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PUBLISHERS
INTRODUCTION

The Nature of Teaching in the Upanishads

The Upanishads superficially read, seem to be intended to teach something about what they call Brahman or Atman, about the universe, and the individual soul, but the varied expressions and style of exposition employed in them, is so bewildering that one is apt to doubt whether they contain any system of thought uniformly propounding any definite doctrine or whether they adopt any dialectical method leading the seeker to the principle they propose to teach. The language and style adopted to teach Brahman is apparently very confusing. All these works teem with various narratives, epigrams, symbolic expressions, metaphors and similes, which do not smell of any dialectical approach to truth. True, we do meet with dialogues conversations and discussions and debates sometimes; but everywhere it appears to be a display of dogmatic arguments and analogies. On the other hand, we find express statements like 'This knowledge is not to be attained (or cannot be confuted by) reasoning' (नैसा नक्षं मतिरापनेय). 'This can be well understood only when taught by another' (प्रौक्तान्येनेव बुद्धानाय प्रेष्ट) (०.२-९).

Conflicting Interpretations

The numerous commentaries embodying the conflicting interpretations of the several Bhāshyakāras whose followers are extant to this day, only confirm this impression. For any scholar skilled in exegetics might bring out any additional system of his own with impunity out of these utterances of the ancient sages, if
only he could adduce cogent reasons to show that his system is consistently built. And no one can rule out the legitimacy of the ingress of any system or systems in the future, each one of them resting its structure on the foundation of consistency and even on some individual intuition and experience to be gained through spiritual discipline.

Is there a Cardinal Doctrine or a Method, adopted in the Upanishads?

In these circumstances, it is most necessary to discover the unique doctrine and the distinctive technique or the method, if there be one at all, which governs all the modes of approach to reality in these writings. If one could succeed in this attempt, that would be the source to provide the critical student of Vedanta with a clincher to help him out of this apparent maze.

The Evidence of the Sutra-Bhashya

Actuated by a curiosity to find out the truth of the matter, and prompted by an instinctive feeling that there must be some doctrine and some method peculiar to all the Upanishads, I began to make a diligent search in the Bhāshyas of the great Śaṅkara, the earliest writer on Vedanta, whose commentaries are available even now. As for the doctrine, it did not take a long time for me to find it out. For the introduction to his Sūtra-Bhāshya contained this unequivocal statement:

अत्यान्तर्थिः: प्रहाणाय आत्मेकत्वविनियंतत्त्वे सर्वं वेदान्तं आरम्भने ॥

"In order to destroy this source of (all) evil, one has to attain the knowledge of the unity of Atman. To this end, all the Vedantas (Upanishads) are begun."
The meaning of this proposition is crystal-clear: all the Upanishads have the uniform purport of teaching the doctrine of the One Atman, on attaining which knowledge, one's ignorance is wiped off for good. And another statement in the opening of the commentary on Vedanta Sūtra 1-1-5, makes this equally unambiguous remark:

एवं तावद् वेदान्तवाक्यानां ब्रह्मात्मायागतिप्रयोजनानां ब्रह्मात्मनि तात्त्येण समानवितानामन्तरेणापि कार्यानुप्रवेशं ब्रह्मणि पर्यवसानामुक्तम् ॥

"So far it has been concluded that Vedantic texts aim at producing the intuition of Brahmatman (the Infinite Self); that they are syntactically construed as teaching the 'Brahmatman' as their one purport, and culminate in Brahman which is without any connection with something that has to be done."

This proposition means that the Upanishads serve the sole purpose of teaching the nature of the Self as Brahman in contradiction to the individual self, and that this knowledge of the Infinite Self, precludes the possibility of any duty to be done after its attainment. Of course this is to intimate that in Śaṅkara's opinion, Upanishadic passages urging a person to do some religious work in order to attain some result, have nothing to do with texts teaching the nature of the One Infinite Atman. This is in consonance with the previous statement in the Introduction which says that all Upanishads have the one purpose of teaching the doctrine of the unity of Self. But is this his individual opinion or has he any traditional background for his view? Even supposing that he is supported by some tradition, how are we to reconcile ourselves to the fact that there have sprung up so many other Bhāshyās each professing to inherit a tradition of its own and
claiming to be the only correct interpretation of the Upanishads?

In the first place, there are Upanishadic texts proclaiming the unity of Brahman or Atman in the most unmistakable terms: "That which we perceive in front is the Immortal Brahman alone; that which is behind is Brahman (alone); to the right and to the left, is Brahman (alone); that which is spread out both below and above, is Brahman. All this universe is Brahman the best" (Mu. 2-2-11), "And now, (is) the instruction concerning Atman itself. Atman alone is below, and Atman (alone) above, Atman (alone) behind, and Atman (alone) in front; Atman (alone) is to the right, and Atman (alone) to the left. All this is Atman alone." (Ch.7-25-2). Secondly, one's misgivings about the dualists are laid at rest by these two ślokas from Gaudapāda, the traditional grand-preceptor of Śaṅkara:-

स्वसिद्धान्तव्यवस्थासु क्रैतिनो निधित्वता हृदम्।
परस्परं विरूध्यन्ते तैरयं न विरूध्यते॥
अद्वैतं परमायथं हि द्रैतं तत्ज्ञेद उच्यते।
तेषांमुखयथा दैतं तेनायं न विरूध्यते॥ गौ.का. ३-१७, १८।

"The dualists (who follow the Saṅkhya or Vaiśeshika, Buddhists of Jains etc.) firmly cling to their respective systems and contradict each other. But this system is not contradicted by them. For non-duality is the only Reality while duality is only its appearance. For them it is duality alone both ways (i.e. as Reality or appearance). Therefore this system is not contradicted by them." GK. 3-17, 18.

As for the texts teaching the creation of multiplicity, Śaṅkara himself quotes two traditional ślokas from Gaudapāda:-
"As for the creation narrated variously by means of illustrations like clay, metal and sparks, it is (only) a device for leading (the seeker to the truth of unity); there is no difference in whatever way (we look at the matter)."

[Sāṅkara has adduced this verse in corroboration of his view that the effect (universe) is nothing other than the cause Brahman. (see SBh. 1-4-14, p.163]

"When the individual soul awakes from the beginningless illusory dream-sleep, then he realizes his unborn sleepless, dreamless, non-dual nature." GK. 1-16.

[This is adduced to corroborate Śaṅkara's position that the states of creation, sustentation and dissolution of the world, are all illusory and not real. See SBh. 2-1-9, p. 191.]

Two more examples may be cited to emphasize the fact that, according to Śaṅkara's tradition, the Śrutis make use of empirical examples of cause and effect relation only to repudiate all real causality and to establish the Vedic non-dualism, their enunciation of brahman as the cause of the birth, sustentation and dissolution of the world, being only a deliberate imputation of causal nature - a device to convince the critical enquirer that everywhere the so-called material cause, is the only real entity imagined to appear in diverse ways like an actor on the stage (नस्ते सर्वव्यवहारस्यदुर्लभ्यते। सू. भा. २-०-९, प. १८९।)

(१) ननु शान्तदिदिह्नं व्रह्म जगतः कारणम्। वाहम्। न तु शान्तदिदिमत् कार्य कारणात्मना हीनं प्रागुत्तरौर्द्धारी वा अस्ति॥
"(Objection:-) Is not Brahman devoid of sound etc., the cause of the Universe?

(Reply :-) Certainly; but the effect with sound and other characteristics, never exists either before creation or even now except in its essential nature as the cause." SBh. 2-1-7, p. 189.

"(२) तस्मात् , यथा घटकरकाराकासायां महाकाशान्यत्वम्, यथा च 
 मूर्गात्मृणिकोदकादीनाम् उपरादिभोज्वन्यत्वम्, द्वन्द्वस्वस्वस्वप्तत्वात्, स्वस्व- 
 शानुपास्यत्वात्, एवमस्य भोग्योक्राब्दिग्रिप्तवज्जातस्य ब्रह्मत्वतिरितिकेनाद्वाय इति 
 द्वैत्यम्।। " सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९७.

"Therefore it has to be concluded that just as ethers like a jar-ether, are non-different from the universal ether, or just as mirage-water etc., are non-different from barren soil etc., being of the nature of appearing and suddenly disappearing and undefinable in their apparent nature, so also this diverse universe of things experienced and experiencers etc., does not exist apart from Brahman. SBh. 2-1-14, p.197.

References to the Traditional Method in the Bhagavadgita

The above-mentioned citations from the Sutra-Bhāshya, not only give us an insight into the main doctrine stressed in all the Upanishads, but also disclose the method of approach adopted in those writings to teach the Absolute (Brahmātman). For while the Absolute is strictly without a second, we see here the deliberate superimposition of causal nature to Brahman, as a device to teach unity, and the abrogation of this property of being a cause by effectively negating the existence of the effect apart from its material cause. As Śaṅkara contends in his Bhāshya (on 2-1-14, p. 196) : ‘तत्र शुद्धात् वाचारम्भाशाभ्यां, दातान्नितिकेण ब्रह्मात्मतिरितिकेण कार्यजातस्याभाव इति 
 गम्यते ॥’ "This is an illustration used to teach the
nature of Brahman. From the expression \textit{Vācārambhānām} (made up of words) used here, we have to infer that in the case of what is illustrated also, the non-existence of all effects apart from Brahman (is meant)." Can it not be surmised from all this that Śaṅkara is referring here to a traditional method common to all the Upanishads making use of this device of deliberate imputation of certain properties to the Absolute just to reveal its real nature, the imputation being subsequently negated when that purpose has been achieved?

References to this method are actually to be found in the Ācārya's Gitā-Bhāshya, to justify this hypothesis. There also, Śaṅkara discloses his anxiety to defend his view on the strength of the traditional method. For example, in the course of criticizing the view of certain thinkers who are of the view that it is impossible for the mind to grasp the Atman, as He is formless, and that therefore permanent stay in Right knowledge is impossible of attainment, that teacher says:

\begin{quote}
‘सत्यम् एवम् गृहस्प्रदायारहितानाम् अत्यन्त-बहिविषयासात्तत्तत्तुद्वेक्सा सम्यक्कार्याणेच्युतक्तथामानाम्; तत्प्रतिद्वाल् तु हौरिक-ग्राह्याहकङ्क्षेत्तवतुनि सदुद्धिविनिर्तं दु:संपाध्या आत्मचैतन्यव्यतिरंकण \vspace{1em} वस्त्रवत्तस्वायानुपलब्धे: ||
\end{quote}

\textit{Gī. Bhā. १८-५०, पा. २८१.}

"True, it is so for those who have had no access to the traditional teaching handed down by the Gurus (the master teachers), for those who have not studied the Vedantas, whose mind is completely attached to the external objects of sense, and who have not taken the trouble to understand the nature of the valid means of knowledge. But for those who are of the opposite nature, it is altogether impossible to conceive the real existence of duality of the nature of subject and object; for they see nothing other than the Consciousness of Atman." \textit{GBh. 18-50, p. 281.}
And he concludes,

"Therefore cognition is quite well-known, and the cognizer also is quite well-known. Therefore no effort is necessary for the attainment of knowledge; effort is necessary only to remove the idea of the self touching the not-self. Therefore perfect stay in Knowledge, is quite possible of attainment." GBh. 18-50, p. 281.

It is evident that Śaṅkara is referring to the traditional way of teaching Atman by removing what is not the property of the Self. This he affirms in so many words elsewhere:-

शास्त्रं तु अन्तर्यं प्रामाण्यम् अत्यद्वैतार्थोपणामात्रनिर्वकल्पे न प्रामाण्यात्मकत्वम्। प्रतिपधे न त्वद्वैतार्थङ्गकल्पे।

"As for the Śāstra, the ultimate means of knowledge, it attains the nature of being a valid means of knowledge by removing what is not the property of that Atman, and not by directly reminding the nature of something previously unknown." GBh. 2-18, p. 16.

A second reference to this *Sampradāya* (tradition) is to be found in Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya on Gītā 13-2, where he takes up for criticism the misinterpretation of the Gītā teaching "Know the Kshētra-jīva to be Myself in all the kṣetras, O scion of Bhārata! (क्षेत्रजीवं स्वरूपम् मे भव)". The follower of that school admits that Kshētra-jīva is certainly Isvara, and kṣetra is something else which is the object of kshētra-jīva alone; "But", this follower of the other school contends, "as for myself, I am a transmigratory soul subject to pleasure and pain; and I have to bring about the cessation of this samsāra by attaining the knowledge of both kṣhētra and kshētra-jīva; and then realizing the Kshētra-jīva, the Lord, I must get and stay in the nature of that (Kshētra-jīva)."
Saṅkara makes these scornful observations with regard to this view:

"He who thinks thus and he who teaches (another) that he is not the Kshētrajña-he who holds this view- is a learned fool who hopes to make out that both bondage and release as well as the Śāstra, would be meaningful (only that way), that slayer of the Self is himself lost in confusion and confounds others, because he is not in possession of the traditional method of the teaching of the Sastras; for he is thereby giving up what is expressly taught (here) and presuming what is not taught. Therefore not being acquainted with the traditional (method of interpretation), he should be ignored like a fool, be he ever so learned in all the Sastras."

GBh.13-2, p.195.

Here the Gītā teaches that the knower of kshētra, though seemingly an individual self, is really the same as Īśvara or the Witness in all beings. Saṅkara says that one who twists this express statement to mean that this Īśvara is to be meditated upon (उपास्य), and not to be directly known as the Self, is making both an addition to and a subtraction from the true meaning. One who has been taught in the right way of interpretation, would never take such a rash step of misinterpreting the teaching. Evidently, Saṅkara is here thinking of the traditional teaching of Gauḍapāda with regard to Upāsana (meditation of Brahman). For Gauḍapāda has these two statements to make concerning the subject:

उपासनाथितो थर्मो जाते ब्रह्मणि वर्तते ।
प्रागुत्यपारज सर्वं तेनासो कृपण: स्मृतः ॥

"The seeker who is dependent on meditation, depends on the born Brahman: for him, all this is the unborn Brahman (only) before creation. Hence he is known to be a poor (knower of Brahman)."

GK.3-1
"Seekers of Reality are of three grades: the lowest, the mediocre, and the best. Therefore, this Upāsāna has been taught (for the benefit of the first two)."

GK. 3-16.

The Upanishads themselves teach that the Brahman meditated upon should not be considered to be the Highest brahman in its genuine nature; नेत्र यदिसमुपासते' (Ke.). This is a refrain of the Upanishadic teaching.

And lastly we meet with a statement of Śaṅkara which actually alludes to the true traditional method by its significant epithet. In commenting on the śloka सर्वेऽपि वाचिक तत्त्र' (गी. 13-13), he writes:

"The collection of specific features in the Kṣetrajña due to the different conditioning associates is wholly unreal and therefore He has been taught to be known as neither being nor non-being, by denying that (specific nature. But here) even the unreal form is presumed as though it were the property of (the Kṣetrajña) the knowable just to bring home its existence (by describing it by the expression) 'It has hands and feet everywhere etc.'.

Accordingly, there is (this) saying of the knowers of the traditional method (तथा हि सङ्गदायित्रिं वचनम्) 'That which is devoid of all multiplicity, is explained by means of (deliberate) superimposition and rescission 'अध्यारोपपन्नवादायां निध्रयत्र घनभरते'.

It would be profitable to note that both the superimposition and the negation, are used by the Śastra or teacher as a device for revealing the true nature of Reality which is inexpressible and inconceivable. This is not an attempt to remove any manifoldness that actually pertains to, or coexists
with, Atman. It is only an apparent manifoldness. As Gaudapāda, proficient in all the techniques of the traditional method, crisply remarks:

प्रपन्नो यदि विषयं निविदते न निर्मयं न संज्ञाय: 
मायामात्रमिदं नैतमेत्तं परमार्थं: ।
विकल्पो विनित्तंतु विकल्पतो यदि केनचित् ।
उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते तेत्रं न विषयं ॥

"Manifoldness, no doubt, would have to be removed, if it (really) existed. This duality is only Māyā (a false appearance), (there is) Non-duality alone in reality. The thought-construct (of the distinction of the Śāstra, master and the disciple to be taught), would have to be removed if it were the (actual) superimposition of some one. This is a doctrine devised (only) for the purpose of teaching. When (Reality) is known, there is no duality whatsoever (in fact)."

GK. 1-17, 18.

The Two Standpoints

This traditional method of teaching the Absolute is responsible for the language and style employed in the Upanishads to amplify it still further so as to make the teaching intelligible to the student. Narratives, mnemonics, enigmatic statements and illustrations, are all made use of for the purpose of adhyātma (deliberate superimposition), which may be supposed to serve as a device to negate some superimposition of the human mind, and when that purpose has been served, the deliberate superimposition is invariably abrogated. Throughout the course of teaching, certain concepts are employed to indicate the inexpressible and inconceivable Absolute which can never be objectified by the mind, and language applicable to ordinary life is employed in special senses by extending the significance of the words in order to make them
suitable to suggest the relation of the phenomenal universe to the Absolute. This doctrine of the distinction of the common sense or empirical-view (लोक्याचित्ति) and the Vedantic view (शास्त्रिचित्ति) or the Really real view (पारमार्थिचित्ति), is one of the most useful principles consistently used in the traditional method of the Upanishads. Śaṅkara was only following in the footsteps of his grand-preceptor Gaudapāda in making use of this distinction in his Bhāshyas. For Gaudapāda had already resorted to this device of superimposition from the empirical standpoint as a means (उपाय) and its final negation, when the intuition of the Absolute unborn Non-duality (उपेय) is achieved :-

स एष्ठ नेतिनेतीति व्याख्यातत निहृते यत: ।
सर्वेऽग्राहाभावेन हैतुनाजं प्रकाशते ॥ ।

"Since (the Śruti) negates whatever had been used in explanation before, by pointing to Atman as 'This Atman is the one described as 'not this, not that' for the reason that all that is not to be taken (as truth). The Unborn shines forth of Its own accord."

GK. 3-26.

The Present Work

While I have referred to the Traditional Method of Vedanta in several works¹ before, this one has been written with the sole purpose of offering an Introduction to the central doctrine of the Upanishads.

¹ Readers interested in the subject may be referred to the English Introduction to the 'Māndūkya-Rahasya-Vivṛti' (Sanskrit), 'How to Recognize the Method of Vedanta' and 'Śankara's Clarification of Certain Vedantic Concepts', published by the Karyalaya.
and to the One Method of approach uniformly employed in all of them in leading the enquirer to the intuition of the Absolute Reality which is his very Self. It is hoped that the beginner will find here ample material to enable him to discern how this method works in the the other sub-varieties of approach not noticed here.
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ESSAYS ON VEDANTA

1. VEDANTA

1. I propose to write a series of essays on Vedanta for the benefit of readers who would welcome a connected account of the important and the essential ideas in the Upanishads and the methods of approach adopted in placing them before the enquirer.

The Upanishads have been also called 'Vedantas' partly because most of them are to be found at the end of the Vedas, and partly and perhaps especially because they contain the ultimate pronouncement of the central philosophy of the Vedas.

2. The word 'Vedanta' itself is rarely found in the classical Upanishads. I have come across two passages which deserve our special notice:

(1) वेदान्तं परमं गुरूं पुराकल्ये प्रचोदितम् ।

 नाप्रशान्ताय दातन्यं नापुज्जत्याशिध्याय वै पुनः ॥

 'This is the supreme secret in Vedanta which has been urged (or taught) of yore. This (teaching) should not be transmitted to any one who has no self-control, nor again to one who is neither one's son nor disciple.' Sve. 6-22.

This is from the Śvetāsvatara Upanishad. We are told here that the teaching contained in the Upanishad is a traditional secret, fit to be revealed to qualified seekers only.
"Those who have perfectly ascertained the nature of the entity revealed by *Vedantic Intuition*, the endeavouring aspirants whose mind has become purified through the *Yoga of Sannyasa*, they are freed from all circumscribing limitations, having become perfectly immortal at the ultimate end of life." Mu. 3-2-6.

Here Vedanta-Vijnana, has been explained by Sankara as *vedantajnatinigraha* (intuition born from the teaching of the Vedantas) and therefore it appears that Sankara takes the word in the sense of the Upanishads. In his Introduction to the Sutra-Bhashya, he writes:–

‘अस्त्यानयहितोऽप्रहाणाय आत्मैकसृष्टिवियाप्रतिपत्तिः सर्वे वेदान्ता आर्थक्ये ’

In order to destroy this source of evil, all the Vedantas are begun so that the knowledge of the unity of Atman may be acquired."

It is evident that Sankara means to say that all the Upanishads aim at helping the aspirant to acquire the knowledge of the one Atman.

3. In this series of essays, I shall uniformly use the word Vedanta (without an article) to denote the philosophy of the Upanishads known by that name.

4. 'The word Upanishad' also is used in different senses in Sanskrit.

"Virocana went to the Asuras. To them he told the following Upanishad: 'The body alone is to be revered here, the body alone
is to be ministered to."

(२) तस्मात्वयेहि दात्सनमथ्यानमथ्यानमदयाञ्च सत्यमिनिपत्॥

"Therefore even now they talk of one who never makes gifts, who has no faith and never worships in these terms 'Alas! he is asuric in nature.' For this is the Upanishad of asuras."

Ch. 8-8-5.

In both of the above-cited excerpts the word 'Upanishad' means a doctrine.

(३) तस्मात्वयेहि सत्यस्य सत्यमिनिपति याणां वेसत्यं तेषामेव सत्यम्॥

"Of Him the Upanishad is the real of satya (or the prāṇas)."

Br. 2-1-20.

Here the word 'Upanishad' means a name. Brahman's significant name is 'the real of satya' (i.e. of the prāṇas which are made up of the five elements), because prāṇas are known to be satyam (made up of sat and tyat) and Atman is the reality underlying the pranas.

(५) अथातः संहिताया उपनिषदं व्यास्यास्यायम्॥

"Now, therefore, we are going to explain the Upanishad of Samhita (euphonic combination)."

Tai. 1-3

Here 'Upanishad' means 'meditation.'

(६) इत्युपनिषदं भो ब्रह्महितयुक्तं त उपनिषद्य ब्राह्मी वाचं त उपनिषदमस्तुमिति॥

"This is the Upanishad." Tai. 2-9, 3-10.

Here the word 'Upanishad' means the supreme secret, to wit, the knowledge of Brahman.
"(The disciple :) Please tell me the Upanishad, sir.

(Master :) The Upanishad has been told to you. We have told you the Upanishad of Brahman itself." Ke. 4-7.

Here also the word 'Upanishad' means the highest secret, to wit, the knowledge of the nature of Brahman.

5. Śaṅkara himself means the knowledge of Brahman primarily and the portion of the Vedas usually called by that name in a secondary sense, whenever he uses the word Upanishad. We quote a few sentences below to illustrate this :-

"Whoever approach this Brahmavidyā with faith and devotion, identifying themselves with Brahman as their self, (this vidyā) chops off all the evils befalling them, such evils as entering the mother's womb, birth, aging and disease. Therefore it is called 'Upanishad'. Or it is so called because it takes the seeker to the Highest Brahman. Or it may be, it is so called because it destroys for ever the source of the miseries of Samsāra, such as Avidyā (ignorance). For, the root 'sad', with the prefixes Upa and ni is said to mean all this in grammar." Mu. Intro.

"Now a brief commentary on the chapters of the Kāthakopanishad, is begun to render them easily understood." Ka. Intro.

[Here Śaṅkara calls the literary work by the name of Upanishad. He has called his commentary by the name of Vṛtti to show how his explanation, though brief, makes the meaning of all the six chapters (called Vallis, literally creepers) more intelligible than in a former Vṛtti by some other author.]
This word 'Upanishad' is the final form of the root 'sad' (meaning to shatter) to go, to loosen - with these prefixes 'upa' and 'ni' and the suffix kvip added on to it.

Ka. Bh. Intro.

[This derivation of the word is for elucidating the several functions of Brahmavidya. This same derivation together with the explanation of what Brahmavidya (does for one who acquires it,) recurs in Sankara's Introduction to several other Upanishads. We have chosen the Kathākōpanishad-Bhashyā as a sample.]

"By the word Upanishad is denoted the knowledge relating to the entity to be known as propounded by the work which is (here) proposed to be commented on:

(Question) :- By the association of which of these meanings then, is this knowledge denoted by the word 'Upanishad' ?

We reply :- This knowledge is called Upanishad by the association of this meaning, that it shatters, that is, kills or destroys avidyā (ignorance) and other evils which are the seed of saṁsāra (bondage) of those aspirants for release who are free from passion for objects seen or heard of (= of this or the other world) and have approached (upasadāya) the knowledge denoted by the word Upanishad hereinafter to be expounded, and investigate it intently and with a firm resolve. Accordingly it is going to be said 'Intuiting Him one is freed from the jaws of death' (1-3-15)."

Ka. Bh. Intro.
"Or Brahmavidya (knowledge of Brahman) is called 'Upanishad' by the association of the meaning that it leads the aspirants for release possessing the aforesaid attributes, to the highest Brahman."

Ka. Bh. Intro.

(3) लोकादिः, ब्रह्मज्ञतो योद्धिः, तद्भवाया विचाया द्वितीयेन वरेण प्रार्थ्यमानायाः. यथार्थाकल्प्पत्वादि वन्माता ब्रह्माद्विद्वेदयुपदस्य लोकान्तरे पौनः उपाधिस्तुवै वर्त्तंस्य अवसादित्वादि द्वारा धात्वर्ध्याथायात्, अभिबिच्यापि 'युपनिषदः' इत्युच्यते। तथा च वक्ष्यति 'स्वर्गलोकोऽस्मृत्याऽभजनते' (३-१३) इत्यादिः।

Ka. Bh. Intro.

"Or again Agnividyā (the knowledge of virāt) is also denoted by the word Upanishad, because it is associated with the meaning of this root. For the knowledge of this Agni, the creator of the world, the knower born of Brahman (Hiranyakarbhā), which is the subject matter of the second boon chosen (by Naciketa)- leads to the heaven (of Virāt) and thus enfeebles or loosens the many evils such as residing in the (mother's) womb, birth and old age, repeatedly occuring in other worlds. For the Upanishad will declare so (in the sequel) : 'Those that reach heaven will attain immortality' (1-13)."

Ka. Bh. Intro.

6. The following extract from the commentary on the Kāthaka explains why the word Upanishad should be deemed to have been used in a secondary sense when applied to a literary work :-

ननु च उपनिषद्देव अध्येतारो ग्रान्थमयबिलपन्ति; 'उपनिषदम् अधीमहे, उपनिषदम् अध्यायमः' इति चैवम्। नैष दोषः। अविचारांसाधारे उपदेशमावधिशिष्यादि: सदिधार्थक्षुभात्रे असम्भवात्, विचायां च सम्भवात्। ग्रान्थस्यापि ताद्देवेन तत्तद्विद्योपपत्तेऽव: 'आयुवेन सुराम' इत्यादिविवत। तस्मात् विचायां मुख्यम् वृत्त्या उपनिषद्व: वर्तते; ग्रन्थे तु भक्तया — इति॥

Ka. Bh. Ab.

"(Objection :-) But students (and teachers) apply the word 'Upanishad' to a literary work also, as when they say 'We are studying the Upanishad' or 'We are teaching the Upanishad'!"
(Reply :-) This is no defect. For the meaning of the root 'sad' viz. destroying the cause of sārṣāra etc., cannot properly apply to a mere work whereas it is appropriate in the case of knowledge. And it is consistent to use the name for a mere work also which treats of that knowledge. This usage is similar as when it is said 'Ghee is verily life' (Tai. Sam. 2-3-11). Therefore the word 'Upanishad' is used in its primary sense when applied to the knowledge (of Brahman or Virat), it is used in a secondary sense when applied to a work."

Ka. Bh. Intro.

7. The reader will note that the word 'Upanishad' in these essays, will be used uniformly in the sense of a literary work unless there is a specific statement to the contrary. While the Upanishads in this sense are numerous, we shall quote in this work only the classical Upanishads which Śaṅkara (the earliest commentator whose works are available) has recognized, and which are universally respected as authoritive by all Vedantins.

The following abbreviations should be noted in the quotations cited :-

1. इ. Iśa. The Īśavāsyopanishad, the Samhitopanishad of Vājasaneyins.

2. के. Ke. The Kēṇopanishad, the Upanishad of the Talavakāras.

3. का. Ka. The Kāthakopanishad, the Upanishad of the Kathas, of the Krishna Yajurveda.

4. मु. Mu. The Muṇḍakopanishad, the Upanishad of the Atharvaṇas.

5. प्र Pr. The Praśnopanishad, the Upanishad of the Atharvanas, regarded as part of the Brahmana explaining the Muṇḍaka, part of the Mantra-portion.
6. मा. Ma. The *Māndūkyopanishad*, of the Atharvaveda, on which the famous Gauḍapāda has written his Kārikas.

7. तै. Tai. The *Taittirīyopanishad*, of the Taittiriyas of the Krishna Yajurveda.


10. ब्र. Br. The *Brhadāraṇyakopanishad*, of the Kāṇvas, belonging to the Śukla Yajurveda.

11. स्वे. Sve. The *Śvetāśvataropanishad*, of the Śvetāśvataras, belonging to the Krishna Yajurveda.
8. What do the Upanishads contain? As contrasted with the previous portion of the Vedas dealing with religious works and hence known by the name of *Karma-kānda*, this portion is called the *Jñāna-kānda*, because it mainly treats of the knowledge of Brahman.

9. Jñāna-kānda deserves to be called *Brahma-kānda*, because it treats of Brahman as distinguished from *Karmas* or rituals. The words Jñāna and some of its synonyms such as *Vidyā* or *Pratipatti*, are used in two different senses. The primary sense of the word is knowledge of the real nature of Brahman. The secondary sense is meditation or active exercise of the mind in staying it on Brahman or some other object and thinking about it as enjoined by the sāstras. We shall confine ourselves to the first sense before taking up the second for consideration.

10. The distinctive teachings of the Upanishads regarding Brahman, are not mere theories advanced by doctrinarians but statements of facts verified and verifiable. These are summed up in the following short text from Chandōgya:

```
ते य एसोडगिमेतदाल्म्यामिन्न सर्व तत्सत्त्वं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि थेतेत्वेतो।
िङ्ग ६-८-७।
```

This text which is repeated nine times in this Upanishad, contains the following truths:
(1) Brahman which is referred to by the name of Sat (Pure Being) here, is Āparima (the most subtle principle). The seeker has to proceed from the grossest aspect of the universe until he realizes this subtle principle.

(2) Aitadātmyam idam sarvam :- The whole universe has this Brahman for its essence. Just as a piece of cloth has threads only for its essence, and yet people speak of the piece of cloth as though it were independent of the threads, it is this Brahman or Pure Being alone which is the essence of the whole universe, and yet people talk of the universe as though it had an independent existence of its own.

(3) Tat Satyam :- Brahman as Pure Being alone is real. The word real in common life, means that which is known through some valid means of knowledge and has some practical efficiency. Water is said to be real, for instance, inasmuch as it moistens our cloth and quenches our thirst. But strictly speaking, this is no test of reality. Things seen in a dream may satisfy this test during the experience of that state, but we all know that their reality is sublated as soon as we awake. A better criterion of reality, therefore, would be that a thing should be considered to be real only when our idea of its ascertained nature, is never likely to be cancelled. More of this anon.

(4) Sa Ātmā :- This Brahman alone is the (real) Atman. The word 'Atman' in Sanskrit means the Self. That which one considers to be one's self and designated by the word 'I' in common life, is scarcely ascertained definitely, though it is the one thing of which one is quite sure. The body, anyone of the senses,
the mind and the intellect, are each imagined to be and spoken of, as one's self, the 'I' so called, as the occasion may arise. The Upanishads declare that the real I or the Atman which eludes our grasp, is common to all creatures and that is Brahman alone.

(5) *Tat tvam asi*. 'That thou art'. This is the last word of the Upanishads. This 'I' of which we are so sure and yet unable to spot out, is the only Reality which underlies all phenomena as well as the innumerable selves felt or imagined, and it is that alone that each one of us really identifies ourself with. It is the only 'One without a second', the 'Advaitam' as it is called in the Upanishads.

(6) This Atman is ultimately described as 'स एव नेतिनेत्यात्मा' (*śa āṁśa netin etyātmā*), the Self which is so free from every specific feature that no concept can comprehend it, and so no word or sentence can express it. Yet it is the only entity that is undeniable, for any one that would be the denier would himself be essentially That.
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11. All the six cardinal teachings of the Upanishads enumerated in the previous section might be summed up in the short and pithy epithets usually assigned to the unique wisdom contained in the Upanishads. The following are some of those epithets:

(1) **Brahma-Vidya**, Wisdom concerning the Supreme Entity; (2) **Adhyatma-Vidya**, Wisdom of intuiting the all-pervading, all-comprehensive, all-enjoying, all-extensive Reality; (3) **Atmaikatva-Vidya**, Wisdom of intuiting the Unity of Atman; (4) **Brahmatmaikatva-Vidya**, Wisdom of intuiting the unity of the Infinity and the Self in one; (5) **Bhūma-Vidya**, Wisdom of intuiting the absolutely Infinite Reality.

12. The Upanishads heap up the highest encomiums upon this unique knowledge of Brahman:

(1) ब्रह्मविद्याय मा विद्वान् \( \text{ये} \) बोव \( \text{निहितं} \) गुढ्यां \( \text{परे} \) \( \text{व्योमनु} \)। सोऽन्नु \( \text{सर्वान्नु कामानु} \) \( \text{सह} \)। \( \text{ब्रह्मण्या} \) विपर्यते \\( \text{तै} \)। 2-१।

"The knower of Brahman attains the highest."
Tai. 2-1

(2) सत्यं ज्ञानमयं ब्रह्म। \( \text{ये} \) वेद \( \text{निहितं} \) गुढ्यां \( \text{परे} \) \( \text{व्योमनु} \)। सोऽन्नु \( \text{सर्वान्नु कामानु} \) \( \text{सह} \)। \( \text{ब्रह्मण्या} \) विपर्यते \\( \text{तै} \)। 2-२।

"Whoever knows Brahman - Reality, Consciousness, and Infinity as hidden in the highest \( \text{काश्चा} \) in the recess of the heart, he accomplishes all the desires simultaneously as the all-wise Brahman."
Tai. 2-1.

