

Topic 5. The nature of jiva and isvara.

1. Both are reflections. The reflection of consciousness in maya which is indescribable as real or unreal is Isvara. The reflection of consciousness in the infinite number of limited parts of maya, which have avarana and vikshepasakti and which are known as avidya is jiva. The part of maya with both avarana and vikshepa sakti is avidya. This is the view of Prakatarthakara.
2. Mulaprakriti is maya when it is predominantly pure sattva not overcome by rajas and tamas and it is avidya when it is impure sattva subordinated by rajas and tamas. The reflection in maya is Isvara and the reflection in avidya is jiva. This is the view of Swami Vidyananya in Tattvaviveka, chapter 1 of Panchadasi.
3. Mulaprakriti itself with vikshepasakti being predominant is maya and is the upadhi of Isvara. With avarana sakti being predominant, mulaprakriti is avidya and it is the upadhi of jiva. Because of this, jiva has the experience of being ignorant, but not Isvara. This is the view of some.
4. Samkshepasariraka view—The reflection of consciousness in avidya is Isvara and the reflection in the mind is jiva.

In the above views in which Isvara and jiva are reflections, the bimba (prototype) is pure consciousness (Brahman) which is attained by the liberated.

5. Chitradipa view: Giving up the threefold aspect of Brahman as pure consciousness, Isvara, and jiva, a fourfold aspect is postulated. The reflection in ajnana tinged with the vasanas in the minds of all living beings, which is dependent on Brahman is Isvara. The reflection in the antahkaranam (mind) is jiva.

Translation of the relevant paragraphs in SLS—The fourfold aspect is-- The reflection in the mind is jiva. The unconditioned consciousness is Brahman. The reflection in maya that is ignorance which is dependent on Brahman and in which are the vasanas in the minds of all living beings, is Isvara. The consciousness which is the substratum of the subtle and gross bodies, which is limited by the two bodies and which is unchanging like an anvil is the kutastha. Thus the difference between jiva and Isvara is that the mind is the upadhi of the former and ajnana tinged with the vasanas of all beings is the upadhi of the latter.

Out of these four it is the jiva who shines as 'aham' who is superimposed on kutastha whose special characteristics of non-attachment and bliss are hidden by avidya, like silver superimposed on nacre. Therefore, just like 'thisness' and 'silverness', the general characteristics of the substratum and the special characteristics of the superimposed entity, which are 'svayam' (self) and 'aham' appear together as in sentences such as "I myself am doing". The 'I-ness' is the special characteristic of the superimposed entity. The word 'self' cannot be used by one person for another. 'Selfness' is the general

characteristic of the substratum, since it can be used for any one as in “Devadatta himself is going”. (So it is like ‘this’ which can apply to any substratum). It is only because of this mutual adhyasa that there is lack of discrimination between kutastha and jiva by ordinary people. They are discriminated in Br.up. 4.5.13—“Pure consciousness alone comes out from these elements and (this separateness) is destroyed with them”. It is with regard to the jiva that it is said that there is destruction (of jivatva) following the destruction of upadhi. The statement in Br.up. 4.5.14—“This Self is indeed imperishable” is with regard to the kutastha which is declared to be imperishable. When the jiva denoted by ‘aham’ is perishable, how can there be non-difference from Brahman which is imperishable? This samanadhikaranyam is not by abhedha, but by badha. Just as by the sentence ‘The post is a man’, the notion of post is removed by the knowledge that it is a man, so also, in the sentence ‘aham Brahma asmi’ by the knowledge of the kutastha Brahman the superimposed ‘aham’ ceases. By the knowledge ‘I am Brahman’, the entire cognition of ‘I’ (as karta, bhokta, etc.) is removed—Naishkarmasiddhi, 2.29.

If, as said by Vivarana this is to be taken as abhede samanadhikaranyam, then the word ‘aham’ whose primary meaning is the jiva should be taken as meaning kutastha by lakshana, since that (kutastha), not being a superimposed entity, can be non-different from Brahman.

Isvara who has been stated to be the reflection in the vasanas in the mind is ‘the anandamaya in the deep sleep state described in Mandukya up. 5, because he is described in the next mantra as ‘He is the Lord of all, omniscient, the inner controller, the source of all, the origin and place of dissolution of all beings’.

