

ANUBHŪTIPRAKĀŚA ŚRĪ VIDYĀRAN̄YA MUNI

(ESSENCE OF 12 UPANIṢADS)

अनुभूतिप्रकाशः श्री विद्यारण्यमुनिप्रणीतः

AITAREYA

TAITTIRĪYA

CHĀNDOGYA

MUNḌAKA

PRAŚNA

KAUṢĪTAKĪ

MAITRĀYANĪ

KAṬHA

ŚVETĀŚVATARA

BṚHADĀRAN̄YAKA

KENA

NṚSIMHOTTARATĀPANĪYA



TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY BY
SWĀMĪ ŚUDDHABODHĀNANDA SARASWATĪ

स्वामी शुद्धबोधानन्द सरस्वती

VOLUME I



अनुभूतिप्रकाशः
(श्री विद्यारण्यमुनिप्रणीतः)

ANUBHŪTIPRAKĀŚA
By Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

BY

SWĀMĪ ŚUDDHABODHĀNANDA SARASWATĪ
स्वामी शुद्धबोधानन्द सरस्वती

VOLUME - I

(*Aitareya, Taittirīya and Chāndogya Upaniṣads*)

SRI VISWESWAR TRUST
MUMBAI

Published by:
Sri Visweswar Trust
C/o V.P. Joshi
302, Silver Classic,
Jay Prakash Nagar,
Road No 3, Goregaon East,
Mumbai - 400 063

Website : www.turiyabodha.com
<https://rubhuvasishtha.wordpress.com>

Contact : [info @turiyabodha.com](mailto:info@turiyabodha.com)

© Sri Visweswar Trust

Printed books are available with Publishers.

Book in PDF format (free download) on
www.turiyabodha.com

Printed by: SEVAK PRESS
Sevak Process
B-1, Shalimar Industrial Estate,
Matunga Labour Camp,
Mumbai - 400 019
Mobile : 98201 49855,
E-mail : sevakpress@gmail.com

PREFACE

Anubhūtiprakāśa is a metrical interpretative exposition of twelve Upaniṣads. It is an explanation of *anubhūti* (experience). Here *anubhūti* (experience) refers to that of *ātmā*/Brahman called *ātmānubhava* or *Brahmānubhava*. To gain the direct (*aparokṣa* or *pratyakṣa*) knowledge of an entity that is either perceptibly available to the sense-organs or is the self-evident 'I' (*ātmā*), an experience true to the nature of the entity to be known is indispensable. Otherwise that knowledge can be either *parokṣa* (indirect) or *bhrama* (erroneous one). In gaining the correct knowledge of an entity, one must be aware of its true nature. Awareness of an object even with the slightest deviation from its true nature results in incorrect knowledge of that object. Merely to be aware of an entity, correctly or wrongly is called an experience of that entity. For example, we do experience 24x7 ourselves as 'I'. But that experience is a mistaken one because the varied features of 'I' experienced in the three states of consciousness are truly not the nature of 'I', *ātmā*. Our present concept of 'I' is erroneous because it is identified with the embodiment and its attributes. As a result, we have landed in what is called *saṃsāra*.

What is the true nature of *ātmā*/Brahman? How to inquire into and investigate our true nature 'I' (*ātmā*)? What are the means of experiencing it in its true nature so that we can gain *aparokṣajñāna* or *aparokṣānubhūti* (direct knowledge)? How to verify that such a unique experience is true to the nature of 'I' and not some other erroneous variety like the innumerable varied experiences that we undergo moment by moment? This mode of inquiry into the true nature of 'I', the exact specification of *ātmānubhava* (experience true 'I', *ātmā*); the means to gain it; and the prerequisites to become eligible to gain it are the subject matters of Upaniṣads which serve as the highest *pramāṇa*, the means of knowledge.

The text *Anubhūtiprakāśa* fulfills succinctly with total clarity the above-mentioned requisites. It describes the final purport of all the Vedas through the means of twelve Upaniṣads in a nutshell which speak of one and the same principle *ātmā*/Brahman. These Upaniṣads are: *Aitareya*, *Taittirīya*, *Chāndogya* (Ch.3 to 5), *Muṇḍaka*, *Praśna*, *Kauṣītakī* (Ch.8, 9), *Maitrāyaṇī*, *Kaṭha*, *Śvetāśvatara*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (Ch.13 to 18), *Kena* and *Nṛsimhottaratāpanīya*. There are in total twenty chapters containing about 2818 verses. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* includes the teaching

of *Īśāvāsya* and *Nṛsimhottaratāpanīya* contains that of *Māṇḍūkya*. Probably that is the reason the author has not included these two Upaniṣads in this text to avoid repetition.

The author Vidyāraṇya Muni, is an exemplary exponent not only of Vedānta but also many other branches of knowledge. True to his name he is the forest (*araṇya*) of knowledge (*vidyā*). He is well-known for the clarity of his exposition. However tough the topic may be, he has the knack of presenting its picture very vividly. Besides Vedānta, he has authored many books on a variety of subjects such as Saṃskṛta grammar, *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā*, *Smṛtis*, the gloss on *Sūtasamhitā* (a Vedāntic magnum opus from *Skanda Purāṇa*), *Purāṇa Sāra*, astronomy and astrology, *Srīvidyā* (*mantra-śāstra*), music, *Sarva-darśana Saṅgraha* (other schools of thought), literature (*Śaṅkara-vijayam*, *Rāmāyaṇa-rahasyam*).

The expositions on Vedānta are:

- a) *Vivaraṇa Prameya Saṅgraha* (an aid for the study of *Brahmasūtras-nyāyaprasthānam*);
- b) *Anubhūtiprakāśa* (to help the study of Upaniṣads - *Śrutiprasthānam*);
- c) *Jīvanmukti Viveka* (useful for the study of *Bhagavadgītā* and *Yoga Vāsiṣṭha-Smṛtiprasthānam*);
- d) *Pañcadaśī* (the essence of entire Vedānta-*prasthāna-trayī* - in fifteen topics);
- e) *Aparokṣānubhūti tīkā*;
- f) *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika Sāra*;
- g) *Brahmavidāśīrvāda-Paddhati*;
- h) *Dīpikās* (elucidators) of *Chāndogya*, *Aitareya*, *Kaivalya*, *Taittirīya* and *Nṛsimha Tāpanīya*.

The first seven chapters of this text are called ‘*Caturveda-vidyāprakāśa*’. The rest of the thirteen chapters are called ‘*Anubhūtiprakāśa*’ (Ch.8-20). But commonly the entire text is known as *Anubhūtiprakāśa*. The word *Caturvedaḥ* means *Paramātmā*, the Brahman. *Caturvedavidyā* means the purport of the knowledge contained in the four Vedas. In other words, it is *Brahmavidyā*.

Commentaries on *Anubhūtiprakāśa* are not available. ‘*Mitākṣarāvivr̥tti*’ by Kāśinātha Śarmā was published in CE 1923-24 (*Bharatiya Kalā Prakāśana*, 2006). It is said that Śrī Śivarāmāśrama wrote ‘*Ādarśa*’ gloss up to the eighth chapter, the handwritten manuscript of which is available at The Institute of Advanced Study of

World Religions, U.S.A. Śrī Muttu Śāstrī published ‘Śrutisaṃyojinī’ tīkā in CE 1984. Both the published glosses give references of śruti statements, connection and meanings of difficult words. But there is no elaboration of the subject matter. Madrās University has published in CE 1992 an English translation of this text by Śrī Godabarisha Mishra. Reprint of only the original verses published by Nirṇayasāgar Press in CE 1926 is available.

An elaborate commentary in Hindi on this text was published for the first time by Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrtimatha Prakāśana, Vārāṇasī in CE 2013. This is a very useful book available in three volumes. It is an edited version of the daily teaching by Pūjya Anantaśrī Swāmī Maheśānanda Girijī Mahārāja in CE 2002-03 at Abu. I have derived much guidance from this commentary. It has enhanced the clarity of this English commentary.

After my study of this text with the help of ‘Śrutisaṃyojinī’ tīkā, I felt sad that the learning and teaching of such a priceless text is neglected nowadays in the Vedāntic circles. That prompted me to teach (in English) this entire text from CE 1998 to 2006 on different occasions. Finally, it was decided to write an elaborate commentary with word-meaning and the translation in the year CE 2016. A brief summary of each chapter contained in each volume is given at the beginning to facilitate the comprehension of the content of those chapters.

Mumukṣus should know the exact nature of *aparokṣa ātmajñāna*/*Brahmajñāna*; *Brahmasākṣātkāra*; *mokṣa*; the source and the nature of Vedas as *svataḥ-pramāṇam*; the modus operandi of Vedānta *pramāṇa*; the defectless *sāmagrīs* (prerequisites) necessary for the Vedānta *pramāṇa* to function; an analysis of when a *pramāṇa* fails to function; the role and the criterion of correctness of Vedāntic *prakriyās* (modes of teaching). An exhaustive discussion on these topics is beyond the scope of the commentary written in the present text. However, passing references have been made to them in the required contexts. Readers are requested to refer to my exhaustive commentary on *Brahmasūtra Śāṅkarabhāṣya (catuṣṣūtrī)* to have clarity about these.

The book presented in four volumes has the table of contents, an exhaustive subject index, indices of topics (chapter-wise) to provide readers quick access to the topics of their choice. Repetition is considered a defect in literature. But that is not so in learning, where it is indispensable. A Latin saying goes - Repetition is the mother of

study. Considering the subtle nature of Vedānta, I have resorted to repetition at a few places with a slightly different presentation in each case - especially in connection with the nature of *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna*.

A commentary written in English language, which does not have a suitable vocabulary for expressing the thought-content and technicalities of Vedānta that are evolved in the Samskrit language, has definite limitations. To understand the advanced Samskrit Vedāntic text such as *Anubhūti-Prakāśa* I seek the co-operation of readers in certain respects to ensure that they derive the maximum benefit from this commentary.

As in medicine or engineering, Vedānta has its own terminology. Many Samskrit terms used in Vedānta have no direct equivalents in English. Their meanings have been expounded elaborately in this commentary. This is not necessary for those who are already exposed to Vedānta and understand the full significance of these terms. Such readers are more at home if the original Samskrit terms are used in the commentary. For these readers, the English counterparts of these words - which are quite lengthy at times - prevent a lucid evolution of the full import of the sentences. However, the use of only Samskrit Vedāntic terminology - even if fully explained earlier - would become a major stumbling block for a beginner without familiarity with Samskrit.

To balance these opposing requirements and to ensure that no one is deprived of vividly grasping the import and lucidity of this text without hindrance, a via media is resorted to. At most of the places the original Samskrit terms in italics with diacritical marks are used along with their English equivalents or with explanations. This is done even at the risk of repetition or at the risk of lengthening the sentence. This practice is not followed where the original word or its explanation is used very often either in the immediately preceding text or in a proximate sentence. The reader is requested to get accustomed to this style. Besides, familiarization with the key to transliteration is indispensable for ease in reading diacritical marks to avoid getting distracted by them which can affect the grasp of topic. The keys and the section on the pronunciation of Samskrit letters are provided separately after the list of abbreviations.

Many of my students have devotedly rendered their services in manifold ways to make the publication of this book possible in its final form. I pray to *Īśvara* for their

liberation in this life itself. May many *mumukṣus* take advantage of this Vedāntic work.

Reverentially I bow down to the entire *Guru-śiṣya paramparā* of Vedānta *saṃpradāya* beginning from Sadāśiva and Nārāyaṇa up to my *Gurus*. Reverentially with immense gratitude I bow down to both my *Gurus* – Pūjya Śrī Swami Chinmayānanda Saraswatī and Pūjya Śrī Swami Dayānand Saraswatī - at whose feet I underwent my study of Vedānta. Further, I offer my *praṇāms* to *Bhagavān Śrī Sathya Sai Bāba* from whom I have received immense inspiration and guidance.

I conclude by offering this book reverentially to *Bhagavān* from whom all knowledge ultimately originates, to whom it truly belongs to and by whose grace I could write this commentary.

त्वदीयं वस्तु गोविन्द तुभ्यमेव समर्पये ।

‘Oh Lord! I truly offer unto you, what is yours.’

Mumbai
23-11-2023

Swāmī Śuddhabodhānanda Saraswatī

Abbreviations

<i>Ā.U.</i>	-	<i>Ātmopaniṣat</i>	<i>Mai.U.</i>	-	<i>Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣat</i>
<i>A.G.</i>	-	<i>Aṣṭāvakra Gītā</i>	<i>Mu.U.</i>	-	<i>Muṇḍakopaniṣat</i>
<i>A.Pr.</i>	-	<i>Anubhūtiprakāśa</i>	<i>Nā.Sū.</i>	-	<i>NāsadīyaSūktam</i>
<i>Ā.pu.</i>	-	<i>Ātmapurāṇa</i>	<i>Nai.Si.</i>	-	<i>Naiṣkarmya-siddhi</i>
<i>Ai.U.</i>	-	<i>Aitareyopaniṣad</i>	<i>Nṛ.Pū.Tā.U.</i>	-	<i>Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanīyopaniṣat</i>
<i>Ai.U.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Aitareyopaniṣad Bhāṣya</i>	<i>Nṛ.U.Tā.U.</i>	-	<i>Nṛsiṃhottaratāpanīyopaniṣat</i>
<i>B.G.</i>	-	<i>Bhagavadgītā</i>	<i>P.</i>	-	<i>Pañcadaśī</i>
<i>B.G.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Bhagavadgītā Bhāṣya</i>	<i>P.U.</i>	-	<i>Paingalopaniṣat</i>
<i>B.G.Gū.Dī.</i>	-	<i>Bhagavadgītā Gūḍhārtha- Dīpikā</i>	<i>Pā.Yo.su.</i>	-	<i>Pātañjala Yogasutra</i>
<i>Br.Ā.P.</i>	-	<i>Brahmavidāśīrvāda- paddhatiḥ</i>	<i>Pā.Sū.</i>	-	<i>Pāninīya sūtra</i>
<i>Br.sū.</i>	-	<i>Brahmasūtra</i>	<i>Pr.U.</i>	-	<i>Praśnopaniṣat</i>
<i>Br.Sū.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya</i>	<i>Pr.U.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Praśnopaniṣad bhāṣya</i>
<i>Br.U.</i>	-	<i>Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣat</i>	<i>R.S.</i>	-	<i>RkSamhitā</i>
<i>Br.U.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad bhāṣya</i>	<i>S.R.U.</i>	-	<i>Sarasvatīrahasyopaniṣat</i>
<i>Br.U.Vā.</i>	-	<i>Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣat Vārtika</i>	<i>Śāṭ.U.</i>	-	<i>Śāṭyāyanyupaniṣat</i>
<i>Br.U.Vā.Sā.</i>	-	<i>Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣat Vārtikasāra</i>	<i>Si.Bi.</i>	-	<i>Siddhāntabindu</i>
<i>Ch.U.</i>	-	<i>Chāndogyopaniṣat</i>	<i>Śv.U.</i>	-	<i>Śvetāśvataropaniṣat</i>
<i>Ch.U.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Chāndogyopaniṣad Bhāṣya</i>	<i>Tai.U.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Taittirīyopaniṣad Bhāṣya</i>
<i>Dr.dr.vi.</i>	-	<i>Drk drśya viveka</i>	<i>Tai.U.</i>	-	<i>Taittirīyopaniṣat</i>
<i>H.ko.</i>	-	<i>Halāyudha kośa</i>	<i>Tai.Vā.</i>	-	<i>Taittirīya Vārtika</i>
<i>Ī.U.</i>	-	<i>Īśāvāsyopaniṣat</i>	<i>Tri.tā.</i>	-	<i>Tripur-tāpinyupaniṣat</i>
<i>Jai.sū.</i>	-	<i>Jaiminisūtra</i>	<i>Ve.P.B.</i>	-	<i>Vedānta-paribhāṣā</i>
<i>Jī.Mu.Vi.</i>	-	<i>Jīvanmuktiviveka</i>	<i>Ve.sā.</i>	-	<i>Vedāntasāra</i>
<i>Kau.U.</i>	-	<i>Kauṣītaki Upaniṣat</i>	<i>Vī.cū.</i>	-	<i>Vivekacūḍāmaṇi</i>
<i>Ke.U.</i>	-	<i>Kenopaniṣat</i>	<i>Yo.Vā.Ni.Pu.</i>	-	<i>Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha Nirvāṇa purvārdha</i>
<i>Ke.U.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Kenopaniṣad Bhāṣya</i>	<i>Yo.Vā.Ni.U.</i>	-	<i>Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha Nirvāṇa uttarārdha</i>
<i>Kṭ.U.</i>	-	<i>Kaṭhopaniṣad</i>	<i>Yo.Vā.st.</i>	-	<i>Yoga-Vāsiṣṭhasthiti prakaraṇa</i>
<i>Kṭ.U.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Kaṭhopaniṣad bhāṣya</i>	<i>Yo.su.</i>	-	<i>Yoga-sudhākara of Sadāśivendra</i>
<i>M.S.</i>	-	<i>Manusmṛti</i>	<i>Yo.Vā.</i>	-	<i>Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha</i>
<i>Mā.U.</i>	-	<i>Māṇḍukyopaniṣat</i>	<i>Yo.Vā.Upa.</i>	-	<i>YogavāsiṣṭhaUpāsama Prakarāṇa</i>
<i>Mā.U.Kā.</i>	-	<i>Māṇḍukyopaniṣat with Kārikā</i>	<i>Yo.Vā.ut.</i>	-	<i>Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha utpatti prakaraṇa</i>
<i>Mā.u.kā.Bh.</i>	-	<i>Māṇḍukya-upaniṣat-kārikā- bhāṣya</i>			

Key to Transliteration & Pronunciation of Sanskrit Letters.

अ a (<u>but</u>)	ट ṭa (<u>start</u>)*	} tongue on upper palate
आ ā (<u>mas</u> ter)	ठ ṭha (<u>anthill</u>)*	
इ i (<u>it</u>)	ड ḍa (<u>dart</u>)*	
ई ī (<u>beet</u>)	ढ ḍha (<u>godhead</u>)*	
उ u (<u>put</u>)	ण ṇa (<u>under</u>)*	
ऊ ū (<u>pool</u>)		
ऋ ṛ (<u>rhythm</u>)*	त ta (<u>thirst</u>)*	} tongue on teeth
ए e (<u>play</u>)	थ tha (<u>thumb</u>)	
ऐ ai (<u>high</u>)	द da (<u>father</u>)*	
ओ o (<u>toe</u>)	ध dha (<u>breathe here</u>)*	
औ au (<u>loud</u>)	न na (<u>numb</u>)*	
◌̣ ṁ - Anusvāra (nasalization of preceding vowel) written like the dot above अ in अंशः	प pa (<u>spin</u>)	
: ḥ - Visarga (aspiration of preceding vowel) written like the two dots after श in अंशः	फ pha (<u>loophole</u>)*	
क ka (<u>skate</u>)	ब ba (<u>bin</u>)	
ख kha (<u>blockhead</u>)*	भ bha (<u>abhor</u>)*	
ग ga (<u>gate</u>)	म ma (<u>much</u>)	
घ gha (<u>log hut</u>)*	य ya (<u>young</u>)	
ङ ṅa (<u>sing</u>)	र ra (<u>drama</u>)	
च ca (<u>chunk</u>)	ल la (<u>luck</u>)	
छ cha (<u>catch him</u>)*	व va (<u>in-between wile and yile</u>)	
ज ja (<u>John</u>)	श śa (<u>shoe</u>)	
झ jha (<u>hedgehog</u>)*	ष ṣa (<u>bushel</u>)	
ञ ña (<u>bunch</u>)	स sa (<u>so</u>)	
	ह ha (<u>hum</u>)	
	क्ष kṣa	
	ज्ञ jña	

* There are no exact English equivalents for the letters listed with an asterisk.

CONTENTS

Sl.No.	Particulars	Verses	Page No.
	Preface		i
	Abbreviation		vi
	Key to Transliteration		vii

Chapter - I

Aitareyopaniṣadvivaraṇam (Aitareyopaniṣad)

01.	Summary		01
02.	Introduction to <i>Anubhūtiprakāśa</i>		01
03.	Statement of contents	1	04
04.	<i>Ātmā</i> is the basis of <i>śṛṣṭi</i> (Creation) - <i>adhyāropa</i>	2-6	06
05.	<i>Adhyāropa</i> - Creation of <i>lokas</i> , etc.	7-11	10
06.	Entry (<i>praveśa</i>) of <i>Parameśvara</i> in the body	12-15	18
07.	Three abodes of <i>Parameśvara</i> as a <i>jīva</i>	16-17	23
08.	<i>Apavāda</i> (refutation of Creation)	18-19	26
09.	<i>Apavāda</i> - effect is identical with its cause	20-21	30
10.	<i>Apavāda</i> - <i>sopādhika bhrama</i> (adjunctive error)	22-23	31
11.	<i>Apavāda</i> - refutation of distinction between cause and its effect	24-29	34
12.	<i>Apavāda</i> - effect (<i>kārya</i>) is only a verbal phrase	30-34	38
13.	<i>Apavāda</i> - <i>jagat</i> in reality is <i>ātmā</i>	35-36	48
14.	<i>Apavāda</i> - <i>ātmā</i> is Brahman	37-39	50
15.	<i>Apavāda</i> - <i>jñānī</i> is called Indra	40-42	53
16.	<i>Vairāgya</i> (dispassion) - three births	43	55
17.	<i>Vairāgya</i> - the first birth	44-46	57
18.	<i>Vairāgya</i> - the second birth	47-52	59
19.	<i>Vairāgya</i> - the third birth	53-57	64
20.	<i>Vairāgya</i> is the main means to gain <i>Brahmajñāna</i> - example of sage <i>Vāmadeva</i>	58	67
21.	<i>Vāmadeva</i> - ending of obstruction	59-61	69
22.	<i>Vāmadeva</i> - the experience of <i>jīvanmukti</i>	62-64	71
23.	<i>Ātmānanda</i> (<i>Brahmānanda</i>) is limitless; it is the source of all happiness	65-69	74
24.	<i>Mīmāṃsā</i> (sacred inquiry) begins	70	78
25.	<i>Mīmāṃsā</i> - <i>kaḥ ahaṃ</i> (who am I?)	71-81	80
26.	<i>Mīmāṃsā</i> - actual <i>ātmavicāra</i>	82-91	87
27.	<i>Mīmāṃsā</i> - <i>prajñānam</i> is <i>mukhya</i> (principal) <i>ātmā</i>	92-95	93
28.	<i>Mīmāṃsā</i> - the word <i>tvam</i> (you <i>jīva</i>)	96	95

29. <i>Mīmāṃsā</i> - the word <i>tat</i>	97-105	96
30. <i>Mīmāṃsā</i> - <i>prajñānam Brahma</i>	106-107	102
31. Conclusion	108	106

Chapter - II

Taittirīyavidyāprakāśa (Taittirīyopaniṣad)

32. Summary		108
33. Introduction to <i>Taittirīya-vidyāprakāśa</i>		109
34. Topic of <i>Taittirīyavidyāprakāśaḥ</i>	1	113
35. Connection of <i>karma / upāsana</i> with <i>Brahmavidyā</i>	2-4	114
36. <i>Brahmavallī</i>	5-6	121
37. <i>Jñeyam Brahma</i>	7-12	123
38. <i>Jñeyam Brahma – guhāhitam</i> (concealed in five sheaths)	13-17	128
39. <i>Brahmajñānam</i>	18-22	133
40. <i>Phala</i> (result) of <i>Brahmajñāna</i>	23-29	140
41. <i>Adhyāropa</i> (superimposition) of Creation on Brahman	30-39	144
42. <i>Apavāda</i> (refutation) of Creation	40-41	155
43. <i>Apavāda</i> – ‘I’ notion in son, etc.	42-44	157
44. <i>Apavāda</i> – <i>annamayakośa</i> (food-sheath)	45-51	160
45. <i>Apavāda</i> – <i>prāṇamayakośa</i>	52-57	166
46. <i>Apavāda</i> – <i>manomayakośa</i>	58-63	170
47. <i>Apavāda</i> – <i>viññānamayakośa</i>	64-73	175
48. <i>Apavāda</i> – <i>ānandamayakośa</i>	74-85	181
49. A doubt – does Brahman exist or not?	86-90	192
50. The summary of <i>pañcakośa-viveka</i>	91-93	196
51. <i>Manana</i> (reflection)	94-97	198
52. <i>Manana</i> (reflection) – Brahman does exist	98-124	201
53. <i>Manana</i> (reflection) – only <i>Brahmajñānī</i> gets liberated	125-130	223
54. <i>Ānanda-mīmāṃsā</i> – quantitative investigation of happiness	131-135	227
55. <i>Satyam jñānam anantam</i> Brahman is <i>ānanda</i>		232
56. <i>Jīveśvara-aikya</i> - identity of <i>jīva</i> and <i>Īśvara</i>	136-137	239
57. Result of <i>ātmajñāna / Brahmajñāna</i>	138-142	241
58. Summary of <i>Bhṛguvallī</i>	143-145	244
59. <i>Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad</i> – a few means	146-150	247

Chapter - III

Śvetaketuvidyāprakāśa (Chāndogyopaniṣad)

60. Summary		252
61. Introduction		253
62. <i>Pratijñā</i> (declaration)	1	255
63. The context of teaching <i>Brahmavidyā</i>	2	255

64. By the knowledge of the cause all its effects become known	3-10	256
65. Effect (<i>vikāra</i>) is just a verbal expression of a name (<i>Vācārambhaṇam-nāmadheyam</i>)	11-17	261
66. <i>Satyānṛta-viveka</i> – discrimination of real and the false	18-26	266
67. <i>Śravaṇa manana</i> and <i>vijñāna</i>	27	272
68. Actual teaching imparted to Śvetaketu	28-34	273
69. Refutation of <i>asadvāda</i> (theory of non-existence)	35-37	277
70. <i>Īkṣaṇa</i> (consideration), etc., about creation	38-44	279
71. Actual <i>śṛṣṭi</i> (Creation)	45-51	284
72. Entry of Brahman	52-53	289
73. <i>Apavāda</i> (refutation) of superimposed (<i>adhyāropita</i>) creation	54-60	290
74. <i>Apavāda</i> – physical body analysed	61-66	295
75. <i>Apavāda</i> – analysis of the mind	67-70	298
76. <i>Apavāda</i> concluded – <i>sat</i> alone is real	71-72	300
77. ‘ <i>Svapīti</i> ’ (asleep) shows the true nature of <i>jīva</i> as <i>sat</i>	73-79	301
78. <i>Saṃsāra</i> is on account of <i>upādhis</i>	80-84	307
79. Means of gaining <i>ātmajñāna</i>	85-87	310
80. The body as the means of gaining <i>ātmajñāna</i>	88-103	313
81. Senses (<i>indriyas</i>) as the means of gaining <i>ātmajñāna</i>	104-105	321
82. <i>Tat tvam asi</i> – you are <i>sat</i> (Brahman)	106-111	323
83. <i>Manana</i> – reflection	112-124	328
84. Reflection – <i>śraddhā</i> (faith)	125-127	337
85. Reflection – <i>upadeśa</i> (teaching) is indispensable	128-130	339
86. Reflection – destruction of <i>karmas</i>	131-132	341
87. Reflection – <i>mokṣa</i> (liberation)	133-137	344
88. Conclusion	138-140	346

Chapter - IV

Sanatkumāravidyāprakāśa (Chāndogyopaniṣad)

89. Summary		350
90. Introduction	1-4	352
91. Advice of <i>upāsanās</i>	5-15	355
92. Teaching about <i>prāṇa</i>	16-22	364
93. <i>Ativādī</i> (assertor of the most exalted)	23-27	369
94. The advice of the entity superior to <i>prāṇa</i> with the means to know it	28-38	372
95. <i>Bhūmavidyā</i>	39-54	382
96. <i>Pratishṭhā</i> (basis) of <i>bhūmā</i>	55-63	393
97. The mode of gaining <i>bhūmāvidyā</i>	64-72	400

98. <i>Jīvanmukta</i> (person liberated while living)	73-78	406
99. Contrast of <i>jīvanmukta</i> , <i>videhamukta</i> and an <i>ajñānī</i>	79-87	411
100. <i>Brahmavidyā</i> - pursuit begins with <i>āhāra-śuddhi</i>	88-89	418
101. Conclusion	90	420

Chapter - V

Prajāpatividyāprakāśa (Chāndogyopaniṣad)

102. Summary		421
103. Introduction	1	423
104. <i>Prajāpati's</i> declaration	2-11	424
105. Indra and Virocana become the disciples of <i>Prajāpati</i>	12-14	434
106. <i>Jāgratsākṣī</i>	15-17	436
107. Misunderstanding of both disciples	18-20	438
108. Clarification	21-24	440
109. The delusion of reflection as <i>ātmā</i>	25	444
110. <i>Prajāpati</i> neglects	26-28	445
111. <i>Āsuropaniṣat</i>	29-31	447
112. Indra's <i>viveka</i>	32-34	449
113. <i>Svapnasākṣī</i> is <i>ātmā</i>	35-37	451
114. <i>Susupti-sākṣī</i> is <i>ātmā</i>	38-41	453
115. <i>Turīya-ātmā</i>	42-49	456
116. <i>Samprasādaḥ-ātmā</i> free from all afflictions	50-61	463
117. <i>Uttamapurusa</i>	62-65	470
118. The result of <i>ātmajñāna</i>	66-82	474
119. <i>Jīvanmuktī</i>	83-87	485
120. <i>Cākṣuṣaḥ puruṣaḥ</i> (<i>puruṣaḥ</i> / <i>ātmā</i> abiding in the eye), etc.	88-93	492
121. Conclusion	94-96	498
122. The purpose of <i>ākhyāyikā</i> (connected narrative)	97-100	500

Chapter - VI

Muṇḍakopaniṣad-vivaraṇam (Muṇḍakopaniṣad)

123. Summary		503
124. Introduction		505
125. The lineage of <i>gurus</i> in <i>Muṇḍakopaniṣad</i>	1-2	506
126. Having known what everything else is known?	3	507
127. <i>Parāvidyā</i> and <i>aparāvidyā</i>	4-10	508
128. <i>Akṣaram</i> (Brahman)	11-18	515
129. The cause of the <i>jagat</i>	19-26	522
130. <i>Akṣara</i> is 'jagatkāraṇa' through <i>upādhi</i>	27-30	528
131. <i>Aparāvidyā</i>	31-46	531
132. <i>Guru</i> is necessary	47-50	545

133. <i>Ātmā (akṣara)</i> is everything	51-57	551
134. <i>Praṇava (Om)</i> as the means to get the mind absorbed in Brahman	58-64	559
135. Result of <i>Brahmajñāna</i>	65-70	568
136. <i>Brahmajñāna</i> amounts to the knowledge of everything	71-72	574
137. The metaphor of two birds	73-76	575
138. <i>Brahmavid-variṣṭha</i>	77-83	580
139. <i>Varaṇa</i> (choice - the longing for <i>ātmajñāna</i>)	84-86	588
140. The failure of <i>śravaṇa</i> to produce <i>jñāna</i>	87-88	591
141. <i>Parāntakāla</i> – the time of final death	89-97	594
142. <i>Adhikārī</i> (eligible person)	98	601
143. Conclusion	99-100	602

Chapter - VII

Praśnopaniṣadvivaraṇam (Prašnopaniṣad)

144. Summary		604
145. Introduction	1-3	605
146. The first question – the result of <i>aparā-vidyā</i>	4-5	608
147. Answer to first question – description of <i>śṛṣṭi</i>	6-12	609
148. The southern and northern paths	13-14	613
149. <i>Prajāpati</i>	15-19	615
150. Result of <i>upāsanā</i>	20	619
151. The second question – <i>viveka</i> (discrimination) of gross and subtle bodies	21-27	620
152. The exaltedness of <i>prāṇa</i>	28-33	624
153. Third question – the inquiry into the nature of <i>prāṇa</i>	34-37	627
154. Answers to six questions about <i>prāṇa</i>	38-51	629
155. Departure to the next body	52-53	638
156. The fourth question introduced	54	640
157. Fivefold fourth question	55	640
158. Discrimination of sleeping and non-sleeping entities	56-58	641
159. The seer of the dream	59-60	643
160. The deep sleep	61-62	644
161. The basis (<i>ādhāra</i>) of <i>jagallaya</i> (dissolution of <i>jagat</i>)	63-66	648
162. The basis of <i>jagatsthiti</i> (existence of <i>jagat</i>)	67-68	651
163. The result of <i>brahmajñāna</i>	69-70	653
164. Fifth question – meditation of <i>praṇava (Om)</i>	71-72	654
165. Meditation on a <i>parabrahma</i>	73-81	655
166. <i>Parabrahma</i> – <i>dhyāna</i> by <i>Omkāra</i>	82	661
167. Sixth question – identity between <i>jīva</i> and Brahman	83-84	663

168. <i>Ṣoḁasakalahpuruṣah</i> (<i>ātmā</i> having sixteen <i>kalās</i>)	85-92	665
169. <i>Akalahpuruṣah</i> (<i>puruṣa</i> free from <i>kalās</i>)	93-95	671
170. <i>Brahmajñāna</i> is the most exalted <i>puruṣārtha</i>	96	674
171. <i>Ācārya</i> is the father	97	675

Chapter - VIII

Indra-Pratardana-saṃvāda (*Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad*)

172. Summary		679
173. The <i>Anubhūtiprakāśa</i> part begins	1-2	680
174. The chapter <i>Indra-Pratardana-saṃvāda</i> begins	3	682
175. Good, better, best for humans	4-6	683
176. Analysis of Indra's teaching	7-13	686
177. <i>Ātmā</i> is <i>akartā</i> (non-doer)	14-19	690
178. Distinction between <i>jñānī</i> and <i>ajñānī</i>	20-23	694
179. The reason why <i>jñānī</i> avoids <i>pāpa</i>	24-30	696
180. Teaching of <i>ātmā</i> through <i>prāṇa</i> and <i>prajñā</i>	31-44	700
181. <i>Viveka</i> of <i>prāṇa</i> and <i>prajñā</i>	45-54	711
182. The exaltedness of <i>prāṇa</i>	55-58	716
183. The oneness of <i>prāṇa</i> and <i>prajñā</i>	59-61	718
184. <i>Prāṇa</i> is the cause of <i>jagat</i>	62-66	720
185. <i>Prāṇa</i> is <i>jagatkāraṇa</i> – <i>drṣṭisṛṣṭi-vāda</i>	67-70	724
186. <i>Prajñā</i> is all pervading	71-77	729
187. Special feature of <i>prajñā</i>	78-79	734
188. <i>Jīva-viveka</i>	80-84	735
189. <i>Paramātmā-viveka</i>	85-89	738
190. <i>Karmaphalas</i> cannot bind <i>ātmā</i>	90-93	743
191. <i>Ātmā</i> prompts though indifferent	94-97	745
192. <i>Īśvara</i> is <i>asaṃsārī</i>	98-100	748

Chapter - IX

Bālāki-vidyopadeśa

Kauṣītakīupaniṣad-vivaraṇam (*Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad*)

193. Summary		751
194. The topic of <i>Bālāki-vidyopadeśa</i>	1	754
195. Narration	2-6	754
196. <i>Bālāki</i> is ignorant	7-9	758
197. <i>Ātmā</i> distinct from <i>sūtra</i> (<i>Hiranyagarbha</i>)	10-19	760
198. The abode of <i>bhoktā-jīva</i> during the sleep	20-26	765
199. <i>Jīvalaya</i> during the sleep in <i>paramātmā</i>	27-29	771
200. <i>Laya</i> of <i>indriyas</i> with <i>viśayas</i> in <i>prāṇa</i> (as both <i>upādhi</i> and <i>paramātmā</i>)	30-36	773

201. Creation manifests on waking up	37-39	778
202. The advantage of the mode of creation as described in <i>Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad</i>	40-50	779
203. The order of creation from <i>prāṇopādhika paramātmā</i>	51-52	789
204. Why <i>śṛṣṭi-prakriyās</i> differ?	53-54	791
205. <i>Jīva</i> pervades the body	55-57	793
206. <i>Kartā ahaṃkāra (jīva)</i> is the chief	58-60	795
207. <i>Paramātmā</i> is pointed out	61-62	797
208. Result of <i>Brahmajñāna</i>	63-70	798
209. Conclusion	71-72	803

Chapter - X

Maitrāyaṇyupaniṣad-vivaraṇam (Maitrāyaṇīya-Śākhā)

210. Summary		805
211. Narration	1-6	806
212. <i>Vairāgya</i> of the king	7-23	811
213. Bṛhadratha's eligibility is praised	24-26	820
214. 'Desire' is not desirable to a <i>mumukṣu</i>		822
215. What is wrong with 'desire'? ' <i>Kāmosmi bharatarṣabha</i> ' (B.G.7-11)		822
216. How does <i>viṣayāsakti</i> (desire or extrovertedness) obstruct <i>ātmajñāna</i> ?		824
217. Teaching begins	27	828
218. Ascertainment of ' <i>tvam</i> '	28-30	829
219. The mind gets sorrow-ridden, but not <i>sākṣī</i>	31-41	831
220. <i>Ātmā</i> is mistaken as <i>jīva</i>	42	840
221. <i>Jīva-viveka</i>	43-45	841
222. <i>Jīva</i> in reality is Brahman	46-49	843
223. Misconceptions about <i>ātmānubhava</i> , <i>aparokṣajñāna</i> and <i>samādhi</i>		847
224. Time-bound experience indicates timeless <i>Brahmānanda</i>		852
225. English translation of the word <i>anubhava</i>		854
226. <i>Jīva</i> in reality is Brahman (continued)		860
227. <i>Jñānasādhana</i> (means of gaining <i>Brahmajñāna</i>)	50-56	861
228. The prompter of the body	57-71	867
229. Creation is on account of <i>māyā</i>	72-77	878
230. Entry of <i>kriyā-śakti</i> and <i>jñāna-śakti</i> in the body	78-91	881
231. The real nature of <i>jīvātmā</i>	92-99	889
232. Description of <i>saṃsārī</i>	100-114	893
233. <i>Antaryāmī (ātmā)</i> is not a <i>saṃsārī</i>	115-120	903
234. Bodily defects	121-123	907
235. Ending of <i>saṃsāra</i>	124-127	909
236. Ending of <i>saṃsāra – tapas</i>	128-129	913

237. Ending of <i>saṃsāra</i> – <i>ātmānubhava</i> is necessary		915
238. Ending of <i>saṃsāra</i> – what is <i>yoga</i>		917
239. Ending of <i>saṃsāra</i> – indirect mention of <i>ātmajñāna</i> in <i>yogasūtras</i>		918
240. Ending of <i>saṃsāra</i> – Upaniṣadic portion on <i>yoga</i>		920
241. Ending of <i>saṃsāra</i> – <i>Bhagavān</i> Kṛṣṇa on <i>yoga</i>		921
242. Ending of <i>saṃsāra</i> – the result of <i>yoga</i>	130-134	922
243. Three <i>guṇas</i> are the constituents of <i>ajñāna</i> (<i>māyā</i>)	135-138	927
244. Description of <i>sūtrātmā</i>	139-144	931
245. Conclusion	145-149	935
246. Concluding prayer	150	938

Chapter - XI

Kāthopaniṣad-vivaraṇam (Kāthopaniṣad)

247. Summary		939
248. Introduction	1	941
249. Context	2-4	941
250. <i>Ātmajñāna</i> is difficult to gain	5-6	944
251. Paths of <i>śreya</i> (ultimate good) and <i>preya</i> (immediate pleasure)	7-11	946
252. Obstructions on the path of <i>śreya</i>	12-16	949
253. <i>Guru</i>	17-19	953
254. Disciple	20-22	957
255. <i>Jijñāsā</i> of <i>nirguṇa</i> (<i>nirupādhika</i>) <i>ātmā</i>	23-24	959
256. The actual teaching	25-35	961
257. Introvert mind is indispensable to gain <i>ātmajñāna</i>	36-42	969
258. The imagery of a chariot	43-46	977
259. The inner order of superiority from senses to <i>Viṣṇutattva</i>	47-52	980
260. <i>Ātmā</i> is limitless (<i>asaṃsāri</i>)	53-54	985
261. <i>Yoga</i>	55-60	987
262. The subtlety (<i>saukṣmya</i>) of <i>ātmā</i>	61-64	992
263. Ending of obstructions that stop the birth of <i>ātmavidyā</i>	65-67	994
264. Brahman	68-69	996
265. <i>Mokṣa</i> is gained by <i>ātmajñāna</i>	70-72	998
266. <i>Advaita</i> (non-duality)	73-79	1000
267. <i>Jīvātmā</i>	80-88	1007
268. <i>Ātmā</i> is <i>asaṅga</i>	89	1014
269. <i>Īśvara</i>	90-91	1015
270. Eternal peace and happiness	92	1016
271. <i>Brahmānanda</i> is self-evident (self-experiencing) and not an object	93-94	1017
272. The metaphor of <i>saṃsāra-tree</i>	95-96	1020
273. <i>Paramātmā</i> is the supreme controller	97	1023

274. Human body is designed to gain <i>ātmajñāna</i>	98-101	1024
275. Gradual reflection upon <i>ātmā</i>	102-104	1028
276. Though not an object how and when <i>ātma-svarūpa</i> becomes evident	105-111	1032
277. <i>Granthibheda</i> – destruction of the knots of the heart (<i>antaḥkaraṇa</i>)	112-115	1037
278. <i>Krama-mukti</i> (gradual liberation)	116	1041
279. Conclusion of Upaniṣad	117	1041
280. Conclusion	118-120	1042

Chapter - XII

Śvetāśvatara-vivaraṇam (Śvetāśvataropaniṣad)

281. Summary		1045
282. Introduction	1	1046
283. Discussion about Brahman	2-14	1048
284. <i>Māyādarśana</i>	15-20	1057
285. Wheel of <i>saṃsāra</i> and river of <i>saṃsāra</i>	21-22	1061
286. Both <i>jīva</i> and <i>Īśvara</i> are Brahman in reality	23-27	1062
287. Means to end <i>Bhrama</i> (delusion)	28-29	1066
288. <i>Pāśa-hāniḥ</i> (fetters are destroyed)	30-33	1068
289. The means to gain <i>Brahmajñāna</i>	34-36	1071
290. <i>Yoga</i>	37-47	1074
291. <i>Sopādhi</i> – Brahman (<i>Īśvara</i>)	48-61	1082
292. <i>Ātma-vicāra</i> (self-inquiry)	62	1094
293. <i>Ajā</i> (female goat and the birthless)	63-64	1097
294. <i>Suparṇau</i> (<i>jīva</i> and <i>Īśvara</i> as two birds)	65-66	1099
295. <i>Vītaśokaḥ</i> (gets freed from sorrowful <i>saṃsāra</i>)	67-69	1101
296. Entry of <i>Īśvara</i> in the individual bodies as <i>jīva</i>	70-72	1103
297. Overcoming of obstacles	73-74	1106
298. <i>Īśvara-viveka</i>	75-79	1108
299. <i>Jīveśvara-viveka</i>	80-90	1113
300. <i>Māyā</i> the glory of <i>Īśvara</i>	91-101	1122
301. <i>Advaita</i> (non-dual)	102-103	1130
302. <i>Phala</i> (result of <i>Brahmajñāna</i>)	104-105	1132
303. The means (<i>upāya</i>) to experience <i>ātmasukha</i>	106	1133
304. <i>Vedānta-pramāṇa</i> , <i>ātmānubhava</i> , <i>samādhi</i> , mysticism	107-111	1134
305. Prayer	112-114	1147
306. <i>Mokṣa</i> can be gained only by <i>Brahmajñāna</i>	115-116	1149
307. Conclusion	117-120	1150

Chapter - XIII

Kāṇvavidyāprakāśa (Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad)

308. Summary		1154
309. Introduction		1155
310. <i>Kāṇvavidyā</i> unfolds <i>Brahmavidyā</i>	1	1158
311. The description of <i>Virāṭ</i> and <i>Hiraṇyagarbha</i> , etc. to highlight their worthlessness	2-5	1158
312. The nature of <i>ātmā</i> who appears as <i>Virāṭ</i>	6-9	1162
313. The origin of erroneous 'I' notion	10-15	1169
314. The pursuit of gaining the <i>Virāṭ</i> - status	16-17	1173
315. The diagnosis of <i>saṃsāra</i>	18-19	1174
316. <i>Ātmavicāra</i> conducted by <i>Virāṭ</i>	20-26	1175
317. <i>Brahmajñāna</i> alone can end <i>saṃsāra</i>	27	1183
318. Fear arises from duality	28	1184
319. <i>Virāṭ</i> does not need a <i>guru</i>	29-31	1184
320. <i>Virāṭ</i> creates the gross world	32-47	1187
321. The glory of <i>Virāṭ</i>	48-49	1199
322. The reason why <i>Virāṭ</i> is described in the section of <i>Brahmavidyā</i>	50-61	1200
323. The <i>adhikārī</i> (eligible person) of <i>Brahmajñāna</i>	62-62½	1208
324. The topics to be known by a <i>mumukṣu</i>	63-80	1209
325. <i>Avyākṛta-śruti</i> describes <i>ātmā</i> to be known and <i>ajñāna</i> to be discarded	81-82	1221
326. Word - meanings of <i>avyākṛta-śruti</i>	83-95	1223
327. Meaning of <i>avyākṛta</i> - sentence	96-102	1230
328. <i>Vyākṛta-śruti</i>	103	1235
329. Word-meanings of <i>Vyākṛta-śruti</i>	104-110	1237
330. The entry of <i>jīva</i> (<i>jīva-praveśa</i>)	111-124	1242
331. Two modes of <i>cit</i> abiding in the body	125-131	1251
332. Ascertainment of the entry (of <i>cit</i>)	132-139	1254
333. <i>Ātmā</i> is unknown in spite of entry	140-155	1258
334. <i>Vidyāsūtra</i> (<i>ātmā iti eva upāsīta</i>)	156	1268
335. <i>Vidyāsūtra</i> - the word <i>ātmā</i> explained	157-181	1269
336. <i>Vidyāsūtra</i> - <i>ātmā</i> is pure (<i>nirupādḥika</i>)	182-199	1288
337. <i>Vidyāsūtra</i> - <i>ātmā</i> is <i>priyatamaḥ</i> (most dear)	200-209	1298
338. <i>Vidyāsūtra</i> - <i>ātmabodhaḥ</i> (self-knowledge)	210-218	1305
339. <i>Vidyāsūtra</i> - <i>aham brahma asmi</i> (I am Brahman)	219-225	1312
340. <i>Vidyāsūtra</i> - <i>sarvātma-bhāva</i> (becoming everything)	226-249	1317
341. <i>Avidyāsūtra</i>	250-259	1328
342. <i>Avidyāsūtra</i> - the creation of <i>varṇa</i> , <i>āśrama</i> , <i>deva</i> , <i>dharma</i> (<i>karma</i>)	260-268	1334
343. <i>Avidyāsūtra</i> - 'seek only <i>ātmā</i> '	269-278	1339

344. <i>Avidyāsūtra</i> - <i>jīva</i> is the resort (or servant) of all	279-286	1345
345. <i>Avidyāsūtra</i> - desire	287-295	1349
346. Conclusion	296-302	1355

Chapter - XIV

Ajātaśatruvidyāprakāśa (Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad)

347. Summary		1358
348. Introduction		1359
349. Context	1-6	1360
350. The place of <i>viveka</i>	7-9	1364
351. <i>Anvaya-vyatireka</i>	10-13	1366
352. <i>Vijñānamayabhoktā</i>	14-27	1368
353. Description of <i>ātmā</i>	28-54	1377
354. <i>Sṛṣṭi</i> (Creation)	55-60	1391
355. <i>Satyasyasatyam</i> (the truth of the truth)	61-65	1394
356. <i>Prāṇopāsanā</i> (<i>upāsanā</i> of <i>prāṇa</i>)	66-77	1397
357. Description of <i>mūrta</i> and <i>amūrta</i>	78-89	1404
358. The second explanation of ‘ <i>mūrta</i> and <i>amūrta</i> ’	90-105	1411
359. The third explanation of two forms (<i>mūrta</i> and <i>amūrta</i>) of Brahman	106-107	1420
360. ‘ <i>Neti neti</i> ’ (not this, not this)	108-110	1421
361. Another meaning of ‘ <i>neti neti</i> ’	111-116	1423
362. The conclusion of <i>neti neti ādeśa</i>	117-120	1430

Chapter - XV

Maitreyīvidyāprakāśa (Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad)

363. Summary		1434
364. Sage Yājñavalkya		1435
365. Context	1-8	1436
366. Primary love and secondary love	9-13	1442
367. <i>Ātmā draṣṭavyaḥ</i> (<i>sākṣātkāra</i> of <i>ātmā</i> should be gained)	14-25	1447
368. By <i>ātmajñāna</i> everything becomes known	26-39	1458
369. <i>Jagat</i> is not distinct from <i>ātmā</i> during its <i>sthiti</i>	40-49	1466
370. <i>Jagat</i> is not different from <i>ātmā</i> during its <i>utpatti</i>	50-55	1472
371. In <i>pralaya jagat</i> disappears in non-dual <i>ātmā</i>	56-62	1476
372. <i>Nididhyāsana</i>	63-66	1480
373. <i>Jīvahood</i>	67-75	1482
374. <i>Ātmajñāna</i>	76-81	1487
375. Non-dual <i>ātmā</i>	82-93	1491
376. <i>Vijñānaghana ātmā</i>	94-103	1499

Chapter - XVI***Madhuvidyāprakāśa (Bṛhadārṇyakopaniṣad)***

377. Summary		1506
378. Context of <i>madhu-brāhmaṇa</i>	1	1507
379. The nature of <i>madhu</i>	2-4	1509
380. <i>Liṅgātmā puruṣa</i>	5-6	1512
381. The efficacy of <i>madhuvidyā</i>	7-8	1513
382. The real nature underlying the <i>madhu</i>	9-15	1514
383. <i>Dharma</i>	16	1518
384. <i>Satya</i> and <i>mānuṣa</i>	17	1519
385. <i>Virāṭ-Hiraṇyagarbha</i>	18-19	1520
386. <i>Ātmā</i> is <i>adhipati rājā</i>	20-25	1521
387. <i>Ātmā</i> is the <i>ādhāra</i> (basis) of <i>jagat</i>	26-27	1524
388. Narration	28-34	1525
389. Brahman	35-43	1528
390. The gist of <i>madhukāṇḍa</i> or entire <i>vedānta-śāstra</i>	44-50	1534

Chapter - XVII***Āśvalāyanādīmunibodha (Bṛhadārṇyakopaniṣat)***

391. Summary		1539
392. Context	1	1542
393. <i>Aśvala-praśna</i>	2-12	1544
394. <i>Ārtabhāga-praśna</i>	13-50	1552
395. <i>Bhujyu-praśna</i>	51-70	1577
396. <i>Uṣasta-praśna</i>	71-132	1586
397. <i>Kahola-praśna</i>	133-187	1624
398. First question by Gārgī	188-202	1659
399. <i>Uddālaka-praśna (antaryāmī-brahmaṇa)</i>	203-234	1667
400. <i>Gārgī-praśna</i> (second question by Gārgī)	235-280	1685
401. <i>Śākalya-praśna</i>	281-298	1712
402. Question by Yājñavalkya	299-305	1724
403. The <i>śruti</i> replies	306-310	1730

Chapter - XVIII***Janakavidyāprakāśa (Bṛhadārṇyakopaniṣad)***

404. Summary		1737
405. The context and the content of this chapter	1	1738
406. <i>Ṣaḍācārya brāhmaṇa</i> (first)	2-4	1739
407. <i>Kūrcabrāhmaṇa</i> (second)	5-6	1742
408. <i>Kūrcabrāhmaṇa, Indhavidyā</i>	7-22	1743

409. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> (third)	23-47	1753
410. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> - who among these is <i>ātmā</i> ?	48-50	1769
411. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> - <i>ātmā</i> is <i>viññānamayaḥ</i> , etc.	51-62	1771
412. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> – <i>ātmā</i> is ‘ <i>prāṇeṣu</i> ’	63-64	1779
413. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> – <i>ātmā</i> is ‘ <i>hr̥dī</i> ’	65	1780
414. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> – <i>ātmā</i> is ‘ <i>antaḥ</i> ’	66-67	1781
415. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> – <i>ātmā</i> is ‘ <i>jyotiḥ</i> ’	68-74	1782
416. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> – <i>ātmā</i> is ‘ <i>puruṣaḥ</i> ’	75-77	1786
417. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> – travel of non-dual <i>ātmā</i>	78-79	1787
418. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> – <i>ātmā</i> <i>dhyāyatīva</i> <i>lelāyatīva</i>	80-87	1789
419. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> - birth of <i>puruṣa</i> (<i>ātmā</i>)	88-92	1794
420. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> - two abodes of <i>puruṣa</i> (<i>ātmā</i>)	93-100	1797
421. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> - <i>ātmā</i> as <i>svayamjyoti</i> is proved.	101-121	1802
422. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> - <i>ātmā</i> is <i>asaṅga</i> (unattached)	122-136	1814
423. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> - sleep as an illustration of <i>mokṣa</i>	137-186	1824
424. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> – Yājñavalkya was alarmed	187-188	1856
425. <i>Jyotirbrāhmaṇa</i> – <i>paraloka-gamana</i> (transmigration)	189-204	1857
426. <i>Śārīraka-brāhmaṇa</i> (fourth), <i>lokāntara-gamana</i> (transmigration)	205-242	1866
427. <i>Śārīraka-brāhmaṇa</i> - <i>mukti</i> (liberation)	243-287	1894
428. <i>Śārīraka-brāhmaṇa</i> (fourth) - the main and the secondary means to gain <i>Brahmajñāna</i> .	288-324	1919

Chapter - XIX

*Talavakāra*vidyāprakāśa (*Kenopaniṣad*)

429. Summary		1943
430. Introduction	1-4	1944
431. The question about <i>ātmā</i> /Brahman	5-13	1948
432. The reply (about <i>ātmā</i> /Brahman)	14-24	1953
433. <i>Īśvara</i> is the <i>preraka</i> (stimulator)	25-32	1961
434. <i>Ātmā</i> transcends <i>indriyas</i> , etc.	33-41	1968
435. The mode of teaching	42-46	1974
436. <i>Idam</i> (this) cannot be Brahman	47-54	1979
437. <i>Mīmāṃsa</i> (sacred inquiry)	55-76	1984
438. <i>Ākhyāyikā</i> (narration)	77-87	2000
439. <i>Ādeśa</i> (instructions in the form of illustrations for <i>upāsanā</i>)	88-93	2005
440. <i>Sādhanās</i> (the means)	94-100	2009

Chapter - XX

*Devavidyā*prakāśa (*Nṛsiṃhottara-tāpanīyopaniṣat*)

441. Summary		2014
--------------	--	------

442. Introduction	1-2	2014
443. Section one the question by <i>devas</i>	3-5	2016
444. <i>Prajāpati's</i> reply	6-21	2018
445. <i>Catuṣpātātmā</i> (<i>ātmā</i> having four <i>pādas</i>)	22-44	2030
446. <i>Ādeśa</i> (advice) regarding <i>ātmā</i>	45-54½	2045
447. Section 2		
<i>Ātmasvarūpa</i>	55-62	2055
448. <i>Upāsanās</i> of <i>viśva</i> , etc., through <i>praṇava</i>	63-72	2059
449. <i>Turīya-dhyāna</i> on <i>nāda</i>	73-82	2067
450. Section 3	83-101	2072
451. Meditation of <i>upasaṃhāra</i>	102-102½	2081
452. Section 4	103-110	2082
453. Section 5	111-118	2087
454. Section 6		2091
455. <i>Sādhānopadeśa</i> (<i>sādhanas</i> advised)	119-128	2091
456. Section 7	129-142	2097
457. Section 8	143-144	2104
458. Section 9 - Conclusion	145-154	2105
459. The conclusion of this chapter	155-156	2109
Topic Index compiled		2113
Bibliography		2128
Verse Index		2131
Word Index		2169



ANUBHŪTIPRAKĀŚĀ
CHAPTER - I
AITAREYOPANIṢADVIVARAṆAM
(AITAREYOPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[*Aitareyopaniṣad* teaches the *mahāvākya* ‘*prajñānam Brahma*’ from Ṛgveda. The chapter *Aitareyopaniṣadvivaraṇam* carries this out very effectively. It first ascertains *ātmā* by the method of *adhyāropa* (superimposition of Creation) and its *apavāda* (refutation). This topic is followed by elaborating on the necessity of intense *vairagya* and discusses it in detail. In the absence of it, the whole process is reduced to an academic study of Vedānta which can earn livelihood but not liberation (*mokṣa*). This is followed by the sacred inquiry (*mīmāṃsā*) of Brahman. It considers the different aspects of *caitanya* with *upādhis* at two levels - the external, perceptions and actions and the internal, knower and known. The common denominator in all of them is the *caitanya* which is free from all *upādhis* including their features and is called ‘*prajñānam*’. It is *ātmā*. The same is Brahman. This establishes the *mahāvākya* from Ṛgveda, ‘*prajñānam Brahma*’. The person who knows Brahman directly and gets firmly rooted in the same becomes *jīvanmukta*. For him, there will be no more transmigration. He is liberated.]

INTRODUCTION TO ANUBHŪTIPRAKĀŚĀ

To live always happily without the death and even the least trace of sorrow is an inborn universal instinct common to all living beings. This is exhibited by their pursuits to live long by avoiding death and always seeking happiness to the total exclusion of sorrows. But a mature person, however, realizes on closer scrutiny that there is neither permanent joy (*sukhaprāpti*) nor a total freedom from sorrow (*duḥkha-nivṛtti*) through the known methods of *sādhana-sādhyā* - achievement through action. The Damoclean sword of death hangs over all having no escape from it. And yet, the instinct to live forever with all happiness totally free from sorrows

cannot be given up. Here is a situation where human intellect fails to provide a sure solution. The only alternative left out is to turn to the Vedas and find out if they have any remedial measure to provide. Yes, the Vedas have an infallible remedy called *ātmajñāna-Brahmajñāna* (the knowledge of our true nature and the ultimate reality). The subject matter of its Upaniṣads or called Vedānta is to solve this specific human problem alone. Its validity has been verified by the galaxies of great masters from time immemorial.

The Vedas reveal the knowledge which is not directly accessible to the human intellect, (i.e. *apauruṣeya*) because of the limitations of sense-organs and the intellect itself. It is said:

प्रत्यक्षेणानुमित्या वा यस्तूपायो न बुध्यते ।
एनं विदन्ति वेदेन तस्माद् वेदस्य वेदता ॥

‘The means that is not known by direct sense-perception or inference, is known through the Vedas. Therefore the Vedas have the status of being the body of highest knowledge’.

The Vedas are universal. They do not belong to the followers of *Sanātana Dharma* (called Hindus) alone. In the entire cosmos, it is the only body of knowledge that enables to know all that is beyond the range of human intellect on its own. Whether the followers of other religions in the world accept it or not, the Vedas form the basis directly or indirectly, of all religions just as the mother earth is to all palaces, mansions, buildings, houses and huts.

The Vedas describe varieties of subjects both verifiable and non-verifiable. Some of them are: rituals, sacrifices, and meditations giving results here and hereafter, heavens, hell, rebirth (reincarnation), laws of *karma*, mode of death and transmigration, astronomy, *ātmajñāna-Brahmajñāna*. Things such as sacrifices that bear results here, prediction of eclipses with precise time without scientific gadgets, *ātmajñāna-Brahmajñāna*, etc., can be verified by us. That provides an enough proof to infer that the other things told in the Vedas must be true. But those who deny the Vedas have no basis whatsoever to do so except to rely on their prejudiced notions.

The portions of the Vedas called the Upaniṣads or Vedānta are the means of knowing the true nature of ‘I’ (*ātmā*) which is identical with Brahman the basis of entire Creation. Vedānta means the finale (*anta*, doctrine) of the Vedas. It reveals the final purport of Vedas. The word Upaniṣad means the ascertainment of the most

proximate entity, 'I' (*ātmā*) which destroys our sorrowful existence called *saṃsāra* and reveals our identity with Brahman. The direct knowledge of true 'I' (*ātmā*/Brahman) itself is liberation (*mokṣa*).

The beginningless *avidyā* (self-ignorance) of one's true nature ('I') is the root cause of all the sorrows of *saṃsāra*. Its termination therefore duly results in the total cessation of all sorrows. Considering this fact the liberation (*mokṣa*) is defined as follows:

- a) *Ātmā* itself known directly without any trace of self-ignorance (*avidyā*) (*Vedāntakalpalatikā* - Śrī Madhusūdana Sarasvatī);
- b) *Swātmani avasthānam* - abidance in one's true nature (*Taittirīya, Kena Bh.*);
- c) *Brahmabhāvaḥ mokṣaḥ* - *Brahmasvarūpa* is *mokṣa* (*Br. U. Bh. 1-1-4*);
- d) *Brahma eva muktyavasthā* - Brahman itself is the state of *mukti* (*Br. Sū. Bh. 3-4-52*);
- e) *Mokṣa* is the state of perfect absorption (*sthānam*) in the true nature of *ātmā* (*Br. U. Saṃbandha-vārtika-109*).

Here a *mumukṣu* should know for certain that *ātmā* (true 'I') is self-existent (*svataḥ siddha*) and self-evident (*svayamprakāśa*). It does not require any means to manifest itself. But the ignorant person is unaware of his true nature. He is in need of means that can reveal *ātmā* by eliminating all obstructions that deny *ātmajñāna*. Erroneous notion about 'I' have to be discarded. To proceed further some understanding of the true nature of *ātmā* (Brahman) has to be obtained. The means to prepare the mind to gain the knowledge need to be adopted. What exactly is the nature of *ātmajñāna*/ *Brahmajñāna* and the modus operandi to gain it has to be described. These and other necessary details are found in the Upaniṣads. Therefore an inquiry into them becomes inevitable. But for common people, the Upaniṣads are hard nuts to crack. For this purpose *Bhāṣyas* (commentaries) will have to be studied. This also is possible only for scholarly persons. Envisaging these difficulties the great Vedāntic masters in the past have written subjectwise or topicwise treatises called *prakaraṇa-granthas*. Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni is one of the foremost among them. His texts *Pañcadaśī* and this *Anubhūtiprakāśa* are masterpieces in this respect. He is well-known for his simple presentation with thorough clarity.

Though this entire text having twenty chapters is popularly known as *Anubhūtiprakāśa*, according to the evidence found in Chapter eight (verse 1,2) the

first seven chapters are called ‘*Caturvedavidyāprakāśa*’ whereas the remaining ones are named *Anubhūtiprakāśa*. Thus we find two sections in this text. *Caturvedavidyāprakāśa* deals with *Aitareya* from Ṛgveda, *Taittirīya* from Yajurveda, *Chāndogya* from Sāmaveda and *Muṇḍaka* and *Praśna* from Atharvaveda. These five Upaniṣads are explained in seven chapters. In the *Taittirīya* and *Chāndogya* explanation the focus is on the *ātmajñāna* topic keeping aside the *upāsanā* contents therein. Thus *Chāndogya* deals with *Śvetaketuvidyā*, *Sanatkumāravidyā* and *Prajāpatividyā* only disregarding all *upāsanās* found in the first five chapters of the Upaniṣad. The second Section called *Anubhūtiprakāśa* contains *Kauṣītakī* from Ṛgveda, *Maitrāyaṇī*, *Kaṭha*, *Śvetāśvatara* and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* from Yajurveda, *Kena* from Sāmaveda and *Nṛsimhottaratāpanīya* from Atharvaveda. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* is explained in six chapters. The author has condensed Sureśvarācārya's *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika* in *Vārtikasāra*. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* explanation in *Anubhūtiprakāśa* is totally based on *Vārtikasāra*. The entire *Anubhūtiprakāśa* is totally true to the original Upaniṣads. It is simple and capable of clearly imparting the teaching of Vedānta. Those *mumukṣus* incapable of studying Upaniṣads directly, can finally discover their true nature by *śravaṇa*, *manana*, etc., of this text. The eligible seekers having acquainted themselves with the Upaniṣads with the help of this text can take to *bhāṣya*, etc. Those who have already studied the Upaniṣads will find this text highly rewarding in terms of revision. Thus this text is very useful to all *mumukṣus*. Another feature of this book is that each of its chapter is a complete treatise in itself.

STATEMENT OF CONTENTS

The content of this chapter is narrated with its purpose.

ऐतरेयेण सम्प्रोक्ता द्वितीयारण्यकान्तगा ।
ब्रह्मविद्या सुविस्पष्टं बालबोधाय तन्यते ॥१॥

द्वितीयारण्यकान्तगा - situated at the end of second *Aitareyāranyaka* ऐतरेयेण - by the sage *Aitareya* सम्प्रोक्ता - thoroughly taught ब्रह्मविद्या - *Brahmavidyā* बालबोधाय - to teach the common ignorant people

सुविस्पष्टं - with utmost clarity तन्यते - is elaborated—(1)

1. The *Brahmavidyā* thoroughly taught by the sage *Aitareya* which is situated at the end of second *Aitareyāranyaka* is elaborated with utmost clarity to teach the common ignorant people.

The *Aitareyopaniṣad* belonging to the Ṛgveda forms fourth to sixth chapters of second *Aitareyāranyaka*.

The seventh chapter contains only the *Śānti-mantra* (peace-invocation) which is a part of the Upaniṣad. The Upaniṣad is available in six sections (*khaṇḍas*) called ‘*ātmaṣatka*’. The earlier three chapters of the *āranyaka* mostly deal with *upāsanās*. *Brahmavidyā* is taught to those who have developed pure and

steady mind by taking to *karma* and *upāsanās*. *Āraṇyaka* means that which is either composed or studied in the forest (*araṇya*). Those who have retired or withdrawn from the hectic lifestyle and thereby made themselves totally available for this study can truly derive its benefits.

Ātmā is attributeless. It is without the sound, touch, form, smell or taste (*aśabdā, asparśam, arūpam, agandham, arasam*; *Kṛ.U.1-3-15*). Such an entity is neither available to know by direct perception through the sense-organs nor by other means of knowledge such as inference, presumption which are dependant on perception. The mind and intellect also cannot know it as an object since it is beyond the realm of anything that can be known as ‘this’ (*drśya*) by the knower (*pramātā*). And yet it is in and through the entire Creation (*sr̥ṣṭi*). It is the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of all experiences and knowledge, and without which nothing can exist. In its presence galaxies of Creations emerge and disappear. It is just like the rope appearing as a snake when not known as a rope itself. In the state of ignorance of the rope, the snake gets superimposed (*adhyāropa*) on it, but it is refuted (*apavāda*) on knowing the rope. You bring the light and see the rope and the so called snake disappears on its own. So on gaining *ātmajñāna*, the hitherto vividly experienced Creation disappears. This method of ascertaining the true nature of *ātmā* is called *adhyāropa-apavāda* way. It is employed here in this Upaniṣad having the *mahāvākya*, ‘*prajñānam Brahma*’. Based on the above, this *vivaraṇam* (exposition) of *Aitareyopaniṣad* can be considered in four topics: i) *Adhyāropa* (Superimposition, Verse 2 to 18); ii) *Apavāda* (Refutation, Verse 18 to 42); iii) *Vairāgya* (Dispassion, Verse 43 to 57 and a demonstration of *virakta* Vāmadeva getting liberated - Verse 58 to 69); iv) *Brahmamīmāṃsā*, the actual inquiry into the nature of *ātmā*, Brahman. *Vairāgya* is specifically highlighted because without a *virakta* (dispassionate) mind none can ever hope to gain *ātmajñāna-Brahmajñāna*.

ĀTMĀ IS THE BASIS OF SRṢṬI (CREATION) - ADHYĀROPA

The next verse describes *ātmā* in its true nature as the basis of Creation.

आत्मैव सृष्टेः प्रागासीन्नाम-

रूपविवर्जितः ।

सोऽप्येक एव नान्योऽस्ति

जडं चान्यन्न विद्यते ॥२॥

सृष्टेः - of Creation प्राक् - before
नामरूपविवर्जितः - without the manifest
names and forms आत्मा - *ātmā* एव - alone
आसीत् - was there सः - that अपि - also एकः
- single एव - only अस्ति - is अन्यः (सचेतनः) -
another (sentient entity) न (अस्ति) - (is)
not there अन्यत् - different from it च - and
जडं - inert entity न विद्यते - is not there—(2)

2. Before the Creation *ātmā* without the manifest names and forms alone was there. That (*ātmā*) also is single only. Any sentient or inert entity different from it is not there.

Ātmā word is derived from the verbal root ‘*āp*’ in the sense of the entity that is all pervasive, that which *ādatte* meaning, ‘that which withdraws unto itself the *jagat* at the time of the dissolution of Creation’ since an effect on destruction merges in its material cause (*upādāna kāraṇa*), or that which *atti* (undergoes the *bhoga* of joys and sorrows) as a *jīva*, and that which is *santata* (continuous) as the ever-existent basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) in and through

everything (*Liṅgapurāṇa*, 70-96). This entire *jagat* or *samsāra* which appears variegated because of varied differences effected by different names, forms and *karmas* before it came into existence was nothing but *ātmā* that is the most exalted (*sarva-sreṣṭha*) one, omniscient (*sarvajña*), omnipotent (*sarvaśaktimān*), free from all attributes of *samsāra* such as hunger, thirst, etc., ever-existent pure knowledge principle that is ever liberated, free from birth, old age and death, immortal, non-dual without the second in nature.

The *eva* (alone) in the first line of the verse is for certitude which negates the presence of manifest names and forms. It is elaborated by the phrase *nāmarūpavivarjitaḥ* (without the manifest names and forms). It denies the *vijātiya-bheda* (differences cast by the species other than *ātmā*) in *ātmā*. The word *ekaḥ* in the second line specifies *ātmā* as having no *sajātiya-bheda* (differences due to other members of the same species). There are no varieties of *ātmā*. The word *eva* (only) in the second line of the verse shows that *ātmā* is without any differences in itself (*svagata-bheda*) like roots, trunk, branches, leaves, etc., in a tree. There are no parts or limbs in *ātmā*.

For a person who is ignorant of the rope wherein he is seeing a snake, it is impossible to understand that there is

no snake but only a rope. As a first step to make him discover the truth, it is essential to tell that before he could see the snake there was only the rope and he can verify it in the light that the snake that he saw is not there in three periods of time. Similarly for a *samsārī* experiencing joys and sorrows every moment it is impossible to comprehend that there is only one *ātmā* and nothing called *jagat* or *samsāra*. Therefore it becomes inevitable for the *śruti* to tell that before this *jagat* came into appearance, only *ātmā* and *ātmā* alone was there. Finally in the light of *ātmajñāna* he should be enabled to directly discover that there is nothing other than *ātmā* at any time.

Here is a doubt. *Ātmā* is changeless (*avikārī*). It can never undergo any modification to become the *jagat*. The *śruti* also says elsewhere that it is the *māyā* that makes *ātmā* appear as *jagat*. In that case, there must be an entity called *māyā* also that exists before Creation. Then how can the *Aitareya śruti* (1-1, vs.2) say that before Creation there was nothing else either sentient or inert? The next verse answers it by reducing *māyā* to its true nature of falsity.

मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम् ।
इति श्रुत्यन्तरे प्रोक्ता माया नास्त्यत्र तत्त्वतः ॥३॥

मायां - *māyā* तु - itself प्रकृतिं -

nature, innate disposition (of *Īśvara*)
विद्यात् - understand मायिनं - the wielder of
māyā तु - whereas महेश्वरम् - the overlord
(*Īśvara*) of the entire Creation इति - so
श्रुत्यन्तरे - in another *śruti*-statement प्रोक्ता -
the one that is told माया - *māyā* अत्र - here
(in *ātmā*) तत्त्वतः - in reality न अस्ति - is not
there—(3)

3. Understand that *māyā* itself is the nature (or innate disposition) of *Īśvara* whereas the overlord (*Īśvara*) of the entire Creation is the wielder of *māyā*. So the *māyā* that is told in another *śruti*-statement (*Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*, 4-10), is not there in reality in *ātmā*.

The *prakṛti* mentioned in the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* (4-10) is called *māyā* in Vedānta. It is not an independent entity. *Māyā* is the Creative power of *Īśvara* (Brahman) dependant on him for its existence and sentience. This *māyā* is not the so called *prakṛti* of *Sāṅkhya* school of thought or *paramāṇu*, etc., of *Vaiśeṣikas* independent of *ātmā*. Power (*śakti*) and the one endowed with the power (*śaktimān*) are not two different entities. So *māyā* does not differ from *ātmā*/Brahman to cast any duality. It is *mithyā* - truly not there but appears to be there. *Māyā* being *mithyā*, its projection the Creation is equally *mithyā*. Therefore there is no duality in Brahman on account of Creation.

There is another reading of ‘*nānyatra*’ (*na anyatra*) in place of ‘*nāstyatra*’ (*na asti atra*). Then it means that *māyā* does not exist elsewhere independent of *ātmā*.

How can the *māyā* that does not exist in reality be the cause of the *jagat*? We find in the world that an existent entity alone can be the cause of something. Non-existent entity is not available for any dealing like a horn of a rabbit. This doubt is answered now.

निस्तत्त्वं व्यवहारार्हम्

अनृतं बालयक्षवत् ।

बालो यक्षं प्रकल्प्यास्माद्

बिभेति व्याघ्रतो यथा ॥४॥

अनृतं - that which is *mithyā* (false)
निस्तत्त्वम् (अपि) - even though it is without
any reality व्यवहारार्हम् (भवति) - can be fit to
deal with बालयक्षवत् - like the ghost
imagined by a child बालः - a child यक्षं -
ghost प्रकल्प्य - having imagined अस्मात् -
from that बिभेति - gets frightened यथा -
just as व्याघ्रतः - from a tiger – (4)

4. A *mithyā* (false) entity even though without reality can be a source of fear like the ghost imagined by a child. A child having imagined a ghost gets frightened from it just as from a tiger.

‘*Asat*’ is that which is not experienced as ‘is’ (exists) and which can be justified as ‘is not’ (exists not) by

reasoning and *pramāṇa* like the horn of a rabbit. ‘*Sat*’ is that which is always experienced as ‘is’ like Brahman (the ever-existent principle of pure awareness). *Mithyā* (*anṛta*) is that whose existence cannot be justified by reasoning or *pramāṇa*, on the contrary its non-existence can be proved and yet which is experienced like an erroneously perceived snake. Such a snake cannot be real only because it can induce fear, trembling, etc. Neither ‘*sat*’ (real) entity depends on the transactional dealing (*vyavahāra*) for its existence nor a *vyavahāra* can establish the reality of anything. There is no rule that ‘*sat*’ must be available for *vyavahāra* and an entity available for *vyavahāra* must necessarily be ‘*sat*’ (real). Therefore it is quite appropriate that *māyā* is *mithyā* (not real) in spite of being the cause of *jagat*. It is well-known that children get frightened by the ghost imagined by themselves.

Based on the above fact it is deduced now that *māyā* can project the *jagat* in spite of its not being there truly.

निस्तत्त्वापि जगद्भ्रान्तिं माया निद्रैव कल्पयेत् ।
वस्तुतत्त्वं जडं किञ्चिन्नान्यदस्त्यात्मवस्तुनः ॥५॥

माया - *māyā* निस्तत्त्वा अपि - even though it is without any reality निद्रा इव - like the dream जगद्भ्रान्तिं - the delusion of *jagat* कल्पयेत् - projects, imagines आत्मवस्तुनः - other than the principle of

ātmā अन्यत् - another entity किञ्चित् - a little जडं - inert वस्तुतत्त्वं - entity न अस्ति - is not there – (5)

5. Even though the *māyā* is without any reality it projects the delusion of *jagat* like the dream. There is no other inert entity, even a little other than the principle of *ātmā*.

When a sleeping person becomes half awake (*ardha vikasita*) his mind projects the dream based on some waking state *saṃskāras* (impressions). The dream is experiential. It is full of joys and sorrows like the waking state. Yet it has no reality. So is the *jagat*, a delusion, because it is the product of *mithyā māyā*. Thus absence of reality of *māyā* is not a barrier for it in projecting a false *jagat*.

The *śruti* (vs.2, *Ai.U.*1-1) had told that before the Creation only *ātmā* was there, and nothing else. It implies the existence of only real *ātmā*. There is no need of separately telling that *māyā* which has no actual existence was not there. Such a statement becomes superfluous because real entity alone is counted and not the false one. Now, before Creation the empirically available entities were not at all there is further confirmed for the sake of clarity in the second line of this verse. Anything other than *ātmā* has to be *anātmā*, inert in nature. Such inert things were not there

even to the least extent.

To describe the state prior to Creation, the deep sleep state is the most appropriate illustration. The author provides the same.

अद्वयानन्दरूपात्मा तदा सुप्ताविव स्थितः ।
निर्विकारोप्यसावात्मा मायावृत्त्या व्यचारयत् ॥६॥

तदा - before the Creation अद्वयानन्दरूपात्मा - *ātmā* that is non-dual and happiness in nature स्थितः - was there सुप्तौ इव - just as in the state of sleep असौ - that आत्मा - *ātmā* निर्विकारः अपि - even though unchangeable मायावृत्त्या - by the function or modification (*vikāra*) of *māyā* व्यचारयत् - considered (to begin the Creation) – (6)

6. Before the Creation, *ātmā* that is non-dual and happiness in nature was there just as in the state of sleep. That *ātmā* even though unchangeable (*nirvikāri*) in nature considered to begin the Creation by the function or the modification of *māyā*.

In the state of sleep *ātmā* (pure awareness principle) is invariably there without the presence of any of the created *anātmā* entities found in the waking and the dream. This can be verified from the universal recollection: ‘I slept well, there was nothing from Creation in the sleep’. No one can say that any concrete *ḍṛśya* (*anātmā*) was

there in sleep. And yet, dream and the waking do emerge from the sleep. Therefore it will not be wrong to say that there must be some cause in the sleep because of which both of them get projected. Similarly before Creation even though *ātmā* alone was there without any manifest name and form, it is obvious that there was some cause of Creation. Such a cause is called *māyā*. It is there before Creation truly being not there. The state of sleep gives some idea about the state of *ātmā* or Brahman before Creation. Though both the states are without manifest names and forms the nature of happiness does persist in them. (According to another reading the order of the lines in verses 5 and 6 differs.)

Ātmā is changeless (*nirvikārī*) in nature. Therefore the question arises as to how can such an entity consider or think of beginning the Creation? Because even thinking is itself a change which is impossible for a changeless entity. The answer is given by the phrase '*māyāvṛtṭyā*' (by the function of *māyā*). The instrumental case in this phrase has to be taken as the nominative case meaning 'in the form of function or modification of *māyā* that is *mithyā*'. There is no separate entity employed therein. *Ātmā* does not undergo any change in terms of thinking. Now onwards starts the ascertainment of the

true nature of *ātmā* briefly mentioned in the verse 2. As already told the method adopted is *adhyāropa-apavāda*. The superimposition (*adhyāropa*) has already begun with the *vicāra* (consideration) of *ātmā*.

ADHYĀROPA - CREATION OF LOKAS, ETC.

How did *ātmā* Create the *jagat* with *māyā* as the means is being elaborated.

स विचार्याखिलान् लोकान् सृष्ट्वा पालकसृष्टये ।
कृत्वा विराट् तनुं छिद्रेष्वथ तद्देवता व्यधात् ॥७॥

सः - that (*ātmā*) विचार्य - having considered (to create the *jagat*) अखिलान् - all लोकान् - *lokas* (fields of experiences) सृष्ट्वा - having created पालकसृष्टये - to create the guardians of Creation विराट् तनुं - the body of *Virāt* deity कृत्वा - having made अथ - thereafter छिद्रेषु - in its openings (such as mouth, eyes, ears, etc.) तद्देवताः - their presiding deities व्यधात् - placed - (7)

7. After such consideration (to create the *jagat*) *ātmā* created all *lokas* (fields of experiences). Further (*ātmā*) made the body of *Virāt* deity to create the guardians of Creation and thereafter in its openings (such as mouth, eyes, ears, etc.) placed their presiding deities.

Many opine that the *jagat* is made of inert matter. They even argue

that the scriptures also have stated so. This is not true. This notion has been refuted in ‘*prakṛtyadhikaraṇa* and *sarvavyākhyānādhikaraṇa*’ of *Brahmasūtras* (1-4-23 to 28). Upaniṣads are very clear in declaring that sentient Brahman (*Paramātmā*) only has created the *jagat* after due deliberation. Though the true nature of Brahman is *nirvikārī* (changeless) it is capable of showing false *vikāra* (change) out of itself without any intrinsic change in it. Such a mode of Creation is called *vivarta* (a seeming change in *Paramātmā* without being intrinsically so) in Vedānta. This is in contrast to the erroneous concept that *Paramātmā* underwent modification in itself to become the *jagat*. Brahman endowed with *māyā* is the *upādāna* (material cause) of the *jagat*. Therefore *jagat* is *vivarta* of Brahman which is also *nimitta* (efficient) cause of the *jagat*. Here in this Upaniṣad it is only said: ‘*sa īkṣata, lokān nu sṛjai*’ (*Ātmā* observed, let me Create *lokas*) (*A.U.*1-1). But in *Taittirīyopaniṣad* it is described: *saḥ akāmayata bahu syām prajāyeya*. (*Ātmā* [from whom space, etc., were born] desired, ‘let me become many. I myself on my own will be born [shall manifest in terms of names and forms]’ [*Tai.U.*2-6].) As a rule, the different features of a single topic described at different places in the Vedas have to be culled together to make the topic complete. This is called ‘*guṇopasaṃhāra*’ (collecting the

features together). It is ascertained so in *Brahmasūtras* (3-3). By this method the final ascertainment of the Vedas can be known. The Creation of five elements not mentioned in this Upaniṣad has to be considered from other Upaniṣads where it is described.

Aitareyopaniṣad describes the *lokas* in four categories:

- i) All heavens up to *Satya loka* the highest one as ‘*ambha*’;
- ii) *Antarikṣa* the intervening space between earth and the heaven is called ‘*marīci*’;
- iii) *Bhūloka* (earth) where death is prominent is referred to as ‘*marah*’;
- iv) All *lokas* below the earth are called as ‘*āpaḥ*’.

Inert entities need to be protected by someone who is sentient. In order to protect all *lokas* their guardians or presiding deities are created. First the *Virāṭ*, the deity of macrocosmic gross embodiments, was created. In its openings in the form of sense-centres (*indriya golaka*), the faculties of those senses (*indriyas*) and their presiding deities were made to manifest. Thus we get the order of their creation as sense-centres (*indriya golakas*), senses (*indriyas*) and their presiding deities. They are: a) the opening of mouth, the organ of speech, the deity *Agni*; b) nose,

sense of smell, the deity *Vāyu*; c) eye, sense of sight, the deity *Āditya*; d) ear, sense of hearing, the deity *Dik*; e) skin, sense of touch, the deity *Oṣadhi-Vanaspati*; f) heart, the mind, the deity Moon; g) naval, *apāna* (faculty of excretion), the deity *Mṛtyu*; h) genital, the organ of generation (*upastha*), the deity *Prajāpati*, etc. The deities enumerated are themselves the guardians (*lokapālas*) of the *jagat*. The *chidras* (openings) mentioned here refer to the *indriya-golakas* (sense-centres).

The manifestation of presiding deities in the senses is enabling them to take to their respective functions.

With the creation of *lokas*, *lokapālas* or presiding deities including *Virāṭ*, the first Section (*khaṇḍa*) of this Upaniṣad is over. The second section describes the creation of hunger, thirst, small embodiments necessary for the deities to undergo the *bhoga*, entry of deities in the individual embodiments and the provision for hunger and thirst to gratify themselves.

Before proceeding further, it is desirable to ascertain the purpose of the Upaniṣads in describing the theories of Creation though the *Śrṣṭi* (Creation) is *mithyā* besides these theories vary from one another. Actually the *śruti* is not at all interested in giving the theories of Creation and yet, they are presented as the means of Vedāntic *prakriyās* (modes of teaching) or *Vādas* (doctrines employed in the teaching). While they serve as means to produce *ātmajñāna-Brahmajñāna*, all of them have inherent limitations. This is not because of any incapacity in the Vedas or shortcomings in Vedāntic masters in the state of *jīvanmukti*, but because of the non-dual nature of Brahman which is inaccessible to the mind and words. What is to be attained is Brahman totally free from *jagat*, whereas what is at our disposal is the empirical *jagat* which has no access to Brahman.

This is a stumbling block that is overcome by *jīvanmuktas*, who at times, stay absorbed in Brahman free from Creation and at other times remain aware of the world and interact with it. Seers (*drṣṭārah*) in the Vedas have devised different modes/doctrines of teaching to guide *ajñānīs* (ignorant *mumukṣus*) and lead them to the attainment of Brahman.

In view of the contrast between the nature of Brahman, which is totally free from *jagat* and the *adhyātmika śāstras* (scriptures) which are in the realm of *jagat*, *prakriyās* have to be viewed in their right perspective. What needs to be examined is their capacity to produce *Brahmasākṣātkāra*, without in any way dwelling on their inherent limitations.

The renowned Gauḍapādācārya in his famous *Māṇḍūkya Kārikās* specifies very clearly the purpose of *śruti* in elaborating the Creation. He says: *Saḥ* (the mode of Creation) *upāyaḥ* (is a means) (*Brahmātmāikyabuddheḥ* – of the knowledge of identity between Brahman and *jīvātmā*) *avatārāya* (for the sake of revealing) (*Mā.U.Kā.3-15*).

In ascertaining the genuineness of Vedāntic *prakriyās*, *mumukṣus* should be guided by the following dictum from the Vārtikakāra Sureśvarācārya. He says: ‘There is no definite rule regarding the form of a *prakriyā* (on the theory of Creation). A *prakriyā* is governed mainly by its capacity to produce *ātmajñāna*. (That is why) it is observed that different (Creation) *prakriyās* are at variance with one another (*Br.U.Vā.1-4-401*)’. ‘By whatsoever *prakriyā* *ātmajñāna* is produced in *mumukṣus*, that *prakriyā* alone is fruitful according to the *śruti*. But the same *prakriyā* is inherently defective in nature (although its utility depends on the different intellectual textures of *mumukṣu* to whom it is taught)’ (*Br.U.Vā.1-4-402*).

The author now proceeds to describe the plight of the deities so far created who are abiding in the *Virāṭ* body.

समुद्रतुल्ये देहेस्मिन्देवताः पतितास्तथा ।
तं देहं क्षुत्पिपासाभ्यां योजयामास स प्रभुः ॥८॥

तथा - so also अस्मिन् - in this समुद्रतुल्ये देहे - in the (*Virāṭ*) body very vast like the ocean देवताः - deities पतिताः - fell सः - that प्रभुः - overlord the Creator (*Parameśvara*) तं - that देहं - *Virāṭ* body क्षुत्पिपासाभ्यां - by hunger and thirst योजयामास - united with, subjected to – (8)

8. So also those deities fell in this *Virāṭ* body very vast like the ocean. That overlord the Creator (*Parameśvara*), subjected that *Virāṭ* body to hunger and thirst.

Here the *Virāṭ* body means the gross *samsāra* which is very vast like the ocean. While commenting on this phrase *Bhāṣyakāra* gives a vivid description of this ocean of *samsāra*. The sorrow born from *avidyā* (self-ignorance), desire, *karma* is the water in it. Severe diseases, old age and death are the big crocodiles. The meagre joys derived from the sense-objects is the temporary resort in this endless ocean, though there is no permanent and befitting resort. The calamitous waves in this ocean are the calamities produced by the storm of insatiable thirst for sense-objects. The roaring sound of this ocean is the crying and screaming born of intense sorrows. The boat to cross over the ocean of *samsāra* is *ātmajñāna-Brahmajñāna*. The provisions for the journey on the

path of gaining self-knowledge are: *satya* (truthfulness), straightforwardness, charity, compassion, *ahiṃsā* (non-injury), *śama*, *dama*, etc. the fourfold qualifications (*sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti*), perseverance, etc. This boat is rowed through the route of *satsaṅga* (company of the good) and *sarvatyāga* (total renunciation). *Mokṣa* (liberation) is its other shore. In such an ocean like *Virāṭ* embodiment, these deities fell. Here the falling means love (*āśakti*) for *saṃsāra* through the 'I' notion in the body caused by self-ignorance. Even the mighty and powerful deities who have attained their statuses by the rigorous *karma* and *upāsana*s are no exceptions to this unless they gain *ātmajñāna*. There is no other path to gain *mokṣa* than *ātmajñāna* (*Sv.U.3-8; 6-15*).

When the cause, the *Virāṭ* was subjected to hunger and thirst, its effect the deities also got endowed with that pair. The hunger and thirst represent all desires entertained by all beings. The wheel of *saṃsāra* gets propelled by these desires referred to as hunger and thirst only. These desires result in *bhoga* the enjoyment and suffering. For any *bhoga* (the experience of enjoyment or suffering), the *bhogyā* (the things to be experienced) must be distinct from *bhoktā*, the experiencer. The *bhoktā* the experiencer subject, and *bhogyā* the

experienced object cannot be one and the same. One and the same entity cannot be both *bhoktā* and *bhogyā*. The deities abiding in the macrocosmic *Virāṭ* body faced this problem. Though they were suffering from the pangs of hunger and thirst, they could not have the *bhoga* because the *Virāṭ* body was one composite macrocosmically whole entity without anything else as *bhogyā* befitting to its dimension. The microcosmic bodies with distinct *bhogyā* entities were needed. Therefore the deities that fell in the *Virāṭ* body prayed to the Creator (*Parameśvara*) to create microcosmic bodies so that they can enter them and have *bhoga*. Accordingly, the Creator created the microcosmic bodies and asked them to enter in their corresponding sense-centres (*indriya golakas*) (*Ai.U.2*). The next three verses summarize this aspect of Creation.

अन्नभोगायात्मदेहान् गवाश्वपुरुषादिकान् ।
सृष्ट्वा प्रावेशयत् तत्र देवतास्ता यथायथम् ॥९॥

अन्नभोगाय - to consume the food
गवाश्वपुरुषादिकान् - cow, horse, human, etc.
आत्मदेहान् - individual bodies सृष्ट्वा -
having created तत्र - in those individual
bodies ताः - those देवताः - deities यथायथम् -
respectively, in proper order प्रावेशयत् -
made to enter, ushered in – (9)

9. (The Creator) having created

the individual bodies such as cow, horse, human, etc., to consume the food, made those deities enter the individual bodies respectively (according to their sense-centres).

In contrast to macrocosmic *Virāt* body, the microcosmic bodies were capable of procuring and consuming the required food. That is what is implied by the phrase ‘*annabhogāya*’ (to consume the food). A small body has the capacity to procure and consume the food.

The Upaniṣad says that to begin with, the Creator (*Parameśvara*) created cow. But the deities rejected it as insufficient. Subsequently, the horse was created. That also was rejected. Then the human body was made. Deities were very happy and appreciated it as ‘well done’. So they entered it. This does not mean that those deities did not enter the other bodies or only the three varieties of bodies were created. All species of bodies were created and deities did enter all of them. But they praised the human body with a preference because it has *karmādhikāra* (eligibility to take to *karmas*) to procure new *bhogas* besides there is a provision in it to gain the knowledge that can liberate. *Buddhi*, the faculty of discrimination is the prerogative of humans. The *śruti* does not intend to specify a particular order of creating these bodies. The narration of

cow, horse and human bodies is only a sample to highlight the superiority of the human body.

The word *ātmadeha* means all individual microcosmic bodies. They can be taken to repeatedly one after the other. Sense-indulgence and progeny are possible only in the individual bodies. *Virāt* body is common to all whereas the individual bodies are unique in the case of everyone. Individual bodies include the specific bodies of deities also. Though the deities are present in all bodies through the medium of senses, they have also their unique individual bodies. All individual bodies are obtained in accordance with their desires and the consequent *karmas* with their result. *Īśvara*, the Creator is only the dispenser of *karmaphalas*. He has no personal will in this matter.

There was no specific centre of abidance for hunger and thirst in the *Virāt* body. As a result they could not get a separate place of abidance in the individual bodies. Therefore they requested *Īśvara* to arrange proper place for them to have *bhoga*. That arrangement is described now.

ईशोऽसाधारणं स्थानमपश्यन् क्षुत्पिपासयोः ।
प्रावेशयद्देवतासु तद्भोगात् ते च तृप्यतः ॥१०॥

ईशः - *Īśvara* क्षुत्पिपासयोः - of hunger and thirst
असाधारणं - distinct स्थानं

- the place of *bhoga* अपश्यन् - not finding देवतासु - in the deities प्रावेशयद् - ushered in, made them enter ते - the hunger and thirst च - whereby तद्भोगात् - by the *bhoga* of deities तृप्यतः - become satiated – (10)

10. The *Īśvara* not finding a distinct place of *bhoga* for hunger and thirst ushered them in the deities whereby they become satiated by the *bhoga* of deities.

Hunger and thirst were ushered in the deities abiding in the individual bodies means they were made the partakers of *bhoga* experienced by these presiding deities of different faculties. Hunger and thirst are not the features of the gross body but they belong to the subtle one. Hunger and thirst in the sense of ‘want’ are present in all senses, mind, *buddhi* (intellect) and *prāṇas* (vital airs). Therefore the *bhogas* undergone at any level of senses, etc., satiate hunger and thirst abiding therein.

Actually the *bhogas* undergone in a given individual body belongs to that specific *jīva* who wields that particular body and not to the presiding deities. This fact is ascertained in ‘*Jyotirādyadhikaraṇa*’ (*Br.Sū.2-4-14* to 16). Then why did the deities pray to *Īśvara* to create the individual bodies and a place for them to abide in it? In this context we have to remember that these deities are also exalted *jīvas* who need a

body for their *bhoga*. Further they being functionaries of different faculties that need to be made operational in all the individual bodies, the field of their function in the form of microcosmic bodies must be ready. Then only they can be operational and derive their *bhoga* as *jīva* in the form of a deity. Thus the general individual *jīvas* derive *bhoga* because of the power lent to them by the deities whereas the deities derive their *bhoga* in their own specific embodiment on account of all individual *jīvas*. There is a mutual interdependence between them. In fact, all entities in this entire cosmos are interdependent including *Īśvara* and the *jagat*. This topic is described in the *Madhubrāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* and the sixteenth chapter of this text has summarized it.

With this tenth verse the second section (*khaṇḍa*) of this Upaniṣad gets over. The third section starts with the creation of food from the five elements. The senses, such as eyes, ears, etc., and the mind tried to eat the food. But they failed. If they were successful in eating, even today the hunger would have got appeased just by our seeing or hearing or thinking, etc., of food depending on which *indriya* (sense-organ or the organ of action) or the mind did succeed. Finally, *apānavāyu* (the air that goes down with an inside-thrust through the

mouth enabling us to swallow) ate the food in terms of swallowing. Therefore even today, that is mode of eating. Then *Īśvara* thought: How can this body (inert in nature) sustain without me? From which route can I enter it? He created an aperture at the top of the head and entered through it. *Īśvara* in reality being none other than Brahman, is called *jīva* after its entry into the body. It has three places of abidance. They are the right eye in the waking state, neck region during the dream and *hrdayākāśa* in the sleep. Or the places of *jīva's* abidance are the father's body, the mother's womb and one's own body. Or waking, dream and deep sleep states. All of which are no better than the dream. The *jīva* on discrimination could find that there is nothing other than Brahman. It got the direct knowledge that the entity who entered the body itself is Brahman. This discovery was expressed: 'I saw (*adarśam*) this (*idam*) *ātmā*/Brahman. It is a great delight'. This exclamation resulted in *ātmā* having the name '*idandraḥ*' which became '*Indraḥ*' indirectly concealing the original one. It is a well-known fact that the adorable persons would love to be addressed by a nickname. These topics of the section three of the Upaniṣad are described in this Chapter up to the verse 42.

अन्ने सृष्टे भोक्तृवर्गो ह्यजिघृक्षत् तदिन्द्रियैः ।
तत्र वागादयोऽशक्तास्तदपानो गृहीतवान् ॥११॥

अन्ने सृष्टे - when the food was created भोक्तृवर्गः - the group of *bhoktās* (consumers) तद् - that food इन्द्रियैः - by the senses हि - indeed अजिघृक्षत् - desired, (i.e. tried) to eat तत्र - to eat the food वागादयः - the organ of speech, etc. अशक्ताः - were unable, incompetent तत् - that food अपानः - *apānavāyu* गृहीतवान् - swallowed – (11)

11. When the food was created, the group of *bhoktās* (consumers) tried to eat it by the senses. The organs of speech, etc., were unable to do so. (Finally) the *apānavāyu* swallowed the food.

Having created the hunger and thirst, *Īśvara* thought that *Virāṭ* onwards who are endowed with them will not be able to sustain themselves without the food. Therefore he created the food using the very same five elements from which all bodies are made even though the deities did not ask for it. No doubt, *Īśvara* does create the food invariably for all. But how much food an individual *jīva* gets is determined by its *karmaphalas*. That is why we find people suffering from starvation, lack of water, etc. The rule is that the *bhogas* of all *jīvas* are strictly in accordance with the results of *karmas* done by them while in the human embodiment. Human species is the only one which has *karmādhikāra* – eligibility to perform *karmas* yielding results. Food is created

from the very same five great elements that go into the constitution of all bodies. The *Aitareyopaniṣad* refers to these five elements as *āp* (water) which indicates the rest of them also. The presence of *jīva* in the body by the entry of Brahman is not yet told. Therefore the word ‘*bhoktrvargaḥ*’ (the group of *bhoktās* – consumers) does not belong to the actual *jīvas*. It refers to senses by implication. Even otherwise, senses are the partners in having the actual *bhoga* besides they do get nourished by the *bhoga*. This particular description is in the context of edible food only swallowed by the *apānavāyu* though the phrase hunger and thirst employed in the second section of this Upaniṣad meant desires in general also. Even in the case of sense-enjoyments by other senses (*indriyas*) it is possible only when the sense-objects are internalized by the senses in terms of *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis*. It is well-known that *prāṇas* are necessary for the senses to function. *Prāṇas* do include *apānavāyu* also. Thus *apānavāyu* has an indirect role in internalizing the sense-objects for *bhoga*. As for the edible food there cannot be any nourishment and contentment unless the food reaches stomach for digestion by the swallowing enabled by *apānavāyu*. Even today, this method of eating with the means of *apānavāyu* is in practice. Assimilated food sustains the body is a fact known to

all. Therefore *apānavāyu* becomes the cause of life span through the food.