(3) तदुक्तमृषिणा - \( \text{गर्भं} \) \( \text{नु} \) \( \text{सत्यन्वेषाम्बेदमहं} \) \( \text{देवानां} \) \( \text{जनिमानि} \) \( \text{विश्वा} \)। \( \text{शातं} \) \( \text{मा} \) \( \text{पुर} \) \( \text{आध्यायनश्च} \) \( \text{ज्ञेयो} \) \( \text{ज्ञवसा} \) \( \text{निर्दीयमिति} \), \( \text{गर्भं} \) \( \text{एवेत} \) \( \text{च्यायानो} \) \( \text{बामदेव} \) \( \text{एकःमुक्ताच} \)। ए० २०।

"Whoever knows Brahman - Reality, Consciousness, and Infinity as hidden in the highest \( \text{काश्चा} \) in the recess of the heart, he accomplishes all the desires simultaneously as the all-wise Brahman."
Atharva 2-6.
"This has been said by the Rshi (mantra): 'While in the womb I have known all the births of these gods. A hundred iron fortresses guarded me. (Like) a hawk, I have come out of them swiftly. Vamadeva proclaimed thus even while he was in his mother's womb!"  

(4) यो या एतामेवं बेदापहत्य पापमानमंनते स्वर्गं लोके ज्ञेयं प्रतितियवतप्रतिनिधित्वतिः  

"Whoever knows this (wisdom) thus, destroys sin and establishes himself in the infinite greater Heavenly World (i.e. Brahman)."

(5) मृत्युवृत्ताना नवविकेतोग्यत हिक्या विधामतः योगविपिंदियु कुतसम्  

"Then Naciketa got this wisdom and also the entire technique of the Yoga imparted by (the God of) Death, and having attained Brahman, became free from the taint of birth and death. So does anyone else also who knows it exclusively as pertaining to the Atman (inward Self)."

(6) स ब्रह्मविदा सर्वविद्याप्रतिष्ठामथर्वाय ज्ञेष्टुश्रुत्राय प्राहः  

"He (Hiranyagarbha) told the Brahma-Vidyā the goal (or refuge) of all the branches of knowledge, to his oldest son Ātharvan."

(7) स यो है तत्तत्वमेव ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मविद्वतः भविति । नायायान्वितलमेव तु कुले  

"Whoever indeed, knows that Highest Brahman, becomes that very Brahman. No one in his family, is born who is not a knower of Brahman. He crosses grief, crosses sin and is freed from the knots of the heart, and becomes immortal."

(8) बिज्ञानात्मा सह देवेश्व सर्वः प्राणा भूतानि संप्रतिद्वित्यं खर । तत्करं  

"My dear young man, whoever knows that Akshara (imperishable Brahman) into which the knowing self (Jīva) along
with the *Devas* (gods), the senses and the primary elements enter, that omniscient one enters into everything."

Pr. 4-11.

"It is only so much. I know this Supreme Brahman. There is nothing beyond this."

Pr. 6-7.

"Even now, whoever knows this in this manner in the form 'I am Brahman', he becomes all this (universe). Even the gods are not able to prevent him from becoming so, for he will have become their very self."

Br. 1-4-10.

"Now this same pervading, unborn, Atman, is the undecaying, undying, immortal, fearless Brahman; Brahman is well known to be fearless; one who knows it thus, becomes verily that fearless Brahman itself."

Br. 4-4-25.

"One who sees thus, indeed thinks thus, and understands thus delights in Atman, sports in Atman, rejoices in the company of Atman and finds the highest bliss in Atman, he becomes his own king; his movements in all the worlds would be just according to his will and pleasure. As for others who know it otherwise, they have others to rule over them, they attain perishable worlds and will have no unobstructed movement in any of the worlds."

Ch. 7-25-2.

13. Brahman or Reality is the All. This is the one theme which the Upanishadic seers have dealt with.
Reality has been given many names, but it can never be contrasted with unreality as second to it. Reality knows absolutely nothing beside it. Hence it is called 'Advaitam'. This word should never be considered either as the absence of duality or a something other than or opposed to duality. Advaitam means the All, the whole, where the 'all' does not imply quantity or number, and the 'whole' does not imply some parts or a number of individual things bundled up.

14. The following extracts would illustrate the uniformity with which the Upanishads sing the praise of this glorious truth again and again:

(1) ईशा बास्यमिदं सर्वं यत्किचं जगत्यां जगत्।

"All this, whatever phenomenon there is in this world, should be covered up by this Lord." Iṣa. 1.

[This is an exhortative statement of truth. If one is an earnest seeker, what appears to be the universe, would be realized to be really Brahman itself. 'ईशा' (by the Lord) should not be interpreted to refer to the theological God who is apart from the world. As will be seen later on, Brahman and Īśvara are convertible terms in the Upanishads.]

(2) ब्रह्मेद्वेदममूतं पुरस्ताद्र ब्रह्म पञ्चात् ब्रह्म दक्षिणतयज्ञकरणं।

अपथुर्यां च प्रसूतं ब्रह्मेद्वेदं विद्वामिदं वरिष्यम्॥

"Whatever there is in front of us, is Brahman the immortal alone; that which is behind is Brahman alone; towards the right and the left, is Brahman alone. What is spread out below and above, is Brahman alone. All this is Brahman the best (all-pervasive)."

Mu. 2-2-12.

(3) एष्य ब्रह्मेश इन्द्र एष्य प्रजापतिति सर्वं देवा इमानि च पञ्च भद्रूमूतानि

पृथिवी बायुराकाश आयो ज्योतिष्णौतानीमानि च श्रुद्धिमिश्रणिव।

बींजानी तराणि चेतराणि चाण्डजानि च जार्जानि च स्वेद्यानि चोज्ञवानि
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This Brahma, this Indra, this Prajapati, all these gods, these five gross elements, viz., earth, air, ether, water and fire - all these creatures small and minute, the seeds (of evolution) the egg-born, womb-born, sweat-born and sprout-born, - horses, cows, men, elephants and whatever creatures moving or flying about and that which is fixed (plants etc.), all that is guided by Consciousness, takes its stand in Consciousness. All the world is Consciousness-eyed. Consciousness is the support (of all), Consciousness is Brahman."

(8) यो वै भूमा तत्सुखं नाल्ये सुरक्षमस्तीति II
"The Infinite is bliss; there is no bliss in the finite."
Ch.7-23-1.

(6) यत्र नान्यत्पसयति नान्यच्छृंणोति नान्यन्त्रित्ज्ञानति स भूमास्थ यज्ञन्तियत्यत्यन्त्यच्छृंणोत्तप्त人力िज्ञानति तदलयं यो वै भूमा तदमृतमथ यदलयं तन्मयैः भगव: कस्मिनु प्रतिशिष्ट इति स्वे महिद्धि यदि वा न महिद्धीति II
"Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, knows nothing else - that is the Infinite. Where one sees something else, hears something else and knows something else - that is the finite. What is Infinite, indeed, that is immortal; that which is finite is mortal."

"In what sir, is He (the Infinite) established?
In His own glory, or rather, not even in (His) glory."
Ch. 7-24-1.

(6) अयात आत्मादेः एव आत्मावन्धसतात्मोपिरशादात्मा परशादात्मा
"Now, therefore, the teaching by Atman himself: Atman alone is below, Atman alone above, Atman alone to the right, Atman alone to the left, Atman alone, is all this."
Ch. 7-25-2.
"All this is essentially this Atman."

"All this is Purusha alone."

[Brahman is called Purusha here.]

"Know that Purusha worthy of being known, in whom (all) the Kalas (parts) are fixed like spokes in the hub of a wheel; so that death may not harm you."

"All this is the Purusha, all that which has passed and that which is to happen in the future."

"All this is pervaded by that Purusha."

15. But what is the standard by which we are to judge this teaching about Atman? And what shall be the thought-position of the person who judges the universe? This is fundamental to an enquiry of the system that can be derived from the study of the Upanishads. The external world alone as we perceive, conceive or imagine it, would be our universe if we confined ourselves to the senses as our standard, and the study of life, sensation and mental phenomena, would be mostly limited to the inferred phenomena bearing that name, besides excluding the conceiving mind as well as its owner whoever it be. And if a person were to include himself together with his own mental phenomena also in this whole, his method of enquiry would have to rely upon reason based upon a study of his own mind also. This would of course be fairer, for
any philosophy that deserves the name ought to find out a concept based upon an assessment and consideration of the worth of all the phases of life. But even then he would be reckoning without the host. What is the real nature of the philosopher, and with which standard has he to measure or weigh this whole before coming to a final conclusion? That is the crux that we are faced with here. When we take the little I that each one of us is aware of within one's self, the infinite number of such individual selves that we deal with or infer, present a challenging enigma, neither to be dismissed as mere appearances like unto those of a dream, nor to be accepted as convincingly real entities like our own self of which we are so proud. This limited self in us, moreover, cannot be directly observed and studied like the perceptible phenomena nor immediately felt like the psychic phenomena such as our emotions or ideas. All the same, our intellect is able to reason about this to arrive at the conclusion that would help us to infer the character of other minds and their owners. This conscious individual subject as opposed to the knowable objects, is what has been called the 'ego' in metaphysics; but Atman or the real I in us, is quite distinct from the ego according to the Upanishads. Śaṅkara writes thus in his Śūtra-Bhāṣya concerning this distinction:


(Objection :-) Atman being the object of the concept I, cannot be rightly claimed to be known exclusively in the Upanishads alone.
Not so, for we have refuted this view by pointing to the Witness thereof. (To explain :-) As other than the agent (of actions) who is the object of the I-concept, the Witness thereof who is in all beings, one and the same, changelessly eternal Purusha, the Self of everyone, has never been ascertained by anyone through the portion of the Vedas dealing with injunctions (of religious works) or through the Śāstras of speculators. Hence He cannot be denied by anybody." SBh. 1-1-4, p. 20.

16. Śaṅkara is here referring to the well-known text from the Svetāsvatara Upanishad:

एको देवः सर्वभूतात्मा, सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा।
कर्मध्येयकः सर्वभूतात्मिकः: साश्च चेता केवलो निर्गुणात्मकः॥

"There is one Deva (the self-shining entity) hid in all creatures, all-pervading, the inmost Self of all beings, the Superintendent of all actions, residing in all beings, the Witness, the Conscious Principle, non-dual, and attributeless." Śve. 6-11.

Here is the unique teaching of the Upanishads that Isvara or Divinity is the Witnessing Self of each and every being and therefore in no need of any proof for his existence. Atman directly intuits Himself by Himself and is His own proof. Not only this; being the very essence of intuition, it is through His light of consciousness alone that men and other creatures go through every transaction of their life:

आत्मनेवायं ज्योतिषानिःस्ते पत्ययते कर्म कुञ्जुते विपल्येतीति॥

"It is with the help of the light of Atman alone that this man sits, moves about, does actions and returns." Br. 4-3-6.

17. Intuition, then, is the ultimate standard by which we have to judge. There is nothing beyond it and there is nothing which does not come within its
purview. The perceiver, perception and the percepts; the conceiver, conception and the concepts; the feeler, feeling and the objects felt; the subject willing, the act of willing and the acts willed; the experiencer, experience and the objects experienced - all these are comprehended within its embrace.

We have to see in the sequel how this grand truth is taught here by the Upanishads for the benefit of those who are not able to understand it as soon as it is mentioned.
4. THE METHOD

18. There are two ways of looking at the universe. One is from the stand-point of the senses, the mind and the intellect. This is the partial view of the common man and is known as the लोक-दृष्टि (the view of common sense), or व्यावहारिक-दृष्टि (the practical view of human procedure). This view is also called the empirical view, because mostly it relies on observation and experiment. Though useful for practical purposes, it restricts itself, as we have already seen, only to a part of the universe. The other view is known as the सास्त्र-दृष्टि (the view-point of the Vedanta Śāstra or the Upanishads), or परमार्थ दृष्टि (really real) because it covers the whole of Reality.

The Upanishads employ both these views when they attempt to enlighten the seekers of truth, the view chosen depending on the level of the intellect of the particular seeker. And as these compositions are not systematical treatises containing logically arranged reasoned thoughts, but only records of the effusions of the Ṛshis to express their various spiritual experiences just as they occured and came up to their minds, it is often difficult for the beginner to decide which point of view they are adopting on a particular occasion.

19. Besides, the Reality taught by the Upanishads being unobjectifiable by word or thought, words used in common parlance or in the other systems which do not recognize the distinction of the two view-
points referred to above, are used in special senses to suggest certain ideas peculiar to Vedanta exclusively, and therefore it becomes very necessary to determine the meaning of such words as used in the Upanishads.

20. Moreover the language and style of the Upanishads has to be studied before we determine the nature of their teaching. Universal truths are often couched in the form of narratives in order to contrast them with empirical notions. Instead of logical propositions and sustained arguments, dialogues, debates and discussions are frequently utilized for the purpose of leading the enquirer to the deeper truths which have to be verified or to be gradually arrived at by reasoning based on partial intuitions. Mnemonic formulae, symbols and fanciful derivations, are freely used, which the unwary reader is likely to pass over lightly or misinterpret unless his attention is drawn to it by a teacher.

21. The most important technique employed here, is necessitated by the nature of Brahman which is strictly absolute, that is unrestricted by and unrelated to anything else. This is not because its nature is such that nothing else can contact it, but because it is the All and there is absolutely nothing else beside it which can restrict, qualify or modify it or can be related to it; or even compared or contrasted with it. It is

निष्कर्ष निभं शान्तं निरवचं निरस्त्रवन्म।

"Without parts, without activity or change, undisturbed, free from all defects, untainted."

Śvet. 6-19.

The Absolute can neither be described by words nor conceived through thought-forms. In fact, there
are neither words nor things to be expressed by words; neither thoughts nor objects to be thought of, beside it. The so-called empirical world of words and thoughts along with their objects, does not exist apart from it. It is in fact an appearance essentially one with the Absolute. The Upanishads do not dogmatically assert or presuppose the existence of Reality and then undertake to prove it by specious arguments as some theological systems propose to do. They have no postulate to defend as against any postulate of other schools of philosophy. Nor do they utilize any critique of reason to defeat and show the hollowness of all rational systems. As the Kathaka Upanishad declares, Reality has to be known through intuition which is universal; and this intuition dawns or manifests itself as soon as one knowing it, suggests it to the qualified seeker:

नैपा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेषः ||

"This knowledge is neither attained (nor refuted) by speculative reason or debate. It is easily intuited my dearest boy, when taught by some one other than a speculator." Ka. 2-9.

Nor do the Upanishads rely on Pramāṇas (valid means of right knowledge); for Brahman as has been already seen, lies beyond the sphere of the senses and the mind. Brahman as the Self of all, is self evident and is in no need of any canon of evidence. In this predicament, the Upanishads have devised a means of teaching this Absolute Reality which, as It is, can neither be taught or caught through any empirical means. This is the use of the method known by the name of Adhyatmopāvadā Nyāya.

22. This Nyāya works in two steps. The first step is the use of words expressing objects to indicate
Reality by negating the opposite significance. For instance in the sentence

सत्यं ज्ञानमन्न्तं ब्रह्मः | यो वेद निन्हितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन्। सोऽशुरे सर्वानु कामानू सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चितेति।।

'The one who knows Brahman as Reality, Consciousness and Infinity as placed in the cave of this subtlest Akasha, he attains all desires simultaneously, as the All-knowing Brahman.' Tai. 2-1.

The words Reality, Consciousness and Infinity suggest Brahman here by negating what is unreal, unconscious and finite respectively. By the collocation of these words, we are told that Brahman is of the nature of 'Infinite Reality and Consciousness' and since it is the Atman or the Self of each one of us, we can conclude that the Śruti requires us to know that our real Self is Brahman of this nature. Thus while the words retain their significance they exclude all that is unreal, insentient and finite; and since they refer to our very self, the proposition seeks to convey the idea that our finite individual self, which is sometimes conscious and sometimes unconscious, is not meant here but only the true Atman the Witnessing Principle that is the self of each one of us, is Brahman, and that the Highest Reality is Infinity and Consciousness in one.

23. The second step of the Adhyārōpāpaṇāda Nyāya is to superimpose some property deliberately on Brahman and from that stand-point to negate what is more obviously seen not to pertain to it. And when this negation has achieved its object, the original ascription is itself rescinded by assuming the thought position of another superimposition which enables us to see it through.
It must never be forgotten that Brahman or Reality according to the Upanishads, is not something other than what we conceive as this familiar world. It is the only reality of this apparent world. Only, the human mind has a natural inveterate tendency to project and regard this phenomenal world alone as real, and to consider it as a bundle of real and unreal things. The Upanishads take advantage of this tendency called Avidyā (Ignorance), and taking an apparently real thing for the really real for the time-being, discard some other thing, the obviously unreal as unreal, and then reject the reality of the apparently real also by assuming something else to be really real. Thus, according to this method, the apparently real becomes a means to determine the really real, while all the while the method keeps in mind that Brahman alone is the one absolutely real entity.

We may illustrate this by means of an example taken from the Chāndogya Upanishad:

यथा सोम्येकेन मृत्तिकेण सर्बं मृत्तिकं विज्ञातं स्वाभाविकं चित्वारो
नामधेयं मृत्तिकेकेयं सत्यम् ॥

"This is just as, my dear boy, by means of one lump of clay known, all that is made up of clay would become known; the effect is merely a play of words and that it is all clay, is the only truth," Ch. 6-1-4.

Here clay being taken to be the material cause of all things made of clay, is shown to be the only real substrate underlying all the effects such as a pot or pitcher which are also considered to be real on account of their causal efficiency. As a matter of fact it is only clay that gets so many names owing to different sizes and uses to which these earthen-ware are put.
Here apparently clay is taken to be real, relatively to the vessels, but when taken to be an effect it becomes in its turn a mere play of words. Śankara in his commentary on the Gītā, says:

यथा प्रतिदिनसंस्थानं चतुष्या निरूप्यमाणं मूर्त्तिरितिरिक्ताणानुपलब्ध्यं तथा सब्री विकारः कारणाव्यतिरिक्ताणानुपलब्ध्यं।

"Just as the form of an earthen pot being examined with the eye, is not seen apart from clay and is therefore unreal, so also every effect is unreal because it is not known to be distinct from its cause."

GBh. 2-16.

[Evidently the reality assumed of clay is only relative to the effect pot etc., but, relative to its own cause, clay is also unreal. This is the _Apavāda_ of the reality of clay.]

This example from the empirical world is used in the Upanishads to draw the conclusion that the world having Brahman for its cause, is unreal because it is not known to exist apart from Brahman or Atman. The causal relation between Brahman and the world of course is another _'adhyārōpa_" (deliberate superimposition to be abrogated later on), the truth being that Brahman alone is absolutely real.

24. This is the technique of the method used by the Upanishads when they intend to take the enquirer from the known empirical world to the unknown Brahman. But when that becomes known as it actually is, when Brahman is not an object at all, when one knows it, or rather intuits it directly without any medium at all, how should one express the nature of Reality? Here is the answer in a _Sruti_ quoted in the Sūtra-Bhāshya:

बायः च बायः: पृथः: सम्बवंचनेत्रेऽव्व्रह: प्रोऽवाचवेति श्रूयाते—स हृतान्तराधिहि भो इति स सूत्ता वर्ण तं ह द्वितीये वा तृतीये वा वचन उवाच ब्रूमः.
25. The best way of expressing one's direct intuition is silence. This is what is meant by all negating texts such as 'स एव नेतिनेतात्मा' (not this, not that) (Br. 3-9-26), 'अस्थूलमनवहस्मस्वमदीर्घमोऽहितमस्मिस्मृ ...' 'Neither gross nor subtle, neither short nor long, not red, not viscid' (Br. 3-8-8). The negation of some property does not necessarily mean the absence of, or something different from or opposed to what is denied. 'Neti neti' (not this, not that) denies everything possibly conceivable. Does not this sweeping, absolute negation lead us to the absurd position of denying even the act of denying and, what is more serious, to the denial of even the denier himself? This repugnant conclusion and absurdity would certainly follow, if we restricted ourselves to the language and thought of empirical life. But here, only the apparent reality of everything phenomenal is negated and not the transcendental ground on which everything phenomenal is superimposed. Even when everything else is negated, the real Reality remains untouched by the negation, because by intuition we know that everything phenomenal is really Brahman which is beyond all language and thought and therefore cannot be affirmed nor negated. Denial of everything is only the
other way of saying that silence is the best way of describing Reality. Accordingly Śaṅkara in his Sūtra-Bhāshya writes:

"There is no appropriate way of describing (It) other than this, hence 'not this, not that'. (To explain:) For, indeed, there is no description of Brahman other than the negation of the phenomenal manifold."

SBh. 3-2-22, p. 366.
5. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD
(Agama and Reason)

26. The application of the method has to be considered now. This will illustrate how Vedanta utilizes the distinction of the empirical and the transcendental standpoints in its procedure to convince the inquirer that Brahman is the only ultimate Reality, and that the epistemological and ontological facts are not affected in the least in spite of the Vedantic teaching that Brahman or Atman is the only Reality.

27. Does Vedanta accept the Pramāṇas, valid sources of right knowledge? This question does not arise here because pramāṇas are accepted only by those who are dealing with objects of empirical knowledge and Vedanta is not interested in proving or disproving the reality of the objects or disputing the nature, number, or validity of the pramāṇas. The empirical world as it appears to all, is accepted only as a device to lead the seeker to the really real Brahman and then where the non-dual Atman alone is intuited, the pramāṇas as well as all phenomena, will have become one with Reality. As the Śruti says:

"Where there is duality, as it were, there one sees another ....... there one knows another. But when everything has become Atman alone, then whom could one see and with what ...... then whom could one know and with what?"  

Br. 4-5-15.
28. A difficulty may rear up its head here. If Pramāṇas are discarded altogether, how is the seeker to know the Reality? He would have no means of knowledge at all, and Vedanta would lose its vocation if even the Upanishads were discarded as a source of knowledge! And how could a Vedantin undertake to refute the position of the other schools of thought if the principles of logic or the Pramāṇas were not accepted at all?

This difficulty is founded more on fancy than on facts. For we have already stated that Vedanta is not interested in defending or disputing the validity of the Pramāṇas. The Upanishads only suggest the nature of Reality to the enquirer, and the fully qualified seeker of truth at once intuits his own Self to be that Reality. In this sense, the Upanishads are a means of knowledge before the intuition, inasmuch as they remind the enquirer that there is no distinction of the knower, means of knowledge and the known in the Absolute or Atman, and no distinction of teacher and the taught (तत्केन के विज्ञानीयतुः तत्केन कम्भिवदेत). In the Reality itself, the Atman Absolute intuited as such, there is absolutely no place for perception and other Pramāṇas or even for the Vedas (तत्केन के परशेतु बृ. २-५-१४ ; वेदा अवेदा बृ. ४-३-२२), nor is there any need for any revealer for the self-resplendent Atman (प्रह्वन तेज एव बृ. ४-५-१६).

29. Śaṅkara thus explains how the unobjectifiable Brahman is known through the Upanishads which are considered to be a 'Pramāṇa' for it:

अविषयत्वे प्रह्वणः शास्त्रमोनित्वातुपपतिरिति चतुः। न। अवियाक्षितमेदनिगृहितपर्यत्वचतुश्चाख्यतः। न हि शास्त्रमूद्धत्वम विषयभूतं प्रह्व प्रतिपादयिष्टिः,
30. The 'Upanishads, the Bhagavad Gītā and the Brahma-Sūtras are the three classical reservoirs of Vedantic knowledge. These three sources approach the subject from three different angles and open up different vistas of study. The Upanishads are the original and perennial sources of the eternal truths of Vedanta and should be studied reverently. Their teachings have to be assimilated not through faith and belief, but verifying each revelation by an appeal to direct intuition and reason based upon intuition. Faith and belief may also be required in the case of Upanishadic teachings regarding Upāsanās or meditations. That is why Śaṅkara writes in his Sūtra-Bhashya:

"In the enquiry into the nature of Brahman, it is not merely Śrutis etc. alone that are the valid means of knowledge, as is the case in the enquiry into the nature of Dharma (religious duty), but also Śrutis etc. and direct intuition and the like are here the valid means according to the applicability of these. For knowledge of
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Brahman has to culminate in intuition, and relates to an existent entity."

SBh. 1-1-2, p. 8.

[While meditation is only a mental act not in need of direct intuition, knowledge relates to an entity immediately to be known, and therefore demands immediate intuition.]

31. ‘अनुभवाद्यथा’ (intuition etc. also), प्रमाणम् (means of knowledge) - The meaning of this sentence should be carefully noted. Partial intuitions such as those of waking, dream and deepsleep- are the means, and the final intuition of the secondless Atman is the resultant knowledge; 'etc' here refers to reason based upon intuition also as will be seen presently. Brahman being a self-existent entity, demands not only immediate intuition, but in the case of persons who may be beset with doubts and misconceptions, a suitable course of reasoning also. That is why Śaṅkara observes as follows:

(१) सत्सु तु वेदान्तवाक्येण जगतो जन्मादिकारणवादिशु तदर्थग्रहण- 
दायित्वात्मानमध्यिः वेदान्तवाक्यायिरीपिः प्रमाणं भवति निवायिति।

While, however, there are the texts teaching the cause of the origination etc. of the universe, inference also not in conflict with the Vedanta texts may become a valid means of knowledge, and as such it is not ruled out, since it serves the purpose of stabilizing the grasp of the meaning of those texts, inasmuch as the Śruti itself has admitted reasoning as an aid (to it). For instance, the Śruti 'Atman is to be heard about, to be reflected on' (Br. 2-4-5), as also (the text) 'Well informed, and shrewd, he would reach the country of the Gāndhāras itself; so also here, one who has an adept teacher knows the truth' (Ch. 6-14-2) shows the need of human intelligence as an aid to it."

SBh. 1-1-2, p. 8.

The reader should be careful to note that the phrases अनुभवाद्यथा (inference also) and प्रमाणम् (when
it becomes a means of valid knowledge) are used in special senses, and not in their usual senses of 'syllogistic inference' and 'immediate means of right knowledge'. This is quite in fitting with the technique used by the Upanishads. 'Purusha Buddhi' (human intelligence) refers to the intelligence of both the teacher and the taught. The disciple has to use his intelligence in grasping the teaching as well as in following it up with his personal reasoning in getting his doubts cleared by the teacher. And the teacher has to simplify the statements of the Šruti. Both will have to use reasoning on the lines indicated by the Šruti and never in conflict with it.

That the inference refers to Vedantic reasoning alone is expressly stated in the following extract from Śaṅkara's Sūtra-Bhāṣya:

(२) यद्यपि अवधव्यतिरिक्तेऽण मनं विद्धचढन्ते एव तर्कमणार्तर्यं दर्शयतीत्युत्तमं, नामेन मिलेन शुष्कतर्कस्या ग्रान्तिमात्रां प्राप्तिः; संभवति; शुर्यनुगृहीत एव हत्र तर्कादुःस्मावाचत्वेनाश्रयते ॥

"As for the other argument that the Šruti itself, enjoining reflection in addition to hearing or the study of Šruti, shows that reason also is to be respected, we reply:- Dry reasoning can find no admittance here on the strength of this plea. For, reasoning proffered by the Šruti alone is resorted to here as ancillary to intuition."

SBh. 2-1-6, p. 188.

(३) इत्यत ् नागमगम्येऽदेहये केवलेन तर्केण प्रस्त्वस्यात्त्वम्। यस्मात् निरागमाव: पुरुषोत्स्वाभासामत्रात्लिनिचन्दनानास्तत्त्वः अन्तर्जित्तिता भवनि, उत्तेश्या निर्दुःस्तत्त्वः ॥

"For this reason also, one should not stand up against what is to be known exclusively by the Agama (traditional teaching of the Šruti; for, reasonings which are the outcome of mere surmises without any Agama for basis, would be inconclusive; since a surmise has nothing to check it."

SBh. 2-1-10, p. 196.
We have already observed that being devoid of colour (or form) etc., this entity is no object of perception, and being devoid of the grounds etc., it is not an object of logical inference and other valid means of knowledge."

S Bh. 2-1-11, p. 193.

32. The Bhagavadgita is called by the name of the S m i t i - P r a s t h ā n a in contrast with the Śrūtis which are called the Ś r u t i - P r a s t h ā n a and the Brahma-
Sūtras known by the name of the ' Nyāya - P r a s t h ā n a '. Although these titles of the works are not to be found expressly employed by Śaṅkara, they are significant of the different ways of approach adopted by them severally and so quite appropriate. The Śrūtis (literally 'what are heard') are never referred to as records, scriptures or compositions of any particular great personages. They are only 'heard' and known by the disciples from the teachings of their masters and the truths they inculcate never depend upon the authority of the Rshis who are sometimes mentioned in them, Thus:

\begin{quote}
(१) अन्यदेवादुत्तविषया अन्यदाहुत्तविषया ।
इति वर्णम धीराणां ये नस्त्रदेविचन्द्रसिः ॥ १
\end{quote}

1. The commentary on theĪsopanishad (Kāṇva), attributed to Śaṅkara, understands by the terms Vidyā and Avidyā, Upāsana and Karma respectively, while the commentary on the Gaudapāda-Kārikā, with reference to the verse Vidyānta avidyānta takes 'Vidyā' to mean knowledge evidently preferring the Mādhyandina version of the Upanishad. This difference of interpretation of the same mantra by the same author, demands some research work on the part of scholars.
"One result, they say, is obtained with the aid of Vidyā, and another, they say, is obtained with the aid of Avidyā. So we have heard the saying of the wise ones who have explained it to us."

Iṣa. 10.

(२) अन्येदेव तद्विदिताद्योपविदितादधि।
इति शुद्धुम पूर्वैयां ये नस्तव्यासाचक्ष्यिए॥

"It is altogether other than the known, and it is beyond the unknown. Thus have we heard our predecessors who explained it to us."

Ke. १-४.

(३) न तस्य कार्य करणं च विषयं न तत्समध्यधिक्षक्षे पद्यते।
परास्य शक्तिमित्रित्रिष्ठृतं श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानविक्रिया च॥ भे. ६-४।

"He has neither body nor any organ of sense; nobody is seen either equal or superior to Him. His supreme power is heard to be diverse as also His natural knowledge, strength and action." Sve. ६-८।

Even the Rṣhis are said to have received the Śrutis by means of their good deeds and acts of discipline but not to have themselves composed the texts:

(४) यज्ञः ब्राह्मणः पद्मीयमायनं तामन्त्वविक्षदन्तू ऋषिषु प्रविष्टाम्॥

"By the act of worship, they got the fitness to receive the Veda, and that word they received as it had entered into the Rṣhis."

Rig. १०-७१-३।

(५) युगान्तेऽन्त्येष्ठितान् वेदान्तू सेवितासानू महर्षयः।
लेभिरे तपसा पूर्वमनुज्ञातां: स्वयम्भुवा॥

"The Maharshis (great seers) got the Vedas which together with Itihāsas had disappeared at the end of the last cycle, by virtue of penance, with the permission of the Self-manifested One."

Mo. Dh. २१०-१९।

The Bhagavadgītā on the other hand, is the work of the revered Vyāsa:

तत्थर्मेन भगवता यथोपदिष्टं वेदव्यासं: सर्वज्ञो भगवानू गीतास्यः समभि: 
शोकशतेशपनिवन्ध॥

गी. भा. अव।
"That (two-fold) Dharma, just as it was taught by the Lord, the omniscient and revered Veda-Vyāsa incorporated in a treatise in the form of seven hundred ślokas called the Gītās."

GBh. Intro.

Hence being the composition of a human being, although a great (almost omniscient) Rṣi, the Gītās or verses composed by Vyāsa as far as he could remember the teaching, have been together called a Smṛti, just like the Manusmṛti or even the Vīshṇupurāṇa, from which Sāṅkara has frequently quoted in his Śruti-Bhāṣya. This work forming the Smṛti-Prasthāna, is only second in rank to the Śruti-Prasthāna, and it has to be interpreted so as to harmonize with Upanishadic teaching.

33. The Brahma-Sūtras popularly so-called comprise what is called the Śārīraka-Mīmāṁsā Śāstra (The Śāstra devoted to the sacred enquiry into the real nature of the embodied self or Jīva), or the Vēdānta-Mīmāṁsā Śāstra (The Śāstra devoted to the sacred enquiry into the meaning of the Vedantas or the Upanishads). This constitutes, as we have already noticed, what is known as the Nyāya-Prasthāna, because it treats of the Nyāyas or principles governing the interpretation of the Vedanta texts. If the Gītā is a Smṛti Prasthāna, aiming at an exposition of Vedanta and placing before us the application of the teaching to practical life, the Śārīraka-Mīmāṁsā is a systematic exegesis both adopting the principles of the Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā (the previous exposition of the Karmakanda) and supplementing them and evolving a new set of principles that are specially needed in understanding the meaning of Upanishadic texts that reveal the nature of Brahman which has to be known only
34. Brahman is technically Āgama-gamyā (known through the Āgama) especially because it has to be intuited with the help of the only right way of interpretation handed down by a succession of traditional teachers and disciples. To this day, the orthodox students of Śaṅkara-Bhāshyas on the Upanishads and the Brahma-Sūtras, solemnly repeat this sentence ‘ॐ नमो ब्रह्मारिष्यो व्रह्मचिवात्रापायन्तो यो कार्मिको महायो नमो गुरूः’ to remind themselves that the traditional method of interpretation alone is being strictly followed in understanding the genuine Vedanta. This is of course liable to degenerate into a platitude, but nevertheless is pregnant with meaningful consequences when all its implications are borne in mind. The Kāṭhakōpanishad warns us thus:

नैपा तर्केण मतिरोपनेता प्रोक्ततांयेत्रेव सुह्वनाय प्रेषः।

"This knowledge is not acquired (or refuted by) speculation; Only when taught by another, it becomes easily intelligible, O my dear boy."

Ka. 2-9.

Śaṅkara explains this as follows:

अत एवं च येयमामाम्बुता मतिः, तार्किकाद्वयेत्रेव आगमाभिज्ञेन
आत्मार्ज्जेव प्रोक्ता सती सुह्वनाय भवति।

"And that is why this knowledge arising out of Vedic teaching, conduces to effective conviction only when taught by another, one other than a mere speculator, one who is specially proficient in Āgama."

Ka. Bh. 2-9, p. 72.

35. Before concluding, we wish to repeat that only Āgama, the tradition which recognizes reason based upon intuition and leads the seeker to universal
intuition of Atman, is the genuine Pramāṇa here and the so-called Pramāṇas or valid means of right knowledge, while they have their place in the empirical field, are really Avidyā (ignorance) so far as the transcendental truth about Atman is concerned.

