

Upadesa Sara

By 'Dravidacharya' Sri Ramakrishnan Swamiji

In this series of retreats, we have seen *Tattva Bodhah*, *Sadhana Panchakam* and in the present retreat we'll see *Upadesha Sara*. *Upadesha* means teaching; *sara* means essence, essence of the teaching.

Here the teaching is going to be, as always, *Vedanta*. We have seen in details what *Vedanta* means. „*Veda*” means the scriptural texts and „*anta*” means in general end, but here it means the essence of the teachings of *Vedas*. This *Vedanta* is synonymous to *Advaita*, non-duality. When we say *Vedanta*, implicitly we say *Advaita*, non-dual, so we don't have to add the adjective *Advaita*.

This text, *Upadesha Sara* is written by one of the greatest persons who lived in the world till recently, 60 years back, Sri Ramana Maharishi.

There is a saying in *telugu* (a language from South India): „Whoever is a great master, to all of them , my salutation”. To all those great people, my salutations. This is the approach; still like the statement from communism that „all are equal, but some are more equal than others”, in the same way, though we respect all great saints, there is a choice of few saints whom I respect more. Sri Ramana Maharishi is among them.

There is no complexity in his life; he led a very simple life. As we always see, to be simple is the complex thing in life. It is not easy to be simple. He was a very normal person, as any boy of that age would be. I am talking about a small instant from when he was 15 years old. It happened so. He was living with his uncle in a place called Madurai. It is a famous place in South Tamil Nadu, it has a huge temple for the deity called Meenakshi. One fine day, he had a fear of death. We also have it, always, he had it once sometime and what do we do? We take a drink or go to sleep or we do something else, but instead of escaping the problem, he decided to face it; he didn't want to discuss it with anyone and decided to solve it by himself. He went to first floor, in a small room and started to think about what is death. Strange question for a 15 year-old-boy and till then no spiritual inquiry (till then he was a normal boy like the other boys at his age). What is death? What would a dead person be like? He lies down and started to imagine what happens when one dies; the body becomes stiff, friends and relatives will come and say „oh, he was a nice person”; he saw that; then, they will carry the body and cremate it.

In India, until the initiation of sacred thread, if the boy dies he is buried; if it is after initiation he is cremated. As he had had the initiation they should have taken his body to the crematory. Those days there weren't

electric crematories; they used to place first wood, after they put a layer of cow dung cake, after the body on which another layer of cow dung and with a paste of clay with straws and made a cover; once you burn that nothing will remain, just small pieces of bones.

So he reached at this point, in his imagination that they are burning his body. The body is burning. "Do I cease to exist?" The question arose. At that point of time, he understood that "I remain".

The whole sequence he explains: the *rigor mortis* sets up, the breathing stops, the mind ceases to exist, the *buddhi* which is watching the mind also ceases to exist, there is void, but that void is seen by something else. Who is this else? Even if the body is burnt to ash, someone remains. Who is that someone? This he understands as the *Self*. This he knows it is *Self*.

This is a strange phenomenon. Any realization of anything needs transference of prior knowledge from someone who has it. For instance: paper. This is paper. How do we know this is paper? Someone told us this is a paper. So anything in this world can be realized, known by someone telling you, someone who has that prior knowledge of that object before you; in this example someone who tells you this is a paper and you accept that. When, for the worldly things we depend on

someone else, *a fortiori* for the *Self*-knowledge we need a *Guru*. We cannot say „oh I meditate“; like this all stupidities come into existence, nothing of that sort (*Realization*) will take place like this.

But then one can say that Sri Ramana Maharishi didn't have any *Guru* to give him the *Knowledge*.

This knowledge cannot enter a new person, and if it enters to someone who has no introduction, no initiation, no *Guru*, it is not because of the present life, but because of his past life. He was practicing this and at that point, *Realization* point, his body dropped off. In the next birth, he will retake it from where he left. As Bhagavan Krishna promises in *Bhagavad-gita* one who slips (passes away) when on the *yoga* path, will be born again in a nice family, in nice circumstances.....This is a promise of *Bhagavan*. This person who is practicing, if he drops his body, he will continue from where he left in his next birth. And the example for that promise is Ramana Maharishi. He retook it from where he left in the previous life. Otherwise it would not be possible; we all have the fear of death, but who faced it as he did? We try to escape it through different ways. So Ramana Maharishi continued from where he left. This is one way to see.

The second way is to see him as *avatara* - *incarnation*. An *avatara* doesn't require these types of explanations; there is no need for any inquiry on this matter. The body of an *avatara* is not made of five elements, because whatever is made of five elements depends upon *karma*, and the *avatara* aren't dependent upon *karma*, they are born to elevate us in spirituality. We can explain in this way also.

Whatever it may be, Sri Ramana Maharishi gained *Realization* as it is explained in *Vedas*.

The method in which he gained *Realization* is what *Taittiriya Upanishad* describes as the inquiry into the five sheaths, which we saw in *Tattva Bodhah* and *Sadhana Pancakam*, too: *annamaya kosha*, *pranamaya kosha*, *manomaya kosha*, *vijnanamaya kosha*, *anandamaya kosha*.

He explains this inquiry in a simple way in a text called „Who am I?“ That is completely based on *Vedic* principles. Some people want to accept this as his own methodology. That's a wrong way. I accept him to be the greatest one, I call him *Bhagavan* (and nor *Ramana* etc.), but this method is not something that he invented, it is a system which is explained in the *Vedas*; he gained the Knowledge through the same system as explained in *Vedas*. By saying he created it, one is not glorifying

Ramana Maharishi, but is denouncing him. Why? Because we say *pramana janita jnana*, the knowledge which can be gained through a proper, means of right knowledge and this can be gained only through means of right knowledge. How does one know there is a *Self*? One may say: "OH, one fine morning I woke up and I thought?" No. One cannot say „I thought, I decided there is a *Self*“, because there are a lot of philosophies which fight for the *Self*: what is the *Self*? Is the *Self* different from the body or not different from the body? If it isn't different from the body, when body is destroyed, burnt, the *Self* is destroyed, there is no *Self*. Other idea is that it is different from the body, it is eternal; so what is it? Is it of the size of the body, is it bigger? These kinds of discussions come into existence. So all these are already explained in *Vedas*, one doesn't have to reinvent the wheel. The people who don't have that kind of mature *karma*, *punya karma*, have to undergo this process. A mature person with a lot of *punya* doesn't need to undergo this process.

During the sacred thread ceremony, *Brahmin* boys are initiated into a *mantra* called *Gayatri mantra*. This *Gayatri mantra* initiation is called *brahma upadesha*, initiation into *Brahman*. And what is *Self*? *Brahman*. So the initiation into *Brahman* is already done during the *Gayatri upadesha* itself. That's the essence of *Gayatri*

mantra, accepted as the essence of *Vedas*. Sri Ramana Maharishi has that initiation and his past *karmas* fructified at a right moment and he understood the *Truth* through the teaching which is given in the *Vedas*, which he has acquired in his past lives.

This is not the first time you are listening to *Vedanta*. This may not be the last time also. If you don't listen to it properly, understand it, assimilate it, you have to come again and study this *Upadesha Sara* some other time.

Let us make this opportunity a fruitful opportunity, let us understand this *Upadesha Sara*, let us try to gain this knowledge once for all.

So Bhagavan Ramana Maharishi gained this knowledge and after that he lost interest in this world. What interest can be there? When one does not see the world to be different from the Self. His brother gave some money to him for the school fees. From somewhere he heard the name of Tiruvannamalai. He decided to go there; he didn't know where it was; he took just the necessary amount from the money his brother left him for his tuition fees and wrote on a piece of paper that "I am leaving" and he left for Tiruvannamalai and at the age of 15 he entered Tiruvannamalai and that was. He did not go anywhere, he stayed there till he left his body; we cannot say till his death, because there is no

death for the realized one. So he stays there, he didn't stay there till the end of his life, he remains there.

Some people say that he gained the *Realization* there. It isn't so. Whatever knowledge he gained, he got established in that knowledge in Tiruvannamalai, *jnana nishta*, being established in the Knowledge. The *vedantic* texts explain *na kincit.....*, once you gain this Knowledge „do not disturb it with any other thought”. Just don't let another thought to swipe you. So he is there.

During his life time, there were many disciples, though he never called any one as his disciple, he never accepted himself to be a *Guru*, but there are many followers who accepted him as a *Guru*.

One among them was a great person called Muruganar. He is a confidant for Ramana Maharishi so while writing a very beautiful poem, composition in Tamil, in a particular place, he is discussing about the lord Dakshinamurthi; Dakshinamurthi means the South face, the form of knowledge, *dakshina* means South, *murthi* means form, the form which is facing the South, which is Knowledge form.

So Dakshinamurthi is Lord Shiva himself. He comes to this place, called *Dharuka Vana*; *vana* means forest, Daruka is its name. He came there because in that forest

there are some *Brahmin* priests who along with their families practice very rigorous *sadhanas* as prescribed in the *Vedas*. They do fire oblation, *puja* etc. They do it not out of Knowledge, but out of ignorance, which is that this *karma* they perform will bring to them the result of *Realization* ; this is the error which also we do.

So the Lord went there, in this forest, to those priests and when he came, all the women of those priests were attracted to him; this didn't go well with these priests and practicing hard *sadhanas*, they had supernatural powers so they made through their *mantra* power some weapons to kill him and sent to him, but whatever they sent as an weapon he used for his good. These priests understood that he is more powerful and went to him because they need to know the secret. We are talking about the story which Muruganar is writing.

So in this junction, these priests are in front of Lord Dakshinamurthi and he has to teach them and Muruganar has to write that. He is a very good poet, but still he is not able to do it; he wants to write it in small couplets and he is not able to, he is trying hard and finally he is accepting his defeat, he took the paper and placed it front of Sri Ramana Maharishi and left it there: „I tried to write, I am not able to, I just leave it here”.

And Sri Ramana Maharishi reads, sees the situation and leaves it for a while there.

The Realized one doesn't have any *karma* or any bondage to do anything. He may not do anything and no bad result will happen. Still this great Realized person at our times has written this to bless us with this Knowledge.

When Muruganar comes back he sees his work completed with thirty beautiful couplets, in a different meter. And that is this *Upadesha Sara*.

So in these thirty couplets, *slokas*, he explained in a very ordered way the methods to gain Knowledge; there is *karma*, there is *bhakti*, here is *jnana*; everything is in this text: *karma* discussion about action, *bhakti* about devotion, *jnana* – knowledge; it's a complete text.

What will Dakshinamurthi tell to those *Brahmin* priests since they had been performing that *karma* for so long and the performing an action creates good deeds and bad deeds and since they were performing the actions as prescribed in *Vedas* for so long they were eligible for Knowledge, having enough purity of mind.

Since this was the situation, the attachment they had to the *karma* should be removed. How to do that?

So first, before giving the Knowledge he had to remove that attachment from them. So he starts this *Upadesha Sara* with this point. So after the needed introduction we come to the text itself, *Upadesha Sara*.

He first wrote it in *Tamil* and then later wrote it in different languages. He himself wrote, he was a multi-lingual.

1

Katurajnyaya prapyate phalam

Karma kim param karma tajjadam

The first *sloka* starts with *kartuh ajnyaya* – *karta* means doer. The doer is none other than *Iswara*. *Bhagavan* in *Bhagavad Gita* very clearly says „ *Aham vaishvanaro bhutva praninaam dehamaashtritaha...*” „I am the *vaishvanara*, the fire within your belly (the fire of digestion) ...”

In every place, *Iswara* is the one who is explained as the indweller in this body. He is the doer who is residing in the body and therefore the individual self is not different from *Iswara*.

Since we don't have this knowledge the text starts with „*katurajnya...*” , taking us from the point we are, the point in which we consider *Iswara* and the individual self as different.

„*Ajnaya*” means „by the order”, so „*katurajnya*” means by the order of *Iswara*, „*prapyate phalama*”, we gain (*prapyate*) the result (*phalam*). So the entire meaning of the first line of first verse is „we gain the results of *karmas* by the order of *Iswara*”.

„*Karma kim param?* –is karma great? „*Karma tajadam*”, That *karma* is inert. How can inert be great?

This is to negate the basic idea of these *Brahmin* priests.

In the tradition there is a school called *poorva mimamsa* that accepts the *karma* portion of *Vedas* to be important. *Vedas* have two portions: *karma* portion and the *Knowledge* portion. These *Brahmin* priests are from this school of *poorva mimamsa*.

So Dakshinamurti is coming to them and is negating that idea.

What do the *karma* school people say? Their school is like this: one performs the *Vedic karma* (*karma* means action, *karma* means result, both). They accept the actions which one performs give results; one doesn't

need to bring *Iswara* in discussion for that. Also common people think like that: doing good things brings results, one doesn't need to bring God in for that, that karma is enough, they say. But it is not enough. What do you do these good things for? If you don't believe in anything, why are you good? Then, if you ask them so, there is no answer. If you don't believe in *Iswara*, if you don't believe in rebirth, if you don't believe in anything, then why do good karma?

The simple answer is that they are afraid. If there is *Iswara*, they may wonder. They are not ready yet to accept, but still not ready to deny completely too.

So these people accept the action gives results. They don't bring *Iswara* in between. They say „I make a decoction, I pour milk into it, I add sugar and I enjoy it. Where is *Iswara* in this coffee?“ They ask. „I made the decoction, I add milk and sugar in a proper proportion, I did it and I gained the result, my action, my result. I don't need to believe in *Iswara*“. This is the normal way of thinking. „My actions give me results“. Someday the coffee is bad, but this is because of my actions, so where is *Iswara* here?“ they ask. This is the thought of those people who think that action is bringing results and there is no necessity of *Iswara* in between.

So Dakshinamurti to negate their idea, he straightly says „*katurajnya*“, by the order of *Iswara*. There is no question. He goes directly, because they accept the idea that the action gives result by itself and there is no need for *Iswara*.

We extend the example: I make decoction, I add the milk and sugar, you make decoction, add milk and sugar, but one is good and other not. How this happens? The process is the same, the ingredients the same, someone always does good coffee of that, and we don't. How it is possible? There is some unknown quantity, x ; science will call that as chaos. We call it order. For them is chaos, for us that unknown x is order. There is a proper order in this world. According the actions we perform, we gain the results and in between there is this x which determines the specific result for a certain action. Actions can be the same, but the results are not the same, because the result is depending upon our *karma* (the past *karma*). Therefore, because of the order of *Iswara*, we gain the results. That unknown variable is what we call *Iswara*. We can even let the example of one person's coffee and other person coffee; we can take for example the coffees of the same person. Yesterday the coffee was very good and today not so. What happened with the coffee? Why? The person is the same, the coffee powder the same, the process the same, the

ingredients the same, but the yesterday coffee was good, today coffee isn't. Why? That is because of this unknown variable and this is *Iswara*.

So, because of the order of *Iswara*, because of the will of *Iswara*, the results are gained for any *karma*. *Iswara* is the one who gives the results. The idea of the opponent is negated straightforward.

