood. The dispassion thus born of enquiry and wisdom further leads to the understanding that the world is an illusion - i.e. *jagataḥ mithyātvam*.

Therefore, by constant enquiry, analysis and pondering over these two aspects, the *viparītā bhāvanā* is destroyed. Contemplate on the illusoriness of the world i.e. the difference between the knower and the known is an illusion.

The resulting knowledge will be that the sense of separateness is imaginary and not real; *aniśam bhāvayet*-one should constantly contemplate on this truth.

Do we expect any rules, do's, don't's etc., with regard to this contemplation mentioned above? ----

किं मन्त्रजपवन्मूर्तिध्यानवद्वात्मभेदधीः ।

जगन्मिथ्यात्वधीश्चात्र व्यावर्त्या स्यादुतान्यथा ॥११३॥

*Kiṁ mantra japavan mūrti dhyānavat vātma bheda dhīḥ
Jagan mithyātva dhī ścātra vyā vartyā syādu tānyathā* (113)

आत्मभेद धीः = the understanding about the separateness of Self from the body, etc.; जगत् मिथ्यात्व धीः = the understanding regarding the illusory nature of the world; च = and; मन्त्र जपवत् = like the practice of *mantra japa*; वा = or; मूर्ति ध्यानवत् = like that of contemplation on the form of the Lord; अत्र = in this contemplation mentioned above; किम् व्यावर्त्या स्यात् = is it associated with do's and don't's; उत = or; अन्यथा = like that of other worldly affairs, without too many do's and don't's.

Do we expect, the practice of contemplation on the twin aspects of: (i) separateness of Self from body and (ii) the world is an illusion, to be of the similar nature as that of *mantra japa* or contemplation on form of the Lord or, one can do it like any other undertakings? (113)

Ātma bheda dhīḥ-The knowledge that I am other than the body (this is with reference to the previous *śloka*). Discrimination of Self from Not-Self. *Jagan mithyātva dhīḥ*-knowledge that the world (of names and forms) is *mithyā*-an illusion.

[Note: *Dhīḥ*-is a word used in *Vedāntik* context in a typical sense. For example, when looking at a golden ornament, when the attention is focussed on the gold and not on the shape,

form and name of the ornament, it is *svaṇa-buddhi* If on the other hand, the attention is on the name and form and not the gold, it is *alankāra buddhi* and one can get cheated. Similarly, *sat buddhi* means that perception of the mind which keeps the *sat vastu* as the only focus of attention. In other words, it is the ability to discriminate the Self from the not-Self. That is *bheda-dhīḥ*]

Mantra japavat etc. - In this particular subject of *tattva bhāvanā* (*atra*) is one to repeat again the two thoughts (*vyāvartyā*) as one does in *mantra japam* and the contemplation of the form.

The question raised relates to the method to be followed in the contemplation of the two thoughts (I am other than the body and the world is an illusion). We were told in the previous *śloka* to meditate on these two thoughts again and again. *Aniśam bhāvayet*- The student asks whether this means like doing *mantra japa* or the *dhyāna* of a particular form? If so, are there any rules and regulations to be followed in *tattva bhāvanā* as in *mantra sādhanā* or *mūrti sādhanā* with reference to time, place, technique, do's, don't's etc?

The answer is----

अन्यथेति विजानीहि दृष्टार्थत्वेन भुक्तिवत् ।

बुभुक्षुर्जपवद्भुङ्क्ते न कश्चिन्नियतः क्वचित् ॥११४॥

*Anyatheti vijānihi dṛṣṭār thatvena bhukti vat
Bubhukṣur japavat bhunkte na kaści nniyataḥ kvacit* (114)

अन्यथा इति = by another method; विजानीहि = know to be; दृष्टार्थत्वेन = because the result of this contemplation is directly experienced; भुक्तिवत् = like that of meals; बुभुक्षुः = the hungry person; कश्चित् = any; जपवत् = like *japa sādhanā*; नियतः = associated with rules etc; क्वचित् = any where; न = not; भुङ्क्ते = takes meals.

The method of contemplation in this case should be like any other undertaking; because, the effect of this is obviously experienced then and there. For example, a hungry person is not seen anywhere taking his food with rules and regulations, like *japa sādhanā* etc. (114)

Anyathā-It is different. It is not as in *mantra japa sādhanā*, or contemplation on form. What is the difference?

Vijānīhi dṛṣṭārtha tvena:- The result of this contemplation is immediate - not in a later period of time. An example is given of this immediacy of effect.

Bhuktivat-A hungry man does not follow any rules and regulations in satisfying his hunger. Satiation of hunger is the only concern on this mind. So when there is urgency there is no question of too many do's and don't's, and the satisfaction of hunger is instantaneous.

Japavat na bhunkte etc.-In the same way, when there is urgency to discover the Truth, all rules and regulations are swept aside. Otherwise it will only mean that ways and means are discovered for procrastination of meditation. When the goal is clear, all other considerations are secondary. When there is no clarity of or urgency for the goal, then there is abundance of doubts.

Therefore, one who has an urgency for enquiry cannot afford to be diverted from his goal by secondary considerations like rules and regulations.

Just as, when hunger is of paramount importance, cessation of that hunger is the primary concern, so also, in Self enquiry the seeker has to keep contemplating without rules and regulations, without concept of time with these two thoughts as the only theme of his thinking.

The example is further analysed ----

अश्नाति वा न वाश्नाति भुङ्क्ते वा स्वेच्छयाऽन्यथा ।
येन केन प्रकारेण क्षुधामपनिनीषति ॥११५॥

Aśnāti-vā na vāśnāti bhunkte vā svecchayā'nyathā
Yena kena prakāreṇa kṣudhā mapā ninīṣati (115)

अश्नाति वा = he eats; न वा अश्नाति = or does not eat; अन्यथा वा = or is engaged in other activities; स्वेच्छया = by one's own desire; भुङ्क्ते = one eats; येन केन प्रकारेण = by whatever means; क्षुधाम् = the hunger; अपनिनीषति = is concerned with satiation of hunger.

With a sole concern of removal of the pangs of hunger, one may eat, if the food is available; or may not eat if it is not available, and keep himself occupied in other activities. By whatever way possible, one is concerned only in the removal of hunger and nothing else. (115)

Aśnāti vā na vāśnāti bhunkte va svecchayā anyathā etc. If there is food he will take it. If there is no food he will not take it. He may do other things like sitting or walking. Taking food in any manner he wants. *Yena kena prakāreṇa*-In all these examples, the only criterion is whether he goes in for eating for the satiation of hunger or does not go near the food because there is no hunger. His association or disassociation with the presence or absence of food has only one criterion namely, whether hunger is troubling him or not.

Similarly, when a seeker does enquiry, how much he gets involved in the world is indirectly proportionate to the intensity of his fulfilment as a seeker. For a spiritual seeker, things other than the Self-knowledge are secondary. What is important, is whether he talks or does not talk, whatever he does or does not do anything (*yena kena prakāreṇa*) all the time, in every experience, he will be constantly reminding himself of his real nature. The rest is of no consequence.

Why we cannot compare the contemplation under discussion with that of *japa* etc? ----

नियमेन जपं कुर्यादकृतौ प्रत्यवायतः ।
अन्यथाकरणेऽनर्थः स्वरवर्णविपर्ययात् ॥११६॥

Niyamena japam kuryāt akṛtau pratyā vāyataḥ
Anyathā karaṇe'narthaḥ svara varṇa viparyayāt (116)

जपम् = the repetition of *mantra*; नियमेन = by rules etc; कुर्यात् = should be done; अकृतौ = if not done as per rules etc; प्रत्यवायतः = the sin of omission; अन्यथाकरणे = if done wrong way; स्वर वर्ण विपर्ययात् = due to error in chanting, pronunciation etc; अनर्थः = results in misery.

(Because), the repetition of a *mantra* must be done with proper rules and regulations etc, - if not, will lead to sins of omission. If there are errors on account of pronunciation, punctuation etc. it leads to results that may end in misery. (116)

Contrary to *japa sādhanā* is *tattva bhāvanā*. The former is subject to strict rules and regulations. If all the prescribed rules are not observed, the sins of omission will result. If proper pronunciation and correct punctuations are not used, it will have a wrong meaning and will produce the contrary effect. For example *Namaḥ Śivāya* means I salute the Pure Self. But if pronounced *Namo Śivāya*, it means I salute, inauspiciousness.

Therefore, *japa sādhanā* has to be done strictly according to prescribed rules and regulations and systematically.

Unlike the *japa sādhanā* etc. the example of hunger satiation explains, the obvious effect of removal of erroneous notion about one's self and the world, which leads to immediate removal of problems of life, as seen in hunger.

Therefore ----

क्षुधेव दृष्टबाधाकृद्विपरीता च भावना ।
जेया केनाप्युपायेन नास्त्यत्रानुष्ठितेः क्रमः ॥११७॥

Kṣudheva dṛṣṭa bādha kṛd viparītā ca bhāvanā
Jeyā kenā pyupā yena nāstyā trānuṣṭhiteḥ kramaḥ (117)

क्षुधा इव = like the hunger; विपरीता भावना च = the erroneous notion also; दृष्ट बाधा कृत् = is the creator immediate problems; केन अपि = by whatever; उपायेन = means; जेया = overcome; अत्र = this *viparītā bhāvanā*; अनुष्ठितेः = for the contemplation on the essence of the world and Self; क्रमः = the rules etc.; न अस्ति = is not expected.

The problems resulting from the erroneous notions are obvious and experienced by all; and need to be removed immediately, by whatever means that are available for it (without wasting time on details like rules etc.). There are no special rules etc. expected about it. (117)

When one is hungry, one takes food and the hunger is satiated instantaneously on consumption of food. Similarly (*kṣudhā iva* etc.) once it is seen/understood that all the problems that are experienced, are because of the *viparītā bhāvanā*, it is essential that it must be overcome by any means available.

The *viparītā bhāvanā* is constituted of two things: thinking that the world is other than 'I' and taking the other-than 'I'-ness as reality. This wrong notion must be conquered by whatever means available. For this, no rules etc. are expected to be followed.

Once the basic principles have been learnt, there is no further question of, whether this should be done first or that. In the contemplation effort, there are no rules (*krama*) as in *japa sādhanā* etc.

What are those means by which one can overcome the *viparītā bhāvanā*? ----

उपायः पूर्वमेवोक्तस्तच्चिन्ताकथनादिकः ।
एतदेकपरत्वेऽपि निर्बन्धो ध्यानवन्न हि ॥११८॥

*Upāyaḥ pūrva mevoktaḥ tat cintā kathanā dikāḥ
Etadeka paratve'pi nirbandho dhyāna vannahi* (118)

उपायः = the remedy for destruction of erroneous notion;
तत् चिन्ता कथन आदिकः = such as contemplation, discussion
about *Brahman* etc; पूर्वम् = earlier already; एव = certainly;
उक्तः = is said; एतद् एक परत्वे अपि = with reference
to single-pointedness etc.; ध्यान-वत् = like contemplation
on form; निर्बन्धः = strictness of rules etc.; न हि = are
not.

The means for the removal of erroneous notion were already
discussed earlier, such as contemplation, discussion etc., about
the *Brahman* (*śloka* No. 106). For the single-pointedness about
the *Brahmābhyāsa* no specific rules etc., are called for (118).

Upāyaḥ-For the removal of the *viparītā bhāvanā* i.e.
misapprehension of the Truth, *Tat cintanam* etc. -the two
methods of contemplating on the *Brahman* and talking
about the *Brahman* have already been told. Constantly
contemplating, thinking, reading, talking and studying about
the Truth alone is called *Brahmābhyāsa*.

Etat eka paratve api-By this method, one is able
to attain single-pointedness and focus his attention on
the Absolute.

Dhyānavat na hi -For the *sādhana*, there are no
stipulations of compulsory rules as in *dhyānam upāsanā*.

According to yoga *śāstra*, *dhyāna* is the ability of
the mind to focus on an object. The ability to focus
on an object in a particular place is *dhāraṇa*. The ability
to focus on an object in particular place for a long period
of time is *samādhi*.

In *dhyānam*, the *sādhaka* ties his mind to an object - in
a particular form - in a particular place (nowhere else) - then
he holds on to the form of his *Iṣṭa devatā* (object)
in his heart (with reference to place, say for one hour,
with reference to time). Thus, the *dhyāna* is conditioned
with reference to time, place and object. The mind
is tied down by these three parameters. These constitute
the *nirbandhaḥ*.

Nirbandhaḥ dhyāna---etc. -In contemplation of the
Brahman, the mind is tied down to nothing. On the
contrary, the mind is 'untied'. All the knots are undone.
Therefore, the mind does not entertain any importance
with reference to object, place or time. Time - place - object
conditionalities (*nirbandha-s*) are only aids to the seeker,
to draw his mind away from the plurality, to (the One)
unity.

In the case of contemplation on Self through
Brahmābhyāsa as explained in *śloka* 106, the mind is
trained to focus its attention beyond time, space and
object.

This is the difference between the single-pointedness
achieved in the *dhyāna upāsanā*, and the single-pointedness
achieved through *Brahmābhyāsa*.

In this context it is important to clearly understand
the meaning of the term 'single-pointedness'. It means
the ability of the mind to focus on any theme in any
moment of time, at any place, in the way desired.
Single-pointedness is not a bondage. It is the ability
to keep the mind focused at one's command.

By *Brahmābhyāsa*, the mind is able to contemplate
on the Truth at any time.

The nature of *nirbandhaḥ* i.e. anchoring mind to
something in *upāsanā* and *Brahmābhyāsa* is ----

मूर्तिप्रत्ययसान्तत्यमन्यानन्तरितं धियः ।
ध्यानं तत्रातिनिर्बन्धो मनसश्चञ्चलात्मनः ॥११९॥

*Mūrti pratyaya sântatyam anyānantari tam dhiyaḥ
Dhyānam tatrāti nirbandho manasa ścañcalā tmanah* (119)

धियः = of the thoughts; मूर्ति प्रत्यय सान्तत्यम् = continuous thought flow towards one object; अन्यान् अन्तरितम् = without any dissimilar thought; ध्यानम् = is known as *dhyānam*; तत्र = in this *dhyānam*; चञ्चल आत्मनः मनसः = of the mind that naturally unsteady; अति निर्बन्धः = is tied down fully.

Dhyānam is a continuous flow of thoughts of similar type towards the object of contemplation with the exclusion of any dissimilar thoughts. In this state, the mind, which is essentially unsteady, is tied down to the object of contemplation. (119)

Manasaḥ cañcalātmanah-The mind is essentially unsteady. Such a mind is tied down in contemplation on form (*mūrti dhyānam*). This is defined as *mūrti pratyaya sântatyam* i.e. thoughts belonging to the same species. For e.g. *Kṛṣṇa japa*, brings only *Kṛṣṇa* thoughts incessantly. *Anyān antaritam*-There is no other thought of any other species. This is *dhyānam*. The mind is tied down to one form in one particular place, for an extended period of time.

Tatra-in this process of *dhyāna sādhanā* the mind being of the nature of constant change, is not allowed to move. This is what happens in *mūrti sādhanā*.

Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa is reported about the unsteady nature of the mind by *Arjuna*----

चञ्चलं हि मनः कृष्ण प्रमाथि बलवददृढम् ।
तस्याहं निग्रहं मन्ये वायोरिव सुदुष्करम् ॥१२०॥

*Cañcalam hi manaḥ kṛṣṇa pramāthi balavat dṛḍham
Tasyāham nigrahaṁ manye vayoriva suduṣkaram* (120)

कृष्ण = O' Lord *Kṛṣṇa*; मनः = the mind; हि = indeed; चञ्चलम् = is unsteady; प्रमाथि = rebellious; बलवत् = strong; दृढम् = firm; तस्य = of such a mind; निग्रहम् = restrain; अहम् = I; वायोः इव = like the wind; सुदुष्करम् = very difficult; मन्ये = consider.

O' Lord *Kṛṣṇa*, the mind is indeed, unsteady, rebellious, strong and firm. I consider the restrain of such a mind very difficult, as that of restrain of wind. (120)

The fickleness of the mind was also the problem with *Arjuna* as can be seen in this *śloka* which is a quotation from the *Bhagavad Gītā* (VI-34). *Arjuna* tells Lord *Kṛṣṇa*: The mind is always in a state of unsteadiness. Not only has it the strength to churn the sense organs, it is also strong and obstinate. To control such a mind is as difficult as controlling the wind.

In the context of *Brahmābhyāsa*, this has an important implication for the *sādhaka*. Forcing the mind to meditate on a certain *mantra* in a certain place and for a certain period of time will only result in considerable frustration. On the other hand, if the *sādhaka* is constantly thinking and talking about the same theme viz. 'I am other than this body', 'this world is *mithyā*', etc. in due course of time, the mind develops the ability to discover the presence of the Truth in spite of the many-ness.

Yet another quotation from *Yoga Vāsiṣṭha* supporting the unsteady nature of the mind is ----

अप्यब्धिपानान्महतः सुमेरुन्मूलनादपि ।
अपि वह्न्यशनात्साधो विषमश्चित्तनिग्रहः ॥१२१॥

*Apīyabdhī pānān mahataḥ sumerūn mūlanād api
Api vahnaya śanāt sādho viśama ścitta nigrahaḥ* (121)

साधो = O' Pure *Rāma*, महतः = of great; अब्धि पानात् = drinking the ocean; अपि = also; सुमेरु उन्मूलनात् = in comparison to uprooting the mountain *Sumeru*; अपि = also; वह्निः = fire; अश्नात् अपि = eating also; चित्त निग्रहः = control of mind; विषमः = difficult.

O' Great *Rāma*, the control of mind is more difficult, than drinking the great oceans or uprooting the great mountain *Sumeru* or even consumption of fire. (121)

The same point about the difficulty in controlling the ever-changing mind, is made by quoting from *Yoga Vāsīṣṭha*. *Vāsīṣṭha ṛṣi* tells *Śrī Rāma*

O' *Rāmacandra*-It is easier to drink the whole ocean; or to uproot the Mount *Meru* or to swallow fire but to control the mind is very difficult.

It is the nature of the mind to be unsteady. All the struggle to tie it down is of no avail. More important is to discover why the process of thinking is initiated in the first place than this mechanical application of brakes to the unsteady mind to stop thought flow. Once the root cause is discovered, remove that. The whole illusion of sequential existence of time will be removed by this process.

In this manner comparison is made of *dhyānābhyāsa* and *Brahmābhyāsa*

The uniqueness of *Brahmābhyāsa* is ----

कथनादौ न निर्बन्धः शृङ्खलाबद्धदेहवत् ।
किञ्चनन्तेतिहासाद्यैर्विनोदो नाट्यवद्वियः ॥१२२॥

*Katha nādaḥ na nirbandhaḥ śrīn khalā baddha deha vat
Kintva nante tihāsā dyair vinodo nātya vat dhiyaḥ* (122)

कथन आदौ = in the matter of discussion about *Brahman* ; निर्बन्धः = anchoring; न = is not; शृङ्खला बद्ध देह वत् = like a body tied down by a chain; किन्तु = but; नाट्यवत् = like enjoying a drama etc; अनन्त = ancient; इतिहास आद्यैः = like the historical themes; धियः = for the intellect; विनोदः = an entertainment.

Unlike the contemplation on form etc., the *Brahmābhyāsa* that includes discussion about the nature of *Brahman* etc., there is no anchoring to anything like that of a body secured by chain etc., but it is a joy of entertainment for the intellect as one discusses the ancient historical themes. (122)

In *mūrti dhyāna sādhanā*, the effort is to tie down the mind as if by a chain, to the object of contemplation. In *Brahmābhyāsa*, it is constantly talking about the *Paramātmā tattva*, from all possible angles and there is no tying down of the mind to an object of contemplation.

Kintu ananta etc. - In the study of *Purāṇā-s*, historical accounts etc., the mind is not tied down to one place, but in and through everywhere our attention is drawn to the Absolute. For example in the *Purāṇa* story of *Prahlāda* many principles are established, the seeker can contemplate on the Lord through a variety of experiences in the story, and he discovers that the *Paramātmā* is the material cause of the world. Therefore, he has no doubt that the Lord is present in the pillar. Thus although many things are discussed, through all of them, only one Truth is being established. Therefore, the mind is able to keep its nature of 'many thought-ness' and yet this does not become a burden to the one owning such a mind. On the contrary it is *vinodaḥ*---a source of joy and entertainment for the mind.

Therefore, a devotee of the Lord will never get bored, because he can always think of so many themes which will keep him close to the contemplation of the *Paramātmā*. Such a *Brahmābhyāsa* should be constantly practised.

The study of *Purāṇā-s* etc. may be a disturbance and *Brahmābhyāsa* may be weakened?

The answer is----

चिदेवात्मा जगन्मिथ्येत्यत्र पर्यवसानतः ।
निदिध्यासनविक्षेपो नेतिहासादिभिर्भवेत् ॥१२३॥

Cidevātmā jagan mithyeti atra parya vasānataḥ
Nididhyāsana vikṣepo netihāsā dibhīr bhavet (123)

आत्मा = the Self; चित् एव = is pure consciousness; जगत् = the world; मिथ्या = is an illusion; इति = thus; अत्र = in this way; पर्यवसानतः = being concluded; इतिहास आदिभिः = by the books of history etc; निदिध्यासन विक्षेपः = an obstacle for contemplation; न = not; भवेत् = becomes.

The books of *Purāṇā-s* and historical accounts etc., ultimately lead to the conclusion that (i) the *ātmā* is pure consciousness and not the body etc.; and (ii) the world is an illusion. Thus, their study does not become an obstacle in unbroken contemplation on *Brahman*. (123)

Ātmā Cit eva-The Self is Absolute Consciousness. *Jagat mithyā itī*-this world is an illusion-that is, in the world of plurality, the plurality is the illusion, not the world. The difference between many toys made of sugar is only an illusion of form, but in essence all of them are of the same substance. That is the reality.

Similarly, that the objects of the world are other than me is an illusion.

Atra-In the study of the *Purāṇā-s* and *Itihāsa*.

Vede rāmāyaṇe caiva, purāṇe bhārata tathā
Ādā vante ca madhye ca, hariḥ sarvatra gīyate

Whether it is the *Veda*, *Ramāyaṇa* or *Mahābhārata* or *Purāṇā-s* throughout the text---in the beginning, middle and conclusion - the *Paramātmā* alone is the theme sung.

Therefore, *parya vasānataḥ*---the conclusion of the study of the *Purāṇā-s* and *Itihāsa* is (1) the self is Pure Consciousness and (2) the world is *mithyā*. In other words, I am real, *jagat* is not.

Nidhidhyāsana vikṣepaḥ na-This is not an obstacle or disturbance in meditation.

Therefore, intense study of *Vedānta* or the story of *Bhāgavatam* both keep the mind in a state of meditation, because the mind is focussed on the theme of the Absolute.

Aham kratu aham yajñāḥ svadhā 'ham auśadham
Mantra 'ham aham evā 'jyam aham agnir aham hutam

(*Gītā* -IX.16)

I am the *kratu* (vedik ritual), I am the *yajña* (Vedik and post vedik sacrificial worship), I am the food offered to the *pitṛ-s* or ancestors etc; I am the medicinal herb and all plants; I am the *mantra*, I am also the clarified butter; I am the fire! I am the oblation (a thing offered to God). So what does it matter if I am the food or the eater of the food. In this way, one is reminded of the Lord by everything and in everything.

The important thing is to discover one's identity. One is not *Paramātmā* only on the seat of meditation!. *Brahmābhyāsa* means keeping the vision of *Paramātmā* as one's Self constantly in mind through all experiences.

Lord *Kṛṣṇa* in *Gītā* (VII-1) says:

Mayyāsakta-manaḥ pārtha yogaṁ yuñjan mad-āśrayaḥ
Asaṁsayaṁ samagraṁ mān, yathā jñāsyasi tat śṛṇu

which means that he who has his mind fixed only on the Absolute, in any field of activity, he is in meditation. There is no *vikṣepa* for him.

The study of the *Purāṇā-s* and *Itihāsa*, therefore, helps in maintaining the mind in such a continuous, uninterrupted contemplation. *Veda Vyāsa* himself has said in *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* that the study of a *Vedāntin* is not complete without the study of *Purāṇā-s*.

Should it mean that even the worldly actions such as trade, agriculture etc. is not an obstacle in contemplation? ----

कृषिवाणिज्यसेवादौ काव्यतर्कादिकेषु च ।
विक्षिप्यते प्रवृत्त्या धीस्तैस्तत्त्वस्मृत्यसंभवात् ॥१२४॥

Kṛṣi vāṇijya sevadau kāvya tarkā dike ṣu ca
Vikṣi pyate pravṛttyā dhīs taista tva smṛtya sambhavāt (124)

कृषि वाणिज्य सेवा आदौ = in case of farming, trade or service etc; च = and; काव्य तर्कादिकेषु = in case of fine arts, logic etc; प्रवृत्त्या = having involved; धीः = mind; विक्षिप्यते = is agitated; तैः = by these agitations; तत्त्व स्मृति = remembrance of the *Brahman*, असंभवात् = is impossible.

(Unlike the *Brahmābhyāsa* achieved by the study of *itihāsa-s* and *Purāṇa-s*), involvement in the fields of farming, trade, service etc. or in enjoyments like fine arts (poetry), logic etc, leads to agitations. These agitations prevent the *Brahmābhyāsa* and the memory of the *Brahman*. (124)

The doubt raised is: If *Brahmābhyāsa* is perceiving the *Paramātmā* in everything, why cannot the student engage in worldly activities like business etc.?

Kṛṣi vāṇijya-agriculture, commerce (*vaiśya vṛtti*) *Sevā*-service (*śūdra vṛtti*) *Kāvya tarkādiṣu*-literature, music, logic etc. (*Brāhmaṇa vṛtti*) *ca-kṣatriya vṛtti Pravṛttyā vikṣepyate*-These are the fields of relative existence. Whenever we stay in the field of relative existence, agitations and *vikṣepa* are created in the mind.

In *Bhaja Govindam* (Verse-14) (also called *Moha mudgara* because it hits hard on the delusion), *Ādī Śaṅkara* says:

Jaṭilo muṇḍi luñchita keśaḥ kāśāyāmbara bahu-kṛta-veśaḥ
Paśyann-api ca na paśyati mūḍho hyudara-nimittam bahu-kṛt-veśaḥ

An-ascetic with matted locks, one with a shaven head, one with hairs pulled out one by one, another parading in ochre robes fool themselves who although seeing, do not see, because of ignorance and its effects. Indeed, these different disguises or apparels are only for their belly's sake.

Tattva smṛti asam bhavāt : - Such individuals who engage themselves in the activities mentioned earlier, lose the remembrance of the main goal of contemplation. For them the secondary thing becomes primary and the primary thing becomes secondary. The study of *Purāṇa-s* etc. on the other hand will not lead to such forgetfulness regarding the Truth itself.

In that case even the daily acts regarding the maintenance of body also will be an obstacle? The teacher answers ----

अनुसंदधतैवात्र भोजनादौ प्रवर्तितुम् ।
शक्यतेऽत्यन्तविक्षेपाभावादाशु पुनः स्मृतेः ॥१२५॥

Anusan dadha taivātra bhojanādaṁ pravartitum
Śakye'tyanta vikṣepā bhāvā dāśu punaḥ smṛteḥ (125)

अत्र = in case of; भोजन आदौ = meals etc; अनुसंदधता एव = while keeping the contemplation going; प्रवर्तितुम् = involvement; शक्यते = is possible; अत्यन्त = too much; विक्षेप = agitations; अभावात् = are absent; आशु = immediately; पुनः = again; स्मृतेः = one is reminded of the Self.

However, in case of activities like taking the meals (daily bodily duties) etc., one can keep the contemplation on the Self going and yet attend to these daily chores. This is possible, on account of absence of too much agitations or disturbances from these activities. (125)

Bhojana ādaṁ- Even while taking food, washing, bathing etc., it is possible to keep the mind tuned to the Absolute.

Atyanta vikṣepa abhāvāt etc. - Even in the midst of these bodily activities, it is possible to return to the task of contemplation and remember the Lord. While bathing - which is when the notion that 'I am the body' is the strongest, the spiritual student should recite the *upaniṣad* etc. so that the forgetfulness about our real nature will not last long.

Therefore, taking food etc., need not become obstacles in *Nididhyāsana* i.e. the contemplation on the Truth for all the times is possible along with daily routine of life.

The absence of agitation and disturbances, does it mean, there is no forgetfulness about one's nature? The answer is ----

तत्त्वविस्मृतिमात्रान्नानर्थः किन्तु विपर्ययात् ।
विपर्येतुं न कालोऽस्ति इति स्मरतः क्वचित् ॥१२६॥

*Tattva vismṛti mātṛān na anarthaḥ kintu viparyayāt
Viparyetum na kalo'sti jhaṭiti smarataḥ kvacit* (126)

तत्त्व विस्मृति मात्रात् = by the forgetfulness of *Brahman* alone; अनर्थः = problems; न = are not (created); किन्तु = but; विपर्ययात् = by *viparītā bhāvanā* i.e. contrary understanding; विपर्येतुम् = for developing erroneous knowledge; कालः = a particular time; न अस्ति = is not specified; इति = quickly; स्मरतः = the one who remembers; क्वचित् = hardly any possibility (of erroneous knowledge).

Mere forgetfulness of the *Brahman*, is not the cause of problem (*saṁsāra*), but the cause is erroneous knowledge. As for the occurrence of erroneous knowledge, there is no specified time required. It can occur at any moment. Therefore, for the one who can quickly remember the *Brahman*, there is hardly any problem of erroneous knowledge. (126)

Tattva vismṛti mātṛāt anartha na - Merely forgetting our real nature does not create any problem of misery. In

the deep sleep state, we are in a state of utter ignorance. We neither know 'who am I' nor do we accept this body and mind to be ME.

Kintu viparyayāt - The problem begins when one begins imagining the body to be the Self. The moment one superimposes one's imagination on the Self, erroneous convictions are created.

Viparyetum kālaḥ na asti - For erroneous perceptions, there is no particular time. Misunderstanding, can take place at any point and at any moment.

Jhaṭiti smarataḥ - However, as one regains one's balance quickly and realises that yielding to such wrong imaginary perceptions is a waste of time, the individual returns to his contemplation.

The choice is ours, whether we yield to the misunderstanding and allow our inner peace to be destroyed, or whether we maintain and preserve that inner peace, whatever be the turmoil in the world. Only by maintaining that inner equilibrium, will we be in a position to face the challenges of the world effectively.

What about the *Brahmābhyāsa* for those whose pursuit is arts, literature etc? ----

तत्त्वस्मृतेरवसरो नास्त्यन्याभ्यासशालिनः ।
प्रत्युताभ्यासं घातित्वात् बलात्तत्त्वमुपेक्ष्यते ॥१२७॥

*Tattva smṛte ravasaro nāsti anyā bhyāsa śālināḥ
Pratyutābhyāsa ghātīt tvāt balāt tattva mupekṣate* (127)

तत्त्व स्मृतेः = for the practice of *Brahmābhyāsa*; अन्य अभ्यास शालिनः = for those engaged in study of non-spiritual subjects; अवसरः = time or opportunity; न = not; अस्ति = is; प्रत्युत = on the contrary; अभ्यास घातित्वात् = being

an obstacle for *Brahmābhyāsa*; तत्त्वम् = the *Brahman*; बलात् = under compulsion; उपेक्ष्यते = is neglected.

For those who are engaged in the pursuit of worldly and material undertakings, there is neither any time nor opportunity for the practice of *Brahmābhyāsa*. And, this pursuit being contrary to *Brahmābhyāsa*, even the Truth is neglected. (127)

The teacher comments on those persons who are engaged in worldly activities such as those listed in *śloka* 124.

Anyā abhyāsa śālīnaḥ- Those who engage themselves too much in worldly activities and the study of subjects other than spiritual topics, *Tattva smṛteḥ avasaraḥ na asti*-they will not have time for *tattva vicāraṇā*. They will be like the man who stood on the sea shore to take a swim when all the waves had stopped!

The seeker has to decide his priorities and make the necessary effort. If we take one step, God will take ten, but that one step we have to take.

Not only do these material and worldly activities and studies deprive the seeker of the needed time to concentrate on the contemplation of *Brahma*, *pratyut*--on the contrary, *abhyāsa ghātītvāt balāt tattvam upekṣate*: because of these unwanted worldly engagements, even the *sādhana* that the seeker has been doing for some time, is destroyed. The effect of this negative influence of making one forget all the spiritual practice and pursuit of *abhyāsa* already invested, is so strong, that all unwanted subjects and activities take a position of priority and the pursuit of *Brahma jñāna* becomes secondary.

Even the *upaniṣads* recommend the withdrawal from the worldly pursuit ----

तमेवैकं विजानीथ ह्यन्या वाचो विमुञ्चथ ।
इति श्रुतं तथान्यत्र वाचो विग्लापनं त्विति ॥१२८॥

Tame vaikam vijānītha hyanyā vāco vimuñcatha
Iti śrutam tathānyatra vāco viglāpanam tviti (128)

तम् एव एकम् = to that one alone (i.e. Self); विजानीथ = come to realise; अन्या वाचः = all other worldly pursuits; हि = indeed; विमुञ्चथ = renounce; इति = thus; श्रुतम् = is declared by *upaniṣad*; तथा = similarly; अन्यत्र = in other places also; वाचः = the worldly pursuits and study etc; तु = is indeed; विग्लापनम् = a wasteful pursuit; इति = thus.

Come to realise that one pure Self alone, and renounce all other worldly pursuits, is thus declared by *Muṇḍaka upaniṣad*. Similarly, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka upaniṣad* also declares, that the worldly pursuit and study is indeed a wasteful pursuit. (128)

The teacher quotes from the *śruti* to substantiate what he said in *śloka* 127.

Tamevaikam vijānītha etc. (*Muṇḍaka Up.* II-ii-5) - Know that one thing i.e. Self alone. That is your only priority. When (*śravaṇam*) studying and understanding the scriptures followed by (*mananam*) reflection, becomes strong, the third stage of *Nididhyāsana* is reached.

Anyā vāco vimuñcatha- Reject all other themes in life, without any hesitation. The rejection must be total and absolute. Many *Paurāṇik* stories illustrate this point. The classic example is, of *Viśvāmitra* getting diverted to the theme of matter, to drive home the point that the seeker has to be very watchful and protective over himself.

Argument is one of the main enemies in the spiritual path. *Nārada Bhakti Sūtra* (74) says: *Vādo na avalambyaḥ*- do not indulge in argumentativeness. Argument gives validity

to that subject of argument, which means that *jagat* has been accepted to be real.

In another *śruti* (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.* 4.4.21) it is said *vaco viglāpanam*-arguments only lead to loss of temper, frustration and increases one's susceptibility to criticism and ridicule. A study of *mahātmā-s* lives will show how much suffering they went through in life, but never lost sight of their goal. A spiritual seeker should not get unnecessarily involved in the world beyond a particular point.

Unlike the activities like taking food etc., the other worldly pursuits are not essential for living ----

आहारादि त्यजन्नैव जीवेच्छास्त्रान्तरं त्यजन् ।

किं न जीवसि येनैवं करोष्यत्र दुराग्रहम् ॥१२९॥

Āhārādi tyajan naiva jīvet śāstran taram tyajan
Kim na jivasi yenaivam, karo syatra durāgraham (129)

आहार आदि = taking food etc; त्यजन् = rejecting; न एव = not at all; जीवेत् = one can live; शास्त्रान्तरम् त्यजन् = rejecting other worldly pursuits of material subjects; किम् न जीवसि = don't you live; येन = because of which; अत्र = here with regards to study of material sciences; एवम् = in this manner; दुराग्रहम् = obstinate emphasis; करोषि = you give.

As by rejecting the activities like taking food etc., one cannot live (hence they are essential for living); Don't you live without the study of worldly subjects? Therefore, why are you so obstinately emphatic about the study of material sciences alone? (129)

Āhāra ādi tyajan na eva jīvasi-If you do not take food, you can't live.

Śāstrāntaram tyajan etc. - But certainly, you will live even if you give up reading material other than the scriptures? Surely you can live without such non-profitable pursuits?

Yena evam durāgraham etc. - Therefore, do not entertain a wrong understanding and insist that pursuing such studies is right.

We do see spiritual persons engaged in the worldly pursuit, like that of *Janaka* etc. How do we account for above thinking?

जनकादेः कथं राज्यमिति चेददृढबोधतः ।

तथा तवापि चेत्तर्कं पठ यद्वा कृषिं कुरु ॥१३०॥

Janakādeḥ katham rājyam iti cet dṛḍha bodhataḥ
Tathā tavāpi cet tarkam paṭha yadvā kṛṣim kuru (130)

जनक आदेः = of king *Janaka* etc.; राज्यम् = the royal undertakings; कथम् = how can be explained; इति चेत् = if this is the doubt; दृढ बोधतः = on account of firm knowledge; तथा = of similar nature; तव अपि = your also is; चेत् तर्कम् पठ = you may read logic; कृषिम् कुरु = practice farming; यद्वा = or.

If the doubt is that we do observe the involvement of king *Janaka* etc., in the worldly undertakings. How is it possible (as it seems to be contrary to your thesis)? The reply is-it is on account of firmness of knowledge. If you are also established firmly in Self knowledge, then you may also engage in study of logic or farming. (130)

The student now raises another point of argument.

Janakādeḥ katham rājyam iti cet etc. -How is it then, that kings like *Janak* were very much involved in governing their kingdoms? They were not sitting in caves and contemplating? The teacher answers this question :

Dṛḍha bodhataḥ: Because they were firmly established in the knowledge: *Tathā tava api*-If you are also equally well established like them in *aparokṣa anubhūti*, if you think you have attained that state of the Absolute; *tarkam paṭha kṛṣim kuru*: whether you become a logician or an agriculturist makes no difference, but not before you have reached that stage of being firmly rooted in absolute knowledge.

Once the world is known to be illusory, as in case of king *Janaka* etc, what can justify their involvement in the worldly affairs?

The answer is -----

मिथ्यात्ववासनादाढ्ये प्रारब्धक्षयकाङ्क्षया ।
अक्लिश्यन्तः प्रवर्तन्ते स्वस्वकर्मानुसारतः ॥१३१॥

Mithyātva vāsanā dāṛḍhye prārabdha kṣaya kāṅkṣayā
Akliśyantaḥ pravartante svasva karmā nusārataḥ (131)

मिथ्यात्व वासना दाढ्ये = when the conviction of the illusoriness of the world is firmly achieved; प्रारब्ध क्षय काङ्क्षया = desiring the elimination of *prārabdha karma*; अक्लिश्यन्तः = without suffering; स्वस्व कर्म आनुसारतः = according to one's own *karma*; प्रवर्तन्ते = participate in the world.

Although, firm conviction about the illusoriness of the world is developed, desiring the elimination of *prārabdha karma*, the wise man, not getting influenced by the sorrows, participates in the world according to one's position or duty. (131)

How does a wise man who has come to the conclusion that the world is an illusion, and *Brahman* alone is Reality, still engage himself actively in the world?

Mithyātva vāsanā dāṛḍhye-When the seeker has strengthened his knowledge about the illusoriness of the world, *prārabdha kṣaya kāṅkṣayā*-desiring the removal

of his *prārabdha karma*, he participates with two distinctions: a) *Akliśyantaḥ* : He keeps himself engaged in the world without getting disturbed or distressed; and (b) *Sva sva karma anusārataḥ*; that is, he carries out actions without being the actor behind the actions. There is *karma* but no *kartā*. Therefore, he does not suffer because of the activities in which he is engaged. The body, mind and intellect function in their own fields, and he is only the substratum supporting all of them, neither getting influenced by the success or failure of his actions-without a trace of suffering.

Will it not mean, that the wise man may also participate in the condemned activities? ----

अतिप्रसङ्गो मा शङ्क्यः स्वकर्मवशवर्तिनाम् ।
अस्तु वा केन शक्येत कर्म वारयितुं वद ॥१३२॥

Ati prasaṅgo mā śaṅkyah svakarma vaśa vartinām
Astu va kena śakyeta karma vārayitum vada (132)

स्वकर्म वश वर्तिनाम् = those who are living according to the *prārabdha*; अति प्रसङ्गः = the possibility of involvement in undue actions; मा = don't; शङ्क्यः = suspect; अस्तु वा = or even if there is, let it be; कर्म = the *prārabdha*; वारयितुम् = nullifying; केन = by whom; शक्येत = is possible; वद = say.

One should not suspect the possibility of involvement of the wise man in undue activities, as he is strictly living according to duty orientation. However, even if he is involved in undue activities, who can nullify the impact of *karma* (i.e. every one has to go through the *prārabdha*)? (132)

Sva karmavaśa vartinām-It was said earlier that the wise man is constantly engaging himself in his due action but suffers no pain or suffering; he is only exhausting his own *prārabdha karma*.

Ati prasaṅgo mā śaṅkyah-But this does not mean that there can be an *atiprasaṅgaḥ* i.e. one who will indulge in any improper actions. Bad actions do not come out of the wise man because of *prārabdha*. Otherwise one can justify bad actions under the guise of *prārabdha*.

Astu vā kena śakyeta etc. - Even if such a thing happens, i.e. if his actions are undue i.e. beyond the limit of rectitude, *prārabdha* does not spare anyone. But it is important to bear in mind that *prārabdha karma* belongs to the body, the body is fabricated with the thread of *prārabdha*, it is maintained in *prārabdha*, and it ends according to the *prārabdha* of the body. It has nothing to do with the Truth.

What situation comes in one's life is certainly according to *prārabdha*. But how do we respond to that situation is not dependent on *prārabdha*. As such ill-actions are very unlikely from the man of wisdom.

The difference of response to the *prārabdha*, is the criterion of being wise or not. How ----

ज्ञानिनोऽज्ञानिनश्चात्र समे प्रारब्धकर्मणी ।

न क्लेशो ज्ञानिनो धैर्यान्मूढः क्लिश्यत्यधैर्यतः ॥१३३॥

Jñānino'jñānina ścātra same prārabdha karmaṇī
Na kleśo jñānino dhairyān mūḍhaḥ kliśya tyadhairyataḥ (133)

अत्र = here; प्रारब्ध कर्मणी = with reference to *prārabdha karma*; ज्ञानिनः = for the wise; अज्ञानिनः = for the ignorant; च = and; समे = although equal; ज्ञानिनः = the wise; धैर्यात् = on account of equipoise; क्लेशः न = do not suffer; मूढः = the ignorant; अधैर्यतः = due to lack of equipoise; क्लिश्यति = suffers.

Although, the presence of *prārabdha karma* is similar for the wise and the ignorant, the wise man does not suffer them

because of his equipoise, while the ignorant suffers, due to his lack of equipoise. (133)

The difference between response to the *prārabdha* by the wise man and that by the unwise man is explained.

Atra jñāninaḥ ajñāninaḥ etc. - *Prārabdha* treats the wise man and the unwise alike---It spares neither. Then what is the difference? *Jñāninaḥ dhairyāt kleśaḥ na*-The wise man is not disturbed by the *prārabdha*. He bears it with fortitude. Whereas, *Mūḍhaḥ adhairyāt kliśyati* etc.-The unwise man suffers with every manifestation of *prārabdha* because of the absence of *dhairya* or equipoise of wisdom.

[In this context, *dhīra* is one who has the ability to live according to wisdom. If he is wise and does not apply it, then he has the wisdom but lacks *dhairya*]

An example is given to make the difference between the response of the wise and ignorant, more obvious----

मार्गे गन्त्रोर्द्वयोः श्रान्तौ समायामप्यदूरताम् ।

जानन्धैर्यात् द्रुतं गच्छेदन्यस्तिष्ठति दीनधीः ॥१३४॥

Mārga gantror dvayor śrāntau samāyā mapya dūratām
Jānan dhairyāt drutaṁ gacchet anyas tiṣṭhati dīnadhīḥ (134)

मार्गे = on the way; गन्त्रोः द्वयोः = for the two persons walking; श्रान्तौ = tiredness; समायाम् अपि = although equally; अदूरताम् = nearness; जानन् = knowing; धैर्यात् = due to perseverance; द्रुतम् = fast; गच्छेत् = goes; अन्यः = while the other; दीन धीः = one lacking perseverance; तिष्ठति = stops wherever he is!

Of the two persons walking the same path and tired equally, the one who knows the nearness of the goal walks fast with perseverance to reach the destination, while the other not knowing the nearness of destination and lacking perseverance, halts on the way before reaching the goal. (134)

This *śloka* illustrates the difference between the *dhīra puruṣaḥ*-man with perseverance and *adhīra puruṣaḥ*-man lacking perseverance.

Marge gantror dvayoh etc. - Two travellers are going on a journey and both are equally tired.

Adūratām jānan- However, the one who does not know how much the remaining distance is and the one who knows, have different perceptions and react differently.

Dhairyāt drutam gacchet-The one who knows the remaining distance, comes out of his fatigue and because of his knowledge of the distance to be covered makes the needed effort to make it to the destination.

Anyah tiṣṭhati dīnadhīḥ-Whereas, the one who does not know the distance, because of his ignorance succumbs to his fatigue, feels discouraged and gives up.

Similarly, the wise man knows that this is *prārabdha* of the body and further ignorance or knowledge makes no difference to the working of *prārabdha*. So, he endures it and carries on his activity with equanimity, but the unwise man becomes *dīnadhīḥ*-discouraged and uninspired.

So far, the first part of the original *upaniṣadik* statement was analysed. The result is evident in the second part of the same statement. So to conclude this part of the discussions ---

साक्षात्कृतात्मधीः सम्यगविपर्ययबाधितः ।
किमिच्छन्कस्य कामाय शरीरमनुसंज्वरेत् ॥१३५॥

Sākṣāt kṛtātma dhīḥ samyak aviparyaya bādhitaḥ
Kimi cchan kasya kāmāya śarīram anusañjvaret (135)

साक्षात् कृतात्म धीः = one who has directly known his Pure Self; सम्यक् = perfectly; अविपर्यय बाधितः = therefore, freed from the 'I am the body' notion; किम् इच्छन् = desiring

what; कस्य कामाय = for whose sake; शरीरम् = body; अनु = after; संज्वरेत् = get worried!