ENTRY (*PRAVEŚA*) OF *PARAMEŚVARA* IN THE BODY

The abode of *bhoga* the body, its means the senses (*indriyas*) and the *bhogyā* the food were created by *Parameśvara*. Now the question is for whose sake are these all? *Parameśvara* deliberated: ‘How can this inert assemblage called body continue to exist without me? Any assemblage is for the one distinct from it. Therefore this body is meant for me the sentient entity who is different from it. If I am there in the body, then the functions of the senses are purposeful. Without me, they become in vain. It will be like a temple without the deity, a kingdom without a king or a house without its owner. Therefore I shall have to be the *bhoktā* the overlord of this body. From which route should I enter this body? I should have a special entrance befitting to my overlordship. I cannot use the openings (*chidras*) used by different deities or the sole (the under-surface of the foot) through which the *prāṇa* entered.’ Having thought so, *Parameśvara* decided to enter the body through an aperture on the top of the head. This is described now.

जीवाभावे वृथा सर्वमित्यालोच्य परेश्वरः ।
शिरोमध्यं विदार्यान्न प्राविशज्जीवरूपतः ॥१२॥

परेश्वरः - *Parameśvara* (the Creator) जीवाभावे - in the absence of a *jīva* सर्वम् - all of the body, senses, food वृथा - will become in vain इति - so आलोच्य - having deliberated शिरोमध्यं - the middle of the head विदार्य - having split अत्र - here (in the body) जीवरूपतः - in the form of *jīva* प्राविशत् - entered—(12)

12. The *Parameśvara* (the Creator) deliberated that all of the body, senses and food will become in vain in the absence of a *jīva*. Therefore having split the middle of the head, he himself entered here (in the body) in the form of a *jīva*.

The split in the middle of the head is called *brahmarandhra*. It is a very subtle aperture in the crown of the head. It is interesting to note that the very same entry serves as an exit for an accomplished *Brahmopāsaka* to eject out the subtle body to reach *Brahmaloka* (B.G.8-10 to13). ‘*Tadokodhikaraṇa*’ (Br.Sū.4-2-17) ascertains this. Brahman got the name ‘*jīva*’ on entering the body. The entity *caitanya* called Brahman before the entry and as *jīva* thereafter is one and the same. The *praveśa-śrutis* (the statements of *śruti* describing the entry of Brahman in the body) in different Upaniṣads is ascertained as the availability of *cidābhāsa* (reflected *caitanya*) in the *antaḥkaraṇa* which enlivens the inert body. On account of

self-ignorance, this *cidābhāsa* leads to *adhyāsa* (superimposition) between *ātmā* and *anātmā* (not self). It is an identification with the limited *upādhi* (body) called *tādātmyādhyāsa*. This results from the entry of Brahman in the body. *Bhāṣyakāra* explains what is meant by connection (*saṃbandha*) of *ātmā* with body in the *sūtrabhāṣya*. He says: *Dehasaṃbandha* is an erroneous universal experience in *ātmā* having the notion that the assemblage of body itself is ‘I’ (Br.Sū.Bh.2-3-48). This *adhyāsa* is the entry of *Parameśvara* in the form of *jīva* (*jīvarūpataḥ*). The word *rūpataḥ* (in the form of) suggests that *Parameśvara* and *jīva* are not two distinct entities in reality, but *Parameśvara* himself assumes the form of *jīva*. It is like an actor donning a role. The actual entity is one and the same though the appearance differs.

The nature of *Parameśvara* (*Paramātmā*) entered in the individual body and parading as *jīva* is described in the next three verses.

प्राणानां धारकः कर्ता चेतनो जीव उच्यते ।
आनखाग्रमहङ्कारश्चिद्व्याप्तश्चेतनोऽभवत्॥१३॥

प्राणानां धारकः - the sustainer of vital airs कर्ता - doer (of *karmas*) चेतनः - (so also) a sentient entity (and therefore a *bhoktā*) जीवः - *jīva* उच्यते - is called चिद्व्याप्तः - pervaded by *cidābhāsa*

अहङ्कारः - 'I' notion (as a *jīva*) चेतनः - (as though) sentient आनखाग्रम् - up to the tip of the nail अभवत् - remains – (13)

13. The sustainer of vital airs (*prāṇas*), the doer (*kartā*) of *karmas*, (so also) a sentient entity (and therefore a *bhoktā*) is called *jīva*. The *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion as a *jīva*) pervaded by the *cidābhāsa* (reflected *caitanya* in the *antaḥkaraṇa*) appearing as though sentient remains in the body up to the tip of the nail.

The verb *jīv* is used in the sense of *prāṇadhāraṇa* (sustaining the vital airs). Therefore *jīva* is the one who sustains the *prāṇas*. The sustenance of *prāṇas* in a body means *ātmā* (on account of self-ignorance) assuming the body as 'I' for one's living. Though *ātmā* is all pervasive, it sustains the *prāṇas* only in a given body where it is identified with. Therefore the *jīva* is *ātmā* identified with a body where alone it sustains the *prāṇas*. When *ātmā* (*jīva*) quits the occupied body, *prāṇas* also abandon it and travel with the *jīva*. Thus *prāṇa* is the sign of the *jīva* abiding in the body. To do *karma* and assume the status of *kartā* (doer) is also a unique feature of

jīva. Being sentient living entity in nature, obviously the *jīva* happens to be the *bhoktā* (experiencer of joys and sorrows). Though *jīva* in its true nature is the knowledge principle *ātmā*, it appears as though the knower (*jñātā*) or ignorant (*ajñānī*) due to the presence or absence of *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* imparting specific knowledge.

The followers of some religions do not accept the sentience and experiences of joy and sorrows in the animal and plant kingdom though they accept the presence of *prāṇa*. This exhibits the rudimentary stage of their knowledge. This is mainly so because those religions are centred around some personality without the solid foundation of some body of trans-empirical knowledge such as the Vedas. No doubt their masters may be benevolent and have done some good to their followers. Yet, being human, what they have imparted is limited and so it cannot encompass everything like the Vedas. It is also true and sad that in the case of some of such religions the imperial power has played havoc and distorted the original teachings of their masters. History is the evidence of this.

There is a definite mode by which the inert body appears as sentient. A *vṛtti* (thought) of *antaḥkaraṇa* in the form of *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion in the entire body) pervades the whole body up to the tip of the nail. The *jīva* and the '*ahaṃkāra-vṛtti*' are

totally identified with each other. The *jīva* does not take *ahaṃkāra* as different from itself. Therefore *jīva* experiences its existence as ‘I am’ in the entire body where there is the presence of *ahaṃkāra-vṛtti*. As a result, the experience in any part of the body or action by any of its limb makes *jīva* experience as ‘I experienced’ or ‘I did it’.

Brahmasūtra (2-3-16 to 53) ascertains the nature of *jīva* as follows:

- i) *Jīva* itself is free from birth and death. Both of these are primarily for the body. But they are attributed to *jīva* secondarily (*Br.Sū.2-3-16*);
- ii) When the *buddhi* is born, the non-dual Brahman enters it in the form of *jīva*. *Jīva* appears to be born on account of *upādhi*, but in reality it is ever-existent without any birth (*Br.Sū.2-3-17*);
- iii) *Jīva* is *caitanya*, the very self-luminous knowledge principle. It does not get extinct any time either in sleep or dissolution though the Creation ceases to exist (*Br.Sū.2-3-18*);
- iv) *Jīva* appears to be limited because of *buddhi-upādhi*. Itself being Brahman, *jīva* is all pervasive in reality (*Br.Sū.2-3-19 to 32*);
- v) *Jīva* appears as *kartā* (doer) because of identification with the *upādhi* (*Br.Sū.2-3-33 to 39*);
- vi) The *jīva* without *upādhi* is the non-doer (*akartā*) *ātmā* (*Br.Sū.2-3-40*);
- vii) The transmigration of *jīva* caused by self-ignorance is in accordance with the laws of *Īśvara*. So is its liberation by gaining the direct knowledge of identity between itself and *Īśvara* (*Br.U.2-3-41 & 42*);
- viii) There is no confusion about the nature of *jīva vis-à-vis* *Īśvara*. A definite rule can be arrived between them with *jīva* as a part (*aṃśaḥ*) or characterized (*avacchinnaḥ*) or reflection (*ābhāsaḥ*) in relation to the superimposed *upādhis* (*Br.Sū.2-3-43 to 53*).

Besides the activities through the gross body, the *jīva* also takes to transmigration without the gross body or called *annamaya-kośa*. *Jīva* becomes fit to function by its identification with the subtle body only and not by mere entry of Brahman in the gross body. The self-inquiry starts from *annamaya-kośa* (food-sheath). Therefore it is appropriate that the scriptures describe the *jīva* in detail when identified with the gross body since the self-inquiry can be taken to only during the waking state.

The *upādhi* of *ahaṃkāra* which presents the body as sentient is further described in the next two verses.

अन्तःकरणभागौ द्वावहङ्कारो मनस्तथा ।

वृक्षस्य मूलमग्रं च यथाभागौ तथेक्ष्यताम् ॥१४॥

अहङ्कारः - *ahaṃkāra* तथा - so also
मनः - the mind द्वौ - these two अन्तःकरणभागौ

- (are) the two parts of *antaḥkaraṇa* यथा - just as वृक्षस्य - of a tree मूलम् - the root अग्रं च - and the trunk भागौ - two parts तथा - so ईक्ष्यताम् - let it be considered – (14)

14. *Ahaṃkāra* and the mind are the two parts of one and the same *antaḥkaraṇa* just as the two parts of root and the trunk of a tree.

Antaḥkaraṇa (inner instrument) basically consists of thoughts (*vṛttis*). *Vṛttis* are made of subtle *pañchamahābhūtas* (five great elements) before their grossification process called *pañcīkaraṇa*. *Vṛttis* (thoughts), being subtle in nature, have an inherent capacity to bear the reflection of *caitanya* (*ātmā*) in themselves. Such a reflection is called *cidābhāsa* (reflected *cit*). Inert *vṛttis* (thoughts) appear aglow with sentience (*cetanatā*) on account of *cidābhāsa*. *Antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* though one and the same are called differently as *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) *buddhi* (intellect) *manaḥ* (mind) and *cittam* (faculty of recollection) depending on their functions as follows:

- i) *Ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) is the *vṛtti* which makes every ignorant person experience the *anātmā* body entirely as 'I';
- ii) *Buddhi* (intellect) is the *vṛtti* that is decisive in nature;
- iii) *Manaḥ* (mind) corresponds to the *vṛtti* having the faculty of consideration;
- iv) *Cittam* (faculty of recollection) is the *vṛtti* having the function of *anusandhānam* (suitable connection).

These four functions of *vṛttis* at times are divided into two also. The author here has named these functions as *ahaṃkāra* which includes in itself the *buddhi* and the other one as the *manaḥ* comprising the *cittam*. Some others call the same *antaḥkaraṇa* as consisting of *buddhi* (with *ahaṃkāra*) and *manaḥ* (with *cittam*). Finally it reduces to four functions only. At some places the names such as *buddhi* or *manaḥ* is used for the entire *antaḥkaraṇa*, etc. Their meaning has to be ascertained in accordance with the context.

चिद्धिम्बप्रतिबिम्बाभ्यां युक्तोऽहङ्कार एव तु ।
चेतनःप्राणभृत् तस्य हृन्निष्ठं करणं मनः ॥१५॥

अहङ्कारः - the *ahaṃkāra* तु - on its
part चिद्धिम्बप्रतिबिम्बाभ्यां - by the original

entity *cit* (*ātmā*) and its reflection (*cidābhāsa*) युक्तः एव - coupled with चेतनः - (is the well-known) sentient (*jīva*) प्राणभृत् - it sustains *prāṇas* मनः - the mind तस्य - its (of *ahaṃkāra* or *jīva*) हृन्निष्ठं - available in the heart, (i.e. *antaḥkaraṇa*) करणं - an instrument – (15)

15. The *ahaṃkāra* on its part coupled with the original entity *cit* (*ātmā*) and its reflection (*cidābhāsa*) is the well-known sentient (*jīva*). It sustains *prāṇas*. The mind that is available in the heart, (i.e. *antaḥkaraṇa*) is its (of *ahaṃkāra* or *jīva*) instrument.

What we consider in our life as sentience (*cetanatā*) is *cidābhāsa*. *Jīva* is the *cit* endowed with *ahaṃkāra*. Pure *cit* is totally free from all *upādhis* or *drśyas*. *Ahaṃkāra* is superimposed on *cit* (*ātmā*). *Cit* is its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*). *Cidābhāsa* (*pratibimba* of *cit*), the reflected *cit*, in the *ahaṃkāra-vṛtti* does include the original entity (*bimba*), the *cit*. An *adhyasta* (superimposed) thing cannot exist apart from its *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis). And yet, *bimba cit* and its reflection (*pratibimba*) are separately mentioned here for the sake of clarity. This verse gives a definition or an equation that the *jīva* called *cetanaḥ* is *ahaṃkāra* endowed with *cit* the original entity (*bimba*) and *cidābhāsa* (*pratibimba* of *cit*). Here the *prāṇas* have to be taken for granted since

ahaṃkāra who is identified with the entire body is *jīva* whose nature itself is to sustain the *prāṇa*. In the ‘*Dvaitaviveka-prakarāṇa*’ of Pañcadaśī (4-11) by the same author, a more comprehensive definition of *jīva* is given. It says: ‘*Jīva* is an assemblage of the basis *cit* (*caitanya*) coupled with the subtle body (*sūkṣma-śarīra*) and the *cidābhāsa* abiding therein’.

Jīva takes to activities by the means of *prāṇa* which is *kriyā-śakti* (the power of action) whereas the mind serves as the instrument in the pursuit of all knowledge. The seat of *antaḥkaraṇa* is the physical heart. Therefore the mind also which is a facet of *antaḥkaraṇa* abides in the heart only. But it goes out for its function.

THREE ABODES OF PARAMEŚVARA AS A JĪVA

The *Parameśvara* who has entered the body as a *jīva* travels to and fro in the three states of consciousness. Depending on the abidance in a particular state the *jīva* has three abodes or fields of operation undergoing different experiences. Since the *jīva* itself is a false entity superimposed on *Ātmā/Paramātmā* by equally false *avidyā* (self-ignorance), the three abodes are no better than the dream - false in nature. While *Aitareyopaniṣad* (1-3-12) describes these abodes as ‘*āvasathas*’

(fields of operation or sports), *Kaivalyopaniṣad* speaks of the same as ‘*puratraya*’ (three cities). It is interesting to note that *Brahmopaniṣad* describes four states abiding in *nābhi* (literally the navel), *hṛdaya* (heart), *kaṅṭham* (throat) and *mūrdhā* (head). These four states are further commented upon in the same Upaniṣad: ‘The waking state abides in the eye, the dream in the throat, the sleep in the heart and the *turīyam* (the fourth state of consciousness) in the head’. According to this explanation the word *nābhi* means the eye instead of the navel. This is quite in order because *nābhi* also means the ‘centre’, ‘focus’ or ‘chief’. Upaniṣads also describe the *viśva* (the waker consciousness) as the *puruṣa* (*ātmā* as *jīva*) abiding in the right eye (*dakṣiṇākṣi*). The famous *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad* describes these four states as four *pādas* (quarters). Actually in the *turīya* state the *jīva* is no more a *jīva* being totally free from all the three states of consciousness called *saṃsāra* including its cause *avidyā*. It is called a state in relation to the earlier three. But in itself, it is the true nature of *ātmā*. In comparison with *turīya*, the waking and the sleep are like the dream, not real in nature. Therefore *Aitareya* and *Kaivalyopaniṣad* focus on the earlier three abodes only. These three abodes are now described in the next two verses.

तस्य हृत्कण्ठनेत्रेषु

प्रचारवशतोऽभवत् ।

सुप्तिः स्वप्नो जागरश्च

सोऽयं संसार ईरितः ॥१६॥

तस्य - of that *jīva* (who is *Parameśvara* entered in the body) *हृत्कण्ठनेत्रेषु* - in the regions of heart, throat and the eye *प्रचारवशतः* - because of to and fro travelling *सुप्तिः* - sleep *स्वप्नः* - dream *जागरः च* - and the waking *अभवत्* - take place (cyclically) *सः अयम्* - such an abidance in the three states of consciousness *संसारः* - *saṃsāra* *ईरितः* - is called—(16)

16. Because of to and fro travelling of *jīva* (who is *Parameśvara* entered in the body) in the regions of heart, throat and the eye, the sleep, dream and the waking take place (cyclically). Such an abidance in the three state of consciousness is called *saṃsāra*.

Saṃsāraṇa or *saṃsāra* means moving, travel or roaming through. The *jīva* is always on the move from one state of consciousness to the other. It also travels from one body to another. On the course of transmigration, the sum total of all the experiences in the three states of consciousness including the transmigration is called *saṃsāra*. It is the course of worldly life.

Though here in this verse the three states of consciousness are described as having the set of these three specific abodes, there is another set of such abodes in the context of transmigration. This will be described from the verse 44. The abodes of eye, throat and heart are in relation to the three states of consciousness whereas the bodies of father, mother and that of one's own are considered to be the abodes in the course of transmigration. The travel in the three states of consciousness is a matter of universal experience. It includes the states such as childhood, youth, adulthood, walking, sitting, eating, talking, etc. But the travel in the different bodies called transmigration can be known only through the Vedas and *smṛtis*. Such a travel, whether in the three states of consciousness or the transmigration is only due to *upādhis*. It is not any intrinsic feature of *ātmā*. Ādi Śaṅkarācārya in his *Dakṣiṇāmūṛty Stotram* very clearly pinpoints *ātmā* as the principle that inheres as a common distinct entity in and through all the changing states such as childhood, youth, old age and waking, etc. (vs.7). That changeless pure awareness principle (*ātmā*) should be directly known. But the self-created plight of the majority is such that they are unable to even spare some time to probe into this travel of *saṃsāra* to discover

the harbour of everlasting existence and happiness which is their own true nature. *Bhāṣyakāra* with a tone of lament remarks: ‘The *jīva* identified with the three states of consciousness who is asleep for a very long period on account of natural self-ignorance does not wake up at all even after experiencing the perpetual hammering by the mace of calamitous sorrows (*Ai.U.Bh.1-3-12*)’. This should impress upon everyone to take to serious self-inquiry as guided by the Upaniṣads and not fritter away the life in the glamorous trifling gains.

This Upaniṣad describes all the three *āvasathas* (abodes) of *jīva* as dreams hinting that they are false in nature. There is a purpose in highlighting the *mithyā* (false) nature of these three states which equate to *saṃsāra* at the level of every individual *jīva*. If the *saṃsāra* constituted of the three states of consciousness were real, it will exist for ever without any cessation. In that case the ever-existent *mokṣa* (liberation) which is *ātmā* alone totally free from *avidyā* and its effect (*kārya*) is not possible because the real *saṃsāra* will limit *ātmā*. Any limited entity is bound to end at one time or the other. Therefore the actual fact that the three states of consciousness are false needs to be exposed first to establish the non-dual nature of ever-liberated *ātmā*. Taking into account this need, even

Śrī Madhusūdāna Sarasvatī starts his famous text ‘*Advaitasiddhi*’ stating: ‘The false (*mithyā*) nature of duality must be established first because non-duality depends on the falsity of duality’. Therefore the *śruti* expressly tells in its own word that the three *āvasathas* (abodes) of the *jīva* are *svapna* (dream). This statement of *śruti* is explained now.

स्वप्नः स्वकाल एवास्ति

नान्यदा सुप्तिजागरौ ।

तथैवेति स्वप्नसाम्यात्

त्रयः स्वप्ना उदीरिताः ॥१७॥

स्वप्नः - the dream स्वकाले - during its period एव - only अस्ति - exists अन्यदा - at other times न - is not (there) तथा एव - truly in that manner सुप्तिजागरौ - (are) the sleep and the waking इति - thus स्वप्नसाम्यात् - because of similarity with the dream त्रयः - all the three of waking, dream and sleep स्वप्नाः उदीरिताः - are called dreams – (17)

17. The dream exists only during its period of existence and not at other times. Truly in that manner, the sleep and the waking exist only during their periods. Thus all the three of them are called dreams.

Svakāla is the period of one's existence. All the three states of consciousness exist only during their periods and not at any other times. Any

one of them is not there in the other two. This is the common feature among them. Therefore they are called dream since the false nature of dream is evident in comparison with the waking which is mistaken as real. Even the utility of entities in one state gets negated in the other. The utility is not a criterion of reality. *Bādhārāhitya* (absence of sublation) determines the reality. *Bādhā* (sublation) is the knowledge that the hitherto experienced entity does not exist in three periods of past, present and future. For example, consider the mistaken snake on a rope. Gauḍapādācārya in his *Māṇḍūkya-Kārikā* (2-5) brands the waking as *mithyā* together with the dream. Keeping this fact of falsity of waking constantly and consistently in our view, reduces the fascination for the sense-objects. Thereby the mind becomes available for *śravaṇa* (self-inquiry), etc.

APAVĀDA (REFUTATION OF CREATION)

Thus the *adhyāropa* (superimposition) of *śṛṣṭi* (Creation) leading to dreamlike *saṃsāra* was described so far. Though experienced vividly, truly the *saṃsāra* or Creation is not there. To reveal *ātmā*, the refutation (*apavāda*) of the *adhyasta* (superimposed) *śṛṣṭi* is done up to the verse 42.

अध्यारोपो मायिकोऽयम् उक्तोऽथासावपोह्यते ।
अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते ॥१८॥

अयम् - this मायिकः - unreal,
projected by the *māyā* अध्यारोपः -
superimposition उक्तः - is told (so far) अथ
- now असौ - this (superimposition)
अपोह्यते - is being refuted (एवं- thus)
अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां - through the means of
superimposition and its refutation
निष्प्रपञ्चं - the Creationless Brahman
प्रपञ्च्यते - is unfolded—(18)

18. This unreal superimposition
projected by the *māyā* is told (so far).
Now this superimposition is being
refuted. (Thus) the Creationless
Brahman is unfolded.

Adhyāropa-apavāda is one of the
methods of ascertaining the true nature
of *ātmā*/Brahman totally free from
Creation. The topic of *adhyāropa* is
concluded now only to do its *apavāda*.
To show that the dream is truly not there,
its temporary appearance has to be
accepted to begin with only to point out
its total absence in the waking and sleep.
If it were real, it can never cease to exist.
A mistaken snake is taken for granted
until its basis the rope is directly
perceived. In that *apavāda* of snake one
discovers that the so called snake can
never be there in reality. So is the
Creation that is experienced in the state
of *avidyā* is nothing but *adhyāropita*

(superimposed). Even to consider
Brahman as the cause of Creation is an
adhyāropa. Now its *apavāda*
(refutation) starts to reveal *ātmā* wherein
there is no trace of Creation.

The *śruti* begins the section of
apavāda by describing the means
employed by the *jīva* (who is none other
than *Paramēśvara* entered in the body)
and its discovery of the truth (*Ai.U.1-3-*
13). The *jīva* having got subjected to
samsāra comprising transmigration and
the three states of consciousness, at one
time by the grace of *guru* and the
scriptures inquires into the true nature of
five great elements, elementals and the
living beings. The mode of inquiry was
to find out the cause from what all these
are born, by what they exist or sustain
themselves and in what they merge at the
time of dissolution. It discovered that the
entire Creation was a projection of
māyā-śakti and in reality there is nothing
other than Brahman. Having ascertained
that there is nothing else other than
Brahman to speak out or to deal with, the
very same *jīva* directly experienced
itself to be the all pervasive Brahman
who had entered the body through the
aperture in the crown of the head. The
real nature of the perceived (*dr̥śya*) *jagat*
and the perceiver (*dr̥ṣṭā*) *jīva* is Brahman
only. This is the gist of the entire
apavāda section. This is now elaborated.

स संसारीश्वरो जात

ईश्वरानुग्रहात् पुनः ।

पृथिव्यादीनि भूतानि

यथाशास्त्रं व्यचारयत् ॥१९॥

सः - that ईश्वरः - *Īśvara* पुनः - again
संसारी जातः - born as *samsārī* ईश्वरानुग्रहात् -
by the grace of *Īśvara* पृथिव्यादीनि - the
earth, etc. भूतानि - elements and beings
यथाशास्त्रं - as directed by the scriptures
व्यचारयत् - inquired into – (19)

19. That *Īśvara* born again as a *samsārī* (*jīva*) inquired into the nature of five elements and living beings as directed by the scriptures by the grace of *Īśvara*.

The words *Īśa*, *Īśvara*, *Parēśa* and *Paramēśvara* are synonyms. The phrase '*Īśvara* born again as a *samsārī* (*jīva*)' has to be understood in its right perspective. It does not mean that *Īśvara* lost his status of *Īśvara* and became *samsārī jīva*. Here the word '*Īśvara*' stands for *caitanya* (pure awareness principle) that is Brahman. The same Brahman which appears as *Īśvara*, itself appears in the body as *jīva* on entry into it. In this sense, in spite of difference between omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent, *asamsārī Īśvara* and the *samsārī jīva* with limited knowledge, power and dimension, the identity between them has to be accepted from the standpoint of real nature - Brahman

(*caitanya*). In fact, both statuses are falsely projected. Both in reality are Brahman only.

The verb *jātaḥ* (born) refers to the entry of Brahman in the body appearing as *jīva* and getting subjected to the experiences of three states of consciousness coupled with transmigration. The word '*punaḥ*' (again) indicates that earlier also there were repeated births as a *samsārī*. The status of *jīva* is because of *anādi* (beginingless) *avidyā* (self-ignorance). Thus *jīva* is beginingless. Therefore 'the law of *Karma*' which states that each birth is because of past *karmaphalas* (results of actions) holds good. Otherwise, the first birth will be without any past *karmas* which is not true.

The *jīva* takes to the pursuit of self-inquiry only by the grace of *Īśvara*. Though *Īśvara* is capable of conferring grace on any one at his will, he does it only as per the laws of *Karma*. Those who perform their duties enjoined by the scriptures according to one's *varṇa* (caste) and *āśrama* (stage in life) with dedication to *Īśvara*, only become eligible to get this grace. *Īśvara's* grace in this context is not the fulfilment of worldly desires, but providing a competent *guru* and conditions in life conducive to the pursuit of gaining *ātmajñāna*.

The inquiry adopted here is to investigate into the five great elements, elementals and all the living beings. The problem of *saṃsāra* is born of erroneous concept of our true nature, *ātmā*. This error can be set right only by the means of inquiry and not by any other means. The problems born of a mistaken snake can be ended only by inquiry and the consequent direct sight of its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) the rope.

‘*Aparokṣānubhūti*’ (vs.12-16) authored by Ādi Śaṅkarācārya gives an effective demonstration of such an inquiry. The inquiry which is the means of knowledge has to be conducted thus: Who am I? The one who knocks around as ‘doer’ (*kartā*), ‘happy’, ‘sorrowful’, etc.? What is my nature? From what this perceptible *jagat* is born? Who is the Creator of the world? Is it created by *jīva* or *Īśvara*? What is the material cause of this world like the mud is the cause of a mud pot? As for ‘who am I?’, ‘I’ the sentient entity can neither be the inert five elements nor the group of senses equally inert made from them. I am certainly some entity who is aware of them and therefore distinct from all those. As regards the question, ‘How this *jagat* is born?’ it should be necessarily from self-ignorance because it vanishes totally by the direct knowledge of *ātmā* (true I). The *vṛtti* of *antaḥkaraṇa*, a thought having the identification with the body called *ahaṃkāra* in the form of ‘I do’, ‘I walk’, ‘I talk’, ‘I enjoy or suffer’, etc., is the one who conducts the *saṃsāra* at the individual *jīva* level. The material cause or the basis of the *jagat* or in other words that of self-ignorance and the *kartā* (doer) which continues to be there in their birth (*utpatti*), continuance (*sthiti*) and destruction (*nāśa*), as the mud in the case of a mud pot, is the non-dual, imperceptible and indestructible ever-existent principle called *sat*. It is Brahman, the *caitanya* (pure awareness). ‘I’, the common entity *caitanya* in our all the three states of consciousness and in all the states such as childhood, youth, old age, ‘I am happy’, ‘I am sorrowful’, etc., is *ātmā*, the illuminator (*sākṣī*) of all. This myself (*ātmā*) is certainly Brahman. Such inquiries, as guided by the different modes of Vedāntic teachings (*prakriyās*) should be repeatedly taken to, coupled with *manana* (reflection) and *nididhyāsana* (meditation on *ātmā*) until direct knowledge is gained.

The self-inquiry conducted by the *śruti* is further elaborated up to the verse 35.

APAVĀDA-EFFECT IS IDENTICAL WITH ITS CAUSE

परमात्मन उत्पन्नं

जगदात्मैव नेतरत् ।

मृदो जातो घटो यद्वत्

मृद्वस्त्वेव तथेक्ष्यताम् ॥२०॥

परमात्मनः उत्पन्नं - that which is born of *Paramātmā* जगत् - Creation आत्मा - (is) *ātmā* एव - only इतरत् न - nothing else यद्वत् - just as मृदः - from the mud जातः - born घटः - pot मृद्वस्तु एव - is truly the entity mud only तथा - so ईक्ष्यताम् - it be considered – (20)

20. The Creation which is born of *Paramātmā* is *ātmā* (*Paramātmā*) only; nothing else. Let it be considered similar to ‘the mud pot born from the mud is truly the entity mud only’.

The first line of this verse is a statement of declaration (*pratijñā*) that is going to be proved now. The second line gives an illustration which is discussed up to the verse 30. The corollary of *adhyāropa* (superimposition) section is that the entire Creation is born of *Paramātmā* (*ātmā*) and therefore it cannot be different from *Paramātmā*. It is just like the mistaken snake born of rope is not different from the rope. This

fact is being established with the help of an illustration: ‘mud pot born from mud is nothing but mud’ as found in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. All earthenwares are nothing but clay. All tools made of iron are nothing but iron. All ornaments produced from gold are nothing but gold (*Ch.U.6-1-4 to 6*). So is the *jagat* born of *Paramātmā*. It is nothing but *Paramātmā* (*sat* Brahman). We all know that any cause inheres in its effect. The effect also merges back in its cause which ‘exists’. It is a matter of common experience that all entities in the world are experienced as ‘is’ which shows that their cause is *sat* (existence). When these get destroyed in the succession of gross effect to its immediate subtle cause, that cause also is experienced as ‘is’. Even when an entity does not exist, its absence is experienced as ‘is’. If the cause of *jagat* were *asat* (non-existence), we would have experienced all the so called entities as ‘is not’. That is not true. Therefore the *jagat* is born from *Paramātmā-sat* Brahman (*Kṛ.U.Bh.2-3-12*). The *jagat/samsāra* is superimposed (*adhyasta*) or imagined (*kalpita*) in Brahman. Therefore it being *mithyā*, Brahman cannot be *vikārī* (changing) or dual in nature. Such a Creation where the cause is unchanged forever and yet the effect seemingly appears to be there, is called *vivarta* (unreal appearance) from the empirical standpoint. But there is no

Creation in reality.

The statement of identity between the cause *Paramātmā* and the effect *jagat* does not mean that *jagat* or *samsāra* is *satya* (real) in nature. This is explained by elaborating the example of mud and the mud pot.

घटः शराव इत्यादि विकाराणां मृदः पृथक् ।
तत्त्वं नास्ति प्रतीते तु नामरूपे प्रकल्पिते ॥२१॥

घटः - pot शरावः - platter इत्यादि - etc.
विकाराणां - of effects तत्त्वं - the real nature

मृदः पृथक् - different from mud न अस्ति - is not there प्रतीते - convincingly recognized नामरूपे - name and form (as distinct from the mud) तु - whereas प्रकल्पिते - are imagined (They are not real.) – (21)

21. The real nature of effects such as pot, platter, etc., (made of mud) are not different from the mud whereas its names and forms (very) convincingly recognized (as distinct from the mud) are imagined. (They are not real.)

A real entity exists all the time, but not the false one which appears to be there for a while and not always. An actual snake is there all along during its life span whereas the mistaken snake can be there only until its basis the rope is seen. Even during the period of its perception it is really not there at all. A false (*mithyā*) entity truly does not exist in three periods of time even though it appears for a while as if it exists. That which comes and goes is false in contrast to the continuously existing real entity. Before the mud pot was made the mud was there; during the existence of the pot the mud is verily there; even after pot is broken the mud continues to be there. But the name and form of the mud pot cease to be there. So is the case with *sat* (existence principle) *Paramātmā* and the manifest Creation as names and forms. Before the Creation the non-dual *sat* alone was there (*Ch.U.6-2-1*). After the dissolution there is total absence of Creation which is made known by *sat* (*caitanya*) principle only like the absence of *jagat* during the sleep. Even during the continuance of Creation its existence and knowledge is possible because of *sat* alone. The utility of or the availability to deal with Creation (*jagat*) is not the criterion of its reality as in the case of dream or the mistaken snake which induces fear, etc. The absence of *bādhā* (negation or cessation) determines the reality of an entity. Thus the *jagat* born of *Paramātmā* as its *vivarta* (unreal appearance) is not real.

**APAVĀDA - SOPĀDHIKA
BHRAMA (ADJUNCTIVE
ERROR)**

If a mud pot being seen with a name and form is unreal or imagined or a delusion, how does it continue to appear

as the pot in spite of knowing its basis the mud? Because the observation reveals that a falsely projected entity should disappear on knowing its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) just as the vanishing of a mistaken snake on seeing its basis the rope or the disappearance of a seeming piece of silver when its basis the sea-shell is seen. This is being explained to show that the appearance of *jagat* having names and forms continues for a while in spite of gaining the direct knowledge of *sat, cit, ānanda Paramātmā*.

प्रतिबिम्बभ्रमो

नीराद्युपाधिवशतो यथा ।

सन्निवेशोपाधितोज्यं

तथा कुम्भादिविभ्रमः ॥२२॥

यथा - just as (चन्द्रादीनां - of moon,

etc.) नीराद्युपाधिवशतः - on account of incidental things or the adjuncts of water, etc. प्रतिबिम्बभ्रमः - (there is a delusive appearance of moon, etc.) in the form of (their) reflection तथा - similarly सन्निवेशोपाधितः - by the adjunct of configuration (shape) (मृदि - in the mud) अयं - this कुम्भादिविभ्रमः - misapprehension, error or delusive (false) appearance as mud pot, etc., takes place—(22)

22. On account of the incidental things or the adjuncts of water, etc., there is a delusive appearance of moon, etc., in the form of (their) reflection. Similarly, this delusive (false) appearance of mud pot, etc., takes place by the adjunct of configuration (shape) (in the mud).

‘*Upādhi*’ means an incidental thing or adjunct. It also means a special cause for a general effect according to *Tārīkikas* (logicians). For example, the ‘wet fuel’ (*ārdrendhana*) is the *upādhi* of smoke emerging from the fire. The reflection of moon or the sun, etc., in any reflecting medium such as water, mirror as *upādhi* is a delusive appearance. A child may take such reflections as the true entities. In such cases, even after seeing the actual moon, etc., as distinct from the reflection, the delusive appearance in the form of reflection does continue until the reflecting medium continues to be there. After knowing the original entity (*bimba*) its reflection (*pratibimba*) does not end. So is the case with the mud pot. Here the transfiguration of different parts such as mouth, neck, belly, bottom made of mud is the *upādhi* that presents the false appearance of pot though what is there is only the mud without any distinct entity called pot. The perception as a pot is the misapprehension or an erroneous concept of the mud.

It is desirable here to consider the two types of *bhrama* (misapprehension, error or delusion) or *adhyāsa* (superimposition). Mādhavācārya in his text

Sarvadarśan-saṅgraha (16-10) defines the two types of *bhrama* or *adhyāsa*: (i) *Nirupādhika-bhrama* (a misapprehension or an erroneous notion without an adjunct or incidental thing), (ii) *Sopādhika-bhrama* (a misapprehension or an erroneous notion with an adjunct or incidental thing).

- (i) A *nirupādhika-bhrama* is born from the ignorance of an entity prompted by some defect (such as distance or insufficient light, etc.) or some *karma* (action such as movement, etc.) and is opposed to the true knowledge of that entity. For example, a rope mistaken for a snake or a sea-shell as a piece of silver. Such a *bhrama* disappears the moment the basis, the rope or the shell is perceived.
- (ii) A *sopādhika-bhrama* is born from the ignorance of an entity on account of some provocation (*kṣobha*) induced by the proximity of an incidental thing or adjunct (*upādhi*) and it ends along with the ending of its *upādhi*. A crystal appearing red in the proximity of a red hibiscus flower, the reflection of moon, etc., in the water or other reflecting surface and the mud appearing as pot, pitcher, etc., with specific configuration (shape) are some of the examples of *sopādhika-bhrama*. This *bhrama* continues till the *upādhi* is present in spite of knowing the true nature of the mistaken entity. It ends only when the *upādhi* is no more.

Since the false appearance of mud pot belongs to *sopādhika-bhrama*, its nature as seen above is described now.

भ्रान्तिः सोपाधिकोपाधिनिवृत्त्यैव निवर्तते ।
न बोधात् तेन भासन्ते जानतोऽपि घटादयः ॥२३॥

सोपाधिका भ्रान्तिः - the misapprehension caused by an incidental thing (adjunct - *upādhi*) उपाधिनिवृत्त्या एव - only by the ending of *upādhi* निवर्तते - disappears न बोधात् - (but) not by the knowledge of its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) तेन - therefore (मृदः) जानतः

अपि - even in the case of a person who knows the true entity is the mud घटादयः - the pot, etc. भासन्ते - (continue to) appear - (23)

23. The misapprehension (*bhrama*) caused by an incidental thing (*upādhi*) disappears only by the ending of *upādhi* (but) not by the knowledge of its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*). Therefore even in the case of a person who knows ‘the true entity the mud’, the pot, etc., (continue to) appear.

The two aspects of *bhrama* (misapprehension) need to be considered. One is the actual experience of *bhrama* and the second is ascertaining the reality of what is

experienced. In the case of *sopādhika-bhrama* the knowledge of the basis in its true nature removes the reality ascribed to the experience of *brahma*. But to cease the erroneous experience the *upādhi* must come to an end. If the experience of *bhrama* comes to an end without knowing the true nature of its basis, the wrong notion that the experienced thing is real will continue to be there. Therefore the knowledge of the basis in its true nature is the main requisite in ending the *bhrama*. The elimination of *upādhi* is only to stop the erroneous experience. Therefore the *bhrama* of *saṃsāra* gets sublated by the direct knowledge of *Paramātmā* even though experience of *jagat* continues for a while until the *prārabdha* gets over.

APAVĀDA - REFUTATION OF DISTINCTION BETWEEN CAUSE AND ITS EFFECT

The *jagat* (Creation) is a *vivarta* (unreal appearance) of Brahman was shown with the help of *sopādhika-bhrama* in the case of a mud pot. The followers of some schools of thought and common people refuse to accept this by propounding cause-effect relation. Among such schools of thought two are prominent. The one is *ārambhavāda* (doctrine of a new effect distinct from its cause). The other is *pariṇāmavāda* (doctrine of effect as a changed form of the cause). When the effect as the changed form of the cause is proved to be *mithyā*, the *pariṇāmavāda* coalesces in the *vivarta-vāda*. Therefore the author now proceeds further to show the fallacy in *ārambhavāda* according to which an effect previously not existing in the cause is born from the cause as its effect.

पृथग् द्रव्यस्वरूपः सन् समवेतो घटो मृदि ।
इत्याहुस्तार्किकास्तत्तु न द्वैगुण्यप्रसङ्गतः ॥२४॥

(कारणे) मृदि - in (the cause) the mud (ततः) पृथक् - distinct from it द्रव्यस्वरूपः - in the form of any entity सन् घटः - an existent pot समवेतः (वर्तते) - remains ever connected to it इति - so तार्किकाः - *Tārīkikas* आहुः - say तु - but तत् - that न - is not (true) द्वैगुण्यप्रसङ्गतः - because of the possibility of getting doubled – (24)

24. The *Tārīkikas* (logicians also called *Naiyāyikas*) say that an existent pot in the form of an entity distinct from the (cause) mud remains in the mud being ever-connected to it. But that is not true because the possibility of getting doubled will arise.

Samavāya is a terminological word often used by *Naiyāyikas* (*Tārīkikas*) or *Vaiśeṣikas*. It means *nitya sambandha* - a permanent connection or inseparable connection/inherence. That which is endowed with *samavāya* is

called *samaveta*. This doctrine is dismissed by pointing out the possibility of dimensions of the cause getting doubled. This fact, (i.e. *dvaiguṇya*) is further elaborated in the next verse.

मृद्भारात् घटभाराच्च

गुरुत्वं द्विगुणं भवेत् ।

तथालङ्कारकर्ता स्यात्

कृती हेमादिवृद्धितः ॥२५॥

मृद्भारात् - by the burden of the mud
घटभारात् - by the burden of the pot च - and
गुरुत्वं - (the total) weight द्विगुणं - twofold
भवेत् - should be (which is not true) तथा -
if it were so अलंकारकर्ता - goldsmith/the
maker of the ornaments हेमादिवृद्धितः - by
increase in the gold, etc. कृती स्यात् -
should become fortunate – (25)

25. By the burden of the mud and that of a pot (distinct from its cause) the (total) weight should be twofold (which is not true). If it were so, the goldsmith should become very fortunate (by increase in the gold, etc.).

The twofold weight is an indication of all the features of the cause becoming twofold by their presence in the effect distinctly existing from its cause. The main defect of *ārambhavāda* is a non-existent (*asat*) entity becoming existent (*sat*) which is opposed to *śruti*, *smṛti* and common sense. Consider the *śruti*, ‘how can from *asat* (non-existent

entity) the *sat* (existent entity) be born?’ (*Ch.U.6-2-2*). ‘A non-existent entity has no existence’ (*B.G.2-16*). The non-existent horn of a rabbit is never born. In fact *pariṇāmavāda* also is somewhat similar to *ārambhavāda*. It says that the manifestation (*vyaktatā*) of effect (*kārya*) was non-existent (*asat*) before its (effect) was born. After its birth the manifestation became existent (*sat*). Thus *pariṇāmavāda* accepts *ārambhavāda* at the manifestation (*vyaktatā*) level though not at the level of *dravya* (thing or entity). *Bhāṣyakāra* discusses at length this topic in *Gītā-bhāṣya* (18-48). Therefore the cause and effect relation between *Paramātmā* and Creation has to be understood in accordance with *vivarta-vāda*. In reality there is no Creation. What is experienced by us as *jagat* is only an erroneous projection by *avidyā* (self-ignorance).

By mere configuration of parts as in the case of mud pots, etc., the original entity (mud) does not become something different from it or many. This is explained with the help of an example to establish that *Paramātmā* does not become something different only because of its appearance as *jīva*, *jagat* and *Īśvara* on account of *vivarta* Creation.

न सन्निवेशमात्रेण पृथग्द्रव्यत्वसम्भवः ।

शयनोत्थानगमनैः न पुत्रे बहुपुत्रता ॥२६॥

सन्निवेशमात्रेण - by mere configuration पृथग्द्रव्यत्वसम्भवः - the possibility of an entity becoming different न - is not there शयनोत्थानगमनैः - by sleeping, getting up and walking पुत्रे - in the son बहुपुत्रता - the occasion of becoming many sons न - cannot be there –(26)

26. (Just) by mere configuration the possibility of an entity becoming different is not possible. A son cannot become many by different postures such as sleeping, getting up and walking.

It was told in the verse 22 that the *upādhi* of configuration (shape) gives rise to the *bhrama* (misapprehension) such as a pot, etc. Parts made up of mud in a specific formation is considered as a pot which has some utility also. This does not mean that the pot is different from the mud. Similarly the son in different postures does not become many sons with each in a specific posture as different from the other. Thus the fact that an effect (*kārya*) cannot be an entity distinct from its cause (*kāraṇa*) is now concluded and its (of effect) inexplicable nature is shown.

तस्मात् कार्यं न वस्तु स्यात् कारणव्यतिरेकतः ।
किन्तु कारण एवैतदनृतं भासते मृषा ॥२७॥

तस्मात् - therefore कार्यं - effect
कारणव्यतिरेकतः - distinct from the cause
वस्तु - entity न स्यात् - cannot be किन्तु - but

कारणे एव - in the cause एतद् - this (effect, *kārya*) अनृतं - unreal मृषा - erroneously भासते - appears –(27)

27. Therefore the effect cannot be an entity distinct from its cause. But the unreal effect erroneously appears in the cause.

It is true that the erroneous appearance called mud pot born of configuration (shape) of limbs in reality is nothing but mud and not an entity distinct from the mud. Yet, in practice (*vyavahāra*) it cannot be said that there is nothing called pot with its distinct features different from those of the mud. If such difference were not there, neither the pot-maker will produce the pots nor the people will purchase them. Therefore the pot is neither distinct from the mud nor totally identical with it. Taking into account this aspect, Vedānta accepts the cause-effect relation as inexplicable (*anirvacanīya*) which is distinct from the concept of difference or identity. The word '*anṛtam*' (not real) indicates that the effect is different from *sat* (real) whereas *mṛṣā* (erroneous) shows that it is not *asat* totally (non-existent). The reason for calling the effect to be *anṛta* (not real) is its perception as a temporary object (*viṣaya*) and it is also considered as distinct from *asat* (the totally non-existent one) because it appears to be there.

Those schools of thought not ready to accept the *mithyā* (false) nature of the *jagat* and also the lay people put forth the reason of its utility (*prayojanam*) to prove the effect (*jagat*) to be real. This is refuted now.

अर्थक्रियानृतेऽप्यस्ति स्थाणौ
चोरभयेक्षणात् ।
ततोऽनृता घटाद्याः स्युर्भान्तु
कुर्वन्तु वा क्रियाम् ॥२८॥

स्थणौ - in the stump (mistaken for a thief) चोरभयेक्षणात् - because the fear from a thief is experienced अनृते - in the unreal अपि - also अर्थक्रिया - utility and a purposeful action अस्ति - is there ततः - therefore घटाद्याः - pot, etc. अनृताः स्युः - are unreal, inexplicable, false (ते - let them) भान्तु - appear to be there वा - or क्रियाम् कुर्वन्तु - get subjected to *vyavahāra* (actions) (or be useful) – (28)

28. Utility and purposeful actions are also found in the unreal or false entities because fear is experienced when a stump is mistaken for a thief. Therefore the pot, etc., are unreal or inexplicable even if they appear to be there or get subjected to *vyavahāra* (actions) (or are useful).

The word ‘*api*’ (also) is used in the sense *eva* (only). In fact false entities only are useful and available for *vyavahāra*. The absolute truth the

Brahman is not available for *vyavahāra*. It is neither the cause of anything nor an effect from any entity. Even the statement, ‘Brahman is the cause of Creation’ is from *vivarta* standpoint and not in the true sense. Therefore Upaniṣads declare that *ātmā*/Brahman is ‘*adr̥ṣṭam*’ (imperceptible), ‘*avyavahārayam*’ (not suitable to deal with), ‘*agrāhyam*’ (not obtainable by the organs of action) (*Mā.U.7*, *Nṛ.Pū.4-1*, *Nṛ.U.1*). Therefore the notion that dualistic *jagat* is real because of its utility, etc., is born of the ignorance of what exactly is *mithyā* (false). A *mumukṣu* must know for certain that the utility of the empirical world is not the criterion of its reality.

The mode of sublating (*bādha*) the effects (*kāryas*) such as mud pots, etc., is being described in the next verse.

सन्निवेशोपाधिहाने गच्छत्येव घटादिधीः ।
विवेकिनां तु वस्तुत्वं घटादीनां निवर्तते ॥२९॥

सन्निवेशोपाधिहाने - when the *upādhi* (incidental thing or adjunct) in the form of configuration ends घटादिधीः - the (erroneous) notion such as pot, etc. गच्छति एव - certainly goes away घटादीनां - of pot, etc. वस्तुत्वं - reality तु - as for विवेकिनां - in the case of discriminative persons निवर्तते - comes to an end – (29)

29. When the *upādhi* in the form

of configuration (shape) ends, the erroneous notion such as pot, etc., certainly goes away. As for the reality (ascribed to) pot, etc., it comes to an end in the case of *vivekīs*.

When you take away the mirror in front of you, the reflection ends. When the specific configuration (shape) such as the mouth, neck, belly, bottom, etc., made of mud is broken the erroneous notion that this is a pot ends. What is there in three periods of time is only the mud. There is no separate concrete real entity called pot. This is the *bādha* (sublation) of the pot. It is just like knowing for certain that there is no snake in three periods of time when one sees the rope, the basis of a mistaken snake. A *vivekī* even while dealing with the pot knows it to be nothing but mud and therefore does not ascribe reality to the appearance of the pot. But a lay person in spite of knowing that the mud pot can break at any moment, takes it to be real. Thus the world of duality though useful in the realm of self-ignorance has an end. This can be verified by all in the deep sleep state. The ultimate reality is *ātmā*, *caitanya* or pure awareness principle that makes us aware of the entire world all the time including its absence. Therefore *ātmā* is *satya* (ever-existent principle) whereas the world (*jagat*) of duality transient in nature is *mithyā* (false).

APAVĀDA - EFFECT (KĀRYA) IS ONLY A VERBAL PHRASE

The falsity (*mithyātva*) of the *jagat* is further corroborated by quoting *Chāndogya śruti* (6-1-4).

घटः शराव इत्येवं

वाचैवारभ्यते वृथा ।

मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यं स्यान्न तु

सत्यं घटादिकम् ॥३०॥

घटः - pot शरावः - platter इति एवं - etc. वाचा एव - only by speech वृथा - in vain आरभ्यते - are made मृत्तिका इति - what is called mud एव - only सत्यं स्यात् - is real घटादिकम् - pot, etc. तु - whereas न सत्यं - are not real – (30)

30. The (names such as) pot, platter, etc., are made in vain only by speech. What is called the mud only is real whereas pot, etc., are not real.

Chāndogyopaniṣad (6-1-3 to 5) through the examples of mud, gold and iron shows that the effects (*kāryas*) made from them exist only in the form of names (*vācārambhaṇam*) uttered by speech. The word speech in this sense stands for being revealed as an object (*viṣaya*) by different means of knowing and not necessarily mere speaking or words. Those effects do not have real existence. They are confined only to the extent of their appearance. Their reality is only the cause mud, etc. Just as the

configuration (*sanniveśa*) (form) was seen as an *upādhi* (adjunct), the effect being available as an object also is an *upādhi*, an incidental thing, whereby the *vyavahāra* (dealing) with the effect (*kārya*) becomes possible. This topic is discussed at length in *Brahmasūtras* (2-1-14 to 20). The mud, etc., are said to be real to begin with in relation to their effects. Finally, it is proved that mud, etc., also are *mithyā*, *ātmā*/Brahman alone is real.

The illustration of mud and the earthenware is applied to the illustrated phenomenon of *jagat* appearing to be born from *ātmā*.

एवमात्मन उत्पन्नं

पृथिव्याद्यपि नात्मनः ।

पृथग्वस्त्वस्ति किं त्वात्मन्यारोपात्

प्रतिभासते ॥३१॥

एवम् - thus आत्मनः - from *ātmā*
उत्पन्नं - born पृथिवी आदि - earth, etc. अपि -
also आत्मनः - from *ātmā* पृथक् - different
वस्तु - entity न अस्ति - is not किं तु - whereas
आत्मनि - on *ātmā* आरोपात् - because of
superimposition प्रतिभासते - appear to be
there—(31)

31. Thus the earth, etc., born from *ātmā* are not any entity different from *ātmā* whereas they appear to be there because of superimposition on *ātmā*.

Just as the pot has no independent

existence apart from the mud, the entire Creation has no reality on its own independent of *Paramātmā*. Here the earth, etc., are mentioned because they fall in the category of effect (*kārya*). *Māyā* (Creative power) is not mentioned here because it does not fall in the group of effects. Even then, *māyā* is not real because it is something that is falsely superimposed on *Paramātmā*. The purpose of mentioning the *jagat* being born from *ātmā* is only to make us discover the reality of *ātmā*/Brahman by pointing out the falsity of *jagat*.

If the *jagat* made of five elements such as earth, water, fire, etc., and elementals is *mithyā* (false) then how do we experience the existence of the entities in the world as ‘earth is’, ‘water is’, ‘tree is’, ‘the sun is’, ‘bird is’, etc.? The answer follows:

सद्वस्तु ह्यात्मनस्तत्त्वं तस्मिन् भूम्यादिकल्पनात् ।
पृथिव्यादीनि सन्तीति भासन्ते तत्तदिन्द्रियैः ॥३२॥

सत् वस्तु - the ever-existent principle sat (Brahman) हि - itself आत्मनः - of *ātmā* तत्त्वं - is true nature तस्मिन् - on that (*sat*) भूम्यादिकल्पनात् - because the earth, etc., are superimposed तत् तत् इन्द्रियैः - through the respective sense-organs पृथिवी आदीनि - the earth, etc. सन्ति - are there इति - so भासन्ते - appear—(32)

32. The ever-existent principle

sat (Brahman) is itself the true nature of *ātmā*. Because the earth, etc., are superimposed on *sat*, they appear as 'they are (exist)' through the respective sense-organs.

Sat is that principle which exists forever without any change or destruction. Such a principle which is absolutely real is called *vastu*. *Ātmā* (*caitanya*) itself is the very existence principle *sat*. It is the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of entire Creation. The Creation is superimposed on *ātmā*. Therefore when we speak of the existence of any object such as 'pot is', the 'is'ness (existence principle) belongs to *sat ātmā* whereas the name and form called 'pot' is superimposed on it. Naturally, *sat ātmā* inheres the Creation without which the Creation has no existence. *Ātmā* is imperceptible (*indriyātīta*). Yet, it is said that the *sat* (existence) aspect of *ātmā* is known through sense-organs. This is so because when a pot is seen, not only its form is seen, but simultaneously its existence as it 'is', is cognized. Thus though *ātmā* is imperceptible by nature, it appears as though accessible to *indriyas* (senses) on account of *upādhis*. There is another reading of '*bhāsate*' in the place of '*bhāsante*' which means the same.

If the configuration (*sanniveśa*) (shape) is the *upādhi* (adjunct) for the

bhrama (erroneous appearance) such as pot, what is the *upādhi* for the erroneous appearance of *jagat* in the form of earth, etc.? How can the error of perceiving the *jagat* though truly not there be set right? The next verse answers these questions.

इन्द्रियोपाधिका भ्रान्तिरक्षरोधान्न भासते ।
इत्येतद् विशदीकर्तुं योगो वेदेषु वर्ण्यते ॥३३॥

इन्द्रियोपाधिका भ्रान्तिः - erroneous cognition (as *jagat*) is born of *upādhi* in the form of sense-organs अक्षरोधात् - by the control of sense-organs न भासते - (it) does not appear to be there इति एतत् - this fact विशदीकर्तुम् - to explain वेदेषु - in the Vedas योगः - yoga वर्ण्यते - is described - (33)

33. The erroneous cognition (as *jagat*) is born of *upādhi* in the form of sense-organs. It does not appear to be there when the sense-organs are controlled. To explain this fact, the yoga is described in the Vedas.

The perception of *dr̥śya jagat* is indispensable for *samsāra*. The external objects are perceived mainly through the means of senses backed up by the mind. Thus the senses as *upādhis*, serve as the gateways for the influx of sense-perception into the mind. This can be verified from our sleep wherein there is no cognition of the perceptible world. But the sleep experience being a state of

total *tamas*, it cannot be of much use in stalling the sense-perception in our pursuit to set right the erroneous perception of *ātmā* / Brahman as the *jagat*. It has to be accomplished consciously in the waking as a means of gaining *ātmajñāna*. Here comes the role of yoga.

The means (*yukti*, *upāya*) by which one can cross over the sorrowful limited existence called *saṃsāra* is known as yoga. The means are twofold, namely (i) *ātmajñāna* (ii) *prāṇasaṃrodha*, (i.e. *aṣṭaṅgayoga*). Though the word ‘yoga’ signifies both, its denotation in popular usage is in the sense of *prāṇasaṃrodha* (*Yo.Vā.Ni.Pu.*13-3, 4 and 6). *Vyāsabhāṣya* while commenting on the first *Pātañjala Yoga Sūtra* defines yoga as *samādhi*. This is so because the verbal root ‘*yuj*’ is used in the sense of *samādhi*. Yoga (*samādhi*) is characterized by ‘*cittavṛttinirodha*’ (withdrawal of all extroverted thoughts with their absorption in their cause namely the *antaḥkaraṇa*) (*Pā.Yo.Sū.*1-2). There are no manifest *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* when *nirodha* of *citta* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) is accomplished.

In this state of *samādhi* the *citta* (the mind, *antaḥkaraṇa*) is *niruddha* (*vṛttirahita*, totally free from all the thoughts) though its *saṃskāras* (subtle impressions) remain. In the absence of all thoughts (*antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis*) that depict our specific experiences, there is no cognition of *prapañca* in such state of *samādhi*. This is called *prapañca-pravilāpana* (dissolving Creation) or *prapañcopaśama* (उपशम - means अभाव - absence of प्रपञ्च - Creation; *Ma.U.Bh.*2-35). Though not asleep, the person in *nirvikalpa samādhi* is not at all aware of *jagat* including one’s body even while being awake all along. In the absence of total experiences of *jagat* reaped in the waking, dream and deep sleep states, in the *nirvikalpa samādhi* the ever self-experiencing principle (*anubhava-svarūpa*) *ātmā* gets reflected in its real nature totally free from all *upādhis* with their features called *saṃsāra* (*Kṛ.U.*2-3-10,11; *Bh.*). This is *ātmānubhava* (experience of *ātmā* in its *nirupādhika/upādhiless* nature) revealed to us by of course a specific state of the same *upādhi*, the mind (*antaḥkaraṇa*) which floods us with the 24x7 experiences of *sopādhika-ātmā* or called *saṃsārī jīva* in the state of ignorance. To say that such an experience of *nitya anubhava-svarūpa ātmā* in its real nature free from falsely attributed or superimposed (*adhyasta*) *upādhis* is not possible is as absurd as saying that only the *sopādhika nitya anubhava-svarūpa ātmā* is experienced but not the *nirupādhika* one. The presence of residual subtle impressions of *antaḥkaraṇa* in the state of *nirvikalpa samādhi* is not an excuse to deny therein the experience of *nirupādhika ātmā*. In fact

this state of *antaḥkaraṇa* is the only means which reveals *nirupādhika ātmānubhava* having the clarity to the maximum extent possible in the human embodiment. The remaining subtle *saṃskāras* of *antaḥkaraṇa* cannot be an obstruction. When you see your face in the mirror the means the mirror is not an obstruction. Let us remember that in and through the 24x7 *sopādhika* experiences of *ātmā* the actual ‘experience-content’ is the ever self-experiencing principle *ātmā* only, but not the inert *upādhis* with their features. The *nitya anubhava-svarūpa* of *ātmā* does not become extinct in the absence of *upādhis*. In the case of human, the *nirvikalpa samādhi* is the only state wherein such *nirupādhika ātmānubhava* is revealed for practical purpose even in the presence of residual *saṃskāras* of *antaḥkaraṇa* which is inconsequential. More intense *ātmānubhava* is possible only in *Brahmaloka* which is very difficult to attain (*Kṛ.U.Bh.2-3-5*).

If one asks : ‘How are we to know that such experience is *ātmānubhava* (the experience of *ātmā* in its real nature)? Though highly covetable, what is the criterion that it conforms to the real nature of *ātmā*?’ This is where the role of inquiry into the *ātmāsvārūpa* with necessary prerequisites comes into picture. The scripture of Vedānta in the form of Upaniṣad-*pramāṇa* (*śruti*) has described exactly the indescribable *ātmānubhava* with its means in detail. The reasoning (*yukti*) justifies it. Further the *vidvadanubhava* [the direct or *aparokṣa* experience of *ātmā* free from *tripuṭī* (trio consisting of the knower, knowledge-thought, and the known) gained by *jñānīs*] validates its correctness. This *ātmānubhava* ascertains the *śodhita tvam pada* (*nirupādhika ātmā*) indicated by the ‘*tat tvam asi*’ *mahāvākya*. *Ātmā* experienced thus is pointed out by the *mahāvākya* as ‘*tat*’ (Brahman). Without being aware of ‘*tvam*’ (you) as real ‘I’ in terms of *ātmānubhava* the *mahāvākya* fails to reveal Brahman because all along what we experience is the *tvam* (you) as ‘I’ who happens to be only the *saṃsārī jīva*. That *sopādhika jīva* with its calamitous *saṃsāra* can never be the *asaṃsārī nirupādhika* Brahman. Please keep in mind that the ignorance of *ātmā* abides in the *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*). The knowledge also has to take place in *antaḥkaraṇa* only. *Ātmā* in its real nature being *nirupādhika* has neither bondage nor liberation. All pursuit is on the part of *sopādhika ātmā* called *jīva* who is required to transform the extrovert mind into a totally introvert one. During the life-span there has to be some connection of *antaḥkaraṇa* in a subtle form with the physical body. Whether a person gains self-knowledge or not, such connection with the present body gets snapped only at death when the *prārabdha* ends.

From the above discussion it should be clear that the “notions such as the

nirvikalpa samādhi has no utility in gaining *ātmajñāna* or *prapañca-pravilāpana* is not possible because *upādhis* according to some people can never be ended”, are wrong. It is true that *ātma vicāra*, etc., as guided by the *śruti* is indispensable to ascertain the real nature of *ātmā*. Without such ascertainment the *nirvikalpa samādhi* because of some erroneous notions will get reduced to *andha samādhi* and not *viveka-prajñā samādhi* that Vedānta envisages. This topic is discussed elsewhere (*A.Pr.Ch.5-87*, commentary).

In Vedānta while describing the means that have to be acquired to gain *aparokṣa-ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna* the state of mind required is described by words or phrases such as *nirvikalpa samādhi*, *prapañca-pravilāpana*, *adhyāropaṇa-nivṛtti*, *adhyāropa-nirākarāṇa*, *citta-samādhāna*, *samāhita-citta*, etc. They are either synonyms or interrelated with one common feature of total non-cognition of dualistic *jagat* including the body, *tripuṭī* and the three states of consciousness. In this state of mind distinct from sleep the person is awake all along. This state of mind as described above is so irrespective of the means adopted such as *cit-jada viveka* (*dr̥g-dr̥śya viveka*), *aṣṭāṅgayoga*, *dirgha-praṇava*, *pañcīkaraṇa dhyāna*, *kṛta-upāstitva* (*upāsanā* to the point of *upāśya-daivata-sākṣātkāra*), etc. The *dvaita-jagat* is totally out of range of cognition in the above state of mind will become clear from the following passages of *dīpikā on Nṛsiṃhottara Tāpanīyopaniṣad-6*, by Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni, and the *bhāṣya on Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*.

समाहिताः - बाह्यान्तःकरणगणम् अन्तर्मुखं एकीकृत्य सर्वद्वैतजातविस्मरणपूर्वकं तत्साक्ष्यनुसारेण अवस्थानं समाधानं नाम । एतदेव समाधानं साध्यं साधनं च भवति । आत्मनि चित्तसमाधानं एव हि पूर्णसमाधिसाधनम् ।

Tr. *Samādhāna* (of *antaḥkaraṇa*) is (its) abidance conformably to (with similarity to) the *sākṣī* of all *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* on having withdrawn together the group of external senses attended with (accompanied by) the oblivion or unawareness of entire dual *jagat*. This *samādhāna* (deep contemplation) can be both means and the end. The *samādhāna* of *antaḥkaraṇa* in *ātmā* alone is the means to attain the intense *vivekaprajñā-samādhi* (*Dīpikā, Nṛ. U. Tā-6*).

समाहितः - शान्तः बाह्येन्द्रियव्यापारतः उपशान्तः, तथा दान्तः अन्तःकरणतृष्णातः निवृत्तः उपरतः सर्वेषणाविनिर्मुक्तः संन्यासी, तितिक्षुः द्वन्द्वसहिष्णुः, समाहितः इन्द्रियान्तःकरणचलनरूपात् व्यावृत्त्य एकाग्ररूपेण समाहितः भूत्वा । तदेतद् उक्तं पुरस्तात् । बाल्यं च पाण्डित्यं च निर्विद्य (*Bṛ. U. 3-5-1*) आत्मानि एव स्वे कार्यकरणसंघाते आत्मानं प्रत्यक्चेतयितारं पश्यति ।

Tr. A *Sannyāsi* who is *śanta* (has withdrawn from the extroverted pursuits of senses), *dānta* (has stopped the hankering for sense-pleasures), *uparata* (has freed himself from all types of desires), *titikṣu* (has forbearance while undergoing the pairs of opposites), *samāhita* (has composed oneself with single pointed concentration having withdrawn from all functions of senses and *antaḥkaraṇa*) sees (experiences) *citsvarūpa pratyagātmā* in this body itself. This accomplishment itself was described earlier (*Br.U.3-5-1*) as ‘having thoroughly gained (*nirvidya*) the *ātmavijñāna* (*ātmāsākṣātkāra*) called *pāṇḍitya* and *bālyā* (the strength which totally discards the sense-indulgence by the means of *ātmavidyā*)’ (*Br.U.Bh.4-4-23*).

These passages bear the testimony that an *antaḥkaraṇa* totally withdrawn from, and oblivious to the dualistic *dr̥śya jagat*, and in conformity (similarity) to *sākṣī caitanya*, (i.e. *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti*) is indispensable in gaining *ātmajñāna*. This should also make it clear that mere understanding of *ādhyātmika* scriptures with *tripuṭī* and the perception of *dr̥śya* dualistic *jagat* intact can never be the *aparokṣa ātmajñāna*. Such understanding, if it is correct, can only be the *parokṣa-jñāna*, indirect in nature.

It is needless to say that in such introvert state of *antaḥkaraṇa* with its *samskāra-śeṣa* (residual impressions) serving as a mirror, and which state is indispensable to gain *ātmajñāna*, the *nitya anubhava-svarūpa* (ever self-experiencing principle) *ātmā* gets reflected in its *upādhiless* real nature. This reveals the *nirupādhika ātmānubhava* (experience or awareness of *ātmā* in its real nature) totally free from experiential *samsāra*. To know ‘I am hungry’, I should experience or be aware of hunger. To know that my hunger is appeased also I should experience the absence of hunger. Similarly to know that ‘I am free from experiential *samsāra*’, I must necessarily experience at least for a while in my full awareness (and not in sleep) that I am free from *samsāra*. The rule is: ‘Any undesirable subjective experience or deeply rooted erroneous notion can be terminated only by its opposite or correct subjective experience alone’ (*Yo.Vā.Ni.U.79-31*). Notwithstanding this to say that *ātmajñāna* is not experiential is an outcome of not understanding the full import of *nitya anubhava-svarūpa* (ever self-experiencing or ever self-evident) nature of *ātmā*. This will become clear from the following fact.

We mistake ourselves to be *samsārī jīvas* because we experience so all along. As a result we conclude because of ignorance that we are *samsārīs*. If in reality the self-evident ‘I’ is free from *samsāra*, we must experience ourselves to be totally free from *samsāra* in our full waking at least for a while and some *pramāṇa* that can never

be invalidated has to validate it as our real nature. Thus *ātmānubhava* becomes the basis for *aparokṣa ātmajñāna*. No separate efforts are needed to gain *ātmānubhava* except the ending of entire *adhyasta dṛśya anātmā* from the range of one's cognition coupled with the ascertainment of *ātmā* by taking to *śravaṇa*, etc. The changeless *caitanya* 'I' (*ātmā*) which is the *sākṣī* of everything never becomes extinct like the heat of fire (*Br.U.4-3-23* to *30*). *Ātmā* is *vipaścī* which never ceases to exist (*aviparilupta*) (*Kṛ.U.Bh.1-2-18*). This being the nature of self-evident, self-experiencing (*anubhava-svarūpa*) *cit-svarūpa ātmā*, it never loses its experience-nature whether it is a state of ignorance or knowledge. Notwithstanding this fact to claim that *ātmajñāna* is not experiential is only the outcome of not knowing its (of *ātmajñāna*) nature. Impervious to the totally introvert state of mind required or being blissfully ignorant of such necessity, some people advocate that *ātmajñāna* is mere understanding of Vedānta which is a *pramāṇa* and therefore *ātmānubhava* is not required. They translate the word '*anubhava*' (experience) or '*svānubhava*' (one's experience or the experience of *ātmā*) from *ādhyātmika* lore as knowledge or recognition, and the word '*samāhita*' by a vague phrase such as 'composed mind' with a gleeful notion that they have proved their stand! They take *ātmajñāna* to be a process of information-gathering. This appears convincing because often the information passes as knowledge in the world. But the experience true to the entity to be known always precedes its knowledge if the entity is experientially available like the *pratyakṣa jñāna* (perceptual knowledge through sense-organs). *Ātmā* is always self-evident (*nitya anubhava-svarūpa*) the basic self-experiencing principle. It becoming non-experiential or जड (inert) at any time is next to impossible. Therefore its knowledge must precede *ātmānubhava* free from *saṃsāra*. This requirement can never be vitiated.

Bhāṣyakāra asserts the above fact in the *sūtrabhāṣya* when he says, 'In the case of *Brahmajñāna*, in addition to the *śruti*, etc., the direct experience of Brahman, (and reasoning) are also *pramāṇas* as it is appropriate to the context (श्रुत्यादयः अनुभवादयः च यथासंभवम् इह प्रमाणं) (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-2*). The appropriateness of experience as a *pramāṇa* is because *ātmā* (identical with Brahman) is always the self-experiencing principle (*nitya anubhava-svarūpa*) and therefore its experiential nature never gets extinct. That is why the *aparokṣa* (direct) knowledge is just impossible without being aware of (or in other words without the experience of) *ātmā*/Brahman in reality free from *saṃsāra* including the *pramātā* (knower). This was verified earlier in the context of knowing hunger and its appeasement. It was

corroborated also by the rule cited by the sage Vasiṣṭha. Keeping in view these facts the *bhāṣyakāra* concludes his assertion by pointing out that *Brahmajñāna* culminates in its experience since it pertains to the ever-existent entity that is always experiential (अनुभवावसानत्वात् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वात् च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य) (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-2*). Therefore to say that *Brahmajñāna* does not need *Brahmānubhava* because Vedānta is a *pramāṇa* is a misconceived notion. Whether any direct knowledge needs or not the experience conforming to the entity to be known depends on the nature of that entity, and not the indispensable *pramāṇa*. This is why the truth revealed by Vedānta rests on three cardinal tests of *śruti* (Upaniṣads) *yukti* (reasoning) and *anubhava* (experience) true to the nature of *ātmā* free from *saṃsāra*. The reasoning and experience serve as *pramāṇa* only when they are in conformity with the *śruti*, but not otherwise.

Vedānta is not an exercise in verbosity, but the final means to set right our present 24x7 erroneous experience of calamitous *saṃsāra* by revealing our real nature *ātmā* totally free from *saṃsāra* whereby *nitya Paramānanda ātmā* which is always *anubhava-svarūpa* (self-experiencing principle) alone remains. This is only the continuance of *nitya ātmānubhava* in its real experiential nature free from hitherto *sopādhika* experiential *saṃsāra*. No new experience is produced. Only the obstructing veiling of *adhyāsa* is removed by the means provided by Vedānta. That is the fruition of Vedānta *pramāṇa* wherein that *pramāṇa* itself ceases in the absence of *pramātā* like the dream-*pramāṇa* on waking up (*B.G.Bh.2-69*). *Brahmānubhava* is defined as the imperceptible (*atīndriya*, without being an object of any senses) manifestation (appearance, revelation) of *cit* (*caitanya*, pure awareness) totally withdrawn from the cognition of *dr̥śya-viśayas* (अविषयतया एव विषयानुपरक्त-चित्सफुरणं ब्रह्मानुभवः।) (*Ānandagiri gloss-Ke.U.Bh.2-1*). Anything short of this is *parokṣa-jñāna*, but not *aparokṣa* in nature.

Those according to whom the *prapañca-pravilāpana* is not possible because of *saṃskāra-śeṣa* (residual impressions) in either *nirvikalpa samādhi* or in *pralaya* claim that the phrase '*prapañca-pravilāpana*' means only '*mithyā-niścaya*' (ascertainment of *mithyātva* or falsity) of *saṃsāra/jagat*. But without the '*satya adhiṣṭhāna darśana*' (direct experience or cognition of real basis) the *mithyā* (false) nature of *adhyasta* (superimposed entity) cannot be ascertained. Only directly seeing the basis rope can prove that the superimposed snake is *mithyā*. Similarly only *ātmānubhava* (experience of 'I' in reality) coupled with *śāstra-pramāṇa* can ascertain the *saṃsāra* or *prapañca* to be *mithyā*. Simply parroting *śāstra-pramāṇa* by

itself is not a remedy of calamitous *samsāra*. It is like simply reading a medical prescription with full faith in the doctor. It cannot cure the disease. These topics will become more and more clear as we proceed with the text. Based on Upaniṣads the author does address all such wrong notions.

Bhāṣyakāra describes the *samādhi* or *niruddha citta* as ‘*niruddham-sarvataḥ nivārita-pracāram*’ (*citta* totally withdrawn from all extrovertedness, *vṛttis* and activities) (*B.G.Bh.6-20*). *Niruddha citta* is highly *sāttvika* whereas sleep is full of *tamas* with *avidyā-vṛttis*. Control of sense (*akṣarodha*) is a means of *citta-nirodha*. In yogic terminology it is called *pratyāhāra*-the abidance of senses in the *citta* itself after withdrawing themselves from their respective sense-objects (*Pā.Yo.Sū.2-54*). Thereby one gains total mastery over the senses (*Pā.Yo.Sū.2-55*). By developing staunch *vairāgya* (dispassion) through *viveka*, abstaining from all avoidable sense-contacts and not loading the mind with unwanted informations help to gain the mastery over the senses. Reality of sense-objects and the *jagat* becomes more and more confirmed by consistent sense-indulgence. According to *Yogaśāstra* which leans on *Sāṅkhya* school of thought, the *viśayas* (sense-objects) are real because of being the product of their *prakṛti* which is *satya* (real). Therefore the author specifies the yoga as described in the Vedas (*Śv.U.2-8*) because Upaniṣads have very clearly established the *mithyātva* (falsity) of *dṛśya jagat* and the non-dual nature of Brahman. Vedānta does accept the *Pātañjala* Yoga as a means to enable the mind to be a replica of *ātmā*, but it does not accept their doctrine which implies duality. Yoga as a means is very clear from the statement of *Bhāṣyakāra*: *Samādhi pariśuddhena antaḥkaraṇena ātmā upalabhamānaḥ* (directly experiencing *ātmā* by the means of *antaḥkaraṇa* cleansed by *samādhi* (*B.G.Bh.6-20*)). Thus *Pātañjala* Yoga is a *citta-cikitsaka śāstra* – a scripture that treats the *antaḥkaraṇa* to make it fit to gain *ātmajñāna* and the *jñānaniṣṭhā* (firm abidance in self-knowledge).

The non-cognition of *dṛśya jagat* is a means to directly experience *ātmā* in its true nature without *tripuṭī* and to gain *niṣṭhā* in *ātmajñāna*. Once the *jñānaniṣṭhā* is gained and *mithyātva* is known beyond any trace of doubt, the appearance or disappearance of the *jagat* is immaterial. The author highlights this point.

सदात्मनः पृथग्भूतमसद्भूम्यादि
तेन तत् ।
भात्वक्षैः कार्यकृद् वाऽस्तु मिथ्यैव
स्याद् घटादिवत् ॥३४॥

सदात्मनः - from the *ātmā* having
the nature of ever-existence (*sat*) पृथक्
भूतम् - that are (or appear to be) different
भूम्यादि - (the *jagat* consisting of) earth,

etc. असत् - are false (*mithyā*) in nature तेन
 - therefore तत् - (let) those (earth, etc.)
 अक्षैः - by the senses भातु - be perceived वा
 - or कार्यकृत् - (be) useful अस्तु - let it be
 (तथापि - even then) घटादिवत् - like pot, etc.
 मिथ्या एव स्यात् - they are certainly *mithyā*
 (false) – (34)

34. The earth, etc., (together called *jagat*) that are (or appear to be) different from *sat ātmā* are *mithyā* (false) in nature. Therefore let them be perceived by the senses or be useful, (even then) they are certainly *mithyā* (false) like mud pot, etc.

As already seen earlier, devoid of mud there is no independent existence of mud pot or its utility. So also the *jagat* without *sat, cit, ānanda ātmā* neither appears to exist nor has its spell of *saṃsāra*. Physically the mud pot cannot be separated from the mud. Only in terms of knowledge one can know that the mud is real and the pot is only an erroneous appearance. Similarly by inquiry as guided by the Upaniṣads and consequent direct knowledge, it is possible to know that *ātmā/Paramātmā* is real and the *jagat* constituted of names and forms is false (*mithyā*). The direct cognition or experience of *ātmā* free from the superimposed *jagat* and consequent *saṃsāra* is essential to counteract the hitherto experience in the state of ignorance wherein *ātmā* is directly experienced to be a *saṃsārī*. The experiential sorrowful *saṃsāra* can be ended only by an antidotal experience wherein there is no *saṃsāra* at all. It is just like your experiential pangs of hunger can be overcome only by the remedy of experiential hunger-appeasement. Simply gathering the information from the scriptures with *śraddhā* in it is only *parokṣa jñāna* (indirect knowledge). Gaining the direct experience of *ātmā* is like the indispensability of directly seeing the crystal to be colourless without its *upādhi* to know its true nature when a crystal is mistaken to be red in the close proximity of a red hibiscus flower. Then only the appearance of the red colour seen in the crystal is known to be false. A *mithyā* appearance of a superimposed entity gets exposed only on seeing the *satya* basis totally free from that superimposed entity. Thereafter the appearance of superimposed entity can neither invoke any reality nor invalidate the true knowledge. Likewise on gaining *niṣṭhā* (firmness) in *ātmā*, the appearance of *jagat* is not a problem.

APAVĀDA - JAGAT IN REALITY IS ĀTMĀ

The result of self-inquiry (begun from vs.19) is now concluded by

describing its final outcome expressed by the *śruti* in the phrase ‘*kim iha anyam vāvadiṣat*’ (What can I speak out of something other than Brahman in this

jagat?) (*Ai.U.1-3-13*). The *Paramātmā* who entered the body as *jīva* ascertained that everything is falsely projected by *māyā*. The only reality is Brahman. Therefore 'I' am unable to speak of anything else other than Brahman because truly it does not exist. The next two verses explain this conclusion.

ईदृग्विवेकदृष्ट्येदं

जगदात्मैव नेतरत् ।

एवं सत्यात्मनोऽन्यत् किं

वस्तुतोऽस्तीति शङ्क्यते ॥३५॥

ईदृग्विवेकदृष्ट्या - by such discrimination (as told in the Upaniṣad) इदम् - this जगत् - world (Creation) आत्मा - (gets reduced to) *ātmā* एव - only इतरत् न - (and) nothing other than *ātmā* एवं - thus सत्यात्मनः अन्यत् - something other than the real *ātmā* वस्तुतः - in reality अस्ति - is there इति - so किं - wherefore शङ्क्यते - (it) is doubted (there is no scope for such doubt)–(35)

35. By such discrimination (as told in the Upaniṣad) this world (Creation) gets reduced to *ātmā* only (and) nothing other than *ātmā*. Thus wherefore it is doubted that there is something in reality other than the real *ātmā*? (There is no scope for such doubt).

Here the discrimination is the actual ascertainment of what is real (*satyam*) and what is false (*mithyā*)

because there is a confusion of taking *satyam* (*ātmā*) as *mithyā* and the *mithyā* (*jagat*) to be *satyam*. In the direct cognition or experience of *ātmā* the entire *jagat* becomes extinct without any trace of it. This reveals that the *drśya jagat* can never be there in three periods of time. Thus it gets sublated (*bādhita*) in the wake of *ātmajñāna* exposing its *mithyā* (false) nature even if it appears to be there during the state of ignorance.

The phrase '*jagat ātmā eva*' (*jagat* is *ātmā* only or gets reduced to *ātmā*) is a 'sublated equation' (*bādhita sāmānādhikaranyam*). It is just like saying 'the thief is a stump' (*sthāṇurayam puruṣaḥ*). A thief can never be a stump. But when a stump is mistaken for a thief, the above statement holds good by sublating the mistaken thief on seeing its basis the stump. Thief was imagined and the stump is the reality. So is the *jagat* (Creation) of names and forms falsely projected on the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of *ātmā*. The *jagat* has no existence apart from *ātmā*.

'*Kim śaṅkate*' (wherefore it is doubted) is not an actual question, but it voices the objection suggesting that there is no scope for any doubt.

अद्वयानन्दरूपात्मा सृष्टेः

पूर्वमभूद्यथा ।

तथैवाद्यापि सम्पन्नो बुद्ध्या

सम्यग् विवेचितः ॥३६॥

यथा - just as सृष्टेः पूर्वम् - before Creation अद्वयानन्दरूपात्मा - *ātmā* who is non-dual happiness in nature अभूत् - was there तथा एव - truly in the same manner अद्य अपि - even now (during the state of Creation) सम्पन्नः - (the same nature of *ātmā*) holds good (इति - so) सम्यक् - thoroughly विवेचितः - (*ātmā*) ascertained बुद्ध्या - by the intellect – (36)

36. Just as before Creation there was *ātmā* who is non-dual happiness in nature, truly in the same manner even now (during the state of Creation) (the same nature of *ātmā*) holds good. So *ātmā* is (thus) thoroughly ascertained by the intellect.

Ātmā (Brahman) is the only ever-existent *sat* principle and itself the *cit* (knowledge) and *ānanda* (limitless happiness) in nature. It is non-dual. It was before Creation, it is during Creation and continues forever even after the end of Creation. The superimposed (*adhyasta*) false Creation in no way can affect or change *ātmā*. Whether Creation is present or not *ātmā* continues to be the same. It is just like the rope which is the basis of a mistaken snake totally independent and unaffected by the presence or absence of the superimposed snake. *Bhāṣyakāra* clarifies that the locus or basis of any superimposed entity is not at all connected to the virtues and the

defects of what is superimposed (*Br.Sū.adhyāsa-bhāṣya*).

APAVĀDA - ĀTMĀ IS BRAHMAN

The subsequent *śruti* continues further the description of how the *jīva* discovered its true nature. ‘The *jīva* described hitherto as the one who is none other than the Creator of *jagat* who entered the body through the aperture on the top of the head (vs.12) making oneself available as the *jīva* abiding in the body, discovered itself as Brahman, the most pervasive (*tatatamam, तततमम्*)’ (*Ai.U.1-3-13*). In short, the true nature of *drśya* (perceptible) *jagat* and the *jīva* is the principle of Brahman. This is the gist of the topic of *apavāda* (refutation of Creation).

इत्थं सर्वात्मकं ब्रह्म विविच्य पुनरप्यसौ ।
एतमेव स्वमात्मानं ब्रह्मत्वेन व्यलोकयत् ॥३७॥

इत्थं - thus सर्वात्मकं ब्रह्म - Brahman the true nature (*ātmā*) of the entire *jagat* (or *samsāra*) विविच्य - having ascertained असौ - that *jīva* पुनः अपि - and also, again एतम् एव - truly this स्वम् आत्मानम् - oneself ब्रह्मत्वेन - as Brahman itself व्यलोकयत् - directly knew – (37)

37. Thus that *jīva* having ascertained Brahman the true nature of the entire *jagat* (or *samsāra*), again directly knew oneself truly as Brahman itself.

The inquirer here is the *jīva* who is none other than *Īśvara* who entered the body to make oneself available as *jīva* (vs.19). *Caitanya* (*ātmā*) endowed with the *upādhi* of *māyā* is *Īśvara* whereas the same *caitanya* conditioned by *avidyā* (self-ignorance) at individual level is the *jīva*. The *caitanya* distinguished from both *upādhis* is one and the same principle and not two distinct entities. This reveals that *jīva* in reality is *Īśvara*.

The next verse deduces the identity between *jīva* and Brahman by analysing the constituents of *jīva* as specified in the verse 15. The equation given therein was *jīva* as a composite entity of *cit*, reflected *cit* (*cit pratibimba* or *cicchāya*) and *ahaṃkāra*.

अहङ्कारश्च चिच्छया मिथ्या भूम्यादिवत् ततः ।
चिदात्मैकोऽवशिष्टोऽयं जीवो ब्रह्मैव नेतरः ॥३८॥

अहङ्कारः - the 'I' notion च - and चिच्छया - reflection of *caitanya* भूम्यादिवत् - like the earth, etc. मिथ्या - are false ततः - therefore एकः - the only चिदात्मा - *ātmā* having the nature of *cit* (from the constituents of *jīva*) अवशिष्टः - is left (एवं - thus) अयं - this जीवः - *jīva* ब्रह्म एव - is Brahman only इतरः न - nothing else - (38)

38. The 'I' notion and the reflection of *caitanya* are false like the earth, etc. Therefore only the (real

entity) left (from the constituents of *jīva*) is *ātmā* having the nature of *cit*. Thus *jīva* is Brahman only and nothing else.

On scrutinizing the constituents of *jīva*, the false (*mithyā*) nature of *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) and the reflection of *caitanya* becomes clear on account of their transitory nature. They are the products of transient superimposed (*adhyasta*) *upādhis*. The remaining *cit* (*caitanya*) happens to be the true nature of *jīva*. It is all the time same whether the status of *jīva* is superimposed on *cit* or not. Thus *jīva* in reality is Brahman the all pervasive *caitanya*. On inquiry with an eligible mind its ever-liberated nature becomes evident because the notion of bondage is false (*mithyā*) in nature.

Who and how of gaining the knowledge of identity between *jīva* and Brahman begun in the verse 37 is explained now.

यथाशास्त्रं विविच्येत्थं

प्रत्यग्दृष्ट्या चिदात्मनः ।

साक्षाच्चकार ब्रह्मत्वं जीवः

शान्त्यादिसंयुतः ॥३९॥

शान्त्यादिसंयुतः - endowed with *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti* (fourfold prerequisite) comprising *śama* (mastery over the mind), *dama* (mastery over the senses), etc. जीवः - *jīva* यथाशास्त्रं - in accordance with the scriptures इत्थं - thus

विविच्य - having ascertained प्रत्यग्दृष्ट्या - by the totally introvert *buddhi* conforming to *ātmā* चिदात्मनः - of *cidātmā* (of *ātmā* whose nature is *cit*) ब्रह्मत्वं - identity with Brahman साक्षाच्चकार - directly experienced—(39)

39. The *jīva* endowed with

sādhana-catuṣṭaya-saṃpatti (fourfold prerequisite) comprising *śama*, *dama*, etc. having ascertained (one's real nature) in accordance with the scriptures directly experienced the identity of *cidātmā* with Brahman by the totally introvert *buddhi* conforming to *ātmā*.

Ātmā is an entity imperceptible to the senses. It being the very nature of the knower (*pramātā*) cannot be the object of itself. It is well-known that a subject cannot be its object. Its inquiry has to be strictly as guided by the Upaniṣads. In the academic education the intelligence alone counts. But *ātmajñāna* needs an *antaḥkaraṇa* or *buddhi* capable of conforming itself to the true nature of *ātmā* as its replica. Then only *avidyā* (self-ignorance) can be ended. Otherwise it remains as *parokṣajñāna* only, at best a proper understanding of Vedānta-śāstra. Therefore Vedānta highlights the indispensability of cultivating *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-saṃpatti*. They are:

- i) *Viveka* (discrimination between *ātmā* and *anātmā*).
- ii) *Vairāgya* (dispassion or disinterestedness in the sense-pleasures here and hereafter by seeing their defects and incompetency to make oneself contented).
- iii) The group of six disciplines such as *śama*, *dama*, etc.: a) *Śama* is the mastery over the mind. b) *Dama* is the mastery over the senses. c) *Upama* is the withdrawal from the preoccupation in *karmas*. d) *Titikṣā* is the endurance or forbearance of pairs of opposites such as pain and pleasure, heat and cold, honour and dishonour, etc., and other pinpricks of life. e) *Śraddhā* is the attitude of trust in *Īśvara*, *guru* and the *śāstras* (scriptures) with a firm conviction that they are useful. f) *Samādhāna* is the composure of the mind.
- iv) *Mumukṣutvam* is an intense yearning for liberation from *saṃsāra*.

All the above prerequisite along with *Karmayoga* including *bhakti* (devotion) and other values such as *amānitvam* (absence of pride), etc., (*B.G.* 13-7 to 11) enables the *antaḥkaraṇa* to be pure (*śuddha*). In such an *antaḥkaraṇa* only the *ātmā*/Brahman gets reflected in its true nature without the *adhyasta* (superimposed) features of all *upādhis*. Such a *vṛtti* (thought) called *akhaṇḍākāra* or *ātmākāra vṛtti* is described

here as *pratyak-dṛṣṭi*. The word *pratyak* (interior) shows the introvertedness of such a thought centred on *ātmā* alone to the total exclusion of all extrovertedness. *Cidātmā* so experienced directly gets revealed itself as Brahman by the *mahāvākya pramāṇa*. This is *sākṣātkāra* wherein the self-evident *ātmā* having the same nature (*tādātmya*) of Brahman gets revealed on its own. Even the *akhaṇḍākāra vṛtti* which was necessary in the beginning gets dropped at the final stage. What remains is Brahman in its true nature totally free from *prapañca*.

APAVĀDA - JÑĀNĪ IS CALLED INDRA

The *śruti* further describes the exclamation of the *jīva* who has discovered directly its true nature *ātmā*: ‘Oh, I saw (directly experienced) this (the most proximate ‘I’ referred to as *idam*) true nature of mine. Because of this vision the *jñānī* or *ātmā* has the name ‘*Idandraḥ*’. The same *Idandra* is called indirectly as ‘*Indraḥ*’ because it is dear to deities or the exalted ones that they are addressed indirectly by a nickname’ (*Ai.U.1-3-13, 14*). The next three verses explain this topic.

इदमित्यपरोक्षेण ददर्शति विवक्षया ।

इन्द्रनामाभूज्ज्ञानी वैयाकरणदृष्टितः ॥४०॥

वैयाकरणदृष्टितः - from the grammarian's viewpoint इदम् इति - as ‘this’ अपरोक्षेण - directly ददर्श - saw इति विवक्षया - in the sense of ज्ञानी - *jñānī* इन्द्रनाम - named ‘*Idandra*’ अभूत्- became –(40)

40. From the grammarian's viewpoint the *jñānī* got named ‘*Idandra*’

in the sense that he saw Brahman directly as ‘this’.

The pronoun *idam* (this) is used for all proximate entities other than ‘I’ (*ātmā*) which can be known very clearly. *Ātmā* can never be ‘this’ (*idam*). Yet, the word ‘*idam*’ (this) is used for *ātmā* to suggest its total proximity as ‘I’ itself besides the clarity of its knowledge that one can gain. Further, *ātmā* cannot be an ocular object because it is the *caitanya* principle that enables the eye itself to see. Even then the verb saw (*dadarśa* or *adarśam* in the *śruti*) is used to show the directness of *ātmajñāna* without even the *tripuṭī*. Such a usage is employed because the sight is the most direct and powerful mode of perception. It is well-known in the court of law that an eye-witness is the final evidence.

तमिन्द्र इत्याहुरन्ये नाम्नः पारोक्ष्यसिद्धये ।

पूज्यस्य देवपित्रादेः परोक्षं नाम हि प्रियम् ॥४१॥

(किन्तु - but) अन्ये - others तम् - that *Idandra* इन्द्रः इति - as *Indraḥ* आहुः - call नाम्नः - of the name पारोक्ष्यसिद्धये - to present indirectly पूज्यस्य - to the

adorable one देवपित्रादेः - such as deity, father, etc. परोक्षं नाम - indirect name (instead of addressing by the actual one) हि - because प्रियम् - is dear – (41)

41. But, others call that *Idandra* as *Indraḥ* to present it indirectly because an indirect name (nickname) (instead of addressing by the actual one) is dear to the adorable one such as deity, father, etc.

Respectable or elderly persons do not like themselves being addressed by their personal names. They prefer to be called by some change in their names or some adjective or a word of respect. Even till now in India the custom of wife not taking the name of her husband and the children not addressing their parents or grandparents by their proper name is followed in many regions except in case of introducing oneself. It is interesting to note that in the state of Maharashtra till recently, while conversing, the husband used to address his wife indirectly by the phrase ‘did you listen?’ (*aikala kā?*) and the wife to the husband as ‘I said’ (*mī mhaṭala*). *Bṛhadāraṇyaka śruti* states: ‘Deities are somewhat fond of being addressed by an indirect name and dislike the direct one’ (*Br.U.4-2-2*). Therefore ‘*Idandra*’ the etymological name of a *jñānī* who is identical with Brahman is not in much usage. Instead, a changed name, ‘*Indra*’ is in vogue.

Primarily in vogue the name ‘*Indra*’ refers to the King of *devatās* (deities) which suggests the exaltedness. An *ātmajñānī* being Brahman itself is the most exalted one. Thus the name ‘*Indra*’ aptly applies to a *jñānī*.

The verbal root ‘*ind*’ means to have great power or overlordship. Thus, the word ‘*Indra*’ means the overlord the *Parameśvara*. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (2-5-19) declares that ‘*Indra* (*Parameśvara*) appears to be many on account of *buddhi* or identification with various *upādhis* (called *māyā*), but not in reality’. A *jñānī* being *Parameśvara* himself in reality, the name *Indra* can directly point to him. Having told this fact the first chapter of *Aitareyopaniṣad* is concluded now.

परमेश्वररूपत्वादपीन्द्रत्वमिहोचितम् ।

समाप्ता ब्रह्मविद्येयमुत्तमस्याधिकारिणः ॥४२॥

परमेश्वररूपत्वात् - because of being identical with *Parameśvara* (ज्ञानिनः) इन्द्रत्वम् अपि - the status of *jñānī* as *Indra* इह - (as described) here in the *Aitareyopaniṣad* उचितम् - is quite befitting इयम् ब्रह्मविद्या - this *Brahmavidyā* (taught so far) उत्तमस्य अधिकारिणः - for a highly eligible seeker समाप्ता - is adequate – (42)

42. The status of a *jñānī* as *Indra* as described here in the *Aitareyopaniṣad* is quite befitting because both *jñānī* and

Parameśvara are identical. This *Brahmavidyā* (taught so far) is adequate for a highly eligible seeker.

This Upaniṣad started with the declaration that before Creation *ātmā* without the manifest names and forms only was there. Then Creation was superimposed including the entity *jīva*. Further the *jīva* inquired into its nature and that of *jagat* only to discover itself to be nothing but Brahman in reality. The Upaniṣad adopted the method of *adhyāropa* (superimposition) and its *apavāda* (refutation). This much teaching of *Brahmavidyā* is sufficient to a highly eligible (*uttama*) seeker who has intense *vairāgya* (dispassion), mastery over the mind and the senses besides other prerequisite. The seekers who are in the category of mediocre (*madhyama*) or dull (*manda*) eligibility (*adhikāritva*) need to be taught more elaborately. Therefore Upaniṣad continues its teaching.

VAIRĀGYA (DISPASSION) - THREE BIRTHS

In gaining the *ātmajñāna* vividly, intense *mumukṣā* (yearning for liberation) and *vairāgya* are the most indispensable. When these two things are accomplished, the other requisite such as *śama*, *dama*, etc., become effective and fruitful. If *mumukṣā* and *vairāgya* are dull, the *śama* and *dama*,

etc., even if they appear to be there, they are no better than an illusive mirage in a desert (*Vi.Cu.29, 30*). Considering the unique role of *vairāgya*, the *śruti* expounds it in a greater detail. In the context of *adhyāropa* (superimposition) the Upaniṣad had pointed out the waking, dream and sleep as the three places or abodes (called *āvasathas*) inhabited by the *jīva* (*Ai.U.1-3-12*) (vs.16 and 17). The same topic is further elaborated in the third chapter of this Upaniṣad by describing the three births of *jīva*. First of all the *jīva* enters the semen of the would be father. From there reaching the mother's womb by conception is the first birth (*Ai.U.2-1-1*). The actual birth in the form of the son from the mother's womb is the second birth in the light of the first birth in the form of semen (*retas*) conceived as foetus in the womb (*Ai.U.2-1-3*). At the end of the present life after death entering the body of the next father as semen is the third birth (*Ai.U.2-1-4*). The purpose of narrating all these is to inculcate intense *vairāgya* in the *mumukṣu* (seeker of liberation). Therefore the next verse introduces *vairāgya* as one of the main means in gaining self-knowledge by highlighting its role.

विरक्तस्योक्तबोधः स्याद् वैराग्यं दोषदर्शनात् ।
जन्मैव प्रथमो दोषस्तद्धीभत्सा निरूप्यते ॥४३॥

उक्तबोधः - the direct self-knowledge (revealed by the *śruti* so far) विरक्तस्य स्यात् - can be gained (only) by a dispassionate (*virakta*) person वैराग्यं - *vairāgya* दोषदर्शनात् (स्यात्) - takes place by dwelling on the defects of sense-objects and one's existence as a *samsārī* प्रथमः दोषः - the main defect (of *sāmsārika* or worldly existence) जन्म एव - is taking to birth only तद्भीभत्सा - the loathsomeness and fright of birth निरूप्यते - is being

described – (43)

43. The direct self-knowledge (revealed by the *śruti* so far) can be gained (only) by a dispassionate (*virakta*) person. *Vairāgya* takes place by dwelling on the defects of sense-objects and one's existence as a *samsārī*. The main defect (of *sāmsārika* or worldly existence) is taking to birth only. (Therefore) the loathsomeness and the fright of birth is being described.

The direct *ātmajñāna-Brahmajñāna* can be gained only by a person who has total *vairāgya*. He is the best eligible one to gain this knowledge. Total disinterestedness in all the desirable things ranging from the post of *Hiraṇyagarbha* to any insignificant sense-object is the highest *vairāgya*. People generally fall for sense-objects (*viśayas*) being enamoured by some virtues in them. As a result, they conveniently ignore the fact that *viśayas* breed perpetual sorrows in the long run. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa describes the sense-pleasures as nectarine to begin with, but at the end they become like poison (*B.G.* 18-38). He has fixed a big name-plate to this world. It is: ‘*Anityam* (transient) *asukham* (sorrowful)’ (*B.G.* 9-33). No sensible person will opt for an immediate transient pleasure which ends in enormous sorrow. Therefore the first stepping stone for developing *vairāgya* is *viveka* - the faculty of discrimination as to what is everlasting and what is ephemeral. In spite of seeming virtues the inherent defects in the sense-object will dissuade a person from indulging in the *viśayas*. No one would like to eat the sweets that are poisonous. It should be kept in the mind that the chief instrument of sense-indulgence is the physical body coupled with the subtle body. Our entire care and concern is for these bodies only. But it is a fact that body is the biggest source of sorrows beginning from birth up to the death besides being infested in between by diseases, cyclic hunger and thirst, old age, etc. The mind preoccupied in sense-indulgence can never hope to take to self-inquiry and gain *ātmajñāna*. Thus *vairāgya* becomes indispensable.