Even though you present it in this way, because of the attachment of a particular idea, we accept whatever we want to believe. So to explain it logically, he says: „*karma kim param?*” - Are the actions great? Can the actions be great? Can the actions be absolute? Here great means absolute. That means you don't have to depend on the Absolute *Iswara*, because the *karma* is absolute. Can *karma* be absolute? Yesterday we discussed what *Iswara* is according to *Vedanta*. We said whatever is limited cannot be *Iswara*. And *karma* is limited, we don't need to give special arguments for this, is obvious. Limited *karma* ends by giving limited results. What is limited cannot produce unlimited results. *Karma* in itself is limited and so gives limited result. What is limited cannot be absolute. Whatever is non-eternal cannot be eternal. So straightforward *karma* is negated for it is limited.

Karmas are limited. We don't need proofs for that. But the opponent is not that ignorant. He says „yes we know that *karmas* are limited, we perform *karmas* it ends here. What are *karmas* good and bad? Good *karmas* bring you to Heaven , bad *karmas* bring you to Hell; this is a common idea, generally accepted. How can this happen? Because the *karmas* I perform end here; it's over and something which is over gives me result?

There is a beautiful story we saw in last session: there is this impotent man. His wife is asking him: „Why are we not getting a baby? My younger sister has a baby, my younger brother also. Why aren't we getting a baby? This man says: oh don't worry, after I die, I give you a son.” This is a story in *Yoga Sutra Bhashya*.

Can a result be gained after the destruction of a *karma*? The opponent is not so naive so he says: this *karma* generates something which is called *apoorva* (a *punya* or a *papa* is called as *apoorva*); it means „that which cannot be perceived by you”. This *apoorva* is created and it is associated with your individual self. How logically they speak. You do *karma* , it generates that *apoorva* and this is associated with the individual self and the individual self is eternal and goes from this world to another and this associated *apoorva* gives result there. You do good *karma* and it generates this

apoorva which is eternal and is associated with this *jiva* and will give this result. Is this *apoorva* eternal or not? We saw *karma* is not eternal, but how then this *apoorva* be eternal? He says then „i am not talking about present *karma*, I am talking about the effect of present *karma*, this can be absolute, there is no problem with it. This is the logic he follows.

But „wait, *karma* is not eternal, it ends here; the result travels with the individual self; it is travelling all along? No, after giving the result, it also has to end, so how is absolute something that comes to an end? You said you are logical and you said something which is not logical.”

Then he says: „Wait, understand when we say absolute, what do we mean by that? When you say *Iswara* what does it mean? *Iswara* comes from the root word „It” which means to govern, that which rules and gives the proper results for actions. That is *Iswara*. Now, in the same way, my *karma* generates an *apoorva* which governs my results so I don’t need to believe in *Iswara*, this *apoorva* is absolute, in the sense that it governs, it gives a result.” This is the opponent’s point of view.

To negate that he (Dakshinamurthi) is asking, is *karma* absolute? It, by itself gives result? If it were like this, every *karma* should end with the same result. We teach ten people, and one among them is not listening or we

plant some seeds, in the same conditions and temperature, some sprout and some don't. So the action in itself is not absolute, the result of action in itself cannot be absolute, there is an unknown variable and that is *Iswara*. Why? This action and its result are inert, *karma tajjadam* (that karma is inert). *Karma* which is inert can never be absolute, can never govern anything. Inert cannot give result. Otherwise, you have a vessel in which you are making this coffee, you make a good coffee and what happens, and the vessel drinks itself. It will not let you to drink the coffee, it will drink it itself. And this would be the case with everything. Another example: an automatic car, you press one button and it heats the seat, another gives you massage, another music starts, but it cannot give you these by itself, you have to ask it by pressing the buttons; so there should be a person who handles the *karmas* to produce the effects, like the necessity of a person to produce the required effects in an automatic car. In the world, we see the necessity of an intelligent being for an action to produce the specific result. An action needs an intelligent being to effectively produce the proper result in everywhere. That intelligent being is what we call as *Iswara*.

In the world when one do bad deeds, for e.g., those bad deeds must be proven and the judgment is based on *karmas*, but it is pronounced by an intelligent being.

Therefore, *karma* cannot be the intelligent one, because it's inert, inert cannot be intelligent; it can neither be intelligent, nor stupid; inert cannot be qualified. So this is the essence of the teaching: „As ordered by *Iswara*, the results are gained; can *karma* be absolute? No, because *karma* is inert.”

In the *Vedas* there is a ritual, a fire oblation, called *Chaturmasya*. The one who performs it, gains bliss eternally.....(the quote). So the opponent says „I perform a *karma* , this will produce a result which is associated with the individual self and that result will give another result. But can it be so?

Like I have this glass, I break it down. This is a broken glass. Can we make it one again, the same? You can paste it, but it cannot be the same glass. Action of breaking produces eternal damages. We saw earlier that action is limited, effect is limited, but here, in the example we see that the action is limited and the result of damage is eternal. So, according to this logic, this opponent says „I perform an action and I gain the bliss eternally in Heaven. ”That is why the next *sloka* comes and explains.

An action can make the eternal non-eternal and the non-eternal eternal. How? Example: the pot I break - action, but it creates an eternal non-existence of the pot, absence of pot. Or there was absence of pot and through creating the pot, I create non-eternal from eternal.

So to the opponent He says:

2

Krtimahodadhau patanakaranam

Phalamasasvatam gatinirodhakam.

Krti means action, *maha* means great, *udadhi* means water, *maha udadhi* means ocean, the whole meaning of the first verse is „in the ocean of action”, *patanakaranam* – cause for falling, *phalamasasvatam* – result non-eternal, *gati* - the movement (towards *Realization*), *nirodhakam* - it prevents (that *Realization*).

„In the ocean of actions”, *krtimahodadhau*, what does it mean? How do we gain this birth? We have seen in *Tattva Bodhah* that we gain birth because of our *punya* (virtues) and *papa* (sins). I gained this birth because of

my *punya* or *papa*. How many virtues or sins are necessary for a birth? We have options: a. One *karma* (*punya* or *papa*) is equal to one birth; b. One *karma* is equal to multiple births; c. multiple *karma* is equal to multiple births; d. multiple *karma* is equal to one birth. Which is true? One *karma* equal to one birth, that would be difficult. Even more difficult would be the second version, one *karma* equal to multiple births. We negated the first two. The third also is negated, there is no logic in it, how much *karma* is needed for how many births. So through deductive logic, through negation, we come to the final version: multiple *karmas* equal to one birth; because of multiple past *karmas*, we have this body.

If by multiple *karmas*, I gain one body, where is the ocean? This ocean of *karmas*? In fact I am burning so many *karmas* to gain this one birth, so where is the ocean of *karma*? I don't see the ocean, one may say.

Let's take an example: we have seen in the world, we go for one hour walking, we burn so many calories, we come back and when we come back, we are presented a chocolate. So many calories you burnt and all the effort is annulled by that chocolate. In fact you are gaining more calories. In the same way it happens with the *karma*: definitely once born here, a lot of *karma* is burnt, but the moment you came here, you are not going to

keep quit. We always don't want to correct ourselves, but to correct others. So we acquire a lot of *karmas*, good *karma*, and bad *karma*. We know this. So we are not going to keep quit, we cannot keep quit, though we may try to. This is the nature, we cannot keep quit, and we are going to acquire more *karma*, because of our activities here.

And we haven't still burnt all our past *karmas* and we acquire more. We saw the classification of *karma* in *Tattva Bodhah*: there is the whole group of *karma*, acquired in all the past lives, like a bank deposit, another like the amount taken from the account for the monthly expenditures, and from this the today's cash, for today's expenditures.

We have taken a petty cash, for this life; it is not even that monthly amount that we are working now on, we are working on the today's petty cash. What are we going to do with this petty cash? We are going to invest and earn a good profit which will be again be deposited in the bank.

This is the ocean of *karma*, *krtimahodadhau*, the text is talking about. You are going to acquire more *karma* in the present life, when yet the past one is not even burnt yet entirely. Like this there is a never ending process.

Patanakaranam - this birth is the cause for falling in to it (the ocean of *karma*).

So *krti* here, which in general means action, should be understood as *Samsara*. When we talk about *Samsara*, we call it as ocean, ocean of sorrow. In that, there is *patanakaranam*, cause for falling into it. Why? Because *Vedas* clearly say: one goes to Heaven because of his good *karma*, stays there for a while, or one goes to Hell because of his bad *karma* and after spending his *karma* (good or bad), from there he comes back on Earth, he takes the form of clouds and through rain, to the earth, becomes grains which is eaten by people, the family where the *jiva* has to come; this is the cycle, the *jiva's* travel. The rain falls, the *jiva* falls (through rain), *patanakaranam*. It is said „*kshine punye martya loka vishanti*”, after finishing the *karma* there, he comes back in this mortal world.

Phalamasvatam – *phalam* means result, *asvatam* means non-eternal; result is non-eternal. You perform that *karma*, after finishing it there, you come back here. But the promise in many religions is that of an eternal Heaven. It is a very attractive promise. The results never are eternal and so Heaven cannot be eternal.

Earlier we said we break a pot and we produce an eternal result of damage, and now we say result never

are eternal. How is it? There is no contradiction here. We do an action and we do a non-eternal pot and this pot we break it and we create an eternal absence. This is the power of logic. Logic is like magic. You make people believe it is true. But listen to it carefully: existence and absence. The absence before is called prior absence, the absence after is called post absence. In reality absence cannot be qualified as prior or post absence, or cannot have any attribute. Can we say good absence, bad absence, beautiful absence, ugly absence? No. Absence cannot be qualified. We made you believe that absence is eternal; this because we cannot explain it. So this result which we showed as eternal is just a bluff of logicians. Because they cannot explain it and they say „fine, this is what it is, over”. Can we *Vedantin* explain, then? Yes. I already told in another lecture, what a chair is. What is a chair? It is something that you place in front of a table and a table is something which you place in front of a chair. Otherwise one cannot explain what a table is in his whole life. So we say *anirvachanya*, inexplicable (about *maya*); ask anything, we accept, it is inexplicable. So there is no confusion for us.

So, *phalamasasvatam*, the results are always non-eternal. If you are made to believe that the results are eternal, that is a bluff.

Next is *gatinirodhakam* - obstacle to one's movement forward. How? See, you want to buy something, you decide to go to Carrefour (supermarket); till there you see a shop, you enter and buy some items; if you go to Carrefour you buy that you want and sometimes not that and many things which you didn't want; you always end up buying things which you didn't plan to. You wanted to go to Carrefour; on the way, you entered some other shop and bought some other things and you came back. In fact if you had gone to that mall, you could have bought something necessary for this which you were buying (we are not talking about the unnecessary things, but about the necessary things). So here, you are travelling in the spiritual path. Many people are travelling on the spiritual path and in fact they go backwards, instead of progressing. So here you are travelling on the spiritual path and you find someone who says „we'll give you experience". Yes, experience, one will say, good, good, good. In this way your path towards the truth is presented with an obstacle. Why does this happen? Because of your *papa*; the obstacle are most generally caused by your sins. Something or other comes in front of you, it can be in the form of husband, wife etc. It is not your *punya*, but your *papa*, presenting in front of you, in a form of an obstacle. This is *nirodhakam*, obstacles. Or sometimes, your *punya* brings in some joys, pleasures that make you forget

about the goal. One may say, oh I experience happiness while meditation, why study *Vedanta*? I am happy when meditating, my *kundalini chakra* spins..."; this is a big problem. Don't believe that. Nothing happens like that. If you have an experience, how can an experience be truth? You are seeing me and I am telling you, what you see is an illusion. You are an illusion. How can this illusory illusion be real? In this illusion, you are seeing many illusions. How can that be real? So the biggest problem for us is this small diversion which presents itself in front of us on the spiritual path. That is why he says: *gatinirodhakam*, bad *karmas* and good *karmas* bring in experiences which may divert us from the goal.

We will have different experiences, no doubt; they may not be good, but don't qualify them as bad. Understand one thing, experience in itself establishes the limitedness. The experiences, however good they may be at the end bring sorrow. Do they last till the end of the life, whatever is the experience? We may say „that was the happiest moment, but now I am not able to experience that happiest moment again". So the sorrow comes, that happiest moment of your life becomes the cause of sorrow till the end of your life. Let those good experiences be, we don't have to carry forward those good experiences. Remember „*phalam asasvatam*" (the results are not eternal); you are having some

experience, because you have acted for that, you have done a *karma* for that. *Karma* is not eternal, the results also are not eternal, and therefore the results which are brought in by these *karmas*, will be an obstacle for your progress and never support you for your progress. That is why *Yoga Sutra-kara* very beautifully says about supernatural powers (*siddhis*)...quote....."in the *Samadhi* they are obstacles". People will be astonished by those *siddhi* one has, but that person which possess them, will know his difficulty. Let us suppose: we can see the future. Will it make you happy? It will make your life terrible, don't worry. Or the past, will it make you happy? No, it will make your life even more terrible. Any kind of *siddhis* becomes a burden; like in the example of a kid who is learning dance, all will be expected and asked to dance and show what he learnt whenever the parents and relative want. So, when we have a supernatural power, other will expect us to use that supernatural power. You are always under pressure to use your *siddhi*. So the *siddhi*, however good it may be is an experience, is an obstacle. So experience is equal obstacle. That's why it is said: *krtimahodadhau patanakaranam phalam asasvatam gatinirodhakam*, „it is cause for falling in the ocean of actions"; because *phalam asasvatam*, the results are not eternal and it is not just because the results are non-eternal, but also because *gatinirodhakam*, they are obstacles to the path.

What is the cause for falling in the ocean of *karma*? We see in the previous *sloka*: *Karma* is the cause for falling into the ocean of *karmas*.

3

Isvararpitam necchaya krtam

Cittasodhakam muktisadhakam

Isvararpitam - surrendering the results to *Iswara* (see *Sadhana Pancakam*, third teaching); *necchaya krtam*- not desire propelled, not done by desire (see also *Sadhana pancakam* - give up the association with *kamyas karma*); *cittasodhakam-citta* means mind; *sodhakam* means pure, „is an act of purifying your mind”. What is an act of purifying your mind? Surrendering the results of *karma* to *Iswara* and not performing desire propelled *karma*. These two are means for purifying the mind. If we purify our mind, what is that useful for? The purity for mind is not useful for anything in outside world, but this is necessary, it's a prerequisite for *Realization* . Just that is not enough. When with that purity of mind you enter the study of *Shastra*, it becomes a very important means. It brings you to the path of *mukti*, *Realization* .

Why is the need for this *sloka*, since he already said *krtimahodadhau*, action brings more actions. Because from this someone may say that he doesn't want to do anything, he would be happy not to do anything. But this is not what Bhagavan Ramana Maharishi intended. He doesn't want you to avoid actions. Even Bhagavan Sri Krishna is saying the same in *Bhagavad-gita* „Not even me, I also cannot escape performing action“. We cannot stay without performing actions. When Lord himself cannot do that, how can one think he can do that?! One can never not-do *karmas*. It is impossible. One may say, „no, I can sit down..“ but his mind is not quiet. Actions may not be physical, but the mental actions are also actions. They also have an impact. One may say, for instance „oh, I didn't kill him or I didn't hit him physically, but I just thought“... in this way, he may suppress his aggression, but again he did an action. That action creates an imprint which sprouts at some other time and brings another action, another imprint, suppression and so on, without any limit. So whether one does it physically or mentally, it doesn't really matter, action is an action. So we cannot stay without performing an action.