Thus, he who has directly known his essential Self perfectly and therefore, given up the erroneous identity with the body etc., desiring what and for whose sake, will he, thereafter get worried on account of the body? (135)

This *śloka* concludes the explanation of first part of *śloka* 1 of this Chapter.

Sākṣāt kṛtātma dhīḥ samyak aviparyaya bādhitaḥ-He who has thus discovered his real essential nature through *aparokṣa anubhūti*, has no more erroneous notions that existed earlier, namely, 'I am the body', 'I am the limited individual', 'I am the conditioned unhappy *jīva*'. All these misconceptions are removed.

Kim icchan kasya kāmāya etc. - Can he have any desire? Because there is nobody to enjoy, there is neither the desirer nor the enjoyer. There is no need for him to get involved in the body i.e. all its relative existence --- gross body and the waking world; subtle body and the dream world; and the causal body and the deep sleep world.

Here onwards the second half of the first verse is taken up for analysis and discussion ----

जगन्मिथ्यात्वधीभावादाक्षिप्तौ काम्यकामुकौ ।
तयोरभावे सन्तापः शाम्येन्निःस्नेहदीपवत् ॥१३६॥

Jagan mithyātva dhībhāvāt akṣiptau kāmya kāmukau
Tayorabhāve santāpaḥ śāmye nniḥ sneha dīpavat (136)

जगत् मिथ्यात्व धी भावात् = on account of the conviction that the world is an illusion; काम्य = the desirable; कामुकः = the desirer; आक्षिप्तौ = are negated; तयोः = of these two; अभावे = absence; सन्तापः = the sorrow; निः स्नेह दीप

वत् = like a lamp without oil; शाम्येत् = will die off naturally.

Once the conviction about the illusory nature of the world is firmly established, there is negation of the desirer and desired. In the absence of these two, the sorrows will naturally disappear, as the flame of the lamp lacking oil dies away of its own. (136)

The sorrows can result only when there is some one desiring something and the desire is not fulfilled. However, once the illusory nature of the world is fully established in one's understanding, there cannot be any desire for an illusory object. Therefore, there cannot be a relative phenomenon called, the desirer! When, the factors responsible for sorrow disappear, how can there be any sorrow, as the lamp without oil can't burn, due to the absence of oil.

This point of desirelessness due to illusory nature of desired objects is seen ----

गन्धर्वपत्तने किञ्चिन्नैन्द्रजालिकनिर्मिते ।
जानन्कामयते किन्तु जिहासति हसन्निदम् ॥१३७॥

Gandharva pattane kiñcit aindrajalika nirmite
Jānan kāmāyate kintu jihāsati hasan nidam (137)

गन्धर्व पत्तने = in an illusory creation; किञ्चित् = anything; ऐन्द्र जालिक निर्मिते जानन् = knowing, that it is a creation of magician; न कामयते = does not desire; किन्तु = but; इदम् = this thing; हसन् = smilingly; जिहासति = desires to give up.

Knowing well, the illusory nature of a creation by a magician, no one desires anything from that creation, but is ever ready to give up everything smilingly. (137)

The creation of a magician appears to be real; but it is not. Knowing this, i.e. absence of any real object

in such a creation, none can ever desire to own any thing out of it. Similarly, he who has clearly known the world to be an illusion, there cannot be either a desire, or a desirer.

The above illustration is applied to the man of wisdom and desires for enjoyment ----

आपातरमणीयेषु भोगेष्वेवं विचारवान् ।
नानुरज्यति किन्त्वेतान्दोषदृष्ट्या जिहासति ॥१३८॥

Āpāta ramaṇīyeṣu bhogeṣvevaṁ vicāravān
Nānu rajyati kintve tān doṣa dṛṣṭyā jihāsati (138)

आपात रमणीयेषु = the appearance of beauty due to ignorance; भोगेषु = in the objects of enjoyment; एवम् = in this way; विचारवान् = one enquiring about the reality of the apparent beauty; न = not; अनुरज्यति = gets enchanted; किन्तु = on the contrary; दोष दृष्ट्या = by discovering the faults; एतान् = to these enjoyable objects; जिहासति = desires to give up.

Similarly, (as in the example given in above śloka), a wise man, having enquired about the apparent beauty of this worldly objects, appearing during the state of ignorance and known to be an illusion, does not get enchanted, and gives up considering them to be full of faults on a critical appraisal. (138)

Āpāta ramaṇīyeṣu etc. - The one who has reflected about the world and come to realise that the glitter and imaginary joy that is seen in the world is not real, he can never be enchanted by these objects. The attraction is totally gone from his mind.

Sant Jñāneśvara in his commentary on the *Bhagavad Gītā* gives two powerful examples to illustrate this repulsion to worldly enjoyments:

(a) of a thirsty man being offered the pus from a wound, to satiate his thirst;

(b) of a man being offered the love of a dead woman.

These examples may seem distasteful but they are intended to drive home the urgency and need of a proper understanding of the world and of oneself.

Kintu etān doṣa dr̥ṣṭyā jihāsati-But, by discovering the fallacy in the worldly objects, he is easily able to reject the whole world. It is necessary to see through the external glamour and glitter of worldly enjoyments and discover their true ugly and empty nature in order to be detached from them.

What are the limitations and shortcomings of the worldly objects?---

अर्थानामार्जने क्लेशस्तथैव परिपालने ।

नाशे दुःखं व्यये दुःखं धिगर्थान्क्लेशकारिणः ॥१३९॥

Arthānām ārjane kleśas tathaiva pari pālāne
Nāṣe duḥkham vyaye duḥkham dhigarthān kleśa kāriṇaḥ (139)

अर्थानाम् अर्जने = for earning wealth; क्लेशः = is troublesome; तथा एव = so also; परिपालने = for protection; नाशे = when destroyed; दुःखम् = is painful; व्यये = when spent; दुःखम् = is painful; क्लेश कारिणः = the giver of pain (the wealth); धिग् = away with this; अर्थान् = the wealth.

It is pain ridden efforts that are required for earning wealth, so also for its protection and is painful when lost. The spending is equally painful. Away with this wealth, a creator of all problems. (139)

There are four *puruṣārtha*-s, *Artha*, *Kāma*, *Dharma*, *Mokṣa*. Of these in this *śloka* the teacher explains the limitations of *artha*.

Ārthānām arjane kleśaḥ-There is a lot of trouble in earning wealth, (*Tathā paripālāne*) equally so in protecting it from others, although one wants to show off also at the same time.

Nāṣe duḥkham-When the money is lost, there is misery again. *Vyaye duḥkham*-Even more painful is to spend the money or to give it to others.

Dhigarthān kleśa kāriṇaḥ - Away with this wealth which causes nothing but trouble and distress at all stages.

Yet, right from childhood we are thinking of *artha* which in the larger sense means not only money but anything which gives us an imaginary sense of security. The definition of security varies from individual to individual and from time to time. The happiest man is he who feels the highest security in owning nothing, either to give or to keep.

Thus, contemplation on these three shortcomings with respect to wealth will help a seeker, overcome the impact of worldly things and their illusoriness.

The sense pleasures and infatuation for these worldly things and beings are condemned by proper thinking ----

मांसपाञ्चालिकायास्तु यन्त्रलोलेऽङ्गपञ्जरे ।

स्नाय्वस्थिग्रन्थिशालिन्याः स्त्रियाः किमिवशोभनम् ॥१४०॥

Māṇsa pāñcālī kāyāstu yantra lole'ṅga pañjare
Snāy vasthi granthi śālinyāḥ striyāḥ kimiva śobhanam (140)

मांस पाञ्चालिकायाः = the doll of flesh; स्नायु अस्थि ग्रन्थि शालिन्याः = made up of muscles, bones, glands etc; तु = indeed; स्त्रियाः = of the women; यन्त्र लोले = dynamic like a machine; अङ्ग पञ्जरे = in the assembly of limbs; किम् शोभनम् इव = what is there called as beautiful?

- The body of a woman is made of muscles, bones, glands, etc. and dynamic like a mechanical flesh doll; an assembly of different parts, is there anything that can be called beautiful and attractive? (140)

The limitations of (*kāmaḥ*) desire for objects of enjoyment is the theme of this *śloka*. The term *stri* is used in a technical sense to indicate the desire that man has for the enjoyment of woman and vice-versa. *Stri* has three letters, *Sa, Ta, Ra* meaning the *sattva, tamō* and *rajo guṇā-s* respectively i.e. the world of matter. The world of matter becomes the field of enjoyment for the conscious *jīva*. Thus *stri* means the enjoyable goods in the form of something other than me.

The body of a woman is nothing but *striyāḥ* etc. - a doll of flesh made of bones, veins etc. constantly moving like a restless machine with limbs. *Kim śobhanam*- What is beautiful in this?

The attraction, one has for objects of desire, is because of the value given by that individual to that object. Only he and he alone can devalue the object in his mind by developing *doṣa dṛṣṭi* and reducing *mahatva buddhi*. Therefore, a spiritual seeker must endeavour to withdraw the value he tends to give to worldly objects and their enjoyment, by means of *pratipakṣa bhāvanā*, i.e. discovery of negative points to develop disliking for the object.

In *Vivekacūdāmaṇi* (*śloka* 22), *Ādi Śaṅkara* says:

*Virajya viṣaya vrātāt doṣa dṛṣṭyā muhur muhuḥ
Sva lakṣye niyatā-vasthā manasaḥ śama ucyate*

We can withdraw from the worldly things and beings of enjoyment, only when we develop *doṣa dṛṣṭi* for these things. This is called *pratipakṣa Bhāvanā* (*prati* = opposite, *pakṣa* = side, to look at the opposite side). Through such a process, one can attain *śama* or calmness.

For everything in this world there is a good and a bad side. To think of the attractive side will not help

in developing dispassion. Taking the negative element or the *doṣa* in the worldly things i.e. *pratipakṣa bhāvanā* is the only way to develop true dispassion.

The purpose of this vision development about the worldly objects and enjoyment is not to develop hatred for them, but to relieve oneself from the impact of misery on account of erroneous understanding of the world etc.

Therefore, the purpose which is attained by the scriptural way of looking at the world is ----

एवमादिषु शास्त्रेषु दोषाः सम्यक्प्रपञ्चिताः ।
विमर्शन्ननिशं तानि कथं दुःखेषु मज्जति ॥१४१॥

*Evamādiṣu śāstreṣu doṣāḥ samyak-prapañ citāḥ
Vimar śanna niśaṁ tāni katham duḥkheṣu majjati* (141)

एवम् = in this way; आदिषु शास्त्रेषु = initially in the scriptures; दोषाः = the shortcomings; सम्यक् = exhaustively; प्रपञ्चिताः = are explained; तानि = these; अनिशम् = constant; विमर्शन् = contemplating; दुःखेषु = in the sources of misery; कथम् = how; मज्जति = gets immersed?

In this manner, the initial topics in the scriptures deal exhaustively, about the shortcomings, limitations etc., of the worldly things and enjoyments. Contemplating on them, constantly, how can one get enchanted and lost in these sources of misery? (141)

Evam ādi etc. - In this way, from the study of the scriptures, the *doṣa* or fallacy in the possession and enjoyment of worldly objects is again and again exhaustively explained (*prapañcitā*). *Tani aniśam* etc. - when a seeker constantly thinks about these *doṣā-s* in his mind, and once he develops *doṣa dṛṣṭi*; *duḥkheṣu katham majjati* - how will he ever get enchanted by these worldly objects and allow himself to be drowned in the sorrow resulting from such attachments?

The student must devalue the world, only then can he get away from the world, without getting hurt.

When the enchantment in the objects is lost, there cannot be desire for enjoyment. How? ----

क्षुधया पीड्यमानोऽपि न विषं ह्यत्तुमिच्छति ।
मिष्टान्नध्वस्ततृड् जानन्नामूढस्तज्जिघत्सति ॥१४२॥

Kṣudhayā pīḍyamāno'pi na viṣaṁ hyattu micchati
Miṣṭānna dhvasta tñ jānann-āmūḍhas taj jighat sati (142)

क्षुधया = by the hunger; पीड्यमानः = suffering; अपि = although; अमूढः = wise one; विषम् = the poison; अत्तुम् = for eating; न हि = never; इच्छति = desires; मिष्ट अन्नध्वस्ततृड् = one who is satisfied by sumptuous sweet food; जानन् = knowing that; तत् = poison; न = not; जिघत्सति = desire for eating.

A persons, although suffering from pangs of hunger, will never desire to consume poison knowing fully well it to be so. Further more, he will never desire to consume it, when he is already satisfied with a full sumptuous meal. (142)

Illustrations are given to explain the point made in the previous śloka

Amūḍha kṣudhayā etc. A person who has even an iota of ordinary intelligence, will he ever think of eating poison, even if he is very hungry?

Miṣṭānna etc. Similarly one who has taken a sumptuous meal, will also not want to eat poison.

In short, neither the hungry man nor the man whose hunger is satiated will want to eat poison, knowing its detrimental effect.

In the same way, he who has really understood the fallacy in wordly enjoyments will not be interested in

the wordly things. He who has discovered the joy of his own being, why will he ever go to the world for enjoyment and destroy himself?

What about the impact of *prārabdha* in case of a wise man?

प्रारब्धकर्मप्राबल्याद्भोगेष्विच्छा भवेद्यदि ।
क्लिश्यन्नेव तदाप्येष भुङ्क्ते विष्टि गृहीतवत् ॥१४३॥

Prārabdha karma prābalyāt bhoge ṣvicchā bhavedyadyadi
Kliśya nneva tadā pyeṣa bhuṅkte viṣṭi gṛhīt vat (143)

प्रारब्ध कर्म प्राबल्यात् = by the strength of *prārabdha*; भोगेषु = in the indulgence; यदि = if; इच्छा = desire; भवेत् = happens to be; तदा अपि = even then; एष = this wise man; क्लिश्यन् एव = without real enjoyments; विष्टि गृहीतवत् = like one possessed of a 'devil', etc; भुङ्क्ते = experiences.

As a result of the strength of the *prārabdha*, a wise-man may happen to have some desire for the wordly objects, even then he experiences the objective enjoyment, as if he is dealing with an illusory ghost i.e. without attachment and seriousness. (143)

Prārabdha Karma prābalyāt etc. Because of the strength of the *prārabdha* in his life if a person has some desire for some of the things in this world, even then he accepts the enjoyment but in his heart of hearts he is suffering in that enjoyment.

There are two types of sufferings-(1) an ignorant man suffers because he does not get to enjoy what he wants; and (2) a man of wisdom suffers because he really does not want an object but feels obliged to enjoy it like a man getting too much food and not being able to enjoy it.

Viṣṭi grhītvat-Such a man of wisdom behaves as if he has been possessed by a ghost. After the ghost leaves a man, he talks and behaves as if nothing had happened. So also, a man of wisdom is helpless when worldly things come to him unsolicited and he has to receive them, but he is not dependent on any of these worldly objects.

In the life of wise men, it is generally seen in the world ----

भुञ्जाना वा अपि बुधाः श्रद्धावन्तः कुटुम्बिनः ।
नाद्यापि कर्म न छिन्नमिति क्लिश्यन्ति सन्ततम् ॥१४४॥

Bhuñjānā vā api budhāḥ śraddhā vantaḥ kuṭumbinaḥ
Nādyāpi karma na-śchinnaṃ iti kliśyanti santa tam (144)

कुटुम्बिनः = the householder; श्रद्धावन्तः = full of faith; बुधाः = the wise men; भुञ्जानाः = while experiencing the worldly objects; वा = or being without enjoyable objects; अद्य अपि = even today; नः = our; कर्म = *prārabdha*; न = not; छिन्नम् = one not destroyed; इति = in this way; सन्ततम् = constantly; क्लिश्यन्ति = suffer.

The wise men, being a house-holder and full of faith (in the Lord), while experiencing the worldly objects etc., or without them, take them with a painful gesture 'that these *prārabdha karma* are not leaving us even today'. (144)

Śraddhāvantaḥ kuṭumbinaḥ budhāḥ etc.- Those wise people have *śraddhā* or spiritual faith in their hearts but who are obliged to be *grhastā-s* (to lead family life) they feel 'how long will I have to suffer because of my *prārabdha* while experiencing them or being without them? 'They are not leaving us even today!' In this manner, constantly bemoan their situations caused by the strength of the *prārabdha*.

For such a man the highest grace of the Lord is when he discovers a sense of total dispassion. The *prārabdha kṣaya* (weakening) will happen in due course.

The above attitude of the wise man about the worldly experiences, should not be taken, as their sufferings, because, a wise man does not suffer on account of the world.

Then what it is?

नायं क्लेशोऽत्र संसारतापः किन्तु विरक्तता ।
भ्रान्तिज्ञाननिदानो हि तापः सांसारिकः स्मृतः ॥१४५॥

Nāyaṃ kleśo'tra saṃsāra tapaḥ kintu viraktatā
Bhrānti jñāna nidāno hi tāpaḥ saṃsārikaḥ smṛtaḥ (145)

अयम् क्लेशः = this sorrow of a wise man; संसार तापः = the sufferings on account of world; न = is not; किन्तु = but; अत्र = here about this world; विरक्तता = dispassion; हि = because; सांसारिकः = worldly; तापः = 'sufferings; भ्रान्ति ज्ञान निदानः = is the result of delusion; स्मृतः = is declared.

This sorrow of the wise man is not (to be understood by us) the sufferings due to world. This is his dispassion about the worldly things and its enjoyments, because, the worldly sufferings are born of the delusion. (And how can the wise man have delusion?). (145)

[Therefore, the sufferings of the wise man, born out of discrimination, are not miseries similar to those of the worldly man in delusion].

Ayam kleśaḥ etc.-The suffering of the wise man, when he is exposing himself to worldly things, is not the same as that experienced by the ignorant man, in a similar situation.

Kintu viraktatā-In the wise man his unhappiness is an expression of *viraktatā*-dispassion towards worldly things. He is disinterested in worldly activities not because of frustration but because he has developed *vairāgya*-lack of interest i.e. detachment. The more the *vairāgya*, the easier it is to see the Lord. There, his trouble is not because of frustration on account of the incomplete fulfilment of worldly desires, but out of dispassion.

Bhrānti jñāna nidānaḥ hi tāpaḥ etc. - On the other hand, the suffering (*tāpaḥ*) of the ignorant man on account of the worldly things (*saṁsārikaḥ*) is because of delusion. They have taken the world to be real. From this illusory world, they want to achieve real joy which they can never get. This is the difference in the nature of the *tāpaḥ*-suffered by the wise man and by the ignorant man.

The criterion for the sufferings of the wise man is discrimination. Hence ----

विवेकेन परिक्षिप्यन्नल्पभोगेन तृप्यति ।
अन्यथानन्तभोगेऽपि नैव तृप्यति कर्हिचित् ॥१४६॥

Vivekena pari kliśyann alpa bhogena tṛpyati
Anyathā 'nanta bhoge'pi, naiva tṛpyati karhi cit (146)

विवेकेन = being discriminative; परिक्षिप्यन् = seeing the sufferings; अल्प भोगेन = by little enjoyments; तृप्यति = the wise is satisfied; अन्यथा = or else; अनन्त भोगे अपि = even with unlimited comforts; कर्हिचित् = none; न = not; तृप्यति = is satisfied; एव = at all.

The wise man being discriminative about the worldly enjoyments, is satisfied with very limited involvements. Or else, on the contrary, even with unlimited enjoyments, an ignorant man can never be satisfied at all. (146)

Viveken parikliśyan alpa bhogena tṛpyati-The wise man who is able to discriminate and sees the futility

of getting involved too much in worldly enjoyments, is able to control himself and be totally satisfied even with a little bit.

Lord Kṛṣṇa says in *Gītā* (VI-17) says:

Yuktāhāra vihārasyayukta ceṣṭasya karmasu
Yukta svapnāva bodhasya yogo bhavati duḥkha-hā

He who is able to maintain a balance in his life with reference to everything, (moderation in eating and recreation, regulates his sleep and wakefulness) and does not go to extremes in any of his undertakings, to such a person alone *yoga* becomes a destroyer of misery.

Anyathā etc. - The ignorant man, on the other hand, however much *bhoga* (worldly enjoyment) he may enjoy, he will never be satisfied. He will still have a hungry, greedy look when he looks at the world, wanting more and more. There is no end to the acquisition and enjoyment of worldly goods.

Thus the wise man having reached the *vairāgya* (dispassion) stage, does not derive the same enjoyment in worldly things as earlier.

The contentment can never be reached by mere indulgence, as an ignorant thinks ----

न जातु कामः कामानामुपभोगेन शाम्यति ।
हविषा कृष्णवर्त्मैव भूय एवाभिवर्धते ॥१४७॥

Na jātu kāmāḥ kāmānām upa bhogena śāmyati
Haviṣā kṛṣṇa vartmeva bhūya evābhi vardhate (147)

कामः = the desire; कामानाम् = of the objects of enjoyment; उपभोगेन = by indulging in them; जातु न = can never be; शाम्यति = is fulfilled; हविषा = by fuel; कृष्णवर्त्मा इव = like the fire; भूयः एव = again vigorously; अभिवर्धते = is fanned.

The desire can never be satisfied by indulgence with enjoyable objects, as the fire is fanned vigorously again by the addition of fuel. (147)

The present thought that, there is no such thing as complete satisfaction so far as worldly enjoyments are concerned, one only hungers for more and more; has its origin in the *Kāthopanīṣad* (I-26). *Naciketā* was offered all the temptations of the world by the teacher *Yama Rāja*, to which *Naciketā* replies:

*Śvo'bhāvā martyasya yadantak-aitat, sarvendriyāṇām jarayanti tejah
Api-sarvaṁ jīvitam alpam-eva, tavaiva vāhās-tava nṛtyagīte*

'All things have a knack to change (transient), O! Death, the senses wear out due to over-indulgence, however long life may be, it is always short, you may keep your comforts like chariots, songs dances etc., for yourself'

Na jātu kāmah etc. - Desires can never be satiated by enjoyment. We must grow out of them.

Haviṣā Kṛṣṇavartma etc. - If you add fuel (*ghee*) to the fire, the fire will gain more strength. The fire is called *analam* as it does not say 'enough' (*alam*). In the same way, the fire of desire for enjoyment of wordly things has no end.

Therefore, the only way to quell desire is to grow out of it. Once that is done, even if things of desire are available, desire cannot take possession of us.

The indulgence supported by proper discrimination leads to satiation. How? ----

परिज्ञायोपभुक्तो हि भोगो भवति तुष्टये ।
विज्ञाय सेवितश्चोरो मैत्रीमेति न चोरताम् ॥१४८॥

*Parijñāyopa bhukto hi bhogo bhavati tuṣṭaye
Vijñāya sevitaś coro maitrī meti na coratām* (148)

परिज्ञायै = having discriminated; उपभुक्तः भोग = the experience of enjoyment; तुष्टये = to satisfaction; भवति = leads to; हि = certainly; विज्ञाय = having well known; सेवितः = served; चोरः = thief; मैत्रिम् = to friendship; एति = becomes; चोरताम् = the attitude of theft; न = not.

Knowing well, someone to be a thief, when accepted with an attitude of service and compassion, does not behave as a thief, but extends a hand of friendship, so also, the experience of enjoyment when dealt with an understanding and discrimination, leads to satisfaction easily (unlike what is said in the above *śloka*). (148)

Parijñāya upbhuktaḥ etc. - Once the *viveka* or discrimination has developed as discussed in the previous *śloka*, the enjoyment which he indulged in earlier, now knows the source of that joy and is no more dependent on it. The stealing effect of objects of desire will no longer affect him.

An example is given to illustrate:

Sevitaḥ coraḥ etc. - When a person known to be a thief and yet we do not treat him like a thief, but with understanding and love, he will no more be a thief for us. Similarly, when the discrimination dawns, the objects of enjoyment no more are able to delude us with their enchantment.

How can one reduce the impact of temptations on the mind? ----

मनसो निगृहीतस्य लीलाभोगोऽल्पकोऽपि यः ।
तमेवालब्धविस्तारं क्लिष्टत्वाद्बहु मन्यते ॥१४९॥

*Manaso nigrhītasya līlā bhogo'lpā ko'pi yaḥ
Tamevā labdha vistāraṁ kṣiṣṭa tvāt bahu manyate* (149)

निगृहीतस्य = well controlled; मनसः = of the mind; अल्पकः = very little; अपि = also; यः लीला भोगः = the experience of enjoyment; अलब्ध = does not; विस्तारम् = expand; तम् = to that; एव = alone; क्लिष्टत्वात् = being a source of sorrow; बहु = enough; मन्यते = thinks.

A well trained and controlled mind is able to enjoy the objective world even with a very little availability and does not lead to more expectations; but thinks even these little experiences of enjoyments, to be an abode of sorrows. (149)

A new thought is being developed. It was stated in *śloka-1* that he, who has discovered his own real nature, why will he have desire? Because he has no desire in him, he will not get unnecessarily heated up in life. From this point, the teacher-student dialogue is taken up: when a person has known the Truth and discovered his own essential nature, thereafter, will his earlier *prārabdha* continue to influence him or will he be able to go beyond it? If not, then what will his state be?

Manasaḥ nigṛhītasya etc. - He who has controlled his mind by proper practice, *yogābhyāsa* etc., for him even very little enjoyment that he experiences after the dawn of wisdom is satisfying.

Furthermore, he will not allow that small enjoyment to be expanded i.e. lead to dependence. When an ignorant man comes across an enjoyment, he wants to repeat it and maintain it forever and thus he gets entangled in worldly objects. In the case of the man of wisdom, even if he is exposed to an object of enjoyment, he will be satisfied even by a small amount of such objects of enjoyment.

Further, he will not plan to expand his activities for the continuance of the same indulgence.

Tameva klišṭatvāt etc. - Even though he has the *bhoga* or enjoyment, in his heart of hearts, he is always aware,

that if that *bhoga* does not continue, he should not be concerned and if he goes after too much of the *bhoga* he may fall again.

A disciplined mind can lead to satisfaction even with very little enjoyment i.e. the contentment is easy for a controlled mind.

How?----

बद्धमुक्तो महीपालो ग्राममात्रेण तुष्यति ।
परैर्न बद्धो नाक्रान्तो न राष्ट्रं बहु मन्यते ॥१५०॥

Baddha mukto mahīpālo grāma mātreṇa tuṣyati
Parair na baddho nākrānto na rāṣṭram bahu manyate (150)

बद्ध मुक्तः = one freed from bondage; महीपालः = king; ग्राम मात्रेण = by a gift of a village alone; तुष्यति = is content; परैः बद्धः न = a king not under bondage of others; न आक्रान्तः = neither invaded by other king; राष्ट्रम् = the nation; बहु न मन्यते = does not consider to be enough.

A king liberated from the earlier bondage feels satisfied even with a gift of a mere village; while for an independent king, not invaded by an enemy, even the whole nation is not satisfying enough. (150)

Baddha muktaḥ mahīpālaḥ etc. - The king who had been in bondage and now released, even if he has only a small village now, he is happy (because he is a free man now).

Paraiḥ na baddhaḥ etc. - But the other king who has not been under bondage and is totally free, for him even his whole kingdom appears so insignificant. In fact he wants to conquer more land.

The king who was in jail was suffering the pangs of limited existence, for him just going out of that condition

was the highest freedom. With that freedom he is happy. Whereas the king who has never known what bondage is, what limited existence is, any extent of additional kingdom will not satisfy him.

So also, the wise man who has discovered the limitations of worldly enjoyments, he will feel perfectly contented with just a little enjoyment. He will not hanker after more.

What about the impact of *prārabdha* on the man of wisdom. This doubt is asked by the student in the following *śloka*----

विवेके जाग्रति सति दोषदर्शनलक्षणे ।
कथमारब्धकर्मापि भोगेच्छां जनयिष्यति ॥१५१॥

Viveke jāgrati sati doṣa darśana lakṣaṇe
Katha mārabdha karmāpi bhogecchāṁ janayiṣyati (151)

विवेके जाग्रति सति = when the discrimination has dawned on; दोष दर्शन लक्षणे = which is of the nature of seeing fallacy and limitation in enjoyments etc; आरब्ध कर्म अपि = even the *prārabdha karma*; भोग इच्छाम् = the desire for enjoyment; कथम् = how; जनयिष्यति = can create?

How can one justify the presence of desire for enjoyment, after the dawn of wisdom about the fallacy and limitations in enjoyments; in a man of discrimination, as a result of even *prārabdha*? (151)

The doubt is raised by the student *Doṣa darśana* etc. - *Doṣa dr̥ṣṭi* was discussed in earlier *śloka-s* (139-141) and it was stated that once spiritual student has developed *Doṣa dr̥ṣṭi* in *artha* and *kāma*, the potency of desire will be reduced.

Now the question is raised: Once a man of discrimination has developed such a vision by which he sees the fallacy

in the worldly objects and their enjoyment, *Katham prārabdha* etc. - how can *prārabdha karma* have the strength to generate the desire for enjoyment? It seems to be a contradiction. What is that which prompts us to do again and again which is contradictory to the knowledge that we have gained through *doṣa dr̥ṣṭi*? How is the presence of desire even in such a man of wisdom explained or justified?

The above doubt is answered ----

नैष दोषो यतोऽनेकविधं प्रारब्धमीक्ष्यते ।
इच्छाऽनिच्छा परेच्छा च प्रारब्धं त्रिविधं स्मृतम् ॥१५२॥

Naiṣa doṣo yato'neka vidhaṁ prārabdha mīkṣyate
icchā'nicchā parecchā ca prārabdhaṁ trividhaṁ smṛtam (152)

एषः = this; न = not; दोषः = a fallacy; यतः = because; प्रारब्धम् = the *prarabdha karma*; अनेक विधम् = of many types; ईक्ष्यते = is described; इच्छा = by one's own desire; अनिच्छा = even by not desiring; पर इच्छा = by the desire of others; प्रारब्धम् = the *prārabdha*; त्रिविधम् = of three types; स्मृतम् = is said.

There is no fallacy in our explanation, because, the *prārabdha* is described to be of different types. The *prārabdha* can be on account of one's own desire, even by not desiring or due to the desires of others. Thus it is described to be of three types. (152)

The question raised in *śloka* 151 is answered here.

It is nothing to be surprised about nor is there anything erroneous about it, because *prārabdha* is of three types. The answer to the doubt raised depends on which of these three types, is operating.

Previously also, a similar question was raised about 'Who knows the Truth?'. Is it the pure consciousness

or the *cidābhāsa*? It was explained by a statement that *aham* is of three types: one that is understood by the ignorant man; second, who consider themselves to be limited and therefore suffer---refer to the conditioned consciousness---, because they have yet some worldly obligations to be discharged; and third, *aham* refers to the *cidātmā* - the *śuddha caitanya*. Of these three, who uses what and when, has to be understood.

Similarly, *prārabdha* is of three types: *icchā prārabdha* or that which comes according to one's own desire and is responsible for generating desire in our mind; *Anicchā prārabdha* - without desiring, and *Parecchā prārabdha* - through the desire of others. These are explained further:

To explain the law of *karma*, the basic pre-supposition is that we accept our existence to be limited in time. The scriptures try to bring us out of this limitation of time. Then the question comes 'Why do I suffer or enjoy?' The theory of *karma* says because of our own doings, no one else is responsible. *Karma* and *karma phala* falls under three categories:

- Prārabdha karma* - What has matured and has resulted in our present birth.
- Āgāmi Karma* - *karma* that is gathered in the present birth, but will bear fruits at a later date.
- Sañcita karma* - The total of past and present *karma*, which lies in balance and will fructify at a future date.

Sañcita means accumulated balance. Out of *Sañcita karma*, only a fraction becomes mature to produce the fruits of action. *Prārabdha karma*; is that which has become manifest.

It is this *prārabdha karma* that falls under three categories as referred to above.

The first type i.e. *svecchā prārabdha* is explained ----

अपथ्यसेविनश्चोरा राजदाररता अपि ।
जानन्त एव स्वानर्थमिच्छन्त्यारब्धकर्मतः ॥१५३॥

Apathya sevina ścora rājadāra ratā api
Jānanta eva svānartham icchantyā rabdha karmataḥ (153)

अपथ्य सेविनः = the consumers of harmful food etc;
चोराः = thieves; राजदाररताः = engaged in secret love with queen; अपि = also; स्व अनर्थम् = detrimental for them;
जानन्तः = knowing well; आरब्ध कर्मतः = due to *prārabdha karma*; इच्छन्ति = desire these.

Those engaged in (i) the consumption of detrimental or harmful foods etc; (ii) thefts and (iii) in secret love with the queen; although knowing these acts are an invitation to calamity, do desire so, as a result of the first type of *prārabdha* i.e. *icchā prārabdha*. (153)

Examples of *icchā prārabdha* are given:

Apathya sevinaḥ etc. - He who knows he should not eat or drink harmful food (like liquor) because it is doing him harm. However, he is driven by desire, he keeps on eating/drinking the same harmful stuff. Similarly the thief and he who is a secret lover of the queen continue with their obnoxious activities driven by their own desire.

Jānantaḥ eva etc. - All of them know the consequences of their improper actions. They act for their own destruction and follow their desire. This kind of *prārabdha* is called *svecchā prārabdha*.

How can we attribute these acts to *svecchā prārabdha*? ----

न चात्रैतद्वारयितुमीश्वरेणापि शक्यते ।
यत ईश्वर एवाह गीतायामर्जुनं प्रति ॥१५४॥

*Na cātrai tadvā rayitum īśvareṇāpi śakyate
Yata īśvara evāha gītāyā marjunam prati* (154)

ईश्वरेण अपि = the Lord also; अत्र = in this world;
एतत् = this *prārabdha*; न = not; वारयितुम् = evade;
शक्यते = can; च = and; यतः = because; ईश्वरः एव
= the Lord himself; गीतायाम् = in *Gītā*; अर्जुनम् प्रति
= to *Arjuna*; आह = said the same thing.

In this world even the Lord is not able to evade the effects of *prārabdha*, because He himself declared this in *Gītā* to *Arjuna*. (154)

Īśvareṇa api etc. When the *icchā prārabdha* mentioned in the examples above start operating in an individual, even *Īśvara* cannot help such an individual. This is what Lord *Kṛṣṇa* himself tells *Arjuna* in the *Gītā*.

Quoted in the following *śloka*-----

सदृशं चेष्टते स्वस्याः प्रकृतेर्ज्ञानवानपि ।
प्रकृतिं यान्ति भूतानि निग्रहः किं करिष्यति ॥१५५॥

*Sadṛśam ceṣṭate svasyāḥ prakṛter jñāna vānapi
Prakṛtiṁ yānti bhūtāni nigrahaḥ kiṁ kariṣyati* (155)

ज्ञानवान् अपि = although knowing well, the man of knowledge; स्वस्याः = his; प्रकृतेः सदृशम् = according to nature; चेष्टते = performs; भूतानि = the beings; प्रकृतिम् = to their nature (i.e. *prārabdha*); यान्ति = attain; निग्रहः = our effort to hold back; किम् = what; करिष्यति = can do.

Even a man of knowledge, knowing well, is compelled to act according to his nature, because the beings express their tendencies. In this matter, what can the efforts do to hold them back from expression? (i.e. the *icchā prārabdha* operates with full vigour). (155)

This is a quotation from the *Gītā* (III.33) to support the statement explaining *svecchā prārabdha*, how it operates, how its effects are to be experienced and how even God cannot help in escaping its effects. *Jñānavān api*- Even if one has sufficient *viveka* or discrimination, and even if he who is operating under this *prārabdha* knows what the consequences of his actions will be, *svasyāḥ* etc. - he functions according to this *prakṛti*. (*Prakṛti* is a term used by Lord *Kṛṣṇa* to indicate the impact of the tendencies from the earlier life). Whenever the earlier tendencies become manifest, they start functioning.

Prakṛtiṁ yānti etc. - Everyone follows his own nature (*prārabdha*). Thereafter, what can repression and suppression achieve? Will-power breaks down sooner or later. Therefore, this type of *prārabdha karma* is very difficult to be conquered by self-effort alone.

Lord *Kṛṣṇa* says the same thing in *Gītā* chapters IV and XVIII also. 'Instead of struggling by yourself to conquer your *prārabdha karma*, change your attitude. Try to do the worship of the Lord through your activities; then the impact of the *prārabdha karma* also starts reducing.

Another reference is quoted to support this view of Lord *Kṛṣṇa*----

अवश्यंभाविभावानां प्रतिकारो भवेद्यदि ।
तदा दुःखैर्न लिप्येरन्नल राम युधिष्ठिराः ॥१५६॥

*Avaśyaṁ bhāvi bhāvānām pratikāro bhavedhyadi
Tadā duḥkhair na lipyeraṇ nala rāma yudhiṣṭhirāḥ* (156)

अवश्यम् भावि भावानाम् = the destined events in one's life; यदि प्रतिकारः भवेत् = if can be avoided; तदा = can be; तदा = in that case; नल राम युधिष्ठिराः = kings (like) *Nala, Rāma* or *Yudhiṣṭhiraḥ*, दुःखैः = by miseries; न = not; लिप्येरन् = are influenced.

Were it possible to avoid the impact of the destined events of one's life, the kings like *Nala*, *Rāma* or *Yudhiṣṭhira* would not have undergone the miseries of life. (156)

Avaśyam bhāvi bhāvānām etc. - Whatever is to happen is bound to happen. If it were possible to change the course of what is destined to happen, *Nala*, *Rāma* and *Yudhiṣṭhira* would not have suffered as they did. *Yudhiṣṭhira* was a wise man, but he gambled again and again. So did *Nala*. *Rama* was very upright and intelligent and he still acted in such a way that drew harsh words even from such a staunch ally like *Lakṣmaṇa*.

The concept of *prārabdha* is only to explain to such actions as these. There is one principle that a spiritual seeker must learn from all this, that whatever happens to him, good or bad, nobody else is responsible other than his own past actions. *Prārabdha karma* is the bundle of impressions he himself has gathered from his earlier life-style.

There seems an over-emphasis on the impact of *prārabdha*, that even God is helpless before it, thereby reducing the status of the Lord ----

न चेश्वरत्वमीशस्य हीयते तावता यतः ।
अवश्यं भाविताप्येषामीश्वरेणैव निर्मिता ॥१५७॥

Na ceśvaratva mīśasya hīyate tāvatā yataḥ
Avaśyam bhāvitā'pyeṣām īśvareṇaiva nirmitā (157)

ईशस्य = of the Lord; ईश्वरत्वम् = the Governership;
तावता = by such a thing like the strength of
the *prārabdha*; न च हीयते = is not lost; यतः = because;
एषाम् = of these miseries etc; अवश्यम् भाविता =
the necessity; अपि = also; ईश्वरेण एव = by the Lord
Himself; निर्मिता = is created.

Because of the overpowering effect of *prārabdha*, one may assume a loss of the Lordship of God. But it is not so. Because, even the necessity of the miseries etc., and their impact on the beings is created by the Lord Himself. (157)

The question can be raised: If even the God cannot change *prārabdha*, does it mean the *prārabdha* is stronger than God? The answer is: *no*. *Īśasya īśvaratvam* - The omnipotent quality of *Īśvara*, His strength is not in any way be-littled, just because he cannot remove the impact of *prārabdha karma* from the life of an individual.

Yataḥ eṣām etc. - This is the rule laid down by *Īśvara* Himself that *prārabdha* has to be worked out by going through it. There is no short-cut out of it. Having created that inexorable rule Himself, he is in no position to break it, Himself, although he can.

A similar thought comes in the *Rāmāyāṇa* when *Rāma* is preparing to build a bridge across the ocean to *Śrī Lankā*. When after three days of prayer, the ocean did not make way, *Rāma* gets annoyed with *Varuṇa* and wants to send his arrow to dry up the ocean, *Varuṇa* appears before *Rāma* and says 'we are inert. But, then you alone gave us the rules and regulations as per our nature. How can you expect us to break the rule which you yourself have laid down?'

The point that emerges is that a spiritual seeker never demands change in the quota of his experiences that he is destined to get. He is one who is prepared to face the problems of life with a smile on his face and courage in his heart.

The second type of *prārabdha* is ----

प्रश्नोत्तराभ्यामेवैतद्गम्यतेऽर्जुनकृष्णयोः ।
अनिच्छापूर्वकं चास्ति प्रारब्धमिति तच्छृणु ॥१५८॥

*Praśno itarābhyā. mevai tad gamyate 'rjuna kṛṣṇayoḥ
Anicchā pūrvakam cāsti prārabdha miti tacchṛṇu. (158)*

अर्जुन कृष्णयोः = of Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa; प्रश्नोत्तराभ्याम् एव = in the dialogue; अनिच्छा पूर्वकम् = without desiring; प्रारब्धम् अस्ति = the prārabdha is; च = certainly; इति एतद् = thus; गम्यते = is seen; तत् शृणु = listen to that.

It is seen from the dialogue of Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa that there is *anicchā* (undesired) *prārabdha*. Listen to it. (158)

The first type of *prārabdha* which was discussed hitherto was *icchā prārabdha* i.e. that *prārabdha* is because of the impressions from past lives that are maturing and fructifying. The second type of *anicchā prārabdha* is explained with quotations from the *Bhagavad Gītā* in the form of questions and answers between Arjuna and Lord Kṛṣṇa. From the dialogue, the point is made out that there is something called *anicchā prārabdha* i.e. *prārabdha* which the individual does not want, but it manifests under compulsion.

The following three verses are quoted from *Gītā*, to demonstrate the principle of *anicchā prārabdha*----

अथ केन प्रयुक्तोऽयं पापं चरति पूरुषः ।

अनिच्छन्नपि वार्ष्णेय बलादिव नियोजितः ॥१५९॥

*Atha kena prayukto'yaṁ pāpaṁ carati pūruṣaḥ
Anicchan api vārṣṇeya balādiva niyojitaḥ (159)*

वार्ष्णेय = O' Kṛṣṇa; अथ = now; अयम् = this; पूरुषः = man; केन = by what; प्रयुक्तः = prompted; अनिच्छन् अपि = although not desiring; बलात् = under compulsion; नियोजित इव = as if well designed; पापम् = sin; चरति = commits.

O' Kṛṣṇa, now the question is, this man, although unwilling under whose promptings commits sins as though under compulsion. (159)

This and the next *śloka* (III-36 & III-37) in the context in which they occur in *Gītā* have a certain significance with reference to Arjuna---a confused, deluded individual who does not know which way his duty lies.

In the present context of *vedāntik* enquiry, they hold a different meaning. The main point made is that there is such a thing called *anicchā prārabdha* and that it is authenticated by the *Bhagavad Gītā*.

Atha Kena prayukto etc. - Arjuna's question is, Oh Kṛṣṇa! Tell me, prompted by what or whom (*anicchan api*) although he does not desire to do wrong things in life, yet he commits sins (*balādiva*) as if compelled by some force? [Here the word *puruṣaḥ* is used for *jīvātmā*]

The Lord replies ----

काम एष क्रोध एष रजोगुणसमुद्भवः ।

महाशनो महापाप्मा विद्ध्येनमिह वैरिणम् ॥१६०॥

*Kāma eṣa krodha eṣa rajoguṇa samud bhavaḥ
Mahāśano mahā pāpmā vidhye namiha vairi ṇam (160)*

एषः = this *anicchā prārabdha*; कामः = is desire; एषः = this desire; क्रोधः = is itself manifests as anger; रजोगुण समुद्भवः = born of *rajo guṇa*; महा अशनः = of insatiable hunger; महा पाप्मा = of the nature of terrible sins; इह = in this world; एनम् = to, this; वैरिणम् = enemy; विद्धि = know to be.

The *anicchā prārabdha* is desire, which itself manifests as anger and is born of *rajo guṇa*. It has an insatiable hunger and can commit terrible sins. Consider this desire to be an enemy in this world. (160)

Lord Kṛṣṇa (in *Gītā* III-37) replies *Arjuna*'s question:

Kāma eṣa etc. - *Anicchā prārabdha* is because of desire, and of anger which are born out of *rajo guṇa*.

Mahā aśanaḥ etc. - Desire is a voracious 'eater', any amount of desire fulfilment puts no end to desire. It is also a big sinner because to get the desire fulfilled one will do anything. It is the most terrible enemy in one's life.

[Note: The greatness of the *Gītā* lies in the way the same *śloka* can be interpreted in different contexts in different ways, all equally appropriate and equally valid. For example, *Tilak* interpreted the whole of *Gītā* in terms of *karma yoga* which was appropriate in that context and time. Whereas *Bhagavān Śāṅkarācārya* interpreted as *jñāna mārga* which was necessary to counter the negative and defeatist tendencies that were gaining ground at that time.]

Yet another *śloka* from *Bhag. Gītā* (XVIII-60) explaining the role of *anicchā prārabdha* is quoted----

स्वभावजेन कौन्तेय निबद्धः स्वेन कर्मणा ।

कर्तुं नेच्छसि यन्मोहात्करिष्यस्यवशोऽपि तत् ॥१६१॥

*Svabhāva jena kaunteya nibaddha svena karmaṇā
Kartum necchasi yanmohāt kariṣyasya vaśo'pi tat* (161)

कौन्तेय = O' *Arjuna* ; स्वेन = by one's own; स्वभाव जेन = born of (thy) own nature; कर्मणा = by action; निबद्धः = under bondage; यत् = that; कर्तुम् न इच्छसि = do not desire to do; तत् अपि = even that; मोहात् = under delusion; अवशः = helplessly; करिष्यसि = you shall do.

O' *Arjuna*, one is under the bondage of one's own *prārabdha karma*, and is compelled to act in the field under the delusion and helplessness, without desire. Therefore, what you think

you will not do, will be done by you, even against your own will.. (161)

The *anicchā prārabdha* is again confirmed by Lord Kṛṣṇa at the end of the *Bhagavad Gītā* in the above quoted *śloka*. He tells *Arjuna*, 'You may think you do not want to fight. Let us see.'

Svabhāvajena nibaddhaḥ etc. One who has come under the spell of *prārabdha*, you may wish not to do something but the *anicchā prārabdha* is so strong, that you will do it in spite of yourself.

