

Vedanta Madhuryam

Salutations to all.

Yet another month has passed. As Sankara beautifully puts it, time plays and age passes by. What is still not achieved is getting rid of desires through realization of one's very nature of Brahman. Realization of Brahman shouldn't be postponed as tomorrow or later never comes. Hence sadhakas have to strive for realization of Brahman or moksha here and now itself.

In order to understand the seriousness of our sorrow experienced from the world we just have to look at the world (or events in the world). We find that in the past years there have been many natural calamities like earthquakes, tsunami, hurricanes etc. And these natural calamities are still continuing. We find the sleepless city of the world, that city which is said to control the entire world through stock markets, the city of New York, being affected heavily by the latest hurricane of Sandy (that affected the Caribbean, Bahamas and the eastern portions of the United States). We find as to how life changes within fraction of a moment. Though with respect to science and technology we have progressed a lot, nobody could predict (just before few days) that such a huge disaster in the form of Sandy would strike the United States. And what such a disaster leaves behind is people struggling to get their lives back to normalcy. At least those who are alive can try to forget things and catch up on life again. But what about those who gave up their lives during this natural calamity? They don't have a second chance in this life. They will have to try their luck in the next birth. Though the chain of birth and death continues again and again still there is no surety that we will be able to continue towards the goal of moksha at a later time.

Such natural calamities thereby show us as to how volatile life is in this world, hence Sankra says that life is so volatile like the water on a lotus leaf. Just remembering this in order to brood or enjoy life to the fullest isn't the wise decision. The wise decision is to strive to realize Brahman or attain the goal of moksha here and now itself without any delay. Any delay will postpone things indefinitely and we don't know how long this birth continues.

Thus all sadhakas should strive for moksha here and now itself. Sankara thus says to contemplate on govinda or seek govinda rather than just going through grammar lessons (or performing any worldly activities of any kind).

Realization of Brahman can happen only through knowledge and knowledge is only found in the shastras. Shastras are termed as Vedanta as they end knowledge completely – by making us realize the essence of everything (that by knowing which everything becomes known and nothing else remains to be known or attained).

Many think Vedanta is very tough to learn but it is very simple to learn and much simpler to implement as well. What is required is just the desire for knowledge (and moksha); thereby through delving deep into Vedanta we will find that Vedanta has sweetness which we cannot find anywhere else. All other sweetness of the world will leave us desiring for more (leaving leading to any contentment) whereas this sweetness once experienced will make us addicted or focused on it and more and more we experience the sweetness, the more and more blissful we will come. Vedanta slowly will take us to the state of ever-contented living. The purpose of this magazine is to show advanced concepts or various deep nuances of Vedanta which will bring out the sweetness in such a way that we will get addicted to it and we will stop until we are ever blissful in constant contemplation or living of Vedanta (or the subject-matter of Vedanta as Brahman).

May the ultimate reality of Brahman guide us towards relishing the sweetness of Vedanta so that we will be able to realize Brahman and ever rejoice in bliss here and now itself.

AUM NAMA SHIVAYA

Nov 2nd

Aukramaanika

Vedanta Madhuryam	1
Jeeva Brahmaatma Siddhi.....	4
Chathussutra Prakaashah	12
Avidyaa Prakaashah	18
Jeeva Nirnaya	28
Aukramaanika Nirdesham	31

Jeeva Brahmaatma Siddhi

Jeeva

In this world we find that there are so many experiences of different kinds that we undergo each and every day. Experiences in one day itself is huge so what to talk about experiences that we gain from one birth to another. And as Sankara says a person goes from birth to death to birth to death until realization or moksha.

The concepts of moksha as well as all experiences are focused on the entity of "I". This "I" or individuality is called jeeva generally. Though everybody in the world accept jeeva or "I" to be existing at all times, as to what this jeeva there are various different views. The charvakas say that jeeva is the body; few other charvakas say that jeeva is the sense organs, prana, indriya and manas. The jains say that jeeva is something which constantly changes or evolves until reaching the highest goal. Buddhists variously say that jeeva is shoonya or is changing consciousness. Nyaaya and Vaisheshika systems say that jeeva is a padaartha endowed with the guna or quality of knowledge. Sankhya and Yoga systems say that jeeva is purusha distinct from prakrithi but is benefitted by enjoyment from materials of prakrithi as well as moksha while realizing his total detachment from prakrithi (kevalaavasthaa). Mimaamsakas say that jeeva is Consciousness with ignorance. Vedantins variously say that jeeva is distinct from Brahman, same and distinct from Brahman, same from Brahman etc.

These various distinct views have to be sorted and this requires analysis of jeeva. Without knowing about jeeva, moksha is impossible because moksha is for the jeeva. With jeeva being clarified, moksha also becomes clear. Moksha since depending on jeeva, therefore it is essential to define jeeva. As per Vedanta (Advaita Vedanta), knowing jeeva really is moksha (this means when we figure out who jeeva really is, that is moksha and then we will be instantly liberated).

I don't want moksha, I am happy as I am. So then why is it essential to know jeeva?

Jeeva means ourself. If we aren't able to know our own Self, then what is the point of knowing anything else in the world. Any other knowledge of the world will be futile without knowing our own very nature. And we call a person a mad person who doesn't know his own very nature. Thus it is essential to know as to what is jeeva.

Jeeva – “I” or Consciousness associated with intellect

It is a generally accepted notion that jeeva is Consciousness that is reflected in the intellect (buddhigata chaitanyaprathibimba eva jeevah). This means that is a pure consciousness which is often termed as kutastha or saakshi – this Consciousness is a mere witness to all activities that happen with respect to the adjuncts of body, sense organs, mind and intellect. But if this Consciousness is a mere witness then what propagates the adjuncts to work or perform activities? That is the reflection of Consciousness in the intellect. Because of being close to Consciousness, this reflected Consciousness (which is reflection of Consciousness in the reflection medium of intellect) appears as if sentient. This is like an iron piece appearing as if a ball of fire due to proximity with fire.

Vedanta gives the analogy of space or akaasha to illustrate as to how Brahman becomes as if limited by various adjuncts. Thereby it appears inside the adjuncts like mahaakaasha or infinite space appears as if limited when inside a pot (though essentially space is without any limitations). Now this pot has water in it. The pot-space gets reflected in the water and thereby becomes reflected pot-space. This reflected pot-space is called as jeeva (or RC or reflected Consciousness) whereas pot-space is called kutastha (or OC or original Consciousness).

The Lord says in the 15th chapter of Gita that when one body is given up, the sookshma shareera gets out and gets into a new body even as air takes away fragrance from one flower. Thus in the next birth, the sookshma shareera is continued. Here sookshma shareera includes buddhi or intellect and the Consciousness reflected in the buddhi, which means that jeeva also goes from one birth to another. It is good to remember that birth and death are of the body and jeeva just goes from one birth to another even as a person changes from one dress to another.