So that is why he says, you cannot stay without performing an action and *Vedas* are giving the injunctions for different actions, like daily rituals, those

rituals you have to perform and you must not escape those. Why? Because those are *karmas Iswarapitam*, those are surrendered (the results) to *Iswara*, and are not done for results; like in the case of a tough boss, he says „do that!“ „Why, what do I get?“ „Nothing, just do that“, will be the answer. But here you may not get something physically, but you get purity of mind. You perform that, your *karmas* are removed, you gain purity, you gain focus, *ishavarapitam*. Since this is not desire propelled, but they cannot make me do it, we may say... daily *karmas* are prescribed by *Vedas*, like we say we can take the horse to the water, but we cannot make it to drink; so too *Vedas* prescribe *karmas*, but they cannot make me do it. Let us see, we challenge *Vedas* also. Or one may say „I decide to do the actions prescribed in *Vedas*, the daily rituals...” No, one cannot decide. One can decide for something he has a real option, here if he performs, he gains purity of heart, if he doesn't perform, he gains sin. No choice. So *Vedas* are like a mother; they always present us with a choice, but we have always to choose what she wants, no escape.

So surrendering the results to *Iswara* and not performing result propelled *karmas* bring purity of mind and this is a prerequisite for *Realization*.

Now we understand: *karma* are not absolute, *karma* will bring more *karmas*, *karmas* with the sense of duty will be cause for purification and means for *Realization*.

Finally we have to do something. What should I do, how should I do? This is explained in the fourth *sloka*.

4

Kayavanmanah karyamuttamam

Pujanam japascintanam kramat

Kayavanmanah - *kaya* means body, *vak* means speech, *manah* means mind; *karayamuttamam* - actions are greater; when one is related with the former, the latter is greater; from physical action, verbal action is better, with respect to the latter, mental action is better.

What is physical action here? It's not any action, but *pujanam*, worship; here the verbal action is *japah*, and mental action is meditation. So *kramat* with *uttamam* should be associated, in respective order, they are greater. The latter one is greater than the former one.

There might be a doubt what kind of *karma* we have to perform which will help us to grow in spirituality and which doesn't become an obstacle. So here are prescribed actions which are not an obstacle on the spiritual path: *puja* (physical action), *japa* (verbal action) and *cintanam* (meditation), these in respective order are greater than the former. Meditation is the best, the lower category is *puja*. That doesn't mean that we should not do *puja*. It is like in the case of the people who study astrology; at the beginning, they just check any planet position on the houses and come fast to the conclusion of the effect just by its position on the house, without taking into consideration the aspects between planets which can negate that primary effect of the house. They don't see that. Or in the case of older people who watch the TV programme, where a doctor is invited and he talks about the symptoms of a disease, e.g. drinking water continuously, the older people immediately come to the conclusion they have that disease, without taking other symptoms into consideration. These kinds of ideas that we have are obstacles. So to help us to get rid of these ideas, he gives you the rules: what are the *karmas*: *puja*, *japa* and *cintanam*. We should not jump to the third directly; we should start with the basics. You don't have to give up *puja*, *puja* will give you up, at the right moment. If you do it, that becomes your *karma*, if the *puja* gives you up

is not your *karma*. Very beautiful: Newton and the apple: when it fell, he understood gravity; gravity was there before, but he said „this is gravity”; we have said in Tarka Sangraha,..... it talks about gravity long before, attraction towards, because of the weight. The fruit cannot stay on and on, it falls from the tree at a point, similarly, when you are in that proper junction when you don't need the puja anymore, puja and japa will „leave” you. So until you are enough mature to do *cintanam*, you should practice *japa* as much as possible. That is why whenever I give *mantra*, I said to leave it just in the inauspicious periods, you chant the *mantra* always”: sitting in a train, plane, driving, chant *mantra*, always, why wasting your time thinking at that or this, or why it happened so etc. because we cannot prevent something from happening or not happening, so utilize your time you have to chant *mantra*. Then when you are ready for that, the *cintanam* will come naturally. How it should be done? We will see in the next *sloka*.

Each one of them is necessary for our growth. Though *cintanam* is the best, that doesn't mean *puja* is not necessary. Like we have an iron bar and we have to break it. To break it, let's say one needs ten beatings. We cannot say why doesn't he start with the tenth beating itself? Or in another example, you want to eat pancakes. How many pancakes can one eat? Ten, let's

say. We cannot start with the tenth in the first place. Similarly, we have to start from scratch, because we don't know where we left it in the previous birth. If we start from this: I forgot I had a breakfast in another house, now I am going in another house, they are offering me food. They don't know I had eaten, but I know; oh I already ate two pancakes, this will be enough; they will say „no, no you have come to my house, you have to eat”, that will be a problem; so the moment you take the second pancake you will be full, you will feel and you will say this is enough. That is how the *karmas* will show you a signal and it will drop you, you don't have to drop it. So *kayavanmanaha karyamuttamam*. No matter how beautiful the ladder is, you are going to leave it when you reach to the top portion. You will not say: this ladder is very beautiful, this first step is very nice, I am going to hold on it. You will go further to reach the top. Similarly, here also, no matter beautiful this *japa* is, we should not be stuck in it. That doesn't mean we should give it up ourselves. Remember that! Just keep practicing *japa* and at the right moment it will tell you “I am done with you, I am going”. It will be very clear, like a slap on your face.

Jagata isadhi yuktasevanam

Astamurtibhrddevapujanam

We saw that *karmas* are not absolute. It is *Iswara* who is absolute and he is the bestower of the results. Then we saw the *karmas* not only are not absolute, but they also lead us to more *karmas*, which means more bondage. This doesn't mean one should stop doing anything. Further he answers no; we have to perform the actions with the attitude of surrendering the results to *Iswara*. Not surrendering the *karmas*, but surrendering the results. So, one should surrender the results to *Iswara*. People say that without the desire of results, one has to perform the *karmas*; that is *kamyā karma*, they say; but without the desire for the results, even an idiot would not perform anything. Everyone here is thinking only about the results. Now, what we say is „ think about the results, but surrender those results to *Iswara*”. Meaning you have to perform at the best, but let the results not bother you. It is *Iswara's* will. Let us accept *Iswara's* will.

Then he says if we perform the *karma* without the attachment to the results, then that *karma* leads to purity of mind which becomes a means for *Realization* . After that it is said what *karma* should be performed:

puja, japa, scintanam - physical, vocal, mental; in this order they are greater. Vocal is better than physical, mental is better than vocal. So after saying this he explains what it is meant by physical, vocal and mental. It is about: *puja*, worship, *japa*, chanting, and *scintanam*, meditating.

Then he explains what kind of *puja* is best.

Puja, japa and *meditation*, all are necessary. Since meditation is the greatest among them, one may think that he can jump directly to it, but no, one should do all.

So here the normal *puja* is necessary for the normal people. When one is not mature enough he should not go beyond it. He should start from the scratch.

For the person who is mature enough, it is given an option for *puja*, in this fifth *sloka*: „*Jagata Isadhi yuktasevanam/Astamurtibhrddevapujanam.*”

When we explain God in Hinduism, we say *Iswara* is in everything, we don't worship the forms, we worship the Consciousness, *Iswara* in those forms; we worship deities, human beings as *Iswara*, we worship trees, plants as *Iswara*, we worship animals as *Iswara*, we worship the mixtures (of animal and human etc.) as *Iswara*. This *Iswara* meditation is what is taught here. „*Jagata Isadhi*” means that meditation with the

knowledge that everything is *Iswara*. The knowledge that it is *Iswara*. What is *Iswara*? *Jagata*, in the world. Meditating that everything in the world is *Iswara* is *yuktasevanam*. Here *Bhagavan* is talking about a higher form of *puja*: meditating that everything in the world is *Iswara*: *jagata isadhi yuktasevanam*.

How? He says: *astamurtibhrddevapujanam*, in eight (*asta*) forms, holding to eight forms (*murti*). *Iswara* in these eight forms: the five elements, sun, moon and *jiva* (the individual self) himself. All these eight are nothing but *Iswara*. Meditating about all these as *Iswara*, seeing all these as *Iswara* is *deva pujanam*, is the worship of the deity.

This is a different view on *puja*. Like in *Vivekacudamani*, when *Acharya* discusses about *bhakti*, he says *atma anusandhanam eva bhaktih*, meditation on the Self is devotion. Devotion is normally: the relation where there is the devotee, the object of devotion and the means of devotion. There is always a duality, I am always different from the object of devotion, I cannot be one with the object of devotion, because there will not be any devotion (as per this acceptance). So the one who is devoted to the object of devotion should be separate, but in *Vedanta*, meditating on the *Self* is devotion, not meditating on the external objects. That is explained as

devotion. Now here we are giving a new interpretation for *puja*.

When we do this *puja*, then we don't have to do a talking meditation, a walking meditation, our life will become a meditation. Your mere existence will become a meditation.

What do we have to see, the object of meditation, here the special form of *puja* (seen as a meditation)? It is said „*devo bhutva.....*” „One becomes the God, *Iswara* and worships *Iswara*”. Like when I am going to chant a *mantra*, I place that *Iswara* in my whole body; there are different *nyasa*. So then I meditate on *Iswara*, because that *mantra* is *Iswara*. Name and form cannot be different. Name is form. This name and form are one and the same, therefore meditating on the name means meditating on the form, which is not different from myself, because name and form are illusory and superimposed should reside on the substratum and who is superimposing? I am superimposing. And where that superimposition resides? In me. So I am meditating on the *Iswara* after becoming that very *Iswara*. That is the form of meditation said in *Vedas*.

Now here he says what *puja* is; meditating with the knowledge that everything in the world is *Iswara*. Instead of I becoming the deity and worshipping I am

seeing everything as deity including myself. Where can there be any duality? The objects, the five elements are *Iswara*, the Sun and the Moon are *Iswara*, me, the *jiva* is also *Iswara*. There is nothing other than *Iswara*. This is the best form of worship.

This form of *puja* is better than the general form of *puja*. How is it better than the general worship?

Normally, when we worship, we worship an object in front of us. Let it be *Shiva* or *Vishnu* or other deity. You are worshipping a form of the deity in front of you, in form of a stone, for instance. This stone is limited. We superimpose the idea of *Iswara* in that small stone and we meditate on that. Here he is not giving you the idea of the small stone as *Iswara*, but everything in this world, every element, everything is *Iswara*. This is what we do in Hinduism. We don't worship the tree, the plant the animal, we worship the existence in it, i.e. we worship *Iswara* in it. In India we do salutation to each of these elements, earth, mountains like Tiruvanamalai where Bhagavan Ramana Maharishi stayed all his life and he is staying. That mountain is worshiped and people go 14 kilometers around it. People walk around this mountain meditating at this mountain as *Iswara*. And they go far to mountain Kailash. We go to holy river Narmada, from where the river starts. We go to the

point of origin and come back to the point where it merges with the ocean. And they come back to the place from where we started. This is the physical way to worship the element water. The element Fire: when we do fire oblation, when the marriage takes place, the grooms have to take oaths going around the fire, we do worship fire. Air and space: how do we worship? One cannot go around it. So what we do, we stand in the same place and go round (revolve). We do a circle standing in one single place. Every day in the morning the Sun is worshiped by everyone. Generally they throw water looking at the Sun, and in the evening they do it looking at the Moon or at least they pray if they don't throw water. So we have a physical puja of the five elements and the Sun and the Moon.

Jiva is the one who is worshipping the elements and Sun and Moon. This is normal *puja*.

But here, instead of seeing these elements as different, seeing each element as *Iswara* is what is explained. Sun and Moon are *Iswara*; Sun is a perceivable God.....*Jiva* cannot be different from *Iswara* (we already saw this). If I am different from *Iswara*, I am limiting *Iswara*. I am in fact becoming a problem for *Iswara*. If I am different from *Iswara*, *Iswara* should really be afraid of me. Like I am afraid of *Iswara*, *Iswara* will be afraid of me. Because

wherever there is duality, there is fear. *Veda* says whether I am different from *Iswara*, or He is different from me, there is fear for both of us. *Iswara* will be afraid of me and I will be afraid of *Iswara*. There is no other way. So instead of seeing this, here it is said to see everything as *Iswara*. All the elements are *Iswara*, the Sun and Moon are *Iswara* and I am *Iswara*. I am not different from *Iswara*. This is the best form of *puja*.

The text is coming to the next topic in the 6th *sloka*: *japa*

6

Uttamastavaduccamandatah

Cittajam japadhyanamuttamam

Stavad (stotram) songs which venerate *Iswara*; they can be songs from *Vedas* or songs written by great people for *Iswara*; can be even *mantras*. These can be chanted in three different forms: a) *ucca* – in a high pitch, in a high voice; b) *manda* - lower voice; c) *upamshu* - slowly, murmuring. These are the three ways of chanting.

The best way of chanting is that born in the *citta* (mind). When one does the chanting in the mind it is called *japa*

evam dhyana; the chanting itself is a meditation. This is *uttama*, the best form of chanting. The best form of chanting is none of the three mentioned above (*uccha* etc.), but meditating upon an object in your mind.

Doing or acting against someone physically or vocally has the same effect as doing it mentally, as we saw above (...). Just because one abuses someone inside his mind without anyone knowing doesn't make it without any result. It is much worse than the physical action. So that's why it is said that the best form of chanting is doing it in the mind. Best form of abusing is doing it in the mind. The physical or the vocal abuse is lesser form of abuse than the mental one, because this creates a very strong imprint. If somebody is going to slap you, physically that is, it is over; if bad words will be used against you, it is over, but for a mental abuse one has to create your form in his mind and his form and use the abusing words against you, so he has three creations in his mind: of you, of him and of the choicest of abuse. Now, which will create more impression? And he will carry over this abuse to the next life, while in a slapping for e.g., one can also not remember after years. So the worse form of abuse is mental abuse. It creates more thought impression. Similarly, the best form of *japa* is mental *japa*.

So the abuse done mentally or verbally is only carried on by the person who receives it; the one who abused may not even remember, the other person will remember, but if it is mental then it will create a very strong impression in the abuser's mind. The other person will not even know. Whenever you think of that person, you only will think of this abuse. And this imprint will not be just for this life, it will be carried on in the next life. One may say he doesn't know about next life, but we can see situations when we first meet a person and we feel either attracted towards him/her or either we reject this person. He sees the person for the first time, but he doesn't like her/him. This is because he carries over the thought impression from the previous life. This is the reason. So we should be very careful when we formulate a thought. We should be double cautious when thinking bad about someone.

