Introduction

A student has to take three knowledge-steps in understanding the advaitic import of the mahāvākyā ‘Tat tvam asi’. These steps are — sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha-jñānam, viśeṣa-viśeṣyatā-sambandha-jñānam and laksya-lakṣaṇayātā-sambandha-jñānam. The first one sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha-jñānam is the knowledge (jñānam) of the relationship (sambandha) of the words tat and tvam having the same locus (sāmānādhikaranya). In order to understand this concept, the terms vākyā, pada, vākyārtha, padārtha and samsārāga were taken up for detailed analysis. ‘Vākyā’ is a sentence, ‘padas’ are the words that constitute a sentence, ‘padārtha’ is the word-sense denoted by a particular pada and ‘vākyārtha’ is the collective sentence-sense arrived at by perceiving the relationship between the padārthas. This relationship between the various padārthas is termed ‘samsārāga’ (literally ‘coming together’). Knowledge of these samsārāgas is the direct cause for determining the vākyārtha or the sentence-sense. All these were elaborately discussed in the last essay1. We had concluded the last essay by mentioning that the samsārāgas (relation) between the padārthas (word-senses) are basically of two types — bheda-rūpa-samsārāga and abheda-rūpa-samsārāga. In this essay we shall elaborate on these two types of samsārāgas, for a thorough grasp of them alone will facilitate the right understanding of the first knowledge-step — sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha-jñānam.

1Please refer to Tat Tvam Asi – Part II, which appeared in the September 2004 issue of Tapovan Prasad. It is advisable to gain a good grasp of the terms therein before going through this essay.
Bhedas-Rūpa-Saṁsarga

The example used by the Ācāryas to explain bheda-rūpa-saṁsarga is — '(tvam) daṇḍena gām ānaya'. This sentence means — '(You) bring (ānaya) the cow (gām) with a stick (daṇḍena)'. The word 'tvam' or 'you', which is the subject of the vākya (sentence), is implied in Sanskrit and need not be explicitly written. It is therefore put within brackets².

Each of the padas (words) in this vākya (sentence) connotes different padarthas (word-sense). The padartha of the pada 'go' or 'cow' is 'an animal which has cow-ness (gotāta)'. The go-pada (the word go) in the vākya is seen to be in the grammatical form which is the second or the accusative case. Hence we come to the conclusion that the go-pada's padartha (the word-sense of the word go) namely — 'an animal having the property of cowness (gotāta)' is the object of the (vākya) sentence. The next pada, the daṇḍa-pada (the word daṇḍa or stick) has its padartha as 'an object having the property of stick-ness (dāndatva)'. The daṇḍa-pada (the word daṇḍa or stick) is present in the sentence in its third case or the instrumental case as indicated by the word-form 'daṇḍena'. This enables us to come to the decision that this padartha — 'an object having the property of stick-ness (dāndatva)', is used in the sense of an instrument or means for an act. Now relating these padarthas also with the (imperative or command) verbal sense of 'ānaya' or 'bring', we arrive at the vākyārtha of the sentence as 'You bring the cow using a stick'.

Let us now analyse the nature of the relationship between the two padarthas of go-pada and daṇḍa-pada which are 'an animal having the property of cow-ness (gotāta)' and 'an object having the property of stick-ness (dāndatva)' respectively. It is natural that the two padas 'go-pada' (the word 'cow') and the 'daṇḍa-pada' (the word 'stick') have different padarthas because their connotations (pravṛttinimitta) are different. What is of special interest to our analysis is that these padarthas do not have a common single adhikaraṇa or locus which they are related

¹This implication is inferred from the second-person-singular verbal form ānaya.
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to. This relationship between the padārthas which are not related to a single common adhikarana is described as bheda-rūpa-saṁsarga or ‘the relationship of difference’.

We are now led to a logical question — What makes the padārthas have the relation of bheda-rūpa-saṁsarga or having the relationship of not being related to a single and common adhikarana or locus? We infer that the capacity of the padas to indicate padarthas which are not related to a common adhikarana or locus arises because the padas are placed in different grammatical cases. Since the ‘go-pada’ (word go) and the ‘danda-pada’ (word danda) are found in different grammatical cases — the accusative (or second) case and instrumental (third) case respectively — they are not related to a single common adhikarana or locus. If they were in the same grammatical case the result would be contrary. This will become clearer when we analyse and compare the bheda-rūpa-saṁsarga with abheda-rūpa-saṁsarga.

