CHAPTER -- XVI.

"THE DISCIPLINE -- II"
THE discussions contained in the previous chapter present a picture of Suresvara as a complete opponent of any Vedic injunction as a way to Realisation. However, it is not correct to estimate him as a fanatic advaitin who opposes any injunction at any stage of discipline of the seeker of Final Emancipation. Dr. Radhakrishnan observes "We are impelled to transcend the world of change and finitude in order to reach a reality where the subject and predicate are absolute. The assumption of such a reality is the basis of logical procedure. In judgement we try to bring out the full nature of reality by a series or predications."
Suresvara's Contribution to Advaita

Suresvara, just as his preceptor, considers that a series of predications are quite necessary for a discipline of the seeker. But the difference between Sri Saikara and his disciple lies in that while the former is prepared to accept these predications in some passages of Upanisads, where there is an expression of injunction, Suresvara does not admit so. According to him these are pseudo-injunctions that present only the final principle of Advaita. A detailed examination of one such sentences occurring in Brhadaranyaka reveals this difference of opinions. "Tameva Dhiro Vijnaya Prajnam Kurtiva Brahmam," as such this knowledge, which is based upon the words and their mutual relationship, is projected from multiplicity and it is a means for the relation of
Brahman which is free from any duality. The word Viśnūya presents this stage of realisation i.e., as is viewed from the angle of knowledge as a means. The word Prajñā represents a stage when this means viz., knowledge, freed from all the multiplicity from which it is generated, gets identified with the Realisation itself. It is hence a word denoting the stage from the angle of Realisation. This transformation from the stage of means to the goal is automatic and is the very nature of knowledge. It does not require an instigation caused by injunction according to Advaita.

But the views of Dharottapa and Mandana Misra differ from this point widely. The view of the former, as explained by Suresvara himself, is that one should understand the real nature of Brahman as represented through the Mahāvākyas and this point is represented by the word Viśnūya. The logical representations and discussions including the Purupadesa fall within this stage. The word Prajñā represents the stage of meditation.
and concentration (Nidhyāsana). In this stage the mind should not think anything else, as such an extraneous thought produces fatigue. As such, since the process of meditation is a human effort, there is scope for the interpretation of the sense of injunction in Mūrvita. But in this process, according to Suresvara, there is no unification or Aikyata between the means and the result. It is not correct to say that the Nidhyāsana serves the purpose of negation of the multiplicity and the realisation dawns as a consequence of it. The correct means of knowledge has two fold purpose, to remove the ignorance, hence negation of Avidyā, and to present the Realisation. In fact both these are two sides of the same thing and Pramāṇa that serves only one of it is no Pramāṇa at all. The mind, purified as it were by the intellectual process of Vijnāna, takes up to concentration etc., by the force of injunction. The meditation and concentration etc., can be of only a multiple entity and it is dependant on the wilful effort of the person who takes it. There is
no stage at which this multiplicity is dropped and the knowledge, the means, gets transformed into Realisation.

It shall be either that there is no connection between the means and its result for that the multiplicity of the means remains even at the stage of Realisation. Such an ambiguity and confusion is due to the stand of Bhartr-prapanca that there is a need for an injunction to instigate the activity of Realisation. According to the theory of Sankara and Suresvara, the stage of goal (Realisation) is the very essence of even the stage of means, knowledge, and its starting point, the multiplicity. Hence by the very force of this nature the knowledge gets automatically transformed into the Realisation without any external force of an injunction. There is no need for any effort to drop down the multiplicity of the means first, as no special effort is needed to get rid of the extraneous cases like Cakra, Kula etc., when the mud transforms itself into pot.
The view of Mandanamisra is however based upon the theory of Bhāvadvaita, which is attributed to him. The two functions, negation of the multiplicity and dawn of Realisation are quite different. The Vijnāna comprises in that the nature of Ātman and Avidyā are understood through the Mahāvākyas, as represented through the words and their relationships. As such, real nature of Ātman is understood in a confused and confounded way with Avidyā. At the stage of comprehension of Mahāvākyas, Avidyā and Ātman are presented separately whence Avidyā is dropped by proper analysis. Then follows the stage of prajña, which is an automatic consequence; thus the dropping out Avidyā is equal to Vijnāna and the Realisation to prajñā, the former being a result of an effort and the latter, a dawn. Hence there is a sense of injunction upto the stage of Vijnāna and the word nivṛtti actually refers to the Vijnāna. The lyap suffix in Vijnāya indicates that the nature of Brahman is indirectly presented by the Mahāvākyas through the word relationship.
etc., and its direct presentation can be done through meditation and concentration and this Sadhana is indicated by the injunction in Kurvita. But the stock argument of Sureśvara and others against such a proposition is that if the correct nature of Brahman is not presented by the Mahāvākyas, how can the latter be considered as a means of realisation at all. A gradation in the process of realisation presupposes a distinction in the means of knowledge and only the final means can be the exact one.

If the theory of Mandana is accepted, Mahāvākyas will not be the means for Realisation. If they are so powerful of presenting the Realisation, there is no need for any process of mediation etc., through injunction and its instigation. Moreover the knowledge at the stage of Vijnāna, if it is not correct, cannot produce the required realisation through meditation or concentration. Hence the only plausible interpretation in this respect is that by presentation of Mahāvākyas, the Realisation dawns when the ignorance stands dispelled automatically.
2. The second interpretation of Suresvara for this Vākya is that the Vijñāna is the means of knowledge based upon Avidyā and it gets extended to the point of Realisation whence it gets identified with the latter. The Lyap in Vijñāya indicates the extension of this means into the Realisation. At the stage of Vijñāna there is a distinction of knower, knowledge and means and in Prajñā all are merged into one, the realisation. The Avidyā base of the means too is turned into a composite of Realisation.

The former interpretation is based on Vivarta school and this on Pariṇāma. There the cause from which the Pariṇāma starts, the multiplicity and Avidyā, is warded off and here this cause too is realised as Brahman; one is subjective interpretation and the other objective.

