The Background

The vācyārthas (literal meanings) of the tat-pada as Īśvara and tvam-pada as jīva, arrived at by mukhyavṛtti (direct connotation) are incompatible with the akhaṇḍārtha envisaged by the Mahāvākyā ‘Tat tvam asi’. This failure of mukhyavṛtti (direct connotation) to elucidate the akhaṇḍārtha forces us to take recourse to laksanāvṛtti (implied connotation). Laksanāvṛtti primarily requires the discovery of the laksyārthas of the tatpada (word ‘tat’) and tvampada (word ‘tvam’). In the last essay we saw that the laksyārtha (indirect or implied meaning) cannot be determined by jahallaksanā (exclusive secondary connotation) or ajahallaksanā (inclusive secondary connotation).¹

In this essay we shall see how the laksyārtha can be successfully determined by using the third type of laksanā-vṛtti (secondary connotation) – the jahad-ajahal-laksanā (exclusive-inclusive secondary connotation).² Once the determination of the laksyārtha is accomplished, we shall be able to take the

¹Application of jahallaksanā would cause the rejection of the whole tat-pāda-Īśvara and tvam-pāda-jīva. This complete rejection is not required for the difference between Īśvara and jīva is in bhāga-mātra, i.e. in the upādhi portion alone. In the caīānya-bhāga (Consciousness portion) there is no difference whatsoever. The application of ajahallaksanā is also not tenable, for the difference that lies in the upādhi portion remains unaltered (‘Tat Tvam Asi VIII’, April 2005 issue of Tapovan Prasad)

²Also termed ‘bhāga-tyāga-laksanā’. This has been elaborated in ‘Tat Tvam Asi VII’ which appeared in March 2005 issue of Tapovan Prasad. A cursory glance at the same will help in grasping this essay easily.
third and final knowledge step\(^3\) termed – lakṣya-lakṣaṇatā-sambandha-jñānam or 'the knowledge of the relationship between the 'implied' (lakṣya) and the 'implier' (lakṣaṇā)'. It is this knowledge that ultimately helps the student to understand the oneness between tat-pada and tvam-pada.

**So’yāṁ Devadattaḥ**

The example which is used for explaining jahad-ajahal-lakṣaṇā is ‘so’yāṁ devadattaḥ (asti)’\(^4\) – This is that Devadatta’. The vācyārtha of this sentence may be mathematically presented as:

\[
\text{a}yāṁ \text{devadattaḥ} = \text{s}aḥ \text{devadattaḥ}.
\]

We have on one side of the equation ‘a\(\text{yāṁ devadattaḥ}\)’ (this Devadatta) and on the other side is ‘s\(\text{aḥ devadattaḥ}\)’ (that Devadatta). The verbal form ‘asti’ which indicates the identity between them is represented by the mathematical symbol ‘equal to’.

The vācyārtha (literal meaning) of ‘a\(\text{yāṁ devadattaḥ}\) – this Devadatta’ is etatkāla-etatdesa-visiṣṭa-devadatta (Devadatta who is qualified by the time and space of the present) and the vācyārtha of ‘s\(\text{aḥ devadattaḥ}\) – that Devadatta’ is tatkāla-tatdesa-visiṣṭa-devadatta (Devadatta who is qualified by the time and space of the past). But etatkāla-etatdesa-visiṣṭa-devadatta and tatkāla-tatdesa-visiṣṭa-devadatta look very different from each other and hence their identity seems untenable.

Vācyārtha of ‘a\(\text{yāṁ devadattaḥ}\)= etatkāla-etatdesa-visiṣṭa-devadatta

Vācyārtha of ‘s\(\text{aḥ devadattaḥ}\)= tatkāla-tatdesa-visiṣṭa-devadatta

By mukhyavrūṭti (direct connotation):

\[
\text{etatkāla-etatdesa-visiṣṭa-devadatta} \neq \text{tatkāla-tatdesa-visiṣṭa-devadatta}.
\]

To understand the identity envisaged by the above statement ‘so’yāṁ devadattaḥ’ we discard the contrary aspects of the ‘two’ Devadattas and arrive at the oneness between them by focussing

\(^3\)The first two knowledge steps are sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha-jñānam and visesānya-viśeṣyatā-sambandha-jñānam. These two have been covered in ‘Tat Tvam Asi III’ and ‘Tat Tvam Asi IV’ which appeared in the October and November 2004 issues of Tapovan Prasad respectively.

