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THE SCIENCE OF BEING

SECTION I

THE INTRODUCTORY NARRATIVE

ॐ । बेतकेतुहरूमेव जास तं ह पितोवाच बेतकेतो वस प्रकारं
नै सोमयासलकुटीलोऽनन्तरं प्रहासवरिष्प भवतीति ॥ (ढं.६-१-१)

"Śvetaketu was the grandson of Aruna. His father said to him 'O Śvetaketu, do serve a teacher and learn the Vedic lore. It is well-known that no member of our family remains a mere relative of a Brāhmaṇa without studying the Vedas.'" (Ch. 6-1-1).

The controversy about Vedantic anecdotes:

1. Bādarāyana composed the Vedanta Sutras at a time when it was absolutely necessary to determine the exact import of the Upanishads. In the first place he had to contend against the atheistic philosophy of the Sāmkhyas who had built an almost impregnable system of evolution based upon speculative inference and an analytical psychology and interpreted all the Upanishads in their favour and in the second place against the equally atheistic Pūrva Mīmāṁsakas in his own Vedic camp who were eager to absorb all the Upanishadic teachings by Jaimini’s exegetical system which countenanced no other sentient principle other than Jīvātmān the performer of sacrifices which took him to svarga or the highest heaven.
Badarayana's dictum:

2. We have now to determine the significance of certain narratives which are interspersed in the Upanishads. What might be the motive of the Rshis who introduced certain teachings with some narratives? The ritualistically biased mīmāṃsakas held that these are for being recited during the performance of certain sacrifices since the recitation has been enjoined by the Vedas. This contention of the Mīmāṃsakas leads to a far-reaching consequence; for if the story be a part of some ritual it would go to show that the Vedic texts do not serve the primary purpose of teaching the nature of Reality as Vedantins understand; but like the Vedic mantras they are only subservient to the performance of Vedic rites. As against this argument Badarayana says:

पारिप्रेयायं हि भेष नियोगितवादः। (वे. सू. ३-४-२१)

This cannot be so, for they have been particularized.

(To explain) The injunction which begins with पारिप्रेयायं आचारीत (He shall recite the Pariplava) enumerates some particular narrative only such as that beginning with यनुस्तवतो राजा (The King Manu Vaivaswata etc.). This particularization would serve no purpose if it were intended to cover all Vedic narratives. तथा रैविक्योपवन्यात् (वे.सू. ३-४-२४) (Accordingly we find there is unity of thought in context in the teaching that follows;) for instance, the narrative of Yajnavalkya and Maitreyi serves the purpose of showing the importance of the science of the Vision of Atman by creating interest in the knowledge and eulogizing it.
3. Consistently with this argument, we find that Uddālaka the son of Aruna is expostulating with his son Svetaketu about the necessity of approaching a guru and getting initiated in the Vedic learning. Being learned in the Vedic lore he could have undertaken the task of initiation himself, but instead, he asks his son to serve as a Brahmacharin under somebody else probably because he was about to go travelling elsewhere.

4. The father’s remark ‘no one in our family stays here merely as a relative of Brahmans’ भ्रमणन्युतिः (without studying the Vedas) shows that Uddālaka inherited a long-standing tradition of successive predecessors who never failed to acquire Vedic learning. Sixteen years was the maximum age limit for initiation and as the next passage reveals ‘Svetaketu was already twelve years old.’

The verity of secular knowledge as compared with spiritual wisdom:

स ह गार्द्यवर्षं उपेत्य चतुर्बिशालित्वम् सर्वान्तेवैदानो ज्ञात्व महामना अनूचानमानि सम्ब्व प्रायां तं ह तिथोपचाः || (छः ६-२-२)

"He studied under his Guru for twelve years and having acquired proficiency in all the Vedas returned when he was twenty four years of age. He was most conceited and impolite and thought he was highly learned ".

(Ch. 6-1-2)

His father said to him:

शेतेदेतो कुष्ठो लोम्यें महामना अनूचानमानि सत्योत्सुकत ममाखिनम्प्रायस्य वेनायुर्व धृतं भत्त्वयमं नतनविचारं विज्ञातामिति कुष्ठ । नु मगवः स जावेदो महतीति || (छः ६-२-३)
“Svetaketu, my dear boy, now that you are arrogant and impolite thinking yourself very learned, have you enquired about that entity needing special instruction by means of which even that which is not heard about becomes heard, even that which is not reflected upon becomes reflected upon, and even that which is unknown becomes known?” “How, revered Sir, would that special instruction be?”

(Ch. 6-1-3).

"In the same way, my dear boy, that by knowing a single lump of clay everything made of clay would have become known and the effect is merely a name being only a play of words; in the same way, my dear boy, that by knowing a nugget of gold, all that is made of gold would have become known and the effect is merely a name being only a play of words; in the same way, by knowing a single pair of nail scissors all that is made of steel would have become known and the effect is merely a name, being only a play of words, even so, my boy, is this Entity of special instruction.”

(Ch. 6-1-4, 5, 6).

5. Svetaketu’s study at the feet of his guru may be compared with that of a modern student’s school and college career at a modern university where he has specialized in many subjects and come off with flying colours. Such a student would naturally think very high of himself when he goes back to his home flushed
with his success in having taken so many academic degrees. Svetaketu is naturally proud that he has mastered all branches of Vedic learning in twelve years. The object of describing this attitude of the boy is to lay bare his secular knowledge in its true colours and to show that it dwindles into nothing beside the all-embracing wisdom of one who possesses the knowledge of Reality.

6. The question, "Have you asked your teacher about this precious teaching, for you seem to be so proud of your learning?" should not be interpreted to mean that one is justified in being proud even if one has gained mastery in any particular branch of knowledge. For, as a matter of fact, humility would be the one distinctive feature of a person who has known Brahman. The father only wants to say, "There is much more to know than you have dreamt of, during your academic career." The youth's curiosity is thus roused and he wants to know how there could possibly be anything so marvellous as to reveal the truth about everything else merely by knowing that one thing.

The principle of Causal Relation:

7. Uddālaka now reveals what is hidden in his heart. The knowledge that he is speaking of does not concern any wonderful thing like the philosopher's stone but only the metaphysical cause underlying all phenomena. In order to introduce his son to this ultimate cause, he begins by extending the Vedantic theory of causality to empirical things also, so as to enable Śvetaketu to realise that the so-called effects of material causes do not actually exist apart from their supposed causes.

8. Herein lies the bearing of the introductory narrative on the subject matter of the Sixth Chapter. The Vedantic theory of
causation is that all the Universe is an effect of Brahman or Reality which is the material cause. That this theory is not the result of mere speculation can be seen by closely examining the relation of the empirical causes and their so called effects. Nobody can deny that jars, pots, pitchers and other vessels of clay are anything but clay except for the fact of their names, shapes and sizes and uses to which they are put in ordinary life. The material is all clay. Similarly ornaments of gold are nothing but gold and tools made of iron and steel are nothing but iron and steel only. Observation leads us to this conclusion everywhere with regard to material causes. Taking advantage of this fact, Uddalaka says that it is quite reasonable to hold that Brahman or Reality is the only underlying substance of the phenomenal world, notwithstanding the variety of names and things that we see here. Of this, more later.

No injunction about the means of knowledge:

Introductory:

9. There is one point more in Uddalaka’s teaching that we have to notice here. It will be seen that he says: वैनाब्जनमुन्य महात्म्यमत्त मतसत्तिम्बां बिज्ञातम्। “which being heard about, everything else will have been heard about, which being reflected upon everything else becomes reflected upon, and which being known everything else becomes known.” These means of knowing Atman are also enumerated in the Maitreyi Brahmana.

आत्मनि सत्तिरे हो मूते मते बिज्ञाते हं सर्वे विक्षितम् (पृ. ४-५-६)

Atman being seen, heard about, reflected upon and known, my dear, all this becomes known. (Br. 4-5-6)
This proposition is again and again put forward as a general enunciation in Vedantic teaching. Some post-Sankara Vedantins have taught that hearing and reflection as means of self-knowledge are enjoined in the Upanishads; but a reference to the introductory narratives is enough to nullify this contention. In this particular case it is abundantly clear that Uddālaka is merely telling his son that Atman being known everything else becomes known just to rouse the curiosity of Śvetaketu. There is no question of any Vedic injunction whatsoever which urges the young man to undertake the enquiry. We shall see that in the end of this dialogue there are only a series of doubts raised by Śvetaketu about the nature of Reality which Uddālaka clears by means of apt illustrations. There is not even an inkling of any injunction about hearing, reflection etc. referred to in the whole of this context.

न वै नूतनं मगवन्तस्त पतितविदिष्याणे एवं सम्पर्कमे नावावलिति मगवान्तवेचे मे तद्द्वीलिति तथा सोभ्यर्थि होवात्र 
(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so."

(Ch.6-1-7)
SECTION II

• BEING AND NON-BEING

"This was Being alone in the beginning, ONE with-out a second. Here some say this was non-being alone in the beginning, ONE without a second and from it being was born; But my dear boy, how could it possibly be so? he said. How could being be born from non-being? On the contrary, this was Being alone in the beginning, ONE without a second."

(Ch. 6-2-1, 2)

The Style of the Upanishads:

10. There is a peculiar style adopted by the Upanishads in giving expression to universal truths. The Absolute which is devoid of all attributes and beyond all time and space is described by them as though It did possess certain characteristics, and as though It did exist in some distant past time. This is because in the first place empirical language and thought used being made to symbolize only empirical objects, are incapable of expressing its nature as it is and yet this is the only vehicle of teaching available in life and therefore has to be adopted somehow to suggest to the learner the nature of transcendental Reality also, by assigning certain indirect or induced significations to words
and concepts at the risk of the latter being misunderstood by the unwary.

Thus when Brahman or the Absolute is described as \textit{sat}, Being, it is the intention of the teacher that it should not be supposed to exist in time or space like things in ordinary life to be restricted by certain features which distinguish it from things co-existent with it. In order to avoid both these contingencies, the whole of the Universe is conceived as though it were itself existent in the present and on the Absolute is deliberately superimposed a past time when the universe did not obtain in its present apparent form. In this deliberate superimposition it is described as though there was Being alone. The expression ‘One without a second’ is superadded to convey the idea that the word ‘Alone’ does not signify loneliness in circumstances when the non-existence of other things is conceivable. Thus ‘Being alone’, ‘One only without a second’ means the Absolute Self which being neither genus nor species knows nothing of its kind or of a different kind and not being partible is devoid of all distinction within its own-essential notion.

**What is the meaning of the ‘is’ness of Being?**

11. One who is usually given to think of objective phenomena only, would be perplexed to know what this proposition could possibly mean. What is the meaning of the statement “Being alone” was in the beginning of things? Being, as it is commonly known, is only an attribute of things; Everything conceivable ‘is’; We cannot conceive of anything whatsoever which has no being; But to say that being ‘is’, sounds sheer tautology. Has it any more significance than,—for instance,—a statement like ‘a horse is a horse’? Moreover how could mere
being exist of its own accord, any more than redness can exist independently of a rose? On the face of it, this proposition almost amounts to saying that before the beginning of things nothing existed.

Now this proposition which predicates existence of 'nothing' should either demand one to conceive of something positive since existence can appertain only to something that is positive or if we attach the face-value of absolute nothingness to what is signified by the word nothing 'was' would have to be interpreted to mean 'was not' which is absurd. So that on the whole the proposition would only amount to saying that something was something or that nothing was nothing! Being and non-being thus become synonymous!

In fact there have been a class of positive thinkers who suppose that nothing which has no attributes and which exists nowhere and nowhere can possibly exist. And the nihilists have always denied all existence. The section of Buddhists usually called by the name of Sūnyavādins inherits this nihilism by denying essence to everything. It may be surmised that these thinkers were only systematizing and echoing the view of the common man whose naive view is that the effect to deserve that name must be newly born and its cause should ‘cause’ it to take shape anew. As the Indian logician defines it:

"कारणात् कारणम्".

(the cause is that which invariably precedes the effect.)

But a little reflection will reveal the hollowness of this argument. For, in the first place we are talking of the state of the principal cause of all the Universe as the effect of that cause.
How could there be any time before the Universe shows itself, that is to say, how could there be any time before time itself makes its appearance, for time is a concomitant of the universe and cannot be torn from the latter by any feat of the intellect. Therefore Being or Reality cannot be supposed to be a cause in the sense that it is immediately antecedent to the universe. The word ‘cause’ therefore as applied to Being can only mean the prior to the idea of the universe. In the second place it will be seen that Uddalaka means Atman or the essence of everything by the word Sat or Being only, for, his repeated reference in the discourse is ‘तत्सत्त्वं स आत्मा’. ‘It is Reality, it is the Atman’. It is clear that Atman or the Self cannot be the cause of the universe in the sense that the antecedent clay is the cause of a clay jar or a pitcher.

One without a Second:

12. The proposition that ‘the Being alone was’ may, therefore, be compared to the sentence ‘the river was flowing’, just as the river and its flowing are one and the same thing, so Being and its ‘is’ness in the past are one and the same. This way of expressing the nature of Being has been adopted only to bring home the dissimilarity of the being of things in common life and the being of Being itself. Things are, that is, they exist in time or place but Being ‘is’ by virtue of its very nature or essence.

Similarly the expression ‘one without a second’ is only a device to reveal that Being is unlike a thing which is always conditioned by its qualities and number. A horse is always one with reference to another horse or some other animal or thing. But Being is the all and absolutely precludes the idea of any quality or number attached to it.
Absolute Being:

13. Being therefore is absolute in every respect and therefore brooks no second to it, not even non-being can be opposed to it. The positivists’ or the naturalists’ attacks are altogether wide of the mark when they make frantic efforts by relentless logic to show that things have no being. Uddalaka anticipates such thinkers when he observes ‘How could it be thus, my dear boy? How can Being be born out of non-being?’ nothing which is existent in the world is ever-born out of non-existence and so this dialectician is considerably exercising himself in defending or attacking a shadow created by himself. On the other hand the Being propounded by Uddalaka is the very marrow of both the being and the non-being that one encounters in the empirical world and is the essential factor of even the nihilist who would fain deny it.

Mayic origination:

14. But some might object here: how could this Being give rise to or transform itself into the Universe? It is admittedly changeless from within itself or from something outside it since there is nothing beside it?

To this the traditional authorities of Advaita Vedanta have replied as follows:

तत्त्वो हि मायया जन्म बुन्धते न तु तत्त्वत: ।
तत्त्वतो जायते बस्म जातं तस्म हि जायते ॥
अततो मायया जन्म तत्त्वतो नैव बुन्धते ।
वज्ञायुत्रो न तत्त्वेन मायया वापि जायते ॥

(गी. का. ३-२७, २८)
From something that is, (or in the case of something that is, illusory origination is reasonable, but not actually. For according to one who holds actual origination, it will have to be admitted that something already born can alone be held to be born. (G.K. 3-27)

[That is to say, if we say that something can transform itself as something else, we shall have to admit that that something itself is a transformation of something antecedent and thus we shall be committed to regressus ad infinitum]

Nothing which is non-existent can have birth either illusorily or actually. A barren woman’s son is born neither actually nor illusorily even. (G.K. 3-28)

[Non-being is nothing absolutely. Neither change nor changelessness can be attributed to it]
SECTION III

THE CAUSE AS CONSCIOUSNESS

The Three elements as the effect of Sat:

तदेहत्र बहु त्वां प्रजापिति तत्रेंकोर्हृजत तत्रें ऐश्वर बहु त्वां
प्रजापिति तत्रोर्हृजत। तत्स्मात्र क च शोचति स्वेते वा पुरृस्तेजि
एवं तद्भावो जायते॥ (छाँ. ६-२-२)

ता भाप ऐश्वर वहस्य: त्वाम प्रजापितहृति ता अभमसृजन्त
तत्स्मात्र क च वर्ति तदेव सुप्रिम्बमं भवत्यज्ञः एव तद्भावानं
जायते॥ (छाँ. ६-२-४)
three elements in consonance with Taittiriya, only these three are mentioned here just to illustrate how the grosser objects in the world are all composed of the primordial elements.

Before entering into a detailed consideration of this latter part of creation we have to take up the subject of Consciousness as an aspect of the Absolute herein presumed by using the significant word ऐश्वर्य (It saw).

