

# Saddarshanam, Class 16

Greetings All,

**Shloka #26:**

**The body does not know. Of the Truth, there is no birth. In the middle of these two, another of the size of the body rises, which is of the names ego, knot, bondage, subtle mind, mind, the realm of becoming and the individual.**

Continuing his teaching, Swami Paramarthananda said, from shloka # 23 onwards Bhagawan Ramana Maharishi is analyzing the mysterious and mystical nature of Ahamkara. He wants to show us that it is a false entity created by features of both Atma and Anatma. In creation there is the Chetana Atma and the Achetana Anatma. Ahamkara is a mysterious third entity with features of both Atma and Anatma. The sentiency of Ahamkara is a feature borrowed from Atma. Modifications of Ahamkara such as Kartritvam are a feature borrowed from Anatma. Thus, a new mythical Ahamkara is created. While my face is reflected and the mirror reflects my face, the Reflected face itself is a third entity. It is a false entity. It has features of the original face as well as the mirror as well. Thus, while the mirror moves, my face does not move. Motion is a feature of the mirror. This motion is transferred to the reflected face. The motion property is borrowed from mirror. Thus, the reflected face has a location not determined by original face. Location is determined by mirror. Location and motion are both borrowed from mirror. Now, Bhagawan Ramana Maharishi says, Ahamkara is similar to this mirror, with features borrowed from Atma and Anatma. Thus, you have the changing features of Ahamkara. Attributes like young, old etc. are features borrowed from the Anatma Body. Ahamkara is neither Shariram nor Atma. It is a mysterious and fraudulent entity. Ahamkara has birth and death although it is sentient. It is like Narasimha, who has features of man as well as a lion. When you

try to get to the reflected face it disappears. Whatever disappears on enquiry is a fraudulent entity.

Ahamkara has the size of the body but is different from the body. Body is insentient while Ahamkara is sentient. It arises only in proximity of the Atma (face) and Anatma (the mirror). If you separate the Atma and Anatma, Ahamkara does not rise. Because it is a fraudulent entity, like a cheat, Ahamkara assumes different names. These names include:

- Ahamkara: Or one who says Aham Karomi Iti. Who says this? Anatma cannot say it. Body is matter. It is inert. How about Atma? Atma does not have a mouth. It is all pervading, like space. Neither say this. So, Ahamkara alone says Aham Brahma Asmi.
- Granthi: Knot. Ahamkara is a knotty entity. It cannot be easily disentangled. It has been there since time started. Actually time itself is a concept generated by Ahamkara. In sleep, Ahamkara dissolves, so time dissolves as well. Even time transcendence requires Ahamkara. Even Bhakthi cannot remove Ahamkara. A Bhakta can still feel he is a great Bhaktha. Thus, we have Narada Bhakthi Bhanga story. Hence it is called Granthi.

Knot also means combining of two things, Atma and Anatma. A wedding also has three knots.

- Vibhanga: means strong bondage or strong Samsara. Here Ahamkara is the problem. Moksha cannot happen if Ahamkara or individuality remains. In some philosophies they say individuality can be retained. Vedanta however says individuality and Moksha cannot go together. Moksha cannot happen, if one still has individuality.
- Sukshma Shariram: It is a thought arising in the subtle body. It is the "I" thought. In sleep, the "I" thought gets resolved. Thought is Sukshma Shariram.
- Cetaha: It is the Mind. Ahamkara is also known as the Mind. When mind is active, Ahamkara rises. It is,

however, passive in sleep. So, the mind is figuratively called the Ahamkara.

- Bhava: means Samsara. It can also mean God Shiva, although here it not used to denote Shiva. Individuality is Samsara. Individuality and freedom cannot go together. Individuality means differences, gradations, and resulting jealousies. In some philosophies the individual soul sits in front of God with other souls. This is sure to lead to jealousies. Jealousy can never get us Moksha. Therefore, individuality has to be falsified.
- Jiva: The individual. The one who is born, lives and dies. This is also Ahamkara.

### **Shloka # 27:**

**This ghost of the ego is born amidst forms, based on a group of forms, the eater of forms, who has given up and held forms, is by itself formless and runs away at the time of inquiry into itself.**

In previous shlokas it was said that Ahamkara is an entity produced from Atma and Anatma. The expression " I am " means sentiency. A Conscious entity alone can say so. It is a borrowed sentiency from the Atma. Ahamkara comes in when you say: I am so and so. The " I am" itself is Atma. However, when an attribute is attached to the " I am" it becomes Ahamkara. Thus, we say: I am fat; I am angry; I am sleepy etc. The fat, angry, sleepy are all attributes borrowed from Anatma. Attributes from Anatma keep changing. The " I am" does not change at any age. It is the attribute alone that changes. Ahamkara has many manifestations depending on properties of Anatama. It becomes a Karta and Bhokta. Ahamkara exists due to Anatma.

Ahamkara rises with rising attributes of the body, mind and thought complex. In sleep it gets resolved. Ahamkara moves in the field of attributes such as: Body is fat, body is thin,

body is born etc. When mind is awake, borrowed properties of Anatma are food for Ahamkara. Thus the feeling: I am doer; I am dreamer etc.