\(^4\)The verbal form ‘asti’ is implied and hence is placed within parentheses.
on the common Devadatta aspect. The difference between etatkāla-etaṭadeśa-viśiṣṭa-devadatta and tatkāla-etaṭadeśa-viśiṣṭa-devadatta is only in the etatkāla-etaṭadeśa and tatkāla-etaṭadeśa aspects respectively. Bereft of these two contrary aspects, both etatkāla-etaṭadeśa-viśiṣṭa-devadatta and tatkāla-etaṭadeśa-viśiṣṭa-devadatta become the same person Devadatta. Hence Devadatta is the single common lakṣyārtha (implied meaning) of both etatkāla-etaṭadeśa-viśiṣṭa-devadatta and tatkāla-etaṭadeśa-viśiṣṭa-devadatta and from this lakṣyārtha perspective the identity is discovered between ‘ayaṁ devadattaḥ’ and ‘sah devadattaḥ’. To present the above mathematically:

\[
\text{Lakṣyārtha of 'ayaṁ devadattaḥ'} = \text{Devadattaḥ} \\
\text{Lakṣyārtha of 'sah devadattaḥ'} = \text{Devadattaḥ}
\]

By lakṣaṇā-vṛtti (secondary connotation):

\[
\text{etatkāla-etaṭadeśa-viśiṣṭa-devadatta} = \text{tatkāla-etaṭadeśa-viśiṣṭ-a-devadatta}^5 \\
\Rightarrow \text{devadatta} = \text{devadatta}
\]

\% ayaṁ devadattaḥ = saḥ devadattaḥ

This partial rejection and partial retention of the vācyārtha (literal meaning) is the unique method of jahad-ajahal-lakṣaṇā and through this a single common lakṣyārtha is arrived at. This method is also termed ‘bhāga-tyāga-lakṣaṇā’ for unlike the first two types⁶, here only a portion (bhāga) of the vācyārtha is rejected (tyāga) in order to arrive at the lakṣyārtha. It is this jahad-ajahal-lakṣaṇā or bhāga-tyāga-lakṣaṇā that will enable us to discover the akṣaraṃgrotha or impartite meaning of the Mahāvākyo ‘Tat tvam asi’. In his Vākyā Vṛtti (Verse 48), Sri Sankaracharya makes this explicit:

\[
\text{तत्त्वस्ययादिवाक्येशु लक्षणम भागलक्षणम।} \\
\text{सोयमित्यादिवाक्यास्थपदयोगियानघर नापर।} \\
\]

\[
tattvamasyādivākyeṣu lakṣaṇā bhāgalakṣaṇā \\
sa'ynamityādivākyastrpadhayoriva nāparā
\]

⁵ The striking indicates that the vācyārtha aspect is rejected for arriving at the lakṣyārtha.

⁶ In jahallakṣaṇā the whole vācyārtha is rejected and in ajahallakṣaṇā the whole vācyārtha is retained.
In the statements like ‘That thou art’ etc., the method to be employed is that of bhāga-tyāga-lakṣaṇā, just as in the case of the words of the sentence ‘This is that (Devadatta)’. No other kind of implication is to be resorted to.

We shall now see in detail how bhāga-tyāga-lakṣaṇā or jahad-ajahal-lakṣaṇa is employed for deriving the single common lakṣyārtha of both tat-pada and tvam-pada.

**Tat Tvam Asi**

The vācyārtha of ‘Tat Tvam Asi’ may be mathematically presented as:

\[ tvam = tat \]

We have on one side of the equation ‘tvam’ and another side ‘tat’. The verbal form ‘asi’ which indicates the identity between them is represented by the mathematical symbol ‘equal to’.