The controversy about Consciousness:

16. The followers of the Sānkhya system claimed that the expression सदेव (‘Being alone’) used at the commencement of this section could only mean Prakṛti or the balanced state of the three guṇas in the beginning of things, and argued that Sat as Brahman cannot possibly be meant here inasmuch as Being which is of the nature of Consciousness, is a perfectly changeless entity without body or senses; It cannot be supposed to be an agent of the action of knowing which occurred at a particular point of time in the past. Therefore it stands to reason to assume that the Primordial Pradhānam though insentient in itself, may yet be spoken of as omniscient in a secondary sense since it comprehends the satva guṇa (the basic pre-supposition of knowledge) also along with Rajas and Tamas and since it is well known that Yogins owing to the attribute of Consciousness of Satva endowed with body and senses actually become omniscient. Even the Vedantin who holds that Brahman is omniscient should grant that its omniscience is due to its potency of knowing all. For if the knowledge of Brahman be eternal the latter would cease to be an agent of the action of knowing; On the other hand if that action be impermanent, Brahman would cease sometimes to know and consequently should be granted to
be omniscient only by virtue of His possessing the potency of omniscience. Moreover, Brahman is granted to be devoid of the factors requisite to produce knowledge before the origin of the universe and it is inconsistent to presume that, anyone devoid of body and senses can be credited with knowledge directly. Therefore the conclusion of the Sankhya philosophers is that Being, mentioned in the first verse of the section, is the Pradhāna alone which is composed of many elements and can be allowed to evolve into an effect, like clay which being composed of parts can transform itself into effects like pots, Jars etc.

The witness alone can be omniscient:

17. Sankara rebuts this charge on the ground that a mere function of satva cannot be denoted by the verb ‘to know’ without someone witnessing it and hence it must be granted that Brahman which alone can be a witness of all is omniscient. As for the contention that if the act of knowing be eternal, Brahman cannot be held consistently to be the agent of that act, the opponent should be asked to explain how eternal Consciousness would contradict omniscience. It is self-contradictory to say that one who possesses eternal Consciousness capable of throwing light upon all objects is not omniscient. If it be objected that to speak of it as an agent of knowledge which is eternal is not reasonable, we say ‘No’, for we see the sun being spoken of in such terms as ‘he burns, he shines upon things’. But it will be objected, that it might be consistent in the case of the sun in those terms, inasmuch as there are objects to be burnt or shone upon; whereas in the case of Brahman there is no contact of the knowledge with any object whatever and hence this comparison is not on all fours with this illustration. But we see usage allows us to say- 'the sun
shine even when there is no object to be shone upon. So even if there be no object of knowledge, the usage 'it saw' (thought) is quite justified and hence there is no disparity whatever. Further, if it be supposed that an object is needed, Sruti texts speaking of Brahman as knowing all are more consistent. And what is this object at the time of creation? The reply is undifferentiated name and form intended to be differentiated, these (name and form) being undefinable as either identical with or other than Brahman.

Those proficient in the science of Yoga declare that even Yogins acquire knowledge of the past and future through the Grace of the Lord. How much more should it be deemed reasonable that that Lord, ever endowed with all perfections, should be possessed of eternal knowledge of creation, sustenance and dissolution of the world?

As for the argument that it is not reasonable to think that the Ruler is able to know anything since He has no body or senses before creation, that objection is not valid here at all; since it is quite consistent and reasonable to think that there is no need for the means of knowledge since Brahman is eternally of the essential nature of knowledge itself just as the brightness of the sun is eternal. Moreover in the case of the transmigratory self, inflicted by ignorance and other defects, birth of knowledge may depend upon the body and other factors, but not in the case of the Lord who has no cause of obstruction to His knowledge. The following two mantras point out that the Lord is in no need of body and other factors but possesses unveiled knowledge throughout; For to Him there is neither body nor any instrument of knowledge and no one is seen equal to or greater than He.
"We hear of His great power of various kinds and of inherent knowledge, power and activity (Sve.6-8) having neither hands nor feet. He is swift and grasps everything, sees without eyes and hears without ears. He knows everything knowable but there is none that can know Him. He is said to be foremost supreme Purusha."

(Sve. 3-19); (S. Bh. 1-1-5 Pp. 26-28)

The Consciousness of the Elements:

18. Empirically speaking, the elements Fire. Water and Earth being insentient cannot see and therefore in their case to say that they thought of becoming many may rightly be considered, to be figurative. But since their creation is only illusory their seeing also may be traced to the conscious nature of the Absolute, very much in the same way as when we say that a reflection in water or in a mirror moves correspondingly to the original man or animal moving. The description of creation is merely intended to make it intelligible to an enquirer that there is only one Atman in reality, so says the venerable Gaudapada:

मृद्धोविस्फुकिकाये: तृणिं चोदितान्यथा ।
 ज्ञायः सोऽद्वताराय नास्ति मेवेद: कथवन ॥  (भौ.का. ३-१६)

Creation which has been described in a variety of ways with the
help of illustrations such as those of clay, metal and sparks of fire is only a device to introduce the enquirer to the truth of the unity of Atman. There is no difference of things however we may look at it.

(G K. 3-15)

Pure Being and pure Consciousness in one:

19. It should by no means be supposed that Being and Consciousness are two distinct qualities or natures of Brahman. Reality is absolutely and uniformly the same in its nature and no manifoldness is thinkable in it. As we have already remarked, variety and manifoldness inherent in the objective not-Self, is but an illusory aspect of the Sat which is both Being and Consciousness in one.

As Śankara remarks:

न च सहस्रणमेव ब्रह्म, न बोधत्तत् श्वयं बकृमुः
‘विभागनन्त्या’ ह्यत्तियितिवैयथ्यप्रसक्रात्र। कर्म वा निरस्तवैतन्य ब्रह्म
चैतन्य सुविक्षात्तुत्तवनेपि विद्यते। नापि बोधत्तत्तमेव ब्रह्म न
सहस्रणमिति शक्त्वस्य बकृमुः; ‘अस्तीत्येकोपलक्ष्यम्’ (कान. २-३-१६)
ह्यत्तियितिवैयथ्यप्रसक्रात्र। कर्म वा निरस्तसत्ताको बोधोद्वृयुग्मत्वे?

(सू. भाग. ३-२-१२. पा. ३६०)

“It is not possible to say that Brahman is the nature of Being alone and not of the nature of Consciousness; for then Sruti texts like ‘He is Consciousness through and through’ (Br. 2-4-12) would become meaningless. And how possibly could Brahman bereft of Consciousness be thought to be Self of Jiva, the individual self (as it is found to be taught in the sequel?) nor can Brahman be said to be of the nature of Consciousness alone and not of the nature of Being, for then texts like ‘He is to be seen as Being alone’ (K.6-13) would become meaningless.
and how could Consciousness bereft of Being be postulated?"

(S.B. 3-2-21. P. 360)

**Brahman as the material as well as the Efficient cause:**

20. Since the Sruti declares that Sat or Brahman wished to be born as many and then created light, it is clear as Badarayana says अभिवोपदेशाः (वेमू १-५-२४).

And because of the teaching that ‘Brahman thought of becoming many’ (S.B. 1-4-24) it is both the material and efficient cause of the universe; and as Being Absolute or Consciousness, Absolute can never be conceived to change itself into something else. we are constrained to believe that the elemental fire which Brahman created and Changed itself into, can be only *mayic* (illusory) as Gaudapada has argued. More of this in the next section.
SECTION IV

THE INDIVIDUAL SELF AND THE DOCTRINE OF MAYIC EXISTENCE OF THE EFFECT

Significance of thought attributed to the elements:

21. We have now to see how Uddalaka is going to make good his initial statement, वाचारम्भणं विक्रारो नामचेतस्। (छां. ६-११-४) ‘The effect is only a play of words, a mere name’.

We have already quoted three statements about Fire, Water and Earth, where the first two elements are said to have thought and proposed to be born as many and then like Sat itself to have created their immediate effects. Badarayana (V. S. 2-3-13) infers from this text that Brahma alone assumes the form of Fire etc. and thinks of becoming many and is born as the next effect, since the elements cannot be conscious of themselves. The Sruti elsewhere says that there is no seer other than Brahma (Br. 3-7-23) and therefore it stands to reason to assume that it is Consciousness of Brahma itself that is seen elsewhere or is attributed by the Sruti even to the insentient elements which are superimposed on it. We all know that the sheen of the apparent silver actually belongs to the name on which the silver itself is superimposed. It is to make this fact intelligible that expressions like ‘The Fire thought or wished to be born as many’ have been used here.
The triple constituents of things:

22. The Sruti now proceeds to relate how all phenomenal things are the result of the triplication of the Primordial elements. Of course this triplication must be taken to be symbolic of all the five elementary constituents of phenomena including Ether and Air.

(चार. ६-३-२, ३, ४.)

“This Devata (Goddess) thought, ‘Well, I shall enter these three devatas in my jiva-self and differentiate name and form. Each of them I shall make triple severally.’ This Devata entered these three devatas in this its Jiva self and differentiated name and form. Each of them made triple severally. How each of these is triple I shall tell you, my boy, so that you may learn it.”

(Brahman the original Devata:)

23. Here Brahman, the primary cause, Being and Consciousness, in one has been styled Devata. In the Vedas especially in their ritualistic portion, Gods as the presiding deities of external and internal phenomena are usually designated by the word ‘devatas’ (shining ones) chiefly because of their unimpeded knowledge and powers. The Upanishads, therefore, sometimes depict the Supreme Cause or Brahman as Isvara
(Ruler) and dominating Devata (shining) as it outrivals them all in its glory and is unexcelled by any one else in any respect. Witness the mantra —

तमीथराणां परमं महेश्वरम्।
तं देवतानां परमं च देवतम्॥

(पे. ६-७)

We know that Devata, the greatest Ruler of all Rulers, and the greatest Devata of all devatas (Sve. 6-7) and the primeval elements have been also called Devatas because they are derived from Brahman in every respect.

**Brahman’s entrance into the elements:**

24. Sat or Brahman entered into these lesser devatas in its form as Jiva and differentiated names and forms of things. In the discussion about the Conscious nature of Brahman we have referred to these names and forms in an undifferentiated state before creation.

It is Brahman alone that enters into the elements and brings them into a differentiated state. Brahman is said to enter these elements in its Jiva form for two reasons. In the first place, Brahman as the Universal Self continues to remain in its Brahmic nature even after entering into the creation as the sage Kaśa Kṛtsna quoted by Badarayana (VS 1-4-22) opines, and in the second place the Jiva form superimposed upon Brahman is a mayic reflection, as it were, of that supreme Self (VS 2-3-50), very much like the reflection of a scene in water depending upon its original for its very existence as a reflection. It is true that even Jiva also differentiates names and forms of things as for Instance when a potter differentiates clay into names and forms such as pitcher or a claylid. But he himself is not involved at all in the
differentiation of names and forms in the maze of phenomena like a hill, a river or a sea. Therefore Sankara while interpreting Badarayana Sutra “संबंधात्वकार्यसूतिः निषेधायुक्तेः यपदेशायाः” (2-4-20) says that the Sruti ‘I shall differentiate name and form’ (Ch. 6-3-2) should be taken literally to mean that it is Supreme Devata, the Sat alone, that is responsible for the differentiation of all names and forms. Even where we know that the Jiva himself makes things and invests them with names and forms, the act should be ultimately traced to Sat, Brahman only, inasmuch as the Jiva is quite distinct from the Supreme Lord like an employed servant of a king and that is why in the Sruti अनेन जीवनात्मानानुश्रविष्ठ (entering into them in the form of my Jiva Self). It is said the Jivahood of the individual is only due to circumscribing conditions such as the body and the senses.

The three elements in the effects:

25. How each of these differentiated products of the elemental constituents reveal their triple nature is illustrated by the following texts:

चक्रो रोहिन्यं र्गूङ्गे तेजसस्तपूर्वं कच्चुहं तद्भवं यत्त्:एकं

termaṇa, वार्तसन्धिरेकीतं बायासमध्यं विक्रमे नामवेयं श्रीणि रुपाणीत्येव तत्त्वम्॥

तद्निष्ठस्य रोहिन्यं र्गूङ्गे तेजसस्तपूर्वं कच्चुहं तद्भवं वर्त्त्वें यत्त्:एकं

मदन्तान्तता, वार्तसन्धिरेकीतं बायासमध्यं विक्रमे नामवेयं श्रीणि

रुपाणीत्येव तत्त्वम्॥

क्षणस्यो रोहिनः र्गूङ्गे तेजसस्तपूर्वं कच्चुहं तद्भवं यत्त्:एकं

तद्वर्तात्मानाविदानदिनियं बायासमध्यं विक्रमे नामवेयं श्रीणि

रुपाणीत्येव तत्त्वम्॥
"What is seen to be the red colour of fire, that is the colour of the Primordial Fire; what is seen to be white that is the colour of Primordial Water; and that which is black is of the elemental Food. Thus the fireiness (quiddity) of fire as the effect is a mere play of words, only a name; that the so called fire is only the colours is alone the reality". (Ch.6-4-1)

(The other texts are similarly translated. In place of the word fire, we have only to substitute 'the sun' ‘the moon' and ‘the lightning’ respectively while rendering texts number 2, 3 and 4 respectively)

This extract should serve as a type for the analysis of all combinations of the three elements. What is aimed at is the conclusion that every phenomenon in the universe is made of the constituents (fire, water and earth) which are themselves illusory manifestations of Sat, the Original Cause. The products of fire—the common fire, the sun, the moon and the lightning—enumerated here should be taken to be typical for the products of the other two elements also. The sum and substance of the argument is that every phenomenon is only an appearance of Reality, Being. This is what Gaudapada has described भावभवावनम् “Illusory Birth of Reality.” The so called effect is in its apparent aspect, a play of words, only a name, that is to say, our common sense, intellect in its ignorance gives a local habitation and a name to appearances only and lives in a fool’s paradise so long as it has not realised their quiddity which is Brahman alone.
The Sankhya and the Vedanta Doctrines contrasted. Vedanta contrasted with Sankhya with regard to the effect:

26. Both the Sankhya and the Vedanta systems have accepted the theory of Sat-Karya (the pre-existence of the effect in the cause before its manifestation). For the Sankhya, the effect (the Universe) exists in the form of the cause, the Pradhana which evolves itself into Mahat and other effects at the time of creation. But this is only a hypothesis taken for granted on the basis of reasoning that the effect of the nature of things conducing to pleasure, pain and delusion should have come from a cause similar to it in nature. For us, Vedantins, however, the effect pre-exists in the cause Brahman. The Sankhyans and other adverse critics object to this on two grounds. In the first place this is against the accepted doctrine of Sat-Karya in the system and in the second place the effect according to Advaita will have to be confessed to be dissimilar to the cause. Sankara refutes these charges as follows:

...
If Brahman which is Conscious, Pure and devoid of sound and other qualities is affirmed (hypothecated) as the cause of or effect opposed to it, its nature being inert, impure and invested with sound etc., then it would lead to the conclusion that the effect is non-existent before its birth, and this is repugnant to you, holding as you do, the doctrine of the pre-existence of the effect (even before its birth!)

(Reply:) This is no defect in our system. For it is a mere negation.

(To explain:) This is a bare negation: for there is no object to be negated here. How is this? The reply is that, in the same way as the effect is even now existent as the cause, even so it is to be concluded that it is existent before its birth. For even now its effect has no independent existence of its own except as that modification of the cause. The Sruti says, ‘everything would reject him who would recognise anything as other than Atman’ (Br. 2-4-6). The existence of the effect as identical with the cause of course, is nothing peculiar to it at the time preceding creation.

Objection: Well, but Brahman without sound and other qualities is the cause of the world?

Reply: Of course, yes. But there is no world with sound and other qualities apart from its form as the cause, whether before creation or even now. Therefore it cannot be maintained that the effect has no being before its birth.

(S.Bh. 2-1-7 ; P. 189)

And elsewhere Śaṅkara observes:

सत्त्वावता जस्तेरकालकालानां महात्मान्नत्त्वम्, वषा च
मुननृत्विगृहात्मानृपरिवर्तितत्त्वम्, एवमहत्त्वत्त्वात्,
स्थिरेन ज्ञात्त्वत्त्वात्, एवमत्त्व योगेन्द्रकिर्मिप्रि-प्रवचनगतात्म ब्रह्मविभासितेनात्मानी यथेऽर्थम् ॥

(सृ.भ. २-१-१४ ; वा. १९७)
"Therefore just as jar space and a drinking pot space have no independent existence apart from space in general and just as the water of a mirage and the phenomena have no existence independent of a mirage and other things, these being of a nature just appearing and disappearing the next moment and indefinable in their character, so also, one should know that this phenomenal world consisting of distinctions like the experienced objects and experiences has no being other than that of Brahma."