In some manuscripts of *Aitareyopaniṣad*, before the beginning and after the end of second chapter, two instructions are appended. In the beginning the pregnant ladies are requested to leave the audience (*apakrāmantu garbhīnyah*). At the end they are requested to resume their seats (*yathāsthānam garbhīnyah*). This is to avoid their exposing to the teaching on *vairāgya* centred on birth. It will be a great offence if by developing *vairāgya* they neglect the upbringing of foetus without realizing their immediate duty. Already accepted commitments will have to be honoured. If they had developed *vairāgya* before marriage, occasion of such duty itself will not crop up in the absence of marriage. That does not mean that ladies should not develop *vairāgya* after marriage. Even a youngster who develops *vairāgya* soon after marriage cannot leave the young wife in the lurch to fend for herself and take himself to *sannyāsa*. According to the scriptures the consent of his wife is necessary in such cases. It is also well-known that in general the only son of the parents is not expected to take to *sannyāsa*. The above instructions can also be for the purpose of avoiding any possible lustful thoughts in the minds of the pregnant ladies on listening to the occasion of conception contained in the teaching. Such unwanted thoughts can

imprint undesirable impressions in the mental texture of the would-be baby. Pre-natal education was a matter of common knowledge and practice in the ancient India.

VAIRĀGYA - THE FIRST BIRTH

The purpose of *śruti* in describing the three births is to expose the defects in the bodies which are most dear to all. The author here is going to describe the first birth in the verses from 44 to 46, the second in 47 to 52 and the third in 53 and 54. It should be kept in mind that the main purpose of this description is to inculcate *vairāgya* towards the body wherein we get totally involved. The topic of transmigration is discussed in greater detail in the chapter *Janakavidyāprakāśa* (*A.Pr.*18-205 to 242).

स्वर्गाद्वा नरकाद्वायं वृष्टिद्वारान्नसंस्थितः ।

प्रविश्य पितरं तत्र गर्भो भवति रेतसि ॥४४॥

अयं - this *jīva* स्वर्गात् वा - either from heaven नरकात् वा - or from hell वृष्टिद्वारा - along with the rain अन्नसंस्थितः - (having come down) remains in the food (such as rice, wheat, vegetation, etc.) (भुज्यमानतदन्नद्वारा) पितरं प्रविश्य - having entered the body of the father (through the means of eaten food) तत्र - there (in that body) रेतसि - in the semen गर्भः - foetus भवति - becomes—(44)

44. The *jīva* having come down either from heaven or hell along with the rain remains in the food (such as rice, wheat, vegetation, etc.). (Then) having entered the body of the father (when that food is eaten) becomes a foetus there (in that body) in the semen (*śukra*).

Samsāra is beginningless (*anādi*). So the transmigration is also beginningless. In such an incessant flow of bodies wielded by the *jīva*, the numbering of bodies as the first, second, etc., has to be with reference to a certain point. Here the counting is with reference to the present human body of the *mumukṣu*. In accordance with the past *karmaphalas* (results of action) the *jīva* goes to heaven or hell, etc. After the exhaustion of those *karmaphalas* which procured for him the heaven or hell, while descending to the earth, the space, air, clouds, rain, etc., are used as couriers without any identification with them. This is explained in the context of a *upāsanā* called *pañcāgnividya* (*Ch.U.5-10*). Through the rain fallen on the earth (and not on the rocks or oceans), the *jīva* enters and remains in the food such as grains, vegetation, etc. When such food is eaten by a potential father (and not by old people or children, etc.) the *jīva* enters his semen. This shows that to gain a human embodiment is difficult and fraught with rare chance. Therefore having got the human body, the first and the foremost duty is to gain the

ātmajñāna.

तद्रेतः पितृदेहस्थं सर्वाङ्गोभ्यः समुत्थितं ।
पितुः स्वदेहो गर्भाख्यदेहश्चेति वपुर्द्वयम् ॥४५॥

पितृदेहस्थं - abiding in the body of the father तद् - that रेतः - semen सर्वाङ्गोभ्यः - from all limbs समुत्थितम् - is born पितुः - in the case of father स्वदेहः - his own body गर्भाख्यदेहः च - and the body called foetus in the form of semen where a *jīva* has entered इति - so वपुर्द्वयम् - there are two bodies - (45)

45. That semen (sperm) in the father's body is born from his all limbs as their essence. In the case of the father, there are now two bodies, viz. his own body and the body called foetus in the form of semen where a *jīva* has entered.

The food assimilated by the father becomes different primary fluids or essential ingredients of the body called *dhātus*. They are seven in all and the seventh one is the semen (*śukra* or *vīrya*). The *jīva* gets identified with the semen which is now called its body in the form of foetus (*garbha*). This semen now called foetus is the essence of father's body. Therefore it happens to be father's second body in relation to the original one.

स्त्रियां सिञ्चति तद्रेतस्तत्पुत्रोत्पादनं पितुः ।
पुत्ररूपेण तज्जन्म पितुराद्यं स्वयं कृतम् ॥४६॥

तद् रेतः - that semen (in the form of

foetus) स्त्रियां - in his wife सिञ्चति - (the father) instils तत् - that act of instilling (is) पितुः पुत्रोत्पादनं - begetting the son on the part of the father तत् - that instilling of semen in the wife's womb पितुः - of the father पुत्ररूपेण - in the form of son आद्यं - is (father's) first जन्म - birth स्वयं कृतम् - (that) is brought forth by (father) himself – (46)

46. When the father instils that semen (in the form of foetus) in his wife, that act of instilling corresponds to the begetting of son on father's part. That is the first birth of the father in the form of a son brought forth by himself.

Actually it is the wife who conceives the foetus and delivers it later as a baby and not the father. And yet, the semen in the father's body where the *jīva* has entered is called foetus by the *śruti* since the locus of the foetus started there. With current knowledge about chromosomal constitution of human genome it can be stated that the Y chromosome is a must for a progeny to develop into a male. The Y chromosome passes from male to male, i.e. father to son. The mother does not have the Y chromosome and cannot provide this chromosome. The male differentiating Y chromosome passes from father to son generation after generation. Therefore its transfer by the father to the mother's

womb is considered as the first birth of the father in the form of his son. This shows that the *jīva* is present in the mother's womb from the first day of conception. Nowadays the abortion is rampant because of the wrong notion that the *jīva* enters the foetus after the couple of months since conception. This is not correct according to *Aitareya*, *Chāndogya* and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* Upaniṣads. The *jīva* is there in the mother's womb from the first day of conception. The foetus gains the full experiential level of consciousness in its fifth month (*Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*; *Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa*, *Kiṣkindha Kāṇḍa* 8-21 to 29). Until that it is in a state of swoon from the very time of its departure from the heaven or hell. Killing a fainted person is also a murder. Thus abortion is certainly sinful.

VAIRĀGYA - THE SECOND BIRTH

To point out the second birth, the disgusting condition in the mother's womb is described so that one develops *vairāgya* and gets liberated by acquiring *ātmajñāna*.

योषिद्योनिं प्रविश्यायं योषिद्गर्भं स्फुटीभवेत् ।
योषिद्दीर्येण पुष्टोऽसौ तद्देहेनैकतां व्रजेत् ॥४७॥

अयं - this *jīva* योषिद्योनिं - the female organ of generation प्रविश्य - having entered योषिद्गर्भं - in the womb of the

mother स्फुटीभवेत् - grows असौ - that (jīva) योषिद्वीर्येण - by mother's ovum (śoṇita) पुष्टः - nourished तद् देहेन - with her body एकतां ब्रजेत् - becomes one, (i.e. part and parcel of) – (47)

47. The jīva having entered the female organ of generation grows in the mother's womb. Further, being nourished by mother's ovum (śoṇita), it (foetus) becomes part and parcel of her body.

The bodily form in the foetus is the aspect from the father's side which was not concretely perceptible earlier in the semen. It gets nourished by mother's bodily essence beginning from ovum. As it grows the mother comes to know it first and then others.

अन्यथैनां स्त्रियं हन्याद्

गुल्मव्याधिवदान्तरः ।

स्वाङ्गावन्न हिनस्त्येनां गर्भं

रक्षति सा ततः ॥४८॥

अन्यथा - otherwise (if the foetus were not one with mother's body) गुल्मव्याधिवत् - like a chronic enlargement of the spleen आन्तरः (गर्भः) - the foetus in the womb एनां - this स्त्रियं - pregnant lady हन्यात् - would have harmed स्वाङ्गावत् - like one's limb एनां - to this lady न हिनस्ति - does not harm ततः - therefore सा - she (mother) गर्भं - foetus रक्षति - protects – (48)

48. Otherwise (if the foetus were not one with mother's body), like a chronic enlargement of the spleen, the foetus in the womb would have harmed this pregnant lady. It does not harm like her own limb. Therefore, she (mother) protects the foetus.

Only mothers know how much difficult, troublesome and painful it is to bring up the foetus in the womb, leave alone the delivery trauma. In Indian culture, there is an annual death ceremony called 'śrāddha' to propitiate the departed entities. Instead of it there is an alternative called Gayā-śrāddha to be performed only once at Gayā (a holy place in North India). If that is done the annual śrāddhas can be skipped. In Gayā-śrāddha performed for the mother, in the initial saṅkalpa (solemn declaration) the son vividly describes all pains endured by the mother to bring him up from the state of foetus onwards with the expression of total gratitude. Troubles given by him to the mother are also enumerated to seek the pardon from her. The indebtedness to one's mother is so great that any magnitude of our service to her is incapable to repay her obligation.

As seen earlier, the foetus in the wife's womb is none other than the husband himself in the form of a replica. The husband is very dear to the wife. Therefore she tends that foetus with all love and care.

गर्भरूपं भर्तृदेहं यतः सा पालयत्यतः ।
सापि भर्त्रा पालनीया तदिष्टान्नादिवस्तुभिः ॥४९॥

यतः - because सा - she (wife)
गर्भरूपं - in the form of foetus भर्तृदेहं -
husband's body पालयति - protects अतः -
therefore सा अपि - she (wife) also भर्त्रा - by
the husband तदिष्टान्नादिवस्तुभिः - by the food
and other things liked by her पालनीया -
should be protected –(49)

49. Because the wife protects husband's body in the form of foetus, the husband also (for his part) should protect her by providing the food and other things liked by her.

Since the foetus nurtured by the wife is the husband himself in essence, it is incumbent on the husband that he

takes special care of his wife during pregnancy by providing all her needs to her total liking to the best of his capacity. Around seventh or eighth month of the pregnancy the mother gets varieties of cravings of not only different types of food, but also of clothes, ornaments, vehicle, etc. As far as possible, they should be catered to and she be kept in a pleasant mood without anxiety and trouble. It is said that the senses of the child related to the unfulfilled desires can turn out to be deficient in some respect. The wife also should take care that she expresses only the natural desires and does not pester the husband by undue demands. By protecting the wife with nutritious food, etc., the foetus also gets protected indirectly.

Āyurveda (ancient Indian system of medicine) makes clear the high value put on the expectant mother-care and well-being of children. Before trying to know what *Āyurveda* has said about the need of expectant mother-care, it will not be out of place to remind ourselves how advanced this system of medical science was until it was subdued by certain section of vested interests. After the long foreign rule in India, majority of us have a wrong notion that *Āyurveda* is a primitive system of medicines with some herbs and ashes (*bhasmas*). Modern medicos sneer at it. Yet, a slow awareness is growing nowadays about the genuineness of *Āyurveda*.

Āyurveda is an ancient medical system which originates in the Vedas with 'Dhanvantari' as the first physician and Aśvinīkumāras (twins) as the first surgeons. It is interesting to note here that Aśvinīkumāras had done successfully head transplants between the sage Dadhyañ Muni and a horse twice (*Br.U.2-5-16* and *17*). Dhanvantari taught it to sages and thereafter it continued in oral tradition from the teacher to the taught.

Historically this tradition is traced to 5000 BCE. The great two luminaries

whose texts called *Samhitās* (compendiums) are followed now are Charaka and Sushruta (circa - 6th century BCE). These texts are further enlarged by their disciples. Both *Samhitās* discuss the eight branches of *Āyurvedic* medicine. Deep knowledge of anatomy, etiology, embryology, digestion, metabolism, genetics and immunity is also found in many texts. Charaka and Sushruta have presented this medical science in a very organised manner. But in addition to emphasizing therapeutics, Sushruta also discusses surgery, which Charaka barely mentions. Sushruta is considered as the father of Indian surgery and also the father of plastic surgery and Cosmetic surgery. Surgeons in his times conducted surgeries such as caesareans, cataract, artificial limbs, fractures, urinary stones, plastic surgery and even brain surgery. Usage of anaesthesia was well-known in ancient India. Over 125 surgical equipments were used. The technique of forehead flap rhinoplasty (repairing the disfigured nose with a flap of skin from the forehead) that Sushruta used to reconstruct noses is practised almost unchanged in technique to this day. Sushruta *Samhitā* details about 650 drugs of animal, plant and mineral origin. In addition, it describes more than 300 kinds of operations that call for 42 different surgical processes and 121 different types of instruments. In keeping with the *Āyurvedic* philosophy of preserving life and preventing the infirmity of old age, he extols the benefits of clean living, pure thinking, good habits, regular exercises, special diets and drug preparations. It is worth noting here that *Āyurveda* treats the diseases taking into account the entire body as one composite whole entity than the linear method of modern medical science like repairing a motor car part by part independently.

Both these *Āyurvedic* texts were translated into Arabic and later in Persian in the eighth century. That made *Āyurveda* spread far beyond India. Chickenpox inoculation has its origin in India. The procedure of rhinoplasty was observed in India by a British surgeon in 1793. He published it in London the following year. That changed the course of plastic surgery in Europe.

Charaka describes the need of expectant mother-care at length. He says: It is indispensable that the expectant mother has to observe certain restrictions during the pregnancy. Her food and other habits have to be regulated so as to be conducive to the nourishment and the growth of the foetus. Otherwise it can have adverse effect on the foetus in terms of some incompleteness or sickness. Similarly, at a certain stage of pregnancy the mother gets some intense cravings. Their fulfilment has a bearing on the healthy growth of the foetus. At times the causes of such cravings can be mental in

nature. Just as her health has to be kept in good condition, so also she should be kept cheerful all along. This is very necessary from the standpoint of both the mother and the foetus. Lack of such conditions has an adverse effect on the healthy growth of the foetus (*Charaka Śārīra*, 3-23).

At times the cravings of the expectant mother can be prohibitive in terms of demanding verily the restricted food, etc. In such case she should be handled very tactfully without hurting her by harsh words or scolding. Lovingly she should be dissuaded from such a desire. If, in spite of persuasion from different angles she cannot be convinced, she should be referred to the *Vaidya* (*Āyurvedic Doctor*). The *Vaidya* should fulfil her desire partly by simultaneously counteracting the adverse effects on her and the foetus through the nullifying medication. But the cravings should not be denied. Defects arising from the faulty diet of a pregnant lady and the non-appeasement of her cravings produce different types of defects in the foetus. If there are drawbacks in the conditions necessary for the foetus to grow or if they are totally contrary, the foetus gets destroyed in the beginning itself or gets aborted without remaining for a long period. This is why the *śruti* exhorts the husband to take special care of his wife during the pregnancy (*Ai.U.2-3*).

गर्भो विण्मूत्रयोः स्थित्वा

दशमे मासि जायते ।

पिता स्वात्मधिया पुत्रं

संस्कारोति यथाविधि ॥५०॥

गर्भः - foetus विण्मूत्रयोः - amidst the urine and faeces स्थित्वा - having remained दशमे मासि - in the tenth month जायते - is born पिता - father पुत्रं - son स्वात्मधिया - considering (him) as oneself यथाविधि - according to the scriptures संस्कारोति - purifies – (50)

50. The foetus having remained amidst the urine and faeces is born in the tenth month. The father purifies his son according to the scriptural ceremonies

considering him as oneself.

The disgustful condition of the womb wherein a foetus has to grow itself is sufficient to inculcate *vairāgya* in a thoughtful person. The paternal love towards the son as one's replica prompts the father to do his purificatory ceremonies. All along here the foetus or the born child is referred to as the son. It equally applies to daughter also. Contextually it is implied in the word son.

पितुर्द्वितीयं तज्जन्म पुत्ररूपेण संस्थितम् ।
स्वोदरात् दारजठरादपि जन्मद्वयं क्रमात् ॥५१॥

तत् - that पुत्ररूपेण - in the form of

the son संस्थितम् - abidance पितुः - of the father द्वितीयं - is second जन्म - birth स्वोदरात् - (emergence) from one's stomach, (i.e. from the body as semen) दारजठरात् अपि - and from mother's womb जन्मद्वयं - are two births क्रमात् - in course of (time) – (51)

51. That abidance in the form of the (born) son is the second birth of the father. The emergence from one's body as semen and that from mother's womb are two births in course of time.

At the time of the father's first birth, i.e. when his semen endowed with the *jīva* as a foetus was transferred to his wife's womb, it had no concrete form of the actual son. It was a theoretical proposition because the origin of the son started in the father's body. After wife's delivery, the actual son was born which is considered as father's second birth.

In taking the birth, besides the disgustful stay in the mother's womb, there implies a very shameful situation also which none will indulge in willingly.

पतिर्जायां विशत्यादौ गर्भो भूत्वा स्वमातरम् ।
जायैव माता सम्पन्नेत्यहो संसारकष्टता ॥५२॥

आदौ - in the beginning of the series of these three births पतिः - husband गर्भः - foetus भूत्वा - having become जायां - wife स्वमातरम् - who is in

the place of his mother विशति - enters जाया एव - (as a result) the wife herself माता सम्पन्ना - happens to be his mother इति - because of this अहो - alas! संसारकष्टता - how distressful is this *samsāra* (transmigratory existence)? – (52)

52. In the beginning of the series of these three births, the husband having become the foetus enters his wife who is in the place of his mother. As a result, the wife herself happens to be his mother. Because of this, alas! How distressful is this *samsāra* (transmigratory existence)?

The lady in whose womb the foetus grows is its mother. The husband as described earlier remains in the womb of his wife. Therefore the wife becomes his mother. This is an unavoidable very shameful affair if one is required to be born. Therefore the best solution is to develop *vairāgya* and gain *Brahmajñāna* at the earliest.

VAIRĀGYA - THE THIRD BIRTH

Now the third birth of the father is being described.

लौकिकं वैदिकं सर्वं पुत्रेऽवस्थाप्य तत्पिता ।
मृतो देहान्तरे पित्रोरन्ययोर्विशति स्वयम् ॥५३॥

तत्पिता - that father लौकिकं - worldly वैदिकं - Vedic सर्वं (कर्म) - all *karmas* (duties) पुत्रे - to the son अवस्थाप्य - having entrusted मृतः - having died स्वयं -

himself अन्ययोः पित्रोः - of different parents
देहान्तरे - in another body विशति - enters –
(53)

53. That father having entrusted all the worldly and Vedic *karmas* (duties) to the son, having died, enters in another body of different parents.

‘*Tatpitā*’ (that father) refers to the person whose two figurative births were described earlier. The one was in the form of semen endowed with the *jīva* (of the actual son) in his body which was transferred to his wife's womb. His other figurative birth was that of the actual son delivered by the wife. Or to point out precisely, *tatpitā* is the father of the actual son. A person who lives a life of *dharma* as enjoined by the scriptures gets an inkling of his nearby death. Therefore through a ritual called ‘*sampratti karma*’, the father entrusts his scriptural duties and worldly responsibilities to his well-trained son. After death he himself takes to a new body through the next parents as determined by his *karmaphalas*.

पुत्ररूपेण यज्जन्मद्वयं पूर्वमुदीरितम् ।
तदपेक्षं तृतीयं तज्जन्म स्याद् देहाधारिणः ॥५४॥

पूर्व - earlier देहाधारिणः - of the *jīva*
पुत्ररूपेण - in the form of father यत् जन्मद्वयम्
- whatever two births उदीरितम् - were told
तदपेक्षं - with respect to those two तज्जन्म -
the birth through the next parents तृतीयं

स्यात् - happens to be the third one – (54)

54. Earlier the two births of the *jīva* in the form of father were told. With respect to those two, the birth through the next parents happens to be the third one.

Here a doubt about the numbering of father's birth is possible. The earlier mentioned two figurative births (vs. 46, 51) refer to the actual father. Accordingly the body that the father wielded ‘in the second birth’ is the body of his son. This being so, as long as the son who is considered as the father in his second birth (vs. 46, 51) continues to live, how can the birth after the bodily death of the actual father under discussion (and not after the death of his son) be considered to be father's third birth? In reply, the numbering of father's birth can be viewed in two ways. One view is that with reference to the earlier two figurative births (vs. 46, 51) the next birth after the bodily death of the father also is counted figuratively as the third birth ignoring the continued living of his son. Or consider the body wielded by the father in his immediate previous birth as father's first birth. After its death the father's birth is the second one. Subsequent to the bodily death of this father the next birth is taken as the third one. In either way the *śruti* has no interest in actual counting of these three

births. It only considers a sample segment of three births in succession to highlight the disgusting condition that the foetus has to undergo in the womb and the unavoidable shameful situation that accompanies every birth in the perpetual transmigration. This is only to inculcate *vairāgya*. This description of only three births does not mean that births stop thereafter. From the incessant flow of births the consecutive three of them are only an investigative cut-out.

The topic of three births is being concluded now.

स्वोदरं दारजठरं तथा पित्रन्तरोदरम् ।

त्रय आवसथा इत्थं जन्तोः सर्वस्य जन्मने ॥५५॥

स्वोदरं - one's stomach, (i.e. father's body) दारजठरं - wife's, (i.e. mother's) womb तथा - so also पित्रन्तरोदरम् - the stomach, (i.e. body) of another father (after the death) इत्थं - thus सर्वस्य जन्तोः - of all the living beings जन्मने - to take birth त्रयः - (are the) three आवसथाः - abodes, dwelling places—(55)

55. The father's body, the wife's, (i.e. mother's) womb and the body of another father (after the death) are the three dwelling places of all the living beings in the process of taking births.

The three births described earlier are restated with reference to their places of dwelling. The father is born from his

own body (as indicated in the phrase 'svodaram') is in the sense that the son is identical with his father as shown earlier. For example, the branch of a tree is identical with it. But in the case of some trees when their branches are planted, they grow into new trees. It is also known that the branches of banyan trees hang down and root themselves. Such newly grown trees can be considered as either identical with the original ones or separate from it. Similarly the old and the new bodies in the above context can be called the father and the son.

The sample analysis of three births undertaken by the *śruti* pertains to the human body. But *jīvas* are subjected to varieties of bodies from the total 84 lakhs of species according to their *karmaphalas*. It is a great ordeal.

जन्मानि योनिलक्षाणां जन्तुश्चतुरशीतिषु ।

उत्तमाधमरूपाणि प्राप्नोत्येवं पुनः पुनः ॥५६॥

जन्तुः - every living being, *jīva* योनिलक्षाणां - of species चतुरशीतिषु - in 84 (lakhs) उत्तमाधमरूपाणि - good and bad जन्मानि - births एवं - in this manner (as described) पुनः पुनः - repeatedly प्राप्नोति - gains—(56)

56. In this manner (as described), every living being repeatedly gains good and bad births in the 84 lakhs of species.

In this cycle of transmigration, there may be some heavenly bodies. But

that does not stop the dwelling in the womb sooner or later. It can end only in *mokṣa* on gaining *Brahmajñāna*.

In this *saṃsāra* there are endless other intense sorrows. Then why does the *śruti* highlight the defects of births only? The answer now follows.

दुष्टत्वं जन्मनः प्रोक्तं स्पष्टा रोगादि दुष्टता ।
विरक्तो बुद्धतत्त्वस्तु मुच्यते वामदेववत् ॥५७॥

जन्मनः - of the birth दुष्टत्वं - defective or painful nature प्रोक्तं - is vividly told (by the *śruti*) रोगादि दुष्टता - diseases, etc., (as the defects of the body) स्पष्टा - are very clearly known (by all) विरक्तः - the person with *vairāgya* बुद्धतत्त्वः

(सन्) - having become a *Brahmajñānī* तु - certainly मुच्यते - gets liberated वामदेववत् - like the sage Vāmadeva – (57)

57. The defective or painful nature of the birth is vividly told (by the *śruti*). Diseases, etc., (as the defects of the body) are very clearly known (by all). The person with *vairāgya* having become a *Brahmajñānī* certainly gets liberated like the sage Vāmadeva.

The disgust and sorrow involved in being born is not known on one's own unless told by the *śruti*. On the contrary the other sorrows in the world can be discerned easily by a *vivekī* (discriminative person).

VAIRĀGYA IS THE MAIN MEANS TO GAIN BRAHMAJÑĀNA - EXAMPLE OF SAGE VĀMADEVA

The fascination for one's body, wealth, marital happiness does not allow the common man to see the inevitable sorrows inherent in them. Developing *vairāgya* by seeing their defects is the main means of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa enumerates, 'seeing birth, death, old age and diseases being endowed with the defect of sorrow', as one of the means to gain *Brahmajñāna* (B.G.13-8). He also emphasizes the absence of attachment (*āśakti*) with children, wife (or husband), house, etc., as a prerequisite (B.G.13-9). *Viṣṇupurāṇa* at one place remarks in despair: 'We don't know how to inculcate *vairāgya* in this donkey donning a human form (*naragardabha*) who does not get disgusted with the foul smell of his body which can surely induce *vairāgya*.'

From a *mumuksu's* standpoint the wealth is denounced: 'Fie upon that wealth which is invariably accompanied by distress while earning or preserving and infested by sorrow when lost or spent' (P.7-139). 'Having abandoned the marital happiness the world (*jagat*) is abandoned, having abandoned the world one becomes happy' (*Yo.Vā.Vai.* 21-35). The intense *vairāgya* commands a pure mind (*śuddha*

antaḥkaraṇa) which alone can cognize Brahman directly in its true nature. Therefore sage Aṣṭāvakra equates the absence of love for sense-objects, (i.e. *viṣaya-vairasya*) as *mokṣa* (liberation) and love for them, (i.e. *vaiṣayiko rasaḥ*) as bondage (*Aṣṭāvakra Gītā*,5-2). To begin with staunch *śraddhā* (faith) is necessary. The world does present both joys and sorrows. But the transient joys are at the cost of perennial sorrows denying us our true nature of ever-existent *paramānanda* (limitless happiness). To run after the paltry pleasures born of *viṣayas* (sense-objects) is not a practical proposition. No doubt, the senses are designed to be extrovert (*parāñci khāni*), but *Parameśvara* has made a provision of *viveka* (discriminative faculty) to discern what is everlasting and what is fleeting. Only such a resolute person (*dhīraḥ*) who uses his *buddhi* (intellect) to withdraw senses (*āvṛtta cakṣuḥ*) from their objects (*viṣayas*) gains *aparokṣa-jñāna* (direct-knowledge) of *pratyagātmā* (*Kṛ.U.2-1-1*). Thus without *vairāgya*, it is impossible to gain *ātmajñāna*. The *śruti* gives an example of sage Vāmadeva in this context.

पूर्वजन्मनि बोधेन स्वमुक्तिं चाब्रवीदृचा ।
गर्भस्थो वामदेवोऽयं प्रतिबन्धविवर्जितः ॥५८॥

अयं - this गर्भस्थः - dwelling in the womb वामदेवः - Vāmadeva प्रतिबन्धविवर्जितः - having got freed from obstructions (that hindered the self-knowledge) पूर्वजन्मनि (प्राप्तेन) - gained in the past birth बोधेन - by the knowledge स्वमुक्तिं - his liberation ऋचा - by a ṛk mantra च - indeed अब्रवीत् - declared—(58)

58. This sage Vāmadeva dwelling in the womb having got freed from obstructions (that hindered the self-knowledge), indeed declared through a *ṛk mantra* his liberation gained by the knowledge in the past birth.

It is said that many *ṛṣis* were engaged in the pursuit of gaining

Brahmajñāna. One of them (born later as Vāmadeva) was on the verge of gaining *Brahmasākṣātkāra* (direct knowledge of Brahman). But a very powerful *karmaphala* with impending *garbhavāsa* (dwelling in the womb) obstructed it. According to that *karma* when he dwelt in the womb, at the ninth month the obstruction that hindered the *Brahmasākṣātkāra* ended. As a result, Vāmadeva even while living in the womb got docked to the prior stage of *Brahmajñāna* in the earlier birth and gained *Brahmasākṣātkāra* in the womb itself. He declared his experience of liberation from there in the form of a *ṛk* (*Ai.U.2-1-5*). This episode of Vāmadeva gaining *Brahmajñāna* is further explained in detail.

VĀMADEVA - ENDING OF OBSTRUCTION

जन्मन्यतीते वेदान्तं श्रुत्वाप्येष न बुद्धवान् ।
बलिना प्रतिबद्धत्वात् कर्मणा जन्महेतुना ॥५९॥

एषः - this Vāmadeva अतीते जन्मनि - in the past birth वेदान्तं - Vedānta (Upaniṣads) श्रुत्वा अपि - even having listened to बलिना - by very powerful जन्महेतुना कर्मणा - because of *karma* producing birth प्रतिबद्धत्वात् - because of being obstructed न बुद्धवान् - did not get *Brahmasākṣātkāra*—(59)

59. Vāmadeva even having listened to Vedānta (Upaniṣads) in the past birth did not get *Brahmasākṣātkāra* because of being obstructed by a very powerful *karma* producing birth.

The phrase *śrutvā api* (even having listened to) refers not only to *śravaṇa* (self-inquiry), but also to *manana* (reflection) and *nididhyāsana* (contemplation) that he undertook.

गर्भे प्रविश्य तत्कर्म विनष्टं प्रतिबन्धकम् ।
नवमे मासि संस्मृत्य श्रवणं प्रतिबुद्धवान् ॥६०॥

गर्भे प्रविश्य - having entered the womb, i.e. having produced the *garbhavāsa* (dwelling in the womb) तत् - that प्रतिबन्धकम् कर्म - obstructing *karmaphala* विनष्टं - got destroyed नवमे मासि - in the ninth month श्रवणं संस्मृत्य - having remembered the Vedāntic

listening (in the past life) प्रतिबुद्धवान् - (Vāmadeva) got the direct *Brahmajñāna*—(60)

60. Having produced the *garbhavāsa* (dwelling in the womb), that obstructing *karmaphala* got destroyed. Vāmadeva in the ninth month (of *garbhavāsa*) having remembered the Vedāntic listening (in the past life) got the direct *Brahmajñāna*.

The sage Vāmadeva was a *yogabhraṣṭa* who was a highly evolved *mumukṣu* but died before gaining this knowledge. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa describes the greatness of even pursuing *ātmajñāna*. The beginning of this pursuit even if not completed does not go waste. There are no adverse effects. Even a little of this pursuit saves the *mumukṣu* in due course of time from the great danger of *saṃsāra* (B.G.2-40). A *yogabhraṣṭa* gets connected to his earlier pursuits helplessly (B.G.6-44). But *Bhāṣyakāra* adds a statutory clause to this: He says, this is true provided that *yogabhraṣṭa* has no more powerful *saṃskāras* of *adharma* (sinful acts) than those of the yoga (his pursuit of gaining this knowledge). If *adharma* is more powerful, then *adharmika saṃskāras* overpower those of yoga. Only after undergoing the *bhoga* (experience) ordered by those sins, the *saṃskāras* of yoga will get activated on their own.

Vāmadeva belonged to this category. It took him the dwelling in the womb (*garbhavāsa*) to nullify those sins.

Obstructions (*pratibandhas*) in the path of gaining *Brahmajñāna* can be many. Some can be eliminated by worldly means. Some others can be overcome by invoking *Īśvara*. But there are some which have to be ended only by *bhoga*. Though *Īśvara* is omnipotent and there is nothing that is impossible to him, he does not interfere and go against his laws. Rest of all other obstructions in gaining knowledge are to be overcome by *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana*. The hindered knowledge of Brahman does not give *mokṣa* (liberation). To get liberated, *Brahmasākṣātkāra* wherein the mind totally absorbed in Brahman completely free from *dr̥śya jagat* including the *tripuṭī* (knower, knowledge thought and the known) is indispensable. *Mokṣa* is nothing short of *ātmā/Brahman* free from *avidyā* and its effects. Vāmadeva was on the verge of this, but the *garbhavāsa karma* obstructed the knowledge. Once that was undergone, he directly experienced his true nature even in the womb of his mother.

Garbhopaniṣad (*Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda*) describes that all the faculties of knowing of the foetus get fully developed by the ninth month. Then the foetus remembers all about its

past lives. It realizes how all those lives were wasted in the sense-pleasure without seeking the liberation. So the would be child decides that it will take to the spiritual pursuits once it comes out of the womb. But alas! That decision is short-lived until the delivery trauma starts. After birth, forgetting all such decision, the old game of *saṃsāra* continues in full swing. But Vāmadeva's case was different. Because of his past pursuit of intense *śravaṇa*, he got *Brahmasākṣātkāra* at the ninth month of his stay in the womb as he had no further obstructions in gaining it.

विद्वान् भूत्वा समुत्पन्नो जीवन्मुक्तोऽभवत् तदा ।
शरीरमात्मनो भिन्नं मिथ्यैवेत्यवगच्छति ॥६१॥

तदा - then विद्वान् - *Brahmajñānī*
भूत्वा - having become समुत्पन्नः - was born
जीवन्मुक्तः अभवत् - remained liberated
(even) while living शरीरं - (his) body
आत्मनः भिन्नं - is distinct from *ātmā* मिथ्या
एव - actually false in nature इति - so
अवगच्छति - directly comes to know – (61)

61. Then (Vāmadeva) having become a *Brahmajñānī* was born. He remained liberated (even) while living. He directly comes to know that his body is distinct from *ātmā* and it is actually false in nature.

Brahmajñāna destroys the ignorance but not the *prārabdha-karma*. It will have its course until it is exhausted

by *bhoga* (experience). Vāmadeva's *prārabdha-karma* of that life started with the conception of the foetus in the womb. Obviously it is bound to continue yielding birth up to its end in spite of gaining *Brahmajñāna* in between. It is true that there is no more rebirth after gaining liberation, but Vāmadeva had it before becoming a *Brahmajñānī*. He was already out from the father's body and had entered the mother's womb in the form of a foetus. This is not his rebirth after gaining *Brahmajñāna* because his *sañcita karmaphalas* (accumulated in the past) and *āgāmi karmaphalas* (which get added in future) have got destroyed in the wake of knowledge itself. The already born body continues up to its end according to its *prārabdha*.

In some rare exceptional cases there appear to be one or more births even after gaining liberation. This phenomenon is restricted to only *adhikārī puruṣas* or called *jagannirvāhakas*. They are cosmic administrators appointed by *Īśvara*. In the past *Kalpa* (aeon) they had done intense *upāsanās* of *Īśvara*. In this *Kalpa* they have gained *Brahmajñāna* but their *prārabdha* is such that *Īśvara* appoints them on different posts of authority which involve one or more births. In and through all these, their *Brahmajñāna* is unaffected. They are in the state of

jīvanmuktas (liberated even while living in the body). When their missions are fulfilled and *prārabdha* is over they attain *videhamukti* (bodiless liberation). This topic is ascertained in 'Yāvadaadhikārādhikaraṇa' (*Br.Sū.3-3-32*).

Brahmajñāna of Vāmadeva was 'sthira' - firm and steadfast. Even while living in the body he did not lose sight of his *svarūpa* and remained a *jīvanmukta* being liberated all along. He had no longer identification with this body and knew for certain that the body and the *drśya jagat* are false in nature.

VĀMADEVA - THE EXPERIENCE OF JĪVANMUKTI

इयन्तं कालमेतस्मिन् भ्रान्त्या

देहे निमग्नवान् ।

बोधेन देहादुत्क्रम्योत्कृष्टोऽभूज्जीवतां

त्यजन् ॥६२॥

इयन्तं कालं - so far (until this birth was taken) भ्रान्त्या - on account of delusion एतस्मिन् देहे - in this body निमग्नवान् - he (Vāmadeva) was immersed (identified with) बोधेन - by the knowledge of one's true nature देहात् उत्क्रम्य - having given up the false identification that 'I am the body' जीवतां त्यजन् - (and) abandoning the wrong notion that 'I am a *samsārī jīva*' उत्कृष्टः अभूत् - became (remained oneself as) the

most exalted Brahman only – (62)

62. He (Vāmadeva) was immersed in (identified with) this body on account of delusion until this birth was taken. (Now) by the knowledge of one's true nature, having given up the false identification that 'I am the body' (and) abandoning the wrong notion that 'I am a *saṃsārī jīva*', he became (remained oneself as) the most exalted Brahman only.

Since the beginningless time we are identified with a series of bodies on account of our self-ignorance. We are so much engrossed in them that sorrows arising from them become that of ours. Anything conducive to the body comforts us. Rising above the body (*dehāt utkramaṇa*) means the giving up the identification with the body by gaining the direct knowledge of *ātmā*. The most exalted entity (*utkr̥ṣṭa*) is *ātmā*/Brahman (*Paramātmā*) which is simultaneously limitless happiness (*paramānanda*), ever-existent (*sat*) and knowledge (*cit*) principle. 'Becoming Brahman' is directly (*aparokṣatayā*) knowing *ātmā* as oneself. In that knowledge itself the false notion that 'I am a *saṃsārī jīva*' gets dropped because the *jīvatā* (status of *jīva*) is erroneously superimposed on *ātmā*. On knowing the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) the superimposed (*adhyasta*) entity vanishes. It is just as

the disappearance of the mistaken snake on seeing the rope. This fact is expressly told in the next verse as 'what remains is *Paramātmā*'. Thereafter the nature of *Paramātmā* as discovered by Vāmadeva is elaborated up to the verse 69.

जीवत्वेऽपगते तस्य शिष्यते परमात्मता ।
स एव स्वर्गतुल्योऽभूदिन्द्रियाविषयत्वतः ॥६३॥

तस्य - of that *ātmā* जीवत्वे - superimposed appearance as a *jīva* अपगते - when disappears (is sublated) परमात्मता - the *Paramātmā* in its true nature शिष्यते - remains सः - that *Paramātmā* एव - itself इन्द्रियाविषयत्वतः - because of being imperceptible to the senses स्वर्गतुल्यः - similar to heaven अभूत् - becomes – (63)

63. When the superimposed appearance of *ātmā* as a *jīva* disappears (or is sublated), the *Paramātmā* in its true nature remains. Because of being imperceptible to the senses, that *Paramātmā* itself becomes similar to (the features of) heaven.

When it is said that *jīvatva* (appearance as *jīva*) disappears or 'is sublated', what is meant is the *buddhi* and *cidābhāsa* which project the false appearance of *jīva* actually end, but not their basis *cit* (*ātmā*). In fact, there is no separate independent entity called *jīva* apart from *Paramātmā* (Brahman). *Paramātmā* itself appears erroneously

as the *saṃsārī jīva*. It is like the appearance of a snake in the place of a rope.

The nature of *Paramātmā* which is now directly discovered by Vāmadeva as his true nature 'I' is imperceptible to the senses and it is described to be similar to heaven (*svargatulya*). It does not mean that the attributeless *Paramātmā* (Brahman) is similar to some field of experience called heaven. Just as the heaven is beyond the purview of senses, so is *Paramātmā* imperceptible. Relatively, heaven stands for an entity that is abundant happiness without sorrow. So the word heaven (*svarga*) is used secondarily to signify *Paramātmā* that is limitless happiness without any trace of sorrow. The *śruti* describes the nature of *Paramātmā* or the *ātmajñāna* gained by Vāmadeva as, 'amuṣmin svarge loke sarvān kāmān āptvā amṛtaḥ samabhavat' (Ai.U.2-1-6). It means: in that (*amuṣmin*) imperceptible (*indrīyāgocara*) unsurpassing *Brahmānanda* (*svarge*) which is self-luminous knowledge principle (*svaprakāśe* called *loke*) having gained (*āptvā*) all possible happiness belonging to all beings ranging from an emperor to *Hiraṇyagarbha*, (Vāmadeva) became (*samabhavat*) immortal (*amṛtaḥ*). All

and sundry happiness (*ānanda*) are included in the limitless happiness that is *Brahmānanda*. A *jñānī* has no rebirth after the end of the present body. In the absence of future bodies, the death (*maraṇa*) characterized by separation of *prāṇas* (vital airs) from the physical body is not there. Therefore he is *amṛta* (deathless or immortal). The author is going to elaborate further the *Brahmānanda* or *ātmānanda* (called *svarga*).

परोक्षोऽपि विमूढानां

विद्वद्भिरवलोक्यते ।

सर्वेऽपि विषयानन्दाः

प्राप्ता दृष्टे निजात्मनि ॥६४॥

विमूढानां - to the ignorant people (आत्मानन्द - *ātmānanda*) परोक्षः अपि - though unknown विद्वद्भिः - by *jñānīs* अवलोक्यते - (it) is directly experienced निजात्मनि दृष्टे - when the true 'I' (*pratyagātmā*) is directly known (experienced) सर्वे अपि - all without any exceptions विषयानन्दाः - sense-pleasures प्राप्ताः - are (as good as) gained—(64)

64. Though (*ātmānanda*) is unknown to the ignorant people, it is directly experienced by *jñānīs*. In the direct knowledge (experience) of true 'I' (*pratyagātmā*), all sense-pleasures are (as good as) gained.

The nature of *ātmā* is happiness totally free from sorrows. It can be verified from the sleep. In sleep there is nothing else except ignorance. Yet universally happiness is experienced in sleep. It belongs to *ātmā*. The joy that continues immediately after waking is due to lingering impressions of happiness experienced in sleep. The happiness that is enjoyed without the *tripuṭī* in the state of mind (*antaḥkaraṇa*) wherein one is neither asleep nor dreaming, and though awake has no cognition of dualistic world including one's body is *ātmānanda-Brahmānanda* (*Brahmavidāsīrvāda-paddhati-25*, by Vidyāraṇya Muni). A *ātmajñānī* who has *niṣṭhā* (firmness) in *jñāna* alone can command this state and know it. The ignorant people identified with the body and totally engrossed in the *dr̥śya jagat* can never hope to dream it even, leave alone knowing it.

ĀTMĀNANDA (BRAHMĀNANDA) IS LIMITLESS; IT IS THE SOURCE OF ALL HAPPINESS

An *ātmajñānī* gains all sense-pleasures does not mean that he enjoys all of them available in the entire Creation individually which is not even practical. What it means is that *ātmānanda* is limitless (*ananta*) and all encompassing. When it is gained, there is no separate need of any individual sense-pleasure. It is just like the absence of your longing for your daily simple meal when you are contented by eating a sumptuous feast to your heart's content. Moreover, *ātmā* is simultaneously the only ever-existence (*sat*), fundamental knowledge (*cit*) and basic happiness (*ānanda*) principle.

It is the basis of all relative or empirical existence, specific types of

knowledge and varieties of sense-pleasure (*viśayānanda*). Like the sugar in all sweetmeats made of it, *ātmānanda* is the common basic factor in all the sense-pleasures. Therefore when the limitless *ātmānanda* is directly experienced all sense-pleasures lose their relevance. Thus they are as good as gained. This fact that all sense-pleasures have their source in *ātmānanda* is shown in the next verse.

आत्मानन्दसमुद्रस्य विप्लुषो विषयोत्थिताः ।
आत्मन्यन्तर्भवन्त्यन्ते समुद्रे बिन्दवो यथा ॥६५॥

विषयोत्थिताः (आनन्दाः) - pleasures born from sense-objects आत्मानन्दसमुद्रस्य - of the ocean of *ātmānanda* (happiness that is the nature of *ātmā*) विप्लुषः - (are) drops (अतः - therefore) आत्मनि - in *ātmā* अन्ते - finally अन्तर्भवन्ति - are contained, included यथा - just as बिन्दवः - drops समुद्रे -

in the ocean (अन्तर्भवन्ति - are contained) –
(65)

65. Pleasures born from sense-objects are the drops of the ocean of *ātmānanda*. They are finally contained in *ātmā* just as the oceanic water-drops are contained in the ocean.

The oceanic water is the source for the water-drops from it. These drops are contained in the ocean. Similarly, tinsels of sense-pleasures finally originate from *ātmānanda* only. The word ‘*ante*’ (finally) is used because to begin with the source of pleasure seems to be the sense-objects (*viśayas*). But in fact these inert *viśayas* are incapable of giving happiness because it is not their nature at all.

Then how do the sense-objects appear to give joy? This process needs a thorough investigation. Though all pervasive *ātmā* is *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* and though its *sat* (existence) aspect is manifest and cognized everywhere, it is not so with *cit* (knowledge principle) and *ānanda* (happiness). *Cit* is manifest and cognized only where there is *antaḥkaraṇa* (*mana*, *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and *cittam* – the inner instruments). That is how we get sentient and inert entities. But *ānanda* aspect needs some subtle (*sūkṣma*) *vṛttis* called *priya*, *moda*, *pramoda* to manifest and be available for

experience in varying degrees. These *vṛttis* surface in a calm state of mind or when a desire is fulfilled or during the sleep. But *ānanda* (happiness) that is manifest therein is actually the nature of *ātmā* and nothing else (*Tai.U.Bh.2-5*). Not knowing this fact, the ignorant people mistake that the happiness is produced by sense-objects. The author brings to our notice this fact.

आत्मन्यानन्दमज्ञात्वा विषये

सुखविभ्रमात् ।

भोक्तुमिच्छति तल्लाभाद्

धीरात्मन्युपशाम्यति ॥६६॥

(मूढः - ignorant person) आत्मनि - in *ātmā* आनन्दम् - (its) happiness nature अज्ञात्वा - not knowing विषये - in the sense-object सुखविभ्रमात् - because of delusion that joy is there (in the *viśaya*) (बाह्यम् विषयं - external sense-object) भोक्तुम् - to enjoy इच्छति - desires तल्लाभात् - because of gaining that (external sense-object) धीः - *buddhi* (intellect) आत्मनि - in *ātmā* उपशाम्यति - becomes clam, reposes – (66)

66. The ignorant person not knowing the happiness nature of *ātmā* because of the delusion that joy is there in the *viśaya* desires to enjoy it (external sense-object). Because of gaining the desired object, the *buddhi* reposes in *ātmā*.

Universally, it is believed that joy accrues when a desire is fulfilled. Truly it is not. The fact is that whenever a desire is entertained there is unrest in the mind because of hankering, efforts involved to fulfil it, uncertainty of its fulfilment, etc. When the desire is fulfilled, the prevailing unrest ceases. There is no desire in the mind until the next desire crops up. This short while desireless state of mind is calm and composed compared to the earlier restlessness. This is when the mind or intellect in the sense of *antaḥkāraṇa* reposes in *ātmā*. This is the state when the *priya*, *moda* and *pramoda* subtle *vṛttis* surface in accordance with the *karmaphala* wherein *ānanda* aspect of *ātmā* gets reflected. *Priya* results in the delight when the desired object is at sight. When the same is gained the joy that is born is by *moda*. The excessive joy that one experiences on indulging in that entity is *pramoda* (*Tai.U.Bh.2-5*). The adjective 'excessive' is used with a purpose. At times the gained entity may fail to give the expected joy. Then it is not *pramoda*. For example, you like mangoes very much. You saw them in the market. That made you happy. You purchased a few. You are still more happy. But when eaten, let us suppose that they turned out to be sour. Then it is not *pramoda*. Thus finally the source of happiness happens to be the *ātmā* only and not the sense-objects. Generally two common illustrations are given in this respect. Dogs relish eating the dry bones. Actually there is nothing edible in them. Their tongues get ulcerated by the roughness of bones and the resultant oozing saline blood that is tasted is considered to be because of eating bones. Similar is the case with camels. They simply rush to eat a specific type of thorny bush only to get their mouths ulcerated and bleed. They taste their own blood. They think that this saline taste is because of eating the bush. The dire consequence is that they cannot even drink the water for weeks together.

The sense-pleasure gained by sense-objects is fleeting in nature. Therefore there arises the need of repeated sense-indulgence. This is how all people run after the sense-objects whole lifetime considering that alone to be the means to be happy.

आत्मानन्दं क्षणं भुक्त्वा
पुनर्भ्रान्त्या बहिर्व्रजेत् ।
विवेकिधीर्निजानन्दं भुङ्क्ते
तत्स्थैव सर्वदा ॥६७॥

(मूढः - ignorant person) क्षणं - for a moment आत्मानन्दं - *ātmānanda* (the

nature of *ātmā* which is happiness) भुक्त्वा - having experienced पुनः - again भ्रान्त्या - by the erroneous notion that it (happiness) is born from sense-objects बहिः - outward (sense-objects) व्रजेत् - goes to विवेक धीः - the *buddhi* of those endowed with discrimination (*viveka*) सर्वदा - always तत्स्था - (is) abiding (absorbed in that (*ātmā*) निजानन्दं - *ānanda* of true 'I', *ātmā* एव - alone भुङ्क्ते - experiences—(67)

67. The ignorant person having experienced *ātmānanda* for a moment (occasioned by *viśayas*), again goes outward to sense-objects prompted by the erroneous notion that happiness is born from them. The *buddhi* of those endowed with discrimination (*viveka*) always abides (is absorbed) in that (*ātmā*). It alone experiences the *ānanda* of true 'I', *ātmā*.

This is the plight of the ignorant people. They disown their true nature *ātmānanda* which is limitless happiness and perennially run after the drops of happiness at the cost of enormous sorrows called the calamitous *saṃsāra* characterized by transmigration. In contrast to this, the *ātmajñānī* has ended all obstructions that deny him *ātmānanda* such as self-ignorance and its effect by self-knowledge. He is able to experience his true nature, the ocean

of happiness, free from all *upādhis*. Unlike any experience, the experience of *ātmānanda* of a *jñānī* is free from *tripuṭī* (trio) of experiencer, experience-*vṛtti* and experienced. An *ajñānī* also can directly discover his *ātmānanda*. How to begin with, is suggested now.

विषये दुःखजातं

यत्तद्वीक्ष्यापक्षपाततः ।

शक्यो बोद्धुं निजानन्दो

बुध्यन्ते हि विवेकिनः ॥६८॥

विषये - in the sense-object यत् - whatever दुःखजातं - varieties of sorrows (are there) तद् - that, (i.e. them) अपक्षपाततः - with an unprejudiced mind वीक्ष्य - having seen निजानन्दः - *ātmānanda* बोद्धुं शक्यः - is possible to know directly विवेकिनः - those who have the faculty of discrimination (*viveka*) हि - indeed (since the beginningless time) बुध्यन्ते - know it directly—(68)

68. Having seen the varieties of sorrows that are there in the sense-objects with an unprejudiced mind, it is possible to know *ātmānanda* directly. Indeed (since the beginningless time) those who have *viveka* know it directly.

It is impossible for the mind preoccupied in the sense-objects to gain *ātmajñāna*. Its withdrawal from them is most essential. That is why Vedānta-*śāstra* highlights the necessity of

vairāgya (dispassion) at the risk of repetition or perhaps to the annoyance of some immature beginners! The mind without *vairāgya* is restless. It is totally disqualified to gain *ātmajñāna*. That is why the *śruti* elaborated at length the topic of *vairāgya*. With this the illustration of sage Vāmadeva is being concluded.

वामदेवोऽखिलानन्दानाप्यात्मन्यमृतोऽभवत् ।
देहप्राणवियोगाख्या मृतिश्चिद्वस्तुनो न हि ॥६९॥

वामदेवः - sage Vāmadeva अखिल - all varieties of individual आनन्दान् - happiness आत्मनि - in *ātmā* आप्य - having gained अमृतः - immortal (deathless) अभवत् - became देहप्राणवियोगाख्या - the separation of *prāṇa* (subtle body) from the physical body called मृतिः - death चिदवस्तुनः - to *ātmā* that is nothing but *cit* न हि - is not connected, applicable at all – (69)

69. The sage Vāmadeva having gained all varieties of happiness in *ātmā*, became immortal (deathless). The separation of *prāṇa* (subtle body) from the physical body called death is not applicable to *ātmā* whose nature is nothing but *cit* (pure awareness principle).

We had seen earlier (vs.64, 65) that all types of sense-pleasures are contained in *ātmānanda* like the oceanic

water-drops in the ocean. *Ātmānanda*/*Brahmānanda* is limitless, full unlike the drops of happiness enjoyed by entities such as emperor to *Hiraṇyagarbha*. A *jñānī* discovers oneself to be nothing but *ātmā* which is only *cit* totally free from body, etc., the *upādhis*. The death (*mṛti*) is separation of subtle body from the gross one. It has no connection whatsoever with *cit* (*ātmā*) which is totally free from bodies. Therefore a *jñānī* who is *cit* discovers oneself to be *amṛta* - free from *mṛti* (death). This is what Vāmadeva became.

With this summary of *Aitareyopaniṣad*, Chapter 2, dealing with *Vairāgya* is over. Now begins the self-inquiry to be taken to by *mumukṣus* having cultivated staunch *vairāgya*.

MĪMĀMSĀ (SACRED INQUIRY) BEGINS

In the first chapter of the *Aitareyopaniṣad* the *ātmajñāna* was revealed by the method of *adhyāropa* (vs.2 to 18) and *apavāda* (vs.18 to 42). In the second chapter, *vairāgya* the indispensable means to gain knowledge, was highlighted (vs.43 to 57), with a brief demonstration of *ātmajñāna* and its result as obtained by the sage Vāmadeva (vs.58 to 69). Now starts the topic of *Brahmamīmāṃsā* (inquiry into the nature of *ātmā*/Brahman) to ascertain the nature of *ātmā* identical with Brahman.

This necessitates the ascertainment of the nature of *jīva* and *ātmā/Paramātmā*.

इत्थं संसारदुष्टत्वं पुरुषार्थं च बोधतः ।
श्रुत्वा विरक्ता बोधार्थं मीमांसन्ते मुमुक्षवः ॥७०॥

मुमुक्षवः - *mumukṣus* इत्थं - as explained so far संसारदुष्टत्वं - the defective nature of *saṃsāra* बोधतः च - and by *ātmajñāna* (*Brahmasākṣātkāra*) पुरुषार्थं (प्राप्यते) - the highest *puruṣārtha* (accomplishment in life) is gained (इति - so) श्रुत्वा - having learnt from the *śruti* विरक्ताः - (became) dispassionate

(तथा - so also) बोधार्थं - to gain the *Brahmasākṣātkāra* (the direct experience of Brahman) मीमांसन्ते - conduct the self-inquiry (*ātmavicāra*) - (70)

70. *Mumukṣus* having learnt from the *śruti* the defective nature of *saṃsāra* and the means of *Brahmasākṣātkāra* to gain the highest *puruṣārtha* as explained so far, became dispassionate. So also they conduct the *ātmavicāra* to gain the *Brahmasākṣātkāra*.

Left to ourselves, the majority of us are carried away by the glamour of the world overlooking its inherent defects. Therefore it is necessary for the *śāstra* (scriptures) and the *guru* to arrest our attention and point out the nature of the world in its right perspective. Of course, a mature unbiased mind with *duritakṣaya* is highly desirable. *Mīmāṃsā* (*pūjitavicāra*) is an inquiry about something which is highly sacred and exalted. Here it is about *ātmā*. The exaltedness of *ātmā* can be grasped only after gaining intense *vairāgya*. Or else such an inquiry is at best an academic feat. Science and technology with its extravagance in the objective field have landed on even other planets to the total neglect of the subject 'I' (*ātmā*). Scientists are totally indifferent towards *ātmā* and its knowledge because they have not yet found its value. The mind that is highly engrossed in the worldly affairs or steeped in sense-pleasures or hyperactive can never hope to take to self-inquiry (*ātmavicāra*). It needs a leisure.

The *śruti* uses the verb 'upāsmāhe' (we adore/worship or totally engage ourselves in) in the place of 'mīmāṃsante'. Usually the word 'upāsanā' is used for the meditation or worship of one's adored deity. Or it can also mean getting engrossed in

something consistently. Gaining *ātmajñāna* is the purpose of *mīmāṃsā* or the so called *upāsanā* of *ātmā*. The liberation (*mokṣa*) is the result of *ātmajñāna*. This inquiry is not for gathering some information.

Usually the word 'upāsanā' is

used for the meditation or worship of one's adored deity. Or it can also mean getting engrossed in something consistently. Gaining *ātmajñāna* is the purpose of *mīmāṃsā* or the so called *upāsanā* of *ātmā*. The liberation (*mokṣa*) is the result of *ātmajñāna*. This inquiry is not for gathering some information.

MĪMĀMSĀ - KAḤ AHAṀ (WHO AMI?)

The actual *mīmāṃsā* as conducted by the Upaniṣad (*Ai.U.3-1-1 to 4*) is described now.

अहं पश्याम्यहं वच्मीत्यात्मानं
सर्वदा वयम् ।
उपास्महे योगिवद्यं कोऽसौ
मूर्ध्नि प्रविष्टवान् ॥७१॥

मायावी शुद्धचिद्वात्मा कतरः सृष्टितः पुरा ।
बुभुत्सन्ते द्वयोस्तत्त्वं जीवात्मपरमात्मनोः ॥७२॥

वयम् - we सर्वदा - always अहं पश्यामि - 'I see' अहं वच्मि - 'I speak' इति - so यम् आत्मानं - which *ātmā* योगिवत् - like a *yogī* (meditator) उपास्महे - deal with (in terms of its reference) असौ कः - who is that (*ātmā*) (यः - the one who) मूर्ध्नि प्रविष्टवान् - had entered the head (through *Brahmarandhra*) (सः - that one) मायावी - is it *ātmā* conditioned by *māyā* वा - or सृष्टितः पुरा - that was existing before Creation (निरुपाधिकत्वेन श्रुतः - described by the *śruti* as free from *upādhi*) शुद्धचित् -

pure *caitanya* कतरः आत्मा - which of these two is the actual *ātmā* (इति - thus) द्वयोः जीवात्मपरमात्मनोः - of both *jīvātmā* and *Paramātmā* तत्त्वं - the true nature बुभुत्सन्ते - desire to know - (71, 72)

71, 72. Who is that *ātmā* ('I') with which we always deal with (in terms of its reference) as 'I see', 'I speak', etc., like a *yogī* (meditator)? Who is that *ātmā* that had entered the head through the *Brahmarandhra*? Is that the *ātmā*, the one conditioned by *māyā upādhi*? Or is it pure *caitanya* free from *upādhi* that was existing before Creation (as described by the *śruti*)? Which of these two is the actual *ātmā*? (Thus *mumukṣus*) desire to know the true nature of both *jīvātmā* and *Paramātmā*.

Prompted by the illustration of sage Vāmadeva gaining *ātmajñāna* certain *mumukṣus* are inquiring among themselves the true nature of *ātmā*. The inquiry is conducted at two levels. The first one is with respect to whatever that is experienced as 'I'. One may wonder, why this 'I' needs to be inquired into when it is universally known to be a sentient entity. It is true that 'I' is known as sentient in nature. Yet, it manifests through *upādhis* with varied characteristics of sense-perceptions, actions and thoughts, etc. We are always meditating as it were on 'I' in our all daily dealings such as 'I see', 'I hear', 'I

taste', 'I smell', 'I walk', 'I talk', 'I bathe', 'I sleep', 'I get up', 'I think', 'I decide', 'I love', 'I hate', 'I am angry', 'I am hungry', 'I am thirsty', 'I forget', 'I remember', 'I enjoy', 'I suffer', etc. The phrases 'I see' in the verse refers to all sense-perceptions and the functions of *antaḥkaraṇa* whereas 'I speak' includes all actions by the organs of actions and *prāṇas*. Now the question arises which of these is the true 'I'? In and through all these we always refer to or remember as it were the 'I' like a *yogī* meditating on his *dhyeya* (the entity meditated upon). The author points out that this is an inquiry to ascertain the true nature of *jīvātmā*.

The second level of inquiry is with respect to two statements of the *śruti*. The *ātmā* that was there before Creation seems to be *nirupādhi* (without *upādhi*) (vs.2, *Ai.U.1-1-1*). After effecting Creation, to accomplish the status of *jīva*, the *Paramātmā* endowed with the *upādhi* of *māyā* as *Parameśvara* entered the body through *Brahmarandhra* (vs.12, *Ai.U.1-3-12*). This raises the question whether the true nature of *Paramātmā* is with or without *upādhi*.

For everyone, oneself is self-evident. Yet, it is known differently from what it is in reality. Its nature is being now inquired into with the justification

of its necessity.

जीवस्य चेतनत्वेन चैतन्यं

चिन्त्यतामिदम् ।

चक्षुरादिविशिष्टं तच्छुद्धं वा

तत्त्वमस्य किम् ॥७३॥

जीवस्य चेतनत्वेन - *jīva* being a sentient entity in nature इदम् - this चैतन्यं - the nature of this *caitanya* (principle of sentience) चिन्त्यताम् - be inquired into तत् - is that (*caitanya*) चक्षुरादिविशिष्टं - characterized by eyes (faculty of sight), etc. शुद्धं वा - or free from the features of sight, etc. अस्य - of this (*caitanya*, who appears as *jīva*) तत्त्वम् - true nature किम् - what—(73)

73. The *jīva* being sentient in nature, the nature of this *caitanya* (principle of sentience) be inquired into. Is it (*caitanya*) characterized by eyes (faculty of sight), etc., or free from the features of sight, etc.? What is the true nature of this (*caitanya* who appears as *jīva*)?

'I' or what is called *jīva* is a sentient entity is established by the fact that there is not even a moment in our life without either knowledge or experience or action. All these are possible only when there is *caitanya*, the sentience or knowledge or self-experiencing principle. Inert things cannot have these. But our all knowledge, etc., such as

seeing, hearing, knowing, acting are only through the senses or the *antaḥkaraṇa*. We are not aware of any other knowledge, etc., independent of the means such as senses and the *antaḥkaraṇa*. Even at the time of death one certainly knows that he is not able to see, etc. This postulates the possibility that the entity 'I' or *jīva* is the knowledge principle characterized by knowing, seeing, hearing, etc. On the other hand the Upaniṣads and other Vedāntic scriptures without any exception declare that the true nature of *jīva* is the pure knowledge principle free from all specific features. Thus there is a scope for an inquiry.

Jīva is constituted of both the sentience and the superimposed *prāṇas*, senses, *antaḥkaraṇa*. But inert *upādhis* such as *prāṇas*, etc., cannot be *caitanya*. To show this fact the nature of *prāṇas*, senses, etc., is described up to the verse 81. To begin with the sense-organs (*jñānendriyas*) with their sense-objects are described.

चक्षुःश्रोत्रे घ्राणजिह्वे त्वक् च

धीन्द्रियपञ्चकम् ।

रूपशब्दौ गन्धरसौ

स्पर्शश्चविषयाः क्रमात् ॥७४॥

चक्षुःश्रोत्रे - eye and ear घ्राणजिह्वे - nose (sense of smell) and tongue त्वक् - skin (sense of touch) च - and

धीन्द्रियपञ्चकम् - are the five sense-organs (*jñānendriyas*) रूपशब्दौ - form and sound गन्धरसौ - smell and taste स्पर्शः - touch च - and क्रमात् - respectively विषयाः - are their sense-objects – (74)

74. The eye, ear, nose (sense of smell), tongue and skin (sense of touch) are the five sense-organs. Their sense-objects are form, sound, smell, taste and touch respectively.

The five organs of actions and their corresponding functions are enumerated now.

वाक्पाणिपादपायूपस्थाः कर्मेन्द्रियपञ्चकम् ।
भाषणादानगमनविसर्गानन्दकाः क्रियाः ॥७५॥

वाक्पाणिपादपायूपस्थाः - the organ of speech, hand, foot, anus and the genital कर्मेन्द्रियपञ्चकम् - are the five organs of action भाषणादानगमनविसर्गानन्दकाः - speaking, taking, walking, excretion and delighting (procreation) क्रियाः - are their functions respectively – (75)

75. The five organs of action are the organ of speech, hand, foot, anus and the genital. Their functions are speaking, taking, walking, excretion and delighting (procreation) respectively.

These ten senses (*indriyas*) have their definite places or locations (sense-centres) in the physical body from where they function. The actual ten faculties called *indriyas* are subtle in nature and

so not visible. But their places of abidance called *indriya golakas* being gross are seen and well-known to all. These *golakas* are now pointed out with the two divisions of *indriyas* in terms of their nature.

गोलकानि दशैतेषामक्ष्यादीनि

स्फुटानि हि ।

ज्ञानक्रियाशक्तिरूपमिन्द्रियं

गोलकस्थितम् ॥७६॥

एतेषां - of these (*indriyas*) अक्ष्यादीनि - eyes, etc. दश - ten in numbers गोलकानि - sense-centres स्फुटानि हि - (being gross) it is well-known that they are very clearly perceived ज्ञानक्रियाशक्तिरूपम् इन्द्रियं - the group of ten *indriyas* having both the power of knowledge (viz. sense-organs) and the power of action (viz. organs of action) गोलकस्थितम् - are housed in these sense-centres—(76)

76. It is well-known that the ten sense-centres of these *indriyas* such as eyes, etc. (being gross), are very clearly perceived. The group of ten *indriyas* having both the power of knowledge (viz. sense-organs) and the power of action (viz. organs of action) are housed in these sense-centres.

The sense-centres (*golakas*) by themselves cannot function. But the *indriyas*, having their abode in the *golakas* function.

If senses (*indriyas*) were themselves sentient and capable of gaining the perceptual knowledge or taking to action on their own, there will not be the need of any distinct *caitanya*. But on inquiry it becomes clear that *indriyas*, the products of inert five elements, cannot be sentient on their own. Further if *indriyas* were sentient principles on their own, there should be ten varieties of sentience. But it is a matter of common experience that in and through all varieties of experiences such as seeing, hearing, tasting, touching, walking, talking, etc., there is one common denominator 'I' who is self-evident in nature. This is true in the dream and sleep also. Three numbers of different 'I' in three different states of consciousness are not there. Again sense-objects depend on *indriyas* for their existence. In the absence of *indriyas* as in sleep, sense-objects are not there. Both the *indriyas* and sense-objects are transient. They are inert. They can never be sentience by themselves. The ten sense-centres are parts of physical body. Though the body appears to be sentient while living, its inert nature can be verified by observing a dead body. Just like the *indriyas*, the *prāṇas* and *antaḥkaraṇa* also cannot be sentient on their own.

The five *prāṇas*, their abodes or the places of functioning and their

functions are being told in the next two verses.

प्राणोऽपानस्समानश्चोदानव्यानौ च वायवः ।
हृद्गुदे नाभिकण्ठी च देहश्रेषु वसन्ति ते ॥७७॥

प्राणः - *prāṇa* अपानः - *apāna* समानः - *samāna* च - and उदानव्यानौ च - *udāna* and *vyāna* वायवः - are (the five) vital airs ते - they एषु - in these हृद्गुदे - heart and anus नाभिकण्ठी - naval and throat च - and देहः - the entire body वसन्ति - abide, are located - (77)

77. The five vital airs (*prāṇas*) are *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *samāna*, *udāna* and *vyāna*. They abide (respectively) in the heart, anus, naval, throat and the entire body.

The five physiological functions in the body are called *prāṇas* (vital airs). They are: *prāṇa* (respiratory faculty), *apāna* (excretory faculty), *samāna* (digestive faculty), *udāna* (upward thrust that ejects the subtle body from the gross one at the time of death and vomiting, etc.) and *vyāna* (circulatory faculty). Though *prāṇas* are physiological functions and not simply the air, they are called vital airs because their main function corresponding to the respiratory faculty (also called *prāṇa*) involves breathing of gross air. *Prāṇas* have no faculty of gaining knowledge. Therefore they cannot be *ātmā* or *jīva*. Yet they constitute the essential aspect of

living and so the life-force of *jīva*. One can live without *indriyas* but not without the *prāṇa*. The places where they abide in the body are: *prāṇa* in the heart, *apāna* in the anus, *samāna* in the naval, *udāna* in the throat and *vyāna* in the entire body. Now the author himself hints at their function.

श्वासाधोगतिवृत्ती द्वे वपुष्यन्नसमीकृतिः ।
उद्गारादिर्देहबलं पञ्च वायुक्रिया इमाः ॥७८॥

द्वे श्वासाधोगतिवृत्ती - the two functions of breathing (*prāṇa* - respiration) and downward movement (*apāna* - excretion) वपुषि - in the body अन्नसमीकृतिः - digestion of the food (*samāna*) उद्गारादिः - ejection of the subtle body, vomiting, etc. (*udāna*) देहबलं - bodily strength (*vyāna* - blood circulation) इमाः - these पञ्च - five वायुक्रियाः - are the functions of *prāṇa* - (78)

78. The five functions of *prāṇas* are breathing (*prāṇa* - respiration) downward movement (*apāna* - excretion), digestion of the food (*samāna*), ejection of the subtle body, vomiting, etc. (*udāna*), bodily strength (*vyāna* - blood circulation).

The *antaḥkaraṇa* is described in the next verse through *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) and *manaḥ* (mind) with their functions and the places of abidance.

अहंकर्ता वपुर्व्याप्य जडं
चेतनतां नयेत् ।

मनोऽन्तर्हृद्वस्थाय वृत्तिः

कामादिकाः सृजेत् ॥७९॥

अहंकर्ता - *ahaṃkāra* (the thought entertaining the notion of 'I'ness in an entity) वपुः व्याप्य - having pervaded the body जडं (देहं) - the inert body चेतनतां नयेत् - makes sentient मनः - the mind अन्तः हृदि - in the heart अवस्थाय - having remained कामादिकाः - desires, etc. वृत्तिः - thoughts सृजेत् - produces - (79)

79. *Ahaṃkāra* (the thought entertaining the notion of 'I'ness in an entity) having pervaded the inert body makes it sentient. The mind remaining in the heart produces the thoughts such as desires, etc.

The pervading of the body by *ahaṃkāra* shows the body as its place of abidance. Making the inert body appear as sentient is its function. When the *ahaṃkāra* does not pervade the body as in the case of sleep, swoon, etc., we are not aware of body as 'I'. There is not a single moment in the waking and dream when the *ahaṃkāra* does not qualify the *jīva* with the identification with one thing or the other. The mind abides in the heart. Producing thoughts (*vṛttis*) such as desires, anger, etc., is its function. The *śruti* gives a long list of these thoughts as a sample (*Ai.U.3-1-2*). They are:

Sañjñānam (the feeling that I am sentient or the cognition that this thing is good), *ājñānam* (feeling of overlordship), *vijñānam* (64 numbers of lower knowledge other than *Brahmajñāna* or the thought that this is better than other things), *prajñānam* (the presence of mind or the capacity to understand texts), *medhā* (power of retaining what is studied), *dr̥ṣṭi* (thoughts corresponding to sense-objects perceived through the senses), *dhṛti* (fortitude or the thought having the capacity to revive the sinking body, senses), *matih* (deliberation), *manīṣā* (independence in deliberation), *jūtiḥ* (mental agony by diseases, etc.), *smṛtiḥ* (memory), *saṅkalpaḥ* (knowing specifically as white, yellow, etc., the forms generally known or taking wrong things also as right ones), *kratuḥ* (decisiveness such as 'I shall do it certainly'), *asuḥ* (the thought that enables the functions such as respiration, etc.), *kāmaḥ* (hankering for *viśayas* not in proximity), *vaśaḥ* (the thought to have conjugal happiness), etc.

Actually the *antaḥkaraṇa* consists of *mana*, *buddhi* (intellect), *ahaṃkāra* and *cittam* (faculty of recollection). Yet, the verse describes only the two of them. This is not a defect. The decisive thought (*vṛtti*) called *buddhi* is included in *ahaṃkāra* whereas *cittam* is grouped under the mind (*manaḥ*). The entire *antaḥkaraṇa* is inert

by itself and has beginning and end. Therefore it cannot be the nature of sentient *jīva*.

The ten senses, five *prāṇas*, *ahaṃkāra* and the mind together constitute the subtle body which travels to the next bodies until *mokṣa*. A doubt can arise that the subtle body (*sūkṣma* or *liṅga śarīra*) may be the true nature of *jīva*. This doubt is now dispelled.

ज्ञानेन्द्रियाणि पञ्चात्र

तथा कर्मेन्द्रियाण्यपि ।

वायवः पञ्च कर्ता च

मनः सप्तदशं स्मृतम् ॥८०॥

अत्र - here पञ्च - five ज्ञानेन्द्रियाणि - sense-organs तथा - so also कर्मेन्द्रियाणि अपि - five organs of action पञ्च - five वायवः - vital airs कर्ता - *ahaṃkāra* च - and मनः - the mind सप्तदशं - seventeen (constituents) स्मृतम् - are mentioned - (80)

80. Here seventeen constituents containing five sense-organs, five organs of action, five *prāṇas*, *ahaṃkāra* called *kartā* and the mind are mentioned.

सोऽयं सप्तदशस्तोमो लिङ्गदेहः स्वयोनिषु ।
सर्वासु संसरत्यस्य विनाशो मोक्ष उच्यते ॥८१॥

अयं सप्तदशस्तोमः - this group of seventeen constituents सः लिङ्गदेहः - is the well-known subtle body (*liṅga śarīra*) (सः - that) सर्वासु - in all स्वयोनिषु - in the wombs to be taken by the *jīva* संसरति - roams अस्य - its विनाशः - destruction मोक्षः उच्यते - is called liberation—(81)

81. This group of seventeen constituents is the well-known subtle body (*liṅga śarīra*). It roams in all the wombs to be taken by the *jīva*. Its destruction is called liberation.

That which reveals an unseen entity is called a *liṅga* - a sign. The yonder smoke makes one know the presence of fire there. Thus smoke is the *liṅga* (sign) of fire. Similarly the presence of these seventeen aspects as one entity reveals the presence of a *jīva* there. Therefore they as a body is called *liṅga* of *jīva*. The *liṅga śarīra* (subtle body) is inert and destructible because its constituents are so. At death the subtle body gets separated from the physical one and goes to the next womb. That movement appears as if the movement of *jīva* because wherever the subtle body goes there is *cidābhāsa* in it which is synonymous with *jīva*. It is like the appearance of pot-space moving with the movement of pot. The subtle body can get destroyed only when *avidyā* (self-ignorance) is destroyed by *ātmajñāna*. The specific *jīva* ends and gets liberated when its subtle body is destroyed. Thus the subtle body is destroyed

only in liberation. In sleep, swoon, etc., the subtle body is dormant in its cause *avidyā*, but not destroyed. On getting the *ātmajñāna*, the subtle body does get destroyed in principle, but appears to be there till the *prārabdha* gets over.

An effect gets destroyed when its cause is destroyed. The author himself tells us expressly that the ignorance of *ātmā* as the cause of subtle body and when it can get destroyed to justify the continuation of self-inquiry further.

MĪMĀMSĀ - ACTUAL ĀTMAVICĀRA

अज्ञानकल्पितो देहस्तत्त्वज्ञानेन नश्यति ।
ज्ञानोत्पत्तिर्विचारेण तस्मादात्मा विचार्यते ॥८२॥

देहः - the subtle body अज्ञानकल्पितः
- is falsely projected by the ignorance of
oneself (*ātmā*) (अतः - therefore) तत्त्वज्ञानेन
- by the knowledge of the true nature of
oneself नश्यति - gets destroyed ज्ञानोत्पत्तिः -
the birth of *ātmajñāna* विचारेण (भवति) -
takes place by self-inquiry (*ātmavicāra*)
तस्मात् - therefore आत्मा - *ātmā* विचार्यते - is
inquired into – (82)

82. The subtle body is falsely projected by the ignorance of oneself (*ātmā*). Therefore it gets destroyed by *ātmajñāna* - the knowledge of the true nature of oneself. The birth of *ātmajñāna* takes place by self-inquiry (*ātmavicāra*). Therefore *ātmā* is inquired into (further).

The subtle body is projected by self-ignorance. As seen earlier (vs.80),

antaḥkaraṇa which bears *cidābhāsa* (reflected *caitanya*) in it is a part of the subtle body. This *cidābhāsa* permeates the entire gross body giving a feeling that the body is sentient. Everyone knows for certain that the entity called ‘I’ is something sentient in nature even when they do not know its exact nature. This leads to the erroneous notion that ‘I am the embodiment consisting of gross and subtle bodies’. All sorrows, limitations, transmigration, tensions and confusions, etc., popularly known as *saṃsāra* belong to the gross and subtle bodies, but not to *nirupādhika ātmā*. On account of erroneous identification with both the bodies the *saṃsāra* appears to be the intrinsic feature of *ātmā*. But it is not so. This is a problem of error effected by self-ignorance (*avidyā*). An error has to be corrected by inquiry and ascertainment of the truth. It needs *ātmavicāra* (self-inquiry) to correct the error by directly (*aparokṣatayā*) knowing *ātmā*. *Ātmavicāra* can be fruitful only when the *mumukṣu* has intense *vairāgya*. A *vivekī* disregards the transient paltry sense-pleasures to own the limitless happiness (*ātmānanda*) which is his true nature. In contrast to this an *avivekī* sacrifices *ātmānanda* in

preference to the fleeting sense-pleasures. A *mumukṣu* has to set his priorities first. Even a life of *dharma* and *sāttvika* disposition by themselves are not sufficient. An extrovert mind can never take to *ātmavicāra* to gain *mokṣa*. Therefore an introvert mind withdrawn from the preoccupation in the *viśayas* is indispensable. Thus having established the necessity of *ātmavicāra* with intense *vairāgya*, the actual inquiry (*vicāra*) is begun now.

येन पश्यत्यसावात्मा यः पश्यति स वा भवेत् ।
द्रष्टा पश्यति बोधेन चाक्षुषेण तयोस्तु कः ॥८३॥

येन - that by which (means or *karāṇa*) पश्यति - one sees असौ - that one (किम्) आत्मा भवेत् - is it *ātmā* वा - or यः - the one (seer, *kartā*) पश्यति - who sees सः (आत्मा भवेत्) - is *ātmā* द्रष्टा - seer, *kartā* चाक्षुषेण - by the ocular बोधेन - *rūpākāra-antaḥkarāṇa-vṛtti* as *karāṇa* (thought conforming to the form of being seen) (रूपं - form) पश्यति - sees तयोः - among those two (*kartā* and *karāṇa*) तु - indeed कः - who (आत्मा भवेत् - who is *ātmā*?) - (83)

83. Is that entity by which (means or *karāṇa*) one sees the form is *ātmā* or the one (seer, *kartā*) who sees it? The seer sees the form by the (means of *karāṇa*) ocular thought conforming to the form (*rūpākāra-antaḥkarāṇa-vṛtti*).

Among those two (*kartā* and *karāṇa*), who indeed is *ātmā*?

शृणोति येन यः श्रोता तयोरित्यादि योज्यताम् ।
चैतन्यमस्ति करणे कर्तरीत्यत्र चिन्त्यते ॥८४॥

येन - that (*śabdākāra-vṛtti*) by which (*karāṇa*) शृणोति - one hears यः - the one who श्रोता - is the hearer (*kartā*) तयोः - among them (कः आत्मा - who is *ātmā*?) इत्यादि - etc. योज्यताम् - should be applied to (other perceptions and actions) अत्र - here करणे - in the means of knowledge or action, (i.e. *karāṇa*) कर्तरि (वा) - (or) in the subject (*kartā*) the perceiver or doer चैतन्यं अस्ति - *caitanya* is there इति - so चिन्त्यते - this is inquired into - (84)

84. Who is *ātmā* among the thought conforming to the sound heard (*śabdākārāntaḥkarāṇa-vṛtti*) (*karāṇa*) by which one hears and the one who is the hearer (*kartā*)? Thus this inquiry be extended to other perceptions and actions. Here what is inquired into is whether *caitanya* is the nature of *karāṇa* (the means of knowledge or action) or of the subject (*kartā*), the perceiver or the doer?

The sample inquiry conducted in the verse 83 and the beginning of verse 84 needs to be extended to other varieties of perception such as tasting, touching and smelling besides all actions by the organs of action. The purpose of this

inquiry is to ascertain whether the nature of the means of perception or action, (i.e. *karaṇa*) is *caitanya ātmā* or the perceiver or the doer (*kartā*) is so because both appear to be sentient. Or who among all of these (*karaṇas* and *kartās*) is *ātmā* since *ātmā* is one whereas the *karaṇas* and *kartās* are many. In addition, all of them have *caitanya* as their feature. Therefore their manyness is brought to our notice.

बहूनि करणान्येषु बोधा दृष्ट्यादिनामकाः ।
बहवः कर्तृबाहुल्यमपि द्रष्टादिभेदतः ॥८५॥

करणानि - *viṣayākāra-vṛttis* (thoughts corresponding to sense-objects perceived or to actions) called *karaṇas* बहूनि (सन्ति) - (are) many in numbers येषु - in whom दृष्ट्यादिनामकाः बोधाः - perceptions such as sight (*dṛṣṭi*), hearing (*śruti*), etc. बहवः - are many कर्तृबाहुल्यमपि - manyness of the perceiver (and doer) called *kartā* is also there द्रष्टादिभेदतः - because of distinctions such as seer, hearer, etc., (called *kartās*)—(85)

85. *Viṣayākāra-vṛttis* called *karaṇas* are many in number. Their perceptions such as sight, hearing (or actions), etc., are (also) many. Manyness of perceiver (and doer) called *kartā* is also there because of distinctions such as seer, hearer, etc.

The *jīva* undergoes many

experiences such as perceptions and actions through the means of sense-organs and organs of actions. The *vṛttis* (thoughts) called *karaṇas* which enable these are sentient in nature. The knowing or acting entity 'I' called *kartā* is also sentient. Not only *karaṇas* such as *vṛttis* that enable seeing, hearing, acting, etc., are many and different from one another but also the knower/doer (*kartā*) such as seer, hearer, doer, etc., happens to be many and different. If sentience or having *caitanya* alone is taken as the criterion of *ātmā* all these can be so. Then the question is which of these many and different entities is *ātmā* because *ātmā* is one and the same but never many?

The above observation does hold good within the body at the level of *antaḥkaraṇa* also with reference to the *kartā* as *ahaṅkāra* (or *buddhi*) and its *karaṇas*, the thoughts (*vṛttis*). This is shown in the next two verses.

करणानां च कर्तृणां भेदः स्याच्चक्षुरादिके ।
बाह्ये यथा तथैवान्तः शरीरेऽप्यवगम्यताम् ॥८६॥

यथा - just as बाह्ये चक्षुरादिके - in the context of eyes, etc., the senses operating in the external world करणानां - of means (*karaṇas* such as *viṣayākāra-vṛttis*) that impart the perceptual knowledge or enable the actions च - and कर्तृणां - of perceivers or doers called *kartās* भेदः

स्यात् - there is a difference (and manyness) तथा एव - similarly अन्तः - within शरीरे - in the body अपि - also अवगम्यताम् - it should be understood – (86)

86. Just as there is a difference (and manyness) among the means (such as *viṣayākāra* - *vṛttis* called *karāṇas*) that impart the perceptual knowledge or enable the actions and perceivers or doers (called *kartās*) in the context of the senses operating in the external world, similarly within the body also (such difference and manyness) should be understood.

The difference in respect of *kartā* and *karāṇa* within the body is explained in the next verse.

कर्तृपाथिरहङ्कारो वाच्यो

हृदयशब्दतः ।

करणं स्यान्मनस्तस्य

संज्ञानाद्यास्तु वृत्तयः ॥८७॥

हृदयशब्दतः - by the word ‘*hrdaya*’ (used in the Upaniṣad) वाच्यः - expressed अहङ्कारः - *ahaṃkāra* or *buddhi* कर्तृपाथिः - is the *upādhi* (adjunct mark) of *kartā* (doer, subject ‘I’) मनः - the mind करणं स्यात् - happens to be the instrument (means *karāṇa*) संज्ञानाद्याः तु - whereas the cognition that this thing is good or the feeling that I am sentient, etc. तस्य - of that mind वृत्तयः - are thoughts – (87)

87. The *ahaṃkāra* or *buddhi* expressed by the word ‘*hrdaya*’ (used in the Upaniṣad) is the *upādhi* (adjunct) or the mark of *kartā* (doer, subject ‘I’). The mind is its instrument (means, *karāṇa*). Its thoughts (*vṛttis*) are *Sañjñānam* (the cognition that this thing is good or the feelings that I am sentient), etc.

Invariably in all the experiences within the body such as ‘I am thinking by the mind, I know by the *buddhi* (intellect), I remember by the means of *citta*’, there is the division of *kartā* (doer, the subject ‘I’) and its instrument (*karāṇa*). The entity referred to as *kartā* can come into existence only when there is *ahaṃkāra*, the ‘I’ notion in the body. in the absence of *ahaṃkāra* *kartā* cannot be there. Therefore *ahaṃkāra* is said to be the *upādhi* or mark of *kartā*. It is well-known that we use the mind, senses, etc., as the instrument (*karāṇa*) but the subject *Kartā*, the product of *ahaṃkāra* is never used as *karāṇa*. The corresponding *Aitareya* statement (*Ai. U.3-1-2*) of this verse starts with ‘*yad etad hrdayam manaśca.....*’. It lists a sample of *vṛttis* (thoughts) produced by the mind beginning with *sañjñānam*, etc. These *vṛttis* have been enumerated already in the context of verse 79. As in the case of external perceptions, perceivers, actions and the doers the doubt arises whether *kartā* characterized by sentience (*caitanya*) is *ātmā* or

karāṇa that is sentient.

The question that was started in the verse 73 and further reiterated in the verse 83 is concluded now after its elaboration.

तत्र सर्वत्र चैतन्यं लक्ष्यते हि पृथक् पृथक् ।
एवं सति बहुष्वेषु कः स्यादात्मेति संशयः ॥८८॥

तत्र सर्वत्र - in all these cases (of *kartā* and *karāṇa*) हि - it is well-known that पृथक् पृथक् - different चैतन्यं - *caitanya* (sentience) लक्ष्यते - is observed एवं सति - therefore एषु बहुषु - among many of these (*kartā* and *karāṇa*) कः - who आत्मा स्यात् - is *ātmā* इति - so संशयः - is the doubt – (88)

88. It is well-known that in all these cases (of *kartā* and *karāṇa*) different *caitanya* (sentience) is observed. Therefore the doubt is that who is *ātmā* among many of these?

‘*Tatra sarvatra*’ (in all these cases) refers to all *karāṇas* in the form of *viṣaya-vṛttis* imparting the specific knowledge and all *kartās* (knowers, subject ‘I’) both internal and external. The *caitanya* is said to be different because the specific features that qualify it (*caitanya*) individually in both the cases (of *kartā* and *karāṇa*) are different. So they are different from the practical standpoint. The author started this inquiry as a question in verses 73 and 83, but concludes here as a doubt. This is because all *kartās* and *karāṇas* can be

easily concluded to be *caitanya* (sentient *ātmā*) by all including the learned scholars in spite of the declaration of *śruti* that *ātmā* is one without the second. Therefore this doubt can be resolved only by *śruti*. It is beyond the purview of human intellect.

The *śruti* reveals the true *ātmā* by its statements: ‘*Sarvāṇi* (all) *etāni* (these *karāṇas* and *kartās*) *prajñānasya* (of pure *caitanya* free from all specific features) *nāmadheyāni bhavanti* (are only names but not the *caitanya ātmā* in reality)’ (*Ai.U.3-1-2*). This is now explained up to verse 96.

प्रज्ञानमेकं सर्वेषु यत्
स आत्मेति निर्णयः ।
प्रकृष्टं निरुपाधित्वात्
चैतन्यं यत् तदीक्ष्यताम् ॥८९॥

यत् - that which सर्वेषु - in all एकं - is one common entity प्रज्ञानं - the pure (free from *upādhi*) *caitanya* सः आत्मा - that is *ātmā* इति - so निर्णयः - is the ascertainment यत् - that चैतन्यं - *caitanya* (awareness principle) निरुपाधित्वात् - because of being free from or independent of *upādhi* प्रकृष्टं - superior तद् - that ईक्ष्यताम् - should be directly known – (89)

89. The ascertainment is that the pure (*upādhi*less) *caitanya* which is one and the same common entity in all (*karāṇas* and *kartās*) is *ātmā*. The *caitanya* (awareness principle) that is

superior because of being independent of *upādhi* should be directly known to be *ātmā*.

The word ‘*sarveṣu*’ (in all) like ‘*sarvatra*’ in the earlier verse refers to all *karaṇas* and *kartās* besides any other sentient entities having *caitanya* which are mistaken to be *ātmā*. *Prajñānam* is the *caitanya* totally free from the *upādhis* that belong to all *karaṇas* and *kartās*. Just as the different sweetmeats made of different ingredients have sugar as common factor in all of them, but the sugar has none of those ingredients, likewise *caitanya* without any *upādhis* called *prajñānam*, is the actual *ātmā*. The prefix ‘*pra*’ in *prajñānam* shows the exaltedness or superiority of *jñānam* (*caitanya*) on account of its *nirupādhika* nature. All *upādhis* breed sorrows. The word *prajñānam* as used here does not mean ‘the presence of mind’ or ‘the capacity to understand texts’ that was mentioned earlier in the case of a *vṛtti* (thought) called *prajñānam*. Thus, *prajñānam* (*nirupādhika caitanya*) is the true ‘I’, *ātmā*. Its direct knowledge, called *Brahmasākṣātkāra* should be gained.

It was stated in verse 88 that the *caitanya* is present in all *karaṇas* and *kartās*. Why they cannot be *ātmā*? If *prajñānam* distinct from them is *ātmā*, then how do they appear to be sentient?

The answer follows.

अहङ्कारो मनोबाह्यं करणं चाप्युपाधयः।
तेषु सर्वेषु चिच्छाया संक्रान्ता चेतनास्ततः॥९०॥

अहङ्कारः - *ahaṅkāra* (‘I’ notion)
मनः - the mind बाह्यं करणं - external instrument (*indriyas*, senses) च - and अपि - also उपाधयः - are *upādhis* तेषु सर्वेषु - in all of them चिच्छाया - *cidābhāsa* (reflected *caitanya*) संक्रान्ता - enters into ततः - therefore चेतनाः - they appear (as if) sentient – (90)

90. The *ahaṅkāra*, the mind and also the external sense-organs and the organs of action are *upādhis*. The *cidābhāsa* enters into all of them. Therefore they appear (as if) sentient (in nature).

Caitanya is not the nature of these *upādhis*. It is just like the water appearing to be luminous when the sun gets reflected in it though it (water) is non-luminous by its nature.

The sentience and the ‘I’ness appearing in the *upādhis* is not the true one but secondary.

न मुख्यं तेषु

चैतन्यमात्मत्वस्याप्यमुख्यता ।
सुषुप्तौ तानि लुप्यन्ते
न त्वात्मा तत्र लुप्यते ॥९१॥

तेषु - in those *upādhis* (such as *ahaṅkāra*, mind, etc.) चैतन्यं - sentience

मुख्यं न - is not the original one (अतः तेषां - therefore their) आत्मत्वस्य - of the 'I'ness (*ātmatva*) अपि - also अमुख्यता - secondariness is there तानि - those *upādhis* (*ahaṃkāra*, mind, etc.) सुषुप्तौ - in the sleep लुप्यन्ते - become extinct तत्र तु - but there (in sleep) आत्मा - *ātmā* (the illuminator of their extinction) न लुप्यते - is not extinct – (91)

91. The sentience in those *upādhis* (such as *ahaṃkāra*, mind, etc.) is not the original one. (Therefore their) 'I'ness (*ātmatva*) is also secondary (in nature). Those *upādhis* (*ahaṃkāra*, mind and external senses, etc.) become extinct in the sleep whereas *ātmā* (the illuminator of their extinction) does not become extinct.

Inert *upādhi* appearing to be sentient and *ātmā* appearing to have the features of *upādhis* is because of mutual superimposition (*adhyāsa*) of the nature of one on the other. Actually *ātmā* is free from all *upādhis* including self-ignorance (*avidyā*) whereas *upādhis* are inert by themselves. If the *upādhis* appear to be *ātmā* on account of *cidābhāsa* coupled with self-ignorance, it is only a seeming appearance.

MĪMĀMSĀ - PRAJÑĀNAM IS MUKHYA (PRINCIPAL) ĀTMĀ

In fact *ātmā* is the ever-existence principle free from birth and extinction,

but *upādhis* are transient.

The next verse proves this fact having recourse to sleep.

प्रज्ञानं निरुपाधित्वात् नित्यं
तल्लोपभासकम् ।

प्रज्ञानस्यात्मता तस्मान्मुख्या
नान्यस्य कस्यचित् ॥९२॥

तल्लोपभासकम् प्रज्ञानं - *Prajñānam* which illumines (the presence and) absence (extinction) of those *upādhis* निरुपाधित्वात् - because of being free from *upādhis* in reality नित्यं - everlasting in nature तस्मात् - therefore प्रज्ञानस्य - of *prajñāna* आत्मता - the nature as *ātmā* मुख्या - is principal अन्यस्य कस्यचित् - of anything else (आत्मता - the nature as *ātmā*) न - is not so – (92)

92. The *prajñānam* which illumines the (presence and) absence (extinction) of those *upādhis* is everlasting in nature because it is free from *upādhis* in reality. Therefore *prajñāna* is the principal *ātmā*, and nothing else whatsoever.

The *upādhis* such as *ahaṃkāra*, etc. belong to the category of *mithyā* (false) *drśya jagat* which are superimposed on the *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) *ātmā*. *Ātmā* is totally free from the superimposed *drśya jagat* including *upādhis*. Before Creation was actually superimposed, *ātmā* is verily there (vs.2,

Ai.U.1-1-1). In dissolution of *jagat* or in sleep, the extinction of *jagat* is certainly known on account of *prajñānam* (knowledge principle) *ātmā* only. The first and the last is *prajñānam*. The *jagat* comes and goes in between. During the tenure of transient *jagat* even if some *upādhis* appear as if they are *ātmā*, it cannot be truly so. It is only a false appearance. Therefore the everlasting *prajñānam* alone is *mukhya* (principal) *ātmā* and not others. The words *ātmā* and *caitanya* (sentience) are used in the case of *upādhis* only in the secondary sense and not primarily.

Just as the words *ātmā* and *caitanya* are used for *upādhis* in the secondary sense, so also the words seer (*draṣṭā*), hearer (*śrotā*), etc. are secondary when used to qualify *ātmā*. This is shown now.

द्रष्टाद्या अपि दृष्ट्याद्याः

शब्दा मुख्यात्मवस्तुनः ।

नामान्युपाधिमालम्ब्य

तस्मादात्मोपलक्षकाः ॥९३॥

द्रष्टाद्याः - the seer (*draṣṭā*), etc., (called *kartās*) अपि - and दृष्ट्याद्याः - *vṛttis* conforming to *viśayas* (sense-objects), etc., (called *karaṇas*) शब्दाः - words उपाधिम् आलम्ब्य - depending on different *upādhis* मुख्यात्मवस्तुनः - of the entity called principal *ātmā* नामानि - (become) names तस्मात् - therefore आत्मोपलक्षकाः -

(they are) words that indicate *ātmā* – (93)

93. The words such as ‘seer’, ‘hearer’, etc., (called *kartās*) and the *vṛttis* conforming to *viśayas* (sense-objects), etc., (called *karaṇas*) become the names of the entity called principal *ātmā* depending on different *upādhis*. Therefore those words indicate *ātmā*.

By the words such as *draṣṭā* (seer), *śrotā* (hearer) belonging to *kartā* category the *ātmā* is indicated. The words *drṣṭi* (*viśayākāra-vṛtti*), etc., (of *karaṇa* category) point out *caitanya* (knowledge). But *ātmā* and *caitanya* (*jñāna*) are one and the same *prajñānam*. The seer, hearer, *viśayākāra-vṛttis*, etc., are the roles of *prajñānam* while interacting with the world through perceptions, actions, etc. *Upādhis* (being inert in nature) alone cannot take to these dealings (*vyavahāra*). But the reality behind seer (*draṣṭā*), etc., is *prajñānam* only. The words *draṣṭā*, *drṣṭi*, etc., are called names of principal *ātmā* because they directly do not mean attributeless *ātmā*, but can indicate *ātmā*. *Draṣṭā* and *drṣṭi* or in other words *kartā* and *karaṇa*, etc., are dependant on *prajñānam* whereas *prajñānam* is independent of everything. One and the same *prajñānam* appears to have many names because of its association with many *upādhis*. The author explains now in two verses with examples how different

names attributed to *prajñāna* indicate the same *ātma*.

यथैकस्यैव संबन्धविशेषोपाधिनाखिलाः ।

पुत्रभ्रात्रादयः शब्दा नामत्वेनोपलक्षकाः ॥९४॥

उपलक्ष्यं तु हस्तादि युक्तमेकं वपुस्तथा ।

चेतनैः कर्तृकरणैः प्रज्ञानमुपलक्ष्यते ॥९५॥

यथा - just as पुत्रभ्रात्रादयः - son, brother, etc. अखिलाः - all शब्दाः - words संबन्धविशेषोपाधिना - by the distinguishing attribute (*upādhi*) in the form of specific relations एकस्यैव - of one and the same person नामत्वेन - as names उपलक्षकाः (भवन्ति) - become indicators उपलक्ष्यं तु - whereas the entity indicated हस्तादियुक्तं - endowed with the hands, etc. एकं वपुः - is the single body तथा - similarly चेतनैः कर्तृकरणैः - by the sentient *kartās* and *karaṇas* प्रज्ञानम् - *prajñānam* उपलक्ष्यते - is indicated—(94, 95)

94, 95. Just as all words such as son, brother, etc., as names become indicators of one and the same person by their distinguishing attribute (*upādhi*) in the form of specific relations whereas the individual entity indicated is the single body endowed with the hands, etc., similarly *prajñānam* is indicated by the sentient *kartās* and *karaṇas*.