**Abheda-Rūpa-Saṁsarga**

The traditional example used to explain this type of saṁsarga is ‘nīlam utpalam (asti) — (There is a) blue lotus’. The verbal word-form ‘asti’ (derived from the verbal root ‘as’ — ‘to be’), is translated freely as ‘there is a’. This is implied in Sanskrit and there is no actual need to explicitly mention it. Hence this is put within brackets.

In this vyākya (sentence) ‘nīlam utpalam’, the pada (word) ‘nīla’, refers to a colour ‘the quality nīlatva or blue-ness’. This becomes the padārtha (word-sense) of the ‘nīla-pada’ (the word

---

3One may object to this sort of relationship — if there is no relationship of the nature of being related to the same adhikarana or locus why can’t we simply say there is no relationship at all between the padārthas rather than saying there is ‘the relationship of difference’? This is not an acceptable objection. In a sentence the padārthas referred to by the padas (words) will have to be necessarily related to each because of the mere fact that it is only the relationship between the padārthas that establishes the vyākṛthi of a sentence. Thus, the relationship between the padārthas exists and in this case their relationship (saṁsarga) is that of difference! What is being denied is only the relationship of the padārthas being related to a single adhikarana (locus).

4The different grammatical cases are called ‘vibhaktis’ in Sanskrit. They are eight in number.
The.padārtha.of.‘utpala-pada’.(the.word.‘utpala’).refers.to.
‘the.substance.characterised.by.‘utpalatva’or.‘lotus-ness’.
Since.
the.connotations.(praṇātiti-nimitta)of.both.the.‘nīlā-pada’
and.
‘utpala-pada’are.different,.their.padārthas.are.also.naturally.dif-
ferent.

Upto.this.point.there.is.a.similarity.with.bhedā-rūpa-
samsarga.In.the.example.used.to.illustrate.—‘danḍena.gām.āṇaya’
—.we.saw.that.the.padārthas.referred.to.by.the.‘danḍa-pada’.(the.
word.‘danḍa’).and.‘go-pada’which.are.‘an.object.which.has.the.
property.of.stick-ness.(danḍatva)’and.‘an.animal.having.the.
property.of.cow-ness.(gōtva)’,.respectively,.are.different.

But.the.similarity.ends.here.In.bhedā-rūpa-samsarga.the.padas
are.in.different.cases.—‘danḍa’is.in.the.instrumental.or.third.
case.as.danḍena.and.‘go’is.in.the.accusative.or.second.case.as.
gām.

But.in.the.case.of.abhedā-rūpa-samsarga,.we.find.that.both.
the.‘nīlā-pada’and.‘utpala-pada’are.grammatically.in.the.same.
case.(vibhakti),.the.first.case.or.the.nominative.case.(prathama-
vibhakti)as.evincing.by.their.grammatical.forms.‘nīlām’and.
‘utpalām’.

Noticing.therefore.the.grammatical.agreement.between.the.
two.padas.‘nīlām’and.‘utpalām’we.conclude.that.their.two.
padārthas,.i.e..‘the.quality.characterised.with.nīlatva.or.blue-
ness’and.‘the.substance.characterised.by.the.property.of.
utpalatva.or.‘lotus-ness’should.inhere.or.be.related.to.the.same.
adhikarana.(locus.or.substratum)—.here.the.object.‘flower.’.Once.
this.understanding.happens,.we.then.arrive.at.the.vākyārtha
(sentence-sense)of.the.sentence.‘nīlām.utpalām’as.‘nīla-abhinna-
utpalām’,i.e..the.knowledge.of.‘there.being.a.flower.which.has.
both.the.properties.of.‘nīlatva’(blue-ness)and.‘utpalatva’.

Invoke.sattvic.qualities.and.remake.
your.destiny.