But is this jeeva real? Is RC jeeva’s real nature?

The answer to this would have to be no. As to why, the simple reason is because it is not eternal. As Hastamalaka beautifully points out, the reflection of one’s face in a mirror is non-existent without the original face. Similarly RC has no existence without OC. And RC or jeeva by itself is an illusion because buddhi which is created out of Maya itself is an illusion. Thus the notion of Consciousness getting reflected in buddhi itself not true.

Jeeva – not a reflection

Of course if we start terming everything to be illusions then we will end up with absolutely nothing as real. But this is a fact that everything is an illusion except the ultimate reality of Brahman. This Brahman alone is real – absolutely everything apart from Brahman is just an illusion or empirically appearing to exist.

Vedanta thus says that there are two levels of reality – one is the empirical level where duality is accepted; the other is ultimate level where Brahman alone exists. Empirically jeeva is accepted as existing but ultimately jeeva cannot have any existence as a reflection.

If empirically jeeva is accepted then why negate it as a reflection? If it is answered that ultimately we have to get rid of jeeva as reflection, then that is not needed as ultimately Brahman alone exists, no jeeva even exists to be negated. The answer to this doubt is that empirically also jeeva has to be known to be not a reflection; in other words, jeeva's nature of being reflected Consciousness has to be negated if we have to get rid of sorrow. All sorrows are caused due to jeeva being limited in nature. Jeeva as a reflection is limited in nature. And until we negate jeeva as a reflection, we will not be able to get rid of sorrows. And negation of jeeva as reflection only means we don't accept jeeva as a reflection in the mind. Externally the activities of the reflected Consciousness still continue. But jeeva, or the "I" inside us, isn't accepted as Reflected Consciousness.

Or from a different perspective, water may be perceived in the desert. It is not required to get rid of water, as we can never get rid of that which doesn't exist. What is required is to know that water doesn't exist, in the mind. Still externally water may be perceived but it is known as not existing therefore empirically it doesn't pose any obstacle at all. Thus ultimately it is required to remember the ultimate truth of Brahman in the mind while experiencing empirical world so that the world doesn't pose any problems though one may still live in the world (the Lord says that this is like the lotus leaf which is in water but doesn't get tainted by the water – similarly a jnaani lives in the world but isn't affected by the world through contemplation of Brahman alone existing in the mind).

Concluding, it has to be mentioned that if jeeva is a reflection then there wouldn't any progress towards moksha; because a reflection can never become the original Consciousness and be blissful. If it is argued that knowing I as kutastha and jeeva being just an illusion will lead to moksha then it would be like negating our own existence as jeeva

stands for "I" or oneself. This "I" has to be known as OC and not RC but that would mean that jeeva is kutastha and not RC (rather than saying that jeeva is reflection and we have to merely identify with kutastha).

Ultimately jeeva is "I" – that this "I" has no association with anything in the world can be proven through direct experience that I never changes but everything around I changes. Thus the notion of this jeeva as associated with world is the cause of all sorrow – this is termed by Sankara as adhyaasa and called as ajnaana or ignorance of real I which is unaffected, untainted, blissful and non-dual.

Brahman-Atman

Since it is clear that jeeva isn't a reflection, we have to now focus ourselves on the ultimate reality of Brahman before trying to prove that jeeva is Brahman (and not mere reflection).

Brahman is the cause-substratum of the world that is currently perceived. Brahman is the cause when the world is considered as an effect (and real or appearing as if real). But the moment we figure out that the world is always changing and therefore illusory, we will have to say that Brahman is the substratum of the world (that substratum in which the illusion of world appears as existing).

Brahman is of the nature of Existence, Consciousness and Bliss (and infinite or unlimited). When we analyze jeeva or I, we find out that I always exist, is ever shining and is blissful as it is never hated. Thus I am also of the nature of Existence, Consciousness and Bliss. Thus very clearly it is proven that jeeva or I am Brahman.

But if I am Brahman then who performs activities in the world?

The activities of the world are performed by the reflected Consciousness. Since RC still exists as long as buddhi and the world are considered as existing, therefore activities of the world continue with respect to RC. And since jeeva is realized as Brahman or OC therefore a person doesn't get affected by any activities, sorrow, tainting etc. of RC (or buddhi or antah karana).

Generally I which is one with Brahman is called Atman or Self. But since jeeva is I which ever exists therefore we have to say that jeeva is this Brahman-Atman or that which alone ultimately exists.

Jeeva – Brahmaatmaa

Thus it is very clear that jeeva or I am Brahman-Atman. The difference between Brahman and Atman is that Brahman is unlimited always and never subject to any seemingly limitations whereas Atman appears as if limited with respect to the adjuncts of the three bodies of gross, subtle and causal. Brahman is the infinite space which never is limited; but when space appears as if limited by a pot, then pot-space or Atman comes into existence. Ultimately this pot-space and infinite-space are one and the same only.

If it be argued that adjuncts or upaadhis are there, therefore pot-space and infinite-space are not the same, then it is true as long as upaadhis exist. Upaadhis will not always be there and essentially as well pot-space and infinite-space are the same always.

With respect to Brahman and Atman, the upaadhis of bodies are unreal (always changing hence illusion or unreal). Therefore it is very clearly proven that Brahman and Atman are one and the same only. The Lord calls Brahman as *uttama purusha* and Atman as *kutastha* in the 15th chapter of Gita.

It can be argued that the Lord says that the *uttama purusha* is different from both *kshara* (RC) and *akshara* (or *kutastha* or OC) but the Lord says the difference with respect to activities of the world (as he says that the *uttama purusha* supports the entire world). Remove the world and we will find that there is no difference between *uttama purusha* and *kutastha*. And since the world is constantly changing and therefore illusory therefore removing the world isn't necessary (as the world itself doesn't exist). Thus it is very clear that *uttama purusha* and *kutastha* are one and the same. Thus I am jeeva which is Brahman-Atman in nature.

Jeeva – one alone

There are many analysis undertaken with respect to jeeva being one or many. When we consider RC it is clear that it is many. As many buddhis are there, so many RCs will exist. But since it has been proven that jeeva is Brahman alone therefore there is no confusion as to whether jeeva is one or many. Thus Jeeva is one alone.

If jeeva is Atman or *kutastha* then wouldn't there be many jeevas (as many as upaadhis)?

No, due to the rule of simplicity (laaghava) we can say that jeeva is one alone. And considering upaadhis jeevas appear as many but ultimately jeeva is one alone, even as space appears as many with respect to upaadhis but is one alone at all times.