It is as if our knowledge (wisdom) is looted away under the spell of helplessness.

The following *śloka* takes up the theme of *parecchā prārabdha*----

नानिच्छन्तो न चेच्छन्तः परदाक्षिण्यसंयुताः ।

सुखदुःखे भजन्त्येतत्परेच्छापूर्वकर्म हि ॥१६२॥

*Nānicchanto na cecchantah para dākṣiṇya saṁyutāḥ
Sukha duḥkhe bhajan tyetat parecchā pūrva karma hi* (162)

अनिच्छन्तः = although not desiring; न = nor; इच्छन्तः = nor likely to have a desire to experience joy or sorrow; च = however; परदाक्षिण्य संयुता = due to concern for others; सुख दुःखे = the joy and sorrows; भजन्ति = experiences; एतत् = this; परेच्छा पूर्व कर्म = *parecchā prārabdha*; हि = indeed.

Although there is no desire for oneself about joy or sorrow, nor there is any need to experience on account of any reason; however, sometimes one experiences joy or sorrow, for the sheer compassion and concern of others. This experience for joy and sorrow is called *parecchā prārabdha*. (162)

The third type of *prārabdha* is *parecchā*. We do not suffer in life either because of the habit of enjoying the

world, or because of *anicchā prārabdha* under the spell of desire, anger etc, but because of *parecchā prārabdha* wherein *anicchantah*-there is no desire now, - *na ca icchantah*-nor does he want to desire later. *Sukha duḥkhe* etc., however, because of concern for others, he suffers when they suffer, and is happy when they are happy. He experiences (vicariously) the joys and sorrows of others.

Etat parecchā etc. - This is *parecchā prārabdha*. It is invited trouble. If the three types of (*icchā*) desires are categorised on the basis of *guṇā*-s, the first type of *icchā prārabdha* which arises out of sheer habit is *tāmasik*, the second *anicchā prārabdha* is an expression of *rajoguṇa*, the third type of *parecchā prārabdha* belongs to the *sattva* category, and it is the most dangerous, because it can lead to an obsession with goodness.

Tamoguṇa can be removed by invoking *rajoguṇa* and becoming dynamically active. From *dravya pradhānatā*--importance to material things, one moves to activity orientation. This in due course degenerates because of reverses, because of undue expectations. Then as a reaction one adopts a doing-good life-style (i.e. *sattva guṇa*). This leads to self-esteem, expectations of appreciation and recognition and to the strengthening of *ahamkāraḥ*. Thus the *sattva guṇa* putrifies to *tamoguṇa* again.

Therefore, it is necessary to concentrate on one's spiritual unfoldment; when goodness becomes a habit, we become a prey to our own goodness. Therefore, let goodness come out as a natural plan of existence and not as an effort associated with goodness - *sattva guṇī-ahamkāraḥ*. Then it becomes helpless goodness. *Parecchā prārabdha* thus starts initially in a beautiful environment but one must be guarded not to fall a prey to it.

In the *upaniṣadik* statement (*Bṛ. Up.4-4-12*) taken for discussion, the word '*kim icchan*' etc., seems to indicate

absence of desire in the man of wisdom. How come, these three desires are accounted in this case? ----

कथं तर्हि किमिच्छन्नित्येवमिच्छा निषिध्यते ।

नेच्छानिषेधः किन्त्विच्छाबाधो भर्जितबीजवत् ॥१६३॥

*Katham tarhi kim-icchanniti evamicchā niṣidhyate
Necchā niṣedhaḥ kintvicchā bādho bharjita bījavat* (163)

किम् इच्छन् = desiring what; इति एवम् = thus said by *upaniṣad*; तर्हि = then; इच्छा = the desire; कथम् = how; निषिध्यते = is denied; इच्छा = desire; निषेधः = negation; न = is not; किन्तु = but; इच्छा बाधः = the lack of potency in desire to get involved; भर्जित = roasted; बीजवत् = like the seed.

In that case (i.e. when even a man of discrimination is not spared by the three types of desires), how come, the *upaniṣad* has denied the presence of desire in the wise man? No, the desire is not denied in the wise man, but the ability in the desire to induce him into the world by activities, is negated like the roasted seed. (163)

Katham tarhi etc. - The doubt is now raised with reference to the first *śloka* of this chapter where it was stated that 'once I come to know my essential nature and that the world is an illusion, there cannot be any desire'. When desire was thus totally denied in the man of wisdom, why are we discussing so much about three types of *prārabdhā*-s etc.? The word *kim-icchan* and the status of desire in the man of wisdom and the man of ignorance is enquired into.

The teacher replies to this question:

Ichchā niṣedhaḥ etc. - In the statement ('*Kim icchan kasya kāmāya*') it is not a total denial of desire in the man of wisdom. There may be desire in him and he may fulfil it, but *icchā badhaḥ*-it will produce no effect

on him, he will not seek to repeat it again and again. The following example is given. *Bharjit bijavat*: If seed is sown it will germinate into new plants but if it is roasted, the roasted seed will not produce new plants but its usefulness as food will not disappear.

Therefore, by the word *kim-icchan*, what is meant is *icchā bādhaḥ* and not *icchā niṣedaḥ*.

The example of roasted seed is explained and applied to the desires of a wise man ----

भर्जितानि तु बीजानि सन्त्यकार्यकराणि च ।
विद्वदिच्छा तथैष्टव्याऽसत्त्वबोधात् कार्यकृत् ॥१६४॥

Bharjitāni tu bījāni santya kārya karāṇi ca
Vidva dicchā tathai śtavyā 'sattva bodhāt na kārya kṛt (164)

भर्जितानि = roasted; बीजानि = seeds; तु = indeed; अकार्यकराणि = do not sprout; च सन्ति = are; तथा = similarly; विद्वत् इच्छा = the nature of desire in the wise man; इष्टव्या असत्त्व बोधात् = having realised the illusory nature of the world; कार्यकृत् = creator of dependence; न = not.

As the roasted seeds do exist, but do not possess the potency of germination, similarly, the desire of the wise man may exist but do not create dependence in him, on account of his realisation of the illusory nature of the world. (164)

What is *icchā bādhaḥ* is explained: *Bharjitāni bījāni ca santi* etc. - Desires in the bosom of a man of wisdom are compared to the roasted seeds. Act of roasting does not destroy the seed but only its germinating capacity.

Iṣṭavya-'sattva bodhāt - Because he knows very clearly the worldly desires have no value so far as the Reality is concerned, *Kārya kṛt na*, this desire does not become a compulsive force in him, just as the roasted seed has lost its compulsion to germinate into a new plant. Because

of the true knowledge about the world and its objects, the world has no more strength to generate the ability in a wise man to plunge into activities born out of desire.

In the *Aitareya upaniṣad* (I-1-1) this thought regarding the creation of the world by the creator is taken up for discussion. If God has no desire because he is *Sat-Cit-Ānanda Svarūpa*, then how is this desire to create the world explained? He thought I shall indeed create the worlds.

Desire comes out of two reasons: one --- out of a sense of incompleteness, which is a compulsion to make an effort to fill that gap; second --- where there is no compulsion but there is only joy in action. This desire is born out of plentitude. The desire of the Lord to create is not born out of compulsion or out of necessity but out of joy --- thus it becomes a '*Līlā*'. The world is neither a creation nor a dissolution. There is neither bondage nor liberation. The truth is that without happening, everything appears to happen.

Therefore, the desire of a wise man is not the same as the desire of an ignorant man. In the latter case, action is born out of compulsion or necessity, but the wise man's action is an expression of joy, a divine play through the wise man who is a mere instrument. Therefore, the word '*Kim icchan*' does not mean the absence of desire, but the quality of desire --- where desire is like a roasted seed, incapable of generating more desires and resultant involvement in the world.

Should we, therefore, conclude that there is a total absence of desires in a wise man, if they cannot lead to any result?

The answer is ----

दग्धबीजमरोहेऽपि भक्षणायोपयुज्यते ।
विद्वदिच्छाप्यल्पभोगं कुर्यान्न व्यसनं बहु ॥१६५॥

Dagdha bījama rohe'pi bhakṣaṇā yopa yujyate
Vidva dicchā pyalpa bhogaṁ kuryāna vyasanam bahu (165)

दग्ध = roasted; बीजम् = seed; अरोहे अपि = although does not sprout; भक्षणाय = for consumption; उपयुज्यते = can be utilized; विद्वत् इच्छा अपि = similarly, the desire of a wise man; अल्प भोगम् = an experience alone; कुर्यात् = gives; बहु = a lot; व्यसनम् न = not lead to expansion or addiction.

Although the roasted seed is incapable of sprouting, it is usable for consumption (and hunger satiation); so also, the desires of a wise man, as a result of *prārabdha*, does give him satiation - experience only and does not produce the resultant addiction or dependence. (165)

Dagdha bījam arohe api etc. - The roasted seed cannot be sown again. It will not germinate, yet it can be eaten. Similarly, *vidvat icchā api* etc. - the desires of the wise man are helpful in removing the problems in the lives of others, but he does not become addicted to doing good. There is no *vyasanam* - no addiction. *Vyasanam* also means clothing. In the wise man there is no clothing of desire which leads to addiction. He preserves his freedom, he is not dependant. The desire creates no *vāsanā*. Making a habit of thinking means being a worrying type, which results in bondage. Making a hobby of thinking means coming out of the commotion of thinking - results in freedom. *Vedāntik* thinking is a method by which habitual thinking is converted into thinking as a hobby which means no seriousness about the world and its problems nor fatigue. It is only pure joy of Self-Enquiry.

Will not the action leading to experience, result in addiction, as is usually observed? The answer is ----

भोगेन चरितार्थत्वात्प्रारब्धं कर्म हीयते ।
भोक्तव्यसत्यताभ्रान्त्या व्यसनं तत्र जायते ॥१६६॥

Bhogenā caritār thatvāt prārabdham karma hīyate
Bhoktavya satyatā bhrāntyā vyasanam tatra jāyate (166)

प्रारब्धम् कर्म = the *prārabdha karma*; भोगेन = through experience; चरितार्थत्वात् = is fulfilled; हीयते = and is destroyed; भ्रान्त्या = due to delusion; भोक्तव्य सत्यता = reality in the enjoyable objects; तत्र = there; व्यसनम् = addiction; जायते = is born.

The *prārabdha karma* is fulfilled through its experience and is destroyed thereafter. (However), the imagination of reality in the enjoyable objects, due to delusion, leads to addiction. (166)

Prārabdha karma bhogen etc. - The rule is that *prārabdha karma* can be nullified only by going through it. Thereafter, it is destroyed. *Bhoktavya satyatā* etc. - When we have the delusion that the object of enjoyment is the reality and that without it I suffer and with it I enjoy fulfilment, there is no reason not to believe that the reality of satiation of this desire is contained in that object. Thus, we superimpose out of delusion, the ability on the particular object to satiate our desire. And our attachment to that object becomes so strong as to become an addiction.

The wise man who enjoys a worldly object knows that the joy is only in the tranquility of the mind. Thus he is able to go through the *prārabdha karma* without allowing it to leave any impressions on his mind or *vāsanā*-s within. He does not react. Whereas the ignorant man goes through the same *prārabdha karma* but he reacts, thus making the knot of the *vasānā* stronger and stronger in his life.

Therefore, one must learn to live in this world, like a mirror reflecting everything but retaining nothing. Normally, we retain likes and dislikes in the form of memory. When

an experience leaves an impression on the mind it is called a reaction; when it does not, it is called a response. In response, there is no *vāsanā*-formation. This is the technique which the wise man uses.

The nature of the delusion leading to addiction is----

मा विनश्यत्वयं भोगो वर्धतामुत्तरोत्तरम् ।

मा विघ्नाः प्रतिबध्नन्तु धन्योऽस्म्यस्मादिति भ्रमः ॥१६७॥

Mā vinaśya tvayam bhogo vardhatā muttaro ttaram
Mā vighnāḥ prati badhnantu dhanyo' smyasmā diti bhramah (167)

मा विनश्यतु = may not be destroyed; अयम् भोगः = this enjoyment; उत्तरोत्तरम् = progressively; वर्धताम् = may increase; विघ्नाः = obstacles; मा प्रतिबध्नन्तु = may not hinder; अस्मात् = from this; धन्यः अस्मि = I am fulfilled; इति = thus; भ्रमः = is nature of delusion.

The nature of this delusion is - may this enjoyment not come to an end! May it grow progressively. May any obstacles not hinder this enjoyment! I am fulfilled because of this enjoyment! (167)

Why does delusion become so strong and how does it work in the ignorant man?

All of us have to go through our *prārabdha*, there is no choice. Every moment of our lives, is nothing but an expression of *prārabdha*. The question is: how do we face this *prārabdha*? The way an ignorant man faces his *prārabdha* and how he suffers because of the bondage or attachment, is the theme of this *śloka*.

Ayam bhogaḥ etc. - This enjoyment, the ignorant man thinks, should not cease to be. I should always have it. It should grow more and more. I should not face obstacles and difficulties in my enjoyment. Because of these enjoyments, I am a lucky man.

Iti bhramah - This is the delusion. This delusion causes a lot of attachment and addiction in our lives. We give wrong priorities to things. This is the first step. Next is the effort to be a perfectionist to the point of being obsessive, still another step is the thought that one's way is the only right way (i.e. not having an open mind).

Therefore, the teacher says the only right way to live in this world is to respond and not to react. When such a life-style of 'non-reaction' is adopted, one can work out the *prārabdha* and at the same time, the mind is emptied.

Emptying of the mind is called the spiritual life. A spiritual student accepts everyone as he or she is. Because the Consciousness supports the good and the bad, love and anger, divine as well as material thoughts. Therefore, *Paramātmā* is one who denies nothing, nor does he have attachment to goodness nor hatred towards badness.

Lord Kṛṣṇa in *Gītā* (IX-19) says:

Amṛtaṁ cai'va mṛtyuś ca sad asac cā 'ham Arjuna

I am the deathlessness as well as death. I am Existence as well as non-Existence. That, supporting all the pairs of opposites, is not influenced by either of the opposites.

With this knowledge being reflected upon again and again, if we function in this world, slowly this delusion will get out of our mind. Let us therefore, accept the world as it is, if at all anything needs change, it is ourselves!

How do we go beyond the influence of this delusion? The answer is----

यदभावि न तद्भावि भावि चेन्न तदन्यथा ।

इति चिन्ताविषघ्नोऽयं बोधो भ्रमनिवर्तकः ॥१६८॥

*Yad-abhāvi na tad-bhāvi bhāvi cenna tad-anyathā
Iti cintā viṣaghno-'yam bodho bhrama nivartakaḥ* (168)

यद् अभावि = that which is not due; तद् = that; न = not; भावि = shall be; भावि चेत् = that which is certain; तद् = that; अन्यथा = other way; न = not; इति = this; चिन्ता विषघ्नः = the destroyed of the poison of worry; अयम् बोधः = this knowledge; भ्रम निवर्तकः = is the remover of delusion.

That which is not due shall never be; and if due, can never be avoided. Thus, this knowledge, which is the destroyer of the poison of worries, is the remover of delusion. (168)

Yad abhāvi etc. - That which is not going to be (happen) that will not happen, then why worry unnecessarily?

Bhāvi cet etc. - If something is going to happen, it will happen (it can not be otherwise), then why worry?

Cinta viṣaghnaḥ etc. - This knowledge will destroy the poison of worry from our lives. It will remove the delusion in our lives, along with its effects.

This statement may seem to be a fatalistic (defeatist) way of thinking on the surface. If it is interpreted in that way it will make an individual, frustrated, lazy, lethargic and without inspiration. Because of imaginary fear we stop our progress in spiritual life. On the other hand, if the same statement is studied through the channel of wisdom, it can mean a joyful expression of fearlessness. It will make one, more inspired, worry-free and relaxed.

The same thought occurs in the *Bhagavad Gītā*:

*nā'sato vidyate bhāvo, nā'bhāvo vidyate sataḥ
ubhayor api dṛṣṭo'ntas, tv anayos tattva-darśibhiḥ*

(II-16)

The unreal has no existence; the real never ceases to be, the truth about both has been realised by the seers.

Why can't we accept this truth about life? Acceptance with a smile is called *puruṣārtha*. Acceptance under unwilling compulsion with resistance in the heart, represents fatalistic view of life.

Everyone has good and bad experiences to go through in life. He, who tosses up and down with these experiences, is fatalistic; he, who does not get disturbed, has understood the working of *karma*.

Every experience should be converted into an opportunity to evaluate our mind's working and through such a process come to know oneself.

What could be the reason for different responses in the wise and otherwise, that lead to absence of addiction and its presence, respectively?

The answer is ----

समेऽपि भोगे व्यसनं भ्रान्तो गच्छेन्न बुद्धवान् ।

अशक्यार्थस्य सङ्कल्पात् भ्रान्तस्य व्यसनं बहु ॥१६९॥

*Same'pi bhoge vyasanam bhrānto gacchenna buddhavan
Aśakyār thasya saṅkalpāt bhrāntasya vyasanam bahu* (169)

भोगे समे अपि = although the results of the *prārabdha karma* are similar in both; भ्रान्तः = the deluded ignorant; व्यसनम् गच्छेत् = gets addicted; बुद्धवान् = the wise; न = not; अशक्यार्थस्य = of the impossible; सङ्कल्पात् = desiring; भ्रान्तस्य = of the deluded ignorant; व्यसनम् = addiction; बहु = strong.

Although, the results of the *prārabdha karma* are similar in the life of both-the wise and the deluded, the deluded gets addicted to the experiences firmly, on account of desiring the impossible, but not the wise. (169)

What makes the ignorant man and the wise man react in different ways to *prārabdha karma*?

Bhoge same api etc. - Although *prārabdha karma* is operating on both the ignorant and the wise man with equal force, and there is no discrimination in the operation of the *prārabdha karma* in their lives, why the deluded person carries the *vāsanā-s* as impressions thereafter, but not the man of wisdom? Why is this difference?

Āśakya arthasya saṅkalpāt etc. - It is because the ignorant man expects the impossible, and therefore, suffers. The nature of the world is that *śānti* and *aśānti* must go together. The world exists in the self-cancelling pairs of opposites. When this is the reality, to expect only one-sidedness in life, is expectation of an impossibility. This is called *Āśakyānuṣṭhāna*, and results in suffering and misery. When we expect the impossible, we are in the kingdom of delusion.

The wise man will, therefore, put his hand into the world only up to the point from which he can withdraw, leaving no impressions on his mind. Self-protection from the world is most essential for spiritual progress.

The absence of delusion and its effect such as addiction in case of the wise is evident ----

मायामयत्वं भोगस्य बुद्ध्वाऽऽस्थामुपसंहरन् ।
भुञ्जानोऽपि न संकल्पं कुरुते व्यसनं कुतः ॥१७०॥

Māyā mayatvam bhogasya buddhvā'sthā mupa saṅharan
Bhuñjāno'pi na saṅkalpaṁ kurute vyasanaṁ kutaḥ (170)

भोगस्य = of the objects and their experience; माया मयत्वम् = illusory nature; बुद्ध्वा = having known; आस्थाम् = attachment; उपसंहरन् = having withdrawn; भुञ्जानः अपि = although experiencing; संकल्पम् = resolve to again enjoy; न = not; कुरुते = does.

Having known the illusory nature of the objects of enjoyment and their experiences of joy etc., and therefore, having withdrawn his dependence on them, the wise man, does not resolve to enjoy them again and again (i.e. he does not get addicted to the enjoyments). (170)

Bhogasya māyā-mayatvam etc. - Having come to realise that enjoyment and the objects of enjoyment are not real, they are illusory, the man of wisdom is totally withdrawn from these objects and enjoyments.

Sat-buddhi is that understanding which is able to grasp the essence of an object. The man of *Sat-buddhi* knows how to focus on the essence - the *sat-vastu* and ignore the glitter of name and form which is constantly changing.

Bhuñjānaḥ api etc. - Although such a wise man is enjoying the world, he does not give the enjoyment a status of reality (*saṅkalpaṁ na kurute*). *Saṅkalpa* is *samyak kalpanā*. It is composed of three attitudes towards an object:-

- (a) this object of enjoyment is real (*satya-buddhi*);
- (b) this object has the content of happiness (*sukha buddhi*);
- (c) and therefore unless I get this object, I will not be happy.

Where from have these attitudes come? Taking the above three attitudes serially:

- (a) Not from the object but from the mind which has given value to the object and in so doing, devalued oneself. To the extent Reality (*satyatva*) has been given to the object, to that extent one's value of being the Reality, is reduced.
- (b) When one imagines the content of joy in that object, it is an admission of the absence of joy in oneself.
- (c) When one imagines that unless this object is possessed, there will not be fulfilment in life,

one limits oneself, by the presence or absence of the object.

These aspects of the mind are called *sañkalpa*. In *Mahābhārata*, a story is told of a *ṛṣi* named *Mañki* to whom some devotees gifted a cow which yielded twin calves. The *ṛṣi* tied them together with a long rope thinking that, that was the best way to keep a watch on them. One day a Camel came by and lifted them up by the rope binding both. The startled *ṛṣi* said '*kāma jānāmi te mūlaṁ, sañkalpāt kile jāyase*-Oh desire! Now I know your birth place. You are born out of *sañkalpa*. In this case the *sañkalpa* was 'if the cow is here, there will be plenty of milk' etc. Therefore, I am not going to do any more *sañkalpa*, so there cannot be any desire.'

Bhujjāno api na sañkalpam kurute-The wise man stays in the world, enjoys every moment and yet he does not have any *sañkalpa*. *Sañkalpa* creates bondage. But the wise man enjoys thoroughly and thereafter forgets equally thoroughly, without any expectation of repeating the same experience. He can even convert suffering into enjoyment.

Then every moment is a moment of joy - a discovery of the Lord. Because the Lord is marvel as stated in *Gītā* (II-29) :-

To take every moment as it comes is called *prasād buddhi*. Whatever comes, take that as a blessing of the Lord. Action dedicated to God and done without desire purifies the mind. It aids liberation.

Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa says in *Gītā* (II.14):

Oh, *Arjuna*, every experience in this world has the same biography; whether it is joy or sorrow, it begins in time, is maintained in time and ends in time. It is temporary. For a temporary experience to become permanently miserable is not wise. Endure Them! Experience them but don't be influenced by them!

Therefore, the answer is to convert endurance into enjoyment --- that is the spiritual life-style.

Vyasanam kutaḥ-How can there be any impression on the mind? Impression on the mind comes when the experience is recorded in terms of good and bad; liking or disliking; success or failure; fulfilment or frustration. We get clothed in these impressions.

Therefore, the wise man does not take the world too seriously. He takes it lightly, in the light of wisdom.

There seems to be a contradiction in the above verse. If one enjoys the world, how can he be without its impact of good or bad; and therefore, must be influenced by these experiences. Or, if one knows this world to be an illusion, how can he enjoy?

The answer is ----

स्वप्नेन्द्रजालसदृशमचिन्त्यरचनात्मकम् ।
दृष्टनष्टं जगत्पश्यन्कथं तत्रानुरज्यति ॥१७१॥

Svapnendra jāla sadṛśam acintya racanātmakam
Dṛṣṭa naṣṭam jagat paśyan katham tatrā nuraajyati (171)

जगत् = this world; स्वप्न इन्द्रजाल सदृशम् = having known to be illusory like that of dream or magic; अचिन्त्य रचनात्मकम् = incomprehensible; दृष्ट नष्टम् = constantly perishing; पश्यन् = have seen so; तत्र = in that world; कथम् = how; अनुरज्यति = gets attached.

Having known for certain, that this world is incomprehensible and illusory like the dream world or the magical creation, therefore, constantly perishing; how can a wise man get attached to this and its enjoyments! (171)

The question now raised is: If the wise man on the basis of his knowledge that the world of objects is illusory, is able to withdraw from these objects and the addiction

in relation to them, how can he then enjoy the world? When he knows the world is an illusion, how can he have *bhoga-buddhi*-the sense of enjoyment?

Svapna indra jala sadṛśam etc. - when a person comes to know that this world is like a dream, a magic show, an incomprehensible illusion, and if this can be accepted by the mind, then that person has been blessed with the ultimate supreme grace.

Truth or the Absolute is beyond the purview of logic and reason. So also is ignorance or illusion. This world is created without logic. Any logic that we apply from the plane of relative understanding, to the plane of the Absolute, will be an incomplete vision. In an incomplete vision there cannot be a complete solution.

The world exists in the pairs of opposites. There is no logic for it, it is so. Therefore (*drṣtam naṣtam jagat paśyan*) having realised the continuously perishing nature of the world, the wise man understands and accepts the world as such. *Tatra katham anurajyati*? How can such a man get attached to the world which is constantly changing?

How to develop this vision of a wise man? ----

स्वस्वप्नमापरोक्ष्येण दृष्ट्वा पश्यन्स्वजागरम् ।

चिन्तयेदप्रमत्तः सन्नृभावमुदिनं मुहुः ॥१७२॥

Svasvapna māparokṣyeṇa drṣtvā paśyan svajāgaram
Cintayet apramattaḥ san ubhāv anudinaṁ muhuḥ (172)

स्वस्वप्नम् = one's own dream; आपरोक्ष्येण = immediately and directly; दृष्ट्वा = having analysed; स्वजागरम् = one's own waking experience; पश्यन् = seeing and enquiring; उभौ = both; अप्रमत्तः सन् = without any biasness and error; अनुदिनम् = daily; मुहुः = again and again; चिन्तयेत् = one should contemplate.

One should analyse and enquire one's own immediate direct experience of both waking and dream without any error or bias, daily again and again, and contemplate on these lines of thinking (to arrive at the right conclusion of equal status of either of them). (172)

How then do we proceed to get established in this knowledge of the wise man? What is the technique?

Sva svapnam svajāgaram etc. - We have one set of experience in our dream. In the waking state also we have another set of experience. Thus, there are two sets of experiences.

Apramattaḥ san etc. - Constantly contemplate on these two planes of consciousness simultaneously, without any bias introduced out of ignorance (that the waking state and its world of objects is more real than dream etc.).

Why is this being advised? This is explained in the next śloka----

चिरं तयोः सर्वसाम्यमनुसन्धाय जागरे ।
सत्यत्वबुद्धिं संत्यज्य नानुरज्यति पूर्ववत् ॥१७३॥

Ciram tayoh̐ sarva sām̐yam anusandhāya jāgare
Satyatva buddhiṁ santyajya nānurajyati pūrvavat (173)

तयोः = of the two i.e. waking and dream; सर्व साम्यम् = all common points; चिरम् = for a long time; अनुसन्धाय = having contemplated upon; जागरे = in the waking experience; सत्यत्व बुद्धिम् = the notion of reality; संत्यज्य = having rejected; पूर्ववत् = as before; न = not; अनुरज्यति = is enchanted and attached.

(The wise man) having contemplated on the common points of the characteristics of the waking and dream experience comes to renounce the notion of reality in the waking experience and thereafter never gets enchanted and attached to the enjoyments, as before. (173)

There are different fields of spiritual *sādhana*. One is predominantly emotional called *Bhakti*. The other is the field of enquiry or *tattva-vicāra*. The latter demands, that the *sādhaka* does not allow himself to be clouded by the emotional element but must have a ruthless courage to carry the enquiry through, to its ultimate conclusion.

Here the teacher is explaining how to do this (*vicāra*) enquiry and contemplation about both the dream and the waking experience, and what such an enquiry will yield.

Sarvam sāmāya tayoh etc. - A constant reflection on the similarities of these two states again and again will show the following similarities:

- (a) The enjoyments in the two states are valid only in the respective period of consciousness. The food of the dream cannot satiate the hunger of the waking state. The riches of the dream state are not cashable in the waking state. Thus the *bhoga* or enjoyment of the two states is not interchangeable. It is limited only to its own plane of consciousness. If you can take the experiences of the dream state as an illusion, why not treat the experiences of the waking state also as an illusion or take both as real?
- (b) The experiences of both the dream and waking states are nothing except modifications. Experiences of joy, sorrow etc. are all modifications of the mind in both states. Why should we consider the modifications in one state as illusion and in the other as reality?
- (c) The experiences in each state is terminated in absence. Every experience, good or bad in the waking state has its end in that state. Similarly, the dream experience terminates with the termination of the dream state. In this way, both planes of consciousness fall in the same level of reality or illusion.

- (d) No experience in this world can maintain the same intensity, whether it is the waking or dream state.

Therefore, from the above it can be concluded that there is no difference between the two states.

Ciram tayoh etc. In this way reflect on these similarities. For how long? And how will we know that we are proceeding in the right direction?

Jāgare satyatva buddhim - Totally reject (renounce once and for all, without any doubt and with no attempt to assess your own judgement or reverse the process) the belief that the waking state is real - that is, taking the modifications of the mind, as real and forgetting the modified which is supporting the modifications i.e. the mind stuff.

The components of the *jāgrat* or waking state are:

- (i) the world of objects of the waking state;
- (ii) the experiencer of the waking state and
- (iii) the experiences of the waking state.

All these three components must function simultaneously if the waking state is to exist. Therefore, when we are told to reject the waking state, it means not only rejecting the waking world, along with the waking experiences, but also the waker who is rejecting the waking world. As the waking world is an illusion, so is the waker along with his waking experience. Therefore, rejection of the waking state means the rejection of all the three components. This is what is meant by *Jāgare satyatva buddhim santyajya*. Identification with the gross body is beginning of the creation of the gross world. Until our attachment to the gross body is completely gone, the renunciation of the waking state cannot happen.

Na anurajyati pūrva vat - After this proper understanding and right knowledge takes place, the seeker will never be attached to the world again as he was before the dawn of knowledge.

A question is raised at the end of the *śloka* 170, about the status of reality of the world and enjoyment. This is analysed and answered, thus concluding that, the enjoyment or any experience does not demand reality in the object of enjoyment----

इन्द्रजालमिदं द्वैतमचिन्त्यरचनात्वतः ।
इत्यविस्मरतो हानिः का वा प्रारब्धभोगतः ॥१७४॥

Indra jāla midam dvaitam acintya racanā tvataḥ
Itya visma rato hāniḥ kā vā prārabdha bhogataḥ (174)

इदम् = this; द्वैतम् = experience of duality; अचिन्त्य रचनात्वतः = being of inexplicable nature; इन्द्र जालम् = is illusion like a magician's creation; इति = thus; अविस्मरतः = who has not forgotten; प्रारब्ध भोगतः = from the experience of *prārabdha*; का हानिः = what obstacle can be; वा = or (what can obstruct his enquiry?)

A wise man who has not forgotten the illusory nature of this inexplicable world of duality, what obstacle can this world create for him in experience or in enquiry about the illusory nature of the world? (174)

The doubt being raised is: If the man of wisdom come to the understanding that the world is an illusion, how will he be able to enjoy. The teacher says, why should he not enjoy? On the contrary he will enjoy more.

Idam dvaitam acintya etc. - For the experience of *prārabdha karma*, *dvaita* is essential. The world of duality is inexplicable like a magic show. *Iti avismarataḥ* - He who has not forgotten this, namely, that the world is an illusion like a magic show, and without duality there can no *bhoga*, when this happens *prārabdha bhogataḥ kā hāniḥ* - Why should he not be able to undergo the experiences? When there is experience of joy and sorrow, is it necessary that the object which is giving him the joy and the sorrow should be real?

Often we suffer because of the misunderstanding of an imaginary factor which does not exist. Therefore, for getting an experience, the object from which we receive the experience need not be real.

Therefore, the idea, that one will not be able to enjoy if one comes to realise that the world is an illusion is, not correct. The illusoriness of the world, and the knowledge thereof are not obstacles for receiving the experience of the world. On the contrary, he will be able to enjoy more.

Why is it then, the knowledge that the world is illusory, on the one hand and that the *prārabdha bhoga* or experience is real on the other, do not contradict each other?

The teacher, says it is because the two fall under different degrees of reality. The hunger of the waking state cannot be satiated by the food of the dream state. But the waking state hunger is not contradicted by the dream state food. They do not nullify each other, because the two experiences belong to different levels of reality.

So also the knowledge that the world is an illusion, and the experiences of *prārabdha*, of joy and sorrow, fall under two different realms of reality and therefore, there is no contradiction.

This is indicated in next *śloka*----

निर्बन्धस्तत्त्वविद्याया इन्द्रजालत्वसंस्मृतौ ।
प्रारब्धस्याग्रहो भोगे जीवस्य सुखदुःखयोः ॥१७५॥

Nirbandha tattva vidyāyā indra jālatva saṁsmṛtau
Prārabdha syāgraho bhoge jīvasya sukha duḥkhaḥ (175)

तत्त्व विद्यायाः = the knowledge about the essence of the world and its illusory appearance; इन्द्र जालत्व संस्मृतौ = in remembering that the world is an illusion; निर्बन्धः

= is essential; प्रारब्धस्य = of the *prārabdha*; जीवस्य सुख दुःखयोः = with regard to joy and sorrow; भोगे = in the experience of; आग्रहः = is essential.

In remembering the world to be an illusion, the knowledge about the essence of the world and its illusory nature is essential. While experiencing the joy and sorrows by the *jīva*, the *prārabdha* is essential. (Hence, they do not contradict each other). (175)

Tattva vidyāyāḥ etc. - The knowledge about the illusory nature of the world occurs in association with remembering that the world is an illusion like a magic show. The world can be understood as an illusion when it is constantly remembered to be so. The field of operation of this knowledge is the memory that the world is an illusion.

Jivasya sukha duḥkhaḥ - The joys and sorrows of the *jīva* are connected with the *prārabdha*. Thus, there are two pairs of relationships:

- knowledge about the illusoriness of the world is required for remembering that the world is an illusion;
- For experience of joy and sorrow of the *jīva*, the *prārabdha Karma* is essential.

A stick placed vertically in water in a pond, creates its reflection. We know that the reflection is an illusion. When the water (the medium) is disturbed, the reflection breaks into pieces. The perception of the movement of the stick as a result of the movement in the reflecting medium, does not contradict my knowledge that a reflection cannot be destroyed.

Yet again, our knowledge that it is the earth's rotation around her own axis that gives rise to the phenomenon of sunrise and sunset, does not contradict our perception that the sun is 'rising' or 'setting'. Similarly, the conditioning of the mind creates the illusion of time and space and that the world exists. The moment we get out of the

mind, neither the world nor its problems have any impact on us.

The knowledge about the illusory nature of the world and the experience do not contradict each other ----

विद्यारब्धे विरुध्येते न भिन्नविषयत्वतः ।

जानद्भिरप्यैन्द्रजालविनोदो दृश्यते खलु ॥१७६॥

Vidyā rabdhe virudhyete na bhinna viṣayatva taḥ
Jānadbhi rapyain drajāla vinodo drśyate khalu (176)

विद्यारब्धे = the knowledge and *prārabdha*; न = not; विरुध्येते = contradict each other; भिन्न विषय त्वतः = on account of different fields of operation; इन्द्र जाल विनोदः = the wonderful experience of magic; जानद्भिः अपि = even by those who know it to be a magic; दृश्यते = is seen; खलु = indeed.

The knowledge and *prārabdha* do not cancel or contradict each other; their fields of operation being different and independent of the other. Indeed, it is seen in this world, that the wonderful magic is experienced even by those who know that it is magic. (176)

Vidyā-rabdhe bhinna etc. - The knowledge that the world is an illusion and the *prārabdha karma phala* of joy and sorrow, operate in different fields: one operates in the field of reality and the other in the field of illusion. They belong to different degrees of reality and therefore, they cannot contradict each other.

To illustrate this --

Indrājāla vinodaḥ etc. - We appreciate and enjoy the magic show although we are aware all the time that the magician is only collectively befooling us and the experience of wonder is out of delusion. So also the knowledge that the world is an illusion does not prevent

the wise man from having good and bad experiences in the world.

Those who refuse to accept this may have a doubt whether *prārabdha* prevents knowledge? The answer is----

जगत्सत्यत्वमापाद्य प्रारब्धं भोजयेद्यदि ।
तदा विरोधि विद्याया भोगमात्रान्न सत्यता ॥१७७॥

*Jagat satyatva māpādya prārabdham bhojayet yadi
Tadā virodhi vidyāyā bhoga mātrāna satyatā* (177)

प्रारब्धम् = the *prārabdha karma*; जगत् सत्यत्वम् = status regarding the reality of the world; आपाद्य = having given; यदि भोजयेत् = if experienced; तदा = in that case; विद्यायाः = of the knowledge; विरोधि = is opposed to; भोग मात्रात् = only on account of the experience; सत्यता न = the status of reality is not accorded.

If the experience of joy and sorrow due to *prārabdha* is possible only when the world is accorded a status of reality, then the *prārabdha* would certainly prevent knowledge. But the fact is, the experience does not demand the status of reality to the experienced object - hence the world. (177)

Yadi prārabdham etc. - The *prārabdha karma* experience of joys and sorrows establishes the (wrong) understanding that the world is real (*Tadā virodhi vidyāyā*), then it is opposed to the knowledge of the Truth. *Bhogamātrāt na satyatā* - When the experience of joy and sorrow does not create or demand any *satyatva buddhi* i.e. the notion about the reality of the world, then the experience of *prārabdha karma* is not opposed to knowledge. The moment the experience of joys and sorrows is taken as real, then it gives validity to the world as real. Then it invalidates the knowledge that the world is an illusion.

The teacher now proceeds to explain this thought through an example i.e. to have knowledge of experience, the object of experience need not be real ----

अनूनो जायते भोगः कल्पितैः स्वप्नवस्तुभिः ।
जाग्रद्वस्तुभिरप्येवमसत्यैर्भोग इष्यताम् ॥१७८॥

*Anūno jāyate bhogaḥ kalpitaiḥ svapna vastu bhiḥ
Jāgrad vastu bhira pyevam asatyair bhoga iṣyatām* (178)

कल्पितैः = imaginary; स्वप्न वस्तुभिः = by the dream objects; भोगः = experience of joy and sorrows; अनूनः = properly; जायते = takes place; एवम् = similarly; असत्यैः = even the non-existing; जाग्रद वस्तुभिः = by the objects of waking world; अपि = also; भोगः = the experience; इष्यताम् = should be accepted.

Even by the imaginary dream objects, the experience of joy and sorrow takes place in a proper manner. Similarly, the illusory worldly objects of waking state also do give the experience of joy and sorrow. (178)

Kālpitaiḥ svapna vastubhiḥ etc. - The example given is mainly to explain that to experience an object, the object need not be real. The object can be an illusion, yet we can have the experience. The problem starts only when *satyatā* i.e. status of reality is given to the illusory objects.

By the imaginary objects in the dream-state there is experience of joy and sorrow. *Evam jāgrat* etc. - In the same way the objects in the waking world are also not real, they are also equally illusory. However, that does not prevent us from experiencing the joys and sorrows called *prārabdha*, in the waking state.

If the *prārabdha bhoga* is not negated by knowledge, as explained above, can we say that, the knowledge is negated by the *prārabdha bhoga*? ----

यदि विद्यापह्नुवीत जगत्प्रारब्धघातिनी ।
तदा स्यान्न तु मायात्वबोधेन तदपह्नवः ॥१७९॥

Yadi vidyāpa hnuvīta jagat prārabdha ghātini
Tadā syānna tu māyātva bodhen tada pahnavaḥ (179)

विद्या = knowledge; यदि = if; जगत् = the world; अपह्नुवीत = negates essentially; तदा = then; प्रारब्ध घातिनी = the destroyer of *prārabdha karma*; स्यात् = is; मायात्व बोधेन = by the knowledge of the illusoriness of the world; तु = but; तद् = the world; न = not; अपह्नवः = removed.

If knowledge were to destroy the appearance of the world essentially, then the knowledge would have been contrary to *prārabdha*. But the knowledge about an illusion does not destroy the illusion. [Therefore, the knowledge that the world is an illusion, is not opposed to *prārabdha karma*, which falls in the purview of the world]. (179)

Vidyā yadi etc. - Because of the knowledge that the world is an illusion, will the world disappear? There are two types of illusions: *sopādhika* and *nirupādhika* - When I imagine that there is a snake on the road, and then on a closer examination we see it to be only a rope. Once the knowledge of the reality, the substratum rope is seen, the illusion of snake disappears. This is *sopādhika* illusion. When illusion continues to appear even after knowing the reality, like the mirage or the blueness of the sky, it is *nirupādhika* illusion. The second type of illusion is the one referred to in this *śloka*.

Tadā prārabdha ghātini syāt - By the knowledge that the world is an illusion, it does not mean that the world will disappear nor that the *prārabdha* will not operate. The illusion will continue to appear inspite of the knowledge that it is an illusion. *Māyātva bodhena na* etc. - But we come to understand the appearance as the true nature of this illusion, and although we cannot make it disappear,

we perceive its unreal nature. The two things viz. the knowledge that it is an illusion and the continuance of the illusion fall under two different degrees of reality.

Thus three aspects of 'existence' emerge:

- (a) Absolute existence can never be denied;
- (b) Absolute non-existence can never be perceived (e.g. horns of a human being);
- (c) An appearance called *Mithyā* - that which appears but is not, that which appears in its own absence (like the blueness of the sky).

Māyātva bodhena tad apahnavaḥ na is explained i.e. knowledge of illusion does not destroy the illusion or its experience ----

अनपह्नुत्य लोकास्तदिन्द्रजालमिदं त्विति ।
जानन्त्येवानपह्नुत्य भोगं मायात्वधीस्तथा ॥१८०॥

Anapa hnyutya lokāstad indrajāla midam tviti
Jānan tyevāna pahnutya bhogaṁ māyātva dhīstathā (180)

लोकाः = people; तद् = that; इन्द्र जालम् = is a magical creation; इदम् = this; अनपह्नुत्य = without making it disappear; इति = this is; तु = indeed; जानन्ति = know; एव = certainly; तथा = similarly; भोगम् = the objects of enjoyment; अनपह्नुत्य = without making them disappear; मायात्व धीः = the illusory nature of the world can be attained.

As people knowing well that, what they are seeing is an illusion of a magic show, without making it disappear; similarly, one can certainly know the illusory status of the world of enjoyment without its disappearance. (180)

Lokāḥ indra-jāla etc. - When people watch a magic show, they know all the time it is a magic show, but that does not make the show disappear. In the same

way, *Bhogam anapahnutya māyātva dhīḥ*, the experience of joy and sorrow does not make the knowledge that the world is real. The modifications of the gross body will continue to be, joy and sorrows will continue to occur. The gross body of the man of wisdom continues to exist with all its modifications along with his knowledge that the gross body is an illusion.

Similarly, the modifications of the subtle body - *kāma*, *krodhā* etc. will continue to appear, rather will seem to appear in the man of knowledge. Thus all experiences will continue in the life of the wise man who knows that the world is an illusion. The difference lies in the lack of reality which the wise man gives to the experience. He will not suffer or be disturbed by the experiences. **Understanding the illusion as an illusion is the only way to go beyond the illusion, inspite of the illusion.** This is what distinguishes the wise man from the others.

An enquiry is made, through scriptural quotations about the absence of duality and experience which demands duality ----

यत्र त्वस्य जगत्स्वात्मा पश्येत्कस्तत्र केन कम् ।

किं जिघ्रेत्किं वदेद्वेति श्रुतौ तु बहु घोषितम् ॥१८१॥

*Yatra tvasya jagatsvātmā paśyet kastatra ken kam
Kim jighret kim vadedveti śrutau tu bahu ghoṣitam* (181)

यत्र = when; तु = indeed; जगत् = the world; अस्य = of this man of wisdom; स्वात्मा = his own Self; तत्र = then; कः = who; केन = by what; कम् = what; पश्येत् = will see; किम् जिघ्रेत् = what will he smell; वा = or; किम् वदेत् = what will he speak; इति = in this way; श्रुतौ = in the *Veda-s*; तु = indeed; बहु = a lot; घोषितम् = is declared.

When a man of realisation comes to identify himself with the totality, for him there remains no perception of duality. In that state-who is there to see and by which instrument? Or who is there to smell and what? Or who is there to speak and about what? This is how we see a lot of passages in *Veda-s* i.e. there is total absence of duality. (181)

In this and the following *śloka*, the student raises doubts with quotations from the *śruti mātā*.

Yatra tvasya jagat etc. - The moment one comes to know that the whole world is one's own Self, the *ātmā*, there is no duality, in that condition who will see whom and what? For seeing anything, *dvaita* is essential. Eye can see everything except itself. Who will smell what and by what? Who will speak and with whom and what will he speak about?

Śrutau tu bahu ghoṣitam - It has been said again and again by the scriptures that there is a total absence of the world in the state of knowledge. That being so, how can an individual ever experience joy and sorrows etc. once he has come to know that he is everywhere?

A doubt raised ----

तेन द्वैतमपहृत्य विद्योदेति न चान्यथा ।

तथा च विदुषो भोगः कथं स्यादिति चेच्छृणु ॥१८२॥

*Tena dvaitam apahnutya vidyo deti na cānyathā
Tathā ca viduṣo bhogaḥ katham syāditi cecchṛṇu* (182)

तेन = because of this; द्वैतम् = the duality; अपहृत्य = having totally negated; विद्या = knowledge; उदेति = is born; अन्यथा = by any other way; न = not; च = indeed; तथा च = therefore; विदुषः = for the man of knowledge; भोगः = *prārabdha* experience; कथम् = how; स्यात् = is possible; इति = thus; चेत् = if; शृणु = listen.

If the doubt is that-in the wake of the knowledge (as mentioned in last śloka), the world of duality having been totally negated, the knowledge can take place; and not by any other way; and therefore, there cannot be any possibility of *prārabdha* experience for the man of wisdom-then listen to the answer. (182)

The student continues to express his doubt raised in the last śloka. *Tena dvaitam apahnutya* etc. -That knowledge which is referred to in the *śruti* by you, where it was mentioned that the world is totally, explicitly and absolutely destroyed and only then has the knowledge taken place---

Anyathā na ca-Not in any other way. If this is what you have said, then *Viduṣaḥ bhogaḥ* etc. -How can there be experience for the man of wisdom? Or have *prārabdha* operating on him?