3. The third interpretation is based on worldly facts. The Vijñāna is knowledge gained through the Śastric discussion and teaching of the preceptor. After absorbing this, the self-effort, in which one's own intellectual and discriminatory capacity is made use of, is
meant by the Prajña. The Vyap in Vijnaya marks a stage; the need for Sastra and Acarya does not continue when one retires into self-contemplation as a result of which the realisation dawns. In this sense the injunction in Kurvita is perhaps acceptable. But Suresvara does not accept such a possibility here too, because while in the case of preceptor and Sastra there is a need for injunction as the aspirant is dependant upon them, in the case of self-contemplation, it is left to one’s own will and pleasure to continue and any amount of instigation cannot move the aspirant an inch if he does not have an inclination for the purpose.

The next interpretation which is of course subjective again, is that the identification of personal self with supreme self is Vijnana and realisation of immediate and all pervasive nature is Prajña. The former is a means, rather an essential precursory to the latter. The aspirant realises the Bliss in himself the extends the same to one and all. The self is Brahman not separated from the
world but the world is not reflected in it. There is only one way process at the stage of Viṣṇuṇa, the projection of the Universe from the self both being Brahman, in Prajñā stage the merger of the Universe into the self, again both being one, is completed. The evolution and revolution, both being the same act viewed from different angles in completed. If the aspirant does not ward of his mortal coil at the stage of evolution, he has to enter the revolution automatically and thus becomes Jīvanmukta or Sthitaprajñā.

In this interpretation there is no scope for accepting any sense of injunction either for Viṣṇuṇa or Prajñā.

5. A further interpretation is that Viṣṇuṇa is the meaning of words and the sense created by their mutual relationship. The Prajñā is the idea that is conveyed by this sense. The function of the words in a sentence is primary in that they give the direct meaning when formed into a sentence. This is Viṣṇuṇa got by the science of speech and grammar. But there is a secondary function, lakṣaṇa, that is more important and the expo-
rience of this Laksyārtha or fact generated by this function is all the more important. The primary function is not independent. Hence while the former needs instigation, the latter does not require any, because its need arises only when the former does not operate. Even the injunction that instigates the primary function is not an Apurva Vidhi as neither it is based on facts out of ordinary experience nor it generates any fresh thing beyond the scope of the composite words. At the least, it can only be a Niymavidhi in that it regulates the attitudes of the aspirant.21

6. AND yet another interpretation accepting this Niymavidhi; By Viṣṇuna, the means for Realisation (which is explained in the earlier Sukta) and the injunction in Śruti is to say that one shall follow the same means and nothing else for Realisation. The previous interpretation is lowering the stern standards taken in earlier ones, where no sense of any sort of injunction is accepted; now it is still lowered down, as it were to accommodate the opponents.22
7. Another interpretation is to say that Vijnana and Prajna are synonyms. Here the realisation is free from all activities. The word Vijnana with its suffix tyap denoting the cessation indicates that with the attainment of this realisation, all activities also cease. This is an automatic corollary of Realisation. Here is an interpretation in which the two aspects of the same result are presented and Kurvita is perhaps to indicate the oneness of both.23

8. HERE is the last and most practical interpretation possible in Advaita system. Vijnana is understanding the nature of personal self as embodied in mortal self. Prajna is the supreme self. Having gained a knowledge of the 'other, as distinct from the body etc., through the Nyaya Sutra, and other process, one shall resort to Mahavakyas etc., by which the supreme Self as not different from personal self dawns. That Vijnana here means the required Sadhana etc., leading to perfect Cit-tasuddhi whence upon the mere presentation of Mahavakyas.
leads to the final emancipation. There is no need for any process of meditation etc., of these Mahavakyas intervening between both the stages.24

Here are thus eight ways of interpretation of one sentence by Suresvara ingeniously presented; perhaps he recorded the discussions of Saṅkara himself during the Pra-vocana to his four distinguished disciples. But what is the final view of Saṅkara in this matter? His Bhasya gives only one interpretation. "The intelligent aspirant after Brahma, knowing about this kind of self alone, from the instructions of a teacher and from the scriptures, should attain intuitive knowledge of what has been said by the teacher and scriptures, so as to put an end to all questioning i.e., practise the means of this knowledge viz., renunciation, calmness, self-control withdrawal of the senses, fortitude and concentration."25 Here we see a sense or injunction conveyed at both the stages. The Lyap in Vijnāya conveys the sense that one shall jot the idea of personal self through the scriptures and Sastras. The imperative mood in
Kurūtta says that one should practice a means that leads to Prajñā, the final realisation, and this means consists in such things as renunciation.

Then, what made Kurūtta to deviate and dilate on this direct interpretation of his Acārya? Of course, he has a right to do so as a Vartikakāra but there shall be a basis for him to do, so. His interpretations Nos. 1, 2 and 3 represent an absolute Advaitin. The interpretation Nos., 3, 5 and 6 come nearest to the interpretation of his Acārya and Nos. 4 and 8 stand in between both the views. To start from the bottom group 3, 5, 6 accept a sense of activity promoted by injunction at an early stage viz., in the attempt of cessation of the Avidyā and the means of knowledge based on it, even if for the purpose of Realisation. Here there is description of means of Realisation, however illusory it may be in the final stage, and a statement that it is to be warded off as an undesirable entity. But this means has to be sorted to, as an inevitable evil.
In the second group (Nos. 4 and 8) a next stage is based upon. Even in this stage, 8th interpretation proceeds that of 4th. In 8th there may be a need for instigation in the beginning of its stage but it serves purpose in the attainment of sattvasuddhi only. When once it is attained, the realisation dawns through Mahāvākyas. The stage at 4th is supreme bliss experienced in moral coils, which discharge their function automatically. While Janaka can be the example of former stage Suka is an illustration to the later.