An indicator (*upalakṣaka*) or a mark or sign points out the existence of a related entity. Yonder smoke proves the presence of fire over there though not

seen. The statement, ‘The house with a crow sitting on it belongs to Mr. Gopal’, helps to identify the specific house. The indicator need not be the intrinsic feature of what is indicated. The varieties of *kartā* and *karaṇa* referred to here are inert by themselves. Yet, sentience (*sacetanatā*) in them proves the existence of *prajñānam*. Śrī Sureśvarācārya lays down this rule in his statement: ‘A sign depends on (or indicates) the existence of a related entity (*liṅgam astitvaniṣṭham*)’ (*Nai.Si.* 3-5-7).

The inquiry ascertaining the true nature of *jīva* or ‘you’ (*tvam*) in the *mahāvākya* ‘you are Brahman’ (*Tat tvam asi*) is being concluded.

MĪMĀMSĀ - THE WORD TVAM (YOU JĪVA)

प्रज्ञानं कर्तृदेहादिसाक्षिभूतं यदस्ति तत् ।
जीवस्य वास्तवं रूपमित्येवं निर्णयो भवेत् ॥९६॥

कर्तृदेहादिसाक्षिभूतं - the illuminator of *kartā*, body, etc. यद् - whatever entity प्रज्ञानं - *prajñānam* (pure/*nirupādhika caitanya*) अस्ति - is there तत् - that one जीवस्य - of the *jīva* वास्तवं - true रूपं - nature इति निर्णयः - this ascertainment एवं भवेत् - is arrived at from the hitherto inquiry—(96)

96. Whatever the illuminator principle of *kartā*, body, etc., called *prajñānam* (pure/*nirupādhika caitanya*)

is there, that is the true nature of *jīva*. Thus this ascertainment is arrived at from the hitherto inquiry.

Prajñānam was defined as *nirupādhika (upādhiless) caitanya* (vs.89). The same *prajñānam* as the true nature of *jīva* is presented here as *sākṣī*. It means the knowledge principle that independently illumines (makes known) things (*sākṣāt anyānapekṣayā īkṣate prakāśayati iti sākṣī*). Though this word is relative and depends on *sākṣya* (what is made known), it reveals the true nature of *jīva* to be *nirupādhika caitanya* because the illuminator (*sākṣī*) is free from all *sākṣya* (all illumined *drśya upādhis*). *Sākṣī* is ever-existent changeless knowledge principle. Its appearance as *kartā, draṣṭā, śrotā*, etc., and as *karāṇa, drṣṭi*, etc., is falsely effected by the related *upādhis*. They are not its intrinsic features. The true nature of *jīva*, whether called *prajñānam* or *sākṣī*, is always free from all *kartās* and *karāṇas*, even when *jīva* appears as *kartā*, etc. This *nirupādhika* nature of *jīva* is called ‘*śodhita tvam pada*’ (the word *tvam* from ‘*tat tvam asi*’ which is cleansed of all superimposed *upādhis*). This needs to be experienced directly, totally free from *tripuṭīs* which come under the category of *kartā* and *karāṇa*. Without such an experience the equation of any *mahāvākya* will not work. With this the inquiry ‘*kaḥ asau ātmā?*’ (vs.71) is over.

MĪMĀMSĀ - THE WORD TAT

Now the *tat pada* (word *tat*) the true nature of *Īśvara* and Creation with reference to *mahāvākya* is being explained. It is an answer to the question ‘who among the two is *ātmā*? (is it *ātmā* conditioned by *māyā* called *māyāvī* or pure *cit-ātmā* called *śuddha-cit*)’ asked in verse 72. Having described the two words ‘*tvam*’ and ‘*tat*’, the *mahāvākya* revealing the identity between the two will be introduced. The ascertainment of ‘*tvam*’ word is rather difficult than that of ‘*tat pada*’ because the true nature of *jīva* is contrary to our daily experience. Only a *śuddhāntaḥkaraṇa* (pure mind) can verify this truth by its direct experience wherein the perennial false notion that ‘I am a *saṃsārī*’ gets negated. The *mahāvākya* will not operate without this experiential verification personally by the *mumukṣu*. Otherwise the Vedāntic talks get reduced to sheer verbosity. That makes the inquiry of ‘*tvam pada*’ a little difficult. As for the ‘*tat pada*’ it is mainly known through the *śruti pramāṇa* and is relatively easy provided *śraddhā* is there. *Aitareyopaniṣad* first shows *prajñānam* appearing differently with different names such as *sañjñānam*, etc., to be the *mukhya* (principal) *ātmā*. Further it reveals that the same *prajñānātmā* that has individual *upādhi* itself is macrocosm containing *Īśvara, trimūrti (Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Maheśvara)*

deities, five elements, all varieties of *upādhis* and the gross world (*Ai.U.3-1-3*). This accounts for the ‘*tat pada*’ in terms of totality. This topic is discussed till verse 105.

प्रज्ञानं स्वशरीरेऽस्ति तथा देहान्तरेष्वपि ।

ब्रह्मादिस्थावरान्तेषु तस्य स्यात् परमात्मता ॥९७॥

(यथा - just as) स्वशरीरे - in one's body प्रज्ञानं - *prajñānam* is there तथा - similarly ब्रह्मादिस्थावरान्तेषु - from *Brahmā* (*Hiranyagarbha*) to any immobile entity देहान्तरेषु - in other bodies अपि - also अस्ति - is there (अतः - therefore) तस्य - its (of *prajñānam*) परमात्मता - nature as *Paramātmā* स्यात् - is certain – (97)

97. Just as *prajñānam* (*nirupādhika caitanya*) is there in one's body, similarly it is also there in other bodies from *Brahmā* (*Hiranyagarbha*) to any immobile entity. Therefore the nature of *prajñānam* as *Paramātmā* is certain.

The corresponding *śruti* passage describing the ‘*tat pada*’ is: This *Hiranyagarbha* (*eṣa Brahmā*); this Indra the king of *devatās* (presiding deities); this well-known *Virāṭ* (*Prajāpati*); these all presiding deities described earlier such as *Agni*, *Vāyu*, etc.; these five great elements, viz. earth, air, space, water, fire; these insignificant beings such as mosquitoes and ants, etc., besides humans (*kṣudra-miśrāṇi*) who are

themselves the cause of their progeny (*bījāni*) with mutual distinction called birds, reptiles born of eggs (*āṇḍajāni*); humans, cows, etc., born of wombs (*jārāyujāni*), worms, insects, lice, etc., born of sweat (*svedajāni*); trees, etc., born from earth by breaking out or sprouting (*udbhijjāni*) which are further named in particular as horses, cows, humans, elephants, etc., or in short, whatever living beings that walk, fly, etc., and whatever that is stationary such as trees, rocks, etc.; all of them told so far gain their existence to function because of *prajñā/prajñānam* (pure *caitanya* - *nirupādhika* knowledge principle). Therefore all these are called *prajñānetram*. The phrase *prajñānetram* is explained further by pointing out the three unique features of *prajñā* during the birth, continuance and dissolution of Creation. The *prajñā* is the principle on which Creation is superimposed at the time of its birth (*utpatti*), (i.e. *prajñāne pratiṣṭhitam*). The entire Creation has *prajñā* as its means of all *vyavahāra* (dealings) during its existence (*sthiti*), (i.e. *prajñānetram lokah*). During the dissolution (*laya*) Creation abides in *prajñā* (*prajñā pratiṣṭhā*) (*Ai.U.3-1-1*).

Prajñānam appears differently as *jīva* and *Īśvara* on account of *upādhis*. In reality they are one and the same principle, *prajñānam*. To show this later, the *upādhis* of *jīva* and *Īśvara* are highlighted first.

प्रज्ञानस्यास्य जीवत्वं

प्राणधारणतो यथा ।

जगत्सृष्ट्यादिहेतुत्वात् ब्रह्मत्वं च

तथेष्यताम् ॥१८॥

यथा - just as प्राणधारणतः - because of sustaining the *prāṇas* (vital airs) अस्य प्रज्ञानस्य - of this *prajñānam* जीवत्वं (भवति) - the form of *jīva* takes place तथा - so also जगत्सृष्ट्यादिहेतुत्वात् - because of being the cause of birth, sustenance and dissolution of Creation ब्रह्मत्वं च - the form of *Īśvara* (indicated by the word *Brahmatvam*) also इष्यताम् - be understood – (98)

98. Just as *prajñānam* is taken as *jīva* because it sustains the *prāṇas*, so also (the same *prajñānam*) be understood as *Īśvara* because of being the cause of birth, sustenance and dissolution of Creation.

The total space is one. But on account of *upādhis* or conditionings of pot and the hall it appears as pot-space and hall-space. Similarly, the *prajñānam* is one. But the *upādhi* of *avidyā* with its consequent *prāṇas*, etc., seemingly makes it appear as *samsārī jīva* at the individual level. *Māyā* the creative power dependant on *prajñānam* at totality level, (i.e. Brahman) makes it appear as *Īśvara* creating, sustaining and destroying Creation. In the verse the

word *Brahmatvam* is used to signify *Īśvara* by indication. *Nirupādhika* non-dual Brahman free from *māyā* has no Creation in it, leave alone its birth sustenance and destruction.

The *śruti* phrase ‘*sarvam tat prajñānetram*’ (*Ai.U.3-1-1*) which reveals that *jagat* is centred in *prajñānam* is explained in the next verse.

स्थावरं जङ्गमं सर्वं जगदित्यभिधीयते ।
तस्य प्रज्ञैव नेत्रं स्यात् सृष्ट्यादिनयनादसौ ॥१९॥

स्थावरं - immobile जङ्गमं - mobile जगत् - world ‘सर्वं’ - ‘all’ (the word ‘all’ in the *śruti* statement, ‘all that is *prajñānetram*’) इति - so अभिधीयते - is referred to असौ - this प्रज्ञा एव - *prajñānam* itself सृष्ट्यादिनयनात् - because of leading the *jagat* to its birth, sustenance and destruction तस्य - of that *jagat* नेत्रं - leader स्यात् - is – (99)

99. The word ‘*sarvam*’ (all) (in the *śruti* statement, ‘all that is *prajñānetram*’) refers to this mobile and immobile *jagat*. Because *prajñānam* leads the *jagat* to its birth, sustenance and destruction, it is considered to be the *netram* (leader) of *jagat*.

The one who leads is *netram* (leader). Though ‘*netram*’ means eyes, it is called so because eyes show the path and lead to the destination. Eyes lead all

to *vyavahāra*. Inert *jagat* cannot do anything. It is *prajñānam* (*nirupādhika caitanya*) which enables birth, sustenance and destruction of *jagat*. The existence of *jagat* and all activities in it are possible only because of *prajñānam*. Thus it leads the *jagat* in all respects of its *vyavahāra* which is aptly suggested by the phrase ‘*prajñānetram*’.

The *śruti* itself explains the phrase *prajñānetram* in terms of ‘*prajñāne pratiṣṭhitam*’, ‘*prajñānetre lokaḥ*’, ‘*prajñā pratiṣṭhā*’. It establishes *prajñānam* as the cause of *sṛṣṭi* (birth), *sthiti* (sustenance) and *laya* (destruction) of *jagat*. This is explained in the next three verses. The verse 100 explains that the *jagat* abides in *prajñānam* (*prajñāne pratiṣṭhitam*).

प्रज्ञानं शुद्धचिद्रूपमासीद्यत्

सृष्टितः पुरा ।

तस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठितं सर्वं

माययोत्पादितत्त्वतः ॥१००॥

सृष्टितः पुरा - before the Creation यत्
- whatever शुद्धचिद्रूपम् - pure
(*nirupādhika caitanya*) प्रज्ञानं - called
prajñānam आसीत् - was there सर्वं - the
entire *jagat* तस्मिन् - in that *prajñānam*
प्रतिष्ठितं - abides मायया उत्पादितत्त्वतः -
because (the *jagat*) is falsely projected
by *māyā*—(100)

100. Before the Creation

whatever pure (*nirupādhika caitanya*) called *prajñānam* was there in it the entire created *jagat* abides because it is falsely projected by *māyā*.

Prior to the Creation, only the non-dual *ātmā* was there. Its nature is *upādhiless caitanya* called *prajñānam*. It is changeless (*avikriya*) ever-existence principle. Actually there is no possibility of any Creation (*jagat*) emerging from it. And yet if *jagat* appears to be there in it, the only possibility is that the same is falsely projected (*adhyasta*) in *prajñānam* as its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) by an equally false cause called *māyā* or ignorance of *prajñānam*. Being a product of false *māyā*, the *jagat* also is false in reality. It cannot effect any change in *prajñānam*. It is like a falsely superimposed snake on a rope as its basis. The false *jagat* that is *adhyasta* on *prajñānam*, as its *upādhi*, can serve as the means to know its true nature totally free from the *jagat*. *Prajñānam* lends the existence to the *jagat*.

The phrase *prajñānetraḥ lokaḥ* is being explained.

उत्पत्तिस्थितिकालेऽसौ लोकः प्रज्ञाननेत्रकः ।
नेत्रत्वं व्यवहारस्य सुखादेर्नयनाद् भवेत् ॥१०१॥

असौ - this लोकः - mobile and immobile *jagat* उत्पत्तिस्थितिकाले - at the time of its birth and continuance प्रज्ञाननेत्रकः - has *prajñānam* as its *netram*

(leader or conductor) सुखादेः व्यवहारस्य - of *vyavahāra* (dealings) such as joy, etc. नयनात् - because of operating नेत्रत्वं - the status of the conductor भवेत् - is - (101)

101. This mobile and immobile *jagat* at the time of its birth and continuance has *prajñānam* as its *netram* (leader or conductor). *Prajñānam* has the status of being the conductor (or the leader) of the *jagat* because of operating all *vyavahāra* (dealings) such as joy, etc.

The world *lokaḥ* means the entire moving and non-moving *jagat* with all its inhabitants called *jīvas*. The functioning and pursuit of all either at individual or total level is centred in *prajñānam* only. It lends the *sphūrṭi*, the enlivening and knowledge principles to the *jagat*. Thereby the whole show of *jagat* or *saṃsāra* in terms of actions, knowledge and experiences is conducted by *prajñānam* only. That gives it the status of being *netram* - the one who leads, conducts or executes. Without it, no business in the entire cosmos is ever possible.

The third phrase - *prajñāpratiṣṭhā* - points out that *prajñānam* is the principle wherein the entire Creation merges during its dissolution.

लये प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठा स्यात्

तत्र सर्वस्य संहृतेः ।

सृष्टिस्थितिलया इत्थं

श्रुताः प्रज्ञानहेतुकाः ॥१०२॥

लये - during the dissolution of *jagat* तत्र - in *prajñānam* सर्वस्य - of the entire *jagat* संहृतेः - because of merging प्रज्ञा - *prajñānam* प्रतिष्ठा स्यात् - is (its) foundation; place of merging इत्थं - thus सृष्टिस्थितिलयाः - the birth, continuation and destruction of the *jagat* प्रज्ञानहेतुकाः - are centred in *prajñānam* श्रुताः - according to the *śruti* - (102)

102. *Prajñānam* is the foundation or the place of merging of the entire *jagat* because it merges in *prajñānam* during its dissolution. Thus according to the *śruti* the birth, continuation and the destruction of *jagat* are centred in *prajñānam*.

An effect after its destruction merges in its cause which still continues to exist. After the dissolution of the *jagat* what remains is *prajñānam*. Therefore it is called *pratiṣṭhā* - the foundation or the place of merging of *jagat* and it is there even before the Creation is born. This we can verify to an extent in our sleep. The *jagat* as experienced and dealt with by us in the waking and the dream is not there for the one who is asleep. All our faculties also except the involuntary

physiological functions cease to be there. Yet, 'I' *caitanya* continues to be in sleep. So is the case in dissolution. The ever-existent principle *prajñānam* continues even in the absence of *jagat*. Thus (as discussed in verses 101 to 103) according to the *śruti* the birth, continuation and the destruction of *jagat* are centred in *prajñānam* - the *nirupādhika caitanya* - which itself is the *mukhya* (principal) *ātmā*.

To establish further that the entire *jagat* is centred in *prajñānam*, the next two verses describe with illustrations the same *upādhiless caitanya* or *prajñānam* in the form of *jīva* as the *sākṣī* (illuminator) of dream with the birth, etc., of the dreamt world and in the form of Brahman also as the *sākṣī* (illuminator) of birth, continuance and dissolution of the entire *jagat*.

स्वप्नसृष्टिस्थितिलया

जीवचैतन्यसाक्षिकाः ।

निर्जीवस्तंभकुड्यादौ

स्वप्नसृष्ट्यादयो न हि ॥१०३॥

स्वप्नसृष्टिस्थितिलयाः - the birth, continuance and ending of dream
जीवचैतन्यसाक्षिकाः - have the *caitanya* in the form of *jīva* as their *sākṣī*
स्वप्नसृष्ट्यादयः - the birth, etc., of dream हि - because निर्जीवस्तंभकुड्यादौ - in the lifeless (inert) post and wall, etc. न (दृश्यन्ते) - are not seen – (103)

103. The *caitanya* in the form of *jīva* is the *sākṣī* of the birth, continuance and the ending of dream. Because the birth, etc., of dream are not seen in the lifeless (inert) post and the wall, etc.

जगत्सृष्टिस्थितिलया ब्रह्मचैतन्यसाक्षिकाः ।
ब्रह्मचैतन्यरहिते वन्ध्यापुत्रे न सन्ति ते ॥१०४॥

जगत्सृष्टिस्थितिलयाः - the birth, continuance and dissolution of *jagat*
ब्रह्मचैतन्यसाक्षिकाः - have the *caitanya* in the form of Brahman as their *sākṣī*ते - the birth, etc., of *jagat* ब्रह्मचैतन्यरहिते वन्ध्यापुत्रे - in the non-existing entity such as the son of a barren woman devoid of *caitanya* in the form of Brahman न सन्ति - are not there – (104)

104. The *caitanya* in the form of Brahman is the *sākṣī* of the birth, continuance and the dissolution of *jagat*. The birth, etc., of *jagat* are not there in the non-existing entity such as the son of a barren woman devoid of *caitanya* in the form of Brahman.

The above two verses describe both the presence and the absence of birth, etc., of dream and the *jagat* by using the method of *anvaya* (presence) of *caitanya* and its *vyatireka* (absence). The first lines of both verses point out the presence of birth, etc., of dream and *jagat* in the presence of *caitanya-jīva* or Brahman as *sākṣī*. The second lines show their absence where

there is no *caitanya* available as *sākṣī*. Though there is no occasion of *caitanya*/Brahman being not there in an existing entity, a non-existing entity such as son of a barren woman is taken for example.

To reveal the identity between *jīva* and *Īśvara* by *mahāvākya* the true nature of both will have to be shown as one and the same. The true nature of *jīva* or what is called '*śodhita tvam pada*' was shown in the verse 96 as '*nirupādhika caitanya*' called *prajñānam*. As for the true nature of *Īśvara*, the question was introduced in verse 72 by the phrase '*katarah saḥ ātmā*' (who among the *māyāvī* and *śuddha-cit* is *ātmā*?) (*Ai.U.* 3-1-1). It was discussed further from verse 97 and is now concluded in the next verse. It is '*advayam śuddha caitanyam*'.

जगत्सृष्ट्याद्यधिष्ठानं शुद्धचैतन्यमद्वयम् ।
परमात्मस्वरूपं स्यादिति तस्यात्र निर्णयः ॥१०५॥

जगत्सृष्ट्याद्यधिष्ठानं - the basis of birth, etc., of *jagat* अद्वयं - non-dual शुद्धचैतन्यम् - pure (*nirupādhika*) *caitanya* परमात्मस्वरूपं स्यात् - is the true nature of *Īśvara* इति - so अत्र - here तस्य निर्णयः - is the ascertainment of that question ('*katarah saḥ ātmā*') – (105)

105. The non-dual pure (*nirupādhika*) *caitanya*, the basis of birth, etc., of *jagat*, is the true nature of

Īśvara. This is the ascertainment of the question: '*katarah saḥ ātmā*'.

The word pure (*śuddha*) points out the *upādhiless* nature of *caitanya*, free from *māyā upādhi*. Its non-dual (*advaya*) aspect signifies that it is free from *māyākārya* - the effects of *māyā*, viz. the *jagat*. The readers can understand themselves that '*advayam śuddha caitanyam*' is itself '*prajñānam*' the *mukhya* (principal) *ātmā*. This '*śodhita*, (i.e. *nirupādhika*) *tat pada*' leads to the equation called *mahāvākya*, that the true nature of *jīva* is the same as that of *Īśvara*.

The *mahāvākya* '*prajñānam brahma*' is explained now.

**MĪMĀMSĀ - PRAJÑĀNAM
BRAHMA**

यत् प्रज्ञानं स्वात्मरूपं तद्ब्रह्मेति विबुध्यताम् ।
प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म विज्ञाय तिष्ठेत् प्रज्ञात्मना सदा ॥१०६॥

यत् स्वात्मरूपं - one's true nature प्रज्ञानं - that is *prajñānam* तद् - itself ब्रह्म - is Brahman इति - so विबुध्यताम् - should be known directly प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म - *prajñānam* is Brahman (इति - so) विज्ञाय - having experienced it directly (got its *sākṣātkāra*) सदा - always प्रज्ञात्मना - in the form of *upādhiless caitanya* तिष्ठेत् - one should remain – (106)

106. One's true nature that is *prajñānam* is itself Brahman. This

should be known directly. Having experienced it directly (got its *sākṣātkāra*) | one should always remain in the form of *upādhiless caitanya*.

The words *prajñānam* and *Brahma* contained in the *mahāvākya* refer to the *jīva* and *Īśvara* respectively. These two in their direct meaning (*vācyārtha*) are totally opposed to each other. The *jīva* is *saṃsārī*, with limited knowledge (*alpajñā*) and power (*alpa-śaktimān*), subject to transmigration whereas *Īśvara* is *asaṃsārī* (free from *saṃsāra*), omniscient, omnipresent and has no transmigration. But the *mahāvākya* holds good in their implied meaning (*lakṣyārtha*) wherein *upādhis* of both *jīva* and *Īśvara* are stripped off. What remains thereafter is *prajñānam* (*upādhiless pure caitanya*), the true nature of both which is identical. This is what the *mahāvākyas* actually reveal.

Here the verbs ‘*vibudhyatām*’ and ‘*vijñāya*’ have to be understood clearly. *Vibudhyatām* emphasizes that the knowledge gained must be true to the nature of the entity to be known free from doubts, vagueness and error. It is not simply the understanding of the *śāstra* even though it is essential (as *parokṣajñāna*) in the beginning. *Vibodhana* needs the direct experience of *ātmā* in its true nature because unlike heaven *ātmā*/Brahman is a *bhūtavastu*, an existing entity available for experience at the time of gaining knowledge (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-2*). The word ‘direct’ means that there is no *tripuṭī* (knower, knowledge *vṛtti* and known) involving subject-object relation which is universally present in all other experiences undergone by the knower (*pramātā*). In the direct *ātmajñāna* unlike in the understanding even the *pramāṇa* ceases to be there along with *pramātā* having done its function (*B.G.Bh.2-69*). The final *pramāṇa* of *ātmākāra* or *akhaṇḍākāra vṛtti* (called *jñāna-pramāṇa* in *Sūtrabhāṣya 1-1-1*) drops when *jñāna* becomes steadfast (*sthita/sthira*). All that remains is *ātmā*/Brahman free from all *adhyasta* (superimposed entities), itself being the unique *anubhava/jñāna* because it is self-experiencing/self-knowing principle (*anubhava-svarūpa, svayamjyoti*). *Ātmā* is *anubhava-svarūpa* in the state of ignorance also, but then it is mixed with the experiences of all *adhyasta upādhis* which is not its true nature. That experience is not *pramā* (correct knowledge) or *aparokṣajñāna* which liberates but it is only a *bhrama* (erroneous knowledge). *Parokṣajñāna* (lacking *ātmānubhava*) cannot liberate. The gaining of *ātmajñāna* as described above is referred to in ‘*Brahma vijñāya*’ in this verse. ‘*Vijñāya*’ means ‘*sākṣātkṛtya*’ (having got the *sākṣātkāra* - direct knowledge of Brahman) (*Ke.U.Bh.2-5*). *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is not possible without *ātmānubhava/ Brahmanubhava*. The

mukti (liberation) is *ātmā* itself free from self-ignorance and its effect (*Vedāntakalpalatikā*); or *Brahmabhāvaḥ* - true nature of Brahman; or *Brahma eva muktyavasthā* - Brahman itself is the state of *mukti* (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-4, 3-4-52*). It is experientially immediate on gaining knowledge and not something that is to fructify in future having uncertainty (*Br.Sū.Bh.3-4-1, 15*).

The above exposition makes it very clear that the *mahāvākya* or equation 'tvam' and 'tat' are identical will not operate unless 'śodhita tvam pada' (*upādhiless caitanya* or *prajñānam*) is directly experienced. Without this cognition, the *mahāvākya* will be akin to introducing a person to a schizophrenic whose basic perception of any person is usually distorted. The equation of the *mahāvākya* points out that *tat* and *tvam* are identical. This will hold good only when *tvam* (which is self-evident 'I') is experienced in its true nature by the hitherto ignorant person. The *tvam* (you as 'I') that we experience now, namely a *saṃsāri* identified with its *upādhi*, cannot by itself be *tat pada* - Brahman. Let us bear in mind that *Veda-pramāṇa* in the case of *ātmajñāna* is a verifiable one by experience unlike the same that reveals the existence of heavens. Śrī Padmapādācārya in his *Pañcapādikā* and Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni in the text *Vivaraṇaprameya-saṅgraha* have established this fact.*

B r a h m a v i j ñ ā n a or *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is itself the liberation, the highest accomplishment in the entire Creation. Thereafter, there remains nothing else to be done, gained or needed. Therefore such a *jñānī* is exhorted to remain (*tiṣṭhet*) always (*sadā*) in Brahman free from *upādhi* (*prajñātmanā*) which is the true-nature of oneself, *Īśvara* and the *jagat*. Such a state of steadfastness in *Brahmajñāna* is *jīvanmukti* as gained by the sage Vāmadeva.

जीवन्नेव स्थितप्रज्ञो मुक्तः स्याद् वामदेववत् ।
प्रियतां यत्र तत्रास्य वपुः सोऽयं न जायते ॥१०७॥

स्थितप्रज्ञः - the person steadfast in *Brahmajñāna* जीवन् एव - while living in the present body itself मुक्तः स्यात् - gets liberated अस्य वपुः - the body of such liberated person यत्र तत्र (वा) - in whatever place प्रियतां - let it die सः अयं - that liberated person who is dead now वामदेववत् - like the sage Vāmadeva न जायते - is not reborn - (107)

107. The *sthitaprajña* (person steadfast in *Brahmajñāna*) gets liberated while living in the present body itself. Let his body die in whatever place. He is not reborn like the sage Vāmadeva.

* Vide *Brahmasūtra Śāṅkarabhāṣyam (Catuṣsūtrī)* by the same commentator for further details.

Sthitaprajña is a *jīvanmukta* whose *prajñā* is *sthitā* or *sthirā* (firm). The meaning of *prajñā* in some earlier verses was seen as pure (*upādhi*less) *caitanya* called *prajñānam*. *Prajñā* in the context of *sthitaprajña* mean a *vṛtti* (thought) called *ātmākāra*, *Brahmākāra* or *akhaṇḍākāra* which is an exact replica of *ātmā*/Brahman in its true nature. This *prajñā*, the *vṛtti*, is the only means to end ignorance and get one's mind absorbed in *prajñānam*, Brahman. It is defined as the *vṛtti* that is *nirvikalpā* (without the division of subject, object and predicate as in *samādhi*), *cinmātrā* (*caitanya* and *caitanya* alone without *upādhis*) which is fully absorbed in the identity of *śodhita* (purified) *tvampada* (*jīva*) and *tatpada* (*Īśvara*) (*Adhyātmopaniṣad*, 42-43, from *Śukla Yajurveda*; *Vi. Cū.*428). The ignorance of *ātmā* cannot end without this *prajñā*. But this *vṛtti* also is a trace of *antaḥkaraṇa upādhi*. Even its presence denies *prajñā* to be *prajñānam* (*nirupādhi*ca *caitanya*). But repeated practice of this *vṛtti* in course of time when *ātmajñāna* becomes firm eliminates that *vṛtti* also. *Ātmā*/Brahman only remains in such a *nirvikalpa antaḥkaraṇa* in terms of cognition / experience. That *prajñānam* is Brahman. That is *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. The sage Vasiṣṭha emphasizes the indispensability of *prajñā* in his statement: ‘Oh Rama, approaching a *guru* and exposing oneself to his teaching is only a formality in terms of observing the norms of the scriptures. The primary means of gaining *Brahmajñāna* is *prajñā* (*ātmākāra-vṛtti*) born in the pure *antaḥkaraṇa* (*śuddha citta*) of the disciple’ (*Yo. Vā.Ni.Pū.*83-13).

The accomplishment of *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-saṃpatti* (fourfold qualification) with intense *vairāgya*, a life of *karmayoga*, *upāsana*, etc., are necessary to develop *citta-śuddhi* with *niścala antaḥkaraṇa* (single pointed mind). *Śuddha citta* is that frame of mind which can display *nirupādhi*ca Brahman as its replica like in the mirror. In fact the delay in gaining *Brahmajñāna* is for want of such mind. This can make it clear that the study of Vedānta is distinct from academic studies. *Bhāṣyakāra* emphasizes the indispensability of *Brahmānubhava* in gaining *Brahmajñāna* in his statement, ‘*Brahmajñāna* culminates in experience’ (*anubhavāvasānatvāt brahmajñānasya*, *Br.Sū.Bh.*1-1-2). Anything short of it is *parokṣajñāna* (indirect knowledge) and not the *aparokṣa* (direct) one.

The description of *sthitaprajña*, *bhakta* and *guṇātīta* described in the *Bhagavadgītā* (Ch.2, 12, 14) is actually that of a *jīvanmukta* (*Jī. Vi.*Ch.1). Vyāsa describes *jīvanmukta* in Mahābhārata as a *brāhmaṇa* whereas *Sūtasamhitā* contained in the *Skandapurāṇa* describes him an *atyāśramī* (*Jī. Vi.* Ch-1).

The time, place and the mode of death has some bearing upon the future of an *ajñānī jīva* after death. The question arises whether the same is applicable to a *jīvanmukta* or a *jñānī* after his body is cast away. The answer is in the negative. He is liberated at the time of gaining *aparokṣajñāna* (*jñānasamakālamuktaḥ*). In the wake of *Brahmajñāna* the hitherto *jīva* with his *karmaphalas* for future transmigration is not there at all though his body continues because of the momentum of *prārabdha* until his death. Dropping the body in holy places such as Kāśī or the banks of holy rivers such as Ganges, etc., or in the house of the lowliest of the lowly such as a dog-eater or in a state of coma are all irrelevant to him because he is already liberated at the time he gained the knowledge and he has no rebirth (*Paramārthasāra* by Ādiśeṣa, vs.81). His subtle body gets disintegrated at death. He was liberated while living in the body and now gains the bodiless liberation.

CONCLUSION

The first chapter of this text containing the exposition on the *Aitareyopaniṣad* is being concluded by offering the prayers to *Parameśvara* and the *guru*.

ऐतरेयब्रह्मविद्यां व्याख्यातां सङ्ग्रहादिमाम् ।
सुस्थिरामनुगृह्णातु विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः ॥१०८॥

विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः - *Bhagavān Maheśvara* who is the abode (*tīrtha*) of all 64 branches of knowledge (*vidyā*) सङ्ग्रहात् - comprehensively व्याख्यातां - commented upon इमाम् - this ऐतरेयब्रह्मविद्याम् - *Brahmavidyā* unfolded in the *Aitareyopaniṣad* सुस्थिराम् - steadfast अनुगृह्णातु - may he foster/protect us - (108).

108. May *Bhagavān Maheśvara* who is the abode of all 64 branches of knowledge foster us with this *Brahmavidyā*, unfolded in the *Aitareyopaniṣad* which is commented upon here in this chapter comprehensively, in such a way that we get steadfastly rooted in it.

The above is a prayer offered to *Parameśvara* or to the *guru*. *Vidyātīrthamaheśvara* can mean *Parameśvara* or *Bhagavān Śiva* who is the abode of 64 branches of knowledge. The last verse of twelfth chapter of this text qualifies the name *Vidyātīrthamaheśvara* by *antaryāmī* (indwelling *Īśvara* principle in all) which obviously points out to *Īśvara*. Or taking into account the identity between the *guru* and *Īśvara*, the name can refer to *guru* who is the abode of *Brahmavidyā*. *Vidyātīrtha* is also the name of the *guru* of *Bhāratīrtha* who in turn is the pre-monastic *guru* of

Vidyāraṇya Muni. In this case *Vidyātīrthamaheśvara* can refer to Bhāratīrtha as the one who has Vidyātīrtha as his master (*Maheśvara*) or *guru*. But the question arises why does Vidyāraṇya Muni prays to pre-monastic *guru* instead of Śāṅkarānanda, the monastic *guru* to whom he salutes in the beginning of Pañcadaśī text? Therefore it is proper to take this prayer as offered

to *Parameśvara* or to *guru* who is identical with *Parameśvara*. With this the first chapter of *Anubhūtiprakāśa* called *Aitareyopaniṣadvivaraṇam* ends.

इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिकृते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
ऐतरेयोपनिषद्विवरणं नाम प्रथमोऽध्यायः ।

॥ ॐ ॥



CHAPTER - II

TAITTIRĪYAVIDYĀPRAKĀŚA

(TAITTIRĪYOPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[The chapter, *Taittirīyavidyāprakāśa*, mostly deals with the explanation of *Brahmānandvalli* of *Taittirīyopaniṣad*. The *Śikṣāvallī* and *Bhṛguvallī* are only alluded to. *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* is included in this chapter. The teaching starts with a *sūtra* as it were which declares that the *Brahmajñānī* (*Brahmavit*) gains (*āpnoti*) the limitless Brahman itself, (i.e. *param*) concealed in the caves (*guhā*) of five sheaths. This statement describes, (i) the entity - Brahman - to be known, (ii) the locus where and the manner in which the actual knowledge of Brahman is to be gained, and (iii) the result of this knowledge. *Pañcakośa-viveka* (inquiry into the five sheaths) is the main method adopted in this Upaniṣad. The *adhyāropa-apavāda* is resorted to in addition. Universally, there is an error of identifying oneself 'I' with the five sheaths. As a result, all sorrows arising from each of the sheaths are suffered by the individual as if belonging to him as his intrinsic nature. This is what is called *samsāra*. *Pañcakośa-viveka* is a means of overcoming this error of misidentification of 'I' - oneself - with the *Pañcakośa* and knowing directly (*aparokṣatayā*) one's true nature, *ātmā*/Brahman. The author highlights that *Brahmasākṣātkāra* can be gained only by '*antarmukhā-dṛṣṭi*' (introvert mind) free from the perception of the *jagat* and five sheaths. One's false status as *samsārī jīva* can never be ended by *sopādhika bahirdṛṣṭi* (extrovert mind) engaged in the external world, and five sheaths.

To begin with, teaching starts with a thorough self-inquiry into the nature of *ātmā*/Brahman. It is called *śravaṇa*. The Upaniṣads then proceed to answer certain questions that arise from the teaching. This aspect of clearing the doubts is called *manana* (reflection). *Ānanda-mīmāṃsā* (quantitative investigation or analysis of happiness) gives some inkling of what the magnitude of limitless *Brahmānanda* can be. It is an attempt to contrast the existence of limitless happiness with the limited happiness experienced by us directly through the sense-objects (*viśayas*). Even if all

happiness experienced on account of the sense-objects (*viṣayas*) by all embodiments from the lowliest *Jīva* to the highest *Jīva* - *Hiraṇyagarbha* (who has the highest share of it) is put together, it is equivalent only to a drop in the ocean of *Brahmānanda*. This should motivate *mumukṣu* to intensify his *vairāgya* towards paltry sense-pleasures. Without *vairāgya* gaining *Brahmajñāna* is next to impossible.]

INTRODUCTION TO TAITTIRĪYA-VIDYĀPRAKĀŚĀ

Having explained *Aitareyopaniṣad* from Ṛgveda the author is now going to comment upon *Taittirīyopaniṣad* from *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda*. But what is the necessity of studying further Upaniṣads when one of them has clearly unfolded the true nature of *ātmā*? The reply to this question will be clear by the time the following analysis is concluded. At a cursory glance it is true that studying more Upaniṣads appears to be unnecessary. But unlike academic studies wherein certain informations and techniques are gathered to derive benefits by using them, the approach of Vedānta is distinct by itself. It involves three steps of *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* with the eligibility of *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-saṃpatti*. *Śravaṇa* is *ātma-vicāra* (self-inquiry) on the guidelines of scriptures to ascertain thereby the ultimate truth unanimously established by all the Upaniṣads and allied texts based on them. It is taken to by exposing to the teaching of a competent *ācārya* (teacher). *Mananam* is the constant reflection in accordance with the reasonings given in Vedānta to verify the veracity of what is unfolded in the Upaniṣads. *Nididhyāsana* is a consistent endeavour to maintain the flow of thoughts (*vṛttis*) conforming to the non-dual *ātmā* to the exclusion of dissimilar thoughts related to the body and *drśya jagat*. With the sufficient practice of *nididhyāsana* backed up by *śravaṇa* and *manana* the *antaḥkaraṇa* (mind) becomes *ātmākāra*/ *Brahmākāra* (a replica of *ātmā*/Brahman) and gets absorbed in it. This is what is called *aparokṣajñāna* (direct knowledge) of *ātmā*/Brahman or the *sākṣātkāra* of *ātmā*/Brahman. That itself is the liberation. Anything short of it is *parokṣajñāna* (indirect knowledge). It cannot liberate.

In Vedānta, the indirect (*parokṣa*) knowledge is the correct understanding or grasp of details regarding *ātmā*, etc., as told in the *śāstra* (scripture) and taught by the *ācārya* (*B.G.Bh.3-41,6-8*). But one should get direct experience of *ātmā*/Brahman called *vijñāna* in conformity with what is learnt (*B.G.Bh.3-41, 6-8*). Why this is so can be clear to an extent if we consider what is *aparokṣa* and *sākṣātkāra* as mentioned above. From the standpoint of cognition, the world can be categorized as *parokṣa*, *pratyakṣa* and *aparokṣa*. The *parokṣa* is that which is remote in terms of time or space

and therefore is not available for direct perception. What is available for direct perception through the sense-organs (*jñānendriyas*) is *pratyakṣa*. The knowledge so gained perceptually also is called *pratyakṣa*. A *parokṣa* entity can become *pratyakṣa* when the distancing factor such as space or time is removed. For example, the arctic region is *parokṣa* for us now, but it becomes *pratyakṣa* when we reach there. As for entities such as heavens, they are *nitya parokṣa* (ever remote) with respect to our present bodies.

Aparokṣa is an entity which is neither *pratyakṣa* (perceptible through the sense-organs) nor *parokṣa* (remote or unavailable for cognition at times). It is ever experienced as ‘I’ without any means of cognition such as sense-organs, the mind or intellect. It is simultaneously self-evident, self-experiencing and self-knowing principle present in the waking, dream and deep sleep. The universal recollection, ‘I slept well, I did not know anything’, shows that the sleep experience was possible because of this basic principle of experience. Actually this ‘I’ itself is the *ātmā* or Brahman revealed by the Upaniṣads as the ever-existent principle (*sat*), the very knowledge principle (*cit*) and the limitless happiness (*ānanda*) totally free from sorrows. Then the question is how do we experience ourselves to be calamitously sorrowful *saṃsārīs* subject to transmigration? This is the problem of universal error giving rise to the mistaken identity and its effects born of self-ignorance. In Vedāntic terminology the diagnosis is *adhyāsa* (superimposition) of *avidyā* (self-ignorance) and its effect *anātmā* on the true ‘I’ (*ātmā*). *Adhyāsa* is *anubhavasiddha* (proved by experience) though false (*mithyā*) in nature. Freedom from it can be possible only by the experience of its termination by the direct knowledge of ‘I’ (*ātmā*) to be *sat-cit-ānanda*. It has to be free from all superimposed entities because the self-experiencing principle *ātmā* is so. For example, hunger or sickness experienced gets ended only by the contrary experience of its appeasement or regaining the health. Merely knowing the remedial measures however accurate and in detail they may be, cannot by themselves set right any experiential problem. ‘What is known subjectively (by *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*), true or false, is established by experience’ (*Yo.Va.Ni.U.79-31*). The outcome of this implies that any deeply rooted erroneous knowledge of an entity (e.g. *ātmā*), which is subjectively experienced (as I am a *saṃsārī*) cannot be ended without the correct experience of that entity (viz. true ‘I’ - *ātmā*). Thus *ātma-vicāra* must culminate in the direct experience of what *ātmā* truly is. Such an experience is called *ātmasākṣātkāra* or *Brahmasākṣātkārah*. Adequate *nididhyāsana* leads to it.

The phrase *Brahmasākṣātkārah* contains three words. They are Brahman, *sākṣāt* and *kārah*. Brahman or *ātmā* is revealed by the Upaniṣads as the only non-dual *caitanya* or *cit* (pure awareness) principle which itself is *sat* and *ānanda*. It is all pervasive in nature, the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of *prapañca* falsely superimposed on it, but itself totally free from it. *Sākṣāt* (direct) in this context means the Brahman that is not at all obstructed by *avidyā* and its effect the *dṛśya jagat* known through *antaḥkarana vṛttis* (*Br. U. Bh. 3-4-1*). That means it is totally unobstructed by *avidyā* and any *vṛtti* (thought). *Kāra* (कार) derived from the verbal root *Kṛ* (कृ, to do) with a suffix घञ् (to form a noun) means doer, maker, doing, making. Thus *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is making Brahman or doer of Brahman totally unobstructed by *avidyā* and all *vṛttis* (thoughts). This is accomplished by *nididhyāsana*. The *vṛtti* conforming to *ātmā*/Brahman free from all *dṛśyas* called *ātmākāra*, *akhaṇḍākāra*, etc., eliminates the *avidyā*. The lingering *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* which is also *dṛśya anātmā* drops down in its steadfastness. What remains is the self-revealed self-experiencing Brahman in its true nature totally free from *avidyā* and *samsāra*. This is *mokṣa*. Mere understanding of *śāstras* is not *Brahmajñāna*. In fact *ātmā*/Brahman cannot be understood in the sense it cannot be the entity ‘the understood’ (*prameya*) of the understander (*pramātā*) because *ātmā*/Brahman is the true nature of the understander. In *Brahmasākṣātkāra* making Brahman direct or unobstructed is from our state of its ignorance. Wherein we are required to know it in its true nature. Otherwise, Brahman is in its true nature even in our state of ignorance. It never changes or deviates from its real nature. All that is required is to strip off *avidyā* and *dṛśya jagat* which hinders our vision of true Brahman.

The English verb ‘realize’ can correspond to ‘*sākṣātkāra*’. The suffix ‘ize’ (or ‘ise’) is used in the sense ‘to make’. Thus ‘realize’ means ‘make it real’. In the present state of ignorance Brahman appears to be other than what it truly is. Therefore make it appear in its real nature as guided by the Upaniṣads.

Brahmasākṣātkāra is the final result of *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana*. It is gained here while living and not hereafter. Therefore repetition of *śravaṇa*, etc., is necessary until *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is gained. Only the person who can command *Brahmasākṣātkāra* within a trice does not need them. This is highlighted in the *Brahmasūtra*. ‘Repetition of *śravaṇa*, etc., has to be taken to; because the *śruti* itself advises repeatedly’ (*Br. Sū. 4-1-1*).

Different Upaniṣads adopt different modes of teaching called *prakriyās*. This

helps *mumukṣus* because different people have different preferences and likings. It caters to their needs. Moreover, all the Upaniṣads irrespective of their different *prakriyās* reveal one and the same Brahman having the nature of *Caitanya* as the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of falsely superimposed *jagat*. This proves the status of Upaniṣads as infallible *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) which imparts the same knowledge through all Upaniṣads just as all eyes see the same form and all ears hear the same sound, etc. (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-10*).

Another reason why many Upaniṣads need to be studied is that different facets of Brahman are discussed in different Upaniṣads. Since Brahman unfolded in all Upaniṣads is one and the same and therefore *Brahmavidyā* also is the same, the different features of Brahman such as *ānanda*, *vijñānaghana*, *sarvagata*, *sarvātmā*, *ananta*, *prajñānam*, etc., described in different Upaniṣads need to be collected together for its knowledge to be complete. This is called *guṇopasaṃhāra* and is established in ‘*ānandādi adhikaraṇa*’ (*Br.Sū.3-3-11* to 13). These features described by different words can be grouped together as, *satyatva* (ever-existent changeless), *jñānatva* (basic knowledge principle), *ānandatva* (basic happiness distinct from sense-pleasures), *ātmatva* (as *pratyagātmā* ‘I’ in all), *pūrṇatva* (limitlessness or *ananta*). Thus Vedāntic pursuit of *śravaṇa*, etc., has to be repeated up to the point of *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. It is said that daily the time should be spent in Vedāntic discussions until one sleeps (*āsupteḥ*) during the whole life till one dies (*āmṛteḥ*) or gets *Brahmajñāna*. But the problem with the majority is that they have no priority for this. The *śruti* knows the danger and warns with the love of thousands of mothers: If you gain *Brahmajñāna* in this birth, you have fulfilled the goal of human existence; if not, calamitous disaster of transmigratory *samsāra* is in store for you (*Ke.U.2-5*).

According to *Muktikopaniṣad* there are 109 *śākhās* (recensions) of Yajurveda out of which names of 43 *śākhās* are available in some *Purāṇas* and other texts. This Veda has main division of *Kṛṣṇa* and *Śukla*. *Śuklayajurveda* (*Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā*) has two *śākhās* of *Kāṇva* and *Mādhyandina* having some differences in the reading at places. The biggest

śākhā of *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* is *Taittirīya*. Customarily there is a story about the name *Taittirīya* having more or less the same central theme but with slight variations. It is there in *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (*Aṃśa 3, Ch.5*) also. Once Yājñavalkya disobeyed his *guru* Vaiśampāyana (disciple of Vyāsa) justifying it by his own reason. The annoyed *guru* asked Yājñavalkya to return what he has learnt

from him. It is said that he vomited whatever he learnt from his *guru* and the other disciples of Vaiśampāyana consumed it by taking the form of *tittiri* birds (francoline partridges). But this story is not found anywhere in Upaniṣads and *brāhmaṇas*. According to Pāṇinī, the sage Tittiri taught *Taittirīya śākhā* (*Pā.Sū.4-3-102*). The followers of Tittiri are called *taittirīyāḥ*.

The *anukramaṇikā* (index showing the succession) of *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda* shows its lineage as Vedavyāsa, Vaiśampāyana, Yāska (the first Vedic lexicographer) and Tittiri. Tittiri's disciples are called *taittirīya*. *Taittirīyāranyaka* contained in the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* has ten parts. Its seventh to ninth parts are called *Taittirīyopaniṣad*. It contains *Śīkṣāvallī* (also called *Sāṃhiti* Upaniṣad), *Brahmānandavallī* and *Bhṛguvallī* (together called *Vāruṇī* Upaniṣad). The tenth part of *Taittirīyāranyaka* is called *Yājñīkī* Upaniṣad which is famous as *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad*.

Among the three *vallīs* (chapters) of *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, the middle one, *Brahmānandavallī* reveals *Brahmavidyā* whereas other two describe the means of gaining *Brahmavidyā*. In this chapter, *Taittirīyavidyāprakāśa*, the *Brahmānandavallī* is described in

detail with a brief gist of the other two. At the end a brief narration of the last two sections (*anuvākas*) of *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* is included.

Some scholars opine that Ādi Śaṅkarācārya wrote first of all his commentary (*bhāṣya*) on this Upaniṣad. Sureśvarācārya has written *vārtika* on the *Taittirīyopaniṣad-bhāṣya*. It speaks of esteemed importance of this Upaniṣad.

TOPIC OF

TAITTIRĪYAVIDYĀPRAKĀŚAḤ

ब्रह्मवल्ल्यां ब्रह्मविद्यां तित्तिरिः प्राह यामिमाम् ।
वक्ष्ये सुखावबोधाय ऋडन्वत्र मुमुक्षवः ॥१॥

तित्तिरिः - Sage Tittiri याम् - whatever ब्रह्मविद्या - *Brahmavidyā* ब्रह्मवल्ल्याम् - in the *Brahmānandavallī* प्राह - taught with pros and cons इमाम् - the same one सुखावबोधाय - for an easy understanding वक्ष्ये - I shall explain अत्र - in this exposition मुमुक्षवः - *mumukṣus* ऋडन्तु - let them sport – (1)

1. I (Vidyāraṇya Muni) shall explain for an easy understanding in this exposition the *Brahmavidyā* taught with pros and cons by the sage Tittiri in the *Brahmānandavallī* (called *Brahmavallī*). Let the *mumukṣus* revel (in it) as if in sports.

The sage Tittiri, the promulgator of *Taittirīyaśākhā* has taught

Brahmavidyā elaborately in a language and style of Vedic age. Though it is in saṃskṛt language, the nuances therein are beyond the grasp of common *mumukṣus* who are not that much learned. Considering this difficulty in light of the indispensability that *Brahmavidyā* commands, Vidyāraṇya Muni is undertaking this task of teaching the same in an easily understandable style without compromising with the basic principles. He has dispensed with the details contained in *Śīkṣāvallī* and *Bhṛguvallī* by giving only their salient points and focused mainly on *Brahmavallī* by presenting it in a simple easy manner. The difficulties one may encounter in the direct study of the Upaniṣads are not going to be here.

‘*Krīḍantu*’ means let *mumukṣus* sport. It shows that the study be taken to with delight as in sports with much interest in it and not as a dreary endeavour. Or more precisely it means: having gained *Brahmavidyā* delightfully let one revel in it as in sports. In other words, let one become ‘*ātmakrīḍaḥ*’ - the one who revels in *ātmānanda*.

CONNECTION OF KARMA / UPĀSANĀ WITH BRAHMAVIDYĀ

Brahmavallī is not an independent treatise. It is a portion from the Vedas. Even before this Upaniṣad

there is a voluminous portion dealing with *Karmas*, etc. Therefore it is expected that the connection of *Brahmavallī* with the earlier portion is shown. The author does this by specifying in verses 2 and 3 how the *karmas* and *saṃhitopāsanās* enjoined in the preceding *Śīkṣāvallī* serve as the useful means in the pursuit of gaining *Brahmajñāna*.

दर्शादिपितृमेधान्तैः कर्मभिर्बहुजन्मसु ।
अनुष्ठितैर्विविदिषा जायतेऽन्तिमजन्मनि ॥२॥

बहुजन्मसु - in many births अनुष्ठितैः - by (the *karma*) performed दर्शादिपितृमेधान्तैः कर्मभिः - by the *karmas* beginning from *darśa*, etc., ending with *pitrmedha* अन्तिमजन्मनि - in the last birth विविदिषा - intense desire to know Brahman जायते - is born - (2)

2. By the performance of *Karmas* beginning from *darśa*, etc., ending with *pitrmedha* in many births the intense desire to know Brahman is born in the last birth.

The narration of *Karmas* in Yajurveda begins from the chapter of *darśa-pourṇamāsa* and ends with the chapter dealing with *pitrmedha*. It does not mean that *darśa* is the first and *pitrmedha* is the last one. In fact *agnihotra* is the basic unit of *Karma*. *Darśa-paurṇamāsa* constitute its occasional supplementary *karmas*.

Aśvamedhayāga is the higher *karma*. The phrase ‘*darśa* to *pitṛmedha*’ used here based on the chapters in the Yajurveda has to be taken to signify all *Karmas* told in the Vedas. It is not true that all have to do all *Karmas*. Everyone has to perform whatever maximum *Karmas* possible to oneself within the framework of *varṇāśrama dharma*. By such performance which presupposes the *dhārmika* life inherent in them, one's *duritas* (past sins) get nullified. Thereby *viveka* (discrimination of ever-lasting and transient) dawns leading to *vairāgya*. Such an evolution over the period of many births finally gives rise to very intense desire to know one's true nature Brahman by all means. This is called *vividiṣā*. Such a *Brahmajijñāsu* (or *vividiṣu*) does not rest contented unless he gains *Brahmasākṣātkāra* which itself is *mokṣa*. From that standpoint the birth in which a very strong *vividiṣā* is born is called the last birth since he is determined to gain *mokṣa*. Until such *vividiṣā* is not gained, everyone must follow one's *varṇāśrama dharma*.

Karmas performed during many births can give *vividiṣā* and when coupled with *Karmayoga* can also confer *cittaśuddhi* (purity of mind). But to gain *Brahmajñāna cittanaiścalya* (चित्तनैश्चल्य - Single pointedness of the mind) or called *cittaikāgratā* is also

essential. This cannot be gained by *Karmas*. On the contrary, they have a tendency to create *Vikṣepa* (agitations or distractions) in the mind. The means recommended to gain *ekāgratā* of mind are *upāsanās* and *yoga*. Therefore the Vedas invariably enjoin *upāsanās* after the *Karma* chapters. *Taittirīyopaniṣad* is not an exception to it. Such *upāsanās* are found in the *Śṭkṣāvallī*. Their purpose is told before introducing *Brahmavidyā*.

ततो योगं समभ्यस्य संहितोपासनादिभिः ।
एकाग्रे साधितेऽथास्य विद्यां सूत्रयति श्रुतिः ॥३॥

ततः - then (after gaining *vividiṣā*)
संहितोपासनादिभिः - through the means such as *saṃhitopāsanā*, etc. योगं - single pointedness of the mind, (i.e. *cittanaiścalya*) or ending the thoughts from the mind, (i.e. *cittavṛttinirodha*)
समभ्यस्य - having practiced very well
एकाग्रे साधिते (सति) - when *cittanaiścalya* is gained
अथ - thereafter अस्य - to this *vividiṣu* (the one who has got *vividiṣā*)
श्रुतिः - the Veda विद्यां सूत्रयति - imparts *Brahmavidyā* in an aphoristic form – (3)

3. After gaining *vividiṣā*, having practiced very well the single pointedness of the mind, (i.e. *cittanaiścalya*) or ending the thoughts from the mind, (i.e. *cittavṛttinirodha*) through the means such as *saṃhitopāsanā*, etc., the *cittanaiścalya*

is gained. Thereafter the Veda (*śruti*) imparts *Brahmavidyā* in an aphoristic form to this *vividiṣu*.

After gaining the eligibility, the means of accomplishing *mokṣa* (the highest *puruṣārtha*) is nothing but *Brahmavidyā*. *Brahmavidyā* does not fructify without the eligibility such as *vividiṣā*, *cittaśuddhi* and *cittanaiścalya*.

Śikṣāvallī has twelve *anuvākas* (sections). Even an eligible *mumukṣu* may have many obstructions that can deprive him of *Brahmavidyā*. Therefore a peace invocatory *mantra* (*śānti mantra*) is necessary to ward off different types of obstacles. The first *anuvāka* provides it. The prayer is on the following pattern beginning from “*Om, śam nomitraḥśam varuṇaḥ*”, etc. *Om*, may Mitra (the presiding deity of day and *prāṇa* as respiration) favour us the *mumukṣus* who are being exposed to *Brahmavidyā*. Similar prayers are offered to Varuṇa (the deity of night and *apāna*), Aryamā (the deity of eyes and the solar orb), Indra (the deity of arms and the strength), Bṛhaspati (the deity of speech and the intellect), Viṣṇu having long strides (the deity of feet). Thus the prayers to these presiding deities of vital airs (*prāṇas*) and the senses, etc., abiding in the body is for unobstructed *śravaṇa* and gaining the self-knowledge. Further salutations are offered to

Brahmā - Hiranyagarbha (sūtrātmā) and its counterpart *prāṇavāyu* perceptibly available in this body in terms of respiration. Both of them are extolled and further prayed to. O *Prāṇa* in the form of *vāyu*, you are Brahman perceptibly available in my body by nourishing it. To you alone I call the Brahman available as ‘I’ in everyone. To you of the nature of *Prāṇavāyu*, I call *ṛtam* - the things to be done as ascertained by the *śāstras*. I call you *satyam* - the verbally expressed and physically performed *ṛtam* because without you the *Prāṇavāyu* these are not possible. May that *sūtrātmā Brahmā* available in this body as *prāṇa* protect me the disciple by conferring the power to grasp *Brahmavidyā*. May the same *Brahmā* protect my *ācārya* by giving him the capacity to teach well. These blessings are sought for both the teacher and the taught, first at the time of learning. Then the same prayer for both is once again repeated for the second time to seek the blessing for the fructification of learning so that myself the disciple gets freed from *avidyā* with its consequent *samsāra*, and the *ācārya* feels delighted by having such a worthy disciple who can continue the lineage of *Brahmavidyā*. Invoking the peace (*śānti*) thrice is to ward off obstructions arising from (i) one's body (*ādhyātmika*), (ii) from surrounding

(*ādhibhautika*) and (iii) from phenomenal powers, etc., (*ādhideivika*).

The second *anuvāka* advises about phonetics so that students should take extra care while chanting the Vedas. The third *anuvāka* describes *saṃhitopāsanās*. They are meant to gain *Cittaikāgrya* in the case of *mumukṣus* whereas for others to get the results here and hereafter. The word *Samhitā* or ‘contact’ means the closest proximity of letters (*Pā.Sū.1-4-109*). The conjunction (*sandhi*) found in the Vedas or anywhere else has to be divided into four parts, viz. prior form (*pūrvarūpa*), latter form (*uttararūpa*), gap (*sandhi* different from the meaning of *Samhitā*) and the result of union (*Sandhāna*). This *upāsanā* is to be done with respect to five loci (*ālambanas - adhikaraṇas*) told by the Vedas. Further each of the four parts should be loaded (superimposed) by (or looked upon as) each of four relevant entities strictly as told by the Vedas but not by one's imagination. The details of *saṃhitopāsanā* can be tabulated as follows.

Locus (<i>ālambana</i>)	Prior form (<i>pūrvarūpa</i>)	Latter form (<i>uttararūpa</i>)	Gap (<i>sandhi</i>)	Result of union (<i>sandhāna</i>)
<i>Adhiloka</i> (Centered on <i>lokās</i>)	Earth	Heavens	Intervening Space	Air (<i>vāyu</i>)
<i>Adhijyautiṣa</i> (Centered on luminaries)	Fire	Sun	Water	Lightning
<i>Adhividya</i> (Centered on learning)	<i>Ācārya</i>	Resident Student	Knowledge	<i>Pravacana</i> (interaction by question and answer)
<i>Adhipraja</i> (Centered on progeny)	Mother	Father	Progeny	Procreation
<i>Adhyātma</i> (Centered on the body)	Lower lip	Upper lip	Speech	Tongue

At all places such as earth, heavens, etc., their presiding deities are to be considered because mere earth, etc., cannot be *upāsya* (object of *upāsanā*).

The fourth *anuvāka* enjoins *japa* to gain *medhā* (power that retains what is studied). It also tells *mantras* to be used for *homās* (small sacrifices) to gain food, wealth and fame. The fifth and the sixth *anuvākas* describe respectively the *upāsanās* of *aṅgas* (auxiliaries) of *hārdākāśabrahma* and that of Brahman itself abiding in *hārdākāśa* (space in the heart). For those who are unable to take the earlier subtle *upāsanās*, the *upāsanā* of Brahman with the gross *upādhis* is recommended in the seventh *anuvāka*. The eighth *anuvāka* enjoins *upāsanā* of *omkāra* as Brahman to those who are highly eligible (*uttama adhikārī*). The ninth *anuvāka* highlights the necessity of performing *Karmas* by all *upāsakas*. The tenth one gives an alternative of doing *japa* of ‘*aham vṛkṣasya*’, etc., to those who cannot take to the *Karma* of *svādhyāya* (reciting one's branch of Veda) because of dull intelligence, etc. The eleventh *anuvāka* is like a convocational address highlighting how one has to conduct oneself before gaining *Brahmajñāna* in the case of those who opt for *gṛhasthāśrama*. The twelfth *anuvāka* contains the same prayer of *śānti mantra* as offered in the beginning with the two verbs in the past tense. It says that *Parameśvara* has protected me and my *ācārya*. This expresses the gratitude and absolves oneself from ungratefulness.

The word ‘yoga’ in the verse stands for *cittavṛttinirodha* (controlling the thoughts in the mind). This is very essential along with *ekāgratā* (single pointedness of the mind) to gain *akhaṇḍākāravṛtti* and its steadfastness.

In the modern context most of the *Vaidika Karmas* and *Upāsanās* are not in vogue. Many of *paurāṇika pūjās* (worships) and *upāsanās* of *Īśvara (saguṇabrahma)* and *bhakti* (devotion) are in practice. How a *mumukṣu* has to conduct oneself in such a situation? There is no contradiction. *Navavidhābhakti* (ninefold devotion), *pūjā*, *japa*, *Bhagavannāma saṅkīrtana*, serving the distressed and needy besides philanthropic activities (*iṣṭāpūrta*) come under the category of *Karma* as envisaged by the Vedas. Even *upāsanās* of all type are *mānasa karmas* (mental *karmas*). Devotion is indispensable in *Karmayoga*. That is why *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa says that there are two *niṣṭhās* (firm adherence of life style) of *jñāna* and *karma* (*B.G.* 3-3). He does not postulate *bhakti* (devotion) separately as the third one. Therefore all the *karmas* and *upāsanās* in the modern context having scriptural sanction do have the capability of conferring *vividiṣā*, *cittaikāgrata* when taken to with required attitude.

There are certain votaries who claim a specific one among *jñāna*, *bhakti* (devotion) or *karma* to be superior over the other two. This only exhibits their immaturity due to the lack of knowing the roles played by them. It is true that knowledge of Brahman gives *mokṣa* the highest accomplishment. But it is just next to impossible to gain it without acquiring the disposition for which *karma* and *upāsanā*/devotion alone are the means. At the same time *karma*, *upāsanā* and devotion by themselves cannot give *mokṣa*. Arjuna had *sakhya-bhakti* (devotion with friendliness). Yet *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa imparted him *ātmajñāna* through his *Gītā* at the zero hour of the dreaded Mahābhārata war only after Arjuna sought it. *Pāṇḍavas* (Dharmarājā with his brothers) had a very high degree of devotion. Even then *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa ensured that they get *Brahmavidyā* through their grandfather Bhiṣma in spite of his lying on the death bed. That teaching is famous as *mokṣadharmā*. Therefore all of them being mutually dependant are necessary as the means. Only the difference is that *Brahmavidyā* is direct and others are supportive indirect means. It is just like the academic education divided into primary, secondary and higher or up to post-doctoral research. Higher education gives maximum return. But it is just impossible to accomplish it without the earlier two.

The word *atha* (thereafter) in the verse shows the eligibility of the *mumukṣu* to gain *Brahmasākṣātkāra* on gaining intense *vividīṣā*, *cittaśuddhi* and *cittaikāgratā*. Its meaning is synonymous with the word ‘*atha*’ used in the *Brahmasūtra* (*Br.Sū.1-1-1*) wherein it means after gaining the indispensable *sādhana-catustaya-sampatti* (fourfold qualification of *viveka*, *vairāgya*, etc.). The *sūtra* (aphorism) from the *śruti* referred to is ‘*Brahmavit āpnoti param*’ (*Brahmajñānī* gains or discover) himself to be Brahman (*Tai.U.2-1-1*). It is quoted in verse five with a synonymous verb.

The *Brahmavallī* has two *śānti* mantras. The first is the same as the one in *Śikṣāvallī*. The second one begins with ‘*Om, sahanāvavatu ...*’, etc. The author first tells us the purpose of *śānti* mantras.

सूत्रात् पूर्वं शान्तिमन्त्रो

जपायान्नोपवर्णितः ।

जपेन विघ्ना द्वेषाद्याः

शाम्यन्ति मनसि स्थिताः ॥४॥

अत्र - here in the *Brahmavallī*
 सूत्रात् पूर्वं - prior to the presenting of *sūtra*
 शान्तिमन्त्रः - the *mantra* for invoking the peace
 जपाय - to take to its *japa*
 उपवर्णितः - is narrated
 जपेन - by the *japa*
 मनसि स्थिताः

- abiding in the mind (of the disciple)
 द्वेषाद्याः - hatred, etc. विघ्नाः - obstacles
 शाम्यन्ति- get eliminated – (4)

4. In the *Brahmavallī*, the *mantra* for invoking the peace is narrated prior to the presenting of *sūtra* to take to its *japa*. By the result of this *japa* the obstacles such as hatred, etc., abiding in the mind of the disciple get eliminated.

Besides the obstacles originating from one's mind and the body, the *mumukṣus* are liable to be disturbed by people around and the hostile circumstances. Even the presiding deities to an extent obstruct. Therefore scriptures advise us to pray to *Parameśvara* repeatedly. Every Upaniṣad has its specific *mantra*, at times more than one. They are chanted before commencing the study of the Upaniṣad and after the daily lesson is over. Customarily ten of them are chanted everyday as a general prayer for a trouble-free pursuit of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. Though the author here refers to only one *śānti mantra*, 'sahanāvavatu', etc., there is another one 'saṃ no mitraḥ', etc., of *Śīkṣāvallī* also according to *bhāṣyakāra*.

The *mantra* 'sahanāvavatu', etc., means: 'May the *Parameśvara* revealed in the Upaniṣads protect us both (*ācārya* and disciples) by revealing

Brahmavidyā as it is. May he protect us both by bestowing liberation the result of this *vidyā*. May we accomplish the strength and the splendour born of *Brahmavidyā*. May whatever studied by us who are brilliant be well studied. May we not hate each other either because of inadvertently done unjust action or some misunderstanding related to defects in teaching and learning.' This *mantra* is mainly to ward off the obstacles at mental level because it clearly says, 'let us not hate each other'. The very important means in gaining *Brahmajñāna* is the right mental disposition. That is why this verse refers to the obstacles abiding in the mind (*manasi sthitāḥ*). The *mumukṣu* should develop with intent efforts the values and dispositions given in the thirteenth chapter of *Bhagavadgītā* (vs.7 to 11) and avoid the things contrary to it. Similarly the *daivi-sampat* to be cultivated and *āsurī-sampat* to be totally discarded (*B.G.Ch.16*). In *Śāntimantra* thrice repeated *śānti* word includes the prayer to seek freedom from other possible obstacles.

After the peace invocation, *Brahmavallī* begins with 'Brahmavidāpnoti param'. Actually the Upaniṣad does not refer to it as a *sūtra*. But the author of this text presents it as a *sūtra* and justifies it by explaining how it is so.

BRAHMAVALLĪ

ब्रह्मवित् परमेतीति सूत्रं सर्वार्थसूचनात् ।
ज्ञेयं ज्ञानं फलं चेति सर्वेऽर्थाः सूचिता इह ॥५॥

ब्रह्मवित् - the knower of Brahman, *Brahmajñānī* परम् - the limitless Brahman itself एति - gains, discovers oneself to be इति (वाक्यं) - this statement of the *śruti* सर्वार्थसूचनात् - because it suggests all topics सूत्रं - is a *sūtra* सर्वे - all अर्थाः - topics (are) ज्ञेयं - entity to be known ज्ञानं - actual knowledge फलं च - and the result इति - so इह - in this statement सूचिताः - are suggested—(5)

5. The statement of the *śruti*, that the *Brahmajñānī* (knower of Brahman) gains (discovers oneself to be) limitless Brahman itself, is a *sūtra* (aphorism) because it suggests all topics. The topics are, (i) the entity to be known, (ii) the locus where and how the actual knowledge can be gained and (iii) the result. All these are suggested in this statement. Here the word *jñānam* (actual knowledge) does not mean the nature of Brahman which is *jñāna tattva* (knowledge principle).

The *Brahmavit* the knower of Brahman or *Brahmajñānī* is the one who has *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. He gains (*eti, āpnoti*) in the sense of discovering oneself to be *param*, the limitless entity. It can be nothing but all pervasive Brahman only.

A *sūtra* is a short rule or precept, an aphorism, a formula. It is a short or concise technical sentence framed as a rule that can be easily remembered. A *sūtra* is brief in its composition, has a clear and unambiguous meaning, contains the essence or the main points and at times yields more than one meaning. It is flawless and free from superfluous words.

The author calls the quoted *śruti* statement a *sūtra* because it contains all the necessary aspects or topics of final accomplishment in human life, viz. *mokṣa* (liberation). It speaks of the entity to be known, the means to be adopted and the result to be gained.

The *śruti* quotes a *ṛk mantra* (*Tai.U.2-1*) to elaborate the aphoristic statement, '*Brahmvid āpnoti param*'. It defines Brahman the *jñeya* (the entity to be known) as *satyam* (ever-changeless), *jñānam* (knowledge principle), and *anantam* (limitless being free from the limitations of *deśa* or space, *kāla* or time and *vastu* - objects). The three defining adjectives *satyam*, etc., are kept in juxtaposition to eliminate by the other two words their shortcomings such as being inert, false, destructible, limited, etc., inherent in them since the same words are used in the empirical sense having limitations. The locus where and how can Brahman be known is explained

by, 'yo veda' (one who knows by *sākṣātkāra* as I am Brahman), *nihitam* (abiding, manifest or concealed) *parame* (in the most exalted) *vyoman*, (i.e. *vyomani*) *guhāyām* (in the form of *avyākṛta hārdākāśa* or *buddhi* the *viññānamayo kośa* indicating all the five *kośas* wherein it manifests as 'I' or hidden as it were in the true nature because of its identification with them). The verb *veda* (knows) suggests that the knowledge is to be gained through a *Brahmākāra-vṛtti* to end its ignorance which abides in the *buddhi*. The result of such *Brahmajñāna* is described by *saḥ* (that *jñānī* who has *Brahmasākṣātkāra*) *Brahmaṇāvipaścītā* (in the form of Brahman that is omniscient *caitanya* principle) *sarvān kāmān* (all sense-objects or sense-pleasures) *saḥ* (together, simultaneously) *aśnute* (enjoys) in the sense his true nature that is *Brahmānanda* (limitless happiness) includes all happiness enjoyed by an insignificant creature onwards up to *Hiranyagarbha*. It does not mean that all sense-pleasures are literally enjoyed by the *jñānī* simultaneously which is just impossible also. This *ṛk mantra* will be explained till the verse 29 with thoroughness.

The *jñeyam*, *jñānam* and *phalam* contained in the *sūtra* as suggested in the above verse are named quoting their source.

ज्ञेयं ब्रह्म तदीया धीज्ञानं स्याद् ब्रह्मता फलम् ।
सूत्रव्याख्यानरूपायामृच्येतद्विशदीकृतम् ॥६॥

ज्ञेयं - the entity to be known is ब्रह्म - Brahman तदीया - belonging to it (Brahman) धीः - *antaḥkaraṇavṛtti* ज्ञानं स्यात् - is (its) knowledge ब्रह्मता - to be Brahman itself फलं (स्यात्) - is the result (of *Brahmajñāna*) सूत्रव्याख्यानरूपायां ऋचि - in the *ṛk mantra* in the form of commentary on the *sūtra* एतत् - this (fact about *jñeya*, *jñāna* and *phala*) विशदीकृतम् - is explained - (6)

6. The entity to be known is Brahman. *Brahmākāra antaḥkaraṇa vṛtti* is the knowledge of Brahman. The result of *Brahmajñāna* is to be Brahman itself. This (fact about *jñeya*, *jñāna* and *phala*) is explained in the *ṛk mantra* which comments on the *sūtra*.

The *ṛk mantra* referred to is 'Satyam jñānam anantam Brahma', etc. The word *Brahmavit* means the knower of Brahman. It implies that the Brahman is the entity to be known (*jñeya*). That is what the *ṛk mantra*, defines first. The question that follows is how can the direct knowledge (*jñāna*) of Brahman be gained?

According to Vedānta the definition of direct and correct knowledge of an entity either in the case of perceptual knowledge through the sense-organs or the knowledge of self-

evident 'I' (*ātmā*/Brahman) is *Caitanya* (pure awareness itself). Here, what is meant by *caitanya* is not *śuddha caitanya* (free from all *antaḥkaraṇa vṛttis*), but its reflection (*cidābhāsa*) in a specific *vṛtti* (thought) conforming to the nature of entity to be known. It is called *tattadākāra-vṛtti* in general. For practical purpose, such a *vṛtti* itself is called *jñānam* (knowledge) secondarily because it alone can end the *ajñāna-vṛtti* (ignorance of the entity to be known) whereby its (of that entity) knowledge is gained. The *tattadākāra-vṛtti* qualifies the *caitanya*, enabling to cognize the actual features of the entity to be known. *Śuddha caitanya* (though by nature is the knowledge principle *cit*) cannot end any *ajñāna-vṛtti* because it illumines (makes known) all *vṛttis* alike irrespective of their features (*Ved.P.Bh*).

Bhāṣyakāra explains the how of gaining of *Brahmajñāna* in *sūtrabhāṣya*. He says: Brahman is accepted to be revealed by the *pramāṇa* of *jñāna* – the *antaḥkaraṇavṛtti* conforming to Brahman which confers its direct cognition (*jñānena hipramāṇena avagantum iṣtam Brahma, Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-1*). The author explicitly tells in the 13th chapter of this text that *dhīvṛtti* or *ātmākāra-vṛtti* is *vedanam* (*jñānam*) (*A.Pr.13-115*). Further that *dhīvṛtti* is described as *ātmābhimukhadhīvṛtti* (*vṛtti* assuming the nature of *ātmā*) is

ātmavedanam (*ātmajñāna*) (*A.Pr.13-116*).

The result of this *Brahmajñāna* is discovering oneself to be *paramānanda svarūpa* Brahman in its reality in contrast to the presently experienced 'I' as sorrowful *samsārī*. The *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* (3-2-9) and *Bhagavadgītā* tells in the same vein that the knower of Brahman becomes Brahman itself. This shows that the true nature of the individual *jīva* should necessarily be Brahman and its appearance as *samsārī* is an error. Otherwise no entity can give up its own nature (*svasvabhāvātna nivṛttiḥ*). Once the self-ignorance is ended the Brahman the true nature of *jīva* gets revealed.

JÑEYAM BRAHMA

The quoted *ṛk mantra* first of all defines Brahman to be known in its phrase '*Satyam jñānam anantam Brahma*' through its *svarūpa lakṣaṇa* (the intrinsic characteristic of an entity) in contrast to *taṭastha lakṣaṇa* (a feature which defines an entity via an adventitious relationship with that entity). The next four verses give the definition of Brahman with the meanings of the words contained therein.

ज्ञातव्यं ब्रह्म यत्तत् किमिति चेत् तस्य लक्षणम् ।
सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं यत्तद्ब्रह्मेत्यवगम्यताम् ॥७॥

यत् - whatever ज्ञातव्यं ब्रह्म -

Brahman to be known तत् - that किम् - what (it is) इति चेत् - if the question is so तस्य - its लक्षणम् - definition (अभिधीयते - is told) यत् - whatever सत्यम् - ever-changeless ज्ञानम् - knowledge principle अनन्तम् - limitless तत् - that (is) ब्रह्म - Brahman इति - so अवगम्यताम् - should be known directly – (7)

7. If the question is, ‘what is the Brahman to be known?’, here is its definition. Brahman should be known as *satyam* (ever-changeless), *jñānam* (knowledge principle), *anantam* (limitless).

The word *lakṣaṇa* also means a definition. Each of *satyam*, *jñānam* and *anantam* by itself is a foolproof definition of Brahman. It can be taken as three sentences. *Satyam* is Brahman. *Jñānam* is Brahman. *Anantam* is Brahman. Or it can be one sentence as ‘that which is *satyam*, *jñānam* and *anantam* is Brahman’. These three words are used in the empirical world also. There the word *Satya* as true can be an inert entity. *Jñānam* as a specific knowledge can be limited. *Anantam* may be relatively limitless like the space. Such shortcomings of each word are eliminated by the other two when the two are kept in juxtaposition (*sāmānādhikarṇyam*). Among these three words the first two words define

Brahman by positive assertion whereas the third one does it by negation of limitations.

What is *satyam* that is Brahman is told here.

आकाशादिजगत्सर्वमनृतं मायिकत्वतः ।
नानृतं ब्रह्म तेनैतत् सत्यमित्यभिधीयते ॥८॥

आकाशादि - beginning from space onwards सर्व - the entire जगत् - *jagat* (world) मायिकत्वतः - because of being the product of (false) *māyā* अनृतम् - is false in nature ब्रह्म - Brahman अनृतम् - false न - is not तेन - therefore एतत् - this Brahman सत्यम् - is *satyam* (ever-existent principle without any change or destruction) इति - so अभिधीयते - is called – (8)

8. The entire world beginning from space onwards is false in nature because of being the product of (false) *māyā*. Brahman is not false. Therefore Brahman is called *satyam* (the ever-existent principle without any change or destruction).

Brahman is going to be told as the cause of *jagat* (vs.30 to 40). This needs to be understood properly. Brahman is *satya* which exists forever without change or destruction. It is impossible for anything to be born from *satya* Brahman because any birth involves a change. Yet the presence of the

perceptual world cannot be denied. Therefore a factor called *māyā* in the form of ignorance is postulated from which the *jagat* is born. It is just like a snake can never be born from a rope. And yet, due to the ignorance of the rope, it appears as a snake or such an entity other than itself. But the so called snake disappears on knowing its basis the rope. Similarly the ignorance of Brahman at totality level called the *māyā* ends when Brahman is known in its true nature. Therefore it is false because a real (*satya*) entity never gets destroyed. The *jagat* born of *māyā* is equally false. Brahman is not so. Therefore it is *satya*. This chapter itself will describe more about *māyā* later.

What is meant by *jñānam* that features Brahman is described now.

जगज्जडं स्वतः स्फूर्तिराहित्याद् ब्रह्म तु स्वयम् ।
स्फुरतीत्यजडं तेन ज्ञानमित्यभिधीयते ॥९॥

जगत् - the *jagat* स्वतः - by oneself स्फूर्तिराहित्यात् - because of being non-cognitive or insentient in nature जडम् - is inert ब्रह्म तु - whereas Brahman स्वयम् - oneself स्फुरति - becomes evident इति - so अजडम् - not inert तेन - therefore ज्ञानम् - knowledge principle इति - so अभिधीयते-called - (9)

9. The *jagat* is inert by itself

because of being insentient in nature, but Brahman is self-evident by itself and not inert. Therefore Brahman is called *jñānam* (knowledge principle).

Svayam sphurati means it is self-evident. The word *jñānam* as one of the defining words of Brahman means the knowledge principle. It is not in the sense of any specific knowledge produced by a relevant *antaḥkaraṇavṛtti*.

What does the word *Ananta* mean which defines Brahman?

जडं घटाद्यन्तवत् स्याद्

देशकालान्यवस्तुभिः ।

न देशादिकृतोऽन्तोऽस्य ब्रह्मानन्तं

ततः स्मृतम् ॥१०॥

जडम् - inert घटादि - pot, etc. देशकालान्यवस्तुभिः - by the space, time and other entities अन्तवत् स्यात् - become limited अस्य - of Brahman देशादिकृतः - effected by or on account of space, etc. अन्तः - limitation न - is not there ततः - therefore ब्रह्म - Brahman अनन्तम् स्मृतम् - is known to be limitless - (10)

10. The inert pot, etc., are limited by the space, time and other entities. Brahman has no limitation on account of space, etc. Therefore Brahman is known to be limitless in nature.

An entity occupying a particular

place is not present at other places. This is *deśa-paricchinnatā* (limitation cast by space). Again an entity present now does not exist before its birth or after its destruction. This is limitation on account of time (*kāla*). A given entity is different from all other entities. No two things are the same. This limitation is cast by other entities. Space is relatively all pervasive. Brahman is everywhere in the presence of space. But Brahman exists even beyond the space and it is also free from space. Thus space cannot limit it. The time, a concept of intellect, is in Brahman (*caitanya*), but Brahman is free from time. One may think that it has *vastu-paricchinnatā* because the *jagat* is different from it. This is not possible because Brahman is the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of *jagat*. So Brahman is there wherever *jagat* is there and at the same time it is free from *jagat*.

Though *satyam*, *jñānam* and *anantam* by themselves define or indicate Brahman, for the sake of clarity all things that feature Brahman are put together in accordance with topic established in ‘*ānandādi adhikaraṇa*’ (*Br.Sū.3-3-11 to 13*). In a famous Vedāntic text, *San̄kṣepasārīraka* (*San̄.Śā.1-173*), all such characteristics which feature Brahman are collected together. They are: *nitya*, *śuddha*, *buddha*, *muktasvabhāva*, *satya*, *sūkṣma*, *sadrūpa*, *vibhu*, *advitīya*, *ānanda*, *Paramātmā*, *pratyak*. Therefore *satyam*, *jñānam*, *anantam* is not a complete enumeration but it is only an indication.

The *sūtra*, ‘*Brahmavidāpnoti param*’ (the knower of Brahman becomes Brahman) implies in itself the *māyā* having the nature of ignorance. The knowledge of Brahman needs to be gained only when its ignorance is there. In addition the Creation elaborated from verse 31 establishes the empirical existence of *māyā* because Creation is just impossible from *nirvikārī* (changeless) Brahman. Even the *taṭastha-lakṣaṇa* which supposes Creation actually suggests *māyā*. *Māyā* is not established by the Vedas with purport because it is false in nature. But

it is referred to in *Bṛhadāranyaka* (*Br.U.2-5-9*) and *Śvetāśvatara* (*Śv.U.6-8*) Upaniṣads. Even when the *śruti* declares that Creation is born from *nirvikārī ātmā*/Brahman, it does take for granted *māyā*. Thus the concept of *māyā* propounded in the *advaita-siddhānta* has its basis in the Veda though it is not elaborated therein. The author highlights here the Creation projected by *māyā* before commenting on the statement of the Upaniṣad that Creation was born from *ātmā*/Brahman. This also explains why Brahman is free from the limitations of space, time and objects.

देशकालाद्यन्यवस्तुत्रयं

मायाविजृम्भितम् ।

ब्रह्म सत्यं मायिकैस्तैः

परिच्छिन्नं कथं भवेत् ॥११॥

देशकालादि - space, time, etc., (for objects) अन्यवस्तुत्रयम् - the three entities different from Brahman मायाविजृम्भितम् - are falsely projected by *māyā* ब्रह्म - Brahman सत्यम् - is *satya* (real) तैः - by those मायिकैः - by falsely projected entities of *māyā* कथम् - how परिच्छिन्नं भवेत् - can it be limited? – (11)

11. The space, time and objects, the three entities different from Brahman, are falsely projected by *māyā*. Brahman is *satya* (real). How can it be limited by those falsely projected entities of *māyā*? (Certainly not).

The word *ādi* stands for objects. Actually ‘*vastu*’ means a really existing entity, the real or reality. Only Brahman can be the ‘*vastu*’. But in the world any existing thing or object in general is called ‘*vastu*’. In this sense the trio of space, time and object is taken as *vastu*. They are different from Brahman because they are not its intrinsic nature. They are false because they get destroyed and themselves are the products of false *māyā*. In contrast to this, Brahman is *satya* (real), the ever-existent principle. A false entity cannot limit it.

In the verse 8 to 10 while giving the meanings of words *satyam*, *jñānam* and *anantam* the impression one can get is that Brahman is neither false (*na anṛta*) nor inert (*na jaḍa*) or not even limited (*na antavān*). Further it was told (vs.11) that *prapañca* (Creation) consisting of space, time and objects, etc., is false (*anṛta*). Therefore the question arises whether there is an existing entity called Brahman which is the basis of the *jagat*? The answer is now being given by pointing out that the statements such as ‘not false’, ‘not inert’ and ‘not limited’ also can point out an existing entity. For example, if it is said that ‘this is not a pot’, there must be some other things such as cloth, etc. If it is said that ‘there is no pot here’, there must be a bare ground or table without the pot. ‘Now, there is no pot’ means there is a time when pieces of mud pot, etc., are there. Further there is a cognitive entity who makes such statements. Therefore the three words *satyam*, *jñānam* and *anantam* indicate by implication Brahman that is *akhaṇḍa* (*pūrṇa*, non-dual).

जडानृतपरिच्छिन्नव्यावृत्तैव

पदत्रयम् ।

लक्षकं स्यादखण्डस्य यत् तद्

ब्रह्मेति बुध्यताम् ॥१२॥

पदत्रयम् - the three words (*satyam*, *jñānam*, *anantam*) जडानृतपरिच्छिन्नव्यावृत्त्या -

by the exclusion of inert, false and the limited entities एव - only अखण्डस्य - of non-dual (Brahman) लक्षकं स्यात् - become the indicators यत् (एवम् अस्ति) - whatever (that is so) तद् - that ब्रह्म - is Brahman इति - so बुध्यताम् - let it be known – (12)

12. The three words (*satyam*, *jñānam* and *anantam*) become the indicators of non-dual Brahman only by the exclusion of inert, false and the limited entities respectively. Let it be known that whatever that is so, is Brahman.

Any negation or exclusion presupposes a basis or existence of something. Therefore the words *satya*, etc., while excluding false, etc., do indicate the existence of some entity. This is implied in such statements. Thus the three statements ‘Brahman is *satyam*’, ‘Brahman is *jñānam*’ and ‘Brahman is *anantam*’ with their meanings of exclusion as ‘Brahman is not false’, ‘Brahman is not inert’ and ‘Brahman is not limited’ by implication serve as the means of knowing one single entity, Brahman.

‘*Akhaṇḍa*’ means whole, entire. It has no parts or divisions and has no connection with any of the *guṇa* (attribute), *kriyā* (action), *jāti* (species), *dravya* (things) and *sambandha* (relation). Such an entity has to be non-dual. It is necessarily the pure awareness

principle, *caitanya* which is self-evident ‘I’ whose existence is universally experienced as a cognitive entity *jīva* or knowledge principle. If ‘*akhaṇḍa*’ entity were distinct from self-evident ‘I’, this ‘I’ will limit it being different from it. Then it will not be *ananta*. Further we do not need the Upaniṣads to tell us that ‘I’ exists. Thus *satyam*, *jñānam* and *anantam* which imply *akhaṇḍa* indicates Brahman which is identical with ‘I’ free from inertness, falsity and limitations. This is *aikyārtha*, the identity of *jīva* and Brahman. Such sentences are called *avāntara-vākyas* in contrast to *mahāvākyas* such as ‘*tat tvam asi*’.

JÑEYAM BRAHMA – GUHĀHITAM (CONCEALED IN FIVE SHEATHS)

What are the means of knowing Brahman and where can it be known? This is answered by the *śruti* portion: *Yo veda nihitam guhāyām parame vyoman* (*Tai.U.2-1*). First how Brahman is concealed in five sheaths due to erroneous identification with them will be told (vs.13 to 17). Thereafter the exact mode of gaining its knowledge will be described (vs.18 to 22).

तादृग् ब्रह्म कथं

विद्यादिति चेदभिधीयते ।

गुहायां परमे व्योम्नि स्थितं

ब्रह्म तु वेद यः ॥१३॥

तादृक् - having the nature such as

satyam, etc. ब्रह्म - Brahman कथं - how विद्यात् - can it be known इति चेत् - if it is asked so अभिधीयते - here is the answer यः - the one who गुहायां परमे व्योम्नि - in the cave of *avyākṛta/hārdākāśa* or *buddhi* the *vijñānamaya-kośa* स्थितं - abiding entity वेद - knows (सः) तु (एव) - undoubtedly he only ब्रह्म - is Brahman – (13)

13. If it is asked, ‘how can the Brahman having the nature such as *satyam*, etc., be known?’ here is the answer. Undoubtedly the person who knows the entity abiding in the cave of *avyākṛta/hārdākāśa* or *buddhi* the *vijñānamaya-kośa* is himself in reality the Brahman.

The question how can Brahman be known implies two questions. Can it be known as an object known by the subject, the knower? Or is it to be known as very subject the knower? The answer is: Brahman is the real nature of the knower and the very knowledge principle which enables all to know. It is *sākṣi*, the direct illuminator of *buddhi* and illumines (makes known) the division of subject (knower) and the object (known).

The five *kośas* (sheaths) *annamaya* (food-sheath) to *ānandamaya* (bliss-sheath) are called *guhā*, a cave which hides the things in it. This

statement of *śruti* that Brahman is concealed (*nihitam*) in ‘*param vyoma guhā*’ is not to be taken literally. If all pervasive Brahman is to be actually hidden, that entity who hides Brahman must be bigger than Brahman which is just not possible. Therefore hiding is the universally experienced denial of the knowledge of Brahman at the loci of five sheaths which are mistaken as ‘I’ though they are *anātmā*. This erroneous identification convinces all that the sorrowful features of five sheaths are our nature as *samśārī* which truly is not. Thus our true nature as *asamśārī* Brahman gets covered. Only knowledge can make us discover directly that in reality we are Brahman.

The material cause of this *pañca-kośa guhā* in the form of *ajñāna* is *avyākṛtākāśa*, the unmanifest condition of Creation, also called *māyā*. In the *akṣarabrāhmaṇa* of the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, *avyākṛta* is clearly referred to as *ākāśa*. But here the word *vyoman* as *vyomni* (in *ākāśa*, in space) can mean elemental space and therefore the adjective *parame* (in the most exalted) is added. This *param vyoma* is also called *hārdākāśa* (*ākāśa* abiding in *hṛdaya-antaḥkaraṇa*). Therein abides Brahman enlivening the individual *jīva* to function. By mistaking the features of *upādhis* as that of myself who in reality is Brahman, we miss the

true knowledge of Brahman. One who strips off all *upādhis* of five sheaths without identifying with them by the direct knowledge of Brahman, discovers that the knower the hitherto *samsārījīva* 'I' itself is Brahman.

The word *guhā* as used here where Brahman is to be known signifies the five sheaths. This is being explained.

देहादभ्यन्तरः प्राणः प्राणादभ्यन्तरं मनः ।

ततः कर्ता ततो भोक्ता गुहा सेयं परम्परा ॥१४॥

देहात् अभ्यन्तरः - inside the physical body made of food and called *annamaya-kośa* (food-sheath) प्राणः - is the vital air (main *prāṇa*) called *prāṇamaya-kośa* (vital air-sheath) प्राणात् अभ्यन्तरम् - inside the *prāṇamaya-kośa* मनः - is the mind or *manomaya-kośa* (mental-sheath) ततः - inside that कर्ता - is the doer or *vijñānamaya-kośa* (intellectual-sheath) ततः - inside that भोक्ता - is the experiencer or *ānandamaya-kośa* (bliss-sheath) सा इयं - this is that परम्परा - assemblage, series गुहा- of what is called *guhā* (cave) – (14)

14. Inside the physical body made of food and called *annamaya-kośa* (food-sheath) is the vital air (main *prāṇa*) called *prāṇamaya-kośa* (vital air-sheath). Inside the *prāṇamaya-kośa* is the mind or *manomaya-kośa* (mental-sheath). Inside that is the doer or

vijñānamaya-kośa (intellectual-sheath). Inside that is the experiencer or *ānandamaya-kośa* (bliss-sheath). This is that assemblage of what is called *guhā* (cave).

A *kośa* or sheath is a covering such as a scabbard. One knows that sword is in it, but cannot see its form. Similarly at each level of *pañcakośas*, the *kośa* itself 'I' is experienced as 'I', but one's true nature as Brahman is not known on account of ignorance and consequent identification with each of the five sheaths respectively. A *kośa* also means the cocoon spun by silk-worm around itself wherein it gets trapped and suffers even to the point of death. So is our identification with the *kośas* which opens the flood-gates of sorrowful *samsāra*.

Though the *śruti* refers to '*param vyoma*' or *buddhi* only as *guhā*, the author here clarifies it as the series of five sheaths, wherein the 'I'ness is experienced universally. It is not possible to give up the identification with all these simultaneously at one stretch. So the Upaniṣad provides a successive method of discarding the 'I'ness in the earlier grosser sheath first and identify with the next subtler one up to the innermost *ānandamaya-kośa*, only to make one discover oneself to be its basis (*pratiṣṭhā*) Brahman (called

puccham, i.e. a tail of a figurative bird). In the direct experience of oneself as Brahman, the hitherto identification with five sheaths is given up successively. This process is called ‘*upasaṅkramaṇa*’ or ‘*saṅkrāntih*’.

The *śruti* phrase ‘*parame vyoman*’ has to be taken as ‘*parame vyomni*’ by changing ‘*vyoman*’ to its locative case as ‘*vyomni*’ (in the exalted *avyākṛtākāśa*). There are two locative cases pointing out two different loci in that *śruti* phrase, viz. ‘*guhāyām*’ and ‘*parame vyomni*’. What are they and what is the relation between them besides what is the entity abiding (*nihitam*) in that ‘*param vyoma*’ which needs to be known? These three questions are answered now.

पञ्चकोशगुहायां यदज्ञानं कारणं स्थितम् ।
तद्व्योम परमं तस्मिन् निगूढं ब्रह्म तिष्ठति ॥१५॥

पञ्चकोशगुहायां - in the cave of five sheaths यत् - whatever कारणम् अज्ञानं - ignorance in the form of cause स्थितम् - is there तत् - that परमं व्योम - is the exalted *ākāśa* (space), i.e. *avyākṛta ākāśa* तस्मिन् - in that ब्रह्म - Brahman निगूढम् - concealed by the ignorance or *param vyoma* तिष्ठति - abides – (15)

15. Whatever ignorance of Brahman in the form of cause is there in the cave of five sheaths, that is the exalted *ākāśa* (space called *avyākṛta*).

Brahman abides in that concealed by the ignorance or *param vyoma*.

The ignorance of *ātmā*/Brahman called *param vyoma*, *avyākṛtākāśa*, etc., itself manifests as five sheaths and rest of the world. The cause inheres in its effect. Therefore it is natural that the *param vyoma*, the ignorance is in the *guhā* having the form of five sheaths. This ignorance, the *param vyoma* ends in the *Brahmajñāna* and so it is false. A false entity should have a basis. That basis is Brahman in the case of *param vyoma*. Because of ignorance the Brahman is not known. This is described as Brahman is concealed (*nigūḍham*) in *param vyoma*.

A doubt may arise that the entity concealed (or that abides) in the *param vyoma* must be the individual sentient *jīva* (*jīva-caitanya*). Then why is it said that the all pervasive Brahman is concealed and it needs to be known? The *śruti* emphasizes that Brahman should be known because the same is not distinct from the true nature of the knower *jīva*. This is clarified in terms of a question and its answer.

जीवचैतन्यमेवात्र निगूढमिति चेत् तदा ।
तस्यैव ब्रह्मतां विद्याज्जीवत्वभ्रान्तिहानये ॥१६॥

अत्र - here in this ‘*param vyoma*’ जीवचैतन्यम् - *caitanya* in the form of *jīva* एव - only निगूढम् - abides or concealed इति

चेत् - if it is said so तदा - then जीवत्वभ्रान्ति
हानये - to end the erroneous notion of
being a *jīva* तस्य एव - of that *jīva* only
ब्रह्मताम् - real nature as Brahman विद्यात् -
should be known – (16)

16. If it is said that in this ‘*param vyoma*’ the *caitanya* in the form of *jīva* only abides (or is concealed), to end this erroneous notion of being *jīva* only its real nature as Brahman should be known.

The one who is identified with the five sheaths is the *jīva*. Therefore the *jīva* must be the entity who is hidden in the *guhā*. Then how can the Brahman be so? Thus the doubt seems *prima facie* to be correct. Another aspect of the doubt also can be there. *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* speaks of two sentient entities as ‘two birds’, etc., to begin with. Therefore unaware of its final ascertainment one may conclude that the other sentient entity different from *jīva* must be Brahman. When such doubts prevail, the *śruti* wants to reveal to us that the *jīva* in reality is Brahman only, but appears as *saṃsarī jīva* erroneously on account of ignorance of oneself. Therefore the *jīva* in reality free from ignorance and its effects should be directly known to be Brahman only.

How the *jīva* is the product of erroneous notion born of ignorance is explained.

स्वतो ब्रह्मैव चैतन्यं

जीवत्वं प्राणधारणात् ।

कोशतादात्म्यविभ्रान्त्या

भात्यस्य प्राणधारणम् ॥१७॥

चैतन्यं - *caitanya* (pure awareness)

स्वतः - itself ब्रह्म - is Brahman एव - only
(चैतन्यस्य - of *caitanya*) जीवत्वं - the state
(role) as a *jīva* is प्राणधारणात् - because of
sustaining the *prāṇa* कोशतादात्म्यविभ्रान्त्या -
by the delusion of identity with the five
sheaths प्राणधारणम् - sustenance of *prāṇa*
अस्य भाति- appears to belong to this
(*caitanya*) – (17)

17. *Caitanya* (pure awareness) itself is Brahman only. Its state as a *jīva* is because of sustaining the *prāṇa*. The sustenance of *prāṇa* appears to belong to *caitanya* by its delusive identity with the five sheaths.

The word itself (*svataḥ*) in the phrase ‘*caitanya* itself’ means without the aid of anything or *nirupādhika* in its true nature. Thus *caitanya* by itself is the limitless Brahman. The seeming limitations such as a *jīva*, etc., is on account of *upādhi*. For example, the space is all pervasive. But it appears to be limited in the *upādhi* of a pot. To sustain or wield the *prāṇa* itself is *upādhi* because of which *caitanya* is considered to be a *jīva*. Though *caitanya* itself being Brahman is all pervasive, the presence of *jīva* is felt only in those

bodies where there is *prāṇa*. It is not so with the inert objects including a corpse. This is how *prāṇa* happens to be the *upādhi* of *caitanya* in presenting it as a *jīva* in a specific body. But the question is how can *asaṅga caitanya* have any connection with the *prāṇa*? The second line of the verse answers it. The erroneous notion (*bhrānti*) of identification (*tādātmya*) with the five *kośas* which are actually distinct from *caitanya* makes it appear as *jīva* by giving it a semblance of *prāṇa* as if its intrinsic feature. This *tādātmya* is a problem of *adhyāsa* (superimposition) born of *avidyā*. It can end only by *ātmavidyā* (the knowledge of *ātmā*).

BRAHMAJÑĀNAM

The fifth verse had mentioned the *śruti* statement, ‘*Brahmavidāpnoti param*’ is a *sūtra* because it suggests all the essential aspects of Vedānta, viz. *jñeya* (Brahman to be known), *jñānam* (the nature of *Brahmajñāna*) and its *phalam* (the result of *Brahmajñāna*). Out of these, the *jñeya* Brahman was discussed so far. Now begins the narration of *Brahmajñāna*. It ends with the verse 22. How the delusive *kośatādātmya* can be ended is being shown here. Any *bhrānti* (erroneous notion) ends with the knowledge of its reality. *Jīvatva-bhrānti* (erroneous notion that I am a *saṃsārī jīva*) also is not an exception to this rule. What is

required is the *antardṛṣṭi* (a *vr̥tti* objectifying *caitanya*/Brahman as its replica) which is totally devoid of *bahirdṛṣṭi* specifying all superimposed *anātmā-jagat* (including the five sheaths).