In sleep, however, body and mind are resolved, hence no properties are available, and so Ahamkara is also dissolved.

In meditation, thought is eventually eliminated and one goes to sleep. However, Vedantic meditation involves Ahamkara. It has to be present.

Ahamkara takes many attributes. In front of son, it becomes father. In front of wife it becomes husband and so on. One attribute goes and another one comes in. It is like an actor in a play changing garbs one after another.

With Best Wishes,

Ram Ramaswamy

---

## Saddarshanam, Class 15

Greetings All,

**Shloka # 24:**

**The Supreme, having distributed light to the intellect, Himself shines hidden inside the intellect. Having turned the intellect inwards, here within the intellect, by uniting, the vision of the Lord takes place, not by any other method.**

Continuing his teaching, Swami Paramarthananda said, in this shloka Bhagawan Ramana Maharishi is pointing out that the Atma alone lends consciousness to the mind. Thus, the mind with

this borrowed consciousness appears as if it is Self-effulgent. This mind is then capable of illuminating the external world. It has to work to know the external world. It, however, does not have to work to know the Atma, as the Atma is self-evident. Therefore, Self-knowledge involves turning attention to the ever-experienced Consciousness and understanding the fact that the ever-experienced consciousness is limitless. Intellect is not required for understanding Self Consciousness.

The word Dhiye in the shloka means giving Consciousness to the mind.

This ever-experienced Consciousness is ever present behind the mind. So, how does Atma remain hidden? If Atma is ever experienced, how can it remain hidden? This is a contradiction, says Swamiji. Citing an example, it is like the movie screen. Without the movie screen the characters in the movie cannot be experienced. In life the screen is never noticed because of our preoccupation with the movie. Experiencing a thing is different from deliberately paying attention to something. This also true with space to which we do not pay attention to. If asked, what is on my hand, most of us will mention the hair, the fingernail etc. We will never mention the light on the hand that allows us see the hand. Due to our extroverted-ness we are preoccupied with the movie and don't pay attention to the screen. The same phenomenon occurs with our mind. We are so busy with our thoughts that we don't pay attention to the Consciousness, which is silence. So the two steps towards Self-knowledge are:

1. To pay attention to the ever experienced Consciousness.
2. With the help of scriptures negate all limitations of Atma and become aware of its limitless nature.

So, turn your attention away from all inert things (Samsara, body, mind and thought) and turn your attention to the ever-experienced Consciousness that illumines (makes known) the

thought. Just as during watching the movie, you are asked to pay attention to the screen, the process followed here is also similar. It is one of changing the attention of the intellect. This is not a new experience rather it is just new information that the screen is not affected by the events in the movie. Tragedies and comedies do not affect it. Similarly, I, the ever-experienced Consciousness, is not affected by the events going on in my life. Don't be carried away by the events happening to you. Intellect alone can reveal this to you.

Guptaha in shloka means not paid attention to.

Na Anya means no other darshanam.

Therefore, turn your attention within your mind and connect the Budhi to the ever-experienced Consciousness.

This alone is Ishwara Drishti. Conscious attention to Consciousness is this Drishti. Bhagawan Ramana Maharishi does not consider all other Darshanam's real. He says they don't liberate you. Therefore, change your understanding of yourself. Anatma Ishwara is only a Prathibhashika Ishwara or Vyavaharika Ishwara.

### **Shloka # 25:**

**The body does not say, "I am". Nobody says, "I was not", in deep sleep. Search with your intellect, the birthplace of that "I", upon whose rise, everything rises!**

Here Bhagwan Ramana Maharishi talks about the mysterious nature of the ego. Ego is a misconception born out of ignorance. On enquiry it will disappear. Discussing Ahamkara, Bhagwan Ramana Maharishi asks, who is saying, "I am"?

Body can't say it and Atma can't say it either. Anatma body is inert as such it cannot say, " I am". Atma cannot say, "I am" as it does not have a mouth. Saying involves an action,

the motion of the mouth. Therefore Atma can't say it. If so, who is saying it? It must be an entity different from Atma or Anatma. Unfortunately there is no other such entity. If so, then who is saying it? The answer is it must be an entity that is a mixture of Anatma and Atma. This is called Ahamkara. It is the one that says, "I am". Citing example of a bowl of salad, one can say there is mango, there is orange, there is cucumber etc., but there is no substance called salad. Salad is only a verbal expression. Ahamkara is also a mysterious entity with only a verbal existence.

If body had sentiency, death will never happen. So, someone else is saying, "I am this body". Nobody would say I was non-existent in sleep. We know "I" exist in three states of existence. If sleep becomes our death (a state of death), we will never sleep. So, the real "I" exists in all three states. Does Atma say, "I am"? Atma also does not and cannot say that. If it said so, in Sushupthi, Atma does not say, "I am". Therefore there is someone other than Atma and Deha, called Ahamkara that is asleep in sleep, but awake in waking state. It is the cause of "I am". The Samsari "I" is neither body nor Atma.