Now coming to the first group (Interpretations Nos. 1, 2 and 7) it represents perhaps the most considered view of Suresvara. Even here there is a difference in the basic principles of the interpretations 7 and 2 while 7 interprets the basic tenet of Advaita. The second takes the starting point, the means of knowledge based upon avidyā also, into consideration at the time of realisation. It gets transformed and merged into the latter.
Here there is no absolute cessation of the world but its transformation. The first and the most cherished one of Suresvara is that the śvidya or its resultant factors do not have any right to continue in the stage of Final Emancipation; in fact they cannot be transformed at all and they are like an uncouth skin to be warded off. Interpretation No. 7 is succinct way of presentation of this absolute view of Advaita. The all comprehensive path tred by Śrī Śaṅkara\textsuperscript{27} is not to the taste of his most prominent disciple. It is however the ingenuity of Suresvara to have discovered so many interpretations on a single sentence of his preceptor. It is however not impossible to do so, if one or other phrase of this sentence in Bhāṣya is str ssed.

SUCH a difference of opinion between the preceptor and his disciple in the matter of interpretation can also be seen in other places too. In the interpretation of Ātṛtyevopāsīta,\textsuperscript{28} Śrī Śaṅkara accepts
Hiyanavidhi in as much that the object of upāsana can be both the self and non-self and the injunction stipulates that it shall be only the self, thus precluding non-self from the field of operation. But Suresvara explains that this stand is only to accommodate the opponents. He says that there is nothing as non-self and self is all pervasive. So much so the question of upāsana of non-self does not arise at all, where by there is no scope for the above said Hiyanavidhi too, while this sounds logical it goes beyond the comprehension of an ordinary aspirant.

It is unbelievable that a practical Mandana, whom Suresvara is traditionally identified, advocates such as abolitionist's theory free from all practicability. But has the psychology of a convert — that he turns into a fanatic of new faith—something to do with this?

Indeed Suresvara appears to do so when he speaks from the stand point of Absolute Reality and its
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Attainment. But just as the other Advaitins he does give a place to these injunctions which purport not only the daily and occasional karmas but those that the needs for mental purification and intellectual uplift. It will be interesting to examine the issues on this point while examining one of the Vidhi Vakyas in Brhadaranyaka Upanisad.  

Sri Sankara in his Bhasya, interprets Vedamuvacana as inclusive both the Karma Kanda and Upanisadic portions, and the daily reading of Veda completely is intended for purification of mind and also body. To support the inclusion of Karma Kanda portion also for this purpose, he stresses the word 'Sacrifice' that follows in the very same sentence and says that since the Karma Kanda portions alone are capable of leading to the 'Sacrifice' and so they too are included in the context.

Suresvara accepts this view of his predecessor obediently and is not however satisfied with it. Hence he gives an alternative interpretation viz., that the word Vedahuv can refer to only Karma Kanda because 'Sacrifice'
next word, can be connected with these portions only. 33

This view is a complete disgression from his preceptor and is just opposed to that of the early Advaita scholars like Bhartriharita. But this view has a disadvantage that it excludes the Upanisadic portions in the daily reading of Vedas and so partial. 34 Suresvara gracefully accepts this point and says that he intends it to be so because in his view the two Kaṇḍas serve different purposes. 35 In this context the Karma Kaṇḍa serves the purpose of creating 'desire to know' (Vividisa) in the seeker and Upanisadic portions step in to continue further and to satisfy this desire. So the mere knowledge of Karmakaṇḍa and performance of relevant Yajñas are adequate. If Upanisadic portions too are intended to be included, then the need for desire does not arise at all, as they present what is desired, the Brahman. 36

WHAT is the motive of Suresvara in adopting this completely different interpretation from his preceptor? This is in accordance with his views of an
extremist in Advaita. He does not want any connection between Karma and Jñāna at any stage, discipline leading to Realisation. Karmas here include not only the sacrificial ones but also the purificatory ones (Samāskārās) which sanctify the physical body, and naturally the context indicates only Karmakanda. The actual Vedic Yajnas help in physical and mental purification while fast, penance etc., help the latter only. But should this Karma be performed by all the seekers positively? Suresvara, to suit the context says. "Of course they have to be" indicating that they need not be performed by some of the exceptionally enlightened persons. It is worthy to note here that Suresvara avoids such of the discussion that tend to defeat the original purpose; he obtains from saying his cherished idea first so as to insist on the need to perform Karma for the purpose of Vividisa.

SRI SANKARA stipulates four requisites for a seeker who has genuine 'Vividisa'. They are (1) Discrimination between eternal and non-eternal (2) Abandonment of desire for the rewards of this and other world (3)
Possessing the six mental disciplines and (4) a desire for attainment of salvation. All these four requirements shall be had by the sincere seeker of truth when only he should be admitted into the order of Samnyāsa.

Suresvara accepts these four fold qualifications in principle but does not mention them as such. He instead describes the channel of perfection starting from the first "performance of Karma" to the last "final emancipation". In two different places in his works he describes these channels, but both these tally to a large extent.

First one shall perform the Vedic Karmas ordained as such to him and these may vary according to his caste and Āśrama. Suresvara expressively says that not only compulsory (Mītya) Karmas are to be performed but also optional Karmas. The next stage that arises from such a performance is mental purification. How does this result from Karmas, which Suresvara himself decries as impure and cumbersome? Notwithstanding such statements which are
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for the sake of argument, Suresvara postulates two intervening steps between these two stages. One is generation of Dharma and aparāvṇa; and Suresvara does not shirk from accepting this at least as a very indirect aid for realisation. The second step is that as and when this Dharma arises, the sins that are accrued as impressions (Samskārās) are cleared off.42

SRI Śaṅkara's requirements of a seeker do not insist these stages, presumably because (1) they relate to the Pūrva-kānda and 2) it is not quite possible that performance of Karmas as such lead to the purification of mind without fail and 3) sometimes even without performances of Karma, it is possible to attain Cittasuddhi and discrimination of the eternal or non-eternal. However, inspite of his adamant opposition to Karma in the field of Vedānta, Suresvara finds it essential to mention these earlier requirements too.