(S.Bh. 2-1-14; P. 197)

The Doctrine of Maya:

27. The two excerpts quoted above should suffice to give the lie direct to the view adumbrated in some quarters that Sankara does not recognize the doctrine of Maya anywhere, the doctrine that the whole of the Universe before us with all its imposing characteristics of reality is nought in itself; it is no more than a mirage enticing thirsty people walking about in a sandy desert. At the same time Sankara wants us to believe firmly that it is not a hallucination; its paraphernalia of names and things is really a manifestation of Pure Being or Pure Consciousness which is the Self of us all. As the Chandogya Bhashya has it:

"What we say is that nothing anywhere is unreal, inasmuch as it
is Being alone that is mistaken for the world of duality and difference. Just as it is a rope alone that is called a ‘snake’ when it is mistaken for a snake or just as a lump of clay or a jar is taken to be other than clay and is called by names like ‘lump’, ‘a pot’ etc., but for those who have distinctly recognized the rope or the clay, the names and ideas of a snake or a jar cease to exist, so also for those who have distinctly recognized the Absolute Being (as the only Reality) the name and the idea of an effect cease to exist” (Ch. Bh. 6-2-3 ; P. 510)

Mayic Existence of the Effect in the Cause:

28. That the fire, the sun, the moon and the lightning cited above are intended to be only illustrative of the general doctrine of mayic existence of all effects in the primary cause, the Pure Being, is corroborated by the following texts:

“Knowing this, the ancient ones who possessed spacious homes and who were highly learned in sacred lore said: ‘There is none amongst us who says anything he has not heard about, reflected upon, and known’. They knew everything from these illustrations.” (Ch. 6-4-5).
“Whatever appeared as red, they knew to be the colour of fire; that which appeared as white, they knew to be the colour of water; and whatever appeared as black they knew to be the colour of food or the earth.”

(Ch. 6-4-6)

“And whatever appeared to be unknown, that they knew to be an aggregate of these Devatas alone. How these three Devatas on getting into the body become triplicated severally, you may now learn from me.”

(Ch. 6-4-7)

अनेन्द्रनिजिं नेना विषीमदे तत्व क वसिन्धो पातुस्तूत्विं गच्छि
नेना मममात् समसन्मां बौद्धिकहस्तीन्मि: ॥

(छ. ६-५-१)

“Food eaten is divided into three (stages of refinement), of that the grossest part becomes faeces, that part which is of medium refinement becomes flesh and that which is the most refined part becomes the mind.”

(Ch. 6-5-1)

This section of the teaching aims at stressing the material notion of the entire ego-complex.

बापै भैलामे विषीमन्ते तसां व वसिन्धो पातुस्तूत्विं गच्छि
नेना मममात् समसन्मां बौद्धिकहस्तीन्मि: ॥

(छ. ६-५-२, ३)

“Water (liquid food) drunk is divided into three; of that the grossest part becomes urine and that which is of medium refinement becomes blood and the most refined part becomes the vital force (Prana).”

“The product of fire taken is divided into three, the grossest part becomes the bone, that which is of medium refinement becomes marrow and the most refined part becomes the organ of speech.”(Ch. 6-5-2,3)
29. The details given above of the physical and psychic components of a man need not be literally or critically examined and compared and contrasted with the findings of modern physiology and psychology. The one fact which is stressed is that all not-self, internal or external to man, including his body, is composed and made up of the Primordial elements and the elements themselves are the illusory manifestations of Sat—Pure Being, which is the only Reality. The following text summarizes the conclusion to be remembered about this ego-complex of which the mind (presumably including the senses), the vital force and the organ of speech are the chief constituents.

अत्यं द्विस्मयम नमः जापोमनः प्राणस्वतं विशिष्टिः प्रृथ्वे तव मा मृगवानु विनिर्पलितम् तता सौम्येति होक्तम्॥ (चण. ६-६-६)

"Of food, my dear boy, is the mind constituted; of water is constituted the vital force (Prama) and of fire is speech constituted. ‘May your revered self be pleased to enlighten me further on the point’. ‘All right, my dear boy’, said (Uddālaka) ‘I shall do so.’" (Ch.6-5-4)

The Purport of the Sequel:

30. The next instalment of the narration is intended to serve as an elucidation of how the mind is a product of food. We shall simply reproduce the relevant texts with their English rendering:

क्रमः तोम्य मन्मानसस्य सोज्यितम् स दर्ष्येष्वः समुद्दीयति कल्याणेऽपि।

एष्वेच सहु सोप्राणस्वतं मत्स्येष्व तद्वर्त्मः समुद्दीयति कल्याणो भवति॥ (चण. ६-६-२, २)

"Of the curd that is churned, my boy, the refined portion rises up and that becomes butter. Even so, my dear boy, the finer part of
food eaten rises up and that becomes the mind."  

(Ch. 6-6-1, 2)

अष्टो सोम्य जीवाव्याना योजनगमा स ऋष्टः समुदीपति स प्राणो भवति ||

तेजससुम्म्याचार्य्यानाय योजनगमा स ऋष्टः समुदीपति सा वागङ्गति ||

(छां. ६-६-३, ४)

"Of water drunk, my dear boy, the finer portion rises up and that becomes the vital force (Prana); of the quality of fire eaten, my dear boy, the subtle part rises up and that becomes the organ of speech."

(Ch. 6-6-3, 4)

(Food, water and fire, it will be remembered, are the technical names of the three Primordial elements and bear the same significance as they do in common life. The elements enter into compounds in various proportions and combinations. The object of the texts is only to draw the attention of the seeker to the fact that the essence of the organic matter, no less than that of the physical in the external nature, consists of nothing but the three elements, the latter being but apparent manifestations of the original cause.)

जन्मयं हि सोम्य गन: आपोमय: प्राणस्तेजोमयी वागिति भूष एव मा चवानू विष्णवत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच || (छां. ६-६-५)

"Of food, my dear boy, is the mind constituted; of water is the life force (Prana) constituted and of fire is speech constituted. 'May your revered self be pleased to enlighten me further on this point.' 'All right, my dear boy,' said (Uddalaka) 'I shall do so.

(Ch. 6-6-5)

The Mind, a Product of Food:

31. The next instalment is intended to be an experiment to
demonstrate how mind is constituted of food.

(Ch. 6-7-1)

"The human body, my dear boy, consists of sixteen parts. Do not eat any food for fifteen days; you may drink water as much as you please, for life force (Prana) is constituted of water and if you do not drink, it may depart."

(Ch.6-7-2)

"He ate not for fifteen days and then came to him (Uddalaka) asking him 'what shall I recite O father?' 'Rks, Yajus texts and Samas' (replied Uddalaka). He then said, 'O father, they do not flash to my mind.'

(Ch.6-7-3)

"He observed, 'just as, my dear boy, out of a great fire enkindled, only one live piece of charcoal (of the size of a spark) should remain and even from that (spark) one could not burn much faggots; even so, my dear boy, of your similar parts, a single part remains now and with the help of that one part alone thou art not able to remember the Vedas. Eat now, I tell you and then, thou shall remember them.' (Ch. 6-7-3)
“He then took food and approached his father (Uddalaka) and whatever the latter asked him he was able to know.” (Ch. 6-7-4)

“Tāṃ hṛtācaḥ pṛtha lomasyāhāritatvaekṣayāṁ kṛpaṇotmarī cākṣeyetmaṁ pariṣṭiṁ tāṁ tṛṇaekṣayamāṇaṁ prāṇaḥ-pratyet te naśīkaḥ vahu dhūṣaḥ ॥

Evaṁ sāmya te sūryānaṁ kāla-timemāṁ kālaṁ tīkṣhādamṣṭu sa khaṇḍaḥ sanātmaḥ kētaṁ prāṇaṁ tṛṇaekṣaṁ bhūtaṁ vai naśīkaṁ prāṇaṁ pratyet te saṁyāmaṁ viśālāchāriḥ tvadhā prajñāchārī prajñāchārī ॥

(Chā. 6-7-5, 6)

“He said, ‘just as when out of a great enkindled fire, if a single live charcoal, of the size of a firefly, should remain, then one should be able to make a big fire again with the help of bits of straw and even with its help one could burn much; even so, my dear boy, out of your sixteen parts, only one part was left to thee and that part kindled by food, blazed again and with its help thou now recalledest the Vedas; of food, indeed, my dear boy, is mind constituted; of water is the vital force (Prana) constituted and of fire is speech constituted’. And he understood, well indeed, what his father explained”. (Ch. 6-7-5, 6)
SECTION V

BECOMING ONE WITH BEING

32. In the preceding sections we have recorded the peculiar narrative form in which the Upanishads teach eternal verities. When, it is said, that Being alone ‘was’ in the beginning of things, One without a second, and It thought of ‘becoming many’ by ‘being born’ in other forms and proposed to Itself that It ‘would enter the creation’ as Jiva under different names and forms, we have only to understand that the Absolute Reality is both Pure Being and Pure Consciousness in one, and that being altogether devoid of any specific features, It appears to be the world differentiated into names and forms to the common man. When it is said that the effect is only ‘a play of words, a mere name’, it means in plain language that Being or Atman is really the cause of it all; that causation is only magic and that all the panorama of the universe that people are aware of, is, from the highest point of view, Reality or Being, Itself. There are no Jivas and objective things differentiated into names and forms at all, independent of Being or Atman. These objective things and inner subtle phenomena such as the mind or life forms are really one with Being. This has been shown by explaining ‘the doctrine of triplication.’ And that the Jiva is really one with Being will now be demonstrated by an appeal to universal intuition.

33. Uddalaka now proposes to examine the state of sound sleep:

उद्दळको हा कण्य: पेरकेतु पुरुषवच स्वार्थं भेतो सोम्य विज्ञानवैधि क्षेततू पुरुषस्वरूपिनि नाम सता सोम्यतम सम्पन्नो भवति
“Uddalaka, son of Aruna, said to his son Svetaketu, ‘Now, my dear boy, know from me the state of sound sleep. When a man is said to be asleep (स्वप्नित नाम) then, my dear boy, he becomes one with Self. He is dissolved unto Himself; therefore they say about him that he sleeps (स्वप्निति). It is well known that he is dissolved into his own Self.”

(Ch.6-8-1)

Here the Sruti takes up the word Svapiti used in common life and offers a fanciful derivation for Sva (into his own Self,) Apiti (is dissolved). This is, of course, not according to any grammarian but only a mnemonic to draw the attention of the aspirant to the actual state of Jiva in that state. The word Sukprantah (स्वप्रान्तः) might mean the dream state also and even then the true nature of Jiva is partially revealed; for all the conditioning associates such as the body, the mind and the senses of the waking state are replaced there by their semblances and yet Atman retains His nature intact, thus showing that it is not the inherent nature of the Jiva to be restricted to the individual notion found in waking or confined within the precincts of the waking world. But sound sleep is specially mentioned here because Jiva not only loses his identity as conditioned by the body, the senses and the mind of the waking state, but also because the whole universe with all its paraphernalia limited by time, space or causality has vanished here absolutely. There is nothing to distinguish him from Pure Being.

34. Sankara in his Sutra Bhashya thus explains the significance of the word Svapiti (स्वपिति) in this context.
The Jiva is awake, when owing to contact of the conditioning factors of the nature of modifications of the mind, he identifies himself with them. As qualified by their impressions, he sees dreams and is then denoted by the word 'Mind'. When both these conditioning associates disappear, he has no distinguishing feature and is therefore 'dissolved,' as it were, into his own Self, and so the Sruti says 'It is well known that he is dissolved into his own Self'.

(S.Bh, 1-1-9: Pp. 32-33)

[Here it is clear that Śankara recognizes only two sets of conditioning associates which determine the Jiva nature of the individual self; but some post-Śankara commentators, recognizing as they do another conditioning adjunct which they call 'Positive Avidya', take advantage of the expression (dissolved as it were), and interpret the Bhashya to "mean that the Jiva is only partially dissolved and has not yet become completely merged in Pure Being in sound sleep. This later interpretation is not only not faithful to Śankara's view but also lays the axe at the very root of Vedantic teaching about the pristine purity of Jivatman to which we revert daily in sound sleep.]

Before proceeding further we shall quote two passages from the Sutra Bhashya which leave us in no doubt whatever on this point:

(2) ...
(2) “It is a conventional teaching of the Upanishads that the Jiva becomes one with the supreme Brahman in sleep; and from that supreme Brahman all the world beginning with Prana is born. Therefore wherein sleep is of the nature of unconsciousness and purity, wherein his own nature is devoid of all particularized consciousness born of conditioning associates, and from which this return to waking is of the nature of a fall from that pristine state, that Paramatman (Supreme Self) is here taught by the Sruti. That is what has to be concluded.”

(S.Bh. 1-4-18; P. 168).

[The sub-commentary Bhamati interprets this passage as follows’ - “Since there is unconsciousness, his nature is pure, as it were, and not purity itself.”

“For there is the Laya (ignorance) and the potentiality of the impression of Vikshepa (the projecting power of Avidya) the similarity (of Purity) is only because of the absence of the several Vrittis functioning, समुदायजनृतिविक्रियाभावभावात्मकोपमानम्” (भामती. 1-4-18, पा. 409)
Comment is needless.]
Moreover there is no time when there is no unity of Jiva with Brahman, for the essential nature of a thing can never disappear. Only relative to the foreign nature which he puts on, as it were, in dream and waking, he is said to resume his own nature in sleep. For this reason also it is improper to say that he becomes united into one or with Being only on a certain occasion but is not united on other occasions.”

(S.Bh. 3-2-7; P. 351)

35. It is clear that Sankara closely follows the Upanishads in declaring that the Jiva does become One with the secondless Atman who has been designated by the significant name of Sat (Being). This is from the standpoint of waking which obliges us to believe that we possess an aggregate of the body, the senses and the mind. Looking at each state from its own standpoint, it is, however, obvious that the states are only apparent not-selves superimposed upon Atman, appearing and disappearing without leaving any stain on the eternally pure nature of Atman. It thus follows that Atman as Brahman is the only Reality.

36. This is not mere speculation but reasoning on the basis of facts experienced by all. Accordingly Sankara writes:
“And as for the argument that the word itself which enjoins manana (reasoning) besides sravana, listening to the teaching of the Sruti, shows that reasoning also should be adopted, we say dry speculation cannot gain entry here in this place, for the reasoning offered by the Sruti itself is adopted here as subservient to intuition. It is of the following type:

1. Both dreaming and waking each prevailing in the absence of the other. Atman is unsullied by the character of either and Jiva becomes one with Being shaking off all differences; he is Being devoid of all

2. The manifold world having been born out of Brahma it is not other than Brahma if we (accept) follow the principle of non-difference of the effect and the cause.” (S.Bh. 2-1-6 Pp. 188-189).

The above is a succinct statement of the distinguishing feature of Vedanta in that, unlike other systems, it follows no syllogistic reasoning or independent speculation for the establishment of its truth. Only direct universal intuition and argument based upon intuition are employed here; and the subject matter being the nature of one’s own Self, there can be no suspension of judgment, doubt or debatability with regard to the cardinal tenets propounded here.

37. The intimate relation between Jiva and the universal Self is seen here even during the states of their seeming distinction. This is brought home in the next Sruti text:
“In the same way as a bird with a string flies in this direction and that, and finding no abode of rest, it would seek refuge in the very post to which it is tied up, so also, indeed, my dear boy, it is that this ‘mind’ flies in this direction and that, but finding no abode of rest, seeks refuge in the Prāṇa alone at last, for the mind is tied up to Prāṇa.”

(Ch. 6-8-2)

Here Prāṇa is another name given to Being in its causal aspect. Prāṇa or substratum is the aspect of Brahman on which all aggregates of body and senses are supported. And ‘mind’ is the name assigned to Jivas, because mind is the conditioning associate of Jivas during their mundane life.

38. We have so far discussed the Vedantic theory of causation and the oneness of Jiva with Brahman during sleep. Before entering into a detailed account of this oneness, Uddalaka makes certain incidental observations on the inter-relation of the three primordial elements. His mnemonic about sleep, Swapiti (स्वप्निति), reminds him to place before his son the other similar derivations of words पिपासति (feels thirsty) and अतिशिष्टति (feels hungry) before he resumes the subject of सत्सम्पति: (becoming one with Being). We shall now state the texts at length with translation and see what conclusions Sankara draws from these.

