

# Siddhantalesasangraha

## Chapter 1.

Invocation of Brahman- Statement of purpose of the work- Discussion of the nature of the vidhi implied by the sruti statement, “The Atma is to be realized, it is to be heard about, reflected on and contemplated on”.

Apoorvavidhi is that statement which contains an injunction about some thing that is not at all known by any other means. e.g., one should sprinkle the grains.

Niyamavidhi- When the options are more than one, the injunction which stipulates the adoption of one particular option, —e.g., one pounds the rice grains.

Parisankhyavidhi- Where there are more than one option, an injunction which excludes one—e.g., five species of five-nailed animals may be eaten. Here animals other than the five specified five-nailed animals are excluded; they should not be eaten. (By way of explanation it may be added here- the injunction stresses the exclusion of the latter type of animals; their eating is forbidden. The eating of the five specified species is not compulsory; it is optional. So the exclusion of some thing is what is important in parisankhyavidhi, while in niyamavidhi the prescription of a particular option is important. Another difference is that in niyama vidhi the various options are not capable of being practised simultaneously, while in parisankhyavidhi the options can be practised simultaneously. For example, rice grains cannot be pounded in a mortar and at the same time dehusked by some other means. But a person can eat the flesh of the five specified animals and also of other animals at the same time).

For a detailed note on vidhi (injunction) please visit [www.geocities.com/snsastri/vidhi.pdf](http://www.geocities.com/snsastri/vidhi.pdf)

### **Topic 1. Discussion of the injunction regarding Sravanam**

1. According to Prakatarthakara (Anubhutiśvarupacharya) and some others, since it is not known at all by any other pramana that hearing of Vedanta is the cause of realisation of Brahman, this is an apoorvavidhi.

The view that it is a niyamavidhi is now dealt with:

2. (a). It is a known fact that definite knowledge about any particular thing results only from enquiry (vichara) about it. The direct realization of a thing which is aparoksha is attained only through a pramana which has that thing as its object. It follows from this that sravana, which leads to the acquisition of knowledge by enquiry into the statements of Vedanta ( by applying the six lingas) is the means of attaining the direct realization of Brahman which is eternal and aparoksha. There is therefore no apoorvavidhi in the injunction regarding sravana. But a person who has studied the Vedas, and has known from some of the Vedantic statements that what he thought of in his mind as ‘I’ is the attributeless pure

Consciousness Brahman may think that by concentrating his mind again on those same statements he could get realization. He may consider sravana to be only optional. The injunction regarding sravana stresses that it is not optional, but it is what should be practised. Thus it becomes a niyamavidhi.

(Vedanta saara,ch.5, para 182—Hearing (sravana) is the determination, by the application of the six characteristic signs, that the purport of the entire Vedanta is the non-dual Brahman. The six signs are—(1)the beginning and the conclusion, (2)repetition, (3)originality, (4)result, (5)eulogy and (6)demonstration. The Sanskrit terms for these are, respectively, *upakramopasamhaara*, *abhyaasa*, *apuurvataa*, *phala*, *arthavaada*, *upapatti*.)

2.(b) Or, One may think that mukti can be attained through the knowledge of paramatma as different from jivatma and may resort to the study of works based on duality (such as Nyaya, Sankhya, etc). To prevent that, sravana of Vedanta which deals with non-dual Self is laid down. This is niyamavidhi.

2.(c) Or, Just as for svadhyaya written texts are to be excluded and the disciple should hear from the mouth of the guru and repeat it, sravana of Vedanta from the mouth of the guru is laid down, even though the disciple may have already studied the other Sastras and may be capable of doing vichara on Vedanta on his own. Thus also there is niyamavidhi.

2.(d) Or, study of Vedanta through books in other languages may be thought of because the student is not proficient in the Sanskrit. This is excluded by prescribing sravana of Vedanta and thus it becomes a niyamavidhi.

2.(e) Or, just as in Vedic rituals the niyamavidhi that the sense of the mantras should be remembered only by chanting the mantra itself and not by uttering the sentences with the same meaning in the kalpa sutras for getting the niyama apurva, so also vichara of Vedanta is laid down as a niyamavidhi according to the followers of Vivarana.

2. (f) Or, the niyamavidhi (of Vedanta sravana) is for excluding the path of yoga, upasana of saguna Brahman, penances, etc.