वक्ष्यमाणविवेकेन

तत्तादात्म्यमपोहते ।

ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कृतिस्त्वीदृग्

बोधेनैव न चान्यथा ॥१८॥

वक्ष्यमाणविवेकेन - by the means of discrimination or investigation that is going to be told तत्तादात्म्यम् - identification with sheaths or between *ātmā* and *anātmā* अपोहते - is ended ईदृक् - of such type बोधेन - by *aparokṣajñāna*, direct knowledge एव - only ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कृतिः - *Brahmasākṣātkāra* (भवति - takes place) तु - but न च - not at all अन्यथा -by any other means –(18)

18. That identification with the sheaths or between *ātmā* and *anātmā* is ended (discarded) by the means of discrimination or inquiry that is going to be told. *Brahmasākṣātkāra* takes place by such type of *aparokṣajñāna* (direct knowledge) only, but not at all by any other means (such as *karma*, *upāsanās*, etc.).

The superimposition (*adhyāsa*) that I am a *saṃsārī jīva* is universally experienced as is the case with all

adhyāsa. It is subjectively known though incorrect in nature. As seen in the introduction of this chapter, it can be ended only by correct experience of *ātmā* free from the superimposed ignorance, five sheaths including the entire *dr̥śya jagat*. Such an experience as shown earlier is *Brahmasākṣātkāra* called *Brahmasākṣātkṛtiḥ* here in this verse.

There are many people who consider that *karmas* and *upāsanās* are very powerful and can attain any height of accomplishments. Why can they not produce *Brahmasākṣātkāra*? Why this insistence on gaining *aparokṣajñāna* only? These questions are born because of not knowing the root cause of *samsāra* and the prerequisite of *karmas* and *upāsanās*. *Samsāra* is born of ignorance of oneself and the consequent erroneous identification with the five sheaths. What is needed is the ending of self-ignorance in the wake of *jñāna* which in turn terminates the bodily identification. On the contrary *karmas* and *upāsanās* take for granted the bodily identification, the product of self-ignorance, without which both of them cannot be taken to. Instead of ending bodily identification, they strengthen it leave alone the terminating the ignorance. All that *karmas* and *upāsanās* can do is to help the *mumukṣu* in gaining purity of mind (*cittaśuddhi*) and

its *ekāgratā* (single pointedness) indispensable in the pursuit of *Brahmajñāna*. 'The *karma* is meant for gaining the purity of mind; but not Brahman. Brahman is to be gained by self-inquiry and not by crores of *karma*' (*Vi.cu.11*).

How the *viveka* is to be conducted to gain *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is shown in the next four verses. Here is the exact mode of gaining *Brahmasākṣātkāra*.

बाह्यं जगत् पञ्चकोशांश्चापोह्यान्तर्मुखास्य धीः ।
ब्रह्म साक्षात्करोत्येव सर्वोपाधिविवर्जितम् ॥१९॥

बाह्यम् - external जगत् - world
पञ्चकोशान् - five sheaths च - and अपोह्य -
having discarded, ended अस्य - of this
(*mumukṣu*) अन्तर्मुखा धीः - introvert
antaḥkaraṇavṛtti, i.e. *Brahmākāravṛtti*
सर्वोपाधिविवर्जितम् - free from all *upādhis*
ब्रह्म - Brahman साक्षात्करोति - directly
experiences without the *tripuṭī* as the
self-experiencing principle एव -
certainly – (19)

19. Having discarded the external world and the five sheaths (from the range of one's cognition) the *mumukṣu*'s introvert *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* (which has become necessarily *Brahmākārā*) free from all *upādhis* certainly experiences Brahman directly as the self-experiencing principle.

The word (*antaḥ*) in the phrase

antarmukha (introvert) refers to *pratyagātmā*. ‘*Pratyak*’ is that which is known having the nature contrary to *parāk* (external) such as body, senses, etc., and the *jagat* (*Br.Sū.Bh.Bhāmatī*, 1-1-1). Or ‘*pratyak*’ is that which manifests as *satya*, *jñāna* and *ananta* contrary to *asat* (false), inert and the

sorrow-ridden *parāk* beginning from *ahaṅkāra* up to the external *jagat* (*Br.Ā.P.37*). Thus the word *antaḥ* signifies the principle *pratyak* which itself is *ātmā*. It is the basis (*pratiṣṭhā*) of the most interior sheath, *ānandamaya-kośa*.

The *jagat* consisting of *dr̥śya* sense-objects external to our body and the body itself comprising of five sheaths comes within the ambit of our experience only through the medium of *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* corresponding to them. This is true for dream also. In the absence of these *vṛttis* as in sleep, there is no cognition of either the waking or the dream world. All these inner *vṛttis* having vivid features of all *upādhis* come to the level of our consciousness or experience through the *cidābhāsa* (reflected *caitanya*) in them. This *cidābhāsa* pre-supposes *cit* their basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) the ever-existent *caitanya* whether the *vṛttis* are present or not. If by some conscious and deliberate efforts all these *vṛttis* having specific features of *jagat* containing varieties of sense-objects and *upādhis* including the five sheaths are put out of the cognitive range of our *antaḥkaraṇa*, what remains is *caitanya* synonymous with *ātmā*/Brahman only. This state of *antaḥkaraṇa* presents the experience of replica of Brahman free from all *adhyasta upādhis* including ignorance. Finally in the steadfastness of such a state of *antaḥkaraṇa* called *akhaṇḍākāra*, *ātmākāra* or *Brahmākāra* even such a *vṛtti*, a replica of Brahman drops. Then what remains is the self-experiencing Brahman and Brahman alone totally free from *adhyasta* (superimposed) *jagat* (*prapañca*, world). This is *Brahmasākṣātkāra* or *aparokṣa Brahmajñāna* (direct *Brahmajñāna*). Anything short of this experience is *parokṣa* (indirect) *jñāna*. It lacks the certitude of *Brahmānubhava* (experience of Brahman).

Bhāṣyakāra highlights the indispensability of *Brahmānubhava* when he says: *Anubhavāvasānatvāt Brahmajñānasya* (*Brahmānubhava* is necessary because *Brahmajñāna* culminates in such *anubhava*, experience). (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-2*). *Anubhavārūḍham eva vidyā phalam* (the result of *Brahmajñāna*, i.e. *mokṣa*) is absorption in *Brahmānubhava* alone (*Br.Sū.Bh.3-4-15*). *Anubhavaparyantā buddhiḥ* (the culmination of *Brahmajñāna* is in *Brahmānubhava*, (*Va.U. 4-43*). *Maitreyopaniṣat* (2-23) rejoinders: ‘In vain does the ignorant fool rejoice in Brahman

without its experience, akin to enjoying fruits on a branch that is reflected (in a lake).’

Why is it necessary to discard the external *jagat* and five sheaths from the range of one's experience, when Vedānta the ultimate *pramāṇa* throughout declares that everything is Brahman (*sarvam Brahma*) and the entire *adhyasta anātmā* called *prapañca* is *mithyā* (false) in nature? *Bhāṣyakāra* says that the *sāmānādhikaranyam* – viz. everything is Brahman is intended for the dissolution (*pravilāpanārtham*) of Creation (*prapañca*)-(Br.Sū.Bh.1-3-1). No doubt in and through all experiences, *caitanya* the Brahman is certainly experienced. Yet that experience is not that of Brahman in its true nature. Therefore the reason why *antarmukha dhī-vṛtti* free from all *upādhis* is essential is told now.

सोपाध्येव बहिर्दृष्ट्या भाति

ब्रह्म न तावता ।

अपैति जीवता

तस्मादन्तर्दृष्ट्यैव बुध्यताम् ॥२०॥

बहिर्दृष्ट्या - by the extrovert perception सोपाधि ब्रह्म - Brahman together with *upādhis* एव - only भाति - is known तावता - thereby जीवता - *samsāra* or the erroneous notion that ‘I am a *jīva*’ न अपैति - does not end तस्मात् - therefore अन्तर्दृष्ट्या - by the introvert *vṛtti* free from all *upādhis* एव - only बुध्यताम् - Brahman should be known – (20)

20. By the extrovert perception only the Brahman together with *upādhis* is known. Thereby the erroneous notion that ‘I am a *jīva*’ (or the state of *samsāra*) does not end. Therefore Brahman should be known only by the introvert *vṛtti* free from all *upādhis*.

Bahirdṛṣṭi signifies all

antahkaraṇavṛttis corresponding to *anātmā* comprising *ahamkāra*, memory and five sheaths onwards up to all objects, beings and events in the *jagat*. The Brahman that enables their experiences or knowledge is experienced in and through them. Yet that experience is coupled with the features of superimposed *anātmā* appearing as though the intrinsic feature of Brahman. It is Brahman together with *adhyasta upādhis* (*sopādhika Brahma*). In the case of direct perception and the knowledge of *aparokṣa ātmā*/Brahman, an experience true to the entity to be known is indispensable. Therefore the *vṛtti* that imparts the knowledge of Brahman has to be its replica totally free from all adventitious superimposed *upādhis*. Such a *vṛtti* conforms to the *nirupādhika* nature of Brahman. It is called *akhaṇḍākāra*, *ātmākāra* or *Brahmākāra*. Here it is described as *antarmukhā dhīḥ* (vs.19) and *antardṛṣṭi*

(vs.20). By such a *vṛtti* only the identity of *ātmā* in its true nature stripped off from the state of *saṃsārī jīva*, with Brahman can be known.

What all are produced by *bahirdṛṣṭi* (extrovert cognition) and their remedial measures are being told now.

बहिर्दृष्टिर्जगद्भानं तस्य सत्यत्वधीरपि ।
विवेकात् सत्यतापैति जगद्भानं तु योगतः ॥२१॥

बहिर्दृष्टिः - the extrovert cognition
जगद्भानम् - the experience of *jagat* अपि -
and तस्य - of that (*jagat*) सत्यत्व धीः -
notion of reality (उत्पादयति - produces)
सत्यता - the notion of the reality of *jagat*
विवेकात् - by inquiry अपैति - ends तु -
whereas जगद्भानम् - the experience of the
jagat योगतः- (ends) by yoga – (21)

21. The *bahirdṛṣṭi* (extrovert cognition) produces the experience of *jagat* and its reality. The reality of *jagat* ends by its inquiry whereas its experience (ends) by yoga.

The extrovert perception not only makes us perceive the five sheaths and the external world, but also induces the notion that it is real. The perceived world gets presented to us through five facets. They are *asti* (is), *bhāti* (known), *priyam* (pleasing), *nāma* (name) and *rūpa* (form). The first three aspects belong to Brahman whereas the last two constitute the *jagat*. (*Dr.dr.vi.20, S.R.U.58*). But in the worldly practice there is mutual

superimposition of these two categories. The existence (is-ness), knowledge and happiness aspects really belonging to Brahman are attributed to *jagat*. The name and form, the features of *jagat* are mistaken as those of Brahman. For example, whenever it is said that a ‘thing is’, the experience of its ‘is-ness’ is mistaken as its reality though it belongs to Brahman and not to the *mithyā nāma* and *rūpa*. This notion of reality of *jagat* can be eliminated by an inquiry as guided by the *śāstras* (scriptures).

As for the experience of the *jagat*, it is bound to continue so long as *antaḥkaraṇavṛttis* (thoughts) corresponding to the external world are produced through the mind and the senses. The means by which these are totally restrained and ended is called yoga. According to *Patañjalayogasūtras* yoga means *Samādhi* – the state of mind totally free from all thoughts including the *pramātā* (knower). It is gained by *cittavṛtti-nirodhah* - making all thoughts absorbed in their cause through introvertedness (*antarmukhatayā*) by giving up extrovertedness (*Pa.Yo.Sū.1-1, 2*).

Bhāṣyakāra highlights different aspects of yoga at different places. Yoga is described as *karmayoga* and *Samādhīyoga* (*B.G.Bh.4-38*). The *antaḥkaraṇa* purified by *samādhi* is the means to know *ātmā* directly

(B.G.Bh.6-20). The absorption of the mind (*samādhāna/Samādhi*) in *ātmā* through a total withdrawal of the mind from sense-objects (*viśayas*) is *adhyātmayoga* (Kṭ.U.Bh.1-2-12). *Dhyānayoga* is making the mind absorbed (*ekāgrākaraṇam*) in only *ātmā* (*ātmaviśaye eva*) (B.G.Bh.18-52).

The result of *viveka* and yoga or in other words the result of ending the *bahirdrṣṭi* and steady maintenance of *antardrṣṭi* is told now.

बहिर्दृष्टावपेतायामन्तर्दृष्ट्या यदीक्ष्यते ।
निगूढं जीवचैतन्यं तद्ब्रह्मेति प्रपश्यति ॥२२॥

बहिर्दृष्टौ अपेतायाम् - when *bahirdrṣṭi* (extrovert cognition) is ended अन्तर्दृष्ट्या - by *antardrṣṭi* (*ātmākāravṛtti*) यत् - whatever निगूढम् - concealed in the *guhā* (cave) of five sheaths or 'param vyoma' जीवचैतन्यम् - the *caitanya* which appears as *jīva* ईक्ष्यते - is considered तद् - that itself ब्रह्म इति - as Brahman प्रपश्यति - knows directly – (22)

22. When the (*mumukṣu*) ends the *bahirdrṣṭi* and considers by *antardrṣṭi* (*ātmākāravṛtti*) whatever *caitanya* concealed in the *guhā* (cave) of five sheaths or 'param vyoma' which appears as *jīva*, knows directly that (*jīva*) itself as Brahman (or gains *Brahmasākṣātkāra*).

The self-evident *caitanya* free from *upādhis* is the absolute reality Brahman. It is mistaken as *jīva* in the state of ignorance. It is the *sākṣī* (illuminator) of *buddhi*. Yet, it is considered as having *pañcakośa* (which includes *viññānamaya-buddhi*) as its feature. This gives rise to *bahirdrṣṭi* on account of erroneous identification with the body. When the *mumukṣu* totally withdraws from *bahirdrṣṭi* what remains is *antardrṣṭi* called *antarmukhā* or *ātmābhimukhā vṛtti*. This reveals *ātmā* in its true nature which itself is Brahman as pronounced by the *mahāvākyas*. Such a direct cognition totally free from all the *upādhis* is *Brahmasākṣātkāra*.

From the verses 19 to 22 it should be clear by now that *Brahmajñāna* or *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is a state of mind wherein there is no trace of any *upādhi* in its cognitive range. *Bahirdrṣṭi* is totally absent. Then what remains there is the *antardrṣṭi* or *ātmākāra/Brahmākāra-vṛtti* to begin with which drops down in its steadfastness. Thereby there is the total extinction of *saṃsārī jīva* and *nirupādhika* self-evident *Brahma* alone remains in one's cognitive range. When the seeker becomes aware of *Brahma* in its real nature in such a state, the self-ignorance ends. It is the state of *aparokṣa* (direct) *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna* based on *aparokṣa ātmānubhava*. Thereby the scriptural statement, '*Jīva* is *satya-svarūpa* Brahman and the *jagat* is

mithyā (a false appearance)', gets verified and confirmed in the light of one's direct cognition of *ātmā*. Without such *ātmānubhava* which itself is the *darśana* (direct cognition) of *satya adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) of *jagat*, to say that the *jagat* is *mithyā* can at best be a solace but not the solution of calamitous *saṃsāra*. The means adopted to gain such *antardṛṣṭi* are *viveka* (inquiry) and yoga.

In fact the complete *antardṛṣṭi* or a totally introvert mind is the cessation of that mind though its *saṃskāras* remain on account of that person's *prārabdha karmas*. Being unaware of the exact nature of the mind, and the phenomenon of gaining the *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna*, some people question: 'Why stone the mind which is a beautiful instrument at our disposal?' First of all, they have to clarify what they mean by the phrase, 'stoning the mind'. If they consider the word 'stone' as a transitive verb meaning 'to intoxicate' (especially with narcotics), it is totally out of context here. Vedānta is not the hippy culture. The mind may be a beautiful and indispensable means in all *vyavahāras* while interacting with the world. But, it is also the disastrous, worst, invincible enemy that projects the calamitous *saṃsāra* at the practical level. Yet, the mind can be transformed into a best friend by the means of *viveka* and *vairāgya* (vs. 21). The mind needs to be ended by totally withdrawing it from its extrovertedness in the wake of knowledge. It is highly desirable that we know fully well that the mind has the capacity to function in a totally opposed manners. The Upaniṣad declare: 'The mind alone is the cause of both bondage and liberation. The mind addicted to the sense-objects (*viśayas*) binds whereas the same mind detached from *viśayas* liberates' (*Maitrāyaṇyupaniṣad*, 4-11; *Brahmabindu* or also called *Amṛtabindu* Upaniṣad 2). Therefore cessation of mind to gain knowledge is indispensable. This is not stoning the mind but purifying it so that the *anubhava-svarūpa, nirupādhika ātmā/Brahman* gets reflected in it clearly. This reflection itself is the direct experience of self-evident *ātmā*.

The above should give enough clue that mere understanding the Vedāntic scriptures is not *aparokṣa Brahmajñāna* or *Brahmasākṣātkāra* though it is necessary in the beginning. In such understanding there is the understander (*jñātā*) who is aware of his body and the *jagat*, the understanding (*jñāna-vṛtti*) and the understood (*jñeya* a concept of *ātmā* as told in the scriptures). This is knowing *sopādhika Brahma* and not *nirupādhika*. Such scriptural knowledge (*śāstra-jñāna*) has to be reduced to *aparokṣānubhava/Brahmānubhava* - the direct experience of Brahman without the *tripuṭī* of understander, understanding and the understood.

An understanding of an entity can be mere information-based or with experiential corroboration. The former gives an idea about the entity under consideration. It is an incomplete knowledge. But it can become complete knowledge when experientially ascertained. This rule applies to all perceptible sense-objects and the self-evident *caitanya-svarūpa ātmā* since they are experientially available at the time of gaining the knowledge. For instance a westerner who has never seen or eaten the Indian mango understands it to be a highly desirable fruit on hearing its vivid descriptions. But after eating it his exact understanding of mango becomes its complete knowledge. Similarly *ātmānubhava* (experience of *ātmā*) makes the mere understanding or the *parokṣa* (indirect) *jñāna* culminate in the direct or exact understanding called *aparokṣa-jñāna*.

That is why *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa at places uses the phrases such as ‘*jñāna-vijñāna*’ and ‘*jñāna-yoga-vyavasthitih*’ (*B.G.*6-8 and 16-1). The *bhāṣyakāra* comments: *Jñānam* - A thorough understanding of what is expounded in the Vedāntic scriptures. *Vijñānam* - One's own experience in accordance with what is known through the scriptures (*B.G.Bh.*6-8). *Bhāṣya* continues further: *Jñānam* - The knowledge of things such as *ātmā*, etc., gained through the scriptures and the teacher. *Yogaḥ* - The reduction to experience of that which is (thus) known, through withdrawal of the senses, etc., and single pointedness of the mind. *Vyavasthitih* - Abidance or steadfastness, in both *jñānam* and *yogaḥ* (*B.G.Bh.*16-1). Those who think after understanding some Vedāntic texts that *ātmā* is ever-liberated without transmigration, bondage is *mithyā* and therefore *Brahmānubhava* is not necessary, should take a lesson from the above four verses.

PHALA (RESULT) OF BRAHMAJÑĀNA

Having described the *jñeya* Brahman besides the nature of *Brahmajñāna* with mode of gaining it, the remaining topic of *phala* (vs.5) is described up to verse 29.

दृष्टे तस्मिन् परप्राप्त्या विदुषोऽतिशयोऽत्र कः ।
इति चेद्युगपत् सर्वकामाप्तिरधिका भवेत् ॥२३॥

तस्मिन् दृष्टे - when Brahman is known directly परप्राप्त्या - because of the accomplishment of absolutely real entity (*Paramārtha vastu*) विदुषः - of a *Brahmajñānī* (in comparison with an *ajñānī*) अत्र - herein *mokṣa* कः अतिशयः - what excellence (is there)? इति चेत् - if it is asked so युगपत् - simultaneous सर्वकामाप्तिः - fulfilment of all desires अधिका भवेत् - is an advantage—(23)

23. If it is asked as to what excellence does a *Brahmajñānī* enjoy (in comparison with an *ajñānī*) in *mokṣa* because of the accomplishment of the absolutely real entity (*Paramārtha vastu*) when Brahman is known directly? Here is the answer. Simultaneous fulfilment of all desires is an advantage over the ignorant one.

The nature of Brahman is limitless happiness called *Brahmānanda* or *Paramānanda*. It was told earlier that all the sense-pleasures from the least to the highest as that of *Hiranyagarbha* put together are infinitesimal portion of *Brahmānanda*. Therefore the direct (*aparokṣa*) experience of *Brahmānanda* is infinitesimal of all sense-pleasures put together. This is figuratively described as the *jñānī* fulfills all desires simultaneously. The cravings for any sense-pleasure is just impossible for him. The phrase '*yugapat sarvakāmāptiḥ*' is explained up to the verse 29.

काम्यन्ते विषयानन्दा निखिलैः प्राणिभिः सदा ।
ब्रह्मानन्दस्य ते सर्वे लेशा इत्यपरा श्रुतिः ॥२४॥

निखिलैः - by all प्राणिभिः - by living creatures सदा - always (ये) विषयानन्दाः - (whatever) sense-pleasures काम्यन्ते - are desired for ते सर्वे - all of them ब्रह्मानन्दस्य - of *Brahmānanda* लेशाः - are particles इति - so अपरा - (says) another श्रुतिः- *śruti* statement - (24)

24. (Whatever) sense-pleasures are desired for by all the living creatures at all the time, all of them are particles of *Brahmānanda*, so says another *śruti* statement.

The other *śruti* is: '*Etasya eva ānandasya anyāni bhūtani mātrām upajīvanti*' (Other living beings subsist on a particle of this *Brahmānanda* only) (*Br.U.4-3-32*). The *sat* (existence) aspect of Brahman is the basis of existence ('is'ness) of everything in Creation. The *cit* (*jñāna*, knowledge principle) aspect of Brahman is the basis of all knowledge available in the world. So is the Brahman that is limitless *ānanda* (happiness) the basis of all sense-pleasures. There is no other happiness principle in the entire cosmos. Therefore all sense-pleasures without any exception are particles of the limitless (*ananta*) *Brahmānanda*. In fact sense-objects have no trace of happiness in their nature. On the contrary they are the sources of sorrows. If so all living beings must get immersed in *Brahmānanda* effortlessly since it is their true nature. Why do they run after sense-objects (*viśayas*)? The next verse answers this question.

आनन्दहेतवो बाह्या

विषया इति विभ्रमात् ।

कामयन्ते बहिर्दृष्ट्या

विषयान् प्राणिनोऽखिलाः ॥२५॥

अखिलाः - all प्राणिनः - living beings
बाह्याः - external विषयाः - sense-objects
आनन्दहेतवः - sources of happiness इति
विभ्रमात् - by such mistake बहिर्दृष्ट्या -
extrovertedly विषयान् - sense-objects
कामयन्ते- desire for – (25)

25. All living beings extro-
vertedly long for the external sense-
objects because of their mistake that they
are the sources of happiness.

Bahirdṛṣṭi is as seen earlier
because of identification with the five
sheaths. It is coupled with the wrong
notion that the sense-objects are real. It is
also a matter of general experience that
external sense-objects favourable to
oneself do give some pleasure. But none
cares to inquire the true nature of this
phenomenon. As a result this notion
continues perennially until the *mokṣa* is
gained.

Then how do the *viśayas* appear
to produce some pleasure?

अभीष्टविषये लब्धे धीः प्रत्यावृत्त्य हृद्गतम् ।
ब्रह्मानन्दं क्षणं भुक्त्वा बाह्यं कामयते पुनः ॥२६॥

अभीष्टविषये लब्धे - when the desired
object is gained धीः - *buddhi* प्रत्यावृत्त्य -
having returned (from the desired
object) हृद्गतम् - abiding in the heart
(*antaḥkaraṇa*) ब्रह्मानन्दम् - *Brahmānanda*
क्षणं - for a moment भुक्त्वा - having
enjoyed पुनः - again बाह्यं - external

(sense-objects) कामयते - desires – (26)

26. When the desired object is
gained, the *buddhi* having returned
(from the desired object) and thereafter
having enjoyed for a moment the
Brahmānanda abiding in the heart
(*antaḥkaraṇa*), again desires the
external sense-objects.

When a desire is fulfilled, the
buddhi hitherto preoccupied in that
pursuit gets relieved from its
preoccupation for a while until it is
seized by the next desire. During this
calmness the subtle *vṛttis* called *priya*,
moda and *pramoda* having varying
capacity to bear the reflection of
Brahmānanda get produced. That gives
the temporary sense-pleasures. The *cit*
aspect of Brahman gets reflected (as
cidābhāsa) just in the presence of
antaḥkaraṇa. But it needs specific past
puṇya for *vṛttis* such as *priya*, etc., to get
produced by fulfilment of desires or in
deep sleep. Outwardly, it seems that
sense-pleasure is occasioned by sense-
objects, but it is not true. This is how the
bahirdṛṣṭi deludes us. Everyone hankers
for perennial pleasure. Therefore being
not content with the momentary sense-
pleasure, the person entertains repeated
desires which is a never ending process
unless our nature *Brahmānanda* is
gained by *Brahmasākṣātkāra*.

Ānanda is the *svarūpa* (true

nature) of Brahman which is *pūrṇa* (limitless). *Brahmānanda* the limitless or *pūrṇa* entity, cannot have parts being non-dual. Then how does the *śruti* (*Br.U.4-3-32*) use the word ‘*mātrā*’ (particle) to point out the quantum or magnitude of happiness enjoyed by all the living beings put together? The use of the word ‘*mātrā*’ is in the secondary sense because the actual limited happiness enjoyed by them is momentary and in accordance with their *punya*. *Brahmānanda* is like the oceanic vast water. How much of its water you can carry depends on your capacity and the volume of your vessel. This is being brought to our notice in the next verse.

क्षणिकत्वल्लेशतास्य

पूर्णस्याप्युपचर्यते ।

विषयानन्दता भ्रान्त्या

ब्रह्मानन्दो हि वस्तुतः ॥२७॥

अस्य पूर्णस्य - of this *pūrṇa* (limitless) *Brahmānanda* अपि - also क्षणिकत्वात् - because of being momentary लेशता - very minuteness उपचर्यते - is told secondarily हि - because वस्तुतः - in reality ब्रह्मानन्दः - Brahman by its nature is limitless *ānanda* (happiness) भ्रान्त्या - mistakenly विषयानन्दता - appears as the happiness produced by sense-objects – (27)

27. Because of being momentary, the very minuteness of this *pūrṇa*

Brahmānanda also is told secondarily. In reality, Brahman by its nature itself is limitless *ānanda*, but by mistake it appears as *ānanda* produced by sense-objects.

The excellence of a *jñānī* in comparison with an *ajñānī* implied in the *śruti* statement, ‘he enjoys all sense-pleasures together’, is deduced in the verse 29 by describing the necessary details in the verse 28.

अन्तर्दृष्ट्या विवेकी तु ब्रह्मानन्दं सदेक्षते ।
अन्तर्भवन्ति क्षणिकाः सर्वे तस्मिन्निरन्तरे ॥२८॥

विवेकी - a *Brahmajñānī* तु - in contrast to (an *ajñānī*) अन्तर्दृष्ट्या - by *ātmākāravṛtti* सदा - always ब्रह्मानन्दम् - *Brahmānanda* without any *upādhi* ईक्षते - experiences तस्मिन् - in that निरन्तरे (ब्रह्मानन्दे) - limitless (*Brahmānanda*) सर्वे - all क्षणिकाः (विषयानन्दाः) - momentary sense-pleasures अन्तर्भवन्ति - are included –(28)

28. A *Brahmajñānī* in contrast to an *ajñānī* always experiences *Brahmānanda* (without any *upādhi*) by *ātmākāravṛtti*. In that *pūrṇa* (limitless) *Brahmānanda*, all momentary sense-pleasures are included.

Here the word *vivekī* refers to a *Brahmajñānī*. *Antardṛṣṭi* as seen earlier is the *ātmākāra* or *Brahmākāra vṛtti* which leads to *nirupādhika sāksātkāra*.

It is a replica of *ātmā*/Brahman in its true nature. It is totally free from *bahirdṛṣṭi* - the extrovert cognitions. This is what a *jñānī* experiences all along once the *niṣṭhā* (*sthiratā*-steadfastness) in the knowledge is gained. Since sense-pleasures (*viṣayānandas*) are particles of *Brahmānanda* which is *pūrṇa*, they automatically get included in *Brahmānanda*. Such an experience of *Brahmānanda* called *sākṣātkāra* is spontaneous without the means of even *ātmākāvṛtti*. It is experienced by the self-experiencing principle *caitanya* itself without the *tripuṭī*. This is what *śruti* declares that the *jñānī* enjoys all sense-pleasure simultaneously in the form of Brahman that is omniscient *caitanya* (*Brahmaṇā vipaścitā*).

तत्त्वविद् ब्रह्मरूपेण सर्वान् कामान् सहाश्नुते ।
इत्येषोऽतिशयो ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरूपं फलं श्रुतम् ॥२९॥

तत्त्वविद् - *Brahmajñānī* ब्रह्मरूपेण - in the form of Brahman that is omniscient *caitanya* सर्वान् - all कामान् - sense-pleasures सह - together, simultaneously अश्नुते - experiences इति - so एषः - this (is) अतिशयः - excellence (that the *jñānī* has in comparison with an *ajñānī*) (एतद् एव - this itself) ब्रह्मप्राप्तिरूपं फलम् - is the result in the form of gaining Brahman श्रुतम् - told by the Upaniṣad – (29)

29. The *Brahmajñānī* in the form

of Brahman that is omniscient *caitanya* experiences all sense-pleasures simultaneously. This is the excellence (that the *jñānī* has in comparison with an *ajñānī*). (This itself) is the result in the form of gaining Brahman told by the Upaniṣad.

This is the conclusion of the answer to the question raised in the verse 23. Whether the *Brahmajñāna* is gained or not can be verified from this result that in the experience of *Brahmānanda* all sense-pleasures are as good as fulfilled. Such a person has no more hankering for any sense-pleasures. The *jñānī* is full (*pūrṇa*). This vindicates that *Brahmajñāna* culminates in *Brahmānubhava*. That itself is the unique experience. *Brahmānanda* is free from all *upādhis* including *tripuṭī*. Therefore the presence of even a single desire by fulfilment of which the person considers oneself to be happy shows that *Brahmajñāna* is still lacking. With this the explanation of the *sūtra*, ‘*Brahmavid āpnoti param*’ is over.

ADHYĀROPA (SUPERIMPOSITION) OF CREATION ON BRAHMAN

Now the superimposition (*adhyāropa*) of Creation (*jagat*) on Brahman with its negation (*apavāda*) is going to be described to reveal the *ānantyam* (limitlessness) of Brahman and its ascertainment by the method of

pañcakośa-viveka. The false (*mithyā*) *jagat* cannot limit its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) Brahman. To begin with, the connection of the *sūtra* and its commentary with the forthcoming portion is told.

सूत्रव्याख्यानरूपायामृच्यनन्तमितीरितम् ।
तदानन्त्यप्रसिद्ध्यर्थं जगत्कारणतोच्यते ॥३०॥

सूत्रव्याख्यानरूपायां ऋचि - in the *ṛk* *mantra* in the form of an explanation of the *sūtra* (ब्रह्म - Brahman) अनन्तम् - is limitless इति - so ईरितम् - was told तदानन्त्यप्रसिद्ध्यर्थं - to establish its (of Brahman) limitlessness (*ānantyam*) जगत्कारणता - Brahman as the cause of *jagat* उच्यते - is told – (30)

30. It was told in the *ṛk* *mantra* in the form of an explanation of the *sūtra* (*Brahmavid āpnoti param*) that the Brahman is limitless. To establish its (of Brahman) limitlessness (*ānantyam*), Brahman as the cause of *jagat* is told.

Brahman was defined in the *ṛk* *mantra* as ‘*satyam, jñānam, anantam*’. It is not that difficult to know that Brahman is *satya* because it is changeless (*avikārī*) and indestructible (*avināśī*). Once it is known to be *pratyagātmā*, which is somewhat difficult to accomplish, it becomes clear that it is *jñāna* (knowledge principle). Compared to the knowing of these two, it is most difficult to know that Brahman is *ananta* (limitless). We know that all entities are

limited by the *deśa* (space), *kāla* (time) and *vastu* (objects). So also to consider that Brahman is also an entity and therefore must be limited by these three is natural. Therefore the *śruti* establishes its *ānantyam* (limitlessness) whereby to know it as *pratyagātmā* (the innermost ‘I’) and *ānanda* (happiness) principle becomes easy. *Deśa*, *kāla* and *vastu* are falsely superimposed on Brahman. Therefore they can never limit Brahman. The *vārtikakāra* Sureśvarācārya states the rule: ‘*Kalpitenā paricchedaḥ na hi akalpita-vastunaḥ*’ (a falsely projected entity cannot limit the real one) (*Taittirīyopaniṣad bhāṣyavārtikam, Brahmavallī* 1-35). *Chāndogya vācārambhaṇa śruti* (*Ch.U.6-1-4* to 6, *Ch.U.6-4-1* to 4) proves that any *vikāra* (effect) is *mithyā* in nature. *Deśa*, etc., are *mithyā* because *vikāras* they are. Therefore the *śruti* describes Brahman as *jagatkāraṇam* from ‘*tasmād vā etasmād ākāśāḥ sambhūtaḥ*’, etc. This phrase is now explained.

यत् सत्यं ब्रह्मकोशाख्यगुहायां व्योमनामके ।
अज्ञाने कारणे गूढं तस्मादाकाश उद्गतः ॥३१॥

यत् - whatever कोशाख्यगुहायां - in the cave called five sheaths व्योमनामके अज्ञाने कारणे - as well as in the cause of self-ignorance called *vyoma* गूढं - concealed सत्यं ब्रह्म - *satyam* Brahman तस्मात् - from that आकाशः - space उद्गतः - is born – (31)

31. From the *satyam* Brahman concealed in the cave called five sheaths as well as *vyoma* in the form of self-ignorance, the space is born.

It was seen earlier (vs.14) that the five sheaths are called cave (*guhā*) because the knowledge of Brahman gets concealed at their level due to identification with them. In the context of that cave *avyākṛta* or self-ignorance was called ‘*paramavyoma*’ (exalted space distinct from elemental space) (vs.15). In the *śruti* statement the words *tasmāt* (from that) *vā* (as *vai* – certainly) *etasmāt* (from this) *ātmanaḥ* (from *ātmā*) reveal the identity of *jīvātmā* and Brahman as propounded in the Upaniṣads (indicated by *vai* – certainly). That (from *tasmāt*) refers to ‘*tat*’ word signifying Brahman which is *parokṣa* (presently remote in the realm of ignorance which can be known: only through *śāstra*) whereas ‘*etat*’ (from *etasmāt*) means *jīvātmā*, the ‘*tvam*’ word and it is self-evident. Thus ‘*tat*’ and ‘*tvam*’ referred here as one and the same entity, reveal *jīva – Brahma* identity according to the *mahāvākya* ‘*tat tvam asi*’. The ablative cases used in both ‘*tasmāt*’ and ‘*etasmāt*’ indicate *ātmā/Brahman* as the *upādāna kāraṇa* (material cause) of *jagat*. Even if it is said that ‘*māyā*’ is the ‘*upādānakāraṇa*’, it refers to Brahman only because *māyā* cannot exist independent of Brahman.

This does not mean Brahman undergoes change (*vikāra*) to become *jagat*, but it just appears so without itself undergoing any change. Such Creation is called *vivarta* (different appearance without giving up one's true nature). It is just like a rope appearing as a snake or garland, etc. *Jñānam Brahma* being the only sentience (*cit*) entity in the entire cosmos, it serves as the *nimitta kāraṇa* (efficient cause) also of the *jagat*. Thus from the *cit* standpoint Brahman is *nimitta kāraṇa* of the *jagat* and it is material cause (*upādāna-kāraṇa*) from the standpoint of *upādhi, māyā*. That is why Brahman or *Parameśvara* (Brahman conditioned by *māyā*) is called *abhinna-nimitta-upādāna-kāraṇa* (undifferentiated efficient and material cause) of the *jagat*. It is worth noting that the theories of Creation differ in many Upaniṣads, but not the fact that Brahman/*Parameśvara* is the cause of the *jagat*. The differing theories of Creation only point out that the *jagat* is false in nature. Those theories are only stop a gap explanations for the questioning intellects which want to know how, why and when of Creation until one has *Brahmasākṣātkāra* only to find out that never there was any Creation.

The further *śruti* portion, ‘*ākāśāt vāyu*’ onwards up to ‘*annāt puruṣaḥ*’ describes that from space (*ākāśa*) the air

(*vāyu*), from air the fire (*agni*), from fire the water (*āpaḥ*), from water the earth (*pṛthivī*), from earth the vegetation (*oṣadhayaḥ*), from vegetation the food (*annam*), from food the body (*puruṣaḥ*). This is summarized in the next verse.

खं वाय्वग्निजलोर्व्योषध्यन्नदेहेषु कारणम् ।
पूर्वं पूर्वं भवेत् कार्यं परं परमितीक्ष्यताम् ॥३२॥

खं वायु अग्नि जल उर्वी ओषधि अन्न देहेषु
- in the space, air, fire, water, earth, vegetation and the body पूर्वं पूर्वं - the preceding one कारणं - the cause भवेत् - happens to be परं परं - the succeeding one कार्यं - is the effect इति ईक्ष्यताम् - (thus it) should be considered – (32)

32. The preceding one in the series of space, air, fire, water, earth, vegetation and the body happens to be the cause (of the succeeding one); the succeeding one is the effect (of the preceding one). Thus it should be considered.

The statements such as ‘from space the air is born’, etc., should not be taken literally as the actual space is the cause of air, etc. It means the Brahman conditioned by space is the cause of air because the space has no existence independent of Brahman. This rule applies to all the stages of Creation. Therefore Brahman alone is the cause at all the levels. The word ‘*puruṣa*’ in this

Taittirīya śruti means the body and not the *jīva*. The *jīva* is not born. It is only an erroneous appearance of Brahman, as is the case with *jagat* and *Īśvara*. The mistaken snake is not born from the rope. It is only a delusive appearance.

The sequential cause (*kāraṇa*) and effect (*kārya*) relation from Brahman, space up to the body can provide a method of meditation wherein the effect is seen as nothing but its cause. Thus by reversing the process of Creation step by step in terms of knowledge, one can arrive at the ultimate source the Brahman. This is called *Pañcīkaraṇa* meditation. It is found in *Paiṅgala*, *Kaṭharudra*, *Varāh* Upaniṣads and *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (*Yo.vā.Ni.Pu.128*). Ādi Śaṅkarācārya has composed a small text ‘*Pañcīkaraṇa*’ describing this meditation*. In the beginning, to worship the all pervasive *Parameśvara*/Brahman in an idol by continuing him (*Parameśvara*) therein may be necessary. It is prescribed by the scriptures only. But one has to grow out of this to see the *Parameśvara* in and through the entire Creation and finally discover directly that there is Brahman only to the total exclusion of any other entity. For this the seeker has to know the superimposition (*adhyāropa*) only to refute (do *apavāda*) it later.

Earlier it was seen that nothing can be born from the non-dual

* Vide ‘Om Based Meditation’ (*Pañcīkaraṇa*) by this commentator.

changeless Brahman. Yet, if it appears as if the *jagat* is born, it only implies that some power such as *māyā* in the form of ignorance projects the *sr̥ṣṭi* (Creation). This Upaniṣad has taken *māyā* for granted without telling it explicitly. To cater to those who follow the beaten path and therefore demand an evidence from the Vedas that the *jagat* is projected by the false *māyā*, the author quotes different *śruti* statements to this effect. It also proves that the created entities such as space, etc., which are the products of false *māyā* cannot be the real attributes of attributeless (*nirvīṣeṣa*, *nirguṇa*) Brahman.

First the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopniṣad* statement is quoted. It says: (That Brahman) became manifold with respect to every *upādhi* of embodiment as their replica only to reveal its true nature. Indra (Brahman, *Parameśvara*) through *māyā*-powers (*māyābhiḥ*), (i.e. through the varieties of cognitions furnished by *buddhi* or because of identification with various bodies having different names and forms) appears to be many (but not in reality) in spite of itself being nothing but knowledge principle all along (*Bṛ.U.2-5-19*). This statement is told now summarily.

इन्द्रो मायाभिरभवद्

बहुरूप इति श्रुतेः ।

आसन् मायिकरूपाणि

खादीनि ब्रह्मगानि हि ॥३३॥

इन्द्रः - *Parameśvara*, Brahman
मायाभिः - through *māyā*-powers बहुरूपः - many forms अभवत् - became, assumes
इति श्रुतेः - because of this *śruti* statement
ब्रह्मगानि - appearing in Brahman हि - so it is well-known in the *śruti* खादीनि - space, etc. मायिकरूपाणि - forms produced by *māyā* आसन् - were there—(33)

33. Because of the *śruti* statement that *Parameśvara*/ Brahman through *māyā*-power assumes many forms, it is well-known that therein (in Brahman) space, etc., are the forms produced by *māyā*.

The name *Indraḥ* means *Parameśvara* or Brahman as described in the *Aitareyopaniṣad* (1-3-14) and not Devendra, the King of *devas* (deities). Since the cause *māyā* is false (*mithyā*) its product (effect) the entire *jagat* also is equally false. This is well-known in the Upaniṣads though the ignorant people take the *jagat* to be real.

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka śruti* uses the phrase '*māyābhiḥ*' in the plural sense. This raises two questions. Are there *māyās* more than one? If not, how can one *māyā* accomplish innumerable effects (*kāryas*)? The answer is given to both the questions taking recourse to *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (*Śv.U.6-8*). One and the same *māyā* has potential to accomplish many and varied effects.

Therefore the phrase specifying *māyā* in the plural sense is appropriate.

परास्य शक्तिर्विविधेत्येवं

श्रुत्यन्तरेरणात् ।

विविधा ब्रह्मणः शक्तिः

सा च मायानृतत्वतः ॥३४॥

अस्य - of this (*Paramātmā* / Brahman) परा - most exalted शक्तिः - power विविधा - manifold इति एवं - so श्रुत्यन्तरेरणात् - because it is said (so) in another *śruti* (viz. *Śv.U.6-8*) (या - the one) ब्रह्मणः - of Brahman विविधा - manifold शक्तिः - power (अवगम्यते - is known) सा च - and that (power) माया - is *māyā*, an illusion of magic, trick (कुतः - how come?) अनृतत्वतः - because it is false - (34)

34. The most exalted power of Brahman is manifold. So it is said in the *Śvetāśvatara śruti* (*Śv.U.6-8*). This manifold power of Brahman called *māyā* is like the illusion of magic because it is false.

‘*Asya*’ (of this) refers to Brahman (*Paramātmā, Maheśa, Deva*). The word *māyā* also means deceit, fraud, trick, jugglery or an illusion of magic. Therefore the name of this power as *māyā* gets justified because it deludes all by presenting Brahman as the *jagat* which is next to impossible. It is *parā* (superior) to space, etc., the created *jagat* because of being their cause. The

manifoldness (*vividhatā*) of *māyā* can be considered in different ways. It operates as *āvaraṇa-śakti* which veils the knowledge of Brahman and thereafter functions as *vikṣepa-śakti*, the projecting power that creates the *jagat*. Or one who operates as the power of knowledge (*jñāna-śakti*), desire (*icchā-śakti*) and action (*kriyā-śakti*). Or it serves as the cause of the birth (*utpatti*), sustenance (*sthiti*) and destruction (*laya*) of this *jagat*, the very nature of whose genesis (*racanā*) is inconceivable (*acintya*) to the mind.

Māyā is *vikārī* (changing) in nature because it produces the *jagat* besides operating in manifold ways. Therefore it has to be distinct from *satyam* (*avikārī*) Brahman having false (*anṛta*) nature and not a real entity (*vastu*). If it were real, it will cast *vastu-paricchinnatā* to *anantam* (limitless) Brahman. This is not possible because *anantam* Brahman has no real entity other than itself which can possibly attribute to it the *vastu-paricchinnatā*. Thus *māyā* has to be necessarily *anṛta* (false). This fact is now brought to our notice and the nature of *māyā* is explained.

सत्यस्य

ब्रह्मरूपत्वाच्छक्तेरनृततोचिता ।

निस्तत्त्वा भासते यासौ

माया स्यादिन्द्रजालवत् ॥३५॥

सत्यस्य ब्रह्मरूपत्वात् - because *satya* is the true nature of Brahman शक्तेः - of *māyā-śakti* (power of Brahman) अनृतता - falsity उचिता - is proper, justifiable या - the one that is निस्तत्त्वा - without reality, really non-existent भासते - appears to be there असौ - that entity माया स्यात् - is *māyā* इन्द्रजालवत् - like the magical play – (35)

35. The false nature of *māyā-śakti* (power of Brahman) is justifiable (proper) because the true nature of Brahman is *satya*. The entity that has no reality or which is really non-existent (and yet) appears to be there is *māyā*. It is like the magical play.

Any power (*śakti*) is only to be inferred from its effects, (i.e. *kāryānumeyā*). A power cannot be known before its effect is seen. It has no real existence (*nistatvā*). If *māyā* the power (*śakti*) of Brahman were *satyam* (real) like Brahman itself, it should not end. But *māyā* ends in *Brahmasākāṣātkāra*. A power (*śakti*) and the entity to whom the power belongs, (i.e. *śaktimān*) cannot be said to be either identical or distinct. For example, fire itself is not its power to burn or vice versa. Even if the fire continues to be there its power to burn can be obstructed by some *maṇi* (specific stone), *mantra* (some incantation) or *auśadha* (specific herbs). Therefore they are not identical because of being separate entities. If they are distinct we cannot relate the burning power to fire by nature. Another aspect to be considered is whether the *śakti* is distinct from *śaktimān*. Is the *śakti* totally non-existent (*śūnyam*) or real? It cannot be *śūnyam* in which case there can be no effect (*kārya*) of *śakti* which is not true. It cannot be some real entity totally distinct from *śaktimān* because *śakti* inheres in the *śaktimān* like the power to burn in the fire. That is why we say that *śakti* belongs to *śaktimān*. Thus *śakti* is inexplicable (*anirvacanīya*) being neither real (*sat*) nor non-existent (*asat*). *Māyā* the *śakti* of Brahman also is inexplicable and therefore *mithyā* (false) (P.2-47 to 49).

In the world that which exists always and never ends is called *sat*. That which appears to be there but ends is *asatya*. Further whatever that is never perceived being totally non-existent is *asat* or *tuccham* such as the horn of a rabbit. *Māyā* does not continue after *Brahmajñāna*. Therefore it is not *sat*. But it is not totally non-existent for the *jīva* before *jñāna* because its effect the *jagat* is perceived in the realm of ignorance and so the existence of *māyā* can be inferred. Thus *māyā* is neither ever-existent (*sat*) nor totally non-existent (*asat*). *Sat* and *asat* being totally opposed to each other, *māyā* cannot be both simultaneously. Therefore it cannot be defined either as *sat* or *asat* or having both the features. This shows that *māyā* is inexplicable

(*anirvacanīyā*). *Māyā* cannot be totally different from Brahman because in that case all the *śruti* statements which describe Brahman as non-dual will go wrong. If it is identical with Brahman it cannot be destroyed since Brahman is indestructible. To be different and identical simultaneously is opposed to each other. So it is not possible. Thus it cannot be described as identical with or distinct from Brahman or simultaneously related as identical and distinct. *Māyā* is *anādi* (unborn, beginningless). Therefore it should be *niravayava* (without parts or *aṅga*). If it has parts (*sāvayava*) it will be something that is born which is not true. But if it is *niravayava*, it cannot produce the *jagat* because of being *nirvikārī* (changeless). Being with parts and without parts simultaneously is opposed to each other. *Māyā* cannot have such nature. Thus from all these standpoints *māyā* is inexplicable. This shows that its nature itself is a great wonder (*Vi. Cu. 109*).

Māyā is postulated to explain the vividly experienced phenomenon of *jagat* which actually can never be born from Brahman. The concern of *mumukṣus* should not be in trying to know what the *māyā* is. On the contrary they should direct their all efforts to end that delusive entity by gaining *aparokṣa Brahmajñāna / Brahmaśākṣātkāra*. The *māyā* (not in the sense of tricks but casting of spell) wielded by a magician can only be inferred, but can never be known. But *māyā* can be known directly (*aparokṣatayā*) as ignorance of oneself, (i.e. *avidyā*) though we may not know it to be so. *Avidyā* and *māyā* are not different though at places some *ācāryas* have presented them separately because it helps to make the *mumukṣus* understand clearly besides it can readily provide answers to certain questions. Therefore the effort must be to end *avidyā* by *Brahmavidyā* and there is no separate attempt needed to end the *māyā*.

As described earlier the *jagat* originated from Brahman and so it is the effect (*kārya*) of Brahman. Then how can it be known that this *jagat* is effect of *māyā*? This is answered by pointing out the *māyā* to be *pariṇāmī-kāraṇa* (the cause that gets transformed) of *prapañca* (*jagat*) whereas Brahman serves as *vivarta-upādānam* (the material cause that never transforms itself) and the

adhiṣṭhānam (basis) of *jagat*. From the space to the body that are created have both false multifaceted *māyā* and the basis Brahman. By showing this the *satya* nature of Brahman is asserted in the next four verses.

मायाया विविधत्वेन तस्याः कार्येषु खादिषु ।
नामरूपेष्वनेकत्वं भात्यन्योन्यविलक्षणम् ॥३६॥

मायायाः विविधत्वेन - because of the

manifoldness of *māyā* तस्याः कार्येषु - in its effects खादिषु - such as space, etc. नामरूपेषु - in the form of all names and forms अन्योन्यविलक्षणम् - mutually distinct from one another अनेकत्वम् - diversity, manyness भाति - appears – (36)

36. Because of the manifoldness of *māyā*, in its effects such as space, etc., in the form of all names and forms, there appears (also) a diversity (or manyness) mutually distinct from one another.

The manifoldness of *māyā* was mentioned in the verse 34. In this verse the diversity that is found in the world is shown as the effect of manifold nature of *māyā*. Thereby *māyā* inheres in the *jagat* as its cause becomes clear. The phrase ‘*nāma-rūpa*’ (name/word and form) encompasses the entire *jagat*. Everything is described in terms of words. The word ‘*rūpa*’ (form) does not mean only the visual forms but it includes in itself all the specific features by which a thing is described. For example, the ‘sound’, the unique feature of *ākāśa* (space) or its ‘accommodativeness’ is its form. All the things in the *jagat* are mutually distinct from one another. They are diverse and varied.

In spite of many and variegatedness of effects in terms of

created *jagat* the one common denominator in them cognized as ‘is’ (*sat*) reveals the *satyatvam* (existence) which pertains to the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*), the Brahman. This ‘*sat*’ (existence) aspect as *adhiṣṭhāna* is one and the same for all distinct effects having different names and forms that abide in the *jagat*. Brahman as *adhiṣṭhāna* of *jagat* is now shown.

भाति सर्वेषु सत्यत्वमेकं यद् ब्रह्मणं हि तत् ।
सर्वाधिष्ठानधर्मत्वात् तत्सर्वत्रानुगच्छति ॥३७॥

सर्वेषु - in all the effects (*kāryas*) such as space, etc., in the form of all names and forms यत् - whatever सत्यत्वम् - *sat* (existence) aspect भाति - is experienced तत् एकम् - that one हि - certainly ब्रह्मणम् - belongs to the nature of Brahman तत् - that *sat* (existence) aspect सर्वाधिष्ठानधर्मत्वात् - because of being of the nature of Brahman which is the basis of everything सर्वत्र - in all the effects (called *jagat*) अनुगच्छति - inheres – (37)

37. Whatever *sat* (existence) aspect is experienced (as ‘is’) in all the effects (*kāryas*) such as space, etc., in the form of all names and forms, certainly that *sat* (existence) aspect because of being of the nature of Brahman which is the basis of everything inheres in all the effects (*kāryas*) (called *jagat*).

In our all experiences such as ‘pot is’, ‘cloth is’, ‘tree is’, etc., the feature of ‘is-ness’, the *sat* (existence) aspect, belongs to the nature of Brahman. It is also referred to as the *dharma* (feature) of *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) of everything, viz. Brahman. The *nāma, rūpa* (names and forms) such as ‘pot’, ‘cloth’, ‘tree’, etc., are effects of *māyā* which manifests in diverse ways. This shows both Brahman and *māyā* as the cause of *jagat*. Here *jagat* having names and forms is called *adhyasta* (superimposed). Its basis Brahman, is *adhiṣṭhāna* whereas *sat* (existence) is referred to as the *dharma* (feature) of *adhiṣṭhāna* (Brahman). That which is truly non-existent, but is experienced as existent is *adhyasta*. The entity by whose direct knowledge the *adhyasta* is discovered to be non-existent in three periods of time is called *adhiṣṭhāna*. That aspect which is experienced in the cognition of *adhyasta* and also in the experience of *adhiṣṭhāna* is called *adhiṣṭhāna-dharma*. At places it is also called ‘*ādihāra*’ (support). But mere experience of *adhiṣṭhāna-dharma* in the *adhyasta* cannot sublimate (show as never existent in reality) it. The direct knowledge of *adhiṣṭhāna* alone can end the *adhyasta*. Thus it becomes clear that Brahman conditioned by *māyā* is the cause of *jagat*.

The feature of the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna-dharma*) appears in the *adhyasta jagat* is demonstrated with an illustration.

सर्पधारादण्डमाला रज्ज्वां याः परिकल्पिताः ।
एतासु रज्जुगं दैर्घ्यं सर्वास्वनुगतं यथा ॥३८॥

याः - those सर्प-धारा-दण्ड-मालाः - such as snake, small stream of water, stick, garland रज्ज्वां - in a rope परिकल्पिताः - are entirely imagined एतासु सर्वासु - in all these अनुगतं - the inherent दैर्घ्यं - length यथा - just as रज्जुगं - belongs to the rope – (38)

38. Consider the entirely imagined (superimposed) entities such as snake, small stream of water, stick or a garland in a piece of rope. Just as the

inherent length in all of them belongs to the rope (similarly what is told in the next verse holds good).

व्योमाद्या देहपर्यन्ताः सत्ये ब्रह्मणि कल्पिताः ।
सर्वेष्वनुगतं ब्रह्म सत्यत्वं तस्य सुस्थितम् ॥३९॥

व्योमाद्याः - beginning from space देहपर्यन्ताः - ending with the body सत्ये ब्रह्मणि - in the ever-existent Brahman कल्पिताः - are falsely projected (imagined) (अतः - therefore) सर्वेषु - in the entire *kārya-jagat* ब्रह्म - Brahman अनुगतम् - inheres तस्य सत्यत्वं - (thereby) its (of Brahman) existence aspect (only) (कार्यप्रपञ्चे प्रतीयते - is experienced in the *kārya-jagat*) (इति) सुस्थितम् - so this fact is well-established – (39)

39. (According to what was told in the earlier verse) the *jagat* comprising the entities ranging from space to the body is falsely projected (imagined) in the ever-existent Brahman. Thereby the existence (*sat*) aspect of Brahman itself is experienced in the *kārya-jagat* (as 'is'). So this fact is well-established.

When a rope is mistaken as a snake, stick, garland, etc., the length of the rope is perceived in all those superimposed entities. Similarly the *sat* (existence) aspect of Brahman is experienced in and through the entire *jagat* or *saṃsāra*. 'Parikalpitaḥ' means a given entity is entirely mistaken to be another entity. It is called *svaṛūpādhyāsa* (superimposition in terms of nature). A rope being mistaken as a snake is an example of *svaṛūpādhyāsa*. But the length of the rope seen in the mistaken snake is a *saṃsargādhyāsa* – superimposition by association. The *svaṛūpādhyāsa* ends only when it is known for certain that the superimposed entity is never there on knowing its basis. As for the superimposition by association (*saṃsargādhyāsa*), it can end when it is known that the superimposed feature belongs to the basis and it is not a feature of the superimposed entity. For example, the length of the mistaken snake belongs to its basis rope and it is not the nature of the snake. The length is not false, but true because it belongs to the basis rope. The notion that the length is the true feature of mistaken snake is wrong. It is an *adhyāsa*.

The above facts can be seen now in the case of *jagat* beginning from space to the body. Though the *Taittirīyopaniṣad* has described *śṛṣṭi* (*jagat*) from space to the body, it applies to the entire *saṃsāra*. The *satyatā* or *sat* (existence) aspect belonging to *jagat* is not false by its nature. But the notion that the *sat* aspect belongs to the *jagat* as its nature is false. It belongs to Brahman and attributing it to the *jagat* is wrong or a superimposition. The 'sat' (existence or 'is-ness' aspect) that is the true nature of Brahman being superimposed on the *jagat* is the case of *saṃsargādhyāsa*. Everything in the *saṃsāra* appears to be existent because the *sat* (existence) nature of Brahman is superimposed on them.

The word 'kalpita' (imagined) used in the verse 39 is not to be mistaken as all *jīvas* came together and imagined the *jagat*. In fact the *jīva* itself is a product of *adhyāsa*. The *adhyāsa* or delusion projected by ignorance is also called 'kalpanā' (imagination). No doubt the ignorance of the *adhiṣṭhāna* is necessary for the phenomenon of *adhyāsa*. But its total ignorance cannot project *adhyāsa*. If the rope is not at all seen there is no occasion for mistaking it as a snake, etc. Something long and tubular lying down is seen but it is not known as a rope. That leads to *adhyāsa*.

Similarly Brahman (*caitanya* principle) is not known in reality. Yet, all know that some sentient entity called 'I' is there and it is directly experienced as 'I am'. Thus a partial or superficial knowledge of the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) is necessary for *adhyāsa*. Another requirement for *adhyāsa* is some impressions (*saṃskāras*) of what is *adhyasta* (superimposed). Unless some impression about the snake is there, the same will not be projected on a rope. As for *saṃsāra* which is a beginningless flow, the impressions of its past experiences are always available.

Thus the illustration of a rope being mistaken as snake, etc., demonstrates that Brahman is *satya* (the ever-existent principle) whereas the *jagat* comprising name and forms is false in nature. The existence experienced in the *jagat* belongs to Brahman and not to the *jagat*. The superimposition (*adhyāropa*) of Creation on Brahman begun from the verse 30 is concluded by disclosing the purpose of *adhyāropa-apavāda-prakriyā*. A *prakriyā* in Vedānta is a methodology of teaching to reveal Brahman in its true *nirupādhika* nature.

APAVĀDA (REFUTATION) OF CREATION

अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते ।
इति न्यायेन देहान्तः आरोपः खादिरीरितः ॥४०॥

अध्यारोपापवादाभ्याम् - by the method of superimposition of Creation and its refutation निष्प्रपञ्चं (ब्रह्म) - the Brahman free from Creation (*prapañca*, *jagat*) प्रपञ्च्यते - is elaborated इति न्यायेन - in accordance with this method खादिः - beginning with space देहान्तः - ending with the body आरोपः - superimposition ईरितः - was told—(40)

40. In accordance with the method of elaborating the Brahman free from Creation by superimposition and its refutation, the superimposition was told from space to the body.

We face the problem of *saṃsāra* in terms of joys, sorrows and transmigration because of *jagat*. In reality this *jagat* is a delusion and false. It is not there at all at any times in our true nature Brahman. Then the question is how does it appear to be there all along? Therefore this phenomenon needs to be explained. The process of explaining this step by step to show its delusive nature is *adhyāropa*. Unless this is clearly understood, its termination called *apavāda* to know Brahman directly free from *prapañca* (*jagat*) is not possible. So far the *śruti* has described the process of *adhyāropa*.

Now starts the inquiry, called *śravaṇa* in Vedāntic terminology, to refute or do *apavādā* of *adhyasta jagat* to reveal Brahman wherein there is not

even a trace of superimposed *jagat* including *avidyā*. The Upaniṣad begins the *apavāda* by having recourse to *pañcakośa-viveka*. This method can be best explained by *śākhācandra nyāya* - the method of showing the crescent with the help of a branch of a tree. It is difficult to point out directly the crescent in the sky on the second day of the bright fortnight when the sunlight is still present. To direct the gaze towards the crescent a specific branch of a tree is used. The eyes of the viewer, the tip of the branch and the crescent have to be in one straight line. First the gaze is directed and fixed at the tip of such a branch. Then the tip is discarded extending the gaze yonder to the crescent. Similarly the notion of 'I'ness is shifted from *annamaya-kośa* in succession to *ānandamayakośa* only to get the *buddhi* absorbed in its basis, Brahman, by discarding all the earlier 'I' notions born of identification with those *kośas*. Otherwise it is not possible for the mind with all the earlier preoccupations to get absorbed in Brahman at once. The author here adds figuratively the near dear ones as another *kośa* to remove the identification and preoccupations with them. The Upaniṣad also enjoins *upāsanās* in the form of a *pakṣi* (imagery of a bird) at all the five sheaths. This enables to develop *cittaikāgratā* - single pointedness of the mind/*buddhi*. It is

essential to gain *Brahmajñāna*. This *pañcakośa-viveka* is one of the methods to know the Brahman described as concealed in the *guhā* (cave) of five sheaths. After the *ānandamaya kośa* there being no other interior *kośa*, the Upaniṣad clarifies certain related doubts by posing the questions as 'anupraśnāḥ'. Now the topic of *apavāda* is introduced.

अथापवादो जगतः कथ्यते ब्रह्मबुद्धये ।

तत्रादौ पुत्रमित्रादिनुत्थै देहात्मतोच्यते ॥४१॥

अथ - after (describing the *adhyāropa*) ब्रह्मबुद्धये - to gain the knowledge of non-dual Brahman जगतः - of *jagat* अपवादः - refutation कथ्यते - is described तत्र - while doing *apavāda* आदौ - in the beginning पुत्रमित्रादिनुत्थै - to remove the 'I' notions in the near and dear ones such as the son, friend, etc. देहात्मता - physical body as *ātmā* ('I') उच्यते - is told (as a temporary arrangement) - (41)

41. After (describing the *adhyāropa*) refutation of *jagat* is described to gain the knowledge of non-dual Brahman. While doing so, the physical body as *ātmā* ('I') is told (as a temporary arrangement) to remove the 'I' notions in the near and dear ones such as the son, friend, etc.

Apavāda is the process of setting right the erroneous vision produced by *adhyāropa*. Different definitions of *apavāda* are found taking into account the different aspects of the result produced by *adhyāropa*. In the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* (*Br.Sū.Bh.3-3-9*) we find: ‘When there is an erroneous knowledge of an entity, its true knowledge born later ends the former wrong notion. That is *apavāda*’. For example, the wrong concept of quarters born of perplexity ends by their correct knowledge. ‘To know that the effect (*kārya*) is not distinct from the cause (*kāraṇa*) is *apavāda*’ (*Laghuvāsudeva-mananam*). ‘Knowing the *avastu* (mistaken entity) to be nothing but *vastu* (actual entity) is *apavāda*’ (*Vedāntasāra*).

The word ‘*atha*’ means thereafter in the sense ‘after describing the *adhyāropa*’. Without knowing it, the *apavāda* is not possible. *Adhyāropa* of *anātma-jagat* and its consequent presence and cognition obstructs the direct knowledge or experience of our true nature *ātmā*/Brahman that is *paramānanda* and totally free from the sorrows of *saṃsāra*. Even the least pre-occupation of our mind in the *jagat* denies the knowledge of Brahman. That is why the *vairāgya* has a role to play. Modernists may accuse Vedānta as *anti-jagat*. It is not so. Vedānta is against the inherent nature of *jagat* which breeds perpetual sorrows. It is against the cheating that the *jagat* does by presenting itself as real. It needs a mature mind with unbiased assessment of *jagat* to diagnose these two drawbacks. A mind steeped in sensualism however intelligent and scientific it may be, cannot discover the defects inherent in the *jagat*. Vedānta addresses to the mature mind. To those who do not have

such a mind, but are steeped in sense-pleasures only, the Vedas do recommend various means of fulfilling *dhārmika* desires in such a way that in due course of time (which may span over many lives) they develop maturity and turn to Vedānta for the final solution to get past the *saṃsāra*. The choice to solve the problem of *saṃsāra* now or later is left to the discretion of an individual. But there is no other shortcut method to escape *saṃsāra* than to know, directly one's true nature (*ātmā*/Brahman).

APAVĀDA – ‘I’ NOTION IN SON, ETC.

Does anyone identify with near and dear ones such as sons, etc., as ‘I’? Why should the *śruti* advise us to give up ‘I’ notion in the son, etc.? Here are the reasons.

आत्मा वै पुत्रनामासीत्येवमात्मत्वविभ्रमः ।
लौकिकोऽनूद्यते पुत्रे श्रुत्या युक्तिश्च विद्यते ॥४२॥

पुत्रे - in the son लौकिकः -
experienced by people आत्मत्व विभ्रमः -

erroneous notion of *ātmā* ('I') 'आत्मा वै पुत्र नाम असि'- 'the one who is called the son is *ātmā* only' (*Kau.U.2-11*) इति एवं श्रुत्या - by such *śruti* अनूद्यते - (the worldly notion) is restated युक्तिः - the reason (for it) च - also विद्यते - is there (which will be told in the next verse) – (42)

42. The erroneous notion of *ātmā* ('I') in the son experienced by the people is restated by the *śruti* such as, 'the one who is called the son is *ātmā* only' (*Kau.U.2-11*). There is a reason for it also (which will be told in the next verse).

Taking into account the prevalent notion in the world whereby the son is considered as everything for oneself, the *Kauṣītaki* Upaniṣad restates that the son is *ātmā*. The Upaniṣad does not intend to establish that the son is really *ātmā* because it is obvious that none takes the body of the son as oneself even if he is the dearest. The *śruti* takes into account the secondary identification of people with the near and dear ones such as son, etc., while making the above statement. The author gives in the next verse the reason for such a statement made by the *śruti*.

साकल्यं पुत्रभार्यादेर्वैकल्यं

चात्मनीक्ष्यते ।

इत्याह भाष्यकृत् तेन

पुत्रेऽस्ति स्वात्मताभ्रमः ॥४३॥

पुत्रभार्यादेः - of son, wife, etc.

साकल्यं - perfection वैकल्यं - imperfection, deficiency च - and आत्मनि - in oneself ईक्ष्यते - is observed इति - so भाष्यकृत् - Ādi Śaṅkarācārya आह - has said तेन - therefore पुत्रे - in the son स्वात्मताभ्रमः delusion of taking one's *ātmā* अस्ति - is there – (43)

43. *Bhāṣyakāra* Ādi Śaṅkarācārya has said that the perfection and imperfection (deficiency) of son, wife, etc., are observed in oneself. Therefore the delusion of taking the son as one's *ātmā* is there.

Sākalya (perfection) stands for entirety, nourishment, flourishment and accomplishment. *Vaikalya* means the opposite of it. The *Bhāṣyakāra* says: *Adhyāsa* is the mistaken cognition of a thing on a basis other than its own. (Its nature is made clear by the following illustration). People (*lokaḥ*) superimpose external attributes on the embodied self (*dehaviśiṣṭātmani*) in statements such as 'I am deficient (*vikalaḥ*)' or 'I am perfect (*sakalaḥ*)' when it is the son, wife and other near and dear ones who are deficient or perfect (*adhyāsa-bhāṣya*).

The word '*ātmā*' as oneself is used in three different meanings. The near and dear ones such as wife, son, etc., are considered *ātmā* in the *gauṇa* (secondary) sense. The *pañcakośas* as *ātmā* is an instance of *mithyā* (false) one.

The principle of *caitanya* as *sākṣī* is the main *ātmā*. In *vyavahāra* (common practice) depending on the context, anyone of these three gains the status of being the primary (*pradhāna, aṅgi*) and the remaining two become secondary (*gauṇa*). For a dying person the close relatives such as the wife, son or some trusted persons become the primary *ātmā* to take care of his property, etc. To an emaciated person the body (which needs nourishment) becomes the primary *ātmā*. For those who desire heavens, the *Kartā* of *Yāgas* (sacrifices), etc., is the main *ātmā*. For a *mumukṣu* the *sākṣī* only is the primary *ātmā* (P.12-39 to 42). This is a matter of common observation in the world. There are instances of brave individuals undisturbed by the personal, (i.e. of *mithyātmā*) trials and tribulations but they get easily distressed by the afflictions of near and dear ones, (i.e. *gauṇātmā*).

Such notion of *ātmā* in the son is now pointed out by quoting a statement from *Aitareyopaniṣad* (Ai.U.2-4).

सोऽस्यायमात्मा पुण्येभ्यः

प्रतिधीयत इत्यदः ।

वचो वक्त्यैतरेयोऽतः

स्वात्मता भ्रम एव हि ॥४४॥

सः अस्य अयम् आत्मा - this *ātmā* of the father in the form of his son पुण्येभ्यः -

to perform the *karmas* enjoined by the scriptures (पितुः स्थाने - in the place of his father) प्रतिधीयते - is assigned इति - so अदः - this ऐतरेयः वचः - statement of *Aitareyopaniṣad* वक्ति - tells अतः एव हि - therefore indeed स्वात्मता भ्रमः - the notion 'I'ness in the son, etc., (cannot be denied)–(44)

44. *Aitareyopaniṣad* says: This *ātmā* of the father in the form of his son is assigned to perform the *karmas* enjoined by the scriptures (in the place of his father). Therefore indeed the notion of 'I'ness in the son, etc., (cannot be denied).

The figurative concept of *ātmā* in the son was described in the first chapter. The father himself is born in the form of his son. Therefore the 'I'ness in the son is proper. At the time of dying, the father appoints his son for making good his all lapses regarding the *karmas*, *Vedādhyana* and gaining of heavens. The well-trained son according to the *śāstras* accepts this. This ensures the good hereafter of the father. All this is told in the Vedas (*Br.U.1-4-17*) as *saṃprattikarma*. Therefore the concept of son as 'I' is quite tenable. Otherwise the *karmas*, etc., done by the son cannot be considered as performed by the father. The results of *antyeṣṭi* (funeral rites) and *śrāddha* (annual rites for the dead father, etc.), etc., certainly go to the father. Thus

there are enough reasons to consider the son as one's *ātmā*.

APAVĀDA – ANNAMAYAKOŚA (FOOD-SHEATH)

The identification with the five sheaths itself is the main source of sorrows. It gets further compounded with the 'I' notion in the near and dear ones such as son, etc. As the first step towards gaining the direct knowledge of Brahman, the identification with the son, etc., is discarded by shifting it to the physical body. This method will be followed successively until the *puccham* (basis, *adhiṣṭhāna*) of *ānandamayakośa* is directly known.

एनं व्युदसितुं

देहस्यैवात्मत्वमिहोच्यते ।

यो देहोऽन्नमयः सोऽयमेवात्मान्यो

न कश्चन ॥४५॥

एनं - this 'I' notion in the son, etc.

व्युदसितुं - to abandon इह - here in this *Taittirīyopaniṣad* देहस्य एव आत्मत्वं - the body alone as *ātmā* उच्यते - is being told यः - whatever अन्नमयः देहः - physical body (that is) food sheath सः अयम् एव आत्मा - that only is *ātmā* अन्यः न कश्चन - nothing else—(45)

45. To abandon this 'I' notion in the son, etc., in the *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, the body alone as *ātmā* is being told. The physical body called food-sheath only is

ātmā and nothing else.

The pronoun '*enam*' (this) refers to the 'I' notion in the son, etc. There is another reading as '*evam*' (thus) in the place of '*enam*'. In that case the phrase: "the 'I' notion in the son, etc.", will have to be added to specify the object of the verb abandon. Here in this verse the assertion that physical body or *annamayakośa* only is *ātmā* and nothing else is not a statement of final truth. It is only to impress upon the fact that son, etc., can never be *ātmā* though the *śruti* has said so for different purposes such as *karma*, *saṃskāras*, etc. Giving up of the identification with the earlier *kośa* including the near and dear ones is only to make the mind more and more introvert (*antarmukha*) so that finally it can be *antardṛṣṭi* or *ātmābhimukha* (a replica of *ātmā*) to the total exclusion of *bahirdṛṣṭi*. This was already seen in the verse 20.

The reason why the body alone has to be taken as *ātmā* and not the son, etc., is given.

मदीयः पुत्रभार्यादिरिति

भेदावभासनात् ।

गौणी स्यादात्मता पुत्रे

भृत्यादौ सिंहता यथा ॥४६॥

मदीयः - my पुत्रभार्यादिः - son, wife, etc. इति - so भेदावभासनात् - because the separation is clearly perceived पुत्रे - in the son आत्मता - 'I' ness गौणी - secondary स्यात्

- should be यथा - just as भृत्यादौ - in the servant, etc. सिंहता- the practice of calling them lion (because of their fearlessness and strength) – (46)

46. The concept of ‘I’ness in the son (etc.) should be secondary because in the experiences such as ‘my son’, ‘my wife’ the separation of oneself (from them) is clearly perceived. It is just like the practice of calling the servant, etc., as lion (because of their fearlessness and strength).

It is a general rule that whatever that is mine, (i.e. related to me) cannot be myself. The possessor can never be the possessed. Such a relation is possible only in two distinct entities. To add further, the father or the husband does exist all along as an individual having ‘I’ness in his body before the son was born or he got married to have the wife. For any reason if they die earlier to him, the ‘I’ness in the referred father or husband as an individual distinct from the son or the wife continues. A brave and strong person is called figuratively a lion. But the one who calls so knows that he is a man and not a lion. A brilliant student may be called ‘fire’. But all know that he is a boy and not the actual fire. Even the *bhāṣyakāra* has told this

fact (*B.G.Bh.* 18-66). In such statements the meaning of the word lion or fire is connected to its *guṇas* (features) such as fearlessness, strength or brilliance, etc. It is not in the sense of the main invariable meaning of the word such as the lion as an wild animal or actual fire, but something related to it.

If by inquiry or *viveka* the identification with the entities secondarily considered as *ātmā* does not end because of excessive *āśakti* (attachment) in them, the *śruti* recommends an *upāsanā* as ‘I am the body’.

पूर्ववासनया पुत्रे स्वात्मता भाति चेत् पुनः ।
तद्वासनापनुत्त्यर्थं देहात्मत्वमुपास्यताम् ॥४७॥

पूर्ववासनया - (but) by the past *vāsanās* (impressions, *saṃskāras*) पुत्रे स्वात्मता - in the son ‘I’ness (as ‘I am the son’) पुनः - again भाति चेत् - if it appears तद्वासनापनुत्त्यर्थं - to get rid of those *vāsanās* देहात्मत्वं - as ‘I am the body’ उपास्यताम्- should do the *upāsanā* – (47)

47. In spite of inquiry, if by the past *vāsanās* the notion that ‘I am the son’ appears again, one should do the *upāsanā* as ‘I am the body’ to get rid of those *vāsanās*.

Generally a decision by itself may not be powerful to overcome the old habits. In spite of knowing the actual fact, one can do the contrary by the old habits. Thus

even after getting convinced that son, etc., are *anātmā*, it is likely that the *mumukṣu* continues to get entangled in the joys and sorrows of the near and dear ones. Therefore if *vicāra* (inquiry) or what is called *viveka* (discrimination) is not adequate to get rid of the identification with the son, etc., the *upāsanā* ‘that the body is *ātmā*’ is advised. For this purpose a bird-imagery is given by the *śruti* at the stage of each *kośa*. The purpose is to enable the *mumukṣu* to discard the identification with the five *kośas* to know directly Brahman. *Bhāṣyakāra* introduces the *pakṣikalpanā* (bird-imagery) as follows. ‘It is desirable that the *mumukṣu* called *annarasmayaḥ puruṣaḥ* in *Brahmavallī* who has got now the eligibility (*adhikāritva*) to gain *vidyā* (*Brahmajñāna*) should be led to gain the innermost Brahman. His *buddhi* has to be made to get absorbed in *upādhiless* Brahman. But presently it is identified with all the external *anātma-kośas*. It cannot be shifted at once directly to Brahman. Therefore the method of showing the crescent with the tip of a branch (which is actually not connected to the crescent) has to be adopted. For this purpose the *mumukṣu's* *buddhi* is led from its identification with the outer sheath step by step to the inner one by pointing it as “*anyontarātmā*” (another interior *ātmā*). This is done with the help of bird-imagery to make the pursuit easy’ (*Tai. U. Bh. 2-1*). The *upāsaka* looks upon the different parts or aspects of each *kośa* as the different limbs of a bird as told by the *śruti*. First of all the physical body is described in terms of bird-imagery.

शिरः पक्षौ मध्यपुच्छे

इति देहस्य पक्षिताम् ।

ध्यात्वा तन्निष्ठतां प्राप्य

त्यजेत् पुत्रात्मतामतिम् ॥४८॥

शिरः - head पक्षौ - the left and right wings मध्यपुच्छे - the trunk and the tail इति - having these देहस्य - (form) of the body पक्षिताम् - as a bird ध्यात्वा - having meditated upon तन्निष्ठतां प्राप्य - having got the firm identification with the body पुत्रात्मतामतिम् - the notion of the son as *ātmā* (‘I’) त्यजेत्- should be given – (48)

48. Having meditated upon the

body by looking it as a bird having head, left and right wings, trunk and the tail, one should get firm abidance in the concept that ‘I am such a bird in the form of body’. Thereby the notion of ‘I’ness in the son (etc.) should be ended.

There is another reading of ‘*putrātmāśrutim*’ in the place of ‘*putrātmāmatim*’. In that case it means that by such meditation the *saṃskāras* that the son is *ātmā* end. Thereby the *śruti* (*Aitareya*) which states that the son is *ātmā* gets discarded.

According to *bhāṣyakāra* in the

context of *pakṣikalpanā* there is only an imagery to make the *buddhi* single pointed to get it absorbed in the innermost Brahman, but no *upāsanā*. *Vārtikakāra* Sureśvarācārya justifies the stand taken by *bhāṣyakāra* but he also says that the possibility of *upāsanā* cannot be ruled out. He accepts *upāsanā* also (*Tai. Vā. 2-1-242*). Therefore *Sāyaṇācārya* describes it as *upāsanā* only. In *Śaṅkarānanda Dīpikā*, while *upāsanā* is accepted in the second *anuvāka* of *Brahmavallī*, the elaboration of *kośa* in the first *anuvāka* is considered only as a means to gain *ātmajñāna*. *Ānandagiri* while commenting on this *bhāṣya* portion positively rules out the possibility of *upāsanā*. He establishes based on *ṣaḍliṅgas* (six criteria) that *Brahmajñāna* alone is the purport of this portion. *Bhāṣya* does not accept *upāsanā* at the stage of *ānandamaya-kośa* also. It follows automatically that the *upāsanās* at earlier stage are ruled out. Even then the *Vārtikakāra* as an alternative gives consent to *upāsanā*. Therefore *Vidyāraṇya Muni*, like *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* accepts *upāsanā* also. Both views cannot be considered as contrary because they can be reconciled based on *adhikāribheda* – gradation of eligible persons.

The *yajñakuṇḍa* (sacrificial pit) prepared for *agnicayana* (keeping or arranging the sacred fire) has the shape

of a bird. One should consider that I am such a bird. The head of my physical body is in the place of the head of bird. My left and right arms are its left and right wings. My trunk (middle portion of the body) is in the place of its trunk. The portion below the navel is its tail. The south (*dakṣiṇa*) and the north (*uttara*) *pakṣas* (wings) of the bird as the arms of the body to be decided by facing oneself the east. This means of bird imagery meditation is to get rid of the identification with the son, etc. At other times also one has to be careful in dealings with the near and dear ones by not having ‘I’ness in them. Otherwise it will be like the *kunjara-śauca* (the bath of an elephant). It is said that the elephant after its bath blows the dust or dirt on itself if it comes across it.

The notion of ‘*ātmā*’ in the near and dear ones was shown on the basis of worldly experience, the *śruti* and reasoning. Now it is proved by reasoning that the son, etc., cannot be *ātmā*.

धीर्मनुष्योऽहमित्यस्ति

पुत्रोऽहमिति नास्ति धीः ।

विकारोऽस्ति परिव्राजो न

पुत्रसुखदुःखयोः ॥४९॥

अहं - I am मनुष्यः - a man इति - such
धीः - concept, experience अस्ति - is there
पुत्रः - the son अहम् - is ‘I’ इति - such धीः -
experience न अस्ति - is not there परिव्राजः -

for a *sannyāsī* पुत्रसुखदुःखयोः - on account of joys and the sorrows of the son (in his prior stage of life) विकारः - reaction न अस्ति - is not there – (49)

49. An experience (concept) such as ‘I am a man’ is there but not that ‘the son is I’. (When the father develops *vairāgya* and takes to *sannyāsa*) he has no reaction on account of joys and sorrows of his son (in his prior stage of life).

The near and dear ones as *gauṇātmā* (secondary *ātmā*) can evoke reaction of elation or dejection in an individual. But no one experiences their body as ‘I’. Therefore like ‘I am the body or a man’, the experience that ‘the body of the son is I’ is not there. It is just like a pot, etc., different from oneself because the actual *ahaṃkāra* (‘I’ notion) in the body of the son is not there. That body cannot be *ātmā* (oneself). The notion of oneness in one’s body is so long as the body is there unless one gains *aparokṣa Brahmajñāna*. But that is not the case with the son because a *sannyāsī* who has staunch *vairāgya* does not experience reaction by the plight of his son (in his earlier stage of life). He has no notion of ‘I’ in his son any longer. This shows that the notion ‘I’ness in the son is an error.

The second *anuvāka* of *Brahmavallī* starts with an *upāsanā* of *annam*. Here ‘*annam*’ means both the

edible food and also the macrocosmic *Virāt*. All beings on earth are born of food. They live because of it and finally merge back in food. *Anna* is described as the *jyeṣṭha* (senior, prior existing one). It is called *sarvaauśadha* – the medicine of all. The food cures the cyclic disease of *jāṭharāgni* (stomach fire) called hunger in all by appeasing it. It is *sarvaauśadha* also because the starving can give rise to varieties of other diseases. One who does the *upāsanā* of *annam* as Brahman gets plenty of food (*Tai.U.2-2*). The next verse suggests this *upāsanā*.

अन्नजो देह एवात्मा तदन्नं ब्रह्मबुद्धितः ।
उपास्य सर्वमप्यन्नं स्वाभीष्टं लभते पुमान् ॥५०॥

अन्नजः - born of food देहः - body एव - itself आत्मा - is *ātmā* (oneself) तद् - that body अन्नम् - food (which is the cause of the body) ब्रह्मबुद्धितः उपास्य - having meditated upon as Brahman पुमान् - that *upāsaka* स्वाभीष्टं - desired for oneself सर्व - all अपि - also अन्नं - food लभते - gets – (50)

50. The body born of food itself is *ātmā* (oneself). Having meditated upon the food, the cause of the body, as Brahman the *upāsaka* gets even all the food desired (by him) for himself.

Earlier it was seen that from *ākāśa* onwards up to *anna* (food) are born from Brahman. Therefore the *anna* the effect is nothing but Brahman the

cause. The body called *puruṣa* is born from *anna*. So it is also Brahman. But it does not mean that only the food that constitutes our body is Brahman. All the bodies in the cosmos are from *anna* which is Brahman.

Sāyaṇabhāṣya explains this *upāsanā* in two ways. Here *anna* (food) is a *pratīka* (a symbol or locus for *upāsanā*). That *anna* is to be looked upon as Brahman. The body born of *anna* which is Brahman is to be meditated as ‘I am that bird’ as described earlier. The *upāsanā* wherein the *upāśya* (meditated entity) is considered as ‘I’ the meditator is called ‘*ahamgraha*’ *upāsanā*. In general *upāsanās*, the meditator (*upāsaka*) meditates on the meditated (*upāśya*) different from oneself. The other way of meditation therein takes into account the Creation of *ākāśa* to *anna*. The same *anna* is our body at the microcosmic (*Vyaṣṭi*) level and *Virāṭ* at the macrocosmic (*samaṣṭi*) level because all bodies are made from *anna*. One has to meditate on *anna* which is thus both as Brahman. In this case bird-imagery is not to be considered. *Vyaṣṭi* and *Samaṣṭi* should be merged in their cause the *anna* and it has to be looked upon as Brahman. The result of this *upāsanā* is to gain *anna* in the form of *Virāṭ*. It leads to *kramamukti* (gradual liberation). The secondary result is that the *upāsaka* has no dearth of

food and he gets varieties of food that he wants.

As already seen, the purpose of the Upaniṣad in describing *pañcakośa-viveka* is to reveal the Brahman concealed in the *guhā* (cave) of sheaths (*kośas*). Having described the *annamayakośa* as *ātmā*, the next *prāṇamayakośa* is considered only to knock down the notion of *annamayakośa* as *ātmā*. This step is being introduced.

विवेकाद्वा ध्यानतो वा

पुत्राद्यात्मत्वनिहुतौ ।

तथा देहात्मतां त्यक्तुं

प्राणात्मत्वं विचिन्त्यताम् ॥५१॥

विवेकात् वा - either by *viveka* (vs.46,.49) ध्यानतः वा - or by meditation (vs.48) पुत्राद्यात्मत्वनिहुतौ - when the ‘I’ notion in the son, wife, etc., is rid of तथा - similarly देहात्मतां त्यक्तुं - to give up the ‘I’ notion in the physical body प्राणात्मत्वं - *prāṇa* as ‘I’ (*ātmā*) विचिन्त्यताम् - should be considered – (51)

51. When the ‘I’ notion in the son, wife, etc., is got rid of either by *viveka* (vs.46, 49) or by meditation (vs.48) to give up similarly the ‘I’ notion in the physical body the *prāṇa* as ‘I’ (*ātmā*) should be considered.

To end the notion of ‘I’ness in the son, etc., the body as ‘I’ was suggested.

After discarding the 'I' notion in the entities other than oneself, the means adopted by taking the physical body as 'I' also needs to be given up because it is not the final truth. It is also a concept accepted only as a stop-gap arrangement.

APAVĀDA-PRĀṆAMAYAKOŚA

The physical body which is inert by itself cannot be *ātmā* is going to be established hereafter. The Upaniṣad further describes *prāṇamaya ātmā* distinct and interior to *annarasamaya ātmā* who is pervading the *annarasamaya kośa*. That *ātmā* also is *puruṣākāra* (has the form of *puruṣa/body*). This does not mean that *prāṇa* has actual form of the body. But it is like the molten copper poured in a mould or cast appearing similar to the mould. The same norm is applicable to the rest of the *kośas*. Its five limbs namely *prāṇa*, *vyāna*, *apāna*, *samāna* (called *ākāśa*), *udāna* (called *pr̥thivī*) are respectively the head, right wing, left wing, trunk and the tail of the bird-imagery. *Devas* (inhabitants of heaven), humans and all the other living beings become active because of *prāṇa*. It is the life of all the beings. The *upāsana* of *prāṇa* with *Brahmadṛṣṭi* (meditating on it as Brahman) gives the result of full life span.

Prāṇa referred to here is the main

prāṇa (vital airs) which is *kriyāśakti* (power of action) having five functions. One of them corresponding to respiration is also called *prāṇa*. Identified with the *prāṇa* we experience as 'I breathe', 'I am hungry', 'I am thirsty', etc. Generally we do not take ourselves to be different from *prāṇa*. It is closer to us than the physical body. To save life (*prāṇa*), people even undergo the amputation of bodily parts. Therefore it is apt that the *śruti* asks us to identify with *prāṇa* as *ātmā* to get rid of 'I'ness in the body. Son, etc., are *gauṇātmā* whereas the body is *mithyātmā*. In spite of knowing the son, etc., as *anātmā* (not actually myself) there is a dealing as if they are *ātmā*. But 'I'ness in the body is natural. Through *śāstra* we may understand ourselves to be distinct from the body. But the experience that 'I am not the body' is possible only in *ātmasākṣātkāra*. Similarly by the practice of '*prāṇa* is *ātmā*', the notion that the body is 'I' does not become totally extinct like the notion of 'son is *ātmā*', but one became relatively more introvert with diminution in the notion that body is 'I'.

It is true that the Upaniṣad describes the identification with each *kośa* as though in an action replay. But in practice we do not take the physical body isolated from the rest of the *kośas* as 'I', but all of them put together as 'I' even

though one may refer the body as 'I'. *Bhāṣyakāra* clarifies this point (*Tai.U.Bh.2-3*). He says: The living beings do not become the whole individual entities because of being limited only by the *annamayakośa*, but also by *prāṇamaya*, *manomaya*, *viññānamaya* and *ānandamaya kośas* put together.

To promote the *prāṇamayakośa* as *ātmā*, hitherto established notion that the physical body is *ātmā* is being refuted.

न देहस्यात्मता युक्ता पूर्वजन्मन्यभावतः ।
पुरात्मा देहदं कर्म कृत्वा प्राप्नोत्यदो वपुः ॥५२॥

देहस्य आत्मता - the physical body as *ātmā* न युक्ता - is not correct पूर्वजन्मनि - in the past life अभावतः - because (the present body) was non-existent आत्मा - the individual *jīva* पुरा - in the past lives देहदं कर्म कृत्वा - (remaining in other bodies) having done the *karmas* yielding the future bodies अदः - this वपुः - body प्राप्नोति - gets—(52)

52. The (notion that the) physical body is *ātmā* is not correct because the present body was non-existent in the past life. (But) the (present) individual *jīva* (inhabiting the other bodies) in the past lives gets this body having done the *karmas* yielding the future bodies.

It is well-known that every *jīva* is

subject to transmigration. The bodies inhabited in each birth differ. In every birth the physical body existing therein is taken as 'I'. If the body is truly 'I' (*ātmā*), the individual *jīva* being one and the same, the same body should be there in all births. We know that this is far from the truth. The present body also is not accidental. It is the result of *karmas* performed by the specific *jīva* in many past births. Thus the 'I' (*ātmā*) - concept in the physical body is wrong.

The suitability of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* is being shown by explaining the process of life and death.

आयुर्मरणयोर्हेतौ प्राणे जीवात्मतोचिता ।
स्थिते प्राणे भवत्यायुः प्राणापाये तु हीयते ॥५३॥

आयुर्मरणयोः - of life and death हेतौ - in the cause प्राणे - in the *prāṇa* जीवात्मता - as *jīvātmā* उचिता - is proper प्राणे स्थिते - when *prāṇa* abides in the body आयुः भवति - there is life तु - whereas प्राणापाये - when *prāṇa* departs हीयते - (life) ends (therefore *prāṇa* is *ātmā*)—(53)

53. It is proper to say that *prāṇa*, the cause of life and death is *jīvātmā*. (Because) life is there when *prāṇa* abides in the body whereas the life ends when *prāṇa* departs. (Therefore *prāṇa* is *ātmā*).

So long as *prāṇa* is present in the body, invariably the experience of

'I'ness and life is there (*Kau.U.3-2*). Such an experience stops the moment the *prāṇa* departs from the body. This establishes a definite relation between the *prāṇa* and 'I' as 'I am the *prāṇa*'. The popular understanding also considers that the body is alive so long as *ātmā* is in it and it is dead when *ātmā* leaves it. This feature attributed to *ātmā* can be found in *prāṇa*. Therefore it is proper to say that '*prāṇa* is *ātmā*'.

The *upāsanā* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* and its secondary result is being told.

देहात्मवासनानुत्थै प्राणात्मत्वमुपास्यताम् ।
प्राणो ब्रह्मेत्युपासीनः सर्वमायुः समश्नुते ॥५४॥

देहात्मवासनानुत्थै - to remove (end) the *vāsanā* (*saṃskāra*) that the body is 'I' प्राणात्मत्वम् - 'I am *prāṇa*' उपास्यताम् - such *upāsanā* should be done प्राणो ब्रह्म इति - as '*prāṇa* is Brahman' उपासीनः - one who does such *upāsanā* सर्वम् आयुः - full life span (or 100 years) समश्नुते - gains – (54)

54. To remove the *vāsanā* that the body is 'I', the *upāsanā* as 'I am *prāṇa*' should be done. The *upāsaka* who meditates as '*prāṇa* is Brahman' gains full life-span (or lives for 100 years).

As seen earlier *prāṇa* is to be considered as *ātmā* is to discard the notion that the body is *ātmā*. *Bhāṣyakāra* explains the *upāsanā* of '*prāṇa* is Brahman' to be done as 'I am the *prāṇa*

who is *ātmā* of all living beings as *āyu* the cause of their life' (*Tai.U.Bh.2-3*). The secondary result of this *upāsanā* is that the *upāsaka* gains his full life-span as earmarked by the *prārabdha-karma*. That means he will not have sudden or untimely or accidental or unnatural death. Some may argue that the duration of life is determined by the *prārabdha-karma*. How can there be any death prior to that? Therefore *Bhāṣyakāra* gives another meaning for '*sarvam āyu*': as one hundred years. This is according to the maximum human life span told in some statements of *śrutis* such as, 'Aspire to live for one hundred years' (*Ī.U.2*), 'May we live for hundred years', 'Humans have life span of a hundred years' (*Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, 3rd *Kāṇḍa*).

The different parts or functions of *prāṇa* are enumerated with an advice to form a bird-imagery.

प्राणोऽपानः समानश्चोदानव्यानौ च वृत्तयः ।
एतासु पूर्ववत् पक्षमूर्धादीन् परिकल्पयेत् ॥५५॥

प्राणः - *prāṇa* (respiration) अपानः - *apāna* (downward thrust) समानः - *samāna* (digestion) उदानव्यानौ - *udāna* (vomiting, ejecting the subtle body out from the gross body at death) and *vyāna* (blood circulation) च - and वृत्तयः - (are) the functions (of main *prāṇa*) एतासु - in these five functions पूर्ववत् - as earlier (in the case of *annamayakośa*) पक्षमूर्धादीन् -

wings, head, etc. परिकल्पयेत् - should be thought of—(55)

55. *Prāṇa* (respiration), *apāna* (downward thrust), *samāna* (digestion), *udāna* (vomiting, upward tendency to eject the subtle body out from the gross body at death) and *vyāna* (blood circulation) are the functions of the main *prāṇa*. In these five functions wings, head, etc., (of the bird-imagery) should be thought of as earlier (in the case of *annamayakośa*).

The word *ṛtti* here means the function. In the *prāṇamayakośa*, the main *prāṇa* has five functions. The *prāṇa* and its functions are not different. These five *ṛttis* are to be looked upon as the different limbs of the bird in the bird-imagery. The *prāṇa* is to be considered or meditated as the head of the bird. The *vyāna* and *apāna* to be meditated as right and left wings respectively. The *samāna* to be taken as the trunk and the *udāna* as the tail.

The author himself tells the *ṛttis* (functions) of the *prāṇa*.

श्वासोऽधोगमनं कृत्स्ने देहेऽन्नस्य समीकृतिः ।
उद्गारादिर्बलं देहे क्रियास्तासां क्रमादिमाः ॥५६॥

श्वासः - respiration अधोगमनं - downward thrust कृत्स्ने देहे - in the entire body अन्नस्य - of the food समीकृतिः - equal distribution, (i.e. digestion) उद्गारादिः - vomiting and ejection of the subtle body

at the time of death देहे बलं - impart bodily strength इमाः - these (are) क्रमात् - in the respective order तासां - of those (*prāṇas*) क्रियाः - functions—(56)

56. The functions of those *prāṇas* in the order of *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *samāna*, *udāna* and *vyāna* are respiration, downward thrust, equal distribution of the food in the entire body, (i.e. digestion), vomiting and the ejection of the subtle body at the time of death and impart bodily strength (by blood-circulation).

All the five divisions of *prāṇa* are basically *vāyu* (vital air), but differ functionally. The above division is as accepted by the *Vedāntaśāstra*. Those who follow *Kāpila-mata* (opinion of Sage Kapila) accept five more *prāṇas*. They are *Nāga* having the function of vomiting, *Kūrma* (opening and closing of eyelids), *Kṛkala* or *Kṛkara* (sneezing), *Devadatta* (yawning) and *Dhanañjaya* abiding all over the body. It has the function of inducing the swelling in the body and it continues to be there in the body even after death for some time making the dead body swell. *Vedānta* includes these *Nāga*, etc., in the five *prāṇas* beginning from *prāṇa*, *apāna*, etc. This fivefold *prāṇa* combined with five organs of action (*karmendriyas*) constitute the *prāṇamayakośa*.

The purpose of meditating upon

the *prāṇamayakośa* as *ātmā* and how long it has to be done is pointed out.

वृत्तिसङ्घं प्राणमयं ध्यात्वा

देहात्मवासनाम् ।

सन्त्यज्याथ प्राणमये त्यजेद्

देहवदात्मताम् ॥५७॥

वृत्तिसङ्घं प्राणमयं - the *prāṇamaya ātmā* which is a collection of five functions ध्यात्वा - having meditated upon (it) as 'I' देहात्मवासनाम् - the *saṃskāras (vāsanās)* of taking the physical body as 'I' सन्त्यज्य - having given up अथ - thereafter देहवत् - like the 'I'ness in the body प्राणमये - in the *prāṇamayakośa* आत्मताम् - 'I'ness त्यजेत् - should be given up - (57)

57. Having meditated upon the *prāṇamayakośa* which is a collection of five functions as *ātmā* ('I'), the *vāsanās* of taking the physical body as 'I' should be given up. Thereafter, like the 'I'ness in the body, the 'I'ness (*ātmātā*) in the *prāṇamayakośa* should be given up.

'I' notion (*ātmātā*) in the physical body was advised to get rid of 'I'ness in the near and dear ones. But the body as *ātmā* ('I') also is wrong. Therefore 'I'ness in the *prāṇamaya* was recommended to end the wrong concept that the body is 'I'. When that purpose is served, the *mumukṣu* has to shift the focus of 'I'ness (*ātmātā*) to the next

stage of *manomayakośa*. The Upaniṣad advises this now. Before proceeding further it is advisable to have a cursory glance about the nature of *manomaya* and *vijñānamaya kośas*.

