

# **ESSAYS ON VEDANTA**

**by**

**Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji**



**ADHYĀTMA PRAKĀSHA KARYĀLAYA**

**Public Charitable Trust**

**Holenarasipura - 573 211, Karnataka - INDIA**

**2008**

Visit us at [www.adhyatmaprakasha.org](http://www.adhyatmaprakasha.org)

## ***About the Book***

The beginner student of Vedanta is likely to see a contradiction when on the one hand the Upanishads teach Brahman or the Real Atman, the One Absolute Reality without a second, on the other his own experience and knowledge is that of a universe of manifoldness and variety.

In these Essays, the revered Swamiji helps the student to understand the teaching of the Upanishads correctly, by stressing on the saying of the *knowers of the traditional method* 'That which is devoid of all multiplicity, is explained by means of (deliberate) superimposition and rescission' and on the doctrine of the distinction of the empirical view and the vedantic view. Thus the earnest student would be able to see how Vedantins who seriously hold on to the Upanishadic teaching of Advaitic Brahman can talk in the same breath of *avidya and maya, cause and effect, God and creatures, states of consciousness and pure consciousness* and such other distinctions which can apply only to a pluralistic Universe.

That our author is firmly rooted in the tradition of the past Masters like Gaudapada and Shankara is obvious from the fact that the Essays are more like a garland of beautiful flowers with numerous and apt quotations from their works as well as the Upanishads strunged together by a common thread of thought.

Adhyātma Granthāvali

# **Essays on Vedanta**

**(Matter & Method)**

**Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji**

Serial No.155

Publishers

**Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya**

Holenarsipur-573211

[www.adhyatmaprakasha.org](http://www.adhyatmaprakasha.org)

[Phone : 08175-273820]

2008

**ESSAYS ON VEDANTA [Matter & Method] : A book  
written by Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati  
Swamiji published by Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya  
Holenarsipur-573211 [Ph.: 08175-273820]  
www.adhyatmaprakasha.org**

First Edition : 1971 - 1000 Copies

Second Edition : 2008 - 500 Copies

Number of Pages : xviii + 172 = 190

Price : 

<b>Rs. 80</b>
---------------

All Rights Reserved

by

The Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya

Holenarsipur - 573211

Type set

**Sree Lakshmi Enterprises**

No.1052, 50 Ft. Mn. Rd.,

1st Stage, Kumara Swamy L/o

**Bangalore - 560 078**

**Ph.: 64555684**

Printed at

**Sri Rama Printers**

No.25, 15th Cross

Srinidhi L/o

**Bangalore - 560 062**

**Ph.: 26321267**

## **PUBLISHERS' NOTE TO FIRST EDITION**

These essays were originally proposed to be published in the '**Adhyatma Prakasha**', the Kannada monthly journal of the Institution. But on second thoughts, it was decided that, in view of the importance of the subject-matter, they had better be brought out in a handy book-form.

We hope that the work will be deemed to be a valuable introduction to more voluminous productions such as '**How to Recognize the Method of Vedanta**' already published in the Karyalaya.

Holenarsipur  
21-7-1971

Y. Narasappa  
Chairman, A.P. Karyalaya.

## **PUBLISHERS' NOTE TO THE FIRST REPRINT**

The copies of the first edition of 'Essays on Vedanta' had been sold out long back and there has been a demand from the readers of Vedanta books in English both from India and abroad. The book is now reprinted after making necessary corrections.

The students of Vedanta will find it very difficult to capture the main teaching of the Upanishads by reading the various commentaries on them, as they are too numerous and embody conflicting interpretations by the Bhāshyakāras and their sub-commentators.

As our author writes in his Introduction, it is most necessary to discover the cardinal doctrine and the distinctive technique or the method which governs all the modes of approach to reality in the Upanishads. With his deep insight in to the Vedantic lore he suggests that the students of Vedanta should carefully note the distinction between the empirical or the vyāvahāric view and the Sastraic or the Paramārtha view of the Vedanta. He writes in the concluding Chapter that 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 Adhyārōpāpavāda Nyāya must be thoroughly understood, if the study of the Upanishads is to yield any tangible or beneficial result.

Needless to say that the present book serves as an excellent introduction to the central doctrine of the Upanishads and to the One Method of approach uniformly employed in all of them in leading the inquirer to the intuition of the Absolute Reality which is his very Self.

The Karyalaya intends to reprint its various books as and when demand arises, and therefore solicits suggestions from the readers. The readers are welcome to visit our website **[www.adhyatmaprakasha.org](http://www.adhyatmaprakasha.org)** to learn about the activities of the Karyalaya.

Dated 30th July 2008  
Holenarasipur

**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' (नैषा तर्केण मतिराप्नेया). 'This can be well understood only when taught by another' (प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्टुं) (का.२-९).

### Conflicting Interpretations

The numerous commentaries embodying the conflicting interpretations of the several Bhāṣhyakāras 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 Śāṅkara, 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 :

अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्यप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते ॥

"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 Vedānta Sūtra 1-1-5, makes this equally unambiguous remark :-

एवं तावद् वेदान्तवाक्यानां ब्रह्मात्मावगतिप्रयोजनानां ब्रह्मात्मनि तात्पर्येण समन्वितानामन्तरेणापि कार्यानुप्रवेशं ब्रह्मणि पर्यवसानमुक्तम् ॥

"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 'Brahmātman' 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 Bhāṣhyas 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 ślōkas from Gaudapāda, the traditional grand-preceptor of Śaṅkara:-

स्वसिद्धान्तव्यवस्थासु द्वैतिनो निश्चिता दृढम् ।

परस्परं विरुध्यन्ते तैरयं न विरुध्यते ॥

अद्वैतं परमार्थो हि द्वैतं तद्भेद उच्यते ।

तेषामुभयथा द्वैतं तेनायं न विरुध्यते ॥ गौ.का. ३-१७, १८.

"The dualists (who follow the Sāṅkhya or Vaiśeṣika, 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 ślōkas from Gaudapāda :-

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदितान्यथा ॥

उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ॥ गौ.का. ३-१५

"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)."

[Śaṅkara 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)]

अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते ।

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥ गौ.का. १-१६

"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 (नटवत् सर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते । SBh. 2-1-18, p. 207)

(१) ननु शब्दादिहीनं ब्रह्म जगतः कारणम् । वाढम्, न तु शब्दादिमत् कार्यं कारणात्मना हीनं प्रागुत्पत्तेरिदानीं वा अस्ति ॥ सू. भा. २-१-७, पा. १८९.

"(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 घटकरकाद्याकाशानां महाकाशानन्यत्वम्, यथा च मृगतृष्णिकोदकादीनाम् ऊषरादिभ्योऽनन्यत्वम्, दृष्टनष्टस्वरूपत्वात्, स्वरूपेणानुपाख्यत्वात्, एवमस्य भोग्यभोक्त्रादिप्रपञ्चजातस्य ब्रह्मव्यतिरेकेणाभाव इति द्रष्टव्यम् ॥ 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 Sūtra-Bhāṣya, 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 Bhāṣya (on 2-1-14, p. 196) : 'एष ब्रह्मणो दृष्टान्त आम्नातः । तत्र श्रुताद् वाचारम्भणशब्दात्, दार्ष्टान्तिकेऽपि ब्रह्मव्यतिरेकेण कार्यजातस्याभाव इति गम्यते ॥' "This is an illustration used to teach the

nature of Brahman. From the expression *Vācārambhaṇam*' (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 *Gītā-Bhāṣya*, 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 :

‘सत्यम् एवम् गुरुसंप्रदायरहितानाम् अश्रुतवेदान्तानाम् अत्यन्त-  
बहिर्विषयासक्तबुद्धीनां सम्यक्प्रमाणेष्वकृतश्रमाणाम् ; तद्विपरीतानां तु लौकिक-  
ग्राह्यग्राहकद्वैतवस्तुनि सद्बुद्धिर्नितरां दुःसंपाद्या आत्मचैतन्यव्यतिरेकेण  
वस्त्वन्तरस्यानुपलब्धेः ॥’

गी. भा. 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." 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 अन्त्यं प्रमाणम् अतद्धर्माध्यारोपणमात्रनिवर्तकत्वेन  
प्रामाण्यमात्मनः प्रतिपद्यते न त्वज्ञातार्थज्ञापकत्वेन ॥ गी. २-१८, पा. १६.

"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 Bhāshya on Gitā 13-2, where he takes up for criticism the misinterpretation of the Gitā teaching "Know the *Kshētrajña* to be Myself in all the kshetras, O scion of Bhārata ! (क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि सर्वक्षेत्रेषु भारत)". The follower of that school admits that *Kshētrajña* is certainly Īśvara, and *ksētra* is something else which is the object of *kshētrajña* 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 saṁsāra by attaining the knowledge of both *kshētra* and *kshētrajña* ; and then realizing the *Kshētrajña*, the Lord, I must get and stay in the nature of that (*Kshētrajña*)."

Śaṅkara 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. Śaṅkara 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, Śaṅkara 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 :-

उपासनाश्रितो धर्मो जाते ब्रह्मणि वर्तते ।

प्रागुत्पत्तेरजं सर्वं तेनासौ कृपणः स्मृतः ॥

गौ.का. ३-१.

"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

आश्रमास्त्रिविधा हीनमध्यमोत्कृष्टदृष्टयः ।

उपासनोपदिष्टेयं तदर्धमनुकम्पया ॥

गौ. का. ३-१६

"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 ; निदं यदिदमुपासते' (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 ślōka 'सर्वतः पाणिपादं तत्' (गी. 13-13), he writes :-

"The collection of specific features in the Kshetrajña 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 Kshetrajña) 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 संप्रदायविदां वचनम्) "That which is devoid of all multiplicity, is explained by means of (deliberate) superimposition and rescission 'अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते'.

It would be profitable to note that both the superimposition and the negation, are used by the Śāstra 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 :

प्रपञ्चो यदि विद्येत निवर्तेत न संशयः ।

मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः ॥

विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत कल्पितो यदि केनचित् ।

उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥

गौ.का. १-१७, १८.

"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 *adhyārōpa* (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 (लोकदृष्टि) and the Vedantic view (शास्त्रदृष्टि) or the Really real view (पारमार्थिकदृष्टि), 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 Bhāṣhyas. 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 एष नेतिनेतीति व्याख्यातं निहुते यतः ।

सर्वमग्राह्यभावेन हेतुनाजं प्रकाशते ॥ गौ. का. ३-२६.

"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 works<sup>1</sup> 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 '*Māṇḍūkya-Rahasya-Vivṛti*' (Sanskrit), '*How to Recognize the Method of Vedanta*' and '*Śaṅkara'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.

### **Acknowledgement**

Being at a distance from Holenarsipur while the book was in the press, and suffering from failing eyesight, I am fully aware that some misprints may have crept in. Any suggestions to improve the errors of thought or of expression, will be thankfully received with grateful acknowledgement and the needful corrections effected by the authorities of the Karyalaya, Holenarsipur, to whom the sole copy right of the work has been made over by me.

My Nārāyaṇa Smaraṇams to all those that have assisted in bringing the present Edition to a shape. Special mention is necessary here of the names of Swamy Brahmanandendra Saraswati, of Sri H.N. Narayana Rao, M.A., B.T., Retd. High School Headmaster, Bangalore, as well as of Sri K.G. Subraya Sharma, Private Secretary for passing the proof sheets.

**Swami Satchidanandendra Saraswati**

Bangalore  
04-08-71

## CONTENTS

	Pages
1. Vedanta	1
2. The Teaching of the Upanishads	9
3. The All	12
4. The Method	21
5. Application of the Method ( <i>Agama and Reason</i> )	29
6. Application of the Method ( <i>Avidya and Maya</i> )	41
7. Application of the Method ( <i>Being and Becoming</i> )	49
8. Application of the Method ( <i>Cause and Effect</i> )	58
9. Application of the Method ( <i>Isvara and Jiva</i> )	73
10. Application of the Method ( <i>The Universal and the Particular</i> )	88
11. Application of the Method ( <i>Panchakosha</i> ) ( <i>The Jiva and the Real Atman</i> )	94
12. Application of the Method ( <i>Examination of the States of Consciousness</i> )	101
13. Application of the Method ( <i>Bondage and Release</i> )	131
14. Application of the Method ( <i>Discipline and Goal</i> )	140
15. Conclusion	160

---

## ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for the names of the Upanishads have been given on pages 7-8 of this book. The other abbreviations used in the work are as follows :-

गी. G.	The Bhagavadgītā.
गौ. का. GK.	Gauḍapāda's Kārikas on the Māṇḍūkya.
पं.	The Pañcapādikā.
पा. p. or pp.	Page or Pages.
म. ना. M.N.	Mahānārāyaṇa Upanishad.
वि. पु. V.P.	Vishnu Purāṇa.
सू. भा. SBh.	Śaṅkara's Bhāṣhya on the Vedānta Sūtras.
C.P.B.	The Central Philosophy of Buddhism.
VS.	Vedānta Sūtra
Bh.	The Bhāṣhya on that work.

---

# 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 :

(१) वेदान्ते परमं गुह्यं पुराकल्पे प्रचोदितम् ।

नाप्रशान्ताय दातव्यं नापुत्रायाशिष्याय वै पुनः ॥ इवे. ६-२२.

"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 *Śvetāśvatara Upanishad*. We are told here that the teaching contained in the Upanishad is a traditional secret, fit to be revealed to qualified seekers only.

(२) वेदान्तविज्ञानसुनिश्चितार्थाः

संन्यासयोगाद्यतयः शुद्धसत्त्वाः ।

ते ब्रह्मलोकेषु परान्तकाले

परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे ॥

मुं. ३-२-६.

"Those who have perfectly ascertained the nature of the entity revealed by *Vedantic Intuition*, the endeavouring aspirants whose mind has become purified through the *Yōga of Sannyāsa*, they are freed from all circumscribing limitations, having become perfectly immortal at the ultimate end of life." Mu. 3-2-6.

Here Vedanta-Vijñāna, has been explained by Śaṅkara as वेदान्तजनितविज्ञान (intuition born from the teaching of the Vedantas) and therefore it appears that Śaṅkara takes the word in the sense of the Upanishads. In his Introduction to the Sūtra-Bhashya, he writes :-

‘अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते ॥’

— अद्यासभाष्यम्

"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."

Intro. SBh.

It is evident that Śaṅkara 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.

(१) विरोचनोऽसुराञ्जगाम तेभ्यो हैतामुपनिषदं प्रोवाचाऽऽत्मैवेह मह्य्य  
आत्मा परिचर्यः ॥

छां. ८-८-४.

"Virōcana 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."

Ch. 8-8-4

(२) 'तस्मादप्यद्येहाददानमश्रद्धानमयजमानमाहुरासुरो बतेत्यसुराणां  
ह्येषोपनिषत् ॥'

छां. ८-८-५

"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) 'तस्योपनिषत् सत्यस्य सत्यमिति प्राणा वै सत्यं तेषामेष सत्यम् ।'

बृ. २-१-२०.

"Of Him the Upanishad is सत्यस्य सत्यम् 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*.

(४) 'अथातः संहिताया उपनिषदं व्याख्यास्यामः ॥'

तै. १-३

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

Tai. 1-3

Here 'Upanishad' means 'meditation.'

(५) 'इत्युपनिषत् ॥' तै. २-९, ३-१०.

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

Here the word 'Upanishad' means the supreme secret, to wit, the knowledge of Brahman.

(६) 'उपनिषदं भो ब्रूहीत्युक्ता त उपनिषद् ब्राह्मी वाव त उपनिषदमब्रूमेति ॥'

के. ४-७.

"(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 :-

(९) य इमां ब्रह्मविद्याम् उपयन्त्यात्मभावेन श्रद्धाभक्तिपुरःसराः सन्तः, तेषां गर्भजन्मजरारोगाद्यनर्थपूगं निशातयति ; परं वा ब्रह्म गमयति ; अविद्या-दिसंसारकारणं वा अत्यन्तम् अवसादयति विनाशयति इत्युपनिषत् । उपनिषदस्य सदेरेवमर्थस्मरणात् ॥ मुं. अव.

"Whoever approach this Brahmadevidyā 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.

(अ) अथ काठकोपनिषद्ब्रह्मीनां सुखार्थप्रबोधनार्थम् अत्यग्रन्था वृत्तिरारभ्यते । का. अव.

"Now a brief commentary on the chapters of the *Kāthakōpanishad*, 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.]



(आ) सदेर्धातोर्विशरणगत्यवसादनार्थस्य उपनिपूर्वस्य किप्रत्ययान्तस्य रूपमिदम् 'उपनिषत्' इति । का. भा. अव.

"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 Brahmanavidyā. This same derivation together with the explanation of what Brahmanavidyā (does for one who acquires it,) recurs in Śaṅkara's Introduction to several other Upanishads. We have chosen the *Kāthak ūpanishad-Bhāṣhyā* as a sample.]

(इ) उपनिषच्छब्देन च व्याग्निस्यासितग्रन्थप्रतिपाद्यवेद्यवस्तुविषया विद्या उच्यते । केन पुनरर्थयोगेन उपनिषच्छब्देन विद्या उच्यत इति ? उच्यते । ये मुमुक्षवो दृष्टानुश्रविकविषयवितृष्णाः सन्तः, उपनिषच्छब्दवाच्यां वक्ष्यमाणलक्षणां विद्याम् उपसद्य उपगम्य तन्निष्ठतया निश्चयेन शीलयन्ति तेषाम् अविद्यादेः संसारबीजस्य विशरणात्, हिंसनात्, विनाशनात् — इत्यनेनार्थयोगेन विद्या 'उपनिषत्' इत्युच्यते । तथा च वक्ष्यति 'निचाय्य तं मृत्युमुखात् प्रमुच्यते ।' (१-३-१५) इति ॥ का. भा. अव.

"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 (*upasadya*) 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.

(ई) पूर्वोक्तविशेषणान् वा मुमुक्षून् परं ब्रह्म गमयति इति च ब्रह्म गमयितृत्वेन योगाद् ब्रह्मविद्या उपनिषत् । का. भा. अव.

"Or *Brahmavidyā* (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.

(उ) लोकादिः, ब्रह्मजज्ञो योऽग्निः, तद्विषयाया विद्याया द्वितीयेन वरेण प्रार्थ्यमानायाः स्वर्गलोकफलप्राप्तिहेतुत्वेन गर्भवासजन्मजराद्युपद्रववृन्दस्य लोकान्तरे पौनःपुन्येन प्रवृत्तस्य अवसादयितृत्वेन शैथिल्यापादनेन धात्वर्थयोगात्, अग्निविद्यापि 'उपनिषत्' इत्युच्यते । तथा च वक्ष्यति 'स्वर्गलोका अमृतत्वं भजन्ते' (१-१३) इत्यादि ॥

का.भा. अव.

"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 (*Hiranyagarbha*), 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 occurring 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 उपनिषच्छब्देन अध्येतारो ग्रन्थमप्यभिलपन्ति ; 'उपनिषदम् अधीमहे, उपनिषदम् अध्यापयामः' इति चैवम् । नैष दोषः । अविद्यादिसंसारहेतुविशारणादेः सदिधात्वर्थस्य ग्रन्थमात्रे असम्भवात्, विद्यायां च सम्भवात् । ग्रन्थस्यापि तादर्थ्येन तच्छब्दत्वोपपत्तेः, 'आयुर्वै घृतम्' इत्यादिवत् । तस्मात् विद्यायां मुख्यया वृत्त्या उपनिषच्छब्दो वर्तते ; ग्रन्थे तु भक्त्या — इति ॥

का. भा. अव.

"(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 *sañsāra* 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 authoritative by all Vedantins.

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

1. ई. Íśa. The *Íśāvāsyōpanishad*, the Samhitōpanishad of Vājasaneyins.

2. के. Ke. The *Kēnōpanishad*, the Upanishad of the Talavakāras.

3. का. Kā. The *Kāthakōpanishad*, the Upanishad of the Kathas, of the Krishna Yajurveda.

4. मु. Mu. The *Muṇḍakōpanishad*, the Upanishad of the *Ātharvāṇas*.

5. ऋ Pr. The *Praśnōpanishad*, the Upanishad of the Atharvanas, regarded as part of the Brahmana explaining the Muṇḍaka, part of the Mantra-portion.

6. मां. Ma. The *Māṇḍūkyaōpanishad*, of the Atharva-veda, on which the famous Gauḍapāda has written his Kārikas.

7. तै. Tai. The *Taittirīyōpanishad*, of the Taittirīyas of the Krishna Yajurveda.

8. ऐ. Ai. The *Aitareyōpanishad*, of the Aitareyins.

9. छं. Cha. The *Chāndōgyōpanishad*, of the Chāndōgya, belonging to the Sama Veda.

10. बृ. Br. The *Bṛhadāraṇyakōpanishad*, of the Kāṇvas, belonging to the Śukla Yajurveda.