The answer to the above question is----

सुषुप्तिविषया मुक्तिविषया वा श्रुतिस्त्विति ।
उक्तं स्वाप्ययसम्पत्त्योरिति सूत्रे ह्यतिस्फुटम् ॥१८३॥

Suṣupti viṣayā mukti viṣayā vā śrutis tviti
Uktam svāpyaya sampatyor iti sūtre hyati sphuṭam (183)

श्रुतिः तु = this Vedic reference indeed; सुषुप्ति विषया = is for the topic of deep sleep; वा = or; मुक्ति विषया = for the topic of liberation; इति = this fact; स्वाप्यय सम्पत्त्योः = *svāpyaya sampatyoh*; इति = this; सूत्रे = the *sūtra*; हि = indeed; अति स्फुटम् = distinctly; उक्तम् = is explained by *Veda Vyāsa*.

In reply to the student's question, the teacher quotes from the *Brahma sūtrā-s*. The *sūtra* (IV-iv-16) clearly says that these texts which you have quoted in your argument, refer to the deep sleep state or to the final release in which the *jīva* attains absolute union with the *Parabrahma Paramātmā* (183).

Suṣupti viṣayā etc. -The teacher tells the student: You are overlooking the context in which those *upaniṣadik* statements, which you have quoted, have been made. That is why you are having this confusion. These statements refer to the condition of deep sleep state or of total liberation. In these two states there is no specific knowledge.

When an individual sees a rope as a snake, there are two knowledges. One, general, that there is something. The knowledge of the 'is-ness'. What that is, is not known. When it is clear that it is a rope, then that knowledge is specific.

In *suṣupti* and *mukti* states, specific knowledge is absent.

[Note: This śloka brings out clearly the need for the *vedāntik* student to be discriminating in interpreting quotations. Since these quotations were stated in different contexts, the student should be careful to draw only that meaning which is of relevance to the main theme of his study. In śloka 159 and 160 the *Gītā* was quoted to illustrate this point.

Svāpyaya sampatyoh anyatara apekṣam āviṣkṛtam hi: is further explained---

अन्यथा याज्ञवल्क्यादेराचार्यत्वं न सम्भवेत् ।
द्वैतदृष्टावविद्वत्ता द्वैतादृष्टौ न वाग्वदेत् ॥१८४॥

Anyathā yājñā valkyāder ācārya tvam na sambhavet
Dvaita dṛṣṭāva vidvattā dvaitā dṛṣṭau na vāg vadet (184)

अन्यथा = if the wrong reference of the quotation is not accepted; याज्ञवल्क्य आदेः = of *Yājñavalkya* etc; आचार्यत्वम् = being teacher; न = not; सम्भवेत् = possible; द्वैत दृष्टौ = if duality is perceived; अविद्वत्ता = absence of knowledge; द्वैत अदृष्टौ = if the duality is not accepted; वाग् = the speech; न = not; वदेत् = is possible.

- If the above quoted *Vedik* statement is not accepted as it should be (as mentioned in *śloka* 183) there cannot be teachership in *Yājñavalkya* etc., because if the duality is accepted then they will be ignorant; and if duality is not accepted, for whom will their teaching be meant? (184)

If the statements in *śloka* 181 & 182 are not understood properly, that they refer to the deep sleep and *videha mukti* states, it will result in erroneous viewpoint.

If you say that there should be total absence of duality in the wake of knowledge, there will be absolutely nothing. This is not what is implied. This wrong viewpoint will lead to a funny situation.

Yājñavalkyādeḥ ācāryatvam etc. - If liberation means only dropping the body because the body is in duality (I the speaker, you the listener etc.) if knowledge means the absence of the total world, the problem will then arise: that all the great *ācāryā-s* like *Yājñavalkya* could not have existed.

Dvaita drṣṭau avidvattā - Because according to your interpretation wherever there is percēption of duality, it is ignorance that is prevailing. Whereas the *ācārya* is talking in the plane of duality, he cannot talk in the plane of non-dual state.

Dvaita adṛṣṭau - If there is no duality who will speak to whom? Therefore, the student's perception that with the dawn of knowledge, there should be total absence of duality is wrong. The knowledge that 'I am' is not contradicted by anything good or bad. The substratum cannot be influenced by the illusion. The perception of duality, the perception of the illusion of duality, is not contradicted in one's own essential nature (in which there is no duality). Therefore, the Absolute (one's own essential nature) has nothing against plurality. Let the plurality remain. There is no need to struggle against it, and try to remove it. *Understanding of an illusion as an illusion, is the only way to conquer it*

The teacher knows very well that the student and *ācāryā* are one and the same in their essential nature, and not two different entities. Yet the teacher has to talk. Thus it must be clearly understood; that perception of duality does not mean the absence of knowledge. Therefore, the experience of joys and sorrows in the world of plurality, does not make the wise man joyful or sorrowful.

The teacher now pursues the same thought in a different manner, taking a view point that the *ācārya* may have indirect knowledge etc. ----

निर्विकल्पसमाधौ तु द्वैतादर्शनहेतुतः ।
सैवापरोक्षविद्येति चेत्सुषुप्तिस्तथा न किम् ॥१८५॥

*Nirvikalpa samādhau tu dvaitā darśan hetutaḥ
Saivā parokṣa vidyēti cet suṣupti tathā na kim* (185)

निर्विकल्प समाधौ = in *nirvikalpa samādhi*; तु = indeed; द्वैत = duality; अदर्शन हेतुतः = on account of absence; सा = that; एव = alone; अपरोक्ष विद्या = direct knowledge; इति = thus; चेत् = you think; सुषुप्तिः = the deep sleep; तथा = similarly direct knowledge; न = not; किम् = why?

If the argument is that in *nirvikalpa Samādhi* alone, there is direct experience, as there is total absence of duality; in that case why should we not accept direct knowledge in deep sleep, on similar count? (185)

Nirvikalpau samādhau tu etc. - In *nirvikalpa samādhi*, because there is no thought, there is no perception of duality. For, perception of duality is possible only when there are thoughts. The teacher replies: *Sa eva aparokṣa* etc. - If according to you, direct knowledge (*aparokṣa* or *ātma jñānam*) means absence of the perception of duality, (and if you think that for knowing the Truth one has

to be in *nirvikalpa samādhi*), *suṣupti tathā na kim?* - then why not go into the deep sleep state and call it a 'state of realization'?

(From the Self the world has come like the wave from the ocean. Self means 'I'. When this 'I' is understood to be somewhere else, the trouble and the struggle starts. When the teacher gives the instruction *Tat tvam asi*, the knowledge gained is *Aham Brahmāsmi*. Objectification is the biggest obstacle in Self-knowledge. Intelligence in the human mind results in obsessive preoccupation with logic to the extent that it blinds the vision of the Truth. Either drop the intelligence in total surrender to the Lord in the field of devotion or get out of the field of intelligence by the simple method: Truth or the Absolute as well as ignorance are beyond reasoning and logic. All our enquiry is about an illusion, to establish that the illusion is the reality. Right enquiry should result in the establishment of illusion as illusion. Thinking should not lead to more complicated thinking, to the habit of thinking, but to thoughtlessness. That is constructive enquiry leading to self-knowledge).

The logic that there can be realisation in deep sleep is not true, on account of total ignorance----

आत्मतत्त्वं न जानाति सुप्तो यदि तदा त्वया ।
आत्मधीरेव विद्येति वाच्यं न द्वैतविस्मृतिः ॥१८६॥

Ātma tattvaṁ na jānāti supto yadi tadā tvayā
Ātma dhīreva vidyēti vācyaṁ na dvaita viśmṛtiḥ (186)

सुप्तो = in deep sleep; आत्म तत्त्वम् = the Pure Self;
न = not; जानाति = knows; यदि = if this is the reason
for not having direct knowledge in deep sleep; तदा =
in that case; त्वया = by you; आत्म धीः एव = The Self
knowledge alone; विद्या = is the nature of direct knowledge;
इति = thus; वाच्यम् = is said; द्वैत विस्मृतिः = the lack
of duality; न = not.

If you argue that in deep sleep there is no Self knowledge possible, in that case, you have accepted that Self knowledge is the criterion of direct knowledge and not the absence of duality. (186)

The student's problem was: When an individual comes to realise his essential nature, where there is total absence of duality, there should be total absence of the perception of duality. To this the reply given is:

Supto ātma-tattvaṁ na jānāti etc. - In the deep sleep state, where there is total absence of duality, one does not know one's own Real Self and its essential nature.

Yadi tvayā ātmadhīḥ eva - Because of this, the deep sleep state cannot be considered as *aparokṣa anūbhūti* i.e. direct knowledge. From this it follows that the knowledge that 'I am the pure Self' is important and not the absence of the perception of duality. It is important that this distinction is clearly understood.

Na dvaita viśmṛtiḥ - The attention should not be on removing the duality but on the enquiry into 'Who am I?' The struggle to remove the duality is a futile exercise, since something can be removed only if it exists.

So long I am the witness, I am observing the mind. Initially I---the witness, seem to be different from the mind that is being observed, which seems to be full of thoughts. What is thought? It is but the modification of the stuff called mind. This modification is the value I give to the object in terms of liking and disliking etc. This value creates turmoil in the mind. That turmoil is called 'thought'. When total devaluation of objects takes place, the turmoil called 'thought', ceases to be.

So while initially I was observing the presence of thought, I now begin observing the absence of thought. Even though, I am making the absence of thought as the object of my knowledge, yet I continue the object-subject relationship. Having reached this point in the *sādhana*,

I remain effortlessly what I am - there is no difference between the knower and the known.

Once this is understood, there need be no further concern about whether there is thought in the mind or not. The mind will have thought. It is necessary to get rid of the mis-conception that **absence of thought means absence of duality and absence of duality is knowledge.** Self knowledge is real knowledge and not the absence of duality.

Can we say that absence of perception of duality along with Self knowledge is direct knowledge? This obsession about absence of duality in knowledge is answered ----

उभयं मिलितं विद्या यदि तर्हि घटादयः ।
अर्धविद्याभाजिनः स्युः सकलद्वैतविस्मृतेः ॥१८७॥

*Ubhayam militam vidyā yadi tarhi ghāṭā dayāḥ
Ardha vidyā bhājinaḥ syuḥ sakala dvaita vismr̥teḥ* (187)

यदि = if; उभयम् = both i.e. absence of duality and Self knowledge; मिलितम् = together; विद्या = is considered as direct knowledge; तर्हि = in that case; घट आदयः = the inert objects like pot etc; अर्ध विद्या भाजिनः स्युः = will be having half knowledge; सकल द्वैत विस्मृतेः = on account of absence of total world of duality.

If one insists that both aspects viz. the absence of duality and Self knowledge together constitute complete direct knowledge, in that case, we will have to accept that the inert objects like pot etc., are having half knowledge, as they do not perceive duality. (187)

The student says: *Yadi ubhayam militam vidyā* etc. - absence of the perception of duality, and the knowledge of the Self together is the nature of *aparokṣa anūbhūti* or Self-realisation. The teacher replies in a sarcastic vein

if this is your understanding then, *Tarhi ghāṭa ādayaḥ*: all the inanimate objects like pot etc. which do not have perception of duality, *Ardha vidyā bhājinaḥ syuḥ*: they should be considered half-enlightened!

The student has defined Self-knowledge as a combination of two components --- absence of perception of duality, and Self knowledge. Inanimate objects fulfil one component of this definition. Therefore, they should be considered to be half-realised!!

Not only the inert objects, but even those who are engaged in the practice of meditation ----

मशकध्वनिमुख्यानां विक्षेपाणां बहुत्वतः ।
तव विद्या तथा न स्याद्घटादीनां यथा दृढा ॥१८८॥

*Maśaka dhvani mukhyānām vikṣepāṇām bahutvataḥ
Tava vidyā tathā na syāt ghāṭā dīnām yathā dṛḍhā* (188)

यथा = as; घट आदीनाम् = for the pot etc.; विद्या = realisation; दृढा = firm; स्यात् = is; तव = your; तथा = and; न = not; मशक ध्वनि मुख्यानाम् = by the bugging sound of mosquito; विक्षेपाणाम् = disturbance; बहुत्वतः = many.

Persons like you, who are disturbed a lot, by petty things like the buzzing sound of a mosquito, the knowledge will not be even that firm, as that of an inert object like pot etc. (as they are never disturbed by duality). (188)

The teacher continues in the same sarcastic vein to expose the ridiculous understanding of the student.

Maśaka dhvani mukhyānām etc. - For us *vikṣepa* i.e. disturbance is so much that even small things like the buzzing of a mosquito disturbs us. *Tava vidyā tathā na syāt* etc. --- whereas, the half-realisation of the inanimate objects is so firm, because they are not disturbed at all by duality!

Therefore, there is no validity in the view that there should be no perception of duality in the man of wisdom. So long as we are functioning through the medium of body, mind and intellect, all the modifications of that medium will be associated with us. But all this is only at the *vyavahāra* level i.e. while functioning in the world. Since, talking is possible only in duality, we speak the language of duality. But that does not mean that duality exists.

Therefore, when the student finally accepts, if at all, then he is blessed by the teacher ----

आत्मधीरेव विद्येति यदि तर्हि सुखी भव ।
दुष्टचित्तं निरुन्ध्याच्चेन्निरुन्धि त्वं यथासुखम् ॥१८९॥

Ātmadhī reva vidyēti yadi tarhi sukhī bhava
Duṣṭa cittam nirundhyāc cen nirundhi tvaṁ yathā sukham (189)

आत्मधीः एव = the Self Knowledge alone; विद्या = is direct knowledge; इति यदि = if you have thus accepted; तर्हि = then; सुखी भव = be blessed; दुष्ट चित्तम् = the impure disturbed mind; निरुन्ध्यात् = should be controlled (for Self knowledge); चेत् = however; त्वम् = you; यथा सुखम् = may you be blissful; निरुन्धि = do control the mind.

If you have finally accepted that the Self knowledge alone is direct knowledge, may you be blessed. However, if you think that for self-knowledge, one should control the mind, please do so and be blissful. (189)

The teacher concludes this thought in this *śloka* :

Ātmadhīḥ eva vidyēti yadi etc. - If you have understood now that knowledge of the Self alone is Self-realisation or knowledge, then be happy.

Dūṣṭa cittam nirundhyāt etc. - For realising the Truth, the essential qualification is that the mind should not be under turbulence all the time. **Only in a quiet mind does knowledge take place**. By the control of agitations of the mind, it becomes easier for us to know the Truth. For that purpose, if you do *nirvikalpa samādhi abhyāsa* - the practice of *nirvikalpa* meditation, then do so. But do not mistake the means for the goal. Control of the mind is only a means, not the goal. Self-Knowledge is the goal.

In the light of above discussion, the purpose and meaning of *kim icchan* in the original *upaniṣadik* statement is ----

तदिष्टमेष्टव्यमायामयत्वस्य समीक्षणात् ।
इच्छन्नप्यज्ञवन्नेच्छेत्किमिच्छन्निति हि श्रुतम् ॥१९०॥

Tadiṣṭa meṣṭavya māyā mayatvasya samīkṣaṇāt
icchan nāpya jñāvan necchet kimi cchan niti hi śrutam (190)

तद् = the control of mind; इष्टम् = is certainly proper; एष्टव्य = and should be practiced; मायामयत्वस्य = the illusory nature of the world; समीक्षणात् = helps in realising; इच्छन् अपि = although desiring; अज्ञवत् = like an ignorant; न = not; इच्छेत् = the wise does not desire; किम् इच्छन् = *kim icchan*, इति = in this meaning; हि = indeed; श्रुतम् = in the *upaniṣad*.

The control of the mind is certainly proper and should be practiced, for it helps in realising the illusory nature of the world. Therefore, the wise man although desiring, is not desiring like an ignorant; in this sense, the *upaniṣad* has said '*kim icchan*' (190)

Tad iṣṭam etc. - Therefore, for this purpose it is necessary to control the agitations of the mind in order that it will be conducive for the realisation of one's own real nature and the illusory nature of the world.

In *Pātañjalī Yoga Sūtra* (2), *yoga* is described as *Yogaḥ citta vṛtti nirodhaḥ* i.e. *yoga* is the suspension of the thought in the mind. An agitated mind will not be able to negotiate through the agitations. It is very good to control the mind and we should always do it. *Māyā mayatvasya samikṣaṇāt*- This type of mind on the basis of the understanding of the illusoriness of the world, is not agitated or frustrated. It has nothing to achieve in this world, it has no regrets about the past, (its successes or failures), it does not carry the load of dead experience. Such a mind alone is suitable for higher contemplation.

Icchan api ajñavat etc. - Although such a person has desire like that of an ignorant man, the desire does not have the potency to bind (it is like a roasted seed).

Kim icchan iti śrutam - For this understanding, the phrase *kim icchan* is used in the first verse of this chapter, referring *upaniṣad-s*, *Ātmānam cet jāniyād āyaṁ asmīti pūruṣaḥ*

The above interpretation of '*kim icchan*' alone can resolve the seeming contradiction in *upaniṣad-s*.

रागो लिङ्गमबोधस्य सन्तु रागादयो बुधे ।
इति शास्त्रद्वयं सार्थमेवं सत्यविरोधतः ॥१९१॥

Rāgo liṅgama bodhasya santu rāgādayo budhe
Iti śāstra dvayaṁ sārtham evaṁ satya virodhataḥ (191)

रागः = attachment; अबोधस्य = of the ignorance; लिङ्गम् = symptoms; बुधे = in the wise; राग आदयः = the desires etc; सन्तु = let there be; इति = thus; शास्त्र द्वयम् = two statements of *Veda-s*; एवम् सति = in the meaning accepted as in previous discussion; अविरोधतः = being not cancelling mutually; सार्थम् = will be meaningful.

The above interpretation of '*kim icchan*' alone can help in discovering proper meaning in the seemingly contradictory statements of *upaniṣad-s* like - the desire is a sign of ignorance, and let there be desires in the wise man. (191)

One more doubt is raised. In one place, it is said that desires are the sign of ignorance, in another it is said that even a wise man may have desires like the ignorant man. These two statements seem to contradict each other.

Rāgaḥ abodhasya liṅgaṁ - *Śruti* statement says that excessive attachment to the worldly objects is the symptom of ignorance.

Budhe rāgādayaḥ santu - But that does not mean that the wise man does not have desire. Let there be desire in him.

Iti śāstra dvayam etc. - These are two types of statements stated in the *upaniṣad-s*. *Sārtham eva sati avirodhataḥ* - Although these two statements seem to be contradicting each other, they are not really opposed to each other.

For, although there is desire in the man of wisdom, there is no attachment like that of an ignorant man, in the fulfilment of the desire. For the ignorant man, fulfilment of desire is the highest joy and non-fulfilment is the depth of disappointment. The wise man is beyond success or failure. He is not touched by either of these.

Upto this point, (the first word *kim icchan* in the second line of the first *śloka* in this chapter), status of desire in the man of wisdom was dealt with.

The word *Kasya kāmāya* is discussed now ----

जैगन्मिथ्यात्ववत्स्वात्मासङ्गत्वस्य समीक्षणात् ।
कस्य कामायेति वचो भोक्त्रभावविवक्षया ॥१९२॥

Jagan mithyātva vatsvātmā saṅgatvasya samīkṣaṇāt
Kasya kāmāyeti vaco bhoktra bhāva vivakṣayā (192)

जगन् मिथ्यात्ववत् = as the illusory nature of world was discussed in connection with 'kim icchan'; स्वात्मा असङ्गत्वस्य = for declaring that Self is unattached and untouched; समीक्षणात् = keeping this in view; भोक्तृ अभाव विवक्षया = to conclude the absence of enjoyership; कस्य कामाय = *kasya kāmāya*; इति वचः = these words are used in the *upaniṣadik* statement.

As the *upaniṣad* has used the words 'kim icchan' to indicate the illusory nature of the world, the words '*kasya kāmāya*' are employed to declare the absence of influence of the world on the pure Self and therefore, that of enjoyership. (192)

Having concluded the analysis of the significance and status of the phrase 'kim icchan', the words '*kasya kāmāya*' are now taken up for an in-depth analysis. After having established the position of desire, the position of the desirer is taken up. Who is desiring and what?

Jagat mithyātva vat etc. - When we enquired into the first part of this enquiry, as also into the 'kim icchan' part of the *śloka*, it was concluded that the world is an illusion. This knowledge of illusory nature of the world, in the context of 'kim icchan' is the reason why there is no desire in the man of wisdom, because he has come to realise the illusoriness of the world.

But it does not mean that the world will disappear. From the *vyavahāra* point of view it will continue, but the wise man will not be influenced by anything that happens in the world. He will be totally untouched (*asaṅgaḥ*).

Svātmā asaṅgasya samīkṣaṇāt etc. - Having discovered by personal, direct understanding that I am essentially unattached to anything, that none of the worldly objects

can touch me, *bhoktr abhāva vivakṣayā* the sense of enjoyership, is absent.

Kasya kāmāya iti vacaḥ - The words '*kasya kāmāya*' are used in the context of this absence of desire to do, to enjoy etc.

'*Kasya kāmāya*' - For whose sake will the man of wisdom desire? For no one!

पतिजायादिकं सर्वं तत्तद्भोगाय नेच्छति ।

किन्त्वात्मभोगार्थमिति श्रुतावुद्घोषितं बहु ॥१९३॥

Pati jāyā dikam sarvaṁ tattat bhogāya necchati
Kintvātma bhogārthamiti śrutā vudgho ṣitam bahu (193)

पति जाया आदिकम् = the husband, wife etc; सर्वम् = everything; तत्तद् भोगाय = for the joy of them; न = not; इच्छति = desires; किन्तु = but; आत्म भोगार्थम् = for the joy of one self; इति = thus; श्रुतौ = in the *upaniṣad-s*; बहु = many times; उद्घोषितम् = declared.

'Every thing is this world like husband, wife etc. are not desired for their joy, but for the joy of one's own self'. Thus, it is declared in the *upaniṣad-s* in many ways and many times. (193)

Śrutau Udghoṣitam - In the *upaniṣad-s* it is loudly and clearly said in many places, that - *Pati jāyā* etc. husband, wife and all such relations are dear not for their respective sake, but *kintu ātma-bhogārtham iti* - for the sake of one's own enjoyment and well being. Nothing is desired by us for his/her/its sake but for our sake.

Ātmanastu kāmāya sarvaṁ priyaṁ bhavati (Br. Up. 2.4.5)

Therefore, *ātmā* is the *bhoktā* or enjoyer.

Now who is this desirer? Various possible alternatives are now examined and discussed.

The Self being untouched by the world, there has to be total absence of enjoyership in the Self. Therefore, that which is not, how can it be removed? However, the enjoyership seems to exist, because of which one suffers or enjoys in life. This enjoyership belongs to whom? And what is the cause of this? Naturally, the delusion about one's own nature which is untouched by the changing world is the cause.

This line of thinking is being developed to analyse the 'kasya kāmāya' words of the *upaniṣadik* statement under discussion ----

किं कूटस्थश्चिदाभासोऽथवा किं वोभयात्मकः ।
भोक्ता तत्र न कूटस्थोऽसङ्गत्वाद्भोक्तृतां व्रजेत् ॥१९४॥

*Kim kūṭastha ścidā bhāsaḥ athavā kim vobhayātmakaḥ
Bhoktā tatra na kūṭasthaḥ asaṅgatvāt bhoktṛtām vrajet* (194)

किम् कूटस्थः = Is Pure Consciousness; भोक्ता = the enjoyer;
अथवा = or; चिदाभासः = the conditioned consciousness;
किम् वा = or; उभयात्मकः = the combination of both;
तत्र = out of these three alternatives; कूटस्थः = the
Pure Consciousness; असङ्गत्वात् = being unattached; भोक्तृताम्
= the enjoyership; न = not; व्रजेत् = be.

Is the Pure Consciousness enjoyer or the conditioned consciousness or an amalgam of the two, the enjoyer? Of the three possibilities, the Pure Consciousness can certainly not be an enjoyer on account of its being totally unattached (like the space). (194)

Let us now enquire into who is this enjoyer.

Kim kūṭastha bhoktā - Is it the pure undisturbed consciousness?
Kim cīdābhāsaḥ - or is it the conditioned consciousness?
Kim va ubhayātmakaḥ - or is it a mixture of the two?

In this way, let us enquire. In that enquiry of 'kasya kāmāya' who is this desirer or enjoyer, of the three alternatives given, *kūṭastha bhoktṛtām na vrajet* - it cannot be the pure Consciousness, for the simple reason, (*asaṅgatvāt*) that in the pure Consciousness there is no attachment. *Kūṭastha Caitanya* being the illuminator of everything - good and bad, there is no attachment or detachment, no likes and dislikes. Therefore, the *kūṭastha* cannot be the *bhoktā* - the enjoyer or sufferer.

The ocean is not attached to the waves; the gold has no preference for any form - whether it is of *Rāma* or *Rāvaṇa*; the space has no shape of its own but supports all shapes, whatever they are. Similarly, *kūṭastha caitanya* - the absolute consciousness being present in everything including the absence, there can be no attachment.

For example in deep sleep, first the worldly objects are rejected, then the worldly thoughts are rejected, then the last thought that 'I am the body' is also rejected, That being so, how can *kūṭastha caitanya* be called *saṅgaḥ* - attached?

The question now arises: That *kūṭastha caitanya* the pure Consciousness is *anaṅgaḥ* - unattached is accepted. But being *anaṅgaḥ* does not necessarily mean that it is not enjoying or suffering.

This correlation between 'being non-attached' (*asaṅgatva*) and absence of enjoyer or experiencer (*bhoktṛtva*) is now taken up ----

सुखदुःखाभिमानाख्यो विकारो भोग उच्यते ।
कूटस्थश्च विकारी चेत्येतन्न व्याहतं कथम् ॥१९५॥

*Sukha duḥkhā bhimānā khyo vikāro bhoga ucyate
Kūṭastha śca vikārī ceti etanna vyāhataṁ katham* (195)

सुख दुःख अभिमानाख्यः = the sense of being happy or miserable; विकारः = modification; भोगः = experience; उच्यते

= is called; कूटस्थः = the immutable; च = and; विकारी च = and also mutable; इति = thus; एतत् = this; कथम् न व्याहतम् = is not contradictory?

The modifications on account of the experience of the notion of joy and sorrow is called *bhogah*. To say and accept it as *kūṭastha* i.e. immutable and also at the same time say it is the enjoyer; is it not a contradiction in terms? (195)

What is experience or *bhoga* is defined. *Sukha duḥkha abhimānākhyā* etc. - The presence of joy or sorrow by itself does not make experience. Only when one becomes joyful with the joy and sorrowful with the sorrow, does *vikāra* or experience takes place in him. In other words, it is the association with the joy or sorrow that makes that joy or sorrow one's own and results in the experience. *Kūṭastha ca vikāri ca* - But the *kūṭastha* cannot be the experiencer of joys or sorrows, because the *kūṭastha* is beyond joy and sorrow. Because the waves rise and die, the ocean does not become a *vikāri* - it does not become joyful or sorrowful. Similarly, the experiences are in us but we are not in the experiences.

Vyāhatam katham na - If *kūṭastha* i.e. immutable Self were to become *vikāri* i.e. mutable because of the experiences, it would be a contradiction of its very nature. Therefore, the *kūṭastha caitanya* cannot be the experiencer of joy or sorrow.

Is there any possibility of attributing the experience of joy or sorrow to the *cidābhāsa* i.e. conditioned consciousness? ----

विकारिबुद्धयधीनत्वादाभासे विकृतावपि ।
निरधिष्ठानविभ्रान्तिः केवला न हि तिष्ठति ॥१९६॥

*Vikāri buddhya dhīnatvāt ābhāse vikṛtā vapi
Niradhi ṣṭhāna vibhrāntiḥ kevalā na hi tiṣṭhati* (196)

आभासे = in the conditioned consciousness; विकारि बुद्धयधीनत्वात् = being dependent on the mutable conditioning of intellect; विकृतौ अपि = although there is possibility of modifications; निरधिष्ठान विभ्रान्तिः = the illusion without substratum; केवला = independent; न हि तिष्ठति = can never be possible.

Although, there is a possibility of modification in the conditioned consciousness, it being conditioned by mutable intellect; this conditioned or reflected consciousness depends on the Pure Consciousness, and the reflection being an illusion, cannot be an experiencer of joy or sorrow. (196)

Can the *cidābhāsa* be the enjoyer? The second alternative is now examined. When a stick is placed in a pond, the reflection is seen. When a stone is thrown in the water, it causes ripples. The reflection of the stick seems to be dancing. Can the reflection of the stick which is non-modified have modification? The reflection cannot be other than the reflected object. In fact, the modification is happening in the reflecting medium of water. Therefore, the modifications (movements) of the water are superimposed on the reflection (the *cidābhāsa*) but not on the stick (the *kūṭastha*).

Vikāri buddhi dhīnatvāt etc. - The reflected consciousness or *cidābhāsa* is conditioned by the modifications of the intellect. These are only seeming modifications, because, *Nir-adhiṣṭhāna vibhrānti na hi kevalā tiṣṭhati* - the very existence of the conditioned consciousness is dependent on the pure consciousness. Therefore, neither the *kūṭastha caitanya* can be the enjoyer - the *bhoktā*, nor the reflected consciousness - the *cidābhāsa*.

Let us find out the status of the third possibility i.e. *kūṭastha* and *cidābhāsa* together constitute the experiencer of the joy or sorrow ----

उभयात्मक एवातो लोके भोक्ता निगद्यते ।
तादृगात्मानमारभ्य कूटस्थः शेषितः श्रुतौ ॥१९७॥

Ubhayātmaka evātaḥ loke bhoktā nigadyate
Tādṛgā tmāna mārabhya kūṭasthaḥ śeṣitaḥ śrutau (197)

अतः = therefore; उभयात्मकः एव = a combination of both; लोके = in the world; भोक्ता = the experiencer; निगद्यते = is called; (in fact this is also not possible); तादृक् आत्मानम् = accepting this being the nature of experiencer; आरभ्य = in the initial steps; कूटस्थः = the pure consciousness; श्रुतौ = in the *upaniṣad* (Br.); शेषितः = (after negating the conditionings) the remainder (pure Self is revealed).

Therefore, in the initial stages, the popular belief that the experiencer is consciousness conditioned by the intellect, is accepted. Beginning with this, the *upaniṣad* negates all the conditionings and reveals the pure consciousness. [Therefore, in fact the combination of *kūṭastha* and *cidābhāsa* is also not the experiencer]. (197)

Loke ubhayātmaka bhoktā etc. - In the worldly transactions both the *cidābhāsa* and *kūṭastha* are regarded as *bhoktā*, the experiencer. This experiencer is accepted in the *śruti vākya*.

Once again the authority of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.* (2-4-5-) is quoted to stress the point :-

Ātmanastu kāmāya sarvam priyam bhavati - For the sake of the Self, everything is liked. Who is this enjoyer?

Tādṛg ātmānam ārabhya - So we come to the 'turning' point in *vedāntik* thought; the point where we take the 'big leap' in the spiritual evolution. The leap consists of the acceptance that I am someone other than this gross body. The basic requirement for a spiritual seeker is to reject thoughts which are predominantly gross-body oriented.

The entire purpose of this enquiry into the experiencer is therefore, to bring the student to a point where his attention will turn away from the *bhoga* or the objects of enjoyment to his own Self, so that he starts the enquiry into Himself - *Tādṛg ātmānam ārabhya*.

This body is merely a 'residence' from which we peep out into the world through the holes of the five senses. The resident is, therefore, different from the house.

Thus, is inaugurated a new dimension in the thinking of the seeker, where he begins to separate out this *bhokta*, the experiencer, from all the non-relevant aspects such as objects of experience, the instrument of experience --- joyful and sorrowful, etc. When the seeker starts such an enquiry (*ārabhya*) where does that line of enquiry take him? *kūṭastha śeṣitaḥ* - he comes to realise that the substratum, the *kūṭastha* alone remains.

When we start to enquire about the snake, we go with proper equipment (proper means of knowledge) such as torch, stick etc. The moment the torch is flashed, the rope is seen, not the snake. Had we known that the snake was an illusion, we would not have gone to enquire at all. But the enquiry started with the illusion that it was a snake and ended with the knowledge that it was the rope, the substratum. Thus, enquiry is about an illusion, the outcome is the Truth.

Tādṛg ātmānam ārabhya kūṭasthaḥ śeṣitaḥ - First, the seeker cognizes himself as someone other than the body; then the question arises 'who am I?'; when this enquiry starts, the one who is enquiring disappears and the pure Consciousness alone remains.

When the salt doll goes into the ocean, what will happen to it? So is the case of this experiencer. Enjoyership is not possible in the *kūṭastha*, the Absolute Consciousness, so also it is not possible in the reflected consciousness, the *cidābhāsa*, then where is the experiencer? When we

start this enquiry, the experience as well as the experiencer disappear. There is neither suffering nor sufferer. Both exist in their own absence. There is neither bondage nor liberation. The Reality is beyond speech. We can speak because of the Reality, we are unable to speak of the Reality as the reality is beyond speech.

Quotation of relevant *upaniṣadik* statement from *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (4-1-4) is given ----

आत्मा कतम इत्युक्ते याज्ञवल्क्यो विबोधयन् ।
विज्ञानमयमारभ्यासङ्गं तं पर्यशेषयत् ॥१९८॥

Ātmā katama ityukte yājñā valkyo vibodhayan
Vijñāna maya mārabyā asaṅgaṁ taṁ parya śeṣayat (198)

आत्मा = The Self; कतमः = which is; याज्ञवल्क्यः = the Sage *Yājñavalkya*; इति उक्ते = having enquired thus; विबोधयन् = pointing to Self; विज्ञानमय = the Self with reference to *vijñānamaya*; आरभ्य = beginning; असङ्गम् तम् = the unattached pure Self; पर्यशेषयत् = concluded finally.

When King *Janaka* enquired of sage *Yājñavalkya* as to which is *ātmā* out of the five *kośā-s*, the sage starting his discussion with *vijñānamaya kośa* and finally concluded in the pure Self (198)

Katamaḥ ātmā ityukte etc. - When *Janaka Mahārāja* (as a student) asked Sage *Yājñavalkya*: 'What is *ātmā*', the sage - *vijñānamayam ārabhya* - begins with the *pañca kośa-s* or sheaths '*vijñānamaya kośa* is the *ātmā*' i.e. the *jīvātmā*; the experiencer is the *ātmā*. An examination of this statement shows its inadequacy to be the Self. *Asaṅgaṁ taṁ paryaśeṣayat* - In this way, when the *guru* guides the student to enquire step by step the various alternatives that could be the *ātmā*, the student comes to the conclusion that the *kūṭastha caitanya* - the association-less One, is the Self and none other.

What has happened to the *bhoktā*: A great saint has said 'By the grace of the *guru*, I crossed the river of *saṁsāra* and on reaching the other shore I looked back. The teacher was smiling and there was no river.' You can cross something only if there is something to cross. It is like planning to conduct the marriage of a *vandhyā putra*, i.e. son of a barren women - it cannot happen because the *vandhyā putra* does not exist. Similarly, the whole world is like the *Vandhyā putra* - non-existent. It appears in its own non-existence.

The final conclusion of the enquiry leads one to pure Self according to the above *upaniṣad*. The same technique is found in *Aitareya upaniṣad* also ----

कोऽयमात्मेत्येवमादौ सर्वत्रात्माविचारतः ।
उभयात्मकमारभ्य कूटस्थः शेष्यते श्रुतौ ॥१९९॥

Ko'yamā tmetyeva mādaḥ sarva trātmā vicārataḥ
Ubhayātmakamārabhya kūṭasthaḥ śeṣyate śrutau (199)

कः अयम् आत्मा = which is the *ātmā*; इति एवम् = in this way; आदौ = etc; सर्वत्र = everywhere; श्रुतौ = in the *upaniṣad-s*; आत्मा विचारतः = by enquiring about *ātmā*; उभयात्मकम् = self conditioned by intellect etc; आरभ्य = beginning; कूटस्थः = the pure Self; शेष्यते = is finally arrived at.

Which is the *ātmā*, that should be contemplated upon, in this way, in many places in *upaniṣad-s*, the enquiry of Self begins by considering the Consciousness along with its conditionings; to finally conclude in discovering the *kūṭastha* i.e. pure Self. (199)

The teacher now cites *Aitareya upaniṣad* (III-i-1) to support the same thought. *Ayam ātmā kaḥ* - Which is this *ātmā*? The *śruti* - *Aitareya-upaniṣad* says: *ubhayātmakam ārabhya*: the consciousness and the

conditioning when they come together, the *bhoktā* i.e. experiencer is called the *ātma*. The ego is seated in the *viññānamaya koṣa*. In this way *ātma vicārataḥ* when the enquiry is started into the status and quality of this ego, *kūṭastha śeṣyate*--the pure Self alone remains, and ultimately the enquiry ends in the absence of illusion. So this *bhoktṛtva abhimāna*- the enjoyer or the experiencer has no existence in reality.

Therefore, '*kasya kāmāya*' really means that there is nobody to enjoy or suffer. All the enjoyments and sufferings are born out of illusion.

To sum up the thoughts expressed in *śloka* 197 to 199; the purpose of bringing the subject of '*bhoktā*' into the enquiry is, not to prove that there is someone who is the enjoyer or the sufferer, but to draw the attention of the student to a new dimension in his enquiry - to stimulate him to enquire into his own real nature. Without such an approach, the enquiry will neither be sincere, nor intense nor purposeful.

If the enjoyer is an illusion, how come everyone considers this illusion of experiencer to be real?

कूटस्थसत्यतां स्वस्मिन्नध्यस्यात्माविवेकतः ।

तात्त्विकीं भोक्तृतां मत्वा न कदाचिज्जिहासति ॥२००॥

Kūṭastha satyatām svasmin adhyasyā tmā'vivekataḥ
Tāttvikīm bhoktṛtām matvā na kadāci jjihāsati (200)

आत्मा = the experiencer; अविवेकतः = due to lack of discrimination; कूटस्थ सत्यताम् = the reality of pure Consciousness; स्वस्मिन् = in one Self; अध्यस्य = having superimposed; भोक्तृताम् = one's own experiencer status; तात्त्विकीम् = Real; मत्वा = considering; कदाचित् = any moment; न = not; जिहासति = desire to reject.

The popular experiencer, due to lack of proper discrimination, superimposes the reality of pure consciousness on oneself and considers, therefore, to be a real experiencer. Thereafter, he never desires to reject (this ignorance created entity called experiencer). (200)

This enjoyer-the one who thinks 'I am enjoying, I am suffering etc.'. Who is this I? This *ātma*, this enjoyer, because of *avivekataḥ*-lack of proper discrimination and understanding, *kūṭastha satyatām svasmin* etc. - superimposes the existence, the reality of the *kūṭastha caitanya* on himself, the reflection, the *cidābhāsa tāttvikīm bhoktṛtām matvā*-thereafter, he imagines that he is indeed the enjoyer and the sufferer and that the experience of joy and sorrow is real.

Thus, by the reality aspect of the *kūṭastha*, the *cidābhāsa* which comes in contact with the world and thinks the world is other than me, these two things coming together lead to a peculiar phenomenon called imagining that 'I am the enjoyer etc.' is true.

Kadācit na jīhāsati etc. - Thereafter, he is unable to believe that he can exist without these objects of enjoyment, therefore, is unable to separate himself from the world of enjoyment.

The joy or sorrow experienced from the world of objects is in the imagination. Once we develop the dexterity and agility to stand apart and watch the experience, then we start discovering our independent existence, as someone other than the enjoyer or sufferer. I as-the *kūṭastha* or I as the *cidābhāsa* both are immune to misery. This knowledge alone will help in shedding the illusory enjoyer or *bhoktā* and discover the *kūṭastha* 'that I am'!

If there is no enjoyer at all, how the *upaniṣad* specifically mentions that 'everything is dear to us for our own sake i.e. for the enjoyer - 'I'?

The answer is ----

भोक्ता स्वस्यैव भोगाय पतिजायादिमिच्छति ।
एष लौकिकवृत्तान्तः श्रुत्या सम्यगनूदितः ॥२०१॥

Bhoktā svasyaiva bhogāya patijāyādi micchati
Eṣa laukika vṛttāntaḥ śrutyā samya ganūditaḥ (201)

भोक्ता = the enjoyer; स्वस्य एव = for him alone; भोगाय = the enjoyment; पति जाया आदिम् = the husband, wife etc. the objects of enjoyment; इच्छति = desires; एष = this; लौकिक = the popular; वृत्तान्तः = experience; श्रुत्या = by the *upaniṣad*-s; सम्यग् = properly; अनूदितः = translated.

The *upaniṣad* merely has enunciated the popular experience, that 'the husband, wife etc., are dear to one for his/her own sake', in the form of a statement (i.e. there is no underlying intention in this statement to prove the existence of an enjoyer). (201)

Bhoktā svasyaiva bhogāya etc. - As was stated in *śloka* 193 ante, the *śruti vākya* says: *Ātmanastu kāmāya sarvaṃ priyaṃ bhavati* (*Br. Up. II-iv-5*) - we love husband, wife, son etc., not for their sake but for our own sake. *Eṣa laukika vṛttāntaḥ śrutyā samya ganūditaḥ* - 'this is the popular experience' by the statement, what the *śruti vākya* means to say? Unless the student is watchful, this *upaniṣadik* statement can be misunderstood to mean that the *ātmā* is the *bhoktā* or enjoyer. On the other hand the *upaniṣadik* statement should be interpreted to translate *our experience* in such a manner that our attention is drawn away from the 'enjoyed' world to the entity called 'enjoyer'. *Eṣa laukika vṛttānta* - therefore, the purpose behind the *śruti* statement is 'that everything in this world is dear to me for my own sake', is not to expound the enjoyer, but to draw the attention to some other point, which is explained further.

The purpose of stating 'our experience' by the *upaniṣad* is ----

भोग्यानां भोक्तृशेषत्वान्मा भोग्येष्वनुरज्यताम् ।
भोक्तार्येव प्रधानेऽतोऽनुरागं तं विधित्सति ॥२०२॥

Bhogyānām bhoktṛ śeṣatvān mā bhogyeṣv anurajyatām
Bhoktar yeva pradhāne'to 'nurāgaṃ taṃ vidhīṣati (202)

भोग्यानाम् = the objects of enjoyment like husband, wife etc; भोक्तृ शेषत्वात् = being means of enjoyment for the experiencer; भोग्येषु = in objects of enjoyment; मा = don't; अनुरज्यताम् = get attached; अतः = therefore; प्रधाने = mainly; भोक्तारि एव = in the experiencer; तम् = that; अनुरागम् = identification; विधित् सति = is suggested by the *upaniṣad*.

As the objects of enjoyment are meant for the experiencer, one should not get attached to the means of enjoyment, but focus one's attention on the experiencer. This is the purpose of the *upaniṣadik* statement. (202)

Bhogyānām bhoktṛ śeṣatvāt - Objects of enjoyment like husband etc. referred to in the previous *śloka*, are not dear for the their own sake but for the sake of the enjoyer.

Once this is clearly understood by the student, his attention will be drawn away from the world of enjoyment, and focussed on the enjoyer-himself. This is the first stage achieved by the *śruti vākya*. *Bhogeṣu mā anurajyatām* - therefore, the first wisdom the student will get if he understands the *śruti vākya* in the correct perspective is: 'everything in the world is dear to me for the sake of 'I', the Enjoyer'. Thereafter, the worldly things become secondary, and 'I', the enjoyer is primary. Attachment to worldly objects begins to lose its potency that disturbs one's balance.

Bhoktari pradhāne eva - when this happens, then in this enjoyer, who has become the most important factor, *taṃ anurāgaṃ*: the attention is focussed.

The student is thus helped and advised to focus his attention on this 'experiencer' who is other than the world of experiences. When we look at the world, if this vision is developed to see the presence of life in the vehicle called the body, then the thought with reference to the body such as male-female, old-young, smart-dull etc. will recede.

This is the purpose of the *śruti vākya* cited earlier - to draw the attention away, from the material world, from the conditionings, from the objects of enjoyment, to the enjoyer or experiencer.

Once this knowledge clearly takes place, once it is clear that the 'embodied One' is someone other than the body, then there will be a sense of joy. Bodies may come and go but one is not disturbed on that account. What is important is the contents - the 'I', the Self, and not the container, the body.

The purpose achieved by the lack of importance in the objects of enjoyment for the enjoyer is ----

या प्रीतिरविवेकानां विषयेष्वनपायिनी ।
त्वामनुस्मरतः सा मे हृदयान्मापसर्पतु ॥२०३॥

Yā prītirā vivekānām viṣaye śvana pāyinī
Tvāma nusma rataḥ sā me hṛdayān mā'pa sarpatu (203)

अविवेकानाम् = of the ignorant; विषयेषु = in the objects of the world; या = that; प्रीतिः = love and attachment; अनपायिनी = firm; त्वाम अनुस्मरतः = he who is remembering you; सा = that devotion; मे = from my; हृदयात् = heart; मा = may not; अपसर्पतु = be lost.

As the love and attachment is firm for the objects of the world, in the hearts of the ignorant, let my devotion for you, be equally firm, who is constantly remembering you. Let it not waver away from my heart. (203)

The teacher proceeds to quote from the *purāṇā-s* and *upaniṣad-s* in support of the above statements. This *śloka* is from the *Viṣṇu purāṇa* (1.20.19).

On the basis of this quotation, *Sant Tulasidāsa* has said in the last *śloka* of the *Rāmāyāṇa*: 'For the lusty man, the woman is dear; for the covetous man, wealth is dear. So also, O Lord! May you be dear to me.'

Avivekānām viṣayeṣu yā prīti anapāyinī - this is *bhakta Prahlāda's* prayer. The love and attachment which the ignorant have for worldly things is so strong, that none can create any doubt in their minds about it and they will continue very sincerely to pursue the same involvement in the world. *Tvām anusmarataḥ me hṛdayāt mā apasarpatu* - Oh, Lord let my constant remembrance of you be as firm, may it never leave my heart, which means: may I never forget you. May I always be attached to you, Oh Lord, all the time, with the same intensity and commitment as the ignorant man brings to bear upon his attachment to the worldly objects.