It is sometimes supposed that the Vedantic Avidyā is a mere doctrine formulated to explain the appearance of difference and manifoldness. That this is a hasty judgment, can be readily seen by any critical enquirer who cares to bestow the close attention which it deserves, on the Adhyāśa Bhāṣya. For the present it will quite suffice to examine the following excerpt from that Introduction:

कर्म पुनर्विद्याविनियमणि प्रत्येकादिनि प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि चेति ? उच्चे-द्वेष्टिनिर्देशिताद्विभीमायामाणनिर्दद्धसंगविषयस्य प्रामाण्यवृत्तिकुप्पति:। न हीननिर्देशित्यनुपादाय प्रत्येकादिनिविनियमानिव भवहारः। संवेदन्ति। । न चाध्यायमन्तरं रेणनिर्देशितान्य व्यवहारः। संवेदन्ति। । न च चान्द्रयस्तात्वप्रभावेन देहन कथितू व्यापियते। ॥ न च वैदिकोऽंत्याचिन्नसति तस्मात् अविद्याविनियमणेऽव च अत्य: भाति॥

"How, again, are perception and other Pramanās and the Śastras (only) for the man (infected) with ignorance?"

We reply: Inasmuch as one who does not entertain the notion of me and mine with regard to the body, and the senses etc., cannot be reasonably a knower, and hence the means of knowledge cannot reasonably function. (To explain :-) There cannot be any talk of perception and other (means of knowledge) without presupposing the senses. Nor can there be the function of the senses without the body as their resting place; and no one can do any act with the body on which the idea of the self is not superimposed. And there cannot be knowership consistently in the Atman who is intrinsically unattached to anything, unless all
this (the idea of me in the body and the idea of mine in the senses) is assumed. And there can be no functioning of the senses unless there is knowership in the Atman. Therefore, perception and other Pramaṇas, and the Šastras also, are only for the man steeped in ignorance."

And here can be no functioning of the senses unless there is knowership in the Atman. Therefore, perception and other Pramaṇas, and the Šastras also, are only for the man steeped in ignorance."

Adh.Bh.

36. It will be noted that the term Avidyā is used in a special sense in Vedanta and the division of knowledge into Vidyā (right knowledge) and Avidyā (error) in empirical life, remains undisturbed by this transcendental terminology. Vidyā and Avidyā in other systems, refer to empirical knowledge only and that division is unaffected and unchanged until the transcendental knowledge of Atman dawns. The following excerpt from the Gītā-Bhāshya will make this clear:--

"When the true nature of the Atman has been known, there is no longer the convention of the means and the object of knowledge; for, the final means sublates the knowership of Atman too and while sublating it, it becomes itself no Pramāṇa, just as the means of knowledge obtaining in a dream (becomes no Pramāṇa) on waking."

37. Avidyā therefore as a tendency of the mind to mix up the real and the unreal, is a fact, not a theory brought forward just to account for appearances. The distinction of truth and error, as well as of reality and unreality in the empirical sphere, is not denied by Vedanta; for, the division rigorously holds good relatively to that sphere. Only, the division is not absolutely real.
As Śaṅkara rightly observes:

"Therefore all secular and sacred convention is consistent before the dawn of the knowledge of one's being identical with Brahman. Just as to the common man who has fallen asleep and sees all sorts of dream objects, high and low, there arises the notion with a certainty that it is real perception, but never at the time does it occur to him that it is only a semblance of perception, so should this (reality of perception also be regarded)." SBh. 2-1-14, p. 198.

38. The above-mentioned illustration of the distinction of dream and waking, is all right so far as we are concerned with the ascertainment of truth and reality with the help of a concept in waking; but as we shall see later on from another standpoint from which we judge both dream and waking, the latter loses its claim to be in possession of higher truth and reality as compared with dream. And from the standpoint of Absolute Consciousness all distinctions of states and degrees of reality and truth are bereft of any value altogether. With this proviso, we are justified in holding for the present as far as the method of Adhyātma-Pāpa-vāda is concerned, Āgama is the sole Pramāṇa and reason based upon intuition, is the only reason that can be employed to ascertain the nature of Atman (Absolute Reality) as such.

In these pages, the Upanishads, the Bhagavad Gītā and the Brahma-Sūtras, will be used as guides to determine the nature of Reality by Āgama as found in the Upanishads, explained by the Gītā and reasoned out in the Sūtras.
6. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD

(Avidyā and Māyā)

39. We have seen that the one teaching of the Upanishads, is that Reality is the All, the one without a second, and that Reality is called Brahman, greater than the greatest entity, because it is not limited by anything else. It is also called Atman, because it is the real Self of everything and everyone of us. The so called Universe as people understand it, is only an appearance. To think otherwise, is Avidyā (ignorance) and to ascertain this as it is, is Vidyā (wisdom).

40. This way of explaining truth and reality on the basis of the Upanishads, belongs to the tradition of Śaṅkarācārya and Gauḍapādācārya, his grand-preceptor. There have been other schools of Advaitins antecedent and subsequent to Śaṅkara, and even among the followers of Śaṅkara, differences of opinion have sprung up as to what exactly is the genuine interpretation of the Upanishads. These differences have arisen mainly owing to ignoring the Upanishadic method of Adhyārāpāpavāda, which Śaṅkara stresses in his Bhāshya. As it is neither possible nor desirable to enter into these details¹ here, we shall rest content with stating the genuine teaching of the Upanishads.

---

¹ The critical reader interested in this subject, is recommended to study these details in the author's work 'How to Recognize the Method of Vedanta' published in the Karyalaya.
and quoting relevant passages supporting our view directly from Śaṅkara's works themselves:

41. It will be helpful to remember that the Upanishads generally restrict the terms Vidya and Avidyā to right knowledge and wrong knowledge respectively, and the terms Prakṛti and Māyā to the objective appearance projected by ignorance.

(१) दूरमेते विपरीते विसूची अविचा या च विचेति द्वाता।

विद्याभीम्पिनं निषेधेतसं मन्ये॥

न त्वा कामा वह्विरोज्जोलेल्पन्त॥

"Wide apart, mutually opposed and moving in different directions, are these two, viz., Avidyā (ignorance) and what is known as Vidya (wisdom), I regard (thee) Nāciketasa as an aspirant for Vidya; for, the many objects of pleasure have not made thee break off from your purpose."

Ka. 2-4.

[This is Yama's introduction to Atma-Vidyā.]

(२) मायां तु प्रकृति विचार०॥

"One should know Prakṛti to be Māyā" S'Ve. 4-10.

Accordingly Śaṅkara writes:

(१) सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्यात्मबुधे इवाविचारकल्पिते नामसूये तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्याम-मनिर्विचारिनीयं संसारप्रप्रत्यविज्ञगृहे सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य माया, शक्ति, प्रकृति:—इति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योर्भिन्यते॥

"Name and form conjured up by Avidyā as though identical with the omniscient Lord, (but) undefinable either as identical with or other than (Him), which constitute the seed of the entire expanse of the world of Sārisāra (mundane life), are spoken of in the Śrutis and Smṛtis as the Māyā, Śakti and Prakṛti, of the omniscient Lord."

SBh. 2-1-14, p. 201.

(२) तथायण्योन्निधिस्मित्रन्यायात्मकताम् अन्योन्निधामाध्यात्मयेतेतारा-
ApPLICATIO:

Although this, there is the natural human behaviour (of thinking, speaking and acting) in the form, 'I am this', 'This is mine', mixing up the real and the unreal, owing to wrong knowledge of both of these and their attributes which are absolutely disparate, by superimposing of the nature and of the properties of the one on the other on account of non-discrimination of the one from the other.

SBh. Intro.

42. In the face of the above unmistakable definitions of both Avidyā and Māyā, the sub-commentaries on Śaṅkara-Bhāshya, have started a procession of the blind led by the blind, in emphatically affirming the identity of both avidyā and mayā, and defining avidyā not as subjective ignorance but as something objective clinging to Atman, and thus distorting his nature by converting the all-pure Brahman into a transmigratory soul by enveloping his essential nature.

We shall quote here a single excerpt from the Pañcapādikā, perhaps the earliest Tīkā on the Sūtra-Bhāshya, which initiated this departure from Śaṅkara's tradition:

पैं श्रुतिस्मृतीतिहासपुराणेषु नामस्य अन्यात्मम, अविवाचि, भाष्य, भाष्याकृति, अग्रहम्म, अविर्यक्तम्, तत्सहास्य, कारणस्य, भव्य, शास्त्र, महामूलस्व, निर्माण, अच्छम्, आकाशम् — इति च तत्र तत्र वहुः गीत्ये चेतन्यस्य स्वयं प्रवर्तितस्तत्त्वादिवृत्तभावास्तु प्रतिवधध प्राणत्वादिका, अविवाचि-कर्म-पुर्वप्रदान-संस्कारचित्रविविधतिः सुमुखे प्रकाशाच्छादनविशेषसंस्कारभ्रमाणरूपस्थिति-रत्नादिविविधाः.

In the above extract intended to describe Avidyā as the Material Cause of Ahaṅkāra (or the form of the
mind which is supposed to be the conditioning adjunct of Atman by virtue of which Atman is turned into the individual experiencer of the fruits of actions), it is particularly noteworthy that nāmarūpa (name and form), avyākṛtam (undifferentiated state of the world), Avidyā (ignorance) māyā, prakṛti, agrahānām (non-apprehension) and avyaktam, are all given as synonymous names of Avidyā in direct contradiction of the Bhāṣya which expressly says that Māyā or Avyākṛtam is 'Avidyākalpita' or invention of Avidyā or Adhyāsa (superimposition).

We shall quote one more passage from Śaṅkara which expressly states that nāmarūpa (name and form) or avyākṛtam (undifferentiated seed of the world) is an invention of Avidyā (ignorance).

"Brahman becomes the object of 'transformation' and other modes of expression in its special aspect of name and form superimposed by Avidyā, which, whether differentiated or undifferentiated, is undefinable as that [Brahman] or other than it. In its real nature, however, it remains beyond all such modes of expression."

SBh. 2-1-27, p. 213.

43. Even according to Śaṅkara, however, it would not be wrong to speak figuratively of Avidyā as Māyā, and Māyā as Avidyā also. In its primary sense, no doubt, Avidyā means ignorance and therefore refers to a subjective notion; but in a secondary sense, the word may be extended to cover any object that is imagined by ignorance. In that case, usage would permit
statements like 'All this is Avidyā' where we only mean that everything objective, is a figment of avidyā, and not really real. Similarly, when the term avidyā is taken to mean a modification of the mind, it is evidently included within the phenomenal world and therefore may be appropriately called Māyā. To avoid confusion, we shall restrict the use of these words Avidyā and Māyā to denote ignorance and name and form respectively; and 'avidyā' shall be the name of mutual superimposition of the self and not-self alone, whatever the signification of these words may be in any other system.

44. One word more before concluding this section. These terms are used in Vedanta for the particular kind of wrong knowledge and the objective phenomena respectively, only as a device to introduce the reader (by means of Adhyātmapāpavāda) to the transcendental entity or the Witnessing principle called Atman, and not for formulating theories which the system undertakes to defend. This latter misconception prevails in certain quarters even now. Rāmānujācārya, for instance, confounds Śaṅkara's teaching of Avidyā and Māyā with the Post-Śaṅkara theory of Avidyā, and with the Māyā doctrine of the Buddhists. He has considerably exercised himself in undertaking an elaborate refutation of the Avidyā Theory and in calling the Advaitins opprobriously 'Pracchannamaływādins' (Crypto-Buddhists). And Dr. Murti has these remarks with regard to Śaṅkara and Gaudapāda:

"Gaudapāda and Śaṅkara merely bring out the implications of this standpoint (of the older Vedantins) when they declare change, difference and plurality as illusory; they formulate the complementary doctrine of avidya to explain the appearance of difference." C. P. B., p. 122.
That Śaṅkara has not formulated any 'doctrine of Avidya' to explain something, but has merely drawn our attention to a natural tendency of the human mind, has been made abundantly clear by citing his express statements. That Gaudapāda is equally innocent of any such doctrine, and that he is merely concerned with inviting the attention of enquirers to the undeniable Non-dual Being and Consciousness or Atman of the Upanishads, will be clear from the following:

(1) अन्यथा गृहस्तः स्वयम् निद्रा तत्त्वमात्रातः ।
विपयासे तत्वेऽऽश्च तुरैयं पतमशुष्टे ॥

"Dream appertains to him who takes (Reality) to be otherwise, and sleep to him who knows not Reality; when the misconception of both these is removed, one attains the fourth abode."

Gaudapāda is here characterizing both waking and dream as only dream or wrong view of Reality, and deep sleep as not knowing. Both of these are 'misconception' (विपयोः) from the standpoint of the real Atman who transcends both consciousness and unconsciousness. Gaudapāda has not used the word 'avidya' anywhere in his work. For him anyathāgra ha (misconception) and agraha (unconsciousness) which he calls kārya (effect) and kāra (cause) respectively, are both 'error' (viparyāsa).

(2) मायामात्रमिदं द्वेषनात्मकं परमार्थतः ॥

"This duality is only Māyā, it is only non-dual in reality."

GK.1-17

Here the word Māyā is applied to the world of duality. There is no theory of Māyā to account for anything.
There is one seeming exception to this use of the word in Gauḍapāda :-

(3) नेत्र नानेरति चाम्यायांत्रिन्द्रो मायाधित्यियपि ।
अजायमानी वहुथा मायया जायते तु सः ॥

"For there is the Śruti 'There is no duality whatever here' (Ka. 4-11), and also Indra (The Supreme Lord) appears as many-formed through 'Māyā' (Br. 2-5-10), Not being born, He is yet born in diverse forms through Māyā" (Tai. Aran. 3-13). GK. 3-24.

These are Śrutis, and therefore there is no theory advanced here. The Brhadāraṇyaka text 'through Māyā' means through sensuous perceptions, for in the Vedas, the word māyā is also used in the sense of knowledge according to Yāska's Nirukta. There are five senses each of which presents Reality in a particular form, such as sound, touch etc. This kaleidoscopic variety of knowledge, is evidently illusory with reference to Reality as it is. Here the name 'Māyā' is applied to the variety of sense-perception.

45. If one remembers the precise nature of Avidyā, its function and effect as defined by Śaṅkara in the Adhyāsa-Bhāshya, a number of unnecessary doubts and differences about it, would vanish altogether. (1) In the first place, avidyā is only a technical name to denote the inveterate natural tendency of the human mind (नेशर्गितोश्च लोकल्यवहारः) and no theory, (2) And in the second place, this is used by Vedanta only as a device for the purpose of teaching the truth (अव्यासोपपत्तिवाभ्यं निश्चयं प्रत्यक्षं) and never as a really real something to be defended. (3) Its function consists in setting up an unreal not-self as a second to the really real Self, and in mixing up the Real and the unreal (सत्यानुत्ते बिस्मुनित्यम्) and in misleading one to mistake the identity and
attributes of one for those of the other, although in fact the unreal self is not another entity beside the real Atman, since Atman is absolutely without any attribute and as such is not numerically one desiderating a second. (4) And finally its effect is to induce one to imagine that one is really an agent of actions and experiencer of the fruits thereof (कलृत्यभोक्त्तम्प्रत्वकः) although all actions, instruments useful to produce actions as well as the fruits thereof (क्रियाकारकफलालि) are really Māyā (false appearance only).

Neither the form of the māyic Universe is perceived as such, nor its end, nor yet its persistence, while it appears (न स्तुपमस्थयेऽत्थोपलभ्यते नान्तो न चावदिन्म च संप्रतिश्च ॥ G. 15-3). Avidyā which gives rise to this appearance is equally beginningless, endless and is no more than a natural superimposition of the human mind and only an erroneous notion (अनादिरन्त्यो नैसर्गिकोपव्यासो मित्याप्रत्यययुपूः ॥).

Therefore it is futile to indulge seriously in speculative discussion about its cause, locus, object or number as many post-Śaṅkara Advaitins have done; for all these categories pertain to the magic phenomena invented by avidyā and can never be applied to avidyā itself which projects these phantoms.

The Upanishads therefore recommend the wisdom of the unity of Atman as the only antidote to remedy this malady, the mother of all evils of life (अस्त्रायपंडितः प्रहाणाय आत्माकल्पविध्यप्रतिष्ठये सवें वेदान्ता आरम्भन्ते ॥).
7. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD

(Being and Becoming)

46. Dr. T. R. V. Murty, author of *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism* makes an observation in the course of a discussion of the Madhyamika Dialectic, which deserves the serious consideration of all philosophical thinkers.

"Philosophy selects a particular pattern from among several exemplified in things, exaggerates it out of all proportion and universalizes it to infinity. The pattern or concept so selected and universalized becomes an Idea of Reason, as Kant calls it. What impels us to select one particular point of view and not any other is a matter of our spiritual affiliation. The Mahāyānists would call this our spiritual gens (gotra). But having chosen one, consciously or rather unconsciously, we universalize it and take it as the norm of evaluation. Though innocently stated as a description of facts, every philosophical system is an evaluation of things or a prescription to view them in a particular way." C. P. B. p. 125.

This is too true in the case of speculative systems, for they all lie prostrate under the tyranny of the intellect. The intellect, indeed, is a humble servant in the hands of any master-thinker who holds the magic wand of intelligibly handling the laws of thought, and can undertake to prove that any particular system presents a complete picture, and the only picture possible, of the universe; or else it can demolish any other system or even all systems by exposing their inconsistencies ruthlessly.

But Vedanta, it must be remembered, is no speculative system which chooses a particular theory
to criticize or defend. Suresvara thus explains how it forms the sole exception to the general rule:

नन्तु सर्वस्मिद्धान्तानामपि स्वस्वद्वद्वाश्च वैपायत। इतरेतरस्त्राश्च वैपायत। दु:स्पष्टितत्तन्नित्तिकाल्फूता, नैक्तापि विश्वासो प्रत्यामः। न च सर्वतार्किकेनस्त्रूपिणं समर्थिन्ते। सर्वतार्किकोपद्वापं शप्तषाखः वर्त्मं संभाव्यमः। उच्यते। विस्मृत्ये: संभाव्यताम्। अनुभवमात्रशतान्तरं सर्वतार्किकप्रस्तानानाम्। तदभिप्यते।

"(Objection :-) All systems are reasonable, each according to its own standpoint, and they are untenable when judged by other points of view. So we do not see any one system on which we can rest our faith. Nor can we possibly conceive of anyone way of approach not blamed by any other thinkers or supported by all, as free from all logicians' attack!

(Reply :-) You may well conceive of such a system without any misgiving. For all approaches to truth take refuge uniformly in intuition. This is being stated (in the following verse):

Taking this umpire (as the common court of appeal), those that are seriously suffering from the fever of speculation, are bewildering one another by means of their magical words ending in the suffix 'tvat' (the ablative ending, meaning 'because of'))."

Nai.2-59.

Every reason adduced, appeals to universal intuition which is undisputed, and so, Suresvara says, Vedanta which stakes its all on this intuition, is consciously or unconsciously admitted by all.

47. We shall illustrate our meaning with reference to the question of 'being' with which we are specially concerned in this section.

Four, and only four, views are possible on any subject and therefore the Buddhist uses his dialectic of four views (चतुप्रत्यक्षक) and refutes all these views; his
rejection is based on the contradiction implicit in each view. Therefore his conclusion is that all possible views have been rejected. Dr. Murti quotes the following verse of Āryadeva from the Catuh-S'atakam:

सदस्तत्सङ्गेति जोभयं चेति च ऋभात्।
एष प्रयोज्यो विद्वंसिकेत्याक्षरिण नित्यन्।

"Being, non-being, both of these, neither of these - these are the four alternative views to be applied by the wise to all other concepts such as 'unity' (to be taken up for critical examination)."

Gauḍapāda who uses the Buddhistic dialectic to refute conflicting views regarding Reality, and at the same time shows how this refutation culminates in revealing Vedantic Reality indirectly, writes as follows:

अस्ति नास्तिस्ति नास्तिति नास्ति नास्तीति वा पुनः।
चलस्तिरोभयाभाबार्थारूणप्येभ बालिस्स।
कोट्त्वशतत्र एतत्स्तु ग्रह्यार्थसं सदास्वरूपः।
महावनामित्स्यृयो येन द्यत् स सर्वेण्टकः।

"This childish person covers up Reality by attributing these predicates to it: 'It is', 'It is not', 'It is and is not' and 'It is not at all'. These are predications signifying change, statical nature, both, and neither, respectively."

"These are the four alternative views, by clinging to which He is ever enveloped. He is the all-seer by whom has been seen this Revered Lord untouched by these views."  Gk. 4-83, 84.

The reader will note that Gauḍapāda holds that Reality, being of the nature of intuition itself, transcends all concepts in the empirical field and consequently it is neither proved nor disproved through affirmation or negation. Atman or Brahman is
the Absolute beyond all empirical predicates.

48. Bearing this Vedantic position in mind, we may now proceed to a consideration of the question of being and becoming according to the Adhyātma Nyāya.

The following texts should be studied in this context:

(१) सोक्षामयति वहु स्या प्रजायेयेति .... । सत्यं चालृतं च सत्यमस्वत् ॥

"He (Atman) wished 'I would become plenteous, I would be born' ......Reality became the real and the unreal." Tai. 2-6.

(२) सत्देव सोमेयदश्रय आसीदिकमेयाध्वितीयम् । तद्भक्त आहुरसस्तेवदश्रय आसीदिकमेयाध्वितीयम्, तस्मादसत: सज्जायति । कुतस्तु खलु सोमेयन्या स्वादिति द्वाराच कथमसत: सज्जायेयेति । सत्तेय मोमेयदश्रय आसीदिकमेयाध्वितीयम् ॥

छ. ६-२-१, २.

"Being alone, was this (universe) in the beginning, One without a second. Here some say 'Non-being alone, one without a second was this (universe) in the beginning. How could it possibly be so, my dear boy', he said, how could being be born from non-being? Being alone, my dear boy, this was in the beginning, one without a second."

Ch. 6-2-1, 2.

(३) तद्दैश्यत वहु स्या प्रजायेयेति तद्जैश्यसृजत तत्जेश्व ऐश्वत वहु स्या प्रजायेयेति तद्पृजसृजत । ....... ता आप ऐश्वन्त बहव्य: स्याम प्रजायेयेमहीति ता अनमसृजन्त ...... ॥

"It thought, 'I would become plenteous, I would be born'. It created Fire. That Fire thought I would become plenteous, I would be born; it created water. That Water thought, I would become plenteous, I would be born'; it created food." Ch. 6-2-3, 4.

Here is an enigma. Reality alone was in the beginning. Reality is the All, the Whole without a second. How could it wish 'to become plenteous'? How
could it be born? Reality being the Absolute, free from all determinations, how could there be any willing, or the action of becoming, unless it ceased to be the Absolute?

This difficulty can be solved only by reminding ourselves that this is only the style of the Upanishads to express universal truths (see p. 22). The statement only means that, while the universe appears to present numerous phenomena subject to change, and different from one another, it is really the Absolute alone, one without a second.

49. It would not be right to suppose that this is a formulation of the substance view as opposed to the view that recognizes reality as change alone. This is not to assert the supremacy of 'being' as opposed to becoming. Absolute Being has nothing to do with the opposition between the permanent and the changeful. True, the Upanishad seems to presuppose a school of thinkers who would appear to have held that all things positive have come out of non-being (तत्स्मादस्यस्मार्थ है जायते), but this is only the Upanishadic way of formulating the common-sense view which considers everything newly born as non-existent before its birth, and therefore concludes that there was nothing before the world made its appearance; or, this may be the philosophic view that there can be no substrate underlying the phenomenal world that we experience. We shall go into an examination of such a view, if there be one, when we take up the concept of causality.

50. 'Being' in the empirical world, implies time or place. It is difficult to ascertain what this corresponds to as distinguished from becoming. Yāska in his
Nirukta says that there are six Bhāva-Vikāras (changes pertaining to things). A thing is born, exists, grows, undergoes transformation, decays, and is destroyed. All these changes may be subsumed under the concept of 'becoming' and they are all perceived to take place in time or place. Yet we have an idea of some 'thing' which undergoes all these changes and is supposed to persist throughout. It is by emphasizing this substance view that certain schools of thought oppose other schools which insist that only change and movement constitute the core of Reality.

The Witnessing principle which enables us to recognize the being or becoming of things, however, neither is, nor undergoes any becoming in time or space, for it is the 'Seer' of the whole universe, within and without, including time and space. It is neither here nor there, neither in the past nor in the future, and is untouched by the concepts of being and becoming. Inasmuch as its non-existence is impossible to conceive for anyone, however, it has been called 'Sat' (Being) by the Upanishad; and inasmuch as it is in its light alone that we are aware of the universe, or even conceive of the disappearance of the universe, it has been called Jñānam or Vijñānam, Consciousness also.

51. This Witnessing Principle in us, has therefore to be described as Being and Consciousness in one.

("Here sat is to be understood as the entity which is Pure Being, subtle, free from all specific features, all-pervading, one, untainted by anything else, indivisible; the consciousness which is known from all the Upanishads.") Ch.Bh. 6-2-1.
Being and Consciousness are not two distinct qualities inhering in Atman; for Atman is the Vedantic Absolute free from all duality either within Itself or without It. In the course of a discussion devoted to the refutation of an ancient school of Advaitins interpreting the Brahma-Sūtras, Śaṅkara remarks:

\[ (२) \ न \ च \ सन्तर्कणमेव \ ब्रह्म \ न \ वोपलक्षणम् \ हृति \ शाक्येन \ बर्तमान। 'विज्ञानयनन \ एवं' \ हित्यादिशृतिवेद्यार्थप्रसंस्थानोऽवृत्त। किं वा \ निरस्त्र-वैवेद्यार्थस्य \ जीवस्यात्मात्-त्वेनोपदित्येत् \ नापि \ वोपलक्षणमेव \ ब्रह्म \ न \ सन्तर्कणम् \ हृति \ शाक्येन \ बर्तमान। ‘अस्तीत्ववेद्योपलब्ध्वन्यः’— \ हित्यादिशृतिवेद्यार्थप्रसंस्थानोऽवृत्त। किं वा \ निरस्त्र-सत्तात्को \ बोपलक-भुयपगम्येत् \ नाप्युभयलक्षणमेव \ ब्रह्मेति \ शाक्येन \ बर्तमान। पूर्ववाक्य-प्रक्रियाधुरात्। सू. \ भा. \ ३-२-२१, \ पा. \ ३६। \\

'It is not possible to assert that Brahman is only of the nature of being alone, and not of the nature of consciousness; for then, the Śruti.' He is conscious through and through' (Br. 2-4-12) would be meaningless. And how possibly can Brahman bereft of consciousness be taught to be the Self of Jiva? Nor can it be asserted that Brahman is of the nature of consciousness alone and not of the nature of being. For then, texts like, 'He should be known emphatically as being' (Ka. 6-13) would lose their force. And how could one possibly hold to the doctrine of consciousness bereft of being? Nor is it possible to assert that Brahman possesses both these characteristics. For then, one would be contradicting what he maintained in the beginning (that Brahman is not manifold)"

SBh. 3-2-21, p. 360.

Therefore one can never hold that being and consciousness are two distinct properties of Atman, without doing violence to the undeniable universal intuition of Atman as Pure Consciousness and Pure Being (consciousness not desiderating an object, and being not admitting any specific characteristics) in one.

52. It is sometimes supposed by critics of Vedanta, that the Upanishads or Vedantins identify the
Absolute with something experienced in some form even empirically\(^1\), to wit, Atman (substance), and that Vedanta deals with the changeless, universal, and unrelated as opposed to the changeful, particular, and related \(^2\). It will be evident from what has been said above, that the real Atman or Brahman as known to Vedanta, transcends all these pairs of opposites. Reserving the consideration of the other concepts such as the universal and the unrelated for a future discussion, we may observe here that even regarding the Absolute as Pure Being (asti), is a device in Vedanta used for the purpose of discarding empirical being and becoming with reference to Atman (the Absolute). The following quotations will vouch for this statement:

\((1)\) अस्तीत्वयोगोपलभ्यस्तत्तच्चाभेन कोभयो: \(\|\) 
अस्तीत्वयोपलभ्यस्तत्तच्छ तत्त्वभावः प्रसीदिति \(\|\) । का. ६-१३।

"He should be emphatically known as being (empirical) and also in His real nature (absolute). Of these two aspects, the real nature (of Atman) who has been known emphatically to be, reveals itself (to one who has known it to exist)." Ka. 6-13.

\((2)\) पूर्वमस्तीत्वयोगोपलभ्यस्तत्तच्छात्मनः सत्कायारूपिकृतास्तित्वप्रत्येकयोपपलभ्यस्तत्तच्छात्मनः—इत्यार्थः \(\|\)। पश्चात् प्रत्येकमा प्राप्तिमिश्रितरूपः, आस्तीत्वस्तत्तच्छात्मकः, विद्विदाविदिताष्ट्रुमन्योपपलभ्यस्तत्तच्छात्मकः, नैति नैतिः (शृं), 'अस्तीत्वमन्त्वहस्तवम्' (शृं), 'हन्देलन्तन्त्रेज्ञनिलवनें' (तैं)— इत्याविद्विदितिनिरिद्धः प्रसीदिति, अभिमुखीभवति, आत्मप्रकाशानाय। पूर्भेऽ अस्ति प्रत्येकमा पलभ्यस्तत्तच्छात्मनः इत्येति \(\|\)। का. भा. ६-१३।

"Of the Atman previously known to be, that is to say, of Him known through the notion of existence due to the conditioning adjunct of the pre-existing effect. Afterwards the Tattvabhāvah, the real nature, the unconditioned non-dual nature distinct from

\(1\) C. P. B. page 236.  \(2\) C. P. B. page 315.
the known and the unknown, pointed out by Śrutis like 'Not this, not that' (Br.), 'Not gross, not subtle, not short' (Br.), 'Invisible, bodyless, undefined, having no support' (Tai.) etc., turns towards him to reveal Its nature. The purport is (that this aspect turns towards him) who has previously known (Atman) as existent."

Ka. Bh. 6-13.

53. This true nature (Tattva-Bhāva) of Atman or Brahman the Absolute, should always be assumed to be meant by the Śruti even when seemingly positive terms are applied to Reality. It will suffice to quote one passage from the commentary on the Aitareya:

"It is, is not; one, many; with qualities, without qualities; knows, knows not; static, dynamic; fructifies, does not fructify; has a cause, is causeless; happiness, misery; the inside, not inside; void, not void; is myself, other than that - whoever tries to superimpose such thought-constructs upon His real nature which is beyond the range of all words and thoughts, he is surely trying to roll up even ether like a piece of leather, and to climb it up as if it were a flight of stairs; he is trying to find out the trail of fish in water and of the birds in the sky! For there are Śrutis like the following: 'Not this, not that' (Br.), 'From which all words fall back.....' (Tai.)."

- Ai.Bh. p.312, discussion at the end of the first chapter.
8. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD  
(Cause and Effect)

54. Consideration of the concept of becoming naturally glides into the consideration of the concept of cause and effect. Both becoming and causation desiderate the concept of time, and it is curious how systems insisting on the reality of change, becoming, or of the relation of cause and effect, have failed to take up the concept of time as demanding a serious explanation.

55. The Sāṅkhya and the Vaiśesika systems both accepted that an insentient principle - the Pradhāna or the atom - can be the material cause of the world, but they differed very widely with regard to the process of causation and the relation of cause and effect. The Sāṅkhya insisted on the identity of cause and effect, and explained that the original or first cause, the Pradhāna, transformed itself into an effect called the 'Mahat' (the Cosmic Intellect), which, in its turn, gave rise to the series of causes and effects. It was a gradual process of evolution that was responsible for the final effect, the universe. The Vaiśesika on his part, held out a doctrine of atoms, which by combination produce dyads, which, in their turn, produce by combination triads etc., in succession until at last the whole world is produced. This doctrine has been called the Ārambha-Vāda (the doctrine of causing by combination of atoms & c.) in contrast with the Parināma-Vāda of the Sāṅkhya. Now both the
Sāmkhyas and the Vaiśeshikas are rationalists with this difference between them, that the Sāmkhyas recognize in addition to Perception and Inference as canons of knowledge, Śruti also as Ṣaptavacana (testimony of experts), while the Vaiśeshikas include even Śruti within the range of Anumāna (syllogistic inference). Both adduce Śruti also in support of their own doctrine, the Sāmkhyas to a greater extent than the Vaiśeshikas.

56. This circumstance has led some scholars to surmise that the Sāmkhya system was a rational synthesis of the Upanishads. Dr. Murti supports this deduction and avers that it is proved beyond doubt by the fact that the Brahma-Sūtras find it necessary to refute the Sāmkhya contention that it represents the true import of the Upanishad texts. The refutations are so numerous and so sustained, that they would be unintelligible if the Sāmkhya had not been considered a rival in the field of Upanishad exegesis. The appellations 'aśabdam' (unscriptural), 'anumānam', 'ānumānikam' (conjectures, inferred) by which the Sāmkhya is referred to in the Brahma-Sūtra, are significant as revealing that the Sāmkhya interpretation was considered 'free' and un-orthodox, and that the Sāmkhya did claim to be a correct understanding of the Upanishads. (C. P. B. pp. 60, 61).

This is perfectly true if we remember that the Sāmkhya system was a rational synthesis and that the followers of the school did claim to be such. The appellation of 'anumānam', and 'ānumānikam' to his Pradhānam, would never be deemed by the Sāmkhya as any reproach to it, for the Sāmkhyas plumed themselves on their being adepts in inferential
reasoning, and boasted that the Pradhāna, Purusha and their mutual relation to be eternally inferential (प्रधानपुरुषसङ्गोगा नित्यानुमेया इति साक्ष्या मन्यते॥ S.Bh. 1-1-5, p.94). Only, they did recognize the testimony of the Upanishads and tried to explain away the seemingly Advaitic texts in the light of their contention.

The Vedantins, according to Śaṅkara's tradition of interpretation of Bādarāyana, however, rejected this Sāmkhya interpretation and explained the Vedantas to show how the non-dualistic Brahman alone was really real and how the knowledge of the meaning of the Upanishads, conduced to the universal intuition of that Brahman as the real Atman or Self of all the phenomenal world.