11. श्वे. Sve. The *Śvetāśvatarōpanishad*, of the *Śvetāśvataras*, belonging to the Krishna Yajurveda.

## 2. THE TEACHING OF THE UPANISHADS

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 Chāndōgya :

‘स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो ॥  
छां. 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 *Añima* (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 एष नेतिनेत्यात्मा' (*sa ēsha nētinētyātmā*), 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.

---

### 3. THE ALL

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) **Adhyātma-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) **Brahmātmaikatva-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 :

(१) ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम् ॥

तै. २-१.

"The knower of Brahman attains the highest."

Tai. 2-1

(२) सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म । यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन् । सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह । ब्रह्मणा विपश्चितेति ॥

तै. २-१.

"Whoever knows Brahman - Reality, Consciousness, and Infinity as hidden in the highest *ākāśha* in the recess of the heart, he accomplishes all the desires simultaneously as the all-wise Brahman."

Tai. 2-1.

(३) तदुक्तमृषिणा - गर्भे नु सन्नन्वेषामवेदमहं देवानां जनिमानि विश्वा । शतं मा पुर आयसीररक्षन्नधः श्येनो जवसा निरदीयमिति, गर्भे एवैतच्छयानो वामदेव एवमुवाच ॥

ऐ. २-५.



"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 !'"

Ai.2.5.

(४) यो वा एतामेवं वेदापहत्य पाप्मानमनन्ते स्वर्गे लोके ज्येये प्रतितिष्ठति ॥  
प्रतितिष्ठति ॥

के. ४-९.

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

Ke. 4-9.

(५) मृत्युप्रोक्तां नचिकेतोऽथ लब्ध्वा विद्यामेतां योगविधिं च कृत्स्नम् ।  
ब्रह्म प्राप्तो विरजोऽभूद् विमृत्युरन्योऽप्येवं यो विदध्यात्ममेव ॥

का. ६-१८.

"Then Naciketa got this wisdom and also the entire technique of the Yōga 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)."

Ka. 6-18.

(६) स ब्रह्मविद्यां सर्वविद्याप्रतिष्ठामथर्वाय ज्येष्ठपुत्राय प्राह ॥ मुं. १-१-१.

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

Mu. 1-1-1.

(७) स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति । नास्याब्रह्मवित् कुले  
भवति । तरति शोकं तरति पाप्मानं गुहाग्रन्थिभ्यो विमुक्तोऽमृतो भवति ॥

मुं. ३-२-९.

"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."

Mu. 3-2-9.

(८) विज्ञानात्मा सह देवैश्च सर्वैः प्राणा भूतानि संप्रतिष्ठन्ति यत्र । तदक्षरं  
वेदयते यस्तु सोम्य स सर्वज्ञः सर्वमेवाविवेशेति ॥

प्र. ४-११.

"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.

(९) एतावदेवाहमेतत् परं ब्रह्म वेद । नातःपरमस्तीति ॥ प्र. ६-७.

"It is only so much. I know this Supreme Brahman. There is nothing beyond this." Pr. 6-7.

(१०) तदिदमप्येतर्हि य एवं वेदाहं ब्रह्मास्मीति स इदं सर्वं भवति तस्य ह न देवाश्च नाभूत्या ईशते । आत्मा ह्येषां स भवति ॥ बृ. १-४-१०.

"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.

(११) स वा एष महानज आत्माऽजरोऽमरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्माभयं वै ब्रह्माभयं हि वै ब्रह्म भवति य एवं वेद ॥ बृ. ४-४-२५.

"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.

(१२) स वा एष एवं पश्यन्नेवं मन्वान एवं विजानन्नात्मरतिरात्मक्रीड आत्ममिथुन आत्मानन्दः स स्वराड् भवति तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति । अथ येऽन्यथातो विदुरन्यराजानस्ते क्षय्यलोका भवन्ति तेषां सर्वेषु लोकेष्वकामचारो भवति ॥ छां. ७-२५-२.

"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 :

(१) ईशा वास्यमिदं सर्वं यत्किञ्च जगत्यां जगत् । ई. १.

"All this, whatever phenomenon there is in this world, should be covered up by this Lord." Iśa. 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. '*Īśa*' (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.]

(२) ब्रह्मैवेदममृतं पुरस्ताद् ब्रह्म पश्चात् ब्रह्म दक्षिणतश्चोत्तरेण ।

अधश्चोर्ध्वं च प्रसृतं ब्रह्मैवेदं विश्वमिदं वरिष्ठम् ॥ मुं. २-२-१२

"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.

(३) एष ब्रह्मैष इन्द्र एष प्रजापतिरेते सर्वे देवा इमानि च पञ्च महाभूतानि पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योतीषीत्येतानीमानि च क्षुद्रमिश्राणीव । बीजानीतराणि चेताराणि चाण्डजानि च जारुजानि च स्वेदजानि चोद्भिज्जानि

चाश्वा गावः पुरुषा हस्तिनो यत्किञ्चेदं प्राणि जङ्गमं च पतत्रि च यच्च स्थावरम् । सर्वं तत् प्रज्ञानेत्रं प्रज्ञाने प्रतिष्ठितं प्रज्ञानेत्रो लोकः प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठा प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म ॥ ऐ. ३-१-३.

"This *Brahmā*, this *Indra*, this *Prajāpati*, 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."

Ai. 3-1-3.

(४) यो वै भूमा तत्सुखं नाल्पे सुखमस्तीति ॥ छां. ७-२३-१.

"The Infinite is bliss; there is no bliss in the finite."

Ch. 7-23-1.

(५) यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमाऽथ यत्रान्यत्पश्यत्यन्यच्छृणोत्यन्यद्विजानाति तदल्पं यो वै भूमा तदमृतमथ यदल्पं तन्मर्त्यश्च भगवः कस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठित इति स्वे महिम्नि यदि वा न महिम्नीति ॥

छां. ७-२४-१.

"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.

(६) अथात आत्मादेश एव आत्मैवाधस्तादात्मोपरिष्ठादात्मा पश्चादात्मा पुरस्तादात्मा दक्षिणत आत्मोत्तरत आत्मैवेदं सर्वम् ॥ छां. ७-१५-२.

"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.

(७) इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा ॥

बृ. २-४-६.

"All this is essentially this Atman."

Br. 2-4-6.

(८) पुरुष एवेदं विश्वम् ॥

मुं. २-१-१०

"All this is Purusha alone."

Mu. 2-1-10.

[Brahman is called Purusha here.]

(९) अरा इव रथनाभौ कला यस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठिताः ।

तं वेद्यं पुरुषं वेद यथा मा वो मृत्युः परिव्यथा इति ॥

प्र. ६-६.

"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."

Pr. 6-6.

(१०) पुरुष एवेदं सर्वं यद्भूतं यच्च भव्यम् ॥

पुरुषसूक्तम्-२.

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

P. Suktam-2.

(११) तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम् ॥

म. ना. १२.

"All this is pervaded by that Purusha." Mahanarayana, 12.

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 Sūtra-Bhāṣhya concerning this distinction :

ननु आत्मा अहंप्रत्ययविषयत्वात्, उपनिषत्स्वेव विज्ञायत इत्यनुपपन्नम् । न । तत्साक्षित्वेन प्रत्युक्तत्वात् । न ह्यहंप्रत्ययविषयकर्तृव्यतिरेकेण तत्साक्षी सर्वभूतस्थः, समः, एकः, कूटस्थनित्यः, पुरुषो विधिकाण्डे तर्कसमये वा केनचिदधिगतः, सर्वस्याऽऽत्मा । अतः स न केनचित् प्रत्याख्यातुं शक्यः ॥ सू. भा. १-१-४, पा. २०.

"(Objection :-) Atman being the object of the concept I, cannot be rightly claimed to be known exclusively in the Upanishads alone.

(Reply :-) 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 *Svetāśvatara Upanishad* :

एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा ।  
कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्गुणश्च ॥

श्वे. ६-११.

"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 *Īśvara* 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 :

आत्मनैवायं ज्योतिषाऽऽस्ते पल्ययते कर्म कुरुते विपल्येतीति ॥

बृ. ४-३-६.

"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 *Lōka-dṛṣhti* (the view of common sense), or *Vyāvahārika-dṛṣhti* (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 *Śāstra-dṛṣhti* (the view-point of the Vedānta Śāstra or the Upanishads), or *Paramārtha dṛṣhti* (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 occurred 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

निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवयं निरञ्जनम् ॥

श्वे. ६-१९.

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

Śve. 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 *Kāthaka 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 :

नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ट ॥ का. २-९.

"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 *Adhyārōpavāda 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 ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म । यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन् । सोऽश्नुते  
सर्वान् कामान् सह । ब्रह्मणा विपश्चितेति ॥ तै. २-१.

"Whoever 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 **Adhyārōpāpavāda 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 Chāndōgya Upanishad:

यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो  
नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् ॥ छां. ६-१-४.

"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. Śāṅkara in his commentary on the Gītā, says :

यथा घटादिसंस्थानं चक्षुषा निरूप्यमाणं मृद्वतिरेकेणानुपलब्धेरसत् तथा सर्वो विकारः कारणव्यतिरेकेणानुपलब्धेरसत् ॥ गी. भा. २-१६.

"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 intuitis it directly without any medium at all, how should one express the nature of Reality ? Here is the answer in a Śruti quoted in the Sūtra-Bhāṣya

बाष्कलिना च बाध्वः पृष्ठः सन्नवचनेनैव ब्रह्म प्रोवाचेति श्रूयते— 'स होवाचाधीहि भो इति स तूर्णं बभूव तं ह द्वितीये वा तृतीये वा वचन उवाच ब्रूमः

खलु त्वं तु न विजानासि । उपशान्तोऽयमात्मा' इति ॥

सू. भा. ३-२-१७, पा. ३५८.

"And it is known through a Śruti that Bādhva questioned by Bāshkali explained it by means of not speaking alone :- He said "Teach me (Brahman), revered sir." He kept silent. When questioned a second and a third time, he (Bādhva) replied 'We are really telling it, but you do not comprehend it; this Atman is devoid of all multiplicity'." SBh. 3-2-17, p. 358.

25. The best, way of expressing one's direct intuition is silence. This is what is meant by all negating texts such as 'स एष नेतिनेत्यात्मा' "This is the Atman who has been described as 'not this, not that' (Br. 3-9-26), 'अस्थूलमनण्वहस्वमदीर्घमलोहितमस्रेहम् ...' '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 can neither 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-Bhāṣya writes :

न ह्येतस्मादिति नेति नेति । न हि प्रपञ्चप्रतिषेधरूपादादेशनात् अन्यत्  
परमादेशनं ब्रह्मणोऽस्तीति ॥ सू. भा. ३-२-२२, पा. ३६६.

"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

*(Āgama 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:

यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति ..... तदितर इतरं विजानाति ।  
यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत्केन कं पश्येत् ..... तत्केन कं विजानीयात् ॥

बृ. ४-५-१५.

"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 कं विजानीयात्, तत्केन कमभिवदेत्). 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 कं पश्येत् बृ. २-४-१४; वेदा अवेदाः बृ. ४-३-२२), nor is there any need for any revealer for the self-resplendent Atman (ब्रह्मैव तेज एव बृ. ४-४-७).

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

अविषयत्वे ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रयोनित्वानुपपत्तिरिति चेत् । न । अविद्याकल्पित-  
भेदनिवृत्तिपरत्वाच्छास्त्रस्य । न हि शास्त्रम् इदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति,

किं तर्हि, प्रत्यगात्मत्वेनाविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं  
वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदमपनयति ॥ सू. भा. १-१-४, पा. १६.

"(Objection :-) If Brahman is not an object, it cannot be consistently held to be (knowable) through the (Vedanta) Śāstra as a valid means of knowledge !

(Reply :-) No, for the Śāstra purports to wipe off the difference invented by Avidyā. (To explain :) The Śāstra indeed does not propose to teach Brahman as such and such an entity as its object, but it teaches that as one's inmost Self, it is unobjectifiable, and removes all differences such as that of the knowable, knower, and knowledge." SBh. 1-1-4, p. 16.

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 *Upāsana*s or meditations. That is why Śaṅkara writes in his Sūtra-Bhāṣya :

न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम्, किं तु  
श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणम् ; अनुभाववसानत्वाद्  
भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य ॥ सू. भा. १-१-२, पा. ८.

"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

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. 'अनुभवादयश्च' (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 वेदान्तवाक्येषु जगतो जन्मादिकारणवादिषु तदर्थग्रहण-  
दाढ्यायानुमानमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि प्रमाणं भवन्न निवार्यते । श्रुत्यैव च  
सहायत्वेन तर्कस्याभ्युपेतत्वात् । तथा हि 'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यः' (बृ. २-४-५)  
इति श्रुतिः, 'पण्डितो मेधावी गन्धारानेवोपसंपद्येतैवमेवेहाचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद' इति  
च पुरुषबुद्धिसाहाय्यमात्मनो दर्शयति ॥ सू. भा. १-१-२, पा. ८.

"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 अनुमानमपि (inference also) and प्रमाणं भवत् (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 Śruti. Both will have to use reasoning on the lines indicated by the Śruti 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) यदपि श्रवणव्यतिरेकेण मननं विदधच्छब्द एव तर्कमप्यादर्तव्यं दर्शयतीत्युक्तम्, नानेन मिथेण शुष्कतर्कस्यात्रात्मलाभः संभवति ; श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभववाङ्मतेनाश्रीयते ॥ सू. भा. २-१-६, पा. १८८.

"As for the other argument that the Śruti itself, enjoining reflection in addition to hearing or the study of Śruti, 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 Śruti alone is resorted to here as ancillary to intuition." SBh. 2-1-6, p. 188.

(३) इतश्च नागमगम्येऽर्थे केवलेन तर्केण प्रत्यवस्थातव्यम् । यस्मात्, निरागमाः पुरुषोत्प्रेक्षामात्रनिबन्धनास्तर्काः अप्रतिष्ठिता भवन्ति, उत्प्रेक्षाया निरङ्कुशत्वात् ॥ सू. भा. २-१-११, पा. १९९, १९९.

"For this reason also, one should not stand up against what is to be known exclusively by the Āgama (traditional teaching of the Śruti; for, reasonings which are the outcome of mere surmises without any Āgama for basis, would be inconclusive; since a surmise has nothing to check it." SBh. 2-1-10, p. 195.

(४) रूपाद्यभावाद्धि नायमर्थः प्रत्यक्षगोचरः, लिङ्गाद्यभावाच्च नानुमानादीनामिति चावोचाम ॥ सू. भा. २-१-११, पा. १९३.

"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." SBh. 2-1-11, p. 193.

32. The **Bhagavadgita** is called by the name of the *Smṛti-Prasthāna* in contrast with the Śrutis which are called the '*Śruti-Prasthāna*' and the Brahma-Sūtras known by the name of the '*Nyāya-Prasthāna*'. 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 Śrutis (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 Ṛshis who are sometimes mentioned in them, Thus :

(१) अन्यदेवाहुर्विद्यया अन्यदाहुरविद्यया ।

इति शुश्रुम धीराणां ये नस्तद्विचक्षिरे ॥ <sup>1</sup>

ई. १०

---

1. The commentary on the *Īśōpanishad* (Kāṇva), attributed to Śaṅkara, understands by the terms *Vidyā* and *Avidyā*, *Upāsāna* and *Karma* respectively, while the commentary on the *Gaudapāda-Kārikā*, with reference to the verse *Vidyāñcāvidyāñca* takes 'Vidyā' to mean knowledge evidently preferring the *Mādhyaṇḍina* 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."

Īśa. 10.

(२) अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथोऽविदितादधि ।

इति शुश्रुम पूर्वेषां ये नस्तद्व्याचक्षिरे ॥ के. १-४

"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. 1-4.

(३) न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते न तत्समश्चाभ्यधिकश्च दृश्यते ।

पराऽस्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च ॥ श्वे. ६-८

"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." Śve. 6-8.

Even the Rshis 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) यज्ञेन वाचः पदवीयमायन् तामन्वविन्दन् ऋषिषु प्रविष्टाम् ॥

ऋ. १०-७१-३.

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

Rig. 10-71-3.

(५) युगान्तेऽन्तर्हितान् वेदान् सेतिहासान् महर्षयः ।

लेभिरे तपसा पूर्वमनुज्ञाताः स्वयम्भुवा ॥ मो. ध. २१०-१९

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

Mo. Dh. 210-19

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

तं धर्मं भगवता यथोपदिष्टं वेदव्यासः सर्वज्ञो भगवान् गीताख्यैः सप्तभिः  
श्लोकशतैरुपनिबबन्ध ॥ 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 ślōkas called the Gītās."

GBh. Intro.

Hence being the composition of a human being, although a great (almost omniscient) Ṛshi, 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 *Vishṇupurāṇa*, from which Śāṅkara has frequently quoted in his *Sūtra-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-Mīmāṃsā Śāstra* (The *Śāstra* devoted to the sacred enquiry into the real nature of the embodied self or Jīva), or the *Vedānta-Mīmāṃsā Śāstra* (The *Śāstra* devoted to the sacred enquiry into the meaning of the Vedāntas 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 Vedānta texts. If the Gītā is a *Smṛti Prasthāna*, aiming at an exposition of Vedānta and placing before us the application of the teaching to practical life, the *Śārīraka-Mīmāṃsā* is a systematic exegesis both adopting the principles of the *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā* (the previous exposition of the Karmakāṇḍa) 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



through direct intuition and reasoning based upon intuition. Hence it is known by the title of the *Uttara-Mīmāṃsā* (Supplementary Exposition).

34. Brahman is technically *Āgama-gamya* (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 Śāṅkara-Bhāshyas on the Upanishads and the Brahma-Sūtras, solemnly repeat this sentence 'ओं नमो ब्रह्मादिभ्यो ब्रह्मविद्यासम्प्रदायकर्तृभ्यो वंशर्षिभ्यो गुरुभ्यो नमो गुरुभ्यः' to remind themselves that the traditional method of interpretation alone is being strictly followed in understanding the genuine Vedānta. 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 Kāthakōpanishad warns us thus :-

नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ट ॥ का. २-९.

"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.

Śāṅkara explains this as follows :

अत एव च येयमागमप्रभूता मतिः, तार्किकादन्येनैव आगमाभिज्ञेन  
आचार्येणैव प्रोक्ता सती सुज्ञानाय भवति ॥ का. भा. २-९, पा. ७२

"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 *Adhyāsa Bhāṣya*. For the present it will quite suffice to examine the following excerpt from that Introduction:

कथं पुनरविद्यावद्विषयाणि प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि चेति ? उच्यते  
— देहेन्द्रियादिष्वहंमाभिमानरहितस्य प्रमातृत्वानुपपत्तौ प्रमाणप्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेः । न  
हीन्द्रियाण्यनुपादाय प्रत्यक्षादिव्यवहारः संभवति । न चाधिष्ठानमन्तरेणेन्द्रियाणां  
व्यवहारः संभवति । न चानध्यस्तात्मभावेन देहेन कश्चिद् व्याप्तिर्यते । न चैतस्मिन्  
सर्वस्मिन्नसति असङ्गस्यात्मनः प्रमातृत्वमुपपद्यते । न च प्रमातृत्वमन्तरेण  
प्रमाणप्रवृत्तिरस्ति । तस्मात् अविद्यावद्विषयाण्येव प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि च ॥

अध्या. भा.

"How, again, are perception and other *Pramāṇas* and the *Śāstras* (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 Pramāṇās, and the Śāstras 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 Vedānta 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-Bhāṣya* will make this clear :-

न ह्यात्मस्वरूपाधिगमे सति पुनः प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः सम्भवति ।  
प्रमातृत्वं ह्यात्मनो निवर्तयत्यन्त्यं प्रमाणम् ; निवर्तयदेव चाप्रमाणी भवति  
स्वप्रकालप्रमाणमिव प्रबोधे ॥

गी. भा. २-६९, पा. ३९.

"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."

GBh, 2-69, p. 39.

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 Vedānta; for, the division rigorously holds good relatively to that sphere. Only, the division is not absolutely real.

As Śaṅkara rightly observes:

तस्मात् प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मतत्प्रतिबोधात् उपपन्नः सर्वो लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः ।  
यथा सुप्तस्य प्राकृतस्य जनस्य स्वप्ने उच्चावचान् भवान् पश्यतो निश्चितमेव  
प्रत्यक्षाभिमतं विज्ञानं भवति, प्राक् प्रतिबोधात् ; न च प्रत्यक्षाभासाभिप्रायस्तत्काले  
भवति तद्वत् ॥ सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९८.

"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 *Adhyārōpāpavāda* 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 *Adhyārōpāvāda*, which Śaṅkara stresses in his Bhāṣya. As it is neither possible nor desirable to enter into these details<sup>1</sup> 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 Vedānta*' 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 **Vidyā** 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 विषूची

अविद्या या च विद्येति ज्ञाता ।

विद्याभीप्सिनं नचिकेतसं मन्ये ।

न त्वा कामा बहवोऽलोलुपन्त ॥

कू. २-४.