The vācyārtha (literal meaning) of ‘tvam – you’ is the jīva, the individual, and the vācyārtha of ‘tat – that’ is Īśvara, the Supreme Lord. Jīva and Īśvara are different in nature and hence the identity seems untenable.\(^7\)

\[ \text{Vācyārtha of \textit{tvam}} = \text{jīva} \]
\[ \text{Vācyārtha of \textit{tat}} = \text{Īśvara} \]

By mukhyavāritti (direct connotation): jīva ≠ Īśvara

In spite of the obvious differences that exist between jīva and Īśvara, the Mahāvākyā ‘Tat tvam asi’ insists on the identity between them. Just as we discarded the contrary aspects of the ‘two’ Devadattas and arrived at the oneness between them by focussing on the common Devadatta aspect, here too, we can

---

\(^7\) By ‘etc.’ is meant the other Mahāvākyas — ‘prajñānām brahma’, ‘ahāṁ brahmaṇāṁ’, ‘ayamāṁ brahma’ and so on. For a list of 11 important Mahāvākyas refer to the essay ‘Mahāvākyā’ which appeared in the July 2004 issue of Tapovan Prasad.

\(^8\) jīva, the vācyārtha of ‘tvam-pada’ is alpapakṣitān — possessing limited power, alpa-pajñāḥ — possessing limited knowledge, parichināḥ — limited, anīśaḥ — not-Lord, karmadhisthānāḥ — dependent on ‘karma’, nitya-aparokṣaḥ — known always as immediate, māyā-mohitaḥ — deluded by māya and bandha-mokṣa-bhāk — enjoying both bondage and liberation Īśvara, the vācyārtha of ‘tat-pada’ is sarva-apakṣitān — all powerful, sarva-pajñāḥ — all knowing, śīv-do — all pervading, Īśvara — Lord, svatantrāḥ — independent, parokṣaḥ — known mediately, māyā — one who wields māya and bandha-mokṣa-rāhitāḥ — devoid of bondage and liberation.
arrive at the identity between tvampada and tatpada by rejecting the contrary aspects of ķīva and īśvara. The difference between ķīva and īśvara is only in the upādhi (conditioning or adjunct) portion and not in the caitanya portion. ķīva's upādhi is vyāṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-śarīra (individual-gross-subtle-causal-body) while īśvara's upādhi is sāmaṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-śarīra (total-gross-subtle-causal-body). ķīva is hence defined as vyāṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-śarīra-upahita-caitanya i.e., the Consciousness conditioned or limited by the individual gross, subtle and causal bodies and īśvara is defined as sāmaṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-śarīra-upahita-caitanya i.e., the Consciousness conditioned by the total gross, subtle and causal bodies. This can be mathematically represented as:

\[
\text{ķīva} = \text{caitanya} + \text{vyāṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-śarīra}
\]

\[
\text{īśvara} = \text{caitanya} + \text{sāmaṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-śarīra}
\]

The upādhis are responsible for the differences between ķīva and īśvara. Bereft of these upādhis, the ķīva becomes the caitanya-vastu (the Principle of Consciousness) and īśvara also becomes the same caitanya-vastu. These upādhis can very well be rejected because they are only illusory. This rejection of the upādhis leads us to the caitanya-vastu which is the single common lakṣyārtha (implied meaning) of both tvampada and tatpada. To summarise:

\[
\text{Lakṣyārtha of } \text{‘toam’} = \text{caitanya}
\]

\[
\text{Lakṣyārtha of } \text{‘tat’} = \text{caitanya}
\]

\[
\text{By lakṣaṇa-vṛtti (secondary connotation):}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{caitanya} + \text{vyāṣṭi-sthūla-} & \text{sūkṣma-kāraṇa-śarīra} & \text{caitanya} + \text{sāmaṣṭi-sthūla-} & \text{sūkṣma-kāraṇa-śarīra} \\
\Rightarrow \text{caitanya} & = \text{caitanya} & \therefore \text{toam} & = \text{tat}
\end{align*}
\]

"When these upādhis of īśvara and ķīva are falsified, there is no īśvara and no ķīva. When the kingdom of a king and the shield of a soldier are taken away, there can neither be a king nor a soldier." (Vivekacūḍāmani-Verse 244). Refer to the sub-heading "Īśvara-Īśva-bheda is upādhika and illusory" in 'Tat Tvam Asi VIII' which appeared in the April 2005 issue of Tapovan Prasad.