Swami.Chinmayananda

Sri.Krishna.Sweets
Despite the *padas* (words) indicating different *padārthas* (word-senses), because of their different connotations (*pravṛtti-nimitta*), the *padas* being in the same grammatical case (*vibhakti*) force the *padārthas* to become related to one and the same locus (*adhikaraṇa*). This type of *samsarga* (relationship) wherein the *padārthas* of different *padas* are associated to the same *adhikaraṇa* is described as *abheda* or ‘non-difference’ – hence the term *abheda-rūpa-saṁsarga*. When we say that the *samsarga* (relation) between ‘nilatva’ (blue-ness) and ‘utpalatva’ (lotus-ness) is that of non-difference, it is not to mean that ‘nilatva’ and ‘utpalatva’ are the same for they cannot be the same because of the different connotations (*pravṛtti-nimitta*) of the *nīla-pada* and *upala-pada*. But what is meant is that they both have the same *adhikaraṇa* (locus or substratum) and in that sense there is the relation of non-difference between the two *padārthas*.

What we have attempted till now is not to be mistaken and discarded as some intellectual gymnastics of the over-analytical grammarians and logicians of yore. It is only a step-by-step lucid verbalisation of the psychological processes which are involved in understanding sentences. This is important because even ‘Tat Tvam Asi’ is a sentence.

**The cause of difference**

It is now clear that in *abheda-rūpa-saṁsarga* the *padārthas* are related to a single *adhikaraṇa* (locus or substratum) while in *bheda-rūpa-saṁsarga* the *padārthas* are not related to a single *adhikaraṇa*. We can now exactly pinpoint the one and the only reason which causes this difference. In the case of *abheda-rūpa-saṁsarga* the *padas* (words) are in the same grammatical cases (*vibhakti*), but in the case of the *bheda-rūpa-saṁsarga* the *padas* are in different grammatical cases and there is no grammatical agreement between them.

**Sāmānādhikaraṇya-Sambandha**

When *padas* (words) are in different grammatical cases, we say that they are in *bhinna-vibhakti*, but when the *padas* are in the same grammatical case, they are described as having *samāna-*
vibhakti. This term ‘samāna-vibhakti’ can be translated as grammatical agreement, grammatical co-ordination or apposition. In our discussions just concluded above, we have seen that padas having samāna-vibhakti (enjoying grammatical agreement or apposition) will have their padārthas related to one and the same locus or substratum, or to put it in Sanskrit, they will have a samāna-adhikaraṇa (samāna = same and adhikaraṇa = locus or substratum). The golden rule is the padas (words) will have a samāna-adhikaraṇa (same locus) for their padārthas (word-sense) if they are in samāna-vibhakti (in the same grammatical case) and will have bhinna-adhikaraṇa (different locus) for their padārthas if the padas are in bhinna-vibhakti (different grammatical cases).

This relationship (sambandha) of the padas which are in samānavibhakti, thereby forcing their respective padārthas to have the same common adhikaraṇa, is termed samānadīkhikaraṇatva-sambandha or samānādhikaraṇya-sambandha. Hence nila-pada and utpala-pada have the relationship of samānadīkhikaraṇya-sambandha. This concept of samānadīkhikaraṇya-sambandha is summarised by Sri Sureswaracharya in Mānasollasa, the vārttika (gloss) on Dāksināmūrti Stotram:

bhinnapravṛttiṁittānāṁ sabdānāmevāstuni, pravṛttisī tu samānādhikaraṇaṁvaśamihocayate.

When padas (words), which refer to different padārthas (meanings), point towards the same substratum (or locus), then the (mutual) relationship of these words is that of samānādhikaraṇatva or ‘having the same substratum’.

Give. To give is life; to take is death.

Swami Chinmayananda

Sri Krishna Sweet's
The jñāna (knowledge) of this sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha between the padas is called sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha-jñāna.

Sāmānādhikaranya-Sambandha-Jñāna in 'Tat Tvam Asi'

Now let us go to our main sentence — the mahāvākya 'Tat tvam asi', to analyse which we have had to do such elaborate groundwork. We find herein that both the tat-pada and tvam-pada are in the same grammatical case which is the nominative or first case (prathamāvibhakti). This looks exactly similar to the example of abheda-rūpa-sāṁsarga - 'nīlam utpalam' wherein we found both the nīla-pada and utpala-pada in samāna-vibhakti (the same first case). This caused their respective padārthas to be related to a samāna-adhikaraṇa (same locus) thereby creating the relationship of sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha between the nīla-pada and utpala-pada.

