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CHAPTER IV

A STUDY OF NATARAJA GURU’S INTERPRETATION ON THE DARANAMÉLÉ OF SREE NARAYANA GURU

Darānāmēlē (Garland of visions) consists of ten chapters, each containing ten verses.

Nataraja Guru, a linguistic and philosophic scholar, in both Eastern and Western, has tried to analytically study the philosophy of Darānāmēlē of Nataraja Guru mainly through the window of modern science. He has a deep understanding in the subjects like mathematics, zoology, physiology, geology, psychology, etc. He was a profound scholar, in many subjects, of par-excellence.
In the present study, the Investigator tries to analyse the interpretation of Nataraja Guru on \textit{Dar\={a}nam\=\={i}l\=\={i}} under various objectives framed for the purpose.

The Investigator follows \textbf{content analysis} for the study. "An Integrated Science of the Absolute" of Nataraja Guru consists a very descriptive study of the subject in the wake of Western and Eastern philosophies to explain the subtle philosophical concepts of \textit{Dar\={a}nam\=\={i}l\=\={i}}. The method he has chosen is to give a prologue before interpreting the verses, followed by his interpretation and at the end, an Epilogue in detail.

The Guru makes use of the theories of many scientists and philosophers of the modern Era - including Einstein, Liebniz, Descartes, Bergson, Kant, Hegal, Darwin, Newton, etc. as a background to explain various concepts associated with
the philosophies of the Absolute (God). He gives a comprehensive explanation of the subject in general in his long Prologues and Epilogues relating to each chapter.

4.4 The Investigator has selected Eighty verses for the purpose of the study. The study is confined to the interpretations given by Nataraja Guru to the selected verses (of the Darśanamālī). Nataraja Guru has given elaborate views on various philosophical concepts, both Western and Eastern, in his long introduction and also in the Prologues and Epilogues of every chapter of Darśanamālī; in his book, "An Integrated Science of the Absolute". The Investigator does not make a comprehensive study of the book but is confined to the interpretation given by Nataraja Guru to the respective verses chosen for the study.

4.5 A humble attempt is made by the Researcher to identify and highlight certain aspects of the study of Nataraja Guru; which he finds suitable and relevant
in a study like this. Nataraja Guru's "An Integrated Science of the Absolute" has been published in two volumes covering over thousand pages. It is an earnest attempt on the part of the Investigator to make a study on the interpretation of Nataraja Guru on Darśanamālī from certain definite angles. It is really a cumbersome task to study and analyse the importance and relevance of the subject which contained in, "An Integrated Science of the Absolute", as it is very complex, profound and scholastic, with in the limited time available for the study.

4.6 Nataraja Guru, for the sake of the interpretation of Darśanamālī, has been given the English version to various chapters as follows:

1. Adyātropa Darśanam - Vision by Supposition

2. Apavāda Darśanam - Vision of Non-Supposition
3. Asatya Darśanam - Vision of Non-Existence

4. Mâyá Darśanam - Vision of Negation

5. Bhñna Darśanam - Vision of Consciousness

6. Karma Darśanam - Vision of Action

7. Jññi Darśanam - Vision by Awareness of Reason

8. Bhakti Darśanam - Vision by Contemplation

9. Yoga Darśanam - Vision of Meditation

10. Nirñya Darśanam - Vision by Absorption

The investigator finds that it is convenient and suitable to study the interpretation given by Nataraja Guru in the three objective angles. The objectives are:
1. To critically study Nataraja Guru's interpretation on the Darśanam īl (Garland of Visions) of Sree Narayana Guru.

2. To examine the scope and relevance of studying and explaining the subtle spiritualistic concepts using modern Science and Mathematics, in the light of Nataraja Guru's the interpretation, on Darśanam īl.

3. To evaluate whether Nataraja Guru has succeeded in communicating the subtle concepts and meanings of Darśanam īl through scientific approach.

4.8 Nataraja Guru has presented the book in a peculiar style giving a long Prologue for every chapter which consists of general concepts and theories he found suitable as a prerequisite to study the subject of Darśanam īl. He gives a discussion at the end of each chapter, namely the Epilogue. This is the methodology he
followed in the interpretation of Darśanamālā. The Investigator tries to study the
textual interpretation to the various stanzas as given by Nataraja Guru, since he finds it
will be worth to analyse and study the Guru's views connected with the
interpretation of different verses. For this purpose, the Investigator has identified
and selected some important verses relating to various chapters, that he found
suitable for the conduct of the study. Every verse follows a commentary and the
interpretation given by Nataraja Guru.
Narayana Guru, in this chapter, Vision by Supposition records his strong, imaginative and logical concept of the creation of the universe.

4.1.1.1. *¡s¢dagre'sadevedam bhuvanam svapnavat punaÅ*

*sasarja sarvam samkalpa|mtre, a parame¿varaÅ ||* (Verse 1)

*In the beginning there was*

*Non-existence indeed!*

*Dreamwise then again by mere willing*

*Every thing existent created He, the Lord Supreme.*

*agree, in the beginning (before creation); idam bhuvanam, this world; asad eva, even as nothingness (as non-existence, indeed); ¡seed,*

*existed; punaÅ, thereafter (at the time of creation); parame¿varaÅ,*
the Supreme Lord; sarvam, everything; samkalpamitra, by mere willing; svapnavat, like a dream; sasarja, (He) created.

Commentary: In the beginning (i.e., at its upper limit which has to be distinguished together with other similar limits), there was non-existence. Posteriorly to this (in pure time), the Supreme Lord (parameśvara) when creation was to begin, by His mere willing created all this (i.e., gave it a conceptual status different from what was merely nominals), just as in the case of a dream (having its own virtuality within consciousness). The stuff that dreams are made of is admittedly unreal to the extent that they belong to the world of ideas. In the same manner the world can be said to be unreal to the extent that its stuff is of the same order as His will. Whatever reality there was at this limiting point can be attributed to the Supreme Lord, rather than to His creation. The Taittireya
Upaniṣad supports this two-fold point of view. The world as objectively manifested apart from the Lord was equated to nothing, tentatively accepting the principle of contradiction between existence and non-existence. In Vedic parlance the upper limit set by the term AGRE (before creation or in the beginning) corresponds to the paramarthika or ultimate reality (i.e., the vertical), while punaA (thereafter) refers to the vyavahārika or work-a-day practical reality (i.e., the horizontal).

It should be noted that according to Sanskrit convention a work of this kind has to indicate the subject-matter, and also imply something by way of adoring the most high value of the Absolute. This requirement is only tacitly fulfilled by virtue of his beginning the very first verse with the letter 'A' which, according to the Bhagavad Gītā (X.33), is equated with the Absolute:

Among syllabic letters I (i.e., the Absolute) am the 'A' . . .
The first word of the verse, moreover, refers to something existing, because the word \textit{sat} suggests something existent (in the ontological sense of \textit{sat}). Because of referring to \textit{sat}, this word occupying the very first position in the verse, can also be considered as fulfilling the requirements of an auspicious beginning required by the same convention referred to above. Moreover, the verse later on equates existence with the Supreme Lord, and further confirms and complies with this same requirement.

\textbf{4.1.2} Nataraja Guru adds that the Supreme Lord depends on nothing outside Himself for His pure act of creation (the word \textit{asat} - nothingness or non-existence, indicates this).

\textbf{4.1.3} It is logical that the Absolute (God) being infinite nothing can exist outside Him. Even the \textit{par
Ā prak
Āti}, the operative principles remain latent in Him in the state of
unqualified consciousness or Nirgu, a Brahma. It is stated that just-like dream ideas of human beings, the created universe remained in the form of ideas, in the Absolute, before creation. The Absolute (God), being infinite, omnipotent and omniscient, He need not keep the dream ideas in Him before creation of the universe. Creation can take place in begest of His will. According to Bhagavad Gità:

"may jagh yādhyakṣe, a prakṛtiḥ
sasyate sacarṣcaram
hetunḥ 'nena kaunteya
jagad viparivartate"¹

¹ Bhagavad Gità, IX/10.
It shows that the Parama-Puruṣa remains only as a presiding or witnessing entity and by His presence; and according to His will, the Prakṛti (mây or ṇakthi) creates this universe and that the creation takes place continuously.

Nataraja Guru's interpretation that in the beginning (Agré), the Absolute is represented by vertical line and thereafter (PunaÅ) being represented by horizontal line may be meant of the Supreme and Created universe respectively. Horizontal line in geometry refers to mention the infinite because, the two ends of the horizontal line meet only in the infinite. So is the case with all horizontal lines. The philosophical fact that the Supreme Puruṣa (consciousness) alone is infinite, the horizontal line representing the created world (PunaÅ) being finite and limited is not correctly and rightfully represented through the science of geometry.

According to the Guru the vertical line refers to the movement towards the
Absolute, (beginningless and the infinite) and the horizontal line shows the created world, by horizontal movements, does not seem logical. The concept of Puruṣa and Prakṛti has not been mentioned either in the above stanza or in the Guru's interpretations.

The integration of Modern Science and Vedanta Philosophy to explain the above, has not been found consistent and logical and not adequate.

4.1.2.1

\[\text{Verse 2}\]

41. mpiyam ev'dv āsidam atha prabhā |

asājān miyaya svasya miyaev/khilam jagat ||

In the beginning in the form of incipient memory factors (All) this remained. Then the Lord.

By His own power of false presentiment, like a magician.

Created all this world (of change).
idau, in the beginning (at inception, before creation); idam, this (visible world); vijan-mayam-eva, even in the form of incipient memory factors, i.e., as samsk\text{"ras} (deep apperceptive masses in consciousness); j\text{"sed}, (remained) existent; atha, thereafter (at the time of creation), prabhu\text{"d}, the Lord; svasya, (by) his own; m\text{"yay}; by (his power of) false presentiment; m\text{"yve-iva}, like a magician; akhilam jagat, the whole world; as\text{"jat}, created.

**Commentary.** At inception this visible world was in the form of v\text{"jan}s (incipient memory factors). Thereafter the Great Lord by His power, which was of a non-existent (or merely conceptual order), after the manner of a magician, created all this phenomenal universe. Before creation this world had merely the status of pure samsk\text{"ras} (deep apperceptive masses in consciousness). The samkalpa (willing) mentioned in the previous verse is only an active version of the same v\text{"jan}. At the time of creation the Lord created all this by his illusory power. This is like the
magician, who while remaining all alone is able to make us believe there are multitudes of other things around him. There is in reality nothing apart from the magician, who is capable of manifesting visible things. Actual entities are not there, but only entities having the status of memory factors are to be considered real. In the same way, there is nothing in the universe which is other than the Lord. What is in the Lord is only a certain power of specification or qualification called \( m_{\text{ji}} \) \((\text{the principle of false presentiment})\), having no (real) existence of its own. By the example of the magician, it has, thus, been shown that the phenomenal world is false.

4.1.2.2. Nataraja Guru observes that the act of creation takes place in, and through Himself in a self-sufficient manner, without any duality between the agent and the action.
This is indicated by the term *jatihireva* - *asrijat* - *svayam* (by His power it was created by itself).

4.1.2.3. It has been stated in the verse that the Lord created this world by His *mâyâ*. Guru Nataraja uses the term power. The concept of *mâyâ* has not been well explained. If *mâyâ* is treated synonymous with *prakârti* or power it would be more clear and convincing. The meaning of the verse that before the creation the world was in the form of *vīsanas* or *samskāras* (the incipient memory factors) does not seem clear.

The *Parampuruṣa* (the Absolute) is beyond the influence of *vīsana* or *samskāra*. He remains in his pure form of consciousness, unaffected by the *samskāras* or *prakārti*. It is not clear what does *samskāras* mean to or attributed to the pure consciousness, the *Puruṣa* (the Absolute). The term illusionary power has not been defined by the Guru in his interpretation, as to whether illusionary power means
prakṛti (mâyā). It is viewed that the God created the universe as if a magician creating illusionary things before the audience. For a magician his mental creations are false and disappearing soon; but the created world remains for long, though undergoes changes in the course of time. The Guru has not expressed his view of the statement given in the commentary that the creator and the created are the same. For example an artist drawing picture cannot be the art itself. They are not the same or identical. So is the Puruṣa (Absolute) and the created beings.

4.1.3.1  praj utpatter idam svasmin vilenam atha vai svataḥ ||

beijd amkuravat svasya ṭakthir evśaṣjat svayam ||  (Verse 3)

This (world) before creation was Latent within Himself;

Thereafter, like sprout from seed,

From Himself, by His power, by itself it was created
Commentary: Before creation this world was only potentially present in the Lord.

Thereafter, at the time of creation His power, which was in Him by its own self-potency created all this manifested world like a sprout from seed. This power is capable of shrinking into nothingness, as well as expanding into elaborate sets of manifested entities. It is only the potent virtual entity which is present within the seed and is capable of manifesting itself as sprout, stem, branch, leaf, flower or fruit. Likewise, it is a potent power within the Lord who created this world. But the Lord is not subject to any process of becoming. It is that power alone, which is
dependent on Him, that can be transformed (vिक्रम) and is capable of creating this world.

4.1.3.2. Nataraja Guru opines that, "God's initiative is directed to both externalising and internalising Himself within the total situation within which He remains with His own neutral epistemological status.

4.1.3.3. Guru's interpretation of the content of the above verse that this world remains in God, in its potential form before creation, is not clear, even the created universe is within Him. The interpretation that 'potential form' needs more explanation, since God is omnipotent. Here Prak्ति's power, a combination of satient force (Sत्त्वगु,a) mutative force (Rजोगु,a) and static force (Tamo gu,a) remains latent in Purुसा before creation; and through Prak्ति according to the will of Purुसा creation takes place. The term potent therefore does not convey clear meaning.
The term potential is one adopted from physical science (physics - potential power, kinetic power, etc.). Physics or any relative science is not adequate to explain the phenomena of the Absolute. The term internalising and externalising used by Nataraja Guru are psychological terms. The use of which at the time of explaining the creation of the world does not seem wholly correct. For God, which is infinite nothing is external and that to Him everything is internal. The interpretation also is very brief. It might be due to the fact that the commentary of Narayana Guru is well explanatory. Regarding this verse there is a corresponding stanza in Bhagavad Gītā:

"bējaṁ mē saṁbhūtmasīṁ

viddhi pṛthva sanītanam"
buddhir buddhimat&m asmi
tejas tejasvin&m aham"²

The meaning is that the seed of all the living and non-living things is He. It is Prakṛti doing creation taking seed from Him.³

Guru Nataraja has not given an explanation to this aspect contained in the verse. Further for explaining the concept of the Absolute (God), human psychology is insufficient. Really He is beyond all psychological scope. Nataraja Guru has not made use of any other scientific concepts to explain this verse.

4.1.4.1.  \( \text{Jaythi tu dvividhi jye\ñ tajse tijmaseti ca} \)  

\( \text{sahayso\ñayor nijti tejas timirayor iva} \)  

(Verse 4)

² Ibid., VII/10.
³ Ibid., IX/10.
The power however, as of two kinds,

Is to be known as the bright and the dark;

There is no co-existence between these two

As with light and darkness.

¿akthiÅ tu, this power, however; taijase t;mase iti ca, and, thus,

made of brightness and darkness; dvividha, two kinds; juey; is to be

known; anayoÅ, as between these; tejas-timirayoÅ-iva, so as with

light and darkness; sahayśaÅ na asti, there is no co-existence.

Commentary: The aforesaid power of the Lord, however, is to be understood in two

distinct ways: (first) as taijase, or belonging to the light (i.e., heliotropic); and

(secondly), as t;mase as belonging to darkness (i.e., geotropic). We can divide the

(specificatory) power of the Lord into two (ambivalent) divisions referring

respectively to light (tejas) and darkness (tamas). Light and darkness cannot co-
exist. It is the same with these two (ambivalent and specificatory) factors or powers of the Lord.

4.1.4.2. Nataraja Guru observes that the arrow of pure becoming implicit in each verse gains primacy both in a forward and a background direction at once. Measured or measurable time is thus ruled out as not consistent with the Unique Absolute time.

4.1.4.3. The interpretation given above by Nataraja Guru to this verse is quite insufficient and not clear. The explanation given by Narayana Guru that, the Lord’s power is to be understood in two distinct ways such as taijasé (belonging to the light) and týmasé (belonging to the darkness) needs some more explanation. Nataraja Guru’s explanation seems to be very simple and uncomprehensive. According to Bhagavad Gétj, the power or prakáti (Bhagavad Gétj, XIV - 5, 6, 7, 8) is of three types - Sáttva gua, Rajo Gua and Tamo Gua.
"tatra sattvaḥ nirmalatvāt
prakṛtikam anjanmayam" 4

The Sattva guṇa or sentient force of prakṛti is illuminating whereas Rajo guṇa and Tamo guṇa are not illuminating. The Taijáṣe power might be meant for Sattva guṇa of the prakṛti (काल्प-power) and Timase (Tamo guṇa - darkness). In every created being the three guṇas shall exist in varied intensities or proportions. Therefore, so far as the term taijáṣe is concerned, it may relate to Sattva guṇa predominant in something is capable of nullifying or reducing the effect of Rajo guṇa and Tamo guṇa.

What Narayana Guru meant by the term taijáṣe might be the Absolute, the Puruṣa. The term Timase, the influence of prakṛti, which can act as a veil, over the

4 Ibid., XIV/6.
light of the Supreme. As regards जाक्षी (power) of God, it can be Sattva Guṇa, Rajo Guṇa and Tamo Guṇa. The features of these guṇas (powers) have been well given in Bhagavad Gītā verses Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8 chapter XIV.

In short, where prakṛti is latent or unexpressed, the Puruṣa, the Absolute is experienced as light. And where the forces of prakṛti are active, especially the static force, darkness is experienced.

The scientific terms; heliotropic and geotropic, may be meant for agni tattva and bhoo tattva of panchabhūtas (Five fundamental elements). Here too his mentioning heliotropic and geotropic have not been explained adequately.
It is stated that Sattvagu, a radiates white light, and that it is the purest form of prakārati or power, which helps one to realise or experience the presence of the Absolute.

"yajente sīttvika devaṁ"\textsuperscript{5}

It stresses the need for becoming Sīttvika to worship God. The other two groups of people Rjjasika and Ṭmasika can not do the real worship of God. Rjjasika (power monkers) and Ṭmasika (static people) can not attain the Absolute as long as they do not purify their mind and become Sīttvika (sentient). This aspects have been not explained by Nataraja Guru to remove ambiguity.

4.1.5.1 \textit{manomātram idam citram ivīgre sarvam edaṃ} | 
\textit{prīpayamīsa vaicitryam bhagavīn citrakravat} || (Verse 5)

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Ibid.}, XVII/4.
In the beginning this world

Which was in the form of mind-stuff, like a picture

Achieved with all this picturesque variety

Like an artist, the Lord.

agre, in the beginning (before creation); manomitrn, in the form of mind-stuff (as made of mere mind-stuff); idam, this (world); citram-iva, like a picture; sarvam edn¿am, all this as such here; vaicitryam, (with its) picturesque variety; pr½payamsa, achieved, citrakiravat, like an artist; bhagavn, the Lord.

Commentary. The terms samkalpa (willing), v½san¿ (incipient memory factor), and ¿akthi (potent power), have been employed so as to be considered equivalent (vertically), each in itself as to the mind (manas), which occupies the central position in this verse. This world was merely of a mental status before creation.

Just as an artist creates in respect of his painting, so the Lord also accomplished all
this artistic variety (seen in the world). Before creation this world remained in the form of (virtual) mind-stuff. If it should be asked how, we say, it remained like a picture in the mind of an artist, before the picture was accomplished. In the same way it was in the mind (manas) or the willing (samkalpa), of the Lord that all this potentially resided. It is possible for an artist to produce works of art with many and varied elaborations. Similarly, the Lord has the ability or the power to produce a world with any amount of elaborations or varieties. In short, the entire manifested world is only an (artistic) expression of the mind of the Lord.

4.1.5.2. Nataraja Guru observes that He transcends the paradox of being an unmoved mover in the context of the pure act. He also transcends both Good and Evil by being a "mysterium tremendum".
4.1.5.3. This verse seems to be a beautiful poetic expression comparing God to an artist.

But He cannot be equated with or compared to anything, because He is beyond all the relativities and is infinite. It would be proper to state that this world is a manifestation of God using His operative principles - the Prakṛti. It cannot be an external expression of mind, because everything is in His (God's) mind.

The explanation by Nataraja Guru is very brief and not clear. The terms like unmoved mover, mysterium tremendum etc. needs further explanation. The unmoved mover might be the Absolute. He while remaining unmoved can move or change the situational status of the world.

This world remained in the mind stuff of the Absolute; before creation, leaves room for some doubts. A spiritualist visionary may view that before creation His power (the operative principles) remained latent in the Absolute (God) and
there can not be a mind-stuff as explained. According to His will the prakṛti becomes active and involved in the process of creation. Therefore the whole world remained in the mind-stuff of the God before creation can be treated only as a beautiful poetic expression of Narayana Guru. Nataraja Guru has not explained these points to give a clear and convincing explanation to the verse.

4.1.6.1.  

\[ \textit{\textbf{Verse 6}} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{||} & \text{vyatanod atha yogavij siddhijlam jagatpati} & \text{||} \\
\text{Potentially what even as Nature remained} \\
\text{Like the psychic powers of Yoga;} \\
\text{Like a yogi did He, the Lord of the World, work out} \\
\text{His varied psychic powers thereafter.} \\
\text{idau, in the beginning; yathj yogavaibhava, as (in the case of) psychic powers; idam, this (world); parkṛti, eva, as nature (itself);} \\
\end{align*}
¡set, remained, atha, thereafter, yoge siddhijýam iva, as a yoge with
his varied psychic powers; jagat-patiÁ, the Lord of the world; idam,
this (world); vyatanod, worked out.

Commentary: In the beginning the world was <i>prakáti</i> (nature), having the same
status as the psychic powers of a <i>yoge</i> (mystic or unitive inner experience).

Thereafter, at the time of creation the Lord made manifest his own nature in the
same way as a <i>yoge</i> makes manifest his powers. The psychic powers of a <i>yoge</i> are in
reality only incipient memory factors within himself. What we mean here by <i>prakáti</i>
only refer to tendencies capable of functioning as contraction or expansion, which
could be merely mental in status; or, otherwise stated, it is mind itself which is
referred to as none other than <i>prakáti</i>, as we should here understand. All the
manifoldly manifested powers of a <i>yoge</i> are only innate tendencies in his mind,
belonging to his own nature, and later on to be expanded and elaborately
manifested. In the same way, it is *prakṛti* that is virtually presented in terms of mind-stuff that becomes transformed into this expanded universe as presented to our vision. What has been discussed so far under the terms of *samkalpa* (willing), *vijñan;* (incipient memory factor), *ākthi* (potent specifying power), *manas* (mind) and *prakṛti* (nature) have one and the same meaning. The term *avidya* (nescience) to be used in the next verse also falls into the same (verticalised) series. It is possible to refer to this same factor in many other ways. In view of simplicity and for the student’s (apodictic) clarity and understanding, we have merely followed a graded series of terms with different designations.

4.1.6.2. Nataraja Guru views that God remains in the total cosmological situation, whether as a common denominator or numerator, a constant placed neutrally between cause and effect.
The interpretation would have been much more clear had the Guru explained the concept of Puruṣa and Prakṛti as given in the Bhagavad Gītā:

\[ \text{prakṛti} \rightarrow \text{puruṣa} \rightarrow \text{ca} ' \text{va} \\
\text{viddha} \text{an}j\text{̄} \text{di} \text{ubh}y \text{api} \\
\text{vikṛṣṭa} \rightarrow \text{ca} \text{gu} \rightarrow \text{E} \rightarrow \text{ca} ' \text{va} \\
\text{viddhī prakṛtisābhav"}^{6} \]

According to Bhagavad Gītā, Puruṣa and Prakṛti are beginningless and before creation Prakṛti remained latent or dormant within Puruṣa (God). Hence the statement, the universe was in the form of Prakṛti before creation seems to be ambiguous and not clear. Further the use of mathematical terms - denominator, numerator, constant etc., are more confusing to the searchers of knowledge. An interpreter shall have to analyse and seek in depth the meaning of the

\[^{6} \text{Ibid.}, \text{XIII}/19. \]
philosophical concepts. Further the statement that a yogi has tremendous (Siddhies) mental powers is not at all conducive to spiritual aspirant for an individual becomes a yogi only when he sheds or gives up mental powers. There is some confusion between a yogi and a person with mental power. Yogi attains, samjãdhi-oneness with the Supreme temporarily and realizes that the mental powers are hurdles to attain the state of yoga or enlightenment. Therefore, attaching much importance to Siddhi (mental powers), to the right path of yoga or realisation of God is not encouraging. A yogi is misunderstood to be a 'Siddha' who has certain peculiar powers. A spiritual aspirant attaching any sort of importance to mental powers can not realize the Absolute. He must remain detached to himself to Siddhi or Asiddhi (power or non-power) Nataraja Guru has not explained this aspect. In Bhagavad Gãti it is clearly stated that:
"siddhyasiddhyo\$ samo bh£tvij

samatvaÆyoga ucyate".\(^7\)

It is equanimity of detached mental status towards powers and non powers
which leads to the communion of \textit{je\$tma} (individual soul) with \textit{Param\$tma} (the
Absolute). Presently we can see that those who have some mental powers project
themselves as Godlymen. But in fact they are far away from God as they are power
mongers.

4.1.7.1. \textit{ark\$d yath\$kramam vijvam tath\$ naivedam jtv\$maA |}

\textit{supter iva pr\$dur ised yugapat svasya ve$k\$ya ||} \textit{(Verse 9)}

\textit{If from a Sun in grade succession}

\textit{This world came, such was not the case at all.}

\textit{Presented as if out of slumber,}

\textit{At one stroke, all came to be.}

\(^7\) \textit{Ibid., II/48.}
idam viśvam, this world, arkṣṭ, from the Sun; yathākramam, as in gradual, manner, priddurṣit (iti-cet), it is manifested (if it should be said); tathā eva, thus not at all; idam, this (world); ītmanā, from the Self; svasya, (by) its own; vekāya, regard (i.e., will); supte āiva, as if from sleep; yugapati, at one stroke; priddharṣit, all came to be.

Commentary: If it be said that this world came to be in gradual steps out of primordial Sun, we say it is not so at all. From the Self, as if from sleep, all came into being at one stroke.

There is a traditional belief that there was an original Sun and from that Sun, by successive steps, the universe was produced, the sky was produced, and from the sky the atmosphere, from the atmosphere the fire, from the fire the water, and from the water the earth. This view is not correct. This world with all its features that we experience in practical life came by the willing of the Self out of the
Self, coming out together all at once. Before creation, the Self had the character of being itself or alone (kevalam). When one wakes from deep sleep (suAupti), the whole world becomes presented all together. In the same way, at the time of creation, by dint of the will of the Self all is manifested together, and projected form out of the Self. There is also the UpaniÀadic dictum which says. "The one Self thought let me be many." By this verse the theory of gradual creation (karma-sizÀ¶i) is repudiated and that of instantaneous creation (yugapat-sizÀ¶i) is upheld. What is implied herein is that the power of the Lord is so great that it could create all this world at one stroke.

4.1.7.2. Nataraja Guru states that Narayana Guru takes special care to deny, categorically the possibility of accepting any cosmological or cosmogonic theories involving actual or merely mechanistic time. He adds that it is because time has necessarily
to belong to the dialectical context of eternal movement within a unified frame of
reference consistent with a science of the Absolute.

4.1.7.3. The above interpretations of Nataraja Guru does not give a clear idea to the readers
about the spirit and content of the verse. But indirectly he endorses the view of
Narayana Guru that the world has come into being with all its features; of on a
sudden as if the whole universe appeared abruptly before a person who awoke from
sleep.

But neither Narayana Guru nor Nataraja Guru gives a logical or convincing
explanation to this concept of the whole universe appearing at one will of the God.

Of course, God is all knowing, omnipotent can do anything as per His will. There
were several seers and philosophers of much enlightenment and vision, earlier to
Narayana Guru. But no one has ever stated that the visible world come into being,
of on a sudden, with all its features. It is true that seers may have different views and visions according to their level of attainment. But one thing is also a fact that seers have different ranges or horizons of their visions. It range from a little light to the infinite light of the Absolute. However both the Gurus have failed to give any logical support or evidence to this effect.

Almost all philosophers and great seers logically stated that this world came into being slowly and that the creation process goes on continuously. If this world was created at one stretch, the creation would not be continuous. There would be a stoppage of creation.
According to Bhagavad Gītā the Prakṛti created the world at the will of the Puruṣa. It has also been stated in the Bhagavad Gītā that the nature of every created thing varies according to the influence of the three 'guṇas' on it. Even in human mind the influence, of the Sattva guṇa (santient force) the Rajo Guṇa (mutative force) and the Tamo Guṇa (static force) is present in varied degrees and as such the character of every individual varies. Further the creation, operation and the destruction process of the God take place all the time, i.e., incessantly.

The plain statement made by Narayana Guru that this world come into being, of on a sudden, cannot be accepted on logical basis and on the basis of the views of other great seers who took birth in this world.

---

8 Ibid., IX/10.
It is to be noted that 'Darṣanamālā' is the view of Narayana Guru communicated to one of his disciples during the time of his daily morning walk.

But in the case of other Gurus or seers - the philosophical concepts are the result of their vision in deep meditation and contemplation, under the guidance of great masters (Satgurus). Therefore, logically speaking the Investigator does not agree with this concept of creation of the cosmos. We know that a large number of cosmological bodies come into being every now and then, and not that, the numerous stars and plants appeared on a sudden as if in a dream,

4.1.8.1

\[dhimm dva va‰jo yasmi‰ prdvurjed jagat|\]

\[sa brahm‰ sjiv vi‰u sa para‰ sarma eva sa‰||\] (Verse 10)

He from whom, like a fig-tree as from seed,

_Came out this world manifested:_

152
He is Brahm; He is áiva and ViÅ,u

He is the Ultimate; everything is He indeed.

dhññt, from a seed; vaGaÁ uva like a fig-tree; yasmit, from whom;

idam jagat, this world; pridur āset, manifested; saÁ brahm; he is

Brahm; saÁ viÅ,u, he is ViÅ,u; saÁ, áiva, he is áiva; saÁ paraÅ,

he is the ultimate; saÁ eva sarvaÅ, everything is He indeed.

Commentary: Just as from a (minute) seed a (large) fig-tree arises (so too) that

Lord from whom this whole wonderful universe became manifested. He is Brahm;

He is ViÅ,u. He is áiva. He is the Supreme Self (Param;tm); and He is everything

indeed. By this Brahm, the creator (in the Vedic context) of the (Vedic gods) Indra

and VaruÅ,a and others, as well as, ViÅ,u who is the Lord of the VaiÅ,avas and áiva

who is the Lord of the áaivites, and the Supreme Self of the vedjintins, are all treated

as one and the same. Because of this reference to the three-fold gods (trimÉrtis), it
is indicated that this world originates from the same Lord having this three-fold character, and that it originates in Him, endures in Him, and dissolves into Him once again. Further, by the statement, that He is everything, it is affirmed that there is no world outside of the Lord. It further states that by the words, sā parā, i.e., 'He is the Ultimate', it is indicated that the Lord is not subject to any kind of transformation (vikṣra) and that He is without any kind of specific attributes.

Being Himself the Supreme Self. The world is only seemingly present in the Lord and it is indicated that the instrumental and material causes (nimitta-kṣra, a and upṣdina-kṣra, a) are none other than the Lord.

In fact, the attribution (wrongly thought of) by the mind of the phenomenal aspect to that which is non-phenomenal is what is referred to as 'superimposition' or "supposed position' characterising this chapter called adhyāropa. All gurus
(spiritual teachers) and āstras (texts) are known traditionally to indicate and take
an initial supposed position in respect of the subject-matter, before giving
instruction about the attributeless Absolute (Nirgu, a Brahma). Following the same
 tradition, the section on adhyāropa has now been terminated. In the next vision of
truth (darśana), the apavāda (i.e., neutralising this supposition) is to be dealt with.

4.1.8.2. Nataraja Guru explains that all possibilities are put together so as to include even
the concrete universal the term ‘Saheva-sarva’ (everything is He) touches the real or
concrete universal being because the cause is compared to the seed, and the
creations compared to a fig-tree grown out of the seed; both belong to a concrete,
yet universal biological order. Nataraja Guru in his Epilogue states that the verse is
meant to symbolise the triple aspects of creation, preservation and dissolution.
4.1.8.3. The meaning is that he who knows that the papal tree with its roots up in the heaven and the stem and branches grown towards the earth (upside down position) is a representation of Brahman and His creation and all knowledge, is the real knower of God.

Nataraja Guru uses a convincing and logical interpretation of the stanza and admits that this universe is created emerging from Nirgu,a Brahma, the attributeless Brahma, God, the Absolute. In this connection it is proper to quote the lines from Bhagavad Géti.

\[ \text{ErdhvamÉlam adha\text{ä}kham} \]

\[ \text{a\text{ä}vattha\text{ä} pr\text{ä}hur avayayam} \]
chandāśi yasya par, īni

yas taśveda sa vedavit\textsuperscript{9}

The same concept is contained in this verse of Narayana Guru also. He has not mentioned the \textit{Bhagavad Gītā}, though almost the same idea is contained in it. He has explained the concept of Advaita stating that the Lord Viśnu, Siva, Brahma all emerges from the Absolute, the God.

4.1.9. Discussion

Nataraja Guru in this Epilogue states that the first chapter is intended to establish a fundamental ontological unity of an Absolute status. He argues that the cause and effects are scientific concepts and as such a total effect necessarily presuppose a total cause. He admits that God is the ultimate cause which can be

\textsuperscript{9} \textit{Ibid.,} XV/1.
termed as Parameśvara, Brahma, āiva etc. He further states that God can better be referred to "God Himself" in the same spirit as calling a spade a spade. Here he uses the image of a spade. (though linguistically correct) to compare God, but no spiritual aspirant shall be dare to use such words in the context of referring to God.

It further shows that Nataraja Guru was not a true devotee of God, when these words are analysed in using the words association techniques of psychology. He states that Narayana Guru using "sarva-eva siva" (verse 10) "meant everything a god". It would be more logical and convincing to state that God resides in everything.

"eṣaṁ svayam idam sarvaṁ "

\[10\]

\[10\] Īśa Upanisad', 1/1.
We know that everything is not God but everything is the manifestation of God. Nataraja Guru claims that he has explained the verse in the first chapter of Darśanamālī giving a unitive and integrated cosmological vision with a fully scientific status given to the notion of the Supreme Lord. It is a fact that no relative science can explain the notion of the Supreme, expect the logical concept of cause and effect. Nataraja Guru’s scientific explanation does not succeed in explaining God. Nataraja Guru uses the geometrical terms like vertical or verticalization, horizontal or horizontalization etc. By vertical or verticalization he means the movement towards the Absolute and horizontal or horizontalization the movement towards the created things.

He makes use of the mathematical terms denominator and numerator. Denominator according to him represents the Absolute and the numerator, the
world around. The fact is that the readers seldom understand the conceptual meanings. Vertical and horizontal terms are adopted from Cartesian co-ordinates.

Descartes was a famous mathematician and a philosopher.

In the long Prologue and Epilogue of the chapter Nataraja Guru mentions many western philosophers like Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Kant, Bergson etc., to explain the 'Science of the Absolute. The concept of 'Caitanya' expressed in this chapter by Narayana Guru to Pure Consciousness is compared to the 'Class vital' of Bergson.

A close study and analysis of the interpretation and the Prologue and Epilogue, it can be conceived that Nataraja Guru could not succeed well in explaining the Science of the Absolute or the concept of Darśanaṁśā. The use of
the technical terms like vertical, horizontal etc., can not make the subject matter well explained and clarified.
Chapter 2

APAVEDA-DARANAM (Vision of Non-Supposition)

Sree Narayana Guru in this chapter specifies concepts of Advaita as understood by him.

4.2.1.1. \( \text{caitanyd jgatam sth\text{E}l\text{s}ek\text{A}makam idam jagat} \)

\( \text{asti cet sad ghanam sarvam nasti ced asti cid ghanam} \) || (Verse 1)

This would which is both subtle and gross

And what has come to be from living consciousness,

If existent, then everything is existent;

If non-existent, then it exists as consciousness

\( \text{caitanyt}, \) from living consciousness (i.e., the Lord); \( \text{\&gatam}, \) what has come to be; \( \text{sth\text{E}l\text{s}ek\text{A}ma-\&takam}, \) which is both subtle and gross; \( \text{idam jagat}, \) this world; \( \text{asti-cet}, \) if existent; \( \text{sarvam-sad-} \)
ghanam-asti, everything is existent; nisti-cet, if non-existent; cid-ghanam asti, it exists as consciousness.