As for the numerous and sustained refutations of Sāmkhya to be found in the Brahma-Sūtras, it must be remembered that the Vedantins had a higher level of knowledge to point to as based upon Vedic reasoning an acquaintance with which was sure to cast all inferential knowledge into the shade. This procedure was adopted more as a defence of the Vedantic genuine interpretation and higher method of reasoning rather than as a debate with an opponent of equal standing. Śaṅkara makes this point quite clear in the following extracts from the Śūtra-Bhāshya:

1. The reader is referred back to the section (5) on Agama and Reason.
"Starting with the Sūtra 'The unscriptural Pradhāna, is not (the cause), because of the (attribution of) seeing' (Vs. 1-1-5), the doctrine of Prādhāna as the cause, was put forward again and again by the Sūtras expressly and refuted. This was because in the Upanishads are to be found what appear to the dull-witted to be like passages implying support to that school. And that system is approximate to the Vedantic teaching inasmuch as it holds the theory of the non-difference of the cause and the effect, and it has been adopted by Devala and other authors of Dharmasūtras in their works. Therefore more effort has been made in repudiating this school in particular and not in refuting the doctrine of atom or anything else presumed to be the cause."

SBh. 1-4-28, p. 178.

"Although this Sastra is begun with the purpose of examining the purport of the Vedanta texts; and it is not begun with a view to establish or refute any particular conclusion (of any other school) with the help of pure reasoning as is done in rationalistic systems, it becomes incumbent on those who explain the meaning of Vedantic texts to refute the views of the Saṅkhya and others which run counter to right knowledge. The next section is therefore begun for this purpose."

SBh. 2-2-1, p. 220.

[The Upanishads are the only source of valid knowledge and therefore to lead disciples to that knowledge we have to refute thoughts of all schools which are an impediment to arrive at that knowledge.]

SBh. 2-2-1, p. 220.
"Sāṁkhya-s and others quote Vedanta texts also and explain them so as to suit their own position. What has been done in the previous portion of this work, was mainly to show that their interpretation is not correct, but (a fallacious one) appearing to be right. But here, there is this difference that their reasons are going to be refuted independently without any reference to texts."

SBh. 2-2-1, p. 220.

[This section will be devoted to show that not only the Sāṁkhya-s and others do not know how to interpret texts which lead to direct intuition, but also that their reasons are fallacious and inconclusive.]

57. We may leave this incidental question at that and return to the consideration of the subject matter of this section, viz. the relation of cause and effect. How does Vedanta differ in handling this problem from the Sāṁkhya, Vaiśeshika or other systems?

It is necessary first of all to determine exactly what is meant by a cause. Since kāraṇa is the Sanscrit word used to denote both reason and cause, we have to restrict ourselves to the consideration of it in the latter sense only. It is derived from the root Kṛ(कृ) to do or to make, and therefore anything that is required to produce an effect, may be called a kāraṇa. Taking the word in its widest sense, therefore, it might mean an agent who does or makes something or something which makes up a thing, or even all the various factors that may be necessary to make up something. Without entering into details, we may here state that Vedantins and Sāṁkhya-s make use of the word निर्मित्कारणम् (literally occasioning cause) for the agent; this term is usually translated into English by making use of the appellation efficient cause. The Sanscrit word to denote the material needed to make anything is उपादानकारणम् (that which should be taken up for
producing something); it is called the समवायिकारणमू (that which inheres in the effect) by the Vaiśeṣikas. We shall make use of the usual term 'material cause' to express it.

58. The difference between the Sāṁkhya and the Vaiśeṣika, turns round the nature of the effect and its relation to its material cause. The Vaiśeṣika has systematized the common sense view that every effect is really born and therefore non-existent before its birth; the Sāṁkhya insists that the cause itself is reborn in the form of its effect. Gauḍapāda in the fourth chapter of his Kārikās, mostly devoted to a rational refutation of systems other than Vedanta, thus caricatures their views and then states the Vedantic view which is above all criticism.

(२) भूतं न जायते किचिंदभूतं नैव जायते ।
विवर्तनो द्वयं हृदयमजाति स्वायत्तति ते ॥

"Nothing that already exists can be born', 'That which is non-existent, can never be born!' The dualists are thus disputing and so are (indirectly) revealing the fact of no-birth."  

GK. 4-4.

(३) भूतं जायते कारणं वत्स जायते ।
जायमानं कार्यमजं भिन्नं नित्यं कर्मं च तत् ॥

"For him in whose opinion the cause is the effect, the cause itself is born; being born how could it be without birth, and how could it be changed and yet eternal?"

GK. 4-11.

[This is the refutation of the Sāṁkhya view that the original cause, Prādhan or primordial matter itself, evolves into the effect.]

(४) कारणामानन्यत्वमात्र: कार्यमजं तत्व ।
जायमानान्यन्त्र कार्यमजं ते कर्मं धृतम् ॥

"If the effect (Mahat etc.) is identical with the cause (Pradhiina) and therefore the cause is taken by you to be permanent, (then there is no effect born). And if the cause be
identical with the effect born, then how could it be permanent according to your view?"

"For him in whose opinion something is born from the unborn, there is no example in life to be cited. And if a thing is born from something born, there will be no end (to the series of born causes)."

Therefore the Vedantin's conclusion is that there is really nothing born, the only Reality or Atman being One without a second.

59. Oblivious of the fact that the fourth chapter of Gauḍapāda's work is mainly devoted to the drawing of Vedantic conclusions from the different contradictory views of schools other than Advaita, and that Gauḍapāda has used Buddhistic arguments both for refuting dualistic systems and for showing Buddhistic arguments pushed to their conclusion lead to Advaita Vedanta¹, scholars have rushed to offer various interpretations of the apparent Buddhistic terminology and logic in this work of that great teacher of Śaṅkara’s tradition.

¹. The reader interested in this subject is referred to the 'Mandukya-RahasyaVivṛti' a Sanscrit commentary by the present author and the English Introduction to that work, where this question has been thoroughly discussed.
Some suppose that the Agama Prakarana may not be Gauḍapāda's work at all and that it may be a part of the Māṇḍukya Upanishad itself as claimed by certain recent Bhāshyakāras. Others guess that the Karikas may be an adaptation of the Yōgacāra school of Buddhism effected with the sole purpose of giving a twist to it so as to suit the purposes of Vedanta, while some others imagine that the fourth chapter is perhaps a Buddhistic work added later on to the first three chapters in the name of Gauḍapāda, or even that Gauḍapāda was himself a Buddhist in disguise!

The reader is warned not to acquiesce in any such surmises in the present case. Gauḍapāda's conclusion that there is no birth (Ajāti) is quite in consonance with Vedanta from the highest stand-point. For as this great thinker repeats again and again in this work, the real Atman of Vedanta, is अजमनिद्रिमस्वप्नम् (unborn, without sleep or ignorance, and without dream or misconception, G. K. 1-16, 3-36, 4-81). But the Vedantin has a Māyā Satkārya-Vāda (illusory existence of the effect in the cause) also to offer to inquirers who wish to harmonize all Vedantic texts which invariably use the Adhyārōpa Pāvāda Method to teach the nature of Reality.

60. The reader should remind himself of what the position of the Vedantin, is with regard to Pramanas and reason. While these may have their place in the empirical field, they can never be applied to the transcendental Reality or Atman. For the purposes of teaching the truth, however, the Upanishads themselves have been given the appellation of
'Pramāṇa' by Adhyārōpa (deliberate superimposition). Just as Pramanas or canons of knowledge in the empirical sphere, produce Pramiti or correct knowledge and remove ignorance regarding their object, Vedantas or Upanishads also in their capacity as Pramāṇa, remove Avidya or ignorance of Atman. This Avidyā again, whatever be its nature in other darsanas (systems) such as Sāṁkhya, Yoga, Viññāna-vāda or the Śūnyavāda, here refers to the natural tendency of the human mind to mix up the real Atman and the unreal not-self by mutual identification of the Self and the not-self and mistaken transference of their properties to each other. The illusory appearance of the universe (both subjective and objective) of names and forms considered to be real from the empirical point of view, is called Māyā by the Adhyārōpa view adopted for purposes of teaching.

Reason, again, as usual in Vedanta by Adhyārōpa, is of various types. It may be the reason actually adduced by the Upanishads themselves (Śrutyanugūṭha), or used by a teacher in harmony with the Vedic teaching (Śrutyanukāla), syllogistic (anumāna), or even bare reasoning based upon the laws of thought-forms (Kēvala or Śushka). It is mostly of the last type in the Alātaśānti-Prakaraṇa. Śruti and reasoning in harmony with it, are used in the Advaita-Prakaraṇa of Gauḍapāda.

61. The Māyā-Satkārya-Vāda or even the teaching of the Absolute, the Ajāti-Vāda, was no revolution introduced by Śaṅkara or Gauḍapāda for the first time. It was already there in the Śrutas, and traces are left in

the Bhāshyas of Śaṅkara and elsewhere, of the teachers of these doctrines like Dravidācārya and Brahmanandin¹, who accepted these teachings. We shall first quote the Śruti which illustrates how the so-called effect is really nothing but a play of words, and that it is essentially the cause itself.

(२) यथा सोम्येकेन मृत्यिम्मेन सर्वं मृत्यिं विष्णुं स्वाद्धाचारम्भं विकारो
नामपेयं मृत्यिकेब्येव सत्यम् ॥

"Just as, my dear boy, by knowing a lump of clay, everything made up of clay is known (to be but clay), the effect being a mere play of words, only a name, and that it is only clay is the truth"

Ch. 6-1-4, p. 505.

Here Uddālaka is represented to have told his boy that all effects of clay such as a pot or a pitcher, are only clay, their cause, and in themselves are nothing but mere names. Similar examples are cited with reference to gold and steel in this Upanishad, and everywhere the reality of the cause is affirmed, and this apparent division of cause and effect, is further extended to Brahman which is taken to be the cause and its effects the primordial elements, as follows:

(३) तदेष्टत्त बुध स्यां प्रज्ञायेयेति तत्तेजोस्मुर्जत तत्तेज ऐश्वर बुध स्यां
प्रज्ञायेयेति तदपोस्मुर्जत.......... ॥

"That ('Sat' or Brahman) thought 'I would be plenteous, I would be born'. It created Tejas (Fire). That Tejas thought 'I would be plenteous, I would be born'. It created Water." Ch. 6-2-3, p. 509.

And this is how this Upanishad extends, to some other empirical effects, the nature of being illusory

¹. See English Introduction to 'Mandukya-Rahasya-Vivrti' pp. 20, 21.
appearances and concludes that all of them are dependent on Brahman alone for their being:-

(३) यदादित्यस्य रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्यूपं यच्चुक्तं तद्यां यत्कृष्णं
तदनस्यापागादादित्यादित्यत्वं बाचारम्भं विकारो नामपेयं त्रीणि रूपाणीनेव
सत्यम्॥

"What (appears to be) the red colour of the sun, that is the colour of Tejas (Fire), that which is white, is the colour of Water, that which is black, is (the colour) of Food (Earth). The nature of being the sun is gone, that it is only the three colours is the truth."
Ch. 6-4-2, p. 515.

Similarly, everything that is the effect of the primary elements, is but the elements only, the effect being merely a name in itself, and in its essence the three elements only. And the Upanishad concludes:

(४) एवमेव खलु सोम्यालेन शुद्धनापोमूलमन्विच्यायः सोम्य शुद्धेन
तेजोमूलमन्विच्य तेजसा सोम्य शुद्धेन सत्‌मूलमन्विच्य सत्मूला: सोम्येमा: सर्वं
प्रजात: सदायतना: सत्यतिद्व: ॥

"In this same manner, my dear boy, from Food, an effect, look for Water as the cause, from Water as the effect, look for Fire as the cause, from Fire as the effect, look for Being as the cause. All these created beings, my dear boy, have their cause in Being, they stay in Being and merge into Being."
Ch. 6-8-4, p. 524.

62. We should note one important difference between the empirical illustrations of clay-pots etc., and the effects issuing out of \textit{Sat} or Brahman. The empirical cause, no less than its effect, is in some time or some place, and that notion of causal relation demands that the cause should be invariably before the effect in time. So long as the effect lasts, however, it should be necessarily intimately connected with its cause.

This relation is called \textit{Samavāya} by the Vaiśeshikas. Relying upon the common-sense view
that no effect is existent before its birth, they hold to the absurd doctrine that a diatom newly born, becomes related to its cause and also to the genus called sattā or being. A previously non-existent thing comes into existence and is called the effect of clay, because it now becomes related to clay as well as sattā (being). The Sāṃkhya, on the other hand, holds that the pot is identical with clay; for it is clay alone that transforms itself into a pot. The weakness of both these views, has been already exposed.

The Upanishads have therefore given the examples of empirical cause and effect and shown how the so-called effect always exists only as the cause, and has no independent being of its own. It is only the cause that is spoken of as the effect on account of its practical uses. It is this point of comparison that is applied to the relation of Being or Brahman and the Universe when by Adhyātma (deliberate superimposition), Brahman is called the cause and the world its effect without any implication of time relation, or of Brahman causing the universe like an active potter or carpenter, who makes some earthenware or an article of furniture. The Vedantic idea of becoming or causality, therefore, is only with reference to an appearance and its substrate

63. We may now return to Gauḍapāda to see how he formulates and explains the Vedantic view of causality :-
As for creation variously described (in the Śrutis) by illustrations such as of clay, metal (gold), and sparks etc., it is only a device for introducing (the seeker's mind to the unity of Atman). There is no difference (of creator and the created), howsoever the matter may be viewed.

GK. 3-15.

Whether something be really created or only apparently, the Śruti equally applies to both the cases. That which is conclusively arrived at as the import of the Śruti and also supported by reason, would be the only truth and not any other.

GK. 3-23.

Of that (or from that) which is existent, birth Mayic (apparent) alone would be reasonable but not real. According to one who supposes that something is really born, only the born would be born.

GK. 3-27.

[That which really is, cannot really change into something else; for if it does change, it must go on changing and so we cannot say that it is really existent, since its real nature can never be determined. Therefore that which is really existent can only appear to change. Therefore the Samkhya view that the Pradhana or the original cause is really changeful, is against reason.]

64. The *Asatkāryavāda*, the doctrine that what was not existent before, newly comes to be, or that empirical things are illusory appearances without any substrate, is both un-Vedic and unreasonable. For the Śruti says:

(५) तद्रैक आहुरस्येवदमय आसीदिकस्याद्वितीयं तस्मादसत: सज्जायत।
कुतस्तु कहलु सोप्येवं स्मादिति होवाच। कथमसत: सज्जायेतेति॥

ष्ठं. ६-२-१, २, पा. ५०६, ५०८.
"Here some say 'This universe was non-being alone in the beginning, one without a second; and from that non-being, being was born.' How could this be, my dear boy? he said. How could being be born of non-being?"  
Ch. 6-2-1, 2, pp. 506, 508.

(He who holds that everything is newly born and does not exist before its birth, actually holds that something can come out of nothing. This is absurd.)

Gauḍapāda is only re-echoing this Śruti, when he says:

(२) असतो मायया जन्म तत्त्वो नैव युज्यते ।
बन्ध्यायुत्रो न तत्त्वेन मायया बापि जायते ॥

"To the non-existent (or from the non-existent), there can be no birth either real or mayic. A barren woman's son is never born either really or mayically (apparently)."

GK. 3-28.

[So, the Vaiśeṣikas' or the Nihilists' view is against all reason.]

Śaṅkara thinks that even the Pariṇāmavāda of the Sāṁkhya pushed to its logical extreme, reduces itself to this Asatkāryavada (doctrine of the non-existence of the effect before it is born):

(३) सात्त्विकस्त्वपि य: परिणामपक्षः सोऽपि अयूर्भिर्मौत्पत्तितिविनाशाशी- 
करणादृशीसहिष्णुक्षणे विलित्यते । अभिव्यक्तितितिरोधावाचकरणेक्कणि अभिव्यक्ति- 
तिरोधीवृत्तिविनिमात्वन्तिविनिमात्वनिमिन्फः । एते 
कारणस्वते संस्थानमुत्त्वत्सादि - इत्येतदिपि प्रत्युक्तम् ॥


"As for the Pariṇāma doctrine of the Sāṁkhya, even that is not different from the doctrine of the Vaiśeṣika inasmuch as it postulates the birth of properties which were non-existent before their birth and after their destruction. Even if it be explained that it is only manifestation and disappearance (that is meant by birth and destruction), their doctrine is, as before, opposed to (all)
Pramāṇas as will be found when it is enquired whether the manifestation and disappearance, are previously existent or non-existent. This would also serve as the refutation of the doctrine that birth etc. is only another form of the cause alone.

GBh. 18-48, p. 278.

Śaṅkara wholly concurs with Gaudapāda when he pronounces his final dictum in the matter :

(३) पारिश्रेष्ठात् सदेक्मेव वस्तु अविद्या जनविविधादिशिर्मेंन्तृदेश्यभाविकत्यते इति भगवतं मतस्वर्गे नास्तो विचयते भवः। (भ. २-१६) इत्यस्मिन् श्रोके सत्यत्वस्वायत्विविचारात् व्यविचारान्वेष्यामिति॥ भ. भ. १८-४८, पा. २७८।

"As the only alternative left, it has to be concluded that Pure Being alone is the one real entity imagined by Avidya as variously endowed with origin and other properties like an actor (on the stage). This opinion of the Lord has been stated in the Śūdra (2-16) 'There is no becoming of the non-existent', because the concept of being is constant and the rest are variable." GBh. 18-48, p. 278.

65. The doctrine of the relation of cause and effect will not be complete unless texts that teach apparent creation, are also taken into consideration, since there cannot be any real becoming of the Real. The change or effect so-called can only be बाचारम्भण (a play of words), it must be understood to be only a seeming change or causality. ‘सत्यं चातृतं च सत्यमभवत’ (तै) (The Real became both the real and the unreal), ‘नदात्मानं स्वयमकुर्ल’ (तै. ३-७) (That seemingly non-existent Reality transformed itself into something else) - all such creation and transformation attributed to Śrutis, are only by Adhyāropa. They only purport to affirm that all phenomena are really Brahman, the only Reality, the phenomenal world being born illusorily (भावया जापयेत् Gk. 3-24) that is, projected by Avidya.
9. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD

(Īśvara and Jīva)

66. It is evident that Brahman or the Real Atman being the only Reality according to Vedanta, the threefold division of 'God, creatures (Jīvas) and the world' recognized in the theological systems of religions, could find no place in this Advaitic system. Nevertheless we do find mention of Īśvara (Ruler), Jīva (the soul supporting the senses and life) and (the universe) in the Upanishads. How are we to account for this? The answer is very simple:

(१) कृत्स्थानात्मवादीः एकत्वात्मा श्रीमृत्युण्डत्वाभवे, इश्वरकारणप्रतित्वाविरोध इति चेत्त, न; अविद्यात्मकनामस्थितविज्ञास्पद्यापेक्षाचात् सर्वन्तेत्तत्स्य । ....... सर्वन्तेश्वरस्यात्मभूते इश्वरविद्याकल्पिते नामस्थित तत्त्वात्मानिर्वचनीये संसारप्राप्तवीज्ञात्म भावया, शक्ति, प्रकृति: - इति च श्रुतिःमूलभित्तिः । तत्त्वानंतर: सर्वेऽः इश्वर: । .... एवमविद्या-कृतनामस्थितविज्ञात्मरूपः इश्वरो भवति, व्योमेव घटकस्यापाण्याधिः । स च स्वात्मभूतनेव घटकाश्चनायिनू विद्यात्मेष नामस्थितविज्ञात्मरूपलक्ष्यकाॅरस्यहं जीवाश्च भावात्मनः प्रतिद्वद्य व्यवहारविविधः ॥

"(Objection :- ) Unity being absolute for one who holds the doctrine of changeless Brahmātman, there is no place for the distinction of the Ruler and the ruled, and consequently (this postulate) would run counter to (his) proposition that Īśvara (the Ruler) is the cause (of the universe).

[This objection is raised on the basis of the presupposition that the Absolute or Brahman cannot be Īśvara (ruler) also at the
same time. In the Bhāṣya on 1-1-2, however, Īśvara has been equated with Brahman to be enquired into, which is apparently self-contradictory.]

(Reply :-) No. For omniscience (or Rulership) is (only) relative to the differentiation of the seed of name and form which are the product of avidyā. (To explain :) ............ Name and form conjured up by avidyā as though identical with the omniscient Lord, (but) undefinable either as identical with or other than (Him), name and form, which constitute the seed of the entire expanse of the world of samsāra, are spoken of in the Śruti and the Smṛti as the 'Māyā', 'Sakti' and 'Prakṛti' of the omniscient Lord. Īśvara (the Ruler) is other than these.... In this way, Īśvara is he who is in conformity with the conditioning associates of name and form made up by avidyā in the same way as ether conforms to the conditioning associates such as a pot or a Kamandalu. And he rules, from the empirical stand-point, over the conscious selves (Vijnānātmans) called Jivas, who conform to the aggregates of body and senses made up of name and form projected by avidyā, and correspond to the pot-ethers (of the illustration).

SBh. 2-1-14, p. 200.

[The reader will note that avidyākalpita (conjured up by avidyā), avidyātmaka (product of avidyā), avidyākṛta (made up by avidyā, or made up of avidyā), avidyāpratyupasthapita (projected by or presented by avidyā), are all synonymous terms in this passage: Īśvara, ruler or God is illustrated by ākāśa (ether) conditioned by name and form, while Jivas (individual souls conditioned by bodies etc.) are likened to apparent portions of ether conditioned by jars etc. the effects of ether. The relation of the Ruler and the ruled is only apparent like that of the ether in general and the apparent portions of ether conditioned by pots etc.]

(2) तदेवम् अत्रियात्मकोपाधिपतिनिर्मिताः परस्परशयन्तं सर्वनिः

"So then, Īśvara's rulership, omniscience, and omnipotence, are only relative to the limitation caused by avidyāc associates but no such convention as that of the distinction of the ruler and
the ruled, or omniscience, is possible in the Atman whose real nature is such that all conditioning associates are abolished (there) by Vidya"

SBh.2-1-14, p.201.

67. The Jivas then, are the effects of Brahman only figuratively, inasmuch as they are really one with Brahman for ever, in the same way as pot-spaces are one with space in general. Their limiting conditions such as the body and the senses, are only apparently so, for they are only products of avidyā. Śaṅkara has closely followed in the foot-steps of Gauḍapāda in thus describing the individual selves and the conditioning associates:

(1) आत्मा ह्याकाशथाज्ञानियतायत्थाकोऽतर्योदितः ।

गौ. का. ३-३.

"Atman is born as Jivas, like pot-ether from (ether in general); and he is born as the aggregates (of bodies and senses) like pots & c."

GK. 3-3.

(2) संघाताः स्वप्नवत्त सवेय आत्ममायायाबिषजितं ॥

आधिक्ये सर्वसाये च नोपपतितहि विचिते ॥

गौ. का. ३-१०.

"The aggregates (of bodies and senses) are projected by Atman's Māyā as in a dream. There is no reason supporting the superiority (of one aggregate over the others), or the equality of all (aggregates)."

GK. 3-10.

[Gauḍapāda uses the word 'māyā' as synonymous with avidyā. He does not strictly adhere to the distinction of the two as defined by Śaṅkara.]

68. Jivas as such have two aspects. Their real nature is always identical with that of Atman, but the aggregates of body & c. by which they are apparently conditioned are māyic, and hence, in respect of their conditioning associates, they are anirvacanīya, i.e., they cannot be defined to be one with or different from
Brahman. Thus Śaṅkara describes the Jīva in two ways:

(1) स्थिते च क्षेत्रज्ञपरमात्मेतिविषयं सम्बन्धने क्षेत्रज्ञ: परमात्मा इति
नामात्मत्रेदात् ‘क्षेत्रज्ञयं परमात्मनो भिन्नः’ परमात्मायं क्षेत्रज्ञादृ भिन्नः
इत्येवंजातीयः आत्मभेदविषयं निर्विशेषं निर्योक: । एको हयात्माया
नामात्मत्रेदेन बहुदार्शियत्यत्ते ॥

SBh. 1-4-22, p. 174.

"While there is this correct knowledge of the identity of Kshetrajña (individual self), and the Supreme Atman, there is only a difference of names (when we use the words), 'Kshetrajña' and 'Paramātma' and therefore to say 'This Kshetrajña is different from the Supreme Self' or 'This Supreme Self is different from the Kshetrajña' and to insist on the difference of the two atmas in this way, is purposeless; for one and the same Atman is spoken of diversely by different names."

Here 'Kshetrajña' is the name of the Witnessing Consciousness which objectifies the entire aggregate of the body and the senses, and 'Paramātma' is the name of Atman as he is in himself. There is absolutely no difference at all between the two. Sri Krishna therefore tells Arjuna:

क्षेत्रज्ञ चापि मां विद्यते सर्वक्षेत्रोऽभवत।
क्षेत्रज्ञयोधिथियान यथ तत्त्वान्तः मतं मम ॥

"Know the Kshetrajña in all Kshetras (bodies) to be myself, scion of Bharata! The discriminatory knowledge of the Kshetra and Kshetrajña, is the one right knowledge, according to me."

G. 13-2.

(2) आभास एव जैत्य जीवः परस्यात्मनो जलसूर्यकारिता श्रद्धास्वयः । न
स एव साक्षात् नापि वस्तुत्त्वनर्म । अतः यथा नैकास्मिनं जलसूर्यकि कम्पानां
जलसूर्यकारितं कामते, एवं नैकास्मिनं जीवे कर्मस्वलस्माक्यन्ति जीवान्तरस्य
तत्सङ्केत: । एयंप्रयत्नितकर एव कर्मस्योऽधिकारं
तदाधिकारं संसारस्मार्थ्याभिषेकावृत्तवर्तिति तदाभिषेकं व पारापरापरस्य
ब्रह्मात्माभास्योपदेशोपपति: ॥

"And this Jiva should be taken to be only an appearance of the Supreme Atman such as the reflection of the sun; neither directly the same nor something other than that (Atman). And therefore, just as when anyone of the reflections is shaking, no other reflection moves, so also it is in the fitness of things that when one Jiva is in contact with the fruit of his karma, no other Jiva comes in contact with it. On this ground also (as for other reasons already adduced), there is no inter-mixing of the karmas (of the Jivas) and their effects. And this appearance being a concoction of avidyā, it stands to reason that the samsāra having its seat in it, is also a concoction of avidyā. And hence the feasibility of teaching the real Brahman-nature by negating this (samsāra)."

SBh. 2-3-50, p. 302.

69. Just as the Upanishads teach that Brahman is the creator, sustainer and the final goal which all phenomena finally reach and merge in, with the sole purpose of revealing that they are really appearances ever essentially one with it, they uniformly teach that Brahman has entered into the created world in the form of Jiva:

(1) स एतमेव सीमानं विदर्शितमा द्वारा प्राप्तच ॥
    "Having cleft this parting place (of hair), He entered through this opening."  
    Ai. 1-3-12.

(2) तत्सृष्णा तदेवानुप्रविष्टम ॥
    "Having created it, He entered that very (object of creation)."
    Tai. 2-6.

(3) स एष इह प्रविष्टः ॥
    "The self-same One has entered here."  
    Br. 1-4-7.

(4) अनेन जीविनात्मानानुप्रविष्टम् नामस्ते प्रविष्टाचारणम् ॥
    "As this Jiva, my own self, let me enter and differentiate name and form."  
    Ch. 6-3-2.

(5) अश्चैर्य यथैवो भूचनं प्रविष्टो रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो वभूतः ॥
    एकस्तथा सर्वभूतानन्तरात्मा रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बहिर्ज्ञ ॥
    का. ५-६
"As the one fire has entered the world and taken a form in conformity with each and every form, so also, the inner Atman of all creatures, takes a form in conformity with each and every form and is also outside of them."

[This teaches not only the identity of the Supreme Self with Jiva, but also that it yet retains its transcendental nature.]

(५) पुरुषक्रेण द्विपदः पुरुषक्रेण चतुष्पदः।
पुरः स पक्षी भूत्वा पुरः पुरुष आविष्कृतः॥
स वा अर्य पुरुषः सर्वसु पूर्वः पुरुषायो

नैनेन किंचनानावृत्तां नैनेन किंचनासंवृतम् ॥ वृ. २-५-१८।

"He made fortresses (bodies) with two feet, and fortresses with four feet. He first became a bird (the subtle body), and the Purusha entered the fortresses. This is Purusha indeed, because He is the indweller of the fortress, in all fortresses. There is nothing not covered by this (Purusha), nothing not pervaded by Him."

[All the bodies as well as the embodied souls, are verily His very self.]

70. The reader will have realized by now, how the Vedantic अनन्तत्र (not being other than it) of the cause and the effect is different from the Sāṅkhya's ananyatva (identity of cause and effect). We have seen in a different section how Gaṇḍapāda has inveighed against the doctrine of the Sāṅkhyaś that the cause and the effect are identical. Bādarāyaṇa in his Sūtra (2-3-13) anticipates a similar objection against Vedantic causation. There the objector appeals to common sense which requires that one who experiences ought to be distinct from what is experienced. If the universe be the effect of Brahman the cause, then either Jiva the experiencer would be identical with what he experiences or the experienced itself would be the experiencer since both are not other than Brahman the
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first cause (तस्य च विभागस्वाभावः प्रसज्ज्येत, यदि भोज्यता भोग्यभावमाप्येत, भोम्य वा भोज्यभावमाप्येत । त्योश्चैतरस्वाभावितः परमकारणाद्रेः प्राणोऽन्यत्वात् प्रसज्ज्येत ॥ SBh.) This objection is met by citing the example of the sea, where the distinction of the effect, billows, waves, or bubbles as well as non-mixing of them with one another, is maintained even while each of them is not other than their essence, the sea as water. Thus the distinction of the experiencers and the experienced, may well be kept up, and yet they will not be other than the Highest Brahman, the first cause.

71. This reply would be all right if we recognized the empirical distinction of experiencer and the experienced. The Vedantin does recognize this sort of causal relation between Atman and the universe from the empirical standpoint. Bādarāyaṇa has an aphorism (१-४-२३) which says in so many words that Brahman is the material cause (as well as the efficient cause) of the universe (प्रकृतिनिश्च प्रतिज्जातः प्राणानुपरोधान) in conformity with the Śrutí which says that everything else becomes known when Brahman is known, and cites the example of clay and other material causes which are transformed into several effects. And there is another Sūtra (आत्मकृतः परिणामात् १-४-२६) which expressly refers to Śrutis teaching Brahman's transformation into the universe. But all this represents only one aspect and does not present a complete picture of the genuine Vedantic tradition followed by Śaṅkara and his predecessors. That no revolution has been ushered in by Śaṅkara or Gauḍapāda in this respect, is more than obvious in Bādarāyaṇa's Sūtra (लदन्न्यत्तमार्गश्राणान्तः २-४-१४). The Sūtra declares in consonance with the Śruti
that the effect is only a play of words. Śaṅkara writes in substance: "But this distinction of cause and effect, is not really real; for as the Śrutī says the so-called effect being merely a name, is factually nought in itself, unreal (न तु कर्तव्यृत्तेन विकारो नाम कक्षिदत्ति; नामस्थे योगीत्र हैतदन्तत्तम) and there are a good number of texts purporting to teach the unity of Atman (आत्मकल्पेन्द्रियप्रकृति बचनतात्म), and if we do not accept them, the knowledge of all by knowing one, would not be possible (न चात्मका, एकत्रियन्त विद्विज्ञानं संप्रदयते)."

तस्मात, यथा धर्मकासायाकाशानां महाकाशान्न्यत्वम्, यथा च मृगाक्षाकोडकारीनामूषयार्द्धादिवस्तयत्वम्, हर्षनन्दस्त्वपत्तात्, स्वसुपेणातु- नास्त्वत्वात्, एवमस्य भोष्यभोक्तादिप्रकृतिजातस्य भ्रमावतिरिक्तेणाभाब इति दृष्ट्यवत्। सू. भा. २-२-१४, पा. १९७.

"Therefore just as a pot-ether, a Kamandalu ether and the like, are not other than ether in general, and just as the water of a mirage and the like, is not other than a barren soil and the like, since they are of the nature of vanishing soon after they are seen, and in themselves undefinable in nature, so also it should be concluded that this world of experiencers and the experienced etc., has no existence apart from Brahman." SBh. 2-1-14, p. 197.

Here, 'pot-ether etc.' of the illustration correspond to the Jīvas, and water of a mirage etc. corresponds to the names and forms constituting the insentient part of universe. Thus, while both of these are essentially one with Brahman, the Jīvas are actually identical with Brahman whereas the insentient phenomena such as the five elements are only appearances super imposed on Brahman.

72. In accordance with the illustration of धर्मकासाय (pot-ether) in the context of the soul, we have to explain its birth and death, its atomic size, its being limited by
the associate intellect, its being an agent of action, being dependent on God for its activities, its being spoken of as a part of Brahman in Śruti and Smṛti texts, injunctions in the Veda permitting it to act in certain ways and prohibiting it from doing other acts, absence of intermixture of the actions of Jivas and the results there of all these we have to explain- to be due to the Upādhis (conditioning associates) peculiar to the several individual selves. We may cite the following verses from Gauḍapāda in support of this statement:-

रूपकार्यश्चेत्याय भिन्ने तत्र तत्र वे।

"Just as the pot-ether and the like ethers merge in the universal ether when the pot and other (Upadhis) are destroyed, so also the Jivas merge in the (Supreme) Atman."

GK 3-4.

रूपकार्यश्चेत्याय भिन्ने तत्र तत्र वे।

"Just as all ethers do not come into contact with dust smoke etc., when one pot-ether comes into contact with them, so also the Jivas (do not all promiscuously come into contact) with pleasure etc."

GK 3-5.

रूपकार्यश्चेत्याय भिन्ने तत्र तत्र वे।

"The form, function and the name differ indeed in each individual case, but yet there is no difference in the cosmic ether. So also we have to decide in the case of the (various) Jivas."

GK 3-6.

रूपकार्यश्चेत्याय भिन्ने तत्र तत्र वे।

"Just as pot-ether is neither a modification nor a part of the cosmic ether, so also the Jiva is neither a modification nor a part of the Supreme Atman."

GK 3-7.
Just as the sky becomes soiled by different kinds of dirt in children's eyes, so also Atman too is soiled by (ignorance, attachment and other) defilements in the eyes of the unenlightened.

"Atman is not dissimilar to cosmic ether with regard to birth, death, going (to other worlds) and coming back (to earth) and in dwelling in various bodies."