The highest wisdom can be compared only with the highest folly. The absolutely ignorant is happy; so is the absolutely wise. [All others go up and down]. However, there is a difference between the two: there is a possibility for the ignorant man to become wise, but there is no possibility for the wise man to lose his wisdom and become ignorant again. So the joy of ignorance cannot be permanent, it is destroyable, but wisdom is immune to destruction.

The conclusion arrived at by the *upaniṣadik* statement under discussion, is also meant by the aforesaid *paurāṇik* statement.

Therefore ----

इति न्यायेन सर्वस्माद्भोग्यजाताद्विरक्तधीः ।
उपसंहृत्य तां प्रीतिं भोक्तार्येव बुभुत्सते ॥२०४॥

Iti nyāyena sarvasmād bhogya jātāt virakta dhīḥ
Upasam hṛtya tām prītim bhoktar yeva bubhut sate (204)

इति न्यायेन = by these words of *Purāṇa*; सर्वस्मात् = from all; भोग्य जातात् = objects of enjoyments; विरक्त धीः = man with total dispassion; ताम् प्रीतिम् = the love he has for worldly objects; भोक्तारि = in the Enjoyer Self; उपसंहृत्य = focussing; एव = in this way; बुभुत्सते = desires to know.

In this way, the *Paurāṇik* statement (*śloka* 203), also describes that a man of total dispassion, withdrawing his love from all the worldly objects of enjoyment, focuses it on the enjoyer Self, with a view to know its nature. (204)

Iti nyāyena-By this logic or understanding or thought from the scriptures, by which the attention is focused on the enjoyer, (at this stage, the concern is not about who the enjoyer is - *kūṭastha*, *cidābhāsa* or a mixture of both) *Sarvasmād bhogya jātāt virakta dhīḥ*- a man of wisdom is able to develop total dispassion for all the objects of enjoyments in the world.

Tām prītim upasamhṛtya-Earlier my love was all the time with the worldly objects. Now there is total withdrawal from the world.

Bhoktari eva bubhutsate-Therefore, all that love is now poured on the experiencer-the Self. Love cannot go hand-in-hand with forgetfulness. Because of the love for the Self, the whole world will be forgotten; but it will be impossible to forget the object of our love-the Self because the very definition of love is *yā prītim hi anapāyini* (*śloka* 203).

Therefore, when the love from the world is withdrawn and poured on the 'I' the enjoyer, the Self, immediately the desire to know more and more about the beloved one, grips us - who am I? *Bubhutsate* one

wants to know who is this 'I' on whom all the love is being focused?

The result of focusing our attention to the enjoyer Self is ----

स्रक्चन्दनवधूवस्त्रसुवर्णादिषु पामरः ।
 अप्रमत्तो यथा तद्वन्न प्रमाद्यति भोक्तारि ॥२०५॥

Srak candana vadhū vastra suvarṇā diṣu pāmarah
Apramatto yathā tadvann na pramādyati bhoktari (205)

पामरः = a helpless addicted fool; स्रक् चन्दन वधू वस्त्र सुवर्ण आदिषु = in garlands, sandalwood, wife, clothing, gold, etc.; यथा = as; अप्रमत्तः = without forgetfulness; तद्वत् = in the same way; भोक्तारि = in the enjoyer Self; न = not; प्रमाद्यति = forgets.

As a helpless victim of worldly enjoyments like garland, sandalwood, wife, clothing, gold etc. is ever alert about his enjoyable objects; so also this man of dispassion, who has once focused his attention on the enjoyer Self will never forget the Self i.e. will constantly contemplate on the nature of the Self. (205)

Yathā pāmarah etc. - As one who is living at the very low level of the senses, he is intensely and tirelessly involved in the enjoyment of objects such as garlands, sandal paste, young women, clothes, gold etc; *tad vat bhoktari na pramādyati*-in the same way, the *mumukṣu*, the one whose attention is focused on the enjoyer, he is all the time keeping his attention fixed on the inner core-the Self---constantly enquiring as to what his real nature is.

Therefore, the spiritual aspirant has to be alert all the time, so that he will know how far he should go in his involvement with the external world. This '*maryādā*' or limit which we set for ourselves in our involvement

with the world is our immunity zone into which we can withdraw and where 'I' - the self, is always present.

Bhagvān Kṛṣṇa says in *Gītā* (V-2)

Samnyāsaḥ karma yogaś ca niḥ-śreyas-karāv-ubhau

For the attainment of the highest, both *karmayoga* i.e. performance of action in this world and *samnyāsaḥ* i.e. renunciation of action -- withdrawal from the world, are essential.

Those who fail to withdraw from the world, suffer. *Bhoktari apramattaḥ* - therefore, he should be able to focus his attention or alertness on this enjoyer - or the experiencer.

One should not yield to *pramāda* i.e. the habit of forgetting again and again. Although, he knows that his essential nature is that of the *kūṭastha caitanya* and that the *bhoktā* and *kartā* cannot be he, yet he tends to forget and reverts to the previous rut of erroneous thinking. To remove this *pramāda* habit, he must do *abhyāsa* i.e. practice of knowledge again and again.

The importance of lack of habitual lethargy, i.e. alertness in practice of *sādhana* of Self enquiry, is emphasised through various examples in the following *śloka*, taking our popular worldly pursuits ----

काव्यनाटकतर्कादिमभ्यस्यति निरन्तरम् ।
विजिगीषुर्यथा तद्वन्मुमुक्षुः स्वं विचारयेत् ॥२०६॥

Kāvya nātaka tarkādī abhyasyati nirantaram
Vijigīṣur yathā tadvan mumukṣuḥ svaṁ vicārayet (206)

यथा = as; विजिगीषुः = one desiring victory in arguments; काव्य = poetry; नाटक = drama; तर्कादिम् = logic etc.; निरन्तरम् = constantly; अभ्यस्यति = studies and revises; तद् वत् = in the same way; मुमुक्षुः = the desirer of freedom; स्वम् = about Self; विचारयेत् = contemplate.

As a person desirous of victory in scriptural arguments keeps himself well equipped by constant studies of poetry, drama, logic etc., similarly, a seeker desiring freedom, also should keep himself fully involved in the contemplation of the nature of the Self. (206)

Kāvya nātaka tarkādi etc. - He who wants to excel in poetry, drama, debate etc., constantly practices in the respective art indefatigably. *Tadvat mumukṣaḥ svaṁ vicārayet* - In the same way, the *mumukṣu*, who desires to discover his own real nature, to get out of the limitations of conditioning, should constantly contemplate on the Self. For the student who wants to discover the Truth, it is a continuous practice in going through life with this vision in his mind. He should not succumb to a sense of *tuṣṭi bhāva*, a sense of surfeit, nor should he allow spirituality to become a *bhogaḥ* - an entertainment. He should on the other hand steadily and constantly enquire and contemplate on the nature of Self.

After having emphasised the importance of full time involvement in spiritual practice the next item is *śraddhā*----

जपयागोपासनादि कुरुते श्रद्धया यथा ।
स्वर्गादिवाञ्छया तद्वच्छ्रद्धयात्स्वे मुमुक्षया ॥२०७॥

Japayāgo pāsanādi kurute śraddhayā yathā
Svargādi vāñchayā tadvan śraddhadhyā tsve. mumukṣayā (207)

यथा = as; स्वर्ग आदि वाञ्छया = for attainment of heaven etc.; जप = *japa*; याग = offerings to *devatā*-s; उपासनादि = worship etc.; श्रद्धया = by faith; कुरुते = is practiced; तद् वत् = in the same way; मुमुक्षया = by the longing for the Self; स्वे = in one's Pure Self; श्रद्धयात् = should have faith.

As a desirer, of attainment of heavens, practices various means of this fulfilment, such as *japa*, *yāga*, worship etc. with

faith, so also the seeker of the Self, should have faith in the scriptures, teachers, for knowing about one's own Self, and practice the knowledge with faith. (207)

Yathā svargādi vāñchayā etc. - One who is prompted by the desire to attain heaven is constantly engaged in *japa*, *yāga* and *upāsana* with great faith and observing all the rules and regulations. [For example *nāma japa* may be chanted in any manner but *mantra japa* has to adhere to certain procedures and formalities especially when it is result-oriented]. What is important is *śraddhā*, the faith and conviction that there is a place called *svarga*. *Tad vat*- In the same manner, *mumukṣaya* by the longing for liberation *sve śraddhyāt*: one should accept in full faith that there is the Self in him, which is immune to all miseries.

By lack of faith one cannot achieve success in any field, what of spiritual enquiry!

The third point, of importance in the practice of Self Enquiry, is single-pointedness of the mind ----

चित्तैकाग्र्यं यथा योगी महायासेन साधयेत् ।
अणिमादिप्रेप्सयैवं विविच्यात्स्वं मुमुक्षया ॥२०८॥

Cittai kāgryam yathā yogī mahāyāseṇa sādhyet
Animādi prepsa yaivaṁ vivicyā tsvaṁ mumukṣayā (208)

योगी = the practitioner of *yoga*; अणिमा आदि प्रेप्सया = with a desire to attain powers like *anima* etc.; महायासेन = by great efforts; चित्तैकाग्र्यम् = the single-pointedness of mind; यथा = as; साधयेत् = has to attain; एवम् = similarly; मुमुक्षया = by longing liberation; स्वम् = Self; विविच्यात् = discriminate to be other than body etc.

A *yogī* desiring the great powers called *animā* etc., has to practice single-pointedness of the mind, with great efforts,

to achieve them, so also a seeker desiring liberation has to practice discrimination with great efforts. (208)

Yathā yogī animādi prepsayā-He who is doing *yoga* following *Pātāñjali Yoga Sūtra*, desiring the eight *siddhi-s* (*siddhi* is that which transcends the cause-effect field) like *animā* becoming small, *mahimā* becoming big, *laghimā* becoming light, *garimā* becoming heavy etc., *Mahāyāseṇa citta aikāgryam sādhyet*-practices single-pointedness of mind without the mind entertaining any other thought, with constant and assiduous effort. *Mumukṣayā vivicyāt svam*:- Similarly, he who desires liberation should try to separate himself from all the limitations and come to realize that he is in reality the *kūṭastha caitanya* and not the one who is suffering or enjoying.

This *abhyāsa* i.e. practice has to be done again and again. This *abhyāsa* consists of examining the mind every time a turmoil, called thought, arises in it. Enquire into who is disturbed, thus objectify the experience. When the experiences are objectified and watched from a distance, one gains perspective like viewing a portrait from a distance. The mind quietens and slowly by degrees, one comes to realise that these experiences are because of me, but I am not conditioned by either good or bad experience.

The result of this continuous practice of Self knowledge with alertness, *śraddhā* and single-pointedness of the mind is ----

कौशलानि विवर्धन्ते तेषामभ्यासपाटवात् ।
यथा तद्वद्विवेकोऽस्याप्यभ्यासाद्विशदायते ॥२०९॥

Kauśalāni vivardhante teṣāma bhyāsa pātavāt
Yathā tadvat viveko'syāpi abhyāsāt viśadā yate (209)

यथा = as; तेषाम् = their; कौशलानि = efficiency; अभ्यास पाटवात् = due to the strength of practice; विवर्धन्ते = grows; तद् वत् = similarly; अस्य = of the seeker;

अपि = also; अभ्यासात् = by the strength of practice;
विवेकः = discrimination; विशदायते = 'become intense
and clearer.

As the efficiency of these persons (referred in the last three *śloka-s*) grows due to the strength of practice, so also, the intensity and clarity of discrimination grows by the practice of the knowledge, in the seeker of the Self. (209)

Having explained the first four components of *tattva upāsanā*, viz. -

- (a) unfaltering attention on the Self (*apramattaḥ*) - (*śl.205*)
- (b) constant *abhyāsa* (*nirantara abhyāsa*) - (*śloka 206*)
- (c) full faith in the Self (*śraddhā*) - (*śloka 207*)
- (d) discrimination with single-pointedness of mind (*vivicyāt citta aikāgryam*) - (*śloka 208*).

The teacher proceeds to emphasize the importance of perseverance in practice. *Teṣām yathā abhyāsa pātavāt*-All those referred to above, who practice *kāvyā, nāṭaka, tarka* i.e. logic, *japa, yoga sādhanā*, because of the strength of the repetitive practice, *kauśalāni vivardhante* ---they become experts. *Tadvat asya api abhyāsāt*-in the same way, when all the seekers of Self, practice very sincerely, their ability 'to watch their own minds' becomes stronger. The study of *vedānta śāstra* and continuous *abhyāsa* is effective in due course here and now. All problems arise because of the erroneous angle of our view of the world. Once that vision is corrected, the problems cease to exist. By the method of discrimination again and again that 'I am not the body, mind nor its modifications', the mind becomes placid. Such a mind is very distinctly noticed by the seeker.

This intensity of discrimination leads to ----

विविञ्चता भोक्तृत्वं जाग्रदादिष्वसङ्गता ।
अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां साक्षिण्यध्यवसीयते ॥२१०॥

Viviñcatā bhoktr tattvam jāgra dādi śva saṅgatā
Anvaya vyati rekābhyām sākṣi ṇyadhya vasiyate (210)

अन्वय व्यतिरेकाभ्याम् = by the method of inclusion and excluding; भोक्तृत्वम् = the essence of the experiencer; विविञ्चता = one, who is able to discriminate conscious Self from the world of experience; जाग्रद् आदिषु = in the waking, dream and deep sleep states; साक्षिणि = in the witness; असङ्गता = unattachment; अध्यवसीयते = is ascertained.

He who (on the strength of practice) is able to discriminate the experiencer from the experienced, by the method of inclusion and separation, is qualified to ascertain the unattached nature of the witness, in all the three states viz. waking, dream and deep sleep. (210)

The teacher now proceeds to explain a technical method known as *anvaya vyatireka* by which one can arrive at one's own identity without a trace of doubt.

Viviñcatā bhoktr tattvam jāgradādiṣu etc. - When the object of enjoyment is separated from the enjoyer; in all the three periods of time - the waking, the dream and deep sleep states, the conclusion is *Sākṣiṇi asaṅgatā adhyavasiyate*-that I, the witness, who is the witness in all the three states of consciousness, is totally unattached, unconcerned either in the field of enjoyment or as the enjoyer or as the experience of enjoyment.

The method by which it is discovered that these three states are not in me, who am only a witness of all the three but they cannot be without I, is called *anvaya vyatireka*.

The presence of the cause in the effect is called *anvaya*. The existence of the cause is independent of effect. This is known as *vyatireka*. For example, gold

is the cause and the ornament is the effect. Without the gold (cause) the ornament (effect) cannot exist. But without the ornament (effect) the gold (cause) can exist. From this it can be concluded that (a) gold is the cause, ornament the effect; (b) cause is independent of effect; (c) in the cause-effect relationship, effect is nothing but cause in different name and form and (d) the cause and effect - the gold and gold ornament, both are superimposed on the essence, the *tattva*. The same *tattva*, when it is seen with reference to the effect is called the cause. But from the point of view of the gold, it is neither a cause nor an effect. This process of analysis is called *anvaya vyatireka*.

How this technique of analysis is applied to the *Sākṣī*, the witness, is discussed further. ----

यत्र यददृश्यते द्रष्टा जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तिषु ।
तत्रैव तन्नेतरत्रेत्यनुभूतिर्हि समता ॥२१॥

Yatra yad dṛśyate draṣṭā jāgrat svapna suṣuptiṣu
Tatraiva tanne taratreṭi anubhūtiḥ hi samatā (211)

जाग्रत स्वप्न सुषुप्तिषु = in waking, dream and deep sleep;
यत्र = in whichever; यत् = that which; द्रष्टा = the experiencer; दृश्यते = experiences; तत् = that; तत्र एव = in that state alone; इतरत्र = in other states; न = is not present; इति = this; अनुभूतिः = experience; सम्मता = well accepted; हि = indeed.

The various objects of experience in waking, dream or deep sleep are present in their respective states alone; and are not found in other states of consciousness; (unlike *draṣṭā*). This experience is accepted by all indeed. (211)

Yatra yat dṛśyate etc. - in the waking state, we see the gross world, in the dream state the subtle world, in the deep sleep state, it is the absence of the two.

Draṣṭā dṛśyate - in the waking state, when the waker is enjoying the waking state, the 'I' is present. When 'I' leaves the waking state and enters into the dream state, at that time also 'I' continues to be present, although another personality called the 'dreamer' is born. In the deep sleep state, the dreamer is also rejected and a third plane of consciousness called as deep sleep is born. There is the deep sleeper as also the 'I' denominator. Thus the 'I' continues to be the same in all the three planes of consciousness, experiencing the joy and suffering of the waker, the dreamer and the bliss of ignorance of the deep sleep. At the same time, there is the substratum in whose light there is an enjoyer and sufferer, but which itself neither suffers nor enjoys, but because of whom the experience of enjoyment and suffering is possible.

Draṣṭā dṛśyate tat tatra eva - The experience of each of the three states is limited only to that state. Experience in one state cannot influence the other two planes of consciousness.

Iti anubhūtiḥ sammatā - The joys and sorrows, the loss and gain of the waking state are only during that state and so also in the dream state. That the planes of consciousness are mutually exclusive i.e. the experiences of one state cannot be carried over into the other, is accepted by all indeed.

The authority of experience in above statement is authenticated by quotations from *upaniṣad-s* ----

स यत्तत्रेक्षते किञ्चित्तेनानन्वागतो भवेत् ।
दृष्ट्वैव पुण्यं पापं चेत्येवं श्रुतिषु डिण्डिमः ॥२१२॥

Sa yatta trekṣate kiñcit tenā nanvā gato bhavet
Dṛṣṭvaiva puṇyaṁ pāpaṁ ceti evaṁ śrutiṣu diṇḍimāḥ (212)

सः = the Pure Self; तत्र = in that plane of consciousness;
यत् किञ्चित् = whatever; ईक्षते = experiences; तेन = by

that experience; अनन्वागतः भवेत् = does not get carried away; पुण्यम् = the joyful experience; पापम् = the experience of misery; दृष्ट्वा एव = also having illumined; च इति एवम् = and in this way; श्रुतिषु = in the *upaniṣad-s*; डिण्डिमः = proclamation.

The *upaniṣad-s* proclaim that whatever experiences -- whether joyful or miserable -- are cognised by the pure Self in any plane of consciousness are not carried over from one state to another. Having illumined that plane of consciousness, the pure Self is ready to illumine the next, without getting lost in the earlier plane. (212)

The teacher now quotes *śruti vākya* from the *upaniṣad* in support of the above statement about the experiences in the three states of consciousness. The *vedānta śāstra* always talks about three factors: *śruti*, *yukti* and *anubhūti*.

Śruti vākya being the authority or guiding force, our *yukti* or logic must follow the guidance of the *śruti*. This logic should then be confirmed by *anubhūti*, one's own experience. The three together result in doubtless knowledge or else knowledge with doubt is ignorance, indeed *Sa tatra yat kiñcīt* etc. - the *ātmā* or pure Self --- whatever the Self experiences in each plane of consciousness, *tena ananvāgataḥ bhavet*: those objects or experiences cannot follow him into the other states. Their existence is limited only to that specific plane of consciousness. *Puṇyam pāpam dṛṣṭvā eva* etc. - Therefore, the *pāpa* and *puṇya* experienced by the waker in the waking state ends in the waking state. In the dream state another entity called the 'dreamer' goes through another set of *pāpa*-sin, *puṇya*-merit, joy and sorrow experiences.

Through all these planes of consciousness, there is one thread that runs through in all the states, which is not affected by the experiences in any of the states and that is the Self. It is erroneous understanding to say that I am in the waking state, dream state etc.;

the correct way of understanding these three planes of consciousness is that the waking state comes on me and goes away; then the dream state comes on me and goes away, absence of both those states is deep sleep state, but I continue to be the same.

Few more *upaniṣadik* statements are quoted to indicate the point ----

जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्त्यादिप्रपञ्चं यत्प्रकाशते ।
तद्ब्रह्माहमिति ज्ञात्वा सर्वबन्धैः प्रमुच्यते ॥२१३॥

Jāgrat svapna suṣuptyādi prapañcam yat prakāśate
Tad brahmā hamiti jñātvā sarva bandhaiḥ pramucyate (213)

यत् = that; जाग्रत् स्वप्न सुषुप्ति आदि = the waking, dream, deep sleep; प्रपञ्चम् = planes of consciousness; प्रकाशते = illumines; तद् = that; ब्रह्म = *Brahman*; अहम् इति = I am thus; ज्ञात्वा = having realized; सर्व बन्धैः = from all bondage; प्रमुच्यते = is freed.

That pure Self, which illumines waking, dream and deep sleep states, is *Brahman* and 'Me' ! In this way having realised, one is freed from the bondage of all conditions. (213)

This quotation is from *Kaivalya upaniṣad (I-17)*. *Yat jāgrat svapna suṣuptyādi prapañcam prakāśate* - that absolute, conscious existence which is present all the time, illuminating the experiences in all the three states of consciousness i.e. of the waker in the waking state, of the dreamer in the dream state and of the deep sleeper in the deep sleep state, *Tad brahma aham iti jñātvā* : know that reality to be none other than 'I' alone.

Each state is a drama in which I play different roles. But in all these different roles, I do not ever deny that 'I' exist. All the roles in all the three states are supported by me alone. All these experiences come, dance and play in me for a time and disappear.

If our real identity is thus clearly understood, there are two entities: one 'is', the other 'appears to be'. Once it is realized that *Brahman* is and that is 'I', *sarva bandhai pramucyate*: that individual is liberated from all bondages.

The bondage is only because of our imagination that we are a very small existence limited by so many prison walls. When we, through the above understanding, break the shackles of imagined limitations, we come to realise that while I support all the limitations, the limitations cannot touch me. The result is the joy of unlimited-ness. When we own limitations, we are debarred from unlimited existence.

Yet another *upaniṣad* is quoted ----

एक एवात्मा मन्तव्यो जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तिषु ।
स्थानत्रयव्यतीतस्य पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते ॥२१४॥

Ek evātmā mantavyo jāgrat svapna suṣuptiṣu
Sthāna traya vyatī tasya punar janma na vidyate (214)

जाग्रत् स्वप्न सुषुप्तिषु = in waking, dream and deep sleep states; एक = one; एव = alone; आत्मा = Self; मन्तव्यः = is worthy of knowing; स्थान त्रय व्यतीतस्य = the Self that is beyond the limitation of the three planes; पुनर्जन्म = birth again; न = not; विद्यते = is.

In the waking, dream and deep sleep, only one Self should be known. He who has thus realised this one Self, which is beyond the limitations of the three planes, is not born again. (214)

Eka eva ātmā mantavyaḥ jāgrat svapna suṣuptiṣu- There are three distinct entities experiencing the three planes of consciousness. The experiences of the entity in one plane of consciousness have nothing to do with those of the entities in the other two planes. But there is one *ātmā* which is common to, but beyond, all the three states of consciousness, which is constantly present. That is the point on which we should constantly meditate.

Sthāna traya vyatī tasya punarjanma na vidyate- This *ātman* or Self is beyond the spell of the three planes of consciousness. He who is able to understand himself to be this Self, he is not born again.

The waker is born with the waking state, and dies with the completion of the waking state; then the dreamer is born with the dream state and dies the moment the dream state is over, so also with the deep sleeper. But there is 'one' who is observing the birth and death of the three states. Once 'one' has realised that this observer (witness) is the Self, the question of birth and death ceases to be relevant.

Kaivalya upaniṣad (1-18) makes the point amply clear ----

त्रिषु धामसु यद्भोग्यं भोक्ता भोगश्च यद्भवेत् ।
तेभ्यो विलक्षणः साक्षी चिन्मात्रोऽहं सदाशिवः ॥२१५॥

Triṣu dhāmasu yad bhogyam bhoktā bhogaśca yad bhavet
Tebhyo vilakṣaṇaḥ sākṣī cinmātro'haṁ sadāśivaḥ (215)

त्रिषु धामसु = in all the three planes of experience; यद् = which is; भोग्यम् = the objects of experience; भोक्ता = experiencer; भोगः च = and the experience; यद् = that; भवेत् = manifests; तेभ्यः विलक्षणः = other than these planes of experience; चिन्मात्रः = Pure Consciousness; साक्षी = witness; सदाशिवः = always pure auspicious; अहम् = I am.

In the three planes of experience, which manifest as the experiencer, experienced and experience, other than these and of different nature is the witness. That always immaculate, auspicious witness I am! (215)

Triṣu dhāmasu yad bhogyam bhoktā bhogaś ca- In all the three planes of consciousness, there are three components in each: the world of enjoyment (*bhogyam*),

the enjoyer (*bhoktā*) and the experience of enjoyment (*bhogah*). *Tebhyo vilakṣaṇaḥ sākṣī*- But the *sākṣī* or witness has a characteristic which is the opposite of those of the three planes of consciousness.

The *lakṣaṇa* or characteristic of the objects of experience (*bhogya vastu*) is that they are not permanent. So the *vilakṣaṇatā* of the *sākṣī* is its permanent and unchanging nature.

The *bhokta* or enjoyer is also constantly changing in his moods and reactions. The *sākṣī* is ever the same, neither happy nor unhappy, not swayed by moods and emotions. In each plane there is different *bhoktā*.

The *bhoga* or experiences are present sometimes, and at others not. Whereas, the *sākṣī* is the witness of all the three components---the object of knowledge, the knowledge of the object and the knower of the knowledge. The *sākṣī* is the one who is observing without participation.

Disengagement of oneself from the thought process, voluntarily, consciously, is called the discovery of the Self or *sākṣī*. Who is this *sākṣī*? *Cinmātra*-It is Pure Consciousness alone.

One consciousness is that which is associated with objects and experiences and consequently suffers and enjoys. The other consciousness is not associated with anything. Consciousness separated from any entification is called *Sat-Cit-Ānanda Paramātmā*. *Aham sadāśivaḥ*- This consciousness is always (*sadā*) auspicious (*śiva*). In it there is no impurity of the knower-known-knowledge, experiencer-experienced-experience differentiations. That I am!

The above 211-215 *śloka-s* give us a line of discrimination and the practice of this leads to a point that pure Self is not the experiencer.

Then the question arises, who is this experiencer? ----

एवं - विवेचिते तत्त्वे विज्ञानमयशब्दितः
चिदाभासो विकारी यो भोक्तृत्वं तस्य शिष्यते ॥२१६॥

*Evam vivecite tattve vijñāna mayā śabditaḥ
Cidābhāso vikārī yo bhoktṛtvaṁ tasya śiṣyate* (216)

एवम् = in this manner; विवेचिते तत्त्वे = when the Self is enquired into; यः = that; विज्ञानमय शब्दितः = the meaning of *vijñānamaya kośa*; चिदाभासः = the conditioned consciousness; विकारी = subject to modifications; तस्य = his; भोक्तृत्वम् = experiencer-hood; शिष्यते = is left.

When the Self is enquired and discriminated in this manner (*śloka-s* 211-215), the experiencer-hood is left with the conditioned consciousness, which is subject to modifications, and is meant by the word *Vijñānamaya kośa* (216)

Evam vivecite tattve- When we enquire into the nature of the Self, in this manner, that is by discarding the objects of the world and the thoughts about the objects, *Vijñānamaya śabditaḥ cidābhāsa vikārī*: it is seen that the light of consciousness conditioned by or reflected in the *vijñānamaya kośa* is the one to whom is attributed all this exercise. Having accepted the conditioning, the conditioned consciousness or *cidābhāsa* in the *Vijñānamaya kośa*, acquired *bhoktṛtva* and becomes the *bhoktā*-the experiencer.

In an earlier instance (*śloka* 192) it was emphasised that the purpose of the words '*kasya kāmāya*' is to deny the very existence of the experiencer. However, now it is again said that the *cidābhāsa* is the experiencer. Is it a contradiction? ----

मायिकोऽयं चिदाभासः श्रुतेरनुभवादपि ।
इन्द्रजालं जगत्प्रोक्तं तदन्तःपात्ययं यतः ॥२१७॥

*Māyiko'yaṁ cidābhāsaḥ śrute ranubha vādapi
Indrajālam jagat proktaṁ tadantaḥ pātyayaṁ yataḥ* (217)

अयम् = this; चिदाभासः = the reflected consciousness;
मायिकः = being a product of *māyā* is an illusion;
श्रुतः = according to this statement of *upaniṣad* (ibid.
śloka 3); अनुभवात् = from our experience; अपि = also;
जगत् = the world; इन्द्र जालम् = an illusion; प्रोक्तम् =
is declared (*śloka* 171); यतः = because of this; अयम् =
this *cidābhāsa*; तदन्तः पाती = is included in it.

As already declared (in *śloka* 3) this *cidābhāsa* is a product
of *māyā*, hence an appearance, and so also the world is an
illusion (*śloka* 171). This is also according to our experience,
as this *cidābhāsa* falls within the world. (217)

Ayam cidābhāsaḥ māyikaḥ śruteḥ anubhavāt api- What
is the status of this *cidābhāsa* which is the experiencer?

In *śloka* 3 it was said clearly that *māyā* reflecting
the consciousness creates the *jīva* and *Īśvara*. *Cidābhāsa*
is not the reality. This has been stated very clearly.

Indrajālam jagat proktaṁ etc. - The whole world
including the 'I' the experiencer (who is as much a content
of the world as any other object) is like a magic show;
an illusion, which means that the experiencer, the
experienced and the experience, all three are illusions.
Therefore, there is 'no one' who is experiencing. Thus
the enquiry into who is the *cidābhāsa* cannot find an
answer, because it will only lead to its disappearance,
for illusion is one which appears in its own absence.

Absence has taken the status of existence in the form
of an appearance. There is no real entity who is enjoying
or suffering. It is like a drama where actors act different
parts and portray different experiences, and create the
illusion in the audience that all those experiences are
really happening. But when the drama is over, the

experiences as well as the characters depicting the
experiences both disappear. In reality nothing happened.

The *jīva* is thus, not a reality, it is only a reflection - it
is like a light being reflected in hundreds of buckets
of water. With each new bucket of water a new *jīva*
is 'born'! When the water from one bucket is thrown
away, the *jīva* 'disappears'. Does it die? Does it get
liberated? It never was, so terms like birth, death, bondage,
liberation do not apply.

Earlier also when the question '*kasya kāmāya*' was
asked, the purpose was to suspect or question the very
existence of an enjoyer and a desirer. The present analysis
proves this point.

As the world is an illusion on account of its being
destructible, so is *cidābhāsa*----

विलयोऽप्यस्य सुप्त्यादौ साक्षिणा ह्यनुभूयते ।
एतादृशं स्वस्वभावं विविनक्ति पुनः पुनः ॥२१८॥

*Vilayo'pyasya suptyādaū sākṣiṇā hyanu bhūyate
Etādṛśaṁ svasvabhā vaṁ vivinakti punaḥ punaḥ* (218)

सुप्ति आदौ = in sleep etc; अस्य = of this *cidābhāsa*;
विलयः = absence; अपि = also; साक्षिणा = by the witness;
हि = indeed; अनुभूयते = is experienced; एतादृशम् = in
this way; स्वस्व भावम् = one's own nature; पुनः पुनः = again
and again; विविनक्ति = discriminates from *Kūṭastha*

In deep sleep, under sedation etc., the absence of the
cidābhāsa is illumined by the witness, and is certainly experienced
by the witness. In this way, the *cidābhāsa* discriminates its
own absence and presence, as distinctly different from the
Kūṭastha, again and again. (218)

What is the status of the *cidābhāsa* ?

Vilaya api suptyādaṁ sākṣiṇā hi anubhūyate-This reflected consciousness as a waker, or dreamer or deep sleeper in the other planes of consciousness, is distinctly illumined by the witness. When this is understood by us - *Etā dṛśaṁ svasvabhāvaṁ punaḥ punaḥ vivinakti*-when the student goes on discriminating again and again (*punaḥ punaḥ vivinakti*), he will be able to find out his own nature - that as *cidābhāsa*, the waker, the dream-state dreamer and the deep sleeper, there is someone other than himself observing himself as a *sākṣī*. This ability to separate the *cidābhāsa* from the witness, when practised again and again will lead to the understanding that this conditioned consciousness (*cidābhāsa*) comes with the conditioning, and when one conditioning is dropped, another is taken up. Thus, the conditioned consciousness keeps changing with the conditions. But it appears, as though, the pure consciousness has been conditioned. This appearance of being conditioned is called the *cidābhāsa*.

In this way, the *cidābhāsa* or the conditioned consciousness is again and again separated and discriminated. What will happen by this, is explained in the next *śloka*----

विविच्य नाशं निश्चित्य पुनर्भोगं न वाञ्छति ।

मुमूर्षुः शायितो भूमौ विवाहं कोऽभिवाञ्छति ॥२१९॥

Vivicya nāśaṁ niścitya punar bhogaṁ na vāñchati
Mumūrṣuḥ śāyito bhūmau vivāhaṁ ko 'bhi vāñchati (219)

विविच्य = having properly discriminated; नाशम् = annihilation;
निश्चित्य = having ascertained; पुनः = again; भोगम् =
enjoyments; न = not; वाञ्छति = desires; भूमौ = on the
floor; शायितः = laying down; मुमूर्षुः = and on the death
bed; कः = who; विवाहम् = marriage; अभिवाञ्छति = desires?

Once the illusory nature of the *cidābhāsa*-the experiencer, is fully ascertained to be destructible, one never again desires

objective enjoyments. Will there be a person, lying down on his death bed, desiring to marry? (219)

Vivicya nāśaṁ niścitya-In this way (as described in the above *śloka*) when the seeker conducts an enquiry into the nature of *cidābhāsa*, he knows that this enquiry is going to annihilate his very existence, like the river running fast and strong towards the ocean, and when it meets the ocean, the river disappears.

In a beautiful poem of *Rabindranath Tagore*, there is a story of a cow that was grazing and she grazed and grazed and grazed---and became the pasture---the enjoyer and the enjoyed had become one!---the difference had disappeared.

So also when we start enquiring about the *cidābhāsa* (not about the *Paramātmā* which is beyond enquiry)-the conditioned entity which is enjoying and suffering, we come to the conclusion that the *cidābhāsa* cannot have the status of existence.

Punaḥ bhogaṁ na vāñchati-There cannot be any more enchantment about the worldly things.

Kaḥ mumūrṣuḥ bhūmau śāyito bhūmau vivāhaṁ abhivāñchati-When a person is on his death bed, laid on the floor, will he desire to marry? Similarly, when the *cidābhāsa* is losing the ground under his feet, and his very existence is getting dissolved, thoughts of desire and enjoyment cannot occur. When proper *vicāra* takes place, slowly in gradual stages, desire automatically drops away. That is, one grows out of the desire. The seeker now knows that when his (the *cidābhāsa*'s) existence itself has totally gone, for whose sake will he desire?

A further example is given in the next *śloka*, to illustrate the lack of pride about one's past achievements and failures, in the wake of this knowledge----

जिहेति व्यवहर्त च भोक्ताहमिति पूर्ववत् ।
छिन्ननास इव हीतः क्लिश्यन्नारब्धमश्नुते ॥२२०॥

*Jihreti vyava hartam ca bhoktā hamiti pūrva vat
Chinna nāsaḥ iva hrītaḥ kliśyann ārabdha maśnute* (220)

अहम् = I; भोक्ता इति = as an experiencer; पूर्ववत् = as before; व्यवहर्तम् = events refer; जिहेति = feels ashamed; च = and; छिन्न नासः इव = like one with a cut nose; हीतः = being ashamed; क्लिश्यन् = feeling painful; आरब्धम् = the *prārabdha phala*; अश्नुते = goes through.

On realising the non-existent status of this *cidābhāsa*, which he was considering himself to be, so far, not only avoids to refer as an experiencer, but feels ashamed, as a person with a cut-nose who is not only ashamed but also feels pain, and goes through the *prārabdha* of the body (without identifying with the body). (220)

Pūrva vat aham bhoktā iti etc. - As he was saying earlier, that 'I am the enjoyer, the experiencer, etc.' he feels ashamed to talk in the same style now. When the seeker has realised the status of the enjoyer, the poverty of his very limited existence, he cannot ever be proud of his previous opinion in the manner he was talking about himself before. *Chinna nāsaḥ iva hrītaḥ* - Like a man whose nose has been cut off, will feel ashamed to go and show it to others. He would much rather suffer it alone.

Similarly, the man who has understood the true nature of the *cidābhāsa* (i.e. its non-existence) will thereafter face all the problems of life stoically, knowing that the *prārabdha* will take its own course. He will allow nature and events take their course, not blaming or condemning anyone. Sufferings will be there, but there will be no sufferer.

Thus, if the experiencer-hood is not possible in the *cidābhāsa*, how can it be labelled on the pure Witness? ----

यदा स्वस्यापि भोक्तृत्वं मन्तुं जिहेत्ययं तदा ।
साक्षिण्यारोपयेदेतदिति कैव कथा वृथा ॥२२१॥

*Yadā svasyāpi bhoktṛtvam mantum jihre tyayaṁ tadā
Sākṣi nyāropa yedetat iti kaiva kathā vṛthā* (221)

अयम् = this *cidābhāsa*; यदा = when; स्वस्य अपि = even one's own; भोक्तृत्वम् = experiencer-ship; मन्तुम् = accepting; जिहेति = feels shy; तदा = in that case; एतत् = this experiencer-ship; साक्षिणि = in the witness; आरोपयेत् = will superimpose; इति = in this way; वृथा = illogical; कथा = possibility; का एव = how can be thought of.

When this *cidābhāsa* (the seeker), is ashamed of accepting the experiencer-ship on itself, how can this experiencer-ship be labelled in the witness? Will such a thoughtless illogical possibility be thought of? (221)

Yadā svasyāpi bhoktṛtvam mantum jihreti - When the *cidābhāsa*, the experiencer, the seeker, himself is ashamed to accept the enjoyership - *Tadā sākṣiṇi āropayet* etc. - how will he be able to superimpose the enjoyership on the *sākṣī*?

When four different types of mirrors reflect one object, each reflection looks distorted in different ways according to the nature of the reflecting medium. In reality there is no change either in the object or in the reflection. The modifications in the reflection are not real. They are even less so, for the object reflected.

Similarly, when the enjoyership role is unreal for the *cidābhāsa* which itself is unreal, the experiencer-ship cannot be superimposed on the *sākṣī chaitanya*, which is the common denominator of all experiences.

Thus, the very existence of enjoyership is questioned by the *upaniṣad*, which is meant by the words '*kasya kāmāya*'----

इत्यभिप्रेत्य भोक्तारमाक्षिपत्यविशङ्कया ।

कस्य कामायेति ततः शरीरानुज्वरो नहि ॥२२२॥

Ityabhi pretya bhoktāram ākṣi patya viśaṅkayā
Kasya kāmāyeti tataḥ śarīrā nujvaro nahi (222)

कस्य कामाय इति = *kasya kāmāya iti*; इति = thus; अभिप्रेत्य = in this sense; अविशङ्कया = without any doubt; भोक्तारम् = the experiencer; आक्षिपति = is negated; ततः = having denied the experiencer; शरीर अनुज्वरः = the worries about body; न = not; हि = indeed.

In this (that there is no possibility of existence of an experiencer) sense, the *upaniṣad* uses the words - '*kasya kāmāya iti*', and thus negates the very existence of the experiencer. Thereafter, how can there be any worry about the body and for the body, is said! (222)

This thought is concluded in this *śloka*. The words *kasya kāmāya iti* cited from the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka upaniṣad*, what is the purpose underlying these words? The purpose is to indicate that there is no one that is experiencing the joy or the sorrow. In the absence of the experiencer, when experience takes place, that is the state of realisation. There is action without an actor, experience without an experiencer, meaning that the identification with the experience has no value; it is an illusion. Therefore, *kim icchan kasya kāmāya* means that there is no desirer to desire.

Desires are possible only when there is a desirer. But desire itself is an illusion. The desire for an object can die, that means the entity of desirer which was born with reference to this particular object, no more exists. Once this status, of the desirer as well as the desire,

being an illusion is established, who is to desire and what?

(Without any doubt) *kasya kāmāya*----- *bhoktāram ākṣipati*-So, by these words *kasya kāmāya* in the *śruti*, the very existence of the enjoyer/sufferer is doubted.

Śarīram anujvaro na hi etc.-Therefore, by the modifications or the conditionings of the body, the conditioned one does not get perturbed. The conditioned as well as the conditioning are both illusions. The man of wisdom is unaffected by anything (any fever-*jvara*) that happens to the body. This is the conclusion.

Which body is referred to in the statement *śarīram jvaraḥ*? This is now taken up ----

स्थूलं सूक्ष्मं कारणं च शरीरं त्रिविधं स्मृतम् ।

अवश्यं त्रिविधोऽस्त्येव तत्र तत्रोचितो ज्वरः ॥२२३॥

Sthūlaṁ sūkṣmaṁ kāraṇaṁ ca śarīraṁ trividhaṁ smṛtaṁ
Avaśyaṁ trividho'styeva tatra tatro cito jvaraḥ (223)

स्थूलम् = the gross; सूक्ष्मम् = the subtle; च कारणम् = and the causal; शरीरम् = body; त्रिविधम् = of three types; स्मृतम् = is known; तत्र तत्र = in them respectively; उचितः = proper; ज्वरः = disease; त्रिविधः = of three types; अवश्यम् = essentially; अस्ति एव = certainly is.

There are three types of bodies viz. the gross, the subtle and the causal body and they have certainly their respective three types of diseases, indeed. (223)

The teacher now takes up the explanation of the three bodies-their nature and their afflictions. *Sthūlaṁ sūkṣmaṁ kāraṇaṁ ca* etc.-We function through three bodies: the gross body, the subtle body, which is mainly the mind complex and the causal body in the deep sleep state. In the dream state, we have the functional centre

at two levels - the causal body and the subtle body. In the waking state, we are functioning through all three bodies, the gross, the subtle and the causal.

Avaśyam trividho etc. - And of course each body has different diseases.

These are described further ----

वातपित्तश्लेष्मजन्यव्याधयः कोटिशस्तनौ ।

दुर्गन्धित्वकुरूपत्वदाहभङ्गादयस्तथा ॥२२४॥

Vātapitta śleṣma janya vyādhayaḥ koṭīśa stanau
Durgandhitva kurūpatva dāha bhaṅgā adaya stathā (224)

वात = gaseous; पित्त = acidity; श्लेष्म = cough; जन्य व्याधयः = diseases born out of; तनौ = in gross body; कोटिशः = in innumerable ways; तथा = similarly; दुर्गन्धित्व = foul smelling; कुरूपत्व = deformation; दाह = burning; भङ्गादयः = breaking etc.

There are innumerable diseases born out of the disorders pertaining to gases, acidity, cough, in the gross body. Similarly, there are other disorders like foul smell, deformation, burning, fractures etc. associated with the gross body. (224)

Vāta pitta śleṣma etc. - The diseases of the gross body are: *Vāta* - vayū; *Pitta* - bile, *śleṣma* - cough. These are the three main principles, in which balance is to be maintained. Any imbalance in these three causes ill-health. Out of the imbalance between these three main principles are born hundreds and thousands of diseases. In addition, disorders such as *durgandhitva* - bad smell; *kurūptva* - deformity; *dāha* - inflammation; *bhaṅga ādayaḥ* - fractures etc. are different modifications of the body in terms of ill-health.

What are the disorders of the subtle body? ----

कामक्रोधादयः शान्तिदान्त्याद्याः लिङ्गदेहगाः ।

ज्वरा द्वयेऽपि बाधन्ते प्राप्याप्राप्या नरं क्रमात् ॥२२५॥

Kāma krodhā dayah śanti dāntyā dyāḥ liṅga dehagāḥ
Jvarā dvaye'pi bādhante prāptyā' prāptyā naraṁ kramāt (225)

काम क्रोध आदयः = desire, anger etc; शान्ति दान्ति आद्याः = control of mind, senses etc; लिङ्ग देहगाः = are associated in subtle body; ज्वराः = disorders; द्वये अपि = both these; प्राप्या = having gained; अप्राप्या = having not gained; क्रमात् = respectively; नरम् = to man; बाधन्ते = afflict.

The disorders associated with the subtle body are desire, anger etc. as well as peace of mind, control of senses etc. Both these types afflict man, the former having gained and the latter having not gained. (225)

Liṅga dehagā kāma krodha etc. - The subtle body or the mind has six modifications: *kāma* - desire, *krodhā* - anger; *lobha* - greed; *moha* - lust; *mada* - passion, and *mātsaryam* - envy or jealousy. These are one set of diseases. *Śhanti, dānti, dayā* etc. - Peace, calmness, quietude, love, compassion, charity, helping others, these are also diseases of the mind. *Dvaye api jvara naraṁ bādhante kramāt* etc. - both these modifications bind us in that order. How?

When we get them (the first category) we suffer, when we don't get them (the second category) we suffer. If we get angry we suffer, because we don't want to get angry; if we don't get peace or the calmness, say to do meditation, we suffer.

What is necessary to be understood is that the presence of the thoughts of charity or goodness is not freedom. They are also a bondage. Any modification, plus or minus, bounces on the mind. If water-level rises above a certain level it is harmful, it is equally harmful if it goes down below the minimum level.

The disorder of causal body is quoted with reference of *Chāndogya upaniṣad*----

स्वं परं च न वेत्यात्मा विनष्ट इव कारणे ।
आगामिदुःखबीजं चेत्येतदिन्द्रेण दर्शितम् ॥२२६॥

*Svaṁ paraṁ ca na vettyātmā vinaṣṭa iva kāraṇe
Āgāmi duḥkha bījaṁ cet yetadin dreṇa darśitam* (226)

कारणे = in the cause; विनष्ट इव = as gone back to;
आत्मा = this Self; स्वम् परम् च = to oneself and the
other things; न = not; वेत्ति = knows; आगामि = the incoming;
दुःख बीजम् = cause of misery; च = and; इति = thus;
एतत् = the disorders of causal body; इन्द्रेण = by *Indra*;
दर्शितम् = is described to *prajāpati*

When an effect becomes unmanifest, it goes back to its cause. Similarly, the Self (individuality) neither knowing oneself nor anything else goes back to the causal body (in deep sleep). Here it exists in seed for the incoming miseries. In this manner *Prajāpati* explained to *Indra* about the modifications of the causal body. (226)

Kāraṇe vinaṣṭa iva ātmā svayam param ca na veti- When the ornament is melted, the name and form go back to the gold. That does not mean the same type of name and form cannot be remade. Only it is not existing as a discrete existence of an ornament. Similarly, in the deep sleep state, *ātmā*-the *jīva* is associated only with the causal body, it is in the state of utter ignorance. It does not know itself nor the others. In the waking state, I know I am this body, or that this body is other than me etc. Thus there is transaction of knowledge. But in deep sleep, we are in the state of absolute total ignorance.