10 The striking indicates the vācyārtha aspect that is rejected while arriving at the lakṣyārtha.
So’yam Devadattah and Tat Tvam Asi

To understand the similarity in the application of jahad-ajahal-laksanā in ‘so’yam devadattah (asti)’ and ‘Tat Tvam Asi’, let us have an overall view in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>So’yam Devadattah (asti)</th>
<th>Tat Tvam Asi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Representation</td>
<td>Ayam Devadattah = Sah Devadatta</td>
<td>Tvam = Tat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vācyārtha</td>
<td>This is that Devadatta.</td>
<td>You are that (Thou art That)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padas</td>
<td>Ayam and Sah. Asti is the Aikyapada</td>
<td>Tat and Tvam. Asti is the Aikyapada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vācyārthas</td>
<td>Ayam Devadattah = etatkāla-etadasa-visiśṭa-devadatta;</td>
<td>Tvam = jīva = Caitanya + vyāṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-sarīra;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sah Devadattah = tatkāla-tatdesa-visiśṭa-devadatta</td>
<td>Tat = Isvāra = samaṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-sarīra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakṣyārthas through jahad-ajahal-laksanā</td>
<td>Devadatta is the common lakṣyārthā of both Ayam Devadattah and Sah Devadattah.</td>
<td>Caitanya is the common lakṣyārthā of both Tvam and Tat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity equation through jahad-ajahal-laksanā</td>
<td>Etatkāla-etadasa-visiśṭa-devadatta = Tatkāla-tatdesa-visiśṭa-devadatta ⇒ Devadatta = Devadatta</td>
<td>Caitanya + vyāṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-sarīra = Caitanya + samaṣṭi-sthūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa-sarīra ⇒ Caitanya = Caitanya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Ayam Devadattah = Sah Devadattah</td>
<td>Tvam = Tat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lakṣya-Lakṣaṇatā-Sambandha-Jñāna**

Since lakṣaṇa-vṛtti is used for deciphering the implied meanings of tatpadā (word ‘tat’) and tvampada (word ‘tvam’),
these padas (words) are referred to as ‘lakṣaṇās’ (i.e., ‘impliers’ or ‘words that do the job of implying’) in the context of lakṣya-lakṣaṇatā-sambandha. We have seen how these two lakṣaṇās (impliers) have the single common caityana-vastu (Consciousness Principle) as their lakṣya or lakṣyārtha (implied meaning). Lakṣya-lakṣaṇatā-sambandha-jñāna is the third knowledge step and is the knowledge that the lakṣaṇās - tvampada and tatpada - have the caityana-vastu as their lakṣya (implied meaning). In Vedānta Śāra, Swami Sadananda explains this lakṣya-lakṣaṇatā-sambandha:

लक्ष्यलक्षणसम्बन्धस्तु यथा तत्वेय सत्त्व-अय्याल्यो: तत्ता: ता: वा विरुद्धेऽत्त्वम् - एत्त्वाविशिष-त्त्व-परिवर्त्यागेन अविरुद्धदेवेदवत्तेन सह लक्ष्यलक्षणधान्या: । तथा तत्त्वापि वाक्येय तत्त्वपद्योः: तद्यथायोः वा विरुद्धपरिक्ष्यत्वम् - अपरिबीतवादि-विशिष्टवय-परिवर्त्येन अविरुद्धचेतने सह लक्ष्यलक्षणधान्या: ॥

lakṣyalakṣaṇasambandhastu yathā tatraiva saśabda-ayamśabdāyoh tadarthāyoh va viruddhahatatkāla-etatkālavīśis-ītāvaparītyāgēn āviruddhādevadattena saha lakṣyalakṣaṇa-bhāvah । tathā tatraipi vākye tattvapadāyoh tadarthāyoh va11 viruddhaparokṣatva-aparokṣatvādi-viśisītāvaparītyāgēn āviruddhacaitanyēna saha lakṣyalakṣaṇabhāvah: ॥