All transactions and limitations arise with Ahamkara. So, attack Ahamkara. So, find the source of Ahamkara (by enquiry) with the help of intellect. Swamiji says it is a misconception that one has to transcend the intellect. As per Bhagwan Ramana Maharishi you require intellect for Self-Knowledge. Intellect is, however, not required to experience the Atma. The Atma is ever experienced. Intellect is required to pay attention to the ever-experienced Consciousness.

Knowledge comes to us during Vedanta Sravanam. In meditation this does not happen. No new knowledge comes from meditation. For knowledge, one needs Guru Shastra Upadesa. This is the Vedantic parampara.

**Shloka #26:**

**The body does not know. Of the Truth, there is no birth. In the middle of these two, another of the size of the body rises, which is of the names ego, knot, bondage, subtle mind, mind, the realm of becoming and the individual.**

Bhagwan Ramana Maharishi continues on the mysterious Ahmakara. Ahamkara has some features of Atma as well as some features of Anatma. Upto Shloka # 27, he discusses Ahmakara.

The inert body can never say, I am. If it can say so, then it will become sentient and it wont die. Can Atma say "I am" the Conscious Being? Atma cannot undergo any modification. If it were to say, it would be " I am the eternal Consciousness" because it is birth-less. Atma is not mortal.

So this entity has taken properties of body and Atma and is called Ahamkara. It is the one that says I am a mortal sentient being. So this third entity comes into being. It is of the size of the body. It is a localized Ahamkara. It is an imposter I or false I. It has several names. It is called the Knot, as it cannot be easily removed. It has been placed a long time ago. Ahamkara cannot be removed easily.

In spite of Vedantic knowledge Ahamkara will be difficult to remove, hence it is called Granthi. Ahamkara is formed by joining of the two ( Mortal + Consciousness). It is called a Knot or Granthi. A third name is bondage. So, Ahamkara is bondage or Vibhandi. Ahamkara is not freedom.

With Best Wishes,

Ram Ramaswamy

Foot Note:

1. Pāramārthika (paramartha, absolute), the absolute level, "which is absolutely real and into which both other reality levels can be resolved".<sup>[web 5]</sup> This experience can't be sublated by any other experience.<sup>[20]</sup>



2. Vyāvahārika (vyavahara), or samvriti-saya<sup>[17]</sup> (empirical or pragmatical), “our world of experience, the phenomenal world that we handle every day when we are awake”.<sup>[web 5]</sup> It is the level in which both *jiva* (living creatures or individual souls) and *Iswara* are true; here, the material world is also true.
3. Prāthibhāsika (pratibhasika, apparent reality, unreality), “reality based on imagination alone”.<sup>[web 5]</sup> It is the level in which appearances are actually false, like the illusion of a snake over a rope, or a dream.

It is at the level of the highest truth (*paramārtha*) that there is no origination.<sup>[7]</sup> Gaudapada states that, from the absolute standpoint, not even “non-dual” exists.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

## Saddarshanam, Class 14

Greetings All,

**Shloka # 22:**

**That vision of the Lord which is without seeing the Seer can only be a mental vision. Indeed the Supreme is not other than Seer. His vision is absorption and abidance in one's own source.**

Continuing his teaching and refreshing our memory of last class, Swami Paramarthananda said, in this shloka Bhagawan Ramana Maharishi is pointing out that real god realization is not possible without Self -realization. The reason is that the real Ishwara is the Atma itself. This is the central teaching

of the Upanishad's as well. Both Keno Upanishad and Brihadaranyaka Upanishad say that whatever God one objectifies such as external (worship of god such in a temple) or internal (during meditation), all these forms are not the Absolute Reality. The God whom you worship outside is Vyavaharika Satyam while the God one worships inside is Pratibhashika Satyam. Both are not Paramarthika Satyam. Thus, both Vyavaharika (outside) and Partibhashika (inside) are both Mithya. Bhagawan Ramana Maharishi calls it Manasika Ikshanam.

Brihadaranyaka, Chapter 3, Section 8, dealing with Akshara Brahmana says absolute Brahman is never experienced; rather it is the Experiencer or Knower. It is ever the Thinker in the thought. Real God is "I" the subject. Bhagawan Ramana Maharishi says real God being "you" how can you objectify it. So, know your "Self". Puranas do talk of objectified Gods. However, these Gods are not the real ones. Real one is "you". Ignoring the subject consciousness (the seer) and seeking any other darshanam is called Manasika Ikshanam.

How do we know if God who came in our dream is real or mithya? It is also a Vyavahrika God as such it is also a Mithya. There is no god other than Atma the experiencer. This is Consciousness (Sakshi Chaitanyam). Experiencer means that which illumines the mind by its mere presence or Chaitanyam. So, how can I experience the real God? Tasya Viksha? It is by abiding in real Consciousness after resolving the very seeker who wants to know. The very attempter (I want to experience God) has to be resolved and focus on "I" am the Consciousness. It is neither Pramata nor Prameya. Abiding in consciousness is abiding in knowledge that " I " am . This is the knowledge.