THE next stage comprises what is termed as
discrimination of the eternal and non-eternal and also the renunciation of the rewards here and hereafter. The Citta-suddhi leads to the knowledge of the real nature of world and also of the fact that the awards of all the Karmas are worthless. But actually before the generation of the spirit of Renunciation, Suresvara enunciates two steps to it from the above knowledge of worthlessness of world. They are 1) arising of a desire to renounce the world 2) Abandonment of all the three human seekings. By mentioning these two steps Suresvara indicates that human effort is necessary to get the real Vairāgya. It is not quite enough if the seeker notes the uselessness of the world because that leads him only into darkness, as he tries to adjust himself with such a world without knowing what to do then. Hence it is very essential that he shall make a conscious effort to develop a desire to renounce and also renounce the world. This requires a great effort and here most of the aspirants fail.
NOW the seeker takes up to the life of mendicant. He starts the search for the Truth and so he is called a searching mendicant (Vividisa Samnyasin). The next two requirements enunciated by Sankara namely 1) possessing the six qualities of mental discipline and 2) desire for liberation, constitute this stage propounded by Suresvara. To become eligible for the Vividisa Samnyasa one should not only renounce the world but possess a positive desire for getting liberation. Otherwise, mere renunciation of the world, which is a negative act, will result only in complete annihilation of the individual. Hence Suresvara places the Mumuksutva immediate to Vairagya unlike his preceptor who makes the six mental disciplines to intervene between the two. For Suresvara considers that even in the practice, there shall be no distance between the negative and positive, the Vairagya shall be followed, if not preceded, by the Mumuksutva. Otherwise, he feels the danger of Buddha's discipline intervening and the same being considered the be-all and end-all of renunciation.
AT the same time he does not under-estimate the importance of the six mental disciplines for a seeker. These six qualities are physical restraint, mental restraint, satisfaction, capacity to withstand hardship, concentration, and faith. The discipline that gives this qualities to the seeker are called "Yogābhyāsa" by Suresvara, thereby indicating that he recommends the adoption of Patanjali's system as far as this context is concerned. These disciplines are aids for comprehension of the Supreme and only when he becomes the master of them to such an extent that they become his second nature, the seeker is considered to be a perfect Vividūsā Samyāsin.

THEN the seeker is introduced to the process of Sravana, Manana and Nidhidhyāsana. By the disciplines he practised earlier his mind becomes fully diverted to the Supreme and then only the purport of Vividūsā through this process becomes fruitful. It should however be noted here that Suresvara does not expressively
mention these three activities at this stage or any other stage; presumably the reason is that he does not consider them to be quite unavoidable. The six disciplines help the mind to divert itself to the Immediate. He mentions this diversion immediate to the Yojābhyasa. This diversion of mind is nothing but its assuming the form of the Supreme. The afflictions and impositions of impurity are washed away by the performance of karmas and mental disciplines and the mind becomes like a pure manom. There shall be no difficulty in such a mind assuming the very nature of Immediate. This does not mean that the Avidyā qualification of mind has also disappeared; the Sattva nature of Avidyā exists in this stage. Thus when the mind could comprehend the Reality on account of its own capacity, Suresvara, perhaps, does not find any necessity for further activities and disciplines like gravana etc.,

THESE being activities as such, fall under the scope of injunctions which have no operation and are
useless at this stage which is almost the Final Realisation. Hence he introduces the "Experience of Vedaṅta Vākyas" as the stage in this ladder next to the "diversion of mind towards the Supreme." Thus the positive result of a negative act, namely the experience of Reality of the Supreme through the renunciation of the world is achieved, more through a course of self disciplines only of the seeker, than any external direction.

The next stage is automatic, when the seeker comprehends the import of Vedaṅta Vākyas completely because of the pure and perfectly reflective capacity of his mind. The result of such a comprehension, which is also automatic from Suresvara's standpoint, is the experience that personal self is one and the same with Supreme self. There is a difference between this step or result and the previous one namely the knowledge of the Vedaṅta Vākyas. The Vedaṅta Vākyas are to be presented by a preceptor, who may be personal or impersonal like Upaniṣads. The proper stage for presentation of Vedaṅta
and Upanisad teaching, hence, according to Suresvara, is
when the seeker becomes perfect in the stage of Vīvidīśa
Samnyāsa, when only he becomes eligible to receive them.
This is perhaps the importance of the extremist tradition
that only a perfect Samnyāśī is eligible for going through
'Prasthāna Traya'. The insistence of Suresvara and Śrīkara,
that the Realisation of the Supreme is automatic on the
presentation of Vedānta Vākyas is also due to this fact.

The next stage, which is not exactly a
consequence of the dawn of Realisation since it occurs si-
multaneously to it, is dropping down the effects of Avidya. 56
The Realisation results in the fact that all the psychical
and physical objects in the Universe are nothing but the
Supreme being, which is possible only when it is noted
that all these appearances are nothing but the modifications
of Avidyā. This is the stage of 'Jīvamukta' when the
Avidyā ceases to exist in the effectual stage but is there
in the causal stage. The Realisation of Supreme Reality
too, hence, is in the effectual stages as bases of the modifications of Avidyā and in its causal stage beyond Kūtastha is yet to be realised. It is only a question of time, during which the remaining impressions of past actions of seeker (Vāsana) in the primordial Avidyā, which are the activating causes of the projection of the universe and the individual, are completely annihilated. The moral coil then is warded off and the seeker becomes a Mukta, completely freed and remains as his own perfected self eternally.

THUS, even if Suresvara accepts that Karma have a part to play in the final Realisation, he envisages a very big gap between these two limits and the seeker is likely to be exhausted or diverted at any point of the many stages till he becomes a perfect avidīṣa Śamyāsin.

IT is interesting here to examine Sureswara's views on some of the issues that have occupied the intellectual deliberations of latter scholars in Advaita literature. One
SUCH is the place and import of Sravana, Manana and Nidhidyāsana in Advaita discipline of the seeker.