With regards to the ‘relation of the implied and the implier’, just as in the sentence (‘This is that Devadatta’), the relationship of the implied and the implier is between the words ‘that’ and ‘this’ or between their meanings and the identical Devadatta, divested of the conflicting attributes viz., being related to the past and present; so in the present sentence (Tat tvam asi) the relationship of the implied and the implier is between the words ‘Tat’ and ‘Tvam’ or their meanings and the Consciousness Principle which is divested of the conflicting attributes such as mediacy and immediacy etc.”

---

11 Swami Sadananda introduces an interesting phrase in his definition ‘padayoh tadarthayoh va’. This means that the lakṣya-lakṣaṇatā-sambandha can be said to exist between the padas ‘tvam’ and ‘tāt’ with the Caitanya-vastu or between their vācyārthas i.e., ēśvara and ēśvara with the Caitanya-vastu. The relationship between the vācyārthas and the lakṣyārtha may be considered to be sākṣāt-sambandha (direct relationship) and that of the padas and their lakṣyārtha as paramparā-sambandha (indirect relationship).
Once this sambandha or relationship between the lakṣaṇās and their lakṣyaarthas is taken into consideration, the identity between tvamypada and tatpada is discovered instantaneously and the vākyārtha of the Mahāvākyya stands revealed. Thus lakṣya-lakṣaṇatā-sambandha-jñāna, i.e., the ‘knowledge of the relationship between the implied and the impler’ acts as the final step in arriving at the akhaṇḍārtha (unitary or impartite meaning) of the Mahāvākyya ‘Tat Tvam Asi’.

The purpose of the Mahāvākyya is accomplished with this discovery of the akhaṇḍārtha. It is this akhaṇḍārtha that is commonly called ‘jīva-brahma-aikya’ by Vedāntins.

**Tat Tvam Asi Route Map**

The following is a brief recapitulation of the various salient points that were covered under the three knowledge steps\(^\text{12}\). This will help us to see the thought route involved in the discovery of the akhaṇḍārtha.

The statement ‘nīlam utpalam asti’ which has some obvious similarities with the Mahāvākyya ‘Tat tvam asi’ was initially chosen for comparative analysis with ‘Tat tvam asi’ with the hope that the method employed in understanding ‘nīlam utpalam asti’ could be used to decipher ‘Tat tvam asi’.

**Step I: Sāmānādhikaranyā-sambandha-jñānam**

- This is the knowledge of the relationship of apposition of words. This relationship of apposition exists between words which are in the same grammatical case.
- Just as nīla-pada and utpala-pada in the sentence ‘nīlam utpalam asti’ exist in the same nominative case and therefore have sāmānādhikaranīya-sambandha, so too tat-pada and tvam-

---

\(^{12}\) The topic of ‘Tat tvam asi’ has been covered in a series of nine essays. *Tat Tvam Asi* – I, appeared in the August 2004 issue of Tapovan Prasad. Sāmānādhikaranīya-sambandha-jñānam was covered in *Tat Tvam Asi* II and III; viśeṣaṁa-viśeṣayatā-sambandha-jñānam in *Tat Tvam Asi* IV; and lakṣya-lakṣaṇatā-sambandho-jñānam in *Tat Tvam Asi* V, VI, VII, VIII and IX.
pada in the Mahāvākyā ‘Tat tvam asi’, which are in the same nominative case, enjoy sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha.