So we saw the best form of *japa* and the best form of *puja*. We will see the third: the best form of *cintanam* (meditation), how to do meditation:

Saralacintanam viralatah param

Bhagavan Sri Ramana Maharishi is giving two examples for meditation in this *sloka*: a) *ajyadharaya* - like the smooth flow of ghee or oil; and b) *srotasa* - like the flow of a river (without any gap), *saralacintanam* – smooth flow of one thought, *viralatah param*- better than thought broken by other thoughts. So this flow of one thought is better than broken thoughts, than broken meditation.

So the meditation should be like a flow of river or like a flow of oil without any disturbance. We also try to meditate. When we meditate, whether it is chanting the God's name or we meditate upon one of his forms, we start very nice, but after a period we realize that we are chanting something else. We keep chanting, but we will be chanting something else.

There is a story related to this in India. My grandmother used to tell it to me. There was a new married man, son-in-law who went to his mother-in-law's house. His mother-in-law prepared a very good sweet, like a dumpling. He liked this sweet a lot and asked for more. Then he says that his wife doesn't prepare that sweet. His mother-in-law tells him that in fact his wife is better

in preparing that sweet than her. He left happy repeating in his mind the name of the sweet so he wouldn't forget till home: dumpling, dumpling, dumpling...On the way back he keeps chanting dumpling, and after jumping over a puddle he changed the chanting (because of the jumping): to yaahooo and kept chanting yaahooo, yaahooo till home. Upon reaching his house he told his wife, „ok, make some yaahoo”. „I don't know yaahoo”, then the man: „Of course you know, your mother told me you prepare the best yaahoos, so don't bluff me”, thinking she doesn't want to admit that she knows, because it is hard to do; still she keeps telling him she doesn't know what is yaahoo and he starts beating her. It becomes so worse that the neighbor's intervene and ask what he was doing; he says „She is not cooking me the food which I like very much; her mother told me she prepares the best yaahoo”, „you have beaten her so hard that everywhere on her face and they look like dumplings”, says the neighbor. Then he remembers „Yes, that's the sweet”.

Similarly, we start with dumpling dumpling and suddenly it becomes yaahoo yaahoo yaahoo. We experience this. Or we chant dumpling, dumpling and we start: „the best dumplings are available in this place, oh! In that place I have seen that person, oh! that person comes from this

place". We start with one idea and we roam around the world without holding on to one idea. This is not the point. The point is holding on to that one idea; that is why he says that the smooth flow of one thought is better than broken meditation, because the meditation is sometime disturbed, our mind is not completely under our control so we start chanting for e.g. *Om namah Shivaya* and meanwhile think „oh, today I have to go to work", then we continue „*Om namah Shivaya*", „*Om namah Shivaya*", then „oh, I have to cook". Now this is said by *viralatah*, broken meditation. Instead of a broken meditation, a continuous one like a flow of oil or of a river is best.

So *puja*, *japa*, *cintanam* are explained. In *puja* whatever one sees is seeing *Iswara* (in every form), in *japa*, the best form of it is chanting in the mind, in *cintanam*, a continuous flow of a thought is the best form of meditation. But in all these three, one is seeing something else as *Iswara* or he is seeing this world as *Iswara*, meaning *Iswara* is different and the object of meditation is different. You see the object of meditation as *Iswara*. You see the element, which is different from *Iswara*, as *Iswara*. There is this duality. And again, you the meditator are different; you see that meditator as *Iswara*. There is always duality, everywhere, duality between the object of meditation and *Iswara*, and

between the meditator and *Iswara*. There is always this duality. So in this meditation also, there is a better form of meditation. So Bhagavan is trying to bring you to that meditation:

8

Bhedabhavanat so'hamityasau

Bhavana'bhida pavani mata

Bheda - duality, *bhavanat* - meditation, instead of meditating in duality, *so ahamityasau* - the form of meditation of „I am that *Iswara*“, that which is called *bhavani* is accepted to be the best, the pure (*pavani*) form of meditation, is better than the meditation in duality.

When we are discussing about *bhavana* (mental mode):

9

Bhavasunyasadbhavasusthitih

Bhavanabaladbhaktiruttama

Meditating upon the non-duality of one's Self and *Iswara* is the best form of meditation he said in the previous *sloka*. Now, in the present *sloka* he says that thinking presupposes duality, there is the subject and there is thought, so forget about „I am that“ also.

That's why he says *bhavasunya*, absence of thought; *bhava* here means thought, *sunya* - absence, absence of this form and that form. *Sadbhava* - existence, *susthitih* - nicely establish, nicely establish into existence, without thinking, without any idea. *Bhavanabalad* - that comes with the strength of meditation in non-dual form; *bhaktiruttama* - that is the best form of *bhakti* (devotion).

So the first form of meditation is seeing everything as *Iswara*, second is seeing that *Iswara* being non-different from you. Meditation presupposes thought function, so there is a thought function where you see that *Iswara* to be non-different from yourself. Even that thought function is an obstacle. The whole Creation is because of the thought function. The mind starts functioning the Creation exists. When the mind does not function, the Creation doesn't exist. In the deep sleep, there is no mind, there is no trouble with the world, because it doesn't exist. In *Samadhi*, mind doesn't exist, there is no

trouble. The moment the mind starts functioning, everything is a problem. Whatever you see is a problem, nothing is fine here, because the mind is functioning, overtime. So he says: better than seeing yourself as *Iswara* - seeing so you have to do a *bhavana*, you have to meditate; you have to imagine - loose this imagination also, loose this thought function also. When the thought function ceases to exist, *bhavasunya*, at that point of time, you cannot stay to be different from your *Self*.

We explained this from the standpoint that the world is illusory. In the deep sleep it doesn't exist, therefore in the waking state it has no existence. We can forget about this and let us accept the existence of this world. There are two ways of looking at this world: one it is illusory, other is that it's *Iswara's* creation. Let us see this world to be a creation of *Iswara*. There is no error, no problem in *Iswara's* creation. There is nothing wrong in the creation of *Iswara*. Everything is good. But one may not see so. One may see only problems, errors, troubles. Why? Because that is not *Iswara's* creation, that his creation; his creation is different from *Iswara's* creation. That is why the problem arises.

This is a paper. Common paper is worthless, but if it has 100 euros printed on it, it becomes worthy. Or we can

take as example a flower, a fruit, anything. It has nothing wrong or otherwise in it, but we perceive it in different ways and so we can say „oh, paper, it could have been green coloured paper, or even with lines, it would have been better. So there are so many different opinions about one and the same paper. We don't see it just as a simple paper and that the end, but we start imagining, superimposing our ideas in that paper: good, bad, this etc. So this paper is *Iswara's* Creation and in this paper, my attachment or my aversion is individual creation, *jiva's* creation. This is with respect to everything in this world. I see something as good and the same object is not seen as good by someone else and other person doesn't even care about it or someone else doesn't even know that this kind of object exists. There exist so many different viewpoints with respect to the same object. So the problem is not with *Iswara's* creation, but the problem is with respect to our creations, our attachments, and our hatred. Therefore, this *jiva's* creation, which is the attachment etc. is what is said by duality and about it *bhavasunya*, the absence of any attachment or aversion, thought function of those. When one removes that *bhava*, attachment or aversion, all the different attributes, when one removes them, what remains is the substratum, like we ask „who are you“, „I am x“, „no, forget, who are you? That's your name, who are you?“ „six feet“, that's your height, who

are you?" „white", „that's your colour, who are you?"“
diabetic", „that's your disease, who are you?" now you
don't have an answer, you are thinking with respect to
your body - sense-organ complex. When all these idea
about you are negated, when there are no attributes of
this and that, what remains is „I am". In that existence
nicely establish yourself, *sadbhavasusthitih*. When the
attributes cease to exist, you become establish in the
Self, because there is no attribute, there is nothing to
differentiate you from yourself.

This is not easy; that's why he says *bhavanabalad*, that
comes with the strengthening of your focus, *bhavana*.
This is the best form of *bhakti*.

The best form of *bhakti* is a thoughtless state; when
there is no thought the *Self* exists without any
attributes. This is the best form of devotion.

After explaining the best form of devotion, he is going
on to explain how to achieve it:

10

Hrtsthale manah svasthata kriya

Bhaktiyogabodhasca niscitam

Hrtsthale- hrt means *Self*; in *Sanskrit* we say *hrdaya* meaning heart, meaning in that in which the *Self* exist; from *hrt – Self*. In that *Self*, the mind (*manah*) stays in its own point of origin: *kriya* is action. The action of establishing the mind in its point of origin is what is called as *bhakti, yoga* and *jnana*.

There are different paths: path of *bhakti*, devotion, path of *yoga* - meditation etc. and path of knowledge, inquiry. These seem to be different paths, but in reality they are not different. Because what is *bhakti*? It is said above: the best form of *bhakti* is being the state devoid of thought function. What is *yoga*? *Yoga citta vrtti nirodah, yoga* is absence of thought function. And what is *jnana*? *Jnana* is thoughtless state. So all these are definitely, any path, any philosophy does not let you do whatever. If it lets you do whatever, that's no path. Keep control over your mind, every path in the world teaches you that. How to manage your mind? We go a step forward and we say how to annihilate your mind, how to remove your mind, that is the best *bhakti*, the best *yoga* and the best knowledge.

Mind being established in its place of origin means the mind becoming identical with the place of origin, the mind ceasing to exist, to be different from the place of its origin. That is what is explained here. And when that

state is achieved, that is the ultimate *bhakti, yoga, jnana*.

How to control the mind. How do we place the mind in the *Self*. This is going to be explained in the eleventh *sloka*.

When we talk about *pranayama*, we have to remember that it is not the first stage in *yoga*. First there are *yama* and *niyama*, later *asanas* and after those *pranayama* comes. When coming to *yama*, we cannot establish or quantify it, like saying for instance how many „kilos“ of *yama* we have. Like in football, not the numbers of runs is important like in cricket, but the numbers of goals. When talking about *yama* and *niyama* we don't measure in kilos, we don't ask what is the number of *yama* or *niyama*? One should understand this, we have first to have *yama* and *niyama* and after gain a little of *asana siddhi*, meaning one has to be able to sit in a posture without being disturbed (troubled). That's why when it talks about *asana*, *Yoga Sutra-kara* says „*sthira sukham asanam*“, in which *sthiram* means stability, *sukham* is peacefulness, whichever posture; even though most of us find the best peaceful posture to be *savasana*, the final one. A proper posture is necessary for *pranayama*. Because when one is doing *pranayama*, if there isn't stillness of the body, the *prana* is not going straight

through *sushumna nadi*, it is going to go somewhere in-between. And then, there is a pain here and there. Instead of doing proper *yoga*, you will be practicing *roga*, disease. One should be careful about this.

11

Vayurodhanalliyate manah

Jalapaksivadrodhasadhanam

We saw above, controlling the mind is of prime importance. Whichever philosophy or whoever the philosopher it may be, talks about controlling the mind. How to gain this control of mind? He says: *vayu - prana*, vital air, *rodhanat* - controlling; *liyate manah* - mind subsides; so by controlling the *prana*, mind subsides, settles. Like what? He is giving an example: *jala* - cage, *pakshivad* – like a bird, like a bird in a cage; *rodha sadhanam* – is the means to control the mind. When one is controlling the *prana*, the breathing, then the mind is as well controlled.

When one is emotional distressed, people advise to breathe slowly, profoundly; but forget about this, you

can take a deep breath and stop the breathing for some time. Or just stop breathing for a while. See that your mind will not function for some time and in that point you can divert it towards something else. At that moment, what you need is to stop the mind to function towards that moment of distress, it needs a diversion so stop it and put the mind in something else. It is a temporary escape.

So what do we do? We practice *pranayama*. *Pranayama* means control of *prana*. Sri Patanjali in *Yoga Sutra* describes three stages of *pranayama*: a) *puraka*, b) *rechaka* and c) *kumbhaka*. *Puraka* means inhaling, filling, b) exhale and leave the *prana*, c) *kumbhaka* means holding the *prana*. There are two types of *kumbhaka*: *antar kumbhaka* - internal *kumbhaka* and the other is *bahya* - external *kumbhaka*. One inhales and retains the air inside and after a proper calculation he exhales. *Kumbhaka* is not for normal people. *Kumbhaka* is to be done by a person who practices proper *yoga*, meaning he practices only *yoga* as his *saddhana*. It is not for anyone. A normal person should do a simple *pranayama*: *nadi shuddhi pranayama*: inhale through a nostril and exhale through the other, inhale through this latter and exhale through the former. And slowly increase. First one should do three rounds, the five, till

ten repeats, not more. This is good enough for purifying the *nadis*, the spiritual nerves.

No *kumbhaka* for normal people. The *yogis* inhale and keep the *prana* inside for some seconds and minutes and they later exhale; this holding inside is called *antar kumbhaka*, and then they exhale calculating with the reference of the inhaling and retention. After exhaling they retain the breathe outside - *bahya kumbhaka* for the same number of seconds as in *antar kumbhaka*. This is proper *pranayama*. For this proper *pranayama*, one should have proper *yama* and *niyama*, a proper life style, a proper food habit and a proper *asana*. All these are very difficult and complicated, so let us do just a simple *pranayama*.

So *vayu rodhana*, when one controls the breathing, not stop it, then naturally the mind is also controlled.

There are five *koshas*, as seen in *Tattva Bodhah*: physical body, vital air body, mental sheath, intellect sheath, bliss sheath. Inside of the physical body there is *pranamaya-kosha*. And we see the external being controlled by the internal. That which is closer to the *Self* is the controller and that which is farther to the *Self* is the controlled one. The body is controlled and the *prana* is the controller. The *prana* controls the body. For example I decide not to move my body; I have to control the

prana. The body is controlled, the *prana* is the controller. The next stage: mind. Inside of the *prana* sheath there is the mind (mental sheath, *manomaya-kosha*). Mind is the controller and *prana* is controlled. I control the *prana* I control the physical body, I control the mind I control the *prana*. I decide not to breathe. What can *prana* do? Nothing. I decide. Mind is the controller. The inner is the controller and the outer is controlled.

But the text is saying here that if one controls the *prana*, the mind is controlled. It is seemingly contradictory. Because he is giving us the answer in the next *sloka*, saying that the mind and the *prana* come from the same place. If one is controlled the other is as well controlled. Since mind and *prana* emerge from the same place, if one is controlled the other is controlled too.

One method to control the *prana*, as we saw above is *pranayama*. This is not the only method.

Pranayama is by brute force, *hathayoga*. It is very difficult, counting and applying always a brute controlling. The easier method is: when you inhale, chant the mantra, when you exhale chant the mantra. I focus on my breathe, chanting while inhaling and exhaling. Up till this one may even not know he was breathing, it has been an involuntary act, but now by

observing one makes it a voluntary action. The breathing becomes consciously. Chanting while inhaling and chanting while exhaling. This is one way.

Or there is another way: by doing anything, just watch the breath while entering and going out. Focusing on the nose and inhaling and not doing anything else just watching the breathe going in and out and in this way the mind subsides. It merges.