APAVĀDA – MANOMAYAKOŚA

The mind (*manaḥ*) is one of the four functions of *antaḥkaraṇa* (inner instrument) whose functions are called *vṛttis* (thoughts). It is made of collective *sāttvika* content of all the five elements. Because of the nature of *sattva-guṇa* in them the *cit* (knowledge) aspect of *ātmā* gets reflected in it. The reflected *cit* is called *cidābhāsa* which enlivens the inert body and the *prāṇa*. As a result they appear to be sentient. The *manaḥ* (mind) is *antaḥkaraṇavṛtti* in the form of *saṅkalpa-vikalpa* (consideration or reflection and indecision). Coupled with the five sense-organs it is called *manomayakośa*. It is in the form of means (*karaṇa*) endowed with the desiring power (*icchāśakti*). The *buddhi* (intellect) is a decisive (*niścayātmikā*) *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*. The *buddhi* along with the five sense-organs is *vijñānamayakośa*. It is in the form of *kartā* (*doer*). The other two functions of *antaḥkaraṇa* are *ahaṃkāra* (the *vṛtti* that identifies the body as 'I') and *cittam* (the *vṛtti* in the form of faculty of recollection). Some others club the *ahaṃkāra* and *cittam* in *manaḥ* and

buddhi taking into account their different similar functions.

प्राणो नात्मा जडत्वेन चेतनस्यात्मतोचिता ।
मनस्तु चेतनत्वेन सर्वस्य प्रतिभासनात् ॥५८॥

जडत्वेन - because of being inert in nature प्राणः - *prāṇa* आत्मा न - cannot be *ātmā* चेतनस्य - of a sentient entity आत्मता - being the nature of *ātmā* उचिता - is proper तु - and सर्वस्य प्रतिभासनात् - because of revealing (making it known) everything चेतनत्वेन - on account of its sentience मनः (आत्मा) - the mind is *ātmā*—(58)

58. The *prāṇa* cannot be *ātmā* because it is inert in nature. A sentient entity as the nature of *ātmā* is proper. The mind on account of its sentience is *ātmā* because it reveals (makes known) everything.

Irrespective of what the exact nature of *ātmā* ('I') is, all do know that the entity 'I' is some sentient principle because all living beings are sentient by nature. This totally rules out the possibility of *prāṇa* being *ātmā* since it is inert. On the contrary the mind appears to be sentient. The reason for this was given by the phrase, '*sarvasya pratibhāsanāt*' (because it reveals everything). This phrase is explained now.

चक्षुराद्यक्षसापेक्षं मनो बाह्यार्थभासकम् ।
निरपेक्षेण मनसा सुखाद्यान्तरभासनम् ॥५९॥

मनः - the mind चक्षुराद्यक्षसापेक्षम् - depending on the sense-organs such as eyes, etc. बाह्यार्थभासकं - reveals the external sense-objects निरपेक्षेण मनसा - by the mind independent of sense-organs सुखाद्यान्तरभासनम् - the internal entities such as happiness, etc., are made evident—(59)

59. The mind reveals the external sense-objects depending on the sense-organs such as eyes, etc. The internal entities such as happiness, etc., are made evident by it independent of sense-organs. (Therefore the sentient mind which makes known internal and external entities is *ātmā*).

The sentient entity is that which has the power of cognition or being aware of something. In the sleep the mind is dormant. It does not function. But the *prāṇa* that functions is not aware of what is going on around including the internal joys, sorrows, hunger, thirst, etc. Hunger, thirst, etc., are the features of the *prāṇa*. And yet, *prāṇa* is not aware of it unless revealed by the mind. This can be verified by our ignorance of it in such cases. That is why a person totally engrossed in some work is unaware of his hunger in spite of being very hungry. The mind needs the help of sense-organs to perceive the external sense-objects whereas it is aware of all subjective joys,

etc., on its own.

Following the earlier pattern, the *upāsanā* of mind is enjoined to discard the notion that *prāṇamayakośa* is *ātmā*.

आत्मत्वं मनसो बुद्ध्वा त्यक्तुं प्राणात्मवासनाम् ।
उपासीत मनस्तच्च वृत्त्याख्यावयवैर्युतम् ॥६०॥

मनसः - of the mind आत्मत्वं - the nature as *ātmā* बुद्ध्वा - having known प्राणात्मवासनाम् - the *saṃskāras* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* त्यक्तुं - to give up मनः (आत्मा इति) - the mind as *ātmā* (इति) उपासीत - such *upāsanā* (meditation) should be practised तत् च - that mind that is to be meditated upon वृत्त्याख्यावयवैः - by parts called *vr̥ttis*. युतम् - is endowed with—(60)

60. Having known the nature of the mind as *ātmā*, to give up the *vāsanās* (*saṃskāras*) of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* the *upāsanā* (meditation) of the mind as *ātmā* is to be practised. The mind that is to be meditated upon is endowed with parts called *vr̥ttis*.

A *vr̥tti* means function. In general, different *vr̥ttis* or modifications of the mind are thoughts. However, here what is described as mind is restricted to the *vr̥ttis* corresponding to the Vedic words. The monumental collection of Vedic words cannot be the parts of the mind. Therefore the *vr̥ttis* revealing the proper Vedic recitation in the form of sound are the *avayavas* (parts) of the

mind for *pakṣi-kalpanā*. Even though the mind has endless *vr̥ttis*, because of prominence, Vedic *vr̥ttis* alone are considered as *avayavas* for *upāsanā*. The form of *manomayakośa* as the bird-imagery is being told.

यजुराद्याश्चतुर्वेदा आदेशस्तद्गतो विधिः ।
तद्भासके मनोवृत्तिपञ्चके पक्षिकल्पना ॥६१॥

यजुराद्याः - *Yajus*, etc. चतुर्वेदाः - (are) the four Vedas तद्गतः विधिः - the injunctions (*vidhis*) contained therein आदेशः - (are called) *ādeśa* तद्भासके मनोवृत्तिपञ्चके - in the five types of mental *vr̥ttis* (thoughts) that reveal the four Vedas and the *ādeśa* पक्षिकल्पना (कर्तव्या) - the bird-imagery (has to be imagined by the *upāsaka*)—(61)

61. The Yajurveda, etc., are the four Vedas. The injunctions (*vidhis*) contained therein are called *ādeśa*. (The *upāsaka* has to imagine) the bird-imagery in the five types of mental *vr̥ttis* (thoughts) that reveal the four Vedas and the *ādeśa*.

The mental *vr̥ttis* (thoughts) that reveal or depict the chanting of *mantras* pertaining to the Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, Sāmaveda, *Atharvāṅgirasaveda* and the *brāhmaṇa* portion of *ādeśa* are to be taken as the *avayavas* (limbs, parts) of the bird-imagery (*pakṣi-kalpanā*). The Upaniṣad says that Yajurveda (*mantras* in the form of prose) is the head of the

bird because of its prominence in the sacrifices, etc., as their very core. By chanting the *Yajurmantras*, the *havis* (sacrificial oblations) are offered accompanied by *svāhākāra* (utterance of the exclamation in offering the *havis*). The reasons seen in determining the Yajurveda as the head are only for the sake of our understanding. Primarily such imaginations are to be accepted because the Vedas say so. It is called *vācanikī*. This rule applies to all sacrifices and *upāsanās*, etc. Wherever possible, it can be reasoned out. But it is not possible everywhere. Therefore they have to be accepted because the Vedas have said so. The Ṛgveda (*mantras* poetic in nature) is the right wing. The *Sāma* (*mantras* that are sung) is the left wing. The *ādeśa* is the trunk and the *Atharvāṅgīrasa* (*mantras* revealed to sages Atharvaṇa and Aṅgīrasa) is the tail. The *Atharvāṅgīrasa* mainly gives *prāyaścittakarmas* (*karmas* for atonement) and *pauṣṭikakarmas* (*karmas* for regaining the health).

To gain the *aparokṣa Brahma-jñāna* the mind assuming the exact attributeless form of Brahman, (i.e. *Brahmākāra*) is indispensable to end the ignorance. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* says: By the mind alone the Brahman is to be known (*Br.U.4-4-19*). But the mind and the words or speech cannot objectify Brahman as their distinct object (*Tai.U.2-4; 2-9*). Thus

though the mind cannot objectify Brahman as an object known by it, it has a role in ending the ignorance of Brahman. This is possible only if the mind is made ready for it. To prepare the mind to dispel such ignorance, the *upāsanā* of 'mind is Brahman' is a means that is suggested by the *śruti* in the context of bird-imagery.

अवाङ्मनसगम्यस्य ब्रह्मणोऽप्यवबोधने ।
शक्तं भवेन्मनस्तच्च मनो ब्रह्मेति कल्पना ॥६२॥

मनः - the mind अवाङ्मनसगम्यस्य
ब्रह्मणः - of the Brahman that cannot be objectified by the speech (or words) and the mind अपि - also अवबोधने - in knowing directly शक्तं भवेत् - should be able to (अतः - therefore) तत् - that मनः च ब्रह्म - the mind also is Brahman इति कल्पना - so the imagination (*upāsanā*) (should be done)–(62)

62. The mind also should be able to know directly the Brahman that cannot be objectified by the speech (or words) and itself. Therefore the *upāsanā* as 'the mind also is Brahman' (should be done by the *upāsaka*).

The knowledge of any entity can be gained by the *antaḥkaraṇavṛtti* corresponding to that entity, (i.e. *tattadākāra*). The knowledge of Brahman is not an exception to this because its ignorance cannot be ended by any other means. For this the mind

has to be pure and single pointed. Here comes the role of *sādhana*s such as *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-saṃpatti*, *upāsanā*, etc. A prepared mind alone can be *ātmākāra*, *Brahmākāra* or *akhaṇḍākāra* since *ātmā*/Brahman is limitless sentience principle unlike the sense-objects. The mind can objectify only the limited inert sense-objects. The mind cannot objectify the knowledge principle Brahman which enables it to cognize (*Ke.U.1-5*). Therefore to enable the mind to dispel the ignorance of Brahman by making it introvert, the *upāsanā* of 'mind is Brahman' is advised here since the *pañcakośa-viveka* with *pakṣi-kalpanā* is under consideration.

How can the mind know Brahman which it cannot objectify? This is answered.

न ब्रह्मणि मनोजन्यस्फूर्तिस्तस्मादगम्यता ।
मनस्यन्तर्मुखे नश्येदविद्या तेन शक्तता ॥६३॥

ब्रह्मणि - in the self-luminous

(self-evident) Brahman मनोजन्यस्फूर्तिः - the *cidābhāsa* born in the *manovṛtti* having *Brahmākāra* न (अस्ति) - has no access तस्मात् - therefore अगम्यता - (Brahman) cannot be known by the mind मनसि - when the mind अन्तर्मुखे (सति) - becomes totally introvert and *Brahmākāra* अविद्या - ignorance (of Brahman) नश्येत् - necessarily ends तेन - thereby शक्तता - the mind is capable of imparting *Brahmajñāna* - (63)

63. The *cidābhāsa* born in the *manovṛtti* having *Brahmākāra* has no access in the self-luminous Brahman, (i.e. that *cidābhāsa* [reflection of *cit*] cannot illumine its source *citsvarūpa* Brahman). Therefore the mind cannot know Brahman (as its object). However when the mind becomes totally introvert and *Brahmākāra* the ignorance of Brahman necessarily ends (whereby self-evident/Brahman gets revealed in its real nature). In this sense the mind is capable of imparting *Brahmajñāna*.

As seen earlier the knowledge of an entity is gained by *tattadākāra-vṛtti* - a *vṛtti* (thought) corresponding to the entity to be known. Obviously the *vṛtti* is endowed with *cidābhāsa* in it. This mode whereby such *vṛtti* coupled with *cidābhāsa* conforming to the entity to be known is called *vṛtti-vyāpti* wherein the *cidābhāsa* permeates the *vṛtti*. This *vṛtti-vyāpti* removes the ignorance of the entity to be known. The *cidābhāsa* in such *vṛttis* is called *phala*. It illumines the inert object to be known. This modus operandi is called *phala-vyāpti*, wherein the *phala* objectifies the entity to be known in order to reveal it.

In the process of gaining *Brahmajñāna*, there is a slight difference. The *vṛtti*-

vyāpti in the form of *Brahmākāravṛtti* removes the ignorance. Thereafter the *phala* (*cidābhāsa*) in that *vṛtti* is not necessary to make the self-luminous Brahman known. The author highlights this point in his text Pañcadaśi. ‘*Vṛtti-vyāpti*’ is necessary to destroy the ignorance of Brahman, but Brahman being the self-luminous knowledge principle, the *cidābhāsa* (*phala*) is not useful (P.7-92). This is also the import of two paradoxical Upaniṣadic statements. They are: ‘Brahman should be known by the well-prepared mind only’ (*manasā eva anudraṣṭavyam - Br.U.4-4-19*). This shows the necessity of *vṛtti-vyāpti*. ‘Brahman cannot be known by the mind’ (*yanmanasā na manute - Ke.U.1-5*). This shows the futility of *phala-vyāpti*. All these aspects are implied in this verse (63). The same fact is emphasized by *Bhāṣyakāra* when he says: ‘All that is required for gaining *Brahmajñāna* is therefore the *nirākaraṇam* of *avidyādhyāropa*, namely, termination of the ignorance and its effect. The means to abide in the true nature of *ātmā* is verily the withdrawal (*nivṛtti*) of the mind from the distinct pluralistic cognitions alien to *ātmā*’ (*B.G.Bh.18-50*). In short the knowing of *ātmā* is to end the superimposed ignorance with its effects (*Br.U.Bh.1-4-13*).

APAVĀDA - VIJÑĀNAMAYAKOŚĀ

The Upaniṣad proceeds further to describe the *vijñānamayakośa* which is interior to the *manomaya*. *Manomaya* was described in the form of the Vedas. In the same trend, here the *vijñāna* is taken as the ascertained knowledge of the Vedas. That also is the feature of *antaḥkaraṇa*. Therefore the *śruti* describes *śraddhā* (attitude of trust in the scriptures, etc.) as the head, *ṛta* (the ascertained meaning of duties as per *śāstra*) as the right wing, *Satya* (*ṛta* put in practice) as left wing, *yoga* (composure of mind) as the trunk whereas *manaḥ* (*Hiraṇyagarbha*) as the tail. Though the *prakaraṇa-granthis* (topicwise treatises) describe the

buddhi coupled with sense-organs as *vijñānamayakośa*, here it has to be taken as the *antaḥkaraṇa* endowed with the *śraddhā*, etc., because the Upaniṣad says so.

प्राणात्मवासनानाशे मनसोऽप्यात्मतां त्यजेत् ।
कर्तुरात्मत्वमुचितं मनोऽन्तःकरणं खलु ॥६४॥

प्राणात्मवासनानाशे- when the *vāsanās* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* have ended (by practicing the *upāsanā* of the mind as *ātmā*) मनसः अपि - pertaining to the mind also आत्मतां - the notion of *ātmā* (‘I’ness) त्यजेत् - should be given up मनः - the mind खलु - indeed अन्तःकरणं - inner instrument कर्तुः - as for the ‘doer’ *vijñānamayakośa* आत्मत्वं - the nature of being *ātmā* (‘I’) उचितं - is proper – (64)

64. When the *vāsanās* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* have ended (by practicing the *upāsanā* of the mind as *ātmā*), the notion of *ātmā* ('I'ness) in the mind also should be given up. Indeed the mind is an inner instrument. (Therefore) it is proper that the 'doer' (*kartā*) *vijñānamayakośa* is *ātmā*.

The *manomayakośa* as *ātmā* was a temporary arrangement to get rid of the wrong notion that was adopted by taking the *prāṇamaya* as *ātmā*. Once the notion of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* is overcome, the next step is to discard the concept that the mind is *ātmā*. For this the support of *vijñānamayakośa* as *ātmā* has to be resorted to. At this juncture *vijñānamayakośa* as *ātmā* is justified by showing that the mind cannot be so. The mind is in the place of an inner instrument at the disposal of others to wield it. It is meant for serving others like a pot, etc. But *vijñānamayakośa* is in the place of *kartā* (doer) and is therefore independent unlike the dependant mind. Thus it is proper to consider *vijñānamayakośa* as *ātmā*.

The *vijñānamayakośa* that is to be meditated as 'I' (*ātmā*) is being indicated.

अहं कर्तृत्यदो ज्ञानं विशिष्टं यस्य भासकम् ।
तत्कर्तृरूपं विज्ञानमात्मत्वेनावगम्यताम् ॥६५॥

'अहं कर्ता' - 'I am the doer' इति अदः

- this type of विशिष्टं - specific ज्ञानं - knowledge यस्य - is whose, (i.e. of *vijñānamayakośa*) भासकम् - the revealer, one who makes it known तत् (एव)- that itself कर्तृरूपं - in the form of 'doer' (*kartā*) विज्ञानम् - is *vijñānamayakośa* (तद् - that) आत्मत्वेन - as *ātmā* अवगम्यताम् - should be considered - (65)

65. The one who is revealed (made known) by the specific knowledge that 'I am the doer' is itself the *vijñānamayakośa* in the form of 'doer' (*kartā*). That should be considered as *ātmā*.

In the experience 'I am a doer', there is 'I' (*ātmā*) qualified by an action. That entity referred to as *ahamkāra* itself is called *vijñānamayakośa*.

Why *vijñānamayakośa* is called *ahamkāra* and what is its nature is being explained in the next two verses.

अहङ्क्रियत इत्येषोऽहङ्काराख्यः

स विग्रहे ।

आनखाग्रमभिव्याप्य स्थितो

जागरणे स्फुटः ॥६६॥

(जडः अपि देहः - the inert body also which is not 'I') (येन - by whom) अहं - 'I' क्रियते - is made, is objectified इति (हेतोः) - because of this (reason) एषः - this *vijñānamayakośa* अहङ्काराख्यः - is called *ahamkāra* (the notion of 'I' in the body)

सः - it विग्रहे - in the body आनखाग्रम् - up to the tip of the nail अभिव्याप्य - having pervaded स्थितः - remains जागरणे - during the waking स्फुटः- clearly perceived – (66)

66. This *viññānamayaakośa* (by whom the inert body also which is not 'I') is objectified as 'I' is called *ahaṃkāra* (the notion of 'I' in the body). It remains in the body having pervaded up to the tip of the nail and is clearly perceived during the waking state.

तेन चेतनवद् देहो भाति

सुप्तौ तु तल्लयात् ।

भवेत् काष्ठसमो देहस्तेनाहङ्कारे

आत्मता ॥६७॥

तेन - by that *viññānamaya* called *ahaṃkāra* देहः - the physical body चेतनवत् - sentient भाति - appears सुप्तौ तु - whereas in sleep तल्लयात् - because the *viññānamaya* merges in its cause देहः - the physical body काष्ठसमः - like the wood भवेत् - becomes (inert) तेन - therefore अहङ्कारे - in the *ahaṃkāra*, (i.e. in the *viññānamayaakośa*) आत्मता - 'I'ness (consideration as *ātmā*) (युक्ता - is proper)–(67)

67. The physical body appears sentient by *viññānamaya* called *ahaṃkāra* whereas in sleep because it merges in its cause the body becomes (inert) like the wood. Therefore in the

ahaṃkāra, (i.e. in the *viññānamayaakośa*) the 'I'ness (consideration as *ātmā*) is proper.

Ahaṃkāra is that entity which is experienced as 'I'. It also generates such experience in any other entity to which it gets connected. 'Ahaṃ' in Sanskrit means 'I', and the suffix 'kāra' at the end of the compound conveys the sense of 'maker' or 'doer'. Therefore *ahaṃkāra* is a befitting name for *viññānamayaakośa* who is characterized by the specific knowledge in the form of 'I am the doer' (vs.65). Based on the reasons seen so far, it is proper to take *viññānamayaakośa* called *ahaṃkāra* as '*ātmā*'.

The reason why the *manomayaakośa* is an instrument is given to ascertain finally that the *viññānamaya* is *ātmā*. Thereafter the *upāsana* of *viññānamaya* as *ātmā* with the help of bird-imagery will be introduced.

मदीयं मन इत्युक्तेरात्मनः करणं मनः ।

इत्यात्मानं विविच्याथ तमुपासीत पक्षिवत् ॥६८॥

मदीयं मनः - 'my mind' इति उक्तेः - by this statement मनः - the mind आत्मनः - of *ātmā* करणम् - an instrument इति - on the basis that आत्मानं विविच्य - having ascertained the *viññānamaya* as *ātmā* by distinguishing it from *manomaya* अथ - thereafter तम् - that *viññānamayaakośa* पक्षिवत् - like a bird उपासीत - *upāsana* should be done as 'I am that'–(68)

68. By the statement, 'my mind', it becomes clear that the mind is an instrument employed by *ātmā*. On the basis of that the *vijñānamayakośa* as *ātmā* has to be ascertained by distinguishing it from the *manomaya-kośa*. Thereafter the *vijñānamayakośa* should be meditated upon 'as I am that' considering it like a bird.

An instrument is at the disposal of the one who wields it. So the mind is an instrument of myself (*ātmā*). It cannot be the *ātmā* the one who uses it. Therefore the 'doer' (*kartā*) in the form of *vijñānamayakośa* is *ātmā* or who employs the instrument mind. Thus *vijñānamayakośa* should be understood as *ātmā* after distinguishing it from *manomaya*. Then the *upāsanā* as depicted in the bird-imagery should be done.

The *avayavas* (limbs) of विज्ञानमय are explained in the next two verses.

श्रद्धाद्याः पञ्च तत्रस्थाः

कल्प्याः मूर्धादिरूपतः ।

श्रद्धास्तिक्यमृतं बुद्धौ

यथावस्त्वनुचिन्तनम् ॥६९॥

तत्रस्थाः - there in the *vijñānamaya-kośa* श्रद्धाद्याः - *śraddhā*, etc. पञ्च - five in numbers मूर्धादिरूपतः - in the form of head, etc., (of bird-imagery) कल्प्याः - should be imagined श्रद्धा - the word *śraddhā*

means आस्तिक्यम् - the firm conviction that what is told in the scriptures is true ऋतम् - the word *ṛtam* means बुद्धौ - in the intellect यथावस्तु - rituals, duties, etc., as told in the scriptures अनुचिन्तनम् - ascertaining - (69)

69. There in the *vijñānamaya-kośa* the *śraddhā* (faith), etc., five in numbers, should be imagined in the form of head, etc., (of bird-imagery). The *śraddhā* is the firm conviction that what is told in the scriptures is true. The word *ṛtam* means the ascertainment of rituals and duties in accordance with the scriptures.

The different aspects of *pakṣi-kalpanā* (bird-imagery) in the case of *vijñānamayakośa* were seen in the introduction of the verse 64. The author explains the meaning of every limb of this *kośa*. The *śraddhā* is considered as the 'head' because it is the first one necessary before undertaking any endeavour. One has to get convinced about the genuine nature of what is to be done by a proper scrutiny of *śāstras*. It is an attitude of trust because the related means of knowledge is found to be authentic. It can be considered as indispensable as a seed-capital in a business enterprise. *Ṛtam* is determining the exactness of what is to be done, etc., as per the *śāstras* (scriptures).

यथार्थभाषणं सत्यं योग

एकाग्रता धियः ।

महस्तु योगजं ज्ञानं चिन्त्याः

श्रद्धादयोऽखिलाः ॥७०॥

यथार्थभाषणं - speaking the truth सत्यं
- inner is *satya* धियः - inner of the *buddhi*
एकाग्रता - single pointedness, composure
or *samādhi* योगः - is yoga महः तु -whereas
maha is योगजं - born of yoga ज्ञानं -
knowledge अखिलाः - all श्रद्धादयः -
śraddhā, etc. (पक्षिकल्पनया - in the form of
bird-imagery) चिन्त्याः - should be
considered—(70)

70. Speaking the truth is *satya*.
Single pointedness (composure or
samādhi) of *buddhi* is yoga. *Maha* is the
knowledge born of yoga. These *śraddhā*,
etc., all should be considered (in the
form of bird-imagery).

Bhāṣyakāra describes *satya* as
the *ṛtam* put in practice. *Bhāṣya* also
describes *maha* as the *mahat tattva* the
first born (*prathamaja*), *Hiraṇyagarbha*
the presiding deity of macrocosmic
subtle bodies.

The Upaniṣad further quotes a
mantra in support of what is said about
the *vijñānamayakośa*. It describes that
vijñānamayakośa with *śraddhā*, etc.,
produces both the Vedic and worldly
karmas. All the deities such as Indra,
etc., do the *upāsanā* of *vijñānamaya*

ātmā as the first born (*prathamaja*)
Hiraṇyagarbha (called *Brahmā*). Any
upāsaka who does such *upāsanā* no
more commits the mistake of identifying
with the earlier *kośas*. Thereby he
cleanses himself of all *pāpas* (sins) while
living itself and remains with
identification only in *vijñānamaya ātmā*.
The result of this *upāsanā* is that the
upāsaka after death goes to *Brahmaloka*
and enjoys all pleasures available there.
The topic of *vijñānamayakośa* is
concluded now by pointing out the result
of its *upāsanā* as mentioned in the
mantra.

लौकिके वैदिके कर्तृविज्ञानं

ब्रह्म वेत्ति चेत् ।

त्यजेदामरणं नो चेत् ब्रह्मलोके

सुखं व्रजेत् ॥७१॥

लौकिके वैदिके कर्तृ - the doer of
both worldly and the Vedic *karmas*
विज्ञानम् - *vijñānamaya ātmā* ब्रह्म - as
Brahmā (*saguna* one) वेत्ति चेत् - if one
does such *upāsanā* आमरणम् - until death
न उ त्यजेत् चेत् - is continued without
giving it up ब्रह्मलोके - in the *Brahmaloka*
सुखं व्रजेत् - gains happiness—(71)

71. The one who does the
continuous *upāsanā* until death of the
vijñānamaya ātmā the doer of both
worldly and the Vedic *karmas*, as
Brahmā (*saguna* one, *Hiraṇyagarbha*)
gains happiness in the *Brahmaloka*.

The *upādhi* by which *ātmā* appears to be the 'doer' (*kartā*) is called *vijñānamayakośa*. That is why the *vijñānamayakośa* is instrumental in doing the worldly and Vedic *karmas*. But due to error this 'doership' (*kartṛtva*) is superimposed on *ātmā*. Therefore it should be known that this 'doership' belongs to *vijñānamaya* and not to the *nirupādhika* (*upādhiless*) *ātmā*. The 'I'ness that is superimposed on *vijñānamayakośa* is only a step to remove the wrong notion that *ātmā* is *kartā* (doer). It is not meant to accept *ātmā* as really a *kartā*. The *mantra* quoted in the Upaniṣad says that the *upāsaka* enjoys all *kāmas* (sense-objects). This only means that he gets identified with *Hiranyagarbha*, the deity of macrocosmic *vijñānamayakośas*. Therefore all pleasures are as good as his.

The statement that the *upāsaka* gains happiness in the *Brahmaloka* implies that there is no perpetual happiness so long as one is identified with the individual *vijñānamayakośa*. Resorting to this fact the next advice is to give up the identification with *vijñānamayakośa* also once the 'I'ness (*ātmatva*) in *manomaya* has ended.

विज्ञानध्यानतो नश्येन्मनस्यात्मत्ववासना ।

विज्ञानात्मत्वमप्येष त्यजेच्छोकयुतत्वतः ॥७२॥

विज्ञानध्यानतः - by the *upāsana* of

vijñānamayakośa as *ātmā* मनसि आत्मत्ववासना - the *vāsanās* that the *manomaya* is *ātmā* नश्येत् - should necessarily end विज्ञानात्मत्वम् अपि - the notion that *vijñānamayakośa* is *ātmā* also शोकयुतत्वतः - because it is endowed with sorrows एषः - this (notion that *vijñānamaya* is *ātmā*) त्यजेत् - should be given up—(72)

72. By the *upāsana* of *vijñānamayakośa* as *ātmā* the *vāsanās* that the *manomaya* is *ātmā* should necessarily end. This notion of *vijñānamayakośa* as *ātmā* should be given up because it is endowed with sorrows.

Sorrows are bound to be there for a *kartā* (doer) who is subject to change and has to function in the limited *jagat*. Though it was told (vs.68) that *vijñānamaya kartā* as a wielder of mind is relatively independent in comparison with the mind which is its instrument (*karana*), he is dependant on many factors so as to function as *kartā*. Then how is it possible for *kartā* to be free from sorrow which is inevitable? Therefore sorrow-prone *vijñānamaya* cannot be *ātmā*.

शोकं तरत्यात्मबोधादिति श्रुत्यन्तरं जगौ ।

शोकसागरमग्नोऽयं कर्ता तस्यात्मता न हि ॥७३॥

आत्मबोधात् - by the knowledge of *ātmā* शोकं - sorrow तरति - one crosses

over इति - so श्रुत्यन्तरं - another Upaniṣad (Ch.U.7-1-3) जगौ - has said अयं - this कर्ता - doer, (i.e. *viññānamaya ātmā*) शोकसागरमग्नः - is drowned in the ocean of sorrows तस्य - its आत्मता - nature as *ātmā* unfolded in the Upaniṣads न हि - is not at all possible – (73)

73. The *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (Ch.U.7-1-3) declares that sorrow is crossed over by the knowledge of *ātmā*. This ‘doer’ (*kartā*), (i.e. *viññānamaya ātmā*) is drowned in the ocean of sorrows. He can never be the *ātmā* unfolded in the Upaniṣads.

The celebrated sage Nārada approaches the great master Sanatkumāra with a request to impart him the *ātmajñāna*. In an answer to the query by his *guru* he complains that he is in great sorrow in spite of himself being a very highly learned person. Further he says that he has also heard from great masters that *ātmajñānī* gets freed from sorrows totally (*tarati śokam ātmavit*). Therefore he be taught the same. Sanatkumāra points out that his learning was confined to the realm of *nāma*, (i.e. name and form) which is changing in nature and so false. Thereafter step by step Nārada was lead to the superior entities in succession with their *upāsanās* up to *sukha* (happiness). Having found Nārada eligible to gain *Brahmajñāna*, finally the *Bhūmā* the

limitless *sukha* (happiness) otherwise called Brahman was unfolded. This shows that *ātmā*/Brahman is limitless happiness without any trace of sorrow. Anything inferior to *Bhūma* (Brahman) called *alpam* (limited) is full of sorrows. It is a matter of universal experience that the ‘doer’ (*viññānamaya ātmā*) is always a victim of sorrows. Therefore the ‘doer’ or *viññānamayakośa* cannot be *ātmā*. In view of this Upaniṣad shifts the ‘I’ness (*ātmavā*) to *ānandamayakośa*.

APAVĀDA - ĀNANDAMAYAKOŚĀ

It is a fact that the *viññānamaya*, the *kartā* (doer) does *karmas* and *upāsanās* for procuring good results so that the *bhoktā* (enjoyer, experiencer) can be happy. Thus *viññānamaya ātmā* becomes subordinate to the main one called *bhoktā* in the form of *ānandamaya ātmā* who is the most proximate to *ātmā*. *Ānandamayakośa* is a *dhīvr̥tti* (*antaḥkaraṇavr̥tti*) that gets produced at the time of enjoying the results of good *karmas/upāsanās*, (i.e. *puṇya*). When the *bhoga* (experiences) of *karmaphalas* during the waking and dream are over it merges in its cause *ajñāna* in the form of sleep. The *ānanda* (happiness) nature of *ātmā* gets reflected in it. Though the *ānandamayakośa* is characterized by limbs (parts) such as *priya*, *moda* and *pramoda*, these themselves are of the nature of joy produced by *puṇya* of good *karmas* and

upāsanās. It is proper that such *ānandamayakośa* is *ātmā*. Now begins the description of *ānandamayakośa* presented by the *śruti* as interior to *vijñānamayakośa*.

आनन्दस्यात्मता युक्ता सोऽत्रास्ति प्रीतिदर्शनात् ।
सदा भूयासमेवेति नित्यं प्रेमात्मनीक्ष्यते ॥७४॥

आनन्दस्य - of the *ānandamaya-kośa* आत्मता - considering as *ātmā* युक्ता - is proper, stands to reason सः - that *ānanda* (happiness) अत्र अस्ति - is there in *ānandamayakośa* प्रीतिदर्शनात् - because natural love is seen for oneself सदा भूयासम् एव - 'may I exist forever without fail' इति - so आत्मनि प्रेम - the love for oneself नित्यं ईक्ष्यते - is always experienced—(74)

74. Considering the *ānandamaya-kośa* as *ātmā* stands to reason. *Ānanda* (happiness) is there in the *ānandamayakośa* because the natural love for oneself is seen. Love for oneself in the form of 'May I exist forever without fail' is always experienced (by all).

It is a matter of universal experience that love for oneself is very prominent in the case of all living beings without an exception. One may say that the love for others also is found. Yes, it is true. But that love is occasional and not perennial. This can be verified from the fact that all without exception want to

live forever without fail. Even a suicide has the concept that he will be free from his problems and be happy if he ends the body though it is not a solution at all. This fact is highlighted in Pañcadāsī (P.1-8): 'This *ātmā* is limitless happiness because (of being) the locus of limitless love. Surely in the wish "May I never cease to be, but may I exist forever without fail", the love for oneself is experienced. It is true that this norm is told in the context of *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda ātmā* free from all *upādhis*. But it equally applies to notional *ātmā* identified with *kośas*'.

But one may argue that the experiences such as 'I am sorrowful', 'I am distressed' show the sorrow, distress, etc., as the feature of *ātmā*. Actually sorrow, distress, etc., do not belong to *ātmā*. Their origin is told now.

आनन्दैकस्वभावोऽपि

कर्तृविज्ञानसङ्गमात् ।

निजानन्दं तिरस्कृत्य

कदाचिच्छोकमाप्नुयात् ॥७५॥

आनन्दैक स्वभावः अपि - though *ātmā* is of the nature that is nothing but happiness कर्तृविज्ञानसङ्गमात् - because of the identification with the *vijñānamaya-kośa* in the form of 'doer' निजानन्दम् - one's true nature that is happiness तिरस्कृत्य - having set aside कदाचित् - at times शोकम् - sorrow आप्नुयात् - gains—(75)

75. Though *ātmā* is of the nature that is nothing but happiness, gains sorrow at times having set aside its true nature that is happiness because of its identification with *vijñānamayakośa*.

In spite of the nature of *ātmā* being happiness it appears undergoing sorrows on account of its identification with *upādhis*. It is like a fragrant piece of sandalwood that stinks when in contact with water for a long time. The root cause of sorrow is *avidyā* - the ignorance of *ātmā*. *Bhāṣyakāra* points this out in his statement: ‘*tamaḥ iti śokādikāraṇam avidyā ucyate*’ (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-3-8*). The word *tamaḥ* means *avidyā* which is the cause of sorrows, etc. But the sorrow is experienced only when the *avidyā* modifies into its effects. Among these the first is *vijñānamayakośa* in the form of ‘doer’. At places the sorrow is attributed to the *manomayakośa*. But *manomaya* is invariably connected to *vijñānamaya*. It cannot be independent. Therefore there is no contradiction.

Sorrows belong to *buddhi* (*vijñānamaya*) is established by the method of *anvaya* (presence) and *vyatireka* (absence) of *buddhi*.

समाधि सुप्तिमूर्च्छासु

विज्ञानस्य लये सति ।

नित्यानन्दस्वरूपेऽस्मिन्

शोकोऽल्पोऽपि न वीक्ष्यते ॥७६॥

समाधि सुप्तिमूर्च्छासु - in the states of *samādhi*, deep sleep and swoon विज्ञानस्य लये सति - when the *vijñānamayakośa* has disappeared अस्मिन् - in this (*ātmā*) नित्यानन्दस्वरूपे - in the nature of eternal happiness अल्पः अपि - even a little of शोकः - sorrow न वीक्ष्यते - is not experienced – (76)

76. In the states of *samādhi*, deep sleep and swoon when the *vijñānamayakośa* has disappeared, even a little of sorrow is not experienced in this (*ātmā*) whose nature is eternal happiness.

The ‘doership’ or *vijñānamaya ātmā* is not experienced in the states of *samādhi*, deep sleep and swoon. In the *nirvikalpa samādhi* though *antaḥkaraṇa* is there in a subtle form, the ‘doership’ (*vijñānamaya*) is not there. In the deep sleep the *antaḥkaraṇa* merges in its cause the *ajñāna*. During the swoon also *vijñānamayakośa* is not functioning. In these three states where the *vijñānamayakośa* is absent, there is no experience of even the trace of sorrow. Sorrow is experienced in the states other than these three where *vijñānamayakośa* functions. Therefore the sorrow belongs to *vijñānamayakośa* the ‘doer’.

Now the question is how does the *vijñānamaya* remember the above three states and the presence of *ānanda*

(happiness) therein in spite of its absence? The rule is the experiencer alone can be the rememberer of what is experienced. On waking up the *viññānamaya* characterized by *ahaṃkāra* remembers the earlier experiences of sleep, etc. That means its presence has to be accepted earlier also. Otherwise the remembrance is not possible. In an answer to this it is now shown how the remembrance is possible in spite of the absence of *viññānamaya* in the above three states.

मूर्च्छासुप्त्योर्यदज्ञानं भाति

तत्कारणं धियः ।

कारणे बुद्धिवृत्तौ च

स्वानन्दः प्रतिबिम्बति ॥७७॥

मूर्च्छासुप्त्योः - during the swoon and deep sleep यद् - whatever अज्ञानं - ignorance भाति - is experienced तत् - that one (is) धियः - of *buddhi* (intellect) कारणं - cause कारणे - in the cause (of *buddhi*, viz. *ajñāna*) बुद्धिवृत्तौ च - and (thereby) in the *viññānamaya* having the form of a *buddhivṛtti* (which is merged now in its cause *ajñāna* during the deep sleep and swoon and is dormant therein) स्वानन्दः - happiness that is the true nature of oneself प्रतिबिम्बति - reflects (therefore it is possible for *buddhi* to remember the experiences of the deep sleep and swoon on waking up)–(77)

77. The ignorance that is experienced during the swoon and deep sleep is the cause of *buddhi* (intellect). The happiness that is the true nature of oneself reflects in the cause (of *buddhi*, viz. *ajñāna*) and (thereby) in the *viññānamaya* having the form of *buddhivṛtti* (which is merged and is in the dormant form now in its cause *ajñāna*).

It is a fact that an effect though not manifest is always present in its cause in an unmanifest condition. So is the *viññānamayakośa* having the form of *buddhivṛtti*, dormant in its cause the self-ignorance during the swoon and deep sleep. The reflection of *svānanda* in the cause ignorance amounts to its reflection in the *viññānamaya* dormant in it. Because of such presence of *viññānamaya* in deep sleep, etc., their remembrance on waking up is possible since the dormant one who had the reflection of *svānanda* in it is manifest now. During the deep sleep state, etc., the experience such as ‘I am experiencing such a condition’ is not possible because *viññānamaya* is not manifest though it is there in a dormant condition.

The verse considers only the swoon and deep sleep but not the *samādhi*. There is no occasion of either *ahaṃkāra* (*viññānamaya*) merging in the ignorance or *ajñāna* being experienced in the state of *viveka-prajñāsamādhi*. It

is a *sāttvika* state that can be gained only by conscious efforts. *Samādhi* is included in the waking state. Though the *antaḥkaraṇa* does not disappear in it, there is no 'doership' in *samādhi* as a result the function of *viññānamaya* ends. Even in the absence of 'doership' or *viññānamaya* there is awareness or sentience in *samādhi* unlike the lack of it in the deep sleep or swoon. The presence of certain subtle *sāttvika vṛttis* is accepted in *samādhi*. It enables remembrance of such experience once the person is out of it.

If self-luminous *ātmā* is happiness principle, why does it manifest only in deep sleep and not in waking? Vivaraṇācārya replies: The happiness characterized as the locus of limitless love does manifest in the waking. But it is obscure like the flickering flame of a lamp by powerful wind. It cannot illumine the objects around though the light is there. Similarly *ātmānanda* is not clearly experienced due to unsteadiness on account of the constant agitations (*vikṣepas*) of false worldly objects. It is more manifest during the deep sleep in the absence of such agitations. Thus though *ātmānanda* is present all along it gets concealed by the state of agitations born of mind getting involved in the *anātma-drśya jagat*. Therefore the cause of sorrows in the waking and dream is

agitations (*vikṣepas*) in the mind. This fact is shown now.

दुःखं राजसधीवृत्तौ सात्त्विक्यां तत्सुखं भवेत् ।
प्रियं मोदः प्रमोदश्चेत्युच्यते धीसुखं त्रिधा ॥७८॥

तत् - *ātmā* that is happiness
राजसधीवृत्तौ (प्रतिबिम्बितम्) - reflected in the
vṛtti of *buddhi* having *rajoguna* as its
nature दुःखं (भवति) - becomes sorrow
सात्त्विक्यां (धी वृत्तौ प्रतिबिम्बितं) - (the same
ātmā) (reflected in) *buddhi-vṛtti* having
sāttvika disposition सुखं भवेत् - reveals
happiness धीसुखम् - the happiness that is
reflected in *sāttvika buddhi-vṛtti* प्रियम् -
priya मोदः - *moda* प्रमोदः च - and *pramoda*
इति - thus त्रिधा उच्यते - is called three
ways—(78)

78. The *ātmā* that is happiness reflected in the *buddhi-vṛtti* having *rajoguna* as its nature becomes sorrow. (The same *ātmā*) reflected in the *sāttvika buddhi-vṛtti* reveals happiness. The happiness that is reflected in *sāttvika buddhi-vṛtti* is called in three ways as *priya, moda* and *pramoda*.

The desire (*kāma*) and anger (*krodha*) are born from *rajoguna* (B.G.3-37). The desire obstructed becomes anger and when fulfilled breeds greed (*lobha*). *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa describes the nature of *rajoguna* as *rāga* (*āsakti, preeti*, love for sense-object). It creates *tṛṣṇā* (hankering for things not gained)

and *āsaṅga* which binds the individual with the *viṣayas* (sense-objects) fulfilled. As a result of all these the *rajoguṇa* entangles the person in non-stop *karmas* for results here and hereafter (B.G. 14-7). In spite of doing all these the greed with never depleting desires goad the people in new ventures with continuous restlessness in the mind without any peace. Therefore the main result of *rajoguṇa* is nothing but sorrow.

No doubt, a *tāmasika* person should be whipped into activities through *rajoguṇa*, but finally it should get pacified into *sattvagūṇa* whereby the *buddhi-vṛtti* becomes capable of revealing happiness that is our true nature. The happiness manifest in *sāttvika buddhi* is presented in three modes depending on the intensity of happiness each reveals. These three with the common cause in them with their original source are described in the next verse which will be used as the five parts of the bird-imagery.

इष्टस्य दर्शनाल्लाभात् भोगाच्च स्युः प्रियादयः ।
ते त्रयः कारणानन्द आत्मानन्दश्च पञ्च ते ॥७९॥

ते - those त्रयः - three प्रियादयः - *priya, moda* and *pramoda* इष्टस्य - of the desired entity दर्शनात् - by seeing लाभात् - by gain भोगात् च - and by enjoying स्युः - are born ते - those three कारणानन्दः - (with) the common happiness manifest in them

called *kāraṇānanda* आत्मानन्दः च - and their original source *ātmā* which itself is happiness पञ्च- become totally five in numbers – (79)

79. Those three *priya, moda* and *pramoda* are born respectively from seeing the desired entity, its gain and enjoyment. The three of them with the common happiness manifest in all of them called *kāraṇānanda* and their original source *ātmā* which itself is happiness become totally five in numbers.

The joy that is born when the desired thing is seen is called *priya*. On gaining the desired thing for oneself, comparatively more joy is experienced than merely seeing it. That is *moda*. When the desired thing is actually enjoyed the much more intense happiness that is experienced is *pramoda*. All these three are essentially happiness in varying degree. The common happiness abiding in the *vṛttis* of *priya, moda* and *pramoda* is called *kāraṇānanda*. It is the *ānanda* (happiness) nature of *ātmā* reflected in *ajñāna* of *ātmā*, (i.e. self-ignorance). *Ātmānanda* is the very nature of *ātmā* totally free from the *vṛttis* such as *priya*, etc., and their cause the ignorance. These five are the parts (limbs) of the *ānandamayakośa* which will be employed in bird-imagery as specified

by the Upaniṣad.

The *pakṣi-kalpanā* (bird-imagery) is introduced in the next verse.

पक्षिणोऽवयवाः पञ्च मूर्धाद्यास्तेषु कल्पिताः ।
आनन्दमयकोशोऽयमुपास्यः पूर्वकोशवत् ॥८०॥

तेषु - in those (five parts of *ānandamayakośa*) पक्षिणः - of the bird (imagined as a *ānandamayakośa*) मूर्धाद्याः - head, etc. पञ्च - five अवयवाः - limbs कल्पिताः - are (to be) imagined अयं - this आनन्दमयकोशः - *ānandamayakośa* पूर्वकोशवत् - as told in the case of earlier sheaths उपास्यः - the *upāsanā* should be done—(80)

80. In those (five parts of *ānandamayakośa*), the five limbs of head, etc., of the (bird-imagery) are (to be) imagined. The *upāsanā* of *ānandamayakośa* should be done as guided in the case of earlier sheaths.

The five parts of *ānandamaya-ātmā* are the *ānanda* manifest in three *vṛttis* called *priya*, *moda* and *pramoda*, *kāraṇānda* and *ātmānanda*. The *priya* is to be considered as the head, *moda* as the right arm, *pramoda* as the left arm, *ānanda* (happiness called *kāraṇānda*) as the trunk and Brahman, the basis (*pratiṣṭhā*) of sense-pleasures, as the tail (*puccham*). Thus the *upāsaka* has to meditate on such *ānandamaya* as myself the *Brahma*. The *ātmānanda* (vs.79)

refers to Brahman. As the tail it signifies the *pratiṣṭha* (basis) in the sense of source in the form of limitless happiness (*Brahmānanda*) from which all sense-pleasures originate. The tail (*puccha*) in the case of other sheaths (*kośas*) was one of their parts. But it is not so in the case of *ānandamayakośa*. Here it is like a tail. It is said that monkeys, etc., sit on their tail. A tail can also mean an *adhikaraṇa* (substratum). *Bhāṣyakāra* says that the word tail in the statement ‘*Brahma puccham pratiṣṭha*’ means similar to a tail as basis. *Brahmānanda* is the only abode (*ekanīḍam*) or *parāyaṇam* (last resort) of all the worldly pleasures. ‘All living beings enjoy an insignificant particle of *Brahmānandā*’ (*Br.U.4-3-32*). The word Brahman used in the context of *ānandamayakośa*, is *saguṇa* (with attribute) Brahman because of its limbs *priya*, etc. Attributeless (*nirguṇa*) Brahman that is not an object of the mind and words will be told later (vs.140, *Tai.U.2-9*) (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-19*).

Brahman was described as concealed in the *guhā* (cave) of five sheaths. Beginning from *annamayakośa*, each of the subsequent one was said to be internal (*āntara*) to the former *kośa*. This was conveyed by the phrase ‘*tasmād vā etasmāt.... anyontara ātmā....*’ at the link of each next *kośa*. The word ‘internal’ is used in the sense of being subtler, relatively independent,

more pervasive than the earlier one. This fact of 'innerness' is explained now and the cause of each *kośa* is given.

अन्नप्राणमनोविज्ञानानन्दैर्जनिता इमे ।

कोशास्तेषु क्रमेण स्युरुत्तरोत्तरमान्तराः ॥८१॥

इमे - these (aforesaid) कोशाः - sheaths अन्नप्राणमनोविज्ञानानन्दैः - from the food, vital airs, the mind, intellect and the happiness जनिताः - are produced तेषु - among these five sheaths उत्तरोत्तरम् - the successive one क्रमेण - in order आन्तराः - internal ones स्युः - are—(81)

81. These aforesaid sheaths are produced from the food, vital airs, the mind, intellect and the happiness. The successive ones among these five sheaths in order are internal to the former ones.

The above fact shows that the *ānandamayakośa* directly covers Brahman. It is the last *guhā* (cave) most proximate to *satyam*, *jñānam*, *anantam Brahma* denying its true knowledge. Unlike the *upāsanās* of the earlier *kośas*, the Upaniṣad has neither advised any *upāsanā* of *ānandamayakośa* nor any result told. This shows that the *upāsanā* at the level of *ānandamayakośa* is not accepted primarily. The bird-imagery at this stage is for *viveka* (discrimination) to gain the direct knowledge. Yet, the author of this text and a few others have accepted the *upāsanā* of *ānandamaya*

considering its possibility, utility and the fruitfulness. As told earlier the Upaniṣad does not specify any result for this last *upāsanā*. But the author extracts the result from the *upāsanā* of *vijñānamayakośa*, by resorting to the rule of 'the lamp on the threshold' (*dehalī-dīpanyāya*). Such a lamp illumines both the inside and outside simultaneously. It is connected to both sides. Thus the result of *vijñānamayakośopāsanā* is made applicable to *ānandamaya* also.

विज्ञानकोशन्यायेन

फलमुन्नीयतामिह ।

तदुपास्तिफलं चार्थात्

तत्त्वबोधफलं भवेत् ॥८२॥

इह - here in the case of *ānandamayakośa* विज्ञानकोशन्यायेन - by an analogy to the *vijñānamayopāsanā* फलम् - the result of *upāsanā* उन्नीयताम् - be ascertained तत् - that one उपास्तिफलम् - is the result of *ānandamayakośopāsanā* अर्थात् च - also by implication तत्त्वबोधफलं भवेत् - (the main result of) *Brahmajñāna* is gained—(82)

82. The result of *ānandamayakośopāsanā* should be ascertained by an analogy to that of *vijñānamayopāsanā*. That is the result of *ānandamayakośopāsanā*. The (main result of) *Brahmajñāna* is also gained by implication.

An *upāsaka* who does the *upāsanā* of *viññānamayakośa* gets rid of all sins and gains all sense-pleasures in *Brahmaloka*. (vs.71, *Tai.U.2-5*). The *upāsaka* of *ānandamayakośa* also gets the same result because both these *upāsanās* are more or less analogous. This is secondary result. The author also says that by implication the primary result of *Brahmajñāna* (called *tattvabodha*) is gained. *Upāsanā* gives rise to *cittaśuddhi*. It enables to gain *Brahmajñāna*. This will be explained in the verses 84 and 85. Both these results are now being described in the next three verses.

आनन्दं ब्रह्म विज्ञाय

त्यजेदामरणं न चेत् ।

शरीरे पाप्मनो हित्वा सर्वान्

कामानवाप्नुयात् ॥८३॥

आनन्दं ब्रह्म - Brahman as happiness
विज्ञाय - having done the *upāsanā* of
आमरणम् - till death न चेत् त्यजेत् - if not
given up शरीरे - while living in the body
पाप्मनः - sins हित्वा - having given up सर्वान्
कामान् - all desires अवाप्नुयात् - the *upāsaka*
fulfills – (83)

83. Having done the *upāsanā* of Brahman as happiness until death, the *upāsaka* having become sinless while alive fulfills all his desires.

Here the word ‘*viññāya*’ contextually means ‘having done the

upāsanā’ and not ‘having gained the knowledge’. The *upāsanā* has to be continuous till death. What is meant by fulfilling all desires was elaborated while commenting on the verse 71. This is the secondary result of taking to *ānandamayakośopāsanā*. The main result is gaining the *aparokṣa Brahmajñāna* through *cittaśuddhi*. According to *bhāṣya* there is no *upāsanā* here and the result of gaining *Brahmajñāna* is through the *viveka* of *ānandamayakośa* only. The earlier *upāsanās* were that of the entire *kośas*. It is not so here. The author points out (vs.84) that the *upāsanā* in this case is of *Brahma* (*Hiraṇyagarbha*) only and not of *jīva* having the entire *kośa* when he specifically refers to the *upāsanā* of *Brahma* mentioned as the fifth limb (*puccham*, tail). In the case of earlier *kośas*, the entire *kośas* were taken as *jīva* whereas in the *ānandamayakośa* only the first four limbs together are taken as *jīva* whereas the word ‘*Brahma*’ mentioned as the fifth limb is retained separately for *upāsanā*.

आनन्दमयकोशेऽस्मिन्

पञ्चमावयवः श्रुतः ।

ब्रह्मशब्देन तद् ब्रह्म स्वात्मानन्द

इतीक्ष्यताम् ॥८४॥

अस्मिन् - in this (पक्षिरूपे)
आनन्दमयकोशे - *ānandamayakośa*
(presented as a bird-imagery) पञ्चमावयवः

- the fifth limb (called *puccham*) ब्रह्मशब्देन - by the word *Brahma* श्रुतः - is described by the Upaniṣad तद् ब्रह्म - that *Brahma* (*Hiraṇyagarbha*) स्वात्मानन्दः - (is) *ātmānanda* (happiness that is the true nature of oneself) इति ईक्ष्यताम् - thus the *upāsanā* be done – (84)

84. In this *ānandamayakośa* presented as a bird-imagery, the Upaniṣad describes the fifth limb (called *puccham*) by the word *Brahma*. *Upāsanā* of that *Brahma* (*Hiraṇyagarbha*) should be done as *ātmānanda*, the true nature of oneself.

The result of this *upāsanā* is gaining the *Brahmajñāna* through *cittaśuddhi* here in this life itself when done properly.

उपासनाच्चित्तशुद्धौ ब्रह्मतत्त्वमवेक्षते ।

गुहाहितब्रह्मबोधात् सर्वकामाप्तिरीरिता ॥८५॥

उपासनात् - by taking to the *upāsanā* (told in the earlier verse) चित्तशुद्धौ (सति) - when the purity of the

mind is gained (ब्रह्मविचारे प्रवर्तते - the *mumukṣu* engages oneself into the inquiry of Brahman). (विचारेण गुहाहितं - by inquiry into the nature of Brahman, the one who is concealed in the cave/*guhā*) ब्रह्मतत्त्वम् - the true nature of Brahman अवेक्षते - is known directly. गुहाहित ब्रह्मबोधात् - By gaining the *aparokṣajñāna* of Brahman concealed in the *guhā* (cave), सर्वकामाप्तिः - the fulfilment of all desires ईरिता - was told earlier (vs.23, *Tai.U. 2-1*) – (85)

85. By taking to the *upāsanā* (told in the earlier verse) when the purity of the mind is gained (the *mumukṣu* engages oneself into the inquiry of Brahman). Thereby the true nature of Brahman is known directly. By gaining the *aparokṣajñāna* of Brahman concealed in the *guhā* (cave), the fulfilment of all desires was told earlier (vs.23, *Tai.U. 2-1*).

Upāsanā is a *mānasa karma* (mental *karma*). It serves as a means to produce *cittaśuddhi* (purity of mind) besides *cittanaiścalya* (steadiness of mind). *Aśuddha citta* (impure mind) is the mind full of likes, dislikes, desires, anger, etc. It is incapable of evaluating the true worth of the world. It superimposes a silken veil of glamorous goodness on the objects, beings and events in the world as the only source of permanent joy. Such a mind always follows the beaten track of the majority without any investigation into its efficacy. It has no *śraddhā* in the *śāstras*. Even if a little of it is there, it lacks the stamina and courage to accept and follow the scriptural dictum. For example, *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa declares at the top of his voice that this world is

transient (*anityam*) and it lacks true happiness, (i.e. *asukham*) (*B.G.9-33*). The *Kaṭhopanīṣad* cautions that man cannot be satiated by wealth (*Kṛ.U.1-1-27*). How many among those who have some *śraddhā* in the scriptures or religious disposition or the acceptance of the Vedas are in a mood to listen to this advice leave alone verifying its truth and conduct accordingly. All this is the handiwork of impure mind which robs away the capacity to discriminate between the permanent and the transient or the passing bouts of joys and the lasting good.

Naiṣkarmyasiddhi succinctly describes the means of gaining *cittaśuddhi* with its role in a sequential crescendo wherein the succeeding effect is produced by the preceding cause. *Nityakarmānuṣṭhāna* (performance of daily and occasional scriptural *karmas*) produces *puṇya*. It destroys *pāpa* (sins). Thereby the *cittaśuddhi* is gained. It enables to gain the correct knowledge of *saṃsāra* in the right perspective. That leads to *vairāgya* (dispassion). The *vairāgya* gives rise to *mumukṣutvam* (intense yearning for liberation). As a result of *mumukṣā* the seeker searches for the means of *mokṣa*. Because of having intense *vairāgya*, he further gives up all *karmas* with their means to free himself from the entanglements of *karma* so as to make himself more available for the full time pursuit of further means. Thereafter *yogābhyāsa* in terms of *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* is taken to. This enables the mind to abide in *ātmā* effortlessly. Therein the clear and direct knowledge of *jīva-Brahma* identity revealed in the *mahāvākyās* such as ‘*tat tvamasi*’, etc., takes place. That destroys the *avidyā* (ignorance) of *ātmā*. As a result this *jñānī* is absorbed in *ātmasvarūpa* (‘I’ - one’s true nature). Thus ‘the *mumukṣu* gains Brahman being all along nothing but Brahman only’ (*Bṛ.U.4-4-6*) (*Nai.Si.1-51*). The very foundation of this entire pursuit is centred on the *cittaśuddhi* and the *vairāgya* that it produces. The degree of *cittaśuddhi* is measured by the intensity of *vairāgya*. The means of accomplishing *cittaśuddhi* is described there in *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* only. ‘The *citta* (mind) that is getting purified by the performance of daily and occasional *karmas* in dedication to *Īśvara* develops *vairāgya* for *Brahmaloka*, etc. Thereafter that mind becomes very pure (and cheerful) (*Nai.Si.1-47*).

Cittaśuddhi (also called *cittaprasāda*) is indispensable for the Vedānta *pramāṇa* to produce *Brahmajñāna*. It is defined as the purity of the *antaḥkaraṇa*, which can display Brahman in its true *nirupādhika* state as a faithful replica (*cittasya Brahmākāra-prathanānukūlā svacchatā*). The ‘*tat tvamasi*’ *mahāvākyā* will fail to function in the absence of direct experience of the *śodhita* (*nirupādhika*) *tvam pada* (‘I’) which needs *cittaśuddhi*.

In his teaching to *Bhagavān* Rāma, sage Vasiṣṭha emphasizes the indispensability of *citta-śuddhi*, for which the means such as *sādhana-catustaya* are imperative. The sage says – ‘Approaching a *guru* and exposing oneself to his teaching is only a formality in terms of observing the norms of the scriptures. The primary means of gaining *Brahmajñāna* is *prajñā* (*ātmākāra-vṛtti*) born in the pure *antaḥkaraṇa* (*śuddha citta*) of the disciple’ (*Yo. Vā. Ni. Pū.* 83-13). This shows that an unprepared mind cannot gain direct *Brahmajñāna* in spite of exposure to the Vedānta *pramāṇa* - *śravaṇa*. Let us bear in mind that the Vedānta *pramāṇa* fails to operate for sure unless the *mumukṣu* has the indispensable defect-free *sāmagrīs* such as a *śuddha citta* with *citta-naiścalya*, capable of bearing in itself the replica of *nirviśeṣa ātmā* as revealed by the *akhaṇḍākāra/ātmākāra vṛtti*. Otherwise it would be akin to seeing with defective eyes, giving rise to a vision that is distorted.

On gaining the *Brahmajñāna* all desires are as good as fulfilled. This was explained earlier in detail in the verses 23 to 29.

A DOUBT – DOES BRAHMAN EXIST OR NOT?

The topic of *pañcakośa-viveka* is over. The highest accomplishment can be gained by only *Brahmajñāna* which itself is the direct (*aparokṣa*) knowledge of *ātmā* (‘I’). Brahman is *satya*, *jñāna* and *ananta*. Its limitlessness (*anantatā*) was described by pointing it as cause of *jagat* beginning from all pervasive space (*ākāśa*). Brahman as knowledge principle (*jñāna*) should be clear from the fact that it is *guhāhita* (concealed in the caves of five *kośas*) as the self-evident ‘I’, the knowledge principle. Now its existence aspect is established. To begin with a doubt of a lay person based on the general observation in the

world is posed in the next two verses as a contrary view (*pūrva pakṣa*).

गुहाहितं ब्रह्म यत् तत् सत्यं

ज्ञानमिति श्रुतम् ।

तस्य ज्ञानस्य दृश्यास्ते कोशाः

सर्वं जगत् तथा ॥८६॥

यत् - whatever गुहाहितं - concealed in the cave of (five) sheaths ब्रह्म - Brahman तत् - that one सत्यं ज्ञानं - is *satya* and *jñāna* इति - thus श्रुतम् - is declared by the Upaniṣad ते कोशाः - those five sheaths तथा - and also सर्वं जगत् - the entire *jagat* तस्य ज्ञानस्य - of that *jñāna* principle (Brahman) दृश्याः - (are) perceptible objects – (86)

86. (Contrary view:) The Upaniṣad declares that the Brahman concealed in the cave of (five) sheaths is *satya* (changeless) and *jñāna* (knowledge principle). Those five

sheaths and also the entire *jagat* are perceptible objects of that *jñāna* (knowledge principle) (Brahman).

जगत् कोशाश्च दृश्यत्वात् सन्ति
ब्रह्म न दृश्यते ।

अतो नास्तीत्याह मूढस्तत्सत्तां
वक्ति बुद्धिमान् ॥८७॥

जगत् - the *jagat* कोशाश्च - and the five sheaths दृश्यत्वात् - because of being perceptible objects सन्ति - do exist ब्रह्म (तु) - (whereas) Brahman न दृश्यते - is not perceived अतः - therefore (ब्रह्म) न अस्ति - (Brahman) does not exist इति - thus मूढः - an ignorant person आह - says तत्सत्तां - the existence of that (Brahman) बुद्धिमान् - a *vivekī* (man of discrimination) वक्ति - says, affirms – (87)

87. The *jagat* and the five sheaths do exist because of being perceptible objects (whereas) Brahman is not perceived. Therefore it does not exist. Thus says an ignorant person. (Contrary view is over). A *vivekī* affirms the existence of Brahman.

In the world generally a perceptible thing is considered as the existent one whereas whatever that is perceptibly not available as non-existent in nature. The five sheaths and the *jagat* are perceived. Therefore they are taken as the existent ones. Brahman being the basic knowledge principle sentient in

nature that enables the perceiver to know, cannot be itself an object of perception which is invariably inert. Any *drśya* the perceived entity is inert and therefore subject to destruction. All entities such as the gross objects in the world, senses, the mind, the intellect and the ignorance are *drśyas*. They appear to exist but are really destructible. The ultimate knower (*drk*) principle Brahman alone can be ever-existent in nature. Yet the ignorant person gets carried away by the notion that perceptibly available entities only exist and therefore denies the existence of Brahman taking it to be *asat* (non-existent). A *vivekī* sensing the necessity of a knowledge principle (*drk*) to know the *drśya* affirms the existence of Brahman. Thus a doubt crops up whether Brahman exists or not.

The Upaniṣad answers that the person who says that Brahman does not exist is no better than a non-existent entity (*asan*) because he denies his own existence inadvertently (*Tai. U. 2-6*).

ब्रह्म नास्तीति चेद् वेद
स्वयमेव भवेदसन् ।
कोशात्मता दूषिता चेत् नान्य
आत्मास्ति तन्मते ॥८८॥

ब्रह्म - Brahman न अस्ति - does not exist इति - so वेद चेत् - if (one) considers (सः - he) स्वयमेव - himself only असन् -

non-existent भवेत् - becomes कोशात्मता - the nature of *kośas* (sheaths) as *ātmā* दूषिता चेत् - if refuted तन्मते - according to him अन्यः आत्मा - an *ātmā* distinct from the *kośas* न अस्ति - does not exist—(88)

88. If one considers that Brahman does not exist, he himself becomes non-existent. If the nature of *kośas* as *ātmā* is refuted, then according to him an *ātmā* distinct from the *kośas* does not exist (at all).

The contender accepts the *drśya kośas* alone as *ātmā* ('I'), but not the *dr̥ṣṭā* distinct from them. Therefore when the *kośas* are proved to be not *ātmā*, he has no *ātmā* of his own. No one including an atheist can say that the experience 'I am' is a delusion. It can get negated only by an equally evident experience as 'I am not'. Universally it is known that such an experience is never there. Even if accepted theoretically that 'I am not' is experienced, there still remains the 'I' who is aware of such a non-existence and who is verily evident as 'I am'. It may be true that the words such as '*ātmā*', *paramātmā*, Brahman might have created a confusion by not knowing what exactly they mean. In fact the truth is that all of them mean 'I' and 'I' alone. But our present concept of 'I' is incorrect in spite of knowing 'I am'. The mother *śruti* is all eager to set right this erroneous notion provided we make

ourselves available.

The first four *kośas* up to *vijñānamaya* as not *ātmā* was already negated by the Upaniṣad itself in its phrase '*tasmād vā etasmād.... anyontara ātmā....*' while introducing the next *kośa* as more appropriate *ātmā* compared to the previous one. The possibility of the remaining *ānandamayakośa* as *ātmā* will be refuted in the next verse.

आनन्दमयकोशेषु

प्रियाद्याः नश्वरास्त्रयः ।

अज्ञानं च ज्ञाननाशयं

न ब्रह्माङ्गीकरोत्यसौ ॥८९॥

आनन्दमयकोशेषु - in the *ānandamayakośa* अपि - also (ये पञ्चावयवाः तेषु - in its five parts) प्रियाद्याः - *priya*, etc. त्रयः - three नश्वराः - are destructible अज्ञानं - the ignorance (wherein *ānanda* is reflected, called *kāraṇānanda*) च - and ज्ञाननाशयं - is destructible by *ātmajñāna* असौ - this contender ब्रह्म - Brahman न अङ्गीकरोति - does not accept—(89)

89. Among the five limbs of *ānandamayakośa* the first three *priya*, *moda* and *pramoda* are destructible, (therefore they cannot be *ātmā*). The fourth part, *kāraṇānanda*, is characterized by ignorance which is destructible by *ātmajñāna* (thereby *kāraṇānanda* also cannot be *ātmā*.)

(*Dṛśya* ends here and now what remains is only Brahman.) But this contender does not accept Brahman. (As a result, he loses his existence also for want of any other sentient knowledge principle evident as 'I').

It is well-known that the entity called 'I' is experienced as a self-evident principle all along in the three states of consciousness. Even in the deep sleep it is verily there because of which the recollection (*pratyabhijñā*) of sleep experience is possible. When the different features that are experienced as the part and parcel of 'I' (*ātmā*) get discarded at one time or the other, what finally remains is the true nature of 'I' (*ātmā*). *Annamaya*, *prāṇamaya*, *manomaya* and *viññānamaya kośas* cannot be 'I' *ātmā* for the reasons given by the Upaniṣad itself. The *priya* (head), *moda* (right wing), *pramoda* (left wing) of *ānandamayakośa* are basic happiness (*ānanda*) principle reflected in these three *vṛttis*. Those *vṛttis* are born on account of individual's *puṇya*. They are transitory and therefore cannot be the ever-existing *ātmā*. The trunk in this case called '*ānanda ātmā*' by the Upaniṣad is the basic *ānanda* principle reflected in the *ajñāna* (self-ignorance), called *kāraṇānanda* by the author (vs.79). Therefore it cannot be ever-existent *ātmā*. What remains now is '*Brahma puccham pratiṣṭhā*'. Though to begin with this *Brahma* is

Hiranyagarbha, by *viveka* it signifies the basic happiness principle Brahman the existence of which is not accepted by the contender. Therefore he is denying his existence itself unknowingly because there is no other 'knower principle' in the entire *śṛṣṭi* other than *citsvarūpa* Brahman.

Or he cannot gain any worthy *puruṣārtha*. *Bhāṣyakāra* says: The entire path laid down by the Vedas in terms of systems such as *varṇa*, *āśrama*, etc., are direct or indirect means to gain *Brahmajñāna*. The person who denies the existence of Brahman has no *śraddhā* in the path recommended by the Vedas and so he is an atheist (*nāstikaḥ*). Therefore he is *asan* in the sense *asādhu* - not a good person. On the contrary the person who accepts the existence of Brahman has *śraddhā* in the Vedic path and follows it. He is *sat* in the sense he follows the right path. He is considered to be a good person (*Tai.U.Bh.2-6*). The author describes in the next verse the other type of person who accepts the existence of Brahman based on the *śruti* and reasoning. He also points out that the perceptibility (*dṛśyatva*) alone of an object is not the criterion for the existence of an entity.

अस्ति ब्रह्मेति चेद् वेद

स्वयमेवात्र सन् भवेत् ।

अदृश्यस्यापि सत्ता स्यात्

स्वप्रकाशत्वसम्भवात् ॥१०॥

अस्ति ब्रह्म - Brahman exists इति वेद चेत् - if one knows so स्वयम् एव - he himself अत्र - in this world सन् भवेत् - becomes an existent one or the follower of right, (i.e. Vedic) path of *adhyātma* अदृश्यस्य अपि - of an entity imperceptible as an object also सत्ता स्यात् - there can be existence स्वप्रकाशत्वसम्भवात् - because it having the self-evident nature is possible – (90)

90. If one knows in this world that Brahman exists, he himself becomes an existent one or the follower of right, (i.e. Vedic) path of *adhyātma*. The existence of an entity imperceptible as an object also is possible because it can be self-evident in nature.

The self-evident ‘I’ is universally experienced. No one including an atheist can deny this experience and the existence of ‘I’. Therefore only the perceptible objects (*drśyas*) exist is not a correct proposition. Thus the person who accepts the existence of Brahman follows the Vedic path and in due course can discover oneself to be Brahman itself.

THE SUMMARY OF PAÑCAKOŚA-VIVEKA

The author summarises the teaching of *pañcakośa-viveka* in the next three verses and thus concludes this topic.

गौणात्मा

पुत्रभार्यादिर्मिथ्यात्मान्नमयादिकः ।

ब्रह्मानन्दो मुख्य आत्मा

क्रमेणैते विवेचिताः ॥९१॥

पुत्रभार्यादिः - son, wife, etc. गौणात्मा - (are) secondary *ātmā* अन्नमयादिकः - beginning from *annamayakośa* up to *ānandamayakośa* मिथ्यात्मा - are false *ātmā* ब्रह्मानन्दः मुख्यः आत्मा - Brahman having the nature of happiness (that was described as the basis [*puccham*] of *ānandamayakośa*) is the main *ātmā* एते - these क्रमेण - one after the other विवेचिताः - were ascertained – (91)

91. The following topics were ascertained one after the other. (i) The son, wife, etc., are the secondary *ātmā*. (ii) The *kośas* beginning from *annamaya* to *ānandamaya* are false *ātmā*, (iii) The Brahman having the nature of happiness (that was described as the basis [*puccham*] of *ānandamayakośa*) is the main *ātmā*.

The topic of *gauṇa* (secondary), *mithyā* (false) and *mukhya* (main) *ātmā* was elaborated earlier in the context of verse 43.

How Brahman (referred to as *Brahmānanda*) is the *mukhya ātmā* (main *ātmā*) is being derived from the *pañcakośa-viveka*. The Upaniṣad has repeatedly used the following phrases

while introducing the next *kośa* as *ātmā* by refuting the previous *kośa* as not *ātmā*: ‘*Tasmāt vā etasmāt anyontara ātmā tena eṣa pūrṇaḥ, tasya eṣa eva śārīra ātmā yaḥ pūrvasya*’ (Than the previous *kośa* considered as *ātmā*, the next internal one as *ātmā* is more appropriate. By the latter *ātmā* the previous *kośa* is filled up. The previous *kośa* becomes the body in which the latter *kośa* abides as *ātmā*). Based on this fact enunciated by the *śruti*, it is being proved now that Brahman is the final irrefutable *ātmā* of all the five *kośas*.

उत्तरात्मविवेकेऽस्य पूर्वात्मा देहतां व्रजेत् ।
तेनोत्तरेण पूर्वस्य पूर्णत्वाद् देहिदेहता ॥९२॥

उत्तरात्मविवेके - when the next (internal) *kośa* is ascertained as *ātmā* अस्य - its पूर्वात्मा - earlier (external) *kośa* considered hitherto as *ātmā* देहतां व्रजेत् - becomes the body (of the next *ātmā*) तेन उत्तरेण - by that subsequent (internal) *ātmā* पूर्वस्य पूर्णत्वात् - because the earlier (external) *kośa* is filled up देहिदेहता - (there is a relation of) the indweller *ātmā* and (its) body (between the next internal *ātmā* and its immediate preceding external *kośa*) – (92)

92. When the next (internal) *kośa* is ascertained as *ātmā*, its earlier (external) *kośa* considered hitherto as *ātmā* becomes the body (of the next *ātmā*). Because the earlier (external)

kośa is filled up by that subsequent (internal) *ātmā* (there is a relation of) the indweller *ātmā* and (its) body (between the next internal *ātmā* and its immediate preceding external *kośa*).

Deha means the body. It is subordinate and meant for the utility of *dehī*, its indweller, who is the main one. Because the subsequent *ātmā* totally fills up the earlier *kośa* as its indweller at every link of the latter internal *ātmā*, there is such a relation of body and its indweller between them. Based on this fact, Brahman as the main *ātmā* abiding in all the five *kośas* put together as one embodiment is now derived.

सत्येवं निखिलं पूर्वं शरीरं ह्यन्तिमात्मनः ।
ब्रह्मानन्दस्तु शरीरः पूर्वस्यात्मेति निर्णयः ॥९३॥

एवम् सति - this being so, therefore अन्तिमात्मनः - of the final *ātmā* हि - indeed निखिलं पूर्वं - all the previous five sheaths शरीरं - (become) the body तु - whereas ब्रह्मानन्दः - Brahman having the nature of happiness पूर्वस्य - of all the earlier (*kośas*) शरीरः आत्मा - (is the) indweller इति - so निर्णयः - is the ascertainment – (93)

93. Therefore all the previous five sheaths indeed become the body of the final *ātmā* whereas Brahman having the nature of happiness is the indweller (*śārīraḥ*) of all the earlier (*kośas*). Thus is the ascertainment.

Literally the final *ātmā* (*antim-ātmā*) referred to in the first line of this verse means the *ānandamaya ātmā* because of being the last in the series of five notional *ātmā*. Yet, taking into account the context, the *priya*, etc., the four limbs of *ānandamaya ātmā* get reduced to *anātmā* because they are destructible. Therefore the remaining limb ‘*Brahma puccham pratiṣṭhā*’ reminds us the Brahman as final *ātmā* (*antimātmā*) with which this Upaniṣad began its teaching. In the *upakrama* (beginning) we get ‘*Brahmvidāpnoti param*’ (*Brahmajñānī* gains the limitless Brahman) and that Brahman is *satyam*, *jñānam*, *anantam* (vs.5, 7). Thus Brahman which is *ānandasvarūpa* is the *mukhya* (main) *ātmā*. Because an *ātmā* internal to the *ānandamaya* one is not told explicitly, some commentators take *ānandamaya ātmā* as the final one. This is incorrect. *Bhāṣya* has proved it. Therefore the word *nirṇaya* (ascertainment) suggests that this topic is discussed in detail in *bhāṣya*, and *Taittirīya Vārtika*, etc., before arriving at the final decision.

MANANA (REFLECTION)

Even after exposing to the teaching of the Upaniṣad, there can be doubts in the mind of the *mumukṣu* which hinder the gaining

of *Brahmajñāna*. Therefore the Upaniṣad itself introduces the questions of disciples by the phrase ‘*athātonupraśnāḥ*’ (after listening to the teaching [*atha*], because one and the same Brahman is the *ātmā* of one and all and therefore [*ataḥ*] here are the questions related to the teaching) (*Tai.U.2-6*). To deliberate doubts and resolve them is a process called *manana* (reflection) in Vedānta. It presupposes that self-inquiry or *śravaṇa* in terms of teaching is already over. The author explains what is *śravaṇa* and *manana*.

श्रवणं मननं चोभे तत्त्वज्ञानस्य साधने ।
उक्तनिर्णयपर्यन्तं विज्ञानं श्रवणाद् भवेत् ॥९४॥

श्रवणं मननं च - *śravaṇa* (self-inquiry) and *manana* (reflection) उभे - both तत्त्वज्ञानस्य - of *Brahmajñāna* साधने - are the means उक्तनिर्णयपर्यन्तं विज्ञानं - the knowledge up to the ascertainment told (in the earlier verse second line, viz. *Brahmānanda* is *ātmā* in all *kośas*) श्रवणात् - by *śravaṇa* भवेत् - takes place - (94)

94. Both the *śravaṇa* and *manana* (reflection) are the means of *Brahmajñāna*. The knowledge up to the ascertainment told (in the earlier verse second line, viz. ‘*Brahmānanda* is *ātmā* in all *kośas*’) takes place by *śravaṇa*.

What is the necessity of *manana*?

Here is the answer.

अथ स्वबुद्धिदोषेण यतः

सन्देहसम्भवः ।

अतोऽसौ मननं कुर्यात्

सन्देहाः स्युस्त्रयोऽस्य हि ॥१५॥

अथ - thereafter (after the *śravaṇa*) यतः - because स्वबुद्धिदोषेण - by defects in one's intellect सन्देहसम्भवः - doubts (regarding the teaching) are possible अतः - therefore असौ - that listener (*śrotā*) मननं कुर्यात् - should take to reflection हि - because अस्य - with respect to Brahman त्रयः - three सन्देहाः - doubts स्युः - are there –(95)

95. Because of defects in one's intellect, after *śravaṇa* doubts are possible (regarding the teaching). Therefore the listener (*śrotā*) should take to reflection because three doubts are there with respect to Brahman (which are dispelled by the *śruti* hereafter).

The teaching of the Vedas cannot be defective because they are authored by the omniscient and omnipotent *Īśvara*. Its misunderstanding is possible because of the shortcomings in our intellect. The true nature of Brahman which is *atīndriya* (beyond the realm of the senses and the mind to know it as an object) can be known only through the Vedas. To know what is told in the Vedas according to the criteria laid down to

unravel it is *śravaṇa*. Though told by the Vedas our understanding may not be clear or may be full of doubts. What we experience about ourselves and what the Vedas declare about us seems to be contradictory. To resolve such doubts and have clarity in understanding is *manana*. The mind needs to be prepared to grasp the contents of the Vedas. If not, it is the fault of the individual (*puruṣāparādha*). The Vedas cannot be blamed for our lapses. The *śravaṇa* is one and the same because the Veda *pramāṇa* is the same. But our doubts can differ from individual to individual. Therefore *manana* varies. The Vedāntic masters put together the reasonings useful to varieties of *mumuṣus*. Some may find many of them to be redundant. But there are people to whom they are useful by which they get answers to their doubts. These doubts cannot be resolved by seekers themselves. That is why from the second chapter of *Brahmasūtras* onward there are many texts composed which help the seekers to dispel their doubts. Some people say, 'You say what Vedānta has to say. Why do you point out the mistakes of other schools of thought?' The answer is obvious. There are many who in their inability to decide what is right and what is wrong, get astrayed from the correct path by mistaking the wrong as the right. Such wrong things are not brought to one's

notice out of hatred. The *guru* is responsible for correct *śravaṇa* whereas the responsibility of *manana* is on the shoulders of disciples though the *guru* certainly helps.

At places the Upaniṣads themselves present the teaching which includes reasoning. For example, here in this Upaniṣad by introducing questions and answering them, the *manana* is being demonstrated. We find two doubts expressly presented but while answering, an earlier doubt already answered is taken into account by answering it from a different standpoint. Thus in all they become three doubts.

ब्रह्मास्ति नो वेत्येकः स्यादज्ञानी मुच्यते न वा ।
तत्त्वविन्मुच्यते नो वेत्यपरौ संशयावुभौ ॥९६॥

ब्रह्म अस्ति - (whether) Brahman exists न उ वा - or not at all इति - thus एकः (सन्देहः) स्यात् - is one doubt अज्ञानी - the person ignorant of Brahman मुच्यते - does he get liberated न वा - or not तत्त्ववित् - *Brahmajñānī* मुच्यते - does he get liberated न उ वा - or not इति उभौ - these two अपरौ संशयौ - are the other doubts - (96)

96. Whether Brahman exists or not at all is one doubt. Does the person ignorant of Brahman get liberated or not? Whether a *Brahmajñānī* gets liberated or not? These are the other two doubts - (96)

The question about the existence of Brahman is very important because the pursuit of gaining *Brahmajñāna* will be taken only when a person is convinced about its existence. Earlier the first question was based on the argument that Brahman is not a *dr̥śya* (perceptible object) and therefore it does not exist (vs.87). But now the same doubt is based on the argument that an entity having name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*) exists, but not the one without them. In this new context the doubt is answered in the verses 98 to 124. The other two doubts are based on the fact that the *ātma* of both *Brahmajñānī* or an ignorant person is one and the same *ānandarūpa* Brahman (vs.93). Therefore either both *jñānī* and *ajñānī* should be liberated or bound alike. There is no reason why one of them can get liberated and not the other one. These two doubts are reiterated in the verse 126 and then answered in verses 127 to 130.

The mode of thinking which concludes the non-existence of Brahman is described now.

यदस्ति नामरूपाभ्यां व्याप्तं तद् वियदादिकम् ।
ब्रह्म निर्नामरूपत्वान्नास्तीत्याह विमूढधीः ॥९७॥

यत् - whatever (entity) वियदादिकम् - (such as) the space, etc. नामरूपाभ्याम् - by the name and form व्याप्तम् - is invariably accompanied तत् - that one अस्ति - exists

ब्रह्म - Brahman निर्नामरूपत्वात् - because it is nameless and formless न अस्ति - does not exist इति - so विमूढधीः - an *avivekī* totally engrossed in the world आह - says, doubts – (97)

97. An existent entity (such as) space, etc., is invariably accompanied by the name and form. Brahman does not exist because it is nameless and formless. So doubts an *avivekī* totally engrossed in the world.

Nāma (name) and *rūpa* (form) are the words often found in the Vedāntic literature. Here the word ‘*rūpa*’ (form) is not confined only to the shape seen by the eyes. In the practical (*vyāvahārika*) world the word ‘name’ (*nāma*) means the word by which an individual, person, animal, place or thing is known, spoken of, etc. Or it can be described as any nounal word or phrase which indicates a particular person, place, class or thing. The word ‘form’ can mean shape, outward aspects, a person or animal, etc., as visible or tangible, the mode in which a thing exists or manifests itself. According to Vedānta the distinct features of an entity which distinguishes it from the others is its *rūpa* (form) and not necessarily the visible shape. ‘Whatever that is cognized by the *buddhi* (intellect) in terms of sound, touch, taste, smell, etc., is considered as the *rūpa*’ (*Br.U.Vā.1-6-19*). ‘That which is

revealed (made known) is the *rūpa* whereas the one that reveals is the *nāma*’ (*Br.U.Vā.1-5-141*). ‘If a *nāma* is being made known, it becomes *rūpa*. Similarly if a *rūpa* does the function of revealing, it falls in the category of *nāma*’ (*Br.U.Vā.1-5-142*).

The entire *drśya jagat* can be reduced to *nāma* and *rūpa*. That is why the contender (called *vimūḍhadhīḥ*) thinks that *nāma* and *rūpa* which operate in the field of attributes are the *sine qua non* of the existence of an entity. Brahman is free from *jagat*. It is nameless and attributeless. Therefore the *avivekī* contender concludes that Brahman does not exist.

MANANA (REFLECTION) – BRAHMAN DOES EXIST

The question whether Brahman exists or not is answered in the verses from 98 to 124. First the topic is introduced.

विवेकी ब्रह्मणः सत्तां सृष्टिकामादिहेतुभिः ।
साधयन् बहुधा मूढं बोधयेन्मोहनुत्तये ॥९८॥

विवेकी - a person of discrimination
सृष्टिकामादिहेतुभिः - because of the reasons such as the act of Creation, entertaining the desire to Create, etc. ब्रह्मणः - of Brahman सत्तां - existence साधयन् - establishing मोहनुत्तये - for removing the ignorance मूढं - the *avivekī* बहुधा - in

manifold ways बोधयेत् - should teach
–(98)

98. A *vivekī* establishing the existence of Brahman on the basis such as the act of Creation, entertaining the desire to Create, etc., should teach the *avivekī* in manifold ways for removing his ignorance.

The Upaniṣad gives many reasons to prove the existence of Brahman. It says: Brahman (as *Īśvara*) (i) creates the *jagat*, (ii) desires to become itself *jagat*, (iii) deliberates on what is to be created, (iv) enters the individual bodies as *jīva*, (v) takes the form of *bhogyā* (objects of enjoyment and suffering). Besides these the (vi) word '*sukṛta*' proves the existence of Brahman as the best Creator. (vii) It also exists because of being the source of happiness of *jñānīs*. Further the existence of Brahman can be proved because (viii) it is the principle on account of which the body, senses, the mind, etc., function and also (ix) it happens to be the cause of sense-pleasures. All these reasons are meant by the phrase '*sṛṣṭikāmādihetubhiḥ*' and are going to be discussed by the author one by one. Therefore the existence of Brahman does not depend on *nāma* and *rūpa*.

To prove the existence of Brahman, the Upaniṣad says: *Saḥ* (that

ātmā/Brahman from whom *ākāśa*, etc., were born) *akāmayata* (desired) *bahu syām* (let me become many) *prajāyeya* (I should be born) (*Tai.U.2-6*). Such a desire on the part of Brahman is being explained. This is being explained in the next four verses.

अकामयत सृष्ट्यादौ परमात्मा स्वमायया ।
बहु स्यामहमेवातः प्रजायेयेति कामना ॥९९॥

परमात्मा - *Paramātmā* (Brahman)
सृष्ट्यादौ - at the beginning of the act of Creation
स्वमायया - by its own *māyā* अहम्
एव - I myself बहु स्याम् - should become many (इति- so) अकामयत - desired अतः - therefore प्रजायेय - I should be born इति - such कामना - is the desire that was entertained –(99)

99. *Paramātmā* at the beginning of the act of Creation desired by its own *māyā* as, 'I myself should become many, therefore I should be born' (*Tai.U. 2-6*). Such is the desire that was entertained.

There is a perfect orderliness in Creation. It cannot be an accidental outcome from some inert entity on its own. Therefore a sentient entity having an inconceivable power of creation (*acintya-racanāśakti*) must necessarily be its Creator. For example, there is a big very old palace. Whether we know it or not, there is a person who built it. If an inscription about it is available, more authentic details can be procured.

Similarly an orderly Creation has its Creator is an inference. But it is corroborated by the *śruti-pramāṇa* such as the one found here in this Upaniṣad.

There is a similar phrase to ‘*saḥ akāmayata*’, etc., in *Chāndogya* Upaniṣad. It reads: ‘*tat (sat Brahman) aikṣata, bahu syām prajāyeya*’ (That *satsvarūpa* Brahman considered, let me be many, I should be born) (*Ch.U.6-2-3*). The desiring or consideration are the acts of *antaḥkaraṇa* or *buddhi*. But Brahman has neither gross nor subtle *upādhis*, the products of *pañcamahābhūtas* which are yet to be born. Brahman is *apāṇipādaḥ* (without hands and legs, etc.) (*Śv.U.1-3-19*). It is ‘*Sarvendriya-vivarjitam*’ (without all senses) (*B.G.13-14*). Then, ‘how can the Brahman ever desire or consider to create?’ There is nothing wrong here. This desiring or considering is not a *buddhi-vṛtti* like ours. But it is the first *māyā-vṛtti* or change in *māyā* imbued with *cidābhāsa* which is on the verge of Creation. The Vedāntic masters call it as ‘desired’ (*akāmayata*) or ‘considered’ (*aikṣata*) (*Saṅ.Śā.3-251, 252*). In the Upaniṣadic phrase ‘*saḥ akāmayata*’, the pronoun ‘*saḥ*’ (he), masculine in gender, refers to *ātmā* from the phrase ‘*ātmanaḥākāśaḥ saṃbhutaḥ*’ (from *ātmā* the space was born) (*Tai.U.2-1*) though at present Brahman that is neuter in gender is under active consideration. This is only to reveal the

identity of *jīvātṃ* and Brahman.

Every creation has two essential factors. One is the material cause (*upādāna kāraṇa*) which takes the shape of the thing produced. The other one is the intelligent sentient entity called efficient cause (*nimitta kāraṇa*). Brahman being non-dual, it Creating the *jagat* out of a material other than itself is not possible, for such a thing is not possible. What are they in this case is implied in the ‘*sokāmayata*’ *śruti*. The same is being explained.

स्वस्यैव बहुभावोक्तेरुपादानं

मृदादिवत् ।

तथा कामयितृत्वेन

निमित्तत्वं कुलालवत् ॥१००॥

स्वस्य एव - of oneself only
 बहुभावोक्तेः - because of the statement of becoming many entities उपादानं - (Brahman becomes) the material cause (of Creation) मृदादिवत् - like mud, etc., becoming the material cause of pot, etc.
 तथा - so also कामयितृत्वेन - because of mention of Brahman as the one who desires to Create निमित्तत्वं - (it) becomes the efficient cause कुलालवत् - like a pot-maker - (100)

100. Because of the statement of becoming oneself only to be many entities, (Brahman becomes) the material cause (of Creation) like the

mud, etc., (becoming the material cause of pot, etc.). So also because Brahman desires to Create, (it) becomes the efficient cause like a pot-maker.

There is another reading of 'bahudhā cokteḥ' (because of the statement of becoming diverse) in the place of 'bahubhāvokteḥ'. Both speak of one and the same Brahman desiring to become the manifold Creation. An inert entity cannot desire. Therefore the inert *pradhāna* of *Sāṅkhya* cannot be the cause of Creation. Further the Creation was projected by Brahman from itself. Therefore *cidrūpa* Brahman only is both the material and efficient cause (*abhinna nimittopādāna kāraṇa*). The example of one and the same mud, gold, etc., becoming various pots, ornaments, etc., shows that the Brahman is the material cause for the variegated world. A pot-maker, a sentient entity, produces the pots from the mud different from oneself. But Brahman, sentience in nature, produces the world out of itself like a spider weaving a web out of itself (*Mu.U.1-1-7*) or we projecting the dreams from ourselves.

A pot maker or a spider being limited and changing (*vikārī*) in nature with limbs, can create something from different material or from oneself. But the status of being a cause is an attribute that an entity can have. Brahman is attributeless (*nirviśeṣa*), *niravayava*

(limbless) and *avikārī* (changeless). Therefore how can attributeless Brahman be both *nimitta* and *upādāna* cause of Creation? The answer follows.

निर्धर्मकेऽप्यात्मतत्त्वे निमित्तत्वं स्वमायया ।
उपादानत्वसहितं माया दुर्घटकारिणी ॥१०१॥

निर्धर्मके - in the attributeless अपि - also आत्मतत्त्वे - in the true nature of *ātmā* उपादानत्वसहितं - along with the nature of material cause निमित्तत्वं - that of efficient cause स्वमायया - by its *māyā* (घटते - is possible) माया - *māyā* दुर्घटकारिणी - does which is next to impossible – (101)

101. In the attributeless nature of *ātmā* also, by its *māyā*, having the nature of efficient cause along with that of material cause is possible. *Māyā* does that which is next to impossible.

Māyā is the ignorance of Brahman - the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of everything. If the rope is not known, entities such as snake, garland, stick, crack in the earth, etc., are seen therein. Only the ignorance of the rope is capable of showing all these. *Māyā* does just that which is impossible whatever that can never be, is made to appear as if it is truly there. Brahman is attributeless (*nirdharmaka*, *nirviśeṣa*) in reality but *māyā* presents it as *nimitta* and *upādāna kāraṇa*. Actually when Brahman can never be a cause, where is the question of its being *nimitta* and *upādāna* causes?

That is why it is said that *māyā* does which is next to impossible. There is nothing impossible for *māyā* to accomplish is further explained.

असम्भाव्यं न मायायामुपालम्भं न सार्हति ।
ततो वेदो यथा ब्रूते सृष्टिरेषा तथेष्यताम् ॥१०२॥

मायायां - in the *māyā* असम्भाव्यं - (what is called) impossible न - is not there सा - that *māyā* उपालम्भं - censure न अर्हति - does not deserve ततः - therefore वेदः - the Vedas यथा ब्रूते - the manner in which it describes (such as Brahman is both efficient and material cause) तथा - accordingly एषा - this सृष्टिः - Creation इष्यताम् - be accepted—(102)

102. What is called impossible is not there at all in *māyā*. It does not deserve the censure. Therefore this Creation be accepted as described by the Vedas (with all the details such as Brahman is both efficient and material cause, etc.).

Māyā is a postulate only to explain the impossible phenomenon of *sr̥ṣṭi* (Creation) from Brahman. In *Brahmasākṣātkāra māyā* gets sublated (*bādhita*) only to discover that it did not exist in three periods of time. So *māyā* has to be accepted so long as it is useful in the pursuit of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. It does not deserve further attention. In fact the Vedas are not interested in the *sr̥ṣṭi-prakriyās* (the modes of Creation). Yet,

they are described because they are useful in the pursuit of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. Gauḍapādācārya says: *Saḥ* (that mode of Creation) is a means (*upāyaḥ*) to gain (*avatārāya*) the knowledge of identity between *jīva* and Brahman (*Brahmātmaikya-buddhi*) (*Mā.U.Kā.* 3-15). The final purport of the Vedas is to liberate us from *saṃsāra*. The modes of *sr̥ṣṭis* are useful from the standpoint of accomplishing the final goal of life. *Mumukṣus* should accept them as told by the Vedas and proceed on those guidelines.

The topic of Brahman entertaining a desire as a proof for its existence is over. The next portion of the Upaniṣad says: *Saḥ* (*Parameśvara*/ Brahman) *tapaḥ tapyata* (deliberated on what is to be Created), *saḥ tapaḥ taptvā* (having deliberated) *idam sarvam asṛjata* (Created all this), *yadidam kiñca* (whatever that is here), *tatsṛṣṭva* (having created it), *tad eva anuprāviśat* (it entered the same Creation) (*Tai.U.2-6*). This phrase gives three more reasons of ‘deliberation’, ‘actual Creation’ and ‘entry into it’ on the part of Brahman that exists. This portion of the *śruti* is summarized in the next verse.

सृज्यमालोचयन् सर्वमसृजत् परमेश्वरः ।
सृष्ट्वाथ जीवरूपेण प्रविवेश वपुष्ययम् ॥१०३॥

परमेश्वरः - *Parameśvara* सृज्यम् - whatever that is fit to be created

आलोचयन् - deliberating सर्वम् - everything
 असृजत् - created सृष्ट्वा - having created
 अथ - thereafter जीवरूपेण - in the form of
jīva अयम् - this (*Parameśvara*) वपुषि - in
 the body प्रविवेश - entered – (103)

103. *Parameśvara* created everything having deliberated upon whatever that is fit to be created. After the Creation He entered the bodies in the form of *jīvas*.

Before creating something the person who creates does deliberate on how, what, etc., of the thing to be created. Similarly *Parameśvara* also deliberated. The word used in the verse is *ālocana* which corresponds to the word *tapah* of the Upaniṣad. *Tapah* also means the knowledge characterized by omniscience as found in the *bhāṣya* of ‘*yasya jñānamayam tapah*’ (*Mu.U.1-1-9*). The knowledge involved here is that of the earlier *śṛṣṭi*. There is no occasion of omnipresent *Parameśvara*/Brahman entering somewhere. Therefore entry of *Parameśvara* in the body is availability of *cidābhāsa* in the *antaḥkaraṇa*. This was seen in the earlier Chapter (1-12). That *cidābhāsa* enables the sustenance of vital airs (*prāṇadhāraṇa*) in the body as a result of which, *Parameśvara* for all practical purposes appears as a *saṃsārī jīva*. Thus the nature of *jīva* is described now.

यो विज्ञानमयस्तस्मिन्
 चैतन्यं प्रतिबिम्बितम् ।
 तच्च धारयति प्राणान्
 जीवाख्यां लभते ततः ॥१०४॥

यः - the one who विज्ञानमयः - is
viññānamayakośa, (i.e. *ahaṃkāra* or
antaḥkaraṇa) तस्मिन् - in that चैतन्यम् -
caitanya प्रतिबिम्बितम् - is reflected तत् च -
 and that reflected *caitanya* प्राणान् - vital
 airs धारयति - sustains ततः - thereby (वपुषि
 प्रविष्टः ईश्वरः - the *Parameśvara* who has
 entered the body) जीवाख्याम् - the name
 ‘*jīva*’ लभते - gets – (104)

104. *Caitanya* gets reflected in the *viññānamayakośa*, (i.e. *ahaṃkāra* or *antaḥkaraṇa*) and that reflected *caitanya* sustains the *prāṇas*. Thereby (the *Parameśvara* who has entered the body) gets the name *jīva*.

The aggregate of the basis the *caitanya*, the subtle body and the *cidābhāsa* in it is called the *jīva* (*P.4-11*). In our body the *caitanya* gets reflected in the *antaḥkaraṇa* made up of nascent five elements which permeates up to the gross body. As a result it appears to be sentient. Thus the entire body is universally mistaken as ‘I’ (*ātmā*), because it is a matter of common experience that I am a sentient entity. Thereby all the features, limitations and sorrows including transmigration that belong to the body appear as the very

nature of *jīva* due to self-ignorance. This gives the impression that *jīva* and *Īśvara* are two distinct entities opposed in nature.

The Upaniṣad continues to describe the further facets of Creation after such entry into the body. *Parameśvara* created pairs of entities with form (*mūrta*) and without it (*amūrta*) called *sat-tyat*, *nirukta-anirukta*, *nilayana-anilayana*, *vijñāna-avijñāna*, *satya-anṛta*. All these will be described. But all of them are nothing but *satyam* (*Parameśvara*/Brahman) only (*Tai.U.2-6*).

भोक्ता भूत्वेश्वरस्तद्वद्

भोग्यरूपोऽपि सोऽभवत् ।

भोग्यं च बहुधा सच्च

त्यच्चेत्यादि विभेदतः ॥१०५॥

ईश्वरः - *Parameśvara* भोक्ता - experiencer, (i.e. enjoyer and sufferer) भूत्वा - having become तद्वत् - similarly सः - He (*Parameśvara*) भोग्यरूपः - the form of *bhogyā* (things of enjoyment and suffering) अपि - also अभवत् - became सत् च - *sat* and त्यत् च - *tyat* इत्यादि - etc. विभेदतः - because of divisions such as भोग्यं - the *bhogyā* च - and बहुधा - in different forms (भवति - becomes) - (105)

105. *Parameśvara* first having become the experiencer/*bhoktā*, (i.e. enjoyer and sufferer), in the same trend (thereafter) took the form of *bhogyā*

(things of enjoyment and suffering). The *bhogyā* has various forms because of divisions such as *sat* and *tyat*, etc.

Parameśvara / Brahman becoming the *bhogyā* is the next reason for its existence. The meanings of *sat*, *tyat* and other *bhogyas* created will be explained in the next verse.