There have been many objections raised with respect to one jeeva or one Atman concept; primarily being that if the Self in me is the Self in you then I should know your mind. But such objections are foolish because equality between Self is mentioned, not between RCs or upaadhis. Since the Self has no part in activities and since there is no association whatsoever with the upaadhis, therefore whatever happens in upaadhis will not affect the Self (means Self will not know anything about the upaadhis).

If it be argued that Vedanta says that a person who knows Brahman knows everything, then this statement means the person will know everything to be essentially Brahman and thereby will end all knowledge. When a person has known all gold ornaments to be gold alone, then what else is there to be known? Should he know the nature of various ornaments? Definitely not needed. If still doubts/arguments are there, then we can visit a goldsmith and put forth the questions (and we will figure out the truth ourselves).

All arguments with respect to one Self is due to not understanding the two levels of reality as empirical and ultimate. Empirically everything exists and is accepted but once ultimate knowledge is gained, these are just qualified as "illusions" or "unreal". This is the ultimate viewpoint that Brahman alone exists. But empirically this Brahman appears as existing in many names and forms; since these names and forms don't affect Brahman in any way, therefore there is no harm in accepting them. As to a jnaani, he doesn't accept many even from a worldly perspective because his mind converts all duality into one Brahman. Therefore irrespective of whatever happens in the world, he is able to ever rejoice in bliss.

Jnaana – way to moksha

Ajnaana makes us feel as if I jeeva am RC. When this ajnaana vanishes through knowledge, as got from the shastras, then I realize that I am Brahman. Once this knowledge that I am Brahman dawns, there is no sorrow because there is nothing apart from Brahman (for sorrow to be caused) and because Brahman is blissful in nature (as Brahman is blissful and bliss alone exists, there cannot be any sorrow at all).

The state where a person gets rid of sorrow completely and ever rejoices in bliss is the state of moksha (liberation from bondage and sorrow). Moksha is ever present as jeeva is Brahman always. But due to ignorance and superimposition of jeeva on reflected consciousness, I experience sorrow (or appear as experiencing sorrow). This means that sorrows of the body, mind, intellect, objects and people are superimposed on jeeva. The moment knowledge dawns that I am jeeva, then all sorrows instantly vanish. Thereby a person then ever rejoices in bliss at all times. Thus knowing jeeva or I to be Brahman gives instant moksha or makes I ever rejoice in bliss instantly.

Conclusion

Though all analysis here has been from a logical perspective it isn't tough to prove through sruthi and anubhava as well that jeeva or I am Brahman alone (as nothing apart from Brahman ever exists). This jeeva or I appears as Reflected Consciousness and thereby experiences sorrow. This appearance of jeeva as RC is due to adhyaasa. The moment a person realizes his very nature of Brahman, then adhyaasa vanishes (this is through adhyaaropa or negation and through knowledge of Brahman). Then a person realizes that jeeva is Brahman alone; since this Brahman is blissful and non-dual in nature, therefore such a person thereby ever rejoices in bliss.

In essence each and every one of us, jeeva or I, are Brahman alone. This one Brahman alone exists, though differences appear in the world even like differences appear in the dream world but aren't real. Through contemplation of Brahman, anusandhaanam, which alone exists as the entire world and as our very nature of jeeva, we will be able to ever rejoice in bliss.

May we all strive to remember jeeva, I, as Brahman that ultimate reality which alone exists here so that through contemplation we will be able to get rid of sorrows and will be able to ever rejoice in bliss here and now itself.

Anumaanas to prove jeeva is Brahman

जीवो ब्रह्मैव, अहं स्फुरणस्य सच्चिदानन्दरूपत्वात्, ब्रह्मवत् ।१ ।

jīvo brahmaiva, ahaṁ sphuraṇasya saccidānandarupatvāt, brahmavat|1|

1. Jeeva is Brahman alone, due to the pulsation of I (jeeva) being of the nature of Sat, Chit and Ananda (Existence, Consciousness and Bliss), like Brahman.

जीवः कूटस्थैव न चिदाभासः, नित्यत्वात् ब्रह्मस्वरूपत्वाच्च, ब्रह्मवत् ।२ ।

jīvaḥ kūṭasthaiva na cidābhāsaḥ, nityatvāt brahmasvarupatvācca, brahmavat|2|

2. Jeeva is kutastha alone; not Reflected Consciousness, due to being real and of the nature of Brahman, like Brahman.

कूटस्थो ब्रह्मैव, उपाधिनिमित्तभेदस्य मिथ्यात्वात्, घटाकाशवत् ।३ ।

kūṭastho brahmaiva, upādhinimittabhedasya mithyātvāt, ghaṭākāśavat|3|

3. Kutastha is Brahman alone, due to difference created by upaadhi being an illusion, like pot-space.

उपाधिः न मिथ्या, दृष्टत्वात्, घटादिवत् ।४ ।

upādhiḥ na mithyā, dṛṣṭatvāt, ghaṭādivat|4|

4. Upaadhi (itself) isn't an illusion (difference created by upaadhi alone is real), due to being perceived, like pot etc. (due to being upaadhi perceived in the case of pot, room etc. with respect to space therefore upaadhi itself isn't an illusion).

Summarizing Sloka

जीवो ब्रह्मैव निश्चयात् स्फुरणादहमित्यतः ।

सच्चिदानन्दब्रह्मणः तदैक्यलक्षणात्ततः ॥

jīvo brahmaiva niścayāt sphuraṇādahamityataḥ|

saccidānandabrahmaṇaḥ tदैक्यलक्षणात्ततः ॥

Jeeva is definitely Brahman, because of the pulsation of "I" and due to the quality of its oneness with Brahman of the nature of Sat Chit Ananda (Existence, Consciousness and Bliss).

Chathussutra Prakaashah

Shareeraka Nyaaya Sangraha

First Sutra

अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा

athāto brahmajijñāsā

Now, therefore let us desire to know Brahman.

We saw in the previous couple of magazines Prakashatman first saying that knowledge is the only means of realization and after mentioning the three anubandhas, he put forth purvapaksha statements saying that enquiry into Brahman cannot be started because the three anubandhas don't exist at all. This is that there is no phala, adhikaari and vishaya for enquiry.

Let's now continue and see Prakashatman's answering of purvapaksha statements and proving that enquiry into Brahman can and should be started.

Literal Translation of the work

Of statements like "that has to be known", "he is to be enquired", "to be listened, reflected and contemplated", "see the Atman" which mention the vidhi of vichaara (injunction of enquiry) and accepting oneness thereby of learning the prakaranas of scriptures, statements like "Brigu is vaaruni", "analyzing the world", "thereby the worlds filled with action is conquered", "desiring the Self everything becomes dear", "controlling the mind and senses", "knower of Self crosses over sorrow", "knowing Brahman, one becomes Brahman alone" all collectively pointing out activities with respect to Brahman alone for special adhikaaris endowed with saadhana chathustayam, enquiry described as different (and opposing) to karma or actions with vishaya or subject which is attained not through any other means, and its goal which is phala anubandha (or fruit) being explained as illusoriness of bondage, therefore for a adhikaari endowed with saadhana chathustayam and getting rid of bondage being the fruit, enquiry into Brahman through the statements of Vedanta by supporting the three anubandhas the starting of this scripture (shaastra) is shown.