Shloka # 23:

**The meaning of the sayings of the Vedas, "one should see the Self"; one should see the Lord" is not easy. If the Self is not seen, then what can be the talk of the Lord? The vision of Him is oneself becoming food unto Him.**

Self-realization does not require knowing Self as a new thing. Experiencing anything other than Self requires effort. Thus, if one wants to see a wall, one has to turn and use our eyes to see. Every object in the world is experienced using effort and time. Only Self is experienced as Consciousness all the time. No instrument is required. No process or time is required to experience the Atma. Although Atma is ever experienced, we still need the mind to turn attention to this ever-experienced Atma.

Vedanta asks us to turn our attention to this ever experienced Atma by asking if " Are you conscious or not". "I am a conscious being", once you claim this, then shastra is required to talk about the nature of Consciousness.

Thus, again:

Mind is required to turn attention to Consciousness.

Shastra is required to talk about nature of Consciousness.

Mind and shastra both are not required to experience Consciousness as it is ever Experienced.

When I turn my attention, when I study Shastra, I realize this ever experienced Consciousness is independent, not limited by the body, survives even after body's death and is non-transacting as well. This ever-experienced Consciousness exists all the time.

This Atma, the Consciousness, lends its sentiency or life or Chiddabsha to the mind. Mind is like a mirror. This mirror becomes bright with this borrowed sentiency and thus becomes capable of performing many things. The inert mind becomes sentient.

Atma continues, as it is all pervading. Reflected Consciousness (RC) and Original Consciousness (OC) remain. OC remains hidden in RC.

So how to discover the OC?

With Best Wishes,

Ram Ramaswamy

---

## Saddarshanam, Class 13

**Shloka # 21:**

**It is possible to talk of fate and self-effort for them who know not the source of the two. To them who know well the source of fate and effort, there is neither fate nor effort.**

Continuing his teaching and refreshing our memory of last class, Swamy Paramarthananda said, in this shloka Bhagawan Ramana Maharishi is pointing out that any discussion of fate and free will is a useless one. A discussion with an Agyani will never have an end. One can never say if fate influences free will or vice versa. If you say fate is the original influence, we will never be able to trace the beginning as to which is first. It is a like a chicken and egg paradox. That is why it is called Maya or Mithya. In Chapter # 3 of Manduka Upanishad there is a discussion if Janma produces Karma or if it is the other way around.

Bhagawan Ramana Maharishi says for a wise person there is no creation at all, no duality, and no cause and effect. Therefore never enter into a discussion.

Why do we say such a discussion will be inconclusive? This is because fate cannot be established without free will. Who gives fate to an individual? God does not do it. If god does

it, he will be charged with partiality. The world is not responsible for fate. Chance also is not responsible for fate. Since the world is harmonious and orderly, fate cannot be an accident or chance. None of them determine my fate. I determine my fate alone. My past actions are now coming as my fate.

My body, mind, parentage, etc determine my past actions. Therefore my actions are determined by my surroundings. So which determines fate versus freewill is not possible to establish. It is like asking: does body control the mind or vice versa? Is individual controlling society or vice versa? It is impossible to say. Hence such a discussion is futile.

Even though a discussion is futile, we must, as Sadhakas, give importance to one it. We must focus on one. The choice need not be based on logic but more as a working arrangement. Therefore we must decide if the life we wish to lead is a Freewill-based life or fate-based life.

### **Visishta advaitam and Dvaitam philosophies:**

Followers of Visishta advaitam and Dvaitam philosophies feel the following:

I am eternally dependent on God for moksha. You are never free. Only God is free. We are all dependent. Moksha is recognizing that I am a Dasa.

Now, Moksha itself means freedom. So there is a contradiction. So, free will is never our focus here. I am a small person. I have no free will. Therefore, fate dominates my life. Therefore, I learn to use a new language. "Everything is his will etc." " I am a Dasa and enjoy serving the lord in moksha". Here **free will is suppressed and fate is expressed.**

**Advaitam Philosophy:** The Advaita Guru teaches us, " I am cause of my karmaphalam". "I am responsible for everything" Later this also leads to the claim that Aham Bramha Asmi. Everything

is born out of me and everything rests in me. I am the Swamy. I don't depend on time. Shankaracharya says, in this world (Jiva-Jagat-Ishwara), the Ishwara depends on me. Therefore if you want to know advaita, assimilate free will. Start practicing this now.

Therefore do not get into a debate.

Shloka # 21 (continued):

Discussion of fate and free will occurs only among ignorant. Vidhi is past action by a past "I". Prayatna denotes the present "I". So, this is a time connected "I". Time connected I is Ahamkara. This discussion occurs, as we do not know the moolam of Ahamkara. The timeless I, Atma, is the moolam of Ahamkara.

A debate of Ahamkara is only possible when they do not know the Ahamkara moolam. Once they know it, Ahamkara vanishes.

Note: Shloka # 15 or 17 (depends upon book) discusses time, which is imaginary. Past and future, both are myths. Present is also a myth as it is in relation to past and present. Thus, there is no Karta "I" or Bhoktha "I". Therefore in advaita, Aham must be emphasized.