Abhedha samanadhikaranyam is also known as aikye samanadhikaranyam and mukhya samanadhikaranyam. The difference between the two kinds of samanadhikaranyam is brought out in the following note:

With regard to the two kinds of samanadhikaranyam, Dr. R. Balasubramanian says in his book on Naishkarmyasiddhi:

In a sentence words which, having the same case-endings, denote one and the same thing are said to be in samanadhikaranyam and the relation that obtains between (or among) the words is called samanadhikaranyam-sambandha. This relation is of two kinds--- mukhya-samanadhikaranyam and badhayam samanadhikaranyam. In the former, the objects denoted by the words of the sentence will have equal ontological status (samana-satta), will be identical in nature (samana-svarupa), and will not be really different from each other. For example, when we say, “The pot-ether is the great ether”, the words pot-ether and great ether are in mukhya samanadhikaranyam. The pot-enclosed ether and the ether outside it have the same ontological status, i.e., both are

empirically real. Also, both of them have the same nature. Though they appear to be different, they are not really so. The pot which is the upadhi (adjunct) separates the ether in the pot from the ether outside it, and so the difference between the two is only aupadhika. When the upadhi is removed, they become one which they really are all the time.

But if the words of a sentence, which have the same case-endings denote objects which have different ontological status and if they purport to convey only one idea, then they are in badhayam samanadhikaranyam. For example, when we say, "This post is a man", the objects denoted by the words 'post' and 'man' have different ontological status. Since what exists really is a man and not a post, 'man' is empirically real (vyavaharika) whereas 'post' is apparently real (pratibhasika).

6. In Brahmananda, however, it is said that the anandamaya in deep sleep is the jiva. In the commentary the Agama prakarana of Mandukya karika is explained in detail.
7. In Drigdrisyaviveka Swami Vidyaranya describes jiva as threefold, as paramarthika, vyavaharika and pratibhasika. The immutable kutastha chaitanya which is associated with (avacchinna) the two bodies is the paramarthika jiva. Though the associated factors are only kalpita (not real), since what is associated is not kalpita, it is non-different from Brahman.

The word avacchinna stands for all the following three---upahita, upalakshita, and visishta—limited by, indicated by, and qualified by. The reflection of consciousness in the mind which considers itself as 'I' because of identification with the mind is the vyavaharika jiva. Though it is due to maya, it continues as long as there is vyavahara. In the dream state the person who considers himself as 'I' is the pratibhasika jiva. Sleep is a mode of maya by which the vyavaharika jiva of the waking state is concealed. The jiva who sees the dream ceases along with the dream world on waking up.

The above are the different views of those who hold that Isvara is a reflection.

8. Isvara is not a reflection, nor is unconditioned Brahman the prototype (bimba). But the jiva is the reflection in avidya. Isvara is the bimba. Pure consciousness permeates both these. This is the view of the followers of Vivarana.

9. Pure consciousness delimited by the inner organ is the jiva. Isvara is not limited by the inner organ, but conditioned by avidya. This is the view of the followers of Vachaspati Misra. It is pointed out that whatever objections are raised against the theory of limitation are equally applicable to the theory of reflection. Finally it is said that the sruti " When a pot is moved from one place to another the space inside the pot is not moved; so also the jiva which is similar to the space" (Amritabindu upanishad,13) supports only the theory of

limitation. Brahmasutra 2.3.43 which describes the jivas as parts of God also supports it.

10. The jiva is neither a reflection nor a limitation, but it is pure Brahman who is Existence-Consciousness-Bliss, who attains the state of jiva because of his own avidya, just as Karna became the son of a charioteer. This is based on the example narrated in the Brihadaranyaka upanishad Bhashya of a prince who grew up in the family of a hunter. He considered himself to be a hunter until he was reminded by a knowledgeable person that he was a prince. Similarly, the ignorant jiva realizes that he is Brahman on hearing the mahavakya 'tat tvam asi'. Isvara is also imagined by the jiva to exist with such qualities as omniscience, etc., on the analogy of the perception of a deity in dream. This is the view of the followers of Vartikakara.