Self-enquiry – propounded by the shaastra

Though there are so many darshanas or philosophies or philosophical systems available yet it is in Vedanta that we find knowledge ending. Knowledge ending means that a person becomes contented and there is nothing more to know (or attain). This state of total contentment is one without any sorrows and with bliss. This state is called as moksha and is sought out by all darshanas. All darshanas target this state of blissful existence or moksha though they describe the ways to it variously.

Some may argue that all paths lead to Rome therefore any path is fine. This is a wrong notion. Though each and every path in the world leads to moksha as realization of Brahman because Brahman is the substratum of the entire world; in other words the entire world is Brahman alone (the differences appearing in the world are mere names and forms) and therefore all paths lead us to Brahman alone. But what if a path preaches the goal different from Brahman? Then even though we may come to learn about Brahman we will reject it because our goal is something different. Hence sadhakas have to be very careful in choosing the path towards moksha or Brahman.

Though there are many paths that help in purifying the mind and gaining concentration of the mind there is only one way to moksha. The way to moksha is through knowledge alone as ignorance is the cause of all sorrow. This knowledge is knowledge about one's very nature of Brahman. And since Brahman is only found in the shaastras therefore shaastras are to be learnt (or enquiry into Brahman through the shaastras is the way to moksha). This is what differentiates all other systems from Vedanta, that shaastras are the ultimate authority to Brahman and therefore shaastras have to be listened, reflected and contemplated upon.

It is well known that shaastras are the very breath of Brahmaa and therefore they are the most valid pramana or means of knowledge that we have. If it be argued that anubhava or one's direct experience is the ultimate pramana and shaastras also will be proved wrong if one's anubhava is against it, then we are again wrong. We experience water in desert; we experience the dream world; how do we know what is real and what isn't? All are our direct experience or anubhava. Thus we need a source like shaastras which are the anubhava of rishis from ancient times. Shaastras thus have been tested and verified from time immemorial. Thus there is no fault in the shaastras and they have to be accepted as the ultimate means. And when we follow the path that shaastras set forth for us (that of

knowledge) we will find that shastras don't go against our anubhava. Generally our anubhava is split into two – anubhava of vishaya and anubhava of vishayee or subject; first being experience of the external world isn't authentic as the world itself constantly changes. The second being experience of the Subject (the I that pulsates inside us as I-exist, I-exist) which never changes is authentic. Our anubhava is generally focused on the external world and not the subject. The shastras make us introverted and experience our own Self – through this shastras prove us to that the anubhava of Self is eternal (and the external world's experience which we were always having isn't real). Thus shastras don't go against anubhava as well.

Why so much analysis on the shastras?

It is essential to prove or make a person understand that shastras the ultimate proof. And then we will find that what Prakashatman does here is just quote from the shastras thereby showing the three anubandha of phala, adhikaari and vishaya are all there in Vedanta.

Phalaanubandha

The fruit of all activities is moksha. But then we assume that moksha isn't already there and bandha is there. There will be objection that moksha being newly attained, it will not be eternal. And if moksha is already there then is there bandha or not? If bandha is there, then it will never vanish. If bandha isn't there then there is no need of any enquiry at all. Thus in whatever way we analyze we will come to conclusion that enquiry cannot be started.

But this is not so. If bandha is not real and the fruit of enquiry be illusoriness of bandha, then enquiry has to be started. Enquiry is valid as bandha is currently experienced and considered as real. Removal of bandha thus is the fruit of enquiry. But since bandha itself is mithyaa or illusory therefore removal here is just knowledge of bandha being illusory. Therefore there is neither bandha ever existing/never vanishing nor bandha not being experienced.

If bandha is illusory then it only means that moksha is ever present. Moksha isn't something to be attained. We just have to know that bandha is an illusion. Any illusion appears as real when we experience it but once we know its substratum then we realize that it never even existed. Similarly bandha when experienced makes us feel sad but through knowledge of

shaastras we find the bandha isn't real; thereby sorrow ends and there will be only blissful experience remaining behind.

To conclude, phalaanubandha is bandha mithyaatva siddhi or bandha mithyaatva jnaanam or knowing the illusoriness of bondage. This phalaanubandha thus exists and is valid.

Adhikaaryanubandha

Since bandha is to be known as illusory, therefore shaastras prescribe activities with respect to an adhikaari. This adhikaari does exist as bandha is experienced and removal of bandha is the goal or fruit to be achieved. This adhikaari's main duty is to know about Brahman – all activities are with respect to Brahman alone. Vedanta says also that such an adhikaari needs to have four-fold qualifications or saadhana chathustayam.

The four-fold qualifications are viveka, vairagya, shamaadi shatka sampatti and mumukshutvam.

1. Viveka – viveka is discrimination between real and unreal. This is the conviction that Brahman alone is real and the world is temporary/illusory/unreal.
2. Vairagya – we can say that viveka is theoretical whereas vairagya is implementation of viveka. Vairagya is two-fold. First is lower vairagya which is dispassion towards the world through knowing its nature to be temporary and sorrowful. Second is higher vairagya which is passion towards Brahman knowing that Brahman alone is real and blissful.
3. Shamaadi shatka sampatti – six qualities of the mind. Though viveka and vairagya might be there in little amount, it is essential for the mind to stick unto them. For this the mind needs to become capable. There are six qualities that are required for the mind in order to make it capable to gain and implement knowledge. These are shama or calmness of the mind, dama or control of sense organs, uparathi or withdrawal of sense organs from their objects, titiksha or forbearance at times of testing, sraddhaa or faith in Guru & shaastras and samaadhaana or tranquility of the mind (ability of mind to continuously focus on the Self or Brahman alone).
4. Mumukshutvam – all the above three saadhanas are futile if the sadhaka isn't focused on the goal of moksha. Thus mumukshutva or desire for liberation is very essential for a sadhaka.

Though acharyas say that without these four qualifications, a sadhaka will not be able to gain knowledge, we have to modify it a bit and say that though a sadhaka can gain knowledge the knowledge will not be fruitful or useful unless sadhana chathustayam is there. Without viveka one will not have conviction on knowledge gained thereby leading to non-implementation of knowledge. Without vairagya there will not be passion on Brahman as the subject of knowledge thereby leading to non-implementation of knowledge (through not contemplation of Brahman). Without shamaadi the mind will not be able to either gain knowledge or remember and implement knowledge. Without mumukshutva, there will not be any focus on the goal of jnaana as moksha – and thereby though gaining knowledge, it will just boost the ego and not lead to realization of Brahman.