**Shloka # 22:**

**That vision of the Lord which is without seeing the Seer can only be a mental vision. Indeed the Supreme is not other than Seer. His vision is absorption and abidance in one's own source.**

In this shloka all upanishadic teachings are condensed. For some it may even be disturbing. It captures the essence of Keno and Brihadaranyaka Upanishads.

What we experience is not absolute reality. It is only a relative reality. Relative reality means it is Mithya. " I" the observer alone am the absolute reality. Whatever is

observed is a mithya. This world is mithya, as is my body and as is my mind. We can train the mind to understand this. But what about God? Is God a Mithya or Sathyam?

Upanishad says, it will not answer this question rather it asks you to determine the answer based on the norms it has provided.

What does God mean? If God is someone who is experienced by me (devotee), then God is Anatma. This may disturb some devotees. Upanishad though says a seeker of truth does so without emotions.

Therefore an objective God is a Mithya.

The absolutely real God can only be discussed in one way. When you understand him as " I" the Experiencer.

Aham Asmi, this is God. The Aham is not the body or the mind. Therefore Ishwara Darshana as an object is a myth. However Darshanam of "I" is real.

For a Karmakandin this Shloka will be disturbing. Vedanta says duality is acceptable till you mature. During Karma and Upasana Yoga duality is acceptable, however, ultimately the objective god has to be negated.

The shloka: Ignoring I, the Atma, who is the real God and instead going after a God vision (darshanam) as an object does not make sense. God vision is only a mental projection or Mithya. There is no other God than " I" the observer. Saddarshana is heavily influenced by Manduka karika. Upanishad does not see God as He. Non-advaitic philosophies downplay Upanishads by focusing on shakthi.

With Best Wishes,

Ram Ramaswamy

---

# Saddharshanam, Class 12

As far as dehathma bava (experience of limitation caused by physical body) is concerned it is same for gyani and agyani. This experience of limitation is common on jagrada avastas and swapna avasta. But in sushukthi avasta, there is absence of experience. There is no third experience in sushukthi as the experience of limitlessness does not exist. The very word experience presupposes thripudi (experience, the experiencing instrument and the experienced object). The moment thripudi comes, there is limitation. Experience of limitlessness is a contradiction. In sushukthi what we have is not experience of limitation (because the experiencer himself is not there) but the absence of experience of limitation.

You cannot make a difference between gyani and agyani based on their experiences. Difference between gyani and agyani is not in experience but in gyanam or knowledge that I am the consciousness that pervade the body and universe and as a result, I am poornatvam. Gyani also experiences but he attributes to the body and not to I the subject. This is a conclusion and not an experience. Knowledge need not change the experience. For example, the experience of sun going around the earth continues even after we gain the knowledge it is actually the earth that goes around the sun. Knowledge can falsify the experience, even after that the experience can continue. I am a limited body is a fact for agyani and it is a fiction for gyani. Therefore, don't expect experiential difference after the study of vedanta.



*The world exists for the ignorance and the Wise Man. To the former the seen world alone is real. To the other, the one that has become substratum of the seen, the full, formless Truth shines.*

As long as there is duality, there will be limitation. As long as there is limitation, there will be mortality. As long as there is mortality, there will be insecurity. As long as there is insecurity, there will be samsara.

If samsara must be negated, insecurity must go away.

If insecurity must be negated, limitation must go away.

If limitation must be negated, duality must go away.

If duality must be negated, object must go away.

The objective world must be negated for the negation of samsara. The I the subject alone will be there.

Negation of the world is not the negation of the experience of the world. It is only the negation of the reality that we have attributed to the world. Vedanta only changes my perceptive of the world. That perspective is that the world enjoys a reality which is lesser than my reality. The world includes the external objects, our own body, our own mind. Objects plus body plus mind has lower order of reality. Pradhikathika Sathyam and vyavaharika Sathyam are many, but paramarthika Sathyam is one. Pradhikathika sathyam and vyavaharika sathyam will continue but I, the paramarthika sathyam will not be affected. World will be experienced by both gyani and agyani.

Perceived world is common to both gyani and agyani and experientially there is no difference, but the gyani knows that the perceived world is mithya and the agyani thinks it is real.

Verse 21

*It is possible to talk of fate and self-effort for them who know not the source of the two. To them who know well the source of fate and effort, there is neither fate nor effort.*

Experiential change is not required for liberation. Cognitive change is enough. Experiential change can't give liberation because they are temporary. If liberation is based on knowledge. it will be permanent because knowledge is permanent.

I create my own fate with my own free will and efforts; free will alone control my destiny. The counter argument is free will controls your future, but current free will by your past free will. A debate between fate and effort will be inconclusive and therefore we should never enter into this debate. Both fate and effort are mithya for a gyani.

---

## **Saddarshanam, Class 11**

I, the atma becomes ahangara because of ignorance. I become temporarily localized I, known as ahangara and this is the first product of ignorance. This is the foundation for space, time and plurality and this is alone is the cause of samsara.