(छां. ६-८-३.)
"Know the truth about hunger and thirst, my boy, from me. When a person is spoken of as अतिरिक्ततम (he feels hungry), then water alone leads on that which is eaten. Just as they speak of गोमय (leader of cattle), अश्म (leader of horses), पुरुषमय (leader of men), so also they call water by the name गोमय (leader of food eaten). You should know, my dear son, that it is thence this offshoot has sprouted. This can never be without a cause."

(Ch. 6-8-3)

"Where else could its cause be if not food? In like manner too, my dear boy, from the offshoot food trace the cause, water; from the offshoot water, my dear boy, trace the cause, fire; from the, offshoot fire, my dear boy, trace the cause, Being. All these beings, my dear boy, have their cause in Being and Being alone have they for their residing abode and in Being alone they ultimately merge themselves".

(Ch. 6-8-4)

"And when a person is spoken of as अतिरिक्ततम (feels thirsty) then it is heat that leads on what is drunk. Just as they speak of a गोमय (leader of cattle), अश्म (leader of horses), पुरुषमय (leader of men), so also one calls 'fire' by the name वातस्य (leader of water), thirst. And know that, my dear boy, it is thence that this offshoot has sprouted."
This can never be without a cause."

(Ch. 6-8-5)

"Where else could its cause be if not water? From the offshoot, water, my dear boy, trace the cause fire; from the offshoot fire, my dear boy, trace the cause Being. All these beings, my dear boy, have their cause in Being and Being alone have they for their residing abode and in Being alone they ultimately merge themselves."

"How these three devatas, my dear boy, on entering the body become, each one of them, triplicated severally, has been already described."

"Of this person who is departing, speech merges in the mind and the mind in the प्राण (Life-Force). प्राण in fire and fire in the Supreme Devata."

(Ch.6-8-6)

39. The conclusion to be drawn from the incidental treatment of hunger and thirst is that all created things are ever one with Pure Being or Brahman, whether in the incipient stage or during their stay or when they reach their end. They have no independent being of their own at all.

40. The Śruti now resumes the subject of Jivas, oneness with Brahman. Just as in sound sleep the individual self loses its self-identity in the Absolute Being, it occurs at the stage of death also. And what is the conclusion to be drawn from this fact?
The following text states this at length:

स व एवंविमेतदात्मामिनं सर्व तत्सत्वं स आत्मा तत्वमसि वेतस्ते श्रीं भूप एव मा कर्मानु विधायमिति तथा लोपयिति होणां (छां. ६-६-१)

"Now it is this subtle Entity which all this universe has for its essence. It (alone) is real. That is the Atman, That Thou Art, O Svetaketu". (Ch.6-8-7).

41. We shall now state the various doctrines incorporated in this text, one by one, with certain observations that should stimulate the thought of the student.

1. This Being is the most subtle Entity which forms the substrate of all creation.

2. Being is the one essence of all things, animate or inanimate. Apart from It they are nothing in themselves.

3. Being or Brahman is the only Reality. It is not something opposed to the unreal. It transcends both the empirically real and empirically unreal.

4. Being is the only real Atman. The apparent atmans that one can conceive of in empirical life have their self-hood in It. Brahman transcends both the self and the not-self.

5. The Jiva or the individual self has only a seeming existence of its own. As Śankara says elsewhere, it is only a semblance (अभास एव), neither one with nor different from the Real Atman. Each one of us really is eternally and essentially one with this really real Atman.
42. Svetaketu asked his father to enlighten him further on the doctrine of oneness, because he had one great misgiving about it. How is it that no Jiva ever recognizes himself during sleep as having become one with Atman of whom Uddālaka is speaking? If one has arrived at a particular village, surely, he ought to be able to recognize his having done so. The father’s reply to this objection is here:

यथा सोम्य मधु मधुकृतो नित्तिहितति नानात्वायानं वृष्णाणं रसानं समबहारसेकूंतां रसं गमयन्ति ॥

ते यथा तट्र न विवेकेः हमन्तोद्वृष्णाः वृष्णस्य रसोउत्स्पृष्ट्यां वृष्णस्य रसोउत्स्मीयेयेवेव खलु सोम्येमा; सर्वाः प्रजाः सति सम्बं न विदुः सति सम्प्रभामहि हि ॥

(छां. ६२८-१, २)

“Just as, my dear boy, bees prepare honey by collecting the juices of different trees and reducing all the juices into one and yet they are not discriminated there in this particular way as ‘I am the juice of such and such a tree’ and ‘I am the juice of such and such a particular tree’, so also, my dear boy, all these beings, having become one with Being, do not recognize themselves in the form ‘we are all merged in Being.’

(Ch. 6-9-1, 2)

43. The reply itself gives rise to another doubt. While in the illustration of honey we have a number of juices from flowers of various plants and trees, we have here only one person going to sleep daily and waking again by himself. Has Uddālaka’s answer overcome the difficulty of this anomaly in any way? The reader should know that there are two thought-positions from which sleep is described in the Upanishads. The first one is to grant the empirical distinction of many individual selves and
from that stand-point only one Jiva enters into sleep and becomes one with Being and the same Jiva awakes from Being. As Sankara remarks:

"It is Being itself that is spoken of, as has been shown in detail, as Jiva figuratively owing to the contact with the conditioning associate. This being so, we speak of the Jiva so long as bondage continues in connection with the same conditioning associate but when there is continuance of bondage with reference to another conditioning associate we speak of another Jiva".  

(S.Bh. 3-2-9 ; P. 353)

From this thought position how any particular Jiva does not happen to recognize his having become one with Being in the state of sleep is thus explained:

"In the first place the absence of particular cognition as characteristic of deep sleep is the same throughout. Now it is reasonable to hold that when Jiva is one with Being, he does not know anything in particular because there is only Atman, for the Sruti says 'there (in the state of one Atman) what should one know and with what?'"  

(S.Bh. 3-2-7, P. 351)
A More Comprehensive View of Deep Sleep:

44. But there is another and more Vedic thought position that we sometimes come across in the Upanishads.

स यथोर्णानामिततत्त्वतः नोरेवायः: दुःष्ट विसुलिखतः
बुधरन्वेषवेतवात्मात्मनः सर्व प्राणः सर्व लोकः सर्व देवः
सर्वाद्यमेव ब्याहिति ब्याहिति।।

(Bṛ. २-१-२०)

“In the same way as the spider comes out with the thread, and as from fire little sparks fly off, so also from this Atman all the pranas (senses), all the worlds and all the gods, and all these atmas come out”.

(Bṛ. 2-1-20)

वैतत्त्वुः दुःष्ट: स्वानं न क्षुणा पवयत्वासिन्ग्राण एवैवः
अवति तदेऽं बायसवैद्यामिति: सहायेति चाहुः सर्वः रूपः
सहायेति भोज्यं सर्वः: अन्तः: सहायेति मनः सर्वाव्यानेन: सहायेति
स यया प्रतिवेवते व्याहोर्ज्ञवत्तो विसुलिखतः
विप्रतिवेषवेतवात्मात्मनः प्राणा
व्याहतर्म विप्रतिहत्ते प्राणेयो देवा देवेयो लोकः।।

(Kau. ३-३)

“Therein this purusha now thus sees no dream whatever, then he becomes one with this Prana, then the organ of speech with all names dissolves itself in Him, the organ of sight with all shapes and colours dissolves itself in Him, the organ of hearing with all sounds dissolves itself in Him and when he awakes, just, as from a blazing fire sparks would fly off, so also from this Atman the pranas (the organs of senses) come out and settle in their respective centres, from the pranas the gods (come out) and from the gods, the worlds”.

(Kau.3-3)

The above two passages describe in detail how from the higher standpoint of the Upanishads the whole of the universe
with all its paraphernalia dissolves itself in the Reality called Prana here. The view commonly entertained that the external world with all the inhabitant Jivas and inanimate objects continues to exist in spite of one Jiva going to sleep is unwarranted from the standpoint of intuition and is supported only by the extension of our experience of other Jivas in our waking world. This world, it will be seen, is concomitant with waking and cannot by any subterfuge be made to pass on either to dream or sleep.

45. When therefore all the Jivas have become one with Atman in whom their being was super-imposed in waking, there is no meaning in supposing that they had become one with Atman in the past and then to expect that they ought to remember it in the waking as though the Jiva has travelled from state to state in succession in a single time series. The illustrations of different juices commingling and becoming one with honey is on all fours with the Jivas becoming one with Sat (Being).

46. This argument is in perfect harmony with the Chandogya Bhashya, which remarks:

एक्षेत्र खुद जोग्यम्। सम्सृतः प्रजा जड़न्वेनि सति संपवम्
सुधुश्चाजै जर्जराश्च न निनर्व निचलायौ। सति सम्पवमाहि सति
सम्पवम् इति वा ॥

(छां. भा. ६-१-२ ; पा. ५२८)

"In the same manner, my dear boy, all these beings becoming one with Sat during sleep daily, during death, and general dissolution, are not aware that they are becoming one with Being or that they have become one with Being".

(Ch. Bh. 6-9-2 ; P. 528)

And this will be in consonance with the next passage.

त हि ज्ञाते या सिंहो या पृथियो या ब्राह्मणो या कीटो या पताको या
47. The fact that all creatures become one with Being during sleep, death or dissolution in no way interferes with their retaining their individual form due to their ‘Karma’ so long as they do not realize their metaphysical oneness with Reality. Accordingly, Sankara remarks with reference to the oneness at the time of death:

"We have to discuss as to what sort of oneness would this be. Here the *prima facie* view would be that this merging of the
individuality is absolute; for it would be consistent with the fact that it is the material cause. To explain: it has been established that the Supreme Devata is the material cause of everything that is born. Therefore we have to conclude that this non-distinction is absolute. To this prima facie view we say: that group of subtle elements like fire, which is the locus of organs such as hearing, continues to be till complete dissolution, that is, till release from samsara due to right knowledge; for samsara (transmigration) has been described in Srutis like "some embodied ones go into the womb for assuming bodies; others go to the state of a motionless tree, each in conformity with past karmas and haunting ideas" (Ka.2-2-7), for otherwise everyone would absolutely become one with Brahman at the time of death itself owing to the disappearance of all conditioning associates and so the Sastra dealing with injunctions would be purposeless and so would be the Sastras dealing with right knowledge. Besides, it is not reasonable that bondage due to misconception should loosen without right knowledge. Therefore even while everything has (the supreme Devata) for its material cause this attainment of oneness with Being (at the time of death) must be concluded to be with a residue of latency (of the fire etc.), just like (the attainment of oneness) during sleep and dissolution".

(S.Bh. 4-2-8; P. 483).

48. This doctrine of the conditioning association due to ignorance of the true nature of Brahman (now and then referred to by Śāṅkara) has been developed by post-Śāṅkara sub-commentators into a theory of residue of Positive Avidya in sleep and into the suicidal corollary of the continuance of the distinction of the individual self and the Supreme Self even in sound sleep. It passes one's understanding how these Vedantins reconciled themselves to a conclusion that forces them to believe that there
is no state whatever where non-duality of Atman is intuited. Śankara, on the other hand, states in so many words that the inference of distinction in sleep is based on misconception due to Avidya in waking.

“Just as in the Supreme Atman, devoid of all distinctions, there are conventional dealings of distinctions due to wrong knowledge in the state of sustentation unimpeded as in a dream, so in the state of dissolution also latency of distinctions due to wrong knowledge alone can be inferred”.

(S.Bh. 2-1-9; Pp. 191-192)

It is obvious that Śankara maintains that just as distinctions are empirically felt to exist before dissolution, latency of distinctions might very well be inferred to exist, both latency and potency being due to Avidya, while all along no distinctions are really existent either before or after dissolution. The conclusion from the feeling of oneness with Being in sleep, death or dissolution is the same as has been drawn in connection with the theory of causation in the previous Khandha.

“Now it is this subtle Entity which all this universe has for its essence. It (alone) is real. That is the Atman. That Thou Art, O Svetaketu”.

(Ch. 6-1-9)
“Your reverence may please enlighten me further.”

“So, be it, my boy,” said he “I shall do so.” (Ch. 6-9-4)

49. While Śvetaketu is satisfied that the Jiva cannot recognize his oneness in sleep because of oneness, he cannot make out how it can be that not one of the Jivas ever remembers on waking, his having emerged from Being. Here is Uddālaka's explanation:

इति: सोम्य नक: पुरस्तात् प्राक्ष: स्यात्तस्य पश्चात्तत्त्वसः समुभास्तसमुभापायिन्ति स समुद्र एव भवति ता यथा तत्र न

"These rivers, my dear boy, flow, the eastern ones to the east, and the western ones to the west. They come from the sea and merge themselves in the sea alone. All that becomes only the sea. Just as they do not know themselves there as this river or that, so also, my dear boy, all these creatures having come from Being do not know that they have come from Being only. Whatever they are here—whether a tiger, or a lion, or a wolf, or a boar, or a worm or a firefly or a gnat or a mosquito, that they become again". (Ch. 6-10-1, 2)

50. Just as in the case of honey, the different juices lose their identity and become all honey, so in the case of the sea also the rivers which originate in the clouds and become rivers, flowing in different directions, lose themselves in the sea. In the sea all rivers become part and parcel (undifferentiated) of the sea and can never be distinguished individually; so also with
the Jivas who merge themselves in Being and emerge from It but yet they can never be said to have lost their identity in Being or having again come out of It. The conclusion is the same as before.

स य एतोजमेमतवत्त्वमिदं सर्व तत्सत्तमं स आत्मा तत्सत्मसि बैतकेतो हति ज्ञयं एव मा भगवान् विनासपत्तिति तथा सोम्येति होचाभ॥(छां. ६-१०-७)

“Now it is this subtle Entity which all this universe has for its essence. It alone is real. That is the Atman. That Thou Art. O Svetaketu”.

“Your reverence may please enlighten me further.” So be it, my boy,” he said, “I shall do so.” (Ch. 6-10-3)

51. This time Svetaketu’s difficulty is this. If all Jivas have Being for their cause, how is it that they are not absolutely destroyed on merging themselves in It? The answer is as follows:

अस्य सोम्य महतो वृक्षस्य शो मूलेभयात्माजीवन्नवेयो सम्भवेयात्माजीवन्नवेयो नरोहेभयात्माजीवन्नवेयसः एव जीवनात्मकमूष्टतः पैस्यमानो मोदमानस्तिष्ठति॥ (छां. ६-११-२)

“Of this great tree, my dear boy, should some one strike at the root while it lives, its juice would ooze out; should one strike it in the midpoint while it lives, the juice would ooze out. Should one strike at the top while it lives, the juice would ooze out. Now this one pervaded by the living Self, stands sucking in nourishment and rejoicing.” (Ch.6-11-1)

अस्य येकं शालां जीवो जहात्यथ सा शुष्कति हितं जहात्यथ सा शुष्कति तृतीयं जहात्यथ सा शुष्कति सर्वं जहात्यथ सर्वं शुष्कति॥ (छां.६-१२-२)
"Should the Jiva leave one of the branches, then it withers: should he (Jiva) leave off a second branch, then that would wither up: should he leave off another one, then that would also wither up. If he should leave off the whole tree the whole tree would wither up". (Ch. 6-11-2).

एवेव खऱु सोम्य किद्वीति होयाच जीवापेत्त वाच किलेदं श्र्षयेते न
जीवो श्र्षयत् केति स ॥ एतोज्नितमेतदात्मविवं सर्वं तत्सत्त्मं स आत्मा
तत्सत्त्मात् भेतेतातो केति भूय एव ना भगवान्विधायत्विति तथा तोमेति
होयाच ॥

(छाँ.६-११-३)

"Just like this, you have to understand" said (Uddālaka). 'Bereft of Jiva, indeed, this (body etc.) dies, but the Jiva never dies'.

"Now it is this subtle Entity that all the universe has for its essence. It (alone) is real. That is the Atman. That Thou Art, O! Svetaketu". "May your reverence be pleased to enlighten me further".