Thus it is very clear that only an adhikaari with sadhana chathustayam is capable of implementing knowledge or making knowledge fruitful (by being lead to moksha). Since shaastras talk about adhikaari and there is a phala to be achieved, therefore adhikaari anubandha is valid.

Vishayaanubandha

The subject-matter of enquiry is Brahman. Though Brahman is one's own nature it is not known. Thus the subject-matter of Brahman is something not attained through any means other than vichaara (enquiry into oneself through the shaastras). Thus vishaya of enquiry is something newly attained.

Really speaking Brahman is not newly attained. Brahman or moksha is already there. But before vichaara, a person has forgotten Brahman (seemingly forgotten Brahman). And the direct proof for this is lack of rejoicing in bliss and experience of sorrow. Therefore for such a person, the vishaya or subject-matter is new (or not already attained). If it be argued that this subject-matter can be attained through many means, then it is wrong. This subject-matter being the substratum of the entire world and one's very nature of pure Consciousness, and because of all worldly sciences focusing on the external world of names and forms, therefore it is not attained through any other means than the shaastras. Thus the shaastras are the mirror in which we see our own face. Since we have forgotten our own face therefore our face is newly attained and not attained through any other means than the mirror.

Brahman being our very nature of Consciousness that has been seemingly forgotten has to be attained through the mirror of shastras; therefore the vishaya or subject-matter of enquiry which is Brahman (or shastras) is valid.

Self-enquiry - valid

Since it is proven above that the three anubandhas of phala or fruit, adhikaari or eligible person and vishaya or subject-matter are valid with respect to enquiry into shastras or into Brahman as found in the shastras, therefore self-enquiry is valid. All objections raised by purvapakshin (discussed in previous magazine) has thus been negated or countered.

Thus Prakashatman concludes by saying that through the first sutra it is pointed out that enquiry of Brahman is to be started or conducted.

Summary of first sutra

We have thus come to the end of analysis of first sutra as per the work of Prakashatman We should just remember that Brahman is to be enquired; or Brahman alone is to be enquired/

Why?

Because

- Brahman alone is real
- Brahman alone is blissful
- Brahman is our very nature of "I"
- The world is an illusion
- The "I" associated with the world is just an illusion (or wrong knowledge)
- Sorrow is experienced and we want to get rid of sorrow and ever rejoice in bliss

Though Brahman is well known as the non-dual reality of the nature of Existence, Consciousness, Bliss and the substratum of the entire world, still a thorough analysis as per the shastras is essential. And therefore Vyaasa first explains the term of Brahman in the second sutra (analysis of which we will see from the next magazine).

May the master of Prakashatman as Brahman guide us to enquiry into Brahman now itself so that through gaining knowledge of Brahman as found in the shastras we will be able to get rid of sorrows and ever rejoice in bliss here and now itself.

Avidyaa Prakaashah

We have seen in the previous couple of magazines illogicality of avidya with respect to its support (asraya) and its veiling of Brahman (tirodhana).

Asraya

The purvapakshin says that avidyaa cannot be supported by Brahman because Brahman is self-luminous in nature and will lead to duality (as avidyaa becomes another entity). Avidyaa also cannot be supported by jeeva who himself isn't real and dependent on avidyaa itself for his very existence. Thus, the purvapakshin concluded that avidyaa is illogical and so is the system of Advaita Vedanta which bases itself on avidyaa.

The siddhantin replied saying that the support for avidyaa is Brahman alone as there isn't any real entity apart from Brahman. And since avidyaa isn't real therefore duality isn't affected at all. Avidyaa since it is just a matter of experience for an ignorant person and really not real therefore it doesn't cause any harm to self-luminous nature of Brahman (and also doesn't lead to duality or another real entity like Brahman).

Tirodhana

The purvapakshin said that veiling of Self or Brahman is not possible as Brahman is self-luminous in nature. That which ever shines and is Consciousness in nature can never be veiled. Thus avidyaa can never veil Brahman and therefore avidyaa itself is purposeless (avidyaa is that which veils the Self, so says Advaitin).

The siddhantin replied saying that avidyaa is only for person who is ignorant. Really speaking avidyaa doesn't exist and it cannot ever veil Brahman. And it doesn't ever veil Brahman. But for an ignorant person, the Self appears as veiled by ignorance. This is from an empirical view point. After realization of Brahman through knowledge (which removes ignorance), a person realizes the ultimate view point that Brahman alone exists. Even as light is seemingly veiled by darkness and Sun is veiled seemingly by clouds, similarly the Self is veiled by ignorance (from an empirical view point). Until knowledge of the shastras (that Brahman alone exists) dawns a person experiences ignorance (which is proven through direct experience for an ajnaani) and since ultimately Brahman alone exists, therefore there is no illogicality whatsoever.

Let's now see the next illogicality with respect to avidyaa.

3. svarupAnAnupapattiH- Illogicality with respect to the nature of avidyaa

किं स्वरूपमित्यस्ति संशयः ।

भावरूपकं भाववर्जितं ॥९॥

kiṁ svarūpamityasti saṁśayaḥ |
bhāvarūpakam bhāvavarjitam ||9||

9. What is the nature of Avidya? Thus there is doubt. Is it of the nature of bhaava (existence) or is it without bhaava (abhaava or non-existence)?

नैवभावरूपं तु हीनतः ।

नास्ति सत्यताभावरूपतः ॥१०॥

(अन्यथा तु किं विश्वकारणं ॥)

naivabhāvarūpaṁ tu hīnataḥ |
nāsti satyatābhāvarupataḥ ||10||
(anyathā tu kiṁ viśvakāraṇam ||)

10. It cannot be of the nature of bhaava as it is something destroying (or devoid of) (devoid of ignorance or destruction of ignorance. It definitely doesn't have any reality if it is abhaava in nature, as abhaava itself means no reality (else, if ajnaana is not bhaava in nature, what is the cause of this world?).

भावरूपमज्ञाननामकं ।

वादमेव हि तस्यदर्शनात् ॥११॥

bhāvarūpamajñānanāmakam |
vādameva hi tasyadarśanāt ||11||

11. That which is termed as ajnaana is bhaava in nature; this is just a way of teaching (a preaching) definitely in order to know it (explain it).

नास्तिसत्यता तस्यसर्वदा ।

मामकश्चितेः तस्यसंस्थितिः ॥१२॥

nāstisatyatā tasyasarvadā
māmakaściteḥ tasyasamsthiḥ||12||

12. There is no reality always for that (ignorance); because it is ever existing in my Consciousness (this means that it is an illusion appearing in my Consciousness).

