

Śrī Rudram Anuvāka 01

ओं नमो भगवते रुद्राय ।

Om namo bhagāvate rudrāya

Om – om̐; namaḥ – salutation; bhagavate – unto the Lord; rudrāya – unto Rudra

Salutation unto Lord Rudra.

The word 'rudra' means rodayati sarvān, the one who makes all cry. The root is rudir – vimocane in the sense of shedding tears. Another meaning is rutam drāvayati, the one melts away pain or the cause of pain. The word om is from the root ava which has the sense of protection. Avati, rakṣati iti om, the one who protects and sustains everything is om, name of the Lord. The Lord is remembered at the beginning of the Veda and also at the beginning of its every section. Om also stands for an auspicious beginning. The word namaḥ¹ means salutation.

Bhagavate – It is the dative singular form of the word bhagavān, derived from the noun bhaga. bhagaḥ asya asti iti bhagavān, the one who has bhaga is Bhagavān. There are many similar and more familiar words such as dhanavān, the one who has wealth; balavān, the one who has strength; guṇavān, the one who has virtues.

What then is *bhaga*? It consists of six absolute virtues:

aiśvaryasya samagtasya vīryasya yaśasaḥ śriyaḥ
jñānavairāgyayoścaiva śaṅṅām bhaga itiraṅā

The six virtues—overlordship, power, fame, riches, knowledge and freedom from being wanting—in their absolute measure constitute *bhaga*. The one who has this six-fold *bhaga* is Bhagavān. Every individual has the experience of aiśvaryasya, overlordship with reference to children and smaller creatures. For instance, you have overlordship over an ant but not when it has entered your ears! A cat has lordship over a rat. So overlordship is not totally unknown to you. You therefore appreciate Īśvara as the Lord with total overlordship.

Vīryam, power. One has in a limited measure the strength to create, sustain, bless, chastise and destroy, within the framework of this world, jagat. To create and sustain the very framework and everything therein, the vīryam that is needed is *samagra*, limitless.

Yaśas, fame. Fame can be an object of desire for its own sake, even though it is used for gaining power, wealth and so on. One may be ready to give up power and wealth to win recognition. In the awareness of being recognized, there is an extended sense of oneself that is a bit of Īśvara. Bhagavan's fame is non-local and is the cause of the local fame of an

¹ The root of namaḥ is nam in the sense of prahvī bhāva, bowing down (nam + as (asun) = namas = namaḥ



individual, which can be wisdom, wit or a winning smile; all these are but the vibhūti of Īśvara. On enquiry, one can see that the possibilities to gain, to improve are all given. And the given is not separate from the giver here.

Śri, wealth. Wealth includes time, skill, courage, health, money, marriage, home and children. In fact, anything that makes you comfortable and happy is wealth. Success is also wealth. All the resources on this earth such as oxygen, water and energy would then be wealth. If all these are wealth, whatever one claims as one's wealth is included in the limitless wealth of the Lord, the Lord being both the maker and the made.

Jñāna, knowledge. Knowledge is also *samagra*, total, for Īśvara. As a human being, one certainly knows the difference between being knowledgeable and ignorant. But in spite of one's desire to be more and more knowledgeable, one remains after all ignorant. If there is a person who is free from ignorance, the knowledge of the person has got to be total and must exist without being gained in time.

Vairāgya, freedom from a sense of want, the cause for desire to be complete. The attitude of an adult towards the playthings of a child like marbles, balloons and so on, is vairāgya. In this disposition, there is neither a longing for, nor an aversion to any of those objects. Everyone knows such a condition of the mind where there is freedom with reference to certain objects. But the same condition cannot be commanded towards certain other objects. If that attitude covers every object known and unknown, then the vairāgya is *samagra*, complete. This is the sixth absolute virtue accounting for *bhaga*.

The word *rudra*, as we have seen etymologically has two meanings: the one who removes pain and the one who causes pain. It is the most significant word revealing the nature of the Lord. The Lord cannot be all compassion, mercy, love, without including the opposites and essentially transcending both of them. In certain theologies, God is presented as one of all virtues and another force called the devil accounting for all that is evil. But what is considered good is also judged in terms of human knowledge of what is desirable. The very concept of desirability stems from what is undesirable. Both exist in the world. When one picks the desirable rose, one has to deal with the thorns.