SÜRESVARA accepts clearly that Sravana as an act is ordained and is the subject of an injunction. He defines Sravana as the effort of determining the Vedānta significance in Veda by the aid of various principles of interpretation. Manana is subsequent process of further deliberation on the said meaning. The aim of this process of deliberation is to arrive at the real nature of the Supreme reality. These acts of Sravana and Manana are to be performed by the seeker with every effort, till the knowledge of Supreme reality dawns. Suresvara does not express clearly as to whether Manana also is the subject of an injunction. But since both the processes of Manana and Sravana are joined together according to his interpretation, and form a single unit of discipline, by implication he means injunction for Manana also.

THE process of Sravana and Manana, repeated again and again are termed as meditation, Prasamkhyaṇa,
by Suresvara. Hence this is a mental discipline and is conjoined with the six disciplines mentioned as the prerequisites of an eligible seeker of truth. The commentator Anandagiri explicitly says that these two are to be observed with the practice of the six disciplines. Suresvara perhaps follows his preceptor Sri Sankara in this respect, very closely.

Then what type of Vidhi does he accept to the Sravana and Manana. All the Advaitins are unanimous that it is not an Apurva Vidhi since nothing new is presented by it. The Vivarana school considers this to be a Niyama Vidhi since it ordains the seeker to perform these acts. Appaya Diksita mentions that some attribute to Suresvara the view that it is a parisara Vidhi or an injunction that speaks of exclusion. That is to say this injunction has the main purpose of excluding the thoughts and objects extraneous to the Supreme Reality in these two processes, Sravana and Manana. One of the Vartikas, attributed
to Suresvara and Manana—one of the Vastvakas, but not traced in the available texts, is commented with a stress of imagination to arrive at this interpretation of Pari-sankhya Vidhi.

VACASPATI does not accept any type of injunction in Sravana and Manana too, and simply holds them as terms of cognitive significance. These two constitute mere rational excogitations and help to remove the mental insufficiencies and presumptions. So they are in the nature of mere analysis of cognitive pramanas like verbal testimony and inference. It is not quite essential that these processes shall be gone through by a seeker and they can be avoided if he is already adequately enlightened. Râmakṛṣṇa-dhvarī elucidates this view clearly and says that actually the words signify that the supreme reality etc., presented by Upaniṣads is "fit to be heard, pondered upon etc." It means that they do not compel the seeker to do so; but he can resort to these processes if he has a desire and feels their necessity in his search.
THIS course of thought should have been taken by extremists like Suresvara since he does not accept any injunction whatsoever in the Upanisadic passage. But he accepts a vidhi for sravana and anana. The reason is that he considers these to be a part of disciplines and places them on a par and along with the six disciplines like "śāma", "dāna" etc. When the seeker renounces the world and the three seekings, i.e., when he enters the beginning stage of vividhisa śamnyāsa, he is introduced to the positive means of six disciplines and the three processes of sravana etc., these activities show him his goal and disciplines a way to it. The seeker is still in the stage of receiving injunctions and the aspects of mu-mukṣutva, desire for release, will be developed in him only by these three activities. Hence Suresvara accepts vidhi for the first two and says that vidhyāsana is an automatic consequence of these two, because the six disciplines he is practicing simultaneously result in it. The latter is the final limit of the first two activities.\(^{63}\) The function of these three stop here and their import is
not continued further when the concentration of mind (Cittapravanata) is achieved.

It may also be noted that, even though Suresvara does not expressively say so, he is acceptable to the idea that this can be only a parisankhya Vidhi. Being aware of the examples of Vadhadeva, Suka etc., whose renunciation automatically resulted in the Realisation of the Supreme and also on account of his favourite theme that it is more the abandonment of the Universe and the Karma that is to be accomplished for attainment of salvation, it is but reasonable to consider that Suresvara prefers the Parisankhya Vidhi in this matter.

Another reason that supports such an assumption is the difference of opinion with regards to the application of the purport of śravaṇa etc., in the process of Realisation. Vivarana school considers that the implication of these three activities continue, of course indirectly, till the Realisation of Brahman. So to say the power of the injunction extends to the final stage which is free
from any external activity and this position sounds somewhat anomalous. This very conception is nauseating to Suresvara and so, he accepts only the injunction of exclusiveness which speaks that the non-self shall not interfere with the true nature of self in these activities. The purport of this injunction is over by so excluding the Samsara completely the result of which is concentration of mind on the Supreme (Cittapraṇaṇa).

The stage of seeker's discipline at which the conception of this Vidhi is introduced also supports the view of Parisamkhya Vidhi. He has developed a distaste to the Samsara and wants to avoid it. It is a stage when this distaste has to be strengthened, while a way for him towards the main positive goal, Supreme Reality, has to be shown. It is not within the scope of any injunction as such to finally reveal this Reality which is the subject of positive statements of Vedanta Vākyas. So these passages of injunction like Sravana, Manana and Nidhidvāna are more helpful to strengthen the aversion towards the worldly
things already developed. They are nurtured by the practice of six disciplines which consists in absenteations and so negative in character; hence also they are to be considered only injunctions of exclusiveness.

FROM the above discussion it is clear that Suresvara accepts the view that Vividisa Samnyasa is essential for introduction into the discipline of Vedanta Vakyas. He is of opinion that this initiation shall be given to the seeker as soon as he develops a desire to abandon the worldly Samsara. The six disciplines and Sravana and such other activities follow only such initiations.

FOLLOWERS of Śri Saṅkara however have varied opinions in the matter. Vivaraṇa school holds that the 'Uparati’ the third of the six disciplines is nothing but Samnyasa and as such one shall be introduced to it after he attains perfection in the preceding two qualities of physical and mental disciplines. According to this School this is a compulsory prescription (Niyamavidhi). Vācaspati
Mīśra, on the other hand, thinks that Samyāsa at any stage is not essential for attainment of Supreme Realisation. The examples of Janaka, Yājñavalkya are cited. This School holds that even the worship of personal god is a way for Supreme Realisation, as this too develops the capacity of concentration of the mind.