When one practices these methods, he will see as *Yoga Sutra kara* says:..... „the *prana* becomes elongated and very subtle.” He will not even know that he is breathing. It becomes so subtle. That is why people in *Samadhi*, for an extended period of time one will not see them breathing. And there are stories about great yogis that they stay inert and when they get out of *Samadhi* they get up and they walk like nothing happened. Their *prana* became so subtle and elongated, it will take days to complete one inhaling and days to begin the exhaling and so one looking at such person may say „oh, this Babaji is gone”, „this monk is gone”. So this is a practice, a common one for great yogis. Now it has become a practice to earn a living, but this is not meant for that.

So when one control his *prana* his mind gets controlled like the bird which is caged. The same way the mind stays still when the *prana* is controlled.

Controlling the *prana* through watching the *prana*, it becomes elongated and subtle and suddenly you will see yourself you are not breathing. This may bring a fear: "is this *pranayama* going to kill me?" So let us not get into *pranayama*. Let us practice the *japa*, *puja* and come to this when our food habits and mental habits are in control. I am not talking about mind control; I am talking about food habits and mental habits. First those are to be controlled and after one may come to *pranayama*.

So how it is possible to control the mind by controlling the *prana*, because we saw that mind is the controller and *prana* is controlled, normally. The answer is found in the twelveth *sloka*:

12

Cittavayavascitkriyayutah

Sakhayordvayi saktimulaka

Cittavayavah - *citta*, mind and *vayu* - *prana*, *citkriyayutah* - are endowed with mental activity (thought function) and vital air activity (*kriya*). Mind and vital air are involved in thought function and activity,

respectively. When there is no *prana* there is no activity. The body and the sense-organs don't function. *Sakhayordvayi* - they are two branches, *saktimulaka* - having as their base the *Atma, chaitanya*.

There are two activities: the activity of mind, thought function and the activity of *prana*, action. Since they emerge from the same place, consciousness or the *Iswara sakti, Iswara's* power, whatever name it is said, they start from the same place and that is why either you control the mind and you go to *prana* or control the *prana* and go to mind, whichever way is possible. One control the *prana* your mind is as well controlled, you control the mind, your *prana* is controlled too.

There are three powers in *Iswara: jnana shakti* (the power of knowledge), *iccha sakti* (the power of desire) and *kriya sakti* (the power of action).

Here the text is talking about two powers: the power of knowledge and the power of action. *Cit*, thought function is knowledge and *kriya*, activity is power of action. But there is one power in-between, the power of desire. This is as well included in *jnana sakti*. In the majority of the books which explain *Upadesha Sara*, mind is explained as a bundle of thought function. This is a bundle of lies. Mind is not a bundle of thought function, mind is thought function. There is no mind

other than thought function. Mind transforms itself in thought function and according to the thought function it is called as mind, ego, intellect etc. (and even, desire, anger, guilt, shyness etc.). Mind is just thought function that is why one is not able to find a physical mind no matter how one may try. Have you ever thought at the mind as an object? I was explaining these days: we are used to accept things as we are used to: table is a table, chair a chair, we don't want any explanation; or we say „my mind is very troubled” and over, done. But there is no mind, and the mind which has no real existence is troubled. What a big surprise! And we say mind exist, but when we are asked to show where it is, we can't point it out. One cannot point out the mind because mind doesn't exist as a solid substance, it's just a thought function and when one believes he has a mind, that belief is mind. There is nothing called mind, mind it!

Before explaining *saktimulaka*, we will ask a question: “where is fire in this room?” it's everywhere, not just in the lamp: the fire from the lamp is manifest fire the other is unmanifest fire. *Sakti* is *Iswara sakti*, *Iswara's* power, *mulaka* means it emerges from that power. Mind and *prana* emerge from that power, *Iswara's* power.

Next question we may ask: where is *Iswara*? *Iswara* is everywhere. He is in this glass as well as in me. But the

manifest form of *Iswara* is in me and the unmanifest form of *Iswara* is in this glass. Can we say this? It's not wrong. *Iswara* is everywhere, but as a reflection on the mind *Iswara* exists in me. Since the objects don't have mind, there is no reflection of *Iswara* in them, therefore he is in an unmanifest state in them. *Iswara* is unmanifest in objects and in manifest state in *jiva*, individual self. Therefore, this *prana* and thought function emerge from me, *jiva*, and not from the glass. This is the difference between the glass (object) and *jiva*. Both have *Iswara*, but there is no manifestation of *Iswara* in the glass, because there is no medium for reflection of *Iswara* in the glass. In the *jiva*, there is a medium, mind, in which *Iswara* gets reflected. Therefore, there are two activities: the *prana* and the thought function.

13

Layavinasane ubhayarodhane

Layagatam punarbhavati no mrtam

Layavinasane - merging and annihilation, *ubhayarodhane* - there are two types of controlling the mind: *laya* - merging, *vinasa* - destruction, annihilation. Among these two, *layagatam punarbhavati* - the one

which is merged will manifest again, *no mrtam* - the one which is destroyed doesn't manifest again.

When one practices *yoga*, he may go into the state of *laya*, the maximum state, the mind goes to sleep, and it merges. The merged mind manifests later. It just waits for proper time. For gaining this *laya*, deep sleep is as well as good. Deep sleep, death also brings *laya*. You may not see and understand it, but there is *laya*. It again emerges in a different body. After sleep you wake up in the same body and therefore, you think there is continuity. But after death, you wake up in a different body and think there is no continuity. This is the only difference between death and sleep. That is why in India, highly orthodox houses, spread the mat for sleep, next day they remove it and sprinkle water and wash that area, because they associate the sleep with death. So that is considered to be impure area and they have to purify it. They don't touch the mat (bed) in the day time.

Laya is merging and this can happen even in sleep.

Vinasa is complete annihilation, there cannot be mind.

The term „merging“ may create confusion, because sometimes we use for *vinasa* also „merging“ the mind in the Self, making it Self, identify. Therefore to

differentiate, we use these terms: merging and destruction.

Laya – mind is merged and it emerges back, *vinasa* - destroyed and it doesn't come back.

The difference between these two is: in *laya* the effect gets destroyed, the thought function and its associated objects get negated. But in *vinasa*, the cause is as well destroyed. In *laya*, the mind turning into a thought function is negated, and the mind remains without functioning, but in *vinasa*, not just the thought function, the mind also is destroyed. In *laya*, only the thought function, the effect of mind is destroyed, but in *vinasa* the mind is destroyed. By “the mind is destroyed” after saying the mind is thought function, may seem contradictory, the “mind” ceases to exist, as it become identical with the Self.

So when the mind goes to *laya*, one experiences sleep or *Samadhi*. That is why we don't give a lot of importance for this *Samadhhi (jada Samadhi)*. As mentioned in *Tattva Bodhah*, this person will be in *Samadhi* for several years and when he comes out of the *Samadhi* he will ask for the water, he had asked before entering *Samadhi*. He wanted to drink water before *Samadhi* and he comes out and he asks for water. And he will find near him the disciple of his disciple.

So the thought function means the ego remains in this person who has gained *laya*. Ego, the identification that „I am *jiva*” remains. This is the ego. But when the mind is completely destroyed, annihilated, merged in the *Self*, there is no ego. *Laya Samadhi* is temporary, *vinasa Samadhi* is eternal. There is no going and coming out from *vinasa Samadhi*, but there is going and coming out in *laya Samadhi*, like going and coming out of the sleep.

14

Pranabandhanallinamanasam

Ekacintanannasametyadah

Pranabandhanat - wherever there is „-aat” in the end is for the 5th case and 5th case is for reason; by controlling the *prana*, *linamanasam* - the mind merges; *ekacintanad* - by one thought function (understand this to be the *Self* inquiry), *nasametyadah* - attains annihilation. After the mind merging through *pranayama*, by meditating upon one thing it becomes annihilated.

So by controlling the *prana*, the best one can achieve is merging the mind, make the mind tranquil, that's all. It cannot give you *Realization*. *Pranayama* cannot give you *Realization*, any practice of *yoga* cannot give you *Realization*. So what do we have to do? Meditate upon, *Eka cintana - jiva* and *Brahman* are one, identification of individual self with the *Absolute Self*.

This is the meditation, the thought: *jiva Brahma eva*: the individual self is verily the *Absolute Self*. This thought function is mentioned in the next (sloka), not any thought function will be good, because, we are talking about negation of ignorance. Negation of ignorance cannot happen through any thought function, except this. E.g. the knowledge of a paper can only remove the ignorance of this object, paper. Can I say about the paper that it is a book? No, paper is different and the book is different. And ignorance can be removed only by knowledge and ignorance can be removed only with right knowledge, not any knowledge. Any knowledge cannot do. Because we think any knowledge is good, we are confused. We are not confused because we lack knowledge. We have knowledge, but we lack proper knowledge, the right one. In the beginning we said *pramana janita jnana*, a knowledge produced through a *pramana* (the means of right knowledge). We are talking about a particular ignorance which cannot be removed

through any other knowledge. And ignorance cannot be removed through any action. A problem can be removed through an action, like taking a pill for a headache. But if, for instance, one sees a black spot on a white cloth and the others cannot see it, only one person sees it, who has a problem? The person who sees it is seeing a non-existing black spot on the white cloth and this non-existing black spot cannot be removed by any other means other than the knowledge that there is no black spot, its pure white. Similarly, the knowledge of the Self as non-dual is the only way to get rid of ignorance that „I am individual, I am limited”.

So by controlling the *prana* mind gets merged and by contemplating upon the non-dual *Self*, the mind gets destroyed.

So there are two ways of controlled mind: *laya* and *vinasa*. In *laya* the effect, thought function etc. gets negated, in *vinasa*, the cause also gets negated, the mind gets destroyed and the ignorance which is the primary cause for the mind gets destroyed, too. So, cause and thought functions are destroyed, in other words, the mind becomes identical with the Self.

The method of achieving *laya* and *vinasana* are: control of the breathing will lead to *laya*. *Vinasa* is gained further, after controlling the mind, when one inquires

into the identity between the individual self and the *Absolute Self*. This is the order shown in the text.

At this stage, the mind is destroyed. What follows then? The answer is found in the fifteenth *sloka*:

15

Nastamanasotkrstayoginah

Krtyamasti kim svasthitim yatah

Nastamanasat – the destroyed mind (when the mind is destroyed), *utkrstayoginah* - the *yogi* who is the greatest (who has achieved the destruction of mind); *krtyamasti kim* - what is the act he needs to perform; there is nothing; *svasthitim yatah* - since he is established in the *Self*.

By inquiring into the identity between the individual self and the *Absolute Self*, the ignorance which springs as the „I” thought, as ego, as mind, is destroyed. When the ignorance springs as ego we see the world. The syntagma „springs as ego „ is used because in deep sleep, too there is ignorance, but there is no springing (manifesting) as ego, we don’t see the Creation as we

see it in the waking state. So in that deep sleep the mind is in state of *laya*. Through inquiry into the identity between individual self and the *Absolute Self* that mind is completely destroyed. So we come out of the sleep, the ego springs (manifests); when the ego manifests we see the Creation and we start interacting with the Creation.

Ignorance in dormant state, ego in dormant state manifests, once it manifests we see the world; when this ego that we call mind merges in the ignorance, there is no world. Where did this world come into existence from? From the ego. Only when there is ego, one sees this Creation, when there is no ego, there is no Creation. So the cause for creation is not something else, like somebody is saying „let there be light”, the cause for creation is: we ourselves.

So the moment I wake up, my mind wakes up; when saying I wake up, my mind is the one who wakes up. When mind wakes up, I see all the problems. If the world were a beautiful place, as told in poems, we would not be here in the *Vedanta* class. When this mind is destroyed, there is no Creation. Mind wakes up, Creation exists, mind doesn't exist, and Creation doesn't exist, because there is no cause for the effect. That is why the text says „*nastamanasah*”, a person who has

lost his mind, who has destroyed his mind is the highest among the *yogis*. For this superior *yogi*, the mind is destroyed. For a normal person whose mind goes to sleep, it becomes dormant and when he wakes up, the Creation exists. This dormant state may be during sleep or *jada Samadhi*. So once one wakes up from that dormant state, again he sees the Creation. But this mind which is destroyed will never wake up. So for this *yogi* it is *Samadhi* throughout. For the *yogi* who is in *jada Samadhi*, his mind is dormant, there is no thought function and when he wakes up and he sees the world. For the other *yogi*, whose mind is destroyed, whether he wakes up or he sleeps (in fact there is no sleep), whether he keeps his eyes open or closed, it is *Samadhi*. There is no change in *Samadhi*. For the former there is change in *Samadhi* and he loses the *Samadhi*, but for the latter, there is no mind there is no losing of *Samadhi* because he is established in his own pure natural state, *svasthitim yatah*.

There is one question He is raising: *krtyamasti kim?* - What activity exists? Meaning there is no activity for him (rhetorical question). Bhagavan has gained this state; let's take his example. He is sitting there and this Muruganar presents the paper and what Bhagavan does when he is presented the unfinished poem? He writes these beautiful thirty *slokas*. In the text the question of

what is to be done more is asked. There is nothing to do for a *jnani*, still Bhagavan is writing the poem. Is there a contradiction? No. If the dormant mind wakes up, there are problems. The Realized one opens his eyes and he sees the disciples in front of him. And he is answering the disciples' questions. But the text talks about *nastamanasah*, a person who has destroyed his mind. The activity presupposes mind. If one has to do whatever action, that presupposes mind (accepting the question without answering is in itself an activity). This activity presupposes mind, because from mind the knowledge of this person in front asking me comes. There is a desire and an action. We saw, there are three activities from *Iswara's shakti*: the power of knowledge, the power of desire and the power of action. So the order is: knowledge-desire-action. And we see a person we smile, there is an activity. And this activity rises from the mind. And the text is saying „there is nothing to do” (for the Realized one). If one destroys the mind, there can be nothing in this world, one will not only lose his individuality, he will lose this world. This is not a happy end, this is dangerous. One „loses” everything, whomever he loves, everything. It will not be as it used to be, but there is no need for fear here. Because, you understand, whomever you love is not different from yourself. Now (in ignorance), is seeing somebody in front of you whom you love and who you think is separated

and can bring you pain better? Or is seeing that someone not different from you and therefore never can bring pain better? That is why he asks rhetorically: “what is there to do?”

The question that raises is, how the Realized act?. Because we want this Realized one to guide us. We want this. Whether he wants or not, doesn't really matter. He will answer our question, and that means he has a mind. If a person answers a question, it means he has a mind so he is eligible to sit along with the disciples and not in front of them. To understand this catch-22 situation, one has to understand first what mind is. Let's take an example: we fix the alarm for early morning at an hour and we can't wake up in spite of the alarm, we feel lazy. Why is it so? Because we are slaves of our mind. Our mind is cheating us, it will say „oh, you are very tired, sleep, you work so hard yesterday” or „you have so much to do today, don't get up, you just open your eyes and your kid will call you and you have to start working, just close your eyes”. So it's like in one of our proverbs „the cat closes its eyes and thinks the world has become dark, no one can see it.” It is like that for us, when we keep our eyes shut, we think no one knows. We are not ready for today. It is because we are slaves of our mind. The mind is controlling us.