3. It is accepted in the world that words which have by themselves the capacity to generate indirect (paroksha) knowledge, can, when supported by manana and nididhyasana, generate direct (aparoksha) knowledge, just as a person who constantly keeps his mind fixed on some person dear to him may get a mental vision of that person.. Therefore there is no apoorvavidhi. But by sravana being laid down for the rise of paroksha knowledge and manana and nididhyasana for aparoksha knowledge, there is niyamavidhi. This is the view of some followers of Vivarana.

4. Paroksha knowledge free from doubt is alone what sravana generates, and direct (aparoksha) knowledge of the Self is attained by the mind which has been made fit by hearing the Sastra (mahavakya),

instruction of the Acharya, and cultivation of control of mind, control of sense-organs, etc. Thus there is niyamavidhi by sravana being laid down for the generation of paroksha knowledge and manana and nididhyasana for the rise of aparoksha jnana through the mind. This is the view held by those according to whom realization of Brahman does not arise from the mahavakya alone, but the mind is the instrument for realization, as it is said in Br.up., 4.4.19, "It is to be known only by the mind". The difference between this and the view in para 3 above is that in para 3 realization arises from the mahavakya itself, but here it arises through the mind.

5. For appreciating music the instrument is the ear. For removing wrong understandings about svaras one has to study the science of music. Thus the study of music becomes the aid to the ear for the appreciation of music. Similarly, the mind refined by sama, etc., is the instrument for realization of the Self. Sravana of Vedanta is useful for removing the identification of the body, etc., with the Self and is thus already known to be an aid to the mind. Therefore there is no apoorvavidhi in sravanam. But there is niyamavidhi in sravanam because of its being intended for aproksha jnana, and so also are manana and nididhyasana. Thus they are aids to the mind which is the instrument for realization. This is the view of some others.

6. In the preceding views in which sravana which is of the nature of vichara is laid down for attaining paroksha and aparoksha jnana, jnana cannot arise because vichara is not a pramana (and jnana can arise only through a pramana). So jnana is not the result of sravana. Vichara is not a pramana. Only the words of Vedanta are pramana. If sravana is the determination of the purport of Vedanta by the application of the six lingas it itself becomes jnana. There cannot be any vidhi for jnana. Vichara is an activity of the mind, consisting of the discussion of pros and cons. It is the Vedantic sentences that have non-dual Brahman as purport (tatparya). Vichara only removes the obstructions which are due to defects in the aspirant. Thus sravana which is of the nature of vichara is prescribed as a niyamavidhi only as intended to remove the obstacles. This is the view of the followers of Samkshepasariraka.

7. A person who wishes to learn about medicines takes up the study of the works of Charaka, etc, but now and then may engage himself in other activities. Similarly, a person who has taken up the study of Vedanta for attaining realization of the Self may be tempted to engage in other activities because of past bad vasanas. To exclude such activities the injunction of hearing is laid down as a parisankhyavidhi according to the followers of the view of Suresvaracharya.

8. Manana is of the nature of inference like the inference, "the Atma is of the nature of brahman, since it is pure consciousness like Brahman, the intellect, etc., are only imagined, being knowable, like nacre-silver". Therefore manana is of the nature of knowledge.

Nididhayasana is the determination of the implied meanings of 'tat' and 'tvam' in the form " I am of the nature of consciousness which is the nature of Brahman and Brahman is of the same nature as the indwelling self which is consciousness and homogeneous". It is also therefore of the nature of knowledge. Sravana is the determination by the application of the six signs such as upakrama, etc., that the purport of the Vedanta texts is the non-dual Brahman. It is also therefore of the nature of knowledge and not of the nature of discussion about the purport. Therefore there can be no vidhi at all since all the three are of the nature of knowledge and there can be no vidhi for knowledge which is the fruit of pramana. The suffix 'tavya' which gives the appearance of an injunction is intended only to create interest in the subject by praising it, as in karma kanda in respect of an oblation to Vishnu.

There is no specific injunction for vichara of karma and it is already implied by the injunction to study one's branch of the Veda. Since the case of Vedanta is not different, there is no need for a separate injunction. This is the view of the followers of Acharya Vachaspati.

In Siddhantalesasangraha itself it is said that even without a vidhi the exclusions by niyamavidhis are achieved. In the commentary also the exclusions are stated. In the commentary the view of the vartika that sravana, manana and nididhyasana are of the nature of jnana is discussed.