"Wide apart, mutually opposed and moving in different directions, are these two, viz., *Avidyā* (ignorance) and what is known as *Vidyā* (wisdom), I regard (thee) Naciketas as an aspirant for *Vidyā*; 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 प्रकृतिं विद्यात् ॥

श्वे. ४-१०.

"One should know *Prakṛti* to be *Māyā*"

S've. 4-10.

Accordingly Śaṅkara writes :

(१) सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्यात्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य माया, शक्तिः, प्रकृतिः— इति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलष्येते ॥

सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. २०१.

"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 *Saṁsāra* (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) तथाप्यन्योन्यस्मिन्नन्यान्यात्मकताम् अन्योन्यधर्माश्चाध्यस्येतेरेतरा-

विवेकेन, अत्यन्तविविक्तयोर्धर्मधर्मिणोर्मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य  
अहमिदं ममेदमिति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः ॥ अध्या. भा.

"Notwithstanding 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-Bhāṣya, have started a procession of the blind led by the blind, in emphatically affirming the identity of both avidyā and māyā, 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 Tikā on the Sūtra-Bhāṣya, which initiated this departure from Śaṅkara's tradition :

येयं श्रुतिस्मृतीतिहासपुराणेषु नामरूपम्, अव्याकृतम्, अविद्या, माया, प्रकृतिः, अग्रहणम्, अव्यक्तम्, तमः, कारणम्, लयः, शक्तिः, महासुप्तिः, निद्रा, अक्षरम्, आकाशम् — इति च तत्र तत्र बहुधा गीयते चैतन्यस्य स्वत एवावस्थितलक्षणब्रह्मस्वरूपतावभासं प्रतिबध्य जीवत्वापादिका, अविद्या-कर्म-पूर्वप्रज्ञा-संस्कारचित्रभित्तिः सुषुप्ते प्रकाशाच्छादनविक्षेपसंस्कारमात्ररूपस्थितिरनादिरविद्या... ॥'

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*, *agrahaṇam* (non-apprehension) and *avyaktam*, are all given as synonymous names of *Avidyā* in direct contradiction of the *Bhāṣhya* 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).

अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते ; पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते ॥

सू. भा. २-१-२७, पा. २१३.

"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 Vedānta for the particular kind of wrong knowledge and the objective phenomena respectively, only as a device to introduce the reader (by means of Adhyārōpāpavāda) 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 '*Pracchanna-Māyāvādins*' (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 Vedāntins) when they declare change, difference and plurality as illusory; they formulate the complementary doctrine of avidyā 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 :

(१) अन्यथा गृह्यतः स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजानतः ।

विपर्यासे तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्रुते ॥

गौ. का. १-१५.

"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."

GK.1-15.

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' (विपर्यास) from the standpoint of the real Atman who transcends both consciousness and unconsciousness. Gaudapāda has not used the word 'avidyā' anywhere in his work. For him *anyathāgrahaṇa* (misconception) and *agrahaṇa* (unconsciousness) which he calls *kārya* (effect) and *kāraṇa* (cause) respectively, are both 'error' (viparyāsa).

(२) मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः ॥

गौ. का. १-१७.

"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 Gaudapāda :-

(३) नेह नानेति चास्मादादिन्द्रो मायाभिरित्यपि ।

अजायमानो बहुधा मायया जायते तु सः ॥

गौ. का. ३-२४.

"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 'Māyās' (Br. 2-5-10), Not being born, He is yet born in diverse forms through Māyā" (Tai. Āran. 3-13). GK. 3-24.

These are Śrutis, and therefore there is no theory advanced here. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka text 'through Māyās' 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-Bhāṣya*, 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* (नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः) and no theory, (2) And in the second place, this is used by Vedānta only as a device for the purpose of teaching the truth (अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते १), 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 (सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य) and in misleading one to mistake the identity and

attributes of one for those of the other, although in fact the unreal not-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 (कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः) although all actions, instruments useful to produce actions as well as the fruits thereof (क्रियाकारकफलानि) are really *Māyā* (false appearance only).

Niether the form of the māyic Universe is perceived as such, nor its end, nor yet its persistence, while it appears (न रूपमस्येह तथोपलभ्यते नान्तो न चादिर्न च संप्रतिष्ठा ॥ 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 (अनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः ॥).

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 (अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते ॥).

---

## 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 Mādhyamika 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. Sureśvarācārya thus explains how it forms the sole exception to the general rule :

ननु सर्वसिद्धान्तानामपि स्वस्वदृष्ट्यपेक्षया उपपन्नत्वात् इतरेतरदृष्ट्यपेक्षया दुःस्थितसिद्धिकत्वात्, नैकत्रापि विश्वासं पश्यामः । न च सर्वतार्किकैरदूषितं समर्थितं सर्वतार्किकोपद्रवापसर्पणाय वर्त्म संभावयामः । उच्यते । विस्त्रब्धैः संभाव्यताम् । अनुभवमात्रशरणत्वात् सर्वतार्किकप्रस्थानानाम् । तदभिधीयते

इमं प्राश्निकमुद्दिश्य तर्कज्वरभृशातुराः ।

त्वाच्छिरस्कवचोजालैर्मोहयन्तीतरेतरम् ॥

नै. सि. २-५९.

"(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 'tvāt' (the ablative ending, meaning 'because of')".

Nai.2-59.

Every reason adduced, appeals to universal intuition which is undisputed, and so, Sureśvara 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 (चतुष्कोटि) 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*:

सदसत्सदसच्चेति नोभयं चेति च क्रमात् ।

एष प्रयोज्यो विद्वद्भिरेकत्वादिषु नित्यशः ॥

C. S. 14- 21.

"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 नास्त्यस्ति नास्तीति नास्ति नास्तीति वा पुनः ।

चलस्थिरोभयाभावैरावृणोत्येव बालिशः ॥

कोट्यश्चतस्र एतास्तु ग्रहैर्यासां सदाऽऽवृतः ।

भगवानाभिरस्पृष्टो येन दृष्टः स सर्वदृक् ॥

गौ. का. ४-८३, ८४.

"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 *Adhyārōpāpavāda Nyāya*.

The following texts should be studied in this context :

(१) सोऽकामयत । बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति .... । सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत् ॥

तै. २-६

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

(२) सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् । तद्वैक आहुरसदेवेदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्, तस्मादसतः सज्जायत । कुतस्तु खलु सोम्यैवं स्यादिति होवाच कथमसतः सज्जायेतेति । सत्त्वेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् ॥

छां. 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) तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति तत्तेजोऽसृजत तत्तेज ऐक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति तदपोऽसृजत । ..... ता आप ऐक्षन्त बह्व्यः स्याम प्रजायेमहीति ता अन्नमसृजन्त ..... ॥

छां. ६-२-३, ४.

"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 (*तस्मादसतः सज्जायत*), 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.

(१) सदिति अस्तितामात्रं वस्तु सूक्ष्मं निर्विशेषं सर्वगतम् एकं निरञ्जनं  
निरवयवं विज्ञानं यदवगम्यते सर्ववेदान्तेभ्यः ॥ छां. भा. ६-२-१.

"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 सलक्षणमेव ब्रह्म न बोधलक्षणम् इति शक्यं वक्तुम् । 'विज्ञानघन एव' इत्यादिश्रुतिवैयर्थ्यप्रसङ्गात् । कथं वा निरस्तचैतन्यं ब्रह्म चेतनस्य जीवस्यात्म-  
त्वेनोपदिश्येत ? नापि बोधलक्षणमेव ब्रह्म न सलक्षणम् इति शक्यं वक्तुम् ।  
'अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धव्यः'— इत्यादिश्रुतिवैयर्थ्यप्रसङ्गात् । कथं वा निरस्तसत्ताको  
बोधोऽभ्युपगम्येत ? नाप्युभयलक्षणमेव ब्रह्मेति शक्यं वक्तुम् । पूर्वाभ्युपगम-  
विरोधप्रसङ्गात् ॥ सू. भा. ३-२-२१, पा. ३६०.

"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 Jīva? 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 Vedānta, that the Upanishads or Vedāntins identify the

Absolute with something experienced in some form even empirically<sup>1</sup>, to wit, Atman (substance), and that Vedānta deals with the changeless, universal, and unrelated as opposed to the changeful, particular, and related<sup>2</sup>. It will be evident from what has been said above, that the real Atman or Brahman as known to Vedānta, 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 Vedānta used for the purpose of discarding empirical being and becoming with reference to Atman (the Absolute). The following quotations will vouch for this statement:

(१) अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धव्यस्तत्त्वभावेन चोभयोः ।

अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धस्य तत्त्वभावः प्रसीदति ॥

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.

(२) पूर्वमस्तीत्येवोपलब्धस्यात्मनः, सत्कार्योपाधिकृतास्तित्वप्रत्ययेनोपलब्धस्य—इत्यर्थः । पश्चात् प्रत्यस्तमितसर्वोपाधिरूपः, आत्मनस्तत्त्वभावः, विदिताविदिताभ्यामन्योऽद्वयस्वभावः, 'नेति नेति' (वृ), 'अस्थूलमनण्वहस्वम्' (वृ), 'अदृश्येऽनिरुक्तेऽनिलयने' (तै)— इत्यादिश्रुतिनिर्दिष्टः प्रसीदति, अभिमुखीभवति, आत्मप्रकाशनाय । पूर्वम् 'अस्ति' इत्युपलब्धवतः इत्येतत् ॥ 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 *Tattvabhāva*, 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, bodiless, 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* :

अस्ति नास्ति, एकं नाना, गुणवदगुणम्, जानाति न जानाति, क्रियावदक्रियम्, फलवदफलम्, सबीजं निर्बीजम्, सुखं दुःखम्, मध्यममध्यम्, शून्यमशून्यम्, परोऽहमन्य इति वा सर्ववाक्प्रत्ययागोचरे स्वरूपे यो विकल्पयितुमिच्छति, स नूनं स्वमपि चर्मवद् वेष्टयितुमिच्छति, सोपानमिव च पञ्चामारोढुम्, जले खे च मीनानां वयसां च पदं दिदृक्षते । नेति नेति, 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते' इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः ॥

ऐ. भा. पा. ३४२.

"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 Sāṃkhya and the Vaiśeṣhika 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 Sāṃkhya 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 Vaiśeṣhika 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 *Pariṇāma-Vāda* of the Sāṃkhyas. Now both the

Sāṃkhyas and the Vaiśeṣikas are rationalists with this difference between them, that the Sāṃkhyas recognize in addition to Perception and Inference as canons of knowledge, Śruti also as *Āptavacana* (testimony of experts), while the Vaiśeṣikas include even Śruti within the range of *Anumāna* (syllogistic inference). Both adduce Śruti also in support of their own doctrine, the Sāṃkhyas to a greater extent than the Vaiśeṣikas.

56. This circumstance has led some scholars to surmise that the Sāṃkhya 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 Sāṃkhya 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 Sāṃkhya had not been considered a rival in the field of Upanishad exegesis. The appellations '*aśabdam*' (unscriptural), '*anumānam*', '*ānumānikam*' (conjectures, inferred) by which the Sāṃkhya is referred to in the *Brahma-Sūtra*, are significant as revealing that the Sāṃkhya interpretation was considered 'free' and un-orthodox, and that the Sāṃkhya 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 Sāṃkhya 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 Sāṃkhya as any reproach to it, for the Sāṃkhyas plumed themselves on their being adepts in inferential

reasoning, and boasted that the *Pradhāna, Purusha and their mutual relation* to be eternally inferential (प्रधानपुरुषसंयोगा नित्यानुमेया इति साङ्ख्या मन्यन्ते ॥ 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 Bādarāyaṇa, however, rejected this Sāṃkhya 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 Sāṃkhya 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*<sup>1</sup> 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 Sūtra-Bhāṣhya :

(१) 'ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम्' (१-१-५) इत्यारभ्य प्रधानकारणवादः सूत्रैरेव पुनः पुनराशङ्क्य निराकृतः । तस्य हि पक्षस्योपोद्बलकानि कानिचिद्विज्ञाभासानि वेदान्तेष्वापातेन मन्दमतीन् प्रतिभान्तीति । स च कार्यकारणानन्यत्वाभ्युपगमात्

---

1. The reader is referred back to the section (5) on *Agama and Reason*.



प्रत्यासन्नो वेदान्तवादस्य । देवलप्रभृतिभिश्च कैश्चिद् धर्मसूत्रकारैः  
स्वग्रन्थेष्वश्रितः ; तेन तत्प्रतिषेधे यत्नोऽतीव कृतः, नाण्वादिकारणवादप्रतिषेधे ॥

सू. भा. १-४-२८, पा. १७८.

"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 Vedāntic 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.

(२) यद्यपीदं वेदान्तवाक्यानामैदंपर्यं निरूपयितुं शास्त्रं प्रवृत्तम्, न तर्कशास्त्रवत् केवलाभिर्युक्तिभिः कश्चित्सिद्धान्तं साधयितुं दूषयितुं वा प्रवृत्तम्, तथापि वेदान्तवाक्यानि व्याचक्ष्णैः सम्यग्दर्शनप्रतिपक्षभूतानि साङ्ख्यादिदर्शनानि निराकरणीयानि — इति तदर्थः परः पादः प्रवर्तते ॥ सू. भा. २-२-१, पा. २२०.

"Although this Śāstra is begun with the purpose of examining the purport of the Vedānta 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 Vedāntic texts to refute the views of the Sāṃkhyas 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.]

(३) साङ्ख्यादयः स्वपक्षस्थापनाय वेदान्तवाक्यान्पुदाहृत्य स्वपक्षानुगुण्येनैव योजयन्तो व्याचक्षते ; तेषां यद् व्याख्यानं तद् व्याख्यानभासम्, न सम्यग्व्याख्यानम् इत्येतावत् पूर्वं कृतम् ; इह तु वाक्यनिरपेक्षः, स्वतन्त्रस्तद्युक्तिप्रतिषेधः क्रियते इत्येष विशेषः ॥

सू. भा. २-२-१, पा. २२०.

"Sāṃkhyas and others quote Vedānta 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 Sāṃkhyas 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 Vedānta differ in handling this problem from the Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeṣika or other systems?

It is necessary first of all to determine exactly what is meant by a cause. Since *kāraṇa* is the Sanskrit 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 Vedāntins and Sāṃkhyas make use of the word *निमित्तकारणम्* (literally occasioning cause) for the agent; this term is usually translated into English by making use of the appellation *efficient cause*. The Sanskrit word to denote the material needed to make anything is *उपादानकारणम्* (that which should be taken up for

producing something); it is called the समवायिकारणम् (that which inheres in the effect) by the Vaiśeṣhikas. We shall make use of the usual term 'material cause' to express it.

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

(१) भूतं न जायते किञ्चिदभूतं नैव जायते ।

विवदन्तो द्रव्या ह्येवमजातिं ख्यापयन्ति ते ॥ गौ. का. ४-४.

"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.

(२) कारणं यस्य वै कार्यं कारणं तस्य जायते ।

जायमानं कथमजं भिन्नं नित्यं कथं च तत् ॥ गौ. का. ४-११.

"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 Sāṃkhya view that the original cause, Prādhāna or primordial matter itself, evolves into the effect.]

(३) कारणायद्यनन्यत्वमतः कार्यमजं तव ।

जायमानाद्धि वै कार्यात् कारणं ते कथं ध्रुवम् ॥ गौ. का. ४-१२.

"If the effect (*Mahat* etc.) is identical with the cause (*Pradhāna*) 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?" GK.4-12.

[This is the कार्यकारणान्यत्ववाद (identity of cause and effect) of the Sāṃkhya. This identity understood in either of the two ways mentioned here, leads to a repugnant conclusion.]

(४) अजाद् वै जायते यस्य दृष्टान्तस्तस्य नास्ति वै ।

जाताच्च जायमानस्य न व्यवस्था प्रसज्यते ॥ गौ. का. ४-१३.

"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)." GK. 4-13.

[ Nobody has seen any instance of an effect born from something which was never born. If both the effect and the cause be supposed to be born, then there will be nothing unborn, since every born cause would in its turn desiderate a born cause.]

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 Vedanta<sup>1</sup>, 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-Rahasya Vivṛiti' 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 Bhāṣhyakāras. Others guess that the Karikas may be an adaptation of the Yōgācāra school of Buddhism effected with the sole purpose of giving a twist to it so as to suit the purposes of Vedānta, 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 Vedānta from the highest stand-point. For as this great thinker repeats again and again in this work, the real Atman of Vedānta, is अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नम् (unborn, without sleep or ignorance, and without dream or misconception, G. K. 1-16, 3-36, 4-81). But the Vedāntin has a *Māyā Satkārya-Vāda* (illusory existence of the effect in the cause) also to offer to inquirers who wish to harmonize all Vedāntic texts which invariably use the *Adhyārōpāpavāda Method* to teach the nature of Reality.

60. The reader should remind himself of what the position of the Vedāntin, is with regard to Pramānas and reason<sup>1</sup>. 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

---

1. Section 5.

'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 *Avidyā* or ignorance of *Atman*. This *Avidyā* again, whatever be its nature in other *darsanas* (systems) such as *Sāṅkhya*, *Yoga*, *Vijñāna-vāda* or the *Sūnyavāda*, 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<sup>1</sup>. 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*<sup>2</sup> 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 (*Śrutyānugṛhīta*), or used by a teacher in harmony with the Vedic teaching (*Śrutyānukūla*), 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 Śāṅkara or Gauḍapāda for the first time. It was already there in the *Śrutis*, and traces are left in

---

1. Section 6.

2. Section 6.

the Bhāshyas of Śaṅkara and elsewhere, of the teachers of these doctrines like Dravidācārya and Brahmanandin<sup>1</sup>, 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.

(१) यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् ॥  
छां. ६-१-४, पा. ५०५०.

"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 :

(२) तदैक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति तत्तेजोऽसृजत तत्तेज ऐक्षत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति तदपोऽसृजत..... ॥  
छां. ६-२-३, पा. ५०९.

"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-Vivṛti' pp. 20, 21.

appearances and concludes that all of them are dependent on Brahman alone for their being :-

(३) यदादित्यस्य रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुक्लं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्यापागादादित्यादादित्यत्वं वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ॥

छां. ६-४-२, पा. ५९५

"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 सोम्यान्नेन शुक्लेनापोमूलमन्विच्छाद्भिः सोम्य शुक्लेन तेजोमूलमन्विच्छ तेजसा सोम्य शुक्लेन सन्मूलमन्विच्छ सन्मूलाः सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सदायतनाः सत्प्रतिष्ठाः ॥

छां. ६-८-४, पा. ५२४.

"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 *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 *Samavāya* by the Vaiśeṣikas. 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 *Adhyārōpa* (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' न हि कार्यकारणयोर्भेद आश्रिताश्रयभावो वा वेदान्तवादिभिरभ्युपगम्यते' (Vedantins never admit any difference of the cause and its effect or relation of the effect dependent on its causes as Vaiśeṣikas do; nor do they admit that there is non-difference between the two, as the Sāṃkhyas do).

63. We may now return to Gauḍapāda to see how he formulates and explains the Vedantic view of causality :-

(१) मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदितान्यथा ।

उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ॥

गौ. का. ३-१५.

"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.

(२) भूततोऽभूततो वाऽपि सृज्यमाने समा श्रुतिः ।

निश्चितं युक्तियुक्तं च यत्तद्भवति नेतरत् ॥

गौ. का. ३-२३.

"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.

(३) सतो हि मायया जन्म युज्यते न तु तत्त्वतः ।

तत्त्वतो जायते यस्य जातं तस्य हि जायते ॥

गौ. का. ३-२७.

"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 changeable, 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 :

(१) तद्वैक आहुरसदेवेदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयं तस्मादसतः सज्जायत ।

कुतस्तु खलु सोम्यैवं स्यादिति होवाच । कथमसतः सज्जायेतेति ॥

छां. 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 तत्त्वतो नैव युज्यते ।

बन्ध्यापुत्रो न तत्त्वेन मायया वापि जायते ॥

गौ. का. ३-२८

"To the non-existent (or from the non-existent), there can be no birth either real or māyic. A barren woman's son is never born either really or māyically (apparently)." GK. 3-28.

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

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

(३) साङ्ख्यस्यापि यः परिणामपक्षः सोऽपि अपूर्वधर्मोत्पत्तिविनाशाङ्गी-  
करणाद्वैशेषिकपक्षान्न विशिष्यते । अभिव्यक्तिविरोधावाङ्गीकरणेऽपि अभिव्यक्ति-  
विरोधाभावयोर्विद्यमानत्वाविद्यमानत्वनिरूपणे पूर्ववदेव प्रमाणविरोधः । एतेन  
कारणस्यैव संस्थानमुत्पत्त्यादि - इत्येतदपि प्रत्युक्तम् ॥

गी. भा. १८-४८, पा. २७८.