Āgāmi duḥkham ca-in the deep sleep state, all our problems and worries are in tact. They are not destroyed;

they are in seed form. Therefore, joys and sorrows *sukha* as well as *duḥkha* are stored, in seed form.

In the *Chāndogya upaniṣad*, *Indra* submitted this observation to his teacher *Prajāpati*. After saying that there are three types of diseases in the three bodies, it was stated that these diseases are essential for the existence of the three bodies.

Na veti-What is the disease? 'I do not know myself, nor the Truth'; *Avidyā*, *Kāma* and *Karma* are the diseases in the causal, subtle and gross body, respectively.

These diseases are essentially present in these three bodies ----

एते ज्वराः शरीरेषु त्रिषु स्वाभाविका मताः ।
वियोगे तु ज्वरैस्तानि शरीराण्येव नासते ॥२२७॥

*Ete jvarāḥ śarīreṣu triṣu svābhāvikā matāḥ
Vijoge tu jvarai stāni, śarīrā nyeva nāstate* (227)

त्रिषु शरीरेषु = in the three bodies; एते ज्वराः = these diseases; स्वाभाविकाः = natural; मताः = are known; ज्वरैः वियोगे = when these modifications are absent; तु = indeed; तानि शरीराणि = these bodies; न = not; आसते एव = remain at all.

These disorders are naturally associated with the three bodies. When these modifications leave the respective bodies, these bodies cannot exist, indeed. (227)

Ete jvarāḥ śarīreṣu triṣu svābhāvikāḥ matāḥ-These three types of diseases or afflictions associated with the three bodies, are but natural to the respective bodies, just as it is natural for the eyes to see. We should not expect anything else.

Vijyoge tu jvaraiḥ tāni śarīrāṇi na āsate eva-The body cannot exist when these afflictions are totally absent. Absolute

health at all the three levels is called *Paramātmā* or beyond the bodies.

Now an example is given of how each type of modification is an essential part of that body----

तन्तोर्वियुज्येन्न पटो बालेभ्यः कम्बलो यथा ।

मृदो घटस्तथा देहो ज्वरेभ्योऽपीति दृश्यताम् ॥२२८॥

Tantor viyujyet na paṭo bālebhyaḥ kambalo yathā
Mṛdo ghaṭa stathā deho jvare bhyo'pīti dṛśyatām (228)

यथा = as; तन्तोः = from thread; पटः = cloth; वियुज्येत् = having separated; न = cannot (exist); बालेभ्यः = without wool; कम्बलः = the blanket; मृदः घटः = without the mud, the pot; तथा = in the same way; ज्वरेभ्यः देहः = without these modifications the bodies; अपि = also (cannot stay); इति = thus; दृश्यताम् = should be understood.

As the cloth cannot exist when separated from the thread, the blanket from wool; the pot from mud; so also the bodies cannot stay without these modifications --- in this way one should understand. (228)

Yathā tantoḥ viyujyet paṭaḥ etc. - When the cloth is separated from the thread, that is when the thread is removed from the cloth, the cloth cannot be *bālebhyaḥ kambalaḥ*-as, when the wool is taken out from the blanket, the blanket cannot be and *mṛdo ghaṭaḥ*-and as, when the mud is taken out from the pot, the pot cannot be.

Tathā dehaḥ jvarebhyaḥ api iti dṛśyatām-In the same way, without some affliction or the other, the three bodies cannot exist.

Therefore, the wise man should take these afflictions of the body as inevitable. The bodies cannot, but be associated with these modifications.

These disorders are not possible in the *cidābhāsa*, the reflected consciousness ----

चिदाभासे स्वतः कोऽपि ज्वरो नास्ति यतश्चितः ।

प्रकाशैकस्वभावत्वमेव दृष्टं न चैतरत् ॥२२९॥

Cidābhāse svataḥ ko'pi jvaro nāsti yataścitaḥ
Prakāśaika svabhā vatvam eva dṛṣṭam na cetarat (229)

चिदाभासे = in the *cidābhāsa*; स्वतः = of its own (i.e. without its association with the three bodies); कः अपि = any; ज्वरः = disorder; न अस्ति = does not exist; यतः = because; चितः = of the consciousness; प्रकाशैक-स्वभावत्वम् एव = only to illumine is the nature; दृष्टम् = is also seen (by the wise); न च इतरत् = and not any other nature.

The *cidābhāsa* does not have any disorder of its own (unless associated with the three bodies), because the nature of the consciousness (and therefore its reflection) is known to be illuminator of the changes (without undergoing any change), and not any other nature i.e. to suffer modifications. (229)

Cidābhāse svataḥ kaḥ api jvaraḥ na asti-To the *cidābhāsa* itself, none of these modifications or the afflictions of the three bodies, belong.

Just as the reflection of the stick in the water is not affected by the ripples on the reflecting medium, the water, so also the conditioned consciousness or the *cidābhāsa* is also not touched by the *vikāraḥ*, the modifications of the three bodies; because the reflection of the stick does not really exist. When the *cidābhāsa* itself exists only as an illusion, modifications of an illusion are not possible.

Yataḥ citaḥ prakāśaika svabhāvatam eva dṛṣṭam na ca itarat- Just as the *svabhāva* or nature of the consciousness

is light, the *cidābhāsa* which is its reflection is also seen in the same by a man of wisdom.

The reflection of the sun in the water will also be bright. As is the reflected object, so is the reflection. Similarly consciousness is *prakāśa svarūpa*---self-illuminating, therefore, the *cidābhāsa* which reflects the Pure Consciousness: its *svabhava* is also self-luminous. It cannot be of the nature of ignorance and therefore the disorders cannot belong to it.

If these disorders of *avidyā*, *kāma*, *karma* do not belong to *cidābhāsa*, how can they be attributed to Pure Consciousness?

चिदाभासेऽप्यसंभाव्या ज्वराः साक्षिणि का कथा ।

एवमप्येकतां मेने चिदाभासो ह्यविद्यया ॥२३०॥

Cidābhāse 'pyasaṁ bhāvyā jvarāḥ sākṣiṇi kā kathā
Evama pyekatām mene cidābhāso hyavi dyayā (230)

चिदाभासे अपि = when in *cidābhāsa*; ज्वराः = the disorders; असंभाव्याः = are impossible; साक्षिणि = in the witness; का कथा = how can be; एवम् अपि = however; चिदाभासः = the *cidābhāsa*; अविद्यया हि = due to ignorance; एकताम् = identification; मेने = accepts.

When the disorders are not possible in *cidābhāsa*, how can they be possible in the witness? Although this is so, the *cidābhāsa* accepts identification with the bodies and experiences the joys and sorrows. (230)

Cidābhāsa api jvarāḥ asambhāvyā sākṣiṇi kā kathā-When even in the *cidābhāsa*, there is no possibility of modifications, how can there be modifications (afflictions) in the witness - the *kūṭastha caitanya*?

Evam api cidābhāsaḥ avidyayā ekatām mene-Although this is so, this *cidābhāsa* because of ignorance, starts imagining that it is conditioned like the space inside a

room; that it is imprisoned within the four walls and unless the walls are removed, it cannot be liberated. In reality, however, the walls are in the space and whether the space is in the eye of a needle or in a huge hall or in the total space, it is one and the same. But when the attention is on the wrong place, on the medium of reflection, then the conditionings are imagined to be influencing the *cidābhāsa*. Then the *cidābhāsa* starts identifying itself with the conditionings called the gross, the subtle and causal bodies. Because of this erroneous identification, for no reason (*avidyā*) or logic, there is an illusion of suffering etc.

The illusion of erroneous identification is further explained ----

साक्षिसत्यत्वमध्यस्य स्वेनोपेते वपुस्त्रये ।

तत्सर्वं वास्तवं स्वस्य स्वरूपमिति मन्यते ॥२३१॥

Sākṣi satyatva madhyasya sveno pete vapu straye
Tat sarvaṁ vāstavaṁ svasya svarūpa miti manyate (231)

स्वेन उपेते = the *cidābhāsa* along with itself; वपुःत्रये = in the three bodies; साक्षि सत्यत्वम् = the reality of the witness; अध्यस्य = having superimposed; तत् सर्वम् = all the three bodies; स्वस्य = his own; वास्तवम् स्वरूपम् = real nature; इति = thus; मन्यते = considers.

The *cidābhāsa* superimposes the reality of the witness on itself in association with the three bodies, and considers this to be his real nature. (231)

The reflected stick in the water, when the water surface is disturbed, if it thinks 'I am constantly moving and therefore, I am getting exhausted,' who can help it? It is the modification of the reflecting medium---the water---that is superimposed on the reflection of the stick. The reflection cannot move because it has no real existence.

The movement of the external stick is possible but the reflection can move only if the external stick moves. The reflection has no freedom to make movements of its own. Nor does the reflection have any control over the medium, the water.

Sākṣi satyatvam svena adhyasya-The reality of the *sākṣi*- the *kūṭastha caitanya* is superimposed on the reflected consciousness; because of the delusion then, the reflected consciousness in association with the three bodies, unnecessarily accepts it to be its own real nature.

First, the reflected consciousness borrows the reality of the *kūṭastha caitanya*, second, it considers the conditionings of the three bodies as its own. Thus *cidābhāsa* brings together the pure existence of the *kūṭastha caitanya* which is immune to modifications and the three bodies which are essentially of the nature of modifications and then - *Tat sarvam vāstavam svasya svarūpam manyate*- the *cidābhāsa* starts imagining that to be its real nature and that 'I am old', 'I am young', 'I am happy', 'I am unhappy' etc.

Thus, *kūṭastha caitanya* cannot be the experiencer, the *cidābhāsa* cannot be the experiencer; the modifications called the three bodies cannot be experiencer. Fire cannot burn the fire. These modifications are essential for the three bodies.

The *kūṭastha caitanya* is immune to modifications; the three bodies are totally of the nature of constant modification.

The *cidābhāsa* is totally dependent on these factors: the *kūṭastha caitanya* on the one hand and the conditionings of the body on the other.

This dependent, fictitious, illusory entity called *cidābhāsa* starts imagining, for no logic or reason, that it is real. The reality is drawn from the *kūṭastha caitanya* and the modifications from the three bodies. Now, this impossible

amalgam born out of delusion, this modifying entity, becomes the reality.

Therefore, there is no suffering either in the *Kūṭastha caitanya* or the *cidābhāsa*. The former being a Reality and the latter being an imaginary existence. The *cidābhāsa* starts imagining that it is real and all the sufferings associated with it are also real. The unhappy entity exists only on the substratum of ignorance. We have to understand that it is only an appearance like a mirage.

The results of this erroneous identifications are ----

एतस्मिन्भ्रान्तिकालेऽयं शरीरेषु ज्वरत्स्वथ ।
स्वयमेव ज्वरामीति मन्यते हि कुटुम्बिबत् ॥२३२॥

Etasmin bhrānti kāle'yaṁ śarī-reṣu jvarat svatha
Svaya-meva jvarā mīti manyate hi kuṭum bivat (232)

अयम् = this *cidābhāsa*, एतस्मिन् भ्रान्ति काले = during the period of this delusion; शरीरेषु ज्वरत्सु = when the body has diseases; अथ = how; स्वयम् एव = I myself alone; ज्वरामि = am suffering from disease; इति मन्यते = thus thinks; कुटुम्बिबत् हि = just as a house-holder suffers when the family members suffer.

During this period of delusion, when the bodies are modifying, *cidābhāsa* considers that I am suffering just like a householder suffers on account of the sufferings of a family member. (232)

Etasmin bhrānti kāle- When the *cidābhāsa* is associated with the problems of the body, during the time of *bhrānti* or delusion, it identifies with the gross body (I am old, I am young etc.), when this period of delusion is over, it enters the dream or deep sleep state. It is not permanent, because the *cidābhāsa* has rejected the identification with the gross body for sometime.

Thus, when during the state of delusion, modifications of the body become the modifications of *cidābhāsa*, *Svayam eva jvarāmi*-he starts imagining that all the modifications of the three bodies are its own and it gets absorbed unnecessarily in the body awareness.

Kuṭumbi vat hi manyate-as the *grhastha*, the man with a family gets worried about his wife, his child etc. so also the *cidābhāsa* gets concerned unnecessarily about the modifications of the medium through which it is functioning.

This example of *kuṭumbi-vat* is explained further ----

तपत्सु पुत्र दारेषु तपामीति वृथा यथा ।
मन्यते पुरुषस्तद्वदाभासोऽप्यभिमन्यते ॥२३३॥

Tapatsu putra dāreṣu tapā mīti vṛthā yathā
Manyate puruṣas tadvad ābhāso'pyabhi manyate (233)

पुत्र दारेषु तपत्सु = when the son, wife etc. get sick;
तपामि = I am suffering; इति वृथा = thus unnecessary;
यथा = as; पुरुषः = a person; मन्यते = thinks; तद् वत्
= in the same way; आभासः अपि = the *cidābhāsa*
also; अभिमन्यते = accepts the conditions to be his nature.

As a householder considers that he is suffering, when his wife, children etc. suffer, unnecessarily, so also this *cidābhāsa* accepts the modifications of the bodies to be its own and suffers. (233)

Tapatsu putra dāreṣu tapāmi iti puruṣaḥ yad vat manyate vṛthā etc. - When the children, wife, suffer, the householder or *grhastha* suffers, worries. There are so many people who suffer in so many ways, but we are not affected. But when the same things happens to the conditionings called my children, wife etc., these sufferings become mine. But that is only so long as I accept. One day I may decide to reject this conditioning and think I am

now happy. So long as under the spell of delusion, I accept someone as mine or not mine, I am subjected to misery. But neither delusion nor the misery is real. Only the ignorant, i.e. the one who has associated himself with ignorance, suffers.

The wise man does not associate himself with success or failure, taking victory and defeat with equipoise means not associating oneself with success and failure. The ability to disassociate ourselves with the conditionings of the three bodies is the only way to overcome our problems of life.

When the delusion as a result of ignorance and the conditionings is removed by the dawn of knowledge about the Self etc., one overcomes the problems of life ----

विविच्य भ्रान्तिमुज्झित्वा स्वमप्यगणयन्सदा ।
चिन्तयन्साक्षिणं कस्माच्छरीरमनुसंज्वरेत् ॥२३४॥

Vivicya bhrāntim ujjhivā svamapya gaṇayan sadā
Cintayan sāksīṇaṁ kasmāt śarīram anusam jvaret (234)

विविच्य = having discriminated between *kūṭastha* and bodies; भ्रान्तिम् = delusion; उज्झित्वा = having rejected; स्वम् अपि = to oneself; अगणयन् = considering to be; साक्षिणम् = to the witness; सदा = always; चिन्तयन् = contemplating; शरीरम् अनु = after the body; कस्मात् = what for; संज्वरेत् = become worried?

Why will the seeker get worried and influenced due to the body etc., when (i) the *cidābhāsa* (the seeker) has discovered his essential nature to be the *kūṭastha caitanya* (ii) also knows the conditionings of bodies to be other than him, (iii) when he has given up his (earlier) individual status and (iv) even in contemplation on the nature of the witnessing consciousness? (234)

Vivicya bhrāntim ujjhivā etc. - This reflected conditioned consciousness, giving up this delusion about

his association with the modifications with the three bodies, and also ignores himself to be the conditioned one.

The 'inner space' and 'outer space' has a meaning with reference to the walls of the room. When the room space (i.e. inner space) comes to discover that the conditionings of the walls that have created the 'room space' in the total space, are also existing in space only. These walls, therefore, cannot limit and condition the space to be "room space" as different from the total space. Similarly, the *cidābhāsa* comes to realise that the conditioning of bodies etc., that have created a conditioned-consciousness, is in fact supported by him. Therefore, these bodies can no more condition and limit him. Therefore, he never accepts himself to be a limited being.

Sākṣīnam sadā cintayan-now *cidābhāsa* begins to constantly contemplate on the consciousness, the *kūṭastha* which is without conditioning.

Kasmāt śarīram anu sarījvaret-Having reached this stage, why will he get worried about the modifications of the body?

Instead of focusing attention on the conditionings, if the *cidābhāsa* turns its attention to the consciousness (because of which the body is what it is) - this is meditation - if it does this *abhyāsa* of reflection and meditation again and again, it will never have wrong notions about the conditionings - the body, mind or intellect. There will be no more experiencer, even if there are experiences. As the delusion is the cause of misery, the right knowledge about one's being is the cause for the destruction of the delusion.

Delusion creates worries, wisdom dissolves them ----

अथवावस्तुसर्पादिज्ञानं हेतुः पलायने ।
रज्जुज्ञानेऽहिधीध्वस्तौ कृतमप्यनुशोचति ॥२३५॥

Ayathā vastu sarpādi jñānam hetuḥ palāyane
Rajju jñāne 'hidhī dhvastau kṛta mapya nuśo cati (235)

अथवा वस्तु सर्पादि ज्ञानम् = erroneous knowledge of an object like snake in a rope; पलायने हेतुः = becomes the cause of running; रज्जु ज्ञाने = having known it to be a rope; अहिधी ध्वस्तौ = the perception that it is a snake is destroyed; कृतम् अपि = one's action like running also; अनुशोचति = regrets.

An erroneous knowledge due to wrong perception of the object, like mistaking a rope to be a snake, becomes a cause of running away, while the knowledge of the snake to be rope alone, destroys the wrong perceptions. Thereafter, even the earlier actions that one has done, one regrets. (235)

Ayathā vastu sarpādi jñānam palāyane-When we have the wrong knowledge about the rope - wrong knowledge that it is a snake; the 'is-ness' is from the rope, and 'snake-ness' is from the delusion. When this wrong knowledge takes place, (*pālayane hetuḥ*) one runs away from it.

Ahidhī dhvastau kṛtam api anuśocati-Once I come to know that it is a rope and not a snake, thereafter, will I proceed with my former foolishness in mistaking the rope for a snake and running away from it? I will be ashamed of myself for having been under delusion.

In the same way under the spell of wrong knowledge, we think the world as real; but once we realise the reality, one feels ashamed of one's ignorance born out of delusion. Therefore, one should constantly contemplate on the *kūṭastha caitanya*, the *sākṣī*, the witness.

The nature of contemplation on the witness is illustrated through examples ----

मिथ्याभियोगदोषस्य प्रायश्चित्तप्रसिद्धये ।
क्षमापयन्निवात्मानं साक्षिणं शरणं गतः ॥२३६॥

Mithyā bhiyoga doṣasya prāyaścitta prasiddhaye
Kṣamā payan nivātmānaṁ sākṣiṇaṁ śaraṇaṁ gataḥ (236)

मिथ्याभियोग दोषस्य = The sin born out of defaming someone by mistake; प्रायश्चित्त प्रसिद्धये = for the purpose of completion of atonement; साक्षिणम् आत्मानम् = to the witnessing Self; क्षमापयन् इव = as if begging for forgiveness; शरणम् गतः = surrenders to the witnessing self.

As a person begs the forgiveness for the atonement of his act of defaming another, although by mistake, similarly, the seeker i.e. the *cidābhāsa* surrenders his identity in the witnessing Self, for washing the sins of being a *cidābhāsa* etc. (236)

Mithyā abhiyoga doṣasya prāyaścitta prasiddhaye etc. - When a person who by mistake blames someone for something that has gone wrong, and later finds that the other person had really done a good service to him, he feels profusely guilty and asks for forgiveness from that person's again and again as a *prāyaścitta*.

Kṣamāpayan iva sākṣiṇaṁ śaraṇaṁ gataḥ - In the same way, the *cidābhāsa* goes to the *sākṣī* - the *kūṭastha* and says 'I have realised my error. I have all the time superimposed myself on you that I am miserable etc. and made out as if all these conditionings are real. In reality all these conditionings are not real.'

It is as if the *cidābhāsa* is approaching the *kūṭastha* and submitting himself in a spirit of total surrender (*śaraṇaṁ gataḥ*) and asks for forgiveness (*kṣamā payan eva*). This represents the surrender of the individuality to the Absolute. This is meditation.

The above thought is explained by yet another example ----

आवृत्तपापनुत्तर्यार्थं स्नानाद्यावर्त्यते यथा ।
आवर्तयन्निव ध्यानं सदा साक्षिपरायणः ॥२३७॥

Āvṛtta pāpanu ttyartham snānā dyā vartyate yathā
Āvartaya nniva dhyānaṁ sadā sākṣi parāyaṇaḥ (237)

यथा = as a sinner; आवृत्तपापनुत्तर्यम् = for the removal of the repeatedly committed sin; स्नानादि = the purifying bath etc; आवर्त्यते = is performed for a number of times; ध्यानम् = the contemplation; आवर्तयन् इव = is like practicing the same surrender again and again; सदा = always; साक्षि परायणः = is dedicated to the witnessing self.

As the sins are washed by a person by taking purifying baths, charity etc., repeatedly, so also the *cidābhāsa* (i.e. seeker) engages himself again and again in contemplation on the witnessing self, for washing the wrong notion of one's identity. (237)

Āvṛtta pāpa anuttartham snānādi etc. - In order to wash away his sins, a man undertakes many holy dips to bathe in different holy *tīrtha kṣetra*-s like *Ganges*, *Puṣkara* etc. In the same way, the *cidābhāsa* (seeker) *sadā sākṣi parāyaṇaḥ* etc. - constantly contemplates on the nature of its own real existence called the witness.

Dhyānaṁ iva āvartayan - As if to atone for the sin it has committed in erroneously imagining itself to be a sinner etc., all this 'sin' is washed away by constant contemplation on the nature of the Self.

When a person starts spiritual *sādhana*, all the unmanifest impurity of the mind starts coming up; but the *sādhaka* should not get frustrated. Even if the lava of thoughts come out, they should be allowed to go out gradually. This is the process of washing the wrong notions in the mind.

Such a seeker i.e. *cidābhāsa* is, thereafter, even ashamed of presenting his nature, of which he was proud ----

उपस्थकुष्ठिनी वेश्या विलासेषु विलज्जते ।
जानतोऽग्रे तथाभासः स्वप्रख्यातौ विलज्जते ॥२३८॥

Upastha kuṣṭhinī veśyā vilāseṣu vilajjate
Jānato'gre tathā bhāsaḥ svaprakhyātau vilajjate (238)

उपस्थ कुष्ठिनी वेश्या = a prostitute suffering from venereal diseases; जानतः अग्रे = before a person knowing about it; विलासेषु = for carnal pleasure; विलज्जते = feels ashamed; तथा = similarly; आभासः = the *cidābhāsaḥ*; स्वप्रख्यातौ = to declare one's nature; विलज्जते = feels ashamed.

As a prostitute feels ashamed while exhibiting herself for carnal pleasures because of her venereal disease before a man who knows about it, so also the *cidābhāsa* i.e. (seeker) feels ashamed to proclaim his qualities (of achievement or failure) before the world and witness. (238)

Upastha kuṣṭhinī veśyā vilāseṣu yathā vilajjate etc. - A prostitute who is suffering from venereal disease will not accept a man, who knows her condition, as her customer because she will be ashamed to show herself. Similarly, *tathā ābhāsa sva-prakhyātau* : the *cidābhāsa* (i.e. seeker) who is considering himself to be a success or a failure etc., i.e. he regards himself only with reference to the modifications and the conditionings, is now ashamed to consider himself as the doer or experienter.

That is why it is said in our scriptures that one should not inquire about the origin of the masters and that of the river. The past with its conditioning and the modifications called the gross, the subtle and causal bodies has been discarded as his. Our attention should be on the Reality, that the Master is, and not on the modifications. Having understood the Reality, one is ashamed of the past where one was entangled with the modifications.

One more example about lack of claim of renunciation of three bodies etc-----

गृहीतो ब्राह्मणो म्लेच्छैः प्रायश्चित्तं चरन्पुनः ।
म्लेच्छैः संकीर्यते नैव तथाभासः शरीरकैः ॥२३९॥

Gṛhīto brāhmaṇo mlecchaiḥ prāyaścittaṁ caran punaḥ
Mlecchaiḥ sankīryate naiva tathābhāsaḥ śarīrakaiḥ (239)

म्लेच्छैः = by the *mleccha*; गृहीतः = hold; ब्राह्मणः = a *brāhmaṇa*; प्रायश्चित्तम् चरन् = having undergone purification through atonement; पुनः = again; म्लेच्छैः = with the *mleccha*; न = not; एव = only; संकीर्यते = does not mix; तथा = in the same way; आभासः = the *cidābhāsa* (seeker); शरीरकैः = one's purified from the body.

As a *brāhmaṇa* held by a *mleccha* gets himself purified by acts of atonement, and thereafter again does not mix with them, so also once the *cidābhāsa* (i.e. seeker) having once purified himself by contemplation of witnessing Self, does not again get identified with body etc. (239)

Mlecchaiḥ gṛhītaḥ brāhmaṇaḥ prāyaścittaṁ caran etc. - As a *brāhmaṇa* who is defiled by being touched by an impure person, undergoes *prāyaścitta* or certain penance to remove the *pāpa* or sin of touching a *mleccha*; *Punaḥ mlecchaiḥ na sankīryate* - and thereafter, he will be careful to avoid such a contact with a *mleccha*, so that he does not get impure again.

Tathā ābhāsaḥ śarīrakaiḥ - In the same way, the *cidābhāsa* (i.e. seeker) will no more associate himself with the three bodies and their modifications (on the other hand), he will be always doing *prāyaścitta* (act of purification) for his past identification with body etc., by constant contemplation that 'I am the *kūṭastha caitanya*'.

This custom should be seen in the social perspective of the times of *Vidyāranya Svāmī*, when conversions of *Hindū-s* to Islām were common.

This contemplation on the nature of the *kūṭastha caitanya* by the *cidābhāsa* i.e. seeker, is not only for removal of sin of identification with the gross, subtle and causal body, but also to realise one's pristine glory of Divine Conscious Blissful Existence.

यौवराज्ये स्थितो राजपुत्रः साम्राज्यवाञ्छया ।
राजानुकारी भवति तथा साक्ष्यनुकार्ययम् ॥२४०॥

Yauva rājye sthito rāja putraḥ sāmrajya vāñchayā
Rājānukārī bhavati tathā sākṣyanu kāryayam (240)

यौवराज्ये = being declared as a; स्थितः राजपुत्रः = crown prince; साम्राज्य वाञ्छया = desirous of the throne; राज अनुकारी भवति = becomes a follower of the king; तथा = in the same way; अयम् = this *cidābhāsa* (seeker); साक्षि अनुकारी = contemplates on the nature of witness.

As a crown prince desirous of the throne, follows the king in all respects, so also the *cidābhāsa* (seeker) desirous of his real nature follows i.e. contemplates on the nature of witness. (240)

Yauva rājye sthito rāja-putraḥ sāmrajya vāñchayā- The desire of the crown prince is to enjoy the kingdom as a king. *Rājā nukārī bhavati*- therefore, he becomes obedient to the king, not because the king may give him the kingdom, but also to prepare himself to be the ruler someday. So he follows the king's advice and follows his ways as a king.

Tathā- In the same way, the *cidābhāsa* (i.e. the seeker) who is constantly exposing himself to the witness, is now as if he were the crown prince. When the seeker sits on the seat of meditation, he is no more the ordinary conditioned, sinner, meritorious etc. He is now the crown prince following the King -- the *kūṭastha* and his ways, so that he can take the *kūṭastha's* position one day. The

cidābhāsa as the meditator, constantly contemplates on the status and nature of the *sākṣī*.

Gradually as he trains himself for the responsibilities of the king, the crown prince loses his prince-identity and becomes the king. So also the *cidābhāsa* gains king-hood i.e. *kūṭastha caitanya*-hood; he will lose his identity as *cidābhāsa* and realise his nature to be the *kūṭastha caitanya*.

The result of this contemplations on one's own witnessing Self, the seeker attains his *Brahma svarūpa*----

यो ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवत्येव इति श्रुतिम् ।
श्रुत्वा तदेकचित्तः सन्ब्रह्म वेत्ति न चेतर्त् ॥२४१॥

Yo brahma veda brahmaiva bhavatyeva iti śrutim
Śrutvā tadeka cittāḥ san brahma vetti na cetarat (241)

यो = he who; ब्रह्म वेद = knows *Brahman*; ब्रह्म एव भवति = he attains identity with *Brahman*; एव = certainly; इति = thus; श्रुतिम् = the *upaniṣadik* declarations; श्रुत्वा = having known; तद् एकचित्तः सन् = fixing his mind in *Brahman*; ब्रह्म वेत्ति = comes to realise that the *sākṣī* is *Brahman*; न च = nothing; इतरत् = (desires) to know.

Having known the *upaniṣadik* declarations, that the knower of *Brahman* becomes *Brahman*; he (seeker) comes to fix his mind on the *sākṣī* and comes to realize that the *sākṣī* is *Brahman*, thereafter he does not desire anything. (241)

We have seen thus far how out of delusion, the *cidābhāsa* draws the modifications of the equipment (the three bodies) as his, and gives these modifications the Reality drawn from the *kūṭastha caitanya*, and out of the combination of these two incompatibles, a fictitious personality called the *Bhoktā*-the experiencer, is born. How will the *cidābhāsa* drop his false identity?. Of course, only by understanding its illusory nature.

The blue-ness of the sky is dropped by the knowledge that it is an optical illusion. Understanding the illusion as illusion is the only way out of illusion.

In the same way, the *cidābhāsa* which has received and accepted the modifications of the three bodies as (a) reality and (b) his own, has to understand that it is a wrong identification. Having come to this understanding, he exposes himself constantly to the contemplation of the *kūṭastha caitanya* and by doing so, *Yo brahma veda brahmaiva bhavati iti śrutim eva*- he who knows *Paramātmā*, becomes *Parabrahma*, meaning that the knower-known difference ends in the knowledge of the Absolute. The drop of water cannot know the ocean by being other than the ocean. The moment the drop goes to meet the ocean, it loses its identity.

Or again the reflection of sun will exist so long as there is water in the bucket. When the water evaporates, the reflection disappears. Similarly, by constant exposure of the *cidābhāsa* to the *kūṭastha caitanya*, i.e. of the imaginary personality with *jīva bhāva* exposes to the *sākṣī* ---- in meditation, by this constant exposure to the Absolute, the conditioning of the relative existence disappears. Conditioning of the relative existence is imagination of separateness from the Absolute. So, having known the principle stated by the *śruti* that he who knows the *Brahman* himself becomes *Brahman*, *Tad eka citta san*-the *cidābhāsa* or the *jīva* constantly focuses his mind on the Absolute with single-pointedness. Thereafter, in knowing the *Brahman*, there is nothing else left. In other words the *cidābhāsa* disappears. He loses his identity in the presence of that of the *kūṭastha caitanya*.

Will the seeker (*cidābhāsa*) knowing well that his individuality will be lost, attempt to know the Self-the Absolute? ---

देवत्वकामा ह्यग्न्यादौ प्रविशन्ति यथा तथा ।
साक्षित्वेनावशेषाय स्वविनाशं स वाञ्छति ॥२४२॥

Devatva kāmā hyagnyādaṁ praviśanti yathā tathā
Sākṣi tvenā vaśe śāya svavināśam sa vāñchati (242)

यथा = As we see in this world; देवत्व कामाः = the desirer of the Godhood; हि = certainly; अग्नि आदौ = the fire etc; प्रविशन्ति = enters; तथा = similarly; सः = the *cidābhāsa* (i.e. Seeker); साक्षित्वेन = in the nature of witness; अवशेषाय = to get established; स्वविनाशम् = one's own annihilation; वाञ्छति = desires.

As we observe in the world that a person desirous of Godhood (i.e. powers etc.) certainly enters the fire etc; so also the *cidābhāsa* (seeker) to get established in the nature of witness, desires one's own annihilation. (242)

Yathā devatva kāmāḥ hi agni ādaṁ praviśanti-As one who wants to attain divinity is willing to enter into the fire and immolate himself if it will give him that divine power or vision.*

*(There is a story of how when a disciple who asked his *guru* to give him the *darśana* of the Lord, the *guru* told him 'Then jump into that fire'. The disciple immediately jumped, so great was his love for the Lord and dispassion for all the conditionings of the body, mind and intellect.)

Sākṣitvena avaśeśāya sva-vināśam sa vāñchati- similarly, having discovered one's identity as the witness, the *sākṣī*, the *cidābhāsa* is now ready, even desirous for his own immolation. This is because he has understood the need to demolish totally this dependence on the world of matter.

The question now crops up is as to how long will the *cidābhāsa* have to do this? How is *jīvan mukti* possible? Once he who knows *Brahman* becomes *Brahman*, thereafter, will his body continue? Will he be able to conduct himself in this world? ---

यावत्स्वदेहदाहं स नरत्वं नैव मुञ्चति ।
यावदारब्धदेहं स्यान्नाभासत्वं विमोचनम् ॥२४३॥

Yāvat svadeha dāhaṁ sa naratvaṁ naiva muñcati
Yāvadā rabdha dehaṁ syāt nābhāsatva vimocanam (243)

सः = he (the man entering fire); यावत् = until; स्वदेह = own body; दाहम् = burning of; नरत्वं = the man-ness; न एव = never; मुञ्चति = renounces; यावत् = so long as; आरब्ध = *prārabdha*; देहम् = of the body (is exhausted); आभासत्वं = *cidābhāsa* (*jīva-bhāva*); विमोचनम् = freedom from; न स्यात् = cannot be.

As a man entering the fire continues to act like a man till his own body is burnt to ashes, so also till the *prārabdha* of the body is exhausted, the response like a *jīva* will continue to be. (243)

Yāvat svadeha dāhaṁ sa naratvaṁ na eva muñcati- The manliness or the figure of the man is not destroyed while his body is burning. Only when the burning is complete, do the ashes remain.

Yāvat ārabdha dehaṁ ābhāsatva vimocanam na syāt- In the same way, so long as we have started this body as a product of *prārabdha*, the reflected consciousness or *cidābhāsa* will continue to be. We have no choice over where this body is born, what parentage, what environment, when we arrive, when we depart, how we depart etc. It is all determined by our *prārabdha*. It is born out of *prārabdha*, is maintained in *prārabdha* and ends at the instance of *prārabdha*.

The destruction of ignorance along with its effects viz. the *jīva-bhāva* etc., although should end all the problems, however, initially till the knowledge is firm, there may be a slip now and then ----

रज्जुज्ञानेऽपि कम्पादिः शनैरेवोपशाम्यति ।
पुनर्मन्दान्धकारे सा रज्जुः क्षिप्तोरगी भवेत् ॥२४४॥

Rajju jñāne'pi kampādiḥ śanairevopa śāmyati
Punar mandāndha kāre sā rajjuḥ kṣipto ragi bhavet (244)

रज्जु ज्ञाने अपि = although the rope is known; कम्पादिः = the effects of snake-fear like trembling etc; शनैः = slowly and slowly; उपशाम्यति = wanes away; पुनः = again; मन्द आन्धकारे = in dim light; सा रज्जुः = the same rope; क्षिप्ता = by agitation; उरगी = a snake; भवेत् = becomes.

Although one has known the rope, the fear born due to earlier wrong knowledge of snake, wanes away slowly, and due to agitations of the mind again, the same rope is suspected to be a snake. (244)

Rajju jñāne api- Although one comes to know it is only a rope and not a snake, e.g. when we wake up from a bad dream, although we know it was only a dream, the frightening experience in the dream lingers on for some time. It does not go away instantaneously. *Kampādiḥ śanaiḥ eva upaśāmyati*- similarly, the effect of the vision of the snake (on the rope) goes away only slowly. *Punaḥ manda andhakāre rajju kṣiptā uragī bhavet*- If again, there is darkness, the fear of the non-existing snake still haunts the person.

In the same manner, although the knowledge that 'I am the *kūṭastha caitanya*' takes place, the association with the *cidābhāsa* in so many births, lingers on and goes away only very slowly.

The example cited above is now applied on the theme of the text ----

एवमारब्धभोगोऽपि शनैः शाम्यति नो हठात् ।
भोगकाले कदाचित्तु मर्त्योऽहमिति भासते ॥२४५॥

Evam ārabdha bhogo'pi śanaiḥ śāmyati no haṭhāt
Bhoga kāle kadā cittu matyor'hamiti bhāsate (245)

एवम् = in the same way; आरब्ध भोगः अपि = the *prārabdha bhoga* also; शनैः = slowly; शाम्यति = is exhausted; न उ = not; हठात् = instantaneously; कदाचित्तु = sometimes indeed; भोग काले = while going through the experience; अहम् मर्त्यः = I am a mortal; इति भासते = appears to be.

In the same way, the experience of the *prārabdha karma* gets exhausted slowly and not instantaneously. At times, while going through the experience, 'I am a mortal *jīva*' is also felt or imagined. (245)

Evam ārabdha bhogaḥ api śanaiḥ śāmyati-In the same way, the impact of the *prārabdha karma* also dies down only slowly.

No haṭhāt-It does not disappear immediately and fully. *Kadācit bhoga kāle tu*-And at times, now and then, when due to *prārabdha*, a person experiences suffering of the body or the mind, even if he is a man of wisdom, he may get the thought 'I am suffering' (or the enjoyer) out of past habit.

But such a thought will not remain for long. *Kadācit*: it may occur only for a brief while, and by repeated discrimination, such thoughts will totally disappear. The moment the doership or enjoyership comes, the knowledge of the Absolute, one's own real identity is denied.

A random thought of 'I am a sufferer etc.' does not make a man of knowledge, ignorant again, for there is no breach in the conviction ----

नैतावतापराधेन तत्त्वज्ञानं विनश्यति ।
जीवन्मुक्तिव्रतं नेदं किन्तु वस्तुस्थितिः खलु ॥२४६॥

Naitā vatā'parādhena tattva jñānaṁ vinaśyati
Jīvan mukti vratam nedam kintu vastu sthitiḥ khalu (246)

एतावत अपराधेन = by such an insignificant sporadic thought; तत्त्व ज्ञानम् = the Self knowledge; न = not; विनश्यति = is destroyed; इदम् = this knowledge; जीवन् मुक्ति व्रतम् = the vow of *jīvan mukti*; न = is not; किन्तु = but; खलु = certainly; वस्तु स्थितिः = is a reality.

By such an insignificant passing thought 'I am *jīva*', once in a while, the Self knowledge does not get lost; because this knowledge is not a vow to be a *jīvan mukta*, but certainly a reality. (246)

Etāvata aparādhena tattva jñānam na naśyati-even if a man who has once understood the Truth about his own essential nature, once in a while experiences lapses of the kind mentioned earlier, 'that I have had enough of this world. Let me get out of here', it does not deny or nullify his knowledge in any way because the experience of being one with the Absolute and of not being conditioned by any limitations.

Idam vratam na-It is not a fulfilment of a vow, it is not a *vrata udyāpanam*. In undertaking a *vrata*, there is a beginning and an ending. But *jīvan mukti* does not begin or end in time. Therefore, the Self knowledge 'that I am the Absolute' is not the result of any *vratam* and therefore, it will not be destroyed. Such a knowledge is not born in time. It always i.e. *Kintu vastu sthitiḥ khalu* that 'I am the pure Self' is the Reality. How can that be ever denied? The denial was an illusion - a temporary, passing phase. When once the denial is understood as an illusion, all *sāadhanā* acquires one and only purpose - that of

correcting our erroneous identity with the wrong point, and not for creating *Paramātmā*.

The knowledge in the example of the tenth person, having known to be the tenth, does not again return to earlier delusion that the tenth man is lost. How can we say that the knowledge is not instantaneous? ----

दशमोऽपि शिरस्ताडं रुदन्बुद्ध्वा न रोदिति ।
शिरोव्रणस्तु मासेन शनैः शाम्यति नो तदा ॥२४७॥

Daśamo'pi śiras tāḍaṁ rudan buddhavā na roditi
Śiro vṛṇastu māseṇa śanaiḥ śāmyati no tadā (247)

शिरःताडन् = the one who is hitting his head; रुदन् अपि = and while weeping; दशमः = I am the tenth; बुद्ध्वा = having come to realise; न रोदिति = does not cry; शिरःव्रणः = the wound on the head; तु = indeed; शनैः = slowly; मासेन = after a month or so; शाम्यति = heals; तदा नो = not instantaneously.

When the weeping man, hitting his head due to sorrow of the loss of tenth person, comes to realise that he is the tenth person, he will certainly stop weeping (once for all). However the wound that has resulted due to this act of grief will heal only after a month or so and not instantaneously. (247)

Daśamaḥ śiras tāḍaṇ rudan budhvā na roditi-The same point is now being explained by citing the example of the 'tenth man'. The tenth man was mourning the loss of the tenth man and crying and beating his head in frustration. When he came to know that he himself was the tenth man, he stops crying.

Śiro vṛṇaḥ tu māseṇa śanaiḥ śāmyati etc.-But the earlier lamenting had left a wound on his head. His sorrow may have been removed; but the wound will take its own time to heal. Similarly, the effect of one's *prārabdha*

or the-ignorance will be removed only slowly in due course of time, like the wound on the tenth man's head and not instantaneously.

If the world and the miseries of the world continue to be even after the dawn of knowledge, how can there be a possibility, of attainment of liberation while living? ----

दशमामृतिलाभेन जातो हर्षो व्रणव्यथाम् ।
तिरोधत्ते मुक्तिलाभस्तथा प्रारब्धदुःखिताम् ॥२४८॥

Daśamā mṛti lābhena jāto harṣo vṛṇa vyathām
Tirodhatte mukti lābhaḥ tathā prārabdha duḥkhitām (248)

दशमः = the tenth man; अमृति लाभेन = having realised that the tenth is not lost; जातः हर्षः = therefore, having become happy; व्रण व्यथाम् = the pain of the wound; तिरोधत्ते = covers, i.e. forgotten; तथा = similarly; मुक्ति लाभः = the discovery of liberation; प्रारब्ध दुःखिताम् = the sorrows born of *prārabdha*.

Having realised the existence of the tenth man (that he is not lost) the joy, one gets out of this knowledge, makes one forget the pains of the self-inflicted head-wound on account of the imagined loss; similarly, the discovery of one's own freedom, makes one forget the *prārabdha* and its effects. (248)

Daśamaḥ amṛti lābhena jātaḥ harṣaḥ etc.-when the tenth man comes to realise that the tenth man is no more dead, that he is very much alive and that it is he himself, he is so happy that he forgets the pain of the wound on his head. In the same way when the seeker comes to discover his own identity with *kūṭasthaḥ*, *prārabdha duḥkhitām tirodhatte*-the misery and suffering resulting from the *prārabdha* is totally gone. This is what the *Gītā* describes in the words '*Duḥkheṣu anudvigna manaḥ, Sukheṣu*

vigata spṛhaḥ (Bh. Gītā II-56) i.e. beyond the impact of joy and sorrows.

Bhagvān Śrī Kṛṣṇa in *Gītā* (VI-23) defines *yoga* as follows :-

Tam vidyād duḥkha saṁyoga viyogaṁ yoga saṁjñitam

There will be miseries in life, but not to be a miserable is *yoga*.

The arrival of misery is because of *prārabdha*, but that relates to the body. Nothing can be done to alter the course of *prārabdha*, but I refuse to become perturbed and miserable. And Self-realisation or vision of God does not mean that *prārabdha* will stop functioning. That is why great Masters like *Śrī Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahansa* and *Ramaṇa Maḥarṣī* could ignore the agony of the cruellest of diseases and still remain immersed in the joy of their own Being.

The Self-knowledge and the practice of that knowledge is like taking a vow, was mentioned earlier in *śloka* 246. A further explanation of this thought follows----

व्रताभावाद्यदाध्यासस्तदा भूयो विविच्यताम् ।

रससेवी दिने भुङ्क्ते भूयोभूयो यथा तथा ॥२४९॥

Vratā bhāvād yadā'dhyāsaś tadā bhūyo vivicyatām
Rasa sevī dine bhunṅkte bhūyo bhūyo yathā tathā (249)

व्रताभावात् = not being a vow; यदा = whenever; अध्यासः = there is delusion; तदा = then; तथा = there; भूयः = again; विविच्यताम् = one should discriminate; यथा = as seen; रस सेवी = the one taking food or medicine; दिने = daily; भूयः भूयः = again and again; भुङ्क्ते = consumes.

The Self-knowledge not being a vow, one has to practice discrimination whenever there is delusion or mistaken perception,

as we observe in case of a hungry or diseased man who consumes food or medicine daily, whenever there is a need, not as a vow. (249)

Vratā-bhāvāt adhyāsa yadā yadā bhūyaḥ- Because the knowledge of *jīvan mukti* is not a *vrata*, a vow which is a conditioning imposed on ourselves. Whenever there is a recurrence of this erroneous knowledge that I am the body and its modifications, I am the mind and its modifications etc.--- *Tathā bhūyo vivicyatām rasa sevī dine bhunṅkte* etc.---that very moment, the *sādhaka* must begin reflection and discrimination again. In the same way, as the man who eats food, eats again and again during the day, whenever he is hungry, so also the moment the *sādhaka* is likely to fall prey to *adhyāsa* ---the old delusion (because of old habit), he must separate it out, analyse it and restore the balance in his understanding.

We do not get worried when hunger returns at intervals, we eat, satisfy the hunger and then forget about it. So also, when the influence of this delusion shows signs of returning and clouding the mind, one should restart the *viveka*- discrimination and understand what is happening and thus re-establish that true knowledge about oneself.

Acceptance of one's *prārabdha* as unavoidable and going through it with courage and equanimity constitutes in itself spiritual *sādhana*.