Step II: Viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣyatā-sambandha-jñānam

- This is the knowledge of the relationship between the qualifier (viśeṣaṇa) and the qualified (viśeṣya).
- Sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha between the nila-pada and utpala-pada leads to abheda-rūpa-saṁsarga13 between the nilatva-padārthā and utpalatva-padārthā.
- This abheda-rūpa-saṁsarga enables the application of anyonya-viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣyatā-sambandha which in turn ensures the discovery of the object. The nilatva-padārthā and utpalatva-padārthā mutually qualify each other and we arrive at the flower which is blue in colour and also belongs to the lotus genus.
- While viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣyatā-sambandha-jñānam enables the discovery of the vastu (the object ‘flower’) in the case of ‘nilam utpalam asti’, it turns out to be a parody in the case of the Mahāvākyā ‘Tat tvam asi’. This is because the tat-padārtha-Iśvara and tvam-padārtha-jīva cannot mutually qualify each other because their natures are contradictory. A lotus can be blue, but Iśvara while retaining His characteristics, cannot simultaneously have the characteristics of a jīva.
- At this point it is seen that the Mahāvākyā ‘Tat tvam asi’ is not exactly similar to ‘nilam utpalam asti’, in spite of the similarity of sāmānādhikaranya-sambandha between their padas.
- When viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣyatā-sambandha fails, the mukhya-vṛtti is rejected and one takes recourse to the laksana-vṛtti.

---

13 It is to be carefully noted that while there is abheda-rūpa-saṁsarga between the nilatva-padārthā and utpalatva-padārthā (i.e., both these padārthas denote the same object ‘flower’) there can be no abheda-rūpa-saṁsarga between tat-pada-laksyārthā-caitanya and tvam-pada-laksyārthā-caitanya. They are both one and hence saṁsarga (relationship) cannot be spoken off. This position of Vedānta is known as ‘svarūpa-abheda’.

Tapovan Prasad
Step III: *Lakṣya-lakṣaṇatā-sambandha-jñāna*

- This is the knowledge of the relationship between the 'implied' (*lakṣya*) and the 'implier' (*lakṣaṇā*).
- The two *lakṣaṇās* are the *tatpada* and the *tvampada* which enjoy *sāmānādhikaraṇya-sambandha* between them. Their common *lakṣya* (or *lakṣyārtha*) is the *caityā-vastu*. This *lakṣyārtha* is derived by *bhāga-tyāga-lakṣaṇā* (or *jñād-ajñahal-lakṣaṇā*).
- Though there is disparity between *tatpada* and the *tvampada* from the *vācyārtha* perspective, there is no difference between them from the *lakṣyārtha* perspective. This *lakṣyārtha* perspective alone is true, for the *upādhis*, which are the foundation for the *vācyārtha* perspective, are illusory.
  
  In this way, using the three 'knowledge-steps' the identity between *jīva* and *Īsvara* (*jīva-brahma-aikya*) is discovered and *akhaṇḍārtha* or the impartite meaning of the *Mahāvākya 'Tat tvam asi'* is established.

**Conclusion**

The *jñāna* (knowledge) of 'jīva-brahma-aikya' that arises by the understanding of the *Mahāvākyas* is the direct means (sāksātkāraṇa) for the destruction of ajñāna (ignorance). *Jñāna* has to be in the form of *vṛtti* (thought) alone. For example, *puspajñāna* (flower-knowledge) is attained through *puspavṛtti* (flower-thought) alone and not by any other means. The content of the flower-thought is the object flower.

If these ideas are accepted, a question arises regarding the exact nature of the thought form whose content is jīva-brahma-aikya-jñāna. Can the Self or Brahman ever be an object of thought? And how does it put an end to ajñāna? In what way is this *vṛtti* (termed *brahmakāra-vṛtti*) different from a *puspavṛtti* (flower-thought)? These are interesting and challenging questions, which will be taken up for analysis one by one in the forthcoming issues.

May the Lord's grace and the Guru's blessings be with us in understanding *Vedānta* and gaining *aparokṣānubhūti*.
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