"As for the *Pariṇāma* doctrine of the Sāṃkhya, 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) पारिशेष्यात् सदेकमेव वस्तु अविद्यया उत्पत्तिविनाशादिधर्मैर्नटवदनेकधा विकल्प्यते इतीदं भागवतं मतमुक्तं 'नासतो विद्यते भावः' (गी. २-१६) इत्यस्मिन् श्लोके सत्प्रत्ययस्याव्यभिचारात्, व्यभिचाराच्चेतरेषामिति ॥ गी. भा. 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 *śloka* (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 वाचारम्भणं (a play of words), it must be understood to be only a seeming change or causality. 'सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत्' (तै.) (The Real became both the real and the unreal), 'तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत' (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 ('मायया जायते' 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 three-fold 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 ईश्वर (Ruler), जीव (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) कूटस्थब्रह्मात्मवादिनः एकत्वैकान्त्यादीशित्रीशितव्याभावे, ईश्वर-कारणप्रतिज्ञाविरोध इति चेत्, न ; अविद्यात्मकनामरूपबीजव्याकरणापेक्षत्वात् सर्वज्ञत्वस्य । ..... सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्यात्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य माया, शक्तिः, प्रकृतिः - इति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलष्येते । ताभ्यामन्यः सर्वज्ञ ईश्वरः । .... एवमविद्याकृतनामरूपोपाध्यनुरोधी ईश्वरो भवति, व्योमेव घटकरकाद्युपाध्यनुरोधि । स च स्वात्मभूतानेव घटाकाशस्थानीयान् अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपकृत-कार्यकरणसङ्घातानुरोधि नो जीवाख्यान् विज्ञानात्मनः प्रतीष्टे व्यवहारविषये ॥

सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. २००.

"(Objection :-) Unity being absolute for one who holds the doctrine of changeless Brahmatman, 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 Bhāṣhya 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 saṁsāra, 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 *Jīvas*, 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 *avidyākālpita* (conjured up by *avidyā*), *avidyātmaka* (product of *avidyā*), *avidyākṛta* (made up by *avidyā*, or made up of *avidyā*), *avidyāpratyupasthāpita* (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 *Jīvas* (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.]

(२) तदेवम् अविद्यात्मकोपाधिपरिच्छेदापेक्षमेव ईश्वरस्येश्वरत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वशक्तित्वं च, न परमार्थतो विद्यया अपास्तसर्वोपाधिस्वरूपे आत्मनीशित्रीशि-  
तव्यसर्वज्ञात्वादिव्यवहार उपपद्यते ॥ सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. २०१.

"So then, Īśvara's rulership, omniscience, and omnipotence, are only relative to the limitation caused by *avidyāic* 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 :

(१) आत्मा ह्याकाशवज्जीवैर्घटाकाशैरिवोदितः ।

घटादिवच्च संघातैर्जातावेतन्निदर्शनम् ॥

गौ. का. ३-३.

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

GK. 3-3.

(२) संघाताः स्वप्नवत् सर्वे आत्ममायाविसर्जिताः ॥

आधिक्ये सर्वसाम्ये वा नोपपत्तिर्हि विद्यते ॥

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 avidya. He does not strictly adhere to the distinction of the two as defined by Śaṅkara.]

68. Jīvas 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 *anirvacanya*, i.e., they cannot be defined to be one with or different from

Brahman. Thus Śaṅkara describes the Jīva in two ways :

(१) स्थिते च क्षेत्रज्ञपरमात्मैकत्वविषये सम्यग्दर्शने क्षेत्रज्ञः, परमात्मा इति नाममात्रभेदात्, 'क्षेत्रज्ञोऽयं परमात्मनो भिन्नः', 'परमात्मायं क्षेत्रज्ञाद् भिन्नः' - इत्येवंजातीयकः आत्मभेदविषयो निर्बन्धो निरर्थकः । एको ह्ययमात्मा नाममात्रभेदेन बहुधाभिधीयत इति ॥ सू. भा. १-४-२२, पा. १७४.

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

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 :

क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि सर्वक्षेत्रेषु भारत ।

क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोर्ज्ञानं यत् तज्ज्ञानं मतं मम ॥

गी. १३-२.

"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.

(२) आभास एव चैष जीवः परस्यात्मनो जलसूर्यकादिवत् प्रतिपत्तव्यः ; न स एव साक्षात्, नापि वस्त्वन्तरम् । अतश्च यथा नैकस्मिन् जलसूर्यके कम्पमाने जलसूर्यकान्तरं कम्पते, एवं नैकस्मिन् जीवे कर्मफलसम्बन्धिनि जीवान्तरस्य तत्संबन्धः । एवमप्यव्यतिकर एव कर्मफलयोः । आभासस्य चाविद्याकृतत्वात्, तदाश्रयस्य संसारस्याविद्याकृतत्वोपपत्तिरिति तद्व्युदासेन च पारमार्थिकस्य ब्रह्मात्मभावस्योपदेशोपपत्तिः ॥ सू. भा. २-३-५०, पा. ३०२.



"And this Jīva 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 Jīva is in contact with the fruit of his karma, no other Jīva 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 saṁsāra having its seat in it, is also a concoction of avidyā. And hence the feasibility of teaching the real Brahman-nature by negating this (saṁsāra)."

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 Jīva :

(१) स एतमेव सीमानं विदार्यैतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत ॥ ऐ. १-३-१२

"Having cleft this parting place (of hair), He entered through this opening."

Ai. 1-3-12.

(२) तत्सृष्ट्वा । तदेवानुप्राविशत् ॥ तै. २-६.

"Having created it, He entered that very (object of creation)."

Tai 2-6.

(३) स एष इह प्रविष्टः ॥ बृ. १-४-७.

"The self-same One has entered here."

Br. 1-4-7.

(४) अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि ॥ छां. ६-३-२.

"As this Jiva, my own self, let me enter and differentiate name and form."

Ch. 6-3-2.

(५) अग्निर् यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव ।

एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बहिश्च ॥ का. ५-९

"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." Ka. 5-9.

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

(६) पुरश्चक्रे द्विपदः पुरश्चक्रे चतुष्पदः ।

पुरः स पक्षी भूत्वा पुरः पुरुष आविशदिति ।

स वा अयं पुरुषः सर्वासु पूर्णं पुरिशयो

नैनेन किञ्चनानावृतं नैनेन किञ्चनासंवृतम् ॥

बृ. 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." Br. 2-5-18.

[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 अनन्यत्व (not being other than it) of the cause and the effect is different from the Sāṃkhya's *ananyatva* (identity of cause and effect). We have seen in a different section how Gauḍapāda has inveighed against the doctrine of the Sāṃkhyas 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

first cause (तस्य च विभागस्याभावः प्रसज्येत, यदि भोक्ता भोग्यभावमापद्येत, भोग्यं वा भोक्तृभावमापद्यते । तयोश्चैतरेतरभावापत्तिः परमकारणाद्ब्रह्मणोऽनन्यत्वात् प्रसज्येत ॥ 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 (1-4-23) which says in so many words that Brahman is the material cause (as well as the efficient cause) of the universe (प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्) in conformity with the Śruti 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 (आत्मकृतेः परिणामात् १-४-२६) which expressly refers to Śruti's 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 Gaudapāda in this respect, is more than obvious in Bādarāyaṇa's Sūtra (तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः २-१-१४). 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 Śruti says the so-called effect being merely a name, is factually nought in itself, unreal (न तु वस्तुवृत्तेन विकारो नाम कश्चिदस्ति ; नामधेयमात्रं ह्येतदनृतम्) and there are a good number of texts purporting to teach the unity of Atman (आत्मैकत्वप्रतिपादनपरं वचनजातम्), and if we do not accept them, the knowledge of all by knowing one, would not be possible (न चान्यथा, एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं संपद्यते).

तस्मात्, यथा घटकरकाद्याकाशानां महाकाशानन्यत्वम्, यथा च मृगतृष्णिकोदकादीनामूपरादिभ्योऽनन्यत्वम्, दृष्टनष्टस्वरूपत्वात्, स्वरूपेणानुपाख्यत्वात्, एवमस्य भोग्यभोक्त्रादिप्रपञ्चजातस्य ब्रह्मव्यतिरेकेणाभाव इति द्रष्टव्यम् ॥

सू. भा. २-१-१४, एा. 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 घटाकाश (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 Jīvas 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 :-

घटादिषु प्रलीनेषु घटाकाशादयो यथा ।

आकाशे संप्रलीयन्ते तद्वज्जीवा इहात्मनि ॥

गौ. का. ३-४

"Just as the pot-ether and the like ethers merge in the universal ether when the pot and other (*Upādhis*) are destroyed, so also the Jīvas merge in the (Supreme) Atman." GK. 3-4.

यथैकस्मिन् घटाकाशे रजोधूमादिभिर्युते ।

न सर्वे संप्रयुज्यन्ते तद्वज्जीवाः सुखादिभिः ॥

गौ. का. ३-५

"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 Jīvas (do not all promiscuously come into contact) with pleasure etc." GK. 3-5.

रूपकार्यसमाख्याश्च भिद्यन्ते तत्र तत्र वै ।

आकाशस्य न भेदोऽस्ति तद्वज्जीवेषु निर्णयः ॥

गौ. का. ३-६

"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) Jīvas."

GK. 3-6.

नाकाशस्य घटाकाशो विकारावयवौ यथा ।

नैवात्मनः सदा जीवो विकारावयवौ तथा ॥

गौ. का. ३-७

"Just as pot-ether is neither a modification nor a part of the cosmic ether, so also the *Jīva* is neither a modification nor a part of the Supreme Atman." GK. 3-7.

यथा भवति बालानां गगनं मलिनं मलैः ।

तथा भवत्यबुद्धानामात्मापि मलिनो मलैः ॥

गौ. का. ३-८

"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."

GK. 3-8.

मरणे संभवे चैव गत्यागमनयोरपि ।

स्थितौ सर्वशरीरेषु चाकाशेनाविलक्षणः ॥

गौ. का. ३-९

"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."

GK. 3-9.

73. The distinction of Īśvara and Jīva, therefore, is only a distinction without difference. Īśvara's divinity and superiority and the Jīva's dependence upon Īśvara, 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 Sūtra-Bhāṣya which make this point clear :-

(१) यावदेव हि स्थाणाविव पुरुषबुद्धिं द्वैतलक्षणाम् अविद्यां निवर्तयन् कूटस्थनित्यदृक्स्वरूपमात्मानम् अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति न प्रतिपद्यते, तावज्जीवस्य जीवत्वम् । यदा तु देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिसङ्घाताद् व्युत्थाप्य श्रुत्या प्रतिबोध्यते 'नासि त्वं देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिसङ्घातः, नासि संसारी, किं तर्हि तद्यत् सत्यं स आत्मा चैतन्यमात्रस्वरूपः, तत्त्वमसि' इति, तदा कूटस्थनित्यदृक्स्वरूपमात्मानं प्रतिबुद्ध्य अस्माच्छरीराद्यभिमानात् समुत्तिष्ठन् स एव कूटस्थनित्यदृक्स्वरूप आत्मा भवति ॥ सू. भा. १-३-१९, पा. ११२.

"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 Jīva's Jīva-nature persist. When, however, the Śruti 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 eternally changeless seer." SBh. 1-3-19, p. 112.

(२) यावद्वि अविद्या न निवर्तते, तावद् धर्मादिगोचरत्वं जीवस्य जीवत्वं च न निवर्तते । तन्निवृत्तौ तु प्राज्ञ एव तत्त्वमसीति श्रुत्या प्रत्याप्यते । न चाविद्यावत्वे तदपगमे च वस्तुनः कश्चिद् विशेषोऽस्ति ॥ सू. भा. १-४-६. पा. १५४

"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, Prājña (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.

(३) अतश्च विज्ञानात्मपरमात्मनोरविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपरचितदंहाद्युपाधिनिमित्तो भेदो न पारमार्थिक इत्येषोऽर्थः सर्वैवेदान्तवादिभिरभ्युपगन्तव्यः ॥ सू. भा. १-४-२२, पा. १७३

"For this reason also, all followers of Vedānta must accept that the difference between the Vijñānātman (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.

(४) तदेवम् अविद्यात्मकोपाधिपरिच्छेदापेक्षमेवेश्वरस्येश्वरत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वशक्तित्वं च न परमार्थतो विद्ययाऽपास्तसर्वोपाधिस्वरूपे आत्मनीशित्रीशितव्य-सर्वज्ञत्वादिव्यवहार उपपद्यते ॥ सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. २०१.

"So, the Īśvara'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.

(५) यावदेव चायं बुद्ध्युपाधिसम्बन्धः, तावद् जीवस्य जीवत्वं संसारित्वं

च, परमार्थतस्तु न जीवो नाम बुद्ध्युपाधिसंबन्धपरिकल्पितस्वरूपव्यतिरेकेणास्ति । न हि नित्यमुक्तस्वरूपात् सर्वज्ञादीश्वरादन्यश्चेतनो धातुर्द्वितीयो वेदान्तार्थ-  
निरूपणायाम् उपलभ्यते ॥ सू. भा. २-३-३०, पा. २८७.

"And it is only so long as there is this connection with the conditioning associate of the mind (*buddhi*), that this Jīva continues to be a Jīva and a transmigratory soul. In reality, however, there is no such being as a Jīva other than the form conjured up by the connection of the conditioning associate, to wit, the mind. For when the meaning of Vedānta texts is closely examined, there is no second sentient entity to be found, other than Īśvara who is ever-free by nature and omniscient."

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

(६) अपि च मिथ्याज्ञानपुरस्सरोऽयमात्मनो बुद्ध्युपाधिसंबन्धः । न च मिथ्याज्ञानस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानादन्यत्र निवृत्तिरस्तीत्यतो यावद्ब्रह्मात्मतानवबोधः, तावदयं बुद्ध्युपाधिसंबन्धो न शाम्यति ॥ सू. भा. २-३-३०, पा. २८८.

"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.

(७) अविद्यावस्थायां कार्यकरणसंघाताविवेकदर्शिनो जीवस्याविद्यातिमिरान्धस्य सतः परस्मादात्मनो कर्माध्यक्षात्, सर्वभूताधिवासात् साक्षिणश्चेतयितुरीश्वरात् तदनुज्ञया कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वलक्षणस्य संसारस्य सिद्धिः । तदनुग्रहेतुकेनैव च विज्ञानेन मोक्षसिद्धिर्भवितुमर्हति ॥ सू. भा. २-३-४१, पा. २९६.

"During the state of ignorance the Jīva 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. Īśvara, 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 Jīva)."

SBh. 2-3-41, p. 296.



(८) निरतिशयोपाधिसंपन्नश्चेश्वरो निहीनोपाधिसंपन्नाजीवान् प्रशास्तीति न किञ्चिद् विप्रतिषिध्यते ॥ सू. भा. २-३-४५, पा. २९८.

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

(९) जीवस्याप्यविद्याकृतनामरूपनिर्वृत्तदेहेन्द्रियाद्युपाध्यविवेकभ्रमनिमित्त एव दुःखाभिमानो न तु पारमार्थिकोऽस्ति ॥ सू. भा. २-३-४६, पा. २९९.

"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.

(१०) स्वयंप्रसिद्धं ह्येतच्छारीरस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वमुपदिश्यते, न यत्नान्तर-प्रसाध्यम् । अतश्चेदं शास्त्रीयं ब्रह्मात्मत्वम् अवगम्यमानं स्वाभाविकस्य शारीरात्मत्वस्य बाधकं संपद्यते, रज्ज्वादिबुद्ध्य इव सर्पादिबुद्धीनाम् ॥

सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९७.

"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 sublatter of the innate idea of one's identity with the body, like the ideas of rope etc., subsuming 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.]

(११) कः पुनर्देहसंबन्धः ? देहादिरयं सङ्घातोऽहमेवेत्यात्मनि विपरीत-प्रत्ययोत्पत्तिः । दृष्टा च सा सर्वप्राणिनाम् 'अहं गच्छामि', 'अहमागच्छामि', 'अहमन्योऽहमनन्धः', 'अहं मूढोऽहममूढः' - इत्येवमात्मिका । न ह्यस्याः सम्यग्दर्शनादन्यन्निवारकमस्ति । प्राक्तु सम्यग्दर्शनात् प्रततैषा भ्रान्तिः सर्वजन्तुषु ॥

सू. भा. २-३-४८, पा. ३०१.

"(Question :-) But which is this देहसंबन्ध (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.

(१२) कस्मात् पुनर्जीवः परमात्मांश एव सन्, तिरस्कृतज्ञानैश्वर्यो भवति ? युक्तं तु ज्ञानैश्वर्ययोरतिरस्कृतत्वं विस्फुलिङ्गस्येव दहनप्रकाशनयोरिति । उच्यते । सत्यमेवैतत् । सोऽपि तु जीवस्य ज्ञानैश्वर्यतिरोभावो देहयोगात्; देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिविषयवेदनादियोगाद् भवति । अस्ति चात्रोपमा यथाग्नेर्दहन-प्रकाशनसंपन्नस्याप्यरणिगतस्य दहनप्रकाशने तिरोहिते भवतः, यथा वा भस्मच्छन्नस्य । एवम् अविद्यत्पुण्यपस्थापितनामरूपकृतदेहाद्युपाधियोगात् तदविवेकभ्रमकृतो जीवस्य ज्ञानैश्वर्यतिरोभावः ॥ सू. भा. ३-२-६, पा. २४७.

"(Objection :-) But why is it that the Jīva 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 Jīva'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 Jīva'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.

(१३) अपि च यदा तत्त्वमसीत्येवंजातीयकेन अभेदनिर्देशेन अभेदः प्रतिबोधितो भवति अपगतं भवति तदा जीवस्य संसारित्वं ब्रह्मणश्च स्रष्टृत्वम्, समस्तस्य मिथ्याज्ञानविजृम्भितस्य भेदव्यवहारस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानेन बाधितत्वात् ॥

सू. भा. २-१-२२, 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 Jīva's transmigratory nature is unreal being superimposed by avidyā.]

(१४) तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ योऽसौ सोऽहम् ॥ ऐ. आ. २-२-४.

"In Him (the universal Prana), what is myself that is He (in the Sun); what He is, that I am myself." Ai. Āranyaka 2-2-4.

(१५) त्वं वा अहमस्मि भगवो देवतेऽहं वै त्वमसि ॥ जाबालश्रुतिः

"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 Īśvara with Jiva's Atman, transmigratory nature would have to be imputed to God, and that is not desirable. Śaṅkara rebuts the charge thus :

(१) नैष दोषः ; ऐकात्म्यस्यैवानेन प्रकारेणानुचिन्त्यमानत्वात् ॥

सू. भा. ३-३-३७, पा. ४११.

"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 एकत्वदृढीकारं वारयामः ; किं तर्हि, व्यतिहारेणेह द्विरूपा मतिः कर्तव्या वचनप्रामाण्यात्, नैकरूपा - इत्येतावदुपपादयामः । फलतस्तु एकत्वमपि दृढीभवति ॥

सू. भा. ३-३-३७, पा. ४११

"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 Jīva, 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 Īśvara and Jīvas, is only relative and that Īśvara 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 (जन्माद्यस्य 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) तदेतद् ब्रह्मापूर्वमनपरमनन्तरमबाह्यमयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूरित्यनु-  
शासनम् ॥ बु. २-५-१९.

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

Br. 2-5-19.

(२) अन्यत्र धर्मादन्यत्राधर्मादन्यत्रास्मात्कृताकृतात् ।

अन्यत्र भूताच्च भव्याच्च यत्तत्पश्यसि तद्वद ॥ का. २-१४.

"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 *adhyārōpa*, 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 जगतो नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य अनेककर्तृभोक्तृसंयुक्तस्य प्रतिनियत-  
देशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाश्रयस्य, मनसाप्यचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य जन्मस्थितिभङ्ग-  
यतः सर्वज्ञात् सर्वशक्तेः कारणाद् भवति, 'तद्ब्रह्म' इति वाक्यशेषः ॥

सू. भा. १-१-२, पा. ७.

"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 दुन्दुभेर्हन्यमानस्य न बाह्याञ्शब्दाञ्शक्रुयाद् ग्रहणाय दुन्दुभेस्तु  
ग्रहणेन दुन्दुभ्याघातस्य वा शब्दो गृहीतः ॥

बृ. २-४-७.