How do we get rid of *prārabdha*? ----

शमयत्यौषधेनायं दशमः स्वं व्रणं यथा ।

भोगेन शमयित्वैतत्प्रारब्धं मुच्यते तथा ॥२५०॥

Śama tyauṣa dhenāyaṁ daśamaḥ svaṁ vraṇaṁ yathā
Bhogenā śama yitvai tat prārabdhaṁ mucyate tathā (250)

अयम् दशमः = this is the tenth person; यथा = as; स्वम् व्रणम् = his wound; औषधेन = by the medicine;

शमयति = heals; तथा = so also; एतत् प्रारब्धम् = this *prārabdha*; भोगेन = by going through; शमयित्वा = exhausting; मुच्यते = is freed from its impact.

As the tenth person heals his wound by the application of medicine, so also the wise man exhausts his *prārabdha* by going through, and thus frees himself. (250)

Yathā ayam daśamaḥ auśadhena svam vṛṇam śamayati-the tenth man who had been weeping and beating his head for the 'lost' tenth man, when he finds out that he himself is the tenth man, is relieved and is happy, but the wound caused by himself during his expression of sorrow takes time to heal, even after application of medicine.

Tathā bhogen prārabdham śamayitvā etat mucyate-In the same way, the seeker has to patiently work out his *prārabdha* and achieve liberation from the bondage of limitations through constant *abhyāsa* and self-discovery.

We suffer because of the *moha*, the delusion caused by the wrong identification with the body, mind and intellect. Once the enquiry to discover one's real identity starts, we realise the folly in getting over-involved in the world. Nevertheless, the dawn of this knowledge of one's real status does not mean the *prārabdha* will disappear. Being embodied, we have to go through it (good or bad) and allow it to get spent out in due course, like the wound on the head of the tenth man takes its own time to heal. In the meantime, the *sādhaka* must maintain himself steadily in that knowledge about his Self, and if there should be occasional lapses, immediately restart his reflection and discrimination till the balance is restored.

Having commented upon the sixth state viz removal of delusion and its effects, now the seventh state is taken for discussion....

किमिच्छन्निति वाक्योक्तः शोकमोक्ष उदीरितः ।

आभासस्य ह्यवस्थैषा षष्ठी तृप्तिस्तु सप्तमी ॥२५१॥

Kimi cchan niti vākya ktaḥ śoka mokṣa udīritaḥ
Ābhāsasya hya vasthaiṣā ṣaṣṭhī tṛpti stu saptamī (251)

किम् इच्छन् = *kim icchan*; इति = this; वाक्योक्तः = mentioned in this sentence; शोक मोक्षः = the freedom from grief; उदीरितः = is said so far; आभासस्य = of the *cidābhāsa*; हि = indeed; एषा = this; षष्ठी अवस्था = sixth stage; तृप्तिः = unconditioned bliss; तु सप्तमी = the seventh stage.

'*Kim icchan*' etc. in this statement under discussion, the sixth stage viz. freedom from grief, is explained so far. Now the seventh stage, called '*Nirankuṣā Tṛptiḥ*' i.e. infinite bliss is being explained (hereafter). (251)

Kim-icchan iti vākyoktaḥ śoka mokṣa udīritaḥ-In the first *śloka* it was stated: *kim icchan kasya kāmāya* etc.!. In that, the point was that *icchā*-desire, with reference to the illusory world is the cause of misery.

Aśakyasya apekṣitvāt-When the impossible is desired, misery is inevitable. To expect the world to behave according to our choice results in frustration, anger, depression and dejection - all modifications of the same disease.

Upto this point in this chapter, the release from misery - was discussed. The misery is removed by the discovery of this simple Truth that I want to achieve perfection in this imperfect world, and this perfection should be according to my definition is the highest folly. Therefore, it is liberation from all miseries for all time.

Ābhāsasya hi avasthā eṣā ṣaṣṭhī tṛptiḥ tu saptamī-This *śoka mokṣa* was the sixth stage of *cidābhāsa*. The seventh stage is unlimited bliss. This is now being taken up.

To explain the unlimited bliss, first the joy from objects is shown to be limited ----

साङ्कुशा विषयैस्तृप्तिरियं तृप्तिर्निरङ्कुशा ।
कृतं कृत्यं प्रापणीयं प्राप्तमित्येव तृप्यति ॥२५२॥

Sāṅkuśā viṣayai śr̥ptir iyaṁ t̥rptir niraṅkuśā
Kṛtaṁ kṛtyaṁ prāpaṇīyaṁ prāpta mityeva t̥rpyati (252)

विषयैः तृप्तिः = the satisfaction from the objects; साङ्कुशा = is conditioned; इयम् तृप्तिः = the satisfaction of Self knowledge; निरङ्कुशा = is unconditioned; कृत्यम् कृतम् = having done that was to be done; प्रापणीयम् प्राप्तम् = gained what is to be gained; इति एव = in this way; तृप्यति = one attains contentment.

The satisfaction or contentment born out of the objective indulgence is always conditioned, but the joy and contentment of Self knowledge is unconditioned. This bliss of Self-knowledge is like ---having done what is to be done and having achieved what is longed for. (252)

T̥rpti-is contentment that results from enjoyment or fulfilment. There are two types of *t̥rpti*. One type results from and through indulgence in wordly things either in terms of *bhoga* or success. While the other type is from Self-knowledge.

Viśaiḥ t̥rptiḥ iyaṁ sāṅkuśā-This type is always dependent on the means (wife, children, objects etc) through which this fulfilment is achieved. This dependence is so great that it becomes a bondage. Thereafter, those very objects or persons become the cause of our unhappiness.

Therefore, the contentment in the relative world is always conditioned and therefore, with bondage.

Niraṅkuśā t̥rptiḥ-is the *t̥rptiḥ* in which the *jīvan mukta puruṣa* is. *Jīvan mukta* is he who has discovered his

essential nature, and realised that 'I am the *kūṭastha caitanya*, I am not dependent on any thing, and everything is dependent on me', experiences the *t̥rptiḥ* born out of wisdom or knowledge and is absolutely independent of any object, person or situation.

This contentment of the man of wisdom expresses itself in two ways: *kṛtaṁ kṛtyaṁ prāpaṇīyaṁ prāptaṁ iti eva t̥rpyati*-whatever is to be done, has been done, there is nothing more to be done in the world, whatever is to be achieved has been achieved. The urge to 'achieve' is an expression of the value that one attaches to the world.

When absolute and total contentment of the nature of *kṛtaṁ kṛtyaṁ* and *prāptaṁ prāpaṇīyaṁ* is gained, then one experiences the joy of the great Masters, who could move in the world like lions, worryless and free!

The nature of the *kṛtaṁ kṛtyaṁ* i.e. the fulfilment is ----

ऐहिकामुष्मिकव्रातसिद्धयै मुक्तेश्च सिद्धये ।
बहु कृत्यं पुरास्याभूत्तत्सर्वमधुना कृतम् ॥२५३॥

Aihikā muṣmika vrāta siddhyai mukteśca siddhaye
Bahu kṛtyaṁ purā syābhūt tat sarva madhunā kṛtaṁ (253)

अस्य = for this man of wisdom; पुरा = before Self Realisation; ऐहिक = of this world; आमुष्मिक = of the other world; व्रात सिद्धयै = forgetting gain of these worlds; मुक्तेश्च = from achieving freedom from these; बहु कृत्यम् = a lot of duties; अभूत् = were obligatory; अधुना = now; तत्सर्वम् = all these obligations of *karma*, *upāsana* and *vedānta* listening; कृतम् = is done with.

For the man of realisation, before the dawn of Self knowledge, a lot was to be done for achieving the joy in this world or hereafter. But now, all these obligations of duty, *upāsana*,

listening etc., are done away with, as he has realised his essential nature. (253)

Purā asya aihika āmuṣmika vrāta siddhyai mukteḥ ca etc. - Before the dawn of knowledge, this man of wisdom, for the attainment of glory and success in this material world, and also for the attainment of liberation, *Bahu kṛtyam abhūta*-he was all the time engaged in the field of obligations. But now, after having discovered his essential nature, *tat sarvaṃ kṛtam*-study of the scriptures, going to the temple, sin and merit etc. everything is over.

There is nothing more to be gained in this world for him who has discovered the Truth. His contentment is complete and therefore, he won't get engaged, excited and agitated by the *karma kāṇḍa*, by observances of rituals etc.

Now the condition of this *jīvan mukta puruṣa* before and after the dawn of knowledge is compared.

The fulfilment of obligation that one achieves through Self knowledge is ----

तदेतत्कृतकृत्यत्वं प्रतियोगिपुरःसरम् ।
अनुसंधधदेवायमेवं तृप्यति नित्यशः ॥२५४॥

Tadetat kṛta kṛtyatvaṃ pratiyogi puraḥ saram
Anusāṇḍa dhadevā yam evaṃ tṛpyati nityaśaḥ (254)

तद् एतत् कृतकृत्यत्वं = this state of fulfilment; प्रति योगि पुरः सरम् = remembering the earlier state of unfulfilment; अनुसन्धधत् एव = contemplating or analysing; अयम् = this man of wisdom; एवम् = in this way i.e. that is being explained in following *śloka-s*; नित्यशः = always; तृप्यति = is contented.

This man of wisdom having achieved this state of fulfilment, remembering his earlier state of non-fulfilment, is now fully contented as is being explained in the following pages. (254)

Ayam anusāṇḍadhat evam- This *jñāni puruṣa*, this man of knowledge, now constantly compares his present state of total contentment, where he has no more desire for anything in the world nor ambition to 'become' anything - in a state of *niraṅkuṣā tṛptiḥ*-with *prati yogi puraḥ saram*, the earlier state in which there was constant dependence on worldly things, and *nityaśaḥ tṛpyati*-always feels totally contented.

So, in this way, one should be able to watch one's own performance so as to be able to assess, if we are truly and firmly established in the Self. But when we catch ourselves watching other's performance, it should indicate that we are not on the right path, that we are only being one in the crowd of this world.

The following *śloka-s* give us an attitude and vision which will help us in continuing our contemplation that leads to Self Knowledge ----

दुःखिनोऽज्ञाः संसरन्तु कामं पुत्राद्यपेक्षया ।
परमानन्दपूर्णोऽहं संसरामि किमिच्छया ॥२५५॥

Duḥkhino'jñāḥ saṁsarantu kāmam putrādya pekṣayā
Paramā nanda pūrṇo'haṁ saṁsarāmi kimi cchayā (255)

दुःखिनः अज्ञाः = the miserable ignorant people; पुत्र आदि अपेक्षया = because of a lot of expectation of and from son etc.; कामम् = as required; संसरन्तु = may go through *saṁsāra*; अहम् = I am; परमानन्द पूर्णः = supreme infinite bliss; किम् इच्छया = desiring what; संसरामि = should suffer like an ignorant?

Let the miserable ignorant persons desiring and expecting things like son etc. may go through this *saṁsāra* as they feel right. I am supreme infinite bliss, desiring what, should suffer this world of relative existence? (255)

Duḥkhinaḥ ajñāḥ putra ādi apekṣayā-Let the ignorant people desiring children, wealth etc., go on seeking and working for the fulfilment of such desires. They will be continuously unhappy. No one can be helped to come out of this entanglement in *saṁsāra bandhan* unless he himself desires it.

Aham paramānanda pūrṇaḥ kim icchayā saṁsarāmi-I am infinite supreme bliss! What is there to desire in this world, and that too only to experience all the consequent miseries?

There are three main steps that a true seeker should avoid, expressed by the three words: *icchāmi, bhavāmi and karomi*: I want something from this world; I want to become something in this world; I want to do something to become that. Let things happen as they will. That is knowledge.

Similarly, it is also futile to want to improve the world or help others, because that itself becomes a bondage. When we want to help or change something or someone, it means we accept that object or person to be a reality, which it is not. To want to help is as meaningless as the waking-state person wanting to change something that he experienced in the dream-state.

The distinction between a desirer of heavens, and a man of wisdom ----

अनुतिष्ठन्तु कर्माणि परलोकयियासवः ।
सर्वलोकात्मकः कस्मादनुतिष्ठामि किं कथम् ॥२५६॥

Anuṭiṣṭhantu karmāṇi paraloka yiyāsavaḥ
Sarva lokātmakaḥ kasmāt anuṭiṣṭhāmi kiṁ katham (256)

परलोकयियासवः = those desiring heavens etc; कर्माणि = *yajña* etc; अनुतिष्ठन्तु = may they perform; सर्वलोकात्मकः = I, who is the Self of every world;

कस्मात् = what for; कथम् किम् = how and which; अनुतिष्ठामि = should perform.

Those who are desirous of the worlds of heaven etc., let them perform the required *yajña, yāga* etc. I am the very Self of all the worlds, therefore what for, how and which *karma* or *yajña* should I perform? (256)

Paraloka yiyāsavaḥ karmāṇi anuṭiṣṭhantu etc. - Those who are desirous of the other worlds, higher *lokā-s* like heaven etc., let them engage themselves in performing *yajña, puja* and other *karma anuṣṭhāna*.

Sarva lokātmakaḥ kasmāt katham anuṭiṣṭhāmi-Once I have discovered the Truth and surrendered the relative existence at the altar of the Absolute, where is the question of my again giving value to the 'relative'?

Once I discover my identity with the Absolute, nothing will prompt me to get involved in any further effort, to achieve anything. Because everything is already gained. For one who has achieved *sarvātmā bhāva*, what is there to add to his bliss? Till the position remains that there is something lacking to be added in our lives, we are in the realm of the finite. When a state is achieved where no addition, no subtraction is possible, that state is *sarvātmakaḥ*.

Kasmāt katham kiṁ anuṭiṣṭhāmi-Why will I unnecessarily make myself miserable?--and how?--and what for?

Why a man of wisdom stops from these activities, if not for himself, may be for the worldly people ----

व्याचक्षतां ते शास्त्राणि वेदानध्यापयन्तु वा ।
येऽत्राधिकारिणो मे तु नाधिकारोऽक्रियत्वतः ॥२५७॥

Vyācakṣatām te śāstrāṇi vedāna dhyā payantu vā
Ye'trā dhikāriṇo me tu, nādhikāro 'kriya tvataḥ (257)

अत्र = in *karma*, *upāsanā*; ये = those; अधिकारिणः = are qualified; ते = they; शास्त्राणि = the scriptures; व्याचक्षताम् = may expound; वा = or; वेदान् = the *Veda*-s; अध्यापयन्तु = may teach; तु = but; अक्रियत्वतः = I being non-doer; मे = my; अधिकारः = authority; न = is not.

Those who are qualified in *karma*, etc. exposition of scripture etc. may they expound. Those who are qualified to teach, may they teach. Being a non-doer I am not qualified in these fields. (257)

Ye atra adhiṅkārīṇaḥ te śāstrāṇi vyācakṣatām-Those who are qualified to act in this world, let them study the *veda*-s and become *vedāntik* scholars. Let them teach the *veda*-s, *upaniṣad*-s etc.

Na me adhiṅkārāḥ-So far as I am concerned, I am not qualified either for learning or for teaching because I have no more actions to do, no more duties to perform.

Therefore, those who imagine that they can improve the world, they are in the field of ignorance. If there is anything to be improved, it is not the world, but our vision of it. Once, that vision is corrected, then it will be seen that other than the expression of the divine, nothing else is!

What about the activities such as sleep, eating etc? ----

निद्राभिक्षे स्नानशौचे नेच्छामि न करोमि च ।

द्रष्टारश्चेत्कल्पयन्ति किं मे स्यादन्यकल्पनात् ॥२५८॥

Nidrā bhikṣe snāna śauce necchāmi na karomi ca
Draṣṭā raścet kalpayanti kiṁ me syād anyā kalpanāt (258)

निद्रा भिक्षे = sleep, taking food; स्नान शौचे = bathing, purification; न = not; इच्छामि = I desire; न च = nor do; करोमि = do them; द्रष्टारः = the on-lookers; चेत् = if; कल्पयन्ति = imagine; अन्य कल्पनात् = by the

imagination of others; मे = to; किम् स्यात् = what does it matter.

Neither I desire things like sleep, eating food, bath, acts of purification, nor do I perform them. If, however, the ignorant on-lookers superimpose them on me, what do I care for the imagination of others i.e. by the imagination of others I don't become a doer! (258)

Na icchāmi na karomi nidrā, bhikṣe etc.-Neither I desire, nor do I do, sleeping, or begging for alms; nor bathing nor ablutions. *Draṣṭāraḥ cet kalpayanti*-If others 'see' me doing these things, this is their imagination; these actions have been superimposed on me by the viewers. I have no control over the thoughts of others.

When *Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahansa* was suffering from cancer, his devotees viewed the disease of his body as his suffering. But from *Bhagavān*'s standpoint, the cancer was in him, but he was not in the cancer.

Similarly, if others think that I am taking bath etc., it is their vision, their perception. I cannot help it, nor does it bother me.

Because of other people's view, the non-doership does not get disturbed; as we see in the following example ----

गुञ्जापुञ्जादि दह्येत नान्यारोपितवाह्निना ।

नान्यारोपितसंसारधर्मनिवमहं भजे ॥२५९॥

Guñjā puñjādi dahyeta nānyāropita vāhniṇā
Nānyā ropita saṁsāra dharmā neva maham bhaje (259)

अन्य आरोपित = superimposed by others; वाह्निना = by the fire; गुञ्जा पुञ्जा आदि = the heap of red berries; न = not; दह्येत = burns; एवम् = in the same way; अन्य आरोपित = superimposed by other; संसार धर्मान् = qualities of the world; अहम् = I; न भजे = don't get.

If some superimpose the fire on the heap of red berries, it does not burn anything; similarly, the qualities of this worldly things when attributed to me, I do not get them as mine. (259)

Anyā āropita vahninā guñjā puñjādi na dahyet- Someone imagines that there is a fire in the bush of red berries but this superimposed fire (which is only the colour of the berries) cannot burn the bush. In the same manner, *Anyā āropita saṁsāra dharmān*- The *dharma* or duties and actions of *saṁsāra* such as *nidrā*, *bhikṣā*, *snāna*, *śauca*. etc. *aham na bhaje*- do not concern me.

This thought is stated by *Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa* in *Gītā* (V-8-9):

Thirteen different activities have been listed by Lord *Kṛṣṇa* which a man of wisdom is 'seen' to be doing, but he himself is totally detached from them, such as: *Paśyan*- seeing, he does not see, that means seeing without a seer, smelling without a smeller and so on.

It is the senses that are engaged in the respective perceptions. They exist in relation to each other. Both are supported by something which does not come under the influence of relative existence. Therefore, when the eyes see, that is their *dharma*, nature. Why should 'I' be concerned? If the body gets old, that its nature, it does not disturb me.

Similarly, the changes in the mind or of the three bodies should not affect us, That is their nature. It is the nature of the mind to have thoughts. Expecting the cessation of thought is an impossible expectation. Therefore, what a man of realisation does is to watch these modifications from a distance without having the feeling that he is participating in them.

Anyā āropita dharmān aham na bhaje-I do not suffer the misery of *saṁsāra*, although I am staying in the *saṁsāra*.

What about *śravaṇam* etc. ----

शृण्वन्त्वज्ञाततत्त्वास्ते जानन्कस्माच्छृणोम्यहम् ।
मन्यन्तां संशयापन्नाः न मन्येऽहमसंशयः ॥२६०॥

Śṛṇvntva jñāta tattvā ste jānan kasmāc chṛṇomyaham
Manyantām saṁśayā pannāḥ na manye'hama saṁśayaḥ (260)

अज्ञात तत्त्वाः = those who do not know the Self; ते = those; शृण्वन्तु = let them listen to scriptures; अहम् जानन् = I the knower of Self; कस्मात् = for what purpose; शृणोमि = listen *vedānta*; संशयापन्नाः = those with doubt; मन्यन्ताम् = may reflect; अहम् = I; असंशयः = without any doubt; न मन्ये = do not reflect.

Those who do not have the knowledge of identity of the individual Self and the total Self, let them listen to the *vedānta*. I am the knower of the real Self, what for will I listen to *vedānta*? Those who are full of doubts about the Self, let them reflect; since I don't have any doubt, why should I reflect and on what? (260)

From *śloka* 250 onwards there is a steady development of thought about the nature of a man of wisdom: First, the participation in the affairs of the world in the form of desire is totally absent; second the *vaidik* or worldly *karma* to attain other worlds like heaven etc. is absent; third, the normal functions of the body may be 'seen' to be happening, but the man of wisdom is not concerned.

Now the teacher goes one step further to explain *śravaṇam*, *mananam* and *nididhyāsanam* in relation to a man of realisation.

Ajñāta tattvāḥ śṛṇvantu te etc. - Those who have not known their essential nature, the *Brahman*, let them listen to the *vedāntik* teachings, study scriptures etc. What is the need for me to listen to such teachings again and again?

Samśayā pannāḥ manyantām-Those who have doubts about their own essential nature, let them go on reflecting (*mananam*) on what they have heard from the scriptures.

Ahaṁ asaṁśayaḥ na manye-I have no more doubts. Therefore, there is no need for me to do any reflection.

Śravaṇam i.e. listening is done if one does not know; *Mananam* i.e. reflection is done to remove doubts; *Nididhyāsanam* or contemplation is done to remove *viparyaya* i.e. erroneous understanding.

This is dealt with in the next *śloka*----

विपर्यस्तो निदिध्यासेत्किं ध्यानमविपर्ययात् ।
देहात्मत्वविपर्यासं न कदाचिद्भजाम्यहम् ॥२६१॥

Viparyasto nidi-dhyāset kiṁ dhyāna maviparyayāt
Dehātma tva viparyāsaṁ na kadācid bhajā myaham (261)

विपर्यस्तः = the one with erroneous knowledge; निदिध्यासेत् = may he contemplate; अविपर्ययात् = having no erroneous knowledge; ध्यानम् किम् = what for meditation; अहम् = I; देहात्मत्व विपर्यासम् = mistaking the body to be self; कदाचित् = never; न भजामि = attain.

He who has mistaken identity of the Self, may contemplate and meditate. On account of lack of erroneous knowledge about Self, what meditation will do to me? I never have the mistaken identity that I am the body, nor do I get in that wrong identity. (261)

Viparya-staḥ nididhyāset aviparyāyat dhyānam kiṁ? -He who has erroneous knowledge -'that I am the body etc.,' let him do meditation again and again. So far as I am concerned, I have no such erroneous knowledge. Therefore, why should I do meditation?

Ahaṁ dehātmatva viparyāsaṁ kadācit na bhajāmi-I never have such erroneous knowledge, even by mistake, even once in a while. I never take myself to be the body. Therefore, why should I go in for meditation?

Now one more doubt is raised. If it is said that a man of wisdom has no thought of his being the body etc., then how will he conduct himself in this world?

This doubt is taken-up in the next *śloka*----

अहं मनुष्य इत्यादिव्यवहारो विनाप्यमुम् ।
विपर्यासं चिराभ्यस्तवासनातोऽवकल्प्यते ॥२६२॥

Ahaṁ manuṣya ityādi vyavahāro vināpya mum
Viparyāsaṁ cirā bhyasta vāsanā to'va kalpyate (262)

अहम् मनुष्यः = I am a man; इत्यादि व्यवहारः = the conduct of this nature; अमुम् विपर्यासम् विना = without the body identification; अपि = also; चिर अभ्यस्त वासनातः = due to long standing practice of being body; अवकल्प्यते = is possible.

Even in the total absence of the body identification, I am man etc., and conducting oneself in this world, is also possible on the strength of long standing practice of being body. (262)

Upto this point, the state of the *jīvan mukta* was explained as: *kṛtam kṛtyam prāptam prāpaṇīyam*-whatever had to be done has been done; whatever is to be achieved has been achieved; there is nothing left to be sought. Therefore, he is no more concerned with actions: worldly actions, religious actions, bodily actions such as sleeping, etc., or with the learning and teaching of *vedāntik* scriptures, or with *śravaṇam* and *mananam*.

Now one more doubt is raised: *Ahaṁ manuṣya ityādi vyavahāraḥ amum viparyāsaṁ vinā api*-since the man of wisdom has already rejected every conditioning in relation

to the body, how will he conduct himself in the world as a human being? Without getting identified with the body (*viparyāsam*) how will he behave? The teacher clarifies:

Cirābhyasta vāsanātaḥ avakalpyate-It is possible for such a person to conduct himself in human affairs in spite of his discrimination of the fallacy such as he is a human being and this body etc., because of long practice it has become a natural way of behaviour. Because of the long *abhyāsa* there is no difficulty to conduct himself. The actions as a human being are thereafter conducted mechanically without any identification with that role.

The end of conduct of human affairs will be possible only after the *prārabdha* is lived through ----

प्रारब्धकर्मणि क्षीणे व्यवहारो निवर्तते ।
कर्मक्षये त्वसौ नैव शाम्येद्ध्यानसहस्रतः ॥२६३॥

Prārabdha karmaṇi kṣiṇe vyavahāro nivartate
Karmā kṣaye tvasau naiva śāmyet dhyāna sahasrataḥ (263)

प्रारब्ध कर्मणि क्षीणे = when the *prārabdha karma* is exhausted;
व्यवहारः = the transactions in the world; निवर्तते = get negated; तु = but; कर्म अक्षये = without exhausting the *karma*;
असौ = the regular conduct; ध्यान सहस्रतः = by thousands of meditations; न एव = never; शाम्येत् = will be negated.

When the effect of *prārabdha karma* is worked out by going through them, the conduct of transactions in this world will get negated, but in the absence of the exhaustion of the *karma*, this worldly affairs will never be negated even by thousands of meditations (263)

How will the *vyavahārah*--- the conduct of worldly affairs, decline? Can it be achieved by withdrawing from such activities through conscious efforts? The teacher says, No, that is not required. It will have to take its own course.

Prārabdha karmāṇi kṣiṇe- When the *prārabdha karma* with which this body was born is worked out in the normal course, *vyavahārah nivartate*- then withdrawal from worldly affairs automatically takes place.

It is like a stone being thrown by a person. How far will it go? As far as the power with which it was propelled by the man lasts. The man himself has infinite power, but the power associated with the propulsion of the object is finite. Therefore, when the finite power will by its very nature, get exhausted, the object will fall down.

So also, the body which is born out of *prārabdha*, it will keep moving, acting with all the experiences that it has to get according to the *prārabdha*. When this *prārabdha karma* with which the body was manifested is exhausted, all undertakings in this world are over. And *karma kṣaye tu asau na eva śāmyet* etc. - without the exhaustion of the *karma* this total withdrawal from *karma* or action in this world cannot be achieved even if one devotes thousands of hours to meditation.

But *karma kṣaya* does not mean that the man of wisdom should do nothing. What is important is how we view the actions of such a man, what is his attitude behind the action.

Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa says in *Gītā* (IV-18)

He who sees no work in work, and work in no work, he is wise among men, he is a *yogin*, and he has accomplished all his work.

The question now raised is---is it possible to accelerate the process of withdrawal from worldly affairs, say through meditation? ----

विरलत्वं व्यवहृतेरिष्टं चेद्ध्यानमस्तु ते ।
अबाधिकां व्यवहृतिं पश्यन्ध्यायाम्यहं कुतः ॥२६४॥

*Vīralatvaṃ vyava hṛter iṣṭaṃ ceddhya na mastu te
Abādhikāṃ vyava hṛtīm paśyan dhyāyā myaham kutaḥ* (264)

व्यवहृते: = of the activities; विरलत्वम् = lessening; चेत् = if; इष्टम् = is expected; ते = for you; ध्यानम् अस्तु = may you have to meditate; व्यवहृतिम् अबाधिकाम् = the Self-knowledge is not opposed to conduct; पश्यन् = having known; अहम् = I; कुतः ध्यायामि = should I meditate.

If you think that for the reduction of activities and involvement in the world, *dhyānam*-meditation is very essential, may you do so. I know for certain that the Self knowledge is not opposed to conducting oneself in the world. Therefore, why should I meditate? (264)

Vyavahṛteḥ vīralatvaṃ cet dhyānam iṣṭam etc. - to reduce the amount of involvement in activities, one may think that meditation is helpful. However, *vyavahṛti abādhikāṃ paśyan* - The involvement in the worldly affairs is known to be not contrary to knowledge. Darkness cannot be removed by any means other than light. In the same way, involvement in the world can be counteracted only by knowledge about one's essential being. When the mirage is understood to be an illusion, this understanding will not be contradicted next time, when the mirage is seen.

Therefore, why should I do meditation?

The *jīvan mukta puruṣa* does not need to do meditation in order to reduce his involvement in worldly activities, because he has already attained knowledge and this knowledge is not contrary to action.

The meditation may not be required to reduce the involvement in the world, but certainly for reducing the *vikṣepa* i.e. projections or agitations in the mind?

विक्षेपो नास्ति यस्मान्मे न समाधिस्ततो मम ।
विक्षेपो वा समाधिर्वा मनसः स्याद्विकारिणः ॥२६५॥

*Vikṣepo nāsti yasmānme na samādhi stato mama
Vikṣepo vā samādhir vā manasaḥ syādvī kāriṇaḥ* (265)

यस्मात् = because; मे = to me; विक्षेपः = agitations; न अस्ति = is not; ततः = therefore; मम = for me; समाधिः = meditation; न = not (required); विक्षेपः वा = or agitations; समाधिः वा = or *samādhi*; विकारिणः = modifying; मनसः = of the mind; स्यात् = belong.

Because the agitations do not belong to me, there is no need for meditation. Both the agitation and *samādhi* (i.e. absence of agitation) belong to the mind which is of changing nature. (265)

Yasmāt me vikṣepaḥ na asti tataḥ mama samādhi na - Because I do not have any mental disturbances, therefore, there is no need for *samādhi* for me. *Vikṣepa* or agitations are of the mind, so who goes into *samādhi*? --- the mind, not me. Wherever, there is *upādhi* or conditioning, the *upādhi* is necessarily associated with *ādhī*, *vyādhī* and *samādhi*. *Vyādhī* is associated with the gross body, *ādhī* --- agitations are associated with the subtle and *samādhi* is also associated with the mind as we have seen earlier in *śloka* 227.

The *antaḥkaraṇa* has four aspects: *manas* (mind), *buddhi* (intellect); *cittam* (memory) and *ahaṃkāra* (ego). In the waking state all the four function; in the dream state *buddhi* does not function; in the deep sleep state only *ahaṃkāra* functions; and in *samādhi* even the *ahaṃkāra* subsides. It is *citta pradhāna*. These are all conditions of the *antaḥkaraṇa*. In deep sleep state, the *ahaṃkāra* holds the five elements together and their functioning still exists. In the *samādhi* state when *ahaṃkāra* is suspended, all the functions of the five elements are also suspended: respiration, hair and nails etc. do not grow.

Vikṣepo vā samādhir vā vikāriṇaḥ manasaḥ syāt-In other words, all these are modifications of the *antaḥkaraṇa* and not of the *sākṣī caitanya*. Therefore, whether we talk about agitations or meditation or *samādhi* (absolutely opposite conditions), they belong to the mind and not the consciousness. The consciousness is not influenced by the presence or absence of thoughts in the mind.

Use of terms like getting experience of *Paramātmā*, or of *samādhi*, or enjoying meditation, should be guarded against, because they connote objectification of a subjective experience, they make a *bhoga* out of *yoga*.

Therefore, there is no possibility of experience etc., the Self being Self-effulgent, Self-existence etc.

नित्यानुभवरूपस्य को मे वानुभवः पृथक् ।
कृतं कृत्यं प्रापणीयं प्राप्तमित्येव निश्चयः ॥२६६॥

Nityā nubhava rūpasya ko me vānubhavaḥ pṛthak
Kṛtaṁ kṛtyaṁ prāpaṇīyaṁ prāpta mityeva niścayaḥ (266)

नित्य अनुभव रूपस्य = of the nature of eternal conscious existence; मे पृथक् अनुभवः = the experience of otherness than me; कः वा = which is?; कृतम् कृत्यम् = having done that was to be done; प्राप्तम् प्रापणीयम् = whatever was to be gained is gained; इति एव निश्चयः = this alone is my conviction.

I being of the nature of eternal conscious existence, how the experience of I being separate be possible? And what experience can be had without me? It is a firm conviction that all that is to be done is done, and all that is to be gained is also gained. (266)

Nitya anubhava rūpasya me kaḥ anubhavaḥ pṛthak- *Anu* means behind, *bhāva*-means to be. *Anubhāva* therefore means ---I am behind every experience, good or bad.

It is incorrect to say I have experience of something, because very experience is possible only because of me. There is no experience other than me. I am the experience. So where is the need to do meditation to get divine experience as if that experience is other than me?

So long as the subject-object dichotomy is maintained, the world will be, and we will continue to suffer.

KṛtamIkṛtyaṁ prāpaṇīyaṁ prāptaṁ iti eva niścayaḥ- So far as I am concerned I have no doubt that I want nothing from this world, there is nothing that the world can give me, for the simple reason that the world is because of me and I am not because of the world.

Will not the absence of doership lead to an uncontrolled and licentious behaviour of a man of knowledge?

व्यवहारो लौकिको वा शास्त्रीयो वाऽन्यथापि वा ।
ममाकर्तुरलेपस्य यथारब्धं प्रवर्तताम् ॥२६७॥

Vyavahāro laukiko vā śāstrīyo vā'nyathā pivā
Mamā kartura lepasya yathā rabdhaṁ pravartatām (267)

लौकिकः = the worldly conduct (such as taking food etc.); वा = or; शास्त्रीयः वा = or the disciplined conduct with "do's and don'ts"; व्यवहारः वा = and also that conduct; अन्यथा अपि = any other also (not included in above two); अकर्तुः = to the non-doer; अलेपस्य = not affected by the action; मम = i.e. me; यथारब्धम् = according to *prārabdha*; प्रवर्तताम् = may I get involved in the world.

I, who is a non-doer, and is therefore not affected by the actions whatsoever, whether worldly or according to scriptural injunctions or any other conduct not included in these two, I may get involved in the world according to *prārabdha*. (267)

Laukikaḥ śāstrīyaḥ anyathā vyavahāraḥ- There are three types of *vyavahāraḥ* activities: (a) *Laukika*:- the normal

routine activities of the day, eating, sleeping, shopping etc., activities every common man does; (b) *Sāstrīyaḥ*: doing *japa*, *pūjā*, studying scriptures, meditation etc; and (c) *Anyathā*: other activities not falling under these two categories.

Akartuḥ alepasya mama yathā rabdham pravartatām- Let all these three activities be there. Let them be manifested. So far as I am concerned, they do not affect me in any way - because I am not the doer of these activities.

Where there is no sense of doership, there is no problem. There is no sense of accomplishment in doing some work nor is there a sense of guilt in not doing. None of the rules and regulations of behaviour in the world applies to the man of wisdom.

Or else a man of wisdom may act tirelessly in the world - who can stop him? ----

अथवा कृतकृत्योऽपि लोकानुग्रहकाम्यया ।
शास्त्रीयेणैव मार्गेण वर्तेऽहं का मम क्षतिः ॥२६८॥

Athavā kṛta kṛtyo'pi lokā nugraha kāmīyā
Sāstrīye ṇaiva mārgēṇa varte'ham kā mama kṣatiḥ (268)

अथवा = or; अहम् = I; कृत कृत्यः अपि = although totally fulfilled; लोक अनुग्रह काम्यया = desiring the good of the world; शास्त्रीयेण एव = by the proper scriptural injunctions alone; मार्गेण = ways adopting; वर्ते = may I lead my life; मम = for me; का = what is; क्षतिः = a loss.

Or although I have obtained totally all that was to be achieved, what is the harm if I myself lead a life style as ordained by the scriptural injunctions alone, desiring welfare of the world (268).

Athvā kṛta kṛtya api loka anugraha kāmīyā etc. - Contrary to this behaviour where he does not care whether he does

conduct himself according to social or scriptural regulations and expectations or not, although there is nothing to be gained or lost (by the man of wisdom) from any life style adopted; only for the betterment of the people, *Aham śāstrīyeṇa mārgēṇa varte mama kā kṣatiḥ*-engage myself in activities in complete accordance with prescribed code of conduct. There is nothing wrong in engaging myself in this manner, and no one can stop me.

This thought also appears in *Bhagavad Gītā* (III-22) where Lord *Kṛṣṇa* says :

Oh, *Pārtha*, there is nothing in the whole world which is obligatory for me to do; yet I work for the joy of it. Otherwise there is nothing that I have not gained already and nothing that I will gain from it.

The question now raised is, 'If you start working for the betterment of society according to scriptural injunctions, will it not lead to acceptance of 'doership'?

देवार्चनस्नानशौचभिक्षादौ वर्ततां वपुः ।
तारं जपतु वाक्तद्वत्पठत्वाम्नायमस्तकम् ॥२६९॥

Devārcana snāna śauca bhikṣāḍau vartatām vapuḥ
Tāraṁ japatu vāktadvat paṭhat vām nāya mastakam (269)

वपुः = the body; देव अर्चन = worship of the Gods; स्नान = bath; शौच = acts of purification; भिक्षा आदौ = begging food etc; वर्तताम् = may be doing; वाक् = the speech; तारम् = of *Om*; जपतु = be engaged in chanting; तद् वत् = similarly. आम्नाय-मस्तकम् = the *upaniṣad-s*, पठतु = may read.

Let the body be busy in activities like worship of gods, bath, purification, begging food etc. Let the speech be engaged in chanting *Om* or the study of *upaniṣad-s*. (269)

[This thought is completed in the next *śloka*]

Vapuḥ deva arcana, snāna, śauca, bhikṣā ādau etc. - Let the worship of the Lord, bathing, cleaning oneself, going for alms and such activities, keep the gross body engaged or *tāram japatu va* etc. - let the speech may be engaged in the chanting of the Lord's name or the *Omkāra* or let the mind be engaged in the study of the *vedānta śāstra*.

This thought is continued in the next *śloka*----

विष्णुं ध्यायतु धीर्यद्वा ब्रह्मानन्दे विलीयताम् ।
साक्ष्यहं किञ्चिदप्यत्र न कुर्वे नापि कारये ॥२७०॥

Viṣṇum dhyāyatu dhīryadvā brahmānande vilīyatām
Sākṣyaham kiñcida pyatra na kurve nāpi kāraye (270)

धीः = the intellect; विष्णुम् = of the Lord *Viṣṇu*; ध्यायतु = may contemplate upon; यद्वा = or; ब्रह्मानन्दे = in the *Brahmānanda*; विलीयताम् = get absorbed; अहम् साक्षी = I am *sākṣī*; अत्र = in these; किञ्चित् अपि = any one among; न कुर्वे = don't I do; न अपि = nor do; कारये = I prompt any one to do so.

Let the intellect contemplate on the nature of Lord *Viṣṇu* or get absorbed in *Brahmānanda*. I am *sākṣī*. All these neither I do, nor do I inspire others to do so. (270)

It was said in the previous *śloka*, let the gross body be engaged in various *śāstrik* activities, let the speech be engaged in chanting Lord's name, let the intellect be occupied in study of the scriptures and *upaniṣad-s*.

Viṣṇum dhyāyatu dhīḥ - Let the intellect be engaged in the contemplation of Lord *Viṣṇu*, *Yadvā brahmānande vilīyatām* - or let the intellect be absorbed in its own essential being or *Brahmānanda*.

Aham sākṣī atra kiñcit api na kurve na kāraye - I am the witness, therefore, none of these things (*deva*

arcanā, snāna etc.) do I do, nor do I prompt any one to do so. Because I am the Absolute *sākṣī* - the consciousness, the *kūṭastha caitanya*, I have stopped doing any of these activities. Furthermore, I do not also tell others 'You do this, or that or the other', because I know that all this relates to matter and according to *prārabdha* and is an illusion.

Once the real identity is discovered, where is the arrogance of achievement or guilt of failure? All these differentiations will disappear from the mind. There will be no head-long pursuit of activities.

This thought appears in the *Muṇḍaka upaniṣad* while defining the qualities of a wise man (III 1.4)

The *Brahmavit*, his essential nature being *Brahman*, does not have insistence *Nātivādī*. He is silent, he does not insist on the world being according to his definition, nor does he want to change the world.

A spiritual seeker has greater responsibility than others to be adoptive to the world rather than expect the world to be adaptive to him. One who starts walking the path of spiritual evolution, has increased responsibility to accept everything and everybody as they come with (a) reverence and (b) love. This is the highest *sādhana*. Reverential, loving acceptance of the world is worship of the Lord, as unconditional love for everyone is the manifestation of the Lord through us.

The conclusion of the entire above said thinking is---

एवं च कलहः कुत्र संभवेत्कर्मिणो मम ।
विभिन्नविषयत्वेन पूर्वापरसमुद्रवत् ॥२७१॥

Evam ca kalaḥ kutra sambhavet karmiṇo mama
Vibhinna viṣayatvena pūrvā para samudra vat (271)

एवम् च = in this way; पूर्व अपर समुद्रवत् = like eastern and western sea; विभिन्न विषयत्वेन = because the fields be quite different; कर्मिणः = with the *karma kāṇḍī*; मम = my; कलहः कुत्र = where is the need to oppose and fight; संभवेत् = is ever possible.

In this manner our fields being of opposite nature like the two oceans, the eastern and the western; how can there be any disagreement and opposition with those engaged in *karma* and how can it be ever possible? (271)

In this way, the *karmī*, the one who is engaged in activities has accepted doership, and the man of wisdom has rejected doership. They belong to exactly opposite types. Therefore, let him who has accepted the doership, work. Why should I insist that he should not. Unless we develop an attitude of accepting the world as it is, we are far away from Truth.

Evam ca pūrva apara samudravat vibhinna viśayatvena-Just as the eastern and western oceans are far away from each other, in the same way, the fields of operation for the man of ignorance and the man of wisdom are as far removed from each other as the eastern and western oceans; for the former the field is that of ignorance, for the latter, it is wisdom. There cannot be any contradiction between the two. The *karma indriyā-s* act and the *jñāna indriyā-s* think or pursue knowledge. They are so different that they cannot oppose each other.

Mama kalahah kutra sambhavet-therefore, how can I fight with others who are occupied with the *karma kāṇḍa*?

The lesson to be learnt from this is, that the spiritual seeker should not assume the role of an *upadeśaka* wanting to improve the world and to render advice to others whether such advice is solicited or not.

The thought continues ----

वपुर्वाग्धीषु निर्बन्धः कर्मिणो न तु साक्षिणि ।
ज्ञानिनः साक्ष्यलेपत्वे निर्बन्धो नेतरत्र हि ॥२७२॥

Vapur vāgdhīṣu nirbandhaḥ karmiṇo na tu sākṣiṇi
Jñāninaḥ sākṣya lepatve nirbandho netaratra hi (272)

वपुः-वाक्-धीषु = in body, speech and mind; कर्मिणः = of the *karma kāṇḍī* i.e. engaged in actions; निर्बन्धः = is insistence and identification; साक्षिणि न तु = but not in the *sākṣī*; ज्ञानिनः निर्बन्धः = the identification of the man of knowledge; साक्षी = of the *Sākṣī*; अलेपत्वे = in the non-involvement, non-attachment of; इतरत्र न हि = not in other things like body etc.

Those who are established in action have their full identification and attachment with the body, speech and mind etc, but not with the witness. The wise man's identification and conviction is in the non-involvement and non-attachment of the witness, but not in body etc. (272)

To summarize the development of the *niraṅkuṣā tṛptiḥ*-one who has come to realise his essential nature, has reached the sixth stage-*śoka hāni*. No misery can touch him now. It is not only a negative state of absence of misery, but it is a positive, affirmative state (the seventh) of *niraṅkuṣā tṛptiḥ*. What is the effect of this unconditioned bliss? It is *kṛtam kṛtyam prāpanīyam iti eva tṛpyati*- whatever is to be done is done, what has to be gained has been gained. So there is no reason why a man of wisdom will get excited for or in action or will get elated or depressed over achievement or failure.

The man who is experiencing *niraṅkuṣā tṛptiḥ* wants nothing, because he is everything i.e. *sarva-lokātmakaḥ*. When this knowledge takes place there is no need for any vow. Therefore, obligatory and religious actions (to achieve heaven, study of scriptures etc.), *vedānta* listening, reflection and meditation, all these, are not required.

Thus, when the body of a man of wisdom is engaged in bodily activities etc., he is not touched, because he is totally absorbed in *Brahmānanda*. He knows himself to be the witness (*sākṣī aham*). The knower-known (matter and spirit) difference which exists in the world of plurality, is obliterated. The world - the *saṁsāra* disappears.

Let the intellect be engaged in the contemplation of *Viṣṇu*, get absorbed in *Brahmānanda* as for him he neither does anything himself, nor makes others do anything.

The state of bliss is characterised by acceptance of the world as it is. Space does not contradict anything, it accepts the weight of the earth, the wet-ness of water, the heat of fire, and the speed of air. It is the substratum for all. So also 'I', the consciousness is supporting all the conditionings, how can 'I' be conditioned.

In this state of absolute bliss, where is the conflict between the *karmī*-i.e. doer and myself the *sākṣī*-witness? Both function in two different fields of operation, therefore, there can be no conflict between the two.

Having brought the discussion upto this point, this difference between a man of wisdom and the action-oriented doer is further analysed in the present *śloka*.

Karminah vapuḥ vāk dhī nirbandhaḥ-The man who is engaged in activities (the *karma kāṇḍī*) is totally identified with the body (*vapuḥ*), speech (*vāk*) and buddhi (*dhī*) or intellect. Whereas, *jñāninaḥ nirbandha na*-the man of wisdom is not identified with any of these three.

Sākṣī alepatve itaratra na hi nirbandhaḥ-The *sākṣī* being of the nature of unattachment, there cannot be any attachment to the three equipments---body, speech and intellect. Thus, there can be no conflict between these two entities:-

- (i) a man of ignorance who has taken himself to be the body, speech and intellect; and

- (ii) a man of wisdom who has realised his real nature to be the *sākṣī* which is unattached and uninfluenced by three conditionings.