"So be it, my dear boy; I shall do so." (Ch. 6-11-3)

52. The doubt that troubles Svetaketu now is how this universe of gross names and forms could take its origin from the subtlest Entity, Being. The next section will be devoted to this and other kindred questions.
SECTION VI

BEING, THE MOST SUBTLE ENTITY

How the Subtle Being Can Give Rise to the World:

53. Uddālaka now gives an illustration to show how a subtle entity can give rise to grossest effects.

“Bring a banyan (न्यायोप) fruit from yonder tree”. “Here, it is, O! revered one”. “Break it.” “It is broken, O! revered one”. “What do you see now?” “There are very small seeds. O! revered one”. “Break one of these. I say”. “It is broken. O! revered one”. “What do you see now?” “Nothing O! revered one.” (Ch. 6-12-1)

तेन हृदावते पदेष्यतमस्यिमानं न निवाच्यस एतं वै सोम्येऽपोनिन्तर् ।
पण महान् न्यायोपसिद्धिः भवतव सोम्येऽति । (छां. 6-12-2)

“Then he said to him, ‘That subtle thing, my dear boy, which thou dost not see, it is out of that indeed so great a banyan tree as this has grown up and stands here; believe it, my dear boy.” (Ch. 6-12-2)

54. It is not blind faith that is demanded here. We know that big trees like the banyan grow out of the extremely small seeds and similarly out of the imperishable Self, which alone persists in sound sleep or during dissolution, all the universe of manifoldness and variety comes out, though our intellect cannot conceive exactly how it comes out.
"Now it is this subtle Entity that all the universe has for its essence. It (alone) is real. That is the Atman; That Thou Art. O, Svetaketu."

"May your reverence be pleased to enlighten me further". "All right, my dear boy," said he, "I shall do so." (Ch. 6-12-3)

55. The son now wants to know how it is that Being is not seen by everyone as the cause of the universe. The father offers another illustration to clear this doubt.

"Put this piece of salt in water and come to me (tomorrow) morning" - He did so and the father said to him 'Well, my dear boy, bring the piece of salt that you put in water last night'. Feeling for it, he could not find it.” (Ch. 6-13-1)

"Well, my boy, melted as it is, sip some of it from the surface. How do you find it?" ('It is) salt' 'Sip some from the middle. How do you find it? 'Salt.' 'Sip some from the other end (bottom). How do
you find it? ‘Salt.’ ‘Throw this away and then come to me.’ He did so (saying) ‘it is there always’. He (Uddalaka) then said to him, ‘Thou do not see what is just here, my dear boy, (but) it is here indeed’.

(Ch.6-13-2)

56. This illustration is to convince Svetaketu that Pure Being or Atman is just here but the common man is unable to see it because he is not using the right means to know it. very much like one who uses the hand for feeling salt melted in water instead of the tongue. Pure Being can be realized by one who uses the right means.

“Now it is this subtle Entity, which all this universe has for its essence. It (alone) is real. That is Atman. That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu!” “May your reverence be pleased to enlighten me further. ‘Be it so, my dear boy, I shall do so.”

(Ch. 6-13-3)

57. This time Svetaketu wants to know what other means of knowledge is available to man than the ordinary ones he has been using in the empirical world. The father now proceeds to enlighten him on this point.

(Ch. 6-14-1)
“Just as, my dear boy (when) some one should bring a person blind folded from the country of Gandhara, and then leave him in an uninhabited region and when that person shouted out towards the East or towards the North or towards the South or towards the West crying ‘I have been brought blind-folded and left blindfolded!’ and then some one should loosen his bonds and say ‘this way lies the country of Gandhara, so you had better go in this direction’ and he, enquiring his way from village to village and becoming well informed and also clever, would at last reach the country of the Gandhara; even so, a person who has a good teacher, would know the Reality. And for him the delay would be so long as he is not freed and then he would immediately become one with Being”.

(Ch. 6-14-1, 2)

58. The point of comparison is that just, as the person kidnapped and blindfolded, so also the common man does not know his way to Atman, because the senses like the kidnappers in the illustration make him always look in the wrong direction.

59. His inner eye has to be opened and the right direction shown to him. He has to be directed by one who knows the Truth to turn inwards and see the Atman as He is. Another point is that the seeker should also be able to reason and judge for himself in accordance with the direction given by the teacher, for in this case, it is the aspirant alone that has to intuit the Self. Accordingly Sankara writes in his Sutra Bhasya:

\[
\text{नेदात्वाव्यवधि हि सूर्यांभन्त विचार्यते;}\n\text{वास्तविविचारणान्यसाङ्गनिरूप्ता हि भ्रातावानि;}\n\text{नानुभावपि गाथानिकर्ता हि सत्तु तु नेदात्वाक्षेपु जगतो जन्मातिर्वंबारितो तत्त्रवृहस्पतिकार्यायुवंस्य नेदात्वाव्यवधिविवधिप्रमाणं अन्य विधाने।}
\text{तथेऽत्र च भृत्तीव च सहस्यत्वेन तदेत्यामुपेत्तत्वात्। तथा}
\]
It is the Vedanta texts that are adduced and discussed, for the
intuition of Brahman is to result from the enquiry and determination
of the meaning of the texts and not from the application of syllogistic
inference and other such means of right knowledge. While there are
Vedantic texts teaching the cause of the origination etc. of the world,
inference also unopposed to Vedantic texts may become a means, in
order to place on a firm ground the comprehension of the exact meaning
of the texts and is not to be ruled out, for the Sruti itself accepts reason
as an aid. To explain: the Sruti quotations, 'Atman is to be heard
about, reflected upon and again just as the well-informed and clever
person would at last reach the country of the Gandharas; even so, here
a person, who has a capable teacher, knows the Reality', permit the aid
of man's intelligence.'

"Sruti, etc., alone are not here the means of knowledge in the
enquiry into the nature of Brahman as in the case of the enquiry into
the nature of Dharma; but Sruti and intuition, etc., also are the means
here, as the case may be, because the knowledge of Brahman has to
culminate in the intuition of Brahman and it has for its object an existent
entity."

(S.Bh. 1-1-2, Pp. 7, 8)

60. So far we have considered the various doubts and
difficulties with regard to the question of sat sampaththi in sleep
and other kindred states. Uddalaka, having cleared all possible
doubts, concludes with a reiteration of the general truth that he has been propounding so far:

स य एवोणिमेतदात्मसमिद्वर्त्तिस सत्तत्वं स भात्मा तत्त्वसिर शेतकेने इति यूष एव मा भगवान् विवारपत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच

(Ch. 6-14-3)

"Now it is this subtle Entity that all this universe has for its essence. It (alone) is real. That is the Atman, That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu."

Svetaketu wants to know what distinguishes the merging in Being of the knowing person from that of ordinary people. This we have to see in the sequel.
SECTION VII

THE KNOWER OF BRAHMAN AND THE IGNORANT PERSON

61. The process of merging in Being is the same both in the case of the wise man who knows Brahman and an ordinary person. This is described now:

पुरुषं सोम्योतोपतापिनं ब्राह्मणं पर्यैःपस्तेज ज्ञानसि मां ज्ञानसि मातिति तत्स्य याब्ध वाक्षमासि संपन्तते मनः प्राणे प्राणस्तेजसि तेजः परस्यं देवतायं तावज्ञानाति॥

अय बहास्य बाक्ष्मासि संपन्तते मनः प्राणे प्राणस्तेजसि तेजः परस्यं देवतायाम्य न ज्ञानाति॥ (ब्र. ६-१५-१, २)

“Of the person who is ailing, relatives gather around him and ask ‘Can you recognise me? Can you recognise me?’ So long as speech does not become one with the mind, the mind with life-force, the life force with fire, and the fire with the Supreme Devata, he knows; and when his speech becomes one with mind, the mind with life-force and the life force with fire and fire with the Supreme Devata, he does not know”.

(Ch. 6-15-1. 2)

62. The above process is common to the ignorant man who dies and the meditating devotee of Brahman as well as the one who has known the Truth. Śankara in the Sutra Bhashya explains thus: (1) the function of speech dissolves itself in the mind (S.Bh. 4-2-1). By this we have to understand that all the senses cease to work while the mind goes on working; (2) that mind dissolves itself in the life force. (Prana), that is, it ceases to work while life
force continues to work on and then the life force becomes one with the individual soul. The Sruti says that the life force dissolves in fire; and the fire in Sat. And for the meditating devotee the speciality is that he goes to the Sushumna Nadi and passes on through the Devayāna path to Brahma Loka. (S.Bh. 4-2-7)

It has been already explained that this merging of fire with the Jiva and the life force and the sense organs together with the other elements is only temporary like the merging in Being during sleep and dissolution.

As for one who has known the Truth through the teacher as explained above, however, Śankara in his Bhashya on Chandogya has the following to say:

अविद्वानस्तु सत ज्ञात्य प्राग्याविहं ज्योतिषादिविहं वा विषाति। विद्वानस्तु शाश्वतास्यापदेशश्रजितं ह्यादिप्रस्ताबिः सद्यात्मानं प्रविष्टं यावतेत इत्येष सत्तनेच्छिकम्।

(छान. भा. ६-१५-२; पा. ५३३)

“The ignorant one rises from Sat and enters his nature as the tiger or some other animal as a god or a man. The wise one, however, enters into his natures of Sat Brahman revealed by the light of the great lamp of knowledge and does not return thence. This is the process of becoming one with Being”. (Ch. Bh. 6-15-2; P. 537)

In his Bhashya he writes:

तस्यार्थमार्थवतो मुक्तविपाविकिनिन्त्य तत्तदच्छ तात्तिरे तत्त्वो विभिन्न्रजितं। साधनोपसभवेत शास्त्रसम्भवेत, शास्त्रप्रक्षिपति तत्त्वोपने शास्त्रसम्भवेत। तत्त्वार्थवतो मुक्तविपाविकिनिन्त्य।

(छान. भा. ६-१४-२; पा. ५३६)
“To such a one who has a competent teacher there is only so much delay ‘for being merged in his real nature as Sar’ must be supplied. How much delay in time? The answer is ‘so long as thou art not released’. This must be interpreted to mean ‘so long as he is not released’ by altering the first person of the verb to suit the context. The meaning is: till the body falls off after experiencing the Karma which has produced the present body.”

(Ch.Bh.6-14-2; P. 535.)

63. This is evidently in the nature of a concession to the popular view that the wise man also has a body due to his Prarabdha Karma that has fructified in the birth as this body.

The truth from the highest standpoint, however, is that the knower of Truth who understands the meaning of the text, ‘That Thou Art, is ever free even while he appears to have a body.’ That is why Śankara writes in his Sutra Bhashya:

अनुभवस्तु तु ज्ञानपत्मः; ‘पत्ताङ्कास्त्रोऽक्षाक्षः’ (वृ. १-४-१)

इति मुदेः; ‘तत्त्वसिः’ (छां. ६-८-७) इति च सिद्धचुदेशात्। न हि

‘तत्त्वसिः’ इत्यत वात्वप्वार्यसतत्तत्व मूलो भव्यपार्थीवेत् पहिनेनुष्माते

सब्दः। ‘तदैति वस्तु भविष्यमये; प्रतिपदेत्रैं मनुष्यम् सर्वेष्य’

(बृ. १-४-१०) इति च सम्पर्कसन्वार्यस्मांतम्र तदकलं सर्वत्रात्वं

ग्याति॥

(सू. गा. २-२, प.४०७)

“But the result of knowledge is immediately intuited. For the Śruti says ‘That which is direct, and immediate is Brahman’. And the teaching ‘That Thou Art’ is as of something that is already existent. Surely the meaning of the sentence ‘That Thou Art’ cannot be twisted to mean ‘That thou wilt become after death’. The Śruti, seeing this indeed Rishi Vamadeva realized, ‘I have become Manu and Surya’ points to the result of right knowledge as accruing simultaneously with it.”

(S.Bh. 3-3-32. P. 407)
Elsewhere Sankara writes:

एवंसिद्धार्थमोक्तविषीतं हि त्रिवस्त्रे कालेन 
वद्यंस्मांग्रंगुत्सवक्तवः प्रभावितम्, नेतृ: पर्वमनि कर्ता गोक्षा 
वाजायसं नेवानी नापि यविप्रत्याग्नि इति प्रभावितप्नष्टति

(सू. मा. ४-२-१३, पा. ४७३)

"The knower of Brahman has arrived at this conclusion: 'As opposed to the previously supposed nature of being an agent and experiencer of the fruits of action—I am Brahman of the nature of Being for all the three periods of time, never an agent or experiencer of fruits of action; not even before this was an agent or experiencer nor ever such now nor shall I be such in the future either.'

(S.Bh. 4-1-13. Pp. 473)

64. The conclusion to be drawn from this is therefore that it is only metaphorical to say that either naturally at sleep and other states or metaphorically at the time of enlightenment any one actually becomes one with Being. For there never was a time when there was anything else by the side of Pure Being or Brahman. It is as a concession to the popular view that the universe exists apart from Brahman that the oft-repeated truth is enunciated by Uddalaka.

त एवंपूर्विधात्रेत्तम्यिं सस्ततं स आत्मयत्स सत्यसिद्धे ज्ञेयः 
मून एवं आत्मयते विवाक्षाच्यिते वषा संपेयति इत्यथः

(छि. ६-१५-३)

"Now it is this subtle Entity that all this universe has for its essence. It alone is real. That is the Atman, That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu." 'May your reverence be pleased to enlighten me further'. "So be it, my dear boy, I shall do so."

(Ch. 6-15-3)

65. What remains now about which Svetaketu wants to be enlightened? It is only to know whether this merging in the
Being is the same both for the common man shuffling off his mortal coil and the wise man who realizes his oneness with Being. How is it the ordinary man returns to mundane life again even after being merged in Brahman? Why should he alone be subjected to the evils of samsara, while the wise one is left scot-free? The answer is as follows:

"They bring a person, my dear boy, by the hand saying, ‘He has made away with such and such a thing, he has stolen such and such a thing’. Heat the axe for him. If he has committed theft, from that alone he makes himself a false person. That one devoted to the unreal covers himself with untruth. He touches the heated axe and is burnt and then is beaten."

"If, on the other hand, he has not committed theft, from that alone he makes himself a true person, covering himself with truth he touches the axe and he is not burnt and is set free."

"Just as he is not burnt there, it is this (Truth) that all this universe has for its essence. It alone is real. That is the Atman. That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu.” That statement of the father he understood well, he understood well.”

(Ch. 6-16-1, 2, 3)
In this illustration of the ordeal of the heated axe the man who knows that he is innocent is not burnt because Truth shields him from the effect of heat, while one who knows himself to be guilty and misrepresents himself to be innocent, takes refuge under falsehood which is powerless against the burning effects of fire.

The Śruti text says truly:

चोज्ज्वस नन्तमात्मानमन्त्या पत्र्यिपहते ।
कि तेन न कृतं पार्यं चोरेनात्मापहारिणा ॥

"As for one who believes himself to be something other than what he actually is, what sin is there which he has not committed? He is a thief who has kidnapped the Self."

While it is true that the world in itself is quite unreal as compared with the real Atman, yet the evil effects of believing it to be real are extremely rigid and vigorous while they last, very much like the acute pain from which he suffers during dreams, unreal as they are.

The truth that one who has committed the most heinous sin is yet one with Brahman does not save him, so long as he does not awake from the nightmare of *samsara*.

66. The concluding sentence 'he understood what the father had told him' should not be interpreted to mean a mental assent on the part of the son. Svetaketu had now no cause for any doubt whatever, because there was no occasion for it. This is what is known as अन्त्यप्रमाण (final means of right knowledge) among Vedantins. An extract from Śankara Bhashya on the subject is presented here:
Moreover, this means teaching the oneness of Atman is ultimate and nothing more to be questioned remains beyond this. Unlike the meaning of the injunction ‘one should sacrifice’ in ordinary life which gives rise to questions ‘what’, ‘with what means’ and ‘how?’ the hearing of the statement, ‘That Thou Art or ‘I am Brahman’ does not give rise to anything more to be enquired into, for the intuitive knowledge is about the unity of the Self of all. It is only when something else remains (to be known) an enquiry would arise; but there remains nothing to be enquired into beyond the unity of Atman nor can it be said that this intuition is not born at all, for there are texts like ‘this teaching of the father he understood’ and as the means of understanding It, such listening to the Srutis and the study of the Vedas etc., has been enjoined. Further it cannot be said that this knowledge is useless or delusive, for we see the result of it in the eradication of ignorance and there is nothing else which sublates it. We have already said all ideas of true and false, secular and Vedic, goes on intermittently only before
the dawn of the knowledge of the oneness of Atman.”

(S.Bh. 2-1-14; Pp. 199-200)

67. The knowledge arising from the teaching and reasoning herein employed, therefore, is final, not because there is no higher court of appeal wherein one could put forward one’s doubts and difficulties but because the very distinction of the knower, knowledge and the knowable disappears here finally in the one Atman who is without a second. The Sruti here is a valid means of knowledge, not because it irrefutably teaches the truth about Atman but because it lifts the enquirer to a final state of intuition where the seeker knows without the act of knowing, that the very Atman or Pure Being which he seeks to know is no object of knowledge but his own very Self in which there is no possibility nor need of any further knowledge.