**Commentary.** This world which is seen as having both a subtle and a gross form, has come out of the Lord who is of the form of consciousness. In other words, it is that Lord who appears as the world. (But) the world does not really exist. This world which is none other than the Lord, if we should say it is real, it consists of existence (sat). If we should say, on the contrary, that it does not exist because it still remains in the form of knowledge, it consists of the stuff of consciousness. Because it is both existent and made of consciousness it is none other than what the Lord is. Therefore, whether we say the world is existent, or non-existent, we have to admit that it is not different form the Lord; this is because the world is merely superimposed (adhyastā) on the Lord who is existence-substance-value (sat-cit-
\( jnanda \). It has no real existence and that which really exists is the foundation which is the Lord alone.

4.2.1.2. Nataraja Guru states that we have to notice the reference of two grades of realities.

They are called \( Sth\text{\'}\text{\'}la \) (gross) and \( S\text{\'}\text{\'}k\text{\'}ma \) (subtle). The gross implies a greater degree of objectivity or at least duality between subject and object. It must have besides, an ontological content within the scope of vital consciousness (\textit{caitanya}) which is treated here as the key concept for the whole chapter, having the status of an absolutist norm. The gross has a horizontal content, while the subtle, as its reciprocal counterpart, has a vertical content. There is still a trace of duality retained between them for the practical purpose of starting the discussion. The concept of ultimate substance of Spinoza has been presented as a philosophical background to state that there exists the Absolute, being the first material cause.
Narayana Guru reaffirms that effect must have a cause when adopted for scientific or philosophical reasoning.

4.2.1.3. The simple meaning of the verse is that this world is treated as existent because it is created by the reality (Sat/God) and if the created world is treated as non-existent, there too exists the Supreme or the Absolute. Since the Absolute (God) is infinite and beginningless, every created thing is within Him.

There exists a duality between the Absolute and the world. The Mathematical application of vertical and horizontal does not seem logical to this context.

"caitanyath sarvamuthpannam
jagadetha ccaracaram"
The above verse seems to be similar in meaning. Everything comes into being form the consciousness (Caitanya). That is according to áiva Samhita, the whole world is created from Consciousness. If the world is considered as existing, it reminds in the (Samkalpa) imagination of God. If the world is untrue it reminds in God in the form of knowledge (Jñana). The verse is closely related to the ideas of the áiva Samhita as above.

Even when the created things do not exist, He exists. Nataraja Guru states that the resolution of duality in the Absolute reality corresponds to the concept of 'class vital of Bergson'. Bergson has explained his view on Physics and Metaphysics.

---

"Siva Samhita", 1/77.
relating to time and space. Finally he succeeded in abolishing multiplicity of times in terms of one "unique time" which is very close to the Absolute.

It would be very practical and clear as one thinks in the lines of Īśvāsa Upaniṣad - that the Absolute resides in everything rather than everything is God.

"Sarvam Brahmam Jayam" seems to be unambiguous and more realistic to the readers and for true searchers of knowledge.

4.2.1  
\[ \text{anyanna krya, at kryam asad etad atokhilam} \]  
\[ \text{asatā katham utpattir anupannasya ko layā} \]  
(Verse 2)

Other than the cause the effect cannot be;

Therefore, all this is non-existent:

Of what is non-existent, how can there be any origin,

And of something unoriginated, how

(can there be) re-absorption?
"kíra¸¡t, from the cause, anyat, other; kíryam na, there is no effect;

ataÅ, therefore;  et akhilam, all this (universe); asat (bhavati)
becomes non-existent; asataÅ of what is non-existent, utpattiÅ,
katham, how can there be origin; anutpannasya, of something
unoriginated, layaÅ, re-absorption; kaÅ how (can there be)?

**Commentary:** There is no effect independent of the cause. That is, when we
examine it more closely all effects are unreal. Their causes alone are real.

Therefore, the visible and invisible universe is unreal because of being an effect.

That which is existent, is what is real. It is what constitutes the one cause for
everything, which is the Lord, or in other words, the Absolute (Brahman). How can
a non-existent world have an origin? In other words, it never originated at all.

How can anything which does not originate have re-absorption? That is, there is
no re-absorption. For something which has neither origin nor re-absorption there
is no state of being. That is in the Absolute this universe has no being at any time (either) in the past, present or future.

4.2.2. Nataraja Guru supporting Narayana Guru’s view states that the effect (Kṣraya) corresponds to the gross visible world and the cause (Kṣraya, a) is its more subtle dialectical counterpart. The relation between them tends to be treated in a move verticised context. The duality of either or, begins to give place to unity where both cause and effect belong together without contradiction. Horizontal realistic plurality is resolved in terms of a verticised unity between pure and more refined fundamental causes and effects treated together. This is the very essence of the transition of what is relativistic into what is more absolutist. Causes and effects belong together as in the context of pure mathematics and are treated interchangeable in a reversible process. The immanent transcendent character of
the verse is evident from the fact that no assertion is made but the answer is indirectly indicated by two rhetorical questions. Contradiction still lingers because of the use of the terms asat (non-existence).

4.2.2.3. The meanings of the verse is that effects cannot exist without a cause and that effect is not separate from the cause and hence non-existent. This is according to the Advaita Philosophy, that the God only is true and the world is illusionary. However, in the practical sense, this concept cannot be accepted. Because the creator and the created cannot be one and identical. The world is a relative truth and not an illusion and not an Absolute truth either. To logically explain, the artistic work of an artist and the artist are not the same. Though he has given a more convincing meaning of the cosmology that, He exists, so the created things, the world cannot be an illusion. We experience every time the existence of this
world and we strive to adjust ourselves with this relative world. If these are not absolute truth, they have to be considered as relative truth and not as illusion. At this point the concept of Advaita seems to be incorrect, illogical and misleading. Nataraja Guru does not give a clear and convincing interpretation to the above. The Mathematical application vertical and horizontal does not make the idea clear to the readers. If God created this world through His मंज्य (मंज्य) the creator and the created cannot be the same. No body can experience both as one. It is logical to say that God is there and also every created things. It may be true that a योग, at the time of absorption (communion) can experience the Absolute alone, but it is not proper to state this world does not exist or the Absolute and relative are identical. Nataraja Guru states that there is transition from relativism to absolutism citing the theory of relativity of Einstein. It is an accepted concept among the great seers...
that the relative or the created would one day merge with the Absolute. The individual soul gets merged with the Supreme (The Absolute) at the time of *Nirva,na* or *Mokša* (Liberation). But for that an individual has to strive hard to purify his mind and to escape from the bondages of *prakṛti*. Once the bondages of *miyā* (*jākthi*) consisting of three guas are broken the *jivātma* (soul) gets unified with the Absolute. But for this, one has to strive for many years and even to take several births, one after another. If it is treated that the Absolute and this world are one it does need so much effort to break the influence of *prakṛti* in one’s mind and soul.

Nataraja Guru tries to establish the concept of Advaita of Narayana Guru through scientific reasoning. But he is found not very successful in this context.

4.2.3.1. \textit{yasyotpattir layo nāsti tat param brahma netarat} |

\textit{utpattīca layo'stetibhramaty ītmani miyāj ||} (Verse 3)
To that which origin and dissolution is not

That is none other than, the ultimate Absolute;

(That there) is origin and re-absorption

By my's confusion in the Self (is supposed).

yasya, to that which; utpattīA, layā ca, origin and re-absorption; na

asti is not' tat, that param brahma, (than) the ultimate Absolute;

itarat na, is non other; upattiA layā ca, origin and re-absorption;

jtmani, in the Self; asti iti, as present; miyay, by miy; bhramati by

confusion (one thinks).

Commentary: Because origin and re-absorption have been mentioned, being

(existence) is also to be understood as included. That one reality which has neither

origin, being, nor re-absorption is none other than that supreme and ultimate,

Absolute. In that Absolute which is in the form of the Self the origin, being and re-
absorption of the world is taken to be present because of confusion. This confusion

is caused by the conditioning (upādhi) imposed by mīyī.

4.2.3.2. Nataraja Guru observes that the principle of error or indeterminism (mīyī) is involved here. There is not any question of origin and dissolution with reference to a non-existing thing. Through the vague and neutral ground of indeterminism presented by the principle of mīyī, interposed as an ambiguous element between the absolute and relative factors, that are the pīramāthika and vyavahārika references here, the transition from the relative standpoint to an absolute one is seen to be most easily effected in this verse. The reference to mīyī as also fully justified in order to completely transcend all vestiges of contradiction in the use of the terms asti (is) and nṛsti (is not). The term Brahman (the Absolute) also occurs for the first time in this chapter. We have to notice how the non-existence
suggested in the previous verse is quickly resolved in the present verse. In higher
reasoning the contradiction can be bypassed by a purer and more verticalised
dialectical treatment. Such a treatment, as it were, by cancellation properly belongs
to the methodology of the Science of the Absolute. \( M_{\text{y}} \) represents the relativistic
counterpart of the Absolute for linguistic communicability and has no reality of its
own. It is the name for an overall category of philosophical error.

**4.2.3.3.** The \( M_{\text{y}} \) stated as relativistic counterpart of the Absolute for linguistic
communicability and has no reality of its own, needs further clarification. It would
be more easily communicable if \( M_{\text{y}} \) is relative truth but not the Absolute truth.

\( M_{\text{y}} \) disappears only at the stage of final absorption. *Brahma* is the beginningless
and hence it has no absorption. But an individual whose \( t\text{man} \) (self) being under
the bondages of \( M_{\text{y}} \) (\( Prak\text{\=a}ti \)) has final absorption or liberation from the hold of
$M_jy$ It is a reality but not the ultimate reality. It is not a mere illusion. If it is illusion everybody experiences it till the merger of the self ($\text{tman}$) with the Supreme self, the Absolute. Men strives hard to escape from this illusionary state by meditating upon God with constant devotion and surrender of his self. It is unwise and meaningless to cancel the influence of $M_jy$ simply on a confusion of unreal or non-constant. Further it needs constant effort on the part of a $\text{yoge}$ to reach that state where he would feel that the Absolute alone is the ultimate truth.

In all other cases this world is a truth, a relative truth and that everybody experiences as if being influenced by it. Nataraja Guru’s interpretation does not seem clear and easily communicating.

4.2.4.1 $k\text{yra}, a \text{vyatirik}t\text{aty}t k\text{yryasya katham astit;}$

$bhavya tata\text{A k}\text{yra, asya katham asti ca nystit}||$ (Verse 4)
Because of non-difference from cause

The effect, how could it have being?

How could there be for the same reason,

For the cause also any non-being?

\(k\text{\=ira}, vyatiriktatv\text{\=it}, \) because of non-difference (of effect) from cause;

\(k\text{\=ir}ya, \) for the effect; \(katham, \) how (could there be); \(astit\text{\=i}. \) (state of)

being; \((bhavati, \) come to be\) \(\text{\=at}aÅ\) for the same reason; \(k\text{\=ira}, asya, \) for

the cause; \(na astit\text{\=i}. \) \(ca\) non-being also; \(katham asti; \) how could there

be?

**Commentary.** Because an effect is non-different from its cause, the effect has no independent status in being. By the same reason for the cause there is no non-existence either. That is to say, the world as an effect is given to the vision, but on further examination it is seen to be unreal. If there is an effect it should necessarily
have a cause. That effect should not be different from its cause in principle. That is
to say, when we (still) examine it further there remains only the cause and not the
effect, because the non-existence of the effect as given to view is the unsublated
reality of the cause itself. By virtue of such a reasoning, the Absolute as the cause
alone is real. The world as an effect is thus, established as unreal without further
argumentation.

4.2.4.2. Nataraja Guru points out that we arrive at a form of double-sided reasoning fully
legitimate to Advaita Vedānta. This method of anvaya-vyatireka is known in
Western logic as the combined method of agreement and difference. There is a
double movement first from plurality to unity and then a reverse movement from
negative unity to existence treated as a whole. The term avyatiriktatvat is a highly
technical form of unitive and negative reasoning favoured by Vedāntic thinkers.
There are other similar favoured expressions such as *ananya* (none-other) and *prag-abhiva* (anterior non-existence) which, with the three other *abhivas*, *anyonyaabhiva* (mutual non-existence), *atyanta-abhiva* (ultimate non-existence) and *pradhvamsjhiva* (final non-existence) which have all to be treated together in a four-fold structural context to enable us to see how reasoning functions globally and structurally. The subtlest type among such two-sided concepts is the present one used in this verse (i.e., *avyatirktatv†t*) because of the condition of not being different. This double movement takes place like action and retroaction in cybernetics purely in the vertical axis as in an interchangeable reaction or its mathematical equation. The two questions in the verse indicate the bracketing peculiarity which we have already explained.
The simple meaning of the verse is that the effect is not different or dissociated from cause. Therefore the effect has no real existence, that is, cause and effect cannot be separated. Then both must have existence or non-existence. For effect is reduced to cause, in the final analysis the cause alone have final or ultimate existence. Nataraja Guru’s statement that the double movements take place like action and retroaction in cybernetic, purely in a vertical axis or in an interchangeable relation or its mathematical equation, sounds confusing and not clear. Narayana Guru’s intention is to make clear that ultimate cause is real and the intermediate effects and causes are unreal and get cancelled in the ultimate status. The ultimate cause, the Absolute alone has, real existence since the intermediaries get lost consequently on its absorption in the final cause.
4.2.5.1. \textit{kîryatvåd asato' syàst kîra, am nahi yato jagat}\ |

\textit{brahmaiva tarhi sad asad iti muhyati mandadhå} \ || \ (Verse 5)

By being an effect and thus non-existent

An existent cause there is, the world is thus not indeed;

On the other hand, it is in the Absolute alone that is existent.

That dull minds mistake as non-existing:

\textit{kîryatvåt}, because of being an effect, \textit{asata}, what is non-existent;

\textit{asya}, for this (visible world); \textit{kara, am}, an (existent) cause; \textit{asti}, there is; \textit{atah}, therefore, (because there is a cause); \textit{jagat}, the world (which is an effect); \textit{na hi}, is not (real) indeed; \textit{tarhi}, on the contrary; \textit{sat} existent (as a cause); \textit{brahma-eva}, the Absolute it is indeed;

\textit{mandadhå} dull minds; \textit{asad iti}; as unreal, \textit{muhyati}, mistake.

\textbf{Commentary.} All things which constitute an effect are unreal. This is well known.

Therefore, the whole world is unreal and because of being unreal it must have a
cause which is real. Because the cause alone has a status in reality, it naturally
follows that the effect is unreal. That unique cause which represents real existence
is the Absolute. Dull minds not capable of discrimination due to a confusion
between existence and non-existence, treat real existence as unreal. In other
words, they mistake the Absolute for the world and thus suffer.

4.2.5.2. Nataraja Guru opines that by referring to dull minds (mandadhéṣ), Narayana
Guru wishes to underline a subtlety in this verse which should not be missed. The
effect is seen to be fully absorbed into the cause. The reality belonging to the effect
has necessarily to pass to the side of the cause. In doing so it has to go beyond the
zone of ambiguity presented by the incertitude of mâyā where existence and non-
existence reside together. In admitting both, one is still caught in the alterations of
an either - or -situation. This ambiguity has to be transcended to give reality full
Absolute status which could not be one without any rival dual factor. This *bheda-abheda-vydins* (follower of the principle of difference - non-difference) like Bhartṛprapaṇca have been effectively reputed by ākara on the basis of this same tendency to ambiguity which is an attribute of "dull minds". The primary, most definitely passes from the relative to the Absolute in the verse.

**4.2.5.3.** The Investigator finds that the identity concept of this world and the Absolute needs further clarification. The God (Absolute) is said to be Omnipotent and Omniscient (all knowing), but we know that no one in this world knows everything. They are different in many ways. This world can be a manifestation of God but not God. All entities are different. But the seed of the Supreme is there in everything. Though not ultimate reality all the created things, living and non living, have
separate status and identity. This concept has well explained in the verse of Īśavasya Upaniṣad:

"cījvṣyam idam sarvam yat kimca jagatyam jagat" ¹²

So also in Bhagavad Gītā there are several verses to show that everything is not one (God) Nataraja Guru here tries to establish the view of Narayana Guru. Narayana Guru and Nataraja Guru both stands as exponents of the Advaita of ākara, but they do not clarify as to what is mâyā or illusion unambiguously. Here Dvaita of Madvachīrya seems to be more clear, logical, convincing and appropriate. Narayana Guru has not considered the concepts Puruṣa and Prakṛti, Puruṣa stands for consciousness and Prakṛti for mâyā or the operative principles. The operative principles do also exist and that is why the creation takes place. Prakṛti

¹² Īśa Upaniṣad’, 1/1.
or the operative principles acting according to the will of Puruṣa and taking the seed from him creates the world.

"bejam mÆ sarvabhÉtanÆ" ¹³

4.2.6.1. \textit{vibhajyavayavam sarvam ekaikam tatra dÅ¿yate}\ |

\textit{cinmytram akhilam nỳyad iti mỳyvidÈragam} | (Verse 7)

Dividing all parts one by one

Everything then is seen there

As mind-stuff alone and as no other:

As thus banishing mỳ (relativity) for away.

\textit{avayavam}, parts limbs; \textit{ekaikam}, one by one; \textit{sarvam}, all; \textit{vibhajya}, having divided; \textit{tatra}, then; \textit{akhilam}, everything (i.e., the whole world); \textit{mỳy-vidÈragam} banishing \textit{mỳy} far away (i.e., without any

¹³ 'Bhagavad Gétá', VII/10.
taint of mind; cintātram, mind-stuff alone (of the stuff of Absolute consciousness); anyat na, other things; iti, thus; dhyāyate, is seen.

**Commentary.** To understand this let us examine the reality of a cloth. In the first place we can divide the cloth into its threads. When the threads have been taken out there is no cloth to be seen. Thus, we know that it is the threads that take the form of cloth, and the cloth (itself) has no reality. The reality of the cloth merely resides in the thread. If we proceed once again in the same manner to examine the thread we see that it gives place to cotton. Now we understand that it is cotton that appears like thread, and the reality of thread is not in the thread but in the cotton.

If we further examine these elements. Now the reality is not even in the cotton, and (instead) it is in the atoms were reality resides. If we further examine the atoms by means of instruments, or even by the instrumentality of the mind, which is subtler
than the subtlest instrument, all perception hiding is a sort of darkness or ignorance, which is nescience. That is to say, nobody is able to know how all this originated. Now by this kind of enquiry, cloth, thread, cotton, elemental atoms and ignorance, we know that for all these there is only nescience. But even this nescience is capable of being abolished by knowledge or science, it is this aspect of knowledge that is attributed to the Lord. The absence of knowledge is what constitutes the stuff of ignorance. When knowledge operates nescience becomes abolished and with the help of such knowledge one is able to see the casual status is reality of each one of the items ranging from cloth to atom. Such awareness is a kind of everpresent and lasting witness, having an ultimate status of its own. Awareness itself is without, further cause and is self-evident. All others have
dependent causes, one behind the other. Therefore, it is knowledge alone that remains supreme and eternal. All other things are unreal.

4.2.6.2. Nataraja Guru states that, it is required to add even by the analytical approach it is possible to remove \( m\mathcal{y}_i \) to a great extent. Relativity can be by passed both by the synthetic or the analytic approaches. The latter leads to the heart of matter and the former to the overall conceptual nominalistic Absolute.

4.2.6.3. It is true that one can reach the Absolute by analytical method and by synthesis. In the process of analysing the atoms it is not possible to realise Him. But the analysis must be further more subtle. Where the influence of \( M\mathcal{y}_i \) (prak\( \mathcal{a} \)ti) is removed from the created things only then it is possible to identify and realize the Absolute in the Analytical process. No physical science can do it. It is possible by those human beings only who continuously purifies his mind-stuff and finally causes to
the release of the 'jītman' (soul) from the clutches of the mind constituted by the
three guṇas of prakṛti. Nataraja Guru does not explain the concept of real though
he conceives the real as Supreme. He did not explain well the relative truth - the
effect. It would be more convincing to say relative cause and effect and that there is
only one absolute cause which is the Absolute. Negation of the effect or the relative
truth as non-existent brings much confusion and ambiguity to the seekers of
knowledge. It would be better to understand that the cause of one effect may be
effect of its immediate cause and so on and not the Absolute cause. They are not
illusionary; they exist in their own plains and that they are not the Absolute Truth.

We live in the relative world. If anybody says that it is illusion it is nothing but
totally misleading. Therefore, we should accept relativity and the Absolute
simultaneously existing, which is more logical and rational. Nataraja Guru has the
view as that of áa’kara and Narayana Guru. This verse has therefore no novelty or originality apart from Advaita.

It would be logical to view that there exists relative truth and cause and immediate cause and so on. Nataraja Guru has stated that (P/330) "That is to say, nobody is able to know how all this originated." If so the enlightenment or realization of the Supreme too is unreal and all the philosophies would be false and formed out of illusion.

4.2.7.1. cid eva n̄nyad jbh̄yti citaÅ param ato nahi |

yacca n̄bh̄yti tad asad yad asat tannj bh̄yti ca || (Verse 8)

Thus it is pure mind-stuff alone that shines

There is nothing therefore beyond pure mind-stuff at all;

What does not shine is not real either,

And what is non-real does not shine indeed.
cit eva, it is even pure mind-stuff; \( j\hbar \hbar i \hbar i \), shines; anyat na, not anything else; at\( a \hbar \), therefore; cita\( a \hbar \) param, beyond pure mind-stuff (i.e., other than knowledge); na hi, nothing indeed; yat ca, that which also, na \( j\hbar \hbar i \hbar i \), does not shine, tat, that; asat, is non-real, yat, that which; asat, is non-real; tat, that; \( nabh\hbar i \hbar i \); ca, also does not shine indeed.

**Commentary:** All that enters consciousness is nothing other than what is real. That which is not real cannot enter consciousness. It is knowledge alone that remains real. That which is both real and consciousness is the Absolute which is none other than the Lord as consciousness. Therefore, what appears as this world is nothing other than the Absolute. Existence and subsistence are both the form of the Absolute. Existence-substinance-value all have the characteristics of the form of the Absolute. What is both existence and subsistence is a High Value at the same time.
Nataraja Guru views that a pure verticalised status of the Absolute is fully accomplished in this verse. There is, however, a final vestige of duality which is still to be expressly cancelled out. It is required by Advaita Vedānta that both horizontal contradiction and vertical duality should be together abolished. This is called ‘Sajñeya - vijñeya-bheda-ényata (non-difference as between those of the same class and one that is different). Both vertical and horizontal aspects of duality have to be abolished to give the Absolute its fullest status.

It is rather unwise to state that "cit" alone exists because it shines and that it is only real. The sun shines. It is not true to say that sun alone exists and other stars and plants do not exist. It seems logical to state that the planets exists and the sun too. We feel the existence of light because there is darkness. It is also not correct to state
that the Absolute alone real and all other things are unreal. The Absolute reality and the relative truth exist simultaneously.

Here Narayana Guru and Nataraja Guru strongly support the Advaita concept of áā´kara. The purpose of interpretation is to simplify and clear the intricate and implicit meanings contained in the verses. But any reader sincerely approaching the book may find that interpretation is very much confusing and not clear. The verse itself is comparatively obvious and vivid than the interpretation.

Everything is created from Him is more rational and convincing. The Absolute truth exists, so the Relative. It seems that Nataraja Guru has not understood the concepts of PuruĀa and Prakāti (consciousness & power) as well explained in many verses of Bhagavad Getj; Chapter 14, Verses 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.
4.2.8.1.  ānanda evāsti bhūti nīnyaḥ kaścid ato’khilam |

ānandagonam anyanna vinī ‘nandena vidyate ||  (Verse 9)

High Value (Bliss) alone exists and shines,

Therefore not anything else at all;

Thus everything is of the stuff of the High Value,

And besides this High Value nothing else exists.

ānanda eva asti, High Value (Bliss) alone exists; (ānanda eva) bhūti,

(it is High Value alone that) shines: anyaḥ kaścid na, not anything else; ato therefore; akhilam, everything (i.e, the whole world);

ānanda-ghanam, is of the stuff of this High Value; ānandena vinī

besides this High Value; anyat na vidyate, nothing else exists.

Commentary. This verse merely underlines the High Value content called bliss or ānanda as comprising the totality of the Absolute.
Nataraja Guru explains that before arriving at the last verse where the Absolute is described under the three categories of *sat-cit-nanda* (existence-subsistence-value), in this verse the notion of Value is made to stand out in a certain relief, independent of the two other factors. These two factors have to be first fused together into unity so as to abolish horizontal or vertical implications that might persist between them. When duality has been mutually absorbed they are raised to a unitive status under the caption of a High Value which is *nanda* as bliss. Such a status for the Absolute is fully recognised in the various Upaniṣads where bliss is equated with the Absolute. We quote the *Taittireya Upaniṣad* (III.6):

> Having performed austerity, he understood

> That Brahman is bliss (*nanda*).
4.2.8.3. The absolute is explained as 'jnandaghanam' (infinite bliss). This universe is filled with the infinite volume of bliss which is the Absolute. It is the Absolute, the Brahma that alone shines and nothing else. Nataraja Guru observes that the verticalized and the horizontalized status cease to exist at the state of Ėnanda.

One loses his total existence either internal or external, when he realizes the infinite bliss which alone is the ultimate reality. All other intermediary existence are not real and hence neutralized in the vision of the Absolute Bliss. The Brahman lone shines and exists for a Yoge in his state of Absorption (Samadhi). He cannot visualize anything else at the state of his soul merging with the Supreme. It is only to that yoge, this world is identical as Bliss and Bliss alone, but for others this world exists in the pluralistic sense. It is the highest state of spiritual attainment applicable to purified individuals or yoges only. It is the ultimate state of spiritual
experience and not applicable to those who have not removed the impurities from
the self (mind). Thus for the vast population this is not a reality experienced but
only a philosophical idea not being conceived yet. Nataraja Guru does not make
clear the concept of bliss to understand it to a common reader or searcher of truth.

He makes this explanation too brief and technical.

4.2.9.1. \( \textit{sarvam hi saccid\text{\textunderscore}nandam neha n\text{\textunderscore}na\text{\textunderscore}sti k\text{\textunderscore}j\text{\textunderscore}cana} \)

\( \textit{yaA p\text{\textunderscore}rayati\text{\textunderscore}Aa n\text{\textunderscore}neva m\text{\textunderscore}t\text{\textunderscore}yor m\text{\textunderscore}t\text{\textunderscore}yum sa gacchati} \) \)

(Verse 10)

\textit{All is indeed existence-subsistence-value,}

\textit{Herein there is not even a little plurality;}

\textit{He who sees (this) as pluralistic;}

\textit{From death to death he goes}

\[ \textit{sarvam saccid\text{\textunderscore}nandam hi, all is indeed existence-subsistence-value; iha,} \]

\[ \textit{herein; k\text{\textunderscore}j\text{\textunderscore}cana, not even a little; n\text{\textunderscore}na, plurality; na asti, there is not; iha, in} \]
this (Absolute); yA, he; ny iwa, as if pluralistic; pañyati, sees; saA, he;
mAtyoA, from death, mñtyum, to death; gacchati, goes.

Commentary: The meaning of the verse is sufficiently clear. The note on which it
ends is reminiscent of an UpaniÀadic dictum as found in the KaÀa UpaniÀad.

The Absolute is here reduced as comprised with the categories of existence-
subsistence-value.

4.29.2. Nataraja Guru views that "this verse insists in the name of the Absolute on
abolishing all vestiges of plurality that might still cling to the mind of the reader.

The three categories of the Absolute are meant to absorb each other. First sat and
cit are mutually absorbed and then they are finally included under "ananda"
which knows no difference between subject and object." Nataraja Guru points out
this concept of the Absolute as conceived by Prof. O. Lacombe and Bergson. The
Spinoza's concept of absolute substance has also being made use of by Nataraja Guru in interpreting the concept of Absolute.

4.2.9.3. If one considers that Brahma (God) as one as identified by Nirgu, a Brahma, where the influence of Prakāśti (mâyā) is absent and that it would be a state where the presence of Puruṣa (consciousness) alone is experienced, it is wise to say that it is God, the Absolute. In the case of Sagu, a Brahma or the created world of multiplicities no one can experience the pure consciousness, unless he can escape from the influence from (mâyā). It is wise to see God in created things and it may be a practical blunder to consider everything as He (the Absolute). At the time of Yoga or communion one's 'Ētman' gets liberated from the bondages of prakāśti (mâyā), temporarily or permanently. In the case of temporarily absorption the ītman (soul)
experiences the existence of the Absolute and he totally forgets the pluralities. But

it shall not be taken for granted that the multiplicities do not exist.

4.2.10. Discussion

Nataraja Guru views that in the final analysis the duality will be lost by the

unision of all pluralities into the Absolute. This view seems to be very much logical

in the sense of ultimate analysis. Indirectly he admits that diversity exists. In the

ultimate analysis the diversity may disappear and the Absolute may alone exist.

However he has not given any stress on the diversified existence or plurality. It is

ture that there cannot be two Absolute truth; It is the duty of a philosopher and

thinker to provide others with practical and meaningful interpretation to
philosophical concepts rather than creating a constantly mounting confusions and
ambiguities.

It is simply logical to state that Atoms exist, molecules exit and the matter
exists and energy too exists. Energy is not synonymous with consciousness but
without consciousness (God) no creation may take place for energy is blind. It is
not logical to say that energy and consciousness are identical. According to modern
science energy is constant (Law of Conservation of Energy) but the infinite; the
Consciousness is immesaurable. Therefore the identification of consciousness and
power is required, for all those do spiritual search or philosophical search of the
Absolute.
Chapter 3

ASATYA-DARĀNAM (Vision of Non-Existence)

Narayana Guru expresses his concept of illusionary vision and reality, in this chapter.

In this chapter, Asatya-Darānam (Vision of Non-Existence), Narayana Guru reveals the pluralities of existence of this world as a mere passing show and not real. It is because of the mind, one feels this world as real. Mind is not real and whatever we perceive with mind is also not real. It may be noted that real, represents the ultimate reality or the Absolute.

4.3.1.1. \[\text{manom}y\text{y}m \text{idam sarvam na mana\text{\texte} kv\text{\texti}pi \text{vidyate}|}\]

\[\text{ato vyomneva ne\text{\texti}di dy\text{\texti}yate jagadi\text{\texti}tmani}||\] (Verse 1)
All this (world) is of mind-stuff:

The mind, however, is not anywhere;

Therefore like the blue and so on in the sky

The world is seen in the Self:

idam sarvam, all this (world); mano jyām, is of mind-stuff; mana ā, the mind; ku̍pi, anywhere; na vidyate, is not; atā ā, therefore;

vyomni, in the sky; nel ōdi iva, like the blue and so on; ātmā, in the Self; jāgat, the world; dhātyate, is seen.

Commentary: In the sky there are no colours such as blue, etc. In spite of this, however, we know this verity as we actually perceive the blue colour in the sky. In reality only the sky is real, and blueness, etc. are fully unreal. In the same manner, in the pure unqualified Self this world is perceived which is a presentiment of the will. It is the Self alone that is real, and the world consisting of mind-stuff is unreal.
4.3.1.2. Regarding the first verse Nataraja Guru views that, the purpose of this verse is to start off by referring to the equal phenomenological status of the mind and the world presented to it. The appearance of the one is virtually present in the other. When both are so equated we attain to an idea of the ontological factor belonging to phenomenology. Then we have two sets of antithetical factors given to common factual experience. They are, the blueness of the sky and the sky itself. This pair is given to common experience, while the more deep-seated factors exist between the Self and the overt phenomenological world. This phenomenon includes even colour when understood as a concrete universal.

4.3.1.3. The colour of the sky being felt as blue is only an illusion, but the blueness of the sky, is not suitable to be compared to the created world as mere illusionary. This world is not so transitory. Though every created things undergoes changes in the
course of time it does not altogether dissolve in the Absolute. Only that part of the object representing \textit{jey\textit{tma}} (\textit{\'{E}tman}) merges with \textit{Param\textit{tma}} (the Absolute) when an individual soul has exhausted all “\textit{karmaphal\textit{a}}” (the result of actions), in due course.

The concept that the mind-stuff of the Supreme are the created things and they do not really exist, is based on the Advaita Philosophy that, there is no duality and that everything is \textit{Brahma}. The term Advaita is not equal to oneness, but not separate from the One.

Nataraja Guru does not differentiate between the cosmic consciousness and the created world. However, for practical purpose Advaita Philosophy does not seem logical and it has confused the seekers of knowledge and truth without differentiating the relative truth and the ultimate truth. The influence of \textit{prak\textit{\^{a}}}t\textit{i}
or ḍakthi or guṇas, the operative principles, has not been well understood and explained to make the concept simple and clear. There might be different philosophical views but the interpretation shall have to be convincing, logical and empirical. To this extent the interpretation of Nataraja Guru does not hold good.

Everybody knows that this world exists and God also exists, though this world is within his cosmic mind. Yoga Vsiṭtha says that - “the created universe is made of His cosmic mind” (Manohijagatham kartr manohi puruṣa: para:).

4.3.2.1. \( \text{manaso}'nanyay\text{, sarvam kalpayate'vidyay' jagat} | \)

\( \text{vidyay'} \text{ sau layam y'ti tadi lekhyam iva'khilam} || \) (Verse 2)

By nescience which is no other than the mind

All this world is a presentiment of the will;

\[ \text{Yoga Vsiṭtha, Verse } 49. \]
This (nescience) by knowledge gets re-absorbed,

Then the whole world (becomes) a mere configuration.

manasa, from the mind; ananyay, which is no other; avidyay. By nescience; sarvam jagat, all this world; kalpyate, is a presentiment of the will; asau, this (nescience); vidyay, by knowledge (i.e., true knowledge of the Self); layam ytti, gets re-absorbed; tad, then (when ignorance is abolished and Self-knowledge prevails); akhilam, the whole (world); jlekhyaiva, (bhavati), then it (becomes) a mere configuration (drawing).

**Commentary.** It is the mind that is to be considered the same as nescience. It is because of this ignorance that the world seems to be real. For destroying this ignorance which is nescience there is no other way than through knowledge, that is true knowledge of the Self. When nescience is abolished Self-knowledge prevails, i.e., when nescience is abolished and science prevails, the whole world resembles a
configuration (drawing) presented by the mind. In the same way by the power of
nescience which is the form of mind, the whole world is willed. Therefore, this
world is non-existent. When Self-knowledge prevails the fact that the world is
unreal becomes experienced.

4.3.2.2. Nataraja Guru observes that, in this case a subtle form of equation to be taken note
of. It is between the mind and the comprehensive notion of nescience. The mind is
simple horizontal virtuality, while nescience belongs to a deeper and richer world of
intentions. The peculiar reasoning of Śaivism that is
employed to give what is horizontal a more verticalised status. The cancellation of
knowledge with the world presented to nescience results in eliminating its eidetic
content, instead of being real in a vital or actual sense it is reduced to a mere
configuration. The term ‘lekhyam’ or configuration suggests something sketched
by an artist. It can be called a schematised version of the world. In the cosmic mind there exist two forces (powers), \textit{vidy\=i} and \textit{avidy\=i} and it is stated that this world is created out of \textit{avidy\=i} of the Absolute. This world finally will be absorbed in the Supreme by the force (power) of \textit{vidy\=i}. Nataraja Guru quotes \textit{\=a\=kara} to explain \textit{Avidy\=i} (nescience) or \textit{m\=y\=i}. She is without beginning and made up of the three \textit{gu\=as}. It is She who brings forth this whole universe.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{4.3.2.3.} From the above it is very clear, of the influence of \textit{Prak\=ati (m\=y\=i)} representing the three \textit{gu\=as}. But Narayana Guru or Nataraja Guru does not make use of this concept well in the \textit{Dara\=banam\=i\={l}} or its interpretation.