SURESVĀRA has fully contradicted this view of Upāsana being a stage in Brahman Realisation. He is of firm opinion that Samyāsa is the only way for this Realisation and he differs from his preceptor in the details of it. Śrī Śankara, according to Vivarana, holds the view that Samyāsa is prescribed as duty, Miyama, for the seeker after he has perfected the six disciplines. That is to say he is to be initiated just as he developed the capacity for concentration, when he is to be introduced to Upaniṣadic texts by way of śravaṇa etc., So, he does not appear to approve the vividisa type of Samyāsa, and even if he is considered to do so, it can safely be
assumed that this Vividisa starts only towards the end of all disciplines when the Vedanta vakyas are presented.

Suresvara does not accept this view. He is of the opinion that Samnyasa is to be prescribed as soon as the seeker develops a desire to renounce the world. When one renounces, and if no positive way is presented immediately, there is a negative feeling and frustration. The prescription of six disciplines which are negative in their nature, does not help him in the matter. In fact psychologically this results in depression and only proper time to prescribe the Sravana and Manana is before such a sorrowful stage of affairs does not set in. The desire to renounce what is on hand is also succeeded if not born simultaneous, by a desire to know the next and this is Vividisa with Samnyasa (Renunciation to know). Hence Suresvara accepts Vividisa Samnyasa at a much earlier stage than his preceptor whose conception of the same is very vague.
Another conception of this Vividśa Samyāsa according Suresvara is that this really produces an "Apūrva" in the seeker which helps in creating an eligibility to hear Vedanta Vākyas and cultivate the six disciplines. According to him, it is not justifiable to consider this prescription of Samnyāsa at this stage, even as an injunction of exclusiveness (Parisāṅkhyā Vidhi) presumably because the purpose of excluding the world is in the purview of the six disciplines that follow and śravaṇa etc., as already explained. Samnyāsa has more positive element as it reveals a gateway for further effort towards realisation, than being a negative act because the negation as such has its life in affirmation only.

Unlike his preceptor and the orthodox of Advaitins, Suresvara is prepared to open the portals of Samnyāsa at least to the first three communities of Hinduism. He shows his extremist view in this respect and also catholicity. This fact also substantiates his above conception of Vividśa Samyāsa. A Samnyāsin is considered
to be above the conception of caste and creed and a seeker when he takes up to this Āśrama can be introduced to Upanisadic passages without any hesitation of his past attachments. If Saṃnyāsa is opened to Brahmans only, as they alone are eligible to learn Vedas, Sravana etc., can not be positively prescribed even before Saṃnyāsa as is so held by Sankara and his followers of Vivarana school. But the Supreme Reality is not the possession of one community only and it behaves the all pervasive character of the same to reveal itself to any irrespective of the external differences. To adjust the injunction that Veda shall be studied only by Brahmanas, it is but essential to prescribe Saṃnyāsa even before the Upanisadic portals are opened as a way of discipline. The nature of Supreme Reality and the catholicity of Advaitic thought too are in consonance with this conception of Saṃnyāsa of Suresvara.

Tradition ascribes to Suresvara, the authorship of various duties and rules of conduct to be observed by a Saṃnyāsin. He is also credited with having been
empowered by his preceptor to discharge a superintending
authority over all the Maths founded by him instead of at-
taching himself to one single one. Even though his main
study was perhaps in the Śrīnagara (this is also disputable)
he is not burdened with the routine duties of this math,
so that he can discharge his supervisory duties of Sam-
nyāsa order. The question of enunciating any duties
of Samnyāsa order does not arise when the seeker is ad-
mitted to the order of Samnyāsa at the final stage of
his discipline, because then he would have all most
realised the Supreme Reality. Hence this traditional
authorship too goes to substantiate this conception
of Vividisha Samnyāsa.

ONE of the published and most important
works that prescribe the practical application of Ve-
danta is Pancikaraṇa of Śrī Śāṅkara. It opens with a
statement that the procedure prescribed in it is for
the Samnyāsins who are in the highest order of enlighten-
ment. But Suresvara in his Vartika does not accept
this position. He says that in the work the way to mental tranquility is prescribed for seekers of liberation (Mumukṣu). In the conclusion also he says that this work is for "Bhagavattama" and "Yogi", thereby indicating a seeker who is to practice the disciplines and not a perfected soul. Such a definite departure of interpretation from his preceptor clearly indicates the conceptions of Vividisa Samnyāsa of Suresvara, since this work of practice for Samnyāsin holds good not before he has reached the stage of enlightenment but only before he is introduced to the order of discipline.

It may not be difficult to guess the reason for this shift effected by Suresvara. Presumably the change in the outlook of the society towards the religion may be the cause for this. Śrī Śankara has practically annihilated Buddhism that was predominating hitherto and also the philosophy of Purvamimamsa school. The emptiness of Buddhistic philosophy and the cumbersome procedure of Mīmāṃsa way to liberation should have been realised by a large
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section of the people on account of the sweeping victory of Śrī Sankara. It fell to the lot of Suresvara to consolidate this gain at the levels of both intellectuals and masses. The real seeker of the truth and the enthusiast had to be taken under the fold of the Advaitic tonet and for this purpose a code of disciplines at lower levels had to be strictly enforced so that those who take up to the path and yet are unable to continue it have to be considered "Arūḍha Patijjas", fallen from the crest, which is considered to be a blasphemy for a Śamnyāsin. If such a fall is from the quasi-final stage of "cittapravāṇata", when only Śamnyāsa is to be initiated as per Śankara, then people will loose faith in Advaita, since it is unbelievable and impossible that persons of such a height fall down at all. So the elimination shall be effected at lower level by a strict code of conduct and discipline framed by Sankara himself, so that the purity of high st order of Śamnyāsa is preserved. A fear and awe towards this order is created among the people by such a strict measure at lower
level adopted by Suresvara. He does not wish a Vidvatsanyas in to be considered an "Arūdha Patita".