The Śruti says:

यत्र त्तस्य सर्वात्मलेलामूलः तत्त्वेतिु तत्त्वेतिु... तत्त्वेतिु के विजानीयात् बेनें सर्व विजानाति तं के विजानीयात् ......
विजातार्थे के विजानीयात् ॥ (३२. ४-५-१६)

"Where, however, everything becomes Atman alone, there what could one see and with what?........ there what could one know and with what? With what could one know that Atman by means of whom one knows all this? With what, my dear, could one know the knower Himself?"

(Br. 4-5-15)

68. And Śankara thus justifies how the Śruti is called a means of valid knowledge with regard to Brahman which is everyone’s Atman.
“And as for the objection that there would be no aspirant at all, and it would be opposed to the evidence of perception and other valid means of knowledge (If even the transmigratory soul, be deemed to be one with Iswara), we reply that even that is not right, for we grant that one is a transmigratory soul before enlightenment; and perception and other mental processes relate to that state only. (The Śrutī) points out that there is no perception or any other process during the state of enlightenment (when it says), ‘where for this (enlightened) one, all
has become Atman only, there, whom could one see and with what?" (Br. 4-5-15). (objection) : But in the absence of perception, etc., it would lead us to the repugnant conclusion that even the Sruti is not there! (Reply) : Not so, for the consequence is admitted. (To explain) : The Sruti beginning with, "In this state the father becomes no father", and concludes "The Vedas, become no Vedas, and so we do admit even the non-existence of the Sruti in the state of enlightenment".

(S.Bh. 4-1-3 : P. 465)

The last objection that might be urged against this doctrine of secondless Pure Being is thus disposed of by Śāṅkara in the course of the discussion we have now referred to:

"(Objection): And to whom then does this ignorance pertain?"

"(Reply) : To you who is asking the question."

"(Objection): But the Sruti says that I am Isvara Himself?"

'(Rejoinder): If you are thus enlightened, there is none to whom unenlightenment pertains. And this disposes of the other defect also which some would urge against this doctrine. For according to them, forsooth Atman having a second to Him, admission of the doctrine of non-duality would be inconsistent." (S.Bh. 4-1-3, P. 465)

(Śāṅkara means to say that there is no duality even during the state of seeming duality due to ignorance, while, absolutely speaking, there is no ignorance at all, second to the Real Atman).
CONCLUSION

The Intuition of Atman:

69. What does the Upanishad exactly mean when it says that Svetaketu now knew the teaching of Uddalaka? We have explained (in the last section) that Śankara has clarified the Vedantic doctrine that the knower of Brahman comes to realize that he has always been Brahman, that this idea of the known and the knowable belongs to the empirical sphere which pertains to the state of unenlightenment and even the talk of unenlightenment pertains to the sphere of unenlightenment, there being absolutely no unenlightenment or enlightenment whatever in Absolute Brahman, called Pure Being in this Upanishad.

70. This doctrine of Reality, in which there is absolutely no second thing conceivable, belongs exclusively to the school of Advaitins of Śankara’s tradition. Sri Gaudapāda, for instance, thus writes about this Reality:

न निरोधो न चोत्यति: न बद्धो न च साप्तकः।
न मुमुख्यन्ति मुक्तः हत्येषा परमार्थता॥

(गी. का. २-३२)

“This is Reality, in which there is no dissolution, no origination, none bound and none who is a practicant of the means of the highest goal. There is none desirous of release and none who is released.”

(G.K. 2-32)

This should not be understood to mean that there is no view of Reality which can be rightly held, nor that all things are
without an essence of their own, which is the doctrine of the Buddhist Nāgārjuna and his followers.

This Kārika, on the other hand, purports to say that Reality or the Real Self is such that nothing can be predicated of it.

71. But how can anyone teach such a thing? Teaching and learning evidently imply speaking and grasping something through the mind and that means using the assistance of concepts. There is no speech without words and every word implies a concept. To think is to judge and judgment implies putting together two or more concepts together and weighing them. And there is no judgment unless we put one concept to predicate something, to qualify something denoted by another concept or unless we analyse the concepts that go together to synthesise them so as to denote a whole, made up of certain parts. So, whatever method we may adopt we are constrained to submit to a process of expressing or implying something which concepts cannot grasp. How do the Upanishads or the teachers, who teach the Upanishadic doctrine of Reality without a second, succeed in imparting the Truth to us?

This difficulty is, no doubt, inevitable with regard to phenomenal things. But the Reality that the Upanishads and the Rṣhis attempt to teach is nothing phenomenal or objective. They have, therefore, openly admitted that it cannot be taught through words or caught through concepts. (यतो वाचो निबर्तत्ते अप्राय्य मनसा सह) - That from which words turn back unable to reach there together with the mind (Tai. 2-9). But yet there is the advantage in teaching Reality, for it is the Essence,-Self (Atman) of all and everything (एतदात्मायथं सर्वं ज्ञत्तम) and is the only Reality worth
the name (तत्सत्त्वम्). Therefore, the teachers and the Upanishads appeal to the seeker to turn towards his own Self which is devoid of all attributes. Whenever there may happen to be something which the listener is liable to mistake for the Self, the residual Self, which can never be desired is easily intuited by the enquirer.

Thus Sri Gaudapāda, who was one of the ancient teachers that have handed down the Vedantic traditions, has written:

स एष नेति नेतीति व्याख्यातं निहुते यति: ।
सर्वमयायामेव हेतुनार्जं प्रकाशते ॥

(गै. का. ३-२६)

"Inasmuch as the Sruti by using the formula स एष नेतिनेत्यात्मा
(this is the Atman who is described as ‘not this, not this’) negates everything used for the purposes of explanation—the unborn (Reality), being unobjectifiable, consequently reveals Itself". (G.K. 3-26)

The Unique Method of Superimposition and Rescission

72. Besides negating the characteristics of the phenomenal world that may unavoidably be involved in teaching, the Upanishads have used a unique method of bringing out the nature of Reality. This method has been formulated by Śankara in Gitā Bhashya in these words :

अयारोपापवादायं निग्रापश्च प्रकाश्यते ॥

(गै. शा. १३-१३, पा. २०४)

"That which is inexplicable, being devoid of specific features, is explained by (the method of) deliberate superimposition and rescission.” (G.Bh. 13-13, P. 204)

The method itself consists in imputing certain characteristics to Atman by means of which some other attribute
is easily discarded and becomes obvious as not pertaining to the Self.

In the present Upanishad, for instance, Reality or Atman has been deliberately assumed to be the cause of the whole world. It is presumed to have deliberately transformed itself into the element Fire, which changed itself into Water which in its turn became Food. This deliberate ascription (अध्यारोप superimposition) of causality was only a device to reveal its essential characteristics of Being and Consciousness which are inseparable from it. Later on causality is itself shown to be illusory and therefore the causeness of Atman is easily negated (अपवाद rescission), so that His Absolute nature remains intact.

**Reasoning Based Upon Intuition**

73. This device of imputation and negation of certain characteristics of the not-self would lose all significance, were it not for the universal intuition on which the reasoning employed in the whole discussion is based. All this universe of manifoldness displays an apparent causal relation throughout, though the effect is only a play of words and is invariably the cause in its essence. And all the Jivas or individual souls with all their variety displayed in the waking state become undeniably one with this secondless Atman, as vouched for by universal intuition such as states of deep sleep, death or dissolution.

The word 'intuition' as used throughout in these pages bears a signification. While the dictionary meaning of this word would be immediate apprehension by the mind or the senses without reasoning, it has been deliberately extended to mean not only direct knowing by the mind, the senses and the sense data in
waking but also the experience we have of the evanescent and seeming things in dreams and in fact of all the states of Consciousness, such as waking, dream, sound sleep, swoon, trance and other kindred states of the so called unconsciousness. Those that are capable of introspection and discrimination of their internal feelings cannot escape the conclusion that both the conscious states and their absence are directly intuited by a Witnessing Principle in themselves which is distinct from their limited selves which function in the waking. It is this Witnessing Principle that throws the light of its immutable Consciousness on all the states. That the Upanishad here calls as the Essence of all this: ऐतदत्त्वभिदं सर्वम् Reality (तत्सत्यम्) the one Self (स जात्मा) which everyone of us is in essence, whatever be our seeming nature in the various conditions which we call the waking state. It is reasoning based upon this universal intuition which is the very stuff of our Being, on which the Upanishads base their final doctrine of the One Being without a second. Reasoning based upon sensory intuition and syllogistic inference has very little to do with the affirming or denying of any characteristics of Reality. Illustrations from the phenomenal world are freely drawn upon in the course of the argument, but they are used only as a device or aid in refreshing our understanding and have no direct bearing on the doctrine to be propounded.

Intuition of the Self:

74. The expression 'intuition of the Self' used here as a synonym for the Sanskrit words विज्ञान, अवगति or अनुभव should be carefully examined and the principle for which it stands must be exactly determined. It does not mean exactly the same thing that we mean when we speak of sense intuition or mental
intuition. The latter are intuitions in the sense that those sense objects or feelings of heat and cold, etc., are directly experienced by the senses of sight, hearing, touch, etc., and that the mental phenomena of desire, wrath, avarice, wonder, fear, etc., are directly felt and not reasoned. In all these cases the objects intuited are distinct from the subject, but in the case of the Self and its intuition, they are identical. Thus when we say: "I intuit my Self", we are using a language very much similar to that which we employ when saying, 'the fire burns', 'the light shows itself' or 'the stream flows'. And when we use the language like, 'Svetaketu came to intuit his Self as the Self of all and the only Reality' we are using the word Svetaketu to denote an individual boy who lived in a particular place and discussed the Vedantic doctrine with his father. And the "intuition" of the Self that he arrived at, at the end of the discussion should be likened to the vision of the sun that a person has of the sunrise with the aid of the twilight, with whose assistance he began to look about and see all things around him. We know all the while that it is the very sunlight that helped him to see the sun. It is one and the same whether we say "I am so and so, who managed to see the sun" or "The sun showed himself to Mr. so and so". Similarly "Svetaketu had an intuition of Atman" is the same as saying "The Universal Atman revealed Himself to be identical with Svetaketu's Self, after all the seeming mental obstructions to the intuition were cleared away in the light of that Intuition". From the empirical point of view, things appear in time and place and events happen at particular points of time in certain regions, while, transcendentally speaking, nothing happens or appears to anybody because there are no concepts of time and space independent of Atman. Reality is all that is.
APPENDIX

THE CENTRAL TEACHING

1. The central teaching of the sixth chapter of the Chāndogya Upanishad is contained in the refrain of Uddālaka at the end of each step of his clarification of the doctrine.

स य एतोरणितत्त्वात्मास्मिदं सर्वैं तत्तत्वं स आत्मा तत्त्वात्मसि शेतकेलो।

“It is this Subtle Entity that all this universe has for its essence, That alone is real; that is Atman, That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu”.

2. Of course the teaching is too general to be treated as a historical piece of precept addressed by a father to his son. It is a statement of universal truth that might be placed before an enquirer by any teacher in the present time or in the future just as it is represented to have been proclaimed by the sage Uddālaka in an indefinitely past time to his son, a certain Svetaketu.

3. There is no reason to restrict the expression “all this” to any one aspect or portion of the universe. In Sanskrit philosophical works it is usual to divide the universe into Ādhātyāmic (interior or physiological or psychical or ethical etc.) Ādhībhautic (external or physical) and Ādīdaivic (relating to the heavens or the regions of the gods). Since there is no restrictive attribute here, the statement एतत्त्वात्मास्मिदं सर्वं (all this has for its essence This Entity) requires that all without exception has this Subtle Entity alone for its essence and there is nothing which has any existence independent of this Entity.
4. We have now to consider the meaning of the word (सत्यम्) Subtle (Entity). Does it mean something very tenuous like rarefied air or very minute like the scientist’s chemical atom? This cannot be, for Uddalaka is here talking of Pure Being which is One without a second, which is ‘the essence of all this’. Besides it is the cause which created and transformed Itself into all the universe and then It cannot in Itself be any one of the categories (such as substance, quantity, quality, relation etc.) or even the Psychic entities which Its seeming effects superimposed upon it. That is why Uddalaka says that it is Reality (सत्यम्) as distinguished from all superimposed Objects. Therefore (अपित्वा) Subtle Entity is only another name for something neither perceivable nor conceivable, but is the substrate of all that is born. In fact, all that is born thrives and finally merges is being in it. Reality is subtle in the sense that it is Pure Consciousness through which everything shines and there is nothing which can objectify and throw light on It nor is there any need for it.

5. This Reality as the Universal Witnessing Principle is the only Atman in the real sense of the word. The individual selves in the empirical world are mere reflections, as it were, of this Real Atman. They are therefore really one with the Absolute Being even as they are.

THE TEXT TEACHING

The Identity of the Jiva and Iswara

6. ‘तत् त्वम् असि’ ‘That Thou Art’, therefore states an eternal verity and it might have been addressed to any one of these innumerable Jivas of all times.

7. Strictly speaking, ‘तत् त्वम् असि’ (literally ‘That Thou
Art’) is neither a grammatical sentence nor a logical proposition about Brahman, for neither words nor thoughts can objectify Brahman. As the the Śruti says:

यद्वाचावन्मुदति चेन चागम्युदते।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्विन्न नेद वधिर्मुपासते॥

(Ke 1-6)

“That which is not expressed by speech but by which speech itself is expressed (i.e. it is revealed by the light of the Consciousness which is Brahman, and is manifested by Brahman) know that alone to be Brahman and not this which is meditated upon as ‘This’.”

(Ke 1-5)

चन्दनसा न मनुते येनाहुर्मनो मतमु।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्विन्न नेद वधिर्मुपासते॥

(Ke 1-6)

“That which one cannot think of by the mind, but that by which the mind itself is thought of (i.e., it is revealed and shot through and through with the light of the Consciousness which is Brahman and is manifested by Brahman) know that to be Brahman and not this which is meditated upon.”

(Ke. 1-6)

‘That Thou Art’ is called a बाक्य (sentence or proposition because when uttered by a competent teacher it suggest Brahman, which is One without a second, as the Self of the seeker of Truth.

Sureswara, the author of Naishkarmya Siddhi, therefore calls Brahman in accordance with the Taittiriya Bhashya in 2-1 वाक्यावर्ग, (नै.सि. २-९) i.e., that which is realized neither through the knowledge of the relation (संतर्ग) of things expressed by the words in a sentence, nor through the knowledge of distinction of things (भेद) denoted by the words in a sentence.
Knowledge of Atman, no Meditation

8. It goes without saying that this sentence तत् त्वम् असि does not enjoin or imply any sort of meditation, as for instance, in ‘अज ते मन’ (Infinite, indeed, is the mind - Br. 3-1-9), ‘मनो ब्रह्मात्मकानि’ (One should meditate on the mind as Brahman - Ch. 3-13-1), ‘आदित्यो ब्रह्मचायादिः’ (The sun is Brahman, such is the instruction - Ch. 3-19-1), ‘प्राणो वान संवर्ग’ (Prana is indeed sovereign, all inclusive - Ch. 4-3-3). In all such sentences two different things are enjoined to be meditated upon as though they were one. But in the present case ‘That’ and ‘Thou’ do not refer to two different things, but actually to one and the same entity. Swetaketu is really the same as the Pure Being proposed to be taught. We have already quoted the Upanishadic text which expressly negates that Brahman in its true nature can be meditated upon - so says Sankara:

सम्प्रदायिके विद्वानेन ब्रह्मात्मेतक्षणेन जगमम ममाने, ‘तत्वमसि’, ‘अज ब्रह्मासि’, ‘समस्तत्वत्वम’ - इत्येक्यार्थानां वाक्यानां ब्रह्मात्मेतक्षणेन समस्तविपक्षानां रक्षत्वपरं प्रसिद्धं पीडत॥ (सू. मा. १-१-४, पा. १६)

If the knowledge of the identity of Brahman and Atman were to be taken to be of the nature of meditations like imagination (सम्प्रदाय), then the syntactical relation of the words purporting to teach an existent fact viz., the identity of Brahman and Atman, would be contradicted.”