\textsuperscript{15} Swami Siddh Nathana\=nanda, ‘Viveka\=Ch\={dhamani}’ (Commentary), Sri Ramakrishna Math, Thrissur, 1970, p. 39.
Nataraja Guru by the term vertical means that relating to the Absolute and the term horizontal, representing the innumerable things in this world. But the concept of horizontal and vertical does not seem to be appropriate for explaining the infinite or the Absolute. Here too he uphold the Advaita of Narayana Guru. It is philosophically very easy to state that only He is real and the world is unreal. But we do feel pain and pleasure associated with the life in this world. The Researcher does not find, the logic of this concept of Advaita, to be convincing. The term ultimate truth, ultimate reality, etc. are not being made use for explaining the relationship with the Absolute or the Ultimate Truth and the relative or intermediate existence. It is true that all the rivers flow towards the sea, but it is unwise and illogical to say that the rivers are sea. Perhaps the philosophy of Advaita has not been critically analysed and proved illogical by the Narayana Guru.
or Nataraja Guru, because of the influence of the great scholar, seer like Sa’karaçırya. According to spiritualistic concept no seer or philosopher is perfect in their vision or philosophy, simply because no individual can be perfect, as there is imperfection in him. Therefore it is not wise to accept any philosophy as such without being analysed logically and convincingly examined and interpreted.

Every seer visualises the concept of truth only according to, and to the extent of his psychic vistas or intellectual horizon. It cannot be infinite as that of the Absolute, and so not perfect. This philosophy seems to be a negation of the existence of this world, and to a certain extent resulted for the negation of the Absolute. The creator and the created cannot be equal to or one and the same. But the subtle philosophical concepts that can be derived is the created universe is only a manifestation of the Absolute and that it is not an Absolute truth. The manifested
world may disappear into the Supreme at the time of total absorption. Until then He and His creation shall have separate existence. It is better to say that God exists in every created things rather than all created things are equal to God.

4.3.3.1. **vijñambhate yat tamaso bhoro iha pijcavat |**

**tad idam jigrati svapnalokavad dyate budhaiA ||** (Verse 3)

*Here what a coward finds through darkness To be like a looming ghost, That same is seen to be by the wise Like a dream-world of a waking state.*

*iha*, here (i.e., from a work-a-day standpoint); *bheroA*, to a coward; *tamasaA* through darkness; *pijca vat*, like a ghost; *yat*, what; *vijambhate*, looms; *tat idam*, that same (i.e., what is visible); *budhaiA*, by the wise; *jigrati*, of the wakeful state; *svapnalokavad*, like a dream-world; *dyate*, is seen.
Commentary: For a coward darkness is like a ghost, and this is a common experience. The ghost and its cause which is darkness are both non-existent. To the coward, however, because of his fear and lack of light it is darkness that is seen as a ghost. When a lamp is brought and one looks as it there is neither darkness nor a ghost. In the same way for those who are not aware of the principle of nescience, this world which is of the form of, nescience (which is the same as ignorance), i.e., for a man is not know this principle, it seems real. Just in the same way as darkness becomes, for a coward a ghost, through that ignorance which is of the nature of darkness, what looms in the form of this world is seen to be true only to those who have not attained to Self-knowledge. But to those who have Self-knowledge and who are wise, this world is like a day-dream and seen to be unreal.
According to Nataraja Guru the intention here is to accentuate one degree further the effect of nescience. Eidetic phenomena can be either weak or strong. The term *tamas* or darkness is substituted for nescience or *avidyā* which has a weaker status.

The full power of ontological darkness is capable of making a ghost emerge as fully eidetic representation from its own ontological negativity. Just as in mathematics a numerator and a denominator are cancelled out only when they have equality of status belonging to the same class, so here, too, we have to note one of the laws regulating phenomenology which is the assumption that the negativity is of the same order as its positive counterpart and cancellable against it. The dream takes away just that amount of reality from the presentiment of the ghost, as a ghost takes away from the actuality of the waking state or conscious state. To the mind of a wise man the dream represents the result of the cancellation of the two eidetic
counterparts. The ghost is a fully horizontalized version reduced into its own
verticalised version in the eyes of the wise man.

4.3.3.3. The term ‘pis\(c\)’ is derived from terms namely pisam (meat) and 'asyate' (eat). The
word meaning is the eater of meat. But the meaning is stated as ghost. It may
mean ghost like.

For a 'j\(\mu\)ani' this world is equivalent to a dream state, which is not real and
is cancellable on the waking state. Nataraja Guru uses mathematical terms like
numerator, denominator, etc. to amplify the concept. The idea is not quite clear by
the use of verticalisation and horizontalisation.

In this connection it would be proper to quote a verse from Bhagavad G\(\text{\textae}t\j\).

“\(y\j ni\j j sarv\(\j\text{\textae}t\ \text{\textae}\)E

tas\y/\j\j grati sa\(\j\text{\textae}yame
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Regarding the meaning, that for a yogi or a 'jñani' this world is equal to darkness or nescience i.e., ignorance and that in the spiritualistic realm, the 'jñani' or a yogi remaining awake feels that the mundane world is a world of ignorance or nescience from which he has got to be liberated. The meaning is quite clear as regards the above verse of Bhagavad Gētā. But Darśanamālā as interpreted by Nataraja Guru is seen obscure and ambiguous.

4.3.4.1. \[\textit{samkalpakalpitam daśyam samkalpo yatra vidyate}\]

\[\textit{daśyam tatra ca nīnyatra kutracidrajusarpavat}\] \(\text{(Verse 4)}\)

This visible world results from a willing presentiment;

Where willing is present alone

\(^{16}\) 'Bhagavad Gētā', II/69.
In this visible world seen; not anywhere else

As a snake too, when (alone) a rope is found.

dध्यम, this visible world is seen (results); samkalpakalpitam (as) a presentiment of the will; yatra, where; samkalpa भिद्यते, willing is present; tatra ca, there alone; dध्यम (vidyate), this visible (world exists); anyatra kutracid na, not anywhere else; rajusarpavat, as a snake too where alone a rope (is found).

Commentary: All visible things are the product of willing. Only where there is willing is there any object. If there is no willing there is nothing at all. The snake imagined on the basis of a rope is merely a product of willing. For a man who has the presentiment of a snake, a piece of rope lying in a place badly lit seems like a snake. When a lamp is brought and the object is examined, there is no snake in the rope. If we now inquire where the snake was, we can see that it has its being only in
the will. This snake has neither a work-a-day reality (*vīyavāhīrika*) nor an absolute reality (*prāmāṇthika*). It has only a reflected eidetic (*prātibhāsika*) status. In the same way as with this eidetic snake, if we consider any other of the many objects presented to us we conclude that they are only products of the will. Here we find the justification for what was said in the first chapter about the creation of the world by the mere will of the Highest Lord. In the same way as this eidetic snake came from the vitalistic will (of the individual), (so too) this work-a-day world is the product of the Highest Lord. All things as presentiments of the will are unreal. When knowledge comes they are destroyed. But the difference we should note here is that the snake-rope is of the nature of vital presentiment of the will. When the right knowledge which belongs to the living being is operative they (i.e., snake and rope) get abolished. But in the case of this work-a-day world having its origin in
the will of the Highest Lord, even after we come to know of it as unreal we cannot abolish it completely because the Lord’s willing is stronger than individual vital willing and because all beings are caught and helplessly spun around by the will of the Lord. It is only the will of the Lord that can abolish altogether this collective presentiment (called) the visible world. In spite of this, however, those great souls who have attained to the experience of reality through Self-knowledge, know the unreality of the world in respect of the three aspects of time whether past, present or future. Because it arises from the will and is also dissolved by the will the world is non-existent in the same way as the snake supposed in the basis of the rope. By bringing in the analogy of the rope and snake we have to understand that the world was not before or after but only present in the intermediate period when
nescience prevailed and knowledge had not asserted itself. What is not present in
the past and in future can certainly be said to be non-existent in the present.

43.42. Regarding the above verse Nataraja Guru points out that, the mind is serially
equated with nescience, etc. It is finally taken over by a still more ontologically rich
notion of samkalpa or will. Although ‘Samkalpa’ is not the same as the horizontal
mind it can be equated with it when vertically reduced. Here the presentiment is
not of the other order of an imaginary snake but has a more valid ontological
substratum as in the rope. Error is not so inexcusable, yet some feebleness of mind
still exists for the type of error envolved. It is in semi-darkness that such a type of
error is natural in common experience. The main point underlined is the
ambivalent and mutual reciprocity between the two ontological and transcendent
presentiments. The snake is superimposed on a more existent rope. Furthermore
the snake-rope counterparts inseparably and more intimately belong together to
one and the same phenomenological context.

4.3.4.3. The world is formed out of the will of the Lord. It is transitory and those who have
realised the Self feel that it is not real and is just like a presentiment of snake on a
piece of rope. When the willing disappears the snake also disappears. In the same
way this world is the presentiment of the will of the Lord. It shall altogether
disappear when the will of Lord is withdrawn or ceased. Here a doubt arises; in the
case of imagination the things presented are illusionary and that the illusionary
beings cannot create anything new. In the case of imagination of the God; the
living beings; for example, man makes his own creation of science and technology,
philosophy, machinery, medicine and so on. No explanation has been given by
Nataraja Guru on all these. He simply approves the Advaita Philosophy as
explained by áa’kara and understood by Narayana Guru. The Researcher feels that

the Advaita Philosophy as adopted and explained by Nataraja Guru has failed to

know the influence of Prakâti on the created things as revealed in Bhagavad Gétã.

"prakâte kriyam,jini
gu,aiA karm, i sarva:jâA
aha:jkar:jvimâ hitma
kart;i ham iti manyate" 17

It is prakâti, according to its nature and qualities, that all actions are

carried out.

Whenever prakâti’s influence is removed from the created things, it will

merge with the Supreme Consciousness, the Absolute. Prakâti or mâyâ also exists

17 'Bhagavad Gétã', III/27.
and that is why we feel the presence of this world. A spiritual aspirant strives for attaining mokṣa because of the reality of the influence of the principles of prakṛti, acting on him. Any individual who exists in this universe cannot say that he is totally free and immune from the influence of guṇas or qualities of prakṛti. In Bhagavad Gītā, it is clearly explained.

“prakṛtim puruṣām cai’va
viddhya ānaye ubhīv api
vikṛtām ca guṇāṃ cai va
viddhi prakṛtisābhyāṃ”

Prakṛti (mâyā) and puruṣa are both beginningless. The guṇas like Sattvaguṇa, Rajoguṇa and Tamoguṇa are born out of prakṛti.

---

18 Ibid., III/19.
However, a yogi who goes beyond all relativities, breaking the bondages of Prakṛti can temporarily feel oneness with God, the Absolute. He soon comes back to the earlier state and knows the existence of this world. It does not mean that this world is unreal. Though it is not the Absolute Reality, it is a Relative one, cognizable to every one jñāni (knower) or a layman.

4.3.5.1. \[ \text{marecikvata pṛjñasya jagad jtmāni bhṛsat} \]

\[ \text{bṛlasya satyam iti ca pratibimbam iva bhramt} \]

(Verse 6)

Like a mirage to a wise man

The world looms in the Self;

Just as to an infant by confusion

A reflected image might real seem too.

pṛjñasya, to a wise man (who can discriminate between what is real and unreal); jagat, the world; maricikvata, like a mirage; jtmāni, in
the Self; *bh*ṣate, shines, looms; *balasya*, to an infant (without discrimination); *bhramit*, by confusion; *pratibimbam iva*, like a reflected image; *satyam-iti ca*, as if real too; (*bh*ṣate), might seem.

**Commentary.** For a child having no discrimination, when it sees a reflection in a mirror it thinks that there is another child in the mirror. The child treats the reflection as if it were a real child. This is due to confusion in the child’s mind. By confusion we mean the erroneous comprehension of one thing for another. But a person who has attained to discrimination understands the reflection in the mirror to be non-existent. In the same way people of non-discrimination understand the world as real, but those with discrimination take it to be non-existent. The mirage that is seen in the desert in the form of water seems only real to animals, while those who have knowledge and experience understand it to have no real existence.

In the same way, the wise man who discriminates between the transient and eternal
values in life arrives at certitude in knowledge. He treats this world like a mirage, or, in other words, as having no real existence. It is only to people of non-discrimination that the world seems real. The world is a mere superimposition, epiphenomenon, of the Self. Therefore it is absolutely non-existent.

4.3.5.2. Nataraja Guru deduces the meaning of the above verse as the phenomenal world is here compared to a mirage and the classical Vedānta analogy is aptly restored to with great advantage. The mirage is only an epi-phenominal effect of a lower eidetic. He further states that, there is a horizontal reciprocity of a bialateral nature of the same status as between a thing and its - mirror - reflection. The feeling of the existence of water in a desert is a mirage and cannot satisfy thirst, although the full appearance of water is presented. Life on this plus side of the vertical axis moves forward or backward as the case may be in the world of empty presentiments. The
observing subject is technically known as ‘dak’ and is more important than its objective counterpart (dāya) what is seen, taken as a whole, is only a mirage, without any thirst - quenching power. It is a kind of passing show without any lasting value content. Only the infant mind or the unwise man is capable of treating it seriously.

4.3.5.3. The following verse gives a similar idea.

“asadevamga sadiva
bhıḥthi pāthyadi vedaṇth
yathıḥ bhlasya vethṭlo

njbhıtthi thadha vedaṇth” 19

The meaning is that the unwise think that this earth is real and they do not know what is actually real. It is like a child knowing that its image seen in the mirror is real.

This also is a continued explanation of the philosophy of Advaita. The world is a mirage for the yogi or wise man, according to Advaita Philosophy and according to the meaning of the above verse. However, the concept of illusion, is not well explained by the example of mirage of a desert. It is true that the soul or Atman goes beyond the ambit and influence of prakṛti at the time of unison with Paramātman and it feels the existence of Paramātman alone at that stage. It does not mean the created things are totally absent at that time or is a mere illusion.

The concept of Nirgu, a and Sarvag, a Brahma gives clear explanation and convincing logic in the case of this world and the Absolute, the Paramātma.
It is true that at the time of absorption one cannot feel anything other than the Supreme Lord, because he goes beyond all relativities for the moments. But the things are there though he cannot perceive. In the light of the Supreme every other things seem not present to the yogé. It is a fact that one cannot perceive the subtlest and the crude (Sthééla) simultaneously; the infinite and finite at the same time, but both exist.

4.3.6.1.  

\[
jtm; na kāēravat yēti rēpā-antaram ato akhilam |
\]

\[
vivartam indrajēlakam vidyate nirmitam yathā ||
\]

(Verse 7)

This Self like milk (that turns)

Does not attain to another form;

Therefore the whole (universe), as if created

By Indra’s magic, exists (an eidetic) presentiment.

\[
jtm; the Self; kāēravat, like milk; rēpa-antaram, to another form;
\]

\[
a na yēti, does not attain; ataÅ, therefore; akhilam, the whole
\]
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(universe); yathı indrajilena nirmitam, as if created by Indra’s magic; vivartam vidyate, exists as (an eidetic) presentiments (i.e.,
being non-existent it appears as existent).

Commentary: The Self is something that remains changeless and is without the
states of birth, being growth, transformation, decrease or destruction. Like milk
that goes sour and changes over into curds or buttermilk the Self does not change
taking the form of the world, because it is not possible for even an atom to be
outside the Self. If one asks how this marvellous visible world originated and how it
came about and on what basis it is established, the reply is that it exists in the Self
in the form of an eidetic presentiment (vivarta). The things produced by the
magician do not really exist. In the same way this world is really non-existent (i.e.,
it is false).
4.3.6.2. Nataraja Guru observes that here the theory of actual change or transformation taking place in the phenomenal world is strictly rejected. It is only in the world of mechanistic actualities where chemical changes such as milk turning into curds, take place. In the mental world of pure Self-consciousness no actual change (vīkśra) occurs. All change is reciprocal and belongs to a purely phenomenal or mental order. The technical term describing such mental states having apparent reality is ‘vivarta’. The magic of Indra is once again cancelled into service. Because the transcendental phenomenal world bears to close resemblance to actuality, it is referred to “as if created” (‘nirmitam yath’).

4.3.6.3. The content of this verse is that this world is not a metamorphosed form of a God because God cannot transform or change itself into another as if the milk
undergoing to a change forming curd. The world is therefore is a magical creation of the Supreme.

This view does not seem to be absolutely correct, because according to Bhagavad Gēt; it is Prakṛti, influencing on Puruṣa creates, taking seed from Him, this multitudinal world; and it is not the transformation of the Supreme. The created world is seen different and multitudinous due to the permutation and combination of the influence of the three guṇas of prakṛti - Sattva guṇa, Rajo guṇa and Tamo guṇa. Thus this world is a sudden creation of the Puruṣa (Consciousness or God) as a magician’s creation is rather unconvincing and illogical. There is an interesting statement that “God created followers on the earth but man has built beautiful garden”. If we follow Bhagavad Gēt; there will be no doubt or ambiguity in the understanding of the subtle concepts contained in Dārśanamāli. But the
resources available has not been made use of by Nataraja Guru for interpreting 'Darśanam'. He rather tries to use the western philosophies and modern science to interpret the inner meanings of spiritualistic concepts. The knowledge of the Western thought shall not suffice to give an appropriate interpretation of the Absolute.
4.3.7.1. *myaiva jagatim j dikrim am nirmitam tay* |  

*sarvam hi myino n nyad asatyam siddhijlavat ||* (Verse 8)

*M iy i* itself is the prime (material) cause

Of the world; what is no other

Than the *miy i*-maker; everything indeed

Created itself as various unreal magical effects.

*miy i*-eva, *miy i* itself is; *jagatim*, of the world (with varied forms);

*j dikrim, the prime material cause; *miy ina* na anyat, what is no other than the *miy i*-maker (i.e., the Self); *siddhijlavat asatyam*, as various unreal magical effects; *sarvam*, everything (i.e., the whole world); *tay hi*, indeed by herself (i.e., by *miy i*); *nirmitam*, created, made.

**Commentary.** *M iy i* is what does not exist at all. When we say that the non-existent *miy i* is the prime material cause of the world it goes without saying that the world
is not real. \( \text{M\!y\!} \) is not other than the Self and the resulting world which in its effect is not different from the \( \text{m\!y\!} \)-maker which is the Self. The various unreal magical effects are none other than their Author. Even, thus, they are unreal. In the same way the world is none other than the Lord, although it is non-existent.

4.3.7.2. Nataraja Guru sees; all-comprehensive category of error, falsehood appearance, or illusion in this verse. The special purpose of introducing it in advance is, to say that the principle of error (\( \text{m\!y\!} \)) has an agent (\( \text{m\!y\!\!n} \)) as its cause. This agent is like the magician producing the numerous and varied horizontal aspects of plurality, while as the total cause it remains a unique verticalised potentiality. The horizontal is false and the vertical is true.

4.3.7.3. It is made very clear in the verse that \( \text{m\!y\!} \) is the first cause for creation. But in many previous verses it has been stated that the Absolute is the cause of all
creation. Therefore, there is a deviation and accepting \textit{mây} (prak\textit{\amash}; power) as the cause of creation. It shows that puru\textit{\amash} (Parame\textit{\amash}wara) - conscious exists and \textit{mây} too exists. In \textit{Bhagavad G\textit{\amash};} there are several verses stating that prak\textit{\amash} and puru\textit{\amash} exist. \textit{Mây} is synonymous with prak\textit{\amash}. It is prak\textit{\amash}, at the will of the puru\textit{\amash}; taking seed from Him creates everything in multitude. Nataraja Guru does not make this concept clear or understandable.

\textit{Bhagavad G\textit{\amash};} upholds that the world is created by \textit{Mây} at the will of the puru\textit{\amash}.\textsuperscript{20}

The earlier verse of Narayana Guru states that God creates and is the cause of the world (I-1 Dar\textit{\amash}anam\textit{\amash}I). But this verse is a contradiction of the earlier view

\textsuperscript{20} 'Bhagavad G\textit{\amash};', IX/10.
of Darśanamây. The concept given in Bhagavad Géétá is more convincing, logical and unambiguous.

4.3.8.1.  ekam satyam na dvitéyam hy asatyam bhîti satyavat |

¿ilaiva ¿ivalingam na dvitéyam ¿ilpin¿ kr̄tam || (Verse 10)

One (alone) is real, not a second:

What is unreal indeed seems as being real;

The áiva-li¿gam is stone itself,

Not a second made by the mason.

ekam satyam, one (alone) is real; dvitéyam na, not a second; asatyam hi, what is unreal indeed; satyavat bhîti, seems as being real; ¿ila-eva ¿ivalingam, the áiva-li¿gam stone is stone itself; ¿ilpin¿ kr̄tam dvitéyam na, not a second made by mason.

Commentary: It is the Self that alone is real. Anything other than the Self is not at all real. The unreal world merely has a semblance of the real. That which seems
like the áíva-li´gam (i.e. the phallic emblem of áíva) is really the stone itself. As for the áíva-li´gam it merely seems as if it is a reality independent of the stone. What is real is the stone and the áíva-li´gam is what is supposed on the basis of what really exists. The áíva-li´gam is not one that the mason made independently of the stone.

It is the stone itself. The stone is real and the áíva-li´gam is unreal. In the same manner the Absolute is real and the world is unreal. The unreal world (only) seems real.

4.3.8.2. Nataraja Guru views, that the theme of this verse is to abolish the last vestige of paradox natural to the context of appearances. Ontology is now given a revised, revalued, and absolutist status. This is done by the process of reasoning employing both a double negation and double assertion. Together they yield unity and abolish
all doubt of the duality. This apodictic, ontological and absolutist position marks

the terminal limit of this chapter. Ontological negativity is still valid.

4.3.8.3. According to this verse, there is only one truth. That is He. All others seem to be
true or are not true. Here truth shall be stated as Absolute truth or ultimate truth
or final truth, instead of merely truth, which may bring confusion to the seekers of
knowledge. The explanation that áiva-líga created out of stone is merely a stone
and all others are mere superscriptions seem to be not completely true. It may be
noted that we worship áiva-líga, only when a stone is modified and converted in
the form of áiva-líga. Therefore, the áiva-líga has a separate existence than a stone
lying on the way side.

The explanation given by Nataraja Guru is not clear. The terms absolutist
status, double negation, ontological negativity etc. make the meaning more
confusing. It shall be treated that puruṣa (consciousness) and prakṛti (mâyā) are beginningless and hence truth. The term Brahma is to be construed as a combined concept of Puruṣa and Prakṛti, to make the ideas relevant and to be understood properly. For a yogi - it is true to realise Puruṣa alone at the stage of Absorption or communion. But it should be conceived that at this state too mâyā (prakṛti) is present in Puruṣa latent.²¹

4.3.9. Discussion

Nataraja Guru in his Prologue to this chapter quotes many philosophers like Hegel, Edmund Hussersl, C.G. Jung, Sir William Hamilton, Brentano, Descartes, Heraclitus, Kierkegaard, Einstein and others to establish his concept of the science of the Absolute. He uses terms like pratīṣṭhā, vyavahārika, etc. adopted

²¹ 'Bhagavad Gētā', XIII/19.
from Vedānta to explain the concept like reflection, appearance and the work-a-day world. This is based on the scholastic development of Vedānta, after ākāra.

Nataraja Guru compares miyī darśanam to the negative state of Hegel. He tries to co-relate the theory of the vision of non-existent with the philosophies of the above thinkers and seers. But Western philosophies are inadequate to explain the concept of Absolute and related matters. The term vision of ‘non-existent’ is not adequate to explain ‘asatya darśanam’ because in English there are no synonymous terms to Sanskrit vocabulary which are used in philosophical contexts.
Chapter 4

MÆYÆ-DARÆANAM (Vision of Negation)

Narayana Guru gives his concept of illusion or non-existence. This chapter contains the definition of ‘m¡y¡’ and the synonyms and concepts. M¡y¡ is represented by all negativities where positive means those related to the Absolute.

M¡y¡ is not the absolute truth but the negative concept of the absolute, the God.

4.4.1.1

na vidyate yi s¡ m¡y¡ vidy¡‘vidy¡ para‘par¡

| tamaA prad¡jnam prak🙏tir bahudhi jaiva bh¡sate |

(Verse 1)

What is not real, that is Negation

Which by itself, as science-nescience,

Transcendence-immanence, darkness and prime potency

Of Nature, in many forms, looms.
Commentary: The term *mâyâ* refers to what is not real. What really does not exist but seems to exist in practical life is what is to be understood here. It is this same *mâyâ* which is not real but in practical life seems to us to be the basis of science, etc.

4.4.1.2 Nataraja Guru observes that ‘*Mâyâ*’ is meant to cover all other negative concepts, and its rival in dignity and status is the neutral Absolute itself still to emerge in to full view. The inner contradiction involved in asking whether *mâyâ* is real or exists, or even bringing in the question of belief or non-belief is revealed by the first characteristic of *mâyâ* in the definition given in the very first verse. It is like a
person shaking his head to say no when asked not to move his head by a doctor or a barber, or of writing the words 'this is white pencil' with a black lead. There is an inner inconsistency in denying $mi\hat{y}i$ which is itself based on a basic denial.

4.4.1.3. According to the above $mi\hat{y}i$ is not real or existing but only seems to exist. The synonymous terms of $mi\hat{y}i$ include $prak\ddot{a}t\ddot{i}$. We cannot say prakâti does not exist, because it is also eternal, as mentioned earlier. Narayana Guru or Nataraja Guru does not give a convincing explanation to the term $mi\hat{y}i$ ($prak\ddot{a}t\ddot{i}$) and thus the interpretation is not comprehensive.

The concept of Consciousness and $Prak\ddot{a}t\ddot{i} (mi\hat{y}i)$ has been clearly explained in Bhagavad Géti as follows.

$prak\ddot{a}t\ddot{i}m puru\hat{a}lam ca\hat{i}va$

$vid\ddot{h}y an\ddot{d}i ubh\hat{i}v api$
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In the commentary it is said that \( m_{y} \) is the basis of science. Then it is to be stated that science is also unreal and the interpretation given basing science stands meaningless.

More convincing is that the Supreme Consciousness (Parama Puruṣa) that is influenced by \( prakṛti \) and brings 'jīvan' under its control. The jēvatma (soul) tries to free itself from the bondages of \( prakṛti \); because \( m_{y} \) exists and continuously tries to keep jīvan under Her control. At the time of temporary Šamādhi or absorption, the jīvan (soul) gets absorbed into the all pervading God (the Absolute) and feels or gets the vision of the Supreme. Then the soul cannot feel

\[ vikṣṣita guṇaḥ ca iṣṭvā \]
\[ viddhi prakṛtis ābhavā\]

\[ ^{22} 'Bhagavad Gītā', XIII-19. \]
the existence of the world. It does not mean that the world is non-existing. It is like
date we cannot feel the existence of darkness while there is light and vice versa.

Therefore $m\dot{y}$ exists and He also exists.

Nataraja Guru views that '$m\dot{y}$' is the negative concept and the positive
concept would be the Absolute. If there is positive, the negative would also exist. If
$m\dot{y}$ is treated synonymous with $prak\dot{t}$i it is also beginningless and existing. If

$Brahma$ is the combination of $puru\dot{A}a$ and $prak\dot{t}$i ($m\dot{y}$) and 'if $Brahma$ is

Absolute both exist at the same time. As stated earlier $prak\dot{t}$i ($m\dot{y}$) is dormant in

the state of $Nirgu\,a\,Brahma$, where the $puru\dot{A}a$ ($Param\dot{t}$ma) is not influenced by

$prak\dot{t}$i. She is latent and inactive. $Sagu\,a\,Brahma$ refers to the created world

where $Puru\dot{A}a$ is almost dormant and $prak\dot{t}$i is very active. In $Sagu\,a\,Brahma$ the

created things undergo changes continuously. Narayana Guru and Nataraja Guru
would mean and refer the changing phenomenon as $m\varphi y$. The explanation given by Nataraja Guru to this verse does not suffice to a seeker of spiritual truth or philosophical meanings.

4.4.2.1. $pr\acute{\text{p}}g \ utp\grave{\text{at}} \ t\acute{\text{a}} \ y\acute{\text{h}} \ i\acute{\text{b}} \ h\acute{\text{v}} \ no \ m\grave{\text{\ddot{a}}}d \ eva \ b\varpi \ h\acute{\text{m}} \ a \ A \ p\acute{\text{\ddot{a}}}h \ a k$ |

$na \ \text{vidyate} \ \text{brahma} \ hi \ y\grave{\text{\acute{\text{i}}} \ si} \ \text{m\acute{\text{\ddot{y}}}} \ \text{meyavaibhav} \ |

(Verse 2)

*Just as, before the origin of the pot the clay itself is*

*In its non-being, (so too before the origin of the world) as other than the world*

*What had no being as the Absolute itself*

*Such is $m\varphi y$ (the negative principle) of indeterminate possibility*

*\text{yath}, just as; (gha}gasya \ utpatte} A pr\acute{\text{\ddot{a}}}k, before the origin (of the pot); abh\acute{\text{\ddot{y}}}va\acute{\text{\ddot{a}}} \ the non-existence; m\grave{\text{\ddot{a}}}d \ eva, is the clay itself; (tath* jaga\acute{\text{\ddot{a}}} A utpatte} A pr\acute{\text{\ddot{a}}}k, in the same way, before the origin of the*
world); yj br¯hma,aA paúṣthak na vidyate, what as other than the

Absolute is not there; yj brahma hi, what is the Absolute indeed; sa

miyj ameya-vaibhava, such is the Negative Principle of

indeterminate possibility.

Commentary. Although the term abhiva as used in ordinary language means

nothingness, according to the Ny¯ya (Logic) school of philosophy, it is counted as a

pad¯rtha (ie., a category of existence). Even according to the Advaita Philosophy,

abhiva is non-different from its counterpart bhiva (being). Before the pot

originated, its non-existence is to be attributed to the clay. In other words, it is the

clay that remains as the prior non-existence (prj abhiva) of the pot. Therefore, the

non-existence prior to the origination of the pot, has its anterior non-existence

which is stated to be the clay. To state this another way, the non-existence of the pot

and the existence of the clay are the same. But in reality even after the origin of the
pot, what is the being of the pot is a supposition, and the being of the clay is real.

The non-existence of a certain object always resides in the existence of another thing. As the clay constitutes the anterior non-existence of the pot, it remains as another entity. Similarly, before the origin of the world its non-existence remains something which is none other than the Absolute. In other words, it is the Absolute alone. But from the Absolute which is without change of form, how this world with all its different forms came about, is a matter that cannot be decided on the basis of inferential reasoning (anumāna), etc. Therefore, that non-existence which was the cause of the origination of the world and is non-different from the Absolute is described here as the principle of indeterminate possibility. In other words, māyā is the non-existent -
is the Absolute. Within the scope of the term $miy$ it is not wrong to include also

$manas$ (mind), $samkalpa$ (willing) and other faculties.

4.4.2.2. According to Nataraja Guru the non-otherness of what is unreal in connection with the Absolute requires careful examination. The existence of a pot contains the existence of the clay which in its material cause. This dialectical way of thinking is an accepted feature of Indian logic and fully valid in Vedanta although properly speaking this method originated with the Nyaya (Logical) school of philosophy. Cause and effect thus belong to a context similar to a reversible reaction and together constitute a pure mathematical equation where the terms are interchangeable. In principle there is no harm in equating pure nothingness with the pure Absolute as is done by the Madhyamika School of Buddhism. We have to suppose that the negative side of the Absolute is first absorbed into the pure
nothing anterior to nothingness referred to here. By the very act of abolishing the negative, the positive Absolute evaporates because the positive and negative are dialectically interdependent. The paradox is to be solved thus by a double negation and a double assertion so that the neutral Absolute could be attained.

4.4.2.3. The concept of Brahma needs a little more clarification. It is a concept where Puruṣa (consciousness); and Prakṛti (mâyā) exist in the unmanifest form. If mâyā and prakṛti are synonymous terms, mâyā too is beginningless and hence existing and real. If mâyā is not synonymous to prakṛti and that it is an illusion created by the prakṛti, then it is unreal or not the ultimate reality. The Bhagavad Gītā states that Puruṣa and Prakṛti are beginningless.
"prakṛtim puruṣām cātiva
viddhya anādī ubhāvapi" ²³

In Nirguña Brahma (unqualified Puruṣa), the Absolute (Supreme Consciousness) alone is being felt present and the Prakṛti (mâyā) remains dormant (latent). Latency does not mean non-existence or unreal. But if the cannotation of mâyā is related to the pluralities of manifested world, the changing nature and existence; it is not the ultimate reality. But it exists in varied forms in relation to temporal and special factors. The example given in the verse is of 'clay and pot'. The pot is made of clay and that the nature of clay exists in the pot too. But the form alone is changing and the concept of soil remains abstract while the nature of soil exist in the different formal existences. If nature can be attributed to mâyā

(prakṛti), Brahma (consciousness) is different from its attributes or qualities.

These concepts are not explained well to make clear the verse in the interpretation of Nataraja Guru.
4.4.3.1. \( \text{a} \text{n\¡tm\¡ na sad \¡tm\¡ sad iti vidyotaye yay\¡} \)

\( \text{sa vidye\¡m yath\¡ rajju-sarpa-tattva-avadh\¡ra,am} \) \quad (Verse 3)

"The non-Self is unreal, the Self is real",

Thus what looms is vidy\¡, knowledge

As the reality of the snake (appearance)

(Superimposed) on the rope-reality is understood.

\( \¡tm\¡ sat, \text{the Self is real; a} \¡tm\¡ na sat, \text{the non-Self is unreal; iti yaya} \)

vidyotate, thus what looms; \( s\¡ iyam vidy\¡, \text{that what is here is knowledge; yath\¡ rajju - sarpatattva - avadh\¡ra,am, as the reality of} \)

the snake (superimposed) on the reality of the rope is understood.

**Commentary.** That knowledge which sees things as they really are is knowledge or science. That knowledge which makes us aware that the Self alone exists and all else outside it does not exist is (also) knowledge or science. \( \¡\¡y\¡ \) has a bright
intelligent side and a dark ignorant side, of these the bright intelligent side is here referred to as *vidyā* or science which is the way to salvation.

4.4.3.2. Nataraja Guru points out that the verse begins with a double negation (‘The non-self is unreal . . .’ in order to double asserts ‘. . . the Self is real’), the fully Absolutist ontological aspect of the Self here the Self belongs to the ontological or negative side because the appearance of the snake belongs to the conceptual non-Self side. A subtle inversion is present which is the basis of the appreciation of wrong values and comes into evidence where a simple pair of ambivalent ontological factors are under consideration. Already in its germinal state nescience contains the element perverting normal values of intelligent life.

4.4.3.3. Nataraja Guru’s interpretation using terms like - ontological, ambivalent, double negation etc. needs further clarification. Double negation may mean the negation
of the world and negation of the Absolute. In this verse the meaning of \textit{prak\textasciitilde{ti}} implies \textit{Vidy}\texttext{\textasciitilde{}}} and \textit{Avidy}\texttext{\textasciitilde{}}. It is said that \textit{Vidy} is bright. It is nothing else than \textit{Sattvagu\textasciitilde{a}} of \textit{prak\textasciitilde{ti}} and the dark intelligence is referred to as \textit{Avidy}. It again is to prove that \textit{vidy} and \textit{avidy} exist; which are two aspects of \textit{miy}. \textit{Miy} cannot be confused as non-existence. \textit{Miy} is the force behind all diversified existence. We can say that the created things exists due to the influence of \textit{miy}. This seems to be more clear and logical. \textit{Vidy} refers to that force by which one can escape from \textit{Avidy} or ignorance. \textit{Vidy} is that force of \textit{prak\textasciitilde{ti}} which directs the spiritual aspirant towards realising the Absolute. It is stated that \textit{Vidy} and \textit{Avidy} are born out of \textit{prak\textasciitilde{ti}}.

The verse and commentary is very clear that \textit{Vidy} is the true knowledge, leads us towards the ultimate truth; and all other knowledge are \textit{Avidy} (not true).
A piece of rope may be felt as a snake, but when we closely see it would be realised that there is no snake but a piece of rope. The first vision is therefore not true. It is the vision of $m\bar{y}$. According to the Guru, in this word, He alone is sat (real) and $m\bar{y}$ is asat (unreal) anything devoid of $\bar{t}\text{ma}$ (consciousness) is treated as unreal or 

Avidyā.