The similar sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha is also present between the tat-pada and tvam-pada in the mahāvākya 'Tat tvam asi'. Since both tat-pada and tvam-pada are in the same grammatical case, we have to choicelessly accept here that they too should enjoy sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha. And since the 'tat-pada' and 'tvam-pada' have come to have sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha we have to accept a single adhikaraṇa (locus) for both the tat-padārthā (the padārtha of the pada 'tat') and tvam-padārthā (the padārtha of the pada 'tvam'). We have already discussed the tatpadārthā and the tvampadārthā as Īśvara and jīva respectively. This leads to the inescapable conclusion that both Īśvara and jīva should have a single adhikaraṇa (locus).

There is one major difference between the vākya 'nīlam utpalam' and the mahāvākya 'Tat tvam asi'. The former has abheda-rūpa-sāṁsarga while in the latter there is svarūpa-abheda and no sāṁsarga at all. This subtle difference will be explained when the third knowledge step laksya-laksana-sambandha-jñānam is dealt with.

Refer to August 2004 issue of Tapovan Prasad 'Tat Tvam Asi – Part I'.
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This knowledge of the padas ‘tat’ and ‘tvam’ having a samāna-adhikaraṇa (the same locus) because of their grammatical apposition (or agreement or co-ordination) is the very first knowledge-step to be taken in the understanding of the mahāvākya ‘tat tvam asi’. This alone and nothing else can lead us to the appreciation of the fact of a single common locus for the tatpadārtha Īśvara and the tvampadārtha Īva. This is the basic, necessary and unavoidable component of the thought process involved in arriving at Īva-brahma-aikya — the tatparya-viśaya (central subject-matter) of Vedānta. A person who has not taken this step has hardly begun his journey into ‘Tat tvam asi’.

The Tussle between Grammar and Logic

It is vital at this juncture to note that the relationship of sāmānādhikaraṇya between ‘tat-pada’ and ‘tvam-pada’ is not a forced manipulation or a product of some calculated thinking. It is naturally present according to the grammatical rules of two words which are present in sāmāna-vibhakti (same grammatical case).

Just as how the sāmānādhikaraṇya-sambandha-jñāna of ‘nīlam’ and ‘utpalam’ leads to the acceptance of the locus (i.e., the flower) which has both ‘nīlatva’ and ‘utpalatva’ so too the naturally visible sāmānādhikaraṇya-sambandha-jñāna between ‘tat-pada’ and ‘tvam-pada’ leads us to the seemingly illogical acceptance of an adhikaraṇa (locus) which has the nature of both īśvara-tva and īvātva. But logic and mere commonsense prevent the acceptance of such a possibility for it is impossible to visualise a locus or substratum which has these two mutually exclusive and contradictory properties of īśvara-tva and īvātva. The adhikaraṇa of a flower can definitely have both ‘nīlatva’ and ‘utpalatva’ because they are not mutually exclusive but how can one ever imagine an adhikaraṇa which has the properties of both īśvara-tva and īvātva which are absolutely contradictory and hence mutually exclusive? Accepting this proposition is to
admit that there exists a *vastu* (thing or object) which is both *Iśvara* and *jīva* at the same time!

We are thus led to an interesting logical impasse caused by the tussle between grammar and commonsense. The *ṭīkā* (sub-commentary) on *Saarajyasiddhi* seems to mock at the grammatical necessity of having a single and common locus for 'tat-pada' and 'tvam-pada':

Sārvaibādbhātāvya-satyamuktatvabaddhatva-sukhaikarasa-atvaduhkhita-sarvanimitrtekapāratantryādānām parasparaviruddhatvāt.

Because the pairs such as omniscience and limited knowledge, ever liberated nature and bound nature, unalloyed bliss and misery, controller and the controlled etc., are mutually opposites...

**Conclusion**

Let us see if at least the next knowledge-step — *viśeṣa-viśeṣyatā-sambandha-jñānam* will help us break this stalemate between grammar and logic. *Mahāvākyā vicāra* has been the subject of many books and a vast amount of literature is available on this topic. *Mahāvākyā vicāra* being the direct cause for Liberation, great attention has been paid by our *Vedānta Acāryas* to perfect this analysis. A boon for us indeed!

---

*Śaaraśiddhi* and its *ṭīkā* Kaivalyakalpadruma are written by Sri Gangadharendra Saraswati. Some scholars opine that this text is written by Sri Sureswaracharya.