Slokas

The first two slokas explain the illogicality with respect to asraya of avidyaa. The first two slokas (4th and 5th) thus are purvapaksha statements whereas the last two (7th and 8th) slokas answer the objections and the siddhantha or advaitic view-point.

Avidyaa – a fundamental concept in Vedanta

Too much analysis has been spent by other Vedanta acharyas on this concept of Avidyaa. The reason for this is that if avidya is proven illogical or unreal, then the entire system of Advaita Vedanta will fall apart, thus is the contention. But this is wrong. Advaita Vedanta bases itself on the one entity of Brahman, not on avidyaa. As to why the one entity of Brahman which alone exists isn't directly experienced (and knowledge of shastras is required) is being explained by the concept of avidyaa. Thus avidyaa is only valid for an ignorant person; for a jnaani there is no avidyaa at all. Avidyaa is like darkness; it exists only for one experiencing it. Darkness cannot be proven but is a direct experience for a person (who perceives it). The moment we try to analyze it, we find that it doesn't really exist. Can darkness really destroy or veil light? Definitely not possible but still it appears to be so. Really speaking there is nothing called darkness. It is just a matter of experience and only light is brought out, it is known that darkness doesn't exist at all. Similarly avidyaa doesn't really exist but is a matter of experience for an ignorant person. If it is experienced then such a person has to through the shastras remove ignorance so that the non-dual reality of Brahman is realized (as that which alone always exists). After realization there is no avidyaa at all and therefore no need for any discussion whatsoever for the jnaani.

Avidyaa's nature

Lot of attack has befallen avidyaa with respect to its nature. Though it is clearly said that avidyaa is just a matter of experience for an ignorant person and cannot withstand any

proof similar to darkness, still lot of analysis has been conducted by purvapakshin's into avidya's nature.

Very clearly Sankara raises the question about Avidyaa and answers that avidyaa is only for an ignorant person in the 13th chapter of Gita. Still if there is a need to analyze the nature of avidyaa then we find acharyas like Chitsukhacharya mentioning that avidyaa is bhaavarupa; but this is just a way of telling as avidyaa is neither bhaava or abhaava.

We have to first understand the two terms of bhaava and abhaava before entering into further analysis. Bhaava is that which exists and abhava is that which has no existence (non-existence). If it be asked whether abhaava can exist or not, the answer is that abhaava of something can definitely appear as existing. There is no real entity darkness but it is just absence of light. Similarly absence of knowledge is ignorant or avidyaa. Though such absence cannot be the cause of the world, still there is nothing wrong in assuming avidyaa as the cause of the world because the world is also an illusion; and even as darkness can create illusory entities while perceiving it, similarly avidyaa when experienced can definitely make the illusory world as if appearing and as if real.

But acharyas take a better stand with respect to logic and therefore say that avidyaa is neither existence nor non-existence (absence). This is because avidyaa isn't subject to logic. Like darkness is not subject to light similarly avidyaa is not subject to knowledge or logic. The moment try to apply logic we will find that ignorance instantly vanishes. Though we can say that ignorance is that of the Self, the moment we try to analyze ignorance of the Self we will find that there is no ignorance; in order to say ignorance of the Self, we need to know the Self. And since the Self is known there is no ignorance at all. Thus while saying ignorance of the Self itself ignorance simply vanishes. This might be the reason why Sankara didn't emphasize too much on analysis of ignorance but just that when knowledge dawns then ignorance automatically vanishes.

But if we in this way term avidyaa as absence of knowledge then further questions will be raised as to how this avidyaa is terminated, is its removal real or unreal etc. Therefore acharyas say that avidyaa is neither existence nor absence. Moreover avidyaa can be just said to be avidyaa and not avidyaa of Self or avidyaa of something else – it cannot really be applied to entities, when seen from a logical perspective. Sankara again doesn't dwell too much on this and therefore emphasizes on adhyaasa or superimposition (which is

synonymous with avidyaa) and this adhyaasa being the cause of all problems. This adhyaasa is mixing of the Self with the not-Self through lack of knowledge of the Self. Know the Self through negation of the not-Self and assertion through the ways propounded in the shaastras, then adhyaasa and avidyaa instantly vanish leading to the ever-present, ever-changeless Self.

Avidyaa – neither bhaava nor abhaava

Acharyas mention again and again that avidyaa is neither bhaava nor abhaava. It isn't bhaava as it doesn't always exist, for if it exists then it cannot be removed (its destruction will not be real). It isn't abhaava as it isn't mere non-existence for it is a matter of experience. Thus it is neither bhaava nor abhaava.

Ramanujacharya and Madhvacharya start their accusation generally from few words from famous works of Advaitaacharyas. Chitsukhacharya defines avidyaa as "bhaavarupam anaadi yad vijnaanena vileeyate" or "that which is existence in nature, beginning-less and removed through knowledge". The words of "bhaavarupam" is what comes into attack. Chitsukhacharya in his own explanation of this word says that by bhaavarupa what is meant is that it isn't abhaava in nature – that's it, there is nothing more to it. Through the words that it is anaadi or beginning-less but has an end through knowledge, Chitsukhacharya makes it quite clear that avidyaa is an illusion, not real. It appears as if existing but once knowledge dawns it ceases to exist.

There is no illogicality whatsoever in the explanation of Chitsukhacharya or other acharyas regarding avidyaa's nature. Swami Sacchidaanandendra Saraswati of Holenarsipur takes a very different stand in saying that avidyaa is just abhaavarupa and thereby all the arguments of madhva and ramanuja are futile. This doesn't seem to be very true as then the arguments would be directed towards abhaavarupa and as to how a non-entity like avidyaa can cause sorrows in life. If it is answered that avidyaa in itself is not a real entity therefore sorrows also aren't real, then such an argument is better made by saying that avidyaa is neither bhaava nor abhaava. If it is to stick on to tradition that avidyaa is said to be abhaavarupa, then Sankara by saying that avidyaa is experienced makes avidyaa bhaavarupa (for an ajnaani) and for a jnaani we all accept that avidyaa doesn't exist at all.

Having got perspective into avidyaa's nature let's look at the arguments of the purvapakshin now.

Purvapakshin – avidyaa veils/destroys knowledge

Self or Brahman is self-luminous and always exists as pure Consciousness or pure knowledge. This Self though is ever-shining is veiled by ignorance; thus figuratively, ignorance destroys knowledge. As a result of ignorance destroying knowledge it cannot be bhaava in nature. That which is bhaava in nature just exists as itself – it doesn't exist by harming the existence of something else. Darkness is not bhaava as it exists by harming light. Similarly since ignorance exists by harming knowledge therefore it cannot be accepted as bhaava or existence in nature.

Even then if we accept avidyaa as bhaava then it is self-contradiction. To say that avidyaa or lack of knowledge is existence is absurd and illogical. Hence we cannot say that avidyaa is bhaava in nature.