4.4.4.1. \begin{align*} & a\text{`g}r\text{n}y \text{ et}\text{n}y \text{ ava}j\text{tabhya sukhe dukhe va muhyati} | \\
& \text{cid}t\text{m}j \text{ m}\text{\`y}j svasya tattvato\'sti na ki\text{\`u}cana || } \tag{Verse 6} \\
\end{align*}

Adopting as its own these limbs, the Self that is consciousness in essence

By its own negative base of error imagines,

(Itself) as if happy or suffering;

In Truth there is nothing at all.
cid†tm†, the Self that is consciousness in essence; svasya miy†, by its own negative base of error; a’gni-et†mi ava†tabhya, adopting as its own these limbs; sukhi iva, as if happy; dukhe iva, as if suffering; muhyati, imagines; tattvataÄ, in truth; kiµcana na asti, there is nothing at all.

**Commentary:** When the vital principle (jiva) has happiness or suffering of a sensuous character, it considers them to belong itself, and that there is an agent behind such happiness and suffering. (It also) erroneously considers itself to be happy or suffering. But in reality this happiness and suffering are only presentiments and, therefore, unreal. The vital principle which is the Self that is consciousness in essence is ever free from happiness and suffering. It is miy† which is the transcendental (par†) that is at the basis of this wrong assumption.
4.4.4.2. Nataraja Guru describes that when the structural mechanism is understood a full verticalisation of the tendencies in the 'jiva' would be found to abolish the ambivalent alternation of pleasure and pain. At a higher level both get absorbed into the Absolute.

4.4.4.3. It is the 'cidatma' (supreme consciousness), with the help of His own operative principles (mâyâ-prakârti) residing in individuals in the form of jévâtma allures of happiness or pain. Really there is no such pain or pleasure in the ultimate analysis and that it is due to this feelings of pain and pleasure (mainly pain) jévâtma (the Self) wants to liberate himself from pain and pleasure caused by the alluring forces of prakârti (mâyâ). It is only to that yogë who could go beyond the influence of the bondages of prakârti can experience that there is no pain or pleasure ultimately.

Till then, there exists pain and pleasure. All feel pains and pleasure. It is only that
yoge who remaining in a state of *Sam\(\text{dhi}\) (communion) can experience lasting peace with out pain and pleasures. Even the yoge who returns from *Sam\(\text{dhi}\) (absorption) would feel pain and pleasure. Therefore feeling of pain and pleasure exist even though it can be considered as not true for a theoretical sense. If so everything is a feeling, in the sense. This concept has no practical relevance.

Nataraja Guru does not give his views, rather he agrees with Narayana Guru. Therefore, it would be wise to state that there exists pain and pleasure as long as an individual exits. So pain and pleasure are to be treated as existing reality until final absorption of one's \(\text{\^\text{E}tman}\) in the Absolute. It is true by yogic practice one can reduce the intensity of pain and pleasure. A true worshipper of the Absolute to a great extent, can bring relief to his soul by lessening the intensity of *Karmaphala (reactions in potentialities). But he cannot escape wholly from pain and pleasure as
long as his body exists and as long as his mind not got purified. The term verticalization used by Nataraja Guru may mean the transcendality of the pain and pleasure, when ultimately, the soul merges, with the Supreme and the ambivalent nature disappears.
It would be proper to quote *Iṣṭvisya Upaniṣad*:

"yasmin sarvāni bhojanya jītvā Dịchbhēd vijñatā
tatra ko mohā kaśoka ekatvam anupātyata" \(^{24}\)

For the soul who has realised himself that all beings are the Absolute can get rid of pain or unhappiness. But such individuals are very rare and exist only in concepts.

\(^{24}\) *Iṣṭvisya Upaniṣad*, Verse 7.
indriyinm hi, the senses indeed; vi\&a\&a, the objective data; ayam prapa\&ca\&a, which is the world; yay, by what (mi\&y factors); vi\&\&i\&yate, emanates forth; s\& eva, that indeed, adhy\&tma-sth\&la- samkalpan\&maye apar, which is the context of the Self is the basis therein of all gross presentiments of will, is the immanent.

**Commentary.** This visible world of the five elements has been already stated to be a product of the will. What remains in the Self in the form of gross presentiment creates this world as presented to the senses is that aspect of mi\&y called the immanent (apar). What is called par or transcendent is subtle and what is called apar or immanent is gross.

**4.4.5.2.** Nataraja Guru observes that in the immanent (apar) aspect of the ontological, fully existential and negative Absolute there is the nuclear pattern of reality, present as a universal concrete. This is compatible with our own idea of the colour-solid. The
universal concrete of Hegel tallies with the ontological aspect. When nature operates more fully this potential nuclear aspect of the concrete universal transforms itself kinetically from its inner epistemological status to a more manifest one.

4.4.5.3. A similar verse is present in Bhagavad Gétā.25

The explanation given above by Nataraja Guru is not very clear as he uses many technical terms like kinetically, Hegel tallies, potential nuclear aspect, etc. The interpretation of Nataraja Guru above is an excellent example of how clear philosophical concepts can be made more confused and complex. The meaning of the verse is that - the created universe which can be felt by the sensory organs are due to the influence of 'apara prakāti' (mâyā). According to philosophical concepts

---

Aparj is the external manifestation of the prakṛti, the created world. Parj Prakṛti represents the operative principles (mâyā) remaining latent in the Absolute or Parama Puruṣa. The explanation given by Nataraja Guru by using his technical and mathematical jargons does not seem to be convincing.

Parj and Aparj represent the operative principles of prakṛti; in the manifest and unmanifest form of the Absolute (puruṣa or supreme consciousness). The Guru does not use the more convincing common terms like para prakṛti or aparj prakṛti. The verse itself is self explanatory.

4.4.6.1. 
Ekātiṣyām yathā jujnam rajatasya yad tmanai
kalpitasya nidhatnam tattama ity asavagyate ||

(Verse 8)

As the ignorance about the mother-of-pearl

The basis of the silver presentiment becomes:
So too what in the Self is the basis (of the world)

That is known as darkness (tamas)

yathä, as; śktikyām, in the mother-of-pearl; kalpitasya, what is a presentiment; rajatasya, of silver; ajñānam, lack of knowledge; nidānam, the basis; bhavati; is; tathā; so; ātmani, in the Self; yad, that which; kalpitasya, of what is imagined; jagatā, as the world; nidānam, the basis; ajñānam, lack of knowledge; tat-tamaā iti avagamyate; this is known as darkness.

Commentary: Some people see the mother-of-pearl and mistake it for silver. The reason for this error is ignorance. In the same way, ignorance which is the cause of the presentiment of the world is darkness. When the Self is properly understood we come to know that it alone is real and the world is only a presentiment in the Self and is unreal. Just as darkness is the cause of the error in perceiving silver in
the mother-of-pearl, so the cause of the supposition of the world in the Self is that aspect of mâyâ called darkness.

4.4.6.2. Nataraja Guru explains that the delicate interplay of ambiguity between the mother-of-pearl and the silver appearance rests on an ontological rather than a teleological or psychological basis. A fuller knowledge of the mother-of-pearl abolishes the error of the silver appearance. Negativity when pushed further abolishes duality by diminishing the possibility of error in the opposite pole.

4.4.6.3. The pluralistic world around us is seen real because of ignorance. It is only a presentiment of the Self. The Self here means the Supreme. In short the horizontalistic (pluralistic) appearances of the phenomenal world is conceived due to the ignorance (darkness) existing in the individual mind. It would be more apt to consider the world as the manifestation of the Absolute (the Brahma) rather
than merely unreal or non-existence. Until one realises that the Absolute truth is

*Brahma* alone, he has the dialectical experiences. That according to him, duality or

plurality is the everfelt reality. Only to those who realised the ultimate truth, this

world is not the supreme reality, or truth. Unreal cannot be constructed as non-

existent and mere illusion. The pluralistic existence has also relevance and

importance, perhaps more than the Absolute in the mundane life. Therefore it

would not be wise to underestimate the influence of *miyi* in the worldly life.

However, it shall not be over ruled, that plurality alone exists. The duality

(plurality) existing, is logically conceived, due to the ultimate existence of the one,

the Absolute. Nataraja Guru’s explanation to the verse does not suffice to clarify

the doubts of the readers.
Because of being that aspect (of mâyā) which is a marvel

By containing in all this (universe) like tree in a seed,

Or by virtue of its importance (above others)

This here is known as the prime potent power (pradhāna)

beje vāksa iva akhilam, as is the tree in a seed, everything; asmin, in this (i.e., in this aspect of mâyā); prakāra, a dheyate, contained as a marvel; iti ata v; or else it; asya, of this; pradhānyata (va), (or) its importance; idam, this; pradhīnam iti kathyate, is known as the prime potent power.

Commentary. In the same way as a large banyan tree is contained in a small seed, the whole of this universe is contained within mâyā. Because in the marvellous way it contains the whole universe in itself, it is called prime potent power. There is the
further justification for calling it pradh\(\text{n}\)a, the prime potent power, because it is a more comprehensive factor than science (\(\text{vidy}\text{\text{\u0937}}\)) and the other factors already enumerated.

4.4.7.2. Nataraja Guru says that in the second half of this verse an alternative meaning is given to the notion of the pradh\(\text{n}\)a or the negative Receptacle at the bottom of the total situation. The pradh\(\text{n}\)a is a notion referring to the negative pole of the vertical axis.

4.4.7.3. The explanation given by Nataraja Guru as above to the meaning of the verse is not adequate or convincing. According to the verse the whole universe is within \(\text{m\text{\u0937}}\text{\text{\u0937}}\). It presupposes that the \(\text{m\text{\u0937}}\text{\text{\u0937}}\) exists. Naturally a question arises where does the \(\text{m\text{\u0937}}\text{\text{\u0937}}\) exist? The answer is that \(\text{m\text{\u0937}}\text{\text{\u0937}}\) exists in the Absolute. It is also stated in the commentary that it is prime potent power agreeing \(\text{m\text{\u0937}}\text{\text{\u0937}}\) as a power. Power is to be
considered as *prakṛti*. *Prakṛti* is also infinite and real; though appears to be unreal. Here, therefore, a contradiction to the concept whether *mâyā* is unreal, as already stated in many verses. It would be, therefore, proper to consider that *mâyā* is also real though it seems to be unreal due to its changing nature. *Mâyā* manifests itself differently in *Puruṣa* resulting in multitudinous existence.

### 4.4.8.1.

```verse
karoteti prakarāe, a prakṛtyaiva guṇ, jn pāthak |
nigadyate' sau prakṛtiriteha trigu, jtmik ||
```

(Verse 10)

*By its very nature, because, in a marvellous way*

*It diversifies, the three nature modalities,*

*This (aspect of *mâyā*) consisting of the three Modalities is well known as Nature:*

*prākṛtya eva, by its very nature; guṇ, jn, the nature modalities;*

*prakārāe, a, in a marvellous way; pāthak karoti iti, in that it*
diversifies; asau, this (aspect of \( m\bar{y}\bar{i} \)); trigu,\textit{t}mika, as consisting of the three modalities; \textit{prak\text{"o}ti} \( \text{iti ha nigadyate} \), is well-known as \textit{Nature} (\textit{prak\text{"o}ti}).

\textit{Commentary.} The three Nature modalities remain potentially united within \( m\bar{y}\bar{i} \) before creation. At the time of creation Nature separates them out in a surprising manner. Because it was separated out in a surprising way it is called Nature. The varieties observed in Nature are all due to the three nature modalities. Nature is no other than what is the basis of the variety seen in the world.

In this \textit{dar\text{"c}anam} the same \( m\bar{y}\bar{i} \) has been described under the eight items (including \( m\bar{y}\bar{i} \)) which are: \textit{vidy\bar{i}} (science), \textit{avidy\bar{i}} (nescience), \textit{par\bar{i}} (the transcendent), \textit{apar\bar{i}} (the immanent), \textit{tamas} (darkness), \textit{pradh\text{"i}na} (prime potent power) and \textit{prak\text{"o}ti} (Nature). This is not the ultimate Reality but instead it is
called *mâyâ*; because it is the basis of the discrimination of the Self from the non-Self
it is called *vidyâ;* because it is the basis of contrary knowledge it is called *avidyâ;*
because it remains in the form of potentiality and creates the subtle limbs of the
vital principle such as the indriyas it is called *parâ;* because it remains in a gross form and creates the sense data called the world, it is called *aparâ;* because it remains in the form of darkness forming the basis of wrong supposition it is called *tamas;* because it bears within itself the whole universe in a surprising manner it is called *pradhâna;* (and) because it remains in the form of the three nature modalities and by its own nature it is able to separate them, it is called *prakûti.*

These are only the main divisions, but if necessary we could elaborate them into further sub-divisions.
4.4.8.2. Nataraja Guru says that the term *trigu∆tmika* (consisting of the three nature-modalities) and *prak∆ty-eva* (by its inner nature) are meant to underline that Nature is not to be considered extrinsic, which might suggest itself rightly or wrongly in the light of Śi Ekhya duality to some critics.

4.4.8.3. It is stated that this world is formed due to the influence of three gu∆s, as of *prak∆tī*—Sattva gu∆, Rajo gu∆, and Tamo gu∆. What is meant by Nataraja Guru as three modalities of nature, is not clearly explained. The combination of three gu∆s can be called as *Prak∆tī*. Therefore the explanation given by Nataraja Guru or the commentator do not convey clear and meaningful message to the readers. The Sattva gu∆ (santient force) the Rajo gu∆ (mutative) and Tamo gu∆ (static force) constitute the *prak∆tī* and that the multitudinous world is due to the extent and intensity of the influence of these three forces. In scientific terms the plurality is due
to the permutation and combination of these forces. There are several verses in *Bhagavad Gétà* to clarify the influences of the three guṇas.

In the created beings, if the influence of three gunas on the Ėtman is removed one can understand clearly the Ultimate truth. It is not revealed due to the strong hold of these operative principles in human mind. *Sattva guña* (sentient force) is the force of *prakṛti* which helps us to lead a good life without making any troubles to world around. It is rather a very low state of ego. *Rajo guña* predominated mind is after name, fame and power. They are mainly power mongers and do not give due respect to a good living. They are very much ego centric and selfish. The static predominant are those who are leading a life not much better than animals. In them animal instincts are very active. The
explanation of these aspects or nature of 'guards' would have been given by Nataraja Guru to make his interpretation more useful, and meaningful.

4.4.9. Discussion

In the Prologue and Epilogue Nataraja Guru tries to correlate the views of many Western thinkers to the concept of the Absolute and the vision of negation (Mâyá Darśanam) is a contribution of Indian philosophical thought. Mâyá is considered as a cosmic illusion. Mâyá Darśanam deals with a search for truth and reality behind appearance. To explain the concept of Mâyá in the common parlance Nataraja Guru gives an excellent example that when a stick half-dipped in the water appears seemingly bent, due to the scientific principle of refraction though the stick is not really bent. Advaita philosophers like áa`kara consider Mâyá as one not real, but Rñm;nuja who is a dualist views that the Absolute and this world exist.
Nataraja Guru points out that according to Hegel there are two aspects of the Absolute, negative and positive. The negativity of Kant, Schopenhauer's world of will, Marx Muller views etc. are mentioned to explain in more scientific terms the concept of \( m\ddot{y}\).

Schelling's philosophy of Transcendental idealism is referred to as appropriate to bring the positive and negative aspects of the Absolute. According to the Schelling, "the Absolute is an infinite and eternal reason, in which the conscious and the unconscious, the subject and the object, the ego and the non-ego are identical." \(^{26}\)

Radhakrishnan Sarvepilly, does not hold this world as neither real not unreal, and regarded \textit{mâyâ} as not as an illusion, but as a concept of explanation.\footnote{The Concept of \textit{Mâyâ} from the Vedas to the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century', by Ruth Renya, Asia Publishing House - Bombay - 1962, p 52.}

Nataraja Guru states that Narayana Guru raises \textit{cidad\=tma} by equating it to the status of the Absolute. He further observes that there is a plus and minus sides both acting vertically and horizontally. He states that these can be explained well by using Cartesian co-ordinates in terms of analytical and geometrical forms.

Nataraja Guru refers a number of verses of \textit{Bhagavad Gét\=i}, to support his views and, also \textit{Upani\=ads}.

It would be appropriate to deliberate upon the fact whether Nataraja Guru has succeeded in interpreting \textit{Dar\=yanam\=t\=i} using the various concepts of western
science; there remains a negation. Though he tried his best to convince the
Western scholars and thinkers that the theory of the Absolute and miyē can be well
substantiated using scientific basis, it is a fact that spirituality or the concept of the
Absolute is outside the scope of modern science.
Chapter 5

BHENA-DARANAM (Vision of Consciousness)

Nataraja Guru puts forth his concept of varied vision at different levels of conscious existence.

4.5.1.1. antar bahirvad jsenam sadj bhramara caucalam

bhijnam dvidhaiva smpnyam vijeAa iti bhidyate || (Verse 1)

Present equally within (and) without

In constant bee-agitation

Consciousness is of two kinds:

The generic and the specific

bahirvad antaÅ jsenam, present as within, (and) without; sadj bhramara caucalam bhijnam, in constant bee-agitation consciousness; smpnyam vijeAah iti, as the generic and the specific; dvidha-eva bhidyate, is of two kinds.
Commentary: That which is called consciousness is what constitutes the basis of all events and is of the form of a mental activity. This consciousness remains both outside and inside. In other words, it seems to be both outside as well as inside. (Yet) on closer examination it is neither inside nor outside. Because it has no stable state of existence it is called most changeful. Conventionally it is capable of being referred to as having generic or specific aspects.

For both consciousness and its basic counterpart, four grades of differences (are) known as the concrete (sthēlam), subtle (sēkAmam), causal (kīra,am) and Absolute (turēyam). Because it is difficult to grasp what constitutes the generic and specific aspects without first knowing the factors of consciousness and its basis, we have first to consider these and afterwards explain how the generic and specific aspects enter into them.
4.5.1.2. Nataraja Guru explains this as a stream of consciousness resulting from a pulsation taking place between conceptual and perceptual aspects of Self-consciousness. The effect of such a pulsation is an emergent factor neither physical nor mental but a combination of both. It has no location inside or outside, but belongs to qualitative rather than quantitative space. The pulsation can be intense or mild ranging between oscillations or quick vibrations, resulting in generic or specific configurations given to the mind. This view is also that the Gestalt psychology where such configurations occupy peripheral or central zones in consciousness. Here they are neutrally held together by the Self.

4.5.1.3. The explanation given in the commentary as well as that given by Nataraja Guru are not clear. Bh\textit{\textipa{\textit{na}}} - is a sort of awareness which one experiences at different knowledge levels. It can be stated that, this awareness is changing internally as well
as externally. Infact it is the same externally and internally. The concept of knowledge as per Gestalt psychology is the knowledge acquired through insight or due to different psychological patterns. It is also not made clear. The meaning of 'Bhyna' is associated with changing vision of awareness that one experiences. But Bhyna ceases to exist where the vision is Absolute.

The word Bhyna refers to a vision which is not real. It is the feeling of an individual at different realms of mind, lower or higher, intermediary to the vision of the Absolute. The feeling in an individual varies at different contexts. The changing vision is compared to a wild bee (Bramaram) always of roaring. This changing vision can be general and particular (simnyam and vijeAah).

4.5.2.1. sthElam sekAmam kyra,am ca tureyam ceti caturvidham |

bhynyrayam hi tannya ma bhynasyp cy upacaryate || (Verse 2)
As the concrete, the subtle, the causal and the Absolute

Basic Consciousness (is) of four kinds

So these names even (of basic Consciousness)

Are also applicable to consciousness

sth£lam s£kAmam k¡ra¸am tureyam ca iti, (As) the concrete, the subtle, the causal and the Absolute; caturvidham bh¡n¡¿rayam (bhavati), (there) are four kinds of basic consciousness; tat n¡ma hi, these names too; Bh¡nasya api, for consciousness also; upacaryate ca, are applicable also.

Commentary. For consciousness as well as its basic counterpart there are four divisions. They are concrete basic consciousness, subtle basic consciousness, causal basic consciousness and Absolute basic consciousness. In the same way there are (four divisions for consciousness) and they are also concrete, subtle, causal and Absolute respectively.
The difference of generic and specific belongs to the whole lot of the components of consciousness. They are broadly divided into two, giving four generic and four specific sets, e.g., generic-concrete consciousness, as also, two such as generic-concrete basic consciousness and specific-concrete basic consciousness.

As with the concrete we have to extend such divisions as applicable to the subtle, the causal and the Absolute.

4.5.2.2. Nataraja Guru points out that, the principle of the quaternion representing the correlates implied in Descartes and in complex numbers is in evidence here. Its duplicate form refers to the physical and psychic aspects of consciousness. Both have the same names or monomarks to signify in each of the four limbs. The fourth limb called 'tureya' absorbs and abolishes every other specific items in consciousness.
The feeling or awareness (individual consciousness) is related to four basic concepts, viz., concrete, subtle, casual and Absolute. An individual experiences concrete objects and he develops an awareness or consciousness in-relation to the material things. He experiences the subtle which is above the level of mundanity or material realities. When he goes beyond these two concepts, he experiences the cause or casual concept. In the fourth or the tureya state of experience, a yogi gets the real awareness of the Absolute. The change in concepts intermediary to material and the Absolute can be termed as Bhína-Darśana (Bhína Vision) when all the intermediate visions or awareness disappears the jíma realises the Paramítma in a state of Tureya. The explanation given is the commentary above or by Nataraja Guru does not suffice.
It is stated that ‘Tureya Darśanam’ (the fourth and final vision) is too
\(Bhjn\)a (feeling). It is an awareness of I am Brahma (I am God). Since at this stage, though the fourth stage there is, a feeling of ‘I’ it can not be the Absolute according to Narayana Guru. In the ultimate communion with the Absolute the pure ‘I’ feeling also disappears. The knower and the Absolute become one, rather at that stage only the Absolute exists. The \(\text{Jtman}\) is completely lost in the Param\(\text{Jtman}\) and the \(Bhjn\)a gets dissolved.

Nataraja Guru mentions the Cartesian correlates without explaining the relevance of Descartes co-ordinate’s, the geometrical application in the concept of
\(Bhjn\)a Darśanam.

453.1. \(\text{darsyatm iha kiyo'ham ghamo'yan iti dusyate}||\)

\(\text{sthElam yritya yad bhynam sthElam tad iti manyate}||\) (Verse 3)
Lo, here, ‘I am the body, this is the pot’

Depending on the concrete

What looms as consciousness

That is known as the concrete.

iha, here, (in a visible manner); d̄yaḥyam, lo; aham kṣyaḥ ayam
ghaḥaṃ iti, ‘I am the body, this is a pot’; sthēlam-jaṃritya,
depending on the concrete; yat bhūnam d̄yaḥyate, what looms as
consciousness; tat sthēlam iti manyate, that is known as the
concrete.

Commentary: That which is called concrete consciousness is in the form of ‘I am
the body, this is the pot’, because both derive their reality from visible concrete
objects. In other words, that which looms in the form of concrete objects is concrete
consciousness. This concrete consciousness is experienced by everyone in the
wakeful state.
4.5.3.2. Nataraja Guru views that the gross configuration belonging to the first limb is defined in this verse. Visibility is an attribute, though merely of the order of a Gestalt configuration. It refers to an emergent presentiment with in consciousness, rather than to any physical actuality. Between the case of a pot and the body the former is more peripheral and specific than the latter which is generic and nearer to the source in the Self.

4.5.3.3. The verse and commentary of Narayana Guru to Sthēla Bhñam (concrete vision) is very clear. But Nataraja Guru’s explanation is not so clear. He refers Gestalt psychological concepts, without illucidating the same. This creates confusion in the minds of the readers. The plain meaning is that the concrete vision or awareness relating to the material world is a basis for Sthēla Bhñam. Those concrete objects existing in this world is not real and is the basis for Bhñā (feelings).
4.5.4.1.  

atra kṣyo ghaṇa iti bhūnam yat tad viṣṭaye |

tathāḥ ham ayam iti yat sāmyam iti ca smṛtam ||  

(Verse 4)

Here what is the consciousness of the body

And the pot, that is the specific;

Likewise too, what is (the consciousness) of ‘I’ or ‘this’

Is known as the generic.

atra, here (in what has been said above); kṣya iti bhūnam yat, what is the consciousness of the body and the pot; tat viṣṭaye, that is the specific; tathā, likewise; aham ayam iti (Bhūnam) yat, what is (the consciousness) of ‘I’ and ‘this’ (tat) sāmyam iti ca smṛtam; (this) as the generic is known.

Commentary: Because the body, pot, cloth, house, etc. each have a discrete specific status qualified by specificity in reference to each other, such items of consciousness are called specific. The body is specified by the differences implied in such ideas as
pot, cloth, house, etc. The cloth is specified by the differences implied in such ideas as body, pot, house, etc. Thus, each object has a discrete status of its own. Therefore, the consciousness of such is called specific. Such items as 1, this, that, etc., are called generic because they do not specifically distinguish such items as, body, pot, cloth, house, etc., so, they do not refer to their discrete individuality. For each of the four such as gross, subtle, etc., there are the generic and specific aspects to be considered.

4.5.4.2. Nataraja Guru observes that this verse further elaborates the specific and generic aspects of each of the monadic units belonging to the horizontal plus side. The actuality of the port or body is the specific attribute while the pronoun, whether, personal or not covers more vertical generalities.
The specific and general awareness are clarified through the verse. Nataraja Guru explains that the generic or specific awareness, relates to the horizontal plus side which means those related to the world. The pronouns are more vertical in nature.

The awareness one has about the world is not related to the Absolute. According to him it is the knowledge of the negative side or minus side. Bhñna or awareness that one possesses at different level varies. The awareness of individual on different things or aspects differs from person to person according to the influence of previous experiences each one has.

For a person who is spiritually elevated his awareness of the world before him, will be different from that of a scientist or a layman. The differences in awareness exist in all realms either subtle or less subtle (crude). As a person advances in the verbal side of his awareness or in the spiritualistic sense he
experiences different and subtle awareness about the world and the Absolute.

Nataraja Guru does not clarify this.

4.5.1. \( \text{aham brahma iti bhujnam tat tureyam iti jamsyate} \)

\( \text{sjamnyam aham ity amo bhahmey atra vijiAyate} \)

(Verse 7)

‘I am Absolute’ – Thus what consciousness attains

Is praised as the (consciousness) of the Absolute

Here the element ‘I’ is the generic

(And) Absolute is its specific attribute.

\( \text{aham brahma iti bhujnam yat, ‘I am the Absolute.’ – Thus what} \)

consciousness makes; \( \text{tat tureyam iti jamsyate}, \) is praised as that

Absolute (consciousness); \( \text{atra}; \) here; \( \text{aham iti amo sjamnayam, the} \)

element ‘I’; is the generic; \( \text{brahma iti (amo) vijiAyate}, \) (the element

that refers to the) Absolute is the specific.
**Commentary.** In the case of contemplative yoges or mystics in their state of perfect samādhi (contemplative calmness) which is still conditioned by mental activity, what is experienced in the form of identity with the Absolute as a further state beyond the state of causal ignorance is what is here referred to as Absolute consciousness. Although the Absolute cannot actively enter our conditioned consciousness, still in the case of those yoges who constantly engage themselves in the meditation of the Absolute, when they attain to a state of identification with the Absolute, they experience a consciousness in the form of 'I am the Absolute. The Absolute consciousness comes into evidence only when the natural dispositions (vīsanīs) of the senses and the consciousness of 'I am ignorant' belonging to the state of deep sleep have become weakened. The 'praise' alluded to here is used in connection with this state in order to extol its value as a desirable or significant
spiritual goal. All varieties of consciousness are to be understood as comprised within the scope of the four states of consciousness beginning from the simple ones like that of the pot which is in the common experience of any person, and finally ending with the supreme experience given to the yogé in the form of consciousness of ‘I am the Absolute’. There is not anything higher than this last state even for the most advanced man of spirituality. In this last stage we have also to distinguish that the ‘I’ is common to all individuals while the specific attribute of the Absolute is of an individual character pertaining only to specially qualified yoges.

4552. Nataraja Guru opines that this verse directly refers the tureya where all relativisms got absorbed into the unity of Absolute Self-consciousness. Strictly speaking the Self-consciousness should not have any division of subject and object. It is anterior to all predictability, but as Narayana Guru explains, this fully unconditioned status
of the Self is not intended in this present chapter. Full normalization of the Self
takes it beyond the scope of any analytic description in the same way as the named
Tao is not the Absolute Tao. Rare instances of yoges who by constant practice of
certain type of meditation attain to this consciousness in the form of 'I am the
Absolute', is permissible only in principle as Narayana Guru explains in his short
commentary.

4.5.5.3. The subtlest awareness or Bhjna is that 'I am the Absolute' (Aham Brahmasmi).

Many seers does not consider it as Bhjna or mere feeling rather as the Absolute
vision of reality. But Narayana Guru views this highest stage of feeling or
realization also as Bhjna a relative vision and not Absolute. In the close analysis it
can be felt that as long as I feeling caused by the mjug (prakrti) exists one cannot
get the total vision without the bondage or colour of the mjug. When I feeling also
gets lost, there takes place a perfect absorption or communion of ṛevaṁa with the Supreme. Nataraja Guru states that full normalization of the Self takes, beyond the scope of any analytic description of 'Tureya' state. Normalisation needs more explanation. It may mean realization of the Absolute. What actually meant by Nataraja Guru by the term is not adequately clear.

4.5.6.1. \( \text{yatra bhujnam tatra bhjAyam bhujnam yatra na tatra na} \) 

\( \text{bhjAyam ity anvayenpi yatireke, a bodhyate} || \)  

(Verse 8)

Where consciousness (exists) there the Object of consciousness (exists); where 

Consciousness exists not, its object neither.

Thus both by agreement and difference certitude comes.

\( \text{yatra bhujnam (vartate), where consciousness (exists); tatra bhjAyam (vartate), there (exists) the objects of consciousness; yatra bhujnam na} \)
(vartate), where consciousness (exists) not; tatra bhāyam na (vartate); the object of consciousness (exists) not; iti anvayena vyatireke, a api bodhyate, so by agreement and difference certitude comes.

**Commentary.** Agreement is when we appraised the fact that wherever there is consciousness there is also the object of consciousness. Agreement (anvaya) is defined as the inseparable association of ends and means. Here the ends are the object of consciousness while the means are consciousness (itself). By this method of agreement and difference we should understand that only where there is consciousness there is the object of consciousness, and conversely, wherever there is an object of consciousness there is also an accompanying consciousness that goes with it. Difference (vyatireka) is defined as non-existence: that is, the lack of concomitant associative link as between ends and means. Where there is no object
of consciousness there is no consciousness either. This is called difference or absence of agreement. Here the absence of ends is the absence of the object of consciousness, while the absence of means corresponds to the absence of consciousness (itself). By this method of difference we come to know that where there is no consciousness there is also no object of consciousness, and vice versa (thereby attaining to unitive certitude).

4.5.6.2. Nataraja Guru specifies that, the double method of agreement and difference has a structural implication with the same four limbs where the alternating pulsations of reasoning take place, within consciousness and move along a logical parameter alternately revealing the interlocking of vertical possibilities and horizontal probabilities. This eternal alternating process when fully normalized within consciousness helps us to attain to the Absolute. It is the point where consciousness
alternates that is most important and not its secondary horizontal elements or
features.

4.5.6.3. The term consciousness is used as synonymous to that of awareness or feeling
rather than the unit consciousness (ātman) or the Supreme consciousness (The
Absolute). The visionary awareness of an individual is associated with objects. The
individual consciousness is associated with objects, and that where there are no
objects, the object consciousness or awareness too disappears. In the state of
Tureya there exists no object or individual consciousness. The unit mind and
ātman lose its existence as being absorbed in the Absolute (Supreme
consciousness). The Bhūna vision ceases to exist ultimately in this state of union of
individual Self (ātman) with the Absolute.
Nataraja Guru’s explanation of the words using technical jargons like -

‘alternating pulsation of reasoning’, ‘horizontal probabilities’, etc. do not give a clear concept of the content of the verse. The term normalisation may be meant the ultimate cessation intermediary awareness or feeling or Bhjna vision. But this term is not adequate to specifically communicate the concept or idea.

It is very clearly stated in Mundaka UpaniAad that on realisation of the Supreme (Absolute) all the effects of m¥ or unreal vision and all doubts would disappear.

"bhidyate hñdaya-granthi

eidyante sarva-sam¿ayA,“
All the concepts of Bhīnam (unreal vision of awareness) get ceased on the realisation or attainment of Brahma (Absolute). A seeker of real knowledge is under the strong hold of Bhīna (intermediary awareness or feeling) until the realisation of the certitude (the Absolute).

4.5.7.1.  

\[ yath\var{\text{a}} \text{d} u\text{a}g \text{d} u\text{a}g \text{am} \text{j} t\mu{\text{n}} \text{am} \text{s} \text{v} \text{a} \text{y} \text{a} \text{m} \text{j} \text{t} \text{m} \text{j} \text{n} \text{a} \text{p} \text{a} \text{j} \text{y} \text{a} \text{t} \text{i} \text{|} \]

\[ \text{a} \text{t} \text{o} \text{ n} \text{a} \text{b} \text{h} \text{i} \text{\text{\text{)}}} \text{Ay} \text{a} \text{t} \text{e} \text{h} \text{y} \text{t} \text{m} \text{j} \text{y} \text{a} \text{m} \text{p} \text{a} \text{j} \text{y} \text{a} \text{t} \text{i} \text{s} \text{a} \text{b} \text{h} \text{i} \text{\text{\text{)}}} \text{Ay} \text{a} \text{t} \text{e} \text{||} \]

(Verse 9)

As with the eye which cannot see itself

(So) the Self does not see itself;

Therefore, the Self is not indeed the object of consciousness,

That which the Self sees is the object of consciousness.

\[ ^{28} \text{‘Mundaka Upani\text{\text{\text{)}}} \text{ad’, II-2, 9.} \]
yathā đūg đūm̐ am svayam na paśyati, as with the eye which cannot see itself; (tathā) ātmā ātmānam (svayam) na paśyati, (so) the Self does not see itself; atā ātmā na bhūtaye hi, therefore, indeed the Self is not the object of consciousness; ātmā yam paśyati sa bhūtaye, that which is the Self sees is the object of consciousness.

Commentary. It is the Self that ever remains without becoming the object of consciousness, as the one ever remaining reality, although by the mere presence of the Self all things enter into consciousness. Although by the very presence the Self remains alone in its loneliness as a witness devoid of all conditionings, it is without any limitations either. In the form of Existence-Subsistence-Value (sat-cit-ānanda) it is beyond all states, without change or activity, and not graspable by the mind.

There is no consciousness of the self in the Self. To explain this we take the example
of the eye with the help of which we can see everything but (the eye) does not help us to see itself.

4.5.2. Nataraja Guru observes that on the plus side individual concepts stand out in relief, like the spark from a fire. They are relation - relata units having the same structure. The 'Puruṣa or Golden Person who is immortal has this conceptual status on the plus side. He cannot come into consciousness in the minus side in the same way as the eye or I cannot see itself. You can write the word 'red' with a red pencil, but the ontological redness of the pencil is not of a conceptual order. What enters consciousness as an event has necessarily to be outside consciousness.

4.5.3. The fact that Ītman being the pure form and a part (Amāśa) of the Paramātman cannot be visualised through an ordinary mind. Mind being the combination of gu, as; viz., Sattvagu, a, Rajagu, a and Tamogu, a resulting in three 'I' states namely
the pure 'I' (Sattva-ego), the mutative 'I' (Rajo-ego), and the static 'I' (Tamo-ego).

The Rajo state of 'I' and the static state of 'I' cannot have a vision of the Ætman. But the pure 'I' that is sentient 'I' (Sattvika state) which is transparent can get the glimpse of the Ætman. Therefore ordinary speaking, the unit Ætman cannot be an object of the mind. The Ætman does not see itself rather it strives for freedom from the mind and it realises the Supreme or the Absolute, when the influences of mind on Ætman ceases to exist. The term liberation, therefore, connotes the individual soul's relief from the bondages of Prakṛti born mind. The Ætman cannot see itself.

But it can get the vision of ParamÆtman, the Absolute.

The plus and minus side used for the explanation by Nataraja Guru seems quite technical and ambiguous, lacking clarity of concepts. He tries to explain the
Absolute through a scientific insight but often does not succeed in the effective communication of subtle ideas.

4.5.8.1. \(\text{yad bh}^{\text{h}}\text{Ayate tad adhyastam anadhyastam na bh}^{\text{h}}\text{Ayate}\)

\(\text{yad adhyastam tad asad apy anadhyastam sad eve tat}\) ||

(Verse 10)

What is the object of consciousness, that is conditioned.

What is undconditioned, that is not the object of consciousness

What is conditioned is non-existent.