No value is absolute which is why one can never make a rule without an exception. Carl Jung was critical of the concept of God that created a Satan, because he realised how damaging this concept is to a human mind. The individual has no archetype to respect, to adore, which will include both the opposites—happiness and sorrow, like and dislike, being satisfied and being not satisfied and so on. No individual is free of these opposites and one aspect of every individual is the shadow self. If it is considered evil, Satan, then each one has to see himself or herself as evil. There is no way one can avoid guilt. Jung's God, therefore, includes the opposites. But he had his own difficulty in reconciling with the nature of his God. His God being both good and evil, he could not trust in God because God who could do good could equally do bad.

The problem is also caused by confusion about reality of God. If God is self-evident, self-existent consciousness, which is the basis of everything including time and space, then you have to appreciate two orders of reality—that which is self-existent, the other which is not self-existent. You are like a liker with reference to a given thing and a disliker with reference to another thing. Now, you can say you are both liker and disliker or you can say you are neither liker nor disliker. Both liker and disliker are only referential. The invariable person is a self-evident being who is above both likes and dislikes. So too, God has got to be, in essence,

above right and wrong. It means He can be both right and wrong. In fact, right and wrong are part of the order that is Īśvara.

The whole world can be reduced to one order consisting of many orders. There is an astro-physical order, a geological order, biological order, physiological order and there is an epistemological order. There is order governing *dharma* and *karma*. Within these various orders alone are all opposites. When all that is here is God, it is childish to even think of evil with a separate being as its locus.

Being the maker, God has got to be all-knowledge and all skill. The material necessary for making the *jagat* is not made by God. If it is, then it has got to be made out of another material that is not yet made. That primordial material has to be identified as non-separate from God. The fact opens your eyes to see that the created world is never independent of, or away from the material cause, which also is God. If the world is in the form of one implicate order, then anything that happens therein, is explainable in terms of cause-effect relationship. When I have neither the leisure nor readiness to look into a person's background, I cannot but call a person evil. If that dubbed criminal subjects to psychotherapy, the therapist is bound to validate the person from the standpoint of his background even though his action is definitely wrong. So what exists in this world is only right and wrong, not good and evil. Right and wrong stem from the order that is not separate from the ordainer, God. We even go one step further. If the 'made' is not separate from the 'maker', the effect is not separate from its cause, then what kind of reality does the effect or even the cause have?

If we define reality as what is self-existent and not subject to negation in all the three periods of time, we cannot bring an effect under the label of reality, for it is neither self-existent nor is it beyond negation. A pot, an effect, is not self-existent. It is dependent on clay; in fact, it is clay. Being an effect, the pot was non-existent before its creation, nor will it exist after it is broken. It is subject to time. The effect is, therefore, not real, *satya*; much less it is non-existent, *tuccha*. Every effect is only a form with a name and it is *mithyā*, ontologically. If the effect is *mithyā*, the status of cause attributed to Īśvara is also *mithyā*. In other words, Īśvara is essentially beyond cause and effect, in spite of being both the cause and effect. This transcendental nature releases Īśvara (God) from being both right and wrong. Being transcendental, God is not subject to time, place or any given attribute, making Him a given substantive.

Then how would anybody understand the transcendental God? Well, as an object you need not understand Him; He is you. The consciousness because of which you are conscious of the world, transcends time, place or any given attribute. Both the transcendental God and the individual are one, nonp-dually one. While the Jungian concept of God is both good and evil, God cannot be trusted. But a transcendental and immanent *vastu*, being, does not subject itself to any of our judgment either.

The individual is responsible for his actions and therefore nurses a sense of guilt in terms of omissions and commissions. Being guilty, there is always a fear of the imminent event of loss and sadness. In other words, the person is afraid of his or her own *karma phala*. The infallible one, the Lord, being the very order of all the laws, including the law of *karma*, becomes as though a source of fear, a chastiser. Prayer being a *karma* of imploration is expected to change the devastating course of the past and even win the benign support of the infallible Lord.

To be continued...