73. The distinction of Isvara and Jiva, therefore, is only a distinction without difference. Isvara's divinity and superiority and the Jiva's dependence upon Isvara, are relative to each other and, from the transcendental standpoint, their identity and intrinsic nature as the Absolute (Brahman), is never affected even while they appear to be disparate owing to the conditioning associates. We shall close this section giving a few excerpts from the Sutra-Bhashya which make this point clear :-

"So long as he does not remove ignorance responsible for duality, as one would remove the idea of a man (superimposed) on a stump of tree, and does intuit his own nature as the changelessly eternal Atman in the form 'I am Brahman' so long does Jiva's Jiva-nature persist. When, however, the Sruti causes a person to rise
above the idea of one's being the aggregate of the body, senses, the
mind and the intellect, and enlightens him in this way "You are
not the aggregate of the body, senses, the mind and the intellect,
you are not a transmigratory person, but that which is the Real,
the real Atman. That thou art", then, knowing that he is of
the essential nature of the changelessly eternal Seer, and rising above
the predilection for the body etc., he becomes that very Atman, the
timelessly changeless seer."  
SBh. 1-3-19, p. 112.

"For so long as avidyā is not removed, Jiva's being subject to
right and wrong deeds, and his Jiva-nature is not removed. When,
however, that (avidyā) is gone, Prājñā (the omniscient Atman)
himself is taught to be such by the Śruti 'That thou art'. Nor is the
identity of the entity itself affected by being apparently infected
by avidyā or by the latter's disappearance."  
SBh. 1-4-6, p. 154.

"For this reason also, all followers of Vedanta must accept
that the difference between the Vijñānatman (knowing Atman)
and Paramātman (Supreme Atman) is only due to conditioning
associates like the body made up of name and form presented by
avidyā and not real."  
SBh. 1-4-22, p. 173.

"So, the Isvara's rulership, omniscience and omnipotence is
only- relative to the limitation of the conditioning associate of
avidyāic nature, but in the Atman bereft of all conditioning
associates, there can be really no talk of ruler and the ruled, or
omniscience etc."  
SBh. 2-1-14, p. 201.
"And it is only so long as there is this connection with the conditioning associate of the mind (buddhi), that this Jiva continues to be a Jiva and a transmigratory soul. In reality, however, there is no such being as a Jiva other than the form conjured up by the connection of the conditioning associate, to wit, the mind. For when the meaning of Vedanta texts is closely examined, there is no second sentient entity to be found, other than lśvara who is ever-free by nature and omniscient."

SBh. 2-3-30, p. 287.

Moreover, this connection with the conditioning associate of buddhi, presupposes wrong knowledge (i.e. avidyā) and there is no way of removing wrong knowledge except by right knowledge. Therefore this connection with the conditioning associate of mind, is not destroyed till one does realize one's identity with Brahman."

SBh. 2-3-30, p. 288.

"During the state of ignorance the Jiva who indiscriminately sees his identity with the aggregate of the body and the senses because of his blindness caused by the cataract of avidyā, derives his transmigratory nature of being an agent and experiencer (of the fruits of actions) from the Supreme Atman. lśvara, the Witnessing Conscious Entity, who presides over all activities, indwells and inspires all beings (to action). And it is through the knowledge due to His grace alone that release could be expected to accrue (to the Jiva)."

SBh. 2-3-41, p. 296.
(8) निरतिर्गयोषयाधिसंपत्तिः श्रेष्ठो निरहीनोपाधिसंपत्तिः प्रशास्तीतिः न
किन्तः विद्विवेधः।

Sū. Bh. 2-3-45, p. 295.

"There is nothing self-contradictory in holding that lŚvara with His unsurpassable conditioning associate, rules over the Jivas with inferior conditioning associates." SBh. 2-3-45, p. 298.

(9) जीवरात्मायन्विताकृततामस्मिनिर्विन्तेऽदेहेन्द्रियायुपायमंविवेकविभूतिः

"Even in the case of the jiva, the experience of misery is only due to the delusion caused by indiscriminate identification with the conditioning associates such as the body and the senses made up of names and forms produced by avidyā, while there is no real misery."

SBh. 2-3-46, p. 299.

(10) स्वयंप्रसिद्धं होत्कच्छारिेस्य भ्रातात्मविन्यारिक्षेत, न यतःस्नर

"This Brahmic nature of the embodied self which is being taught here, is what already is a fact and not something to be achieved through a fresh effort. And therefore, this Brahmic nature taught by the Śāstra having been ascertained, becomes the sublater of the innate idea of one's identity with the body, like the ideas of rope etc., sublating the ideas of snake etc." SBh. 2-1-14, p. 197.

[This is an illustration revealing that our identification with the body is only a delusive notion.]

(11) क: पुनर्देहसंवन्ध: ? देहादिर्यं सहातोस्थमेवेवत्मान: विपरीत-

प्रत्ययोत्तिः। द्वयं च सा सर्वप्राप्तिः 'अहं गच्छामि,’ ‘अहमागच्छामि’,

‘अहमन्तोहस्मं’; ‘अहं मूतोहस्मं’। इत्यवाचारिणाः। न हास्यi

सम्यगदर्शनानादन्त्यविवेककर्मिः। प्राचु सम्यगदर्शनात् प्रतिलोच्छ। भान्ति: सर्वजननुप।

Sū. Bh. 2-3-48, p. 301.

"(Question :-) But which is this देहसंवन्ध (body connection)?

(Reply :-) It is the rise of the perverse idea regarding the Self that this aggregate of body etc. is one's own self. It is found in
all creatures in such forms as 'I go', 'I come back'; 'I am blind', 'I am not blind'; 'I am ignorant', 'I am not ignorant'. There is nothing that can eradicate this (perverse idea) other than right discernment. Before the dawn of right discernment, however, this delusion is seen to continue in all creatures." SBh. 2-3-48, 301.

(२२) कत्मादु पुनर्जीवः परमात्माः एव सन्तः तिर्स्कृतज्ञात्मयो भवति।
चुबं तु ज्ञानेश्वरयोगतिर्स्कृतत्वं बिस्मुलिन्धनेय दहनप्रकाशायोरिति।
उच्यते।
सत्यमेवेत्तत्।
सोदर्शि तु जीवस्य ज्ञानेश्वरयतिरभावः देहयोगात्।
देहेण्ट्रियमोगोवुद्धिविचारवेदनादियोगादिदेहयोगादिभवति।
अति चानोपमा यथाग्रेष्ठेन्नुक्राश्चत्रानसंपन्नायार्पणेत्त्वेव दहनप्रकाशाने सन्तोते भवति।
यथा च भस्मचन्नस्य।
एवम्।
अविद्यात्युपस्थापितनामस्स्पून्ता दहनदायुपायोगात्।
तदविवेकचक्रातो जीवस्य ज्ञानेश्वरयतिरभावः।
सू. भा. ३-२-५, पा. २५७।

"(Objection :-) But why is it that the Jiva being a part of the Supreme Atman, has his knowledge and predominant power intercepted? It is reasonable that his knowledge and power should be unintercepted like the burning and illuminating (capacity) of a spark.

(Reply :- ) This is certainly true. But even that interception of Jiva's knowledge and power, is due to his body-connection; that is, connection with the body, senses, mind, intellect, perception of object etc. There are (suitable) similes also here. Just as the burning and illuminating powers of fire which does possess these powers inherent (in it), are intercepted in the fire (latent) in a faggot, or in fire covered up with ashes, so also the interception of Jiva's knowledge and power, is due only to the delusion caused by the non-discriminatory notion owing to the connection with the conditioning associates like the body made up of name and form presented by avidyā."

SBh. 3-2-6, p.347.

(२३) अपि च यदा तत्त्वसति.प्रतिविचित्रकृते अनेकानेदिर्देशन अनेदः
प्रितिभोधितो भवति अपगतं भवति तदा जीवस्य संसारिताः प्रवणाण प्रतितत्वं,
समस्तस्य मिथ्याज्ञानविज्ञितस्य भेदववहारस्य सम्यज्ञानम् वाधितचतात्।
सू. भा. २१-२१, पा. २०९।

"Moreover, when the idea of non-difference, has been awakened by texts like 'That thou art' pointing to non-difference,
the Jiva's transmigratory nature and Brahman's creatorship both vanish for good; for all convention of duality spread out by wrong knowledge will have been sublated (then)."  SBh. 2-1-22, p. 209.

[Brahman's creatorship is only relative; but Jiva's transmigratory nature is unreal being superimposed by avidyā.]

(१४) तयोहाः सोऽसी योसी सोऽसम् ॥
"In Him (the universal Prana), what is myself that is He (in the Sun); what He is, that I am myself."  Ai. Āraṇyaka 2-2-4.

(१५) त्वं वा अहंस्मि भगवो देवतेकं है त्वमसि ॥
"Thyself am I, O revered Divinity. I myself art thou."  Jābāla (?)

The above cited texts are for meditation. Here the objection may crop up that by equating Īśwara with Jiva's Atman, transmigratory nature would have to be imputed to God, and that is not desirable. Śaṅkara rebuts the charge thus:

(२) न वयम् एकत्वदीकारं वायवायम्: ; कि तद्भ, व्यतिद्वर्गवेद द्विरुपमाण्यात्, नैकरुपा - इत्येतार्थपापाधारम्: । फलतस्तु एकत्वमपि हदीभवति ॥
"This is no defect (in the system), for it is unity of Atman alone that is being meditated in this manner."  SBh. 3-3-37, p. 411.

(२) न वयम् एकत्वदीकारं वायवायम्: ; कि तद्भ, व्यतिद्वर्गवेद द्विरुपमाण्यात्, नैकरुपा - इत्येतार्थपापाधारम्: । फलतस्तु एकत्वमपि हदीभवति ॥
"We are not going to ward off confirmation of unity, but only insist that a reciprocity of identity should be meditated upon. As an inevitable consequence, unity also will have been confirmed."  SBh. 3-3-37, p. 411.

Here perfect unity of Īśvara and Jiva, has been allowed from the transcendental standpoint even for a meditator. We shall return to this subject when we take up the Vedantic teaching on meditation.
10. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD
(The Universal and the Particular)

74. We have seen that the distinction of Īsvara and Jīvas, is only relative and that Īsvara is really Brahman the Absolute devoid of all distinctions. The description of Brahman as that which is the cause of the birth, sustentation and dissolution of the universe (जन्मायस्य यतः VS. 1-1-2) is only a device - the device of deliberately superimposing the causal nature on Brahman or Atman in order to transcend all idea of causality.

(१) तदेतदृ ब्रह्मापूर्ववर्णपरमनन्तरवाक्ष्यायमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूतिन्यनु-शासनम्।

"Now this Brahman is without a before, or an after, without an interior or an exterior. This Atman is Brahman, He is the direct experiercer of everything. This is the (whole) teaching."

Br. 2-5-19.

(२) अन्यन्त्र भर्तादमयायमात्मानंतरवायमात्माकृति कृताद।

"That which you see, that which is beyond the right, and beyond the wrong (deed), beyond this cause and effect (-relation) and beyond the past and the future - please tell me That."

Ka.2-14.

From that stand-point of the Absolute, therefore, there can be no creative cause efficient or material; there can be no universe created as an effect; no action,
instruments of action, or the fruits of action; no time, space, or causality; and hence, nothing predicable as
substance or quality, nothing changeful or changeless,
no act or its consequence, and no relation of the
universal and particular.

75. From the standpoint of adhyātma, however,
there is scope for all these in the universe created. Here
is Śaṅkara's description of the universe which is caused
by Brahman:

अस्य जगते नामस्वाभायं व्याकृतस्य अनेकाकर्षोज्ज्यसंयुक्तस्य प्रतिनियत-
देशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाध्यस्य, मनसायचिन्त्यचनात्मकस्य जन्मस्थितिभवं
यत् सर्वज्ञात् सर्वज्ञात् कारणादू भवति, 'तद्भवः' इति वाक्योऽपि: ||

"That omniscient and omnipotent cause, from which the
origin, sustentation and dissolution of this universe which is
differentiated by name and form, which contains many agents of
action and experiencers (of the fruits thereof), and which is the
abode of actions and their fruits regulated by particular place,
time and cause and is such that its structure is beyond all
conception; the clause 'that is Brahman' has to be supplied to
make the sentence complete."

SBh. 1-1-2, p. 7.

76. The Upanishad therefore takes hold of an
empirical example to illustrate how the universal is
indispensable for the particulars to enjoy their being,
and hence concludes that the universal is their real
being. And thus deliberately superimposing
universality upon Atman, the Śruti applies this
illustration to decide that all not-Self depends upon
Atman for its being, and is therefore identical with it.

स यथा तुनुभैर्हन्यमानस्य न बालाञ्चांश्चाचाःकृतयादृ ग्रहणाय तुनुभैर्तु
ग्रहणेन तुनुभैर्घातस्य वा शाब्दो गृहीतः || बृ. 2-4-7.
"Just as while a drum is being beaten, one cannot grasp the particular sounds apart from it, but on their being grasped as the sounds of the drum, or as the outcome of beating the drum, the sound is grasped."

Br. 2-4-7.

Other sources of sound are given as illustrations to show that particular sounds in themselves cannot be grasped except by referring them to their source.

77. The Brhadaranyaka-Bhashya indicates the general line of reasoning suggested by these illustrations thus:

अनेकश्राणीपादानिहृत रामान्यथप्राप्तार्थम्। अनेकश्राणीपादानिहृताः समास्थिता। तेषां पारमपर्णाय प्रधानार्थवेद्यर्मिनः महास्मात्ये अन्तर्भावः प्रज्ञाननेन वर्णनायाः कर्म नाम प्रधानार्थवेद्यर्मिनः, एवं स्थितिकालेत जात्वा समास्थितान्यत्रित्यं ब्रह्मक्रियां शास्त्रमवगतम्य।

"The citation here of many examples, is to draw the listener's attention to the fact that there are many genera. For there are numerous sub-genera sentient and insentient. Therefore the intention is to show how in succession all of them are included in the highest genus of Pure Consciousness just as the sub-varieties of the sounds of the drum, conch and the vina are comprehended in sound in general. Thus during the state of sustentation, since the sub-genera are not apart (from Brahman), it is possible to conclude that Brahman alone is real."

Br. Bh. 2-4-9, p. 762.

78. The force of the argument adduced above, lies in the fact that no phenomenon in the empirical sphere can claim any being of its own unless it is recognized as a species of a genus common to all particular phenomena of its nature. Now all these genera are in themselves dependent on Pure Consciousness, which is Atman. That all phenomena, interior (psychic), or
exterior (physical), enjoy their existence through the grace of Consciousness - not the empirical, but the pure Witnessing Consciousness - whose non-existence is inconceivable - is no mere speculation, but is based on the firm ground of intuition. (Prajñānāmyatiḥ kārṣṭaḥ eva prajñāgatītvam kathād vistavyasya gṛhāt || Br.Bh. 762). We thus see that the Upanishads make use of the device of Adhyātapāvāda by taking illustrations of some genera and species from common life and superimposing the character of a genus on Atman to lead the enquirer to realize that Atman is the only Reality.

79. This device of superimposing the nature of a genus has been combined with the superimposition of the nature of a cause on Brahman in the following verses of the Bhagavadgītā:

\[ नासतो विषयते भावो नामावेश विषयते सतः ||
उभयोपरिः हष्टोदन्तस्ववन्योपत्वद्विस्विभि: ||
अविनाशित: तु तद्विषय: वेन सर्वाभिः सत: ||
विनाशविश्वस्यस्य: न कथित: कृत्वहारति ||
अन्तवन्त: इमेद: नित्यस्योक्त: शरीरिण: ||
अनाशिपावप्रमेयस्य तस्मादू यथ्यवस्म सत्ताः ||
Gī. 2-16

"There is no being of the non-existent, (and) there is no non-being of the (really) existent. The truth concerning both of these, has been realized by those who are used to see Reality (as it is)."

G. 2-16

[ That which is, can never cease to be; if any thing appears to be and ceases to be after some time, then it is evident that really it was not. Similarly that which really is not, can never come to be. If anything which was not, suddenly comes to be, then we may be sure that it’s coming to exist is a hoax. Therefore to be is to be real]

"Know that alone to be imperishable, by which all this
(universe) is pervaded. Nobody can effect the disappearance of this undecayable One."

G. 2-17.

[That which really is can never disappear. This real Being is the all-pervading Brahman or Atman]

"These bodies belonging to Him who is eternal and owns bodies, have an end. These bodies are of Him who is indestructible, and not a knowable object. Therefore fight, O scion of Bharata."

G.2-18.

[These verses are not dealing with the destruction of the impermanent and the permanent. They propose to distinguish the real Being from the apparently existent things.]

Commenting on the first of these three ślōkas, Śankara says :-

(२) यथा घटादिसंस्थानं चः पुप्पा निरूप्यमाणं मृत्युतिरक्रेणानुपलंभेरसतः
तथा सन्तौ विकारः कारण्यतिरिक्रेणानुपलंभेरसन्।
जन्मप्रक्ष्यसामायं प्रागृह्यं चानुपलंभे कार्यस्य घटोऽः।
मृदाृदिकारणस्य च तत्कारण्यतिरिक्रेणानुपलंभे-रसत्वम्॥

"Just as the objective form of a pot being closely examined by perception, is not seen apart from clay and is therefore unreal, so also every effect not being seen to be apart from its cause, is unreal. Not being perceived before its birth and after its destruction, the effect such as a pot is unreal, and clay etc. its cause, is in its turn not seen apart from its own cause and therefore it is also unreal."


[This is obviously the re-echo of the Chandogya Śruti which employs the method of superimposition of causality on Pure Being.]

(३) तदस्सत्ये सर्वभागाप्रसङ्गः — इति चेतु, न। ज्ञेयस्तु वुद्धि योपलंभे;
सत्तुब्रह्मसुदुः। - इति । यदिमया वुद्धि व्यञ्जनाया धिं तदु सत्
यदिमया यदिमया तदस्तु। - इति सत्तुव्यञ्जनाय वुद्धिन्तने स्थिते
सर्वं स्वस्वेषे सामानाधिकारणे। नीलोत्पलवत् 'सनृः घटः,'
'सनृः घटः,' 'सनृः हस्ती,' इत्येव सर्वं सर्वं ।

1. 'सामानाधिकारणे। न नीलोत्पलवत्' is clearly a clerical mistake for the reading given above.
(Objection :-) If that (cause also) is non-existent it would follow that there is nothing existing!

(Reply :-) No. For there are two ideas experienced with regard to everything, to wit, the idea of the existent and the idea of the non-existent. (To explain :-) Now the distinction of (the really existent) and the non-existent depends upon our idea (regarding them), for that is (really) existent (sat) the idea about which is never faithless, and that is non-existent (asat) the idea about which is faithless. Now, the distinction of the really existent and the non-existent thus being ascertained to depend on the idea (corresponding to the object), two ideas (viz. the idea of being and the idea of the thing) are experienced by all with regard to every phenomenon in collocation, like (the ideas of) blue and lotus, as for instance (the ideas with regard to) an existent pot, an existent (piece of) cloth, an existent elephant, and so on in each case. Of these two ideas, the idea of pot etc. fails, as already¹ shown, but not the idea of being. Therefore the object corresponding to the idea of pot is 'asat' (not really) existent, for (its idea) is changeful; not so the object corresponding to the idea of being, for (its idea) never changes."

GBh. 2-16, pp. 14, 15.

[Here 'being' is regarded by adhyārōpa as the universal common to all the phenomena.]

---

¹. While discussing the idea of all effect.
11. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD

(The Jiva and the Real Atman)

80. The Jiva in the state of sustentation of the world, identifies himself with his various conditioning associates. The Adhyāropāpavāda method is applied here in the Śrutis by superimposing the Atman nature on each of these seemingly circumscribing associates successively in order to rescind the Atmanhood imputed to the other. This is what is known as the Discrimination of the Five Sheaths. Gauḍapāda refers to this method thus in one of his Kārikās:

रसादयो हि ये कोशाष्टयावातास्तैत्तरियायेकः।
तेषामात्मा परो जीवः संत्संक्षारितः॥

"The Supreme Jiva (Real Atman) is the Self of the sheaths such as the essence (of food), which have been stated at length in the Taittirīyaka. (He is the One) illustrated by us in the simile of Ākāśa."

GK. 3-11.

81. Subsequent to the account of creation of Ākāśa and the other four elements the Taittirīya Upanishad describes the evolution of man with his physiological associate, the body, thus:

पृथिव्या ओषधयः। ओषधीयोऽस्मात्। अचातुपृथः। स वा एप
पूर्णपोष्याच्यास्मयः। तस्येद्वमेव शिरः। अयमद्विधस्य पक्षः। अयमात्मा।
इदं पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा॥

"From Earth (were born) herbs; from herbs food; (and) from food Purusha (man). Now he, this man, is made up of the essence of food. Of him this, as is well-known, is the head; this is the right
APPLICATION OF THE METHOD (The Jiva and the Real Atman)

Here man is called Purusha because he possesses head and other parts of which his body is made up. It must be noted that while the ignorant take this body alone to be their self, yet this organism together with Brahman or Atman, is called ‘अत्मात्मा’ (Atman made up of food) by the Śruti to indicate that it is the very same Brahman which appears to have been evolved into what is known as man. And while there are numberless creatures who are likewise evolved, man alone is particularly mentioned here because, as Śaṅkara remarks, man alone is specially qualified to perform karma as laid down in the Śastra and also to realize his real nature by acquiring knowledge. He alone possesses the capacity required by the Śastra; he alone is an aspirant for the fruit of karma or knowledge. In his species alone are to be found persons who are qualified to perform Vedic karmas or enter into detailed and direct investigation of the meaning of Vedantic texts teaching the nature of Brahmātman. Man’s body is metaphorically spoken of here as though it were the body of a bird. Hence the words Paksha (wing) and puccha (tail).

82. Evolution of man is here purposely described to lead the enquirer by the method of Adhyāropāpavāda to his real nature of Brahmātman as contrasted with Sārātman. The next Śruti text here therefore superimposes Atman-nature on a more comprehensive conditioned self called the Prāṇamayātman :-

तस्यावज्ञा एतस्मात्मात्मस्मयातः। अन्योदन्तर आत्मा प्राप्यमयः। ते नेव पूर्णः। स वा एष पुरुषविध्य एव। तस्य पुरुषविध्यताम्। अन्यचेव पुरुषविध्यः। तस्य प्राण एव
"Other than this (atman) made up of the essence of food, who was described before, there is another inner Atman made up of Prāṇa (Vāyu). By that (Atman), this (one) is pervaded. Now this one is also of the form of Purusha (human body). This (Prāṇamayaṭman) is of the form of Purusha (human body), after the bodily shape of that (annamayaṭman). Of that (Prāṇamayaṭman) Prāṇa is the head; Vyāna is the right wing, Apāna is the left wing; Akāśa (i.e. Samāna) is the self, the midmost function; (the goddess presiding over) earth is the tail prop." Tai. 2-2.

83. Prāṇamayaṭman and the other atmans hereinafter mentioned, are all subtle, that is to say, supersensuous, and therefore can have no particular shape of their own. Hence the Śruti says that their shape is in conformity with the shape of the body, and Śaṅkara illustrates this by comparing them to an image made up of smelt copper cast into a crucible. Each of the preceding sheaths herein enumerated, is filled with the succeeding one just as bellows are filled with air.

We shall now proceed to the description of the next sheath, on which again the Śruti superimposes atman-nature to negate the self-hood of the Prāṇamayaṭman:–

"Of that former (annamayāṭman), this indeed is the embodied-self. Other than this prāṇamayaṭman, there is an inner Atman made up of manas (mind). By that (atman) this one is
APPLICATION OF THE METHOD (THE JNA AND THE REAL ATMAN)

84. Inasmuch as the vital part of human beings is controlled by the psychic part, it is natural that the mind is considered to be still more subtle and more pervasive than, and the atman (the inner essence) of, the vital aspect.

It might be asked how Yajus and other mantras are here described as organs of Manomaya's body. This difficulty is obviated by observing that it is not the body, vital force or the mind pertaining to any individual man that is being described here. It is the cosmic body etc. which are the conditioning associates of Atman, that are enumerated in succession. Thus the Annamayatman is the Virat and the Pranamayatman is the Sutratman, and that is why at the end of each description, the Sruti refers to the cosmic body of Atman. 'They get all food indeed, who meditate upon food as Brahman' (Tai. 2-2), 'They attain the full span of life, who meditate upon Prana as Brahman' (Tai. 2-3). Similarly, Manomayatman being Hiranyagarbha or Vedatman (Atman conditioned by manas of the form of the Vedas), his body is rightly described as constituted by Yajus etc.

85. Another point of apparent difficulty must be solved here before we proceed. In each of these descriptions, the succeeding 'kosa' (sheath) is described as the self in the body which is the previous kosa (तस्यैष एव शारिर आत्मा। यः पूर्वस्य). This interpretation
is according to the Taittirīya-Bhāshya. An alternative interpretation is offered by Śureśvara. His interpretation seems more plausible, because the two sentences as they stand, are more faithfully translated thus: 'Of him this alone is the Atman residing in his body, who is the Atman in the body of the previous one'. According to this interpretation, the drift would be that one and the same Brahman is the Self in the body of annamaya, prāṇamaya, maṇḍamaya and other sheaths; and this is quite in consonance with the opening sentence तत्स्मात्त्र एतस्मातान्तम अकाशः संभूतः: । 'From this (Brahman, who is the) Self (of all), akāśa was born.' The conclusion that Brahman is the atman of all, therefore, only reinforces what was said at the very commencement. On second thoughts, however, we are more likely to side with the author of the Bhāshya; for it is not the question of confirming a dogmatic statement of the Śrutī, that is being pursued here. The Śrutī aims at utilizing the Adhyātmaṁabhāda method at each step. Identification of Atman with the body, is first discarded by superimposing atman-nature on the pranamaya, and then this is also rescinded by a further superimposition of atman-nature on the maṇḍamaya and so on, till we ultimately reach Brahman, the in most real Atman. Therefore it is better to take the expression एवं एव शारीर आत्मा as equivalent to 'this maṇḍamaya himself is the atman of the previous prāṇamaya.' This interpretation has the support of grammar also, since the word एव (eṣah) refers to the more proximate antecedent ('samipaṁtravarticaitadāḥrūpaṁ' as the grammarian would say), and is preferably construed as referring to maṇḍamaya rather than to the more remote word Brahman.
86. We shall not tarry* long to consider the elaborate description of the Vijñānamayātman and the ānandamayātman. Suffice it to say that they also refer to cosmic kōshas, conditioning associates of Atman as Hiranyagarbha, each taught, by superimposition, as the atman of the preceding one. What is more pertinent to the present discussion, is that in this Upanishad annamaya, prāṇamaya, manomaya, vijñānamaya and ānandamaya, are the five kōshas (or sheaths), each of which is successively spoken of as atman by superimposition - or we might say that Atman conditioned by each of these sheaths, is spoken of as though he were the real Atman - just to lead the enquirer gradually to the really real Atman or Brahman.

87. It would be of some interest to the critical reader to remember that in the description of each of these kōshas, cosmic food, vital force, the mind etc. are praised as the cause of the annamaya kōsha, prāṇamaya kōsha etc. It is perhaps in confirmation of this that the dialogue between Bṛghu and his father Varuṇa, is brought in by the Upanishad, where Bṛghu after deep contemplation, presumes that Food (or, it may be, Atman as conditioned by the associate of that name), etc. as Brahman and finally arrives at the conclusion that Ananda or Bliss absolute is the only real Brahman. Only, there, the nature of Brahman as the cause of the origin, sustentation and dissolution of the world, is superimposed on cosmic Food etc.,

* The reader interested in the subject, is referred to the Bhashyārtha-Vimarsinī on Taittirīya Bhashya, by the present writer, for more details.
whereas in this *Brahmānanda Valli*, the notion of Atman is being examined till it culminates in the notion of Brahman **which is the tail prop of Anandamayātman**. The result of this enquiry is thus stated in the mantra:

यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते । अग्राप्य मनसा सह ।
आनन्द ब्रह्माणो विद्वान् । न विभेति कुत्थनेति ॥

"Knower of the Bliss of Brahman from which (all) words return without reaching It along with mind, is not afraid of anything whatever."

Tai 2-9.

Here Ananda (Bliss) is not to be construed as some property pertaining to Brahman. It is Brahman itself, the Atman of everyone.

So, it is Brahman or Atman which is Pure Bliss that is discovered by both of the sub-varieties of the method.
12. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD
(Examination of the States of Consciousness)

88. Man continually passes through the states of consciousness waking, dream and sleep. While he is waking, perception of objects through the senses is predominate, the mind and the intellect being subservient to the senses. While dreaming, he has left his body and the senses (together with the mind and the intellect of course, but yet) the mind appears to continue to work, in rather a whimsical manner. And one might dream a number of dreams during a single night, not one of which is recognized as a dream, so long as it is being dreamt. And when he is overtaken by deep sleep, all sensuous and mental acts are suspended. There is no trace of consciousness whatever, so that one might even think it a waste of so much life, and might exclaim with Indra -

"O revered one, this (sleeping person) does not now know himself in the form 'I am this' nor these beings (as such). He is reduced to annihilation, as it were; I see no good here." Ch. 8-11-2.

89. Thus from the empirical standpoint, utilizing the method of adhyātārāpanāvāda, the Upanishads ascribe this experience to Atman and by examining the contents of these states, take the enquirer to a point where Atman is seen to be untouched by any of these states of consciousness. We shall now take two
Upanishads where this subject has been treated at some length.

90. In the Jyotir-Brähmana of the Brhadāraṇyaka Upanishad, we find the following introduction to the examination of the three states:

तत्स्य वा एवत्स्य पुरुषस्य द्वारा स्थाने भवति द्वैतं च परलोकस्थानं च सन्न्यां 
तुतीयं स्वभावस्थानं तथिनौ सन्न्ये स्थाने तिर्यक्तं उभे स्थाने परम्परीयं च 
परलोकस्थानं च । अथ यथाक्रमेऽव्यः परलोकस्थाने भवति तत्प्रक्रममप्रकृत्योभयानु 
पापन आपन्दश्च प्रवत्ति स यत्र प्रस्तवित्वस्य लोकस्य सर्वाणि भाट्रामणादाय 
स्वयं विहृत्य स्वयं निर्माय स्वेन भासा स्वेन ज्योतिः प्रस्तवित्वात्राणं पुरुषः 
स्वयंज्योतिर्भावति ॥

रू. ४-३-९, पा. ८७७

"Now, for this Purusha, there are only two stations, this (one) and the station of the next world; the junction is the third, the dream-station. Staying at that station of junction, he observes these two stations this (one) and the station of the next world. Whatever outfit he may have for the next world, providing himself with that outfit, he sees both (the results of) sins and pleasures; when he dreams, he takes off a part of this all-embracing world, he casts himself aside and creates himself, and with his lustre (as object), and with his light (of consciousness as subject), he dreams. Here this Purusha becomes self effulgent."  
Br. 4-3-9, p. 877.

न तत्र स्था न रस्योगस्य न पन्थानो भवत्त्यथ रथानां रस्योगानां पथः । सृजते न 
तत्त्वान्न्वश मुदः । प्रमुदः । भवत्त्यथान्न्वशः मुदः । प्रमुदः । सृजते न तत्र वेशान्नातः 
पुष्करिण्यः । सृजते न तत्र वेशान्नातः । पुष्करिण्यः । सृजते न तत्र वेशान्नातः । पुष्करिण्यः ।

रू. ४-३-१०, पा. ८७८

"No chariots are there, no animals to be yoked, no roads; but he creates chariots, animals to be yoked, and roads. No pleasures, joys or delights are there (really); but he creates pleasures, joys and delights. No pools, tanks or streams are there (really); but he creates pools, tanks and streams. For he is the agent (of all actions)."
Br. 4-3-10, p. 879.
The śrutis quoted above only draw our attention to what is already known about waking and dream, and draw the conclusion that the Atman is self-effulgent with his nature as consciousness. The statement that he creates as the agent of action, only tells us that the illusory appearances that one sees in dreams, are temporary experiences due to his past karma.

There are some Vedantins who think that even dreams are real because the objects there, are created by Īśvara himself. This is rejected by both Bādarāyaṇa and Gauḍapāda on the strength of reason as well as of the express wording of the śruti. Bādarāyaṇa writes:

मायामात्रं तु काल्पनिकानमभिव्यक्तसमस्यास्तित्वात् ।

"(Dream creation), however, is only Māyā, for it is not of a nature which manifests all the features of a real thing." BS. 3-2-3.

The śruti itself denies that there is creation of things which are not really there, and the requisite conditions of a real thing, to wit, sufficient time, place and cause, as well as of being not sublated, are not forthcoming in the case of dream objects. Gauḍapāda therefore declares:

अभावाथ रथादीनां शून्यते न्यायपूर्वकः ।

"The śruti puts forward the absence of chariots etc. (and their creation) as a reason for unreality. Therefore knowers of Brahman, say that thereby is revealed the unreality already well-known on the strength of reason." GK. 2-3.

91. The Kāṭhaka Upanishad draws another important conclusion from the waking and dream experiences :-
"The wise one having ascertained that great and all pervading Atman through whom one sees the contents of both dream and waking, does not grieve." Ka. 4-4.

A co-ordination of the two avasthas (stations) reveals the fact that the Atman whose consciousness throws light on both the states, is distinct from either and is not subject to the pleasure and pain incidental to experience of objects in either of the states.

92. That the Atman is untainted by whatever He seems to experience in waking or dream, is made clear in the following Kaṇḍākās of Brhadāraṇyaka:

\[(२) \text{स वा एष्टमिन् स्वप्ने रत्वा चरित्रा हृद्दृष्टव एष्टमिन् स यज्ञत्र किंवितस्यत्यन्न्यागतस्ते} \\
\text{भवत्यस्त्रोहार्यं पुरुषं इति} \]  

"Now this Purusha, after enjoying himself and roaming about in this dream state, and merely seeing (the effects of) right and wrong deeds, hastens back in the reverse way to his previous condition, to waking alone. Whatever he may see in that state, he is untainted by it, for this Purusha is unattached." Br. 4-3-16.

\[(२) \text{स वा एष्टमिन् बुद्धान्ते रत्वा चरित्रा हृद्दृष्टव} \\
\text{प्रतिन्यायं प्रतियोन्यायार्थव मुरुच्चण्यायेत्र स्वप्नन्तयाये} \]  

"Now this same (Purusha), after enjoying himself and roaming about in this waking state and merely seeing (the effect of) right and wrong deeds, hastens back in the reverse way to his previous condition, to dream alone." Br. 4-3-17.