But what is unconditioned, itself the EXISTENT IS THAT.

\(\text{yad bh}^{\text{h}}\text{Ayate}, \text{what is the object of the consciousness}; \text{tad adhyastam} (\text{bhavati}), \text{that is conditioned}; \text{yad anadhyastam}, \text{what is unconditioned}; \text{tat na bh}^{\text{h}}\text{Ayate}, \text{that is not the object of consciousness}; \text{yad adhyastam}, \text{what is conditioned}; \text{tat asad}, \text{that is non-existent}; \text{api yat anadhyastam}, \text{and what is undconditioned (i.e., the Self)}; \text{tat sat eva} (\text{bhavati}), \text{itself the EXISTENT IS THAT.}\)
Commentary. By this darśanam the conclusion arrived at is that all things that are objects given to the senses, etc., and which enter consciousness are to be considered non-existent, and the only reality is that which is not the object of mental activity and is not the object of consciousness which is not conditioned, but is the basis for all effects of consciousness, while itself remaining without any basis except in the Self.

4.5.8.2. Nataraja Guru points out that the same idea of a basic antinomian principle lurking within consciousness is further clarified in this verse. Going one step further this verse abolishes the plus side in favour of the minus side by calling it 'asat or non-existence. Perfect self-identity is attributed to the ontological Self having attained to its own self-sufficient and absolutist status. It is important to
note the final phrase *sad-eva-tat*, 'That is Existent', is the *mahāvīkyā* (great dictum) though stated in reverse syntactical order.

4.5.8.3. The sensory organs are associated with objects, so the mind. The objective existence implies the ultimate existence of something beyond all objectivities. The term '*asat*' is ascribed to objects which ultimately disappears as soon as the ultimate reality or truth is experienced by the individual soul. For such a soul the intermediary objects entering into consciousness (mind) are *Anadyastham* (not true)

For an Advaita philosopher, there are only two concepts, the real and the unreal. The real is represented by the Absolute or the ultimate and the unreal is represented by various objects of vision of consciousness. The Investigator does not agree with this because as long as the Absolute exists, the relative also do exist; *Paramāṭma* exists; so the soul (*Jīvāṭma*).
Nataraja Guru uses the terms ‘plus’ and ‘minus’ to mean those related to the Absolute and the $M$ or this created world. Negative is meant for those related to the unreal and positive relates to the Absolute the God.

4.5.9. Discussion

Nataraja Guru in the Prologue and Epilogue of this chapter of Darśanamālī refers to the theories of Descartes’ (Cartesian co-ordinates), Spinoza’s Absolute substance, Lebiniz’s monas monadums, Kant’s mathematical thoughts, Einstein’s two theories of relativity, Pythagorean theory of distance etc. to explain the concept of the Absolute and Darśanamālī. He tries to analyse the four fold structuralism of $Ma,dekhya Upaniṣad$ such as the walking state, the dream state, the well dormant ($suAupti$) state and the lord of all ($sarveJvara$ or $sarvajña$) state. He does also mention Hilbert.
He mentions the Vedānta philosophies of āā’kara, Rjmnuja and Madhva.

But he views that the Advaita Philosophy of āā’kara is the most outstanding because of its uncompromising attitude regarding the Absolute. He points out there, Vedānta methodology as fully acceptable, which were originally laid down in Perva-memēś such as ’viālaya’, sambandha and prayojā (content, context and purpose). He considers āā’kara as a mathematical structuralist, while explaining the difference between ghatakṣa (limited space) and mahakṣa (unlimited space or ultimate space). He points out the theory of quantum mechanics and the implication of the relativity theory. He views that Faraday’s discovery of electric and magnetic forces and Max Well’s equations, reveal the world with a double aspect.
The main purpose of Nataraja Guru seems to make aware the Western world, that modern science can be applied to the philosophical concepts and theories, and can be well used to interpret philosophical concepts such as theories of the Absolute. But his interpretation using science and mathematics could not succeed well. The modern science is not adequate to explain the subtle philosophical concepts. However he had made an earnest effort in this direction.

But modern science is based on pascabhetatattva.
Chapter 6

*KARMA-DARȘANAM (Vision of Action)*

In this chapter Narayana Guru deals with the concept of *karma* in relation to the universal self and the individual self.

4.6.1.1. \( \text{Jtmaiva myay} \textit{ karma karoti bahu-rªpa-dhªk} \)

\( \text{asa´gaÅ svaprak¡¿o`pi nidryym iva ta}jasaÅ \) \( || \) (Verse 1)

*It is indeed the Self, tho' Self-luminous
And detached, that through negativity
Does action bearing many forms
Like the dream-agent in sleep.*

\( \text{asa´gaÅ svaprak¡¿A-} \text{api, although detached and self-luminous;}
\text{nidryym ta}jasaÅ \text{ iva, like the dream-agent in sleep; } \text{Jtma-eva bahu-}
\text{rªpa-dhªk, the Self itself bearing many forms; myay} \textit{ karma karoti,}
\text{by means of its negative principle does action.} *
Commentary. Because the Self, like the sky, is without taint and because it is self-luminous like the sun, it cannot be reasonably thought of as capable of any action. In reality the Self does not do any action. If we now examine what it is that acts, we have to say it is \( m_{\text{yy}} \), because it is of the order of inert matter. It is not capable of any action independent of the Self. Therefore, because it is only capable of acting by the presence of the Self and is not different from the Self, and because for accomplishing any action there is nothing else, what effects all the various forms of action is the Self. That is to say, it is quite legitimate to think that it is the Self that effects all actions through \( m_{\text{yy}} \). In the state of sleep it is within everybody’s experience that the subtle dream-agent is able to accomplish all the action without possessing any outward organs of action. What the dream-agent accomplishes is experienced as if it is real as long as the dream lasts. It becomes clear when coming
out of the state of sleep that the work accomplished by the dream-agent is not real but only apparent or virtual. The term *bahu-raṣṭa-dhāk* (bearing many forms) is intended here to include within its scope all possible forms of action, the purport being that there is no action that is not attributed to the Self.

4.6.1.2. Nataraja Guru refers to *taijasa* (the dream-agent) indicating that the activity here is not of a gross, inert or mechanistic order. It is a verticalised version of contemplative activity productive of pure mystical states of mind. A fine and fluid world of events is to be imagined here. Epistemology and ontology can be treated inclusively in an Integrated Science of the Absolute. In every case it is a conceptual Self we have to think of. The instrumental status of this Self is brought out by the reference to the multiplicity of actions as possible effects. All these effects are, however, supported by the instrumental Self as indicated from the expression
bahu-rpa-dhuk (bearing many forms). Its self-sufficiency is underlined by the
term svapra-{a (Self-luminous), while its perfect aloofness or loneliness without
any horizontal implications like Unmoved Mover and is underlined by the term
asa'ga (detached). A pure verticalised version of the Self is thus indicated as a
concept. This Self is to be equated with its counterpart as necessary to any
discussion on contemplative activity.

4.6.1.3. The simple meaning of the verse is that though soul (ıtman) is unattached and self
luminous; it performs every action through the medium of m{yī (prakāti). Ƚtman
assuming different forms using the prakāti does action; as in dream taking the
form of tajasa (luminous body). Nataraja Guru uses the term like unmoved mover,
inert or mechanistic status etc. to explain the unattached and luminous Ƚtman
(soul) of the individual.
It is stated that the ātma does every action through the medium of mâyā (prakāśṭi) but, He is unaffected and unattached and not tainted by action as if a dream agent, where it is seen that the dream maker is not affected on awakening.

The interpretation is that ātman is not affected though He does the function through prakāśti (mâyā).

Nataraja Guru’s statement that the concept of 'taijasa' is that of a verticalised version of contemplative activity, needs further explanation. Vertical activity refers to those related to the Absolute, according to him. But the verticalised concept does not seem sufficiently explained in the context of the verse.

Though Nataraja Guru uses certain philosophical and technical words for the interpretation of the concepts of the verses, the interpretation is found to be more confounded than the verses of Narayana Guru. The function of interpretation or
explanation is to simplify and make the ambiguous more clear and understandable. Here the interpretation needs further detailed study. This shall not be the function in interpreting the mystic concept of philosophy. Nataraja Guru, therefore, could not succeed well in interpreting the concepts, mainly because he uses certain scientific jargons requiring more explanation.

In *Bhagavad Gītā* an almost similar verse is found.²⁹

The meaning is that one performs all actions according to the nature (*prakṛti* or *mâyā*) present in him. The intention of Nataraja Guru might be to give a scientific interpretation to the Western world to convince them better. But science has its own limitations to explain things related to the Absolute.

²⁹ *Bhagavad Gītā*, III/27.
4.6.2.1. \[\textit{manye vad\textbar mi g\textbar h\textbar mi \textbar ity\textbar di r\textbar pata\textbar} \]

\[\textit{kriyate karma param\textbar tman\textbar cittendriy\textbar tmana} \]

(Verse 2)

'I think, I speak, I grasp, I hear'

In such forms whatever actions, are accomplished

By the Supreme Self (which is also),

Assuming the form of pure reason and the senses.

\[\textit{param\textbar tman\textbar manye vad\textbar mi g\textbar h\textbar mi, By the Supreme Self 'I think, I speak, I grasp'; ity\textbar di r\textbar pata\textbar, in such forms; karma kriyate, actions are accomplished; cittendriy\textbar tmana, assuming the forms of pure reason and the senses, (having the form of ego-sense with motor senses).} \]

**Commentary.** When action is accomplished it is the Self that remains, and as the inner organs and the motor organs, accomplishes all works. That is to say, it is the one Self as the reasoning Self (\textit{cidd\textbar tm}) that accomplishes acts of thought by saying
to itself, 'I think', and in the form of speech accomplishes the act of saying, I 'speak',
which is action, in the form of the spoken word, as the Self of the hard accomplishes
the action of taking, which is of the form of grasping, and as the Self of hearing
accomplishes the work in the form of 'I hear'. By reference to actions such as 'I
think', etc., we have to take it that all functions such as rising, falling, contracting,
expanding and moving are also to be supposed. Because there is nothing other
than the Self and because it is impossible that anything that is inert can accomplish
any action, it is the ultimate Self (which is of the form of the reasoning Self with the
senses), that accomplishes all actions as expressly intended to be understood in this
verse.
4.6.2.2. Nataraja Guru observes that, "here the only point to be noted from Narayana Guru's own commentary is the sameness implied between the Paramātmā (Supreme self) and the cittendriyātmā (the self of pure reason and the senses)."

4.6.2.3. The meaning of the verse is that 'Parama Puruṣa' (The Absolute) does all the functions such as hearing, speaking, grasping, thinking, etc. through sensory organs, the thinking faculty of individuals. This concept is against the concept of Bhagavad Gītā; as already stated, it is prakṛti that does all functions.

"prakṛte kriyamāṇaṁ ni guṇaḥ śyat karmāṇi sarvājāh"\textsuperscript{30}

Nataraja Guru does not examine this concept in detail, in his interpretation:

It shall be noted that the poetic verses expressed in Sanskrit shall not be taken for

\textsuperscript{30} 'Bhagavad Gītā', III.27.
granted as philosophically true or unquestionable. Nataraja Guru could have
pointed out this; rather he has given only a very short and passing explanation to
the concept contained in this verse, accepting the commentary of the Garland of
Visions (Darśanamālī).

If the Parama Puruṣa does all the functions, there is no room for good and
vices in the society; that is, the devilish or the right action would also be treated as
being performed by the Absolute. This is philosophically and practically incorrect,
because we know that individuals function according to their nature of mind
constituted by the influence of guṇas (Triguṇas). If all functions are performed by
God, human beings have no role to perform, either spiritual or mundane. This
philosophical concept is quite misleading and against all logical and practical views
contained in Bhagavad Gītā as quoted above. It would be more acceptable and
convincing, where all functions are performed according to the nature of one's mind and that the unit consciousness (jītman) has no direct role in it. It may be noted that the jītman is a part (amıśa) of the Paramātmā and is unaffected, unattached, pure, self-luminous as that of Absolute.

4.6.3.1.  

jītmaiva karma, aścśṛvam anyat kiṣucinna vidyate  

(tataḥ svenaiva karmā, i kriyante nija māyay  

(Verse 3) 

Prior to action it is the Self (that exists); 

There is nothing else at all, 

Through the Self by the own negative principle 

By itself is accomplished (all) actions. 

karma, aścśṛvam, prior to action; jītma eva vidyate, it is the Self that exists; anyat kiṣucit na, there is nothing else at all; tataḥ, through it; svena eva, by the Self itself; nija māyay, by its own negative principle; karmā, i kriyante, (all) action is accomplished.
**Commentary:** Prior to action there is only the Self and nothing else. Therefore, it is
that very Self which accomplishes all action through its \textit{mâyā}. Any action
accomplished posteriorly cannot possibly arise from anything else. If we say that
before the tree there was the seed, is it necessary to assert again that the seed
causethree? The \textit{Upaniṣads} also support such a view when they say that
existence was what was there in the beginning. In other words this was in the
beginning the pure Self.

4.6.3.2. Nataraja Guru views that, "The relation between clay and pot or seed and sprout is
a vertical one. This is the same as the cause and effect relationship of \textit{Vedānta}. One
is derivable from the other. It is permissible for the \textit{Nyāya} and \textit{Vedānta}
philosophies to speak of the prior non-existence of a pot in the clay from which it
posteriorly sprang. Cause of effect can be equated both ways and give the same
It is in this sense that we find the term *pravam* (prior) pointing to the ontological side of reality.

4.6.3.3. It is stated that, Self (the Supreme) alone, existed before *karma* (action). It is also stated that the *étman* does everything through his *mâyê* (power). Then *mâyê* also exists. Every action is performed by the Supreme (Paramêtman) through the medium of *mâyê*. But He is not affected by or tainted by the attachment of *karma* (actions). Nataraja Guru’s explanation that the relation between clay and pot or seed and sprout is a vertical one refers to the Absolutist relation of the visible world of actions. The pure self or impure self is not clear. The self cannot be impure. The Supreme (Absolute) is always pure. He is not affected by *prakätì* (power) which is represented by three guëas. The pure Self may therefore mean the *Nirgu, a Brahma* (The unqualified Brahman). If we admit *Nirgu, a Brahma* there would be *Sagu, a*
Brahma (The qualified puruṣa); being influenced by Its power, the prakṛti. These are not adequately explained by Nataraja Guru.

4.6.4.1.  Ṣakthi asti jṭmanaḥ kṣicd durghaṁ na pāṭhak svataḥ
tayaiva rropyate karma nikhilam niĀkriyātmāi

(Verse 4)

From the Self not different from itself

There exists a certain undefinable specificatory power.

By that (power) all actions

Are falsely attributed to the actionless Self.

jṭmanaḥ, from the Self; svataḥ na pāṭhak, not different from itself;
durghaṁ, an undefinable; kṣicd Ṣakthi, asti, there exists a certain (specificatory) power; taya eva, by that (power); rpyate, is falsely attributed; nikhilam karma, all actions; niĀkriyātmāi, in the actionless Self.
**Commentary:** The Self has a specificatory power which is not different from itself and is undefinable. It is because of this specificatory power that all actions are attributed to the Self. Because the Self is actionless no action can be compatible with it. Then, how is it that we say the Self performs action? We are obliged to answer that \( m\gamma \) is the cause of all action and is the specificatory power of the Self.

It is also incongruous to say that \( m\gamma \) which is by itself non-intelligent, is the cause of action, because it is impossible that there is anything outside the Self. We are forced to admit that \( m\gamma \) is not different from the Self. On closer examination we see that it (i.e., \( m\gamma \)) is a non-existent principle. Thus, when looked at in one way, it has agency, and when looked at in another way it has no agency. When viewed in one sense it is existent and in another sense it is non-existent. On further analysis it is also seen to be indeterminate. When viewed in one way it is capable of
occupying a place in the Self which cannot in principle give any place to anything outside it, and when viewed in another way it has no existence in the Self. In one way it is different from the Self, and in another way it is non-different from the self taken as a whole: as what is unpredicable and indeterminate. It is because of these qualities that it is undefinable and unpredicable. It is this very Self that attributes all actions to the Self which is action-less. It is also by this very Self remaining as desire (icchā), wisdom (jñāna) and action (kriyā) that the Self is made to be an agent or non-agent of action capable of taking on all forms. When it is subject to desire the Self is the actor. In the form of wisdom it is actionless. When it is in action it can assume all forms.

4.6.4.2. Nataraja Guru views that, the ambiguous principle of incertitude necessarily acting as a link between the self and the non-self is found in this verse. It persists from the
ontological side of negativity and encroaches into the domain of concepts. The term 'jropyat' (is attributed) suggests an agency on the part of \( m\bar{y}\). This has to come from the side of the non-self as a concept. It is a horizontalising factor of nescience whose essence cannot belong to any other reality, than the pure verticalised Self.

The horizontal and vertical tendencies belong to the same self at least as references. It is this horizontal factor that is at the root of the multiplicity of things and their interactions. This vertical Self is always independent as such.

4.6.4.3. It is \textit{prak\&ntilde;ti (mi\&bar{y})} which performs all actions though it is attributed to \( \text{\textit{tman}} \) (Self). In the case of individual mind presence of \( \text{\textit{tman}} \) motivates \( mi\&bar{y} \) for the
actions to be performed according to the nature of the mind. It is stated in

*Bhagavad Géti*,³

Nataraja Guru accepting the commentary of Darśanamälé has not pointed
out this. The statement that, "It is horizontal factor of nescience" and 'the vertical
self is always independent" does not suffice. Clarification is required for the
philosophical version of the verse. It is a fact that power (mâyā) itself is non-
intelligent and that it cannot perform any action by itself, but only at the will and
presence of ītman. Mâyā or prakṛti is inseparable from Puruṣā (the Absolute). In
the Nirguṇa state of Brahma, the Absolute; mâyā (prakṛti) is dormant and as such
there is no influence of the operative principles of Prakṛti on Puruṣa. It is only
when Puruṣa (the Absolute) wills; the prakṛti influences the puruṣa and as a

³ *Bhagavad Géti*, III/27.
result creation takes place and Saguña Brahma is formed. In human mind the ītman is influenced by the three forces of the prakṛti; viz., Sattva Guña, Rajo Guña and Tamo Guña and that all actions are being performed according to the predominance and intensity of the guṇas (operative principles of prakṛti).

4.6.5.1.  

\[
\text{\textit{sarvad}ṣa\textit{ga ev\textit{tmjatu}y kar\textit{ma sa\textit{givat}}}} \]

\[
\text{\textit{karoti na karometina j\textit{ua} karmasu sajjate}} || 
\]

(Verse 5)

The Self is always detached indeed!

One performs action as if attached due to ignorance.

The wise man saying, 'I do nothing'

Is not interested in action.

ītma, the Self; sarvad, always; asa\textit{ga} ēva, is detached indeed;

āj\textit{atay}, due to ignorance; sa\textit{givat}, as if attached; kar\textit{ma karoti},

does the action; j\textit{ua}, the wise man; na kar\textit{mi iti}, saying 'I do

nothing'; na karmasu sajjate; is not interested in action.
Commentary: Here the word *jītmā* comprises both the living Self (*jīvajītmā*) and the Supreme Self (*paramajītmā*) without distinction. Like the Supreme Self, the living Self is also always without attachment. It is because of ignoring the living Self, as well as the Supreme Self that it seems as if they participate in action. But wise men who have attained to true knowledge even when engaged in action, know for certain that they are not performing any action at all. They never have any attachment to action. What has been praised in the *Bhagavad Gītā* is, the wise man who sees action in inaction and inaction in action. In reality there is no action at all in the Self. The Self has no relation with those actions seeming to be present.

'But then where do these seeming actions exist? Who performs them? On what basis are they founded?' - When such questions are asked we say that because there is no possible place outside the Self there is no possibility of anything remaining
outside it. We are obliged to admit that all actions merely seemingly exist in the
Self, and that the agency at all action must be attributed to the Self. Furthermore,
the basis of all action is the same Self, and when it takes all possible forms it still
remains as the Great Actor (mahākārtā).

4.6.5.2. Nataraja Guru explains that, 'this verse refers to the attitude of the wise men (jñāni)
He is merely to recognise the verity of the fully verticalised status of the self to be
established correctly in the context of the Absolute. By this sort of detachement he
remains without the blemish from pluralistic activities that might tarnish his pure
self independent of all horizontal factors. The only impediment to such a pure
state is the ignorance accused by 'mâyā'. Once this horizontal tendency is
transcendent, ignorance disappears.
4.653. The Ėtman or Paramātman (the individual Self and the Absolute) actually does not do any action, though it seems to be. He is unattached. But the ignorant thinks that the every action is performed by the Ėtman or Paramātman. The wise thinks that the Absolute or the Ėtman (individual self) in unaffected, unattached, and does do any action (karma). But the inseparable miyā (prakṛti) performs all actions according to the nature of the individual mind and according to the will of the Absolute in the case of cosmological order. To quote Bhagavad Gītā:

"karma,y akarma yaÅ pas'yat
akarma,i ca karma yaÅ
sa buddhimñ manusyesu
sa yuktaÅ kṛtsnakarmakñtæ" 32

32 'Bhagavad Gītā', IV/18.
The meaning is that he who sees non-action (Akarma) in karma (action) and he who sees karma (action) in non-action (akarma) is really wise among human being. He is yoge and performs all actions. Here the selfless action and non-action are implied.

This verse is also quite similar to that of verse III/27 of Bhagavad Géti as already mentioned. It is clearly mentioned, that actions are performed by Prakṛti present in every person, i.e., the qualities of nature in him (Sattva, Rajo and Tamo gu,as) and not by the individual Self. Only the arrogant and the ignorant people think that all actions are performed by them. Nataraja Guru's interpretation is also not clear, if we take this concept as explained in Bhagavad Géti:

4.6.6.1.  
\[ jvalati jvalano vyçor vyti varĀati vyrida\| \]
\[ dhar\{t\}my san dharate khalveko vahati vyhine || \]  
(Verse 6)
The one (Self) alone as fire it burns,

As wind (it) blows,

As water (it) rains,

As earth (it) supports (and) as a river (it) flows.

ekaĀ khalu, the one (Self) alone; jvalanaĀ san jvalati, as fire it burns;

viyuÅ san viÅti, as wind (it) blows; vridaÅ san varÅati, as water it rains; dharÅtmÅ san dharate, as earth it supports; vihine san vahate,

as a river (it) flows.

Commentary: It is the one Self that takes the form of the five elements, each manifesting itself as its gross object by means of which all actions are accomplished.

4.6.6.2. Nataraja Guru observes that, phenomenal aspects of cosmology are brought together into a structural unity so as to be equated upward to the world of pure
intelligibles or downwards to the world of perceptual ontological events within the microcosmic counterparts of the universe, having the same or similar structure as the macrocosmic entity. The laws of nature hold good here. Cosmological events are to be treated as pure algebraic functions so as to be held together by the same Self-linking cosmology and psychology.

The one (eka) referred to is no other than the Absolute Self. Here the wind and the river with its flowing movements can be thought of as one belonging to complementary structural aspects, the wind being nailed as it were to the sky, and the flowing river to the solid earth. The Bhagavad Gét; and the Upaníåads faintly suggest such a structural elaboration. The linking of the earth as supporter with the term ‘¿tma’ is justified because of the rich ontological status of the earth in preference to the sky. Even the sky, when subjected to proper methodological
reduction, can be given a symmetrical parity with the earth as its negative counterpart. Rain represents a central value as a beneficent quality, blessing man that gives and him that receives. The *Tirukural* of Tiruvalluvar also treats rain in this absolute fashion independently of ends and means:

Rain creates fit food for them that eat and is itself their food (verse 12)

Should the sky run dry, there would be neither festivals nor worship (for the Gods here) (verse 18).

4.6.6.3. The sky, the air, the fire, the water and the earth actually represent *pancabhāţhis* (the five fundamental principles). The above five forms are none other than the Absolute, the *Parama Puruşa*, is not convincing. We can not say that the fire is God, the air is God, the water is God. The five fundamental elements constitute the universe. But it does not seem wise to state that everything is He. The created
things are the manifestation of God but can not be the Absolute. He exists in everything. He is not effected by the principles of *prakṛti* but all the multitudinous world and things around us are influenced by the three guṇas of *Prakṛti*.

There is an interesting story, re-told by Rāmakrishna Paramahamsa, worth mentioning in this context, to clarify the concept.

Once a Guru (master) told his disciple, that everything is *Brahma*, and that he should worship accordingly. One day while the disciple was going through a narrow path, in a thick forest, he found a violent elephant, coming towards him, upon which a mahout was sitting. The disciple expressed his strong reverence to the 'Elephant Brahma', while the mahout cried out him to go away from the path of the violent elephant. Thinking elephant as *Brahma*, the young disciple did not move
from the path according to the instruction of the mahout. The result was that the
elephant took hold the man by its drunk and threw to the nearby bushes and then
he was badly injured. When the Guru met, the disciple who was in a seriously
injured condition; the disciple pointed out that, the Guru taught him that
everything is Brahma and because of it he was badly injured. The Guru reminded
the disciple that he forgot that the mahout was also Brahma; and that his words
were not heeded by the disciple. From this it is quite clear and simple to state that
everything is not Brahma, but everything contains the element (Amãja) of God.

The Advaita vision as stated in this is illogical and confusing. The statement
of Nataraja Guru that cosmological events are to be treated as pure algebraic
functions is not understandable to the readers. The relation between Cosmology
and Psychology is not made clear. In the light of Advaita Philosophy the verse is
very clear that it is 'He' who takes different shapes as: air, sky, fire, earth, river, etc.

The Absolute not affected by His *Prakṛti* (*mâyā*), permits her to act upon Him in the great function of creation. The *mâyā* which is inseparable from Him, takes his seed and do the function of creation. The nature or qualities of the created things varies according to the three guṇas of *prakṛti* acting on them. His seed is present in everything but everything is not He.

In this context it would be useful to quote *Bhagavad Gītā*:

"bejam *mâyā* sarvabhūtāṁ *mâyāṁ
dhi prītha sanātanam
buddhir bhūddhat ān asmi
tējas tejasvin āhāṁ".33

33 'Bhagavad Gītā', VII-10.
The meaning is very clear that the Absolute is the seed of everything. He is the intelligence of the intelligent and the glory of the glorious. But Narayana Guru and Nataraja Guru do not have a separate vision of the object and the Absolute. It is not in conformity with the philosophic vision of Vedavyasa.

4.6.7.1. \textit{asti-janma-vadhi-pari, aty-apaksaya-vinijjanam} |

\textit{Aadbhyam-\textit{iha yo y\textit{ti sa niryo\textit{vyakriyam} tamana}}||} (Verse 8)

\textit{Here (in this visible world) as what exists, is born,}

\textit{Grows, transforms, decreases and attains its end,}

\textit{Is subject to six forms of becoming}

\textit{Is no other than the actionless Self:}

\textit{iha, here (in this visible world); yah, what; asti-janma-vadhi-pari, aty-apaksaya-vinja nam, as what exists, is born, grows, is transformed, decreases, attain its end; Aad-bhjvam, six forms; y\textit{ti}, what is subject}
to; sah, that; avikriyātmanā, from the actionless Self; anyāna, is no other.

**Commentary.** All the things we see in the world are subject to six forms of becoming. All these things subject to transformation are also subject to destruction and, therefore, are unreal. It is only because of the existence of a changeless Self composed of pure existence, that there is a semblance of the reality of things and their transformations. It is by dependence on such a changeless Self that the six transformations are possible. If there is no Self there is no world. It is for this reason that it has been said the world consists of the Self with its six transformations.

4.6.7.2. Nataraja Guru, sees that 'the cosmic process from a horizontal perspective with its force of creation, sustenance and re-absorption, going on eternally and cyclically,
equated and abolished in favour of a verticalised version of the Self. Two spiral
process originating at the two poles should be imagined here. The term 'asti' (is or exist) refers to the ontological and 'vinasanam' refers to the teleological. This latter
does not exist in reality, however; apply to the Self.

4.6.7.3. There is a similar verse in Vivekachudamani, of áa’kara

"janma vriddi parinathyapakāya
vyadhi nañjana viññam;vyayam
viñwa srñtyavanag;thak¡ranaE
brahma tatvamasi bhñyayñtmani"34

34 áa’kara, ‘Vivekchudamani’, Verse 259.
It is suggested that a spiritual aspirant or worshiper shall ideate on *Brahma* (Absolute) which is beyond the influence of birth, development, evolution, disease and deterioration. The *Brahma* (Absolute) is unaffected, unattached and eternal.

The Self or the Absolute is undestructible but this world created out of Him undergoes various (six) stages of existence and finally get destructed. According to the above verse though they are undergoing change, they are not separate from Him. It could be wise to state that everything take place within Him and hence not separate from Him. The Advaita concept being developed by áa‘kara, in his latter philosophies modified by coining the terms - *Vyavahyrika*, *Pratipysika* and *Paramyarthika*. That is, there is a work-a-day reality and the Absolute Reality. But Nataraja Guru or Narayana Guru did not present the terms Absolute reality and
Relative one. There is no doubt that the Absolute alone is the ultimate reality, but it is meaningless to state that the relative truth or reality does not exist.

The meaning of the verse seems to be an idea taken from earlier Advaita Philosophy of āa’kara. The term Absolute implies, the presence of relative as well.

All these inconsistencies and ambiguities are due to the want of the clear concept of Puruśa (consciousness) and Prakṛti (mâyā) which are beginningless and infinite. Everything is created due to the interactions of Puruśa and the operative principles of Prakṛti. When this aspect is conceived by the seers or philosophers or researchers of real knowledge their doubts are supposed to be ceased at least in the psychic level. Nataraja Guru’s interpretation stating that the cosmic process froms a horizontal perspective etc. does not carry clear meaning.
4.6.8.1. *svayam kriyante karm¡¸i k¡ra¸air indriyair api |*

*aham tvasa´gaÅ k£¶asthaÅ iti j¡n̄̄ti kovidaÅ ||* (Verse 9)

By means of the inner organ and the senses

Action become self-accomplished.

However, the wise man knows,

'I am the unattached, inner well-founded one.'

*k¡ra¸aiÅ indriyaiÅ api,* by means of the inner organ and the senses;

*karm¡¸i svasam kriyante,* actions become self-accomplished; *kovidaÅ*

*tu,* however, the wise man; *aham asangaÅ k£¶asthaÅ iti jijnati,*

knows, 'I am the unattached, inner well-founded one'.

**Commentary.** The Self does not act, and if we say it is the inner organ and the senses that act because they are inert, then cannot accomplish action as they are only the means of action. But if we examine how actions originate, we conclude that they are beginningless and automatic. Although all actions are accomplished
by the presence of the Self in reality the Self does not act at all. The Self remains apart and is well-founded. The man using the double process of dialectical reasoning (Ehipassiko) knows this reality with certitude.

4.6.8.2. According to Nataraja Guru, the above verse underlines the self-sufficiency and independence of the Self as conceived by a wise man standing independently as it were, above all conceivable phenomena. The term 'Kéjastha' (well founded one, or rock-fixed) clearly suggests this. The I (aham) is really the Supreme Self beyond all plurality found in the world of the intelligibles. The Supreme Self represents the goal of all spiritual aspirants.

4.6.8.3. The reference in this verse is that the individual self (jivitma) actions are performed by the nature of one's mind. The soul is not affected by any action. It is clearly stated in Bhagavad Gétá, as already stated earlier.
"prakrīte kriyāṁ jñi

gu, akarṇaṁ jñi sarvasaṁ\textsuperscript{35}

The meaning is that every action is performed by the individual according to his nature. That is, the nature represents the mental status of the individual.

There exists the three forces of prakṛti (nature) such as Tamo gu, Rajo gu, and Sattva gu. All actions are performed according to the mental status existing in an individual due to the interactions and intermix of these three forces (gu,as).

Therefore, actions are not performed by the ītman. It is unattached. However, the Ītman is under the bondage of prakṛti. So there is the question of liberation. In that sense evil actions may result in keeping the self (ītman) under the bondage of prakṛti for long and good actions may cause for the relief of the jevītman. That is

\textsuperscript{35} 'Bhagavad Gītā', III/27.
liberation from worldly life. It again goes to prove that ātman is affected from pain and pleasure due to various actions performed by the individual.

4.6.9.1.  \[dāyayayād bhīayam aham apy atōhama āuktirāgavat\]

\[adhyastam eva evopi sarvoparisthitā\]  
(Verse 10)

Because of being an object of experience

Even the 'I' is a conditioning factor

Superimposed like the mother-of-pearl gleam;

Above everything else to-day and to-morrow one alone is.

āham api, even the 'I', \(dāyayayā\), because of being the object of experience; bhīayam, is a conditioning factor; atō, because of this;

āham, I; sākti-ra‘gavat, like silver-gleam in the mother-of-pearl;

adhyastam, is super-imposed; adya evopi, today and tomorrow (i.e., always); sarvopari sthitā, fixed above all things; eka eva, one along (is).
**Commentary.** What is the object of consciousness is superimposition. (This verity has already been explained). In other words, all things that constitute objects of consciousness are unreal. Even when considered so, they have their basis in something real in order to express the unreal. Here the example of silver in the mother-of-pearl is given. When there is the superimposition of silver on the mother-of-pearl, although here is no actual silver it seems to be there. In spite of this, the unreal semblance of silver is really based on the reality of the mother-of-pearl. In a similar way all actions and the egoism causing them are superimposed on the Supreme Self. It is the Supreme Self that is alone real, remaining one and eternal. The whole world consisting of action seems to be merely a superimposition on the Self. By the expression ‘fixed above all things’, it is indicated that the Self is
pure and other worldly, transcending time and place, as well as pleasure and pain,
and that it is ultimately superior to all things.

4.6.9.2. Nataraja Guru observes that the second half of the verse finalises the status of the Absolute understood as the plus side, while the first half detracts from its ontological reality. It is of the order of superimposition (adhyāśa) in the sense that concepts are raised above sense data, revealing the empirical world. This high self belongs to the metaphysical context which is repugnant to modern positivists, empiricists, etc. and denounced as 'non-sense'. It is true that such a Self is not within the range of percepts but even raised beyond the plurality of concepts. Still its validity cannot be questioned if axiomatic thinking in which mathematics thrives is also acceptable to physicists for arriving at their laws and theories.
The Absolute cannot tolerate the duality of subjects and object. The very fact of being the content of a concept detracts from the reality of the Self. It is, therefore, compared by Narayana Guru to the epiphenomenon or iridescence imagined in a mother-of-pearl shell.

The terms ekh (one) an eva (even), however, make amends for what has been taken away from the full absolute status of this highest self. It is further underlined by the terms ‘adya’ (today) and ‘svapi’ (as also tomorrow) attesting to its eternal character. This verse finally equates the highest Self backwards to the full status of the central normative Absolute.

4.6.9.3. It would be useful to quote the following verse of Bhagavad Géti in the context.

"sa|E nyśaA karmayoga; ca

nihśreyasakarv ubhau"
There are two ways for liberation. They are sanyāsa and karmayoga (yoga of action). Karma yoga (the yoga of right action) is superior to karma sanyasa (denunciation of action) He, who performs all right actions, rather than mere surrendering every action unto the Absolute; is really great. The 'I' feeling of the individual doer is not real. It is changing and that the ultimate doership lies with the Supreme. When one's petty 'I' is transformed or changed into the divine 'I' feelings by way of sublimation it merges with the supreme 'I' and loses its existence.

According to this verse every object is a superimposition and that the objects of consciousness are unreal. The unreal has a basis on the real. Therefore the

36 'Bhagavad Gétá', V/2.
Supreme Self which is beyond all relativities; i.e., time, space and personal factors is
the only real and eternal.

4.6.10. Discussion

Nataraja Guru gives a long Prologue and Epilogue to the concept of *Karma Darśanam* (Vision of Action) of Narayana Guru, contained in *Darśanamila*.

According to the Indian spiritual tradition, the meaning of *karma* depending on *dharma* is, right action. He choses the word instrumentalism to the title.