For the Realized there is a difference. Let us say I am an electrician. Ok, fine then „where is your tool?“ I may be asked. Do we ask so? No. I bring my tools and prepare for the job and repair it. Just because I am an electrician or plumber for e.g. I don't carry with me my tools always. Similarly, there are two ways to see this Realized person transacting in this world: 1) there is no world, therefore there is no transaction. Mind springs up, ego comes, world exists with all its problems. There is no mind there cannot be any transaction. But He answers my question and so we come to 2) the mind is created, because the Realized one is *Iswara* so he can do anything and he creates the mind and does the transaction and after that destroys it. Whenever needed a mind, it is created and after transacting he destroys it. If this is the case, he doesn't think about past and future, he always sees the present, because there is no mind to think about my past and future. He creates the mind just to do the transaction in the present. This is what is called as living in the present. These are two ways to see: one there is no activity, second: accepting him to be *Iswara*, he creates the mind and does the transaction and destroys the mind. This second can take place in different places.

Mind is destroyed, the world is no more, because the cause-effect is destroyed; the second: we accept the

transaction so we have to explain this transaction. So for that we say he creates a mind. There are two reasons for him to create the mind: a) his *prarabdha* - the Realized one's *prarabdha* which determines the body-sense organs complex and the experiences in the world and the life; it manifests as mind, but this mind is not a mind which binds the *gnani*, this mind is like a roasted seed, there is the form of seed, but it is not really seed, it has no value, or like the rope which is burnt. His *prarabdha* functions, his mind wakes up so creation exists, so his *prarabdha karma* gets over, the transaction needed is over, then his mind goes again to the *Self*, it becomes identical with the *Self* (we don't use the word „merge“, as we used it for *laya*, absorption). The *prarabdha karma* rises, mind rises, creation is; *prarabdha karma* gets over, creation is over, whatever it is mind (as-though-mind) identifies itself with the *Self*; this one way; and the other way to explain is b) others' *prarabdha karma*. It is also sometimes that the others' *prarabdha karma* makes us do things; like when for e.g. you don't want to do something, but you do because the boss is saying so. So it's somebody else's *prarabdha karma* which makes me do or not do something. So the disciples' *prarabdha karma* manifests as the form of *Guru* and there is a teaching. It is called *pareccha prarabdha*, *prarabdha* due to others' desire. This manifests as the desire for projection of *Guru*. We saw creation is because of mind -

ignorance, this ignorance has two powers - the power of projection (*vikshepa shakti*) helps with the creation of Guru, Shastra etc., whereas the power of veiling (*avarana shakti*) only veils the Self. Since there is a need for a transaction, he creates a mind, after the transaction is over, he destroys the mind. Whichever way, the mind which is created for the transaction doesn't bind the *gnani*. That is why he is rhetorically asking „, *krtyamasti kim*, what is there to do?“ Because, whatever has to be done is done. That's why a Realized one is called *krtakrtya*, a person who did whatever was needed to be done.

What is done? Why do we say Realization is the thing to be done? Let us see. What do we do things for? Whatever action? For e.g. why do we drink a cup of coffee? It brings us happiness, we say. We read a book. Why do we read it? Because, it gives us happiness. We watch a good movie; it gives us happiness, we have an iPhone, it gives us happiness. Everything we do in this world is for happiness. An ant is doing its job for happiness. Everything in this world is in search of happiness, at different levels. Some know which the means for happiness are, some don't know. Some even though may know, are confused.

What is this happiness? The cup of coffee is happiness, one may say. But other person may say he doesn't like coffee. So that cup of coffee if it were happiness, then it should be happiness for everyone, but some don't like it so it is not an object of happiness. Therefore, happiness is not the object. Also even if one may like coffee, he drinks one, two, but at the third cup, he will not be able to enjoy it; there is a saturation point. So what he thought is happiness, the cause for it is a misplaced idea. If the object in itself gives us happiness, it should continuously give us happiness no matter what and it should be common for everyone, always, at least for the same person. But it is not so. That very same object becomes an object of hatred for the same person (with the third cup, fourth cup of coffee). So that very cup of coffee which gave us happiness becomes an object of hatred. Therefore, the object is not happiness.

So the object is not the cause for happiness. Then what is the cause for happiness? The substratum, which is nothing but the Self. We see an object, we like that object, we are associated with that object. When we are associated with the object we like, at that very point, our mind takes rest in the Self, merges in the Self. When this happens, I am experiencing the Bliss of the Self, but because of my ignorance I see that happiness as a happiness produced by the object.

Even though, logically, I understand this object is inert and the action is inert (v. supra first sloka), inert action associated with inert object cannot produce any sentient experience, but still because of my ignorance, I want to see just what I want to see; we are always interested to see things which we want, not that which exists. We want to see, therefore it exists, it is not that it exists, therefore we see. So we want to see that happiness in the object, i.e. in the coffee so we say coffee gives me happiness; this is the primary confusion: accepting the object to be the cause for happiness. And from there starts the whole trouble. This is *Samsara*.

So when the mind is destroyed, for that *yogi* there is nothing to be done, because he is established in the *Self*. It is as simple as that. But we cannot leave things as simple as that and we bring in the question of happiness and the objects of happiness and we destroy that; and we say „oh, let it be happiness, this is happiness, that is happiness, let them all be”, but it isn't so, there is no duality.

Cittvadarsanam tattvadarsanam

Drisyavaritam - the object of perception (*drsyā*), *varitam* - negated, when the objects of perception are negated, *cittamatmanah* - the mind sees the experience of *Self*. When the objects are negated, then this person experiences the *Self* and that is the knowledge of Truth. That *cittvadarsanam* is called *tattvadarsanam* (knowledge of Truth).

When the mind is removed from the objects, what happens with the mind and the objects? We see the object. The mind takes form of the thought function, it doesn't produce thought function. And travels through the sense-organs and reaches the object and engulfs the object. Thus, the thought function takes the form of the object, whatever is the object. The mind becomes the object. This is a natural tendency of mind, that of taking the form of objects. The mind is naturally created to go outside, externally towards objects. That is why one experiences big obstacles during meditation and he cannot continuously have the flow of the meditated object, there is not even drops of water, what to say about the flow of a river. That is why to show how difficult we can give an example: take a good movie, watch the movie, once, three times and after knowing

all the characters and the sequences, I ask you not to meditate upon „*Om namah Shivaya*”, I am asking you to close your eyes and watch the movie. Try it. Movie challenge!!! Will it be very difficult or easy? easy !?! Let's see, I close my eyes, I see a name, a character and directly the end of the movie so very fast it is over in my mind. Three minutes it took to see the whole movie which took one hour and a half. And even if we may try to see it in details, we would be surprised that it will take no more than fifteen minutes to watch it in the mind. It is not easy to meditate. It is not easy even on the objects we like (objects we know). *A fortiori*, it becomes even more difficult to meditate upon the *Self*, which we don't know.

The *Vedas* say „*parancikani...*” the Creator created the sense-organs to go externally. The sense organs don't have the power to go externally; the mind has to go through the sense-organs. Naturally, the mind has the tendency to go externally. In the same *mantra* it says.....”Someone with great power, intellect decides „I don't want this, I want to turn this mind inwards”. He turns the mind inwards to see the *Self*. Only then one turns his vision from the external objects towards himself, inwards, „*drsyavaritam*”, when the objects of sense-organs (*drsyā*) are negated (*varitam*), there is nothing to see outside so his vision is turned inwards. At

that point of time, *cittam* (mind) *atmanah cittvadarsanam* gains the knowledge, the perception, the vision of the *Self*. It is non-dual knowledge, knowledge is experience here, there is no experiential knowledge, the knowledge is experience.

So the experience is nothing but knowledge. There is a story, the story of the tenth person. Or somebody is taking a photo of us; that person does not exist in the picture. So this is what we say is the tenth missing person. The *Guru* sends ten disciples to the other side of the river and tells to one that he is in-charge to take care of all the others, till they return; they are very “smart” disciples so they cross the river and when they reach to the other side the one who is in-charge, starts counting and he sees one person is missing; then other counts and the same result, everyone while counting is missing including himself. There is a person who was travelling in that side who sees them, a *Guru* and he understands what the problem is and he said to them not to worry that the tenth person exists. Then all were happy. The sorrow is removed; and he counts and there are ten person; they are happy they found the tenth person. Was the tenth person missing earlier? Never, but they thought the tenth person is lost. This knowledge „I am the tenth person” is the experience. And there cannot be a different experience like „I am feeling etc..”;

whatever you feel is an error. Feeling is error, because feeling depends upon an object to be felt and one who feels and so there is always a duality; whatever be the feeling, it is error. So there cannot be any feeling in the Realized one. We may think this to be a problem. The idea is: since there is no duality, these kinds of idea don't rise in the Realized one. That is why he says: when the objects of sense-organs are negated, the mind turned so inwards sees the *Self* as though. „As though” is used because he is not seeing the Self, the mind becomes one with Self, there is no mind now. Before when asked where the mind is, you were not able to find the mind (see above....), now there is definitely no way to find it, because it doesn't exist there, it is destroyed, that is why He says that is „*cittvadarsanam*”, the vision of consciousness and that vision of consciousness is the vision of *Truth*.

The external objects are negated and the mind turns inwards. What happens now? Vision of *Truth* should happen, but it doesn't at the beginning, but instead of this, we get into sleep (when there are no external objects); in sleep we don't see any objects. So we have to negate this ambiguity so when the external objects don't exist and it is not a sleep state, that is the vision of Truth and that is the vision of Knowledge; so the ambiguity is removed.

Manasam tu kim margane krte

Naiva manasam marga arjavat

Manasam tu kim - what is this mind? *Margane krte* - when we start inquiring, *naiva manasam* - there is nothing called mind, *marga arjavat* - this is the path which is the simplest. When we start inquiry what mind is, we find out that there is nothing called mind; this is the simplest path.

There is a beautiful story. A marriage party takes place. There were people from bride's family and people from groom's family. There was a person there, who comes into the party and starts to behave very rude; the bride's family doesn't want to disturb the groom's person and the groom family doesn't want to disturb the bride's family. So they think „let him be”, not to disturb the marriage. But after a point, he becomes intolerable and they decide to put an end to it; the families come together and discuss it and they so realise that the rude person does not belong to any of the two families. Then who is that person and they try to find out. When this

person understands that there is an inquiry committee investigating about him, he escapes that place. Similarly, when we start inquiry about what mind is, the moment the mind understands it is under investigation, it runs away. When we start inquiry into what mind is we realise there is no mind in reality. This is the easiest path.

Then what is this mind which I experience? It is my experience, you say. We have ignorance. And this ignorance creates a split and a superimposition that I am not I am, I am not me and I think that I am this and I am that. When I am not me, I start thinking that I am this, I am that. When thinking arises there is a problem.

Mind is a product of elements. Does a cup, for example experience the stuff from inside it? No. Nor does the water experience the cup. So elements are inert and they don't experience anything. But then, one may say „my mind experiences (my mind was hurt, for e.g.) and I experience my mind, both“. And then he says I saw the mind being hurt, he sees the mind experience. This mind which is a product of elements (albeit unprocessed), which are inert, how does it come to experience? How can it be sentient? How can it say „I experience“?

When the mind is inert how can it say „I experience“? It is because of its association with the *Self*, not the *Self* in

association with the mind. The mind, the thought function arises, then there is the reflection of the *Self* in that thought function and the mind becomes as-though sentient and it says „I experience”. So the mind, which is basically inert, gets its experiencibility through the *Self*. If there were no *Self*, the mind would have no function. That is why we say the mind is in reality nothing but *Self*, but due to the ignorance, I see the mind as different, and myself as different.

So easiest path to destroy the mind is inquiring into what it is. But this doesn't mean watching the mind. This is what *Buddhists* do. One should go to the root of the mind, because what some say (like *Buddhists*) is that one has to watch the mind, not to react whatever be the thought. We already saw that is impossible not to react, either in the world, or in the inner world, in the mind. We will start to be attached or have aversion to the thought and we start building our own castle inside. We will enter into what is called *manorajya* (day dreaming). When we say to watch the mind, means to go to the root of the mind, where this thought function arises from. This is what one should do, not watch the thought function. We already are day-dreaming and watching the thought function finally will lead to day-dreaming. And day-dreaming is the worst obstacle for the *sadaka*.

But still, what is mind? The discussion continues in the next *sloka*:

18

Vrttayastvaham vrttimasritah

Vrttayo mano viddhyaham manah

Vrttayastvaham vrttimasritah - the thought functions (all) are basically dependent upon the „I” thought function (*aham vrtti*). *Vrttayo mano* - mind is thought function, *viddhyaham manah* - understand myself (I), the ego, to be mind, understand this ‘I’ to be mind.

The thought functions are based on the „I” thought function; therefore, understand the thought function to be the mind and that mind to be the ‘I’ (*Self*).

When we see something, whether we know or we don’t know, doesn’t matter it is first based on „I”; first we say „I”, and then follows the knowing or not knowing. So from „I” starts every thought function. Without the presence of „I”, one cannot make any thought. First „I” arises, then this arises, then the attachment to it, „mine,” the sequence is: I -> this -> mine. This is how one

does the transaction in the world. Every thought function, before I see this or that, is preceded by „I“. So without an „I“ there cannot be any thought function and thought function is mind.

What is this thought function, what is *vr̥tti*? Normally when we talk about mind, in *Vedānta* we say inner sense-organ, *antakarana*. This inner sense-organs is classified under four heads: *manah* (mind), *buddhi* (intellect), *citta* (memory), *ahamkara* (ego). These are not divisions of mind, it is just one mind performing a particular action; the inner sense organ when performs a particular action is called as mind, another and is called intellect, another action and it is called memory and for another it is called ego, when it performs a particular action it is called desire; everything is an act of mind, but generally we talk about four functions. The rest of the thought functions can be brought into these four. Desire, hatred are thought functions, love is a thought function, shyness also, fear, everything as said in *Bṛihadaranyaka* Upanishad : "*kama* (desire), *sankalpa* (will), *vicikitsa* (doubt), *shraddha* (trust, surrender), *ashraddha* (the lack of faith), *hri* (shyness), *bhi* (fear), *dhi* (intellect), everything is mind. All these different thought functions aren't different from mind, they are mind.

Viddhyaham manah - know that „I” to be mind. We saw above (v. supra. *Sloka*.....) that all these is projection of mind. When the mind manifests, then one sees this Creation. When the mind merges, like in deep sleep or in *Samadhi*, there is no world and nothing to disturb. So what we see is a projection of mind. All these are a projection of mind. In this projection of mind one sees a person and he doesn't like that person or he likes that person a lot, he is dealing in fact with his/her like or dislike of that person and not really with that person, but with his image of that person. Already that person is a superimposition and here one is imposing another image on that person and after that he is dealing with that. Very confusing indeed!!!

Mind emerges from deep sleep and I am starting to see this world and in this world I see different persons and start doing the transactions in the world. Now there is illusion upon other illusion. Can that make it right? Two negatives make it positive, minus into minus is plus so two illusions will give a positive? No. It strengthens the illusion. We are already in trouble and we are pulling ourselves in more troubles. That is why He says „*viddhyaham manah*”, know that ego („I”) to be mind.