(S. Bh. 1-1-4, P. 16)

9. How then is one to know that Brahman beyond speech and thought really exists? This question has already been answered when we explained that Brahman being the enquirer’s own Self is to be intuited as such. This is how Swetaketu understood his father’s teaching तद्वास्त्र विजय (Ch. 6-16-3).
The Function of the Text

10. There is only one Reality without a second, from the standpoint of Vedanta Sastra and from that point of view, there is neither teaching nor learning. In accordance with this, Sankara quotes a text in Sutra Bhashya:

स हृद्याभाषीहि भो इति स ज्ञेष्ठि बन्धुः तं हि द्वितीये वा तृतीये वा।
वचन उच्चाच बुमः सतू तण तु न ज्ञेष्ठानि। उपशान्तोऽयमाल्याः॥

(S. Bh. 3-2-17; P. 358)

"He (Bāś’kali) said to him (Bādhva): ‘Please teach me, sir’. He kept quiet. To him on a second and third request (Bādhva) said, ‘We are teaching, but you do not understand! For this Atman is silent (free from all specific features).’"

For the purpose of teaching, however, the distinctions of teaching, the taught and the teacher are presumed as in the present case where Uddālaka is the teacher of the doctrine of absolute unity of Atman to Svetaketu, the son and disciple. Gaudapāda therefore says:

विकल्पे विनिवृत्तत्यस्मितो यदि केनसिदृष्टि!
उपदेशायं नादो गरते तृतं न विषये॥

(G.K. 1-18)

"The assumption of (the distinctions of the the teacher, the taught etc.) would have to be obliterated if really it were erroneously presumed by some one. This is a convention assumed only for the purpose of teaching. So when the Truth is known there remains no distinction whatever."

From this thought position, therefore the function of the text ‘That Thou Art’ is to reveal that there is no teaching necessary and that there is nothing to be actually achieved by knowing the
Truth. ‘That Thou Art. O. Svetaketu’ means you have no need to become That, you have no need to be taught the truth about It; you are already That. In fact, the conventional distinctions of teaching, teacher and taught are only to facilitate knowing. You are the one Reality without a second; neither a teacher nor one to be taught.

11. Sankara therefore illustrates this truth by the rope-snake which is removed by stating the truth that it is a rope:

So long as अज्ञात (ignorance) is not removed, Jiva’s being within the range of right (and wrong) and Jivahood never disappear; but when ignorance does disappear, it is the प्रज्ञा (ever-knowing Atman) Himself that is revealed by the text ‘That Thou Art’. Reality itself is not affected in anyway either by being ignorant or its disappearance. This may be likened to the instance when some one takes a rope lying in deep darkness for a snake and runs away trembling with fear; and listening to some one else who tells: ‘Do not be afraid; it is not a snake but only a rope’, he gives up his fear of the snake, his trembling and running away. All the same, the thing itself would not be affected in any way whatsoever, whether during the time it is taken for a rope or when the notion of its being a snake is removed. So also we are to understand the matter under discussion”.

(S.Bh. 1.4-6, P. 154)
It will be noted that whereas the rope in the illustration is only an object of the notion of snake during ignorance, we have to apply it to the case of Svetaketu who has falsely taken himself to be a transmigratory soul within the range of right and wrong action. On hearing the words 'That Thou Art' he gives up all his false notions about his real nature. When he knows the meaning of the teaching, the form of right knowledge would be: "I am no transmigratory soul doing enjoined or prohibited acts; I am no Jiva at all. There was no ignorance in me at all which is now removed by this teaching; I am the Pure Being and Pure Consciousness in one and there was no distinction of the teacher and the taught in me at any moment."

The Post-Śāṅkara Advaitins therefore go against the very spirit of Śāṅkara Vedanta when they assert that a sort of indefinable snake (अनिर्वचनीयसर्प) is actually born out of the so-called Positive Avidya and destroyed by true knowledge in the instance of the rope-snake and that Avidya; is not completely destroyed even by true knowledge in the case of a released person so long as he has not exhausted the fructifying Karma of his present life. Special attention should be paid to Śāṅkara's emphatic assertion:

न जाविषाक्ते तद्भगमे च वस्तुन: कविधित्वसोजस्ति

"Reality itself is not affected in any way by being ignorant nor by its disappearance."

तत्त्वमस्तीति प्रक्षात्तमात्स्तम्शाक्षमन्तरेनाध्यक्यमान्यतं

(च. भ. १-१-४, पा. ११)

"One’s identity with Brahman can never be known except through the Vedanta Sastra"

( S. Bh. 1-1-4, P. 11)
12. The Vedanta text ‘एन्दात्ममिदं सर्वं तन्त्रं सात्मा
तत्त्वयमि’ (‘All this universe has this subtle Entity for its essence.
It alone is real, that is the only Atman, ‘-That Thou Art’ is the
only valid means of right knowledge concerning Brahman. For
perception and inference are valid only in the case of knowable
objects and they can never objectify Atman who is always the
knower and never the knowable.

And this doctrine of the validity of the Vedanta Sastra holds
good only in the sphere of Avidya or ignorance of the true nature
of Atman.

पुष्पकृत्य सर्वं
प्रमाणप्रमेयवाद्वरा लौकिका वैदिकाय प्रवृत्ताः,
सन्तौ च हाशायि
विग्रहितवेषमोक्षरागि ॥
(अवासभाषयम)

"Now it is by pre-supposing this mutual super-imposition of
the Self and the not-self, called Avidya (ignorance), that all notions
and instances of behaviour relating to valid means of knowledge and
knowable objects, whether Secular or religious (vedic), ‘start’; so do
the Sastras, whether they deal with injunctions and prohibitions or with
release ".
(Adhyasa Bhashya.)

Negation of Jivahdod

13. The proposition, ‘That Thou Art’, therefore, aims at
negating the erroneous assumption of one’s being a
transmigratory soul and reaffirming his true nature as Brahman.
There is actually no Jiva at all distinct and apart from the only
Reality free from all blemishes. The following excerpts from
Sankara are worth remembering in this connection:
1) "The Jiva so-called is not altogether different from Brahman, for there are Sruti texts like ‘That Thou Art’, ‘I am Brahman’. But in consideration of the apparently particular form due to the intellect and other conditioning associates the Jiva, though really Brahman itself, is said to be an agent and experiencer (of fruits of actions)." (S. Bh. 1-1-31, P. 61)

2) "That Supreme Light which has got to be attained, that is the highest Brahman, and that has properties like the nature which has done away with sin etc. That alone is indeed the real nature of Jiva. And texts like ‘That Thou Art’, and not the other one conjured up by the conditioning associates. When, by the Sruti, one is taken beyond the aggregates - the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect, and is taught thus: ‘Thou art not the aggregate of the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect, thou art not the transmigratory soul, but that
Reality, that Atman of the nature of Pure Consciousness,' 'That Thou Art', then one realizes oneself as of the nature of changeless, eternal Witness; and transcending this samsåra of identifying oneself with the body etc., one becomes that very Atman of the nature of changeless eternal Witness.’

(S.Bh. 1-3-19, P. 112)

1) पर एवं त्व दैवत्कालनेत्रतपुपुष्याति मेयिनानात् वाते शारीर
इत्योपर्यर्दा । यथा भद्रकारुपाध्यायो परिणिश्चात्मिनां नमः
परिणिश्चात्मानासे, तद्धः। तस्माण च कर्मकृत्तिकारसंहृतव्यहृषो न विवधे
प्रकृत् तस्मिन् हृतात्मज्ञोनुपदेशग्रहणात्। (सू. या. १-२-६, पा. ६७)

3) “The Supreme Atman Himself as delimited by the conditioning associates - the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect - is spoken of, by the ignorant as the embodied one. This is like unto the appearance of ether, in itself unconditioned, as though it were conditioned by a big pot or a small jar etc. And relative to this it is not incongruous to talk of the differences of subject and object and the like before grasping the unity of Atman taught by the text ‘That Thou Art’.”

(S.Bh. 1-2-6, P. 67)

4) न हैत्यकं संसारावर्तत्वं प्रतिपाद्य इत्यमुक्ताक्षरः, कि
तद्धः! संसारीकं संसारित्वायोहेतुकर्मात्मां प्रतिपाद्यविविचित्रिति।
यथा
तति अमेत्यस्यप्रसादप्रत्याक्षरिकाविविधता, विपरीतगुणात्व स्वित्तथ
विपदोति व्यक्तिहेतु। (सू. या. ४-२-३, या. ४६४, ४६५)

4) “For we do not hold that Isvara is taught to be a transmigratory soul, but that the nature of being a transmigratory soul is negated and it is proposed to teach his Isvarahood. Thus it will be settled that the nature of being free from sin and other such property of the secondless Isvara is true, while the nature of being possessed of properties of an opposite nature on the part of the other self is false.”

(S.Bh. 4-1-3, Pp. 464, 465)
5) “Divinity alone is the real nature of the embodied soul; its embodiedness is due to limiting associations.” (S.Bh. 3-4-8, P. 436)

6) "And the Śāstra, teaching as it does the Brahman, possessing the property of being free from sin etc., is the Self of the self of the embodied soul, wards off all experience of the fruits of action in the case of the embodied soul itself. Where then is there any repugnancy of Brahman becoming an experiencer on account of it (Jiva) being an experiencer?"

(S.Bh. 1-2-8, P. 69)

7) "Indeed, here (in the Patangi Brāhmaṇa) the embodied Kshetrajna is not proposed to be taught as possessing the properties of samsāra such as being an agent and experiencer of fruits of actions, but only as being of the nature of Brahman, essentially as Pure Consciousness, free from all properties of a transmigratory soul; for the text runs “not eating, the other only sees”, that is to say, the knowing Self only witnesses without experiencing anything (Mun.3-1-1) and also..."
because there are the Sruti texts like ‘That Thou Art’, and ‘know the
Kshetrajna to be Myself’ (Gita 13-2) (S.Bh. 1-2-12, P. 74)

8) कामाकृत्वस्थानार्थायविवृत्त: परमेश्वर च जीवो नान्य इति गद्यः

..... तत्र कामाकृत्वस्थानार्थाय नान्य गद्यः नान्य गद्यः नान्य गद्यः

8) “The opinion of teacher Kāśakrtṣaṇa is that the Supreme Lord,
unchanged, is Himself the Jiva, and none other; .......... now we may
conclude that Kāśakrtṣaṇa’s opinion follows the Śruti, for it is in
accordance with what is proposed to be taught and there are Śruti texts
like ‘That Thou Art’.”

(S.Bh. 1-4-22, P.171)

9) जीवस्थापितु हुःश्रापिरनिशायोभिषेकन्तु

तथा

तत्त्वायथावद्यमानमेऽविवेकः जीवस्य निर्देशितस्य निर्देशितस्य

8) “Even for Jiva, we have already said that suffering is due to
ignorance only. Accordingly Vedanta texts like ‘That Thou Art’ negate
the Jiva-hood of Jiva and teach that he is Brahman Itself.”

(S.Bh. 2-3-46, P. 300)

10) अपवादो तत्त्वाः स्वा वर्णिनिविद्यामें विष्कृतमें विष्कृतमें

विष्कृतमें विष्कृतमें

10) “Sublation (अन्तऽ) is an appositional proposition, wherein
a false notion entertained as correct is removed by a subsequent correct
notion, as for instance, the notion of self entertained in the aggregate
of the body and the senses is sublated by the correct notion of the Self
in the real Atman Himself born from the text ‘That Thou Art’.”

(S.Bh. 3-3-9, P. 382)
The large number of statements that are interspersed in the Bhāshya, bearing upon ‘That Thou Art’ of which we have selected a few, the excerpts cited above might naturally lead the reader to suppose that Śākara expects us to believe that the Self indicated by the word ‘Thou’ in this important text ‘That Thou Art’ is equated with the Universal Self, whereas the Universal Self should not be deemed to be equated with the self expressed by the word ‘Thou’. In a sense this is quite appropriate, and Śākara does assert this in so many words:

अपि च ‘तत्त्वसिति’ इत्येतद्राक्ष्यं तंपदार्थैस्य तत्वार्थावमात्मापि ||

(सू. भ. ४-१-२, पा. ४६२)

“Moreover, the text ‘That Thou Art’ affirms the identity of what is connoted by the word ‘Thou’ with what is connoted by the word ‘That’.”

(S.Bh. 4-1-2, P. 462)

But from another point of view, the converse is equally true Bādarāyana has devoted a sutra ‘अत्मेवति तूपणमिति ग्राहयति च’ (VS 4-1-3) exclusively to stress the point that the Supreme Self taught by the Vedanta Śāstra should be conceived of as one’s own Self and no other than one’s Self. While it is perfectly right to say that the Jīva, divested of all properties, fancied by the naive view, which make him a transmigratory soul, is really Brahman, it is equally justifiable to assert that Brahman should be conceived of as one’s very Self in its pristine purity. Here is what Śākara emphatically asserts in the aphorism quoted above:-

आत्मेवेच एमेवरा प्रतिष्ठि:। तथा हि - प्रसर्षक्रियायां

जातान्त्रक जात्मेवेनेत्पणमिति: ‘तं वा ब्रह्मसि भगवो देवतेऽः व

त्त्वसि भगवो देवते’ हि: । तथान्वेचपि ‘अहं प्रभासि’ इत्येक्षामाय:

आत्मचारोपायम इश्वर्या:॥

(सू. भ. ४-१-२, पा. ४६४)
"The Supreme Lord should be cognized as verily one’s own Self; that is why the Jābālās, in context where the Supreme Lord is the topic discussed, approved Him in these words, ‘O Revered Deity, I am verily Thyself; Thou art verily myself, O Revered Deity.’ Similar recognitions of Brahman as the Self such as ‘I am Brahman’ should also be included here.”

(S.Bh. 4-1-3, P. 464)

[Here is a reference to Br. 1-4-10 where it is declared that whosoever awoke to the Consciousness that he himself is Brahman became all that is.]

This makes it evident that the doctrine of भागत्वपरास्त्रम (taking the indicated meaning of both the terms of the proposition ‘That Thou Art’ by rejecting the primary meaning in both the cases) which has become the convention of the post-Śankarās is not faithful to that great teacher.

**Immediate Intuition of Brahmanhood**

14. The text ‘That Thou Art’ gives rise to a real intuition of the nature of one’s being Brahman and is not believed to give the desired freedom at some future time.

1) प्रत्यपक्षविन्धे पंतम्। ‘तत्त्वंततम्’ क्षयसंसारोत्तप्ति सत्यं संसारसंतत्त्वा भवेः॥ (सू. भा. १-४-१४, पा. ४६४)

1) “This fruit (the knowledge of Brahman) is directly intuited here; for so soon as we get the knowledge of Being, the non-transmigratory Brahman, our nature as a transmigratory soul disappears.”

(S.Bh. 1-4-14, P. 164)

2) गृहीते त्वात्मकते वन्यमोक्षादिनिजववहयत्सरसामातिरेभुष्यात्॥ (सू. भा. १-२-६, पा. ६७)
2) “As soon as the unity of Atman is realized, all conventions of differences such as bondage and release would cease.” (S.Bh. 1-2-6, P. 67)

3) “When embodiedness is sublated all conventions would come to an end.”

(S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 197)

4a) न चाष्म ज्ञान्याधारान्तःज्ञात्स्थवर्तनन्तरणज्ञातोज्ञानिते इति पुष्कराप्राप्तो \( \text{‘तत्त्वभासि’} \) तृ ष्ठात्ममात्मकनिर्वास्याविवेचनिति

(S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 198)

4b) “Nor can this cessation of all human procedure (of thought, word and deed) be said to refer to a particular state, for the identity of Brahman and Atman according to the text ‘That Thou Art’, does not depend on any particular state.” (S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 198)

5) न हि ‘तत्त्वभासि’ इत्य्य वात्स्याय: ‘तत्त्वं मृतं भविष्याति’ - इत्येवं परिभेष्यं शक्यः।। (S.Bh. 3-3-32, P. 407)

5) “For one cannot twist the text ‘तत्त्वभासि’ (That Thou Art) so as to mean “That Thou shalt become after death.” (S.Bh. 3-3-32, P. 407)

[The above texts are overlooked by those post-Śankarites who think that intuition of non-duality accrues only in a trance or that freedom after death is the only real release from Samsāra.]

(सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९७)
“This Brahmanhood of the embodied soul is self-established and not something to be achieved with the help of a distinct effort. And hence this Śāstraic identity with Brahman becomes the subliterator of the naïve nature of being an embodied soul, like, the correct ideas of the rope and other existent things which sublate the false ideas of the snake and other appearances. When the nature of one’s being a migratory soul is sublated, then all human behaviour depending on it will become sublated.”

(S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 197)

[This naturally suggests the Vedantic doctrine that all human behaviour resting on the belief of the reality of thinking, speaking and acting in respect of phenomenal objects is only an appearance, like that in a dream. With regard to this see below.]