93. In the above cited text the Śruti says that even in the waking state, the Purusha only 'sees' the effects of right and wrong deeds. This is apparently in contradiction of common experience which reveals that
people not only perceive the consequences of deeds, but actually do good or bad deeds. Śaṅkara therefore raises this objection and replies as follows:

\[\text{(2) ननु 'हस्तेव' इति कथमवधयते? करोति च तत्र पुण्यपापे; तत्त्वलं च पश्यति।} \]

No, for (this) agency can be explained by his revealing the factors of action. (To explain :-) By the text 'It is through the light of Atman alone he sits' etc., (we can see that) the aggregate of the body and senses, does all acts with the help of the light of atman which reveals it, and so agency is attributed to him in a secondary sense, and not as intrinsic. Accordingly, it was said earlier 'He thinks as it were, shakes as it were' referring to the function only of the intellect and other limiting associates and not as intrinsic. Here, however, it is stated that 'he is merely seeing (the effects) of right and wrong deeds, but not doing' from the transcendental standpoint, independently of all conditioning associates. Hence, no objection can be raised on the score of self-contradiction in respect of what was said before and what is being said subsequently."

94. The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible that Atman is untainted by any characteristics appearing as inherent in him either in the waking or in the dream state. The following Kaṇḍākā makes this more explicit.
by an apt illustration: -

तथ्या महामत्य उभे कूले अनुस्मरति पूर्व चारं चैव मेवायं पुरुष एतादेवात्मातानुस्मरति स्वप्नान्त च सुभ्रान्त च ॥

"Just as a great whale swims to both the banks (of a stream), this and the other, so also this Purusha moves to and from both these states, the dream state and the waking state."

Br. 4-3-18.

95. Sāṅkara tells us just what is the point of comparison intended to be stressed here: -

र्ह्जन्त्रप्रदर्शनं तु मृत्युरूपं कार्यकल्युक्तान्तः सह तत्त्योजकाभ्यां कामकर्मभायेव अनात्मस्तथः, अयं चात्मा एतस्मादू विलक्षणः - हृति ॥

"The conclusion to be deduced from the illustration cited is, that the aggregate of body and senses, which is the guise of death together with its causes, desire and action, is the property of the non-self, while this Atman is of a nature distinct from this."

Br. Bh. 4-3-18, p. 887.

96. The whole of this Brāhmaṇa must be studied in detail to convince one's self of the Absolute nature of Atman. For our present purpose, however, it will be enough to cite the Kaṭṭākās relating to deep sleep to show how by this method of adhyātmapāpaśāda, the Śruti makes it clear that Atman is altogether free from all the defects foisted by the ignorant on the eternally pure, conscious, free nature inherent in Him.

97. It is interesting to note the wide difference between the popular view of deep sleep and the Upanishadic view of that state. The common man with his natural partiality for the waking state which presents a world so useful to him for all his practical purposes, has the naive idea that sleep is merely a life of inevitable ignorance which one would gladly evade if
he could. In perfect contrast with this, is the Śāstraic view of this apparently mysterious state:

(१) तद्भव आयात्तदति भन्ना अपहतपापमा अभयं रूपम्। तत्वत्था प्रयव खिया सम्परश्यको न वाहां किंवन वेद नान्तरमेवेवाय पुरुषः प्राज्ञात्माना सम्परश्यको न वाहां किंवन वेद नान्तरं तद्भव आयात्तदताकामात्मकामकामं रूपं शोकान्तरम्॥

"That is indeed his form beyond desire, with all sin destroyed, fearless. Just as one firmly embraced by his dear wife, knows nothing either without or within, so also this Purusha firmly embraced by the omniscient Atman, is aware of nothing whether without or within. That is, indeed, the form of this (Purusha) wherein all desires have been attained; wherein Atman is all desires, free from all desires and free from grief." Br. 4-3-21.

There are two conclusions drawn here by the author of the Bhāṣya :- (1) The self-revealing nature of Atman is not adventitious. (2) Atman's inherent nature is directly intuited in deep sleep.

By bringing forward the illustration of man and wife, this incidental fact has been stated here that the self-effulgent nature actually persists in sleep, but is not experienced there because of the Jiva's becoming one with Prājña, and not because of its being adventitious like desire, action etc. Having affirmed this incidental fact, the Śruti proceeds to relate what is directly the subject-matter in hand. Here the subject-matter in hand, is this that the nature of Atman directly intuited in profound sleep, is altogether free from ignorance, desire and action."

Br. Bh. 4-3-22, p. 893.

(२) अत्र विदानिता भवति मातास्वता लोका अलोका वेदा अदेवा वेदा अवेदा। अत्र स्तेनोदस्तेनो भवति भूणाहृष्णाहा चाण्डालोऽकचाण्डालः
"Here, a father becomes no father, a mother no mother, the worlds no worlds, the Vedas no Vedas, the gods no gods. Here, a thief becomes no thief, the killer of an embryo[^1] no *killer* of an embryo, a *cāndāla* no *cāndāla*, a *paulkasa* no *paulkasa*, a monk no monk, an ascetic no ascetic. The nature of Atman is not haunted by right deed, not haunted by wrong deed, for then, one will have crossed beyond all the cares of the heart."

Br. 4-3-22.

[This text describes how all relations due to one's actions in the waking condition, cease to have any contact with the essential nature of Atman which is intuited here.]

98. The following texts declare in unmistakable terms, how the so-called deep sleep is really no state at all, for from the transcendental standpoint, it is only the non-dualistic Atman alone that ignorant people mistake for a state in which the individual soul is shrouded in the darkness of unconsciousness:

(१) यदृि तब विज्ञानाति विज्ञानचन्द्र तथः विज्ञानाति न हि

"That (Atman) does not know (anything) there, (is to be explained by the fact that) even while knowing, indeed, he does not know anything. For, there can be no absolute disappearance of the cognition of the knower, since it is indestructible. Only, there is nothing second to him, which he could know."

[The Atman alone stays in sleep whereas the knowing faculty of the mind is not there, because mind itself as well as the knowable objective phenomena is all merged in Atman so that Atman is absolutely secondless. Consciousness being the very essence of Atman, is not absent while everything else including empirical cognition as distinct from Atman, is not there.]

[^1]: One who has caused abortion.
Where there would be something else, as it were, there one could see something else, there one could smell something else, one could say something else, one could hear something else, one could think something else, one could touch something else, one could know something else."

Br. 4-3-31.

[But here in the so-called deep sleep, there is nothing other than Atman which he could be expected to see, smell, speak, hear, think, touch, or know. The phenomena distinguished into subject and object, are absolutely not there. Therefore it is not the absence of the conscious nature that is responsible for want of knowledge, but the absence of the factors necessary to produce knowledge. Human perception and conception are possible only in the unreal worlds of waking or dream.]

He is (transparent like) water, One, the Witness without a second. 'This is Brahma-lóka, O emperor' so did Yājñavalkya teach Janaka, 'This is the supreme goal of this (Purusha), this is his greatest acquisition, this is his highest enjoyment, this is his supreme bliss. Other beings live only on a particle of this same bliss.'

Br. 4-3-32.

[Since the Jiva becomes one with the second less Absolute, there is nothing comparable to this nature of the soul in this state.]

99. The only other Upanishad where the examination of the Avasthas has been utilized for the application of the Adhyáyáropápaváda method, is the Mándúkya. The difference between the approach in Brhadárañyaka and that in the Mándúkya, lies in the
fact that, whereas in the Brhadāranyaka the revelation of the self-effulgent nature of Atman, is the principal subject-matter of discussion in the incipient stage, and the identity of the Vijñānamayatman and Brahman, is the final goal of teaching, in the Māndūkya the one theme proposed to be expatiated upon, is that Brahman or Atman is the Absolute eternally beyond the distinction of the name and the named, and beyond all distinction of the knower and the known apparently obtaining in waking and dream, but altogether absent in deep sleep.

100. At first sight, the Māndūkya Upanishad would appear to treat of the symbol 'Om', for it opens with the statement

अभिम्न्यतद्वर तत्त्वोप्यन्यात्मानं भूतं भवद्विष्णविद्विति सर्वमोद्धार एव। यच्चान्त्यतू विकालातीतं तद्योद्धार एव॥ मा। १।

"All this is the syllable Om. Its explanation: Past, present and future - all this is Omkara alone; whatever else there is beyond the three-fold time, that is also Omkāra alone." Ma. 1.

This text evidently says that whatever there is in time and beyond time, is Om. If time is taken as typical, space also may be supposed to be comprehended in Om. If one were to be content with this without proceeding further, he would probably jump to the conclusion that Omkāra is recommended here to be meditated upon as a symbol for the All, as in the Chāndogya text ‘ओक्षर एवेंद सर्वम्’ - All this is only Omkāra (Ch. 2-23-3). But there is nothing here to indicate or suggest that this is an injunction of some meditation. In the next text, we are told:

(२) सर्वं होत्राङ्गहायमत्मा ब्रह्म॥ मा। २

"All this indeed is Brahman. This Atman is Brahman...." Ma. 2.
The Bhashyakara remarks here:

"While both the name and the named are really one and the same, the description 'All this is the syllable Om' has been given laying stress on the name. What has been (thus) described by laying stress on the name, is being again described by laying stress on what is named, so that the oneness of both the name and the named, may be realized. For, otherwise, it might be thought that the statement about the named by the name is only figurative inasmuch as the knowledge of the named depends upon the name. The advantage of the realization of the identity (of these two) is that one could thereby intuit Brahman distinct from either, by completely dissolving them both at one stroke."


That is to say, the distinction of the name and the named, is really applicable to the empirical sphere, whereas Reality is altogether beyond that sphere. So, by the device of alternately applying the name Omkāra which refers to the region of words only and the epithet Brahman which seems to refer to something called by that name, the Śruti suggests to us that Reality is neither a name nor a thing named. The difficulty that might be felt how there could be anything which is neither of these, is overcome by the statement 'This Atman is Brahman'. Obviously our real Atman which is the Witness of the whole universe of names and things named, can be easily intuited to be neither of these.
101. Another device used in this Upanishad, is that by appealing to our immediate intuition of the states, it proposes to suggest that our real Atman as the Witness of each state, transcends the limitation of our body and senses and as such is the Witnessing Self of the whole universe comprising the individual selves and the objective phenomena. For instance the witnessing Atman of the waking state, is described here thus:

Jāgārītīsāthāno braveryaḥ: सत्ताह एकोनविवातितिमुखः स्वूलभवेशानारः प्रथमः पादः II

"Vaiśvanara conditioned by the waking state, of extrovert consciousness possessing seven organs and nineteen doors (for looking out) and experiencing the gross, is the first Pāda." Ma. 3.

And this pada is identified with the first mātra (measure) of Omkāra, as the first step in the intuition of the real Omkāra, which is devoid of all distinctions and differences as already stated in the first mantra.

Jāgārītīsāthāno बैशाश्वारोशकारः प्रथमा मात्राःसेरादिमत्वाद्वात्रात्रःप्रोति ह वै सर्वानुर कामानविद्याय भवति य एवं वेदः II

"Vaiśvanara conditioned by the waking state, is Akāra (A) the first mātra, because He pervades all, or because He is the first. Whoever intuits in this way, attains (āpnōti) all desires, and becomes the first." Ma. 9

102. The seeker of Truth must remind himself of the significance of the identity of Om and Brahma as explained already (para 100). It is obvious that it is absurd to think that the identification of the sound Om and Brahma, is contemplated here. Reality or Absolute is beyond all distinction of words and things expressible by words, for it is the very substrate of this thought-construction. For the same reason, Reality
transcends the distinction of concepts and things conceived. It is only to bring this truth home that the Śruti adopts the device of absolute identification of the two. Accordingly the eighth mantra says:

सोदयमात्मात्माश्चाथ्यश्चमोऽभिषिमात्रं पादा मात्रा मात्राश्र्प पादा अकार
उकारो मकार हि ति॥

"Now, the self-same Atman (with the four pādās) is, from the stand-point of the name, Omkāra now to be considered as made up of mātras. The pādās are mātras, and the mātras - akāra, ukāra and makāra are (the same as) the pādās."

Ma. 8.

This emphasis by way of reciprocal identity of the pādās and the mātras, is a clear indication of the absolute identity of Omkāra and Atman; there is absolutely no difference or distinction in respect of what is meant by these words. Omkāra, therefore, is no symbol for Atman; It is Atman himself.

103. We may now enter into the details of what the Śruti says regarding the Atman conditioned by the waking state :-

(1) Here the Atman is called Vaiśvānara and is described as possessing seven organs, because He is the Witnessing Principle of all the universe consisting of the knower, means of knowledge and the objects of knowledge, encompassed by the waking state. He is the same Vaiśvānarātman as is described in the Chāndogya :-

“तत्स्य हि वा एतस्यात्मनो वैश्वानरस्य मूर्तिः सुतेजानि भविष्यति। प्राण: पृथ्विभूतिः सन्देहे बहुरूपं बिस्तीत्रवेव सिरः पृथ्विभूतिः पादातुर्ग एव बेलिदिर्मानि
विकृतादिर्द्वम् गार्हस्थ्यम् मनोद्वाहार्यपं आस्यमाहवनीयः॥

Ch. 5-18-2.

"Of this Vaiśvānara Atman, Sutejah (the heavenly dyuloka itself) is the head; Viśvarūpa (the multi-coloured, Sun) is the eye; Pthagvartmātman (the wind blowing in diverse directions) is the
breath; bahula (the all-pervading ether) is the mid-part of the body; rayi (water) is the bladder; Pthivi (the earth) His feet; the altar is the chest; the sacred grasses are the hairs (on the body); the garhapaty Fire is the heart; the anv aharyapacana is the mind; shavanija is the mouth.

Ch. 5-18-2.

104. It is evident that the cosmic Self, as conditioned by the whole of the Universe as experienced in the waking world, is referred to here and not merely the individual self with the limiting adjunct of the body and senses of an individual self. That is why the name of 'Vaisvanara' and the epithet 'Saptangah' (having seven organs) are included in the description. The Bhāṣya makes this explicit by way of a reply to a possible objection:

"(Objection :-) The subject-matter in hand is that the inner Atman (the individual self) has four padas, as is evident from the text 'This Atman is Brahman.' This being so, how is it that the heavenly world (dyuloka) etc. are being described as the head and other organs (of this Atman)?"

Ma. Bh. 3, p. 179.

[Evidently the upholder of the primā facie view has misconstrued the text 'this atman' as referring to the individual self. But that this is not so, is clear from the very appellation Vaisvanara which implies that Brahman alone is meant here, and that is the subject-matter in hand, as we learn from the text 'sarvam hi etad Brahma' (all this is Brahman. And Vaisvanara can very well be the inner Atman, for the text describing Him, says 'tasya ha va etasya Atmano Vaisvanarasya' ('of this Atman Vaisvanara' etc.).]"
"This is no fault, for the whole of universe, including the region of the gods, along with this Atman, is meant to be taken when Atman is said to have four pādas. It is only this way, that on the sublation of the whole universe, non-duality becomes demonstrated; and the one Atman in all creatures would be seen, and all creatures in (that) Atman." Ma.Bh. 3, p. 179.

That is to say, the Witnessing Atman alone as conditioned by the associate of the waking world, is meant to be taught, as the first pāda of Atman; for it is on this supposition alone that He can be identified as Brahman really, the conditioning universe being shown to be only an appearance. Śaṅkara says in the Sūtra Bhāṣhya (VS.1-2-28) that Vaiśvānara is described in the Śatapatha to be the Purusha in the body, because it is only the Witnessing Principle, that is meant to be indicated and not the individual self which is limited by the body. And so far as the Witnessing Atman is concerned, it is immaterial by what name we call Him, since He is absolutely changeless whether in Himself or owing to the appearance and disappearance of the two states with all their contents. Gauḍapāda therefore says:-

स्वप्नव्याप्ति स्थाने होक्षावृहातमीर्नीपिण: ।
भेदानां हि समत्वेन प्रसिद्धेनैव हृदया ॥

Gautama, in the Karikas, says:-

'Dream and Waking states are said to be one and the same' say the discerning (persons), for the different phenomena (in them) are of the same nature for the well known reason (of their presenting) themselves (in a subject and object relation)." GK. 2-5.

In the subsequent Karikas we are told how the states appear and disappear like unreal phenomena, how things exhibit causal efficiency in either state, how the distinction of real and unreal obtains in both, and how Atman alone stays unsublated in both the
states, thus confirming His own reality and the unreality of both the states in so far as they are appearances.

"The statement 'He who knows the Entity having the likeness of Purusha and residing in Purusha, is made with a view to present the pure Witnessing nature pertaining to the Supreme Self, conditioned by the associate of being to be Purusha, both microcosmically and macrocosmically the subject-matter of the discussion."

SBh. 1-2-28, 9.

105. But how about the attribute 'sthūla-bhuk' experiencer of the gross? Surely the Witness does not and cannot experience anything, since it is changeless? The reply to this objection, is that the object 'experienced' here and no less in dream, is the consciousness of the individual self. The Bhāshya therefore says in the description of the dream Atman:

"To Viśva (Atman conditioned by waking) the object of experience is gross consciousness, for it has actual objects. But here, on the other hand, the object of experience is subtle, because consciousness of the nature of mere impressions is the object experienced."


That is to say, while the witnessing Atman is the same throughout and there is no change in His nature, He is said to experience the consciousness of the individual self only figuratively, in the same way as we talk of the sun shining upon the earth, when the latter comes in contact with the sun's rays. That the
witnessing Atman is spoken of as having nineteen
doors-ways of experience, to wit, the five organs of
perception (such as hearing, sight etc.), the five organs
of action, and the four-fold inner-organ (antahkaraṇa)
is only a figurative way of saying that each of these
nineteen instruments of perception, action and the
functions of the mind are efficient only in the presence
of the Witnessing Consciousness.

106. The reader will now see that the names
Vaiśvānara and Taijasa as applied to Atman, are only
relative to the states witnessed (waking and dream),
and that the essential nature of Atman is not affected
in the least by the gross consciousness or the subtle
consciousness witnessed. The nature of the states has
as little to do with Atman as the nature of a reflection
in water with its actual original.

107. We may now proceed to consider the nature
of the Atman in deep sleep. The Śruti describes Him
thus:

यत्र सुपीते स्वान काम्यते न काम्यन्ते स्वस्नेन पदयति तत्सुपुष्मृ।
सुपुष्मण्य एकाभूतः प्रज्ञानयन्त एवानन्दमयो ह्यानन्दमुक्तः चेतोमुखः प्राज्ञतृतीयः
पादः ॥

"That is deep sleep wherein one does not desire anything
desirable, nor experiences any dream. Prājñā conditioned by deep
sleep, who has become One (whole), consciousness throughout,
full of bliss, experiencing bliss, the door to (active) consciousness,
is the third pada."

Ma. 5.

108. It would be interesting to appreciate how the
Atman in sleep, having no specific characteristics at
all, could be defined. The Śruti adopts the only method
possible here - the apavāda (negation) of all
conceivable superimposition.
(1) The one conceivable superimposition here is to say that Atman is 'in deep sleep', that is, is not actively consciousness. Sleep is really nothing positive but the human mind which is always addicted to search for some positive thought-determination whenever it seeks to define anything, contrives to imagine that some positive cloud of ignorance, envelops Atman and prevents Him from seeing things even where nothing could possibly be conceived to lurk anywhere. The Indian logician's 'absolute nothing' (atyantābhāva) is, strange to say, treated by him as though it were something positive; for he distinguishes it from prāgabhāva (previous nothing) pradhvaṁsābhāva (nothing which is born after the destruction of a thing) and anvonyābhāva (nothing conceived as the mutual absence of two things in each other). The sushupta (deep sleep) defined by the common man, is something akin to that distinction without a difference:

(2) The Śruti text here quoted utilizes the adhyārūpa method when, from a concessional view, it grants the designation of 'sushuptasthānam' (the station of deep sleep) assigned to Atman in this so-called state, and says that 'one desires nothing here, and dreams no dream' as in the other two states. Śaṅkara makes a significant remark in introducing this text:

दर्शनादर्शनकृत्योऽः तत्त्वप्रतिवेधलक्षणस्य स्वास्य तुल्यत्त्वात् सुपुस्मग्रहणायं 'यत्र सुस' इत्यादिविविधेषणम्। अथवा त्रिच्छिन्नि स्थानेषु तत्त्वप्रतिवेधलक्षणः स्वास्योऽविशिष्टः इति पूर्वभागं सुपुस्मं विभजये॥

"The adjectival (clause) 'wherein sleeping' etc. is for specifically taking 'deep sleep alone' for consideration, for sleep as the absence of the knowledge of Reality, is common to the two
**darśanavāttis** (the states waking and dream wherein one sees something else) and **udarśanavāttis** (the state wherein one sees nothing).

[Here Śaṅkara treats both waking and dream as dream, since one misconceives Reality in either of them. The distinguishing feature of deep sleep, is that there is no conception whatever there.]

"Or it may be, that this is to distinguish deep-sleep from the previous two states, inasmuch as sleep of the nature of ignorance of Reality is common to all the three states."

[Here is an **apavāda** of the distinction of waking and dream as such by applying the word sleep (ignorance) to both of them.]

This second interpretation lays stress upon the word 'supta' and hints at the conclusion that while the sleep of 'deep sleep' has the virtue of being merely characterized by the absence of knowledge, the other two states have the additional disadvantage of misleading the sleeper to see something else and hanker after illusory appearances. More about this when we come to the fourth pada of Atman anon.

109. To proceed with the Śruti about **Sushuptātman.** This avasthā is 'deep sleep' from the empirical standpoint; but really, it is nothing but the Witnessing Atman, the One that is at the back of all the states. The Śruti says that Atman is here **ekibhitah** (He who has become One).

It should not be thought that Atman was manifold in the waking and dream states, but all that was many there, has become rolled up into one here. In grammar the Sanskrit ending 'i' is called **cvipratyaya** signifying what has become so now, but was not such before. Therefore the epithet 'who has become one', is also in concession to the popular view that there is no
manifold world now, as in waking. As a matter of fact, however, Atman is always one; that is, He is the All, One without a second, the Whole.

And Prajnānāghana ēva, 'Consciousness alone throughout' is, another epithet to distinguish Atman's essential consciousness from the apparent bits of consciousness that apparently obtain in the empirical state. When one says 'I now became conscious of myself and of the presence of others', the apparent consciousness that manifests itself at a particular moment of time, is spoken of as 'consciousness' only by courtesy. In reality, it is only the reflection of the real consciousness of Atman that flashes in a particular modification of the mind. In the so called sleep, all these bits of consciousness together with the mind itself, become one with Atman. So then He is One Consciousness through and through. The Praśnōpanishad says:

विज्ञानात्मा सह देवेश्व सर्वं प्राणा भूतानि संप्रतिश्रवण्ति यत्र। तद्भवं बैद्यते यस्तु सोम्य स सर्वेषः सर्वमेवाविवेषे।१॥

"Where Vijñānātman (the conscious individual soul) the 'prāṇas' (organs of sense) together with the devas (their presiding gods) and the (five) elements, are merged (into one), Whosoever intuits that Akshara (imperishable Atman), he is the omniscient one who enters into the All itself."

Pr. 4-11.

110. Atman in sleep is 'ānandamaya' (full of bliss), 'ānandabhuk' (experiencer of bliss). These epithets should be interpreted in the same way as 'One', and 'Consciousness throughout'. While the essential nature of Atman remains the same throughout, He is in waking apparently split up into a number of egos, individual selves who have to extract...
pleasure by enjoying objects of sense with the help of their organs. But here there are neither distinct senses nor sense-objects by the contact of which one has to acquire pleasure after considerable effort. Atman is Bliss itself and there is nothing else, nothing other than Atman to interrupt his bliss. Therefore the limiting associations of the body, senses and the mind being absent, and the sense-objects also being absent - all having been reduced to One as it were- Atman intuits His own blissful nature without any let or hindrance. This is expressed by the epithets ānandamaya and ānandabhuk.

111. We can now see why the appellation of Prājñā (the wise, omniscient one) is applied to Atman in this state. A Brhadāraṇyaka text says ‘अये पुरुषः प्राज्ञेनात्मना संप्रारिष्यको न वाह्य किञ्चन वेद नान्तरम्’ (२४३-२१). 'This Purusha (the individual self) being firmly embraced by Prājñā, is aware of nothing whether without or within' (Br. 4-3-21). That is only by way of splitting up Reality into the empirical self in waking and the Witnessing Self, the Real Atman, who is called by the very name of Prajñā. Śaṅkara says 'प्राज्ञ: परमेश्वरः, सर्वात्मविषयकाण्य प्राज्ञ: नित्य्मविषयाकाण्य ||' (भ. १-३-२२, प. १४३) 'Prājñā is the Supreme Lord himself, because He is never separable from Prajñā (consciousness) of the nature of omniscience.' (SBh. 1-3-42, p. 143).

In the Bhāshya on the present mantra also, Śaṅkara Writes:

भूतभविष्यज्ञातूल्वय सर्वविषयज्ञातूल्यमथैवर्तिप्राज्ञ: || सुप्रकृतिपि हि
भूतपूर्वप्रस्तुतो प्राज्ञ: इत्युच्यते || अथवाप्रस्तिमात्रम् अस्मैवसाधारण रूपमितिप्राज्ञ: ||
इतरयोगिनिहितमैै विज्ञानमस्ति इति ||

मान. भा. ५, पा. १८०.
"He is called Prājñā as He is conscious of the past and the future as well as of all objects. Even the Atman in sleep, is called Prājñā because of his having been so in the previous states. (This of course is with reference to His aspect as the individual self). Or He is Prājñā because pure consciousness is his peculiar nature; the two others have empirical consciousness in addition."

Ma.Bh. 5, p. 181.

Missing the eternal truth that omniscience is the inalienable essence of the nature of Atman, and coming under the sway of the popular view which persists in thinking that the sleeping self is beclouded with the enveloping darkness of dense ignorance, even the so called followers of Śaṅkara, builders of the various subcommentary systems of Vedanta, have interpreted these epithets ānandamaya and Prājñā to mean 'in blissful ignorance' and 'mostly ignorant' respectively. Ānandamaya, they say, is the kōsa of that name which is really the positive Avidya of undefinable nature (अनिर्वचनीय मूलात्मिक) and that the epithet Prājñā should be dissolved into प्राकृतिक (extremely ignorant) to suit the context! We shall simply ignore and pass over this ill-conceived interpretation endorsed neither by Śaṅkara's Bhāshya nor by intuition of the real nature of the Witnessing Consciousness in sleep.

112. There is one more epithet of Atman in sleep that remains to be considered before we proceed further. Atman here is called Cetāmukha (the door to consciousness). Why? Śaṅkara explains :-

स्मादित्यतिबोध चेत: प्रति द्वारिभूतत्वात् चेतोमुखः । बोधहलक्षणं वा चेत: 
द्वारं मुखमस्त्य स्मादिकागमनं प्रति ॥

"He is called Cetāmukha because he is the door-way to the consciousness of dream etc. Or because, 'cetāh' the particular consciousness, is the door-way for Him to come back to dream etc."

Ma. Bh. 5, p. 181.
It is clear that 'consciousness' here refers to empirical consciousness. For dream and waking are possible only when there is empirical consciousness which is adventitious and not inherent in Atman's nature.

113. That deep sleep is only a name and there is nothing there to check or circumscribe the real nature of Atman, is made clear by the following description of Prājña:

एष सर्वेऽक्षर एष सर्वे एष एष \प्रोपन्त्यांत्येष योनि; सर्वस्य प्रभवाध्ययी हि
भूतत्त्वाम्।

"This is the Ruler of all (the universe); this alone is the Omniscient one; this is the Antaryāmin (the controller of everything from within); this is the Cause of everything, for He alone is the source of origination and the final (principle) into which all beings merge themselves." Ma. 6.

The Witnessing Atman as Pure Being, and Pure Consciousness is the only Reality on which the whole universe is superimposed and when realized as such, dissolves itself into it finally. That is why He is spoken of as both the material and the efficient cause, as well as the Controller of the universe.

114. A critical student of this Upanishad would now be able to appreciate how the Śruti uses the adhyārōpāpavāda method step by step to reveal the truth of the statement with which it started that Omkāra or Brahman the Absolute, is the one All without a second. Atman as Brahman has three pādas or aspects; as the witness of the whole of Waking, He is called Vaiśvānara; as the witness of the whole of dream, He is Taijasa. Except for the name and His position relative to either of these states superimposed
on Him, His nature is absolutely changeless. And as the witness of sleep, He is Prājña. That this is called a state, however, is only a concession to the empirical view according to which the individual self is supposed to be ignorant, that is, to miss the particularized consciousness by which he is characterized in the two other states. But as a matter of fact, the supposititious individual self, no less than his supposititious consciousness, has merged himself, if we may say so, together with all the panorama of objective phenomena, into their essence, the real Atman who is called Prājña here, and there is no one really to regret his loss of consciousness. The essential Witnessing Atman remains alone, as He has always been, not in His loneliness, but in His fullness as the All.

That Prājña is described, as the Ruler of 'all', the Knower of 'all', Controller of 'all', the Origin and dissolution of 'all', therefore, is only relative to the supposititious 'all' or the universe, which is superimposed on the Witness with which it is ever one in its essence.

115. It is almost tautological to say that Omkāra is the real All; for Omkāra is Atman, and Atman is Omkāra. We shall therefore simply cite the texts that describe the mātras 'measures' of Omkāra.

(१) जागरितस्थानो वैद्यानारोऽकारः प्रथमा मात्रासेषरादिमत्तात्माप्राप्तः हि
वै सर्वात् कामानादिभविः भविः य एवं वेदः॥

"Vaiśvānara conditioned by waking, is akāra (a), the first mātra (of Omkāra), because it is all-pervading or because it is the first. He who knows it thus, pervades (attains) all desires, and becomes the first (of all)."

Ma. 9

(२) स्वप्नस्वामस्तेः उकारो द्वितीया मात्राकर्पोभयतात्मानाप्राप्तः हि
वै 
झानसन्तति समानक्ष्य भविः नायात्माज्ञातिकुमुखः भविः य एवं वेदः॥

Ma. 10.
"Taijasa conditioned by dream is *ukāra* (u) the second mātra, because He has extracted or because He partakes the nature of both (akāra and makāra). He who knows Him thus, continually prolongs his knowledge and will be equal (neutral to friend and foe), and there will be no one among his progeny who is not a knower of Brahman."

Ma. 10.

(2) सुपुस्त्यानः प्रात्थो मकास्तुलीय याया मात्रा मितेरपित्तवीर् मितौति ह वा

इद्दृश्य सर्वस्मापित्त्वं भवति य एवं बेद ॥

Ma. 11.

"Prajñā who is conditioned by sleep, is *makāra* the third mātra, because it measures or is the place of dissolution (of everything). He who knows it as such measures all, and becomes comprehensive (of all)."

Ma. 11.

116. Want of space forbids our entering into greater detail with regard to the identity of the *mātras* of Omkāra and the pādas of Atman. The whole of the Maṇḍūkya with Gaudapāda's Kārikas, should be assiduously studied and assimilated by an earnest student aspiring for the final intuition of the Absolute to reveal which the application of the unique method of Adhyārōpapāvāda has been strictly pursued here. Suffice it to say that the three states of consciousness have been examined here from the standpoint of *adhyārōpa* only. That is why Śaṅkara says त्रिभविष्य स्वानेदुष्टत्वात्

विभाविशेषः (sleep or want of knowledge of Reality is common to all the three states). The full significance of this statement, is not realized, if we take it to mean merely as declaring that the Jiva does not know his real nature while he experiences anyone of these three states. We have cited this statement already once (see p.118) while explaining the text त्रत्र

सुसः (sleeping wherein etc.). But it is necessary now to know that Śaṅkara means much more here than might be apparent on a first reading of the sentence. He
wants us to understand that none of us knows his real nature so long as he thinks that our passing through the states is real, for our nature as Atman is altogether different and distinct from this state experiencing individuality. This fact is expressly declared elsewhere by Śaṅkara:

"As for the person who thinks that in the course of the exposition there is mention of waking and other states, and therefore the aim of the Śruti must be supposed to be the exposition of the nature of the transmigratory soul, he would as well proceed in the western direction even when prompted to go towards the east. For by mentioning waking and other states, the Śruti does not aim at teaching that the soul has the experience of states or that it is subject to transmigration, but only purports to teach that it is free from all states and is non-transmigratory."

SBh.1-3-42. p. 143, 144.

That negation of avasthas and freedom from all evils incidental to mundane life, is the only conclusion to be drawn from the mention of the three states in the Māṇḍūkya, is clear not only from the fact that the Cosmic Witnessing Self alone is described in dealing with the avasthās, but also from the appellation of Prājña applied to the Self conditioned by sleep as well as the ascription of divine attributes such as Sarvesvara (Ruler of All) to Him.

117. What is most obvious in support of the argument that this Upanishad particularly aims at negating all characteristics of Atman that might be suspected to pertain to Him owing to the association of
the three states is the description of the so-called, 'fourth pada':

"Not of introvert consciousness, not of extrovert consciousness, not of consciousness both ways, not of consciousness amassed throughout, not conscious, not unconscious, unperceivable, not an object of any dealing, ungraspable, without a characteristic, inconceivable, inexpressible, having the notion of the Self only as a means of knowing Him, devoid of all distinctions and differences, calm, auspicious, non-dual, this is what they regard as the Fourth. He is the Atman, He is to be known.

118. Some of the misconceptions regarding this Atman often called the Turiya (the fourth), should be briefly noticed here. Turiya is no avastha or state, and therefore the popular identification of it with Samādhi (trance), is altogether unfounded. Turiya is the fourth only relatively to the illusory number three referring to the three states, Maya-samkhya Turiya as Saṅkara describes it. It is the only real Atman, as the Upanishad expressly tells us, and even Vaiśvānara and others are only a superimposition on It. He has no consciousness attached to Him like the empirical atman (individual self); the Śruti has expressly negated both consciousness and unconsciousness as His properties. Therefore even the state of 'super consciousness' has nothing to do with Him. He is essentially 'विज्ञानमानन्दं भौ' (Pure Consciousness and Bliss in one). He is neither subject (since He has no consciousness) nor object; therefore no pramāṇa (valid means of knowledge) is to be sought to establish Him;
He is apramāya (beyond the reach of all pramāṇas or means of knowledge) as Śrutis and Smṛtis declare. Ātmapratyaya (the notion of the self) is the only pramāṇa, if it may be called such, to intuit Him. In short, He is the nēti-nētyātmā (the Atman who is neither this nor that) as the Brhadāraṇyaka is never tired of describing Him.