According to Nataraja Guru, *Karma-Darśanam* is, a subtle kind of psychophysical interaction. He refers to the theory of Creative Evolution of Bergerson. He mentions Bergerson's Law of Two-fold Frengy (Law of Dichotomy) to explain the concept of the Absolute. He has made an earnest effort to integrate the mystical expression quoting those Modern and Western popular individuals like Sr.
Theresa, St. Catherine of Siena and others. According to Nataraja Guru both Eastern and Western mysticism are equally valid. He refers 'healthy-mindedness' of William James and Walt Whitman's and Richard Jefferies mysticism etc. to explain the concept of the Absolute and as a background to explain Darśanamśāla of Narayana Guru. He mentions the mysticism of Jalaludin Rumi (1207-75) a popular Sufi also to give a background to explain Darśanamśāla. As an Epilogue to the Vision of Action he refers to the Pārvata Mṛṣiṣṭi of Jaimini and the Uttara Mṛṣiṣṭi of Bṛdarjayana, to explain the methodological and epistemological aspects and their implications. He refers the verse of Chapter IV of Bhagavad Gītā to explain the concept of action and inaction. He makes use of ākara's commentary on Brahma Śūtra (IV-7) to explain the concept of action.
He admits that regarding the *Karma Darśanam* it would be more wise to depend on *Bhagavad Gētā*. He points out that Buddhism has the highest significance of the value of compassion.

However, it is well revealed from the interpretation of *Darśanamālā*, that Nataraja Guru is very particular to try to harmonize the Western and Eastern philosophies. But the fact is that the philosophy of the Absolute or spirituality is very subtle which is often found very difficult to be explained using Western philosophies or scientific theories. Nataraja Guru is found unsuccessful to explain the concept of *Karma Darśanam* (vision of action) with the help of modern scientific or philosophical theories of the West.
Chapter 7

JÖENA - DARÁNAM (Vision by Awareness or Reason)

In the Jµana-Dar¿anam (Vision by Awareness or Reason) Narayana Guru gives his philosophical views on the concept of Jµana, knowledge.

4.7.1.1.  

\[ jµ\¡nam ekam hi nirup\¡dhikam sop\¡dhikam ca tat | \]

\[ aham\¡r\¡di-henam yajjµ\¡nam tan nir\£p\¡dhikam || \]

(Verse 1)

Awareness is one and unconditioned, indeed.

That is also the conditioned.

Awareness without egoism, etc.,

That is the unconditioned.

\[ jµ\¡nam ekam nirup\¡dhikam hi, \] awareness is one and unconditioned, indeed;

\[ sop\¡dhikam ca tat, \] that is also the conditioned;

\[ yat-jµ\¡nam aham\¡r\¡di-henam, \] that awareness without egoism, etc.;

\[ tat-nir\£p\¡dhikam, \] that is the unconditioned.
Commentary. By awareness we mean that which is in the form of mental consciousness inside the bodies of animals. This enables mental consciousness to have the awareness of all things within the intelligence. This awareness which is an attribute of the Self remains as one in its true state without any activities or conditionings of the intelligence. In spite of this, when, in practical life, it is connected with egoism and other operations of mind it becomes conditioned. When it is unconnected with such factors as egoism it remains unconditioned.

4.7.1.2. According to Nataraja Guru this verse underlines the purely unconditioned and non-functional character of the absolute reason to be treated as a single nominalistic reality of value. The term ‘hi’ (indeed) stresses the utmost purity of reason as an absolute thing-in-itself. As existing beyond the reach of all functions of the human mind, reason should really be called awareness instead of a form of
active reasoning. It is not possible to bring it within the requirements of scientific
descriptions when its absolute nature is fully credited. Description is possible only
when the knower and the known are together implied as distinguishable factors.

Language must communicate and necessarily have its dual counterparts of the Self
and the non-Self. This is true whether one is talking to oneself or to someone
outside of oneself. The other man spoken of or is thought of as a generalised and
abstracted entity, existing, at least in principle, on the plus side of the vertical axis.

This is necessarily for communication in discourse where such duality is not
detracted from the absolute status of pure awareness.

The second half of this verse steps down as it were to be a position where
communication becomes more admissible. The ontological Self is what is able to
exercise its reason, however, pure it might be, when thought is conditioned by such
an ontological subjectivity or other inevitable conditionings belonging to the side of reality have necessarily to limit the scope and purity of any active reasoning. This ontological Self is, therefore, the first all-inclusive conditioning factor referring to pure awareness. The 'I' sense of egoism (ahamkāra) conditions pure awareness. This permits us to exercise the further implications of pure reason in the context of absolute wisdom. The first verse is thus, meant to give absolute awareness its full two-sided, yet unitive status before discussing other aspects in a graded sequence respecting the organic togetherness of reasoning.

4.7.1.3. The plain meaning of this verse is that real knowledge is one that which is unconditioned, devoid of ego state of mind. When knowledge is associated with one's ego it becomes conditioned and not real.
The implication of the above interpretation of Nataraja Guru is that knowledge exists in conditioned and unconditioned forms. Unconditioned knowledge, i.e., consciousness or awareness exists in that level where ego of the individual disappears or its effect becomes nil. The awareness of the Supreme, the Absolute is possible only through, an unconditioned ego reduced state of mind. If a man’s mind is highly ego centric, he cannot have the awareness of the Absolute: Nataraja Guru’s explanation of this verse is more technical and obscure.

4.7.2.1. ahantayj antar bahir asti yad evam idantayj |

bhijnvarttya'nvitam yat tu jujnam sopjdhikam matam || (Verse 2)

That which, accompanied by egoism, as if inside

And which again as qualified by thisness

Accompanied by conscious activity, such awareness

Is to be understood conditioned.
yat, that which; ahantayi bhinya vsttyi anvitam antaA, accompanied by the active consciousness of egoism (as if) inside; evam yat tu, that what again; idantayi (bhinya vsttyi anvitam bahiA ca) asti, and as accompanied by the active consciousness (thisness) is (as if) outside;
(tat) juinam, (that) awareness; sopidhikam (iti) matam, is understood to be conditioned.

Commentary: The conditioning of awareness consists of function and activity. This functioning has been already stated in chapter V, where it is present with its own specific and generic aspects, and with subtle and gross differences. Beginning from awareness of outside objects such as 'this is a pot', 'this is a cloth', and likewise to awareness of inner 'objects' such as 'I am the Absolute', all functions are to be included within the scope of the varieties mentioned above. All functional activities are the conditionings of that one awareness, although in reality independent of
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conditionings when functionally referring to corresponding 'objects', is called conditioned awareness.

4.7.2.2. Nataraja Guru views that awareness from a perspective admitting of a fundamental interplay of elements involved in general awareness belonging to the dual context of the Self and the Non-self. This gives us the double frame of reference helpful in the analytical discourse. He continues that, the interaction is present in principle but refers to the purest of notions of reason. The subjective implications fade in favour of a more positive one. The conditioning to which Self-awareness is subject to is that of the Self as indicated by the word 'adhyasa' (superimposition) and the 'vātti' (operation or function) refers to the interaction of the two selves, one psychological and the other logical, teleological; treated as two wholes pertaining to the Self and the non-Self respectively.
4.7.2.3. The ego state of mind is meant by its nature as influenced by the guṇas - Sattva, Rajo and Tama. The real vision or knowledge is possible by the Self not affected by the qualities of prakṛti. The individual Self (jīvanmukti) gets the real knowledge when it goes beyond the ego states caused by the guṇas of prakṛti (mâyā). All other visions or knowledge or awareness are conditioned. It would be useful to quote a verse.

From Ṛgveda Upaniṣad

"tad ejati tan naijati tad dēre tad vād antike

tad antarasya sarvasya tad u sarvasyajñaya bhavyataḥ." 37

Those who have conditioned knowledge of the Absolute think it is moving, it is distant. But for the yogi it is not moving. It is very near. It is within and out of everything. The sopadikam (conditioned knowledge) is one, experienced by the

37 Ṛgveda Upaniṣad', Verse 5.
egoistic level where the Supreme Self, the Absolute is not revealed clearly. This awareness is a sort, which is not related to the Absolute but the intermediary awareness. In the ego conditioned functions, one gets a knowledge or awareness which is not real and Absolute.

Nataraja Guru by the dual context of the Self and non-self may refer to the ego related self and the ego not related self (the non self the Ātman). The knowledge, that Ātman experiences is unconditioned, or Absolute. Since the language used by Nataraja Guru is more technical, the readers do not get a clear idea of the concepts explained.

4.7.3.1. 

\[
\text{anytmanjim ahamkirjdenim yena anubheyate} \\
\text{sjkAe tad jtaujnam syd yenaiva amatam aijyate} \]

(Verse 3)
That by which is experienced all things

Of the non-Self such as egoism and so on

And even by which immortality is enjoyed

(As) the Witness, is Self-awareness.

 aan‘tman’m, of things pertaining to the non-Self; ahamk‘r‘den‘m, such as egoism, etc.; s‘k‘r, the Witness (i.e., the Self); yena anubh‘yate, by what is experienced; yena eva, by which even; am‘tam, immortality; a‘yate, is enjoyed; tat j‘tma-j‘jnam sy‘d, that is (absolute) Self-awareness.

**Commentary.** There is a Witness remaining within the bodies of all beings able to take cognisance of all non-Self factors beginning with egoism and reaching out to external entities like pots and cloth. At the time of deep sleep this Witness is not subject to any change and is capable of cognising the subtlest factors in consciousness. Such a Witness is no other than the Self. The awareness by which
the witnessing Self is experienced is Self-Knowledge. It is the final conclusion of Vedānta that liberation is attained through Self-knowledge. By the use of the word eva in the text, it is intended to point out, the primary nature of this sole means of liberation. Such an awareness of Self could be described as unconditioned awareness.

4.7.3.2. Nataraja Guru sees that the term 'ātmajñāna' (Self knowledge) is defined by its reference to what is not rather than to what is. Like the nominalistic pure reason of the plus side, absolute reason abiding in the Self eludes description. Here one has to adopt the law of negative specification. All negativity is specificatory as when a sculptor eliminates chips of marble to reveal his conceived reality. Whatever after elimination is a pure Absolute witness (सक्ति) having a nominal rather than phenomenal status. Narayana Guru underlines here the nature of the self-
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realisation of the Êbsolute witness as constituting of immortality (amrtâ). This view is fully supported in the Upanìâads where we find expressions like Brahmavit Brahma-eva-bhavati, "The knower of the Absolute becomes even the Absolute".

4.7.3.3. It is further explained that the attainment of jñâna with the Êtman not influenced by the ego-state of mind, rather it only witnesses the experiencing of the knowledge of the Absolute, is termed as if 'Amritam Asnute' - meaning is that it is like the experiencing of immortality. Immortality is a state of no further deaths or births. Every man who is guided by the Êtman, the non-qualified consciousness, on attaining a state of real knowledge, Absolute jñâna becomes immortal.

The witnessing entity existing in everybody is unattached of the ego states of mind. If one realises the s/kAirÉpa entity he gets the real knowledge, for it is the projection of the Absolute in to the Jevytma (individual soul or Self).
4.7.4.1. \( \text{ahamkārīdī kīryam yad anītmakam asamkhyaḥ} \) ||

\( \text{yaṇa avagamyate nyūtmajuḥnam tad avadhīryate} \) || (Verse 4)

As innumerable effects of egoism and so on

What as pertaining to the non-Self

Attains to awareness, that is said to be

Awareness of the non-Self

\( \text{yat, what; anītmakam, as pertaining to the non-Self; asamkhyaḥ, as innumerable; ahamkārīdī kīryam, as effects such as egoism, etc.;} \)

\( \text{(tāt), that; yena, by what; avagamyate, awareness attains; (tāt), that; anītmajuḥnam (iti), as awareness of the non-Self; avadhīryate, is said} \)

to be.

**Commentary.** The non-self factors mentioned in the previous verse such as the effects of egoism, sense objects, etc., are innumerable. They pertain to the non-Self, where all objects of knowledge are found. Without knowing the witnessing Self...
which is capable of understanding all the innumerable effects, what cognises only
these objective entities is the opposite of what has been described in the previous
verse and constitutes the awareness of the non-Self. This awareness of the non-Self
is conditioned.

4.7.4.2 Nataraja Guru views that, the reference is to the multiple world of effects (kṣetram).

If the witnessing Self has its unitive place in a vertical axis linked with the
nominalistic Absolute as its transcendental counterpart, the non-self has its
participating locus at some point beyond the origin in the same vertical axis.
Instead of being a unitive factor, the non-Self tends to disperse itself into the
plurality and multiplicity of rival values. This is detrimental to the contemplation
of the Absolute. Nominalistic specification of the unique Absolute has to be
attained again by negation. Practical and utilitarian philosophies still retain a
degree of pluralism in the name of human progress. William James, John Dewey and C.P. Peirce stand for pluralism in the same way the Vaiśeṣikas do. Pluralism refers to the world of horizontal values having as important a reference as the vertical. While a philosopher recognises its presence he prefers not to disperse his interests in to the endless absurdities into which it leads him. A man who does not see unity is not a philosopher, and 'wends from death to death' as it says in the upanisads.

For purposes of discourse it is important to recognise this pluralistic reference and to retain it. One might not like to live in the climate of the equator but this does not mean the equator has no validity as geographical reference. The knowledge of the non-Self has, therefore, the knowledge of the Self as its meaning.
The clear interpretation of this verse is that the awareness or knowledge related to "an\text{\textquoteleft\textprime}\text{\textemdash}tma" (non-self) is not related to the Absolute. It is pluralistic and varied. The knowledge one obtains, according to Nataraja Guru, by horizontal vision is unreal. In the ordinary parlance, those awareness one acquires about this pluralistic world of existence is not actually related to \text{\textemdash}tman or the Absolute. It is related to the mortal. That is all knowledge related to this world, acquired by the egoistic state of one's mind is not at all related to the Absolute. They are termed as awareness of \text{\textemdash}tma (non-self).

The explanation of Nataraja Guru such as "the witnessing self" has its unitive place in a vertical axis, linked with nominalistic Absolute, does not give a clear idea.
4.7.5.1

yathāvad vastu-vijñānam rajju-tattvavabodhavat

yat tad yathārtha-vijñānam ayathārtham ato'nyathā

(Verse 5)

Knowing things as they really are

As when one attains to the truth of the rope

What makes for such, is true awareness

Wrong (awareness) is what is otherwise.

rajju-tattva-avabodhavat, like the right knowledge about the rope;
yathāvat-vastu-vijñānam, awareness of things as they really are; yat,
which; tat yathārtha-vijñānam, that is right awareness, ato'nyathā;
what is different from this; ayathārtham (ca bhavati), wrong awareness (too becomes).

Commentary. It is possible to have a right or wrong awareness of rope. That awareness which is capable of recognizing in the rope its own rope-character is right awareness. While that awareness which is capable of mistaking the same rope
for a snake due to visual defects in contrary fashion is wrong awareness. Knowing things-as-they-are is distinguished as right awareness and cognising them as them as they are not is wrong awareness. These two forms of awareness are of a conditioned order.

4.7.5.2 Nataraja Guru explains that an object is to reveal the nature of the thing-in-itself or all things-in-themselves. Reason has to avoid the four errors of actuality, virtuality, immanence and transcendence. It has to fix facts, truth and values at the central apodictic position of certitude. This is where the last vestiges of superimposition of the non-Self on the Self can be eliminated. There are two definitions of awareness: the first is called true and the second is called false. Both are defined at one stroke in the same verse. Truth and falsehood participate at right angles at their point of origin. Kant's ding-an-sich is no other than this absolute awareness.
4.753. The real knowledge and the unreal knowledge (changing knowledge) or the relative knowledge are again clarified. Real knowledge is the knowledge which is beyond the four errors of existence. Any knowledge or experience within the purview of the relativity or changing nature is explained as unreal knowledge according to the explanation given above. The concept is an adherence to the Advaita Philosophy, which does not attach much importance to the knowledge of the pluralistic world.

But for practical life the knowledge not relating to the Absolute has also its own 'locus standi'. The Advaita Philosophy being conceived by Narayana Guru and Nataraja Guru is therefore devoid of practical wisdom. The Investigator finds and realises that - the concept of paramārtha and vyavahārīka as adopted by āśāka later, have not been conceived or accepted by Nataraja Guru to explain the real knowledge and the relative knowledge. But Narayana Guru means right
knowledge as knowing things as they are; and that wrong awareness refers to the contrary. But in absolute sense the right knowledge may relate to the Paramātma (God) and wrong or incorrect awareness may mean the pluralistic or horizontalised and materialistic knowledge.

4.7.6.1. 

\[ \text{aham mameti jñānam yad idam tad iti yacca tat} | \]

\[ \text{jeva-jñānam tad aparam indriya-jñānam ēAyate} || \] (Verse 9)

That awareness which as 'I' and 'mine'

And that other as 'this' or 'that' is also there;

The former as vital awareness and the latter

As sense awareness is declared.

aham mama iti jñānam yat, the awareness expressing itself as 'I' and 'mine', tat jeva-jñānam, that as vital awareness; aparam idam tad iti jñānam yat, and that which also expresses itself as 'this' and 'that',

tat indriya-jñānam ca, that as sense-awareness; ēAyate, is declared.
Commentary. Living creatures have awareness (in regard to themselves) in the form of 'I' and 'mine'. This does not depend upon any of the external organs such as the ear, etc. Even deaf and dumb people are known to have this kind of awareness. Commonly known throughout the world. Because of such awareness depending solely on the inner vital elements, such awareness as 'I' and 'mine', depending on the vital principle, has been named vital awareness. We have to distinguish such vital awareness from awareness given to the senses which expresses itself in the form of 'this' and 'that' and is independent of any vitalistic elements, being only dependent on the senses.

4.7.6.2. Nataraja Guru observes that this verse is meant to reveal the actuality of the vertical and horizontal references kept together for the purpose of unitive reasoning. The terms 'mine' and 'I' refer to the living self and are vertical. The terms 'this' and 'that'
refer to external objects and are horizontal. Both belong together to the world of logical discourse.

4.7.6.3. Nataraja Guru refers the meaning of horizontal and vertical throughout his study.

Horizontal is meant to explain the external world which is perceived by the sensory organs, such as eye, ear, nose, tongue and skin. The knowledge or awareness one acquires through the media of sensory organs is pluralistic or horizontal which relates to the mundane, the worldly things. But for the pure 'I' feeling there is no need of the external world. It is internal and not objective. Nataraja Guru refers it as vertical. The verticalised awareness will help in the true awareness of the Absolute. The knowledge of the \textit{jivatman} residing in every individual will finally pave the way for the realisation or the attainment of the Absolute (God). It is stated that the \textit{jivatma} is as pure as \textit{Paramatma} and is a part (\textit{amrt}) of the Absolute.
Thus knowledge of the Self (individual soul) would cause for the awareness or the knowledge of the Supreme. The individual self (soul) is one not affected by the 'I' feelings caused by the three gu as of prakṛti, Sattva gu, a, Rajo gu, a and Tamo gu, a.

The ītman (soul) is gu, atheetha (beyond the qualities) and so is the part of Paramātman, the Absolute. One should not forget that though external world is deleted from awareness, there is an equally important and vast internal-world in everybody. Perhaps the internal world will be more extensive and influential than the external world. One should therefore direct oneself towards further verticalised status to get rid of the internal prakṛti (nature or power or māyā) in his search for the knowledge of the Absolute. These concepts of the 'I' feelings have not been well explained by Nataraja Guru.
4.7.1  

*aum tat sad iti nirdhi|am brahm|tmaikyam up|gatam|

**kalpan|di vih|enam yat tat para|jynam eryate ||**  

(Verse 10)

Designated as 'AUM that exists'

Attained to unity of the Absolute and the Self

Devoid of willing or other functions

That is said to be ultimate awareness.

*aum tat sat iti nirdhi|am, that which is designated as 'AUM, that exists', Brahma-|tma-ai|kyam, the unity of the Self and the Absolute; up|gatam, having attained; kalpan|di-vih|enam, devoid of all willing; (jynam) yat, what awareness there is; tat-para-jynam (iti) eryate, that is said to be ultimate awareness.

**Commentary.** It is the same unconditioned awareness of the first verse that is also treated in this verse. The word AUM is what has been conferred by ancient sages (vAis) as designating the Absolute in the form of pure awareness. The āruti
(original Vedic texts), *smrti* (traditional secondary texts) and *puréas* (epic or heroic lore), all present the same wisdom in applied form, and the word AUM is well known to be used in these texts as denoting a meaning everywhere referable to the Absolute. In other words, 'unlimited', 'absolute' and 'awareness' are the same as AUM, and this is the Absolute. Such phrases as AUM the one eternal letter is the Absolute', AUM is all that, and 'AUM is the absolute', are phrases indicating the same truth in the above body of literature. Patanjali also declares, "That Absolute remaining always untouched by harsh or painful activities is indicated by the descriptive sentences, 'the uttered syllable AUM", and 'The Lord has many names'. Of all, the most superior and general in applicability, easy to utter by all persons, and the object of meditation by everyone, is the syllable AUM. The word AUM has also the meaning of general assent. Any name applied to the Lord (*évara*) who is
of the form of pure consciousness is valid, when referred to by AUM. Because it is not capable of being referred to by any name at all, it is beyond the reach of mind and speech, it has been indicated by the relative pronoun 'that' (tat). By 'that' something is meant, which is beyond all predications. Being eternal and essentially of the stuff of pure consciousness, it is called existent (sat). This term means, it has an existent reality in all the three aspects of time. The philosophical principle indicated here is that all other things are not real, and the only reality is the Absolute. Therefore, what has been described as 'AUM' or 'that' or 'existent' are three perspectives of the same. Thus, the three syllables aum-tat-sat have been accepted in such authentic literature as the Vedas, as well-known terms for absolute awareness (which is the same as the Lord or the Absolute).
The ultimate goal of awareness is to establish the identity between the living Self and the Absolute. Within the scope of such awareness, there is neither room for such notions as Brahma (the creator) nor for the willing of the phenomenal world. Therefore, because of its superior nature and its identity with the Supreme Self, it has here been referred to as Ultimate Awareness.

4.7.7.2. Natarja Guru opines that, Narayana Guru refers here to all the important implications. The conditioned nature of reasoning adopted in the intermediate verse for purposes of discourse is fully abandoned here. Instead, axiomatic thinking is resorted to in equating the Self and the non-Self. A vertical or dialectical way of certitude is what is here implied. The Absolute can be called by any name as all propositions prove themselves. Such is the assumption here resulting from awareness of the Absolute.
The content and essence of the verse is that, the Absolute knowledge or awareness is, the one obtained by the communion of the Ėtman (Individual self) with the Paramātman where the individual willing (ica;akthi) is absent. The term parajañnam (ultimate knowledge) clearly indicates that there exists intermediate knowledge, as well. The Advaita Philosophy negates these intermediate knowledge as non-existing and unreal. But Narayana Guru using parajañnam admits the relative truth. This is a deviation from his earlier verses where he adheres to Advaita Philosophy strictly. Nataraja Guru does not explain this. This term parajañnam refers to the knowledge of the Absolute which is not conditioned by the influence of miyī (prakṛti). The knowledge or awareness through the nature of miyī or thri gu as (Sattva, Raja and Tama) becomes conditioned and not real. Real knowledge or parajañnam (knowledge of the Absolute) is possible by the yoge who
goes beyond the influence of *miṣṭi*. At the state of *prajñānam* he loses his doership or all the states of ego. The interpretation to this verse given by Nataraja Guru is very brief and hence not illucidating.
Nataraja Guru gives a dialectical information in the Prologue of the chapter as a background to understand the philosophical contents of Narayana Guru's concepts in Darśanamālī. He points out that syllogistic reasoning of Aristotle's logic helps to develop thinking based on logic. He refers to pure reason which is related to self-knowledge and self-absorption. He tries an ontological study of consciousness in the chapter. As the matter is connected with spiritual knowledge he, mainly based the study on Brahma-Sūtra and Bhagavad Gītā.

Kantian approach to pure reasoning is seen adopted. He mentions Eddington's structuralism, subjectivism, setectionism to understand the concept of awareness. He refers the scepticism of David Hume and the absorption of Hegel.

He suggests the thinking substance and absolute substance of Descartes and
Spinoza. He points out the four principal parts of metaphysics; viz., ontology, rational physiology, rational cosmology and rational theology. While discussing the concept of awareness he mentions the Newton's Law of Universal Gravitation, Pythagorean approaches to scientific certitude through which it can be proved by demonstration: He states that it is essentially dialectical in character. The term awareness is synonymously used in positive and spiritualistic sense.

In the Epilogue he asserts that salvation is the goal of wisdom. Truth must make one free from bondages. He explains the relationship between Self and the non-Self and their horizontal and verticalised implications. According to him, jñāna or awareness has unique position in the series of visions. He explains Sa'kara's Drg-dṛṣṭya-viveka (Discrimination between the seer and the seen). He refers to the conditioned and the unconditioned awareness. The relevance of svādvida of
Jainism in the context of awareness of the Absolute is explained. The influence of

‘mydy’ in different levels of vision is considered as conditioned and not real. The

logos of neo-platonism in the domain of axiomatic thinking is highlighted. He

stresses the highest value of ūnanda or bliss as the summum bonum of man's life.

Nataraja Guru thus studies the possibility of the various theories of Western and

Eastern to harmoniously make use of for the interpretation of metaphysical

theories, especially related to the Absolute, the God.
Chapter 8

BHAKTI - DARÁNAM (Vision by Contemplation)

Narayana Guru gives his philosophic concept of Bhakti (devotion) in this chapter.

4.8.8.1.  
bhaktir ītmı́-nusandhı́nam ītmı́-nanda-ghano yataA |

ītmı́nam anusandhatte sadaivı́tmavid ītmı́n ||  (Verse 1)

Meditation on the Self is contemplation

Because the Self consists of Bliss.

A knower of the Self, meditates by the Self

Upon the Self for ever.

ītmı́-anusandhı́nam, meditation on the Self; bhaktiA, contemplation; yataA, because; ītmı́, the Self; nanda-ghanaA (bhavati), consists of Bliss; tataA, for that (reason); ītmavı́t, a knower of the Self; ītmı́nam, the Self; ītmı́n, by the Self; sadı́ eva, forever, always, anusandhatte, mediates upon.
Commentary. Bhakti is meditation on the Self, the Bhagavad Gétá (III. 17) underlines the truth that a man who is always interested in the Self and satisfied in it has nothing else to do. áa’kara in the Vivekacásha (verse 32) also says the Bhakti is the meditation on the true form of one’s Self. The reason why such great importance is given to contemplation on the Self is stated in this verse by the fact that the very nature of the Self consists of Bliss. It goes without saying that it is the high value of Bliss which deserves to be meditated upon. All living beings are naturally disposed to such meditation. Therefore, the quality of representing this high value is what makes the Self fit to be mediated upon. In the world all people who have attained to Self-realisation are in truth those who contemplate the Self.

4.8.1.2. Nataraja Guru refers to ātmavit (a knower of the Self) in this verse and shows that it is wisdom and not mere religious emotion that is of primary importance.
Moreover, it is the Self itself that contemplates the Self, and not any other deity or divinity of a lower status than the Absolute.

4.8.1.3. The characteristic nature of a devotee (bhakta) of the Supreme is that he contemplates on the Paramâtman incessantly with utmost surrender, thinking that the Supreme is the sole abode of him. There is a similar verse in Bhagavad Gétâ:

"uddhared ītman ītmānaṁ
eṣṭāṁ nam avasādayet

ītmai'va hy ātmano bandhur

ītmai'va ripur ītmanaṁ 38

The Bhakta (true devotee) is he who continuously directs his Self (Ātman) towards the Absolute. Because he knows that the Paramâtman alone is the

---------
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purveyor of ultimate bliss (happiness). The 'Self' used in the verse refers to the individual Self (jñātma) and the Supreme Self Paramātma. A true devotee's mind is always filled with the blissful thoughts of the Paramātma and that he strives at every movement to attain oneness with Him.

Nataraja Guru acknowledges that the real devotion is one directed towards the Absolute only. He negates the other forms of worship by the devotees. But even worshiping symbols, (prateeka) with true devotion and careful attention towards the Parama Puruṣa - the Supreme consciousness, one can elevate or transcend himself to the level of realisation of the Supreme. The explanation given by Nataraja Guru is very short.
4.8.2.1. \textit{anusandhe\text{\textacute{y}}ate brahma brah\text{\textacute{m}}\text{\textacute{n}}\text{\textacute{a}}-ghanam yata\text{\textacute{A}}}|

\textit{sad\text{\textacute{j}} brahm\text{\textacute{n}}usandh\text{\textacute{y}}nam bhakti ity avagamyate}|| (Verse 2)

The absolute is meditated upon

Because it consists of Bliss.

Constant meditation on the Absolute

Is thus known as contemplation.

\textit{brahma}, the Absolute; \textit{anusandhe\text{\textacute{y}}ate}, is meditated upon; \textit{yata\text{\textacute{A}}}, because of this; \textit{brahma}, the Absolute; \textit{\text{\textacute{j}}nandaghanam}, consists of Bliss; \textit{sad\text{\textacute{j}} brahm\text{\textacute{n}}usandh\text{\textacute{y}}nam}, constant meditation on the Absolute; \textit{bhakti\text{\textacute{A}} iti avagmyate}, is thus known as contemplation.

\textbf{Commentary}: The Self is the same as the Absolute, and the meditation of the Self is, therefore, the same as the meditation of the Absolute. It is because the Absolute consists of Bliss that a knower of the Self contemplates the Absolute. Such a constant and unbroken meditation is what is well known as contemplation.
4.8.2.2. Nataraja Guru views that common reference for both views that the Īnanda and Brahman is the value implied in the Absolute. Both are equally made up of the stuff of essential value. The term (constant or always) underlines the principle of continuity that is of the essence of contemplation. Interrupted or piecemeal contemplation does not have any real or cumulative effect. It has to be constant and of biopolar nature.

4.8.2.3. The simple meaning of the verse is that everybody wants happiness and so everyone meditates. No one wants sorrow or pain. Therefore, Bhakti (devotion) refers to the meditation seeking happiness. Nataraja Guru’s concept of religion is based on the universal seeking of the Absolute Bliss.

A devout person continuously meditates upon the Absolute with a view to getting him lasting peace and happiness. It shall not be a casual, worship or
contemplation of the Supreme but an incessant and wilful effort on the part of one, surrendering his ego unto Him. He can alone reach to the state of bliss, when his mind becomes purified enough to get his vision. Therefore real Bhakti (devotion) is an earnest way of contemplating the ultimate source of bliss or happiness. Only the Absolute is able to impart lasting happiness (jnandam). In other words it is an intense force of attraction of the devout person towards the Absolute, the Param¡tma. But to attain true devotion is not easy. One must have a true desire and dedication and a sense of sacrificing of mental status of those sensual pleasures which hinder his progress in the path of spirituality. He would be able to surrender himself before the Absolute as has been stated in Bhagavad Gèt¡:

"śarvadharmaṁ parityajya

mim ekaE āra, am vṛaja"
aĀm tvi sarvapjpebhyo

mokĀayiAyami m ā ucaā

4.8.3.1. jnandam eva dhyāyanti sarve duÅkham na kācana |

yad jnandaparam dhyānam bhaktir ity upadiçyate || (Verse 3)

It is even Bliss that all do meditate,

No one at all (meditates) suffering.

That which is meditation of Bliss,

As contemplation it is taught.

sarve, all; jnandam eva, even Bliss; dhyāyanti, do meditate; kācana, no one; duÅkham, suffering; na (dhyāyati), does not (meditate); yat, that which; jnandaparam, as pertaining to Bliss; dhyānam, meditation; (tat, that); bhaktir ā iti, as contemplation; upadiçyate, is taught.
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Commentary: All creatures in the world desire happiness. There is not even one living being wishing for suffering. As for the Absolute it is made of Bliss. Therefore, the goal desired by all is the contemplation of the Absolute which is the contemplation of bliss, and this is (True) contemplation. Such is the teaching of all knowers of the Self:

It can also be interpreted that what is desired by all living beings and for all time, and beyond which there is no higher goal to be desired on behalf of any living creature, can also be taught of as contemplation. By the term upadiyate (is taught) it is implied that contemplation constitutes an instruction by a teacher who is kind and has the authority to teach.

4.8.3.2. Nataraja Guru states that in this verse as already pointed out, Narayana Guru on his own authority underlines a verity which is at once a secret of secrets, as well as
an overtly acceptable universal characteristic of life in general. Even when at
certain times creatures seem to enjoy suffering, as when people enjoy a tragic play,
the main direction of the flow of life towards happiness is not thereby reversed.

Thus, happiness as the goal for all living creatures gives us the key to a universal
religion. This is the basis of the 'one religion' that he always stood for.

4.8.3.3. Meditation refers to deep contemplation. As God is considered as one giving
lasting happiness, every spiritual aspirant meditates on the Absolute as being a
blissful state of reality. There are a few whose minds are often filled with pain and
suffering and that they are deep in distress and unhappiness. Though they wish to
get rid of this undesirable state of affairs they seldom meditate on the state of bliss
or the Absolute. It is due to, very deep depression. That is, even to meditate on the

Absolute as the blissful state, one should have an equipoised psychic status. The
enjoyment one gets from a tragic play is not merely artistic in spirit, but the relief one experiences, from accepting a punishment to his guilty psychic status.

Psychologically it is the identification of the character with one's mental disposition.

Though everybody aspires pleasure they are often compelled to accept sufferings.

Life does not exist without pain and pleasure. It is a mixture of both. Therefore one should try to elevate himself from the dichotomy of pain and pleasure. It is the right way of attaining lasting peace. It looks like a divine truth, and an irony that one aspiring and meditating on blissful state, faces with more and more pains and sufferings. Therefore it would be wise to get rid of both; to escape from the dichotomic status. Nataraja Guru's explanations is very short and not very effective.
4.8.1. \[ \text{\textit{ijnanda\,\,j\textit{tm}}\,brahma\,\textit{n}maitasyaiva\,\,\textit{tanyate}} \]

\[ \text{iti\,\textit{n}jcita\,\,\textit{dhe\,}\,\textit{yasa\,}\,\textit{sa\,}\textit{bhakta\,}\,\textit{iti\,}\textit{vij\,ruta\,}} \]

(Verse 5)

Bliss, the Self, and the Absolute

Are said to be the names of this alone

In whom there is such awareness

He, as a contemplative is well known.

\[ \text{\textit{ijnanda\,\,j\textit{tm}}\,\,brahma\,\,\textit{iti},\, Bliss, \, the \, Self; \, the \, Absolute; \, \textit{etasya\,} \, \textit{eva}\, \textit{n}jma, \, are \, the \, names \, of \, this \, alone; \, \textit{tanyate}, \, is \, said \, to \, be; \, \textit{iti}, \, thus; \]

\[ \text{\textit{yasa\,}, \, of \, whom; \, \textit{n}jcita\, \, \textit{dhe\,}h \, (\textit{asti}), \, there \, (is) \, sure \, awareness; \, \textit{sa\,},} \]

\[ \text{he; \, \textit{bhakta\,} \, \textit{iti\,} \textit{vij\,ruta\,}, \, as \, a \, contemplative \, is \, well \, known.} \]

**Commentary.** It is the same ultimate reality having the attributes of existence-substance-value which is also referred to as the Self, the Absolute or Bliss. Such a certitude is called contemplation (\textit{bhakti}). The man possessing this certitude is the real contemplative (\textit{bhakta}).
In this verse the truth of the great dictum (mahāvīrya), 'This Self is the Absolute' (ayam ītmē brahma), is indicated. We know by this that the Self referred to is in the form of bliss (jnandarāḍpa). The correct understanding of the meaning of this dictum is true contemplation and the man possessing this knowledge is the true contemplative.

4.8.4.2. Nataraja Guru opines that, the terms of the equation are here more intimately juxtaposed because Narayana Guru considers it very important that unless the distinction between them is completely abolished true devotion will not bear its fruit of full emancipation or liberation in the context of absolute wisdom. The term viṣṭuth (is well known) shows how Narayana Guru wants to point out that all wisdom literature (ṣrutī) justifies this point.
The terms Ėnanda, Brahma, Ėtma are synonymous for a true devotee or a meditator of God, according to this verse. Those who worship god knows that there are many names attributed to the Absolute. When this concept is well understood he becomes a true bhakta (devotee) for he sees the Absolute in everything and everything in the Absolute. Nataraja Guru's interpretation that the terms of the equation are here more intimately 'juxtaposed", that is a sort of mathematical applications to the concept of the Absolute which is not clear.

In chapter twelve of Bhagavad Gıt; there are several verses indicating the signs of a true devout (bhakta) - verses - 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, etc. But there is a very similar verse which is very worthy to quote:

"sa ĖtusgaA satataE yoge
yat;tm; d=dhani:j;cayah"
Mayy arpitamanobuddhir

Yo madbhaktā sa me priya

Meaning is that he is my dear devout who is contended, mentally united with and who has subdued his mind senses and body to Me. Really speaking a true devotee is the knower of the Absolute. He alone is the yogī who has established communion with the Absolute. All others are under the stronghold of mâyā and have only unreal vision or vision under the cover of prakṛti.