"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 Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Bhāṣhya indicates the general line of reasoning suggested by these illustrations thus :-

अनेकदृष्टान्तोपादानमिह सामान्यबहुत्वख्यापनार्थम् । अनेके हि विलक्षणाश्चेतनाचेतनरूपाः सामान्यविशेषाः । तेषां पारम्पर्यगत्या यथैकस्मिन् महासामान्ये अन्तर्भावः प्रज्ञानघने कथं नाम प्रदर्शयितव्य इति । दुन्दुभिः शङ्खवीणाशब्दसामान्यविशेषाणां यथा शब्दत्वे अन्तर्भावः, एवं स्थितिकाले तावत् सामान्यविशेषाव्यतिरेकात्, ब्रह्मैकत्वं शक्यमवगन्तुम् ॥

बृ. भा. २-४-९, पा. ७६२.

"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 vīṇa 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. (प्रज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण स्वप्नजागरितयोर्न कश्चिद् वस्तुविशेषो गृह्यते ॥ Br.Bh. 762). We thus see that the Upanishads make use of the device of *Adhyārōpāpavāda* 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 विद्यते भावो नाभावो विद्यते सतः ।

उभयोरपि दृष्टोऽन्तस्त्वनयोस्तत्त्वदर्शिभिः ॥

गी. २-१६.

अविनाशि तु तद्विद्धि येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।

विनाशमव्ययस्यास्य न कश्चित् कर्तुमर्हति ॥

गी. २-१७

अन्तवन्त इमे देहा नित्यस्योक्ताः शरीरिणः ।

अनाशिनोऽप्रमेयस्य तस्माद् युध्यस्व भारत ।

गी. २-१८

"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 ślokaś, Śāṅkara says :-

(१) यथा घटादिसंस्थानं चक्षुषा निरूप्यमाणं मृद्वतिरेकेणानुपलब्धेरसत्, तथा सर्वो विकारः कारणव्यतिरेकेणानुपलब्धेरसन् । जन्मप्रध्वंसाभ्यां प्रागूर्ध्वं चानुपलब्धेः कार्यस्य घटादेः । मृदादिकारणस्य च तत्कारणव्यतिरेकेणानुपलब्धेरसत्त्वम् ॥

गी. भा. २-१६, पा. १४.

"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."

GBh. 2-16, p. 14.

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

(२) तदसत्त्वे सर्वाभावप्रसङ्गः — इति चेत्, न ; सर्वत्र बुद्धिद्वयोपलब्धेः, सद्वुद्धिरसद्वुद्धिः - इति । यद्विषया बुद्धिर्न व्यभिचरति तत् सत्, यद्विषया व्यभिचरति तदसत् - इति सदसद्विभागे बुद्धितन्त्रे स्थिते सर्वत्र द्वे बुद्धी सर्वैरुपलब्ध्येते सामानाधिकरण्येन<sup>1</sup> नीलोत्पलवत् 'सन् घटः', 'सन् पटः', 'सन् हस्ती' इत्येवं सर्वत्र ।

1. 'सामानाधिकरणे । न नीलोत्पलवत्' is clearly a clerical mistake for the reading given above.



तयोर्बुद्धयोर्घटादिवुद्धिर्व्यभिचरति । तथा च दर्शितम् । न तु सद्बुद्धिः । तस्मात्  
घटादिवुद्धिविषयोऽसन् व्यभिचारात्, न तु सद्बुद्धिविषयोऽव्यभिचारात् ॥

गी. भा. २-१६, पा. १४, १५.

"(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 already<sup>1</sup> 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 Jīva and the Real Atman*)

80. The Jīva in the state of sustentation of the world, identifies himself with his various conditioning associates. The *Adhyāropāpavāda* method is applied here in the Śruti 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 कोशा व्याख्यातास्तैत्तिरीयके ।

तेषामात्मा परो जीवः खं यथा संप्रकाशितः ॥

गौ. का. ३-११.

"The Supreme Jīva (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 । ओषधीभ्योऽन्नम् । अन्नात्पुरुषः । स वा एष  
पुरुषोऽन्नरसमयः । तस्येदमेव शिरः । अयं दक्षिणः पक्षः । अयमुत्तरः पक्षः ।  
अयमात्मा । इदं पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा ॥

तै. २-१

"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

wing; this is the left wing; this is the self (the mid-portion) ; (and) this, the tail, the prop."

Tai. 2-1.

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 'अन्नमयात्मा' (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 Śāstra and also to realize his real nature by acquiring knowledge. He alone possesses the capacity required by the Śāstra; 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 Adhyārōpāpavāda to his real nature of Brahmātman as contrasted with *Sārīrātman*. The next Śruti text here therefore superimposes Atman-nature on a more comprehensive conditioned self called the *Prāṇamayātman* :-

तस्माद्वा एतस्मादन्नरसमयात् । अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा प्राणमयः । तेनैष पूर्णः । स वा एष पुरुषविध एव । तस्य पुरुषविधताम् । अन्वयं पुरुषविधः । तस्य प्राण एव

शिरः । व्यानो दक्षिणः पक्षः । अपान उत्तरः पक्षः । आकाश आत्मा । पृथिवी पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा ॥ तै. २-२

"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 (*Prāṇamayātman*) is of the form of *Purusha* (human body), after the bodily shape of that (*annamayātman*). Of that (*Prāṇamayātman*) *Prāṇa* is the head; *Vyāna* is the right wing, *Apāna* is the left wing; *Akāsha* (i.e. *Samāna*) is the self, the midmost function; (the goddess presiding over) earth is the tail prop." Tai. 2-2.

83. *Prāṇamayātman* 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 *Prāṇamayātman* :-

तस्यैष एव शारीर आत्मा । यः पूर्वस्य । तस्माद्वा एतस्मात् प्राणमयात् । अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा मनोमयः । तेनैष पूर्णः । स वा एष पुरुषविध एव । तस्य पुरुषविधताम् । अन्वयं पुरुषविधः । तस्य यजुरेव शिरः । ऋग्दक्षिणः पक्षः । सामोत्तरः पक्षः । आदेश आत्मा । अथर्वाङ्गिरसः पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा ॥ तै. २-३

"Of that former (*annamayātman*), this indeed is the embodied-self. Other than this *prāṇamayātman*, there is an inner Atman made up of *manas* (mind). By that (atman) this one is

pervaded. Now this (Atman) is also of the form of *Purusha* (human body). This (*Manōmayātman*) is of the form of *Purusha* after the bodily shape of that (*prāṇamayātman*). Of that (*Manomayātman*) *Yajus* is the head; *Rk* is the right wing; *Sāma* is the left wing; *Ādesa* is the self (midmost part); (*mantras* and *brāhmaṇas* discovered by) *Atharvāṅgiras*, are the tail prop." Tai. 2-3.

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 *Annamayātman* is the *Virāt* and the *Prāṇamayātman* is the *Sūtrātman*, and that is why at the end of each description, the Śruti 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 *Prāṇa* as Brahman' (Tai. 2-3). Similarly, *Manōmayātman* being *Hiraṇyagarbha* or *Vedātman* (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 '*kōsha*' (sheath) is described as the self in the body which is the previous *kōsha* (तस्यैव एव शरीर आत्मा । यः पूर्वस्य). This interpretation

is according to the Taittiriya-Bhāshya. An alternative interpretation is offered by Sureśvara. 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, manōmaya and other sheaths; and this is quite in consonance with the opening sentence तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः । 'From this (Brahman, who is the) Self (of all), ākāśa 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 Śruti, that is being pursued here. The Śruti aims at utilizing the *Adhyārōpāpavāda method* at each step. Identification of Atman with the body, is first discarded by superimposing atman-nature on the prāṇamaya, and then this is also rescinded by a further superimposition of atman-nature on the manōmaya and so on, till we ultimately reach Brahman, the in most real Atman. Therefore it is better to take the expression एष एव शरीर आत्मा as equivalent to 'this manōmaya himself is the atman of the previous prāṇamaya.' This interpretation has the support of grammar also, since the word एषः (*ēśah*) refers to the more proximate antecedent ('*samīpataravarticaitado rūpam*' as the grammarian would say), and is preferably construed as referring to manōmaya rather than to the more remote word Brahman.

86. We shall not tarry\* long to consider the elaborate description of the *Vijñānamaya ātman* and the *ānandamaya ātman*. 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, manōmaya, 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 Bhṛgu and his father Varuṇa, is brought in by the Upanishad, where Bhṛgu 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 *Bhāshyārtha-Vimarśinī* on *Taittirīya Bhāshya*, 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 Ānandamayātman**. The result of this enquiry is thus stated in the mantra :

यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते । अप्राप्य मनसा सह ।

आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् । न बिभेति कुतश्चेति ॥

तै. २-९

"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 -

नाह खल्वयं भगव एवं संप्रत्यात्मानं जानात्ययमहमस्मीति नो एवेमानि  
भूतानि विनाशमेवापीतो भवति नाहमत्र भोग्यं पश्यामीति ॥ छं. ८-११-२.

"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 *adhyārōpāpavāda*, 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 *Jyōtir-Brāhmaṇa* of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad, we find the following introduction to the examination of the three states :-

तस्य वा एतस्य पुरुषस्य द्वे एव स्थाने भवत इदं च परलोकस्थानं च सन्ध्यं तृतीयं स्वप्नस्थानं तस्मिन् सन्ध्ये स्थाने तिष्ठन्नेते उभे स्थाने पश्यतीदं च परलोकस्थानं च । अथ यथाक्रमोऽयं परलोकस्थाने भवति तमाक्रममाक्रम्योभयान् पाप्मन आनन्दांश्च पश्यति स यत्र प्रस्वपित्यस्य लोकस्य सर्वावतो मात्रामपादाय स्वयं विहृत्य स्वयं निर्माय स्वेन भासा स्वेन ज्योतिषा प्रस्वपित्यत्रायं पुरुषः स्वयञ्ज्योतिर्भवति ॥

बृ. 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 रथा न रथयोगा न पन्थानो भवन्त्यथ रथान् रथयोगान् पथः सृजते न तत्रानन्दा मुदः प्रमुदो भवन्त्यथानन्दान् मुदः प्रमुदः सृजते न तत्र वेशान्ताः पुष्करिण्यः स्रवन्त्यो भवन्त्यथ वेशान्तान् पुष्करिणीः स्रवन्तीः सृजते स हि कर्ता ॥

बृ. ४-३-१०, पा. ८७५.

"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 कात्स्न्येनानभिव्यक्तस्वरूपत्वात् । ब्र. सू. ३-२-३.

"(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:

अभावश्च रथादीनां श्रूयते न्यायपूर्वकम् ।

वैतथ्यं तेन वै प्राप्तं स्वप्न आहुः प्रकाशितम् ॥ गौ. का. २-३

"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 Kāthaka Upanishad draws another important conclusion from the waking and dream experiences :-

स्वप्नान्तं जागरितान्तं चोभौ येनानुपश्यति ।

महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥

का. ४-४

"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 *Kaṇḍikās* of Bṛhadāraṇyaka :

(१) स वा एष एतस्मिन् स्वप्ने रत्वा चरित्वा दृष्ट्वैव पुण्यं च पापं च पुनः  
प्रतिन्यायं प्रतियोन्याद्ववति बुद्धान्तायैव । स यत्तत्र किञ्चित्पश्यत्यनन्वागतस्तेन  
भवत्यसङ्गो ह्ययं पुरुष इति ॥

बृ. ४-३-१६.

"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) स वा एष एतस्मिन् बुद्धान्ते रत्वा चरित्वा दृष्ट्वैव पुण्यं च पापं च पुनः  
प्रतिन्यायं प्रतियोन्याद्ववति स्वप्नान्तायैव ॥

बृ. ४-३-१७.

"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 :

(१) ननु 'दृष्ट्वैव' इति कथमवधार्यते ? करोति च तत्र पुण्यपापे ; तत्फलं च पश्यति ।

न । कारकावभासकत्वेन कर्तृत्वोपपत्तेः 'आत्मनैवायं ज्योतिषा आस्ते' इत्यादिना आत्मज्योतिषा अवभासितः कार्यकरणसंघातो व्यवहरति, तेनाऽस्य कर्तृत्वमुपचर्यते, न स्वतः कर्तृत्वम् । यथा चोक्तं 'ध्यायतीव लेलायतीव' इति, बुद्ध्याद्युपाधिकृतमेव न स्वतः । इह तु परमार्थपेक्षया उपाधिनिरपेक्षमुच्यते 'दृष्ट्वैव पुण्यं च पापं च', न कृत्वा — इति । तेन न पूर्वपरव्याघाताशङ्का ॥

बृ. भा. ४-३-१७, पा. ८८६.

"(Objection :-) How is it that it is emphasized, (by the Śruti when it says) 'merely seeing' (As a matter of fact we know that) he does perform right and wrong deeds, and experiences the fruit thereof."

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."

Br. Bh. 4-3-17, p. 886.

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 *Kaṇḍikā* makes this more explicit

by an apt illustration :-

तद्यथा महामत्स्य उभे कूले अनुसञ्चरति पूर्वं चापरं चैवमेवायं पुरुष  
एतावुभावन्तावनुसञ्चरति स्वप्नान्तं च बुद्धान्तं च ॥ बृ. ४-३-१८.

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

दृष्टान्तप्रदर्शनफलं तु मृत्युरूपः कार्यकरणसङ्घातः सह तत्प्रयोजकाभ्यां  
कामकर्मभ्याम् अनात्मधर्मः, अयं चात्मा एतस्माद् विलक्षणः - इति ॥

बृ. भा. ४-३-१८, पा. ८८७.

"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 *Kaṇḍikāś* relating to deep sleep to show how by this method of adhyārōpāpavāda, 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) तद्वा अस्यैतदतिच्छन्दा अपहतपाप्मा अभयं रूपम् । तद्यथा प्रियया स्त्रिया सम्परिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद नान्तरमेवमेवायं पुरुषः प्राज्ञेनात्मना सम्परिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद नान्तरं तद्वा अस्यैतदाप्तकाममात्मकाममकामं रूपं शोकान्तरम् ॥ बृ. ४-३-२१.

"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 Bhāshya :- (1) The self-revealing nature of Atman is not adventitious. (2) Atman's inherent nature is directly intuited in deep sleep.

स्त्रीपुंसयोर्दृष्टान्तोपादानेन विद्यमानस्यैव स्वयंज्योतिष्वस्य सुषुप्तेऽग्रहणम् एकीभावाद् हेतोः, न तु कामकर्मादिवदागन्तुकम् - इत्येतद् प्रासङ्गिकमभिधाय यत्प्रकृतं तदेवानुप्रवर्तयति । अत्र चैतद् प्रकृतम् अविद्याकामकर्मविनिर्मुक्तमेव तद्रूपं यत् सुषुप्ते आत्मनो गृह्यते प्रत्यक्षत इति ॥ बृ. भा. ४-३-२२, पा. ८९३

"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 पिताऽपिता भवति माताऽमाता लोका अलोका देवा अदेवा वेदा अवेदाः । अत्र स्तेनोऽस्तेनो भवति भ्रूणहाऽभ्रूणहा चाण्डालोऽचाण्डालः

पौल्कसोऽपौल्कसः श्रमणोऽश्रमणस्तापसोऽतापसोनन्वागतं पुण्येनानन्वागतं  
पापेन तीर्णो हि तदा सर्वाञ्छोकान् हृदयस्य भवति ॥ बृ. ४-३-२२.

"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<sup>1</sup> no *killer* of an embryo, a *cāṇḍāla* no *cāṇḍāla*, 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) यद्वै तन्न विजानाति विजानन्वै तन्न विजानाति न हि  
विज्ञातुर्विज्ञातेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यतेऽविनाशित्वान्न तु तद् द्वितीयमस्ति  
ततोऽन्यद्विभक्तं यद्विजानीयात् ॥ बृ. ४-३-३०.

"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.



(२) यत्र वा अन्यदिव स्यात्तत्रान्योऽन्यत् पश्येदन्योऽन्यजिघ्रेदन्योऽन्य-  
द्रसयेदन्योऽन्यद्वेदेदन्योऽन्यच्छृणुयादन्योऽन्यन्मन्वीतान्योऽन्यत् स्मृशेदन्योऽन्यद्विजानी-  
यात् ॥ वृ. ४-३-३१.

"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.]

(३) सलिल एको द्रष्टाऽद्वैतो भवत्येष ब्रह्मलोकः सम्राडिति हैनमनुशास  
याज्ञवल्क्य एषाऽस्य परमा गतिः एषाऽस्य परमा सम्पदेषोऽस्य परमो लोक  
एषोऽस्य परम आनन्द एतस्यैवानन्दस्यान्यानि भूतानि मात्रामुपजीवन्ति ॥

वृ. ४-३-३२.

"He is (transparent like) water, One, the Witness without a second. 'This is Brahma-lōka, 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 Jīva 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 *Adhyārōpāpavāda* method, is the Māndūkya. The difference between the approach in Bṛhadāraṇyaka and that in the Māndūkya, lies in the

fact that, whereas in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka 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 Vijñānamayātman 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

ओमित्येतदक्षरं सर्वं तस्योपव्याख्यानं भूतं भवद्भविष्यदिति सर्वमोङ्कार  
एव । यच्चान्यत् त्रिकालातीतं तदप्योङ्कार एव ॥ मां. 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 Chāndōgya text 'ओङ्कार एवेदं 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 ह्येतद्ब्रह्मायमात्मा ब्रह्म ॥ मां. २

"All this indeed is Brahman. This Atman is Brahman....."

Ma. 2.

The Bhāshyakāra remarks here :

अभिधानाभिधेययोरेकत्वेऽप्यभिधानप्राधान्येन निर्देशः कृतः  
 'ओमित्येतदक्षरमिदं सर्वम्' इति । अभिधानप्राधान्येन निर्दिष्टस्य  
 पुनरभिधेयप्राधान्येन निर्देशोऽभिधानाभिधेययोरेकत्वप्रतिपत्त्यर्थः । इतरथा हि  
 अभिधानतन्त्रा अभिधेयप्रतिपत्तिरिति अभिधेयस्याभिधानत्वं गौणमित्याशङ्क  
 स्यात् । एकत्वप्रतिपत्तेश्च प्रयोजनम् अभिधानाभिधेययोरेकेनैव प्रयत्नेन  
 युगपत्प्रविलापयंस्तद्विलक्षणं ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्येतेति ॥ मां. भा. २, पा. १७८.

"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."

Ma. Bh. 2, p. 178.

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 :

जागरितस्थानो बहिष्प्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः स्थूलभुवैश्वानरः  
प्रथमः पादः ॥ मां. ३.

"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 *pāda* 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.

जागरितस्थानो वैश्वानरोऽकारः प्रथमा मात्राऽऽप्तेरादिमत्वाद्वाऽऽप्नोति ह वै  
सर्वान् कामानादिश्च भवति य एवं वेद ॥ मां. ९.

"Vaiśvānara 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 Brahman as explained already (para 100). It is obvious that it is absurd to think that the identification of the sound Om and Brahman, 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 :

सोऽयमात्माऽध्यक्षरमोङ्कारोऽधिमात्रं पादा मात्रा मात्राश्च पादा अकार  
उकारो मकार इति ॥ मां. ८.

"Now, the self-same Atman (with the four pādas) is, from the stand-point of the name, Omkāra now to be considered as made up of mātras. The pādas are mātras, and the mātras - akāra, ukāra and makāra are (the same as) the pādas." Ma. 8.

This emphasis by way of reciprocal identity of the padas 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 Chāndōgya :-

“तस्य ह वा एतस्यात्मनो वैश्वानरस्य मूर्ध्वैव सुतेजाश्चक्षुर्विश्वरूपः प्राणः  
पृथग्वर्त्मात्मा सन्देहो बहुलो बस्तिरेव रयिः पृथिव्येव पादावुर एव वेदिलोमानि  
बर्हिर्हृदयं गार्हपत्यो मनोऽन्वाहार्यपचन आस्यमाहवनीयः ॥ छां. ५-१८-२.

"Of this Vaiśvānara Atman, *Sutejah* (the heavenly dyulōka itself) is the head; *Viśvarūpa* (the multi-coloured, Sun) is the eye; *Pṛthagvartmātman* (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; *Pṛthivī* (the earth) His feet; the altar is the chest; the sacred grasses are the hairs (on the body); the *gārhapatya* fire is the heart; the *anvāhāryapacana* is the mind; *āhavanīya* 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 'Vaiśvānara' and the epithet 'Saptāṅgah' (having seven organs) are included in the description. The Bhāṣhya makes this explicit by way of a reply to a possible objection :

कथम् 'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म' इति प्रत्यगात्मनोऽस्य चतुष्पात्वे प्रकृते  
द्युलोकादीनां मूर्धाद्यङ्गत्वमिति ?

मां. भा. ३, पा. १७९.

"(Objection :-) The subject-matter in hand is that the inner Atman (the individual self) has four pādas, 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 Vaiśvānara which implies that Brahman alone is meant here, and that is the subject-matter in hand, as we learn from the text '*sarvam hi ētaḥ Brahma*' (all this is Brahman. And Vaiśvānara can very well be the inner Atman, for the text describing Him, says '*tasya ha vā ētasya Ātmanō Vaiśvānarasya*' ('of this Atman Vaiśvānara' etc.)]