सत्प्रत्यक्षं परोक्षं त्यत्

तदभावानुभौ तथा ।

वक्तुं शक्यमशक्यं चेत्यादि

द्वन्द्वेऽस्ति भोग्यता ॥१०६॥

सत् - *sat* (in the context of created *bhogyā*) प्रत्यक्षम् - is directly perceptible entity त्यत् - *tyat* परोक्षम् - is the remote entity तथा - so also उभौ - both तदभावौ - their absence (those which are neither perceptible [*pratyakṣa*] nor remote [*parokṣa*]) वक्तुं शक्यम् - which can be clearly described, (i.e. *nirukta*) (वक्तुम्) अशक्यम् - which cannot be clearly described, (i.e. *anirukta*) च - and इत्यादि - etc. द्वन्द्वे - in the pairs (viz. *nilayana-anilayana*, *vijñāna-avijñāna*, *satya-anṛta*) भोग्यता - the nature of being *bhogyā* अस्ति - is there - (106)

106. (The division of *bhogyā* is as follows). *Sat* (in the context of created *bhogyā*) is directly perceptible entity. *Tyat* is the remote entity. So also the absence of both, (i.e. those which are neither perceptible [*pratyakṣa*] nor

remote [*parokṣa*].) (Further) in the pairs such as which can be clearly described, (i.e. *nirukta*) and which cannot be clearly described (*anirukta*), etc., (viz. *nilayana-anilayana*, *viññāna-aviññāna*, *satya-anṛta*) the nature of being *bhogyā* is there.

The Upaniṣad has described the features of *bhogyā* by words such as *sat*, *tyat*, etc. The context is of manifest *bhogyas*. *Avyākṛta* (unmanifest) is *bhogyā* in the form of ignorance. In Vedānta the word *sat* stands for Brahman which is ever indestructible. But here the word *sat* is used as *bhogyā* which is perceptibly available such as the earth, water and fire besides their effects (*kārya*). They are called *mūrta* (with form) also. *Tyat* refers to the remote entities such as air and *ākāśa* (space) which are not directly perceived by the sense-organs. No doubt we do feel air (*vāyū*) only when it blows, but not when it is stagnant. Both of them are also called *amūrta* (formless).

Both the words *sat* and *tyat* are accompanied by *ca* (च) as *sacca* (सच्च) and *tyacca* (त्यच्च). They signify the absence of *sat* (perceptible) and *tyat* (remote). Absence of a *bhogyā* can be another type of *bhogyā*. For example, the fever gives sorrow. But when it goes, its absence brings the existence of a relief. We breathe air for our survival. If the

atmospheric pressure falls down as found in the places of very high altitude, there is gasping for air. The *nirukta* is that which can be very well described in terms of their features, position, time, etc. Concrete objects such as pot, etc., fall under *nirukta* category. But *anirukta* is that which cannot be described clearly. Tastes of different things can be an example of *anirukta*, *Bhāmati* gloss on the *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya* at one place points out that the distinction of sweetness between sugarcane-juice, milk, jaggery cannot be described. *Nilayana* is the resort (*āśraya*) or the place of abidance. Therefore the substance (*dravya*) which is the abode of features (*guṇas*) and actions (*kriyās*) is *nilayana* whereas features or actions that abide in are *anilayana*. *Viññāna* as *bhogyā* means sentient beings and *aviññāna* refers to all inert entities. *Satya* in this context means the things that are available in the practical (*vyāvahārika*) world. Those that are not available to deal with, (i.e. *vyāvahāra*) such as mirage are *anṛta*. All these forms of *bhogyā* were assumed by the *pāramārthika satya* (Brahman the absolute truth) whose topic started in the beginning with the definition of Brahman.

The five reasons to prove the existence of Brahman that were begun

from the verse 99 are summed up now.

कामित्वमालोचकत्वं स्रष्टृत्वं च प्रवेष्टृता ।
भोग्याकारश्च पञ्चैते ब्रह्मसद्भावहेतवः ॥१०७॥

एते - these पञ्च - are the five
ब्रह्मसद्भावहेतवः - reasons given to prove the
existence of Brahman कामित्वम् - desiring
आलोचकत्वम् - deliberating स्रष्टृत्वम् - the
Creation च - and प्रवेष्टृता - entering the
body as *jīva* च - and भोग्याकारः - taking the
form of *bhogyā* - (107)

107. These are the five reasons
given to prove the existence of Brahman:
(i) Desiring, (ii) Deliberating, (iii) The
Creation, (iv) Entering the body as *jīva*,
(v) Taking the form of *bhogyā*.

How these five reasons prove
the existence of Brahman is shown
by inferences and further the same
is validated by citing the direct
Brahmānubhava (experience of
Brahman) of *Brahmajñānīs* in the next
two verses.

सद्रूपः परमात्मा स्यात्
कामित्वात् स्वर्गकामिवत् ।
आलोचनान्मन्त्रिवत् सन्
स्रष्टृत्वाच्च कुलालवत् ॥१०८॥

परमात्मा - *Paramātmā* (Brahman)
सद्रूपः स्यात् - is existent in nature कामित्वात्
- because it desired स्वर्गकामिवत् - like a
desirer of heaven (who exists) आलोचनात्
- because of deliberation मन्त्रिवत् - like a
minister सन् - (Brahman) exists च - and

स्रष्टृत्वात् - because of the actual
Creation कुलालवत् - (exists) like a pot-
maker - (108)

108. *Paramātmā* (Brahman) is
existent in nature because it desired. It is
like the one who desires for heaven
exists. Brahman (*Paramātmā*) certainly
exists because it deliberated. One who
deliberates does exist like a minister. It
certainly exists because of creating the
sr̥ṣṭi like a pot-maker.

प्रवेष्टृत्वात् सर्पवत् सन्
भोग्यत्वाच्चोदनादिवत् ।
नानुमानैरेव किन्तु
विद्वत्प्रत्यक्षतोऽपि सन् ॥१०९॥

सर्पवत् - like an existing snake
entering a hole सन् - Brahman does exist
प्रवेष्टृत्वात् - because it entered (the bodies)
(सन् - Brahman certainly exists)
भोग्यत्वात् च - and because it is *bhogyā*
ओदनादिवत् - like the boiled rice (or
food), etc. न अनुमानैः एव - not only
because of inference किन्तु - whereas
विद्वत् प्रत्यक्षतः - on account of direct
Brahmānubhava (experience of
Brahman) of *Brahmajñānīs* अपि - also
सन् - Brahman does exist - (109)

109. Like an existing snake
entering a hole, Brahman does exist
because it entered (the bodies). It
certainly exists because it is *bhogyā* like
the boiled rice (or food), etc. The

existence of Brahman is proved not only because of inference but also on account of direct *Brahmānubhava* (experience of Brahman) of *Brahmajñānīs*.

Vedāntic truth is ascertained by the triple criteria of the *śruti*, *yukti* (reasoning) and *anubhava* (direct experience of *ātmā*/Brahman). The *śruti* alone may not be sufficient because there can be room for doubts and vagueness in our understanding. Therefore reasoning (*tarka*) in accordance with the *śruti* is employed. But there is no finale of reasoning. It can differ from intellect to intellect. *Bhāṣyakāra* remarks: It is not possible to have a gathering of logicians (*tārkikas*) of past, present and future and come to a unanimous conclusion (*Br.Sū.Bh.2-1-11*). Therefore vouching by *vidvadanubhava* (*aparokṣa Brahmānubhava* of *jñānīs*) is indispensable. Inference is only a means to understand the purport of the Vedas properly. Keeping this in view, the author quotes in the second line of this verse the direct (*aparokṣa*) *anubhava* of *Brahmajñānīs* to prove the existence of Brahman. *Brahmānubhava* is precisely defined by *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* which is the replica of *ātmā*/Brahman. It is strictly in accordance with the Upaniṣadic statement and not some imagined fancy.

The *Vidvatpratyakṣa* is *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. It is also called *yogipratyakṣa* (*Mā.U.Kā.Bh.3-47*). Gauḍapādācārya describes it as *Brahmānubhava* or *Brahmaprāpti* in his *kārikā* on the *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣat*. ‘When the mind (that is totally withdrawn from all the pursuits and made to get absorbed in *ātmā*) does not sleep, does not become stupefied (by the adverse unconscious *kaṣāya*), when it does not get distracted by sense-objects and is very steady, free from the projection of superimposed *tripuṭīs*, it (the mind) conforms to the nature of Brahman’ (*Mā.U.Kā.3-46*). This *Brahmānubhava* is what is called *Brahmasākṣātkāra* described in the verse 19. Such *Brahmajñānīs* call Brahman as *satyam* (*tat satyamiti ācakṣate, Tai.U.2-6*).

Further the existence of Brahman is proved by considering the perceptible (*dṛśya*) *jagat*. The original source and cause of many aspects in the world such as the principle of existence, knowledge and happiness, the perfection (*sukṛta*) in Creation, the factor that enables all living beings to function, orderliness in

the behaviour of mighty phenomenal powers, etc., are traced to Brahman. *Brahmajñānīs* based on their direct experience of Brahman also declare that Brahman itself on account of its ignorance appears as *jagat*. The next verse states this fact.

यत् सत्यं ब्रह्म पूर्वोक्तं
 तदेव जगदात्मना ।
 भाति भ्रान्त्या ततः सर्वं
 ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते बुधाः ॥११०॥

यत् - whatever पूर्वोक्तं - described earlier सत्यम् ब्रह्म - Brahman the ultimate reality तदेव - that itself भ्रान्त्या - erroneously जगदात्मना - in the form of jagat भाति - is perceived ततः - therefore सर्वं - the entire jagat ब्रह्म - is Brahman इति - so बुधाः - *Brahmajñānīs* आचक्षते - say- (110)

110. The *Brahmajñānīs* say that Brahman the ultimate reality described earlier itself is perceived erroneously in the form of the *jagat*. Therefore the entire *jagat* is Brahman only.

Brahman is the ultimate truth. It is the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) on which the false (*mithyā*) *jagat* is erroneously superimposed because of its ignorance. This is vouched by *Brahmajñānīs*. Such a phenomenon is explained by citing the well-known illustration of rope and snake.

सर्पधारादिका भ्रान्त्या कल्पितास्तत्त्वदर्शने ।
 रज्जुरेव यथा तद्वद् ब्रह्मैव सकलं जगत् ॥१११॥

भ्रान्त्या - erroneously कल्पिताः - imagined सर्पधारादिका - snake, flow of water or border of some thing, etc. यथा - just as तत्त्वदर्शने - on knowing their true

nature रज्जुः एव - happen to be the rope only तद्वत् - similarly सकलं - entire जगत् - *jagat* ब्रह्म एव - (on knowing the truth) is nothing but Brahman only- (111)

111. Just as the erroneously imagined snake, flow of water, etc., (in the place of a rope) happen to be the rope only on knowing their true nature, so also the *jagat* is discovered to be nothing but Brahman only (on knowing the truth).

It is well-known that in an insufficient light a rope can be mistaken for an entity different from itself such as a snake, flow of water, stick or a garland, etc., because of the ignorance of the rope. Similarly the ignorance of *ātma*/Brahman gives rise to the false appearance of the *jagat*. On directly (*aparokṣatayā*) knowing its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) the *jagat* gets reduced to its true nature that is Brahman.

Thus by the means of *śruti* (vs.93), inference (vs.107), direct experience of *Brahmajñānīs* (vs.109), and their statement that Brahman falsely appears as *jagat* (vs.110) it was proved that Brahman does exist. All these facts serve as the answer to the contention that the nameless and formless Brahman does not exist because only the entity that is invariably accompanied by 'names' and 'forms' such as the *jagat* can exist (vs. 97).

नामरूपयुतत्वेन जगत् सद् ब्रह्म नेति यत् ।
पूर्वपक्षिमतं तन्न ब्रह्मसत्त्वं तदीक्ष्यताम् ॥११२॥

नामरूपयुतत्वेन - because of having names and forms जगत् - the *jagat* सत् - exists ब्रह्म - the nameless and formless Brahman न (सत्) - does not exist इति - so यत् - whatever पूर्वपक्षिमतं - the opinion of the contender (vs.97) तत् न - that is not correct तद् - the existence that is experienced in the *jagat* having names and forms ब्रह्मसत्त्वं - is (actually) the existence of Brahman (only) (इति - so) ईक्ष्यताम् - should be known—(112)

112. The contention that the *jagat* exists because of having names and forms but not the nameless and formless Brahman is not correct. It should be known that the existence that is experienced in the *jagat* having names and forms is (actually) the existence of Brahman (only).

The *jagat* must necessarily have an existent principle as its cause. And that cause cannot be anything other than Brahman. From the non-existence nothing can be born including the perceptible *jagat* which is universally experienced as ‘is’, ‘is’, ‘is’ *Chāndogyopaniṣad* asks: ‘How can from non-existence (*asat*) existent entity (*sat*) be born?’ (6-2-2) (Certainly not possible). *Bhagavān* Ramaṇa Maharṣi asks a question in the very

beginning of his text *Ullāḍu Nārpaḍu* (*Saddarśanam*): ‘What indeed (*kinnu*) are the individual experiences as ‘is’, ‘is’, (*satpratyayāḥ*) discarding (*vihāya*) the *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda ātmā* (*santam*)?’ What are mud-pots without the mud? What are the golden ornaments without the gold? What is the ice cube without the water? What is the cloth without the cotton/thread? (i.e. the *jagat* cannot exist without its basis *sat*). The *Bhāṣyakāra* discusses this topic in the *Kāthopaniṣad-bhāṣya* (2-3-12). He says: The *śruti*-statement that the ever-existent Brahman is the cause of the *jagat* can be verified from the fact that the destruction of any effect (*kārya*) is centred in the existence (*astitva-niṣṭha*) of something. An effect gets destroyed in succession in its subtle and subtler causes. This can be known by the cognition (*pratyaya*) by the *buddhi* in the form of the existence of some intermediate cause. When an object gets destroyed that name and form no longer exists. Even that non-existence of that entity has its basis in (or gets reduced to) an existent cognition (*pratyaya*) by *buddhi* whereby one is aware that it is not there. Such an existent cognition by the *buddhi* alone is the *pramāṇa* (the means of knowledge) to ascertain the existence or the non-existence of an entity. If the *jagat* has no basis, then our experience should have been as ‘is not’, ‘is not’, ‘is

not'. This is not the case. Everything is experienced as 'is', 'is' only. Therefore all must accept that the cause of *jagat* is ever-existent principle *ātmā*/Brahman.

Brahman the existence principle inheres in the *jagat* is demonstrated with the help of the rope-snake illustration.

रज्जुदैर्घ्यं यथा सर्पधारादिष्वनुगच्छति ।
ब्रह्मसत्त्वं तथा व्योमवाय्वादिष्वनुगच्छति ॥११३॥

यथा - just as रज्जु दैर्घ्यं - the length of the rope in the form of the basis सर्पधारादिषु - in the superimposed snake, flow of water or the border of something, etc. अनुगच्छति - inheres in तथा - similarly ब्रह्मसत्त्वं - the existence of Brahman व्योमवाय्वादिषु - in the space, air, etc. अनुगच्छति - inheres in - (113)

113. Just as the length of the rope in the form of the basis inheres in the superimposed snake, flow of water (or the border of something), etc., so also the existence of Brahman inheres in the space, air, etc.

It is a well-known fact that the cause inheres in the effects or certain aspects of the basis are cognized in the entities superimposed on it. This fact was told earlier in the verse 38 in the context of *jagat* being superimposed on Brahman. Here it is repeated to show the availability of existence of Brahman in the *jagat* as 'is-ness' principle is a proof

that Brahman the only ever-existent principle exists.

The Upaniṣad further continues: 'Asat vai idam agre āsīt, tato vai sad ajāyata' (Before Creation this *jagat* was Brahman which is not the *jagat* having the nature of *nāma* [name] and *rūpa* [form] considered empirically as *sat*. From that Brahman is born this *jagat* called *sat* [relatively]) (*Tai. U.2-7*). Here the words *asat* and *sat* as used by the *śruti* should be understood properly. In the worldly parlance whatever that is characterized by name and form is considered as *sat*. According to Vedāntic terminology *sat* is ever-existent and the never destructible Brahman whereas *asat* is false (*mithyā*) or at places the totally non-existent entity (*tuccham*). But the word *asat* used here stands for Brahman which is not or distinct from the *jagat* called *sat* (relatively). Here the word *asat* does not mean total non-existence (*śūnyavāda*) which nihilists advocate.

असदेवेदमग्रेऽभून्नामरूपात्मकं जगत् ।
पश्चात्तु ब्रह्मणा सृष्टं सदभूद् ब्रह्मसत्त्वतः ॥११४॥

अग्रे - Before Creation इदम् - this नामरूपात्मकम् - having the nature of name and form जगत् - *jagat* असत् एव अभूत् - was only Brahman (distinct and free from the *jagat* called *sat*) पश्चात् - thereafter (on desiring, etc.) तु - but ब्रह्मणा - by Brahman

सृष्टं - (the *jagat*) was created ब्रह्मसत्त्वतः - on account of (borrowed) existence of Brahman (जगत् - *jagat*) सत् - existent अभूत् - became (as if) – (114)

114. Before Creation this *jagat* having the nature of name and form (was) only Brahman (distinct and free from the *jagat* called *sat* in common parlance). But thereafter (on desiring, etc.) the *jagat* was created by Brahman. The *jagat* became (as if) existent on account of (borrowed) existence (*sat* aspect) of Brahman.

The *jagat* having the names and forms being transient and *mithyā* does not have an existence of its own apart from that of its *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) the Brahman. It is just as the existence of a superimposed snake because of its basis the rope. If the rope were not there, there cannot be any mistaken appearance of a snake, etc. Thus the existence ('is-ness') aspect cognized in the *jagat* proves the existence of Brahman. This is further proved by the knowledge and happiness aspects found in the *jagat* (vs.116) besides activities possible on the part of the inert body (vs.123). It should be clear that the existence (*sat*), knowledge (*cit*) and happiness (*ānanda*) aspects found in the *jagat* truly belong to Brahman. But they appear as though the features of *jagat* because of self-ignorance (*avidyā*) and the consequent

adhyāsa (superimposition) in terms of identification between the *nirupādhika* Brahman and the *nāmarūpātmaka jagat*.

The phrase '*Brahmaṇā sṛṣṭam*' (*jagat* was Created by Brahman) from the earlier verse is explained based on the subsequent portion of *śruti*: '*Tad ātmānam svayam akuruta, tasmāt tat sukṛtam ucyate*' (Brahman made itself appear in the form of *jagat* without being presided over by any other entity. Therefore that Brahman is called *sukṛtam* [perfect] or Creation is something that is 'well-done') (*Tai.U.2-7*).

तद् ब्रह्मात्मानमेवेमं सच्चिदानन्दलक्षणम् ।
अकार्षीज्जगदाकारं स्वयमेव स्वमायया ॥११५॥

तत् - that सत् चित् आनन्दलक्षणम् ब्रह्म (एवम्) - Brahman characterized by *sat* (existence), *cit* (*caitanya*, pure awareness principle), *ānanda* (happiness) स्वमायया - by its *māyā* स्वयम् एव - itself only आत्मानमेव - oneself alone इमम् - this perceptible (*dr̥śya*) जगदाकारम् - in the form of *jagat* अकार्षीत् - made – (115)

115. That Brahman characterized by *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* itself only by its *māyā* made oneself alone in the form of this perceptible *jagat*.

The phrase '*ātmānam eva*' (oneself alone) indicates *ātmā*/Brahman

itself as the material (*upādāna*) cause whereas 'svameva' (by itself only) suggests Brahman as the efficient (*nimitta*) cause. Brahman itself on account of *māyā* appears as *jagat* without any external aid. Therefore Brahman is called *sukṛta* (a perfect Creator). Or Creation is something that is 'well-done'. Either way the word *sukṛta* implies a sentient Creator which proves the existence of Brahman. *Bhāṣyakāra* has explained this though the author has not dwelt on the word 'sukṛta' from the *śruti*. Actually it is a corollary of the second line of this verse.

Further observation of the *jagat* reveals its five aspects viz. *asti* (is, exists), *bhāti* (shines cognizably, knowledge principle), *priyam* (pleasing, happiness), *nāma* (name) and *rūpa* (form). This confirms Brahman as the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of the *jagat* and exposes its *mithyā* (false) nature. Out of these five facets the first three belong to Brahman and they are experienced in the superimposed (*adhyasta*) *jagat*.

अस्ति भाति प्रियञ्चेति

प्रतिवस्त्ववभासते ।

त एते सच्चिदानन्दा ब्रह्मगा

भान्ति वस्तुषु ॥११६॥

अस्ति - is, existence भाति - shines cognizably प्रियम् - pleasing च - and इति - this trio प्रतिवस्तु - with respect to every

entity अवभासते - appears ते एते - those three सत् चित् आनन्दाः - which correspond to the principles of existence, knowledge and happiness ब्रह्मगाः - belong to the nature of Brahman वस्तुषु - in the entities of *jagat* as their features भान्ति - they appear to be there – (116)

116. The trio of 'is', 'shines cognizably' and 'pleasing' appear to be there with respect to every entity. Those three (which correspond to) the principles of existence, knowledge and happiness belong to the nature of Brahman. They appear to be there in all the entities of *jagat* as their features.

All our contacts and pursuits are with the existing things whether tangible or intangible. No one interacts with non-existing objects or beings. For that matter even the seeming action of lunatics or persons like Don Quixote are with reference to their imageries considered by them as real. So the thing we transact with, exists (*asti/is*). Our expression 'A given thing is' also displays this fact. Existence (*sat*) aspect of everything in Creation is clearly cognized.

The existence of a thing necessarily presupposes its cognition by a knower, the subject. Only after knowing can a thing be said as 'exists/is'. That is how we say a given thing shines cognizably (*bhāti*) or is

known. Inert or non-cognitive things can neither know themselves nor can they ascertain the existence of something else and interact with it on their own. The cognitive/knowledge principle in the subject, the knower, is the all pervasive pure awareness (*cit*).

The word *priyam* means pleasing, a locus of love or pleasure. With 'pleasure' as its meaning *priyam* also suggests happiness (*ānanda*) by implication. While 'existence' (*asti*) and 'is known' (*bhāti*, knowledge) aspects of everything in Creation is clearly cognized, *prima facie* everything is pleasing (*priyam*) does not appear to be correct. We have any number of sorrowful entities also. It is true that sorrows are experienced and not the happiness always and everywhere. But the truth is that happiness is truly present in even the intense sorrows. The *cit* (pure awareness) that makes us experience sorrow is nothing but *paramānanda* (limitless happiness). Its presence cannot be denied. Yet, the happiness aspect of *cit* is hidden from our experience by the veiling brought about by *tamas* (ignorance) and the consequent agitations. Thus the *priyam* (happiness) aspect also is present in all the entities of *jagat*.

The trio of *asti* (is), *bhāti* (shines cognizably) and *priyam* (pleasing) actually correspond to *sat*, *cit* and

ānanda facets of Brahman. But due to mutual superimposition between Brahman and the *jagat* those three appear as though they are the intrinsic features of the worldly entities.

The remaining name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*), the last two aspects of the *jagat*, are seen present and absent alternately because of their absence prior to Creation.

नामरूपे घटादीनां प्रागभावयुते ततः ।
अभावत्वं च भावत्वं पर्यायेणोक्ष्यते तयोः ॥११७॥

घटादीनां - of pot, etc., (the entities in the world) नामरूपे - name and form (during their period of existence) प्रागभावयुते - have non-existence prior to their birth ततः - therefore तयोः - in those (name and form) अभावत्वं - non-existence (prior to their birth) च - and भावत्वं - existence (after their birth) पर्यायेण - alternatively ईक्ष्यते - are experienced – (117)

117. The name and form of pot, etc., (the entities in the world during their period of existence) have non-existence prior to their birth. Therefore the non-existence (prior to their birth) and the existence (after their birth) are experienced alternatively in those (name and form).

An effect (*kārya*) does not exist, (i.e. *abhāva*) before (*prāk*) its birth. This

is called its prior non-existence (*prāgabhāva*). The name and form of a pot do not exist until the pot is born. After its birth they come into existence. Therefore name and form are neither existent nor non-existent all the time. This analysis finally deduces (vs.119) that the absence or non-existence belongs to *māyā* whereas the existence is the intrinsic nature of Brahman.

One may doubt that existence (*bhāva*) and non-existence (*abhāva*) are the characteristic features (*dharma*s) of *nāma* and *rūpa*. This cannot be so because the characteristic features are always inseparable from the entities wherein they abide. But the existence (*bhāva*) and non-existence (*abhāva*) have birth and destruction, (i.e. *āgamāpāyī*). This is explained with an illustration.

आगमापायिधर्मो यौ न तयोर्धर्मिरूपता ।
शयनोत्थानयोर्नास्ति देहवस्तुस्वरूपता ॥११८॥

यौ - those (existence and non-existence) आगमापायि धर्मो - two features which come and go तयोः - of the two (*nāma* and *rūpa*) धर्मिरूपता न - cannot be the nature शयनोत्थानयोः - of lying down and standing देहवस्तुस्वरूपता - the nature of the entity called body न अस्ति - cannot be – (118)

118. Those two features (of existence and non-existence) of both

(*nāma* and *rūpa*) which come and go cannot be their nature (just as) lying down and standing cannot be the nature of the entity called body.

The mud-pot comes in the mud and goes. Therefore the mud-pot is not the nature of mud. The smell that is ever present in the mud is its nature. Similarly the body at times lies down, sits, stands and walks. But lying down, sitting, standing and walking cannot be considered as the nature of the body. An attribute can never be the entity in which it abides. There must be the entity first and then only attribute will be born in it. Afterwards also the entity must be there, then only the attribute may cease to be there. A tree must be there. Then only it can have tallness when, it grows. When half the tree is cut off, the tree is still there but it is no more tall. Similarly name and form exist at times and are not there at other times. They come and go. Therefore the two features of coming and going cannot be the nature of *nāma* and *rūpa*.

Now your face that is seen in the mirror is actually on your neck distinct from the mirror. Similarly the existence and non-existence seen occasionally in the name and form should necessarily belong to an entity other than the *nāma* and *rūpa*. Those two entities are specified in the next verse.

सत्त्वासत्त्वे अन्यदीये

भासेते नामरूपयोः ।

मायारूपमसत्त्वं स्यात् सत्ताया

ब्रह्मरूपता ॥११९॥

नामरूपयोः - in the name and form सत्त्वासत्त्वे - (coming and going) existence and non-existence अन्यदीये - which are the nature of something else (and not that of *nāma* and *rūpa*) भासेते - appear to be there असत्त्वं - the non-existence मायारूपम् स्यात् - happens to be the nature of *māyā* सत्तायाः - (whereas the principle) of existence ब्रह्मरूपता (स्यात्) - is the nature of Brahman—(119)

119. The (coming and going) existence and non-existence that appear to be there in the name and form is the nature of something else (and not that of name and form). The non-existence happens to be the nature of *māyā* (whereas the principle) of existence is the nature of Brahman.

The existence (is-ness) in the name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*) is the nature of Brahman and the non-existence (is-not) is the nature of *māyā*. The word *māyā* means ‘that which is not’ (*yā mā sā*). Actually *māyā* is a postulate adopted by the *jīvanmuktas* to explain the phenomenon of Creation being produced from the changeless Brahman which is next to impossible. It appears to be there so long as the individual

jīva continues to be ignorant of *ātmā*/Brahman. In *Brahmasākṣātkāra*, no trace of either *māyā* or its product the *drśya* (perceptible) *jagat* is there.

Though in this analysis the existence (is-ness) is described as a coming and going (or subject to birth or destruction) called (*āgamāpayī*) feature (*dharma*) of name and form, it is neither a feature (*dharma*) nor *āgamāpayī* (coming and going in nature). But in the realm of ignorance it (existence, is-ness) appears to be so because of its *samsargādhyāsa* (superimposition by association) on the coming and going (*āgamāpayī*) name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*). Similarly the *āgamāpayī* non-existence (is-not) of name and form is the ‘existence’ that is covered as an object by the veiling power displayed by *māyā*. When the veiling gets dispelled, the name and form appear to exist. The *nāmarūpātmaka jagat* is *asat* (non-existent) just like *māyā*, but it is not *sat* (existent) like Brahman. On the contrary *nāmarūpātmaka jagat* appears to be existent erroneously. That is why the *jagat* is called *mithyā* (false) and not totally non-existent (*tuccham*).

The topic contained in the verses 116 to 120 is discussed at length by Sri Bhāratī Tīrtha in his text ‘*Drk-Drśya-Vivekaḥ*’. It is a commentary on Vedāntic portion of *Sarasvatī-Rahasyopaniṣad* (*Kṛṣṇayajurveda*) taught by Goddess

Sarasvati herself to Sage Āśvalāyana*.

The fact seen above about *sat* (existence) in relation to *nāma* and *rūpa* is now applied to *cit* (knowledge) and *ānanda* (happiness).

जाड्यदुःखे मायिके स्तो

भानानन्दौ परात्मगौ ।

लौकिकाः सच्चिदानन्दाः

ब्रह्मगाश्चेदसत् कथम् ॥१२०॥

जाड्यदुःखे - inertness and sorrow (abiding in the *nāma* and *rūpa*) मायिके स्तः - (by nature) are the products of *māyā* भानानन्दौ - knowledge and happiness (appearing in the *nāma* and *rūpa*) परात्मगौ - (by nature) belong to Brahman (एवं च - thus) लौकिकाः - available in the *dṛśyanāmarūpātmaka jagat* सच्चिदानन्दाः - *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* ब्रह्मगाः चेत् - if (they) are the nature of Brahman (ब्रह्म - Brahman) असत् कथम् - how can (it) be non-existent? – (120)

120. The inertness and sorrow (abiding in the *nāma* and *rūpa*) (by nature) are the products of *māyā*. The knowledge and happiness (appearing in the *nāma* and *rūpa*) (by nature) belong to Brahman. Thus if *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* available in the *dṛśyanāmarūpātmaka jagat* are the nature of Brahman, how can Brahman be non-existent? (It can never be so).

The inertness and sorrow, so also the knowledge and happiness are *āgamāpāyī* (come and go) in the *nāma* and *rūpa*. Therefore they should be known as similar to the aspects found in the case of existence and non-existence in the *nāma-rūpa*.

The next portion of the Upaniṣad says: whatever that is *sukṛtam* Brahman, that itself is *rasa* (pleasing, delighting, *ānanda*). Because people become happy by gaining *Brahmānanda* manifest in *sāttvika antaḥkaraṇavṛtti* or what is called *sopādhika viṣaya-sukha* (sense-pleasure). But *jñānī* becomes happy by gaining *nirupādhika Brahmānanda* itself (*Tai.U.2-7*). This portion is presented in the form of a question and its answer.

भवेत्तु ब्रह्मसत्तास्मिन्नानन्दोऽस्ति

कथं शृणु ।

आनन्दोऽत्राभ्युपेतव्यो

रसत्वात् मधुरादिवत् ॥१२१॥

अस्मिन् - in this (*jagat*) ब्रह्मसत्ता भवेत् - let it be accepted that the existence is on account of Brahman तु - but कथं - how (can it be understood that) आनन्दः अस्ति - *ānanda* (is *Brahmasvarūpa* because of which there is happiness in the *jagat*?) (इति चेत् - if so) शृणु - please listen अत्र - in Brahman आनन्दः - *ānanda* अभ्युपेतव्यः - should be accepted (कुतः - how come?)

* Vide 'Vedāntic Ways to Samādhi' (*Dṛk-Dṛśya-Vivekaḥ*) by this commentator.

(ब्रह्मणः) रसत्वात् - because Brahman is *rasa* (pleasing, delighting) मधुरादिवत् - like the sweet, sour, etc. – (121)

121. Let it be accepted that the existence in this *jagat* is on account of Brahman. But how (can it be understood that) *ānanda* is the *Brahmasvarūpa* (the true nature of Brahman) (because of which there is happiness in the *jagat*?) (If the question is so) please listen. *Ānanda* should be accepted in Brahman. (How come?) Because Brahman is *rasa* (pleasing, delighting) like the sweet, sour, etc.

There is another reading of ‘*rasavān*’ (one who has *rasa*) in the place of ‘*rasatvāt*’. In that case we have to take Brahman as *rasasvarūpa* (one whose nature is *rasa*) and then add the phrase, ‘and because in such Brahman the *jagat* is falsely superimposed’.

Rasa means that which is pleasing, or the means of delight and contentment. For example, sweet, sour and savoury food is called *rasa*. The Upaniṣad declares that Brahman is *rasa* (*ānandasvarūpa*). There are many other *śruti* statements such as ‘*vijñānam ānandam Brahma*’ (*Br. U. 3-9-28*), ‘*ānando Brahma iti*’ (*Tai.U.3-6*), etc., which declare Brahman to be *ānanda* in nature. Our deep sleep experience also reveals this fact. On waking up we recollect our experience of

happiness therein. In sleep neither sense-objects nor sense-pleasures were there. Therefore that happiness must necessarily be the nature of *caitanya ātmā*/Brahman which alone was present there in sleep, but covered by ignorance. Even when your mind is highly quiet and peaceful, there being no *manovyāpāra* (mental activities), the happiness that you experience in the absence of all sense-pleasures is *Brahmānanda* revealed through the *upādhi* of quiet mind. Therefore the nature of Brahman as *ānanda* cannot be questioned. That is the only original source of all other sense-pleasures. Like the *sat* (existence), *cit* (knowledge) manifest in the *nāmarūpātmaka jagat*, the *ānanda* nature of Brahman also gets revealed in the *jagat* under specific conditions.

The *rasa* nature of Brahman is further justified by showing its verification based on the experience of *Brahmajñānīs*.

मूढस्य मधुरादिः स्याद् रसो ब्रह्म विवेकिनः ।
मधुरादिभुगानन्दी ब्रह्मविच्च तथा सुखी ॥१२२॥

मूढस्य - as for an ignorant person रसः happiness मधुरादिः स्यात् - lies in the sweet, etc. विवेकिनः - for a *Brahmajñānī* (रसः - happiness) ब्रह्म (स्यात्) - is Brahman (यथा - just as) मधुरादिभुक् - the person who eats sweets, etc. आनन्दी (भवति) - becomes happy तथा - in the same manner ब्रह्मवित् -

Brahmajñānī च - also सुखी (भवति) - becomes happy –(122)

122. As for an ignorant person the happiness lies in the sweet, etc. But for a *Brahmajñānī* the Brahman itself is happiness. Just as the person who eats sweets, etc., becomes happy, so also the *Brahmajñānī* becomes happy.

In *Brahmajñāna*, there are no *drśyas* sense-objects. There is no occasion of sense-pleasure being present there. It is *nirviṣaya ānanda*, the true nature of Brahman totally free from sorrow and limitless in nature. In contrast to this *Brahmānanda*, the *viṣaya-sukha* (sense-pleasure) is dependant on transient sense-objects and senses, etc., limited in nature, and invariably infested with sorrows in the course of time. Thus *Brahmānanda* is verifiable. The ignorant person cannot question its existence only because he is unaware of it.

The existence of Brahman is proved now by showing the principle that activates the inert body can only be the Brahman and nothing else. The *śruti* wonders: ‘*Kaḥ hi eva anyāt Kaḥ prānyāt yad eṣa ākāśe ānandaḥ na syāt*’ (who indeed can inhale, who can exhale in the sense who can be active if this *ānandasvarūpa* Brahman is not present in the space called *param vyoma* abiding in the cave of five sheaths?) (*Tai.U.2-7*).

ब्रह्मानन्दो न चेदत्र देहं को नाम चेष्टयेत् ।
प्राणाक्षाणां चेष्टकत्वं न तत्र करणत्वतः ॥१२३॥

अत्र - here in this body having the five sheaths (called cave) ब्रह्मानन्दः - the *ānandasvarūpa* Brahman न चेत् (स्यात्) - if were not there देहं - this body कः नाम - who indeed चेष्टयेत् - can activate? प्राणाक्षाणां - *prāṇas* (vital airs) and senses (*indriyas*) चेष्टकत्वं न - cannot be the activators तत्र - there (in activities) करणत्वतः - because they are the means of action –(123)

123. If *ānandasvarūpa* (one who has the nature of happiness) Brahman were not there in this body having the five sheaths (called cave), who indeed can activate this (inert) body? (To say that *prāṇas* and senses can activate is wrong). The *prāṇas* (vital airs) and senses (*indriyas*) cannot be the activators of the body because they are the means of action (equally inert in nature).

The basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of the entire Creation is the non-dual Brahman whose nature is simultaneously the *sat* (existence), *cit* (knowledge) and *ānanda* (happiness). The origin of worldly existence, knowledge and happiness appearing in *nāma* and *rūpa* is Brahman only (vs.119 and 120). Inert entities cannot act just as all electrical appliances cannot function on their own. The

sentience (*cetanatā*) is necessary for inert body, etc., to act like the electricity in the case of those appliances.

Brahman being *asaṅga* (unconnected) to anything and everything besides inactive (*niṣkriya*) does not activate anything. But its reflection in the *upādhis* enables the inert body, etc., to function. The *antaḥkaraṇa* (comprising *mana*, *buddhi*, *ahaṅkāra* and *cittam*) made up from the aggregate of *sāttvika* content of all the five elements in their nascent form before their grossification (*pañcīkaraṇa*) bears the reflection of *cit* in itself. It is called *cidābhāsa*. That which is not the actual *cit* (pure awareness) but appears like *cit* at an individual level is *cidābhāsa*. It is like seeing one's face (*mukha*) in the mirror as *mukhābhāsa* - semblance of face. The *cidābhāsa* permeates through the entire body and enlivens it to act. If *cit* which is nothing but Brahman were not there, *cidābhāsa* and the consequent activities on the part of the body would be never possible. The *prāṇas* and *indriyas* (senses) also cannot activate the body because they are themselves the inert means of action. Thus the activities on the part of all embodiments proves the existence of *citsvarūpa* Brahman which is also *sat* and *ānanda*.

The *śruti* further points out that

ānandasvarūpa Brahman alone delights all living beings through the means of sense-pleasures (*viṣayānanda*) (*Tai. U.2-7*). This fact also establishes that Brahman the cause of *viṣayānanda* does exist.

न केवलं चेष्टकत्वं

विषयानन्दहेतुता ।

अप्यल्पविषयान् लब्ध्वा स्वानन्दे

मज्जति क्षणम् ॥१२४॥

न केवलं - not only चेष्टकत्वं - (Brahman) is activator of the body विषयानन्दहेतुता अपि - but also it is the cause of sense-pleasures अल्पविषयान् - insignificant sense-objects लब्ध्वा - having got (जीवः - the *jīva*) स्वानन्दे - in the *ānanda* that is its true nature क्षणम् - for a moment मज्जति - gets immersed (that is called *viṣayānanda*, sense-pleasures) – (124)

124. Brahman is not only the activator of the body but also the cause of sense-pleasures (*viṣayānanda*). (The *jīva*) having got the insignificant sense-objects gets immersed for a moment in the *ānanda* that is its true nature. (That is *viṣayānanda*, sense-pleasure).

How *viṣayānanda* (sense-pleasure) originates from *Brahmānanda* was discussed earlier in the verses 25 to 27. Thus Brahman the cause of sense-pleasure exists. With this verse the

answer to the question 'does Brahman exist or not' asked in the verse 96 is over (vs. 98 to 124). This topic is concluded and the next two doubts whether both the *jñānī* and *ajñānī* get liberation or not are taken for consideration to answer (vs. 127-130).

MANANA (REFLECTION) – ONLY BRAHMAJÑĀNĪ GETS LIBERATED

विषयानन्दपर्यन्तैः

कामसृष्ट्यादिहेतुभिः ।

ब्रह्मसत्त्वे स्थिते मुक्तिश्चिन्त्यते

विद्वदज्ञयोः ॥१२५॥

विषयानन्दपर्यन्तैः - ending with (Brahman as the source of) *viṣayānanda* (sense-pleasure) कामसृष्ट्यादिहेतुभिः - by the causes beginning with desire, Creation, etc. ब्रह्मसत्त्वे स्थिते - when the existence of Brahman is established विद्वदज्ञयोः - of a *jñānī* and *ajñānī* मुक्तिः - liberation चिन्त्यते - is discussed – (125)

125. By the causes, beginning with desire, Creation, etc., and ending with (Brahman as the source of) *viṣayānanda*, having established the existence of Brahman, the liberation of a *jñānī* and *ajñānī* is discussed.

The reasons given so far to prove the existence of Brahman are: *Parameśvara* has the *kāmitva* (desire), *ālocakatva* (*tapas* or deliberation),

sraṣṭṛtvam (the status of actual Creator) *praveṣṭṛtā* (the role of entering the body), *bhogyākāra* (the form of delightful and sorrowful entities), *Sattā-sphoorti-pradāṭṛtva* (the status of one who lends existence and knowledge to *nāmarūpātmaka jagat*) and *viṣayānandaheturā* (the nature of being the cause of sense-pleasures). Earlier (vs.88) it was shown that the one who denies the existence of Brahman himself becomes non-existent because the five sheaths considered as *ātmā* by such ignorant person are proved to be not so. Thus the existence of Brahman is established. Now the other two questions regarding the liberation of a *jñānī* and *ajñānī* are being considered.

The author first reminds the readers about the second and third questions mentioned earlier in the verse 96.

विद्वान् ब्रह्मेति मुक्तश्चेत्

मुच्येताज्ञोऽप्यभिज्ञवत् ।

ब्रह्मरूपोऽपि बद्धश्चेदज्ञोऽभिज्ञोऽपि

बध्यते ॥१२६॥

विद्वान् - *Brahmajñānī* ब्रह्म इति - because his nature is Brahman मुक्तः चेत् - if gets liberated अज्ञः - ignorant person अपि - also अभिज्ञवत् - like a *Brahmajñānī* मुच्येत - should get liberated (because his nature also is Brahman) (अथ - in case) अज्ञः - ignorant person ब्रह्मरूपः अपि - in

spite of having the nature of Brahman बद्धः चेत् - if gets bound अभिज्ञः अपि - *Brahmajñānī* also (अज्ञवत् - like an ignorant person) बध्यते - is (certainly) bound—(126)

126. If *Brahmajñānī* gets liberated because his nature is Brahman, (then) like him an ignorant person also should get liberated (because his nature also is Brahman). (In case) the ignorant person gets bound in spite of having the nature of Brahman, the *Brahmajñānī* also is (certainly) bound (like an ignorant person).

The entire *jagat* including all *jīvas* is in reality nothing but Brahman. All *jīvas* irrespective of being a *Brahmajñānī* or not are Brahman in their true nature. The ignorance does not alter the nature of Brahman. Therefore the questioner opines that if a *jñānī* or *ajñānī* gets liberated or is bound, then the other should follow suit.

The answer follows in the next four verses.

मैवं ब्रह्मात्मैक्यबोध एवैको मोक्षकारणम् ।
ऐक्यदर्शी मुच्यतेऽतो भेददर्शी न मुच्यते ॥१२७॥

मा एवं - please do not say so ब्रह्मात्मैक्यबोधः - the direct (*aparokṣa*) knowledge of identity between Brahman and *pratyagātmā* एव एकः - only and nothing else मोक्षकारणम् (भवति) - (is) the

means of liberation अतः - therefore ऐक्यदर्शी - the one who has the knowledge of their identity मुच्यते - is liberated भेददर्शी - (whereas) the other who takes oneself to be different from Brahman in any manner whatsoever न मुच्यते - is not liberated—(127)

127. Please do not say so. The direct (*aparokṣa*) knowledge of identity between Brahman and *pratyagātmā* only and nothing else (such as the true nature of *jñānī* and *ajñānī* as Brahman) is the means of liberation. Therefore the one who has the knowledge of their identity is liberated (whereas) the other who takes oneself to be different from Brahman in any manner whatsoever is not liberated.

Ātmā or Brahman has neither bondage nor liberation. Only from the standpoint of the *jīva*, Brahman can be said to be ever-liberated (*nitya-mukta*). The bondage and liberation are the features of the mind (*antaḥkaraṇa*) (*Brahmabindūpaniṣad* - 2). *Ātmā*/Brahman continues to be in its own nature even in the case of an ignorant person totally unaffected by his *upādhis* and the consequent *saṃsāra*. Brahman illumines *jīva's* state of mind equally in both the conditions of ignorance and knowledge. Therefore it is left to the individual to end the ignorance by gaining the direct knowledge of

identity between *jīva* and Brahman. Then only the liberation can be gained otherwise the bondage continues to be there irrespective of the fact that one's true nature is Brahman.

Brahmajñāna is a state of *abhaya* (fearlessness). The *śruti* highlights the role of *Brahmajñāna* in its statement: 'When this *mumukṣu* gets absorbed in the Brahman that is distinct from the *drśyas* (objects), devoid of body, changeless, independent, he becomes fearless (because there is no duality, the source of fear). On the contrary when he sees even a little difference between *ātmā* and Brahman, he gets subjected to the fear of *saṃsāra*' (*Tai. U.2-7*). Thus it is the *Brahmajñāna* which is the only means in gaining *mokṣa*. This is told with an illustration.

ऊर्ध्वाकारे समेऽप्यस्मिश्चोरदर्शी

बिभेति हि ।

स्थाणुदर्शी निर्भयोऽतस्तत्त्वबोध

प्रयोजकः ॥१२८॥

अस्मिन् - in this (stump of a tree that is in the front) ऊर्ध्वाकारे - its upright form समे अपि - though is one and the same for anyone who sees it चोरदर्शी - one who sees a thief in its place बिभेति हि - certainly gets frightened स्थाणुदर्शी - one who sees the stump as it is निर्भयः - is fearless अतः - therefore तत्त्वबोधः - the knowledge of reality प्रयोजकः - is fruitful
-(128)

128. Though the upright form in (the stump of a tree that is in the front) is one and the same, the person who sees a thief in its place certainly gets frightened whereas the other who sees the actual stump is fearless. Therefore the knowledge of reality is fruitful.

In a semi darkness, a stump of a tree being mistaken for a man is a common phenomenon. Further he may be considered as a thief also which instils fear. When the light is brought, the stump is clearly seen as stump and the fear vanishes. A person who sees the stump as it is without any mistake has no fear. In either case the stump is one and the same in its nature. There is no change in it. But the vision of the onlooker differs. Similar is the case with Brahman. It is one and the same in both *jñānī* and *ajñānī*. The person who mistakes it as a *saṃsārī jīva* gets bound. The other one who knows Brahman as it is in its true nature has no *saṃsāra*. He is liberated. Thus the true nature of Brahman whether remains one and same in the liberated or the bound person (like the stump of a tree in both the cases) is a matter of inconsequence. It is the correct knowledge or the erroneous concept that makes the difference of liberation or bondage just as the fear and no fear in the illustration of a stump. This explains the indispensability of *Brahmajñāna* in

gaining the liberation. The ignorant person continues to remain bound until he gains the *Brahmajñāna* in spite of his true nature remaining the same as in the case of a *jñānī*.

Even after listening to the above answer, some may feel that *dharmācaraṇa* (life in accordance with *dharma*) should be sufficient to gain liberation. Why should there be the insistence of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. Or the same Brahman having the nature of *Paramānanda* (limitless happiness) on account of its ignorance becomes the cause of fear. The Upaniṣad highlights this fact with examples. It says: Because of the fear (in the sense of command, law) of this Brahman (*Parameśvara*) the mighty wind (*Vāyu*) blows, the sun rises, Indra and Agni discharge their duties, the *Bhagavān* of death (*Yama*) runs about (*Tai. U.2-8*). This is elaborated in the next two verses.

ज्ञातेऽपि कर्मकाण्डार्थे

वेदान्तार्थमजानतः ।

जन्मादिभीर्भवत्येव वाय्वादीनां

यथा तथा ॥१२९॥

कर्मकाण्डार्थे - The meaning (import) of *karmakāṇḍa* ज्ञाते अपि - even though known वेदान्तार्थम् - the purport of Vedānta अजानतः - the one who knows not जन्मादिभीः - the fear of birth, death, etc.

भवति एव - certainly is there यथा - as in the case of वाय्वादीनाम् - deities such as *Vāyu*, etc. तथा - so – (129)

129. To the one who knows not the import of Vedānta in spite of knowing the meaning (import) of *karmakāṇḍa* portion of the Vedas, the fear of birth, death, etc., is bound to be there as found in the case of deities such as *Vāyu*, etc.

The plight of such deities is further described.

वायुः सूर्यो वह्निरिन्द्रो

मृत्युश्चातीतजन्मनि ।

धर्मज्ञा अप्यतत्त्वज्ञा

इदानीं बिभ्यतीश्वरात् ॥१३०॥

वायुः - *Vāyu* सूर्यः - *Sūrya* (the sun) वह्निः - *Agni* (the fire) इन्द्रः - *Indra* मृत्युः - *Yama* च - and अतीतजन्मनि - in their past birth धर्मज्ञाः अपि - even if they were conversant with *dharma* and did great *karmas* and *upāsanās* अतत्त्वज्ञाः (सन्तः) - (being) ignorant of *ātmā*/Brahman इदानीम् - now (as the deities) ईश्वरात् बिभ्यति - are afraid of *Īśvara* – (130)

130. The deities such as *Vāyu*, *Sūrya*, *Agni*, *Indra* and *Yama* even if they were conversant with *dharma* and did great *karmas* and *upāsanās* in their past birth, (being) ignorant of *ātmā*/Brahman are afraid of *Īśvara* (now) as the deities.

No other means than *Brahmajñāna* can liberate. The field of ‘do and accomplish’ (*sādhana-sādhya*), the *karmas* and *upāsanās* described in the Vedas yield the highest results. When even those *karmas*, etc., are incapable of conferring liberation, how can it ever be possible for other means to liberate? Deities such as Indra, Vāyu, etc., certainly performed great *karmas* and *upāsanās* in their earlier birth and could get only those high posts in the cosmic administration but not the *mokṣa*. In spite of their donning such exemplary post they are afraid of or bound by the laws of *Parameśvara*. These observations should inculcate *vairāgya* in the mind of *mumukṣus*. *Bhagavān* Yama in *Kāthopanīṣad* while congratulating the young boy Naciketa for his perfect *vairāgya* confesses that he lacked such *vairāgya* when he took to *karmas* and *upāsanās* to get the post as Yama (presiding deity of death). *Kāṇvavidyāprakāśa* (A.Pr.13) brands even the pursuit of gaining highest posts of *Hiraṇyagarbha* or *Virāṭ* and thereafter become a *jñānī* as a penny wise and pound foolish proposition.

ĀNANDA-MĪMĀMSĀ - QUANTITATIVE INVESTIGATION OF HAPPINESS

The Upaniṣad further conducts a

quantitative analysis or investigation of happiness (*ānanda-mīmāṃsā*) to give a slight inkling of what perhaps can be the magnitude of *Brahmānanda* which is limitless. This is an attempt to point out the limitless happiness with the help of the limited happiness experienced by us. It is like trying to explain the vastness of an ocean to the person who has seen only small pool of water. The *śruti* says ‘*saiṣānandasya mīmāṃsā bhavati*’ (Here begins the quantitative analysis of happiness) (*Tai.U.2-8*). The author first describes the content that lead to this analysis described up to the verse 135.

ज्ञानी कामानेति सर्वान् रसो वै

स इति श्रुतम् ।

ब्रह्मानन्दं स्फुटीकर्तुं

मीमांसानन्दगोच्यते ॥१३१॥

ज्ञानी - *Brahmajñānī* सर्वान् - all
कामान् - desires एति - fulfills
(simultaneously) सः - that *Paramātmā*
(Brahman) वै - indeed रसः - delight,
happiness इति - so श्रुतम् - is told by this
Upaniṣad ब्रह्मानन्दम् - the happiness nature
of Brahman स्फुटीकर्तुम् - to make clear
आनन्दगा - pertaining to happiness मीमांसा -
investigation, analysis उच्यते - is
described—(131)

131. It is told by the Upaniṣad: ‘*Brahmajñānī* fulfills all desires (simultaneously)’ (vs.23, *Tai.U.2-1*).

‘*Paramātmā* (Brahman) is indeed happiness’ (vs.121, 122; *Tai.U.2-7*). (Therefore) to make clear the happiness nature of Brahman, an investigation (or analysis) pertaining to happiness is described.

In the beginning of *Brahmānanda-vallī* it was declared that a *Brahmajñānī* fulfills all desires simultaneously. In the context of *manana* (reflection), after answering all questions, it was told that the Brahman is *rasa*. This implies that simultaneous fulfilment of all desires is experiencing *rasa* limitless (happiness) in contrast to the limited happiness of sense-pleasures. To distinguish this fact the *śruti* uses the word *rasa* to describe *Brahmānanda*. The knowledge of this distinction helps to intensify *mumuṣā* (desire for liberation) by developing steadfast *vairāgya* (dispassion). For this purpose, this investigation is very useful.

संपूर्णो मानुषानन्दः सार्वभौमे गुणैर्युते ।
हिरण्यगर्भे संपूर्णो देवानन्दोऽवधी हि तौ ॥१३२॥

गुणैः युते सार्वभौमे - in the emperor having the virtues enumerated by the *śruti* (*Tai.U.2-8*) मानुषानन्दः - the maximum happiness that humans can enjoy सम्पूर्णः - is complete हिरण्यगर्भे - in the *Hiraṇyagarbha* देवानन्दः - the maximum happiness that deities (*devatās*) can enjoy is सम्पूर्णः - is complete हि - it is well-known (in

the scriptures) तौ - both the happiness of an ideal emperor and that of *Hiraṇyagarbha* अवधी - are the boundaries, furthest limits (of maximum happiness of humans and the *devatās*) – (132)

132. The maximum happiness that humans can enjoy is complete in the emperor having the virtues enumerated by the *śruti*. (Similarly) the maximum happiness that deities (*devatās*) can enjoy is complete in the *Hiraṇyagarbha*. It is well-known (in the scriptures) that both the happiness of an ideal emperor and that of *Hiraṇyagarbha* are the boundaries (of maximum happiness of humans and the *devatās*).

The first and the last boundaries of maximum happiness produced by *viśaya-bhoga* (sense-enjoyment) in the *upādhis* beginning from humans and ending with that of the top most entity the *Hiraṇyagarbha* are stated here. The virtues of the emperor specified by the *Upaniṣad* are: young, lives in accordance with *dharma*, well learned in the Vedas, alert and swift in taking to actions, bold, physically strong, owns the empire of entire earth full of plenty and prosperity without any rivals. The worldly pleasures commanded by such an emperor is considered as the one basic unit of maximum human happiness (*mānuṣānanda*). Human happiness is

complete in an ideal emperor described above. Hundred times that of the maximum human happiness is enjoyed by the next higher embodiment (*manuṣya-gandharva*). Thus at each link of ascending higher embodiments, hundred times the immediate preceding one is enjoyed. The highest embodiment is that of *Hiraṇyagarbha*. There is no *viṣayajanya-ānanda* (sense-pleasure) higher than the *Hiraṇyagarbhānanda*. That is the highest limit of the produced (*janya*) *ānanda*. The maximum happiness that the bodies of *devatās* can have is found in the *Hiraṇyagarbha*.

The varying quantum of happiness in the bodies in between human and *Hiraṇyagarbha* is suggested in the first line of the next verse. The second line points out that the happiness enjoyed by each of these higher and higher entities through sense-enjoyments is as good as accomplished by a desireless (*akāmahataḥ*) *jñānī* without having those bodies.

मध्यस्थे पूर्वपुण्यानामुत्कर्षाद्
वर्धते सुखम् ।

सर्वेषां यत् सुखं तत्तु
निष्कामे ज्ञानिनीष्यते ॥१३३॥

पूर्वपुण्यानाम् - of *punya* earned (by them) in the past birth उत्कर्षात् - by the eminence मध्यस्थे - in the embodiments of species in between the human and

Hiraṇyagarbha सुखम् - happiness वर्धते - increases यत् सुखं - whatever happiness सर्वेषां (भवति) - belongs to all these embodiments तत्तु - that indeed निष्कामे ज्ञानिनि - in a desireless *jñānī* इष्यते - is accepted (to be present by his nature itself)–(133)

133. The happiness in the embodiments of species in between the human and *Hiraṇyagarbha* (progressively) increases by the eminence of *punya* earned (by them) in the past birth. Whatever happiness belongs to all these embodiments, indeed that is accepted (to be present by his nature itself) in a desireless *jñānī*.

The other embodiments in between that of human and the *Hiraṇyagarbha* are : *manuṣya-gandharva* who was first born in this *kalpa* (aeon) as a human and then in future birth became celestial musician (*gandharva*) by performance of certain *karmas* and *upāsanās*; *deva-gandharva* who is born as celestial musician from the beginning of this *kalpa*; *pitṛ* (manes); *ājānaja* *deva* who is born in the *loka* (field of experience) called *ājāna* as a result of performing specific *karmas* enjoyed by the *smṛti*; *karmadeva* who is born in specific heaven by performance of specific *karmas* such as *agnihotra*, etc., without any *upāsanās*; *devas* who are 33 in numbers who partake the

sacrificial oblations; Indra the king of all *devatās* (deities), *Bṛhaspati*, the preceptor of *devatās* and *Prajapati* (*Virāt*). The subsequent one from them enjoys the hundredfold happiness of the immediate preceding one (*Tai.U.2-8*).

The second line of this verse gives the meaning of the Upaniṣadic statement ‘*śrotriyasya ca akāmahatasya*’ (that happiness belongs to the one who knows the exact import of the Vedas and is free from desires) which is repeated in the context of each entity from the *manuṣya-gandharva* to *Hiraṇyagarbha* (called *Brahma*). The how of it will be explained in the verse 135.

The outcome of the statement ‘*sa eko Brahmaṇa ānandaḥ*’ (the hundredfold of *Prajāpati's anand* is that of *Hiraṇyagarbha*) (*Tai.U.2-8*) is told now.

सर्वकामाप्तिरेषाथ रसाख्यानन्द उच्यते ।
अध्यात्ममधिभूतं चाधिदैवं चैक एव सः ॥१३४॥

एषा - this happiness experienced by all from human to *Hiraṇyagarbha* which is abiding in or experienced by the desireless *jñānī* (*niṣkāma-jñānī*, vs.133) सर्वकामाप्तिः - is the fulfilment of all desires (implied in the *śruti* statement ‘*sarvān kāmān saha*’ *Tai.U.2-1*) अथ - so also रसाख्यानन्दः उच्यते - the same

happiness is described by the name *rasa* (*Brahmānanda*) सः एकः एव - that very same *rasa* (*Brahmānanda*) अध्यात्मम् - abides in oneself (*mumukṣu*) च - and अधिभूतम् - abides in all living beings च - and अधिदैवम् - abides in all the deities such as *Āditya*, etc. – (134)

134. This happiness experienced by all from human to *Hiraṇyagarbha* which is abiding in or experienced by the desireless *jñānī* (*niṣkāma-jñānī*, vs.133) is the fulfilment of all desires (implied in the *śruti* statement ‘*sarvān kāmān saha*’ vs.123). So also the same happiness (in its original *Brahmānanda* nature) is described by the name *rasa*. That very same *rasa* (*Brahmānanda*) abides in oneself (*mumukṣu*), in all living beings and in all the deities such as *Āditya*, etc.

The happiness of *Hiraṇyagarbha* is the highest one that can be gained through a body as *viṣayānanda* (sense-pleasures). There is no higher *viṣayānanda*. *Brahmānanda* cannot be counted in this category because it is self-existent, unborn and *nirupādhika* (without a body). The happiness that was described earlier as enjoyed by human to *Hiraṇyagarbha*, all put together, is an insignificant portion of *Brahmānanda*. That (*Brahmānanda*) is called *rasa*. Gaining that happiness is referred to as

the simultaneous fulfilment of all desires (vs.23). The same *rasa* or *Brahmānanda* manifests in all *mumukṣus* (*adhyātma*), creatures (*adhibhūta*) and deities (*adhidaiva*).

It was told (vs.133, *Tai.U.2-8*) that the happiness enjoyed by each of *manuṣya-gandharva* to *Hiraṇyagarbha* is gained by *niṣkāma-jñānī* (called *śrotriyaḥ akāmahataḥ* by the *śruti*). In short it means that the absence of desires gives happiness. How is that explained now.

सर्वे स्वस्वपदे तृप्ताः

कामयन्ते न तत्पदम् ।

ज्ञानी तु दोषदृष्ट्यात्र

निष्कामस्तैः समस्ततः ॥१३५॥

सर्वे - all (from emperor onwards to *Hiraṇyagarbha*) स्वस्वपदे - having got their positions तृप्ताः - are contented (with their particular position) तत्पदम् - that (already gained) position न कामयन्ते - they do not desire ज्ञानी तु - whereas a *Brahmajñānī* अत्र दोषदृष्ट्या - by looking at their faults (such as transience, sorrow-ridden, etc.) निष्कामः - is desireless ततः - therefore तैः समः - (this *jñānī*) is at par with those emperor to *Hiraṇyagarbha* with respect to the happiness gained by them – (135)

135. All (from emperor onwards to *Hiraṇyagarbha*) having got their positions are contented with their particular position. They do not desire the positions already gained by them whereas a *Brahmajñānī* by looking at their faults (such as transience, sorrow-ridden, etc.) is desireless. Therefore (this *jñānī*) is at par with those emperor to *Hiraṇyagarbha* with respect to the happiness gained by them.

A desire is for a thing not gained. It ceases when it is fulfilled and there is happiness. A king aspiring to become an ideal emperor is contented when he becomes so. There is no more any desire in him to become an emperor because he is already one. But he may have desires to become any of *manuṣya-gandharva* to *Hiraṇyagarbha*. Actually the happiness one gains on fulfilling desire is because of the absence of the desire at that moment until new desires crop up. These entities are contented with their respective positions because they have already got them and there is no longer that specific desire in them. Desireless *Brahmajñānī* is happy because he does not have those desires and he knows that they are full of defects. Therefore, he is at par with all of them with respect to their happiness. This shows that desirelessness (*akāmahataḥ*) is a main means of gaining *Brahmajñāna*.

SATYAM JÑĀNAM ANANTAM BRAHMAN IS ĀNANDA

From the unfoldment of Brahman seen so far, the *Brahmānandavallī* establishes that Brahman is *ānanda* (happiness) besides *satyam*, *jñānam*, *anantam*. Brahman was defined as *satyam* (ever-existent principle), *jñānam* (attributeless knowledge principle) and *anantam* (limitless principle). This was accomplished by using the three distinct non-synonym words viz., *satyam*, *jñānam* and *anantam* having distinct meanings in a juxtaposition. Thereby each word eliminates the limitations of linguistic meaning of the other two words to indicate one and the same *upādhi*less Brahman. The three words were used as the adjectives in the sense of definition. Adjectives also reveal the nature of an entity besides distinguishing a thing from others of the same kind.

The Brahman is concealed in the *guhā* (cave) of five sheaths in the sense it gets identified with them denying its real knowledge. The result of *Brahmajñāna* was figuratively described as the simultaneous fulfilment of all desires. This proves that Brahman itself is *ānanda* (happiness) and it itself is the source of all sense-pleasures. It is limitless (*ananta*) *ānanda* because Brahman itself is limitless (*ananta*) as demonstrated by the emergence of Creation including the relatively *ananta* (limitless) *ākāśa* (space) from it. If this *ānanda* gained by a *Brahmajñānī* were something distinct from Brahman it will cast a limitation reducing Brahman to be dual and no longer non-dual. This can never be so.

Then the inquiry (*śravaṇa*) to ascertain Brahman as one's real nature starts with the means of *pañcakośa-viveka* aided by the bird-imagery. The erroneous identification with the body from the grossest *annamaya-kośa* is shifted to the subsequent sheath in the order of internality, more pervasiveness and more independence. In the most internal *ānandamaya-kośa* the first four constituents are *priya*, *moda*, *pramoda* and the common factor in them the happiness reflected in their cause the ignorance called *kāraṇānanda* or 'ānanda ātmā'. All these are with *upādhis*. The basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of all these called *puccha* described in the *śruti* as 'Brahmapuccham pratiṣṭhā'. This proves that the basis of all *kośas* called 'I' (*ātmā*) is Brahman whose nature is *upādhi*less *ānanda* happiness which has to be limitless (*ananta*) because it is not an attribute but the nature of Brahman which by its nature is *ananta*. Thus the *pañcakośa-viveka* establishes the nature of Brahman as non-dual *ānanda* free from all *kośas*.

Further as a part of *manana* (reflection) the *śruti* raises three pairs of doubts:

‘Whether Brahman exists or not?’, ‘Ignorant person gets liberated or not?’ and ‘Whether *Brahmajñānī* gets liberated or not?’ In answer to these, the *śruti* describes that the entire Creation is born of Brahman and is centred in it. Its nature is ‘*rasa*’ (happiness) which is the cause of all delight or contentment. The Brahman abiding in the *ākāśa* (five sheaths called *guhā* or *param-vyoman* is equated to *ānanda* (*ākāśa ānanda*). This Brahman called *ānanda* prompts the living beings to function and delights them because it is the cause or the original source of all *viṣayānanda* which is corroborated by *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (*Br.U.4-3-32*). Finally the *ānanda-mīmāṃsā* proves the *ananta* (limitless) nature of *ānanda* that is Brahman or otherwise called *Brahmānanda*. The *ānanda* of *Hiraṇyagarbha* is the highest in *Viṣayānanda*. *Brahmānanda* cannot be in this category because it is self-existent, unborn and *upādhi*less. All happiness gained from human to *Hiraṇyagarbha* are with *upādhis*. They have a beginning and an end. All of them put together is an insignificant portion of *Brahmānanda* (*Br.U.4-3-32*). Thus the *Brahmānandavallī* begins Brahman having the nature of *ānanda*. It ends with the nature of Brahman as limitless *ānanda*. In between it repeatedly emphasizes in different contexts that Brahman is *ānanda* by nature. By this we get an extended definition of Brahman as ‘*Satyam, jñānam, anantam, ānandam* Brahman’. In this definition each word carries a distinct meaning and it is kept in apposition with the other three words. This provision in the definition clearly indicates that the principles of ever-existence, knowledge, limitlessness and happiness coalesce into one entity - non-dual Brahman.

It is worth noting that ‘*Satyam, jñānam, anantam, ānandam* Brahman’ is only a demonstrative sample definition, but not a conclusive one. To gain *ātmajñāna*/*Brahmajñāna* the knowledge of the nature of *ātmā*/Brahman with its all aspects is necessary. Therefore *ānandādyadhikaraṇa* (*Br.Sū.3-3-11* to *13*) establishes *guṇopasaṃhāra* wherein the nature of Brahman described in all *śākhās* of the Vedas should be collected to reveal the nature of Brahman in entirety. The *ānandādyadhikaraṇa* establishes: ‘The nature (*dharma*) of Brahman such as *ānanda* (happiness), etc., has to be collected together because the *jñeya* Brahman unfolded in the many *śākhās* of the Vedas is one and the same. But the *priya, moda*, etc., of *ānandamaya-kośa* should not be collected together because they increase and decrease. Brahman being one and the same and not varied, they cannot be applied to Brahman. Moreover *priya*, etc., are the features of *kośas* (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-12*). *Priya*, etc., are features of *upāsya* (the thing to be meditated). Other than those such as *ānanda*, etc., as the nature of Brahman are not meant for *upāsana*, but to gain the

knowledge of one and the same Brahman unfolded at different places. *Nyāyanirṇaya* (gloss on *sūtrabhāṣya* by Ānandagiri) suggests minimum five facets of *ātmā*/Brahman such as *satyatva*, *jñānatva*, *ānandatva*, *ātmatva* (*pratyktva*), *pūrṇatva* (*anantatva*) should be put together to describe in entirety the real nature of *ātmā*/Brahman. In fact this can serve as a *mahāvākya* because the word *ātmatva* is there signifying the identity of Brahman and *ātmā*. Sarvajñātmā compiles many more aspects in his *San̄kṣepaśārīraka* (*San̄.Śā.1-173*) such as *nitya*, *śuddha*, *buddha*, *muktasvabhāva*, *satya*, *sūkṣma*, *sat*, *vibhu*, *advitīya*, *ānanda Paramātmā*, *pratyak* so that there is no ambiguity about the real nature of Brahman.’

It is a matter of universal experience that in deep sleep we experience happiness free from sorrows which is recollected on waking. It is also well-known that in sleep the sense-objects and the senses including the mind are not available to experience any sense-pleasure. All that is there in sleep is *ātmā* veiled by ignorance. Ignorance being inert cannot have happiness as its nature. Therefore the happiness available in sleep is necessarily the nature of *ātmā*/Brahman. This fact is confirmed by *Māṇḍūkya* (5) and *Kaivalya* (15) Upaniṣads.

Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni in his prayerful composition called *Brahmavidāśīrvāda-paddhati* (*Br.Ā.P.*) points out a few instances wherein an experience of *ānanda* which is the nature of Brahman is available to us as though the *ānandasvarūpa* Brahman is peeping out: ‘When the mind is fixed on *pratyagātmā* as “I am unconnected (*asaṅga*)”, “I am of the nature of *cit*” and when the mind free from thoughts remains in a subtle form containing only *saṃskāras* (impressions), the *Paramānanda* the real nature of *ātmā* manifests. May it manifest very clearly to me’ (*Br.Ā.P.18*). ‘When there is neither the perception of the dualistic world nor the sleep the happiness experienced during such period is *Brahmānanda*’ (*Br.Ā.P. 25*). ‘The happiness that appears to be there when the mind is free from its usual function (though awake) is the happiness that is the real nature of *ātmā*’ (*Br.Ā.P.26*). ‘*Ātmā* is *Paramānanda* because it is never disliked and is the locus of limitless love (*paramapremāspada*)’ (*Br.Ā.P.35*). ‘*Ātmā* is *paramānanda* because even the body, etc., the source of all sorrows become most dear when in association with *ātmā*’ (*Br.Ā.P.42*).

Scriptures use different synonyms of the word happiness (*ānanda*) to describe the nature of happiness of Brahman. Some of these are: *ānandam* (*Br.U.3-9-28*, *4-3-32/33*; *Tai.U.2-4*, *2-7*, *3-6*); *sukham* (*Ch.U.7-23-1*, *Kṛ.U.5-12*; *Śv.U.6-12*; *B.G.6-21/27*); *kam* (*Ch.U.4-10-4/5*); *rasaḥ* (*Tai.U.2-7*); *priyam* (*S.R.U.58*, *59*).

Generally all words such as *ānanda*, *sukham*, etc., indicate *viṣayānanda*, the limited sense-pleasure born of sense-contacts with sense-objects. This must be true in all languages in the case of words synonymous with happiness as sense-pleasure. But when the words that signify happiness are used to describe Brahman, these limitations are eliminated by qualifying *ānanda*, etc., with words which specify limitlessness, eternity and exaltedness. Such words are: *Bhūmā* (infinite), Brahman, *anantam* (limitless), *śāśvatam* (eternal), *ātyantikam* (endless), *paramam* (primary, best), *uttamam* (exalted), etc. Thus unlike *viṣayānanda*, the words *ānanda*, *sukham*, etc., used to specify Brahman indicate the happiness that is unborn, (i.e. causeless); self-evident (*svaprakāśa*), the *svarūpa* of Brahman free from *tripuṭī*.

In English the words such as joy, pleasure, delight, bliss, gladness are synonymous with the word happiness. All of them do mean sense-pleasure here and hereafter. But the word bliss, according to dictionaries, has an additional meaning of happiness that is perfect or complete or supreme. According to Vedānta an entity that is most perfect, complete or supreme has to be *pūrṇa* (limitless). In this sense the word bliss has to mean the limitless, ever-existent, self-experiencing happiness (*Brahmānanda*, *ātmānanda*). *Bhagavān Śrī Satya Sāi Bābā* defines bliss to be the causeless, (i.e. unborn) happiness which can be gained only by the union with Divinity principle (*ātmā/Brahman*).

It is a matter of investigation as to what is the present concept of western theology about the entity that is perfect, complete or supreme. History records that until 500 years after the death of Jesus, Christian church believed that the soul's very source was God, and the soul was travelling back to oneness with God. This was strictly in accordance with the teaching of Jesus. Origen (185-254 CE) propagated this teaching extensively in his writings. But the emperor Justinian anathematized his teaching in the Fifth Ecumenical Council (545 CE). Pope Vigilius denounced such anathema because Origen's teaching was consistent with that of Jesus. He did not sign the papal decree. The Pope escaped when he was forced to condemn Origen's writings.

Further in the *Bhṛguvallī* it is declared that by *tapas* (self-inquiry as guided by *śruti* leading the mind to get absorbed in Brahman) Bhṛgu finally discovered directly that he is *ānandasvarūpa* Brahman. Notwithstanding the tenets of Upaniṣads including the *guṇopasaṃhāra* as ascertained by *Brahmasūtras* as described above some interpret the word 'ānanda' (happiness) from the statement of *Bhṛguvallī*,

'*ānando Brahmeti vyajānāt* (*Tai. U.3-6*) as *ananta* (limitless) with specific denial that the word '*ānanda*' used there does not mean happiness. They also say that the Brahman or *ātmā* presented in the *śāstra* as *sat, cit, ānanda* corresponds to the *Taittirīya* definition '*satyam, jñānam, anantam*' and thus *ānanda* means *ananta* (limitless) and not happiness.

Of course they make use of some semantic jargon. They contend that the word *ānanda* (happiness) creates a confusion that *Brahmajñāna* needs an experience of Brahman which they do not accept. Further they claim that *sat* is self-evident as 'I am', so is *cit* as 'I am a conscious being'. Being self-evident, these two aspects do not get displaced by other thoughts whereas 'I am happy' gets displaced by 'I am sorrowful', an opposite experience. Therefore they say that if '*ānanda*' (happiness) is translated as '*ananta*' (limitless) there is no possibility of it getting displaced at any time. But if *ānanda* is happiness, it has its opposite, unhappiness, displacing it. This observation does not appear to be thorough. 'I am an *ananta* (limitless) entity' also gets displaced by a thought such as 'I am a limited (*sānta*) one'. The opponent may argue that in Brahman the presence of limitations (*anta*) which can displace its limitless (*ananta*) nature is impossible. Yes, it is true. On the same basis the displacement of happiness nature of Brahman also is not possible because of its sorrowless nature. Let us bear in mind that *sat, cit* and *ānanda* are not three distinct attributes of *ātmā*. The one and the same non-dual, self-evident and self-experiencing entity called *ātmā* is viewed to be *sat*, etc., to refute it to be some non-existent, inert, sorrowful entity. To say that *ātmā* as *sat* and *cit* is self-evident, but not so as *ānanda* is far from truth.

The cause of above misconception will be clear when the cause of such opposed displacements is ascertained. 'I am' or 'I am a conscious being' are unqualified general experiences at the body level with identification with it. They do get displaced by our *vyavahāra* in the world as 'I walk', 'I talk', 'I am hungry', 'I am restless', 'I am ignorant', etc., with a qualified 'I'. In sleep, swoon or total anaesthesia there is totally an opposed displacement such as 'I was not', 'I was not consciousness' through the lack of awareness. These different expressions of one experience getting displaced by its opposite one are because of *upādhis* whereas Brahman is *nirupādhika* in nature. Therefore such displacements are only in the realm of *upādhis*. They are not relevant to Brahman. Semantically also the word '*ānanda*' (happiness) can never be translated as '*ananta*' (limitless). According to Saṃskrit language, these

two words are not at all synonyms.

In their eagerness to escape from the word ‘happiness’ (*ānanda*) by replacing it with ‘limitless’ (*ananta*) they have landed unknowingly in a situation which confirms the meaning of *ānanda* as happiness only even when it is taken as *ananta*. The word *ananta* means the entity that is free from all limitations on account of space (*deśa*), time (*kāla*) and objects (*vastu*). Only Brahman can be such entity and nothing else including space. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* uses the word *bhūma* (limitless) infinite, most exalted, abundant for the limitless Brahman and declares, ‘whatever that is *bhūmā* is *sukha* (happiness); there is no *sukha* (happiness) in *alpa* (any inferior or limited entity) (*yo vai bhūmā tat sukham, na alpe sukham asti*) (*Ch.U.7-23-1*). Therefore *ananta* can only be Brahman that is limitless happiness. There is no *ananta* which is not happiness. The words ‘*satyam, jñānam, anantam, ānandam*’ in the definition of Brahman as established in the *Bṛguvallī* are not four distinct adjectives, but one and the same entity *caitanya* Brahman which is simultaneously ever-existent (*satya*), self-evident knowledge principle (*jñāna, cit, caitanya*), limitless (*ananta*) and itself happiness (*ānanda*). *Cit* (*jñānam*) which is self-evident is itself self-experiencing principle (*anubhava-svarūpa*). Therefore to a *jñānī* who has *jñānaniṣṭhā*, *Brahmānanda* is self-evident experience without any *tripuṭī*.

Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa describes this clearly in the *Bhagavadgītā* while defining yoga as *duḥkhasaṃyoga-viyoga* (disassociation of association with sorrow) (*B.G.6-21 to 23*). ‘The *jñānī* experiences (*vetti*) *ātyantikam* (limitless) *sukham* (happiness)’ (*B.G.6-21*). Here the verb ‘*vetti*’ means both ‘knows’ and ‘experiences’. But *bhāṣyakāra* interprets as ‘experience’ (*anubhavati*). Once again that happiness experienced by the *jñānī* is described as *uttamam* (*niratiśayam*, unsurpassed) (*B.G.6-27*). Not to leave any room for doubt that the *sukha* (happiness) referred to is *Brahmānanda* only, *Bhagavān* specifies further that the *sukha* gained is *Brahmasaṃsparśam atyantam sukham* (unsurpassed happiness identical with Brahman) (*B.G.6-28*) and it is the best happiness not born of *punya* or *pāpa* (*akalmaṣam*). The expression ‘happiness is gained’ is possible only when it is experienced (*B.G.6-27*).

In the *ānanda-mīmāṃsā* conducted in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat* (*Bṛ.U.4-3-33*) and *Taittirīyopaniṣat* (*Tai.U.2-8*) a person *śrotriya* (well-versed in the Vedas), *avrjina* (sinless because he is a *Brahmajñānī*) and *akāmahata* (totally desireless) is mentioned who verifies the *paramānanda* or *Brahmānanda* through his *tripuṭīless*

experience since what remains in *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is *upādhiless* self-experiencing (*anubhava-svarūpa*) Brahman. This role of the person who is *akāmahata*, etc., while ascertaining the nature of Brahman as limitless happiness (*ananta ānanda*) is described by Śrī Vidyāranya Muni in his text *Janakavidyā-prakāśa* (*A.Pr.*18-181 to 186): ‘To indicate the limitless happiness (that *ātmā*/Brahman is), by means of describing the limited happiness enjoyed by the entities beginning from human to *Hiranyagarbha*. The same is illustrated as applicable to *Brahmajñānī* who is *śrotriya* (well versed in the Vedas). The *śrotriya* referred to here is sinless (*avrjina*) because he is a *Brahmajñānī*. He is called *akāmahata* (not afflicted by desires) because he remains detached on discerning the defects of sense-objects. The words ‘happiness’ (*sukham*), ‘contentment’ (*tṛpti*) and ‘desirelessness’ (*akāmatvam*) are synonyms. Therefore in a person who is totally free from all desires the entire happiness is present. In the case of a *Brahmajñānī* indicated by the words *śrotriya*, etc., all types of happiness abide together because he is totally free from all possible desires. Ṛṣi Tittiri also has said that a *Brahmajñānī* enjoys all desirable sense-objects simultaneously (*Tai.U.2-1*). Beyond the *Sūtrātmā* (*Hiranyagarbha*) the *viṣayānanda* stops. The happiness nature of Brahman being limitless, its calculation comes to an end. Another *śruti* (*Tai.U.2-9*) has said that ‘words return from Brahman without being able to describe (the measure of its happiness). These living beings from an emperor up to *Hiranyagarbha* experience the drops of *Brahmānanda* (when compared to the ocean) which is experienced by the *śrotriya* who is a *Brahmajñānī*.’ To say that the droplets of *Brahmānanda* compared to an ocean are experienced by all ignorant living beings in a *sopādhika* state, but the *Brahmajñānī* who has accomplished his *nirupādhika* state (except for the subtle link with the body on account of *prārabdha-karma*) his real nature the self-experiencing principle *Brahmānanda* is not experiential is only the aberration of a prejudiced mind. This is a glaring example which shows how a prejudiced mind misses an obvious fact. The necessity of *ātmānubhava*, *Brahmānubhava*, to gain *aparokṣa-brahmajñāna* or *brahmasākṣātkāra* is established in the commentary at some other places in this text.* There are some others who opine that *brahmānanda* being *nityānanda* (eternal *ānanda* - happiness) is not experiential because we can never gain any *nitya* (everlasting) experience. In answer to this ‘a time bound experience can indicate timeless *brahmānanda*’ will be proved in the context of *Maitrāyaṇīya-śākhā-vivaraṇam* (*A.Pr.*10, vs. 49).

* Also vide *Brahmasūtra* (*Catussūtrī*) by this commentator.

JĪVEŚVARA-AIKYA - IDENTITY OF JĪVA AND ĪŚVARA

This *rasa* or *Brahmānanda* is the true nature of one and all whether it is *jīva* or *Īśvara*. The Upaniṣad says: ‘*saḥ yaḥ ca ayam puruṣe yaḥ ca asau āditye saḥ ekaḥ*’ (The Brahman concealed in the cave of five sheaths and now described as *Brahmānanda* is truly in the *puruṣa*, (i.e. *jīva*) and the *āditya*, (i.e. *Īśvara*). Both are one and the same) (*Tai.U.2-8*). The Upaniṣad began with the declaration, ‘*Brahmavid Āpnoti Param*’ (*Brahmajñānī* gains the liberation) (*Tai.U.2-1*). The statement ‘*saḥ yaḥ*’, etc., reveals the identity between *jīva* and *Īśvara*/Brahman. This truth is concluded in the above statement. It is the result of *ānanda-mīmāṃsā*. The author explains it.

बुभुत्सौ पुरुषेऽन्येषु मनुष्येषु च
योऽस्ति यः ।
आदित्ये चान्यदेवेषु स आनन्दो
न भिद्यते ॥१३६॥

बुभुत्सौ पुरुषे - in the *mumukṣu* who wants to know Brahman directly अन्येषु मनुष्येषु - in other common humans च - and यः अस्ति - the *Brahmānanda* that is there आदित्ये - in the deity *Āditya* च - and अन्यदेवेषु - in other deities यः (अस्ति) - the one who is there सः आनन्दः - that *Brahmānanda* न भिद्यते - does not differ – (136)

136. The *Brahmānanda* that is there in the *mumukṣu* who wants to know Brahman directly, in other common humans, in the deities *Āditya* and others does not differ.

The embodiments on account of one's *pāpa* and *puṇya* differ from individual to individual in all species. But the basis of all these superimposed *upādhis* including the *jagat* is one and the same *ānandasvarūpa* Brahman which lends the existence and knowledge principle to all. The pots differ, but space is one and the same. The distinctions amidst all individuals is because of varieties of embodiments and not in terms of their true nature. The word *anyadeveṣu* (in all other deities) includes all other living beings also.

The *ānanda* that is *Brahmasvarūpa* abiding in all embodiments does not differ was told in the second line of the earlier verse. How is it so is described now by giving the reason.

परप्रेमास्पदत्वस्य
लक्षणस्यैकरूपतः ।
लक्ष्यानन्दो न भिन्नः
स्यादखण्डैकरसो ह्यतः ॥१३७॥

परप्रेमास्पदत्वस्य - of the nature as the locus of limitless love in all लक्षणस्य - of the characteristic एकरूपतः - because of the uniformity लक्ष्यानन्दः - the *ānanda* that is indicated (by the characteristic) न हि

भिन्नः - is not at all different, is certainly one and the same अतः - therefore अखण्डैकरसः - invariable and limitless happiness (*Brahmānanda*) स्यात् - it should be—(137)

137. Because of the uniformity in the characteristic nature as the locus of limitless love in all, the *ānanda* (happiness) that is indicated (by the characteristic) is certainly one and the same. Therefore it should be invariable and limitless happiness (*Brahmānanda*).

It is a universal fact that every living being irrespective of its species, loves one's own self the most. 'I' is the locus of limitless love. This fact itself provides the valid proof that my real nature is limitless *ānanda*. We love a given thing because some delight we get in return. We love a child because it is the very embodiment of innocence which pleases us. We love a beautiful fragrant rose because it delights us. Likewise we may love various things because of the joy that we can derive from them. But for what reason do we love ourselves? We fail to find any external perceptible reason for 'I' being the locus of our maximum love. 'I cannot but love myself' is a universal fact. You cannot say 'I love myself because my eyes are beautiful' or because of some similar reason. In such case you love the eyes which you like because they are

beautiful. Our question pertains to the 'I' and it does not refer to any part of our body. We know for certain that our physical body, mind, etc., are the sources of great sorrows. And yet, coupled with 'I' (*ātmā*) our entire embodiment becomes the most dear. Therefore 'I' (*ātmā*) must be limitless in its nature (*Br.Ā.P.42*).

Love for oneself is the very inherent thing in each and every one of us and that is why we love ourselves the most. The word '*para*' in '*parapremāspada*' suggests the limitlessness of this love, without any specific motive or a cause. And hence the conclusion that the *ānanda* characterized by '*parapremāspadatva*' (locus of limitless love) is '*akhaṇḍaika-rasa*' (invariable and limitless happiness - *Brahmānanda*). The word *akhaṇḍa* suggests that it is invariable, full, whole, all pervasive in the sense of limitlessness. It is independent of any cause in terms of time, place or an object. Unlike the happiness that we get on account of many desired things in the world, this limitless *ānanda*, my nature, is not dependant on anything else. Let us analyse and ascertain as to how 'I', the locus of limitless love, is the limitless *ānanda* itself.

Consider a desired object 'A' which gives us some joy. There is

another object 'B' which gives more joy than 'A'. Therefore our love for 'B' is more than that towards 'A'. If there is an object 'C' which gives still more joy, then our love for 'C' will be still more than that for 'B'. Suppose there is something which gives limitless happiness, naturally our love towards it should be limitless. The corollary of this reasoning is that the entity which is the locus of limitless love should necessarily be the source of limitless happiness. So 'I' the locus of limitless love, must necessarily be the limitless *ānanda* (happiness). Therefore the statement in the earlier verse, '*saḥānandaḥ na bhidyate*', (i.e. the *Brahmānanda* abiding in all living beings up to *Hiranyagarbha* does not differ) does hold good.

RESULT OF ĀTMAJÑĀNA / BRAHMAJÑĀNA

The result of *ātmajñāna* / *Brahmajñāna* is told in the next five verses.

एवं विद्वान् स्वपुत्रादेः कोशषट्कात्
प्रकल्पितात् ।

व्युत्थायाखण्डैकरसे स्वानन्दे
प्रतितिष्ठति ॥१३८॥

एवम् - thus विद्वान् - *Brahmajñānī*
प्रकल्पितात् - from the falsely projected
(identification) स्वपुत्रादेः कोशषट्कात् - with
the six sheaths beginning from the

secondary *ātmā* such as the son, wife, etc., up to *ānandamaya-kośa* व्युत्थाय - having risen up, (i.e. having given up the identification with them) अखण्डैकरसे स्वानन्दे - in one's true nature, *ānanda*, that is invariable and limitless प्रतितिष्ठति - gets absorbed - (138)

138. Thus a *Brahmajñānī* having risen up, (i.e. having given up) the falsely projected (identification) with the six sheaths beginning from the secondary *ātmā* such as the son, wife, etc., up to *ānandamayakośa* gets absorbed in one's true nature, *ānanda*, that is invariable and limitless.

Earlier one's son, wife, etc., were described as a *kośa* (sheath) because of taking them as secondary (*gauṇa*) *ātmā* and consequent identification with them (vs.41 to 44). Thus total six *kośas* are referred to. None of them can be true 'I' (*ātmā*) because all them are *anātmā* (not self). Yet, universally there is an erroneous identification with them which is described as '*prakalpita*' (falsely projected). *Brahmajñānī* in the wake of his *Brahmānubhava* / *Brahmasākṣātkāra* having directly experienced his true 'I' totally free from all sheaths gives up the erroneous identification with them and gets absorbed in the *Brahmānanda-svarūpa*.

A contrast is drawn between all possible happiness produced by sense-

objects in all embodiments including that of *Hiranyagarbha* and the limitless *Brahmānanda*.

सार्वभौमादिकानन्दाः पूर्वैभ्यः

शतसंख्यया ।

परेऽधिकास्ते तु लेशा ब्रह्मानन्दस्य

बिन्दुवत् ॥१३९॥

सार्वभौमादिकानन्दाः - happiness beginning from that of an emperor (up to *Hiranyagarbha*) पूर्वैभ्यः - than the earlier शतसंख्यया - by hundredfold अधिकाः - more परे - in *Parabrahma* (सन्ति - are) तु - but ते - all of them put together ब्रह्मानन्दस्य - of (the ocean) *Brahmānanda* बिन्दुवत् - like a drop लेशाः - (are) particles – (139)

139. Happiness beginning from that of an emperor (up to *Hiranyagarbha*) which are hundredfold more than the earlier, exist in *Parabrahma* (Brahman). But all of them put together are particles like a drop (in the ocean) of *Brahmānanda*.

All living beings beginning from *Hiranyagarbha* to an insignificant ant subsist on the infinitesimal particle of this *Brahmānanda* only (*Br.U.4-3-32*). Even the happiness of *Hiranyagarbha* which is the highest one among the produced happiness enjoyed through an *upādhi*, (i.e. body) is as insignificant as a drop of water compared to the ocean. This fact should provide enough courage

to the *mumukṣu* to develop intense *vairāgya*. Let us remember for certain that *Brahmajñāna* without staunch *vairāgya* is an impossible feat. The frame of mind riddled with desires just does not permit the birth of *Brahmajñāna*.

Brahmānanda is indescribable and inconceivable. The words (*vāk*) and the mind (as the cognitional thought) which are employed to know and describe everything fail in their function of objectifying *Brahmānanda* and return (*Tai.U.2-9*). The first line of the next verse describes this fact. The second line points out that *Brahmajñānī* has no fear of anything including the most dreaded transmigration.

तस्मादियत्ता नैवास्य वक्तुं

ध्यातुं च शक्यते ।

न बिभेत्येव तं विद्वान्

जन्महेतोः कुतश्चन ॥१४०॥

तस्मात् - therefore अस्य - of this limitless *Brahmānanda* इयत्ता - measure वक्तुम् - to describe ध्यातुम् - to think of च - and न शक्यते - is not at all possible तं विद्वान् - the person who has *aparokṣa-jñāna* of Brahman कुतश्चन - from anything whatsoever जन्महेतोः - (including) from the cause of birth, (i.e. transmigration) न बिभेति एव - does not fear at all – (140)

140. Therefore the measure of this limitless *Brahmānanda* is not

possible to describe or to think of. The person who has *aparokṣa Brahmajñāna* does not fear at all from anything whatsoever (including) from the cause of birth, (i.e. transmigration).

There can be innumerable causes of fear. But all of them have their field of operation centred on the bodies that we wield. These bodies are acquired at birth and we identify with them. No doubt the root cause is self-ignorance (*avidyā*) but it operates with all its effects through the birth of body and consequent identification with it. As a result we isolate ourselves as a distinct entity different from all the rest of the *jagat*. This duality becomes the cause of fear. Thus *avidyā* and birth together serve as fulcrum on which the wheel called *saṃsāra* rotates. *Brahmajñānī* has destroyed the root cause of *avidyā*. Therefore there is no transmigration or *saṃsāra*. Thus there is no occasion of fear. In the realm of *sādhana-sādhyā* (do and accomplish) including those contained in the scriptures, the means (*sādhana*s) are aimed at solving specific individual problems. Unlike these temporary remedies Vedānta uproots the very basic cause of all problems and sorrows called *saṃsāra*.

Brahmajñānī has no remorse such as ‘why did I not do *karmas* yielding *puṇya*? Why did I do sinful acts?’ (*Tai.U.2-9*). This is told now.

पुण्यं नाकरवं कस्मात् पापं तु कृतवान् कुतः ।
इति चिन्ता तपत्यज्ञं ज्ञानिनं न तपत्यसौ ॥१४१॥

कस्मात् - why पुण्यम् - *puṇya*, good deeds न अकरवम् - did I not do तु - but कुतः - why पापम् - *pāpa*, bad acts कृतवान् - did I do इति - thus चिन्ता - anguish अज्ञम् - to the ignorant person तपति - afflicts असौ - that anguish ज्ञानिनम् - to the *Brahmajñānī* न तपति - does not afflict – (141)

141. The anguish, ‘why did I not do *puṇya* (good deeds), why did I do *pāpa* (bad acts)’, afflicts the ignorant person. But that anguish does not afflict the *Brahmajñānī*.

The said remorse is on the part of a *dhārmika* person who has *śraddhā* in the *dharmasāstra* and not for those who do not accept the *dharmasāstra*. A person who knows what is right course of duty and action according to *dharma* with due *śraddhā* in it may transgress it carried away by anger, greed, quick gains, etc. But these lapses of ‘not doing the right’ and ‘doing the wrong’ torment ignorant persons later in the old age or at the time of death because of the fear of going to hell. But a *Brahmajñānī* is not entangled in the web of *pāpa-puṇya*. He is above all these. In the wake of *jñāna* he has discovered oneself (*ātmā*) to be an *akartā* (non-doer).

The *śruti* tells further that the *jñānī* sees both *pāpa* and *puṇya* as *ātmā*

(*Tai. U.* 2-9). There is nothing else other than *ātmā*/Brahman from his vision rooted in the ultimate reality. This *śruti*-portion is now explained.

तापकत्वं तयोर्विद्वानुपेक्ष्यानुष्ठितिं
तयोः ।

आत्मानं प्रीणयन् बोधात्
सुदृढीकुरुते धियम् ॥१४२॥

विद्वान् - *Brahmajñānī* तयोः - of both 'not doing the good' and 'doing the bad' तापकत्वं (जानन्) - knowing fully well their power to afflict the *ajñānī* तयोः - of those two अनुष्ठितिम् - doing, performance उपेक्ष्य - having disregarded बोधात् - by the *Brahmajñāna/ātmajñāna* आत्मानं प्रीणयन् - resorting to *ātmā* by seeing *punya-pāpa* as *ātmā* itself धियम् - the knowledge of *ātmā* सुदृढीकुरुते - makes (his) mind very firm - (142)

142. A *Brahmajñānī* knowing fully well the power of both 'not doing the good' and 'doing the bad' which afflict the *ajñānī* (ignorant person), disregards their performance and resorts to *ātmā* through the means of *Brahmajñāna/ātmajñāna* by seeing *punya-pāpa* themselves as *ātmā*. Thus knowledge of *ātmā* makes (his) mind very firm.

A *jñānī* is above the level of sense-enjoyments. The *karma* is not his cup. Therefore he has no concern of

either earning *punya* or escaping *pāpa*. In his vision even the *pāpa-punya* are nothing but *ātmā*. '*Ātmānam prīṇayan*' can either mean pleasing oneself by *ātmajñāna* or pleasing *ātmā* figuratively by getting more and more absorbed in *ātmā*. In either way he strives hard to gain the *niṣṭhā* (steadfastness) in the *ātmajñāna*.

SUMMARY OF *BHṚGUVALLĪ*

With the above the explanation of *Brahmānandavallī* in *Taittirīyopaniṣad* is over. The next is *Bhṛguvallī*. Bhṛgu requests his father Varuṇa to impart *Brahmajñāna*. The father told him to inquire into Brahman at the loci of *anna* (food), *prāṇa* (vital airs), *caḥṣu* (eye), *śrotra* (ear), *mana* (mind) and *vāk* (speech). These signify the five sheaths from *annamaya* to *ānandamaya-kośa*. The norm of inquiry was given in terms of definition of Brahman as the entity which is the cause of birth (*janma*), *sustenance (sthiti)* and dissolution (*bhaṅga*) of the *jagat*. Bhṛgu inquires into and finds out each of the *kośa* from *annamaya* to *vijñānamaya* as Brahman. When he seeks his father's confirmation of the correctness of his discovery, Bhṛgu is encouraged to inquire further since what he discovered is wrong. Finally he discovers *ānanda* the basis (*puccham*) of *ānandamaya-kośa* as Brahman. This is *Bhārgavī Vāruṇī Vidyā* (knowledge imparted by Varuṇa to

Bhṛgu). This chapter is meant for highlighting the means (*sādhana*) of inquiry (called *tapas*). Some *upāsanās* are also told therein. The connected narrative (*ākhyāyikā*) is to show that this is the best teaching because the father will teach his dear son always that which is the best. After the teaching of *Brahmavidyā* and certain *upāsanās*, there is a brief description of the principle that is known by *Brahmavidyā* which is similar to that in the earlier chapter. At the end the *jīvanmukta* is described with the outburst of his joy through his song (a *sāma*). The author of this text does not describe *Bhṛguvallī* here to avoid repetition. Only its salient feature is being given with a reference to the *jīvanmukta*.

देहेन्द्रियकृते पुण्यपापे

चात्मतया सदा ।

पश्यन् सर्वात्मता स्वस्य

गायन् साम्नावतिष्ठते ॥१४३॥

देहेन्द्रियकृते - performed by the body पुण्यपापे - *pāpa* and *punya* च - and सदा - always आत्मतया पश्यन् - seeing (them) in the form of *ātmā* स्वस्य - one's सर्वात्मता - *ātmā* itself as the *ātmā* of all साम्ना गायन् - expressing by singing a *sāma* hymn अवतिष्ठते - remains in *Brahmānanda* as a *jīvanmukta* – (143)

143. (*Brahmajñānī*) seeing always the *pāpa* and *punya* performed

by the body in the form of *ātmā*, expressing *sarvātmātā* (one's *ātmā* as the *ātmā* of all) by singing a *sāma* hymn remains in *Brahmānanda* (as a *jīvanmukta*).