Space is the first tyranny. Because of space alone I feel localized and distanced and struggle to reach people and places. In sleep, there is no space or distance and there is not necessary for travel.

Second tyranny is time. I want to complete my duties before die. Worry of old age, decease and ultimate death is all because of time.

Division is the third tyranny. Division causes raga, dwesha

and asuya. Asuya is pain caused by comparison. Comparison caused by duality or plurality.

Samsara is caused by space, time and division. These three are possible because of ahangara foundation and ahangara is caused by ignorance and ignorance is resting on atma. Ahangara itself is caused by identifying I with the body.

There are two types of I:

1. The original I, the consciousness, this is atma.
2. Second I is the limited by body or anatma. Bagawan also falls into body but we call it avatara meaning it is a deliberate ahangara role Bagawan chooses to play. Avatars are vyvaharika lela which is mithya. If you start identifying with ahangara, the kala leela starts. This is the beginning of samsara and fighting against old age, death, decay etc. Solution is to tackle the foundation, which is ahangara. In Jagra and swapna vashtra, there is time, space and duality tyranny. In deep sleep the ahangara is temporarily suspended and there is not time space duality.

First stage is knowing the cause of samsara which is ahangara.

Second stage is to find the cause of ahangara. Cause of ahangara is the notion that I am the body. Remove the false notion by right knowledge. I am not the mind or body or sense organs. This knowledge is the only solution.

We don't exist in any particular time and space; We, the original atma, exist everywhere; in fact, space itself exist in me. Never trace outward.

Verse 19

*In the state of oneself being the body, the Wise Man and ignorant man are the same. For one, in the heart, in the*

*body, the Self is lit up, full, encompassing the body and the world. For the other the Self is measurable only as the body.*

Experience of the body requires a medium, e.g., sense organs. But sense organs can only sense some of the experiences. I can feel the experiences of my body but I can't feel another body's pain.

Intimate experience of a particular body is (devatma бага) common to gyani and agyani. The confusion we may have for example, whether gyani will feel hungry and whether gyani will feel the hunger of everyone else. Ramana Maharishi says gyani will continue to have biological experiences. With regard to biological experiences, gyanam will not make any experience. A gyani has to go through prarabtha karma; he may avoid further agami karma or future rebirth's sanjitha karma.

One may hear that gyani does not have devatma бага and may conclude that gyani will not have biological experience. This is a misconception. Vedanta is not solution for biological pains, but is a solution for psychological pain, which is caused by samsara. Sorrow, the emotional pain, which is response to biological pain, is not experienced to have the emotional pain. Gyani is similar in that respect and does not have emotional pain as a response to biological pain.

Based on the sunrise, biological experience, we may conclude that the earth is in the middle and the sun is traveling around earth. Based on science, we know now that the sun is not moving around the earth, but the sun rise and sun set is caused by the earth spinning. After this intellectual knowledge, the experience of sunrise and sunset does not change, but the conclusion is changed. In the same way, the biological experiences will continue, but the wrong conclusion that I am the body will change for a gyani. Vedanta is not meant to give you an experience change but a cognitive change or knowledge based change.

Gyani says I am not the body, but I am the consciousness in the body, consciousness in the mind and the consciousness in the sense organs. I am not only the consciousness, I remain pervading my own body and the whole universe. But biologically I experience only this localized body. This statement can take place only in a body. All pervasiveness can never be experienced, but can only be understood. You can never experience limitlessness as it is contradictory term because when you become an experiencer, you are localized and limited.

---

## **Saddarshanam, Class 10**

When I say the I is the cause of all problem, that I represents the ahangara. "I am the cause of all problem" or "the I is the cause of all problem" are different. The HE and The You are dependent on The I. Second and third person are dependent on first person, that is the finite ahangara I. As long as I exist as ahangara, I am susceptible to the second and third person. The Aham in Aham Brahma Asmi, is not first person, not second person and not third person, but it is the person or purushaha. Ahangara is needed to teach Brahma Gyanam Gyani continues to have ahangara, but it is seen as mithya or vyavaharika sathyam.

How do you falsify ahangara or rope snake? For rope snake the adhishtanam is rope similarly for ahangara adhishtanam is sathyam. Ahangara is vyavaharika sathyam and not paramarthika sathyam. The false notion that there is a third person, the false notion that there is a first person and the false notion that there is a second person is the notion of division. This notion of division goes away for a gyani but the experience of the notion will continue. Experience of stationary earth does

not displace the knowledge that the earth keeps moving. Similarly the gyani goes through many experiences but does not let that displace his brahma gyanam.

Verse 17

*The past and the future are, in their own time, the present. Giving up the truth of that present, will not discussion on the past and the future be laughable, like counting without the number one in the world?*

So far Ramana Maharishi has been discussing spacial division. In this version, he is discussing time division.

Spacial division is horizontal division; time division is vertical division.