If we happen to see disagreement and fight between the *jñāni* and *karmī*-both of them deserve ridicule----

एवं चान्योन्यवृत्तान्तानभिज्ञौ बधिराविव ।
विवदेतां बुद्धिमन्तो हसन्त्येव विलोक्य तौ ॥२७३॥

Evam cānyonya vṛttānta anabhijñau bādhirā viva
Vivedatām buddhi manto hasantyeva vilokya tau (273)

एवम् च = in view of the above conclusion; अन्योन्य = each other; वृत्तान्त = the state of; अनभिज्ञौ = both not knowing; बधिरौ इव = like deaf ones; विवदेताम् = get involved in argumentation; तौ विलोक्य = having seen such two; बुद्धिमन्तः = the wise ones; हसन्ति एव = laugh at them.

In view of the conclusion reached above, the possibility and reason for fight between a man of knowledge and a man of action is not seen. However, both not knowing the state and field of the other, if are engaged in arguments and counter-arguments like deaf ones, not knowing the other man's words; the wise men, seeing these two fight, laugh at them. (273)

Evam ca anyonya vṛttānta anabhijñau-In this way, if there is an argument between individuals who cannot understand the standpoint of others-the *karmī* takes the standpoint that this world is real, and therefore he puts forth efforts, talks, argues etc.; whereas a man of wisdom understands things from the absolute standpoint and considers the world only to be an illusion---*māyā*. Thus when their standpoints are so diametrically opposed, there cannot be any similarity in their perceptions, which is like two deaf men conversing and arguing.

Vivadetaṁ buddhimantaḥ hasanti iva vilokya tau-Let the arguments go on whether *karma mārga* is superior

or *jñāna mārga*. The man of wisdom simply smiles and does not consider anything in the world deserving to be taken so seriously.

The ridicule by the wise is due to ----

यं कर्मि न विजानाति साक्षिणं तस्य तत्त्ववित् ।
ब्रह्मत्वं बुध्यतां तत्र कर्मिणः किं विहीयते ॥२७४॥

*Yam karmī na vijānāti sākṣiṇam tasya tattvavit
Brahmatvaṁ budhyatāṁ tatra karmiṇaḥ kiṁ vihiyate* (274)

कर्मि = the *karma kāṇḍī*; यम् साक्षिणम् = to that witness;
न विजानाति = does not know; तस्य = of that witness;
ब्रह्मत्वम् = the nature being *Brahman*; तत्त्वविद् बुध्यताम् =
may the wise man know; तत्र = in that; कर्मिणः = for the
karma kāṇḍī; किम् = what; विहीयते = is lost

Let the man of wisdom know the witnessing Self to be the nature of *Brahman* which is unborn to the *karma kāṇḍī*. What is the loss of the *karma kāṇḍī*? (274)

Karmī yam sākṣiṇam na vijānāti tasya brahmatvaṁ etc. - The *karmakāṇḍī* is not able to know the meaning of word *sākṣī* or witness, because he is so totally identified with the body, mind and intellect equipment, that *sākṣī* which is not known by an ignorant man is known by a *tattvavit*, the man of knowledge, to be of the nature of the *Parabrahma Paramātmā*, *tatra*-therefore, *karmiṇaḥ kim vihiyate*- why should the *karmakāṇḍī*, the man engaged in actions, insist that the man of wisdom should work? What is his loss or gain?

Further----

देहवाग्बुद्ध्यस्त्यक्ता ज्ञानिनानृतबुद्धितः ।
कर्मि प्रवर्ततामाभिर्ज्ञानिनो हीयतेऽत्र किम् ॥२७५॥

*Deha vāgbuddha yās tyaktā jñāninā nṛta buddhitaḥ
Karmī pravartatā mābhir jñānino hiyate'tra kim* (275)

ज्ञानिना = by the man of wisdom; अनृत = being illusion;
बुद्धितः = with the understanding of; देह वाग् बुद्ध्यः =
of the body, speech, mind; त्यक्ताः = renounced; कर्मि =
the *karmakāṇḍī*; आभिः = by these body, speech and mind;
प्रवर्तयतु = may get involved in activities; अत्र = in
this case; ज्ञानिनः = for the man of wisdom; किम् = what?;
हीयते = is lost.

The man of wisdom has renounced the body, speech, mind etc. with a firm understanding of their being illusory and the *karmakāṇḍī* may get involved in activities by these equipments i.e. body etc., In this case, what is the loss of a man of wisdom? (275)

The argument is now taken up in reverse.

jñāninā anṛta buddhitaḥ deha vāk buddhayaḥ tyaktāḥ- The man of wisdom has, with firm understanding that the body, mind and intellect are not real and---conditionings are of an illusory nature, renounced them.

Jñāninā kim hiyate- Why should such a man of wisdom object if the ignorant man acts in this world? what is his loss?

Karmī deha vāg buddhyā- Let the *karmakāṇḍī* engage himself in such activities through the equipment of the body, mind and intellect. (why should that disturb the man of wisdom?)

By this is meant that *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* i.e. involvement in and withdrawal from the world have no contradiction so far as a man of ignorance and a man of wisdom are concerned, because their fields of operation are different.

Involvement itself is in a sense withdrawal and vice versa e.g. one insists that he does not want to do a

certain thing, the desire to withdraw from that action itself becomes an involvement. Therefore, whether one gets involved or not, what is essential is whether it is associated with *durāgraha*--insistence?

How this *durāgraha* causes the problem is explained in the next few *śloka-s*?---

प्रवृत्तिर्नोपयुक्ता चेन्निवृत्तिः कौपयुज्यते ।
बोधहेतुर्निवृत्तिश्चेद्बुभुत्सायां तथेतरा ॥२७६॥

Pravṛttir nopa yuktā cen nivṛttiḥ kvopa yujyate
Bodha hetur nivr̥ttiś cet bubhut sâyām tathe tarā (276)

प्रवृत्तिः = the involvement in activities; उपयुक्ता न = is of no use; चेत् = therefore, should be rejected if this is argued; क = where is; निवृत्तिः = withdrawal; उपयुज्यते = usefulness; बोध = self knowledge; हेतुः = cause for; निवृत्तिः = withdrawal; चेत् = is argued; तथा इतरा = similarly the other i.e. involvement also; बुभुत्सायाम् = is useful in arousing desire to know the Self.

If one condemns the involvement of a man of action being of no use, then the withdrawal is also of no use. If one says that withdrawal is helpful in Self Knowledge, then involvement in *karma* is also helpful in arousing desire to know about one's real nature and therefore, both are good in their own place. (276)

Pravṛtti upayuktā na cet nivṛtti upayuktā na cet-If you say that the involvement of the man of wisdom in the world, is not of any use; then, how will actionless-ness be of use to him? Because, *nivṛttiḥ bodha hetuḥ*- withdrawal from the world is helpful for Self-realisation. *Itarāḥ bubhutsâyām*-Involvement with desire in the sense that I want to know, to study the scriptures etc., is also useful for knowledge.

If it is insisted that withdrawal from the world is essential for the man of wisdom because it helps him to know the Truth, then it is equally valid to say that *pravṛtti* is also needed by him to know the Truth. Our common understanding that *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* operate in mutually exclusive fields---the former of *karmakāṇḍa* alone and the latter in the field of knowledge alone is erroneous, and should not be insisted upon.

Can we say that after knowing the Truth, there is no need of *pravṛttiḥ*?

The answer is---

बुद्धश्चेन्न बुभुत्सेत नाप्यसौ बुध्यते पुनः ।
अबाधादनुवर्तेत बोधो न त्वन्यसाधनात् ॥२७७॥

Buddhaś cenna bubhut seta nāpyasau budhyate punaḥ
Abadhāda nuvar teta bodho na tvanya sādhanāt (277)

बुद्धः चेत् = if one has realised; न बुभुत्सेत = will not desire to know; असौ = this man of knowledge; पुनः न अपि बुध्यते = then he will not know again also; (therefore, withdrawal is also useless); बोधः = the knowledge; अबाधात् = never being negated; अनुवर्तेत = will always be; अन्य साधनात् = by other means; न तु = will not be strengthened.

Once the Truth is known, one will not desire to know again, therefore, the *pravṛttiḥ* will be useless, for he again does not want to know (i.e. therefore, the *nivṛtti* or withdrawal is also useless). The knowledge being never negated by any means of knowledge, nor can it be strengthened. (277)

Buddhaḥ na bubhutseta etc. -The man of wisdom, will not have the desire for knowledge, because he already knows. That means he has no need for *pravṛttiḥ* such as the study of scriptures etc.

He who has known his real being, that he is neither the intellect nor the mind nor the body, nor the speech, nor does he want anything. In such a case, why will he want to engage himself again in actions? Is it because he has forgotten his knowledge, so he wants to get back into action to regain that lost knowledge?

The teacher replies: If this is how you understand it, you are wrong. *Boddhaḥ abādhāt anuvartet anyā sādhanāt na tu*-Once knowledge about the Truth takes place, it cannot be denied ever again. That knowledge cannot be contradicted by action. Nor can that knowledge be contradicted by any other means.

In short the value of *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* i.e. involvement or withdrawal is the same in so far as the man of wisdom is concerned; for *pravṛtti* does not bind him and *nivṛtti* need not free him!

The stability of this Self Knowledge cannot be changed or influenced by anything including ignorance and its effects----

नाविद्या नापि तत्कार्यं बोधं बाधितुमर्हति ।
पुरैव तत्त्वबोधेन बाधिते ते उभे यतः ॥२७८॥

Nāvidyā nāpi tatkāryaṁ bodhaṁ bādhitu marhati
Puraiva tattva bodhena bādhite te ubhe yataḥ (278)

न अविद्या = neither ignorance; न अपि तत् कार्यम् = not even its effects such as veiling and projection; बोधम् = the knowledge; बाधितुम् = to negate; अर्हति = is strong enough; यतः = because; ते उभे = both these; तत्त्व बोधेन = by Self knowledge; पुरा एव = already; बाधिते = are negated.

The Self knowledge cannot be negated even by ignorance or its effects such as veiling and projection. They are not strong enough, because they both were already negated by the Self knowledge. (278)

Na avidyā na api tat kāryaṁ bodhaṁ bādhitum arhati-Neither ignorance --- that I am a limited being, I am the body, the speech, the intellect, I am incomplete etc.-nor the effects i.e. the actions arising out of that ignorance, such as desire, agitations, activity to fulfil that desire --- can destroy the knowledge.

Yataḥ tattva bodhena purā eva ubhe bādhite-Because, by the *tattva jñānam*-both the ignorance and the effects of ignorance are already destroyed. *Tattva jñāna* is the knowledge about one's own real nature. It is not objective knowledge where knowledge takes place in two stages: (a) *vṛtti vyāpti* by which objects are recognised e.g. *this is a book*, and (b) *phala vyāpti* by which the cognition that *I know that this is a book*, takes place i.e. ownership of objective knowledge.

In the case of one's own being, knowledge does not take place in an objective manner. There is only *vṛtti vyāpti*, but no *phala vyāpti*. The mind, when it focuses on its own source, takes the form of the *Parabrahma Paramātmā*. That form is without any form---the knower becomes the knowledge. The distinction between the two disappears. There is no separate identity, since I cannot become the object of knowledge about my Self. Once the ignorance, that I am the knower and something is known is totally broken by *bodhāt* or true knowledge, how can the destroyed ignorance deny the wisdom of knowledge ever again?

It is seen that the ignorance may be destroyed but the effects of ignorance are not, even by knowledge such as sun-rise, etc.

Therefore, these effects of ignorance may destroy the knowledge? ----

बाधितं दृश्यतामक्षैस्तेन बाधो न शक्यते ।
जीवन्नाखुर्न मार्जारं हन्ति हन्यात्कथं मृतः ॥२७९॥

Bādhitaṁ dṛśya tāmakṣais tena bādho na śakyate
Jīvan nākhur na mārjāraṁ hanti hanyāt katham mṛtaḥ (279)

बाधितम् = once known to be illusion essentially; अक्षैः = by the eyes etc.; दृश्यताम् = may it be seen; तेन = by that perception of illusion; बाधः = the negation of knowledge; न शक्यते = is not possible; जीवन् = alive; आखुः = rat; मार्जारम् = to the cat; न हन्ति = does not kill; मृतम् = the dead one; कथम् हन्यात् = how can or will it kill?

The world having once known to be an illusion may thereafter be seen by the eyes etc.; by the mere perception of the illusion, the knowledge about it being illusion cannot be negated, as when a living rat cannot kill a cat, how can a dead one kill? (279)

Bādhitaṁ akṣaiḥ dṛśyatām etc. - The world (which is ignorance and the effects of ignorance) which is already denied as an illusion, let it be seen by the eyes. The eyes continue to see the blueness of the sky even after we know it does not exist. Similarly, let the world be seen by the sense organs, that does not deny the world being an illusion. For seeing the illusion has nothing to do with the validity of the illusion as reality. For example, although we know that the sun does not really 'rise' or 'set', that they are only apparent motions caused by the rotation of the earth, we continue to refer to the sunrise and sunset. So also because we see the world, the world does not become real.

By this perception of non-existing illusory world, the knowledge that the world is an illusion will never be denied.

Jīvan ākhuḥ mārjāraṁ na hanti katham mṛtaḥ - when a live rat cannot kill a cat, how can a dead rat kill

it? When this world is known to be an illusion, how can the illusory world destroy the knowledge? The illusory world is also supported by the knowledge. Moreover, when the knowledge cannot be destroyed by ignorance, how can it be destroyed by the effects of ignorance?

The perception of duality does not deny the non-dual knowledge of Self----

अपि पाशुपतास्त्रेण विद्धः चेन्न ममार यः ।

निष्फलेषु वितुन्नङ्गो नङ्क्षयतीत्यत्र का प्रमा ॥२८०॥

Api pāśu patās treṇa viddhaḥ cenna mamār yaḥ
Niṣpha leṣu vitunnaṅgo naṅksya tītyatra kā pramā (280)

यः = he who; पाशुपतास्त्रेण = by *Pāśupata astra*; विद्धः = injured; अपि = although; चेत् न ममार = if did not die; निष्फलेषु = an arrow without a pointed tip; वितुन्नाङ्गः = injured one; नङ्क्षयति = will be destroyed; इति = in this; अत्र का प्रमा = what is the proof.

If, he who, did not die even though injured by *Pāśupata astra*, where is the guarantee that he will die when injured by an arrow without a pointed tip? (i.e. he will certainly not die.) (280)

Yaḥ pāśupata astreṇa viddhaḥ api na mamār cet - A man is so strong that even the *Pāśupata astra* cannot kill him. If such a man is hit by a blunt arrow, nothing will happen to him. Can there be any authority (*pramāṇa*) to say that he will be killed by such a weapon? There is none !

In the same way----

आदावविद्यया चित्रैः स्वकार्यैर्जम्भमाणया ।

युद्ध्वा बोधोऽजयत्सोऽद्य सुदृढो बाध्यतां कथम् ॥२८१॥

*Ādāva vidyayā citraiḥ svakār yair jṛmbha māṇayā
Yuddhvā bodho'jayat so'dya sudṛḍho bādhyatām katham* (281)

आदौ = during the practice of knowledge; चित्रैः स्वकार्यैः = due to many different effects of ignorance, such as knower, known etc.; जृम्भमाणया अविद्यया = the ever growing ignorance; युद्ध्वा = having fought; बोधः = the knowledge; अजयत् = won over the ignorance; सः सुदृढः = that firm knowledge; अद्य = after the destruction of ignorance; कथम् = how; बाध्यताम् = will be negated by the effects of ignorance?

Initially during the practice of knowledge the ever-growing ignorance and many different effects of the ignorance having fought, the knowledge won over the ignorance. Now it is firm and strong. Therefore, now after the destruction of ignorance how can its effect negate the knowledge? (281)

Ādau svakāryaiḥ citraiḥ jṛmbhamāṇayā avidyayā yuddhvā bodhaḥ ajayat-In the beginning, at the time of study for knowing the Truth, a variety of efforts were made through *sāadhanā* i.e. the study of the scriptures, reflection, meditation and other prescribed means. Through such *sāadhanā* and *dhyāna abhyāsa*, ignorance was conquered, and knowledge of the Truth gained.

Saḥ adya sudṛḍho katham bādhyatām-How can that knowledge which is the result of proper study, understanding and firmness of conviction, be denied again by confusion or illusion. Once firmly established in his own being, it is not possible for a person to be again deluded by ignorance and the effects of ignorance which he had already destroyed.

The glory of knowledge is sung ----

तिष्ठन्त्वज्ञानतत्कार्यशवा बोधेन मारिताः ।
न भीतिर्बोधसम्राजः कीर्तिः प्रत्युत तस्य तैः ॥२८२॥

*Tiṣṭhan tvajñāna tatkārya śavā bodhena mārītāḥ
Na bhītir bodha samrājaḥ kīrtiḥ pratyuta tasya taiḥ* (282)

बोधेन मारिताः = destroyed by the self knowledge; अज्ञान = ignorance and; तत्कार्य शवाः = the dead bodies of the effects of ignorance; तिष्ठन्तु = may they remain scattered; बोध सम्राजः = the king that knowledge is; भीतिः = fear; न = is not; प्रत्युत = on the contrary; तैः = from the debries (destroyed effects) of the ignorance; तस्य = of the knowledge; कीर्तिः = is glory.

Let the ignorance and their effects having been destroyed by the knowledge --- the 'king', lie like carcasses. They can no more be a source of fear for the king-knowledge; on the contrary the destroyed ignorance along with carcass effects, sing the fame and glory of the 'king' --- the knowledge. (282)

Bodhena mārītāḥ ajñāna tat kārya śavāḥ tiṣṭhantu-The dead carcasses of ignorance and their effects are destroyed by the king of knowledge and they are lying around. Who cares?

Bodha samrājaḥ bhītiḥ na-Will the 'king' knowledge be afraid of the dead bodies? On the other hand, *taiḥ tasya kīrtiḥ*: the king's glory is enhanced by his conquest of ignorance and their effects.

The conclusion of all these examples is presented ----

य एवमतिशूरेण बोधेन न वियुज्यते ।
प्रवृत्त्या वा निवृत्त्या वा देहादिगतयास्य किम् ॥२८३॥

*Ya eva mati śūreṇa bodhena na viyujyate
Pravṛtṭyā vā nivṛtṭyā vā dehādi gata yāsyā kim* (283)

यः = he who; एवम् = in this manner; अति शूरेण = by the most powerful; बोधेन = by the Self knowledge; न = not; वियुज्यते = is not separated; अस्य = of such a person; देहादि गतया = by the ways of the body etc; प्रवृत्त्या वा = whether involvement; निवृत्त्या वा = or withdrawal; किम् = what is lost?

In this manner he who is never separated from the most powerful knowledge about the identity of the relative and the absolute Self; what is lost, if such a person's body etc., and their ways of involvement or withdrawal, continue to manifest? (283)

Yah evam ati śūreṇa etc. He who is so strong i.e. so firmly established in the knowledge about his own essential Self, that he has killed ignorance and the effects of ignorance; his greatness lies in not coming under the influence of these two, he is a *dhīra puruṣaḥ*, a man of courage and wisdom. In reality ignorance and their effects are not. It is only because of wrong identification that miseries seem to touch us. Neither the Absolute, nor the *cidābhāsa*, nor the equipment called the body, mind and intellect are touched by *sukha* and *duḥkha*.

Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa defines the *dhīra puruṣaḥ* in *Gītā* (II-15) as follows:

He is a man of courage and wisdom who is not influenced by the miseries and joys of the world, who is not affected by ignorance and the effects of ignorance, qualifies for immortality.

Bodhena na viyujyate asya dehādi gatayaḥ etc., such a wise man's knowledge of the Truth i.e. *Brahma aiyya bodhaḥ* i.e. the knowledge that "I am of the nature of Absolute Consciousness", it is never denied or contradicted. Such a person, why will he ever be concerned, whether the body, mind and intellect are engaged in activities or not? Because he knows that the body, mind and intellect

with their modifications belong to the category of the condition and not Him, the Pure Self.

In that case even the ignorant should also not engage himself in activities?---

प्रवृत्तावाग्रहो न्याय्यो बोधहीनस्य सर्वथा ।

स्वर्गाय वापवर्गाय यतितव्यं यतो नृभिः ॥२८४॥

Pravṛttā vāgraho nyāyyo bodha hīnasya sarvathā
Svargāya vā'pa vargāya yati tavyam yato nṛbhiḥ (284)

बोध हीनस्य = of an ignorant; प्रवृत्तौ = in the involvement and *karmakāṇḍa*; आग्रहः = insistence; सर्वथा = in all ways; न्याय्यः = is justified; यतः = because; स्वर्गाय = for heavens; वा = or; अपवर्गाय = for emancipation or liberation; नृभिः = by the people; यतितव्यम् = should be attempted.

The insistence of an ignorant in action or *karmakāṇḍa* is always justifiable, because men should put efforts for heaven or liberation. (284)

A doubt raised now is: Should the ignorant man also act in the same way? That is, not get involved in the world? The teacher says: 'No. Do not try to change the ways of an ignorant man' because *Bodha hīnasya pravṛttau āgrahaḥ nyāyyāḥ*-For the man who does not know his essential nature and who has accepted the sense of doership and enjoyership, the *kartṛtva* and *bhokṛtva abhimāna*, the involvement in the world and insistence that we must get involved from this standpoint, it is the right thing to do.

Nṛbhiḥ svargāya vā apavargāya yatitavyam yataḥ :--- because, he wants to go to heaven or for liberation or for obtaining whatever he desires by observing the *śāstrīya karmakāṇḍa*-religious precepts. Everyone, who is not aware of his own essential nature should definitely put forward efforts in the world of action and should not attempt

withdrawal in an artificial manner under a sense of compulsion. Withdrawal must come naturally, otherwise withdrawal itself can become involvement.

Lord *Kṛṣṇa* describes this thought in *Gītā* (III-26) as follows:

The wise man should not create doubt in the minds of those who are ignorant and attached to action, whether they should or should not work. The wise man should also get fully involved in action along with the ignorant but with no attachment to doing or not doing or the *karma phala* i.e. the fruits of action.

The absence of insistence in the wise with reference to actions while in the company of ignorant is obvious----

विद्वांश्चेत्तादृशां मध्ये तिष्ठेत्तदनुरोधतः ।
कायेन मनसा वाचा करोत्येवाखिलाः क्रियाः ॥२८५॥

Vidvān ścet tādrśān madhye tiṣṭhet tada nurodhataḥ
Kāyena manasā vācā karotyevā khilāḥ kriyāḥ (285)

विद्वान् = the man of knowledge; तादृशाम् मध्ये = among the ignorant; चेत् तिष्ठेत् = if happen to be; तद् अनुरोधतः = like the ignorant's desire; कायेन मनसा वाचा = by body, mind and speech; अखिलाः = all; क्रियाः = activities; करोति एव = does certainly.

If a wise man happens to be among the ignorant ones, who are busy in activities, is seen to get involved by body, speech and mind, in all the undertakings like the ignorant, certainly it is for their sake. (285)

Vidvān tādrśān madhye cet etc. - How does a man of wisdom perform in the world? He who has discovered his essential nature when he is among those who are ignorant i.e. those who are attached to action etc., *Tiṣṭhet tad anurodhataḥ kāyena manasā vācā* - he should behave

according to their ways, with his body, mind and speech, that is whole-heartedly; *Akhilā kriyā karoti eva* - he also keeps himself fully engaged in the activities along with them.

Because, for him, *pravṛttiḥ* involvement, or *nivṛttiḥ* withdrawal, both carry the same meaning. By getting involved in the activities he will lose nothing. On the contrary, he will be a source of inspiration for those who are in the field of activity.

In this context Lord *Kṛṣṇa* says in *Gītā* (IV-18) :

He who has correct understanding about action, he will not withdraw from action insisting that he does not want to do anything. Here withdrawal itself becomes an involvement. True withdrawal means that he can participate in action without involvement and his withdrawal from action will be natural, unforced process.

The ways of same wise man while amongst seekers of knowledge, are different ----

एष मध्ये बुभुत्सूनां यदा तिष्ठेत्तदा पुनः ।
बोधायैषां क्रियाः सर्वाः दूषयन्त्यजतु स्वयम् ॥२८६॥

Eṣa madhye bubhut sūnān yadā tiṣṭhet tadā punaḥ
Bodhā yaiṣān kniyāḥ sarvāḥ dūṣayān styajatu svayam (286)

एषः = this wise man; बुभुत्सूनाम् मध्ये = among the seekers of knowledge; यदा तिष्ठेत् = while being; तदा पुनः = then again; एषाम् = for the sake of the seekers; बोधाय = so that they understand; सर्वाः क्रियाः = all the activities; दूषयन् = are condemned; स्वयम् त्यजतु = himself renounce.

This wise man while among the seekers of knowledge, will again condemn all the activities for the correct understanding, even he himself renouncing all the activities. (286)

Eṣaḥ yadā bubhutsūnām madhye tiṣṭhet-What should be the attitude of the man of wisdom among wise people? The same wise man, when he is among those who are aspiring for liberation, what should he do? *Tadā punaḥ eṣām bodhāya sarvāḥ kriyāḥ dūṣayam svayam tyajatu*-For the benefit of the *mumukṣu* or the seekers, he should decry actions and advise them against wasting their time in activity, besides himself giving up activity.

Thus, the wise man supports activities when among people of ignorance, and decries activities when he is among seekers and sets an example himself by engaging himself fully in activities in the former case and giving up activities in the latter. The wise man is one who is able to be a wise among the wise and a fool among the fools. Truth does not contradict anything!

Can we justify the dual policy of a wise man? ----

अविद्वदनुसारेण वृत्तिर्बुद्धस्य युज्यते ।
स्तनन्धयानुसारेण वर्तते तत्पिता यतः ॥२८७॥

Avidva danu sāreṇa vṛttir buddhasya yujyate
Stanandhayā nusāreṇa vartate tatpitā yataḥ (287)

अविद्वत् अनुसारेण = according to the ignorant; बुद्धस्य = of the wise; वृत्तिः = involvement; युज्यते = is desirable; यतः = because; स्तनन्धय अनुसारेण = as per the age of the suckling child; तत् पिता = his father; वर्तते = acts.

The involvement in the worldly activities is desirable, as far as the ignorant ones are considered. Because, a father behaves as per the age of the child if it is a suckling one. (287)

Why does the wise man adopt two sets of behaviour? This is explained in this and the next śloka.

Avidvat anusāreṇa buddhasya vṛttiḥ yujyate-When among the ignorant people, in accordance with their nature and inclination he adopts his behaviour is only proper.

Yataḥ stanandhaya-anusāreṇa tat pitā vartate-In the same manner as a father behaves towards a suckling infant (child).

If the man of wisdom starts behaving wise among the ignorant, he will not be accepted. If he really wants to help them, he has first to gain their confidence and adapt his own behaviour according to their interest, before he can advise them. A father adjusts his own behaviour according to the age of the child.

How? ----

अधिक्षिप्तस्ताडितो वा बालेन स्वपिता तदा ।
न क्लिश्नाति न कुप्येत बालं प्रत्युत लालयेत् ॥२८८॥

Adhi kṣipta stādīto vā bālena svapitā tadā
Na kliṣṇāti na kupyeta bālam pratyuta lālayet (288)

अधिक्षिप्तः = censured; ताडितः वा = or beaten; बालेन = by the child; स्वपिता = his father; तदा = for that; न क्लिश्नाति = does not feel pained; न कुप्येत = nor does he become angry; प्रत्युत = on the contrary; बालम् = to the child; लालयेत् = loves more!

When the father of such a small child is either censured or beaten, does not feel hurt nor does he become angry on that child. On the contrary, loves the child in return. (288)

Bālena adhikṣiptaḥ tādīto vā tadā na kupyet etc. - If a small child gets angry with the father or beats him, the father does not get hurt or upset, nor does the father get angry.

Pratyuta bālam lālayet-On the other hand, he loves the child even more.

If a father behaves with the child like a child, then he cannot consider himself grown up. So also when among those who do not know and whose behaviour is foolish, the wise man does not react in the same way, nor does he become angry or hurt by their behaviour.

Similarly ----

निन्दितः स्तूयमानो वा विद्वानज्ञैर्न निन्दति ।
न स्तौति किन्तु तेषां स्याद्यथा बोधस्तथाचरेत् ॥२८९॥

Ninditaḥ stūya māno vā vidvāna jñairna nindati
Na stauti kintu teṣāṃ syāt yathā bodhas tathā caret (289)

निन्दितः = censured; स्तूयमानः = praised; वा = or; अज्ञैः = by the ignorant; विद्वान् = the wise man; न निन्दति = neither censures; न स्तौति = nor praises; किन्तु = but; तेषाम् = of the ignorant; यथा = as; बोधः स्यात् = is their understanding; तथा आचरेत् = demonstrates accordingly.

Similarly, a wise man does not get hurt nor does he praise the ignorant, when he is praised or condemned by them. But he responds in such a manner that the ignorant one's are benefited and therefore, he acts or demonstrates accordingly. (289)

Vidvān ajñaiḥ ninditaḥ stuyamānaḥ vā na nindati na stauti-When a man of wisdom is criticised or praised by ignorant people, he does not reciprocate either by censuring or praising.

In spiritual *sādhana* neither excessive praise should be given, nor should the student lose his balance when appreciated.

Yathā bodhaḥ syāt tathā ācaret-Observing the behaviour of the ignorant man, he behaves in such a way that it will help the ignorant man to progress. Any praise or criticism that the wise man expresses will not be as

a reaction to the ignorant man's behaviour but only with the sole objective of helping him. The wise man himself is above praise or censure.

What is the purpose for such a behaviour of the wise man among the ignorant people? ----

येनायं नटनेनात्र बुध्यते कार्यमेव तत् ।
अज्ञप्रबोधान्नैवान्यत्कार्यमस्त्यत्र तद्विदः ॥२९०॥

Yenāyam naṭane nātra budhyate kārya meva tat
Ajña prabodhān nai vānyat kārya mastyatra tadvidaḥ (290)

येन = by which; अत्र = in this world; अयम् = this ignorant; नटनेन = conduct; बुध्यते = can realise the Truth; तत् = accordingly; कार्यम् एव = should be done; तद्विदः = of the wise; अत्र = in this world; अज्ञः = ignorant; प्रबोधात् = revealing the Truth; अन्यत् = other than; कार्यम् = to do; न एव अस्ति = is not.

By whichever conduct of the wise man in this world, the ignorant man is helped to realise the Truth, is the only thing to do, for the wise man. Other than this, there is nothing else for him to do in this world. (290)

Atra ayam yena naṭanena budhyate-In this world the wise man should behave in such a way that the ignorant persons will be able to understand the Truth by whatever conduct he can present.

The same thought is stated by Lord *Kṛṣṇa* in *Gītā* (IV-21) as follows:-

As the wise man conducts himself in this world, he sets the guidelines for the ignorant. Whatever he sets as the norm of wisdom, that is accepted by the ignorant as *pramāṇam* as example of authority. As the *śreṣṭha puruṣa* behaves, so is followed by the ignorant man.

Similarly, by the behaviour of the wise man, the ignorant man is guided to do likewise.

For the wise man, there is nothing else to do in this world except to reveal the Truth to the ignorant and help the seekers.

The experience of fulfilment and the joy of one's being is thereafter never decreased ----

कृतकृत्यतया तृप्तः प्राप्तप्राप्यतया पुनः ।
तुष्यन्नेवं स्वमनसा मन्यतेऽसौ निरन्तरम् ॥२९१॥

*Kṛta kṛtya tayā tṛptaḥ prāpta prāpya tayā punaḥ
Tṛpyannevaṁ sva manasā manya te 'sau niran taram* (291)

असौ = this wise man; कृत कृत्यतया = because of his fulfilment of his life; तृप्तः = is fully content; पुनः = again; प्राप्त प्राप्यतया = because of the achievement of all that is thought of; तुष्यन् = experiencing the bliss of achievement; स्वमनसा = by his mind; निरन्तरम् = all the time thereafter; एवम् = in this way; मन्यते = continues to experience.

This wise man fully content for having done his lot and gained the fulfilment of his life, thereafter continues again to experience this joy in his mind. (291)

This and subsequent śloka are not statements, but experiences. What is said is not told by the wise man. It is the state of his mind, of his Being. What are the distinguishing marks of the man of wisdom?

- (1) *Kṛta Kṛtyatayā*- Whatever is to be done, is done; there is nothing remaining to be achieved; there is no fear of loss of what has been achieved;
- (2) *Prāpta prāpyatayā*- Because there is nothing to be achieved, there is nothing to be done and vice versa. Therefore, there is total contentment.

Total contentment is not a state of lethargy:

- (a) It is an inspired state of existence because of our association with the Absolute, in a form which manifests itself as inspiration.
- (b) It is a state of total freedom from the things and beings around us i.e. their presence or absence does not make any difference.

Ādī Śaṅkara in Bhaja Govindam (V-19) says -

*Yogarato vā bhogarato vā, saṅgarato vā saṅga vihināḥ
Yasya brahmaṇi ramate cittam, nandati nandati nandatijeva*

Whether he is among objects of enjoyment or among many people around him or with no one, he whose mind revels in *Brahman*, he verily enjoys.

If I get disturbed by the presence of objects in the world, then the objects become powerful and I have become a victim to their presence. If I get disturbed by the absence of objects, then also I become dependent on them for contentment. Therefore, the presence or absence of objects should not touch me. Similarly, if I allow the presence or absence of beings (persons) to disturb me, I am far away from the Truth.

Yasya brahmaṇi ramate cittam-He who is totally established in his own essential Self, in his own unlimited, conscious, blissful existence, that state of *ānanda* is called *tṛptiḥ*. *Ānanda* is total independence, where no thought of the world can disturb the inner poise.

Tṛpyan eva svamanasā manyate'sau niran taram-He always has the following type of understanding in his own mind.

Explained in the next śloka----

धन्योऽहं धन्योऽहं नित्यं स्वात्मानमञ्जसा वेद्मि ।
धन्योऽहं धन्योऽहं ब्रह्मानन्दो विभाति मे स्पष्टम् ॥२९२॥

Dhanyo'ham dhanyo'ham nityam svātmā namañ jasā vedmi
Dhanyo'ham dhanyo'ham brahmā nando vibhāti me spaṣṭam (292)

धन्यः अहम् = I am blessed; अहम् धन्यः = I am fulfilled;
नित्यम् = all the time; स्वात्मानम् = to my real Self;
अञ्जसा = immediately; वेद्मि = know; धन्यः अहम् धन्यः
अहम् = I am indeed fulfilled; मे = to me; ब्रह्मानन्दः
= the bliss of *Brahman*; स्पष्टम् = distinctly; विभाति
= is experienced.

I am blessed. I am indeed fulfilled, because I have discovered my essential Self. I am indeed fulfilled, for I have discovered the Bliss of *Brahman*. It is distinctly clear to me. (292)

Yet in another place *Ācārya Śaṅkara* in his immortal poem *Brahma Jñānāvali* (1) exclaims:

Asaṅgo'ham asaṅgo'ham asaṅgo'ham punaḥ punaḥ
Saccidānanda rūpo 'ham ahamevā aham avyayaḥ

Unattached, unattached, unattached am I, again and again;
of the nature of eternal Existence. Knowledge-Bliss am I;
I am that; That am I, which is irreducible immortal, endless
factor.

These are not mere declarations, they are to be experienced like one's own direct personal experiences.

Svātmānam añjasā vedmi-I have now come to discover my own essential nature very closely i.e. *aparokṣa anubhūti* has taken place. I am completely fulfilled. Because *Brahmānandaḥ vibhāti me spaṣṭam*-now the bliss of *Brahmānanda* is very distinctly experienced by me.

The fulfilment leads to disappearance of worldly sorrows and its cause - the ignorance of Self----

धन्योऽहं धन्योऽहं दुःखं सांसारिकं न वीक्षेऽद्य ।
धन्योऽहं धन्योऽहं स्वस्याज्ञानं पलायितं क्वापि ॥२९३॥

Dhanyo'ham dhanyo'ham duḥkhaṁ sārīsārikam na vikṣe'dya
Dhanyo'ham dhanyo'ham svasyā jñānam palāyitam kvāpi (293)

अहम् धन्यः धन्यः अहम् = I am indeed blessed; अद्य
= now; सांसारिकम् = the worldly; दुःखम् = misery;
न = not; वीक्षे = I don't see; अहम् धन्यः अहम्
धन्यः = I am indeed content; स्वस्य अज्ञानम् = the
ignorance of Self; क्वापि = somewhere; पलायितम् =
has run away.

I am indeed totally fulfilled, for the worldly sorrows are no more seen now, and I am indeed content. Where has the ignorance of the Self run away? (293)

I do not know where the miseries have disappeared. I am not able to see them anywhere. What a joy? Where has my ignorance gone?

The negation of Self-ignorance leads to joy of fulfilment in action and achievements ----

धन्योऽहं धन्योऽहं कर्तव्यं मे न विद्यते किञ्चित् ।
धन्योऽहं धन्योऽहं प्राप्तव्यं सर्वमद्य संपन्नम् ॥२९४॥

Dhanyo'ham dhanyo'ham kartavyam me na vidyate kiñcit
Dhanyo'ham dhanyo'ham prāptavyam sarvamadya saṁpannam (294)

धन्यः अहम् धन्यः अहम् = I am certainly blessed one;
मे = for me; किञ्चित् = a bit; कर्तव्यम् = duty; न विद्यते
= is not left; धन्यः अहम् धन्यः अहम् = I am indeed
fulfilled; प्राप्तव्यं = the gain of life; सर्वम् = all that; अद्य
= now; सम्पन्नम् = is gained.

I am indeed blessed, for not a bit of duty is left for me in this world. I am indeed fulfilled, for I have gained all that I had to! (294)

I am completely fulfilled because, *me kartavyam na vidyate*; I have no more any need to act, for the sake of duty, in this world.

Lord Kṛṣṇa says in *Gītā* (III-17):

'The man who rejoices in his own Being, who is contented in the *Brahman* alone, he has no obligatory duty.'

We tend to be obsessed by duty-orientation too long in life. Obligated as we are to fulfil certain obligations towards one's duties, we should also know when we should go beyond the limitations of duty-orientation.

Duty-orientation implies continued acceptance of doership and the responsibility of doership. The real fulfilment is to transcend the barriers of duty-orientation.

Lord Kṛṣṇa says in *Gītā* (III-22) 'By my very presence things start happening. I have no duty, yet I am doing.'

Praptavyam sarvam adya sampannam-I have attained everything!!

This fulfilment of crossing the barrier of duty in one's life is explained ----

धन्योऽहं धन्योऽहं तृप्तेर्मे कोपमा भवेल्लोके ।

धन्योऽहं धन्योऽहं धन्यो धन्यः पुनः पुनर्धन्यः ॥२९५॥

Dhanyo'ham dhanyo'ham tṛpter me kopamā bhavet lloke
Dhanyo'ham dhanyo'ham dhanyo dhanyaḥ punaḥ punar dhanyaḥ (295)

धन्यः अहम् धन्यः अहम् = I am certainly blessed;
मे तृप्तेः = of my contentment; उपमा = simile; लोके
= in this world; का भवेत् = can be?; अहम् धन्यः
अहम् धन्यः = I am doubly blessed; धन्यः धन्यः

= blessed; पुनः पुनः धन्यः = again and again blessed indeed.

I find myself manifold blessed and there is no simile, for my contentment in this world. How can any worldly contentment be compared with mine? (295)

In the joy of realisation, the *mumukṣu* does not know what to say. He keeps repeating himself. This condition is brought out very vividly in Chapter XI verses 39 & 40 of the *Bhagavad Gītā* where *Arjuna* cannot find words to express his wonder and exhilaration after seeing the *Viśvarūpa Darśana*. He was so overawed that he could not go beyond 'I hail you from every side' etc. It is a joy of total destruction of individuality.

Tṛpteh me kā upamā bhavet loka-Can anything in the world be compared to this fulfilment? Like a frog in the well wanting to know how much water is there in the ocean, how can the infinity of this bliss be compared to the limited, finite, small joys of this world?

The fulfilment is also on remembering the culmination of merit in the past ----

अहो पुण्यमहो पुण्यं फलितं फलितं दृढम् ।

अस्य पुण्यस्य संपत्तेरहो वयमहो वयम् ॥२९६॥

Aho puṇya maho puṇyam phalitaṁ phalitaṁ dṛḍham
Asya puṇyasya sampatter aho vayamaho vayam (296)

अहो पुण्यम् अहो पुण्यम् = the merit of the past;
फलितम् फलिम् दृढम् = is now fully matured to bliss;
अस्य पुण्यस्य = of such merit; संपत्तेः = acquisition of;
अहो वयम् अहो वयम् = we are blessed again and again.

The merits of the past have reached full maturity in attaining this state of blessedness. It is indeed a great joy and fulfilment to have acquired such a merit. (296)

Aho puṇyam aho puṇyam phalitam phalitam dṛḍham- My *puṇya karma* has borne fruit in a very firm, enduring way. My *sādhana* is fulfilled Oh, the great merit that I have acquired on the strength of the spiritual *sādhana* and all the *puṇyā-s* I have done, I have today arrived at the right destination of my life!

All those factors that have helped me in arriving at the Self Knowledge, are also contributors to fulfilment----

अहो शास्त्रमहो शास्त्रमहो गुरुहो गुरुः ।
अहो ज्ञानमहो ज्ञानमहो सुखमहो सुखम् ॥२९७॥

Aho śāstra maho śāstram aho guru raho guruḥ
Aho jñāna maho jñānam aho sukha maho sukham (297)

अहो शास्त्रम् अहो शास्त्रम् = Great indeed are the scriptures;
अहो गुरुः अहो गुरुः = indebted to the Master who revealed the Truth to me!; अहो ज्ञानम् अहो ज्ञानम् = Great indeed is the knowledge; अहो सुखम् अहो सुखम् = Great is the joy Supreme!

Great are indeed the scriptures that gave the knowledge; great is indeed the *guru* who revealed the scriptural knowledge to me. Great is the Self knowledge. Greatest is the bliss of Self knowledge! (297)

Every remembrance of the scriptures, teacher etc. brings the joy of being in their care during *sādhana* and now having arrived at one's real Abode!

As in most of the chapters, the concluding *śloka* describes the benefits of the study and reflection on this chapter----

Phāla Śrutiḥ---

तृप्तिदीपमिमं नित्यं येऽनुसंदधते बुधाः ।
ब्रह्मानन्दे निमज्जन्तस्ते तृप्यन्ति निरन्तरम् ॥२९८॥

Tṛpti dīpa mimam nityam ye'nu sandadhate budhāḥ
Brahmānande nimajjantas te tṛpyanti nirantaram (298)

ये बुधाः = those wise seekers; इमम् तृप्ति दीपम् = this chapter entitled as '*tṛpti dīpa*'; नित्यम् = regularly; अनुसन्दधते = contemplate upon; ते = they; ब्रह्मानन्दे = in the bliss infinite; निमज्जन्तः = having immersed; निरन्तरम् = eternally; तृप्यन्ति = discover unlimited Bliss.

Those wise seekers who study, reflect and contemplate on this chapter entitled *tṛpti dīpa* regularly, thus having immersed in the infinite bliss attain eternal fulfilment! (298)

The spiritual evolution is like the unfoldment of a bud into a full bloom flower. Let it happen at its own pace. What we have to do is to keep the thoughts in the same channel of thinking as explained in this chapter. When these thoughts are no more retained in the book, but become part of our understanding, the knowledge will start revealing its glory - where there will be knowledge without a knower, where there will be joy without an enjoyer, where there will be action without a doer! **This loss of individual entity is the real gain in spiritual unfoldment!**

OM TAT SAT

Verse No.	Subject matter covered	Page.
1-2	Subject matter as taken from <i>Bṛ Up.</i> 4-4-12 and the purpose of this study.	608
3-18	The meaning of the word <i>pūruṣaḥ</i> explained.	611
19-21	Meaning of the word “ <i>ayam</i> ” is explained.	631
22-27	‘ <i>Ayam</i> ’ further elaborated with the help of the story of ten ignorant persons.	634
28-34	The seven stages of ignorance leading to knowledge, belong to <i>jīva</i> .	640
35-37	These seven states include bondage and liberation for the <i>jīva</i> .	647
38-43	The seven stages cannot belong to <i>jīva</i> ---objection raised and cleared -- first three steps taken up for discussion	649
44-96	The fourth and fifth stages viz. -- <i>parokṣa</i> and <i>aparokṣa jñānam</i> explained.	655
97-109	The strengthening of <i>aparokṣa jñānam</i> is done by study of scriptures etc.	732
110-134	The cause of <i>viparītā bhāvanā</i> and its effects and the remedy to remove it. Here the explanation of first half of the <i>mantra</i> i.e. <i>ātmānam cet.. pūruṣaḥ</i> concludes.	751
135-145	The second half of the <i>mantra-s</i> is taken for discussion. <i>Prārabdha karma</i> and its effect on the wise etc...	782

Verse No.	Subject matter covered	Page.
146-151	<i>Nirāṅkuṣā tṛptiḥ</i> and its nature in the wise....	794
152-162	Eruption of desires due to <i>prarabdha</i> can be seen in spite of discrimination.	801
163-168	Desires and <i>prārabdha</i> -- as seen in the side and its implications.	813
169-175	Effects of <i>prārabdha</i> on the wise and ignorant and their vision.	821
176-189	Is the knowledge about the illusion of the world and <i>prārabdha</i> opposed to each other ?	833
190-191	“ <i>kim icchan</i> ”---elaborated.	849
192-222	<i>Kasya kāmāya</i> -- explained.	851
223-229	Impact of body infliction for the wise and its nature....	891
230-233	What is the position of body infliction -- under ignorance and delusion.	898
234-241	Absence of miseries for the wise....	903
242-250	Can the <i>cidābhāsa jīva</i> ever put efforts for its own annihilation ?	913
251-291	The <i>nirāṅkuṣā tṛptiḥ</i> of the <i>jīva</i> .	923
292-297	The nature of <i>nirāṅkuṣā tṛptiḥ</i>	970
298	The <i>phala śrutiḥ</i> (result) of the study, reflection and enquiry of this chapter is attainment of <i>nirāṅkuṣā tṛptiḥ</i> .	975