Accordingly, the reply to this objection is :

नैष दोषः । सर्वस्य प्रपञ्चस्य साधिदैविकस्य अनेनात्मना चतुष्पात्त्वस्य  
विवक्षितत्वात् । एवं च सति सर्वप्रपञ्चोपशमे अद्वैतसिद्धिः । सर्वभूतस्थश्चात्मा एको  
दृष्टः स्यात्, सर्वभूतानि चात्मनि ॥

मां. भा. ३, पा. १७९.

"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 Bhāṣya (VS.1-2-28) that Vaiśvānara is described in the Śatapatha to be the Puruṣa 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 :-

स्वप्नजागरिते स्थाने ह्येकमाहुर्मनीषिणः ।

भेदानां हि समत्वेन प्रसिद्धेनैव हेतुना ॥

गौ. का. २-५.

'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 Kārikas 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.

यः प्रकृतः परमात्मा अध्यात्मम् अधिदैवतं च पुरुषविधत्वोपाधिः तस्य यत् केवलं साक्षिरूपं तदभिप्रायेणेदमुच्यते 'पुरुषेऽन्तःप्रतिष्ठितं वेद' इति ॥

सू. भा. १-२-२८, पा. ९१.

"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 :-

विश्वस्य सविषयत्वेन प्रज्ञायाः स्थूलाया भोज्यत्वम् । इह पुनः केवला वासनामात्रा प्रज्ञा भोज्या इति प्रविविक्तो भोगः ॥ मां. भा. ४, पा. १८०.

"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."

Ma. Bh. 4, p. 180.

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 door-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 सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं कामयते न कञ्चन स्वप्नं पश्यति तत्सुषुप्तम् ।  
सुषुप्तस्थान एकीभूतः प्रज्ञानघन एवानन्दमयो ह्यानन्दभुक् चेतोमुखः प्राज्ञस्तृतीयः  
पादः ॥ मां. ५

"That is deep sleep wherein one does not desire anything desirable, nor experiences any dream. Prājña 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) *pradhvanisābhāva* (nothing which is born after the destruction of a thing) and *anyōnyābhāva* (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 *adhyārōpa* 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 :

दर्शनादर्शनवृत्योः तत्त्वप्रतिबोधलक्षणस्य स्वापस्य तुल्यत्वात् सुषुप्तग्रहणार्थं  
'यत्र सुप्त' इत्यादिविशेषणम् । अथवा त्रिष्वपि स्थानेषु तत्त्वप्रतिबोधलक्षणः  
स्वापोऽविशिष्टः इति पूर्वाभ्यां सुषुप्तं विभजते ॥

"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



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 *Prajñānaghana 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 देवैश्च सर्वैः प्राणा भूतानि संप्रतिष्ठन्ति यत्र । तदक्षरं वेदयते  
यस्तु सोम्य स सर्वज्ञः सर्वमेवाविवेशेति ॥

प्र. ४-११.

"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 *Prājña* (the wise, omniscient one) is applied to Atman in this state. A *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* text says 'अयं पुरुषः प्राज्ञेनात्मना संप्रिख्यक्तो न बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद नान्तरम्' (बृ. ४-३-२१). 'This Purusha (the individual self) being firmly embraced by *Prājña*, 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 'प्राज्ञः परमेश्वरः, सर्वज्ञत्वलक्षणया प्रज्ञया नित्यमवियोगात् ॥' (सू. भा. १-३-४२, पा. १४३.) '*Prājña* 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 :

भूतभविष्यज्ज्ञातृत्वं सर्वविषयज्ञातृत्वमस्यैवेति प्राज्ञः । सुषुप्तोऽपि हि भूतपूर्वगत्या प्राज्ञ इत्युच्यते । अथवा प्रज्ञप्तिमात्रम् अस्यैवासाधारणं रूपमिति प्राज्ञः । इतरयोर्विशिष्टमपि विज्ञानमस्ति इति ॥

मां. भा. ५, पा. १८१.

"He is called Prājña as He is conscious of the past and the future as well as of all objects. Even the Atman in sleep, is called Prājña 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 Prājña 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 *Prājña* to mean 'in blissful ignorance' and 'mostly ignorant' respectively. *Ānandamaya*, they say, is the *kōśa* of that name which is really the positive Avidya of undefinable nature (अनिर्वचनीया मूलाविद्या) and that the epithet *Prājña* should be dissolved into प्रायेणाज्ञः (extremely ignorant) to suit the context! We shall simply ignore and pass over this ill-conceived interpretation endorsed neither by Śaṅkara's Bhāṣhya 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 *Cētōmukhaḥ* (the door to consciousness). Why? Śaṅkara explains :-

स्वप्नादिप्रतिबोधं चेतः प्रति द्वारीभूतत्वात् चेतोमुखः । बोधलक्षणं वा चेतः  
द्वारं मुखमस्य स्वप्नाद्यागमनं प्रति ॥

मां. भा. ५, पा. १८१.

"He is called *Cētōmukha* because he is the door-way to the consciousness of dream etc. Or because, 'cētaḥ' 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 सर्वेश्वर एष सर्वज्ञ एषोऽन्तर्याम्येष योनिः सर्वस्य प्रभवाप्ययौ हि  
भूतानाम् ॥

"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 वैश्वानरोऽकारः प्रथमा मात्राऽऽप्तेरादिमत्वाद्वाप्नोति ह वै सर्वान् कामानादिश्च भवति य एवं वेद ॥ मां. ९.

"Vaiśvānara conditioned by waking, is *akāra* (a), the first *matra* (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) स्वप्नस्थानस्तैजस उकारो द्वितीया मात्रोत्कर्षादुभयत्वाद्बोत्कर्षति ह वै ज्ञानसन्ततिं समानश्च भवति नास्याब्रह्मवित्कुले भवति य एवं वेद ॥ मां. १०.



"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.

(३) सुषुप्तस्थानः प्राज्ञो मकारस्तृतीया मात्रा मितेरपीतेर्वा भिनोति ह वा इदं सर्वमपीतिश्च भवति य एवं वेद ॥

मां. ११

"Prājña 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 Māṇḍūkya with Gauḍapāda'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 Adhyārōpāpavāda 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 तत्त्वप्रतिबोधलक्षणः स्वापोऽविशिष्टः (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 यत्र सुप्तः (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 :

यस्तु मध्ये बुद्धान्ताद्यवस्थोपन्यासात् संसारिस्वरूपविवक्षां मन्यते, स प्राचीमपि दिशं प्रस्थापितः प्रतीचीमपि दिशं प्रतिष्ठेत । यतो न बुद्धान्ताद्यवस्थोपन्यासेनावस्थावत्त्वं संसारित्वं वा विवक्षति, किं तर्हि, अवस्थारहितत्वमसंसारित्वं च ॥ सू. भा. १-३-४२, पा. १४३.

"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 *Sarveśvara* (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' :

नान्तःप्रज्ञं न बहिष्प्रज्ञं नोभयतःप्रज्ञं न प्रज्ञानघनं न प्रज्ञं नाप्रज्ञम् ।  
अदृश्यमव्यवहार्यमग्राह्यमलक्षणमचिन्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं प्रपञ्चोपशमं  
शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः ॥ मां. ७.

"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. Ma. 7.

118. Some of the misconceptions regarding this Atman often called the Turīya (the fourth), should be briefly noticed here. Turīya is no avastha or state, and therefore the popular identification of it with *Samādhi* (trance), is altogether unfounded. Turīya is the fourth only relatively to the illusory number three referring to the three states, मायासंख्यातुरीयम् *Māyā-saṅkhyā* Turīya as Śaṅkara 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 ब्रह्म' (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 *apramēya* (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 Bṛhadāraṇyaka is never tired of describing Him.

119. One word more: Turīya, 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 :-

अमात्रश्रुतुर्थोऽव्यवहार्यः प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवोऽद्वैत एवमोङ्कार आत्मैव  
संविशत्यात्मनात्मानं य एवं वेद ॥ मां. १३.

"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 Brhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya thus explains how this double negation leads to the intuition of Reality :-

ननु कथमाभ्यां नेतिनेतीतिशब्दाभ्यां सत्यस्य सत्यं निर्दिदिक्षितमिति ?  
उच्यते - सर्वोपाधिविशेषापोहेन । यस्मिन् न कश्चिद् विशेषोऽस्ति नाम वा रूपं वा  
कर्म वा भेदो वा जातिर्वा गुणो वा ; तद्द्वारेणैव हि शब्दप्रवृत्तिर्भवति । न चैवं  
कश्चिद् विशेषो ब्रह्मण्यस्ति, अतो न निर्देष्टुं शक्यत इदं तदिति । गौरसौ स्पन्दते  
शुक्लो विषाणीति यथा लोके निर्दिश्यते तथा । अध्यारोपितनामरूपकर्मद्वारेण ब्रह्म  
निर्दिश्यते 'विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म', 'विज्ञानघन एव', 'ब्रह्म', 'आत्मा' इत्येवमादिशब्दैः ।  
यदा पुनः स्वरूपमेव निर्दिदिक्षितं भवति निरस्तसर्वोपाधिविशेषम्, तदा न शक्यते  
केनचिदपि प्रकारेण निर्देष्टुम् । तदा अयमेवायुपायो यदुत प्राप्तनिर्देशप्रतिषेधद्वारेण  
नेतिनेतीति निर्देशः ॥

बृ. भा. २-३-६, पा. ७५५, ८५६.

"(Question :-) But how is it sought to point out the Reality of Satya through these two words 'nēti nēti' (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 Omkara as without mātras :-

(१) अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते ।

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥

गौ. का. १-१६.

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

GK. 1-16.

[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.]

(२) प्रणवं हीश्वरं विद्यात् सर्वस्य हृदये स्थितम् ।

सर्वव्यापिनमोङ्कारं मृत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥

गौ. का. १-२८.

"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."

GK. 1-28.

[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.]

(३) अमात्रोऽनन्तमात्रश्च द्वैतस्योपशमः शिवः ।

ओङ्कारो विदितो येन स मुनिर्नेतरो जनः ॥

गौ. का. १-२९.

"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."

GK. 1-29.

[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 anomaly to be explained ?

123. Advaitins of Śaṅkara'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 Śaṅkara'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) :

(१) तत्कारणं सांख्ययोगाभिपन्नं ज्ञात्वा देवं मुच्यते सर्वपाशैः ॥ श्वे.६-१३.

"Knowing that cause (of the universe) attained by Sāṃkhya and Yōga, one is freed from all bonds." Sve. 6-13.

(२) अव्यक्तात्तु परः पुरुषो व्यापकोऽलिङ्ग एव च ।

यं ज्ञात्वा मुच्यते जन्तुरमृतत्वं च गच्छति ॥

का. ६-८

"Beyond *Avyakta* (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 (*Jīva*) is freed and attains his immortal nature." Ka. 6-8.

(३) वेदान्तविज्ञानसुनिश्चितार्थाः संन्यासयोगाद्यतयः शुद्धसत्त्वाः ।

ते ब्रह्मलोकेषु परान्तकाले परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे ॥ मुं. ३-२-६.

"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 *Yōga* 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.

124. 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.

(१) तस्मै मृदितकषायाय तमसः पारं दर्शयति भगवान् सनत्कुमारः ॥

छां. ७-२६-२.

"To that *Nārada*, who has washed off the impurity of the mind, the revered *Sanat Kumāra* (now) shows the other shore of the darkness (of ignorance)."

Chā. 7-26-2.

(२) त्वं हि नः पिता योऽस्माकमविद्यायाः परं पारं तारयसि ॥

प्र.

६-८

"Thou art, indeed, our (real) father; for thou hast taken us across *avidyā* to the other shore."

Pr. 6-8.

(३) पुरुष एवेदं विश्वं कर्म तपो ब्रह्म परामृतम् ।

एतयो वेद निहितं गुहायां सोऽविद्याग्रन्थिं विकिरतीह सोम्य ॥

मुं. २-१-१०



"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 avidyā."  
Mu. 2-1-10.

125. Release (Mōksha) 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:-

(१) यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः ।

अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते ॥

का. ६-१४.

"When all the desires taking shelter in this Jīva's heart are shattered, then mortal man becomes immortal, and attains Brahman here."  
Kā. 6-14.

(२) यदा सर्वे प्रभियन्ते हृदयस्येह ग्रन्थयः ।

अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्येतावद्ब्रह्मनुशासनम् ॥

का. ६-१५

"When all the knots of the heart are cut asunder, then this mortal Jīva becomes immortal. This is all the teaching (of Vedantas)."  
Kā. 6-15.

आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्न विभेति कुतश्चन ॥

तै. २-९.

"Knowing the bliss of Brahman, one is afraid of nothing."

Tai. 2-9.

(४) अभयं वै जनक प्राप्तोऽसि ॥

बृ. ४-२-४.

"Fearlessness, indeed, hast thou attained Janaka !"

Br. 4-2-4.

(५) तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥

ई. ७

"There, what delusion, what grief, to one who has realized Oneness (of all)."  
Īśa. 7.

(६) भियते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः ।

क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे ॥

मुं. २-२-८.

"The knot of the heart is untied, all doubts are cleared, this (Jīva's) karmas are all destroyed, when that (Brahmātman) who is both the high and the low, is seen."  
Mu. 2-2-8.

(७) आत्मना विन्दते वीर्यं विद्यया विन्दतेऽमृतम् ॥

के. २-४.

"Through Atman one attains vigour, and through knowledge immortality."

Ke.2-4.

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 *Adhyārōpa* 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 :

(१) स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति नास्याब्रह्मवित्कुले भवति तरति शोकं तरति पाप्मानं गुहाग्रन्थिभ्यो विमुक्तोऽमृतो भवति ॥ मुं. 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."

Mu. 3-2-9.

(२) ब्रह्म वा इदमग्र आसीत्तदात्मानमेवावेत् - अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति । तस्मात् तत्सर्वमभवत्तद्यो यो देवानां प्रत्यबुध्यत स एव तदभवत्तथर्षीणां तथा मनुष्याणाम् । तद्वैतत्पश्यन् ऋषिर्वाग्देवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चेति । तदिदमप्येतर्हि य एवं वेदाहं ब्रह्मास्मीति स इदं सर्वं भवति तस्य ह न देवाश्च नाभूत्या ईशते । आत्मा ह्येषां स भवति ॥

बृ. १-४-१०.

"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 Vāmadēva 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.

(३) ब्रह्म दाशा ब्रह्म दासा ब्रह्मैवेमे कितवाः ॥

ब्रह्मसूक्ते.

"Brahman are the fishermen; Brahman, the slaves and Brahman alone verily, are these gamblers."

Brahmasūkta of the Atharva Veda.

127. It is from the highest Śāstraic standpoint that Gauḍapāda 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 :

(१) न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः ।

न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता ॥

गौ. का. २-३२.

"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.

(२) तत्त्वमाध्यात्मिकं दृष्ट्वा तत्त्वं दृष्ट्वा तु बाह्यतः ।

तत्त्वीभूतस्तदारामस्तत्त्वादप्रच्युतो भवेत् ॥

गौ. का. २-३८.

"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.

(३) तस्मात्, 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' इत्येतदवसाना एव सर्वे विधयः, सर्वाणि चेताराणि प्रमाणानि । न हि अहेयानुपादेयाद्वैतात्मावगतौ निर्विषयाण्यप्रमातृकाणि च प्रमाणानि भवितुमर्हन्ति ॥

सू. भा. १-१-४, पा. २३.

"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.

(४) अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितकार्यकरणोपाधिनिमित्तोऽयं शारीरान्तर्यामिणोर्भेद-  
व्यपदेशो न पारमार्थिकः । एको हि प्रत्यगात्मा भवति न द्वौ प्रत्यगात्मानौ  
संभवतः । एकस्यैव तु भेदव्यवहार उपाधिकृतः यथा 'घटाकाशो महाकाश' इति । ततश्च  
ज्ञातृज्ञेयादिभेदश्रुतयः, प्रत्यक्षादीनि च प्रमाणानि संसारानुभवो विधिप्रतिषेधशास्त्रं  
चेति सर्वमेतदुपपद्यते । तथा च श्रुतिः 'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति' (वृ.  
४-५-१५) इत्यविद्याविषये सर्वं व्यवहारं दर्शयति, 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं  
पश्येत्' (वृ. ४-५-१५) इति विद्याविषये सर्वं व्यवहारं वारयति ॥

सू. भा. १-२-२०, पा. ८९

"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), Śruti's teaching the distinction of the knower, the known etc., valid; means of knowledge such as perception, experience of *samsāra*, 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)"

SBh. 1:-2-20, p. 81.

(५) पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि 'त्रिष्वपि कालेष्वकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्व-  
स्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वा अहमासम्, नेदानीं, नापि  
भविष्यत्काले' इति ब्रह्मविदवगच्छति । एवमेव च मोक्ष उपपद्यते । अन्यथा  
ह्यनादिकालप्रवृत्तानां कर्मणां क्षयाभावे मोक्षाभावः स्यात् । न च  
देशकालनिमित्तापेक्षो मोक्षः कर्मफलवद् भवितुमर्हति । अनित्यत्वप्रसङ्गात्,  
परोक्षत्वानुपपत्तेश्च ज्ञानफलस्य ॥ सू. भा. ४-१-१३, पा. ४७३, ४७४.

"The knower of Brahman conclusively knows thus: 'As opposed to the nature of being a doer and experiencer (of the fruit of actions) known (to me) previously, I am that Brahman 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.

(६) तमेतमविद्याख्यमात्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाण-  
प्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः ; सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेध-  
मोक्षपराणि । कथं पुनरविद्यावद्विषयाणि प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि चेति ?  
उच्यते-देहेन्द्रियादिष्वहंममाभिमानरहितस्य प्रमातृत्वानुपपत्तौ प्रमाणप्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेः ॥

अध्यासभाष्यम्, पा. ३.

"On the presupposition of this mutual superimposition of the Self (Atman) and not-self, called *avidyā*, all the conventions of *Pramāṇa* (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.

न हीन्द्रियाण्यनुपादाय प्रत्यक्षादिव्यवहारः संभवति । न चाधिष्ठान-  
मन्तरेणेन्द्रियाणां व्यवहारः संभवति । न चानध्यस्तात्मभावेन देहेन कश्चिद्  
व्याप्रियते । न चैतस्मिन् सर्वस्मिन्नसति असङ्गस्यात्मनः प्रमातृत्वमुपपद्यते । न च  
प्रमातृत्वमन्तरेण प्रमाणप्रवृत्तिरस्ति । तस्मात्, अविद्यावद्विषयाण्येव प्रत्यक्षादीनि  
प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि च ॥

अध्यासभाष्यम्, पा. २, ३.

(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."

Adh. Bh. pp.2, 3.

[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'.]

(७) नेयं श्रुतिरचेतनस्य सत्त्वस्य भोक्तृत्वं वक्ष्यामीति प्रवृत्ता, किं तर्हि चेतनस्य क्षेत्रज्ञस्याभोक्तृत्वं ब्रह्मस्वभावतां च वक्ष्यामीति । तदर्थं सुखादि-विक्रियावति सत्त्वे भोक्तृत्वमध्यारोपयति । इदं हि कर्तृत्वं भोक्तृत्वं च सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञ-योरितरेतरस्वभावाविवेककृतं कल्प्यते । परमार्थतस्तु नान्यतरस्यापि संभवति ; अचेतनत्वात् सत्त्वस्य, अविक्रियत्वाच्च क्षेत्रज्ञस्य । अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितस्वभावत्वाच्च सत्त्वस्य सुतरां न संभवति । तथा च श्रुतिः - 'यत्र वा अन्यदिव स्यात् तत्रान्योऽन्यत् पश्येत्' इत्यादिना स्वप्नदृष्टहस्त्यादिव्यवहारवदविद्याविषय एव कर्तृत्वादिव्यवहारं दर्शयति ; 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत्केन कं पश्येत्' (बृ. ४-५-१५) इत्यादिना च विवेकिनः कर्तृत्वादिव्यवहाराभावं दर्शयति ॥ सू. भा. १-२-१२, पा. ७४.

"This (Paingī) Śruti does not aim at attributing experiencing nature to the insentient mind, but only intends to declare that the sentient *kshētrajña* (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 changeable 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 *adhyārōpāpavāda*.]

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 जन्ममृत्यू कुतो मे । नाहं प्राणः क्षुत्पिपासे कुतो मे ।

नाहं चित्तं शोकमोहौ कुतो मे । नाहं कर्ता बन्धमोक्षौ कुतो 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 :

(१) प्रपञ्चो यदि विद्येत निवर्तेत न संशयः ।

मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः ॥

गौ. का. १-१७.

"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." GK.I-17.

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

(२) विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत कल्पितो यदि केनचित् ।

उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥

गौ. का. १-१८.