Purvapakshin – avidyaa has no reality if it is abhaava

Since avidyaa cannot be bhaava in nature therefore the only other option is that avidyaa is abhaava in nature. Avidyaa cannot be abhaava in nature because then it would have no reality whatsoever. If it has no reality at all then there is no need of proving it to be illogical because it doesn't even exist.

If it be argued that avidyaa having no reality is accepted then that would mean that there is nothing to be really achieved (as avidyaa doesn't even exist and its removal is automatically present). This would mean that sorrows will not be removed and they will continue to exist. Thus the very system of Advaita will fall apart for lack of phala or goal. If it is argued that sorrows might exist but a person can rejoice in bliss then the question will be asked as to what is rejoicing in bliss? If it is due to removal of ignorance, then since removal is automatically there therefore rejoicing in bliss is also automatically there. If it is achieving of knowledge, then since there is no obstacle to knowledge (obstacle being avidyaa and avidyaa being unreal) therefore knowledge is already achieved. Thus there wouldn't be any rejoicing in bliss newly achieved. It cannot be said that rejoicing in bliss is already existing, for sorrow is also being experienced and both are contrary in nature; if both are accepted then the person saying both exist would have to be accepted as mad or mentally unstable.

Thus avidyaa isn't bhaava in nature and it isn't abhaava also in nature.

Purvapakshin – self-contradiction if avidyaa is both bhaava and abhaava

Now if it be argued that avidyaa is both bhaava and abhaava (it is bhaava for an ajnaani and abhaava for a jnaani or bhaava from an empirical viewpoint and abhaava from an ultimate viewpoint) then it leads to self-contradiction. Even as darkness and light cannot exist at the same place at the same time, similarly an entity of avidyaa cannot be both bhaava and abhaava in nature.

If it be argued that this is possible due to one aspect of avidyaa being bhaava and another being abhaava then it would lead to splitting of avidyaa into two entities. Two diverse qualities cannot exist in an entity. If it be argued that even as a person has lean quality with respect to a fatter person and fat quality with respect to a leaner person, similarly is the case with avidyaa; then the question would arise as to what is this second entity with which avidyaa is compared? Is it bhaava or abhaava? All the arguments made for avidyaa will be valid for this entity and it will only lead to various faults like anavasthaa (infinite regression).

Purvapakshin – avidyaa is proof-less if it is neither bhaava nor abhaava

If it be argued that avidyaa is neither bhaava nor abhaava then this is illogical because there cannot be any proof of the same. If it is answered that avidyaa is not bhaava as it doesn't always exist and not abhaava as it appears as existing, then the question would be as to the scenario or situation in which these both experiences of "not bhaava" and "not abhaava" is experienced. It cannot be said that we experience both at the same time. If both aren't experienced at the same time then we cannot say that both the statements are true. Instead we will have to say that one is true and one is false. Irrespective of whichever statement is true, it will still lead to illogicality of avidyaa's nature (as the possibility of avidyaa being bhaava or abhaava has been refuted previously itself).

Thus the purvapakshin's stand can be summarized as: there is doubt with respect to nature of avidyaa. And since we cannot prove its nature to either bhaava or abhaava therefore the conclusion is that avidyaa is illogical with respect to nature or svaroopta. Since avidyaa is illogical with respect to its svaroopta therefore the system of Advaita Vedanta itself falls apart.

Siddhantin – avidyaa is bhaavarupa

We say that avidyaa is bhaava in nature. Before arguments or objections are made, we say that this view of avidyaa as bhaava is just a way of teaching or preaching. As to why this way of teaching is essential, the answer is that it is experienced by ignorant people and therefore we have to definitely say that it is bhaava in nature.

That which is experienced cannot be abhaava in nature because it is a matter of experience. Though avidyaa ultimately doesn't really exist (thus isn't bhaava in nature), it is absurd to say that avidyaa is abhaava in nature when there is direct experience that I am ignorant. Irrespective of whether this ignorance is associated with the Self or exists as itself (as mere ignorance), avidyaa has to be accepted as bhaava because it is a matter of experience.

If it be argued that ghosts are experienced but aren't bhaava in nature then the answer is that ghosts have to be accepted as bhaava as long as one experiences it. A person who experiences mirage in desert have to be said that mirage is bhaava for it is experienced. Any other statement will only lead the person away from truth or knowledge that is provided by the Guru or shastras.

Siddhantin – avidyaa is not abhaava

It is essential to remember Chitsukhacharya's words that avidyaa is mentioned as bhaava in order to negate the view that it is mere abhaava. Mere abhaava has no existence at all and there would be illogicalities with respect to its removal. Hence it is said that avidyaa is bhaava in nature – this view of teaching really means that avidyaa isn't abhaava.

Thus effectively we say that avidyaa is neither bhaava nor abhaava. All the arguments about this view is proven wrong by taking up the examples of an illusion. When a person sees water in desert, the water does exist. Therefore we cannot say that it is abhaava (or non-existence). But since this water will be negated after knowledge of desert therefore we cannot say it is bhaava (as it ceases to exist). Therefore mirage is neither bhaava nor abhaava. Any illusion is neither bhaava nor abhaava.

Thus when it is said that avidyaa is neither bhaava nor abhaava it also means that avidyaa is mithyaa or an illusion.

Siddhantin – avidyaa is unreal

Avidyaa is an illusion which also means that ultimately it doesn't exist. Empirically avidyaa is accepted for ignorant person but ultimately it doesn't really exist. This has to be remembered at all times in order to avoid futile arguments. In the previous magazine we saw the two levels of reality of empirical or vyaavahaarika and ultimate or paaramaarthika. We should remember that avidyaa is an illusion (or appears as existing) from empirical viewpoint but from ultimate viewpoint it doesn't really exist.

Even as the nature of any illusion is neither real nor unreal, same is the case with avidyaa as well. And since it doesn't ultimate exist therefore there is no illogicality at all. As to how this illusion is overcome, we say that it is overcome through knowledge. This knowledge isn't any worldly knowledge but knowledge of Brahman (as one's own very nature of non-dual Consciousness) as found in the scriptures. Knowledge of Brahman negates as-if-appearing avidyaa even as knowledge of desert negates mirage.

If it be argued that after negation of avidyaa will the world exist or not, then the question asked is as to whether jnaani is asking or ajnaani is asking. A jnaani cannot ask as he has no avidyaa at all (and eh only perceives Brahman). If an ajnaani is asking, then he cannot really ask because first he has to negate avidyaa and then ask the question. If it be argued that an ajnaani can ask about the goal to be achieved then it is as foolish as a person asking for a job even before completing his studies (as his goal is to achieve a job).