15. If it be admitted that all that is, is the One Pure Being or Brahman alone, where would the valid means of right knowledge find any room since there would be no objects of knowledge at all? Would not the entire Veda portion consisting of injunctions and prohibitions be out of place? And can the unreal give rise to a real result? How can the text “That Thou Art”, in itself unreal, give rise to a correct knowledge of the nature of Brahman? Strictly speaking, this question does not arise on the transcendental level, where, as we have already seen, there is neither ignorance nor knowledge; neither bondage nor release. But yet Śankara raises this objection from the empirical point of view and rebuts it from the same standpoint.

1) कोणेक्यकान्ताध्युपन्यायः नातालप्रागृहत्व प्रत्यायादेवति त्रिविशिष्टि
प्रमाणानि व्याख्येत्रं, निरिष्क्रियैंस्य, स्वायत्तिनिष्ठानुपायिन! तत् निरिष्क्रियानस्यायायः वेदेद्भिः व्याख्येत, नोन्नायानस्यायः नियमानस्यायायः वेदेर्द्वेषायः व्याख्येत, संस्कार्यानौ वेदेद्वेषायः प्रतिविभासल्लक्ष्याय व्याख्यात्विनिष्ठानुपायिन! कथोच्चते, - नेपत्योः;
1) "(Objection :-) If unity alone is accepted as real, there would be no plurality and consequently perception and other empirical valid means of knowledge would be nullified, having no objects to make known, just like the ideas of man etc., in a post or the like and the Śāstra, dealing with the injunctions and prohibitions, would lose its vocation depending as it does upon plurality. And the Śāstra dealing with liberation, depending as it does on differences like the teacher and the taught, would find no vocation for propounding Truth. And how could the unreal Śāstra dealing with liberation consistently reveal the real unity of the Atman?

(Reply :-) This is no defect, for all conventions can consistently be real before the dawn of the knowledge of the identity of Atman with Brahman, just as all procedure in a dream is real before one wakes up. (To explain :-) So long as the knowledge of the unity of the real Atman has not dawned, no one happens to entertain the idea of unreality regarding phenomena presenting themselves as valid means of knowledge, objects of knowledge and the resultant knowledge of those objects. And it is the modifications that every born soul regards as ‘me and mine’ through अविष्का (ignorance) seeing them as related to one’s own self and things owned by one’s self, abandoning the idea of his inherent nature of oneness with Brahman. Therefore before the dawn of enlightenment of one’s oneness with Brahman every conventional
procedure, whether secular or sacred, is quite consistent. In the same way as for the common man, who has fallen into a dream and there sees things of varying ranks, knowledge of phenomena would be felt to be surely real, a direct perception and not merely an apparent perception, so also appears the knowledge with regard to human procedure here.” (S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 198)

2) कर्म त्वस्तेन वेदान्तज्ञानेन सत्यस्य प्राक्षात्मक रत्निचिस्तिस्वरत्वे। न हि रञ्जुर्त्वम वदो प्रियते। नापि मृगाविद्यासम्म सत्यस्य गुणाद्विगुणोत्तरै। प्रतिभविष्यते सम्भव। \( \text{सू. मा. २-१-१४, पा. १९८, १९९} \)

“(Objection :-) But how can the unreal Vedantic text consistently lead to the knowledge of the real identity with Brahman? Surely one bitten by a rope-snake, does not die; nor can the water seen in a mirage be efficient to lead to results like actual drinking or bathing.

(Reply :-) There is really nothing wrong for we find death and the like real effects, arising out of the suspected poison and in the case of one who is in a state of dream, effects like a snake-bite or bathing in water are also seen to be produced.

(Objection :-) But one might urge that the effect also is unreal!

(Rejoinder :-) To this, we reply that while the snake-bite or bathing in water is unreal, the resultant knowledge of such acts is quite real for it is not sublated even on waking.
(To explain :-) Surely no one who wakes from a dream, even while knowing the act of snake-bite or bathing in the water to be unreal, takes the knowledge thereof to be unreal also." (S.Bh.2.1-4, Pp.198, 199)

[The implication is that knowledge arising out of contact with unreal things may nevertheless be real in itself.]

16. Is the knowledge arising from understanding the meaning of the text 'That Thou Art' to be continuously repeated and kept in remembrance? Or will the knowledge which has once dawned be sufficient to make oneself free? This question has to be answered because the statement 'स य एवोभियमेनदान्तायमिदं सवं ततस्तत्यं आत्मा तत्त्वमसि भेतकेतो' is found to be repeated no less than nine times in the Upanishad.

This question has given rise to a difference of opinion among the followers of Sankara themselves and at least two different sub-schools have been started and reign supreme even today among the pandits of Vedanta. The Bhāmati of Vāchaspatī Misra has the following opinion in the matter :-

1) तत्त्वावचारणाम्यास्य हि स्वभाव एव स तत्त्वं. यद्वाविविध निर्देशनीविडासनम् सन्नाम्यात्मकमपनयति. (भामती प. ४०)

1) "The very nature of the repetition of the conclusive knowledge is such that it removes even the beginningless wrong concept and even the wrong concept which has created a deep-rooted dense impression, for ideas have a natural partiality for reality." (Bhāmati P.40)

2) न ब्राह्मानायां सांसारिकरमिनिवृत्तिकारणम्, अपि तु साधारणशक्तयथम् | ब्राह्मानायांत्यमेव वृत्तिस्तिगेदः | भवणमननाविदि- जनितसंस्कारसाचिवमनोजनम् (भामती २-१-४, पा. १५०)
2) “Knowledge of Brahman alone is not the cause for removing the properties of being a transmigratory soul, but that knowledge culminating in direct realization: and realization of Brahman is a special modification of the mind, born in the mind, which is accompanied by the impression born out of Sravana (theory). Manana (reflection).”

(Bhāmati I-1-4. P.150)

The author of Vivarāna, a commentary upon the Panchapādikā, in an explanatory gloss on Śankara’s Bhashya says:-

3) विशिष्टव्यवहाराणं प्रमेयावगमं प्रत्यत्वव्यवहाराणां बचति; प्रमाणस्य प्रमेयावगमं प्रत्यत्वव्यवहाराणात्। मननविद्यासने तु विचारस्य प्रत्यत्यावरणांस्तरकारिन्यह्यतवेक्षेत्रगृहृतांक्षरं प्रहासादुध्वेतुतां प्रतिच्छेदे। हर्स्य कथं प्रत्यथ्यावहितस्य कालास्विशिष्टव्यवहाराणय व्यवहि। मननविद्यासने तद्रोस्त्रस्य अत्रक्रियेते।

(पञ्चपादिकाविवरणम् - पा. ५११)

3) "The ascertainment of the meaning of the peculiar sentence becomes the immediate cause of understanding the knowable object, for the valid means is the immediate antecedent to the knowledge of the knowable. As for Manana and Nididhyāsana, they would be the cause of experiencing Brahman through creating concentration which is to result from the impression of the mind being turned towards the inner Atman. Therefore they are held to be subservient to the determination of the meaning of the peculiar text which is the immediate cause of final result."

(P.V.:P.511)

It is evident that the Vedantic text alone is enough for leading one to the knowledge of Brahman according to the author of Vivarāṇa, only reflection and meditation are used just to turn
the mind inward. In the opinion of Vāchaspati Miśra, the author of the Bhāmata, the text itself is unable to produce direct realization. Meditation is absolutely necessary to make the mind competent to produce realization. Both of these sub-schools are in direct contradiction to Śankara's dictum; for he wrote :-

4) येषां पुनरिन्युपन्तीतां नाइौचानसंशयविपर्ययत्वस्यः
पदार्थविषयं प्रतिक्षोठस्ति, ते शक्तान्ति सकुरुकलेव
tतत्त्वसिद्धान्तार्थमनुमवितुमिति तात्त्वसिद्धान्तार्थमिन्द्रेव
tसकुरुकलेव ह्यात्मप्रतिपतितिरविं निर्वर्तयतीति नात्र कथिदिवि
इयोन्धयुगम्यते।।
(सू. भा. ४-१-२, पा. ४७२)

4) "In the case, however, of a person who possesses a keen intellect which has no impediment in the shape of ignorance, doubt or misconception regarding the nature of entities denoted by the terms of the proposition, he could certainly intuit what is intended by the proposition 'That Thou Art' and therefore the futility of repeated hearing etc., is certainly welcome to us, for knowledge of Atman removes Avidya at its very inception and so no gradation is countenanced here."
(S.Bh. 4-1-2. P.462)

It is crystal clear that the author of Bhashyā does not consider that the assistance of Manana (reflection) or Nididhyāsana is indispensable for the aspirants of the highest order. They require only to be reminded of their oneness with Brahman to be aware of it.

We have stated that the text 'That Thou Art' is just a reminder of the Truth and is neither a sentence describing it nor any attempt to prove the reality.

17. But there is a show at least of manana (reasoning)
which is displayed in the case of this dialogue between Svetaketu and his father. For whom is it meant and what purpose does it serve? It cannot be argued in the strain of either of the sub-commentators that it aids the mind in developing itself to have a direct realization of the Reality, for as we have already seen, Brahman is the Witnessing Consciousness and the very Self of even the mind which reflects and which therefore can objectify Reality at no stage of its development.

The answer is here:

"For him to whom this intuition does not dawn all at once, it is only to induce this intuition that a repeated instruction (and graded understanding) is admitted. Even in his case, the aspirant must not be drawn asray from the meaning of the text 'That Thou Art' and urged to repeat (and revolve in the mind this notion)- For people do not give a bride in marriage just for murdering the bridegroom - and if so urged, the idea would spring up to him. 'I am urged to this act; I am an agent of action. This is done by me'- an idea which is the very reverse of the notion of oneness with Brahman.

Repetition and the like expressions are only employed to denote that one, who is dull of intellect and who not being able to understand would himself discard what is meant by the text, should be made to stick to the meaning of the text above." (S.Bh. 4-1-2, P.463)
THE CENTRAL TEACHING

The above extract evidently aims at stressing the fact that by *manana* is meant the attempt to remove all difficulties of the seeker that would crop up because of his habitual inclination to phenomenal facts which taken at the face value would seem to be in conflict with the Vedantic doctrine of Perfect Unity. The arguments used in the Śāstra and to be used by the teacher should be based upon intuition and should be such as to lead again and again to the one doctrine which is based on final intuition. The word 'स्मृति' *Smṛti* (used in Sūtra 4-1-1) has been misunderstood in so many quarters that instead of meaning 'repeated appeal to intuition' it has even degenerated into muttering repeatedly like a mantra and even persons occupying high positions have been seriously maintaining that तत्त्वमासि (That Thou Art) is महावाचयमन्त्र (a mantra containing a grand text signifying the identity of the Jiva and Isvara) and there have been serious disputes about whether or not the right to initiate disciples in this mantra rests in a particular mutt.

17. The word 'nididhyāsana' is conspicuous by its absence in the Chandogya. One who has understood (विज्ञात) is of course a 'ब्रह्मसंस्थ' (छ २-२३-१) or a 'ब्रह्मनिधि' as he is described in another Upanishad (Mu. 3-1-4). But the discipline of *nididhyāsana* is not mentioned here and therefore has to be left over for discussion of the Bhādārāyaṇa where it actually occurs.

For the present, it will be enough to state that a competent teacher who rests in Brahma (ब्रह्मनिधि) alone could know where to use any of the items of discipline that are proper for disciples and that *nididhyāsana* has a place in *Sravaṇa* or *Manana* also, whether actually expressed by that name or not.
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21. DELIBERATION ON THE ULTIMATE REALITY 84 P.  
(Translation of “Anudhava Paryantavada Atma Vichara”)

22. BRAHMAVIDYA OR KNOWLEDGE OF THE ULTIMATE REALITY 52 P.  
(Translation of “Brahama Vidya”)

23. THE QUINTESSENCE OF PRISTINE PURE VEDANTA 42 P.  
(Translation of “Parishuddha Vedanta Sara”)

24. THE PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCE OF VEDANTA 44 P.  
(“Translation of Adhyatma Vidyae”)

25. VEDANTA: THE ONLY CONSUMMATE SPIRITUAL SCIENCE (Translation of “Paripurna Darshana”) 44 P.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. THE UNIQUE TEACHINGS OF SANKARA</th>
<th>60 P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. THE SCIENTIFIC APPROACH OF ADVAITA VEDANTA</td>
<td>120 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uses the modern audio-visual method with 14 diagrams to depict the fundamentals of Advaita Vedanta)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. SATCHIDANANDEANDRA SARASWATHI (LIFE SKETCH)</td>
<td>56 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. THE MAGIC JEWEL OF INTUITION</td>
<td>560 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Translation of Paramartha Chintamani This Magnum Opus explains the subtle and secret teachings of Mandukya Upanishad using Avasthatraya Prakriya)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. THE ESSENTIAL ADI SHANKARA</td>
<td>240 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Translation of “Sankara Vedanta Sara”, excellent reference book and a constant guide for a genuine student of Vedanta)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. THE ESSENTIAL GAUDAPADA</td>
<td>432 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Translation of Gaudapada Hridaya; Explanation of Karikaas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. THE ESSENTIAL SURESHWARA &amp; THE ESSENTIAL SATCHIDANANDA</td>
<td>420 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. INTUITIVE APPROACH TO SANKARA VEDANTA</td>
<td>240 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Translation of Vedantarth - Sara - Sangraha. Secrets of Adhyasa, Adhyasa. Adhyaropa - Apavada Nyaya revealed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. THE BASIC TENETS OF SANKARA VEDANTA</td>
<td>200 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Translation of Sankara Vedantadca Moolatatawagalu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. THE PRISTINE PURE ADVAITA PHILOSOPHY OF ADI SANKARA</td>
<td>136 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Translation of Sankara Siddhanta: Explains pure Sankara Siddhanta and exposes the wrong interpretation of Vyakhyanakaras)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. ADVAITA PANCHARATNAM</td>
<td>80 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Commentary of Five Verses composed by Adi Sankara on Advaita Vedanta)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. THE METHOD OF VEDANTA</td>
<td>1004 P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Translation of Vedanta Prakriya Pratyabhijna by Dr. A. J. Alston) Representing the first large scale critic of History of Advaita Vedanta, it seeks to establish a clear view of the traditional Advaita Vedanta based on Upanishads as systematised by Sankara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya

Founded in the year 1920, the Institution was nurtured and developed by the revered Swamiji single-handedly and became recognized as the very "fountainhead" of pristine pure Advaita Vedanta as propounded by Adi Sankara.

Being an Institution himself, the Swamiji made the prime objective of Karyalaya as spiritual dissemination through publication of books, conducting classes, seminars and discourses in genuine Vedanta of Adi Sankara. The same is being successfully carried out by the present authorities of the Karyalaya which was made a Public Charitable Trust in the year 1990.

The Karyalaya is also publishing two Spiritual Magazines in Kannada "Adhyatma Prakasha" and "Shankara Bhaskara" having a wide circulation throughout Karnataka, India & Abroad.

The Karyalaya is continuously publishing books as well as translating Kannada & Sanskrit books to the International language English, with a view to propagate the unique teachings & methodology of Swamiji among the large English knowing people not only in India but also abroad.

The public patronage is the chief source for all the activities of the Karyalaya.

Donations to the Karyalaya are exempted under Section 80G of Income Tax Act.

Hence we appeal to you to help us with a generous donation to take full advantage of the available facilities in our Institution in pursuing a true spiritual Path.
ABOUT SWAMIJI

Shri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji (1880 - 1975 A.D.) the founder of Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarsipur, Hassan Dist., Karnataka - 573 211 - a public charitable trust, wrote and published more than 200 books in Kannada, English and Sanskrit with a view to propagate Pristine Pure Advaita Vedanta as expounded by Shri Gaudapada, Shri Sankara Bhagavatpada and Shri Sureshwara in their famous extant works based on the three canonical Vedantic texts viz., Ten Principal Upanishads, Bhagavadgita and Vedanta Sutras (Popularly known as Brahma Sutras). The revered Swamiji carried out research for over six decades with a profound sense of Dedication and missionary zeal so as to cleanse Advaita Vedanta of the dross and distortions that it has acquired in the post-Sankara era. Although the Swamiji has authored nearly 20 odd books in English and over 25 books in Sanskrit, many of his masterpieces were written in Kannada. In order to provide the benefit of these gems, the Karyalaya has brought out several books in English which are faithful translations of the original texts in Kannada, for the guidance and benefit of ardent students of Advaita Vedanta. He was not just a rare and accomplished individual but a mighty and magnificent Institution.

Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya
Holenarsipur - 573 211. India.