There is the famous statement „I think, therefore I am”. But from the *Vedantic* stand point we say „I exist,

therefore I think.” Only when I exist, there is thinking. If I don’t exist how can I think? So ”I think, therefore I am” is based on this statement: my ego arises, therefore this whole world exists. Only based on the ego, „I thought”, this exists (world, object) and the attachment / aversion to this exists. So everything is based on the „I thought” and that „I thought” is mind.

19

Ahamayam kuto bhavati cinvatah

Ayi patatyaham nijavicaranam

The seventeenth *sloka* is explaining the nature of mind saying that when one starts the inquiry into it, one realises that there is no mind. In the present *sloka* he explains it in a different way. He says: *ahamayam* - this „I” (ego), *kuto bhavati* - from where it takes place, *cinvatah* - when we think about it, *ayi* - oh, dear (addressing the disciple), *patatyaham* - this „I” gets destroyed, *njavicaranam* - this is the real inquiry (into the *Self*).

In the previous *sloka* it is said „ know this „I” to be the mind. In the present it is said „where this ego exists? Where does it come from?” When we start inquiring - like in the story with the X in the marriage party (v. supra...), he vanishes. When we start inquiring about the thought function, the basic one (the ego) from where it comes it vanishes. In *Kena Upanishad* it is said „Pratibodha.....” „In every thought function (I like this, I don’t like this etc.) there is an „I”. Without „I” one cannot formulate any statement, any idea. So, where this „I”, which is the ego, comes from? Where is its beginning, source? When we start to think about its beginning, source, then it falls, it vanishes, there is the end of ego, *patatyaham*. And this is the proper way of inquiry.

20

Ahami nasabhajyahamahamtaya

Sphurati hrtsvayam paramapurnasat

Aham means ego, *ahami* means that which has the ego, the cause for ego, i.e. the source mind. When this mind, this source is destroyed, there is an experience as I, I, I, I.

Self itself is experienced as I, I, I, *sphurati hrtsvayam, paramapurnasat* - the *Ultimate Absolute Self*. When the source of ego is destroyed, the *Self* is experienced as I, I, I, which is the ultimate *Absolute Self*.

When you destroy the „I”, there is experience of I, I, I. One has to understand this very clearly. When one destroys this „I” (ego) of mind then he experience the source of that mind which is the *Self, hrtsvayam*. Without the mind, the thought function, the ego cannot exist (ego is a thought function of mind). Without the *Self* nothing can exist. When the ego thought function is negated, it comes to the source which is mind, when this mind is removed, destroyed, the *Self* shines (that shine is shown through *abhinaya, gesture*) as I, I, I. And this is not an experience implying duality of subject-object of experience, but the *Self* is of the nature of immediate experience. We are negating all the experiences. If there is an experience then there is something different from you, so it is an illusion. Experience is illusion. We are always searching for some experience or other, because of our ignorance *Vedanta* is not getting into us. We are getting into *Vedanta*. Suppose God comes in front of us. What are you going to say to Him, not ask, say. „Thank you, please leave, I don't want an illusion”, because this God which is in front of us is an experience and experience is an illusion.

If one „I” were replaced by other, this would be a problem. One „I” is not replaced by another „I”. Because, this is what we always do, like replacing a political party with another on the base that the first is not good or replacing a person with another. We are replacing things and we are not trying to resolve things. Now, here when we say this „I” is replaced by another „I’ is not replacing but resolving once for all, because the Self is of the nature of experience, of immediate experience. When somebody is asked if he knows himself, he immediately answers „yes, I know myself”; he will not say „Yes, I think I know myself”. Whatever may be that understanding, right or wrong, doesn’t matter, we are clear about it, because this is knowledge of *buddhi*, intellect; may not be right always; let it be, it doesn’t matter. This is why he says this „I” is replaced by another „I”, who is not a replacement of the previous „I”, but is a resolving of the previous „I”. The ego is once for all resolved. When that happens, this immediate experience of *Self* takes place which is shown as a gesture of „I,I,I”. There are no blips of „I’, no intermittences.

How many „I”- s do we have? There is one ego-I („I” of mind), there is another „I” of Self. There is another „I”. There are three „I”. We see things here and in the dream-this „I” thought emerges from the mind; when

the mind is completely destroyed along with its cause, ignorance, there is one „I” which is the capital „I”, of the Self. In between, there is a state of ignorance in deep sleep, where „I” experience the deep sleep. I have a mind-„I”, an ignorance-„I” and Self-„I”. Three „I”-s. normally we see that is a mind –„I” and a Self-„I”, but there is the ignorance-„I” also. The mind doesn’t exist in deep sleep; it just exists in the waking state and in the dream state. Then how one can say he experienced the deep sleep state? Then we will bring the third „I”, the Self-„I” to be common for all the three states. Then there is only one „I”, we may say. If the *Self* is the one who is the experiencer in the three states, then there is only one „I”, but we accepted already another „I” of ego, which is mind. Therefore, if one wants to see it like that (too see „I”-s), then there are: one „I” of the mind, the ignorance-„I” and the third, the *Self*-„I”. There is a specialty regarding the *Self* –„I”, because it exists in the *Self* and in all the three states, waking, dream and deep sleep. Ignorance exists in all the three areas, but the mind exists only in waking and dream state. The *Self* exists in all the four areas: in the Self, in the waking state, in the dream and deep sleep. Ignorance-„I” exists in the deep sleep, in the waking and dream state also, but it is not primarily in the waking and dream states where is overpowered by the mind-„I”. *Self*-„I” is overpowered by the ignorance-„I” in the deep sleep

state and in the waking and dream state, ignorance is overpowered by the mind-„I”.

In the waking and dream state the mind-„I” exists. This is merged in the ignorance-„I” in the deep sleep, when the ignorance-„I” exists. But the mind leaves a seed in the ignorance, that’s why it manifests the next day again. Otherwise when we wake up we would be some other person. So this ignorance also is destroyed by the knowledge. The mind becoming a seed is *laya* (See above....), the ignorance getting destroyed is *vinasa* (13th sloka), *mano nasa*, the source of the mind, which is ignorance is destroyed. There is no existence of ego and mind.

When we say the ego is destroyed, there can be no transaction in the world. And we told about the roasted ignorance to explain to people who don’t want to leave the ignorance alone. The seed of mind exists in ignorance; the seed of ignorance is in the *Self*. The ignorance cannot exist anywhere other than in the *Self*. There is no other place for the ignorance to exist. Where can it exist? Ignorance has as its base (loci / substratum) the *Self*. After destroying this ignorance, if there is a need for explaining this world about the transaction of the realized, we should as explained earlier.

The ignorance doesn't have any place to exist other than the *Self*. The darkness has no other place to exist than the light. Is it acceptable? How can darkness and light exist in one and the same place? Light and darkness cannot exist in one and the same place. Now, we are talking about a light where is no possibility of darkness, the *Self* is self-effulgent, where is no possibility of any darkness. But still, this ignorance has no possibility to exist anywhere other than the *Self*, because only the *Self* alone exists. The *Self* is all-pervading. Therefore, this ignorance cannot exist in another place; where the *Self* does not exist? Therefore, the ignorance has as its substratum the *Self*. How can darkness and light co-exist? How can the *Self* and the ignorance co-exist? There is no problem. Because, the *Self* is not contradictory to ignorance. *Self* doesn't and cannot negate the ignorance. If the *Self* can destroy the ignorance, you will not be in the *Vedanta* class. You would not need *Vedanta*, because there is only *Self*, we (individual *jiva*) don't exist. But we do attend *Vedanta* classes. So the ignorance has no other substratum than the *Self*.

How can we remove the ignorance which is in the *Self*? That is only done through the thought function of knowledge, of the identification between the individual self and the *Absolute Self* (v. supra sloka 14th). This

thought function is also a *vrtti* called *akandaakara vritti*, a thought function which doesn't have as its object limited things. When this thought function arises, it destroys the ignorance, because ignorance is like the superimposed dark spot on a white cloth which can be removed by the knowledge that the spot doesn't exist. Similarly, when we say it has its base in the *Self*, it is just for the name sake, there can be no ignorance in reality. So when we say ignorance exists, when say we exist, and then there is ignorance also, so that ignorance has to have a *locus* and that *locus* is the *Self*. It cannot stand in any other place. And this ignorance is removed through the thought function of the identification of the individual self and the *Absolute Self*. So ignorance is destroyed by the thought function of identification and one may say that the thought function of identification remains and we just replaced the ignorance with the thought function of the identification. I used the thought function, I destroyed the ignorance, and this thought function remains. So there is problem. Thought function is mind. Mind is ignorance. So one may say he is still having a problem. But it is not so. This thought function of identification is of the nature of negating all the other thought functions and itself too. There is an example in tradition. In older days, we didn't have the electric crematory so we used to burn the dead, putting a lot of wood and burn the body; when the body burns, the

water is removed from the body and the nerves become tightened; they will use a bamboo stick and beat the body (that is why they send the relatives away). Once they burn it, they throw also the bamboo stick in the fire. So the stick which is used to control the body is also burnt. Firewood is used to create a fire; they don't stay like that and just the fire burns, the fire destroys the firewood. Once the firewood is destroyed, the fire will become extinguished along with the firewood. Similarly, this thought function of knowledge (identification between the individual self and the *Absolute Self*) will negate the ignorance and also gets destroyed. This is the beauty, there is no residue.

When the ignorance is resolved, *hrtsvayam*, the *Self*, by itself, in all its glory *paramapurnasat*, as the *Ultimate Absolute Existence* shines. There is no other existence other than the *Self*. *Self* is *sat*, *sat* is existence.

21

Idamaham pada'bhikhyamanvaham

Ahamilinake'pyalayasattaya

Idamaham - this which is called „I” (the „I” of the *Self*), the term „I’ *pada'bhikhyamanvaham* - exists in every

thought, *ahamlinake api* - even after the ego is destroyed, there is a continuous existence of this I - *alayasattaya*, without merging, it has an existence (the „I“ of the *Self*).

The “I” of the *Self* exist in the *Self*, in the waking state, in the dream state and in the deep sleep state. Though the others are destroyed, annihilated, this „I“ which exists in all these states, exists without being destroyed.

Ego exists, *Self* exists, ego is destroyed, *Self* still exists. *Self* has existence whether ego exists or not. *Self* has existence whether other things exist or not (doesn't really matter). This is the concomitance we understand from this *sloka*.

This „*aham*“, „I“ is mainly used for the *Self*, but here it is used in a secondary sense for ignorance and ego.

The term „knowledge“ is primary used for *Self*. Inherent nature of the *Self* is knowledge. In a secondary sense, the term „knowledge“ is used for the thought function. For e.g.: I have the knowledge of pot, cloth etc. This is a thought function.

Primary existence refers to the *Self*, the secondary existence is seen in the objects. Glass exists, paper exists. The primary existence is of the *Self*, the secondary one is shadow-existence of the *Self*. Because of the as-

though association, seeming association; the pot, cloth, the other things in the world seem to be having existence. So the secondary existence is in the world and the primary in the *Self*.

Therefore, the primary I is the *Self*, the secondary is the ego, the mind, and primary existence is *Self*, secondary existence: pot, cloth etc.

22

Vigrahendriyapranadhitamah

Nahamekasattajadam hyasat

Vigrah - the body, *indriya* – sense-organ, *prana* - the vital air, *dhi* - intellect, *tamah* - ignorance; here the five sheaths are mentioned: *annamayakosha*, *pranamayakosha*, *dhi* is *manomayakosha* and *vijnanamayakosha* because one function of mind is mind and another is intellect, and the fifth, *anandamayakosha*. All these five *koshas* are not *Self*, *na aham*, because I am one non-dual existence, and they are inert (*tad jadam*) and definitely are non-existence (*asat*).

Different people think different things to be the *Self*. Some think the body – sense-organ complex to be the *Self*; some think the *prana* to be the *Self*; some the mind; some the intellect; some think the *shunya*, the void to be the *Self* (*tamah* is *shunya*). But they are not *Self*. We used a syllogism in *Tattva Bodhah* and *Sadhana Pancakam*. The Creation is illusory because of three reasons: *jadadvad* - it is inert, , *parcchinatvad* - limited and *drstiadvad* - can be seen. Here in the text is mentioned „*tajjadam*“, inert; that which is inert cannot be the *Self*, it is non-Self. So I, the non-dual *Self*, I am not this body-sense organs complex, because they are inert and I am sentient, conscious (ness), not inert. And we already established the *Self* to be existence, knowledge, bliss. These are non-Self. How can these be the *Self*? *Self* is consciousness principle. So here, in the text, we negate all these to be the *Self* with the reason they are inert. Inert cannot be the *Self*, those cannot be „I“, body cannot be „I“ etc., because they are inert and *Self* is existence, knowledge, bliss. I don't call this table, for e.g. *Self*; as it is inert.

They are non-self, *asat* in the text, non-existence, because that is illusory and illusory doesn't have any existence. So they are non-existence. Now how can be a non-existence qualified for the *Self*? I cannot say the *Self* is non-existence and that non-existence is I. So, inert

cannot be qualified as the *Self* and something which doesn't exist cannot be qualified for the *Self*. So two reasons: 1) it is inert; 2) it doesn't have any existence. This world which we see is not even qualified to call as existence (existent). What to say then about the superimposed ideas.

Then one may ask „Who is the experiencer” and this question arises because in general we want experiences. The answer is found in the next sloka, the 23th:

23

Sattvabhasika citkvavetara

Sattaya hi ciccittaya hyaham

Sattvabhasika - the One who illumines the *Existence*,
citkvavetara - what can it be other than *cit* (knowledge)?
Sattaya hi ciccittaya hyaham - in the form of *sat*, *cit*
exists and in the form of *cit*, I am.

The key-question is how do I know I have Realized?
Some so-called masters may say „Come to me and I will
give you a certificate”. How is this *sat* illumined? It is
illumined by *cit*, knowledge. But one may say that this is

in contradiction with the non-duality because we have *sat* and *cit* and *sat* is illumined by *cit*. But we have already established that *sat* is nothing but *cit*. The *Self* is of inherent nature of *aham* (I), existence, knowledge, bliss. This is my inherent nature, the nature of „me”.

If we accept another *sat* to illumine the *sat*, there will be duality of *sat*. Which is then my existence from the two? And the other what is it then? These are questions which would rise. And we could not talk about non-dual existence.

Sat is illumined by *cit* and if *cit* were illumined by another, let's say x, y, z; then there would be no end to it, it would be *regress ad infinitum*. So it is not sustained.

So we say *sat* is illumined by *cit* and *cit* is illumined by *sat*. Another objection which could rise is that in this statement there is an interdependence, which means duality. Until this is illumined the other one cannot illumined. Until that other one doesn't illumine, this one cannot illumine. So it would be a chaos; and it would be duality again. So we say the *sat* and the *cit* are not two different things, they are the inherent nature of *Self*. *Sat* is what is called *cit* and *cit* is what is *sat*. They are different names for the same thing! They aren't different attributes of the same thing. They are not attributes; if one accepts *sat* and *cit* to be attributes of

Self, the *Self* would then be the attributed and there would be duality again. When one studies *Advaita*, whether he knows *Vedanta* or not, his logic should be very clear. Otherwise it would be problem after problem, one after another. So they are inherent nature, not nature (because nature can be separated till an extent) and not attributes.