"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. 1-18.

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 Śruti 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 :

आश्रमास्त्रिविधा हीनमध्यमोत्कृष्टदृष्टयः ।

उपासनोपदिष्टेयं तदर्थमनुकम्पया ॥

गौ. का. ३-१६.

"There are three grades of seekers, possessing the lowest, mediocre and the highest view-points. Upāsana is therefore taught out of compassion for such seekers." GK. 3-16.

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

तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसाऽनाशके-  
नैतमेव विदित्वा मुनिर्भवति । एवमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमिच्छन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति ।  
एतद्धस्म वै तत्पूर्वे विद्वांसः प्रजां न काश्यन्ते किं प्रजया करिष्यामो येषां  
नोऽयमात्माऽयं लोक-इति ते ह स्म पुत्रैषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च लोकैषणायाश्च  
व्युत्थायाथ भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति ॥

बृ. ४-४-२२.

"It is this Atman whom Brāhmaṇas 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 *Sādhanas* and not to negate the recitation (or study) or sacrifice as a means. For instance, in the text

(१) न कर्मणा न प्रजया धनेन त्यागेनैकेऽमृतत्वमानशुः ॥ 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 :-

(२) त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धा यज्ञोऽध्ययनं दानमिति प्रथमस्तप एव द्वितीयो ब्रह्मचार्याचार्यकुलवासी तृतीयोऽत्यन्तमात्मानमाचार्यकुलेऽवसादयन् सर्व एते पुण्यलोका भवन्ति ब्रह्मसंस्थोऽमृतत्वमेति ॥ 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-Saristha* (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 तपश्चैव पावनानि मनीषिणाम् ॥

गी. १८-५

एतान्यपि तु कर्माणि सङ्गं त्यक्त्वा फलानि च ।

कर्तव्यानीति मे पार्थ निश्चितं मतमुत्तमम् ॥

गी. १८-६.

"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 Pr̥thu, 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 ?

नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन ।

यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनूं स्वाम् ॥

का. २-२३, मुं. ३-२-३.

"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." Kā. 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.

नाविरतो दुश्चरितान्नाशान्तो नासमाहितः ।

नाशान्तमानसो वापि प्रज्ञानेनैनामाप्नुयात् ॥

का. २-२४.

"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."

Ka. 2-24.

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.

134. To stop the senses from fleeing from one object to another, the very first step is what has been called the *Karma-yāga* in the Bhagavadgītā. The one way of accomplishing it, is thus explained :-

यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।

स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः ॥

गी. १८-४६.

"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 'तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति' (Br. 4-4- 22) already quoted (Para 130. p. 141) more explicit. No doubt the duties proper to *Varṇas* 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 Smṛtis like the *Pārāśara* say 'ते सर्वे नैव निन्द्याः स्युर्युगरूपा हि 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:

ध्यायन् कृते यजन् यज्ञैस्त्रेतायां द्वापरेऽर्चयन् ।

यदाप्नोति तदाप्नोति कलौ संकीर्त्य केशवम् ॥

वि. पु. ६-२-१७.

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

And there is another *Paurāṇik* śloka :-

कलौ कल्मषचित्तानां पापद्रव्योपजीविनाम् ।

विधिक्रियाविहीनानां गतिर्गोविन्दकीर्तनम् ॥

"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.

तत्र कानिचिद् ब्रह्मण उपासनान्यभ्युदयार्थानि, कानिचिद् क्रममुत्तयार्थानि  
कानिचित् कर्मसमृद्धयर्थानि । तेषां गुणविशेषोपाधिभेदेन भेदः ॥

सू. भा. १-१-१२, पा. ३५.

"Of these, some meditations on Brahman are conducive to prosperity, some to gradual liberation, and some to the greater efficacy of Karmas. Their difference is due to the difference in the

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-kāṇḍa* and the *Jñāna-kāṇḍa* 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-kāṇḍa* 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 'Vidyā' 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 :-

(१) ननु ज्ञानं नाम मानसी क्रिया । न । वैलक्षण्यात् । क्रिया हि नाम सा यत्र वस्तुस्वरूपनिरपेक्षैव चोद्यते पुरुषचित्तव्यापाराधीना च । यथा 'यस्यै देवतायै हविर्गृहीतं स्यात् तां मनसा ध्यायेद् वषट्करिष्यन्' (ऐ. ब्रा. ३-८-१) इति, 'सन्ध्यां मनसा ध्यायेत्' इति चैवमादिषु । ध्यानं चिन्तनं यद्यपि मानसं तथापि पुरुषेण कर्तुमकर्तुम् अन्यथा वा कर्तुं शक्यम् ; पुरुषतन्त्रत्वात् । ज्ञानं तु प्रमाणजन्यम् । प्रमाणं च यथाभूतवस्तुविषयम् । अतो ज्ञानं कर्तुम् अकर्तुम्, अन्यथा वा कर्तुमशक्यम् । केवलं वस्तुतन्त्रमेव तत् । न चोदनातन्त्रम्, नापि पुरुषतन्त्रम् ; तस्मात् मानसत्वेऽपि ज्ञानस्य महद्वैलक्षण्यम् ॥ सू. भा. १-१-४, पा. 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 *hōtr*) 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), *Cintana* (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) ज्ञातुमिच्छा जिज्ञासा । अवगतिपर्यन्तं ज्ञानं सन्वाच्याया इच्छायाः कर्म, फलविषयत्वात् इच्छायाः । ज्ञानेन हि प्रमाणेनावगन्तुमिष्टं ब्रह्म । ब्रह्मावगतिर्हि पुरुषार्थः । निःशेषसंसारबीजाविद्याद्यनर्थनिवर्हणात् । तस्मात्, ब्रह्म जिज्ञासितव्यम् ॥

सू. भा. १-१-१, पा. ६.

"The word *Jijñāsā* (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.]

(३) तत्रैतस्मिन् अद्वैतविद्याप्रकरणे अभ्युदयसाधनान्युपासनान्युच्यन्ते, कैवल्यसंनिवृष्टफलानि चाद्वैतादीषद्विकृतब्रह्मविषयाणि 'मनोमयः प्राणशरीरः'- इत्यादीनि, कर्मसमृद्धिफलानि च कर्माङ्गसंबन्धीनि रहस्यसामान्यात्, मनोवृत्तिसामान्याच्च ॥ छां. भा. अव.

"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 Prāṇa 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." Introduction to Ch.Bh.

Though mental acts, Upāsana's 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 Upāsana's 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.

सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत । अथ खलु क्रतुमयः पुरुषो यथाक्रतुरस्मिँल्लोके पुरुषो भवति तथेतः प्रेत्य भवति स क्रतुं कुर्वीत ॥ छां.३-१४-१.

"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 प्राणशरीरो भारूपः सत्यसङ्कल्प आकाशात्मा सर्वकर्मा सर्वकामः  
सर्वगन्धः सर्वरसः सर्वमिदमभ्यात्तोऽवाक्यनादरः ॥ २ ॥

एष म आत्माऽन्तर्हृदयेऽणीयान् ब्रीहेर्वा यवाद्वा सर्षपाद्वा श्यामाकाद्वा  
श्यामाकतण्डुलाद्वैष म आत्माऽन्तर्हृदये ज्यायान् पृथिव्या ज्यायानन्तरिक्षा-  
ज्यायान्दिवो ज्यायानैभ्यो लोकेभ्यः ॥ ३ ॥

सर्वकर्मा सर्वकामः सर्वगन्धः सर्वरसः सर्वमिदमभ्यात्तोऽवाक्यनादर एष म  
आत्माऽन्तर्हृदय एतद्ब्रह्मैतमितः प्रेत्याभिसंभवतास्मीति यस्य स्यादद्धा न  
विचिकित्साऽस्तीति ह स्माऽऽह शाण्डिल्यः शाण्डिल्यः ॥ ४ ॥

"Made up of mind, having *Prāṇa* for His body, of the nature of the light (of consciousness), having an effective will, of ether-like 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 *Śyāmākā* or the kernel of *Śyāmākā*. 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 Śāṇḍilya, yea Śāṇḍilya." 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 *adhyārōpa* (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.

(१) तस्मात् अपरब्रह्मविषया गतिः । तत्र परापरब्रह्मविवेकानवधारणेन अपरस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि वर्तमाना गतिश्चतयः परस्मिन्नध्यारोप्यन्ते ॥

सू. भू. ४-३-१४, पा. ५०१.

"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 Śrutis teaching going (to Brahman) applicable (really) to the Lower Brahman, are wrongly applied to the Higher Brahman."

SBh.4-3-14, p. 501.

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

(२) किं द्वे ब्रह्मणी, परमपरं चेति ? बाढं द्वे ; 'एतद्वै सत्यकाम परं चापरं च ब्रह्म यदोङ्कारः' (प्र. ५-२) इत्यादिदर्शनात् । किं पुनः परं ब्रह्म किमपरमिति ? उच्यते - यत्राविद्याकृतनामरूपादिविशेषप्रतिषेधात्, अस्थूलादिशब्दैर्ब्रह्मोपदिश्यते, तत्परम् । तदेव यत्र नामरूपादिविशेषेण केनचिद्विशिष्टमुपासनायोपदिश्यते 'मनोमयः प्राणशरीरो भारूपः' (छां. ३-१४-२) इत्यादिशब्दैः, तदपरम् । नन्वेवमद्वितीयश्रुतिरुपरुध्येत । न । अविद्याकृतनामरूपोपाधिकतया परिहृतत्वात् ॥ सू. भा. ४-३-१४, पा. ५०१, ५०२.

"(Question:-) Are there two Brahman - 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 '*asthūlam*' (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 '*manōmaya*' (made up of mind) '*Prāṇa-Sarīrah*' (having Prāṇa for his body), '*Bhā rūpah*' (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*]

(३) एवमेकमपि ब्रह्मापेक्षितोपाधिसंबन्धं निरस्तोपाधिसंबन्धं चोपास्यत्वेन ज्ञेयत्वेन च वेदान्तेषूपदिश्यते ॥ सू. भा. १-१-१२, पा. ३५.

"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 Brahman 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.]

(४) 'तस्य चापरब्रह्मोपासनस्य संनिधौ श्रूयमाणम् 'स यदि पितृलोककामो भवति' (छां. ८-२-१) इत्यादि जगदैश्वर्यलक्षणं संसारगोचरमेव फलं भवति ; अनिवर्तितत्त्वादविद्यायाः । तस्य च देशविशेषावबद्धत्वात् तत्प्राप्त्यर्थं गमनमविरुद्धम् ।

सर्वगतत्वेऽपि चाऽऽत्मनः आकाशस्येव घटादिगमने बुद्ध्याद्युपाधिगमने गमनप्रसिद्धिः  
- इत्यवादिष्म 'तदुणसारत्वात्' (२-३-२९) इत्यत्र ॥सू. भा. ४-३-१४, पा. ५०२.

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 *Pitṛlōka* (the enjoyment of fathers, his fathers present themselves at his mere wish)' (Ch. 8-2-1), would belong to the sphere of *sarīsāra* 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 guṇasāratvāt*' (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 त्वनावृत्तिमावृत्तिं चैव योगिनः ।

प्रयाता यान्ति तं कालं वक्ष्यामि भरतर्षभ ॥

गी. ८-२३.

"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-Yōgins and Dhāraṇā- Yōgins (of Brahman) are both spoken of as Yōgins.

अग्निर्ज्योतिरहः शुक्लः षण्मासा उत्तरायणम् ।

तत्र प्रयाता गच्छन्ति ब्रह्म ब्रह्मविदो जनाः ॥

गी. ८-२४.

"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.

धूमो रात्रिस्तथा कृष्णः षण्मासा दक्षिणायनम् ।

तत्र चान्द्रमसं ज्योतियोगी प्राप्य निवर्तते ॥

गी. ८-२५.

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

G. 8-25.

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

But in contrast to these two Yōgas, there is a third Yoga called the Adhyātma-Yōga in the Katha-Upanishad and Dhyāna-Yōga 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- Yōga.

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:

यस्तु विज्ञानवान् भवति युक्तेन मनसा सदा ।

तस्येन्द्रियाणि वश्यानि सदश्चा इव सारथेः ॥

का. ३-६.

"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.]

विज्ञानसारथिर्यस्तु मनःप्रग्रहवान्नरः ।

सोऽध्वनः पारमाप्नोति तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥

का. ३-९.

"Whoever has for his charioteer a discriminating intellect and a poised mind for the bridle, he reaches the destined end of the (long) road, the Highest place of Viṣṇu (the all-pervading Brahman)."

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 गूढोऽत्मा न प्रकाशते ।

दृश्यते त्वग्रया बुद्धया सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः ॥

का. ३-१२.

"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) यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञस्तद्यच्छेज्ज्ञान आत्मनि ।

ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियच्छेत्तद्यच्छेच्छान्त आत्मनि ॥

का. ३-१३.

"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 Yōga thus formulated, must be unfolded in its naked form before one is able to profit by it. For it is not the same as *Sajātīya-pratyaya-Santāna-karāṇa* (setting up a stream of kindred ideas) by the strength of will in accordance with what is recommended by the Śāstra. As the *Chāndōgya-Bhāṣhya* says :

(१) उपासनं तु यथाशास्त्रसमर्पितं किञ्चिदालम्बनमुपादाय तस्मिन् समानचित्तवृत्तिसन्तानकरणं तद्विलक्षणप्रत्ययानन्तरितम् ॥

छां. भा. अवतरणिका, पा. ३५२

"But Upāsana is taking up any object presented by the Śāstra, 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 *Dhyāna* (a synonym for Upāsana) as an act depending on a person's will. See p. 151.]

In the case of Upāsana (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 ह्यासां फलम् उपास्यविषयसाक्षात्करणम् ॥

सू. भा. ३-३-५९, 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 ब्रह्मेत्युपास्ते यावन्नाम्नो गतं तत्रास्य यथाकामचरो भवति' (छां. ७-१-५) इति चैवमाद्यासु क्रियावददृष्टेनात्मना आत्मीयं फलं साधयन्तीषु साक्षात्करणापेक्षा नास्ति ॥

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 *adṛṣhta*, there is no need of realization."

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

The case of this Adhyātma-Yōga, however, is quite unlike that of Upāsanās of Brahman where, by an act of creative imagination in accordance with the Śāstras, one has first to achieve firm conviction that one has become Brahman, and then after shuffling off the mortal coil, the meditator proceeds to Brahmalōka by the *deva-yāna* path to attain and enjoy the fruits of meditation. Here in Adhyātma Yōga 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. (दृश्यते त्वयया बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः Ka. 3-12). Śaṅkara in commenting on this says :

दृश्यते तु संस्कृतया अग्रया अग्रमिवाग्रया तया, एकाग्रतोपेतया इत्येतत् । सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मवस्तुनिरूपणपरया । कैः ? सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः । इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्थाः (३-१०) इत्यादिप्रकारेण सूक्ष्मतापारम्पर्यदर्शनेन परं सूक्ष्मं द्रष्टुं शीलं येषां ते सूक्ष्मदर्शिनः । तैः सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः ; पण्डितैरित्येतत् ॥ का. भा. ३-१२, पा. ८३.

This, paraphrased, means that Atman is seen by means of Buddhi or mind made extremely subtle. The senses, the mind, the intellect and the ego (or Hiraṇyagarbha's Buddhi) 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 Buddhi, 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 '*tadvishṇōh 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 *Brahma-saṁsparśam 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 (सर्वभूतेषु गूढोऽऽत्मा) :-

सर्वभूतस्थमात्मानं सर्वभूतानि चात्मनि ।

ईक्षते योगयुक्तात्मा सर्वत्र समदर्शनः ॥

गी. ६-२९.

"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."

G. 6-29.

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); 'अनध्वगा अध्वसु पारयिष्णवः' 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. (सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोऽऽत्मा) As Gauḍapāda expresses it :-

यदा न लीयते चितं न च विक्षिप्यते पुनः ।

अनिङ्गनमनाभासं निष्पन्नं ब्रह्म तत्तदा ॥

गौ.का. ३-४६.

"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 Yōga. 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 :

आत्मसत्त्वानुबोधेन न सङ्कल्पयते यदा ।

अमनस्तां तदा याति ग्राह्याभावे तदग्रहम् ॥

गौ. का. ३-३२.

"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 Ātmā*' (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- Vidyā, 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 underived 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 *sāstraic* 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 *Adhyārōpāpavāda-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 Vedānta-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.

## ENGLISH BOOKS

### Books Authored by Sri S.S. Swamiji

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Name of the Book</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Price Rs.</i>
1.	<b>NARADA'S APHORISMS ON BHAKTI</b> (The book will serve as a valuable guide to those who wish to tread the path of Bhakti)	32	10/-
2.	<b>MINOR WORKS OF SRI SANKARACHAARYA</b> (Contains 16 most popular minor works of Sankara)	68	15/-
3.	<b>SANKARA'S CLARIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN VEDANTIC CONCEPTS</b> (Some more deep seated misconceptions among students and scholars of Vedanta are clarified in this valuable text)	96	25/-
4.	<b>HOW TO RECOGNISE THE METHOD OF VEDANTA</b> (Introduction to Sanskrit Text, "Vedanta Prakriya Prathyabijna of Vedantic thought upto the time of Sarvajnatma Muni)	128	30/-
5.	<b>AVASTHATRAYA OR THE UNIQUE METHOD OF VEDANTA</b> (Method of three states of Consciousness, which our real Self transcends. A valuable introduction to the study of Vedanta as a pure philosophy)	20	10/-
6.	<b>SALIENT FEATURES OF SANKARA VEDANTA</b> (Presents matter and method of genuine Sankara Vedanta in a small compass)	136	25/-
7.	<b>MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT SANKARA VEDANTA</b> (All criticisms on Vedanta are convincingly solved using the genuine traditional methodology of Sankara Vedanta)	120	25/-
8.	<b>VISION OF ATMAN</b> (The different aspects of three means of Intuitive knowledge, to wit, Sravana, Manana and Nididhyasana are explained)	130	20/-
9.	<b>INTUITION OF REALITY</b> (The Vedantic Knowledge is not mere subtle intellectualism but is intuition of Reality, arising through Divine Grace)	114	20/-
10.	<b>UPANISHADIC APPROACH TO REALITY</b> (The Unique Method of teaching Vedanta adopted by Shri Gaudapada, Sankara & Sureshwara)	79	20/-
11.	<b>SCIENCE OF BEING</b> (Deals with Chapter VI of Chandogya Upanishads. Presents in a nut-shell the true nature of the Science of Being)	108	25/-



<b>12. ESSAYS ON VEDANTA</b>	185	<b>50/-</b>
(Contains essential tenets of the Upanishads and the method of approach adopted in them)		
<b>13. SHUDDA-SAANKARAA-PRAKRIYA-BHAASKARA</b>	200	<b>50/-</b>
(Sheds Light on the Vedantic method according to Sankara determining the real doctrine of Upanishads)		
<b>14. SANKARA'S SUTRA BHASHYA</b>	121	<b>20/-</b>
(Illustrates to an earnest seeker of Truth, how Sankara Bhashyas are self-explanatory, and do not require guidance of commentators)		
<b>15. INTRODUCTION TO VEDANTA TEXTS</b>	232	<b>40/-</b>
(Compilation of Introductions from English & Sanskrit works of S.S. Swamiji)		
<b>16. ISAVASYOPANISHAD (Sankara Bhashya)</b>	70	<b>20/-</b>
<b>17. VEDANTA OR THE SCIENCE OF REALITY</b>	551	<b>120/-</b>
(Book Written by Sri K.A. Krishnaswamy Iyer) (Deals with the immediate realisation of Brahman by intuitive reflection on the witness of the three states of consciousness)		
<b>17A COLLECTED WORKS OF K.A. KRISHNASWAMY IYER</b>	330	<b>80/-</b>
(Contains lectures & articles contributed to various periodicals on different occasions as well as unpublished writings of the author of the "Vedanta or Science of Reality")		

## BOOKS AUTHORED BY SRI D.B. GANGOLLI

### [SATCHIDANANDA VAAKJYOTHI SERIES 18-25]

<b>18. THE RELEVANCE OF VEDANTA IN THIS MODERN AGE OF CIVILIZATION</b>	70	<b>20/-</b>
(Translation of "Vedantavuu Adhunika Jhivanavuu" - Xerox)		
<b>19. A BROAD OUTLINE OF VEDANTA</b>	24	<b>10/-</b>
(Translation of "Sankara Mahaa Manana")		
<b>20. REALITY BEYOND ALL EMPIRICAL DEALINGS</b>	40	<b>10/-</b>
(Translation of "Sarva Vyavaharateetavada Paramartha")		
<b>21. DELIBERATION ON THE ULTIMATE REALITY</b>	84	<b>12/-</b>
(Translation of "Anubhava Paryantavada Atma Vichara")		
<b>22. BRAHMAVIDYA OR KNOWLEDGE OF THE ULTIMATE REALITY</b>	52	<b>10/-</b>
(Translation of "Brahma Vidya")		
<b>23. THE QUINTESENCE OF PRISTINE PURE VEDANTA</b>	42	<b>10/-</b>
(Translation of "Parishuddha Vedanta Sara")		