119. One word more: Turiya, Atman the Absolute, is avyapadaēśya, inexpressible by any word. Om is neither a name nor a symbol of this Atman; for in the region of this Absolute, there is no place for any distinction of name and thing, symbol and symbolized. Omkāra, as the Upanishad has said at the very start, is Reality itself. Just as the Absolute has no real pādas, so also as Omkāra It has no mātras. The mātras just like pādas are illusory shadows used as the upāya (means) for realizing the nature of this Absolute. Therefore the Śruti proclaims the absolute identity of Omkāra and Atman in these unmistakable terms :

अमात्रकथात्वृत्ताक्षराय: प्रपन्धोपनिषदा एवमेऽद्व्याय संविष्ठात्मतात्मात्मां य एवं वेद ॥

"Without mātras, the Fourth is not the object of any dealing, devoid of all distinctions and differences, auspicious, non-dual; thus Omkāra is Atman himself and no other. He who knows thus, enters as the Atman into Atman."

Ma. 12.

120. Misconceptions of the concept of Omkāra, the Absolute, are as rife as those of the concept of Atman. It is enough to observe that it is not a mystical sound in any sense. Omkāra is a word used by the Upanishad as a device for the negation of all speech, summarized in the three mātras superimposed on Reality. Absolute Omkāra is Atman, and Atman is Omkāra. Even 'Atman' or 'Brahman' cannot be regarded as the name
of the ineffable Absolute. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya thus explains how this double negation leads to the intuition of Reality:

"(Question :-) But how is it sought to point out the Reality of Satya through these two words 'neti neti' (not this, not that)?

(Answer :-) We reply, by denying all kinds of limiting associations. For there is no specific feature here such as name or form, no action, no difference, no genus, no quality. It is well-known that it is through these that words function. But in Brahman no such specific feature obtains. Hence it cannot be pointed out as such and such, as in common life an ox is pointed out by saying 'That is an ox, which moves, white and with horns'. And Brahman is described through name and form superimposed on it by words like 'Consciousness and Bliss is Brahman', 'He is conscious throughout', 'Brahman', and 'Atman'. Where, however, the essential nature alone is intended to be pointed out free from all specific features due to the conditioning associates, then it is impossible to express it in any way whatever. Then this is the only device left, viz., to point it out by negating all conceivable specifications." Br. Bh. 2.3-6, pp. 755, 756.

Looked at from this standpoint, neither Brahman and Atman on the one hand, nor Omkāra on the other, is quite the right means of describing Reality. But by the device of superimposing name and form in order to suggest what is devoid of name and form, we use the
expression 'Omkāra is Brahman itself. The other negations are merely to ward off conceivable specifications incidental to the use of the term Omkāra.

121. This is how Gauḍapādācārya describes Reality as the fourth and Omkāra as without mātras :-

(2) अनादिमायया सुमो यदा जीवः प्रवृत्तसे ।
अज्ञानन्दस्वप्नमदृश्तं वृत्त्यते तदा ॥

"When the Jīva sleeping through beginningless Māyā awakes, then he intuits the birthless, sleepless and dreamless non-duality."

[Jīva is birthless, that is changeless, in his real nature; so he never became Jīva and never passed through the states of consciousness. Yet he has imagined himself in his beginningless dream, that he had avasthas. He never became conscious of a second, nor was he ever unconscious. Yet ignorance presented these mayic experiences.]

(2) प्रणवं हीर्षरं वियायतु सर्वस्य हृदये स्थितम् ।
सर्व्यापिन्मोह्वः मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥

"One should know the Praṇava (Omkāra) to be the Ruler (witnessing Pure Consciousness) present in everyone's heart. The wise one who intuits Omkāra as the all-pervading (Reality) in everyone, never grieves."

[Omkāra is not a sound symbol representing Reality. It is Reality itself, the All that is; one who has realized this, has transcended the ills of mundane life.]

(3) अमात्रोऽन्तमात्रथ श्लेष्येपश्च: शिवः ।
ओष्ठारो विदितो चेन स मुनिनेवरो जनः ॥

"That one is a muni and no other, who has intuited Omkāra which has no mātras, and which knows no bounds to its nature being absolutely free from duality and auspicious."

[One who practises silence or lives in a forest, is no real muni. One who knows his real nature which is infinite and is above limitations due to speech and intellect, is the only real muni]
13. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD

(Bondage and Release)

122. Vedanta as non-dualism advocating the Absolute Reality, the Atman alone, can evidently admit of no distinction of the fall of the soul and release or attainment of the Highest Good after practising religious acts of discipline entitling to attain salvation. Yet the Upanishads do speak of release and practice of meditation or other means to attain freedom. How is this anamoly to be explained?

123. Advaitins of Šaṅkara's tradition, say that the Upanishads contain different teachings addressed to different levels of the spiritual mind. These levels are conceded only from the empirical stand-point. From the transcendental view, however, this distinction of bondage and release is overpassed. Is this distinction of vyavahāra and paramārtha a revolution brought about by Šaṅkara's tradition? In order to be able to answer this question, we have first of all to cull different texts from different Upanishads which speak of Release and Vyavahāra or empirical behaviour consisting of thought, speech and action.

The following are a few texts which contain words directly derived from the root muc (to set free):

\[1\] तत्कारण सांस्क्ययोगाभिमेच्छ ढात्वा देवेऽसुंज्ञ्यते सर्वायाः: || स्वेत.६-१२.

"Knowing that cause (of the universe) attained by Sāṁkhya and Yōga, one is freed from all bonds."  Sve. 6-13.
Beyond Auyakta (potential form of the universe), however, is the 'Supreme Purusha' all-pervading and without the linga (conditioning associate such as the mind), knowing whom the creature (Jiva) is freed and attains his immortal nature. Ka. 6-8.

Those who have fully ascertained what is taught in the Vedantas (Upanishads), by means of direct knowledge, who, by their endeavour, have purified their mind by the Yoga of renunciation, they, at the final time of death, become completely immortal in the Brahman worlds and are freed from all bonds. Mu. 3-2-6.

It is obvious that the freedom obtained through knowledge, can only mean freedom from ignorance of Reality; for knowledge is not something that cuts actual fetters asunder. That is why the Upanishads frequently speak of release from ignorance, or untying its knots.

To that Narada, who has washed off the impurity of the mind, the revered Sanatkumara (now) shows the other shore of the darkness (of ignorance). Cha. 7-26-2.

Thou art, indeed, our (real) father; for thou hast taken us across avidya to the other shore. Pr. 6-8.

The freedom obtained through knowledge can only mean freedom from ignorance of Reality; for knowledge is not something that cuts actual fetters asunder. That is why the Upanishads frequently speak of release from ignorance, or untying its knots.

To that Narada, who has washed off the impurity of the mind, the revered Sanatkumara (now) shows the other shore of the darkness (of ignorance). Cha. 7-26-2.

Thou art, indeed, our (real) father; for thou hast taken us across avidya to the other shore. Pr. 6-8.
"All this is really the Purusha, Karma, the tapas (of knowledge), the highest immortal entity. He who knows this as placed in the cave of the heart, my friend, unties the knot of avidya."

Mu. 2-1-10.

125. Release (Moksha) therefore, is release from ignorance and its effects such as desires, fear, grief, delusion, mental defects, weakness of the heart, old age, death and all other ills of mundane life:-

\[(1) \text{ यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येक्षियः हृदि श्रिता: } । \]
\[\text{अथ मत्यौऽमृताः भवत्वत्र ब्रह्म समस्थृते } ]

"When all the desires taking shelter in this Jiva's heart are shattered, then mortal man becomes immortal, and attains Brahman here."

Ka. 6-14.

\[(2) \text{ यदा सर्वे प्रभियन्ते हृदयस्येह ग्रन्थयः } । \]
\[\text{अथ मत्यौऽमृताः भवत्वेतां भवत्वेतां मुनोऽमृतसानम् } ]

"When all the knots of the heart are cut asunder, then this mortal Jiva becomes immortal. This is all the teaching (of Vedantas)."

Ka. 6-15.

\[(3) \text{ अमरे वै जन्मक प्राप्तिः } । \]
\[\text{बुध: एकत्वमुपस्वत: } ]

"Fearlessness, indeed, hast thou attained Janaka !"

Br. 4-2-4.

\[(4) \text{ तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमुपस्वतः } । \]
\[\text{ई. ७ }]

"There, what delusion, what grief, to one who has realized Oneness (of all)."

Isa. 7.

\[(5) \text{ भिधते हृदयान्धिचिह्नते सर्वंसंशया: } । \]
\[\text{श्लोकने चास्य कर्माणि तत्समि दुःसत्ते पराभवे } ]

"The knot of the heart is untied, all doubts are cleared, this (Jiva's) karmas are all destroyed, when that (Brahmatman) who is both the high and the low, is seen."

Mu. 2-2-8.
126. The individual self being bound and limited only by ignorance, a person attains his nature as Brahman and becomes the All so soon as he gains knowledge. This is from the Adhyātyāpā standpoint utilized for the purpose of teaching; for everyone has been always Brahman, and therefore there is neither bondage nor release for anyone at all. This is the apavāda (rescission) which Śrutis make use of to teach the eternal truth:

(२) स यों हैं तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद्र ब्रह्मवृत्त भवति नास्यात्रात्माभितकुले भवति तर्ति शोकं तर्ति पापानं गुहाप्रकृतियो विमुक्तोडूम्वतो भवति || मुृं. ३-२-९.

"Whoever, indeed, knows that Highest Brahman, becomes that very Brahman. No one who does not know Brahman, is born in his line. He crosses grief, crosses sin, and, freed from the knots of the heart, he becomes immortal."

(२) ब्रह्म वा इदम्प्राण आसीर्वद्वात्मानेवावेतुः - अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति तस्मात् तत्सर्वभवत्तयो यो देवानां प्रत्येकं स एव तदवत्तत्तपस्याणां तथा मनुष्याणामू ||

"Thus was Brahman alone in the beginning. It knew itself thus 'I am Brahman'; and as a consequence of that knowledge, it became everything. There, whoever among the gods know it, he alone became that All. So it was in the case of Rshis, and so in the case of men. It was seeing this, that Vāmadeva discovered the mantra 'I have become Manu, and Sūrya......' And even now whoever knows this in the form 'I am Brahman' he becomes all this. Even the gods are not able to prevent him from becoming such, for he has become their very self."

Br. 1-4-10.
127. It is from the highest Sāstraic standpoint that Gaucāpāda and Śaṅkara declare with one voice that there is none of the conventions of injunctions, pramāṇas (means of knowledge), acts of discipline, bondage or release when one has realized that all is Brahman or Atman:

(२) न निरोधो न चोत्तर्तिनि ब्रह्म न च साधकः।
न मुमुक्षुन्न वै मुकुट इत्येषा परमार्थता॥

"There is neither dissolution nor origination (of the universe), neither a soul in bondage nor one practising the acts of discipline for release; neither one desirous of release nor anyone who has attained release at all. This is the Highest Truth."

GK. 2-32.

(३) तत्त्वार्थ्यास्मिनः हर्षः तत्त्वः हर्षः तु बाह्यः।
तत्त्वीभूतस्तदारामस्तत्त्वायाद्र्युदो भवेत्॥

"Having known the world within to be Reality itself, having known the world without to be Reality itself, and having become one with Reality and taking delight in It alone, one should never swerve from Reality."

GK. 2-38.

(४) तस्मात् ‘अहं ब्रह्मात्मा’ इत्येवतवसाना एव सर्वेऽविधत्वः; सर्वाणि
चेतराणि प्रमाणानि। न हि अहेतुपदेहयाद्रित्तत्त्वायात्मात्मात्ती निर्विभावयाद् प्रमाणाद्विद्याणि
च प्रमाणानि भवितुमहति॥

"Therefore it is only until the intuition 'I am Brahman' dawns that all injunctions and all other pramāṇas (valid means of knowledge) prevail. For when Atman neither to be shunned nor to be taken up, has been intuited, Pramāṇas cannot continue to be, since thereafter they would have neither objects of knowledge, nor knowers desiderating the help of the means.

SBh. 1-1-4, p. 23.
This distinction between the embodied soul and the inner controller, is due to the conditioning associate of the body and senses presented by avidyā, and not real. For there can be only one inmost Atman, and there cannot be two inmost selves. The same Atman is treated as though there were distinction in Him, just as we speak of a pot-ether and the universal ether. And from this (view-point), Śrutis teaching the distinction of the knower, the known etc., valid; means of knowledge such as perception, experience of saṁsāra, the Sāstra of injunction, prohibition and all that becomes possible. Accordingly the Śruti points to all conventional procedure in the region of ignorance when it says 'Where there is duality as it were, there one sees another.' (Br. 4-5-15), and wards off all (conventions of human) procedure in the sphere of knowledge when it says, 'Where, however, to this knower, all becomes Atman alone, there, what could one see and with what?' (Br. 4-5-15)\(^{(6)}\)

\[\text{Sū. Bh. 1:2-20, p. 81.}\]

"The knower of Brahmā conclusively knows thus: 'As opposed to the nature of being a doer and experienter (of the fruit of actions) known (to me) previously, I am that Brahmā which is..."
really no doer or experiencer in its nature in all the three divisions of time. I was never a doer or experiencer even before this, nor am I such now, nor shall I be such even in the future time. 'It is only thus that release would be possible; for otherwise, there would be no release at all since karmas which have continued to function from time without a beginning, could not be exhausted, nor can release be an event depending upon some place, time or cause like the fruit of karmas; for in that case, it would be impermanent. This is so for another reason, to wit, that the result of knowledge (of Atman) cannot be reasonably remote.' SBh. 4-1-13, pp. 473, 474.

(6) तमेतविद्वास्यमात्मानात्मनोरितरेताध्यायां पुरस्कृत्य सर्वेः प्रभाण-प्रमेयव्यवहारा लोकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रृवत्ता: ; सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विद्विन्दित्यम-मोक्षप्राप्ताणि । कथं पुनर्विद्वास्यद्विव्यायाणि प्रत्यक्षादिनी न प्रभाणानि शास्त्राणि चेति । उत्थते देहिन्न्त्रियाधिकृतममाधिमानमचिन्तितस्य प्रभाणज्ञानुपन्ततः प्रभाणज्ञानुपन्तते: ॥

अध्यासभाष्यम् पार्शा.

"On the presupposition of this mutual superimposition of the Self (Atman) and not-self, called avidyā, all the conventions of Prāmāṇa (means of knowledge) and Prameya (object of knowledge) - both secular and Vedic - start, as also all Śāstras treating of injunctions and prohibitions and of release.

[That is to say, all human procedure presupposes avidyā]

(Question :-) But how are (we to know that) the means of knowledge such as perception, and the Śāstras, are intended only for the ignorant?

(Answer) To this, we reply :- Inasmuch as a person who does not regard the body and senses etc. as himself and his own, cannot be a cognizer, the means of knowledge cannot function in his case.

Adh.Bh. p. 3.
(To explain:-) The convention of perception and other Pramāṇas etc., is not possible without the senses; and the senses cannot function without the body as their basis; and no one could be active without identifying oneself with the body. Nor could there be cognizership in Atman unattached to anything, without presuming all this. And without cognizership there can be no functioning of the means of knowledge. Therefore, means of knowledge such as perception, as also the Śāstras, are only for the ignorant.


[Everyone who imagines himself to be a knower, presumes that he is the body on which the senses depend. But really, his real nature as Atman is unrelated to the body or the senses which he calls 'me' and 'mine'.]

(९) नेचन्तत्वमर्यस्य शास्त्रस्य भोक्तृलिं बज्ज्ञामीति प्रवृत्ता, किं तत्त्वमार्यस्य श्रेष्टीकाण्ठाभोक्तृलिं भ्राह्मवध्वातां च बज्ज्ञामीति। तदर्थं सुखादिक्रियाविदितं सत्त्वम्यथायमेवति। इदं हि कर्तृकं भोक्तृलिं च सत्त्वक्षेत्रः पौरोंशीतस्यभावविवेककृतं कल्पते। परमर्थस्तु नायतरस्यापि संबंधितं; अनेतन्त्वस्य सत्त्वस्य, अविक्रियाण्वच श्रेष्टीकाण्ठासत्त्वस्य सुमां न संबंधितं। तथा च श्रुत्ति: ‘यत्र वा अन्यदिव स्मातेतु तत्रात्न्योज्ज्वतु पश्येतु’ इत्यादिना स्पर्शप्रभावयादिभवहर्षज्ञाविधियत्यय एव कर्तृकंदिव्यधारां दर्शयिति। ‘यत्र त्वस् सर्वसात्माभायूत तत्तदादेतु’ (३४। ४५-४६) इत्यादिना च विवेकिन्तः कर्तृकंदिव्यधारामां दर्शविति।

‘This (Paingi) Śruti does not aim at attributing experiencing nature to the insentient mind, but only intends to declare that the sentient kṣhētra jīva (individual self) is not (really) an experiencer, but is of the nature of Brahman. To that end, it superimposes experiencing nature on the mind which is subject to pleasure and other changeful moods.'

[This is an instance of deliberate superimposition of some characteristic to negate some other superimposed characteristic of Atman.]

"For this nature of being active and experiencing, is a fictitious invention due to non-discrimination of the respective nature of the mind and the Self. Really, however, it cannot
conceivably pertain to either of these, for the mind is insentient and the Self is changeless. It is altogether inconceivable in the case of the mind, since it is of the nature of an appearance presented by avidyā. Accordingly, the Śruti beginning with 'Where, indeed, there is duality, as it were, there one would see something other' shows how all such conventions as of an agent of action, belong to the sphere of ignorance and are similar to one's procedure with regard to an elephant etc. seen in a dream. And it shows the absence of all procedure such as of an agent etc. in the case of a man of discrimination, by the statement beginning with 'Where, to this one, all has become Atman, there, what could one see and with what' (Br. 4-5-15)." SBh. 1-2-12, p. 74.

[Here Śaṅkara says in so many words that human procedure is shown to be restricted to the sphere of ignorance only, and this is taught to be so by the Śruti by the method of adhyātma-paśupādā.]

128. It is by the method of deliberate superimposition, therefore, that all ills of mundane life, are attributed by Vedantins to the not-selves to negate what is usually conceived to be a property of the self in empirical life. As a matter of fact, the so-called individual self, has always been free from all samsāric defects. Here is a Sanscrit verse ascribed to Śaṅkara, which is sung by hundreds of Indian devotees of Vedanta every day, putting this method in a nutshell:

नाहं देहो जन्ममृत्यु कुलो मे। नाहं प्राणः शून्यिपासे कुलो मे।
नाहं चित्तं शोकमोहो दुःखो कुलो मे। नाहं कर्ता बन्धमोक्षो कुलो मे॥

"I am not this body; whence could birth and death come to me? I am not the life-force; whence could hunger and thirst come to me? I am not the mind; whence could grief and delusion come to me? Nor am I the ego; whence could bondage and release possibly come to me?"
14. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD  
(Discipline and Goal)

129. From the highest standpoint of Advaita, there can be neither a goal to be reached nor any way to be traversed before reaching that goal. Advaita is not to be acquired by the abolition of duality or the manifold universe, for what is real is always there, and can never be wiped off by any feat or legerdemain. As Gauḍapāda says:

(२) प्रपन्धो यदि विद्यते निवर्तोते न संशयः।  
मायामात्रभिद्वेषत्तमस्तहैं परमार्थतः॥  

"If the manifold were existent, then, no doubt, it would need to be removed. This duality is mere Maya - a magical show; really there is Advaita alone."  
GKI. १-१७.

[It is not a real pluralistic universe that has got to be actually blotted out to attain non-duality.]

(२) विकल्पो विनिवर्तोत कल्पितो यदि केनविद्।  
उपदेशशास्त्रं वादो ज्ञाते हैं न विच्यते॥  

"A thought-construct would have to be removed, if it had been actually conceived by some one. This is only a device for the purpose of teaching; there is no duality when the truth is known."  
GK. १-१८.

It is not true to say that there is some one who has wrongly imagined and actually brought about the appearance of duality. It is not true even to say that some one has got to be actually enlightened by the Sruti or a teacher in order to remove his wrong idea of duality. The distinction of the teacher and the taught,
is merely a device resorted to by the Upanishads to reveal the grand truth that Advaita or the Absolute is eternally unaffected by anything foreign to it, for really there can be nothing foreign beside the Absolute.

130. Yet conceding to the empirical point of view, advaitins talk of levels of intellect as well as of the aspirants for truth and gradations of teaching as well:

आध्यात्मिकविधि दीर्घस्तमात्रोपत्तिः \\
उपासनोपदेश्यं तदर्थयुक्तमया II

"There are three grades of seekers, possessing the lowest, mediocre and the highest view-points. Upāsanā is therefore taught out of compassion for such seekers."

Karma (ritual) is taught to the lowest grade of seekers, Upāsanā (meditation) to those of the middle grade, while Jñāna is reserved for seekers of the highest grade. Thus, for instance, the Brhadāranyaka says

तमेतं वेदानुपदेशनं ब्राह्मणा विविधिपतिः पद्यते दलनेत तपस्वादनाशके-\\
नेतमेव विविधत्वा मुनिभवति। एवेवेव प्राणिनो लोकमिस्त्र्दशः प्राणजन्ति। \\
एतज्जस्म्स्तै तन्नूर्वेव विद्वेषः प्रजां न कायमान्ते किं प्रजया कर्मवादो वेषा \\
नोत्समात्मायं लोक-इति ते ह स्म पुनर्ज्ञानायाथ बिषेषणायाथ लोकवेषा \\
व्युत्तायाथ भिषाशर्थ्यं चरति। II

"It is this Atman whom Brähmana seek to know through the recitation (or study) of the Vedas, sacrifice, charity, asceticism consisting of moderation in enjoyment of sense-objects. It is by knowing this Atman alone that one becomes a Muni (a sage). Urged by the desire of this World (of Atman) alone, they renounce everything. This is it, we learn, that (prompted) the ancient sages never to desire offspring, (thinking). 'What shall we do with offspring, we for whom this is the Atman, this is (the only) World (to be attained) ?' They, we learn, rose above the desire for a son,
desire for wealth, and desire for worlds and went away begging for
alms." Br. 4-4-22.

[In the above passage, discipline necessary for each of the
stages of life, has been mentioned.]

Assignment of lower rank to Karmas

131. Where the efficacy of recitation (or study) of
the Vedas is apparently derided, it should be
understood as intended to lay stress on some other
Sālhanas and not to negate the recitation (or study) or
sacrifice as a means. For instance, in the text

\( \text{(२) न कर्म्णा न प्रज़या धनेन त्यागोनेनकेकमृत्तत्वमानस्य: || म. ना. १२} \)

"Not by karma, not by offspring, nor by wealth, but by
renunciation only did some attain immortality." M.N.12

it is intended to stress that renunciation is a more
immediate means than karma etc.

Similarly :-

\( \text{(२) त्र्यो धर्मस्कन्ध्या यज्ञोवध्यायं दानमिति प्रथमस्तप एव द्वितीयो}\)

\( \text{ब्रह्मचार्यवाच्यकुलावसी तृतीयोत्त्वलाल्मानामाचार्यकुलेवसादवनू सर्व एले}\)

\( \text{पुण्यलोकः भवन्ति ब्रह्मसंस्थोद्मृतत्वमेति || छां. २-२३-१.} \)

"Three are the divisions of (religious) duty: sacrifice, study
of the Vedas, and charity - this is the first (division); asceticism
alone is the second. And the bachelor serving in the house of a
Vedic teacher for life, is the third; (he is the one) who extremely
emaciates himself in the master's house. All these would (indeed)
attain the worlds accruing from merit. But Brahma-Sarīstha (one
devoted to Omkāra) attains immortality." Ch. 2-23-1.

Here the first three stages are lowered, just to
praise meditation on Omkāra.
Vedic rites purify the mind

132. The Bhagavadgītā thus assesses the value of karmas:

यज्ञदानतपःकर्म न त्याज्यं कार्यमेव तत्।
यज्ञो दानं तपश्चिव पावनानि मनीषिणाम्॥

The karma consisting of sacrifice, charity and asceticism should not be given up, it should be practised. For sacrifice, charity and asceticism, are purifiers to the wise. These karmas, however, should be practised, renouncing attachment and fruits (of action). This, O son of Prthu, is my deliberate and final verdict.

G. 18-5, 6.

The Rationale of the course of discipline

133. How are we to determine the course of discipline needed for reaching Atman?

नाथमात्मा प्रक्षवनेन तमायो न मेधया न बहुना शुद्धेन।
यमेवेष चौपुष्टे तेन लभ्यस्ति ामा विवृत्तुष्ये तनू स्वामू॥

"This Atman is not reached by the study and interpretation of the Śāstra, nor by memorizing the meaning of Śāstraic teaching, nor by much listening to teaching. He is attained by that very Atman whom alone this (seeker) intently longs to reach. To him this Atman reveals His true nature."

Ka. 2-23, Mu. 3-2-3.

One who wishes to reach his destiny, naturally tries to get information about the goal, and to remember and discuss the nature of the goal to be reached. But this Atman being the very Self of the seeker, the mere study, memory of what is studied or
even constant discussion with a teacher, would be of no avail. This is not like the geographical study of a particular place to be reached. Intense longing to rest in one's own Self is of the utmost importance here. The reason why one does not know his own nature, is not because of want of study or of memory, for really no study or memory is needed to know that which is known for ever; it is only because of one's yielding to the temptation of taking interest in the unreal not-self.

One who yearns for the knowledge of Atman, has already got it, for the Atman has revealed Himself to all but those who have a tendency to stay away from Him.

No one who has not desisted from bad conduct, no one who has not restrained his mind, and no one who has not achieved one-pointedness of mind, and no one whose mind is not absorbed (in the Atman), can ever reach this Atman through intuition.

This is the graduated course of discipline set forth for those who would retrace their steps back to Atman. First of all one has to control the senses and restrain them from fleeting about aimlessly. Then the mind has to be brought back from fluttering in all directions. The third step is to make the mind single pointed and direct it exclusively towards Atman. The last step is to dissolve the mind into Atman.

To stop the senses from fleeing from one object to another, the very first step is what has been called the *Karma-yoga* in the Bhagavadgītā. The one way of accomplishing it, is thus explained:-
"Him from whom the (evolution and activity of all) beings take place, (and) by whom all this is pervaded by worshipping Him through (the performance of) duty proper to oneself, man attains the end."

Bhg.18-46.

['The end' is the qualification necessary for attaining knowledge. Actions without recognition of Atman as their source and support, cannot conduce to that.]

This verse makes the meaning of the Śruti ‘तमेंवे दानुक्षेत्रनेव ग्राह्यणा विविधियन्ति’ (Br. 4-4-22) already quoted (Para 130. p. 141) more explicit. No doubt the duties proper to Vargas and āśramas, have lost their full force owing to lapse of time and preponderance of desire in this Iron Age, yet performance of what little is still in practice, and even the performance of one's secular duties in a spirit of worship, would be conducive to the purification of the mind. Hence Śrīmālīs like the Pārāśara say ते सच मैत्र निन्या: स्थर्यगृह्य मि ते द्विजाः । (The twice-born act as influenced by the particular Yuga, and so, are not to be condemned). Moreover there is this śloka in the Purāṇa:

प्रायनू कृते यजनू यदिक्षेत्रायं ज्ञापरेऽर्थयन्तः ।
यदाप्राप्ति तदाप्राप्ति कलीः सकीर्त्यं केरावस् ॥

"What good merit one obtains by meditation in the Kṛta Yuga, what through the performance of sacrifices in the Trāta, what through worship in Duṣṭāra, that merit one attains in Kali by the mere loud utterance of Keshava's Name." V.P.6-2-17.

And there is another Pauranik śloka :

कलीः कर्मचितिार्मां पापद्रत्योपजीविनाम् ।
विषिक्रियाविहिताननां गतिगोविन्दकीतनम् ॥
"In the Kali age when people's mind is generally impure, when people mostly live upon earnings through sinful acts, and when people are mostly deprived of the merit of enjoined karmas, the only refuge is the loud utterance of God's name."

All this implies that taking God's name with devotion, makes up for whatever defect may result from want of the perfect performance of one's religious duties owing to inability or pressure of bad environments in this Iron Age.

Upāsanā

135. So much for controlling the senses and weaning them from bad habits. This practice is what is called Dama (taming the senses). Now we shall turn to the control of the mind. First it has got to be purified; that is, the suspended and dissolved impressions created by wrong and vicious thinking, have got to be washed off by creating mental tendencies in the opposite direction. And secondly, its tendency towards constant fluttering in diverse directions has to be cured by withdrawing it inwards and cultivating a habit of concentration upon Atman. For this purpose various Upāsanās have been enjoined in the Upanishads. Upāsanās being really mental acts, are also of various kinds like the karmas enjoined in the Vedas.

शू मा. १-१-१२, पा. ३५।
particular qualities (of Brahman) and in the conditioning adjuncts."

SBh. 1-1-12, p. 35.

136. Upāsanā is often called 'Jñāna'; and the direct knowledge of Brahman or Atman, is also called by the name of Upāsanā. This has misled many to suppose that the entire body of the Vedas is injunctive or prohibitive in nature, the only difference between the so called Karma-kānda and the Jñāna-kanda being that the former enjoins karmas requiring the help of the body and physical ingredients such as milk or curds used in oblations, while the Jñāna-kānda lays down injunctions of purely psychological acts. Advaita Vedantins of Śaṅkara's tradition stand alone in distinguishing the two Jñānas. Both of these have been called 'Vidya' and 'Jñāna' because they are equally mental, but they differ widely both in their essential form and in the result aimed at. The following extract from Śaṅkara's Sūtra-Bhāṣya, would be of great help in distinguishing between the two mental functions:

(1) नन्तु ज्ञानभजी नाम राजसी क्रिया। न। वैद्यक्षण्यभावः क्रिया हि नाम सा यत्र वस्तुव्यक्तमिनिः वहिते पुरुषचित्तव्यापारीया च। यथा ‘यस्ये देवतायेः हविवेरीतं स्थायुं तां मनसा ध्यायेद् वषप्रकारणेऽत्त्र’ (पौर. भागृ. ३०-२२) इति, ‘सत्त्यां मनसा ध्यायेत्’ इति चेतत्तादिपु। ध्यानं चिन्तनं यथपि मानसं तथापि पुरुषेन कर्त्तुमकर्त्तुमेऽ अन्यथा च। कर्तु शक्यम्; पुरुषतन्त्रात् ज्ञानं तु प्रमाणाणजन्त्रम्। प्रमाणं च यथाभूतव्यक्तमिनिः। अतो ज्ञानं कर्त्तुम् अकर्त्तुम्, अन्यथा वा कर्त्तुमशक्यम्। केवलं वस्तुव्यक्तमेऽ तत्। ‘न चोदनान्त्रम्, नापि पुरुषतन्त्रम्; तस्यात् मानसस्वेच्छापि ज्ञानस्य शक्येद्वैद्यक्षण्यम्॥ सूर्यभाग। १-१-४, पाद १८।

"(Objection :-) But what is known as Jñāna is (itself) a mental act!

(Reply :-) No. For there is a difference between the two. (To explain :-) What is known as an act is that, as is well-known, in
whose case an injunction is laid down quite independently of the nature of a thing and which is dependent on the will of a person; as for instance (when it is laid down) in such texts as 'For whichever deity, the libation is taken up (by the adhvaryu), on that deity shall (the hōṭṭṛ) about to utter (the mantra) Vashat, meditate mentally.' (Ai. Br. 3-8-1), 'One shall mentally meditate upon the Sandhyā' (deity presiding over evening). Dhyāna (meditation), Cintāna (thinking of something), while it is mental, is possible for a person to do, or not to do, or even to do in a way (other than the one in which it is enjoined to be done), for it is dependent on the will of a person; but Jñāna (knowledge) is born out of (the use of) some valid means of knowledge. And the means has for its object some thing as it is. And so Jñāna (knowledge) is impossible to do, or not to do, or to do quite in another way, for it is dependent on a thing alone, and not on any injunction or on the will of any person. Therefore, though mental, Jñāna differs widely (from dhyāna).

Sbh. 1-1-4, p. 18.

[This excerpt distinguishes knowledge properly so called, from meditation in so far as the essential nature of the two modifications of the mind is concerned. As for the results of the two, the next excerpt should be carefully studied.]

(२) ज्ञातिपरिपति ज्ञान सन्न्यायाया इच्छायाः कर्म, फलभिपत्त्वत्वात् इच्छायाः। ज्ञानेन हि प्रमाणावगत्वत्वात् तत्र । ज्ञातिपरिपति हि पुरुषार्थः। निरंतरसारसाचारज्ञायायत्नंनिविष्टिश्चामतु। तत्स्मातुः ब्रह्म ज्ञासित्वयम्॥

"The word Jijñāsa (enquiry) literally means 'desire to know', Jñāna culminating in intuition, is the object of desire denoted by the grammatical suffix 'sun'. For, desire has for its object the result (and not the means). (To explain :-) Brahman indeed is desired to be intuited by means of Jñāna, the valid means of knowledge. For the intuition (of Brahman) alone is what is aimed at by the person (enquiring). For that alone finally destroys avidyā and other evils of mundane life. Therefore (the nature of) Brahman is to be enquired into."

Sbh. 1-1-1, p. 6.

[Both means of knowledge (enquiry) and the resultant knowledge (intuition), are denoted by the word 'Jñāna' according
to the derivation. But it is the end and not the means that should be taken as the object of desire here. For nobody resorts to the employment of the means for its own sake. Therefore enquiry, the means, is undertaken here for the sake of the resultant knowledge, (avagati) intuition of Brahman.

(3) तत्तत्त्वसिद्धि अपूर्वत्विवाप्रकरणे अभ्युदयसाधनान्त्यायपासनान्युव्यन्ते, कैवल्यसंनिकृत्यक्तलालि चाद्वैतादर्दीशिक्तस्वकहाविरिष्याणि ‘मनोभायः प्राणश्वरीरः’
ित्वादीनि, कर्मसमुप्स्वित्रक्षलालि च कर्माज्ञासंसाधनीनि रहस्यसामाल्यान्तः, मनोवृत्तिसामाल्यानां ॥

“Now, in this context of non-duality, are laid down meditations leading to prosperity, (meditations) leading to result approximating (advaitic) freedom and having for their object, Brahman slightly modified in comparison with non-duality; (meditations for instance) such as (on Brahman) 'made up of mind, having Prāna for His body.' (Ch. 3-14-2), meditations conducing to the efficacy of karmas, and those connected with subservient factors of karmas also. For they are similar to it inasmuch as they are also rahasya (secret), and they are also modifications of the mind.”

Though mental acts, Upāsanās are more akin to Jñāna (knowledge) because they relate to subtle entities and because they are also like Jñāna, mental.