So *sat* is illumined by *cit*, there is nothing else to illumine it. In the form of *sat*, *cit* exists and in the form of *cit*, I am. This is the conclusion to the cycle. Otherwise what will happen? There are four stages of defects: 1) *sat* – *sat* is illumined by itself; it would be self-dependence. To negate this we say 2) *sat* is illumined by *cit*, *cit* is illumined by *sat* and so it would be interdependence; second defect. 3) So we say: *sat* is illumined by *cit*, *cit* is illumined by „I“, „I“ is illumined by *sat* - this is *chakraka*-cyclic, the third defect; 4) we want to avoid all these defects so we say *sat* is illumined by *cit*, *cit* by *aham*, *aham* is illumined by *aham1*, *aham2*, *aham3*... and this is *regress ad infinitum*, there is no limit to it. So to escape these defects, since we accept one non-dual *Self*, we say *sat* is not different from *cit*, *cit* is not different from I.

Sat cit ananda aham are all different ways to express the *Self*, the „I“.

*Isajivayorvesadhibhida**Satsvabhavato vastu kevalam*

Isajivayor - Between *God, Iswara* and *jiva*, the individual self, *vesadhibhida* - knowledge of different attributes is the difference. But in reality, as existence, there is one non-dual *Self* - *satsvabhavato vastu kevalam*.

Iswara is *maya avacchina chaitanya*, *jiva* is *avidya avacchina chaitanya* (as seen in *Tattva Bodha* and *Sadhana Pancakam*); cancelling the attributes, *maya* and *avidya*, respectively, and just consciousness remains.

There is a story: X decided to join a circus so he is trying to learn some tricks. The boss calls X asking him for a favor; the bear was sick that day so he asks X to wear a bear costume for the show and get into the lions tent and just go around, to entertain the people. X is afraid; for him is not a big deal to wear the costume, but there were lions; the boss comforts him saying not to worry, he will just have to go a little bit around there, not go closer to it. X wears the costume and enters into the

cage; the lion is moving to the other side of the cage and X is trying to escape climbing some staircase so he catches hold of the cage and tries to climb; but bad luck; he falls in front of the lion. His heart is beating very fast; and he starts praying to God and crying towards the lion „Please don't kill me, please, don't kill me". Y from inside the lion's costume says „don't worry, just play the game, it's me, Y".

So when you remove the costumes of bear and lion, it is only Y and X, respectively. So similarly, when one removes the costumes of *jiva* and *Iswara*, there is nothing but one non-dual *Self*.

There was one great *swami* who told this story to a *sannyasi* who had not studied anything. He was just travelling around. Then the *swami* told to this *sannyasi* „Ok, you travel all around, I tell you a story, wherever you go just tell this story".

The „costume" of *Iswara* is: he is omnipotent, omnipresent etc., the „costume" of *jiva*: limited power, limited knowledge etc. So when one removes these limitations of those attributes from both, the *Self*, which appears to be limited by those attributes, is one non-dual. Like in the example: there is space in this room, there is in the pot; when you break the pot and you break the wall of the room, we will not have two

different spaces, like pot-space and room-space, there is one non-dual space. Similarly, here, when the powers of *Iswara* and the limitations of *jiva* are removed, the one non-dual *Existence* remains.

Satsvabhavato - that which is *Existence* in itself. What does *Existence* mean? How do we define *Existence*? That which is not negated in all the three periods of time is *Sat, Truth, Existence, "trikala abhadhiatvam"*.

For instance, this paper didn't exist before its creation and it will not exist after its destruction, so it is not *Sat*. This glass didn't exist before the creation and it will not exist after its destruction, so it is not *Sat*. We give it the adjective of *sat*, like paper exists, glass exists, but this existence is not the inherent nature of the paper, glass etc. It is the nature of the *Self* with which this paper is as -though associated, to gain this shadow existence. So existence is the nature of *Self* and it is that which is not negated in the all three periods of time. And in that nature the *Truth* alone, the *Self* alone remains.

What happens when the „costumes“ (attributes) are removed?

Vesahanatah svatmadarsanam

Isadarsanam svatmarupatah

Vesahanatah - when the externalities (the costumes) are removed, *svatmadarsanam* - we have the vision of the *Self*; and the vision of *Iswara* is in the nature of the immediate experience of *Self* - *isadarsanam svatmarupatah*.

When we remove the costumes, the attributes, we don't need to do anything else. For instance: we take a glass and we cover it with a paper, after we remove the paper, the glass is visible. What is to be done? Nothing. What is needed is just the removal of the obstacle, in the e.g. the paper, the covering and in the exemplified, the embodiments, related to *Iswara* and *jiva*; when we remove those, the *Self* which is nothing but *Iswara* – that's why he says „*isadarsanam svatmarupatah*“, the vision of *God* is gained not as something in front of us (we saw that this is illusory also, because it is seen, experienced) is seen as the nature of ourselves. *Iswara darsanam* is not something that we

gain as something different from yourself, but as your own self, you see *Iswara* as your own Self.

After removing the attributes of pot and room, one doesn't have to do anything for the space to be one. The room space is similar to *Iswara*, bigger one, and pot-space is similar to *jiva*. The pot and the room, the limited adjuncts, the embodiments when removed, the room-space and pot-space are one, therefore that experience, *Iswara* is seen not different from *jiva*, the pot-space in the example, the room-space experiences the pot-space as itself. There isn't a different kind of experience other than this of *Iswara*.

We used the terms vision, experience, for lack of good word. The next *sloka* explains what vision of *Self* is:

26

Atmasamsthitih svatmadarsanam

Atmanirdvayadatmanisthata

Atmasamsthitih – being established in the *Self*, *svatmadarsanam* - vision of *Self*, being established in the *Self* is vision of *Self*, it is experience of *Self*. Why is it so?

Because, *atma* is devoid of duality, *atmanirdvayad* (fifth case, for *hetu*, reason). When there is duality one can say experience and experiencer. Since there is no duality in the *Self*, we say the experience; the vision is nothing but being established in the *Self*.

The vision of the *Self* is nothing but being established in the *Self*. There can be no other vision or experience of the *Self* other than being established in the *Self*; because in our entire life we are behind some experience or other, some vision or other, even after entering *Vedanta* and being in *Vedanta* for a long time (maybe also), with a little better understanding, people still want to have experience, people still want to have visions. This is a problem. We should understand, we should not run behind experiences, because *Self* is one non-dual, there cannot be the duality of experience, experiencer and experiencing (method). So being established in the *Self* is experience. The *Self* is existence, knowledge, bliss. There is no bliss other than the bliss of *Self*. Some people say, like I have seen many monks who teach *Vedanta* uttering with an uptight face (not suited with the bliss) that *Self* is bliss, they make us be afraid of that bliss, actually. So when we say that *Self* is existence, knowledge, bliss, what we mean is *Self* is not experience. Then one may ask: "Then why do you say *Self* is existence, knowledge, bliss? If you say *Self* is existence,

knowledge, bliss, in what way they exist in the *Self*? You say they are not attributes, then you say it is *svarupa* but in what way *svarupa*, because there is also a *svarupa* which implies duality like for e.g. the blue lotus; one cannot separate the blue from the lotus in the blue lotus" - So one may say. We don't mean *svarupa* in that sense. We say *Self* is existence, TO NEGATE it from non-existence, to differentiate it from non-existence; so when we say it is existence, that doesn't mean it is existence, we name it like this just to differentiate it from the non-existence. When we say bliss it is not like experiencing the bliss we know; these are all ideas to be cheated with; it is not like that. What does bliss of the *Self* mean? Because people after studying *Vedanta* will say „I am not experiencing the bliss". You will not experience any bliss, because there is no bliss. Then „why you are saying „bliss", what is there?" one may ask. There is no sorrow. In order to differentiate it from sorrow, we say bliss. Otherwise there is no bliss. Because, it is your inherent nature. There will be no sorrow. If sorrow-less state is what you understand through bliss, then it is that (bliss). Like: what is light? Lack of darkness. If this is how one understands, then fine, *Self* is bliss; when one says light is absence of darkness, then fine, *Self* is absence of sorrow. If that absence of sorrow is bliss for you, this is fine, *Self* is bliss.

But one may ask „Why do I have to interpret it in such a confusing way? If I am satisfied with the statement of existence, knowledge, bliss being the inherent nature of the Self?“ But there is no confusion: when I say that *Self* is bliss, I actually say that it is different or absence of sorrow. Why do I say this? Let’s take an example: in this space, in this place, on this ground, do you see absence of pot? Does pot exists here? Do you see absence of car, of airplane? Yes, of course. So whatever absence I am imagining I am seeing here. Why? Because absence is of the nature of substratum, absence cannot be differentiated from substratum. When I say absence of sorrow, it cannot be an attribute, even if one wants to accept it as an attribute, let it be so. Why? Because it’s an absence-attribute and absence-attribute is of the nature of substratum and there is no duality whichever way. So to remove any ambiguity of duality, we say *Self* is absence of sorrow, is bliss, self is absence of non-existence so it is existence, self is absence of ignorance so it is knowledge. So there is no doubt and no ambiguity here, whatsoever. That is why He says having the vision of *Self* means there is no duality.

Jnanavarjita'jnanahinacit

Jnanamasti kim jnatumantaram

Jnanavarjita - devoid of knowledge, *ajnanahinacit* - devoid of ignorance is consciousness (*cit*); *jnanamasti kim* - what is knowledge, *jnatumantaram* - other than the knower, what is knowledge other than the knower?

The consciousness, the *Self* is devoid of knowledge and devoid of ignorance. We already said above that it is absence of ignorance. And He is adding here also the absence of knowledge. It is absence of knowledge and absence of ignorance. This is the nature of *cit*. Why He is adding the knowledge into equation? Because what is knowledge? Knowledge is not something that is different from the knower. Therefore, absence of knowledge and absence of ignorance is the nature of *cit* and that knowledge is not different from the knower, therefore the *cit* is the knower.

If it were knowledge it should be the trinity relation: knower, object of knowledge and knowing. So we are

negating the knowledge (in that sense) also because it is not different from me, my inherent nature.

At this point, one may ask “Really what is the nature of the *Self*?” He is clearly answering in the next *sloka*:

28

Kim svarupamityatmadarsane

Avvaya’bhava’purnacitsukham

Kim svarupamity - what is the nature of *Self*, *atmadarsane* - when the vision of *Self*, how it will be. When this kind of question arises, he answers: *avvaya* - that which doesn’t undergo decay, changeless, *abhava* - non created, no creation and *purna* - absolutely complete, *cit* - this consciousness, *sukham* - and it is bliss. *Citsukham* - both ways of translating: *cit* is happiness and bliss of the *Self*. So it means: we experience the bliss of the *Self* which doesn’t undergo any transformation, which is not born and which is absolutely complete, there is no limitation in it.

Since we said it is *avyaya* (transformation-less) and *abhava* (not created). What can that be then? It can be

only that which is natural and ever present. That is why the text says „*apurnacitsukham*”; there is nothing and nowhere in/where the bliss doesn’t exist. And „the nothing” and „nowhere” don’t have an existence also. Time and space are an imagination of ignorance. We cannot conceive absence of time and place because these are mind’s creations and the mind cannot conceive its absence itself. So absence of time and place means only the *Self* exist as non-dual, *apurna*, absolutely complete.

29

Bandhamuktyatitam param sukham

Vindatiha jivastu daivikah

Bandhamuktyatitam - that which is beyond bondage and liberation, *param sukham* - absolute bliss, *vindatiha jivah* - the *jiva* experiences/gains, and that is divine - *daivikah*.

We are here for liberation and the text is saying „beyond liberation”. There is no liberation also. It means only when there is an experience of bondage; there is the

necessity for liberation. When there is no bondage, itself being an illusion, then where can there be liberation? The bondage itself is illusory then the liberation cannot be real; if the liberation were real there would be a problem. That is why He says it is beyond bondage and liberation. And that absolute bliss is not a bliss which you have experienced here, and for that it is said it is divine, otherwise „*param*” will imply comparison and to establish the difference it is said „divine”. When *jiva* gains this divine experience *jiva* also becomes divine, too.

We take an example of an object, let’s say a bag, I’ve just found, my pen; I had forgotten where I put it and some minutes ago I found it; can I say I lost it and I gained it? Would that be proper? It was somewhere near me, I could not see it. It was because of my ignorance I could not see the object. So when I say I lost it and now I gained it, I am very happy, it is not correct and in the same way it is to say : „I gained Realization at this time, place etc”. For an ignorant this time and place can be of value because he cannot imagine something without these coordinates, but for the *gnani* (Realized), everything, all these, is not even an illusion, it doesn’t exist entirely. But we have to explain all for an ignorant, but when the whole Creation doesn’t exist for the Realized one, how can the bondage which was there

when...when? There is no „when“. Because time and space are illusory, the Realized one cannot even say „When I was bound...“; this is a stupid statement, because that was illusory. It is like in the above example with the lost object, in fact I hadn't lost it, and it was here. So this idea of *bhandamuktyatitam* is to establish this. So that is why he is saying he gains the divine absolute bliss; like I gained my bag in the above example, he gains the divine absolute bliss; meaning that which is not lost at any point of time or place, he gains. Here gaining is not a physical gaining, but the knowledge that I am not different from *Self*, I am the *Absolute Self* (v. supra the story of the tenth man....).

30

Ahamapetakam nijavibhanakam

Mahadidamtapo ramanavagiyam

Ahamapetakam - devoid of the ego, ignorance-„I“,
njavibhanakam - the experience of one's real nature;
mahadidamtapah - it is the greatest penance. The greatest penance it is to be established in the *Self*, devoid of attachments of ignorance or its products (ego

etc.); *ramanavagiyam* - this (all these thirty *slokas*) is said by Ramana.

The best penance one should do is „to not let go” one’s *Self*. Because whatever we do, the mind comes into play, ignorance comes into play, then we start creating internally and externally things and we become attached to them. So we should practice this penance always, staying with the *Self*. Without creating any idea, thought, through a proper inquiry, when we are established in the *Self*, we should not let go of that. We already saw above that day-dreaming is the worst obstacle. And worse than this is the thought „am I eligible, ready for this?” All these kind of ideas are obstacles, because the moment we have doubt about our eligibility, we have dismissed the *Self*. We are in fact dismissing the *Self*. It is like saying „No, I don’t want the *Self* experience now.” We have already decided that we don’t want in that very moment we ask that question. Never let any of these doubts to creep in. What is doubt? Doubt also is a product of mind. Mind is playing games. Like in that example with sleeping five minutes more; don’t let those five minute more, decide categorically „I want it, I want it now”.

Let us pray that Bhagavan Sri Ramana Maharishi, blesses us with this bliss which is absolutely not different from us.