Kala division or time division is also mithya and is caused by Ahangara. The very idea of three division of time is myth. There is no thing called past existing outside. Yesterday is the past which does not exist today, but it did exist yesterday. When yesterday existed outside yesterday, it was not called yesterday. You only experience as a series of today. What is outside is today and today only. Similarly when you experience tomorrow, it is experienced only as today. So tomorrow does not exist outside. Yesterday is only a name for your memory and tomorrow is only a name for your projection. When you say past is hurting, it is not that past that is hurting, it is the memory that is hurting you. Memory exists in the past or present? Memory regarding the past exist in the present. What hurts is not future but the thought of the future that hurts you. The future thought exist in the present. So you only have memories and projections and not past and future.

Past and future exist as present in their own time. Present alone exist. If you want to analyze time, you have to analyze past, present and future. Since there is no past and future, you have to analyze only present. Every present has its own

time line. For example, for a day, 24 hours are not present. Only one of those hour can be present. Others are past or future. Similarly the hour itself is made up of past, present and future. Only one minute is present. Not the entire minute is present, only part of it is present. What is a point is a mystery in mathematics and similarly what is present is a mystery in vedanta; it is apparent notion caused by ahangara. The timeless consciousness is localized as finite present because of the ahangara, which is caused by deha abimana. The truth of kala thrayam is ahangara and the truth of hanagara is atma. Atma appears as desa thrayam and atma appears as kala thrayam.

Trying to understand time without understanding atma is like trying to understand the number without knowing the number one.

---

## **Saddharshanam, Class 9**

Verse 13

*Can that be true knowledge when the knower does not know himself? To one who knows oneself, the support of knowledge and the object of knowledge the two will vanish.*

How para vidhya is different from apara vidhya? How abatma vidhya is different than atma vidhya

Verse 14

*Sleep is not knowledge. Perception of objects is not knowledge. In the knowledge as it is, one does not hold anything. True knowledge is other than sleep and the perception of objects. It is awareness alone, shining, not*

*void.*

Any wordy knowledge is a process in which the intellect grasps something. Brahma vidhya is a knowledge in which the intellect does not grasp anything new. So drop the idea of grasping something new as Brahman. It may lead to the conclusion that Brahma vidhya is something where we don't grasp anything, so it must be nithra or state of blankness or thoughtlessness. But it is not a state of blankness or thoughtlessness. If thoughtlessness is Brahma vidhya, then sleep will be Brahma vidhya. Perception, knowing, objectification are also not Brahma vidhya and no perception, not knowing and not objectifying are also not Brahma Vidhya. Then what is Brahma vidhya – it is chaithanyam or consciousness itself.

This creates more confusion in that everybody already has consciousness so everybody is already liberated and no need for sravana manana nidhidhyasanam. Brahma vidhya is dropping the two fold misconception. It is not a thoughtless state or it is not grasping something. It is a state where thought arises which removes two misconceptions. What is that thought that arises in the mind is aham brahma asmi. At the time of brahma vidhya, I don't have thoughtless mind, but I have an unique thought that I am aham brahma asmi. This thought removes the following two misconceptions:

1. I am jiva different from Brahman.
2. Brahman is an object to be grasped, but it is the very subject which grasps everything.

The thought that eliminates these two misconception is Brahma Vidhya.

Verse 15

*The Consciousness that is the Self is the Truth. The knowledge which is of various forms is entirely different nor can it exist without consciousness. Here, in the world, can*



*the various gold ornaments exist without gold?*

One gold associated with different forms and names appear as ornaments. In the same way, when consciousness is associated with any particular thought, the consciousness becomes particular knowledge. General consciousness becomes particularized consciousness. Pot outside enters my mind through sense organs, generating pot thought. This is different than any other thought. Before this thought entered the mind, the general consciousness was in the mind. When I opened my eyes, I saw pot, creating pot thought and general consciousness became pot consciousness. This pot consciousness is pot knowledge. When turn my eyes to some other object, the pot knowledge disappears and replaced by the knowledge of that object.

Consciousness is called knowledge when it is associated with a thought. Plurality does not belong to consciousness, it belongs to thoughts. Every knowledge is consciousness associated with a relevant thought. If you extend this principle, Brahma Vidhya is also a consciousness associated with the relevant thought "Aham Brahma Vidhya". Consciousness itself appears as manifold cognition. Consciousness is one but cognition are many. These cognition can never exist separate from consciousness, because consciousness alone is appearing as cognition. Without consciousness, there is no knowledge of pot, ornament, wall etc. Just as ornaments do not exist separate from gold. Gold can exist without ornaments, but ornaments can't exist without gold. Consciousness can exist without cognition, but cognition can't exist without consciousness. Consciousness is sathyam and cognition are mithya. Without real gold, ornaments exists? Similarly without consciousness, the unreal cognition exist? Brahma Vidhya is also a cognition, can it exist without consciousness. We boldly says that is also mithya. Brahman is sathyam, but Brahma vidhya is mithya. But this mithya gyanam is enough to remove the mithya samsara. To remove dream

thirst, it is enough if you have dream water and dream water alone remove dream thirst. Similarly for mithya samsara, mithya gyanam and mithya gyanam alone is required. Vyavahariga sathyam not paramarthika sathyam is required.

