

“The Solid Heart of Round Truth, and Mortals’ Opinions”

«Now, I will tell you- and you listen and welcome my speech – which are the ways that can be thought of: one, which “is” and which could not possibly not to be, is the path of Persuasion, because it goes after the Truth: the other, which “is not” and which needs not to be - and I’m telling you - is a path where nothing is learned. You could not know what is not because it is not practicable. Nor could you express it»¹

“Not even for the [different] place there can be dual characteristics of the Supreme, because it is everywhere [so it is taught]

In the *Chāndogya Up.* it is written:

«...whose body is breath of life, whose form is light, whose concept is truth, whose essence is space...»

«All which is different from *That* is to dissolve»

The argument that could be raised by an opponent is the following: *Brahman* has two natures because the sacred texts illustrate both.

For the *Brahmasūtra*, *Brahman* does not have two natures, why?

Two natures in the same Subject cannot co-exist because there would be two absolutes; neither one could change its nature to transform into something different, nor could one contradict the other as, being both absolute, they cannot relate to each other. And even if we assumed – following Plato – two opposite entities, none of the two being what it is will want to become its opposite, because if that happened, it would die or disappear. Now, we could consider the issue of which of the two is dependent on or subordinate to the other? ... Movement presumes absence of movement as speech presumes silence. Therefore, the *Brahman saguṇa* (with attributes) must depend on the *Brahman nirguṇa* [without attributes]...

If it is [said] not like that as a result of the difference [observed in the Scriptures, it is answered] no, as a result of the negative statement of each [difference of quality]

In some passages of the *Śruti* difference is mentioned, but that is often negated in the same context... [This happens because] the *Śruti* offers all its disciples the possibility to take the Way of return, in accordance with their qualifications.

In addition, others offer this [teaching]

¹ Parmenides, *On Nature*, Frag. 2. Bompiani, Milano. (Italian Edition)

Anyhow, supreme Truth is non-dual, therefore there is no difference according to the previous *sūtra*.

In the *Kātha Up.* it is written:

«Here there is no difference...»

In a similar way, in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* it is written:

«...goes from death to death who sees here only multiplicity»

Because it is devoid of form; this is the main meaning of [the Śruti]

Brahman is formless and devoid of qualities... In this sense, *Brahman*, as devoid of form, qualities and cause, evokes the analogy of light which can apparently take the shape of the objects it illuminates... these are possibilities to see the only supreme Reality.

And [the Śruti] states [that Brahman is] that state

... «The sages think that the Fourth, which does not have knowledge of internal and external objects or, at the same time, of this and that... is the fundamental essence of the *ātman*, there where manifestation completely ceases, and there where there is bliss... without duality...»

Therefore, [there are] comparisons such as the image of the sun [in the water], etc.

But the similitude [of compared things] [is not absolute] to non-perception [in reference to Brahman of any separated substance] as in the case of the water

[Because Brahman] is inside [being the substratum of formal manifestation] participates in the growing and shrinking as a result of the resemblance of both, [it is like that]

And from the statement of [the Scriptures]

Even the *Śruti* states that *Brahman* is inside, or more specifically, that it is the substratum, the foundation that bears all vital expressions in becoming, even though it is not at all touched by that.

In the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* it is written:

«He is the *Puruṣa* because his dwelling is in all bodies: all is embraced and pervaded by him»

«That is *Brahman*, without antecedents and consequent, without internal or external... This is the teaching»

*That [Brahman] is not manifested because [the Śruti] states it*²

What is not manifested is devoid of imagination, pure, non-dual, non-born; so:
“«The vedic texts explicitly talk about birth and māyā, but only what is supported by the Śruti and validated by reason can be considered accurate, nothing else»

...Objection: If words allow for two interpretations, one metaphoric the other direct, it is sensible to interpret them literally.

Answer: We disagree. The word “birth” if not interpreted as projection, is meaningless to us. Any birth, metaphoric or actual, can only refer to an apparent possibility of which *avidyā* is the cause. The vedic texts state: «It (*ātman*) is inside, outside, and truly without birth» *Muṇḍaka Up.*: II, ii, 2. Therefore, what is defined by the *Veda*, and supported by the right reasoning, as: «It is One-without second and exempt of birth and death» represents the only valid meaning with exclusion of any other...³

«In fact, the same from everywhere [the Being] is within its own boundaries»⁴

©Āśram Vidyā.

New York, NY - U.S.A. 2006

² From: Bāḍarāyaṇa, *Brahmasūtra*. Book III, Cap. ii, V topic; *sūtra* 11-14, 16, 18-21. Translation from the Sanskrit, and Commentary by Raphael (Āśram Vidyā Order). Edizioni Āśram Vidyā, Rome. (Italian Edition)

³ *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, with *Gauḍapāda's kārikā and Śaṅkara's Commentary*. “Advaita Prakaraṇa”, *sūtra* 23. Edizioni Āśram Vidyā, Rome. (Italian Edition)

⁴ Parmenides, *On Nature*, Frag. 8, 49. Op. Cit.