HENCE, "Suresvarācārya has vehemently criticised the acceptance of Samnyasa at one's sweep will as a mere formal final order of life. According to him, nobody is entitled to it unless he has become really fit both mentally and spiritually for renouncing the world. He sincerely advises such people to satisfy all their natural cravings and propenities in the three previous orders of life first and after having thus quelled and subdued their evil mental tendencies through actual satisfaction and con-
tinuous control try to come to this exalted final order of life through the proper channel of 1) Nityakarmamūsthaiā 2) Cittasamudīhi, 3) Samsārāsarātā Parijāna, and Samsā-
ra Parijihira. At this stage he is initiated to the Vi-
vidīsā Samnyāsa when he renounces the world-order and these human seekings when "seeker is fully qualified to adopt and practice Sravana and Anāna etc."
IN the discipline of sadhana prescribed for the higher category of Samnyāsins by Śankara, the unification of the individual self with the supreme, the process of identification of the three stages of experience with the three primary stages of evolution plays the important part. Gaudapāda has dealt with this process of discipline elaborately in his Vārtikas on Māndūkyopanisad. There is not much difference between the procedure explained in this and Śri Śankara in his Bāhagvas and Panchākarana. But Suresvara has some discretion in this regard.

As far as waking state is concerned Suresvara agrees with his preceptors that the entire perceptual machinery is operative in it, that the Jīva cognises worldly phenomena by means of the mind and senses which are conditioned by the Avidya and which operate through the identification of underlying consciousness. The soul that is the subject of this operation is called Jīva in the microcosm and its identification with the corresponding swāmi unit of macrocosm, Virat is the first step to-
wards the Sādhana.

BUT Svāpna is considered as the appearance of consciousness, through the mind, of the subject on one hand and object plus means of knowledge on the other; the phenomena however arises due to the residual impressions of waking experience which modify themselves so.\textsuperscript{79} He draws his inspiration of this interpretation from his preceptors Śaṅkara\textsuperscript{80} and Gādāpāda.\textsuperscript{81} In the dream the Jīva has no instrument of knowledge as such and the Vāsanās that lie in the mind serve this purpose.\textsuperscript{82} Suresvara terms these impressions as Bhāvanās and the effect of them i.e., the phenomena of dream as the projection of shining intellect.\textsuperscript{82} The Vāsanās themselves are the delimiting factors of the self-shining lustre of the soul who in capacity is Kūṭastha illumines these Vāsanās as 'Cidābhāsas'.\textsuperscript{83}

THIS account of dream shows that Suresvara considers the dream too to be having a definite entity and a comparative existence. This view about dream is the same as that of Avaccheda school. The pratibimba school on the
other hand considers that the pure consciousness delimited by the primordial Avidya itself is the source of the illusory phenomena in the dream too. According to this school, the dream objects and annihilated as it were, in the waking stage. But according to the theory of Suresvara and also Avaccheda school they are sublated being mere 'Cidabhasas' or Avacchinas of Supreme consciousness. Such a sublation suits the 'sahana' in the Realisation. In the macrocosm, the Hiranyagarbha i.e., the cosmic intellect is the corresponding entity and the seeker is to identify his Swapna with this stage.

IN defining "Susupti" or sound sleep Suresvara has an entirely new idea to give Advalta literature. In fact this is the utmost important in this field as it is all most equated with the Supreme existence where the karmas causing the waking and dreaming states and also the senses including the mind lie dormant merged in Avidya and not effected at all. But there is the experience during this state
and this is proved only by the later expression of happiness of sleep in waking stage. Most of the Advaitins are of the view that this expression is due to recollection since the 'I' of the waking stage continues to exist in the form of Supreme existence in the sound sleep too; because without this 'I-ness' or Ahamkāra no experience including the recollection is possible at all. The Avidya and the Bliss experienced in the sleep do not continue in the state of waking as they are annihilated.

BUT Suresvara does not consider this as a recollection but only as 'Vikalpa'. For him the Susupti is a state of bare Avidya with all its products absorbed in it and there is no connection of one's self and the seed-like Avidya in this state. The self experiences itself and so there is the complete bliss and if Avidya has its way in the Ātma or Ātma is to be considered to 'conceive' Avidya there cannot be this sound sleep and its resultant Bliss.

HENCE he does not consider that there is a
possibility of this bliss being recollected at a later stage, because this experience has no relation to Avidya and so beyond any space and time. A recollection of an experience is possible when the same relates to a different time or place. Hence the experience of happiness of sleep, during the state of waking can only be a 'Vikalpa'. Suresvara himself gives indication of what this Vikalpa is. Since this experiencing of happiness of sleep is not a perception which relates only to the present and those cannot be an experience of the future at all, this can be only a knowledge. The experience in sleep is Mervikalpa and its waking state i.e., when the individual has first woken up, is just a Vikalpa, the expression of the same in terms of duality. In such an expression there is separation of the cognisor on one hand and the cognised on the other, with cognition connecting them, all of which are completely separated in the original state of sound sleep.

The state of sound sleep is to be identified with Isvara, in the macrocosmic side. This state is the seed from which both the Hiranyagarbha and Virat emerge.
and likewise the sleep is the source from which both the dream and waking state emerge directly. But out of these two the former is nearer to the first than the latter. Hence the easier way is to identify the waking state with the sleep through the dream. It is possible only to experienced seeker to do so directly without the intervention of Svapna.

ANOTHER departure of Suresvara is that he advocates identification of sleep with the state of Isvare in the macrocosmic evolution, passing over the earlier state of śūtrātman, where the generation of duality actually starts. In the microcosmic Jiva too there is only the beginning of subject-object relationship in the so called recollection of happiness of sound sleep.

THE reason for this departure is that Suṣupti must be the last stage in the experience to Jiva and this must be as near as possible to the supreme existence, Turiya. The other schools of Advaita consider Śūtrātman and Isvāna to be one and the same but, as already explained,
Suresvara rightly differentiates the two. So Susupti has to be invariably identified with Ísvara only passing over the Sūtra tman which is to be equated with the "Vikalpa", a variety of Mithyā Jñāna itself.

SUCH a Sadhana of the Supreme order makes the seeker a deserving person to receive the Vedānta Mahāvākyas. He becomes perfect in the fact that his mind will be then ready to receive the Supreme experience presented by these passages. He will be a Vidvat Samnyasin.