137. By way of illustration, we shall cite one typical meditation to show how all Upāsanās of Brahman having for their object the same Brahman that is enquired into for obtaining immediate release, conduce to gradual mukti because of the difference in the nature of the mental means employed.

सर्व खल्विदं ब्रह्म तद्भावानििति शान्ति उपासित। अथ सवं कृदवयः पुरुषो
यथाक्रृतसिद्धिः पुरुभो भवति तथेत् प्रेत्य भवति स कृदवयू कर्मित। ॥

“All this is Brahman, for it is born from, dissolved in, and lives in It. One should meditate upon It calmly. Now, man is made up of his resolve. Just as a person’s resolve is in this world, so will
he be after departing from here. He should (therefore) make this resolve:

मनोमयः प्राणवस्त्रीयो भास्तुः सत्यसाधुः आकाशात्मा सर्वकर्मा सर्वकामः सर्वगणः सर्वसः सर्वित्मदम्यात्मोऽवाक्यनादः: ☞ २ ☞

एष म आत्मानंत्तहृदयेष्यन्नियानन्नीत्रीवर्गो यवाद्वा सर्पपादः यथामात्र: यथाशिवाय ज्ञायानन्तरिक्षाऽ

ज्ञायान्त्रिक्षो ज्ञायानेम्यो लोकेम्यः: ☞ ३ ☞

सर्वकर्माण्स सर्वकामः सर्वगणः सर्वसः सर्वित्मदम्यात्मोऽवाक्यनादः एष म आत्मानंत्तहृदये एतद्धैतात्मितः प्रेत्याहसिंहं

ब्रह्मतत्वास्मीर्मृदेवले प्रस्तुतवत्तामुल्यति यस्य स्थाद्वा न विशिष्कित्तसांस्तीति च स्माः श्राणिद्यः: श्राणिद्यः: ☞ ४ ☞

"Made up of mind, having Prāṇa for His body, of the nature of the light (of consciousness), having an effective will, of etherlike nature, maker of all; having all (pure) desires, all (good) odours, all (delicious) tastes, pervading the whole of this universe, having no (organs such as that of) speech, without flurry.

This is my Atman within the heart, tinier than a grain of rice, or that of barley or mustard, than of Śyāmāka or the kernel of Śyāmāka. This is my Atman within the heart, greater than the earth, greater than mid-regions, greater than heaven, greater than all these worlds. Maker of all, having all desires, all odours, all tastes, pervading all this, having no organ (such as that) of speech, without flurry. This is my Atman within the heart, this is Brahman. I shall in the long run attain Him after departing from here. He who has this firm faith, and has no doubt about it (will surely attain It). So said Śāndilya, yea Śāndilya." Ch. 3-14-2, 3, 4.

138. The extract cited just now, is a specimen of Brahman considered as the cause of the origination, sustentation and dissolution of the world, and therefore, from this adhyātrāpa (assumption) standpoint, has manifested itself as the Self of all individual souls, as well as in the form of the whole universe. The Upanishads from this thought-position,
lay down injunctions for meditating on Brahman as possessed of all auspicious qualities. Realized as the Self of the seeker by constant meditation, it ensures special enjoyment with all desires accomplished, and final emancipation at the end of the cycle also. The following extracts should be carefully studied in order to be able to distinguish between this lower empirical aspect of Brahman presented for meditation from the pure, unqualified, transcendental Brahman in its real nature taught for being intuited as the All, and the essential Self of each one of us.

1. सत्त्वानु अपराध्यविवियय गति:। तत्र पराप्राह्वन्विनायमनवारणो अपरमिन्नू ब्रह्मणि वर्तमाना गतिश्रुतयः परस्मिन्या प्राप्तयते।

"Therefore, going (to Brahman) is with reference to the Lower Brahman. This being the case, it is only owing to non-ascertainment of the distinction between the Higher and the Lower Brahman that the Srutis teaching going (to Brahman) applicable (really) to the Lower Brahman, are wrongly applied to the Higher Brahman."

[Wherever the seeker is described as going towards and reaching Brahman, it is only the Lower Brahman that is meant by the Sruti.]

2. किं त्रे ब्रह्माणी, परमपरं चेति ? बांड़ त्रे; ‘एतद्रा सत्यकाम परं च ब्रह्म यदोदारः’ (प्र. ५-२) इत्यादिदिः सानात्। किं पुनः परं ब्रह्म क्रिमपरमिता? उच्यते - ययाविद्याकृतनमस्पूपविस्मृतिप्राप्तैः, अस्मूचिकिर्ष्टेऽर्ध्रोपि स्मारते, तत्तथम्।

"(Question:-) Are there two Brahmans - one the Lower and the other Higher?"
(Answer :-) Yes, (there are) two. For we see (a text) beginning with 'This alone, O Satyakāma, is both the Higher and the Lower Brahman, (this) which is Omkāra'.

(Question :-) And which is the Higher Brahman, and which (is) the Lower?

(Traditional Vedantin :-) This is the answer: Wherever Brahman is taught through such words as 'asthillam' (not gross) negating the specific features like name and form invented by avidya, that is the Higher (Brahman). And when the self-same (Brahman) is presented as qualified by some specific feature like name and form through such words as 'manomaya' (made up of mind) 'Prāṇa-Sarīrah' (having Prāṇa for his body), 'Bhārīpah' (having the nature of the light of consciousness) etc., that is the Lower.

(Objection :-) In that case, the text teaching (Brahman as) without a second, would be contradicted!

(Reply :-) No, for this objection has been already rebutted by (taking this Brahman) as being conditioned by the associate of name and form invented by avidyā." SBh.4-3-14, pp. 501,502.

[This is only a distinction without difference, since the so-called distinguishing feature is only a figment of avidyā.]

(3) एवमेकमपि ब्रह्मापेक्षितोपाधिसंबंधं निर्भृत्तोपाधिसंबंधं चोपास्यचेतनेऽवेतनानि पुपदिद्ये।

"Thus one and the same Brahman, is taught in the Upanishads to be meditated upon and to be known according as (respectively) It is associated with the limiting adjunct or devoid of all limiting adjuncts."

SBh. 1-1-12, p. 35.

[While both the Higher and Lower Brahmans are taught through conditioning associates, these associates are ultimately rejected in the case of the knowable Brahman whereas they are taken to be qualifying adjuncts of Brahman when the latter is to be meditated upon.]

(4) ‘तस्य च चाप्रभरापहसनस्य संनिधिः ्श्रृष्टमाणस्य ‘स यदि पितृसंक्रमो भवति’ (श्रां ८-२-१) हत्यादि जड़देशरूपस्य संसारगोचरों फलं भवति ;

अत्तिकोपिनित्वादिवियाय।।

तस्य च देवानर्तोपाधिवध्यात् तत्रात्माध्यं गमनमविरुङ्गम्।
And the power stated in the Śruti in connection with that meditation of the Lower Brahman, of the nature of control over the world such as 'If he be desirous of the Pitīṭāko (the enjoyment of fathers, his fathers present themselves at his mere wish)' (Ch. 8-2-1), would belong to the sphere of sarīrīśāra only; for avidyā is not (yet) abolished. And (the enjoyment of) that power being restricted to a particular region, there is nothing contradictory in (conceiving) his going to that region in order to attain it. We have said in (explaining the Sūtra), 'Tad guṇasārātvāt' (for he is of the essence of that mind 2-3-29) that in spite of the Atman's being omnipresent, his movement is conceivable when the conditioning adjuncts such as the mind move, in the same way as (the movement of) ākāśha when pots and the like (associates) move."

SBh. 4-3-14, p. 502.

[What powers the practice of meditation offers, are attainable only in particular parts of the universe where he should needs go to attain them. That this travelling is only empirical, is natural, and the transcendental nature of Atman as being non-dual and consequently not admitting of any movement, cannot be in conflict with this movement in the sphere of avidyā.]

Adhyātma-Yōga

139. In addition to Karma and Upāsanā, there is a kind of concentrated contemplation called the Adhyātma-Yōga which leads to immediate intuition. Karma-Yōga and Upāsanā of Brahman, are also often called Yōga. As for instance in the Bhagavadgītā:

यत्र काले त्वनाथृत्तिमार्त्तिः चैव योगिनः ।
प्रयाता यान्ति तं कालं विश्वामित्वभरतपभेः ॥

"In what time departing, yogins go not to return, as also to return, that time I shall tell thee, O best of the Bharatas." G. 8-23.
In this śloka Karma-Yogins and Dhāraṇā- Yogins (of Brahman) are both spoken of as Yogins.

"Fire, Light, Day-time, the bright-fortnight, the six-months of northern solstice - men departing then, knowers of Brahman reach Brahman." G. 8-24.

Here the Upāsakas of Brahman are said to be conducted by divine guides to Brahman.

"The Smoke, Night-time, the Dark-fortnight, the six-months of the Southern Solstice - the Yogan reaching the light of the moon then, comes back." G. 8-25.

Here the performer of karmas is also spoken of as a Yogan.

But in contrast to these two Yogan, there is a third Yoga called the Adhyatma-Yoga in the Katha-Upanishad and Dhyāna-Yoga in the sixth chapter of the Bhagavadgītā. This course of discipline deserves to be specially discussed here, because, while the process involved in it is a mental practice quite different from either, many scholars and teachers of Vedanta, have mistaken it to be a species of Pātanjala- Yogan.

140. The Katha-Upanishad gives the details of this Yoga. It illustrates the usefulness of this discipline by a beautiful metaphor which likens the seeker of truth to the master of a chariot who is assisted by an intelligent charioteer guiding well-trained horses drawing the conveyance:
APPLICATION OF THE METHOD (DISCIPLINE AND GOAL)  

"But whoever has a discriminating intellect with an ever-poised mind, his senses are under control like trained horses of a (clever) charioteer."

Kā. 3-6.

[A discriminating intellect, like a clever charioteer, holds the bridle of the mind just as occasion arises. The senses therefore cannot run away in any direction they please.]

Kā. 3-9.

[The Highest place of Viṣṇu is the Reality all-pervading; for, as said in the previous verse, there is no return thence any more to the misery of mundane life.]

141. The Highest Goal of the journey of Yōga, is reached in the following manner according to the Upanishad:

(१) एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गौरोद्वत्त्या न प्रकारते ।
हस्यते त्यप्रयया बुद्ध्रया सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभि: ॥

"This Atman is hidden in all beings, and does not reveal himself. But with the help of one-pointed subtle buddhi, He is seen by those who habitually see subtle things."

Kā. 3-12.

[Atman is not known in the ordinary way of knowing objective things. He can be intuited by the refined mind by constant effort adapted to see more and more subtle things underlying the gross appearances within.]

(२) यन्त्रेऽत्क्रोऽनसी प्राक्ष्यत्तथच्छेक्ष्यान आत्मनि ।
ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियते तथच्छेक्ष्यान्त आत्मनि ॥

Kā. 3-१३.
The wise (seeker) should merge the (organs of sense such as that of) speech in the mind, and that (mind) in the intellect. The intellect, one should merge in the great Atman (the individual, self or Cosmic Intellect), and that (great Atman) should be merged in the Atman free from all specific features.

Ka.3-13.

142. The Yoga thus formulated, must be unfolded in its naked form before one is able to profit by it. For it is not the same as Sajatiya-pratyaya-Santana-karana (setting up a stream of kindred ideas) by the strength of will in accordance with what is recommended by the Sāstra. As the Chandogya-Bhāshya says:

(१) उपासनं तु यथार्थसमस्यितं किंचिदलाम्बनमुपादाय तस्मिन् समानचित्तवृत्तिसन्तानकरणं तद्विद्विषण्यप्रत्ययान्नतिरिम्॥

छो. भा. अवतरणिका, पा. ३५२

"But Upāsanā is taking up any object presented by the Sāstra, and setting up a stream of kindred modifications of the mind, (a stream) uninterrupted by any idea of a different kind."

Ch. Bh. Introduction, p. 352.

[Earlier we have quoted Śaṅkara's definition of Dhyanā (a synonym for Upāsanā) as an act depending on a person's will. See p. 151.]

In the case of Upāsanās (meditations on Brahman) Sākshātkāra (realizing the idea in a concrete form) is uniformly necessary, except when meditations are performed for particular desired ends.

(२) अविशिष्टं ह्यासं फलम् उपास्यविषयसाधारणम् ॥

सू. भा. ३-३-६७, पा. ४३०.

"The result of these meditations is identical, viz., the realization of what is meditated upon." SBh. 3-3-59, p. 430.

(३) ‘स यो नाम ब्रह्मत्युपासते यावचारो गतं तत्तत्त्वं यथाकामचारो भवति’ (छो. ७-४-५) इति चैवमापवसु क्रियावद्वेषनात्मना आत्मीयं फलं साधयत्नीपु साधारणपेश्य स्वति ॥

सू. भा. ३-३-६०, पा. ४३१.
"In meditations which are undertaken for desired results (as in 'Whoever meditates on name as Brahman') to him accrues the power of moving about there in the whole sphere pervaded by nāma' (Ch. 7.1-5), and which accomplish their results through the form of adṛśta, there is no need of realization."

SBh. 3-3-60, p. 431.

The case of this Adhyātma-Yoga, however, is quite unlike that of Upāsanās of Brahman where, by an act of creative imagination in accordance with the Śastras, one has first to achieve firm conviction that one has become Brahman, and then after shuffling off the mortal coil, the meditator proceeds to Brahmaloka by the deva-yāna path to attain and enjoy the fruits of meditation. Here in Adhyātma Yoga there is no setting up a stream of ideas; but, on the other hand, a turning inward and seeing more and more subtler entities with which the Yōgin identifies himself. (हह्यंते त्ययया कुक्य सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिनि: Ka. 3-12). Śaṅkara in commenting on this says:

हह्यंते तु संस्कृतयास अग्रयास अग्रमिचायां तया, एकायतोत्पेति तयाः इत्येतं।
सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मवस्तुनिरूपण्य तया। कैः ? सूक्ष्मदर्शिनि:। इत्यियेय्यः: परा हार्थाः। (३-१०) ह्यवादिग्रिकायां सूक्ष्मतापरमायिन्यपदिन्य कर्त्ताः सूक्ष्मं द्रुतं शीतलं वेधां ते
सूक्ष्मदर्शिनि:। तैः सूक्ष्मदर्शिनि:। पण्डितेरित्येतुतु॥

This, paraphrased, means that Atman is seen by means of Buddhī or mind made extremely subtle. The senses, the mind, the intellect and the ego (or Hiraṇyagarbhā's Buddhī) are each of them subtler than the one preceding it. The subtlest of all is the Atman on whom all of these are superimposed. As the Yōgin goes on refining his instrument of observation, the Buddhī, more and more, he comes to realize each of the succeeding subtle entities as his self. When at last
he has come to see, that is, to intuit his own Self, the real Self of all beings, there will be nothing more to see. Then this Atman is found to be *tadvishnōh paramam padam* (That Highest nature of the All-pervading One, the Atman.)

143. This Adhyātma Yōga is the same as what is described as the Dhyāna-Yōga in the Bhagavadgītā, chapter six. There also the Yōgin is said to gradually withdraw himself till at last he gets *Brahmasaṁsarpāṁ atyantam sukham*, the contact, or intuition of identity, with Brahman of the nature of unexcelled bliss. The result is the same as seeing the Self hidden in all beings (*svarabhūteṣu gūḍḍottama*) :-

**Gī. 6-29.**

"He, whose mind is poised with the help of Yoga, sees the same in all, that is, sees his own Self in all beings, and all beings in that Self."

144. The spiritual discipline from the transcendental standpoint, may be described as a journey to reach a goal without travelling. According to a Śruti which Śankara often quotes (but whose source we have not been able to trace); ‘अनध्वना अध्वनु पारिष्णवः’ the sages never travel by any path, but they reach the only Goal through all the paths. The seeker who is diligently making search for his real Self, closely examines the senses, the mind and the intellect, and when he has crossed both *mahān* and *avyakta*, he sees Reality face to face with his search-light of buddhi; or rather, the search-light is merged for good in the Atman hidden in all beings. (*svarabhūteṣu gūḍḍottama*) As Gauḍapāda expresses it :-
When the mind (disciplined by Yoga) does not dissolve (fall into) sleep, nor is distracted again (by desires), when it neither flickers nor gives rise to appearances (of objects), then it has become Brahman."

GK. 3-46.

145. This is from the standpoint of Yoga. From the view-point of Jñāna, however, the mind never was. It is only an illusory appearance of Atman Himself. That is why Gauḍapāda has said earlier:

"When, by dint of the intuition of the sole reality of Atman, the mind does not conceive (any more), it attains the state of no-mind; for it is then free from all cognition, having nothing to cognize."

GK. 3-32.

[Everything being an appearance of Atman, the only Reality, the mind will have become one with Atman, when one has realized the truth of the Śruti 'tat satyam sa Atma' (That is real, that alone is Atman)]
15. CONCLUSION

146. It is now time for retrospection. We may try to have a resume of what we have learnt about the Upanishads so far.

The word Upanishad itself primarily means Brahma- Vidya, the knowledge of Paramatman or the real Self of all the universe, internal and external including the enquirer of truth. The word is sometimes used in the sense of a secret. Brahmātma-Vidya, however, is secret only for those who dare not look at things as they are. Being the very Self of the enquirer, as of all other beings, its knowledge cannot be kept as a secret by anyone. It only requires the proper way of looking at It.

147. Brahman is the subtlest principle and is the essence of all things, animate and inanimate. It is the only Reality in the strict sense of the word, and is the very Self of the seeker of Truth. The human mind in its present state, is not capable of knowing It because of its tendency to look outwards, and desire for gross objects which, it imagines, are the only source of happiness in life. Moreover, Brahman is devoid of all specific features, and can be never objectified by the senses or the mind, the usual instruments for observing and determining the nature of phenomenal things. This is an additional reason why Brahman is not comprehensible by means of any concept. Yet it is the inmost Self of the enquirer. It is the only entity that is undeniably real.
148. Brahman is eternally pure, essentially conscious, and ever free. Being the only Reality, It is the All. One who knows It as his very Self, becomes Brahman by that very knowledge. As Brahman is the All, the knower of Brahman also becomes all. The word 'all' here does not denote quantity or number, for Brahman has no specific adjunct such as quantity or number. It is the only entity that ever existed. It is a Whole without parts, One without a second beside It, Infinite not to be contrasted with something finite. It is fearless, for there is no second for It to be afraid of, and there is nothing in Its intrinsic nature about which it could be afraid. It is immortal by nature, is All-pervading, entire in itself, but should not be thought of in connection with something else which is pervaded, or with something else which is broken and decayed. It is changeless and eternal without reference to time, Being not opposed to non-being, Consciousness without an object, Bliss undivided from any object. In a word, It is the Absolute Reality. So soon as one knows It as his real Self, he becomes Brahman Itself with all these characteristics, if they can be called characteristics at all.

149. Brahman or the Real Atman being all that really is, it goes without saying that there can be no one to teach it or to be taught, if the truth of this non-duality is once admitted. But from the standpoint of the common unphilosophic mind, it seems to be absurd to maintain that there is only One Absolute Reality without a second. This view contradicts all experience and denies all canons of knowledge which loudly proclaim the existence of a universe of manifoldness, variety, constant change and novelty.
How can the Upanishads make such a self-contradictory statement like that? And how are they going to teach anybody an Absolute without features, which can neither be described by words nor thought of by the mind?

150. Students of Vedanta as taught by the Upanishads, should first of all acquaint themselves with the Method adopted therein to present the truths of the system. The distinction between the empirical or the vyāvahāric view restricted to the phenomena of the waking state, and the sāstric view, or the Paramārtha (real) view of Vedanta taking cognizance of the whole of life, should be carefully noted; for the Upanishads are treating of Brahman or Reality underlying not only the entire universe (both internal and external) experienced in waking, but embracing life in all its aspects in our waking, dreaming and sleeping states.

The language and style specially devised for suggesting the nature of Brahman which is unobjectifiable by word or thought, and the negation method called the Adhyātārōpāpavāda-Nyāya adopted to lead the inquirer to the intuition of Reality, by sublating all not-self, must be thoroughly understood, if the study of the Upanishads is to yield any tangible and beneficial result.

The aspirant to the intuition of Vedantic Truth, should be prepared to undergo the necessary Spiritual discipline to travel inwards and make a diligent search till he lands at Reality which is his inmost Self. In any case, he must be forewarned that success in mastering Vedantic truth, is never possible to attain through a mere intellectual game.
151. The Upanishads, the Bhagavadgītā and the Vedanta-Sūtras, are the three standard sets of literature that help us to understand the traditional way (Āgama) and the peculiar course of reasoning (Tarka) to be followed in understanding the Vedantic truths. We have shown in these essays how a qualified seeker can follow the application of the method of the Adhyārōpāpavāda Nyāya in all its details. It is hoped that the earnest student who has gone through these specimen modes of application of the method, would be able to see how Vedantins who seriously hold to the Upanishadic teaching of Advaitic Brahman or the Absolute without the slightest tinge of any specific feature, can talk in the same breath of avidyā and māyā, of being and becoming, cause and effect, God and creatures, the universal and the particular, the individual soul and the universal Atman, states of Consciousness and Pure Consciousness, bondage and freedom, discipline and the goal, and such other distinctions which can apply only to a pluralistic Universe.
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10. सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी (पु. 164) 30/–
जन्माधिकरणभाष्यार्थ तत्त्विनिर्विचिताः। यथेव बजासाधिकरण-करणभाष्यायां स्रोतानसतत्वनिर्धारणं कृतम्। एवमेवत्र जगन्नादिकरणसतत्वनिर्धारणं कृतम् सर्वदत्तादृढ्याम् अध्यायपापवादप्रक्रियामुक्तयोऽविचितम्। परिशिष्टे च बजासाधिकरण भाष्यभाष्यवात्वाकृत्व सूत्रार्थसंबंधः केचन विषयः भगवत्यासंस्तेति वेदांतप्रक्रियाः निर्दिष्टविशूष्णाम् उपकाराय विचारिताः।

11. सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी (तृतीयो भागः) (पु. 339) 40/–
शास्त्रोद्धाराधिकरण- समन्वयाधिकरणभाष्योत्तरः। पूर्वमेव शुद्ध-\nशाक्तप्रक्रियायांविश्वासी। परिशिष्टिच्चताय शास्त्रप्रमाणसत्त्वविशिष्टः, श्रवणादीनां \nस्वरूपकृत्याधिकरण इत्यादः। विषयः संकलितः।

12. शुद्धशाक्तप्रक्रियाभास्करः (1–2) : (पु. 43) 10/–
वेदान्तसिद्धांतनिर्जनः, शाक्तसंप्रदायनिर्जनिः। इति किरणद्रष्टमकृत्याः। \nप्रथमौ भागः।

13. शुद्धशाक्तप्रक्रियाभास्करः (3–4–5) : (पु. 53) 15/–
अरिमनू द्वितीये भागे शाक्तसंप्रदायमयः। शाक्तसंप्रदाय प्रक्रियास्वरूपम्। अध्यायपापानिवेशवाचः। इत्येति विषयः प्रतिपादितः।
14. शुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियावाचारकर (6-7) : (पु. 54) 15/-
अस्मिन तृतीये भागे - शाङ्करप्रस्थानन्य प्रस्थानान्तरेष्यो वैलक्षण्यं स्वद्वितिम, शाङ्करामृतस्वस्य बौद्धमतसाम्याषाका च परिहारा ।

15. गीताशास्त्रार्थविवेक: (पु. 216) 30/-
श्रीसचिदानंदन-देन्द्रसरस्वतीसंगिनिमिथिमुरणृहीतोऽधवः । अत्यक्येनेन वरण प्रकरणम सृष्टिनित्येन, श्रीशाङ्करभाष्यत्पाद भाषायतुः एव वेदान्तास्य गीताचार्यानुसरणीय इति, स एव चानुसृतः परमगुणार्थवायी इति च जिज्ञासवो निःसङ्कयं विज्ञानीयः । अत्र प्रश्नम सांक्षेप-योग-कर्म-ध्यान-ज्ञानदिपदार्थाः मवेकः कृतः । तद्नु च कर्मयोग-ध्यानयोग-केष्मियोग-ज्ञानयोगाः परस्परसंबंधी निरूपितः । परिशिशे च भागे सांक्षेपयोगदर्शनाभ्या गीताधर्मायस्य सालिकायवैलक्षण्ये विवेचिते चेन स्मर्य विज्ञायेत सर्वव्यादिनात्सिद्धान्त एव परिशुद्धः स्वीकृतोऽत्र शाखे इति ॥

16. लोकविद्यारहस्यविवृति: (पु. 150) 20/-
समुचिन्मुण्डसंहीतविद्याविवेकेन ज्ञासूणां निरायकप्रशेषः ब्रह्मणि यथा लघुक्षेत तथा श्रीचकणि: छान्दोयोपनिषदोद्धिरथ्याय: अत्र व्याख्यातः ।

17. नैष्कम्यसिद्धि: (‘कलेशापारिणी’ व्याख्या सहित) (604) 200/-
व्याख्यानकर्तवः: श्रीसुपुकशराचररः: प्रमाणीकृतोपदेशसाहिते: वातिकद्वयतच शृंकानू समुद्रतथ वातिकप्रस्थानविशुद्धसंधात्माविविकारः: । सत्रवं जिज्ञासुभिर-बलोकनीयः व्याख्येयमः ।

18. वेदांतप्रक्रियाप्रत्येकविषयं (पु. 822) Under Print
श्रीसचिदानंदन-देन्द्रसरस्वतीसंगिनिमिथिमितोऽधवः । समुचिन्मुण्डस्य स्वतः स्वर्गे सर्वत्र वेदान्तेषु अध्यायोपाध्यायो तयः एकैव प्रक्रिया वायुवाच्यवेतः परमुण्डस्य तित्वं विद्यामत्वोत्तमराजपदविस्तयिनः । अत्यथा: प्रक्रियायाम प्राध्यायेन धृतेः सर्वस्य विद्यादेव वे एव वेदान्तोपदेशस्यात्मानानुग्रहायवतः नाशकुशुव्यत्रिष्ठैः नित्यितमुः अति-प्राचीनकल्याणाकर्तव्यं सर्वत्रात्मायुन्यसंयस्यविशेषतः वेदान्तो विचारेत्तिः सर्वश्रीोपस्य विवेकतः ॥
19. वेदान्तबालबोधिनी (पु. 60) 10/-
भगवत्पादविशिष्ट श्राद्धार्द विषयानुसार व्याख्यानात्मक सहितत्व।

20. वेदान्तविद्विधम (पु. 76) 20/-
सुप्रसिद्धिमिद प्रकरण भाषाविद्या व्याख्या सहितम्। व्याख्यायां
ललितया शैल्या श्रृतिप्रमाणवचनोदाहणपूर्वक भूलकायो विवृतः। युक्त्या
समुप्लबोधित्वम्।

21. विश्वद्वेरान्तसारः (1968) : (पु. 104) 15/-
अनु ब्रह्मदृष्टिप्रायेत भूमिकविशेषाणुसारेण अनुभवप्रभावधृष्टानि:
इन्द्रियप्रभाव- दृष्ट्या चैति वेदान्तीपदेशबोध्या विबध्य प्रदर्शितः।

22. विश्वद्वेरान्तपरिभाषा (पु. 146) 20/-
ब्रह्म, ब्रम्ह, जिव इति पदार्थत्रयस्य सत्त्वम्, जगद्भवणिः जीवभ्रमणोर्च
संबन्धस्य साम्प्रदायिकपरिभाषाजातीमतवल्म्य अन्त्र निरूपितः।

23. शाक्करं वेदान्तमीमांसाभाष्यम् (स्वयंवाभ्यातम) (पु. 121) 20/-

24. वेदान्तविद्वद्धृष्ठी (पु. 164) 25/-
शाक्करभाष्यतदीयत्वानिप्रगृहशाख्यमधिकृत्त्व एकादश विद्वद्धृष्ठ्या-
दानामभिप्रायः: अन्त्र दत्तः। विद्वद्धृष्ठ्यायांग्राहिका आंत्र भूमिकाविभूषित्वम्।

25. पश्चापदिकाप्रस्थानम् (पु. 205) 30/-
अनु पश्चापदिकाप्रस्थानं भाष्यप्रस्थानं तुलितमस्ति; वेदान्तविद्विधिनें
निश्चितं यत् सर्वव्यापि प्रस्थानान्तरमेवावलब्ध्िं पश्चापदिकाकारः, भाष्यकारणं तत्र
तत्रत्ताम्यायोजनं स्वाम्युपगत प्रमेयपराणीव वाक्यानि नीतानि चैति।
26. শ্রীশ্রীকর্ম্মদয়মূ (মূলাবিধানিরাম্য) (পু. 273) Under Print

শ্রীচন্দনন্দ-দ্রাস্তস্মৃতিস্মৃতি: পুরুষে বিনির্মিত প্রকাশিত পূজ্যপাদার্থে শ্রীশ্রীকর্ম্মদয়মূ অনুষ্ঠিত প্রকাশিত কর্ম্মদয়ঁমূ পূজ্যপাদার্থে শ্রীশ্রীকর্ম্মদয়মূ অনুষ্ঠিত প্রকাশিত কর্ম্মদয়ঁমূ পূজ্যপাদার্থে শ্রীশ্রীকর্ম্মদয়মূ অনুষ্ঠিত প্রকাশিত কর্ম্মদয়ঁমূ পূজ্যপাদার্থে শ্রীশ্রীকর্ম্মদয়মূ অনুষ্ঠিত প্রকাশিত কর্ম্মদয়ঁমূ।

27. পারমহংস্যবৈষ্ণব (পু. 160) 25/–

সংবাদংশ: কথা শরণে বিহিতঃ, সংবাদংশ প্রকাশঃ, যতিনাং নিত্যানি অনুষ্ঠিতাঃ, সংবাদংশনাম মুখ্যঃ, প্রকাশিত নাম প্রকাশঃ – ইত্যাদিয়ে বিষয়ঃ – শাহাঙ্কর্ম্মশ্রী প্রকাশিত বিশ্বাসী পুরুষকেতুনাম বিশ্বাসী পুরুষকেতুনাম বিশ্বাসী পুরুষকেতুনাম বিশ্বাসী পুরুষকেতুনাম বিশ্বাসী।

28. ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতিকর্ম্মস্মৃতি (পু. 222) 50/–

নারদ প্রণীতনাম ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতিকর্ম্মস্মৃতিকর্ম্মস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতিকর্ম্মস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতিকর্ম্মস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতিকর্ম্মস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি ভক্তিচন্দ্রন্ত্রস্মৃতি 

29. ভিক্তিস্মৃতি (চন্দ্রন্ত্র শাখিকলামু) (পু. 144) 10/–


সম্পাদকায়িত পুস্তকান্তরে প্রাপ্ত ব্যন্ধরে প্রাপ্ত ব্যন্ধরে প্রাপ্ত ব্যন্ধরে প্রাপ্ত ব্যন্ধরে প্রাপ্ত ব্যন্ধরে প্রাপ্ত ব্যন্ধরে 

1) অধ্যায়ক পারাকার্য্যালয়ঃ, হোলোইনশীলামু, হাসন – 573 211, ডু : 08175-273820
2) ঵েলগোল, ডু : 080-26765548
About Adhyātma Prakāsha Karyalaya

The Karyalaya was founded by Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji in the year 1920. This Institution was nurtured and developed by the revered Swamiji and it became recognized as the very fountain head of pristine pure Vedanta as propounded by Adi Shankara.

The objectives of the Karyalaya were set by the Swamiji and accordingly to this day it is engaged in the interpretation of Indian Culture by stimulating the study and practice of the Adhyatma Vidya - Philosophy and Religion in its universal aspect - especially as revealed in the Upanishads and allied literature.

The Karyalaya has so far published more than 235 books in Kannada, English and Sanskrit. It has arranged for frequent discussions, discourses, public lectures, Vedanta classes and Vedanta camps in Holenarasipura, Bangalore and other places. It is publishing a monthly magazine called 'Adhyatma Prakasha' from the year 1923 and a quarterly magazine called 'Shankara Bhaskara' from the year 1988.

The Karyalaya runs a Vedantic College for imparting Vedanta knowledge to students in the traditional Gurukula manner, and train them to later engage themselves in the dissemination of the same.

The Karyalaya has been made a Public Trust in the year 1990, and it has carried out all its activities always in a very transparent manner. The public patronage and generous donations are solicited as they are the chief source for all the activities of the Karyalaya. The donations to the Karyalaya are exempted under Section 80G of the Income Tax Act.

FOR FURTHER PARTICULARS, PLEASE CONTACT

ADHYĀTMA PRAKĀSHA KARYĀLAYA

# 68, (New No. 6), A.P.K. Road, Holenarasipura 573211
II Block, T.R. Nagar, Bangalore-28 Karnataka, India.
Ph: 080-26765548 Ph:08175 - 273820
visit us at www.adhyatmaprakasha.org
About Swamiji

Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji (1880-1975), the Founder of Adhyathma Prakasha

Karyalaya, Holenarasipur, was the celebrated authority on Shankara Vedanta during the twentieth century. He researched and worked with profound dedication and a missionary zeal throughout his life for bringing out and present to the seeker the pristine pure Advaita Vedanta according to the tradition of Gaudapada, Shankara and Sureswara. He is reverentially hailed as Abhinava Shankara of the twentieth century.

Shankara who appeared more than a thousand years ago recovered the true spirit of the Upanishadic Texts and the Vedantic Tradition from the multitude of wrong interpretations prevailing at that time. Sri Sri Swamiji who appeared on the scene during the last century devoted his life time to recover the pristine pure Vedanta of Shankara and the tradition of Adhyaropa Apavada Prakriya of the past Masters by cleansing the distortions and misrepresentations of Shankara in the post-Shankara sub-commentaries, collectively known as Vyakhyana Prasthanas.

Sri Sri Swamiji was an erudite scholar, a prolific writer and a great organizer. He wrote over 200 books in Kannada, English and Sanskrit, including Kannada translations of all the original and genuine works of Shankara. All his writings are characterized by precision, lucidity and erudition. Many of his independent books like Vedanta Prakriya Pratyabhijna, Mandukya Rahasya Vivriti and Kleshapaharini (commentary on Naishkarmya Siddhi) in Sanskrit, Essays on Vedanta and Salient Features of Shankara Vedanta in English, Paramartha Chintamani and Shankara Vedanta Sara in Kannada are real master pieces.

Sri Sri Swamiji's life is an inspiration and a model and his writings are a real boon for all the earnest seekers.

ADHYÄTMA PRAKÄSHA KARYÄLAYA
Holenarasipura - 573 211, Karnataka - INDIA