4.8.5.1. jnando'ham aham brahmātmāham asmeti rāpata

bhūvan; satatam yasya sa bhakta iti vijñata

(I am Bliss, I am the Absolute, I am the Self)

In whom in such forms,

---
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There is always creative imagination,

As a contemplative he is well known.

aham ānandaś asmi, 'I am Bliss'; aham brahma (asmi), 'I am the Absolute'; aham ātmā (asmi), 'I am the Self', iti rūpataś, in such forms; yasya, in whom; satatam, always; bhūvanī (asti), there (is) creative imagination; saḥ bhaktaś iti viśrutaś, as a contemplative he is well known.

**Commentary:** As stated in the previous verse, a contemplative having conceptually and intellectually understood the truth of the great dicta like 'I am Bliss', 'I am the Absolute', 'I am the Self', as referring to the same reality when he realises himself to be the Absolute through his own inner experience (perceptually), this state is said to be the most superior kind of contemplation. The man attaining to this kind contemplation is the best of contemplatives.
Nataraja Guru points out that, the same truth is repeated here but with insistence and with one slight difference. Here the truth is stated in the first person rather than the third. The more direct equation of the three factors involved with the Self-experienced by each person as a living and conscious human being refers to an important consideration to be fulfilled by true contemplation. Such a type of contemplation means that the integral experience of the contemplative is more important than a mere academic understanding of the subject. The word \textit{bhvan} (creative imagination) comes from the same root (\textit{bh}, to become) as \textit{anubhav} (experience). Through intellectual sympathy one becomes what one contemplates. The man who enters into his own metaphysical knowledge is called an \textit{anubhava} (one capable of true becoming). The term \textit{satatam} (always) again underlies the need for a constant continuity in meditation.
The ideation of a true devotee shall be, *Aham Ênand¡* - I am the Ultimate Happiness, *Aham Brahma Asmi* (I am the God) *Aham Êtm¡ Asmi* (I am the Self).

But Nataraja Guru has not explained the true meaning of *Aham*. In an individual, *Aham* exists in several forms, such as the static *aham* (*Tamasik aham*); the mutative *aham* (*Rajasik aham*); the sentient *aham* (*Sattva aham*) and the *j¢vatma*.

Here the 'aham' would be referred as 'j¢vatma' and not the other forms of feelings.

This point would have been explained by Nataraja Guru to eliminate confusion and instill clarity and meaningfulness. The concepts like 'Aham Brahma Asmi', has created much confusion and distorted meanings to the devotees of God. It would be more practical to teach a spiritual aspirant that, I am a part of *Brahma* - rather than I am *Brahma* - no individual soul is infinite. Infinite is the nature of *Brahma*.

The individual *¡tma* becomes one with the Supreme only at the state of communion.
Therefore, those who are meditating upon the God should be told that - they should contemplate God with his īśman and not with his different 'I' feelings. It is the only practical remedy for removing the false notion created in the people as a result of the concept of 'Aham Brahmasmi'. If a person meditate upon the Brahma with his 'I' feeling originated from the Rajoguṇa of the prakṛti (mâyā) he would become a worshiper of power only and not the Puruṣa, the divine and the infinite consciousness. Since this concept has not been well explained and clarified by many seers or philosophers there exists misleading and wrong concepts in the minds of the seekers of truth and devotees of the Absolute.

4.8.6.1. *evam paśyati kutrīpi vidyān īśtasukham vinv |
na kīcchid aparam tasya bhaktir eva gareyasi* ||

(Verse 8)
For the wise man who sees

Thus at any place whatever

There is nothing at all other than Self-Bliss;

His contemplation verily is the highest.

evam, thus; vidvijn, the wise man (of the Self-knowledge); kutra api,
at any place whatever; ītma-sukham vinī, other than Self-Bliss;
aparam kiṣcid (api), (even) a little of anything else; na pañyati, does
not see; tasya bhaktiśī eva, his contemplation verily; gareyasi, is most
exalted.

**Commentary.** In the same way as worldly people enjoy sensual pleasures on the
basis of the Bliss of the Self, so too the wise man enjoys Self-Bliss everywhere. He
does not see anything but Self-Bliss in any object of interest. Because a wise man
knows the unity of the living Self and the Supreme Self, the bliss he enjoys
everywhere is known by him to belong to the Self. What is more, he treats without
any difference all such bliss anywhere and in any creature as belonging to himself.

In other words, the bliss of the creature is identical with the Bliss of the Self. The wise man understands this verity. Because he is capable of seeing all bliss as pertaining to the Absolute, his contemplation is called the most exalted.

4.8.6.2. Nataraja Guru observes that value appreciation is not confined to idealistic or conceptual levels. The painter's joy in mixing colours on his palette is not of a conceptual or intellectual order. This verse is meant to underline how the same value of Self-contemplation is present at every possible level whether it be perceptual, conceptual, negative or positive. The term vidyā (a knower) is meant to underline the fact that this is a truth only evident to a person who is sufficiently instructed so as to see the common ground uniting the existent and subsistent aspects of Absolute reality. At the levels of the 'nous and logs' the well instructed
man sees the same universal element of Self-Bliss. This form of Bliss is exalted above all other possible values.

4.8.6.3. For a true devotee of God, happiness is one related to the Supreme Bliss and nothing else. But for an ordinary man, his happiness is associated with sensual pleasures. A man of real wisdom or knowledge contemplates on God as the sole provider of Bliss or Happiness. He thinks that the pleasure or pains relating to the mundane living are transitory in nature and that everlasting Happiness or Bliss can be had only in the blissful communion with the Absolute. It is this idea which ought to have been clarified by Nataraja Guru while interpreting the meaning of the philosophical verses of Narayana Guru.

It would be useful to quote a related verse from Bhagavad Ge\'tj.
The meaning is that he who sees God equally present in every things and everywhere as everlasting, alone reaches the Absolute (Brahma).

4.8.7.1. \( \textit{loka} \text{sa} \textit{pi} \text{tari svasa} \text{ya gura} \text{u pita} \text{ri mytari} \) |

(Verse 9)

4.8.7.2. \( \textit{sabyasa sthi} \text{pitari ca tatpathenaiva yitari} \) |

Towards the Father of the World, to one's Spiritual teacher, father, mother;

\( \textit{nityantari ni} \text{ti} \text{iddhasya sarve} \text{apit hitakartari} \) |

(Verse 10)

\( \textit{yo} \text{\'nur} \text{igo bhaktir atra si pari paramitmani} \) |
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Towards the founders of Truth and

Towards those who walk in the same path;

Towards those who put down evil

And those who do good to all, what sympathy

There is, is devotion here; what here

Belonging to the Self-Supreme is the ultimate.

9) lokasya pitari, towards the Father of the World; svasya, to one’s;
gurau pitari m¥tari, spiritual teacher, father, mother; satyasya
sth¡pitari ca, and towards the founders of Truth; tatpathena eva
y¡tari, towards those who walk in the same path.

10) niÀiddhasya niyantari, towards those who put down evil (i.e.,
towards those who control (their subjects) from forbidden actions);
sarveÀym hitakartari (ca), (also) towards those who do good to all;
anur¡gaÁ yaÁ, what sympathy there is; saÁ bhaktiÁ, that is
devotion: *atra param/tmani*, here, what belongs to the Supreme Self;

*s/j parj*, that is ultimate (devotion).

**Commentary.** All humans need adoration to a God for the sake of securing their happiness here as well as hereafter. Those who desire liberation also need the same for the sake of the purification of the Self. It is also important that all persons should respect their spiritual teacher with the same respect given to God, because of their help in removing ignorance and bestowing the light of wisdom. It is the duty, moreover, of every human being to have respect and regard for his mother and father because they caused his birth and suffered for his sake many inconveniences.

When truth and righteousness decline in the world there are people like Ríma, Kåśå, Buddha and Jesus who come for the regeneration of mankind and for once again establishing truth and righteousness. There are also those who
follow the footsteps of such men and they constitute good models. It is good that people have respect and regard for such personalities. In the same way it is but right that they should have respect and regard for people who control and prohibit bad acts like murder, robbery, drunkenness and debauchery. But doing this they give protection to everybody and nurture goodness among men.

4.8.7.2. Nataraja Guru explains that, the various items can be arranged here in a descending order on a vertical axis, ranging from the more contingent to the more practical and necessary items. The implications of this have been explained already by Narayana Guru in his own commentary on these two verses. The only point to be noted here is that the father of the world even if represented as a most high God is to be treated inclusively as comprehended in that ultimate transcendental-cum-
immanent contemplation mentioned in the last lines. The equation here is one between the immanent and transcendent aspects of the Self.

4.8.7.3. There are persons - who revere their parents, the good doers, and those who are established in Truth. Their reverence can also be termed as Bhakti. But if this devotion is directed towards Paramātma, it is called parabhakti - or the true devotion. In short devotion in its divine sense, or good sense is represented by the attraction of the individual Self towards the Supreme (Absolute).

Nataraja Guru's explanation that, "the various items can be arranged in a descending order or a vertical axis ranging from the more contingent to, more practical, etc. is not convincing and it does not give clear meanings. In fact the explanation given by Nataraja Guru has made simple concepts more intricate and complex."
4.8.8. Discussion

Nataraja Guru's translation of the term 'Bhakti' as contemplation seems not to convey the full meaning. Devotion and contemplation do not carry the same meaning. Bhakti can be described as a strong desire accompanied by earnest effort on the part of the individual to attain the Absolute, surrendering the sense of ego unto Him. Constant contemplation or ideation of the Supreme follows. But the exaggerated forms of Bhakti have already been condemned by the seers like áa’kara, Buddha and others. The object of adoration is the cosmological Absolute.

The terms self and non-Self are identified and clarified by Nataraja Guru in a convincing manner in the Prologue. He has explained renormalisation as a process by which the Self and non-Self abolish their differences in respect of axiomatic or experimental certitude. He states that adoration of the Self is the essence of Bhakti.
He refers Bhagavad Géti and UpaniÁads to explain the term Bhakti. He points out the highest form of good in the ethics by Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus and others in this context. Nataraja Guru denotes the historical, sociological, psychological or axiological perceptions of the concept of Bhakti (self contemplation). He states that it is svânanda (self-happiness) which constitutes the highest happiness. He suggests the importance of Bhakti (devotion) in the four stages of Brahmacarya (students life), Grahastha (life of a householder) Vînaprastha (life of a forest dweller) and Sanyôsa (life of renunciation).

Nataraja Guru mentions the Christian or Roman civilisations before and after the Renaissance to explain the then existing morals. He cites the contributions of Voltaire and Rousseau in the path of civilisation and social progress. Rousseau's Social Contact and Emile are examples of the cultural advancement. In the
educational theory of Rousseau, the concept of reverence to one’s spiritual teacher (guru-bhakti) is very much dominant. Nataraja Guru refers to the concept of bhakti, as the highest means of attaining liberation as stated by āa’kara in ‘Vivekacārāṇi’.

In the Epilogue Nataraja Guru states bhakti as devotion or contemplation as understood in Upaṇiṣads; in the theological, cosmological, psychological, and axiological contexts. In this connection he considers Indian religions as both pagan and prophetic, i.e., there exists barbarian culture and the subtlest spiritualistic culture. He refers to Brähmanas, Bhakti Sūtra, Geśi Govinda, etc. to elicit the true sense of bhakti. He specifically mentions the Bhakti Yoga chapter of Bhagavad Geśi. He points out the three concepts, the Bliss (jnānda) the Self (jīma) and the Absolute (Brahman) associated with the term bhakti. He gives the examples of Sree
Ramakrishna, Ramalinga Swami and Ramana Maharshi; the three modern mystics while explaining Bhakti Darshanam of Narayana Guru.

Though Nataraja Guru refers many old and new Western philosophers and seers; to explain bhakti; he depends mainly upon Indian philosophers or seers. To understand the views of Nataraja Guru one must thoroughly go through the Prologue and Epilogue rather than confining to his interpretation merely on the verses.
Narayana Guru unfolds his concept ‘yoga’ in this chapter.

5.9.1.1. \( \textit{satana}m \ \textit{y}o\textit{jayati} \ \textit{yad} \ \textit{yunakti} \ \textit{ca} \ \textit{cid}t\textit{mani} | \)

\( \textit{mano} \ \textit{nirodha} \ \textit{r}\textit{epo}yam \ \textit{sa} \ \textit{yoga} \ \textit{iti} \ \textit{\&amsita}\textit{\&} | \) (Verse 1)

That which always unites the mind

With the Self that is consciousness in essence, and also gets united with it

And which is so of the form of restraint,

That is praised as Yoga.

\( \textit{yat}, \textit{that which}; \ \textit{cid}t\textit{ma}, \textit{in the Self that is consciousness in essence}; \)

\( \textit{mana}\textit{\&}, \textit{the mind}; \ \textit{satatam}, \textit{always}; \ \textit{yojayati}, \textit{unites}; \ \textit{yunakti} \ \textit{ca}, \textit{and gets united}; \ \textit{nirodha-r}\textit{epa}\textit{\&} \ \textit{sa}\textit{\&} \ \textit{ayam}, \textit{that which is of the form of restraint (of the mind)}; \ \textit{yoga}\textit{\&}, \textit{Yoga}; \ \textit{iti} \ \textit{\&amsita}\textit{\&}, \textit{is praised to be}. \)
**Commentary:** The correct meaning of the word *yoga* is the union of the mind, when rid of all dross of nescience, with the (reasoning) Self. This is *yoga* or union. The mind has in it many activities which come under nescience, etc. When all such activities have been countered by the means that have been indicated in the wisdom texts, and when the mind is thus made to unite with the pure Ultimate Self, such a branch of knowledge is called *Yoga*. The radical *yuj* is used in texts as meaning *samādhi* in the expression *yuj-samādhau* (Union in *samādhi* by Pāṇini, the great ancient grammarian and linguistic authority), and we are, therefore, justified in treating *Yoga* and *samādhi* as pertaining to the same subject. The saying of Patañjali in one of his opening sūtras that *Yoga* is the restraint of the mind, as well as the definition of Viśmiki in the *Yoga-Viśmīṭha* which says that *Yoga* consists of the act or means of tranquillising the mind, all indicate the same meaning of *Yoga.*
Because Yoga mainly consists of restraint of the mind, it is referred to as consisting of this restraint in general terms. It is not enough, however, that the activities of the mind should be merely mechanistically restrained (in a unilateral sense), but it is also to be understood that the mind when restrained should be constantly joined to the reasoning Self ($cid/tm$). What is more, such a union should also take place so as to justify the name of Yoga properly understood.

4.9.1.2. Nataraja Guru points out that the intention is to give a revised definition of Yoga in terms of the restraint ($nirodha$) found in the Yoga-Śtras of Patanjali. There is, however, a slight revaluation to be noticed. Instead of referring to restraint of all the functions or the mind, there is a special kind of control exercised over horizontal tendencies. This is to that the mind will gain a vertical and positive orientation enabling it to meet on equal terms with its more positive counterpart,
the reasoning Self (cīd/tm), with which it is ready to unite, to descend in to its arms, as it were. The two-sided reciprocity implied between the two poles of the total structural situation, globally understood, constitutes the delicate revaluation and restatement that we have to note in this revised definition of Yoga.

By the final use of the term āmsītā (is praised), Narayana Guru wants to say that such a definition is already implied and accepted by the well-known classical scholars of Yoga such as Pāṇini, Patañjali, Vīlmekī, Vyśa, Bhoja Rīja and others. Patañjali’s definition is retained as an overall factor of global restraint involved in the totality of the situation, rather than restraint of the mind in a limited and misleading dualistic sense as proper in the context of Śiśekhya Philosophy.
4.9.13. Yoga is the communion of Ājñatma with paramātma. At this state of communion all activities of mind are ceased. It is attained by conscious ideation of the Supreme by the individual Self. It is not merely Cittavritti nirodhā by force but is caused as a result of ideational purity and the purification of mind. The Ītman escapes from the bondages of mind or prakṛti. The liberation is for the Ītman which is under the constant bondage of mind, constituted by Prakṛti (Sattva guṇa, Rajo guṇa, and Tamo guṇa).

In Bhagavad Gītā, it is stated that "samatva/E yoga ucyate". It is a balanced state of mind where everything is viewed with equanimity and it is a state of mind when pain and pleasure caused by all mundanities disappear or it can be stated as one where all pluralities or horizontalities (as named by Nataraja Guru) vanish.

\[42\] Bhagavad Gītā, II/48.
Everything is viewed as one and oneness prevails. The terms ‘horizontal tendencies’ or vertical and positive orientation are not very clear. It is to be explained as īdānwam (upward) - upward movements of mind. The mathematical application does not hold good to explain the state of yoga.

A yogi by constant meditation of the Absolute purifies his mind and consequently the ātman gets liberated from the grip of the mind stuff; the prakṛti or māyā. One shall practice the withdrawal of the mind from sensual pleasures and at one time all the activities of the mind will be suspended and the Self merges with the Absolute, the blissful state. It seems useful to quote a verse from Bhagavad Gītā which suggests the necessity of the individual mind to withdraw itself from sense objects.
"yad¡ saÆharate cj’yam
k£rmo’’ganë’va sarvarva¿aÀ
indriy¡, e’ndriy¡rthebyas
tasya prajµ¡ pratiÆhit¡"

Meaning is that one should withdraw his mind from senses, from sense, objects, to make it stable, as if a tortoise draws its limbs from all directions.

4.9.2.1. na draÀ¶¡ dar¿anam da¿yam vidyate yatra tatra hêt

yojaye· v¦san¡ yvad yogo’yam iti yogavit || (Verse 2)

Where, the seer, the sight and the seen
Are not present there the heart
Should be joined as long as incipient memory factors (are present);

Such is Yoga, (says) the knower of Yoga.

43 'Bhagavad Gétï', II/58.
yatra, where; draśţa darśanam dāyam ca, the seer, the sight and the seen; na vidyate, are not present; tatra, there (i.e., in the Ultimate Self); hṛt, the heart (or mind); yvāt vīsanā (vidyate), as long as incipient memory factors (are present); yojayet, should be joined; ayam yogā, such is Yoga; iti yogavit (vadati), (says) the knower of Yoga.

Commentary: The seer, the seen and the sight, or, in other words, the knower, knowledge and what is known, are called in Vedānta tripūṣi (tribasic prejudice). In the true form proper to the Self there is no tripūṣi. When the outgoing activities of the mind have been restrained and the attitude of samādhi (peace) is reached, there is no room for the operation of tripūṣi. In that state of peace, the form of the Self free from of tripūṣi becomes revealed without any hindrance. Patañjali has also described this state as, 'then takes place the attainment of the proper form of the
This form is free from tripūṣi and is of the status of sat-cit-ānanda (existence-subsistence-value or bliss). As soon as one comes out of the state of samādhi the tribasic prejudice (tripūṣi) asserts itself and the many activities of the mind produce attachment and aversion and the consequent sensations of pleasure and plain. The incipient memory factors (vīsanīs) which remain in the inner faculty of the mind is the subtle and potential source causing all the varied activities of the mind. Therefore, until such time as these vīsanīs are weakened and completely destroyed it is necessary to unite the mind with the Ultimate Self which is free from tribasic prejudice (tripūṣi), and, thus, to practice (the art of) samādhi (i.e., the wisdom of supreme peace which is that of Yoga). It is such a kind of Yoga that has been stated by qualified persons who have experienced this type of peace as consisting of true Yoga.
Nataraja Guru views, it as the philosophical interpretation of the way of yogic orientation of the Self which is referred to here as the heart (हर्त) that is implied in the purpose of this verse. The yogic first of all required to abolish through intense philosophical reasoning the tribasic prejudice (त्रिपुश्यी) which hinders the contemplation of the Absolute. This tribasic prejudice consists of the three discrete elements of knowledge, known and knower or seer, seen and sight. When treated horizontally they still remain disjunct from each other but when contemplation establishes a verticalised orientation at the heart of the Self, they absorb each other. This absorption is an interchange of essences melted and mixed by the purer, more liquid and transparent mind which can relate the heart or the lower Self when it is fully transparent, with its own higher counterpart. The lower Self is necessarily coloured or conditioned by the विसंज्ञ (incipient memory factors), however, faint or
feeble. This keeps the two counterparts apart without their being able to enter into
more perfect unity. An effort is here recommended on the part of the yogè, but this
effort is to last only so long as the viṣanīs are still operative.

This reference to effort is reminiscent of the duality of Patañjali, but none
the less, it is retained even in this revised version for the purposes of structural
consistency and communicability. The use of the term vīt (knower) at the end of
the verse is to indicate that there are in this world persons who are experts on the
subject and know the most important aspects of yoga according to their own
correct philosophical views.

4.9.2.3. In the state of yoga the tribasic prejudices such as the seer, the seen, and the sight
are dissolved and the lasting tranquillity of oneness is experienced by the yogè. The
viṣanīs - instinctual and intellectual intricacies do get reduced or nullified at the
state of Samadhi (yoga) or communion. In Savikalpa Samadhi, the state of pure 'I' feeling exists, but in Nirvikalpa Samadhi that feeling is also lost. i.e., the seer the seen and the sight concepts vanish. When a yoge returns from Samadhi into his mind the visanjs and other disturbing factors of the mind became active. The intensity of the disturbances varies from individual to individual according to the purity of mind stuff.

In Nataraja Guru's interpretation, such as the absorption is an interchange of essence melted and mixed by the purer, more liquid and transparent mind which can relate the heart etc. do not sound clear.

4.9.3.1. nimeshamp idam sarvam brahmaiveti vileyate

yad brahma, i mano nityam sa yoga iti niṣcita|| (Verse 3)
All this consisting of name-form (knowing)

As verily the Absolute, the mind ever merges

In the Absolute, what constitutes such,

As Yoga is ascertained.

$idam \text{n}a\text{ma}-\text{r}\text{Epam sarvam}$, all this of name-form; $\text{brahma eva iti}$, as verily the Absolute; $\text{mana\text{A}}$, the mind; $\text{nityam}$, always; $\text{br\text{h}ma\text{A}}$, in the Absolute; $\text{vile}\text{yate}$, gets merged; $(\text{iti})$ $\text{yat}$, (such) what is; $\text{sa\text{A}}$, that;

$\text{yoga\text{A}}$ $\text{iti}$ $\text{n}\text{ijcita\text{A}}$, as Yoga is ascertained.

**Commentary.** As stated in the previous verse, it is not easy to restrain mental activity and to remain in the unconditioned and calm contemplation of the Absolute, fully free from tribasic prejudice ($\text{tr\text{ipu\text{G}i}}$) and operation of the three nature modalities ($\text{tri\text{gu\text{a}}}$. It is difficult to remain always in a kind of peace which is without any mental activity at all. Even if we should repeat the word Brahman (the Absolute) any number of times, the world of name-form made manifest within
consciousness. When the reasoning mind is distracted by interests of ordinary life consisting of worldly thoughts, the attainment of samādhi (peace) is not possible.

Then how is it possible to accomplish such a Yoga?

This verse intends to give the answer to such a question for the aspirant who wishes spiritual progress through Yoga, and puts the question with an intense desire to know an alternative way. Instead of trying to see this visible world as consisting of name-from, and, thus, as entirely false, it is recommended here as easier on the basis of the mahāvyākyas (great sayings) such as 'Everything here is the Absolute', to look upon the whole phenomenal universe as consisting of the Absolute. It is not easy to turn from the long mental habit, enduring through many births, telling us the world is real. Even though to a discriminating mind the
world is philosophically false, the appearance of the world as real still continues to be operative.

Narayana Guru now makes reference to a verse in his *Advaita Depikā* (Lamp of Non-Duality), which states that even when discrimination has abolished the reality of the world, it continues to be given to the senses just as to a man who has lost his sense of direction, the error could persist for sometimes even after the orientation has been intellectually corrected. A mistake might continue to persist for sometime even after its recognition as a mistake merely by force of habit. There is also reference to another verse in the *Etmapadejēa āatakam* where Narayana Guru states the converse possibility and says that all things are real enough but that the man of philosophical disposition could comprehend the unity underlying all things.
This alternative case can be easily practised and is here recommended in view of an aspirant, who, by practising this kind of Yoga for a long time until the incipient memory factors are eliminated, will accomplish the same purpose of Yoga otherwise more difficult. It is to underline the continued practice that the word nityam (always) has been used. Patanjali also underlines this same verity when he says that by long practice without interruption in a reverent spirit of service, one is capable of stabilising certitude. Such an unceasing practice is itself Yoga.

4.9.3.2. Nataraja Guru regards that, Narayana Guru now enters into the domain of Yoga as something to be practised by a spiritual aspirant. He takes care, however, not to enter in to the overt, gross or brute physical aspects of the practice, and prefers to begin by inserting the thinnest end of the wedge. He refers to the most subtle of epistemological factors called nama-rupa (name and form). These factors
represent the relations and relata constituting the complex conglomeration called

the Universe as the total reality inwardly confronting the contemplative yogé.

When these monadic entities made up of name and form are mentally brought
together and verticalised through meditation, the resulting knowledge will abolish

all pluralistic items of interest, however, numerous they might be. They all become

merged into one vertical axis and finally become absorbed in the crystalline unity

of the Absolute.

What is recommended here as the proper objective for the yogé is to

constantly link his negative subjective mind to such a positive notion of the

Absolute. This kind of discipline implies a form of intellectual certitude about the

nature of the Absolute. The word niscitah (is fixed as certain) is expressly
underlined by Narayana Guru to show how conviction is also a condition of yoga, not mere practice.

4.9.3.3. This world is a conglomeration (group) of various objects with definite names and forms (mama r£pa). A yog¢ is to see that these are the manifestation of God, the Supreme entity. He must see God in every created things. In Bhagavad Get¡ there is a practical concept:

"sarvabh£tastham ¡tm¡naÆ

sarvabh£tani c¡`tmani

ekÅte yagayuk¡tm¡

sarvatra samadar¡anaÆ""44

44 'Bhagavad Get¡', VI/29.
The yogi who is united in identity with the all pervading, infinite consciousness sees unity everywhere. He beholds the Self present in all beings and all beings in the Self.

Nataraja Guru's statement that - these monadic entities made up of names and forms are mentally brought together and verticalised through meditation, the resulting knowledge will abolish all pluralistic items of interest classification and simplification, does not give a clear idea. His method of explaining philosophical aspects does not stand exposed. The essence of these exposition is that when a yogi establishes his relation with the Absolute, thinking that - everything is His manifestation, the influence of the pluralistic world in his mind will subside and will be absorbed in thought of the Supreme.
\textbf{4.9.4.1.} \textit{cittasya tailadhåvat vñttya\textasciitilde{}vicchinnayå\textasciitilde{}stma,} Ṣ |

\textit{nirantaram ramyate yat sa yogo yogëbhå\textasciitilde{}små\textasciitilde{}taÅ} ||

(Verse 4)

That unbroken functioning of reason

Which in the Self, like a streak of oil

Finds incessant joy, such as Yoga

Is by yogës recognised.

taila-dhåvat, like the streak of flowing oil; avicchinnayå, unbroken;

cittasya vñttyå, by the functioning of the reason; átmanå, in the Self;

nirantaram, incessantly; ramyate (iti) yat, (in that) it finds joy; saÅ

yogaÅ (iti), that (as) yoga; yogëbhå\textasciitilde{}små\textasciitilde{}taÅ, is recognised by yogës.

\textbf{Commentary.} The kind of Yoga practised under conditions where no definite rules

are observed, and where the mind still remains distracted, does not yield the results

of the high state of samå\textasciitilde{}dhi (peace). It is not conducive to Self-realisation, because

of the many hindrances. Like the incessant flow of the streak of oil when poured
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from one vessel into another, there must be an unbroken continuity of the relation
of a stilled mind, which whole-heartedly has to be turned towards its proper object
of meditation with continuity and without any interruption, before Self-realisation
can be accomplished. In this way the practice must be continued until the goal is
attained. Occasional meditation will not produce the desired result. It has been
pointed out that the attainment of the goal of Yoga is accomplished only after
many lifetimes of practice. Thus, there is the need for incessant practice. It is only
when such a high state of attainment is reached that one can say that such a state
as found in the text is firmly established and one is not perturbed even by disasters.

4.9.4.2 Nataraja Guru observes that the purpose of this verse is to bring in the value factor
or joy or bliss (nanda). The analogy of a streak of oil flowing when it is transferred
alternatively from one vessel to another is well known in texts on Yoga. When
meditation is interrupted the communicative effect of the intimacy of the union of
the counterparts involved is disrupted and made to suffer damage. The
participation has to be unbroken although at certain stages of the meditation due
to such factors as the alternation or respiration etc., the streak of oil representing
the interchange of essence between counterparts might be thinner than at other
stages. The continuity principle on the process of meditation is therefore, very
important as known in the esoteric texts on Yoga. It is to indicate the importance
of such secret indications that the word smṛta (traditionally recognised) is
employed here.

4.9.4.3 Nataraja Guru has well explained the need for continuity of meditation without
breaking the ideational spirit. A yogé has to maintain psychic ideation of the
Absolute incessantly for establishing and maintaining absorption in the thought of
the Supreme. There is a similar verse in the chapter eight of *Bhagavad Gētā*:

"**abhyāsayogayuktena**

**cetasī niḥnyagminī**

**paramāp puruṣām divyāḥ**

**yīti pṛthiṣṭucintayan**

The spirit of the verse is that a yogī (spiritual aspirant) shall be well
dispassionate internally; that is he should control his mind from wantering in
search of those objects giving him pleasure. He should meditate and concentrate
on the divine *Puruṣā*, the Absolute. He should not try to break the continuity of
the *bhīva* (ideation) of the divine *Puruṣā* (God). Unless one earnestly and wilfully

---

tries to withdraw his mind from sensual objects he cannot meditate on the Absolute and attain the supreme spiritual goal.

4.9.1. \[\text{yato yato mano } y\!^t\!\text{i } \text{sadj} \text{\'tmani tatas tata} \text{\=} \]\n
\[\text{niyamsa yojayed etad yogo'\text{yam } uy\!\text{yat} \text{\=m iha } | \|} \quad \text{(Verse 5)}\]

\textit{To which or which other (interest) the mind goes}

\textit{From that or that others into the Self}

\textit{Ever restraining it, it should be joined;}

\textit{In such Yoga here let it be united.}

\textit{mana}, the mind; \textit{yata, yata}, from which or which other (interest); \textit{y\!^t\!i}, goes; \textit{tata}, from that or that other; \textit{etat}, this (the mind); \textit{niyama}, having restrained; \textit{sadj}, always; \textit{\'tmani}, in the Self; \textit{yojayet}, should be joined; \textit{ayam yogo\=A}, this is \textit{yoga iha}, in this here (yoga); \textit{uy\!\text{yat} \text{\=m}}, let it be united (i.e., let it be joined, let \textit{sam\=j\text{\=dhi} be practised}).
Commentary: As stated in the Bhagavad Gītā (VI. 26),

Whatever causes the changeful unsteady mind to go out (again and again), from each such, restraining (it again and again) it should ever be led to the side of the Self.

As it is difficult to keep the mind in a form of unbroken meditation on the Self, after the manner of the streak of oil that is unbroken and continuous, this alternative method of meditation is suggested in order to lighten such a difficulty.

One should watch out carefully and incessantly for any change that might take place in the mind in its goings and comings. Without one being aware of it, the mind by its incipient memory dispositions tends to follow one or other extraneous interest. In every such case one has to discover the straying of the mind and bring it back by force so as to establish it again in the Self. This Yoga is none other than
the constant effort to bring back the mind and establish it in the Self. Such a Yoga
has always to be practised. As again states in the Bhagavad Gétï (VI. 28):

Ever uniting thus the Self, that yoge, rid or dross, having contact with the

absolute, enjoys easily happiness that is ultimate.

4.9.5.2. Nataraja Guru observes that, this verse, being in a central position, has its own
realistic approach which is neither too philosophical nor too practical. It is when we
recognise such detailed consistency in the arrangement of the verses, as also in
every detail of the terms employed, that the fine workmanship of Narayana Guru
becomes evident in each of the visions (darçanas) that constitute his Garland of
visions.
It is well known that the mind, by its associative process, keeps wandering from interest to interest. Each item of interest has its incipient memory factors (v\text{-}san\text{-}j) determining the interest operating from a lower level. The yog\text{e} practising meditation has the task of constantly keeping his mind from other interests. This is the form of restraint that he has to practice at all times. The word \textit{iha} (in this here) used at the end of the verse correctly refers to the "here and now" aspect of the situation as something the practising yog\text{e} has to attend to immediately whether or not mentioned in the yogic texts and known to experts.

4953. Nataraja Guru's explanation is convincing and clear. He does not use here technical or mathematical jargons to explain the philosophical concepts. A yog\text{e} should practice to control his mind from various objects giving him pleasure and pain. It is relevant to quote \textit{Bhagavad G\text{e}t\text{j}}:
A spiritual aspirant should withdraw his restless mind from all those objects attracting it. He should repeatedly try to fix his mind on the Absolute, the God. It is essential that a yogi should not be attached to the world around or shall not remain under the strong bondages of pleasure principles. He must withdraw his mind (senses) from various objectivities and direct it towards the Supreme. This is highly essential for every spiritual aspirant.

(Verse 6)

4.9.6.1.

`sarynarthakaraA punsíñ samkalpaA kalpitaiA saha` |

`unmálya vsanjjílair yenítmání nirudhyate` ||

(Verse 6)

Uprooting those incipient memory factors of willing

The source of all human disasters, who

Together with their various willed objects

Restrains in the form of Self (saying),

What is seen has no existence as such,

Thus what seen is the Seer's self

He among knowers of Yoga

Is the most superior.

6. pums/m, for man; sarva-anartha-karaÅ, which is the source of all disasters; samkalpaÅ, willing; kalpitaÅ, with the objects of wilful desire; v/san-j/laiÅ saha, together with the various incipient memory factors belonging to the will; unm£/ya after uprooting; yena, by whom; ¡tmani, in the Self; niruddhyate, is restrained.
7. *dasya*, to the visible objects; *na astitvam*, there is no existence;

*dya (astitvam asti)*, it is the seer (that has existence); *ata*, thus;

*dya dhitmakam (bhavati)*, the seen is the form of the seer; *iti*,

thus; *ya*, who; *drg repe*, in the form of the Self; *yugeta*, joins; *saa*

*yogavidm vara*, he is the superior knower of *yoga*.

**Commentary.** The act of the will is the source of all suffering. Every wilful act arises in accordance with the incipient memory factors corresponding to it. The act of willing arises in accordance with some deep-seated incipient memory factors, having there lain rooted for a long time. Therefore, the yogi or the man of meditation who is interested in avoiding suffering, should find out by minute introspection those deep seated incipient memory factors and abolish them so as to become established in the unity of *yoga*. 
Yoga is not any form of self-torture. It is the union of the seer and the seen that is here referred to as Yoga. All that is visible is, in reality, unreal and what really exists is only the basis for such visible entities in the Self. Therefore, having first brought into union the visible with the seer, that is to say, seeing everything in the form of the seeing subject alone, he should remain in the form of that witness. It is a man who understands Yoga in this manner who is to be considered a superior kind of Yoga-knower.

4.9.6.2. Nataraja Guru observes that, a superior knower of Yoga is here under reference as the terminating epithet, sa\right| yagavidam varah (he is a superior knower of Yoga) expressly states. He is evidently one whose knowledge of both the practical and theoretical peculiarities of Yoga are understood in a more expert manner than usual. Sa\right|Ekalpa (willing) has its corresponding incipient memory factors (vi\right|san\right|a)
at a lower level of the mind. Such couples constituting of willing and incipient memory factors have to be looked upon as independent psycho-physical entities, functioning outside the stream of Self-consciousness referred to here as the ātmā (Self). Such multiple entities or extraneous spheres of interest require to be uprooted by a more conscious effort than in the previous operations which were less physical in their importance. The word nirudhyate (is restrained) implies the act of wilful inhibition rather than merely a form of passive unconscious mental restraint.

This is recommended as a mental operation to be practised by a yogi. The seer and the seen may be cancelled out either way into the neutrality of the highest union of yoga. Such wilful practice implies a conscious agent well informed about the technical implications of yoga.
4.9.6.3. The verse six reminds a spiritual aspirant not to indulge very much in the mundanities which bring him anarthi (discomfort) in the path of Yoga. He should dispense with unnecessary thoughts and imaginations associated with worldly pleasures and pains. It is therefore a prerequisite for every spiritual aspirant to make his movement smooth towards the Absolute or Paramatma.