There is again a controversy on the method of presentation of Supreme reality by these Mahāvākyas. The relationship of the constituent words of Mahāvākyas are interpreted on three principles viz., qualified and qualifying, juxtaposition in the same base and secondary significance. Suresvara discusses all these principles of interpretation,91 in his own way. But he attaches the most importance to the last one and the first one is not at all to his preference because there is no possibility of Avidya qualifying the Brahman at any stage and never in the final stage of Realisation.92
THERE is however a possibility of such relationship from the level of Isvara and downwards because of the former getting modified into the mundane world stage by stage. The Realisation is only possible when the product of Isvara is annihilated and consequently the very complication of Isvara too is annihilated.\footnote{93}

IN the case of the second one, juxtaposition on the same base, Suresvara takes the illustration of \textit{\textit{A\textmu ccheda V\ddata{s}}} and explains that the unwanted parts of the sentence i.e., those that indicate Avidyā and its products are just dropped and the base, whence Adhikāraṇa is revealed. This interpretation applies in the case of "Tatvamasi" Mahāvākyā; those elements that do not belong to Reality cease to exist simply by such 'dropping out' because their very presence is possible in the vicinity of Reality only.\footnote{94} But even here Suresvara has his own reservation. He is not prepared to accept that there is a possibility of two (or even more) non-Real elements existing in juxtaposition on the same base because of the natural
opposition of the two. So there is possibility of identification only by dropping down this non-essential aspect.

IN the case of secondary significance this is possible. The immediacy of supreme reality is reflected in jīva and the non-duality is experienced through the discipline. The presentation of Mahāvākyā, "Aham Brahmaāmi" in this context, removes the non-immediacy of the non-dual Brahman and multiplicity of jīva, where the oneness of both is revealed. But Suresvara's speciality consists in this interpretation that he stresses on the dropping out the non-essential part. Actually this annihilation is practically completed by the earlier discipline and so the Mahāvākyas only present the Final Reality automatically.

THIS importance given to the Annihilation (Bādhā) is one of the reasons substantiating the view that Suresvara prefers the process of Secondary significance to that of Juxtaposition on common base, even here he appears to prefer the dropping out the primary sense completely.
(Jahallaksana) to that of partial dropping (Jahadajahallaksana). In the example of "Eat the Poison" oft quoted for this type of Laksana, the primary significance is completely dropped out and the secondary significance only is taken into account. Likewise the Supreme Reality which is not quite different from the world and yet not the same with it is realised by dropping out such a world altogether. For Suresvāra there appears to be no need for accepting that there is an 'Atahat' part of Laksya. The self illumination of Supreme consciousness might have prompted Suresvāra to resort to this divergence from his preceptor.

This realisation of the Supreme results in the complete enlightenment of the seeker and he becomes a Jīvanmukta. Sri Suresvāra, following his preceptor, recognises this last and final stage of Sadhana before actually attaining the liberation through shedding the mortal coil.

Sri SANKARA following Brhadāranyaka explains that in the macrocosmic side the Jīvanmukta is on
a par with Śūtātman the beginning stage of duality.

Here the psychical and physical evolution on the side of the cosmos and the evolution of the same on the part of the Jīva merge when the Supreme remains with termed Avidyā, known as Māyā in a non-evolutionary phase. The consciousness visualises the external Universe as its own form. This vision is quite different from the mundane sight which ends with the previous stages of intellectual discipline culminating in the Niṣṭhā stage.

There is yet however a difference between the stage, which is all comprehensive and is called Turiyā and the higher stage, Supti. This is comprehensive of the external Universe too. In Supti, according to Sureśvara, the consciousness is aware of its own being in the form of bliss and the Avidyā (or Māyā to be correct) stands separate, as it were, without causing any influence over such a consciousness. But in Turiyā, it is this Supreme consciousness that pervades the Avidyā and realises its own self as the enduring basis of the same.
There exists here a duality and feeling as the realised and the realiser. Hence this stage is also considered and that of an internal ruler and internal seer.

THE Advaita literature accepts that in this stage of Jivanmukta, there is the possibility of the seeker attending to his daily needs and also exhibiting the passions. The reason advanced for such a condition is that the karma that has already commenced to bear fruit cannot be stopped in the middle of that process and on the other hand the karma which is not yet brought into operation with theavidya, its base. An Analysis of the arguments of Suresvara in support of this view reveals his in-sight into the fundamental philosophical principles on which the soundness of this conception is based.

THE creation has its beginning in the Īśvara stage because of the primaeval impressions of past karmas that lie dormant in theavidya based on it. These impressions act as motivating forces. It is possible that
These forces may not get stimulated all together; but as and when the destiny of the to-be-created demands, the corresponding impression begins to work. This motivation caused by the stimulation of the impression is called "Iksana" in Upanisads.\(^{105}\) This process gets repeated as and when the need for creation arises. The stimulation caused by the impression does not cease till the final effect by it in the creation is accomplished. The starting point of it, the Avidya, or the consciousness that lies as its base for the evolution has no further control to stop its effectuation because, this very evolved Universe is not far from the Supreme consciousness realised, being only a Cidabhasa and the Enlightened views it as "Cit" itself. The evolved Universe has passed the limits of a stage of an Abhasa of Cit.\(^{106}\) Hence there is no necessity to repudiate it completely, especially because even this Abhasa has ceased to be so but only "Cit" as far as the vision of Jivanmukta is concerned.\(^{107}\) This is really a unique and highly convincing explanation of the thesis,
offered by Suresvara. In the case of the impression of Karmas that have not began to bear fruit, their complete annihilation along with Avidya when the seeker becomes fully liberated on the shed of mortal coils, is accepted by all schools of Vedanta, because, otherwise they along with their base, obstruct the Final Realisation.108

THE Final Realisation consists in Freedom from all Abhasas, beyond the primordial Avidya and it is nothing but pure and unsullied consciousness resting in itself.109

THE END.