If the question of whether world exists or not needs to be answered directly (without logic), then the answer is that there is no real world existing at any point of time. If this is the case then does it matter whether world exists after negation of avidyaa or not. If the reason for the question is that avidyaa being the cause of the world should negate the world with its negation, then the answer is that there is no real negation of avidyaa as avidyaa doesn't even exist. That which doesn't exist can be negated only through knowing that it doesn't really exist. After this knowledge as well, if it appears as existing what is the harm? This is similar to a person seeing water in desert even after knowing that there is no water in desert. Thus after gaining knowledge that there is no avidyaa, even if avidyaa or the world appears as existing there is no harm in it at all. This is all because ultimately Brahman alone exists – it is just a matter of whether a person is able to gain this knowledge and abide in this knowledge. Then avidyaa is baadhitham or non-affecting – it may be there but it will not taint the blissful state of the person.

Siddhantin beautifully ends by saying that avidyaa is unreal because it is in the Self. Can avidyaa exist in the Conscious Self? No, it cannot. Then the statement only means that it appears as existing in the Self but is not really in the Self. And since it doesn't really exist therefore there is no harm in saying that its nature is neither bhaava nor abhaava from an empirical viewpoint while ultimately it is unreal in nature.

To conclude, avidyaa's nature is ultimately unreal and empirically it is neither bhaava nor abhaava though for teaching purposes we can say that it is bhaava in nature.

Anumaana used by purvapakshin and siddhantin

Purvapakshin

अविद्यायाः स्वरूपानुपपत्तिः सत्यं, स्वरूपस्य निरूपणाशक्यत्वात्, वन्द्यपुत्रवत् ।

Avidyaa's illogicality with respect to nature is true, because its nature cannot be established, like the son of a barren woman (even as the son of a barren woman cannot be proven similarly avidyaa's nature cannot be proven and therefore it is illogical with respect to its nature and ultimately it is unreal).

Siddhantapakshin

अविद्यायाः स्वरूपोपपत्तिः सत्यमेव, भावाभावभिन्नत्वात् पारामार्थिकदृष्ट्या असत्यत्वाच्च,

मरिचिस्वप्नादिवत् ।

Avidyaa's logicality with respect to nature is true alone, because its nature is different from bhaava and abhaava & from the ultimate viewpoint it is unreal, like mirage, dream etc.

Jeeva Nirnaya

ॐ जीव निर्णयः

om jīva nirṇayaḥ

स्वात्मनाकृतं जीवभावनं ।

तत्त्यजेत्यदा प्राप्नुयात्सुखं ॥१॥

svātmanākṛtaṁ jīvabhāvanaṁ |
tattyajetyadā prāpnuyātsukhaṁ ||1||

1. The notion of jeeva created by oneself (one's mind through ignorance), when that is renounced a person will attain happiness.

स्वात्मनस्तुसच्चित्स्वरूपतः ।

भेदभावनाज्ञानकारणं ॥२॥

svātmanastusaccitsvarūpataḥ |
bhedabhāvanājñānakāraṇaṁ ||2||

2. My Self is of the nature of Existence, Consciousness and Bliss; difference notion (difference of Self from Brahman) is due to ignorance.

बुद्धिमानसस्याश्रयस्तुयः ।

सस्तु जीवभावोऽज्ञभावना ॥३॥

buddhimānasasyāśrayastuyaḥ |
sastu jīvabhāvo'jñabhāvanā ||3||

3. That which is the basis of intellect and mind, that is called jeeva and this notion is of an ajnaani (ignorant person).

तत्त्वहम्मतिः रूपकस्सदा ।

स्वानुभूतिरेतन्न सत्यता ॥४ ॥

tattvahammatih rūpakassadā |
svānubhūtiretanna satyatā ||4||

4. That jeeva is of the nature of Ego (sense of I) and is a matter of direct experience; yet it isn't real (because this jeeva undergoes change and its real nature is Sat Chit Ananda as mentioned in earlier sloka).

ज्ञानसंयुतबुद्धिकारणात् ।

ज्ञायते पुमान् ब्रह्मस्वात्मनः ॥५ ॥

jñānasamyutabuddhikāraṇāt |
jñāyate pumān brahmasvātmanaḥ ||5||

5. A person knows his very nature of Brahman due to intellect which has knowledge (knowledge leads to a person realizing his very nature of Brahman).

जीवनामकस्सत्यवर्जितः ।

यस्तुब्रह्मव्यावर्तकस्तदा ॥६ ॥

jīvanāmakassatyavarjitaḥ |
yastubrahmavyāvartakastadā ||6||

6. (If I am Brahman, then what about jeeva?) That which is named jeeva is devoid of any reality; as when jeeva is different from Brahman (when jeeva is known as different from Brahman, then it has no reality).

स्वप्नसुप्तिषु यः प्रतीयते ।

तत्स्वरूपतो ब्रह्मस्वीयचित् ॥७ ॥

svapnasuptiṣu yaḥ pratiyate |
tatsvarūpato brahmasvīyacit ||7||

7. That which shines in the state of dream and deep sleep, that is by nature Brahman and one's own Consciousness.

नित्यरूपतोऽनित्यभावात् ।

जीवनिश्चयात् ब्रह्मरूपकः ॥८॥

nityarūpato'nityabhāvanāt
jīvaniścayāt brahmarūpakaḥ ॥8॥

8. By being real in nature and unreal due to imagination (as distinct from Brahman), jeeva definitely is Brahman alone.

Jeeva is real when it is known as Brahman (of the nature of Existence, Consciousness and Bliss).

Jeeva is unreal when imagined by the mind as distinct or different from Brahman.

The I that pulsates inside us as pure consciousness, jeeva, is Brahman.

The I which is ego (sense of I and mine), jeeva, is unreal.

Anukramaanika Nirdesham

1. Editorial – a general message
2. Jeeva Brahmaatma Siddhi - an analysis of jeeva or individuality and proving that jeeva is Brahman alone (individuality isn't real and Brahman alone is real).
3. Chathussutra Prakaashah - a multi-part series on illumination of the first four sutras of Brahma Sutra through learning of the work of Shaareeraka nyaaya sangraha of Prakashatman.
4. Avidyaa Prakaashah - a multi-part series with written slokas explaining the illogicality of avidyaa as per Sri Bhashya and the answering of the same.
5. Jeeva Nirnaya - explanation of jeeva through a set of simple slokas. This section is dedicated to original work written but not explained in depth in order to help sadhakas in reflection of the concepts themselves.

1. Comments
2. Suggestions
3. Corrections (word, sloka, content etc.)
4. Would like to see specific content
5. Would like to contribute (through research from websites, don't need to write up the content yourself)

Mail admin@vedantatattva.org.

Feel free to forward this to anyone who might be interested.

Online download of the magazine can be found at <http://vedantatattva.org/vedantagroup/VedantaMadhuryam>

Subscribing and unsubscribing can be done by mailing admin@vedantatattva.org.