In Bhagavad Gita it is clearly stated as to who is a yogi or Bhakta (i.e., true devotee). Every spiritual aspirant should see that he has come on the earth with a view to attaining liberation i.e., moksha from the bondages of his mind which contains a bundle of the reactions (karma-phala) in its potentialities relating to past actions. One should get rid of the karma-phala - result of actions by purifying his mind with the constant ideation of the Absolute, which showers love and affection on everybody. On getting the potential reactions of the past action
nullified or sublimated by worshipping or meditating upon god, with total surrender; one becomes unblemished and pure and worthy of being absorbed in the Supreme bliss shedding all bondages. The explanation given by Nataraja Guru on the verse is so short and not comprehensive. It might be due to the fact that Narayana Guru has himself explained in the commentary in detail.

The verse seven points out that a wise spiritual aspirant should view that the multiplication of objects around him as unreal and the Ītman alone is the Absolute reality and that the world is a passing show which is unworthy of being meditated upon.

4.9.7.1. \[ yad\ piban manobha\'ga\ sv\'inanda-madh\'Em\'dhurem \]
\[ na spandati va\j\'k\'tya-yojito yogavijn\' | | (Verse 8) \]
When the mind-bee drinking

Of the nectar-sweetness of Self-Bliss

Is drawn into union with Yoga-breeze

And does not flutter (Yoga takes place).

\(yadî, \text{ when; } yogayunj, \text{ by the breeze of Yoga; } va\dot{\text{ek}}\dot{\text{ṛtya}}, \text{ being drawn to its side; } yojitaÅ, \text{ having attained to Yoga, union; }\)

\(\text{manobhūgaÅ, the bee that is the mind; } svj\text{nanda-madhura-}\

\(mj\text{dhurem, the nectar sweetness of Self-Bliss; } pīban, \text{ while enjoying; }\)

\(na \text{ spandati, does not flutter; } (\text{tada } yogaÅ syt, \text{ then Yoga takes place}).\)

**Commentary:** The mind has been compared to the bee which keeps fluttering its wings and wanders from flower to flower attracted by any flower that it sees. The mind is also full of unsettled alternating motions, and because of its random attractions to whatever interests are presented to it, has been compared to the bee.
for the reasons mentioned. When the bee is engaged in drinking the nectar from
the flower, it attains to stillness; likewise the mind, when it has attained to Self-
Bliss, also becomes stilled. Just as the bee is carried along by the breeze, by the
continued practice of Yoga, the mind is also carried along to its goal of happiness.

Just as the bee becomes still by the enjoyment of the honey, so the mind becomes
still by the enjoyment of the honey, so the mind becomes still by the sweetness of
the honey of happiness found in the Self. When such a stillness is firmly
established, such a state is to be understood as Yoga.

As for the term vâªekâªtya (being attracted to its side), we have to remember
that the natural tendency of the mind is to be dissipated by outward interests, and
so this term applies to the withdrawal and canalising of such dissipations. The
mind is always restless and it is necessary that the yogi should insist with a
determination to make it enter into union with itself. By the use of the term \( vyunj \)
(by the breeze of wind), the reference is to be understood as recommending such
practices as \( pr, jyima \) (restraint of the breath), etc. The term \( madhu-m\ddhure \) is to
be understood as the highest bliss afforded by the Self.

4.9.7.2. Nataraja Guru points out that, the restless mind is compared to a bee whose
fluttering wings attain stillness in proportion to the joy or bliss it feels while
enjoying the nectar at the core of the flower. This is to mark a kind of homeostasis
or state of equilibrium between opposing tendencies. Value factors exist on the
plus side and quickly alternating activities exist at the other pole, while the
reciprocity of relationship between them, both active and retro-active, silences both
and immerses the mind in the joy of the Absolute as a supreme though neutral
value factor. The structure and mode of operation of Yoga when it succeeds is here
indicated. This striking analogy is found mentioned in one of the Yoga Upaniṣads. Where there is also the reference to the breeze of Yoga (yoga-vyu) referring to tendencies that have become contemplative in the mind of the yogi.

4.9.7.3. The explanation given by Nataraja Guru is not very clear. He uses intricate concepts and words making the meaning of the verse ambiguous. The plain meaning of the verse is that the mind is like that of a wild bee (bramaram) which wanders from one flower to another for drinking and tasting the nectar available in the flowers. A spiritual aspirant must withdraw his mind from such sensual objects and try to direct it towards the Supreme Self. Consequently it experiences the nectar like enjoyment from the Ātman seated in himself without the aid of any external objects. When the mental activity becomes totally still or gets subsided and
its movements stopped, the individual self gets liberated or immersed in the blissful state of the Absolute.
In the Prologue of 'Yoga Darśanam' (Vision by Meditation) Nataraja Guru states that 'Yoga' is a term related to Indian spirituality. He views that yoga relates to a bipolar relationship between the psychic and somatic (physical) aspects and a harmonious or homogenous interplay culminating into self absorption or Bliss. He states that the occasionalism of Descartes, pre-supposes a sort of psycho-physical interaction. He finds some similarity in 'Weber and Fectiners Law' involving sense and stimuli response. He considers that in the notion of the Absolute there exists a vertical parameter relating to all value-words. According to Nataraja Guru Yoga implies the union of two counterparts. It is made possible by psycho-physical interactions or parallelism; the self and the non-self. It calls for the union of the counterparts in the normalised central, neutral and in the Absolute sense.
points out that the duality between Prakṛti (Nature) and Puruṣa (consciousness-spirit) is fully recognised in Patañjali's Yoga Sūtra. He refers to Hatha Yoga as a wilful practices to keep bodily disciplines. He observes that Patañjali's Yoga Sūtra is one-sided-structuralism of spirit which has been amended by Vyāsa in Vyāsa Bhāṣya to Yoga Sūtra. He states that the Yoga Sūtra by Bhoja Raja is a revaluation suggested by Vyāsa.

Nataraja Guru refers the self and the non-self as the vertical and horizontal counterparts. He considers yoga as the meditating and contemplative science and an art. He mentions the importance of prāṇa, āyāma in the Yoga process. He views that vīṣāṇis as the deep rooted instincts in human personality which can be sublimated thinking that this world is untrue and the Absolute alone is true. He states that sublimation according to modern psychology is a kind of purging,
catharises or purification meant to avoid conflicts between rival patterns of conduct. He refers to modern psychologists like; Freud, Jung, Adler and others in this context. He refers here the concept of collective unconsciousness developed by C.G. Jung, the influence of Zen Buddhism in the West as is very much related to Yoga.

Nataraja Guru refers Yoga (in the Epilogue) as a positively adjusted or oriented spirit or global mind of spiritual aspirant. It is a constant contemplative practice to attain peace or joy. He refers to the non dualistic Absolute and the dualistic concept of Puruṣa and Prakṛti (spirit and prakṛti). He suggests that Yoga shall be treated seriously otherwise it will degenerate into a form of hobby or a pastime activity. The view of Nataraja Guru contained in the Prologue and Epilogue to the chapter Vision by Meditation contains very many valuable
information and suggestions that should be borne by every prospective spiritual aspirant.
In this chapter Narayana Guru minutely specifies the concept of Nirvāṇa (Liberation).

4.10.1.1. nirvāṇa, emancipation (i.e., absorption): āuddham-auddham ca iti, as pure and as impure: dvividham, of two kinds: tatra, of these;

yat nirvāṇanam, what is without incipient memory factors: tat
Uuddham, that is the pure; tadvat, likewise; tat visanj-anvitam, what is qualified by incipient memory factors; (tat) auddham (ca bhavati), (that becomes) the impure.

Commentary: The topic of this chapter is concerned with the ultimate purpose and value which has been reviewed in all the nine previous chapters. For this reason, this vision of Nirvãra is of greater importance than any of the previous visions. It is with this vision that this work comes to an end.

Nirvãra refers to the highest point that is attainable by man. In other words, it represents the perfection of life. Although the term is used more properly in the context of Jain and Buddhist thought, those who adhere to the thought of non-dual Vedânta can also use this term as having the same connotation. The following terms are synonyms for Nirvãra: nirvãtti: escape or absolution; nirvãtti, release,
The **Nirvāṇa** (Nirvāna), usually described under the term *jiva-mukti* (release while yet in life), refers to the same state. That is to say, when a man has, by means of Self-contemplation, attained to (absolute) wisdom and after attaining the practice of Yoga, etc., and while still in life is able to be free from all sufferings, what refers to this ultimate goal of a spiritual aspirant is called **Nirvāṇa**.
Although Nirvåna refers to one and the same subject, as depending on the maturity of certain types of spiritual aspirants qualified for it, and the conditions applying to them, it has here been divided into many divisions, according to the types of expression proper to each. Initially in this verse it has been divided into two (divisions) called the pure and the impure. What is 'free from incipient memory factors' is the pure and what is 'qualified by incipient memory factors' is the impure.

4.10.1.2. Nataraja Guru observes that this verse divides Nirvåna into the main classes without stressing the central normative classes at all. The fusion of counterparts is so complete that the ambivalence is already supposed to be within the same Self without duality. One pole, however, can be darker than the other. Thus, the two-fold initial classification is justified as held together unitively. The reference to
purity might imply action or wisdom or both. The dark or impure side of Nirvāna when it predominates indicates the presence of incipient memory factors (vīsanīs) implying a reference to the ego or the self in a narrow sense.

4.10.1.3. In the commentary it is said that Nirvāna (Liberation) can be of two types - pure and impure. Further Nirvāna is stated as synonymous to Samādhi (Absorption).

According to Buddha Philosophy, Nirvāna is the ultimate absorption, where pain and pleasure disappear. The pure and impure Nirvāna have not been explained in Buddhism. Nirvāna or Samādhi takes place only when one gets perfectly purified.

Therefore the terms Suddha and Asuddha need further clarification. Samādhi (absorption) exists in two kinds; Nirgu, a Samādhi and Sagu, a Samādhi. In the case Nirgu, a Samādhi i.e., the absorption into the Absolute is without any qualities of Prakṛti. In Nirgu, a Samādhi, the yogi loses his existence, i.e., his 'I' feeling. But in
Sagu, a Samādhi (Nirj,am), he realises the Absolute while retaining his pure 'I' feeling. What Narayana Guru used as Sudham (pure) and Asudham (impure) might be the Nirvikalpa Samādhi and Savikalpa Samādhi. Nataraja Guru does not give a correct view to this.

According to Bhagavad Gītā there is Brahma Nirj, a.

"labhante brahmanirj,am

AayaA kAe,akalmaA;A

chinnadvaiddh; yat;tm;naA

sarvabhEtahite rat;A 47

It is stated that a person, whose sins have been exhausted, and who lost the state of duality gets absorbed in Brahma (God).

47 'Bhagavad Gītā', V/25.
4.10.2.1. \textit{atijuddham \textit{guddham iti \textit{guddham ca dvividham tath}||}

\textit{a\textit{guddham ca\textit{guddham a\textit{guddham ucyate}||}} (Verse 2)

As extra-pure and pure, the pure also

Is of two kinds, likewise,

The impure also as pure-impure

And impure-impure is spoken of:

\textit{\textit{guddham ca}, the pure also; \textit{atijuddham \textit{guddham iti}, (as) the extra-

pure and the pure; \textit{dvividham}, of two kinds; \textit{tath}, likewise;

\textit{a\textit{guddham ca}, the impure also; \textit{a\textit{guddham a\textit{guddham a\textit{guddham (iti dvividham) ucyate}, impure-pure and impure-impure

(as of two kinds) are spoken of.

\textit{Commentary.} It will be hereafter described in detail that pure \textit{Nirv\text{\textsuperscript{n}a}, a belongs to

liberated men while still in life, and impure \textit{Nirv\text{\textsuperscript{n}a belongs to those who are

attached to psychic powers and who merely desire liberation. It is based on the
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superiority or inferiority of liberated people in life that the divisions of pure *Nirvāṇa* have been made. Under the impure class of *Nirvāṇa* there are only two subdivisions.

**4.10.2.2.** Nataraja Guru observes that the two broad divisions of the first verse are, here subdivided into two categories, making four in all. These four have a very pronounced ambivalence between them. Structural requirements are fully respected by giving symmetrical status to the plus and minus sides referable to four points of the negative and positive sides of the vertical axis. The pure-impure type generally omitted in other classifications as seen in the *Yoga-Vasiṣṭha* which does not respect structural requirements to the degree as here.

**4.10.2.3.** Nataraja Guru simply acknowledges the four categories of *Nirvāṇa* (liberation). The irony here is that how a person can attain *Nirvāṇa* without being totally pure. Any degree of impurity in oneself shall not make him to realise the
Absolute and to attain the state of Nírváña. Narayana Guru’s concept of áuddham and Ati-áuddam is not convincing. Nataraja Guru does not explain this. If the concept of Nírváña is synonymous to that of Liberation no amount of impurity shall take oneself to that state of liberation. So is the case with áuddham, áuddham and áuddha-áuddham. No individual self tainted with impurities shall attain the state of Nírváña until he gets completely purified. No great seers like Vedavyása, Rámínuja, Rámíkśi Áa, áà-kara or others have identified the different types of Nírváña as pointed out by Narayana Guru.

According to the spiritualistic concept no individual can be perfect. His individualistic existence is a clear proof of his being imperfect. When one becomes perfect he merges with the Absolute. Therefore a yoge, in whatever level of his spiritual state lacks perfection and that his visions, to a certain extent, may be
incorrect or imperfect. The disciple of a Master shall have to rectify the
imperfections of the philosophy or vision of his Guru by his earnest efforts. A true
disciple will have to become a great seer than the Master. To grow beyond the level
of his master is true progress. Here Nataraja Guru does not make any
improvement or modifications to the visions of Narayana Guru to make it more
perfect and acceptable. We can categorise and identify the level of spiritual or
philosophical wisdom of seers or philosophers; falling with in conceptual level of a
small light to the level of a shining sun and even beyond. Therefore, every seer or
philosopher remains in his limited conceptual horizon.
4.10.3.1. \[ ati\text{uddham} \text{ tridh\text{t}}; \text{ pa\text{c\text{d}t}} \text{ vare caikam vareyasi } \|

\[ \text{ekam ekam vari\text{'tha} yuddham brahm\text{avidi} \text{ sthitam} } \|

(Verse 3)

The extra-pure is again of three kinds;

One is the elect, one is the more elect,

One is the most elect, while the pure

Exists in the (simple) knower of the Absolute.

\[ ati\text{uddham, the extra-pure; pa\text{c\text{d}t} \text{ tridh\text{t}}, again is of three kinds; \]

\[ \text{ekam vare}, \text{ one in the elect (knower of the Absolute); ekam vareyasi,} \]

one in the more elect (superior knower of the Absolute); \text{ekam vare\text{'Ghe}, one in the most elect (most superior knower of the Absolute); atha, while; yuddham, the pure; brahm\text{avidi} \text{ ca sthitam,} \]

exists in the (simple) knower of the Absolute.

Commentary: The extra-pure (i.e., the superior \text{Nirv\text{a}}) under reference here has

three grades: the elect, the more elect, and the most elect. Thus, those who have
attained liberation while yet in life are of four kinds. Among them the pure abides in the knower of the Absolute; the positively pure abides in the elect; the comparatively pure abides in the more elect; and the superlatively pure abides in the most elect. The personal characteristics that distinguish these four 

4.10.3.2. Nataraja Guru views that, before characterising any of the negative grades mentioned here passes on to three grades that are to be placed at points higher than the superior grade of the plus side already mentioned. Each of these three grades which are elect, more elect and most elect are sub-varieties under the extra-pure. Together which the plain pure variety there are, thus, four divisions in all in the plus side. The gradation can be understood only if we think of an extrapolation of the superiority implied. The ambivalence of a magnet has a duality stronger
than the nominal polarity of an electric current. The superiority here referred to, is therefore, to be looked upon as belonging to a subtler, more abstract and more generalised order than the ambivalence belonging to the context of simple magnet.

The same principle of extrapolation can be applied to the two other comparative degrees of purity in *Nirvāṇa*.

### 4.10.3.3

The categorisation of extra-pure again to *Atiṣuddhavara, Atiṣuddhavareyas* and *Atiṣuddhavari(Atam* (the pure, more pure and the purest) and the explanations furnished by Narayana Guru or Nataraja Guru do not seem clear. All these are in the state of *Nirvāṇa* according to Narayana Guru. The Investigator has thoroughly gone through the various concepts relating to liberation as given in *The Perennial philosophies of India*. But he could not identify such a mysterious conceptual meaning. There might be different levels of impurities in one's mind or
self but they may not be brought under different Nirvāṇa divisions. No amount of impurity can help one liberated or to attain Nirvāṇa. Therefore Narayana Guru or Nataraja Guru did not succeed making these concepts understandable or acceptable to others.

4.10.4.1. \( \text{dagdhv} \ jñāgni \ sarvam uddenya jagatīya hitam } | \\
\text{karoti vidhivat} \ karma \ brahmavit brahma, i sthitah } || \\
(Verse 5)

Established in the Absolute, a knower of the Absolute,

By the fire of wisdom having burnt everything up,

Aiming at the good of the world,

Performs action according to what is considered as right.

\( \text{brahma, i sthita}}, \) established in the Absolute; \( \text{brahmavit}, \) a knower of the absolute (i.e., a man who is emancipated while still alive);

\( jñāgni, \) by the fire of wisdom; \( \text{sarvam dagdhv}, \) having burnt everything up; \( \text{jagatīya, hitam uddenya}, \) aiming at the good of the
world; \textit{vidhivat karma karoti}, performs actions according to what is considered as right.

\textit{Commentary.} Here the term \textit{brahmavit} (knower of the Absolute) refers to one who has attained to salvation and has no need to perform actions, but none the less, continues to do action without any selfish motive and which are conducive to the happiness of the world. The knower of the Absolute, although he has merged his intelligence in the bliss of the happiness of contemplating the Absolute, is still in the context of \textit{Nirv\={a}}, continuing at the same time to act in the interests of kindness to all living things. Although he is detached from all actions, he will not engage himself in wrong action. \textit{Vidhivat} means what is compatible with the rules laid down for conduct. This indicates (a knower of the Absolute) will not engage in
wrong action. He will, however, remain untouched by both good and bad actions because of his neutrality to both.

In three different contexts the Bhagavad Gē† refers to the fire of wisdom burning up all karma (action), which explain the position here:

That man whose works are all devoid of desires and wilful motives, whose (impulse of) action has been reduced to nothing in the fire of wisdom, he is recognised as a knowing person (pa,îta) by the wise. (IV. 19).

Relinquishing attachment for the benefit of works, ever happy and independent, though such a man be engaged in work, he (in principle) does nothing at all. (IV. 20).

Just as fire when kindled reduces to ashes the fuel, O Arjuna, likewise the fire of wisdom reduces all works to ashes (IV. 37).
(For a description of the *brahmavit* (knower of the Absolute) see chapter II, verses 55-72 in the *Bhagavad Gītā*).

The eloquent description on the part of Lord Kṛṣṇa correctly answers to what constitutes a *Brahmavit* as intended (by us) in the chapter. In various contexts found in the wisdom texts, a knower of the Absolute has been described and praised in the following ways:

*The knower of the Absolute becomes the Absolute.*

*The knower of the Absolute attains the Ultimate.*

Established firmly in his understanding, without having any false notion, that man who has established himself in the knowledge of the Absolute, is called the knower of the Absolute. He does not become glad when obtaining favourable results, nor does he become sorry when obtaining bad results.
Nataraja Guru states that we have the central and most normative type as already pointed out. In principle it should be noted that although this type of Nirvāṇa implies the continuation of natural or normal occupations necessary to life, they are supposed to be burnt out so that their non-intentionality or perversion of purpose will not have any ill-effect on the person. He is not deliberately immoral, yet he does not attach too much importance to conventional or social morality. He does all action according to the norms and standards of a good life found in the contemplative text books. The word *vidhīvat* (what is considered as right) is to be understood as also excluding whatever is harmful to humanity. Like the pot half immersed in water, the structural position is at the point of intersection of the correlates.
The yogi who has realised the Paramātma, may still continue in the physical form doing those actions in the best interest of others in the society. In the point of view of spirituality, such a yogi called Īvān-Mukta will continue to do all actions necessary in the normal life but is not tainted by the karma-pāya (bondages of action) or any bondages. Nataraja Guru seemingly intended of the same sense and meaning. He has not made it adequately clear. There is a related verse in Bhagavad Gītā.

"yogayukto viṣuddhitma
vijititma jitendriyāḥ
sarvabhūtmatmahītatma
kurvann api na lipyate" 48

48 'Bhagavad Gītā', V/7.
A yogé who has purified himself with the higher knowledge may still continue performing his duties without falling into bondages of worldly life. Natarja Guru's explanation here is more comprehensive. There is a connotation of an Avadhétha who continues to lead a mysterious life which may not be socially treated as ideal or moral because such a yogé occupies a position beyond the normal concept of morality or immorality. Yet their actions are ultimately for the good of the society.

4.10.5.1. \[\text{samnyasya sarvakarm¡, i satatam brahmani} \&\text{Jhay|}\
\text{ya¡caratyavanau dehay|tryai brahma} \&\text{vidvarA|} \] (Verse 6)

He who, renouncing, all action,  
Always established in the Absolute,  
Continues the course of bodily life, wandering  
In the world, (he) is the elect knower of the Absolute.
ya; he who; sarva-karami, samnyasa, renouncing all action;  
satatam brahmani, always established in the Absolute;  
dehayitriyai, continuing the course of bodily life; avanau-carati,  
wandering in the world; (sa) brahmavidvara, (he) is the elect  
knower of the Absolute.

Commentary: This is the distinguishing characteristic of the man who has attained  
to the first stage of those who are called elect knowers of the Absolute. This type of  
knower of the Absolute has only that degree of responsibility about carrying the  
burden of the body he has come to possess because of actions from the past, only  
till the moment such actions with their beginnings in the past have been expended  
and, thus, causes the body to drop off of itself. In the Bhagavad Gita (III. 17) we  
read:
But for him who happens to be attached to the Self alone, who finds full satisfaction in the Self, for such a man who is happy in the Self as such, too, there is nothing that he should do.

What has just been stated also answers to the description of the elect knower of the Absolute. It is this type of elect knower of the Absolute that can correctly be called a samyòsin (renouncer). In XII. 13 to 19 of the Bhagavad Gētā we read:

He who has no hatred to all creatures, who is also friendly and compassionate, who is free from possessiveness (mine-ness) and egoism, who is equalised in pain and pleasure, and forgiving.

Such a unitively-disciplined one (yoge) who is always contented, self-controlled, firmly resolved, whose mind and reason are dedicated to Me, he, My devotee, is dear to Me.
He who does not disturb (the peace of) the world and (whose peace) is not disturbed by the world, and who is free from exaggerations of joy, hate and fear, he too is dear to Me.

He who expects no favours, who is clean, expert, who sits unconcerned, carefree, who has relinquished all undertakings, he My devotee is dear to Me.

He who neither rejoices nor hates, nor grieves nor desires, and who has relinquished (both) the beneficial and the harmful, such a one endowed with devotion is dear to Me.

He who is the same to friend and foe, and also in honour and dishonour, who is the same in cold and heat, in pleasure and pain, and who is free from attachment;

To whom censure and praise are equal, who is silent (in manner), content with whatever happens to come, having no fixed abode, mentally constant, such a man of devotion is dear to Me.
The person described in these seven verses in Chapter XII called *Bhakti Yoga* (Unitive Devotion and Contemplation) refers to the elect knower of the Absolute who has renounced all undertakings in life. Because the contemplative state of this type of knower of the Absolute is free from action, public-mindedness, etc., without even the least touch of urgency to action and attachment to public life, and because he is always in the enjoyment of the bliss of emancipation, this type of *Nirvāṇa* has been put in the category of an elect kind of emancipation or absorption.

4.10.5.2. Nataraja Guru states that the elect knower of the Absolute is one who has definitely transcended his action. When he knows that the Absolute is all there is, and he has no other motive than to represent in himself the highest of absolute values for the emulation of all humanity, he becomes himself one of great price and
does not have to perform any good work. His life on earth lasts as long as vital urges rising from past habits remain operative.

4.10.5.3. The terms used by Nataraja Guru do not seem apt, especially connected with spirituality. He who has established himself in the pure thought of Brahma, shedding away all the impurities of mind can even continue to remain in the body and do some actions which are beneficial to the society. Such a knower of Brahma is great. But he can be absorbed in Brahma, at will, ultimately on extinguishing his desires to remain in the mundane world.
anyena vedita vetti svayam eva ya\|v

sa vare\yn sad\\ brahmanir\\, am ayam a\\nute \| \|

(Verse 7)

He, being informed by another is able to know,

But he himself does not know;

He is the more elect, who always

Enjoys absorption in the Absolute.

yah, he (i.e., the jivanmukta or man attaining liberation while still alive); anyena vedita\, being informed by another; vetti is able to know; svayameva, then by himself; na vetti, does not know;

sa\Avare\yn, he is the more elect; ayam, such a one; sad\\, always,

brahmaniry\, am, absorption in the Absolute, a\\nute, enjoys.

Commentary. The (plain) knower of the Absolute, while engaged without passion or motivated by any (personal) gain, enjoys the bliss of Nirv\,a while doing works beneficial to the world. As for the more elect knower of the Absolute, he,
abandoning all works, accomplishes his journey here fully and consciously awake.

If we now think of the second type called the more elect (वार्य्, अधिकतम) knower of the Absolute, he is one without any attachment to the world and without being interested in doing any act, none the less with his activities turned inwards (introspectively) and without any consciousness of outward things, silently remains in the bliss of emancipation or absorption. He attains to outward consciousness only when prompted by somebody else, and, thus, comes to be conscious of such matters as sounds or touch. Thereafter he again relapses into his own natural state of silence and again enters into the bliss of Nirvāṇa. In this state of profound peace (he) enjoys uninterruptedly the bliss of the Self. This kind of Nirvāṇa has been termed as the more elect kind of emancipation. This more elect knower of the Absolute is referred to as one who has transcended the sphere of the operation of
the three nature-modalities (guṇas). It is this very type of jivanmukta (man attaining liberation while still alive) who has transcended the nature-modalities that is described in the Bhagavad Gṛt in XIV. 22-6.

4.10.6.2. According to Nataraja Guru this verse represents a still higher type of Self absorption, where, the counterparts belongs to an order similar to the electric current in the above analogy. The duality between the Self and non-Self lingers very faintly and nominally here in one and the same Self-consciousness as in the case of a sleeping man who has to be touched before he can respond. The absorption is here more complete than in the previous instance. Here it is in the inner enjoyment of the high value implied in the notion of the Absolute that serves as the diagnostic factor. The outer evidence of such enjoyment might be feeble in
the eyes of an onlooker who is not conscious of the Bliss of contemplation of the Absolute.

4.10.6.3. Nataraja Guru fully acknowledges the concept of Brahma vareyn (the great Brahmavid). There are some yoge who remain in deep meditation of the Supreme, unaware of the world around. It may lead to a state of Sam¡dhi (absorption) only when his mental impurities are got removed by the constant ideation of the Supreme. Deep meditation shall not be taken for granted as Sam¡dhi (absorption). It may lead to that sate only when one becomes completely purified. When the influence of Prak¤ti is ceased or suspended for a while in one’s Self he may attain Sam¡dhi (absorption) which is termed as temporary Sam¡dhi, but permanent Sam¡dhi (liberation) is the final absorption. Narayana Guru might have these concepts within him while categorising Nir¥a differently. But these divisions have
made the concepts more ambiguous and misleading than giving new glimpses of philosophical insights.
4.10.7.1.  

\( \text{heyop} \text{‐} \text{deyat} \text{,} \text{nahyasy} \text{‐} \text{tm} \text{‐} \text{v} \text{,} \text{svaprak} \text{‐} \text{aka} \text{A} \text{|} \)

\( \text{iti matv} \text{,} \text{nivartteta} \text{,} \text{v} \text{tàtir} \text{,} \text{nivarttate} \text{,} \text{puna} \text{A} \text{||} \)

(Verse 9)

Of this (world) there is certainly nothing to be rejected

nor accepted;

As for the Self, it is self-luminous.

Having understood (thus), one should withdraw

(from all functionings);

Thereafter function does not repeat (itself).

asya, of this (world); hey-a-up\text‐deyat, rejection or acceptance; na \( \text{hi} \),
certainly there is not; \( \text{t} \text{m} \text{‐} \text{v} \text{,} \) as for the Self; svaprak\text‐\text{aka} \text{A}, it is self-luminous; iti matv, having understood thus; nivartteta, one should withdraw (from all activity); punaA, thereafter, v\text{tàtir}A, function, na

avarttate, does not repeat (itself).

**Commentary.** Because the world is not real there is nothing to be rejected nor

accepted. It is the Self that is real. Therefore, it is the Self that we should attain to.
One should know in the first instance that the Absolute is true and the world is false. Thereafter one should meditate on the fact that the Self is self-luminous.

4.10.7.2. Nataraja Guru observes that this verse underlines the verity that the world as really non-existent, needs no abolishing by special contemplative effort. The horizontal axis thus stands self-abolished. The vertical axis which refers directly both to the plus and minus aspects of the Self, attain to unity by double negation of the negative and by the double assertion of the positive, and, thus, abolishes all vestiges of duality between them. When once, such a unitive understanding is established duality cannot assert itself any more. This state requires no effort to take place when neither the negative nor the positive dominates the other in a normal state of consciousness. Certitude in respect of this normality is all that is needed.
A person who has realised himself with the Supreme, purifying all the impurities of mind, such as instincts and desires etc., feels within his soul the effulgence of the radiant Supreme. His soul (self) loses duality and attains oneness with the Absolute. He maintains equanimity at this stage of realisation. Nataraja Guru may mean the same using verticalisation and horizontalisation, negation of the negation, plus and minus, etc. But he should have more simplified the explanation without using jargons of science and mathematics.
4.10.8.1.  

\textit{ekam ev\textasciitilde dvite\textasciitilde yam brahma\textasciitilde sti ny\textasciitilde yan na sam\textasciitilde ya\textasciitilde A|}

\textit{iti vidvi\textasciitilde n ivartteta daviti\textasciitilde n ivarttate puna\textasciitilde A||}  

(Verse 10)

The one Absolute alone there is, without a second;
Nothing else there is, no doubt herein.

Having thus understood, the well instructed one,

From duality should withdraw; (he) does not return again.

\textit{advite\textasciitilde yam}, without a second; \textit{brahma ekam eva (asti)} one Absolute alone (there is); \textit{na anyat asti}, nothing else there is; (\textit{atra}) \textit{na sam\textasciitilde ?aya\textasciitilde A}, (here) is no doubt; \textit{iti matvi}, having thus understood;

\textit{vidvi\textasciitilde n}, the well instructed one; \textit{daviti\textasciitilde t}, from duality, \textit{nivartteta}, should withdraw; (\textit{sa\textasciitilde A}) \textit{puna\textasciitilde A na avarttate}, (he) does not return again.

\textit{Commentary}: The words 'one Absolute only without a second' is a teaching found in the \textit{Ch\textasciitilde ndogya Upani\textasciitilde Aad}. Its meaning is that the Absolute is without any
difference between entities of the same kind. To say that there is only one Absolute and that there is no other Absolute like it, is the negation of difference between entities of the same kind. To say that besides the Absolute there is no second entity at all, constitutes the non-difference between entities of different kinds. That the Absolute has no change within itself such as origin, growth, transformation, etc., is what amount to saying, there is no internal difference in the Absolute. In the above dictum the term \textit{ekam} (one) refutes any difference. The term \textit{advitēyam} (without a second) underlines the absence of the difference between different kinds of entities. The term \textit{eva} (itself) is meant to underline the absence of any difference within itself of the Absolute. Even in the \textit{Taittireya Upaniṣad}, we see it often repeated that, ‘He, the Absolute is only one’. With the help of the meditation on these truths, one should abolish all doubts and attain firm certitude about the unique status of
the Absolute. The one who has attained to the state of *Nirvāṇa* is the real learned one. He will never more have the confusion arising from duality. He will be finally released from the suffering arising from dualistic belief. Then, by itself, that kind of happiness which is of a never returning order happens and no more suffering can take place. In the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* it is also stated that a wise man is never born nor does he ever die. The released man enters into such an eternal state for ever. The *M紫外aka Upaniṣad* says that when the vision of the ultimate Self takes place, the knots of the heart are severed, all doubts cut off, and all actions weakened. In the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* we also read, 'for them there is no return'. In the *Chīndogya Upaniṣad* it says, 'He attains to the world of the Absolute (and) this is *Nirvāṇa*. The same type of wise man is mentioned similarly in
many parts of the wisdom texts. He enjoys the ultimate bliss of Nirvāṇa which is ever auspicious, most bright, and desirable.

4.10.8.2. Nataraja Guru states that the same truth is here repeated not with a contemplative in mind but as referring to a well-instructed man called vidvīṇa. He is also capable of the same certitude as the contemplative. As the Darśanamālā pertains to the context of instruction and learning, it is but natural that this terminating verse should put the central teaching as a whole in a form natural to it. Narayana Guru has taken care to explain at the end of his commentary the implication of every term as a means to clarify the notion of the normative Absolute. Duality is the one overall error or prejudice to be abolished through certitude on the part of a person who has gained a knowledge of the Science of the Absolute.
4.10.8.3. The commentary seems to be self explanatory and as such Nataraja Guru has not given further explanation. The meaning of the verse can be simply put as - a person who has established himself in God and who experiences oneness, his duality is lost. Such an individual is wise who sees the Absolute everywhere. For him all bondages are cut-off and no need of return to this earth taking further births and deaths for the suffering caused by the result of past actions. He gets finally absorbed in the Absolute (Brahma).

4.10.9. Discussion

Nataraja Guru in his Prologue and Epilogue tries to integrate the modern wisdom of the West with the ancient wisdom of the East. To make his concept of the Absolute, through the interpretation of Narayana Guru's philosophy; Nataraja Guru brings the Western philosophy and science closer to the spiritualistic
thoughts of India. He refers Neitzche’s Superman to an individual trying for perfection by self-absorption into the Absolute. He gives Dionysian version to the most perfected man. Narayana Guru’s impure absorption (Auddha Nirvā) and the interpretation of it by Nataraja Guru do not give a valid or clear idea. He states that the supreme goal of human existence in life, is often referred as salvation, freedom, emancipation, supreme felicity, absorption, ultimate extinction or cessation of all activities and functions. It seems very relevant in the spiritualistic sense.

He quotes Heraclitus, "one cannot enter the same stream twice." If it is so once Nirvā stage is attained there shall not be any return from Absolute. Therefore the concept of pure and impure Nirvā do not hold good. Referring to Plato’s "moving image of eternity" he tries to explain a series of type of ‘Nirvā’. 
These interpretations have in no way been able to convey the right meaning of the concept of 'Nirvāna'. Nataraja Guru refers to Bhagavad Gītā but Vedavyāsa has not given the idea or concept of different types of 'Nirvāna'. According to Bhagavad Gītā (Verse 25/V). A yogi attains Brahma Nirvāna when all his sins are exhausted and who has crossed the level of duality.

Nataraja Guru refers Goetha's 'Faust' and Dante's 'Divine Comedy' while interpreting the concept of equilibrium or the stage of absorption. He observes that ākara, Rūmīnuja and Madhva have not understood the Upaniṣadic dictum or Nirvāna. But the readers of Narayana Guru's philosophy or Nataraja Guru's interpretation cannot agree with this.

Nataraja Guru refers Rousseau's famous words "man is born free but is everywhere is in chains". Man therefore wants freedom from all bondages. His
view on higher Brahman and lower Brahman seems not logical. His referring of prophet Mohammed as a hero who waged war against evil forces in the society because of his uncompromising love of the Absolute seems to be novel. His statement that *Nirvãna* implies a process of very subtle and pure variety of evolution is essentially an outcome of pragmatic wisdom.

It is really appreciable that Nataraja Guru made an earnest attempt for the integration of the Western and Eastern philosophies into a harmonious whole. But the subtility of the eastern philosophies find it not worth to compare or to harmonize. Scientific or Mathematical terms are not suitable to explain the concept of the Absolute or *Brahma* which is outside the purview of science or logical reasoning, to a great extent.