Verse 16

*“That” and “thou” are based firmly “I”. From the knowledge of their origin, when that “I” has perished, for one without the notion of “that”, “thou” and “I”, that natural state of oneself that is shining, will emerge.*

This thought is not generated by meditation but by guru sashtra pramanam. Misconception dropping is brahma vidhya. First misconception is that I am a finite localized individual. This misconception is ahangara creating individuality. Once I create this first person ahangara, then second a's and third person arrives. The finite second person and finite third person arise because of finite first person called ahangara. When gyani says aham, it denotes infinite first person and so there is not second or third person. The word first person is not relevant to gyani.

---

## **Ramana Maharshi – The Sage of Arunachala**

This is a Youtube video regarding Ramana Maharishi. Students of vedanta and Ramana Maharishi will find this very useful:

---

# Saddharshanam, Class 8

*All pairs of opposites and triads shine, taking the support of some entity. When that is searched, all will get dropped. To them who see the Truth, there is never any wavering.*

The idea given in this verse is self-inquiry always means atma vichara, even though we can loosely describe it as ahangara vichara:

- Atma vichara will lead to atma gyanam
- Atma Gyanam will lead to destruction of atma agyanam
- Atma agyanam is all the errors committed regarding atma; Destruction of these errors is technically called adhyasa nasa. These errors are called ahangara. The false I, born out of ignorance of real I, is ahangara.

When the rope in front of me is not clearly known, there is rope ignorance. Rope ignorance leads to snake. The rope is the subtractum of the snake. You tackle the snake by inquiry into rope adhishtanam. Never attack unreal always attack or inquire into the real adhishtanam. Rope inquiry will lead to rope knowledge. Rope knowledge will lead to rope ignorance destruction. Rope ignorance destruction will lead to the destruction of snake knowledge. In the place of rope, we have atma and in the place of snake we have ahangara. Once ahangara is destroyed, all forms of dualities (subject and object) and thirupidies or triads (subject, object and instrument) are destroyed. Thirupudi and dwandams are unreal and require an adhishtanam or substratum, which is atma vasthu.

All dwandas or pair or subject object pairs are born out of ahangara. All of them are supported by atma. If these unreal dwandam or triads are to be destroyed, don't attack the ahangara; attack the adhishtanam, the support which is atma. No dream activity will remove the dream; you must wake up to destroy dream. Similarly, to destroy ahangara, you need to

get the knowledge of atma. When knowledge comes, ignorance go away; when ignorance go away, all the unreal dvaidda and triad get resolved. This results in the establishing the adhishtanam, atma.

In this instance, Ramana Maharishi only talks about the significance of atma vichara and not the procedure for atma vichara. Any pursuit requires employment of appropriate instrument for the pursuit of knowledge. For example, to know the color of crow you need eyes. Simple process of questioning will not generate knowledge. For atma vichara, the regular instruments (mind and sense organs) are incapable, insufficient and irrelevant. They are extrovert, turned outside. The instrument of atma vichara is guru sathra upadesa. Inquiring to atma is exposing to traditional teaching or Vedanta vichara. The procedure for atma vichara is vedanta sravana manana nidhidhyasanam.

Verse 12

*If there is no ignorance, how does knowledge shine? Without knowledge, does ignorance shine? And whose are the two? Thus, having inquired, abidance in the original nature is the knowledge of the Truth.*

If darkness is the problem, light is the only solution. Similarly, to remove ignorance (internal darkness), gyanam is the only solution. Gyanam is a relative entity falling within duality, opposing ignorance and therefore gyanam is also mithya. You can't conceive of gyanam without the concept of ignorance and therefore knowledge and ignorance also come under Dvaiddam. Arrival of one displaces the other. Initially we should pursue gyanam and destroy ignorance and after gaining gyanam we should disown gyanam because claiming gyanam is also a form of ahangara. You should say I am the adhishtanam of gyanam and ignorance and different from both. If knowledge, vidhya is also a mithya, why should I pursue it? Vidhya mithya is required to remove avidhya mithya. Once

avidya is removed, you should disown both. It is like using soap to remove dirt. You apply the soap to remove the dirt but after that you wash off the soap. Similarly, to remove ignorance, you obtain knowledge. But after removing the ignorance, you disown knowledge.

Both gyanam and agyanam are associated with ahangara and this is the real knowledge. Gyana nishta is the availability of this knowledge, effortlessly. We can recall our phone number, names etc. when needed, without any effort. Gyana Nisha is the availability of gyanam effortlessly.

Verse 13

*Can that be true knowledge when the knower does not know himself? To one who knows oneself, the support of knowledge and the object of knowledge, the two will vanish.*

Without understanding ourselves, we are trying to understand one anatma after another. Without knowing about oneself, knowing about everything else is a fruitless pursuit. Apara vidhya is as good as avidhya (ignorance). Apara vidhya, without para vidhya is mithya. Atma alone functions as a knower, without knowing that knower, all other knowledge is false.

Knowledge of anatma is not useful because:

1. It is knowledge of anatma and anatma being mithya and knowledge of a mithya will not be a great knowledge.
2. Anatama gyanam will not free the individual from the sense of limitation which is the problem of samsara.