24.	<b>THE PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCE OF VEDANTA</b> (“Translation of Adhyatma Vidye”)	44	12/-
25.	<b>VEDANTA : THE ONLY CONSUMMATE SPIRITUAL SCIENCE</b> (Translation of “Pariipurna Darshana”)	44	12/-
26.	<b>THE UNIQUE TEACHINGS OF SANKARA</b> (Discussion on Adhyasa Bhashya)	67	10/-
27.	<b>THE SCIENTIFIC APPROACH OF ADVAITA VEDANTA</b> (Uses the modern audio-visual method with 14 diagrams to depict the fundamentals of Advaita Vedanta)	120	30/-
28.	<b>SRI SRI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATHI SWAMIJI (Life Sketch)</b>	56	15/-
29.	<b>THE MAGIC JEWEL OF INTUITION</b> (Translation of Paramartha Chintamani. This <b>Magnum Opus</b> explains the subtle and secret teachings of Mandukya Upanishad using Avasthatraya Prakriye)	560	100/-
30.	<b>THE ESSENTIAL ADI SHANKARA</b> (Translation of “Sankara Vedanta Sara”, excellent reference book and a constant guide for a genuine student of Vedanta)	240	75/-
31.	<b>ESSENTIAL GAUDAPADA</b> (Translation of Gaudapada Hridaya ; Explanation of Karikaas)	432	400/-
32.	<b>INTUITIVE APPROACH TO SANKARA VEDANTA</b> (Translation of Vedantartha - Sara - Sangraha. Secrets of Adhyasa, Adhyasa, Adhyaropa - Apavada Nyaya revealed)	200	40/-
33.	<b>THE BASIC TENETS OF SANKARA VEDANTA</b> (Translation of Sankara Vedantada Moolatatwagalu)	200	30/-
34.	<b>THE PRISTINE PURE ADVAITA PHILOSOPHY OF ADI SANKARA</b> (Translation of Sankara Siddhanta : Explains pure Sankara Siddhanta and exposes the wrong interpretation of Vyakhyanakaras)	136	25/-
35.	<b>ADVAITA PANCHARATNAM</b> (Commentary of Five Verses composed by Adi Sankara on Advaita Vedanta)	80	10/-
36.	<b>THE METHOD OF VEDANTA (DR. J. ALSTON)</b>	No Stock	150/-
37.	<b>ESSENTIAL SURESWARA AND SATCHIDANANDA</b>		150/-

---

अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालये प्रकाशिताः

## संस्कृतग्रन्थाः

अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालयप्रकाशितेषु उपनिषद् शांकरभाष्येषु विशेषोऽयं यत्  
(१) 'विषयानुसारेण प्रविभक्तग्रन्थशरीरत्वम्' (२) तत्तद्विभाग प्रतिपाद्यविषय  
सूचकशिरोलेख-निवेशः, (३) पाठान्तरनिर्देशभाष्यान्तर संवादादिस्थलसूचनापूर्वकं  
हितमिताधट्टिप्पणदानम्, (४) विचार प्रचोदिका पीठिका, (५) उपनिषन्मूलस्य  
स्थूलाक्षरैः भाष्यस्य मध्यगात्राक्षरैः, उपनिषत्सारादि परिशिष्टभागस्य च सामान्य  
सूक्ष्माक्षरैः - इति चैवं विविधगात्रस्फुटाक्षरै-रङ्कनं च इति । सुन्दर अक्षरैः  
शुक्लमसृणपत्रे मुद्रापितानामप्येषां पुस्तकानां गात्राकारानु गुण्येन परिमित मूल्येनैव  
वितरणे प्रयत्नः कृतः । सर्वत्र टिप्पणं व्याख्यानदिकं च नूतनतया  
श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीसंयमिभिरनुगृहीतम् ॥

### 1. ईशावास्योपनिषत् - (पु. 56)

20/-

सभाष्यटिप्पणयुता । उपनिषदो माध्यन्दिनपाठः जिज्ञासूपयोगि मन्त्रानुक्रमणिका  
शब्दसूच्यादिसमेता विचारप्रचोदकपीठिकायुता च ॥

### 2. केनोपनिषत् (पु. 131)

20/-

ईशावास्यभाष्यवदेव सर्वपरिकरोपेतम् । परिशिष्टे सार्थभाष्यस्थमुख्यशब्द-  
वर्णानुक्रमेण दत्ताः । अत्र भाष्यहृदयविसंवादिटीकाभिप्रायाः समालोचिताः ।  
पदवाक्य-भाष्ययोश्चैकककर्तृकत्वमसंभावितमिति सविमर्श पीठिकायामुपपादितं च ॥

### 3. काठकोपनिषद्भाष्यम् (पु. 189)

25/-

केनभाष्यवत् सर्वपरिकरोपेतम् ।

### 4. मुण्डकोपनिषद्भाष्यम् (पु. 152)

20/-

कठभाष्यवत् सर्वपरिकरोपेतम् । पीठिकायां न केवलं भाष्यविषयविवेचनम्, किं  
तु भाष्यतट्टीकाकारयोः मतभेदविमर्शनं च कृतमत्र ॥

### 5. माण्डूक्यरहस्यविवृतिः (पु. 618) Xerox 1/8th Demmy 300/-

श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीभिरनुगृहीतायाम् अन्वर्थाभिधानायामस्यां व्याख्यायां माण्डूक्योपनिषदि गर्भीकृतानि नैकानि रहस्यानि श्रीगौडपादसंमतवेदान्तप्रक्रियानुसारेण तथा विवृतानि यथा मोक्षमाणानां जिज्ञासूनामस्याः श्रवणमननाभ्यां छिद्येरन् सर्वसंशयाः भिद्येत च हृदयग्रन्थिरात्मसत्यानुबोधेन । श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादभाष्य वाक्यार्थश्च प्रतिपदं प्रस्थानत्रय-भाष्यान्तरवाक्यान्तरसंगानेन मतान्तरदोषाविष्करणपूर्वकं तथा व्याकृतो यथा विशुद्ध-संप्रदायध्वना गतिर्निर्विघ्ना भवेत् पाठकानाम् । विशिष्य च अलातशान्तिप्रकरणे प्राचीनग्रन्थतत्त्वशोधकोत्थापितमतान्तरसंक्रान्तिशङ्कानिरसन-पूर्वकं श्रीगौडपादसंमता वेदान्तप्रक्रिया प्रदर्शिता, पूर्वतनप्रकरण त्रय प्रकियया एकवाक्यतां गमिता च । आङ्ग्लभाषामय्या गैर्वाणवाणीमय्या च भूमिकया श्रीगौडपादसंमतप्रक्रियाया असाधारणं स्वरूपं माहायानिकप्रक्रियावैलक्षण्यस्फुटी-करणपूर्वकहृदयंगमं कृतम् ॥

### 6. तैत्तिरीयोपनिषच्छीक्षावल्लीभाष्यम् (पु. 96) 20/-

टिप्पण्यादि सर्वपरिकरोपेतं मुण्डकभाष्यवत् ॥

### 7. तैत्तिरीयोपनिषत् : आनन्दवल्ली भृगुवल्ली च (पु. 447) 50/-

सभाष्या - श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीनिर्मित 'भाष्यार्थविमर्शिनी' व्याख्या-सहिता । व्याख्यायां भाष्याक्षरानुक्रमेणैव विषयोपपादनं कृतम् । भाष्ये अर्वाचीन-मतान्तरप्रविष्टवेदान्तिभिरुत्थाप्यमानशङ्कानां निरसनपूर्वकं विशुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियाया श्रेष्ठ्यं च सम्यगाविष्कृतम् ।

पुस्तकस्थान्ते अनुवाकसूची, उपनिषत्खण्डसूची, अर्थनिर्देशपूर्वकं भाष्यस्थ-मुख्यशब्दानां सूची, विमर्शिनीगतमुख्यविषयसूची च - इत्येता वर्णानुक्रमसूच्यो निवेशिताः । आंग्लगैर्वाणभूमिकयोः भाष्यगता मुख्यविषयाः सप्रपञ्चं परिशीलिताः - इति सर्वाङ्गसुन्दरं परिष्करणमिदम् ॥

### 8. सुगमा (पु. 134) 20/-

अध्यासभाष्यव्याख्या । श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीसंयमिभिर्विनिर्मिता । प्रचलित व्याख्यानानां भिन्नभिन्नप्रस्थानावलम्बनत्वात् शुद्धं शाङ्करदर्शनं कीदृशम्,

कथं च त् अविवादम्, अविरुद्धं च स्यादिति संशयानानां मनःसमाधानाय प्रस्थानत्रयभाष्यैककण्ठ्यम् आदर्शयन्ती सार्वत्रिकानुभवानुसारिवेदान्तप्रक्रिया-प्रख्यापनी इयं व्याख्या ॥

### 9. सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी (पु. 138) 25/-

जिज्ञासाधिकरणभाष्यस्य नूतनेयं व्याख्या श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्र सरस्वतीसंयमिभिः प्रणीता । सार्वत्रिकानुभवानुसारि शाङ्करं प्रस्थानं स्वासाधारणधर्मविशिष्टं व्याख्यान-रातप्रस्थानान्तरकलङ्करहितं दरीकृतभाष्यान्तरदुराक्रमं च परिशुद्धरूपेणाविष्कृतमत्र ॥

### 10. सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी (पु. 164) 30/-

जन्माद्यधिकरणभाष्यव्याख्या सच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीविरचिता । यथैव जिज्ञासाधि-करणव्याख्यायां ब्रह्मज्ञानसतत्त्वनिर्धारणं कृतम्, एवमेवात्र जगज्जन्मादिकरणसतत्त्वनिर्धारणं कृतम् सर्ववेदान्तादृताम् अध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियामनुसृत्य । परिशिष्टे च जिज्ञासाधिकरण भाष्यव्याख्यायामिव सूत्रार्थसंबद्धाः केचन विषयाः भगवत्पादसंमतां वेदान्तप्रक्रियां निर्दिधारयिषूणाम् उपकाराय विचारिताः ॥

### 11. सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी (तृतीयो भागः) (पु. 339) 40/-

शास्त्रयोनित्वाधिकरण - समन्वयाधिकरणभाष्ययोर्व्याख्या । पूर्ववदेव शुद्ध-शाङ्करप्रक्रियाप्रकाशिनी । परिशिष्टचिन्तायां शास्त्रप्रामाण्यसतत्त्वविमर्शः, श्रवणादीनां स्वरूपकृत्यादिगता चिन्ता इत्याद्याः विषयाः संकलिताः ।

### 12. शुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करः (1-2) : (पु. 43) 10/-

वेदान्तसिद्धान्तनिर्णयः, शाङ्करसंप्रदायनिर्णयश्च - इति किरणद्वयात्मकः प्रथमो भागः ।

### 13. शुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करः (3-4-5) : (पु. 53) 15/-

अस्मिन् द्वितीये भागे शाङ्करवेदान्तमर्यादा, शाङ्करवेदान्त प्रक्रियास्वरूपम्, अध्यारोपापवादविशेषाश्च - इत्येते विषयाः प्रतिपादिताः ।

#### 14. शुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करः (6-7) : (पु. 54) 15/-

अस्मिन् तृतीये भागे - शाङ्करप्रस्थानस्य प्रस्थानान्तरेभ्यो वैलक्षण्यं स्फुटितम्, शाङ्कराद्वैतस्य बौद्धमतसाम्यशङ्का च परिहृता ।

#### 15. गीताशास्त्रार्थविवेकः (पु. 216) 30/-

श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीसंयमिभिरनुगृहीतोऽयं ग्रन्थः । अल्पकायेनाप्यनेन प्रकरणेन सुचिन्तितेन, श्रीशाङ्करभगवत्पाद भाष्यादृत एव वेदान्तार्थो गीताचार्यानुगृहीत इति, स एव चानुसृतः परमपुरुषार्थदायी इति च जिज्ञासवो निःसंशयं विजानीयुः । अत्र प्रप्रथमं साङ्ख्य-योग-कर्म-ध्यान-ज्ञानादिपदार्थानां विवेकः कृतः । तदनु च कर्मयोग-ध्यानयोग-भक्तियोग-ज्ञानयोगानां परस्परसंबन्धो निरूपितः । परिशिष्टे च भागे साङ्ख्ययोगदर्शनाभ्यां गीतादर्शनस्य सालक्षण्यवैलक्षण्ये विवेचिते येन स्पष्टं विज्ञायेत सर्ववेदान्तसिद्धान्त एव परिशुद्धः स्वीकृतोऽत्र शास्त्रे इति ॥

#### 16. ब्रह्मविद्यारहस्यविवृतिः (पु. 150) 20/-

सगुणनिर्गुणब्रह्मविद्याविवेकेन जिज्ञासूनां निरायासप्रवेशः ब्रह्मणि यथा लभ्येत तथा श्रीचरणैः छान्दोग्योपनिषदोऽष्टमोऽध्यायः अत्र व्याख्यातः ।

#### 17. नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धिः ('क्लेशापहारिणी' व्याख्या सहिता)(604) 200/-

व्याख्यानकर्तारः श्रीसुरेश्वराचार्यैः प्रमाणीकृतोपदेशसाहस्रीतः वार्तिकद्वयतश्च श्लोकान् समुद्धृत्य वार्तिकप्रस्थानविशुद्धसंप्रदायमाविरकार्षुः । सत्वरं जिज्ञासुभिर-वलोकनीया व्याख्येयम् ।

#### 18. वेदांतप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञा (पु. 822) Under Print

श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीभिर्विनिर्मितोऽयं स्वतन्त्रो निबन्धः । तत्रास्मिन् प्रथमे सम्पुटे सर्वत्र वेदान्तेषु अध्यारोपापवादन्यायाश्रया एकैव प्रक्रिया प्राधान्येन परिगृहीतास्ति वेदान्ताभियुक्तैरित्येतद्वर्णितमत्र । अस्याः प्रक्रियाया अनादरादेव हेतोः सर्वेऽपि वावदूकाः वेदान्तोपदिष्टमात्मैकत्वमनुभवारूढमापादयितुं नाशक्नुवन्त्येतच्च निदर्शितम् अतिप्राचीनकालादारभ्य सर्वज्ञात्ममुनिसमयपर्यन्तवृत्तवेदान्त विचारेतिहास-सङ्क्षेपोपस्थापनेन ॥

विस्तृतांगलभाषामयभूमिकया संस्कृतभाषामयभूमिकया च समलङ्कृतः, प्रधानविषयानुक्रमणिकासहितश्च ।

**19. वेदान्तबालबोधिनी (पु. 60)**

**10/-**

भगवत्पादविरचित प्रातःस्मरणस्तोत्रस्य प्रश्नोत्तररूपं व्याख्यानम् । भाष्यकारोक्तीनां सरणिमेवानुसृत्य वेदान्तसिद्धान्तोऽत्र जिज्ञासूनां हृदयंगमितः ।

**20. वेदान्तडिण्डिमः (पु. 76)**

**20/-**

सुप्रसिद्धमिदं प्रकरणं भावबोधिण्याख्या व्याख्याया सहितम् । व्याख्यायां ललितया शैल्या श्रुतिप्रमाणवचनोदाहरणपूर्वकं श्लोकार्थो विवृतः । युक्त्या समुपबृंहितश्च ।

**21. विशुद्धवेदान्तसारः (1968) : (पु. 104)**

**15/-**

अत्र जिज्ञासुजनचित्तभूमिकाविशेषानुसारेण अनुभवप्रधानदृष्ट्या इन्द्रियप्रधान-दृष्ट्या चेति वेदान्तोपदेशस्त्रेधा विभज्य प्रदर्शितः ।

**22. विशुद्धवेदान्तपरिभाषा (पु. 146)**

**20/-**

ब्रह्म, जगत्, जीव इति पदार्थत्रयस्य सतत्त्वम्, जगद्ब्रह्मणोः जीवब्रह्मणोश्च संबन्धश्च साम्प्रदायिकपरिभाषाजातमवलम्ब्य अत्र निरूपितः ।

**23. शाङ्करं वेदान्तमीमांसाभाष्यम् (स्वयंव्याख्यातम्) (पु. 121)**

**20/-**

**24. वेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठी (पु. 164)**

**25/-**

शाङ्करभाष्यतद्व्याख्यानप्रस्थानयोर्वैलक्षण्यमधिकृत्य एकादश विद्वत्प्रकाण-डानामभिप्रायाः अत्र दत्ताः । विद्वदभिप्रायसंग्राहिका आंग्ल भूमिकाविभूषितश्च ।

**25. पञ्चपादिकाप्रस्थानम् (पु. 205)**

**30/-**

अत्र पञ्चपादिकाप्रस्थानं भाष्यप्रस्थानेन तुलितमस्ति ; येनावलोकितेनेदं निश्चीयेत यत् सर्वथापि प्रस्थानान्तरमेवावलम्बितं पञ्चपादिकाकारैः, भाष्याक्षराणि तत्र तत्रान्यथायोजनेन स्वाभ्युपगत प्रमेयपराणीव वाक्यानि नीतानि चेति ।

## 26. श्रीशङ्करहृदयम् (मूलाविद्यानिरास) (पु. 273) Under Print

श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीभिः पूर्वाश्रमे विनिर्मितं प्रकरणमिदं पूज्यपादानां श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादानां वेदान्तप्रक्रियारहस्यभेदकानां गभीराशयं विवृणोति । सर्वत्र चात्र प्रमाणवाक्यान्युदाहृतानि परःशतम् श्रीमद्भाष्यकृतां तत्साक्षादन्तेवासिनां श्रीसुरेश्वराचार्याणां सुप्रसिद्धमाण्डूक्यकारिकाकृतां श्रीगौडपादाचार्याणां च । अनुशाङ्करवेदान्तिभिः संप्रदायविरोधेन नूतनतया अभ्यूहितस्य औपनिषदप्रक्रिया मलिनीकरणमूलस्य मूलाविद्यावादस्य समूलोत्पाटनरूपोऽयं निबन्धः सम्यग्दर्शन-लालसजनग्राहिशुक्तर्कपिशाचोच्चाटने महामन्त्ररूपो विजयते ॥

## 27. पारमहंस्यमीमांसा (पु. 160)

25/-

संन्यासाश्रमः कथं शास्त्रेण विहितः, संन्यासस्य प्रकाराः, यतीनां नित्यानि अनुष्ठेयानि, संन्यासिना मुख्यो ध्येयः, प्रणवचिन्तनस्य प्रकाराः - इत्यादयो विषयाः - शाङ्करभाष्यं प्रमाणीकृत्य श्रुतिस्मृतिसङ्गतिपूर्वकं निरूपिता अस्मिन् प्रबन्धे । पारमहंस्यस्य वैशिष्ट्यं सम्यक् दर्शितमत्र ॥

## 28. भक्तिचन्द्रिका - नारदभक्तिसूत्राणं व्याख्या (पु. 222) 50/-

नारद प्रणीतानां भक्तिसूत्राणां व्याख्यारूपोऽयं ग्रन्थः ॥ शाङ्करसूत्र भाष्यशैली-मनुकरोति इयं नूतना व्याख्या । भक्तिविषये संभावितानां सम्भाव्यमानानां सर्वेषां प्रश्नानाम् आक्षेपाणां च परिहारोऽत्र दर्शितः । भावुकैः रसिकैः अवश्यं अवलोकनीयोऽयं ग्रन्थः । कन्नडमूलग्रन्थ रचयितारः - श्री स्वामिनः, संस्कृतानु-वादकः - विद्वान् वेङ्कटेशशर्मा, होसहल्ली ।

## 29. भामती (रचयिता विठ्ठल शास्त्रिगलु) (पु. 144)

10/-

“भामतीसमालोचनम्” भामत्याः श्री शाङ्करभाष्यस्य च अनुगुणाननुगुण-प्रदर्शकोऽयं ग्रन्थः ।

सर्वेषामपि पुस्तकानां प्रापणव्ययस्तु पृथगेव प्रापणस्थानम् :

1) अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालयः, होळ्नेरसीपुरम्, हासन - 573 211,

दू : 08175-273820

2) बैंगलोर, दू : 080-26765548



## About Adhyātma Prakāsha Karyālaya

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,  
II Block, T.R. Nagar, Bangalore-28  
Ph: 080-26765548

Holenarasipura 573211  
Karnataka, India.  
Ph: 08175 - 273820

visit us at [www.adhyatmaprakasha.org](http://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.

**ADHYĀTMA PRAKĀSHA KARYĀLAYA**

**Holenarasipura - 573 211, Karnataka - INDIA**