The *sarvātmātā* is the *aparokṣa* (direct) discovery of 'I' (*ātmā*) as the *ātmā* of all or the knowledge that 'I' (*ātmā*) is the *svarūpa* (true nature) of entire *jagat*. A *sāma* is a *mantra* from *Sāmaveda* sung according to the Vedic tune. The *sāmā* sung in the *Bhṛguvallī* is: *Hā, U (3), hā* (Oh! It is great wonder). I am *annam* (the food in the sense the *bhogyā* the things to be enjoyed or suffered), I am *annādaḥ* (the eater of the food, i.e. enjoyer or sufferer). I am the sentient one who as *karmaphala-dātā* (*Īśvara*) effects the connection between *anna* and *annāda*, (i.e. one who is called *ślokaḥ*). I am the first born *Hiranyagarbha*. I am *Virāṭ* born before the *jagat* and the presiding deities. *Mokṣa* (liberation) is centred in me (*amṛtasya nābhi*). The one who gives me in the form of food to those who ask for it, or describes me as the basis of food (*annasvarūpa*) verily protects me, (i.e. he does the right thing) and his food increases. On the contrary 'I' eat the one who eats the food without offering to the needy, (i.e. he comes to a bad lot). (The mention of *jñānī* as *anna* and *annāda* need not create any scare that one will be food of others on gaining the *mokṣa*. It is

not so. The division of *bhoktā* and *bhogya* is only in the realm of ignorance. In the wake of knowledge there is only Brahman and nothing else). I (as *Īśvara*) withdraw unto myself the entire Creation at the time of dissolution. Like the sun, I am the light of knowledge principle (*jñaptisvarūpa*) (*Tai.U.3-10*).

The word *sāmnā* as an indeclinable can also mean 'happily'. Then the last phrase of the verse will mean, 'expressing *sarvātmatā* by singing remains happily in *Brahmānanda* (as a *jīvanmukta*).

A few salient features of the *sāma* expressing *sarvātmatā* are mentioned in the next verse.

अहमन्नं तथान्नादः

श्लोककृच्चेतरोऽप्यहम् ।

इति सर्वात्मतां गायन्

जीवन्मुक्त इतीर्यते ॥१४४॥

अहम् - I (am) अन्नं - *bhogya* तथा - so also अन्नादः - *bhoktā* श्लोककृत् - (as *Īśvara*) the one who effects the connection between *anna* and *annāda* (*bhogya* and *bhoktā*) च - and अहम् - I (am) इतरः - any other entities अपि - also इति - thus सर्वात्मतां गायन् - singing the *sarvātmatā* (who remains he) जीवन्मुक्तः इति - as *jīvanmukta* ईर्यते - is called - (144)

144. I am *bhogya*, *bhoktā* and (*Īśvara*) called *ślokaḥkṛt* who effects the

connection between *anna* and *annāda* (*bhogya* and *bhoktā*). I am any other entities (such as *Hiraṇyagarbha*, etc.) also. Thus the one who remains singing the *sarvātmatā* is called a *jīvanmukta*.

A *jīvanmukta* because of his steadfastness in *Brahmānanda* is always happy. The quoted *sāma* is a sample demonstration of the expression of his joy. It does not mean that every *jīvanmukta* goes on singing this *sāma* or any other one.

The main purpose of *Bhṛguvalli* is told.

जीवन्मुक्त्यवसानाया विद्याया मुख्यसाधनम् ।
विचारो ब्रह्मणस्तेन भृगुर्ब्रह्मावबुद्धवान् ॥१४५॥

जीवन्मुक्त्यवसानायाः विद्यायाः - of gaining *Brahmavidyā* ending with *jīvanmukti* मुख्यसाधनम् - the main means ब्रह्मणः विचारः - the inquiry into the nature of Brahman, (i.e. *Brahmavicāra*) तेन - by that *Brahmavicāra* भृगुः - *Bhṛgu* ब्रह्मावबुद्धवान् - got the *Brahmasākṣātkāra* - (145)

145. The main means of gaining *Brahmavidyā* ending with *jīvanmukti* is the inquiry into the nature of Brahman, (i.e. *Brahmavicāra*). *Bhṛgu* got *Brahmasākṣātkāra* by that *Brahmavicāra*.

Jīvanmukti can be known only by steadfast *Brahmānubhava* in

accordance with the *adhyātma-śāstras*. It is beyond the sphere of reasoning. The author of this text has written a separate treatise on this topic called ‘*Jīvanmuktiviveka*’. The main means (*sādhanā*) of gaining *Brahmajñāna* is *ātmanvicāra/ Brahmanvicāra*. All other means (*sādhanās*) are to prepare the mind to take to the effective inquiry and have steadfastness (*niṣṭhā*) in the knowledge after gaining it.

The entire basic *Vedāntaśāstra* is composed by *jīvanmuktas*. They are firmly rooted in *Brahmasvarūpa* totally free from *drśya jagat*. But at times on account of their *prārabdha-karma*, they are aware of *mithyā jagat* also. Brahman is the principle which is totally beyond the scope of words. No word including the word ‘Brahman’ itself is capable of describing it. The reason is: ‘There is no perception of the *jagat* in *Brahmajñāna*, while there is no *Brahmajñāna* so long as the *jagat* is perceived’ (*Yo.Vā.Ni.U.40-9*). And yet, this stumbling block is overcome by *jīvanmuktas*. They have devised different modes/doctrines of teaching to guide ignorant *mumukṣus* and lead them to the attainment of *Brahmajñāna*. ‘Scriptures devised by *jīvanmuktas* continue to exist in the world for the sake of *mumukṣus* as means to gain *ātmasākṣātkāra*’ (*Yo.Vā.Sti.13-4*). ‘The names of all pervasive Brahman such as

cit, Brahman and *ātmā* have been coined by *jīvanmuktas* for use in scriptures’ (*Yo.Vā.Ut.122-35*). (*Bhagavān Śiva* teaches sage *Vasiṣṭha*): ‘Highly adorned *jñānīs* and guardians of the world such as *Brahmājī* (one of the Trinity), Rudra and Indra have coined for the nameless *Īśvara* (Brahman) names such as *cit*, Brahman, Śiva, *ātmā*, *Īśa*, *Paramātmā* and *Īśvara* in order to teach *mumukṣus*, compose the scriptures, and to validate the Vedas, *Purāṇas* and *Brahmasūtras*’ (*Yo.Vā.Ni.Pū.41-21 to 23*).

MAHĀNĀRĀYAṆOPANIṢAD – A FEW MEANS

With the above verse (145) the explanation of *Taittirīyopaniṣad* is over. As seen in the beginning, this corresponds to the seventh, eighth and the ninth parts of *Taittirīya-āranyaka*. The tenth part called *khila kāṇḍa* or *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* is commented upon by *Sāyaṇācārya* and *Bhattabhāskara*. It contains *Brahmavidyā*, *karmakāṇḍa* and *upāsanās*. In the beginning and in between there is *Brahmavidyā*. Thereafter varieties of *mantras*, *japa*, *homa* (including *virajā homa*), and *upāsanās* are described. In this chapter the author describes briefly the *sādhanās* from *satya* to *sannyāsa* required to gain *Brahmajñāna* and the *upāsanā* of a *jñānī*’s life as a sacrifice.

The next verse gives twelve

sādhanas leading to the prominent of them the *nyāsa* (*sannyāsa*).

सत्यं तपो दमः शान्तिर्दानं

धर्मः प्रजाग्नयः ।

अग्निहोत्रं यागयोगौ

न्यासश्चैतैः बुभुत्सताम् ॥१४६॥

सत्यं - speaking the truth and truthful conduct in life तपः - performance of *varṇāśrama karma* and ascetic practices दमः - the mastery over the senses शान्तिः - the mastery over the mind दानं - giving in charity धर्मः - living as per codes of conduct given in the *śruti* and *smṛti*, philanthropic activities प्रजा - having progeny अग्नयः - tending the sacred fires अग्निहोत्रं - performance of daily morning and evening *agnihotra* यागयोगौ - *yāga* (occasional *karmas* such as *darśa*, *pūrṇamāsa*, *jyotiṣṭoma*, etc.) and *upāsanās* (yoga) न्यासः - *sannyāsa*/renunciation च - and एतैः - by these बुभुत्सताम् - one should strive to gain the *Brahmajñāna* – (146)

146. By the following means one should strive to gain the *Brahmajñāna*: (i) *satya* (speaking the truth and truthful conduct in life), (ii) *tapas* (performance of *varṇāśrama karma* and ascetic practices), (iii) *dama* (mastery over the senses), (iv) *śanti* (*śama* - the mastery over the mind), (v) *dāna* (giving in charity), (vi) *dharma*

(living as per codes of conduct given in the *śruti* and *smṛti*, philanthropic activities), (vii) *prajā* (having progeny), (viii) *agnayah* (tending the sacred fires to be maintained by a householder), (ix) *agnihotram* (performance of daily morning and evening *agnihotra*), (x) *yāga* (occasional *karmas* such as *darśa*, *pūrṇamāsa*, *jyotiṣṭoma*, etc.), (xi) *yoga* (*upāsanās*), (xii) *nyāsa* (*sannyāsa*/renunciation).

Though these *sādhanās* are highlighted in the Upaniṣad by different *ṛṣis* as the exalted means, collectively the first eleven of them amount to the leading of a *dhārmika* life. It leads in course of time to *durita-kṣaya* (destruction of past sins), birth of *viveka*, *vairāgya* and *mumukṣā*. When the *vairāgya* and *mumukṣā* (desire for *mokṣa*) become intense, the *vividīṣā sannyāsa* becomes necessary to take to *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* exclusively. In *sannyāsa* the other *sādhanās* lose their relevance having served their purpose.

Thus *nyāsa* (*sannyāsa*) gains the importance.

न्यासोऽधिकं तपो

न्यासी युञ्जीतात्मानमोमिति ।

योगिनः तस्य देहांशाः

यागाङ्गैरखिलैः समाः ॥१४७॥

(एषु - among these) न्यासः -

sannyāsa अधिकं - the most exalted तपः (भवति) - (is) the means of gaining *ātmajñāna* न्यासी - *sannyāsī* ओम् इति (उच्चार्य) - chanting *Om* आत्मानम् युञ्जीत - should meditate on *ātmā* (ascertained in Vedānta) तस्य योगिनः - of that *jñānī* (*jīvanmukta*) देहांशाः - bodily limbs अखिलैः यागाङ्गैः - with all parts of a sacrifice समाः - are equal (as told by the *śruti*)—(147)

147. (Among these *sāadhanās*) the *sannyāsa* is the most exalted means of gaining *ātmajñāna*. Chanting *Om*, the *sannyāsī* should meditate on *ātmā* (ascertained in Vedānta). The bodily limbs of a *jīvanmukta* are equal to all the parts of a sacrifice (as told by the *śruti*).

The first line of this verse highlights the *sannyāsa* as the exalted means in gaining *ātmajñāna* and specifies the *sāadhanā* to be taken to by him. *Om* with its four *pādas* (quarters) having the spelling a (अ), u (उ) and m (म) provides a means to dissolve Creation in its basis *ātmā*/Brahman. This is elaborated in the *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad* with its *kārikās* (poetic gloss). *Bhāṣyakāra* has also composed a very small text called *Pañcīkaraṇa* meditation explaining this method of meditation*.

From the second line of this verse

up to the verse 149 an *upāsanā* of the life of a *jīvanmukta* as a sacrifice is suggested with its result. The *śruti* (*Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad*) equates the bodily limbs of a *jīvanmukta* with the different parts (*aṅga*) of a sacrifice (*yāga*). His bodily parts are to be looked upon or meditated as the *aṅgas* of a *yāga*. The *śruti* does so by considering the very life of the *jīvanmukta* itself as a *yāga*. This *upāsanā* is found in the section (*anuvāka*) 64 in accordance with *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* (Section 80, Rāmākṛṣṇa Mission publication - *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad*).

अहोरात्रादिकालास्तु समा

दर्शादियागकैः ।

जीवनं सन्नतुल्यं स्यान्मुच्यते

योगिसेवकः ॥१४८॥

अहोरात्रादिकालाः तु - whereas his periods such as day and night, etc. दर्शादियागकैः - with *darśa-pūrṇamāsa*, etc., sacrifices समाः - are (said to be) equal to जीवनं - his life सन्नतुल्यं - similar to a sacrificial session स्यात् - happens to be (as told in the *śruti*) योगिसेवकः - the *upāsaka* of a *jīvanmukta* मुच्यते - gets liberated—(148)

148. His (of *jīvanmukta*) periods such as day and night, etc., are (said to be) equal to *darśa-pūrṇamāsa*, etc., sacrifices. His life happens to be similar

* Vide 'Om Based Meditation' (*Pañcīkaraṇa* with *Vārtika* of *Sureśvarācārya*) by this commentator.

to a sacrificial session (as told in the *śruti*). The *upāsaka* of a *jīvanmukta* gets liberated.

A *jīvanmukta* is as good as *Īśvara* for practical purposes. The *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* (3-1-10) says: *Ātmajñamarcayet bhūtikāmaḥ* (the person desirous of *mokṣa* or prosperity should worship an *ātmajñānī*). The result depends on the motive behind the *upāsana* in terms of *niṣkāma* (desireless) or *sakāma* (with desires). Accordingly the *upāsaka*, after death travels through two distinct routes to get distinct results. This is described in the next verse.

स चोत्तरायणे प्रेत आदित्यं प्राप्य मुच्यते ।
अयने दक्षिणे प्रेतश्चन्द्रं प्राप्य न मुच्यते ॥१४९॥

सः च - the *upāsaka* of a *jīvanmukta* उत्तरायणे प्रेतः - who dies in the northern solstice आदित्यं प्राप्य - having reached *Āditya-loka* मुच्यते - gets liberated (gradually) दक्षिणे अयने प्रेतः - the one who dies in the southern solstice चन्द्रं प्राप्य - having gone to the heaven *Candraloka* न मुच्यते - does not get liberated (he returns) – (149)

149. The *upāsaka* of a *jīvanmukta* who dies in the northern solstice having reached *Āditya-loka*, gets liberated (gradually). The one who dies in the southern solstice having gone to the heaven *Candraloka* does not get

liberated (he returns).

The time of death such as day or night, *uttarāyana* (northern solstice) or *dakṣiṇāyana* (southern solstice) should not be taken literally timewise. The route of departure after the death is determined by the specific results of *karmas* or *upāsana*s and not by the time of death. These routes are manned by a chain of specific deities. The *niṣkāma* (desireless) *upāsaka* of a *jīvanmukta* goes to *Āditya-loka* and from there to *Brahmaloka*. There he gets the teaching of *Brahmavidyā*. Having become a *jñānī* gets liberated at the time of dissolution of Creation. This is called *krama-mukti* (gradual liberation).

The *sakāma* (with desires) *upāsaka* goes to the heaven called *Candraloka*. There he enjoys the heavenly pleasures and after his *punya* is exhausted returns to further transmigration. He does not get liberated.

This chapter is concluded by invoking the blessings of *Parameśvara* and the *Guru*.

तैत्तिरीयकविद्यायाः प्रकाशेनोपसेविनः ।

बुभुत्सूननुगृह्णातु विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः ॥१५०॥

विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः - *Parameśvara* in the form of *Vidyātīrtha* तैत्तिरीयकविद्यायाः - of *Brahmavidyā* taught by

Taittirīyopaniṣad प्रकाशेन - by the explanation उपसेविनः बुभुत्सून् - the *mumukṣus* who are earnest in gaining *Brahmajñāna* by following the teaching अनुगृह्णातु - may he bless—(150)

150. May *Parameśvara* in the form of Vidyātīrtha bless the *mumukṣus* who are earnest in gaining *Brahmajñāna*, (i.e. *jijñāsus*) by following the teaching of *Brahmavidyā* taught in the explanation of *Taittirīyopaniṣad*.

The name Vidyātīrthamaheśvara was thoroughly discussed in the commentary of the last verse in the earlier chapter. The author invokes the blessings of *Parameśvara* on all *jijñāsus* who strive to attain *Brahmajñāna* by following the explanatory teaching imparted herein. There can be many

obstructions in gaining this knowledge. Therefore the blessing of *Parameśvara* is essential. A *mumukṣu* is the one who wants to get freed from sorrows. In this sense all are *mumukṣus* because there is none who does not want to be free from sorrows. But a mature person comes to know that total freedom from sorrows is possible only by *ātmajñāna*/*Brahmajñāna*. He is *bubhutsu* (*boddhum icchuḥ*) or *jijñāsu* (*jñātum icchuḥ*) - one who is desirous of knowing Brahman.

Thus ends the second chapter *Taittirīyavidyāprakāśa*.

इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिविरचिते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
तैत्तिरीयकविद्याप्रकाशो नाम द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ।

॥ ॐ ॥



CHAPTER - III

ŚVETAKETUVIDYĀPRAKĀŚĀ (CHĀNDOGYOPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[The chapter, *Śvetaketuvidyāprakāśa*, contains the teaching from the sixth chapter (*Adhyāya*) of *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. The highlight of this teaching is the great equation ‘*tat tvam asi*’ (you are that *sat* Brahman) *mahāvākya* that declares the identity between *jīva* and *Īśvara*. The *guru* is Āruṇi (Uddālaka) and *śiṣya* is his son Śvetaketu. The father notices that his highly learned son has become an arrogant extrovert on his return from the *Gurukula*. To make him aware of his inadequate knowledge, and to make him an introvert so that he may learn the true knowledge - *Brahmavidyā*, the father inquires with him whether he had asked his *ācārya* to impart that knowledge in which by knowing one entity all else becomes known. Surprised by his ignorance of this, Śvetaketu got humbled. He became eager to acquire such an impossible field of knowledge. He requested his father to be his *guru* and accept him as a disciple.

The teaching begins with centering on a seemingly impossible fact: ‘The knowledge of one entity makes all else known’. The knowledge of the cause (*kāraṇa*) amounts to the knowledge of all its effects (*kāryas*). An effect (*vikāra*) is just a verbal expression by a different name (*vācārambhaṇam vikāro nāmadheyam*) of the cause. A brief description of Creation is given. Then the entry of *sat* (Brahman) into it is pointed out. It shows that the entire *jagat* is a falsely superimposed effect, on the *sat*, just as the snake is superimposed on a rope by mistake. With the process of *apavāda* (refutation) the entire *jagat* including the physical body is shown to be retracting to its cause *sat* just as a mistaken snake is refuted and the rope remains. The reality or ultimate cause is *sat* (Brahman). There is nothing other than it. Whatever appears as different from *sat* can only be *mithyā* in nature just as the snake is on the rope.

Śvetaketu on receiving the teaching was left with no doubt about the real

entity, the *sat*, as the cause of *mithyā jagat*. But the question ‘who am I called *jīva*?’ still did persist in his mind. He wondered, “Am I *sat* or its false effect? If I am not *sat*, how am I related to *sat*? If I exist independent of *sat*, the *jagat* also must be so in which case the *jagat* cannot be false. If I am not at all related to *sat*, then the knowledge of *sat* cannot be the knowledge of myself. In that case the declaration, ‘the knowledge of one entity makes everything known’ will be wrong.” The answer to the questions raised by Śvetaketu is the main thrust of Vedānta. All that “I” as an individual *jīva* wants is freedom from sorrows and acquisition of perpetual happiness. Vedānta considers the *jagat* only because “I” as an individual gets interested in it and interacts with it. The nature of *jagat* whether real or false is a matter of secondary importance to him. Keeping this fact in view, the Upaniṣad proceeds to reveal the truth that ‘I as an individual is not the *saṃsārī jīva* but the *asaṃsārī sat* (Brahman). Without this direct (*aparokṣa*) knowledge about who I am, there can never be the total freedom from *saṃsāra* for an individual.

In view of the above, in the teachings the true nature of *jīva* is established. It is nothing but *sat* (Brahman). This is established by considering the etymological interpretation of the words ‘*svapiti*’ (asleep), *aśanāyā* (hunger) and *pipāsā* (thirst). *Sat* itself is *paramānanda-svarūpa* totally free from all sorrows including transmigration. Uddālaka crystalizes his teachings in the great equation ‘*tat tvam asi*’ (you are that *sat* Brahman). It declares the identity between *jīva* and *Īśvara*. It needs *śraddhā* to inquire into it till such time the *mumuksu* verifies its truth himself. The doubts of Śvetaketu are answered by the *guru* through illustrations. At the end of clearing each doubt the same truth is repeated ‘*tat tvam asi*’. Totally nine times the advice of ‘*tat tvam asi*’ is given. This teaching of *sat-vidyā* as taught to Śvetaketu in *Chāndogya* is pre-eminent in the teachings of Vedānta because it presents to the world the ‘great equation’ through ‘*tat tvam asi*’ *mahāvākya*.]

INTRODUCTION

The *Aitareyopaniṣad* and *Taittirīyopaniṣad* were selected as representatives in the first two chapters from Ṛgveda and Yajurveda respectively. Now we come to Sāmaveda. The sixth chapter of *Chāndogyopaniṣad* from Sāmaveda

deals with *Śvetaketuvidyā*. It is the *Brahmavidyā* gained by Śvetaketu from his father Uddālaka.

The Sāmaveda is said to have one thousand traditional recensions called *śākhās*. But presently only four of them are available. They are: Kauthuma, Jaimini, Talavakāra and Rāṇāyana.

Among these the Kauthuma recension is more prevalent. It has eight sections in its *Brāhmaṇa* portion. One of them is *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. This Upaniṣad is extensively discussed in *Brahmasūtras*. It contains eight chapters. Its first five chapters contain many *upāsanās* which are meant for the fulfilment of specific desires or gaining *cittanaiścalya* (single pointedness of the mind). The last three chapters impart the teaching of *Brahmavidyā*. Upaniṣads are the means of gaining the non-dual knowledge (*advaita-vijñānam*). They end the erroneous concept of ourself as the *kartā* (doer), *bhoktā* (enjoyer or sufferer) and *saṃsārī*, etc., by revealing our true nature that is *sat, cit, ānanda ātmā* which itself is Brahman.

As for *upāsakas*, all that is necessary is the repeated practice of *upāsanā* once having understood it. This is not the case with non-dual knowledge or Vedānta. The highly eligible *mumukṣu* (*uttama adhikārī*) very highly equipped, may straight away get absorbed in one's true nature after a little exposure to *Brahmavidyā*. But the mediocre (*manda-adhikārī*) needs repeated learning until the clarity of vision, free from doubts and absorption in one's true nature is accomplished. Besides this, the repeated exposure to *Vedāntasāstra* is a sure means to curb the extroverted nature of the

mind. At times in the Upaniṣads along with *Brahmavidyā* many other allied topics are interspersed. Therefore to teach *Brahmavidyā* easily Vedāntic masters composed texts such as *Anubhūtiprakāśa*. Accordingly Śrī Vidyāranya Muni explains only the last three chapters containing Vedāntic teaching and excludes the *upāsanā* portions of the first five chapters.

In the sixth chapter of *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, (i.e. *Śvetaketu-vidyāprakāśa*) the *sat* (existence) nature of Brahman is elaborated. It is also very important because it contains the famous *mahāvākya* 'Tat Tvam Asi' (You are that *sat* Brahman). Vedānta is centred on main two principles: (i) the nature of *jīva* is Brahman and (ii) Brahman alone is the ultimate truth. These two are very well discussed here whereby in general all that is required to know Vedānta gets included in this chapter. Broadly this chapter can be divided into two parts. The first part is up to verse 72 and it describes *sat* (Brahman) as the cause (*kāraṇa*) of the *jagat* and establishes the fact that '*kāraṇajñāna*' (when the cause is known) '*kāryajñānam bhavati*' (the effect is as good as known). But this knowledge is insufficient to remove the *saṃsārī jīvatva* (nature as *jīva*). The remaining portion of this chapter is the second part which establishes the identity between *jīva* and Brahman.

The seventh chapter of *Chāndogya* (*Sanatkumāra-vidyāprakāśa*, Ch.4) explains the *ānanda* (happiness) nature of Brahman whereas its eighth chapter (*Prajāpati-vidyāprakāśa*, Ch.5) unfolds the knowledge principle aspect of Brahman. Thus, these three chapters describe the *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* nature of Brahman.

PRATIJÑĀ (DECLARATION)

छान्दोग्ये श्वेतकेतुर्यामारुणेर्लब्धवानिमाम् ।
ब्रह्मविद्यां संग्रहेण वक्ष्येऽहं सुखबुद्धये ॥१॥

छान्दोग्ये - in the sixth chapter of *Chāndogyopaniṣad* श्वेतकेतुः - Śvetaketu याम् - whatever ब्रह्मविद्याम् - *Brahmavidyā* आरुणेः - from Sage Uddālaka, the son of Aruṇa लब्धवान् - got इमाम् - this, the same अहम् - I (Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni) सुखबुद्धये - for an easy understanding संग्रहेण - briefly वक्ष्ये - shall describe – (1)

1. Śvetaketu learnt *Brahmavidyā* from (his father) Sage Uddālaka, (called Āruṇi also) the son of Aruṇa, as narrated in the sixth chapter of *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. I am going to describe briefly (now) the same for an easy understanding.

The subject matter of Upaniṣads is very profound. That is why, *Bhagavat Pūjyapāda Śaṅkarācārya* has written *bhāṣyas* on them. But even they are difficult to grasp for the majority of

aspirants. In view of such difficulty, the author simplifies it further.

THE CONTEXT OF TEACHING BRAHMAVIDYĀ

Śvetaketu as a boy was not interested in learning in spite of fast advancing of his schooling age. The father Āruṇi (Uddālaka) impressed upon his son that an uneducated person is a misfit in their learned family. Finally at the age of twelve he was sent to a good *gurukula* even though the father Uddālaka himself was an eminent *ācārya*. Perhaps the father must have found that disciplining the boy to pursue studies can be a difficult task at home. Śvetaketu returns at the age of twenty-four after learning for twelve years. The next verse describes the situation on his return.

वेदानधीत्य गर्वेण

श्वेतकेतुः पराङ्मुखः ।

आसीत् प्रत्यङ्मुखीकर्तुं

गुरुराहातिविस्मयम् ॥२॥

श्वेतकेतुः - Śvetaketu वेदान् - the Vedas अधीत्य - having studied गर्वेण - by arrogance पराङ्मुखः - totally extrovert and indifferent towards *Brahmavidyā* आसीत् - became प्रत्यङ्मुखीकर्तुं - to make him introvert गुरुः - the father अतिविस्मयम् - very surprising thing आह - asked – (2)

2. Śvetaketu having studied the

Vedas (for twelve years) by arrogance became totally extrovert (and indifferent towards *Brahmavidyā*). To make him introvert the father asked a very surprising thing.

The Upaniṣad says that Śvetaketu returned having become *mahāmanāḥ* (conceited considering no one is equal to him), *anūcānmānī* (thinking himself to be capable of giving discourses) and *stabdhaḥ* (arrogant) (*Ch.U.6-1-2*). According to morality the knowledge looks splendid when coupled with humility (*Vidyā Vinayena Śobhate*). Otherwise it is a matter of common observation that more knowledge breeds more arrogance. The pursuit of *ātmajñāna* is possible only when a person is humble, knows one's limitations and is ready to evolve. Sensing the plight of his son, the father asked him a surprising question which challenged his arrogance for the first time.

Uddālaka asked his son, 'you are considering yourself to be a very highly learned person, but did you ask your preceptor that teaching (*ādeśa*) by which whatever that is not heard or inquired becomes heard or inquired, not considered becomes considered, whatever not known/experienced becomes known/experienced?' (*Ch.U.6-1-2*). Here it is worth noting that the

father did not ask if he has inquired about *ātmā*/Brahman. Instead, he referred to the *ādeśa* (teaching). This shows that *Brahmavidyā* can be gained only by a well prepared disciple from a competent *guru* who is *Brahmaniṣṭha* (steadfast in the direct knowledge of Brahman). In fact Śvetaketu had already studied the Vedas. But here is the knowledge of the entity that is beyond the scope of senses, words and the mind. Mere academic knowledge cannot work. The father's question is summarized now.

BY THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE CAUSE ALL ITS EFFECTS BECOME KNOWN

एकतत्त्वे श्रुते सर्वमश्रुतं च श्रुतं भवेत् ।
अमतं च मतं तद्वदविज्ञातं च बुध्यते ॥३॥

एकतत्त्वे श्रुते - when one entity (the cause) is inquired into सर्वम् - all (effects) अश्रुतम् - not inquired into (individually) च - also श्रुतं भवेत् - become (as good as) inquired into अमतम् - not reflected/considered च - also मतं (स्यात्) - becomes (as good as) reflected/considered तद्वत् - similarly अविज्ञातम् - not directly known/experienced च - also बुध्यते - is (as good as) known/experienced (Do you know that principle?)—(3)

3. When one entity (the cause) is inquired into, all (effects) not inquired

into (individually) also become (as good as) inquired into; not reflected/considered things also become (as good as) reflected/considered; similarly not directly known/experienced also is (as good as) known/experienced, (do you know that principle?).

By the statement, 'by inquiry into one entity all others are inquired into', what is meant by the *śruti* or the father is that inquiry into the cause amounts to be the inquiry into its effects. Similarly the knowledge of the cause is that of its effects also (*Ch. U.6-1-3*). But Śvetaketu mistook it as the knowledge of one thing gives the knowledge of rest all other things. Therefore he doubts the veracity of the statement by questioning how such teaching is possible? (*Ch. U.6-1-3*). His protest is voiced in the following words.

नगर्वेदज्ञानमात्रेण यजुर्वेदादि

बुध्यते ।

तस्मादेकधिया सर्वज्ञानं

स्यादित्यलौकिकम् ॥४॥

ऋग्वेदज्ञानमात्रेण - just by knowing R̥gveda यजुर्वेदादि - Yajurveda, etc. न बुध्यते - are not known तस्मात् - therefore एकधिया - by the knowledge of one thing सर्वज्ञानं स्यात् - all knowledge takes place इति - such a statement अलौकिकम् - is unusual or found invalid in the world – (4)

4. Just by knowing R̥gveda, Yajurveda, etc., are not known. Therefore the statement, 'by the knowledge of one thing, all knowledge takes place', is unusual or found invalid in the world.

If anything in the empirical world has to hold good, it should be established by the worldly means of knowledge. Finding none of this effect, Śvetaketu brands the statement of knowing many by the knowledge of one as *alaukika* (unusual, uncommon) since it is not at all seen in the world.

Uddālaka proves how the knowledge of all is possible by the knowledge of one, based on worldly experience. He gives the illustrations of the mud and the earthenwares, the gold and its ornaments, besides iron and the instruments made out of it. In all these the aspect of material cause is the true entity whereas the name and form are false. By the knowledge of mud all earthenwares become known. What is known is only the one entity gold in and through all the golden ornaments, but thereby those ornaments become known because they are nothing but gold. Thus by the knowledge of one cause, all its effects become known. So is the case with the world or *saṃsāra*. If its basis or the cause is known, the entire world becomes known is explained now. Uddālaka answers.

मैवं मृद्धेमलोहेषु लौकिकेष्वस्य दर्शनात् ।
मृदादिज्ञानतः सर्वं मृन्मयम् ज्ञायते स्फुटम् ॥५॥

मा एवं (वद) - please do not say (that my statement is unusual) लौकिकेषु - in the worldly things such as मृद् हेम लोहेषु - in the mud, gold and iron अस्य - (correctness) of my statement दर्शनात् - because (it) is seen मृदादिज्ञानतः - by the knowledge of mud, etc. सर्वम् - all मृन्मयम् - wares made of mud स्फुटम् - clearly ज्ञायते - are known – (5)

5. Please do not say (that my statement is unusual). Because the (correctness) of my statement is seen in the worldly things such as the mud, gold and iron. All wares made of mud, etc., are clearly known by the knowledge of mud, etc.

The reply to the objection that such a phenomenon is not correct in the world is given from the worldly observation itself (*Ch.U.6-1-4* to 6). This is elaborated here up to the verse 25. The beginning of *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* discusses this point of knowing all effects when their cause is known. There, Śaunaka (the disciple) himself asks the entity having known which, the entire *jagat* becomes known (*Mu.U. 1-1-3*). *Brahmasūtra* (*Br.Sū.1-4-23*) in *Prakṛtyadhikaraṇa* makes it clear that the *śruti* declaration, ‘by knowing one everything becomes known’, is possible

only by the knowledge that Brahman is also the *upādānakāraṇa* (material cause) besides its *nimittakāraṇa* (efficient cause).

मृदो घटशरावाद्याः

विकारात् तत्तदाकृतिः ।

मृद् बोधात् बुध्यते नेति

यदुच्येत न बुध्यताम् ॥६॥

घटशरावाद्याः - pot pitcher, etc. मृदः विकारात् - by the change of the form of the mud तत्तदाकृतिः - (appear) having different shapes यद् - in case मृद् बोधात् - by the knowledge of the mud (तत्तदाकृतिः) न बुध्यते - (the different shapes) are not known इति उच्येत - it is said so न बुध्यताम् - let the (shapes) be not known – (6)

6. Pot, pitcher, etc., (appear) having different shapes by the change of the form of the mud. In case it is said that (the different shapes) are not known by the knowledge of the mud, let them not be known.

Actually what is meant by the different wares of the mud such as pot, pitcher, etc., is a change in the earlier form of the mud, as a lump appearing in different shapes given by the pot-maker. All along whether prior to the making of pot, etc., or after they are made, what is essentially there, is the mud and the mud alone. If it is objected that by knowing only the mud, the shapes of the pot, etc., are not known and therefore it cannot be

said as the knowledge of everything, the answer follows in the next two verses.

आकृत्याधारभागो यो घटस्यासौ तु बुध्यते ।
आधारो मृत्तिकाधेय आकारश्चोभयं घटः ॥७॥

(Though the shape of the pot is not known) घटस्य - of the pot यः - whatever आकृत्याधारभागः - the portion that is the basis of the shape असौ - that one तु - certainly बुध्यते - is known मृत्तिका - the mud आधारः - (is) the basis (or material cause) आकारः च - and the shape आधेयः - is an attributed entity उभयं घटः - both together constitute the pot – (7)

7. (Though the shape of the pot is not known) whatever portion that is its basis (or material cause) is certainly known. The basis (or material cause) is the mud. The shape is an attributed entity. Both together constitute the pot.

The mud pot has two portions or features. The one is the basis (*ādhāra*) or material cause the mud. The other one is the configuration of the mud appearing as a shape. It is attributed to the mud. The shape was not there before the pot was made. It is not going to be there after the pot is broken. The shape comes and goes whereas the mud the cause is always there before the birth and after the destruction of the pot. Though this is accepted, the contender's objection still remains unanswered. How can the mere knowledge of the basis mud without that

of its shape be the knowledge of the entire pot which constitutes both the basis and the attributed shape? The answer continues. The verse 7 furnished the prerequisite for the answer contained in the next verse.

आधारभागमात्रेऽपि ज्ञाते ज्ञातो घटो भवेत् ।
गोपुच्छमात्रसंस्पर्शाद् गोस्पर्शव्रतपूर्तिवत् ॥८॥

आधारभागमात्रे ज्ञाते - when only the feature that is the basis (of mud pot) is known अपि - even घटः - the pot ज्ञातः भवेत् - becomes known गोपुच्छमात्रसंस्पर्शात् - by merely touching the tail of a cow गोस्पर्शव्रतपूर्तिवत् - like the fulfilment of the vow of touching the cow – (8)

8. Even by knowing the feature that is the basis (of mud pot) also the pot becomes known. It is like the fulfilment of the vow of touching the cow by merely touching the tail of a cow.

It is a matter of common practice that by seeing or knowing a part of an entity, and more so when it is an important part, the entire entity becomes known. Just by seeing the face of a person he is identified as so and so. It is neither necessary nor possible to see his entire body in and out. The mud is an essential feature of a mud pot as its basis. Knowing it is obviously knowing the pot. This fact is further proved by taking recourse to the very concept put forth by the contender in the third quarter of the

verse 6. There it was objected that by knowing only the mud, the shape of the pot, etc., is not known and therefore by mere knowledge of the mud, the knowledge of all earthenwares can be known is not valid.

आकृतेर्यद्दज्ञाने घटाऽज्ञानं त्वयोच्यते ।
तद्बुद्धाधारबोधेन घटो बुद्धः कुतो न हि ॥९॥

यद्बुद्ध - just as आकृतेः अज्ञाने - when the shape (or the form) is not known त्वया - by you घटाज्ञानम् - the ignorance of the pot उच्यते - is said; is pointed out तद्बुद्ध - similarly आधारबोधेन - by the knowledge of the basis कुतः - why घटः - pot न हि बुद्धः - is not known? – (9)

9. Just as when the shape (or the form) is not known (even though only the mud is known), the ignorance of the pot is pointed out by you, similarly by the knowledge of the basis (the mud) why the pot is not known?

The person who speaks of the ignorance of entire pot even after knowing its mud portion, is actually pointing out the ignorance of the shape or the name and form aspect of the pot. According to him the ignorance of one portion amounts to the ignorance of pot. Then by the same norm, why not the pot be known on knowing its portion? What is the reason in giving a special status to the shape (or form) of the pot by considering its knowledge alone as the

knowledge of the pot? There is no valid reason to say so. It can only be an individual preference of giving importance to either of the two. People in the *vyāvahārika jagat* (practical world) say that *nāma-rūpa* (name and form) should be known to know everything. But those who know the ultimate reality, (i.e. *paramārthadarśī*) justify that the knowledge of the basis alone makes everything known.

Why giving more importance to the basis-portion is justifiable is being explained.

आकृत्याधारयोस्तुल्यं भागत्वं

न मृदं विना ।

केवलाकृतिमात्रः सन् घटः

क्वापि समीक्ष्यते ॥१०॥

आकृत्याधारयोः - in both the form (shape) and its basis भागत्वं - the aspect of being a portion तुल्यं - is common मृदं विना - (but) without the mud केवलाकृतिमात्रः सन् - only being the form न क्वापि - nowhere घटः - the pot समीक्ष्यते - is seen (or even thought of) – (10)

10. The aspect of being a portion is common in both the form (*ākṛti*) and its basis (*ādhāra*). (But) only being the form without the mud (the pot) is nowhere seen (nor thought of).

Forms (*ākṛtis*) go on changing, but they have to abide necessarily in

their basis (*ādhāra*). The basis is one whereas the forms are many. The basis is independent of forms, but the forms are dependant on their basis. The basis, the cause, inheres in all forms or the effects whereas the forms or effects are distinct from one another. Here the basis or the cause that is considered is not the individual portion of basis in a specific form, but the entire entity in general such as mud element or the metal gold which serves as the cause of all possible effects.

EFFECT (*VIKĀRA*) IS JUST A VERBAL EXPRESSION OF A NAME (*VĀCĀRAMBHAṆAM-NĀMADHEYAM*)

The above explanation of dividing the effect (*kārya*) such as mud-pot, etc., into the portions of *ādhāra* (basis) and *ākṛti* (form) is as per our experience and given to reasoning. But the *Tārkikas* (logicians) *Vaiśeṣikas* and *Naiyāyikas* say that the cause (*kāraṇa*) mud, etc., makes the effects (*kārya*) such as pot, etc. The effects are different from their causes mud, etc. Such effect produced abides in its cause by permanent connection (*samavāya-sambandha*). Both cause and effects are true (*satya*) in nature. This is called *ārambhavāda*. The Upaniṣads declare that the cause appears in the form of a false effect without any intrinsic change in itself. This is called *vivartavāda*. The view of *Tārkikas*, etc., is being refuted

now. For that purpose, first their view about cause and effect phenomenon is described.

मृदूपात् कारणद्रव्यात् कार्यद्रव्यं

घटात्मकम् ।

अन्यत् तत्समवेतं हि मृदीति

प्राह तार्किकः ॥११॥

घटात्मकं कार्यद्रव्यं - the substance called effect in the form of a pot
कारणद्रव्यात् - from the causal substance
मृदूपात् - in the form of mud अन्यत् - is distinct तत् - that (mud-pot) हि - indeed
मृदि - in the mud समवेतं - inseparably connected इति - so तार्किकः - *Tārkika* प्राह - says – (11)

11. The substance called effect in the form of a pot is distinct from its causal substance in the form of mud. That mud-pot is indeed inseparably connected to the mud. So says *Tārkika*.

स्वयुक्त्यासौ तथा ब्रूते न त्वेतल्लोकसम्मतम्

॥११ १/२॥

असौ - this (*Tārkika*) स्वयुक्त्या - by the reasoning imagined by himself तथा ब्रूते - says so तु - but एतत् - this न लोकसम्मतं - is not agreed to by people – (11½)

11½. The *Tārkika* says so by the reasoning imagined by himself, but this is not agreed to by people.

The *dravya* (substance) according to *Tārkikas* is the basis of feature (*guṇa*)

and action (*kriyā*). They accept that *kārya-dravya* (effect-substance) needs a *kāraṇa-dravya* (causal-substance). However according to them, the effect becomes distinct from its cause and the distinct effect maintains a specific permanent connection (*saṃbandha*) called *samavāya* with its cause. An effect having the connection (*saṃbandha*) of *samavāya* is called *samaveta*. They say that ‘the distinct effect abides in the cause’ just as ‘the cloth is in the threads’. If it were like ‘the water in a pot’ with reference to two distinct entities, the connection between threads and the cloth could have been a ‘*saṃyoga*’ (union) which they do not accept. They insist that ‘*samavāya*’ is distinct from ‘*saṃyoga*’. Thus according to them *kārya* (effect) abides in the *kāraṇa* (cause), the *guṇa* (attribute) in *guṇavān* (one who is endowed with *guṇa*), the *kriyā* (action) in the *kriyāvān* (one who is active), the *jāti* (species) in the *vyakti* (individual), etc. What they say is not proved by experience. It is just an imagination to justify their theory. Thereby they oppose the declaration of the *śruti* that effects are known on knowing the cause because for them the effects are distinct from their corresponding causes. Any connection (*saṃbandha*) can only be between two distinct entities. Therefore *Tārīkikas* consider the effect as distinct from

its cause. To assert this further, they imagine that the cause and effect exist independently. There can never be an effect such as mud-pot totally independent or distinct from its cause mud, etc., that in itself proves the fallacy of their arguments.

The *śruti* refutes the theory of *Tārīkikas* by pointing out the fact: *Vācārambhaṇam vikāro nāmadheyam* (Appearance of an effect distinct from its cause is only by getting a distinct name - a verbal expression based on words. In reality, effect is not independent of its cause) (*Ch.U.6-1-4 to 6*). First the contender is asked to describe the essential nature of a mud-pot distinct from the mud. Then the dismissal of *Tārīkika's* theory is done up to the verse 15.

घटे मृदः पृथग्भूते कीदृक् तत्त्वमुदीर्यताम् ॥१२॥

मृदः पृथग्भूते घटे - in the mud-pot totally different from the mud कीदृक् - what type of तत्त्वम् - essential nature (is there) उदीर्यताम् - please tell - (12)

12. (The *Tārīkika*) should tell the type of the essential nature in the mud-pot totally different from the mud.

If the threads are totally pulled out from the cloth, what is its *tattva* (reality or nature)? Then, the cloth has no existence at all. A *kārya* (effect) cannot be *tattva* (reality) when it has no

independent existence apart from its *kāraṇa* (cause). If a *kārya* exists independent of *kāraṇa*, then it is not at all the *kārya* of the *kāraṇa*. An entity having definite essential nature in reality is *tattva*. Effects cannot fulfill this requirement.

Under such circumstances, there can be only two possibilities. Either what is called pot is something expressed by words as a name or a totally distinct entity from the mud, just as the cloth is distinct from the mud. The pot cannot have an existent essential nature in either case.

वाचैवारभ्यते किं वा

पृथगानीयते वद ।

वाचैवारभ्यते तत्त्वं किञ्चिन्न

स्यात् खपुष्पवत् ॥१३॥

किं वाचा एव आरभ्यते - is (the essential nature or reality of) the pot made by words only वा - or पृथक्- distinct from the mud without the mud (itself) आनीयते - is produced वद - please tell वाचा एव आरभ्यते (चेत्) - if the pot is made by words only खपुष्पवत् - like the sky-flower किञ्चित् तत्त्वं न स्यात् - it cannot have any essential nature or reality, (i.e. it cannot be true)–(13)

13. Is (the essential nature or reality of) the pot made by words only or is it produced distinct from the mud

without the mud (itself)? If it is made by words only, it cannot have any essential nature, (i.e. cannot be true) like the sky-flower.

The phrase ‘*kiñcit na tattvam*’, (i.e. *nistattvam*) means devoid of any essential nature or reality. ‘*Khapuṣpa*’ (sky-flower) is a figurative expression to denote an impossibility.

The impossibility of having any reality of the pot because it is only a product of word is further illustrated.

मृगतृष्णाम्भसि स्नातः

खपुष्पकृतशेखरः ।

वन्ध्यापुत्र इति प्रोक्तो

निस्तत्त्वमखिलं खलु ॥१४॥

मृगतृष्णाम्भसि - in the mirage water स्नातः - bathed खपुष्पकृतशेखरः - the head decked out by sky-flowers वन्ध्यापुत्रः - son of a barren woman इति - so प्रोक्तः - is described खलु - certainly अखिलं - entire (description) निस्तत्त्वम् - has no reality – (14)

14. If it is described that the son of a barren woman has bathed in the mirage water and his head is decked out by sky-flowers, certainly the entire (description) has no reality.

All the three phrases such as ‘bathed in the mirage water’, ‘head decked out by sky-flowers’ and ‘son of a barren woman’ suggest only the

utter impossibilities. Therefore the description of a pot by words itself cannot mean its reality.

The possibility of producing a pot from the mud but distinct from it without the mud itself was asked in the verse 13 (second quarter). It is refuted now and the final ascertainment regarding the nature of the pot is pronounced.

पृथगानयनं कर्तुं धीमतापि न शक्यते ।
अतोऽनृतो घटो नैव सत्य इत्यभ्युपेयताम् ॥१५॥

पृथक् आनयनं कर्तुं - to produce a mud-pot distinct from the mud धीमता अपि - even by a wise or a skilled person न शक्यते - is not possible अतः - therefore घटः - pot अनृतः - false (*mithyā*) सत्यः न एव - not at all real इति - so अभ्युपेयताम् - should be accepted—(15)

15. To produce a mud-pot distinct from the mud is not possible even by a wise or a skilled person. Therefore it should be accepted that the pot is false (*mithyā*) and can never be real.

Mithyā (false) entity is that which appears to be there experientially but found to be truly not so on inquiry. All effects (*kāryas*) are *mithyā*. It cannot be said that effects are useful and therefore they are not *mithyā*. It should be kept in the mind that effects such as mud-pots are useful only when their cause inheres in them. Effects distinct from cause can

neither exist nor be useful. For example, the cloth from which all the threads are pulled out cannot cover our body. It can no longer be the cloth. A mud-pot minus the mud neither exists nor can fetch the water. Therefore the *śruti* makes it very clear that all effects are *mithyā* (false) and they are not different from their causes. *Ārambhaṇādhikaraṇa* (*Br.Sū.2-1-14 to 20*) has discussed this topic thoroughly.

It is true that an effect cannot exist independent of its cause and *samavāya* is not possible. But at experiential level the distinction between the cause and its effect cannot be derived. The compatibility of this is explained after drawing the difference about the cause-effect relationship according to *Tārīkika* and *Vedāntin*.

समवायस्त्वया प्रोक्त आरोपं ब्रूमहे वयम् ।
स्थाणावारोपितश्चोरो यथा मृदि घटस्तथा ॥१६॥

त्वया - by you (the *Tārīkika*) समवायः - an effect distinct from the cause maintaining a permanent connection with its cause प्रोक्तः - was described वयम् - we (*Vedāntins*) आरोपम् - superimposition (false attribution, *adhyāsa*) ब्रूमहे - say यथा - just as स्थाणौ - on a stump (of a tree) चोरः - a thief आरोपितः - is superimposed तथा - similarly मृदि - in the mud घटः - the pot (आरोपितः - is superimposed)—(16)

16. (With respect to cause-effect relationship) *samavāya* (an effect distinct from the cause maintaining a permanent connection with its cause) was described by you (the *Tārkika*) whereas we (*Vedāntins*) say (it to be) superimposition (false attribution, *adhyāsa*). Just as a thief is superimposed on a stump (of a tree), similarly the pot (is superimposed) in the mud.

The false perception of a non-existing entity is called *āropa*. It is also called delusion or *adhyāsa*. At places *āropa* is called false imagination also. Much used words in Vedānta for such delusion is *adhyāsa* or *adhyāropa*. Here *āropa* is to be taken as delusion. As per Vedānta, an existing entity is the cause (*kāraṇa*). With that as the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*), we get the delusion of effect (*kārya*). Thus the experience of cause-effect division is explained. That is also not opposed to the false (*mithyā*) nature of effect (*kārya*). The mutual relation between true (*satya*) and false (*mithyā*) itself is *āropa* (superimposition). The illustration of a stump (of a tree) being mistaken as a thief in dull darkness explains how the mud is believed as a pot because of the specific configuration of the mud.

The false (*mithyā*) nature of entities superimposed (*āropita*) such as the thief and the pot was already pointed

out (vs.15). It should be kept in mind that the experience or the utility is not the criterion of reality. For example, the dream food is useful to appease the dream-hunger. But on waking up it gets negated with the knowledge that it does not exist in three periods of time. The *abādhitattva* (ceaseless existence) is the criterion of reality. This can be seen from the following verse.

आरोपात् पूर्वमूर्ध्वं च तदभावादसत्यता ।
आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ॥१७॥

आरोपात् पूर्वम् - before the superimposition ऊर्ध्वं च - and after the superimposition is ended तदभावात् - because of the absence of both the thief and the pot असत्यता - their nature is false यत् - (the rule is) whatever आदौ अन्ते च - in the beginning and after its end न अस्ति - does not exist तत् - that entity वर्तमाने अपि - even during the present (during its period of seeming existence) तथा - is so, (i.e. does not exist at all) – (17)

17. The nature of both the thief and the pot is false because of their absence before and after the superimposition is ended. (The rule is), the entity that does not exist in the beginning and after its end is so, (i.e. does not exist at all) even during the present (during its period of seeming existence).

The mistaken thief was only during the period of delusion, but neither before nor after. Similarly the pot is there only during its period of appearance. Before its birth it was not there. After its destruction it is not going to be there. An entity that ceases to exist at times is truly not there at any time. As seen earlier the *abādhittva* (ceaseless existence) is the criterion of reality. The second line of the above verse is quoted from *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā* (*Mā. U. Kā. 2-6, 4-31*). Gauḍapādācārya has explained in that text the *mithyātva* (false nature) of *kārya* (effect) with many reasonings.

SATYĀNṚTA - VIVEKA – DISCRIMINATION OF REAL AND THE FALSE

All our interactions in the world are with the entities in terms of objects, beings and events that happen to be the combination of real and the false. It is in our interest to know always the real whether at the empirical (*vyavahāra*) level or *pāramārthika* (absolute reality) level. With this intention the author investigates further the nature of *satya* and *anṛta*.

कालत्रयानुगः स्थाणुः सत्यो मृच्च तथेक्ष्यताम् ।
सत्यानृते च मिथुनीकृत्य कुम्भ इतीर्यते ॥१८॥

कालत्रयानुगः - the one who exists in the past, present and future स्थाणुः - stump (of a tree) सत्यः - is real तथा - similarly मृत्

च - the mud also ईक्ष्यताम् - be considered (as real) सत्यानृते च - both the real (mud) and false (form-*ākṛti*) मिथुनीकृत्य - having combined कुम्भः - pot इति - so ईर्यते - is said – (18)

18. The stump (of a tree) that exists in the past, present and future is real. Similarly the mud also be considered (as real). Having combined both the real (mud) and false (form-*ākṛti*), it is called a pot.

The first line of this verse actually defines *satya* (real) though it is stated with reference to the stump. Of course, here the stump has to be taken as relatively real in comparison with the superimposed false entity, the thief. *Pāramārthataḥ* (from the standpoint of absolute reality) only Brahman can be real. The second line refutes the view of *Tārkikas*.

Bhāṣyakāra has established in *adhyāsa-bhāṣya* the fact that all the worldly activities are invariably based on the combination of *satya* (real) and *anṛta* (false) at the level of absolute reality. He says: ‘*satyānṛte mithunīkṛtya*’ ‘*aham idam*’, ‘*mama idam*’, *iti naisargikaḥ ayam loka-vyavahāraḥ* (having united the real [*ātmā*] and the false [*anātmā*] through inexplicable ignorance, people have natural misconceptions such as ‘I am

this body' and 'this is mine') (*Br.Sū. Adhyāśabhāṣya*). All the worldly activities are based on these misconceptions. We have to deal with effects (*kāryas*) only. They have both *satya* as *kāraṇa* and *anṛta* as *kārya* aspects. A *vivekī* should know the *satya* aspect. Though at practical level in every transaction we deal with relative *satya* aspects, they serve as the stepping stone to ascertain the final *satya*, *ātmā*/Brahman. Brahman cannot be dealt with from practical standpoint because it is all pervasive, non-dual, *niravayava* (partless), and *nirguṇa* (attributeless). The effects (*kāryas*) distinct from their causes cannot be interacted with because they cannot exist. Therefore the entire *vyavahāra* is because of combination (*mithunīkaraṇa*) of *satya* and *anṛta*.

So far it was proved that the mud is true (real) and the pot is false. The *vyavahāra* as pot is possible by the combination of both. Notwithstanding the reasonings given so far the contender insists that both mud and the pot are distinct entities with different utilities, etc. The first line of the next verse presents this doubt whereas the second line answers it.

शब्दप्रत्ययकार्याणि सन्ति

मृद्धटयोः पृथक्।

स्थाणौ चोरे च दृष्टानि

पृथक्तानि तथात्र च ॥१९॥

मृद्धटयोः - of the mud and the mud-pot शब्दप्रत्ययकार्याणि - name, the knowledge imparted by it and functions (or utilities) पृथक् सन्ति - are different तानि - (like) the same three स्थाणौ - in the stump चोरे - (in the) thief च - and पृथक् - differently दृष्टानि - seen तथा - (only because of that the thief does not become real) similarly अत्र च - here also (the pot cannot be real) - (19)

19. The name, the knowledge imparted by it, and functions (utilities) of the mud and the mud-pot are different (like) the same three seen differently in the stump and the thief. (Only because of these three distinct features the thief does not become real). Similarly here also (the pot cannot be real).

The name (word) 'pot', the knowledge or cognition as 'pot', and its utility of 'filling the water', etc., are related to the pot and not to the mud. Now the name 'mud', the cognition of 'mud', and its utility as cleansing agent, etc., are related to the mud and not to the pot. Thus because of different word (name), cognition and utility of the 'mud' and the 'pot', why can't they be distinct existing entities? The fallacy in this argument can be exposed by our observation related to the illustration of stump and the thief. The word, cognition and resultant effect are distinct in the

case of stump and the thief. The thief cannot be stump or the stump cannot be thief. Thief is seen as the person, but the stump to be inert wood. We are afraid of the thief, but not of stump. Thus though the trio such as name, etc., are distinct in both the cases, the thief is false and the stump is real. Similarly the cause (*kāraṇa*) is real and the effect (*kārya*) is *mithyā* (false) in spite of the name, etc., being different from each other. The names, etc., of an actor and the roles played by him are different. Yet, the actor is real and roles played by him are false. Therefore the effects such as pot are not real in spite of their utilities, etc.

When facing the combination of *satya* (real) and *anṛta* (false), a *mumukṣu* should be intent on or committed to *satya* only.

द्विविधव्यवहारस्य सद्भावेऽपि

विवेकिनः ।

सत्यायां मृदि तात्पर्यं

नानृतेऽस्ति घटादिके ॥२०॥

द्विविधव्यवहारस्य - of twofold dealings सद्भावे अपि - though present विवेकिनः तात्पर्यं - the commitment or the intentness of a *vivekī* (discriminative person) सत्यायां मृदि अस्ति - is for the real mud (किन्तु - but) अनृते घटादिके न - not for false pot, etc. – (20)

20. Though the twofold dealings

are present, the *vivekī* is committed to or intent on the real mud and not to the false pot, etc.

The twofold dealings are with the cause the real mud, and its effect the false pot, etc. They are twofold because the dealing centred on the cause is different from that on the effect. Water can be stored in a pot because of the mud and the cause aspect and not because of the form free from mud. If the golden ornaments are meant for decorative purpose, the metal gold only counts for selling. Though the dealing is with both real and false, a *vivekī* knows the real as real and the false as false. He is alert about it. If our love (*āśakti*) is for the false, the real will get neglected. And this is how the *samsāra* thrives because Creation is a mixture of both the false name (*nāma*) – form (*rūpa*) and the real *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda*. As told above, real aspect is to be accepted by discarding the false one. This is illustrated by the example of a sugarcane.

इक्षौ रसोऽस्त्यृजीषं च रसं गृह्णाति बुद्धिमान् ।
नर्जीषमेवं कुम्भेऽपि मृद्भागे युक्त आदरः ॥२१॥

इक्षौ - in the sugarcane रसः - sweet juice अस्ति - is there ऋजीषं - residual waste च - and (अस्ति - is there) बुद्धिमान् - wise person रसं - juice गृह्णाति - takes न ऋजीषम् - not the waste material एवं - similarly कुम्भे - in the pot अपि - also मृद्भागे

- for the mud aspect आदरः - importance
युक्तः - (is) appropriate—(21)

21. There is a sweet juice in the sugarcane and also the residual waste. A wise person takes the juice and not the waste material. Similarly it is appropriate to give importance to the mud aspect in the pot.

When you purchase a sugarcane you are paying for its residual waste also. But you drink only the juice and throw away the waste material. You will fall sick if you eat the waste. The same evaluation applies to the pot or the entire jagat. The basis sat, cit, ānanda ātmā/Brahman alone is to be sought and not the nāmarūpātmaka jagat. Instead, if you run after the jagat, you continue to be in the incessant transmigration. Therefore a mumukṣu has to be careful.

In the case of mud-pot, the śruti says, ‘the mud alone is real’ (mṛttikāiti eva satyam) and by the knowledge of the cause, the mud, all earthenware are known. This portion is further explained.

ये घटादिषु मृद्भागा ज्ञातव्या आदरेण ते ।
सर्वेऽपि राशिविज्ञानादेव ज्ञाता भवन्ति हि ॥२२॥

घटादिषु - in the pot (pitcher), etc. ये
- whatever मृद्भागाः - portions of the mud
(are there) ते - they आदरेण - carefully
ज्ञातव्याः - should be known हि - because
(कारणभूत) राशिविज्ञानात् एव - by the

knowledge of the aggregate cause (the mud) (कार्यभूताः - in the form of effects)
सर्वे अपि (मृदंशाः) - all (individual portions of the mud) also ज्ञाताः भवन्ति - become known—(22)

22. Whatever portions of the mud that are there in the pot, pitcher, etc., should be known carefully because by the knowledge of the aggregate cause (the mud), all (individual portions of the mud in the form of effects) become known.

The mud-component serving as the cause in different individual pots, pitchers, etc., made of mud are to be known in aggregate to ascertain the fact that one and the same mud principle is intrinsic in all of them as their cause. The constituent of mud in each of them is not different from one another. On seeing a huge heap of mud we can very easily know that all the mudwares made of it are nothing but one and the same mud. So is the case with all the mud abiding in all its wares.

When the real mud is one and the same why the phrase ‘all portions of mud’ (sarve mṛdbhāgāḥ) is used? This question is answered in the next verse.

मृद ऐक्येऽपि सर्वत्वमाकारैस्तदुपाधिभिः ।
निरुपाधिकविज्ञानात् सर्वोपहितधीर्भवेत् ॥२३॥

मृदः ऐक्ये अपि - though the mud is

one and the same principle तद् उपाधिभिः आकारैः - by different forms attributed (to the mud) by various *upādhis* having the shape of different configurations of the mud सर्वत्वम् - the pronoun 'all' (is appropriate) निरुपाधिकविज्ञानात् - by gaining the knowledge of the cause (mud) free from all *upādhis* (in terms of different configurations of the mud) सर्वोपहित धीः - the knowledge of all effects having *upādhis* (of different configuration of the mud) भवेत् - takes place—(23)

23. Though the mud is one and the same principle, on account of different forms attributed (to the mud) by various *upādhis* having the shape of different configurations of the mud, the pronoun 'all' (is appropriate). By gaining the knowledge of the cause (mud) free from all *upādhis* the knowledge of all effects having *upādhis* (of different configuration of the mud) takes place.

The *upādhis* (adjuncts) of the cause mud are different names and forms attributed to it by its different configurations produced by the labour of the pot-maker onwards. Though, the mud is one and the same, its seeming manifoldness is on account of different *upādhis*. Therefore to know that all pots in the form of different *upādhis* having

different configurations are one and the same mud, the knowledge of *nirupādhika* configurationless mud is essential. That is why the knowledge of a heap (*rāśi*) of mud or aggregate of it free from all pots, etc., is recommended.

Now, the findings about the mud-illustration are extended to the illustrations of gold and iron in line with the *śruti*, to show that everywhere the cause is real and the effect is false.

कटकादौ सत्यभागा बुद्ध्या हेमधिया तथा ।
कुठारादौ सत्यभागा बुध्यन्ते लोहबुद्धितः ॥२४॥

तथा - similarly हेमधिया - by the knowledge of gold (the cause) in its (effects) कटकादौ - bangles, ring, etc. सत्यभागाः - their real portions बुद्ध्याः - are known लोहबुद्धितः - by the knowledge of iron (the cause) कुठारादौ - in the axe, nail-cutter, etc. सत्यभागाः - their real portions बुध्यन्ते - are known—(24)

24. Similarly by the knowledge of gold (the cause), the real portions in its (effects) such as bangles, ring, etc., are known. By the knowledge of iron (the cause), the real portions in the axe, nail-cutter, etc., are known.

The purpose of the *śruti* in giving many, (i.e. three) illustrations is to deduce the rule, 'all effects are known by the knowledge of the cause' (*kāraṇavijñānāt kāryavijñānam bhavati*).

यद्यत्कार्यं तस्य तस्य धीः

स्वोपादानबुद्धितः ।

इति व्याप्तिं विवक्षित्वा

दृष्टान्ता बहवः श्रुताः ॥२५॥

यत् यत् कार्यम् - whatever different effects that are there तस्य तस्य धीः - the knowledge of all of them स्वोपादान बुद्धितः - by the knowledge of their material cause (भवति - takes place) इति व्याप्तिं - this rule विवक्षित्वा - having intended to tell बहवः दृष्टान्ताः - many, (i.e. three) illustrations श्रुताः - are told by the śruti—(25)

25. The knowledge of different effects (takes place) by the knowledge of their material cause. To tell this rule the śruti has given three illustrations.

A *vyāpti* is defined as ‘*sāhacaryā-niyamaḥ*’ (a rule of invariable concomitance). To arrive at such a rule, many cases need to be considered to verify its correctness. Therefore the śruti gives the three illustrations. Thus the knowledge of (material) cause is the knowledge of real portion (*satyāṃśa*) in the effect. The name and form of the effect are false. Therefore the names and forms of *upādhis* are irrelevant in knowing the real nature of the effect. This clarifies what is meant by the śruti statement of gaining the knowledge of many by that of one. By knowing the one (cause) the real nature of many (effects)

can be known, though it cannot give the knowledge of their *nāma-rūpa* (name and form).

Śvetaketu had remarked that gaining the knowledge of many by that of one is something unusual (*alaukika*, vs.4). Its answer elaborated so far is now concluded.

सर्वं जगदुपादाने श्रुते सति भवेच्छ्रुतम् ।
मते ज्ञाते मतं ज्ञातमित्यलौकिकता कुतः ॥२६॥

जगदुपादाने - when the material cause of the *jagat* श्रुते - is inquired into सर्वम् - all individual entities therein श्रुतं भवेत् - become/inquired into मते मतम् - when the cause of *jagat* is reflected upon, everything in the *jagat* becomes reflected upon ज्ञाते सति - when the cause of *jagat* is known, the cause of everything in the *jagat* ज्ञातम् - becomes known इति - because of this कुतः अलौकिकता - how can it be unusual?—(26)

26. When the material cause of the *jagat* is inquired into, all individual entities therein become inquired into. So is the case with the reflection upon it and gaining its knowledge. Because of this, how can it be unusual? (It cannot be unusual).

This Upaniṣad will describe *sat* (‘is’ness, existence principle) as the basis or material cause of the *jagat* because ‘is’ness aspect alone is easy to

grasp in everything that is there in the Creation. The *cit* aspect is not available for direct perception in an inert entity whereas *ānanda* to appreciate in sentient and inert entities is difficult except in oneself. By the knowledge of *sat* (Brahman) as existence principle, the real nature of everything as *sat* (existence) becomes clear. Thus the *śruti*-statement, 'by knowing one, all becomes known' is a statement of fact and not an impossibility.

ŚRAVAṆA MANANA AND VIJÑĀNA

To know the *sat*, the means of *śravaṇa* (self-inquiry), *manana* (reflection) and *vijñāna* (the *aparokṣa*/direct experience/knowledge) are necessary. This has been referred to by the *śruti* as *śrutam*, *matam* and *vijñātam* (vs.3, Ch. U.6-1-3). The nature of these is being described.

श्रवणं गुरुशास्त्राभ्यां मननं तु स्वयुक्तिभिः ।
विज्ञानं स्वानुभूत्येति श्रवणादेरसंकरः ॥२७॥

श्रवणं - *śravaṇa* (is to ascertain the purport of the teaching) गुरुशास्त्राभ्यां - from *guru* and the *adhyātma*-scriptures मननं तु - whereas the reflection (is accomplished) स्वयुक्तिभिः - by one's reasonings based on the *śruti* विज्ञानं - *Brahmasākṣātkāra* (direct knowledge of Brahman) is gained स्वानुभूत्या - by one's

direct experience इति - thus श्रवणादेः - of *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *vijñāna* असंकरः - distinct natures and purposes are (or absence of confusion is) (clear) – (27)

27. *Śravaṇa* (is to ascertain the purport of teaching) from *guru* and the *adhyātma*-scriptures whereas *manana* or reflection (is accomplished) by one's reasonings based on the *śruti*. *Vijñāna* or *Brahmasākṣātkāra* (direct knowledge of Brahman) is gained by one's direct (*aparokṣa*) experience. Thus the distinct natures and purposes of *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *vijñāna* (are clear).

Ātmā/Brahman is attributeless (*nirviśeṣa*). It can neither be objectified by the mind nor described by the words. This was seen in the earlier chapter. And yet, its teaching has to be through the words which cannot describe it. Therefore the Vedāntic masters who were *jīvanmuktas* have devised the teaching method (*sampradāya*) through implication. Therefore a *guru* who teaches strictly in accordance with the *śāstras* following the *sampradāya* is inevitable. *Bhāṣyakāra* goes even to the extent of saying: '*Asampradāyavit sarvaśāstravidapi mūrkhavad eva upekṣaṇīyah*' (the person who does not know the *sampradāya* should be neglected like a fool even though he is learned in all *śāstras*) (*B.G.Bh.*13-2). Therefore the *śravaṇa* should be through

a competent *guru* and strictly in accordance with the *śāstras*. The reasonings adopted in the *manana* must be *śruti-sammata* (in accordance with the Upaniṣads).

Mere understanding the *śāstra* cannot solve the problem of *saṃsāra* though it is essential. The *sat* Brahman is actually the self-evident (*svaparakāśa*) 'I' experienced, moment by moment. But, what we experience is mixed with the *upādhis* of bodies, their features including transmigration, sorrows, etc. Brahman is limitless happiness (*paramānanda*) totally free from sorrows, birth and death. Therefore the experience totally free from all *adhyastas* including the *tripuṭī* (knower, knowledge-*vṛtti* and known) called *Brahmasākṣātkāra* or *Brahmānubhava* is indispensable. This is attained through *nididhyāsana*. The knowledge of *sat* without *Brahmānubhava* is merely *parokṣa* (indirect) knowledge. The direct experience of Brahman has to be totally in accordance with the teaching and the scriptures. Mere understanding of Vedānta is a part of the process of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. There should be uniformity among these three as exhorted by Sage Vasiṣṭha: 'Oh Rāma, you should uniformize my teaching, your understanding of the *śāstra* and the direct experience (of Brahman)' (*Yo. Vā. Ni. U. 203-21*).

ACTUAL TEACHING IMPARTED TO ŚVETAKETU

The illustration of mud-pot was elaborated to highlight that the varieties of *nāma-rūpa* in the *kāryas* (effects) is not real, but the one entity, the cause (*kāraṇa*) inhering in and through them is real whose knowledge is important. The main teaching starts now.

श्वेतकेतुः सर्वबोधमेकबोधेन विश्वसन् ।
प्रत्यङ्मुखो भवेत्तस्मै सर्वोपादानमीरितम् ॥२८॥

श्वेतकेतुः - Śvetaketu एकबोधेन - by the knowledge of one सर्वबोधम् - knowledge of everything (भवति - takes place) (इति - so) विश्वसन् - trusting प्रत्यङ्मुखः भवेत् (अभवत्) - became introvert (and attentive) by indifference towards the names and forms तस्मै - to him (गुरुणा - by the father) सर्वोपादानम् - (*Sat* Brahman) the cause of everything ईरितम् - was taught-(28)

28. Śvetaketu trusting the fact that everything becomes known by the knowledge of one (the cause) became introvert (and attentive) by indifference towards the names and forms. (The father) taught him the *Sat* Brahman (which is) the cause of everything (the entire *jagat*).

The imperceptible (*atīndriya*) *ātmā*/Brahman can be known only by the mind which has become introvert having

given up its extrovertedness. But this is possible only when one has *śraddhā* (the attitude of trust) towards *śāstra* and *guru*. This is all the more necessary because the statement such as ‘by knowing *ātmā* concealed in the five sheaths the entire *jagat* becomes known’ sounds ridiculous on its face value. Śvetaketu was convinced by the explanations given by his father. This shows that the proper teaching of a competent *guru* can inculcate *śraddhā* in the disciple. Teaching is required even to generate *śraddhā*.

The actual teaching begins with the statement: *Sat eva somya idamagre āsīt* (Oh, dear Śvetaketu, this *jagat* (*idam*) before the Creation (*agre*) was (*āsīt*) *sat* only (*sat eva*) (Ch.U.6-2-1). This portion of the *śruti* with its subsequent phrase is explained in the next 6 verses.

इदं जगन्नामरूपयुक्तमद्य सदीक्ष्यते ।

सृष्टेः पुरा सदेवासीन्नामरूपविवर्जितम् ॥२९॥

इदं - this जगत् - *jagat* सृष्टेः पुरा - before the Creation नामरूपविवर्जितम् - nameless and formless सत् - *sat* एव - only आसीत् - was (तु - but) अद्य - at present नामरूपयुक्तम् सत् - as the *sat* endowed with the *jagat* having the nature of names and forms ईक्ष्यते - is considered—(29)

29. Before the Creation, this *jagat* was nameless and formless *sat* only. But

at present the *sat* is considered as endowed with the *jagat* having the nature of names and forms.

If the *jagat* is born of *sat* alone, it should necessarily be nothing but *sat*. An idol made of stone is truly a stone or the mistaken snake seen in the place of a rope is rope only. It depends on the type of Creation. *Sat* Brahman being changeless (*avikārī*) this Creation must be of latter type like a rope seen as a snake. Here the verb ‘was’ is in the past tense. Actually, prior to the Creation there is no concept of time or space. Thus though the past tense is not applicable, the *śruti* is forced to use it to communicate in this present world of time and space concepts. Otherwise, the communication is not possible.

Because the *sat* (ever-existence) is the cause of *jagat*, all entities in it are endowed with *Sat* (‘is’ness). But in this realm of *saṃsāra*, the *sat* is available only with *nāma* and *rūpa*. The moment you say ‘is’, the questions shoot forth ‘what?’ ‘who?’

The variegated *jagat* can be born from one homogeneous *sat*. To this effect, suitable examples are given.

मृद्धेमलोहवस्तूनि

विकारोत्पत्तिः पुरा ।

निर्विकाराण्युपादानमात्राण्यासन्

यथा तथा ॥३०॥

यथा - just as मृद् हेम लोहवस्तूनि - the entities such as the mud, gold and iron विकारोत्पत्तिः पुरा - prior to the birth of their effects (products) निर्विकाराणि - unchanged उपादानमात्राणि - only as the homogeneous cause आसन् - were there तथा - so (was *sat* before Creation – (30)

30. Just as the entities such as the mud, gold and iron were only the unchanged homogeneous cause prior to the birth of their effects (products), so was *sat* before Creation.

All effects (*kāryas*) remain in their original causal form is a universally known fact. Similarly before the Creation *sat* was in its nature without even the trace of *nāmarūpātmaka jagat*.

The *śruti* further adds the phrase ‘*ekam eva advitīyam*’ (one only and non-dual) (*Ch.U.6-2-1*) which specifies what exactly is the *sat*.

स्वसजातिविजात्युत्थभेदत्रयविवर्जनात् ।
एकमेवाद्वितीयं तत् सद्द्विस्वित्यवगम्यताम् ॥३१॥

स्वसजातिविजात्युत्थभेदत्रयविवर्जनात् - because of being free from (*vivarjanāt*) the triple distinctions (*bhedatraya*) arising from (*uttha*) oneself (*sva*), similar species (*sajāti*) and dissimilar species (*vijāti*) तत् - that सत् वस्तु - entity the *sat* एकम् - one एव - only अद्वितीयम् - without the second इति - so अवगम्यताम् - be

known – (31)

31. Know that entity called *sat* to be ‘one only without the second’ because of being free from the triple distinctions arising from oneself, similar species and dissimilar species.

The distinctions (*bheda*) related to an individual entity are of three types. They are: (i) *Svagatabheda* (distinctions obtaining within oneself as an entity on account of parts or limbs (*avayavas*), (ii) *Sajātibheda* (distinctions among the individual members belonging to the same species), (iii) *Vijātibheda* (distinctions prevailing in different species). The author is going to explain first the nature of three distinctions with an illustration and thereafter will show how the three words ‘*ekam*’, ‘*eva*’ and ‘*advitīyam*’ account for the absence of these three *bhedas* in *sat*.

वृक्षस्य स्वगतो भेदः

शाखाद्यवयवैस्तथा ।

वृक्षान्तरात् सजातीयो

विजातीयः शिलादितः ॥३२॥

शाखाद्यवयवैः - by the parts such as branch, etc. वृक्षस्य - of a tree स्वगतः - abiding in oneself भेदः - distinction (भवति - takes place) तथा - likewise वृक्षान्तरात् - from other trees सजातीयः - (distinction of) similar species शिलादितः - from stone, etc. विजातीयः - (distinction of) dissimilar species – (32)

32. A tree has distinctions abiding in itself on account of its parts such as branch, etc., that of similar species from other trees, and the distinction of dissimilar species from the stone, etc.

A tree as an individual entity is constituted of distinct parts such as the root, trunk, branches, twigs, leaves, buds, flowers, fruits and seeds, etc. No two parts are similar. Such distinctions abiding in an individual member is called *svagata bheda*. A human body has different limbs distinct from one another. That is its *svagata bheda*.

There are innumerable trees different from one another though they belong to a single species called 'tree'. These distinctions among the different members belonging to the same species is called *sajātīya bheda*.

A 'tree' is different from a stone, the ocean, a cow, etc. Such distinctions are called *vijātīya* because they are on account of other species.

How in *sat* Brahman, these triple distinctions are absent is explained one after the other.

न सत्यवयवाः सन्ति

तेनैकं स्यादखण्डकम् ।

जात्यभावात् सजातीयं

विजातीयं च दुर्भणम् ॥३३॥

सति - in the *satsvarūpa* Brahman

अवयवाः - parts न सन्ति - are not there
तेन - therefore एकम् - one अखण्डकम् -
indivisibly whole (*pūrṇa*) स्यात् - it is
जात्यभावात् - because of being free from
species सजातीयम् - *sajātīya bheda*
विजातीयम् - *vijātīya bheda* च - and दुर्भणम् -
are difficult to speak, i.e. are impossible
(in it) – (33)

33. There are no parts (*avayavas*) in the *satsvarūpa* Brahman. Therefore it is one indivisibly whole (*pūrṇa*). Because of being free from species, the *sajātīya* and *vijātīya bhedas* are impossible in it.

The only non-dual homogeneous all pervasive entity called *sat* Brahman can never have any parts (*avayavas*) in it or species of the same kind or different. In the absence of parts no *svagata bheda* is possible. A *jāti* (species) needs different members of the same category or different from it. In non-dual Brahman neither *sajāti* (same species) nor *vijāti* (different species) can ever be possible. Therefore *sajātīya* and *vijātīya* distinctions are impossible in Brahman.

The above fact is conveyed by the *śruti*-phrase, '*ekam eva advitīyam*' (*Ch.U.6-2-1*).

एकादिभिः पदैर्भेदत्रयमत्र निवार्यते ।

सर्वभेदविहीनं यदखण्डं तत् सदीक्ष्यताम् ॥३४॥

एकादिभिः पदैः - by the words *ekam*

(one), etc. अत्र - here meaning in *sat* Brahman भेदत्रयम् - the triple distinction निवार्यते - is negated यत् - whatever सर्वभेदविहीनं - free from all (three) distinctions अखण्डं - whole (*pūrṇam*) तत् - that entity सत् - is *sat* ईक्ष्यताम् - (so) it should be considered – (34)

34. By the words *ekam* (one), etc., (told in the *śruti*) the (presence of) triple distinction in *sat* Brahman is negated. It should be considered that the entity that is free from all (those three) distinctions is *sat*.

The three words *ekam* (one), *eva* (only) and *advitīyam* (non-dual) refute the possibility of three types of distinctions (*bhedas*) in *Sat*. If *ekam* (one) is taken as *ekasvarūpa* (having the same nature) without manifoldness it refutes *svagatabheda* in *sat*. *Eva* (only) in the sense of ‘alone’ shows the absence of any other members belonging to the *sat* category. Thus it denies the *sajātīyabheda* in *sat*. On the contrary if *ekam* (one) means the absence of many, (i.e. *anekam*), it refutes *sajātīyabheda* whereas *eva* (only) as the absence of manifoldness (*nānātva*) denies *svagatabheda* in *sat*. In either way the two words *ekam* and *eva* refute the possibility of *svagata* and *sajātīya* distinctions in *sat*. *Advitīyam* (non-dual) speaks of the absence of any thing other than *Sat*. It shows the absence of

vijātīyabheda in *Sat* also. Thus *Sat* is free from all distinctions. Therefore it is *akhaṇḍa* (*pūrṇa*) the full and complete.

REFUTATION OF ASADVĀDA (THEORY OF NON-EXISTENCE)

Uddālaka had told that this *jagat* was in the form of its cause, the *sat* before the Creation. It means the ever-existence principle was there even in the absence of *jagat*. Some people think that the *jagat* is considered as ‘is’ (existent) when it is present. It ‘is not’ (non-existent) during its absence. Then how can it be said that the ‘is not’, (non-existence) ‘was’ (existent) before the Creation? Therefore they conclude that ‘non-existence’ was there before Creation. From ‘non-existence’ the existent *jagat* is born. Uddālaka refers to this doubt and simply brushes it aside by asking rhetorical questions. He asks, ‘how is this possible’, ‘how can from non-existence an existent entity be born?’ (*Ch.U.6-2-1*). This portion is explained in the next three verses.

अस्तीति शब्दबुद्धी द्वे दृश्येते नामरूपयोः ।
तदभावात् पुरा सृष्टेः शून्यमाहुरवैदिकाः ॥३५॥

नामरूपयोः - among all names and forms अस्ति - ‘is’ इति - so शब्दबुद्धी - the word and its cognition द्वे - two दृश्येते - are observed सृष्टेः पुरा - prior to the Creation तदभावात् - because of their absence

(जगत्कारणम्) शून्यम् - non-existence (is the cause of *jagat*) (इति - so) अवैदिकाः - the non-followers of the Vedas आहुः - say - (35)

35. The word ‘*asti*’ (is) and its ‘cognition’ are seen in all names and forms. The non-followers of the Vedas say that prior to the Creation because of their absence, (i.e. absence of existence and cognition of *nāma-rūpa*) the non-existence (is the cause of *jagat*).

They further add the following.

नामरूपात्मकं शून्यात् किलैतदुपपद्यते ।
तदयुक्तं न वन्ध्यायाः पुत्रात् पुत्रान्तरोद्भवः ॥३६॥

शून्यात् - from the non-existence किल - as they say एतद् - this नामरूपात्मकं (जगत्) - the *jagat* comprising names and forms उपपद्यते - is born तद् - that is अयुक्तम् - wrong वन्ध्यायाः पुत्रात् - from the son of a barren woman पुत्रान्तरोद्भवः न - another son is not born - (36)

36. As they say the *jagat* comprising names and forms is born from the non-existence. That is wrong. (For example) another son is not born from the son of a barren woman.

With the first line of this verse, what the contender has to say is over. The Upaniṣad simply proceeds further by remarking, ‘how can this be possible?’ and ‘how can an existing

entity be born from non-existence? It is opposed to universal experience. Here the author proves it to be wrong by giving a suitable example. It is wrong because it is not given to any reasoning, *pramāṇa* and experience. The son of a barren woman himself is a non-existing entity. How can further progeny be expected from him?

Bhāṣyakāra makes it clear that it is not difficult to land in the doctrine of non-existence by taking to reasonings heedless of the *śruti*. Unfortunately those people are unaware of the very existence of that principle which makes them aware of the non-existence that they have arrived at. They disregard all *pramāṇas* (means of knowledge) including their experience.

Further defect is shown if the cause of the *jagat* were the non-existence.

शून्यजत्वे नाम शून्यं रूपं शून्यमितीदृशः ।
शून्यानुवेधो भासेत सद्बोधस्त्ववभासते ॥३७॥

(जगतः) शून्यजत्वे - if *jagat* were born of ‘non-existence’ नाम शून्यम् - name ‘is not’ (is non-existent) रूपं शून्यम् - form ‘is not’ (is non-existent) इति ईदृशः - of such type शून्यानुवेधः - inherence of non-existence भासेत - should appear तु - on the contrary सद्बोधः - inherence of ‘existence’ अवभासते - appears - (37)

37. If the *jagat* were born of ‘non-existence’, (then) there should appear the inherence of ‘non-existence’ such as name (*nāma*) ‘is not’ (is non-existent), form (*rūpa*) ‘is not’ (is non-existent). On the contrary, (there) appears the inherence of ‘existence’ (everywhere). (Therefore *sat* [existence] is the cause of *jagat*).

It is universally known that the cause is inherent in its effects. Anything and everything in the world has for its basis ‘is ness’ (existence). That is why we say, ‘pot is’, ‘cloth is’, ‘name is’, ‘form is’, etc. If non-existence were the cause of the world, our observation should be ‘pot is not’, ‘cloth is not’, ‘name is not’, ‘form is not’, etc. But that is not true. Thus it should be very clear that the cause inheres inevitably in all its effects. Based on the observation of this verse that the *sat* (existence) inheres in everything contained in the *jagat*, it is concluded in the first sentence of the next verse that ‘*sat* is the cause of *jagat*’.

ĪKṢAṆA (CONSIDERATION), ETC., ABOUT CREATION

Uddālaka explains now the modality of the cause *sat* is effecting Creation. The portion ‘*sat* (*tad*) considered (*aikṣata*), let me be many (*bahu syām*)’, ‘I shall produce (*prajāyeya*)’ (*Ch.U.* 6-2-3), etc., will be explained part by part.

ततः सत्कारणं सत्तु सर्वसृष्ट्यर्थमैक्षत ।
बहु स्यामहमेवातः प्रजायेयेति मायया ॥३८॥

ततः - (because the inherence of ‘existence’ [*sat*] appears everywhere) therefore कारणम् - the cause (of *jagat*) सत् (एव) - is *sat* only सत् - *sat* तु - on the other hand सर्वसृष्ट्यर्थम् - to create everything ऐक्षत - considered अहम् - I एव - only बहु - many स्याम् - should become अतः - therefore मायया - through *māyā* प्रजायेय इति - so I shall be born with excellence – (38)

38. *Sat* only is the cause (of *jagat*) (because the inherence of ‘existence’ [*sat*] appears everywhere). *Sat* on the other hand, so considered to create everything: ‘I only should become many. Therefore I shall be born with excellence through *māyā*.’

As told earlier the first sentence in this verse is the conclusion of previous verse.

Īkṣaṇa (consideration) on the part of *sat* (Brahman) as *Īśvara* to produce Creation is described in this verse. The actual nature of *īkṣaṇam* will be described in the verse 44. This topic has already appeared in the second chapter (vs. 99 to 103). Upaniṣads declare that Creation is effected after proper consideration. Therefore *Sat* (Brahman), the undifferentiated material and efficient cause of Creation, is sentient and not

inert like the *pradhāna* of *Sāṅkhya* school of thought. This is thoroughly discussed in *Īkṣatyadhikaraṇa* (*Br.Sū.* 1-1-5 to 11). From such passages of *śruti*, it gets established that Brahman only can be the cause of Creation because inert entity cannot consider, think or desire. Brahman being non-dual, obviously it decided to create *śṛṣṭi* (Creation) out of itself without any actual duality. It is capable of doing it because of its omnipotence (*Sarvaśaktimatva*). It is just like we project the dream containing joys, sorrows, inert and sentient entities, etc., out of ourselves without any external material, cause or help. Just as the dream is false, but the person who projects the dream is true, so is the *jagat* false and Brahman is real.

The *śruti* has used the verb ‘*prajāyeya*’ (I shall be born with excellence) to tell the resolve of *sat* to create instead of ‘*jāyeya*’ (I shall be born) without the prefix ‘*pra*’ which indicates ‘excellence’. What is that excellence? This is explained in the next three verses.

वस्तुतो बहुभावश्चेदद्वैतं सद्विनश्यति ।

मा भूनाश इति श्रुत्या प्रकर्षेण जनिः श्रुता ॥३९॥

बहुभावः - becoming many वस्तुतः चेत् - if (it) were in reality सत् - *sat*, i.e. of *sat* Brahman अद्वैतं - non-dual nature विनश्यति - becomes lost नाशः मा भूत् - let

(non-dual nature) not be lost इति (हेतोः) - because of this reason श्रुत्या - by the *śruti* प्रकर्षेण जनिः - birth with excellence श्रुता - is told – (39)

39. If ‘becoming many’ of *sat* Brahman were in reality, its non-dual nature becomes lost. (Therefore) the birth with excellence is told by the *śruti* (to show that the non-dual nature of Brahman) is intact.

Brahman is *avināśī* (indestructible), *avikārī* (changeless), *niṣkriya* (actionless), *aparicchinnā* (limitless) and *advaya* (non-dual) in nature. If Brahman had undergone a real change in itself to become *nāmarūpātma jagat*, its duality becomes inevitable. Duality casts limitations which results in the destruction of all that is limited. Brahman can never be limited or dual in nature. That means Brahman without any change in its innate nature, has become *jagat* or it appears as seemingly as dual *jagat*. This unique type of Creation is the *prakarṣa* (excellence) signified by the prefix ‘*pra*’. The nature of that *prakarṣa* is described now.

प्रकर्षो नाम

पूर्वस्मादाधिक्यमधिका तु या ।

सा माया न सती नापि

शून्या स्याद् दूषितत्वतः ॥४०॥

प्रकर्षः नाम - what is called by the word *prakarṣa* पूर्वस्मात् आधिक्यम् - is an

added excellence without giving up the earlier state या तु अधिका - but whatever that is manifold (*aneka*) (without altering the oneness - *ekatā*) माया - is *māyā* सा - that *māyā* न सती - is not *sat* (existent) न अपि शून्या स्यात् - is not even *asat* (non-existent) दूषितत्वतः - because both ways it is proved to be not so – (40)

40. What is called by the word *prakarṣa* is an added excellence without giving up the earlier state. But whatever that is manifold (*aneka*) (without altering the oneness - *ekatā*) is *māyā*. *Māyā* is neither *sat* (existent) nor even *asat* (non-existent) because both ways it is proved to be not so.

When an excellence of an entity is described, it is understood that the entity is there as earlier with the addition of some good features, etc. If the entity itself is lost, there is none to whom that excellence can be attributed. Therefore producing manifoldness of Brahman without any intrinsic change in it can only be the sport of *māyā*. Otherwise if Brahman truly becomes many, a change in it becomes inevitable. That is not possible taking into account the nature of Brahman. Therefore by using the prefix ‘*pra*’ in ‘*prajāyeya*’ the *śruti* has declared that the Brahman becoming many is unreal being effected by *māyā*.

Though there is the experience of

endless names and forms in the *jagat* projected by *māyā*, they are all unreal because *māyā* itself is so. Therefore there being no duality in the real sense, the non-dual nature of Brahman is not lost. This is made clear now.

मायया बहुरूपत्वे सदद्वैतं न नश्यति ।
मायिकानां हि रूपाणां द्वितीयत्वमसंभवि ॥४१॥

मायया - by *māyā* बहुरूपत्वे (अपि) - though innumerable forms (from *sat*) appear to be there सदद्वैतम् - the non-dual nature of *sat* (Brahman) न नश्यति - is not lost हि - because मायिकानां रूपाणाम् - of the forms that are produced from *māyā* (and hence unreal) द्वितीयत्वम् - the secondness or dual nature as distinct from the real असम्भवि - is impossible – (41)

41. Though innumerable forms (from *sat*) appear to be there by *māyā*, the non-dual nature of *sat* (Brahman) is not lost because the secondness or dual nature of the forms that are produced from *māyā* (and hence unreal), as distinct from the real is impossible.

The duality in Brahman can be cast by only those which are real having ceaseless existence as the Brahman itself. The innumerable forms called *jagat* that seemingly appear from *sat* being the product of *māyā* end at one time or the other. Therefore they are false. A false entity cannot ascribe

duality to the real one. You and your shadow can never be two. Thus it is next to impossible that the false (*māyika*) forms can ever impose duality on the real Brahman.

By the inconceivable Creative power called *māyā*, Brahman appears as if the undifferentiated material and efficient cause of *jagat*.

अचिन्त्यशक्तिर्मायाऽतो दुर्घटं घटयत्यसौ ।
उपादाननिमित्तत्वे कल्प्येते सति मायया ॥४२॥

माया - *māyā* अचिन्त्यशक्तिः - is an inconceivable power अतः - therefore असौ - that *māyā* दुर्घटम् - impossible घटयति - accomplishes मायया - by *māyā* सति - in *sat* (Brahman) उपादाननिमित्तत्वे - the statuses of material and efficient causes कल्प्येते - are falsely projected – (42)

42. *Māyā* is an inconceivable power. Therefore it accomplishes the impossible. By *māyā* (only) the statuses of material and efficient causes are falsely projected in *sat* (Brahman).

A material cause necessarily undergoes a change in the process of creation. Brahman is *avikārī* (changeless). Therefore it cannot undergo any

change whatsoever. Again Brahman is *niṣkriya* (inactive) and *akartā* (non-doer). And yet, *māyā* presents Brahman as material and efficient causes of *jagat*. The *śruti* itself explains this in its two phrases ‘*bahu syām*’ and ‘*aikṣata*’ (*Ch.U.6-2-3*).

बहु स्यामित्युपादानभावः प्रोक्तो मृदादिवत् ।
ऐक्षतेति निमित्तत्वमिति प्रोक्तं कुलालवत् ॥४३॥

‘बहुस्याम्’ इति - by the statement ‘I (only) should become many’ मृदादिवत् - like the illustration of mud and earthenwares उपादानभावः - the nature of material cause (on the part of *sat*, Brahman) प्रोक्तः - was told ‘ऐक्षत’ - considered इति - by this statement कुलालवत् - like a pot-maker निमित्तत्वम् - the status of (*sat* as) efficient cause प्रोक्तम् - was told – (43)

43. The nature of material cause (on the part of *sat*, Brahman) like the illustration of mud and earthenwares was told by the statement, ‘I only should become many’ (*Ch.U.6-2-3*). The statement ‘considered’ (thought) (*Ch.U.6-2-3*) tells the status of (*sat* as) efficient cause like a pot-maker.

To show whatever that is ‘impossible’ or ‘not at all given to reasoning as possible’, is the handiwork of *māyā*. The *saṃsāra* cannot be ascertained as of such and such definite nature. It cannot be defined as ‘is’ (existent one) because it ceases to exist. On the contrary, it cannot be described as non-existent because it is experienced every moment. That exposes *saṃsāra* as the product of *māyā*. Otherwise how can it

be explained that *ātmanā* whose true nature is limitless happiness (*paramānanda*) parades as sorrowful *saṃsārī jīva*? Similarly in reality *sat* (Brahman) can neither be material cause of *jagat* nor the efficient one because both involve change (*vikāra*) which is next to impossible in Brahman. And yet, we are constrained to accept *sat* as both material and efficient causes in the empirical (*vyāvahārika*) realm because the *śruti* also says so in spite of its repeated assertions that Brahman is *avikārī*. Even reasoning-wise there seems to be no other way out. This is what *māyā* does. Perhaps it may swear that if it cannot do such things it is not worth the name *māyā*! If the *jagat* is presented in front of us so vividly without its actual birth, what a great deal is there in accepting the seeming statuses of *sat* as both the material and efficient causes. The reason for accepting *sat* as material and efficient cause is that the *śruti* describes ‘becoming many’ and ‘consideration’ on the part of *sat* only. Let us bear in mind that this is an Upaniṣadic *prakriyā* (method of teaching) for want of better mode. All that the *śruti* is interested in making us gain is *Brahmasākṣātkāra* (direct or *aparokṣa* experience of Brahman) wherein none of these referred hitherto including *avidyā*, *māyā*, *śṛṣṭi*, *jīva*, *Īśvara* and *saṃsāra* are there. What is there is Brahman and Brahman alone. That is the ultimate truth. Anything short of it is only in the realm of *avidyā* or *māyā*.

The *īkṣaṇa* (consideration, thinking) on the part of *sat* as *Īśvara* is not like that of a *jīva* because the *antaḥkaraṇa* is yet to come into existence. What exactly is the nature of this *īkṣaṇa* is described in the first line of the next verse whereas the second line onwards up to the verse 52, the actual process of Creation (*śṛṣṭi*) is presented.

मायावृत्तिविशेषे या

चिच्छायासौ सदीक्षणम् ।

ईक्षित्वा ससृजे तेजस्तादृक्

संकल्पलीलया ॥४४॥

मायावृत्तिविशेषे - in the first *vikāra*

(change) of *māyā* या - whatever चिच्छाया - reflection of *cit* (gets cast) असौ सदीक्षणम् - that is the consideration (*īkṣaṇa*) of *sat* ईक्षित्वा - having considered तादृक् - according to the consideration सङ्कल्पलीलया - by effortless will तेजः - the principle of fire ससृजे - created – (44)

44. The reflection of *cit* (*sat*) that gets cast in the first *vikāra* (change) of *māyā* is the *īkṣaṇa* (consideration) of *sat*. Having considered so, accordingly it created the principle of fire by its effortless will.

The first line of this verse

describes what exactly is meant by the *īkṣaṇa* of *sat*. The reflection of *cit* (which itself is *sat*) in the first change (*vikāra*) that takes place in the *māyā* on the verge of the Creation is *īkṣaṇa*. It is like the requisite thought that precedes an action. A question can be asked: 'Before Creation there being nobody, *antaḥkaraṇa* and senses, etc., how is it ever possible for *sat* as *Īśvara* to think, etc.?' *Bhāṣyakāra* replies this question in a similar context of *īkṣaṇa* in the *Aitareyopaniṣad*. He says that this is not a defect because omniscience is quite natural to *Īśvara*, (i.e. *sarvajñasvābhāvvyāt*). *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* (*Śv.U.3-19*) says: Brahman is swift without feet, seizes without hands, sees without eyes, and hears without ears. That shows it to be the principle which enables all senses, *antaḥkaraṇa*, etc., to function (*Ai.U.Bh.1-1*). The word 'omniscience' used above indicates omnipotence also.

ACTUAL *SRṢṬI* (CREATION)

It is well-known in the Vedas that *Īśvara* Creates *srṣṭi* to provide the field of experiences to all *jīvas* according to their *karma* and *upāsanāphalas*. Therefore according to the *īkṣaṇa*, the actual Creation begins. Accordingly the principle of fire was created.

In *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, the Creation begins with fire without space

and air whereas in *Taittirīyopaniṣad* the same starts from space, air and the third element happens to be the fire. What is the reason for this obvious contradiction in the Upaniṣads themselves? The answer follows in the next two verses. Another reason will also be given in the verse 58.

आकाशवायू प्राक्सृष्टाविति प्रोवाच तित्तिरिः ।
दिङ्मात्रमारुणिः सृष्टेर्वक्तुं तेज उदैरयत् ॥४५॥

आकाशवायू - the space and air प्राक्सृष्टौ - were created earlier इति - thus तित्तिरिः - the sage Tittiri प्रोवाच - has clearly said सृष्टेः - of Creation दिङ्मात्रम् - a mere indication or direction वक्तुम् - to relate आरुणिः - sage Uddālaka (the son of Aruṇa) तेजः - the fire उदैरयत् - told - (45)

45. The sage Tittiri (in the *Taittirīyopaniṣad*) has clearly said that the space and air were created earlier. The sage Uddālaka (the son of Aruṇa) told (the creation of fire) to relate a mere indication or direction of Creation.

Unlike the formless space and air, the fire, water and earth are perceptibly seen. It becomes easy to prove their false nature. This will be told in the verse 58. But the main purpose of describing Creation is to reveal its basis the Brahman. That can be accomplished even by the mode of Creation as described here by Uddālaka.

ब्रह्मोपलक्षणायैव सृष्टिः सर्वत्र कथ्यते ।
जगतः कियताप्येतच्छक्यं लक्षयितुं खलु ॥४६॥

सर्वत्र - everywhere in the *śruti*
सृष्टिः - Creation ब्रह्मोपलक्षणाय - for the
purpose of ascertaining Brahman एव -
only कथ्यते - is mentioned जगतः - of *jagat*
कियता अपि - by a little portion also खलु -
indeed एतत् - this ascertainment of
Brahman लक्षयितुं शक्यम् - is possible to
indicate—(46)

46. Everywhere in the *śruti*
Creation is mentioned only for the
purpose of ascertaining Brahman.
Indeed this ascertainment of Brahman
is possible even by taking into
consideration a small portion of *jagat*.

It is a well-known fact in the
scriptures that the *śrṣṭi* (Creation) is
described only to indicate Brahman as
the basis or the cause of false *jagat*. The
śruti has no intention whatsoever to
establish the reality of *jagat* by its
description because it can never be so.
The theories of Creation even differ
from one another. In that context
Gauḍapādācārya makes it very clear that
the description of such theories is meant
to reveal the knowledge of identity
between *jīva* and Brahman ('*upāyaḥ saḥ*
avatārāya', *Mā.U.Kā.3-15*) and not for
proving Creation to be real. Brahman
can be indicated by the sample analysis
of even a certain portion of Creation.

There is no need of describing it
completely every time.

The gold is the cause of golden
ornaments can be ascertained by
examining a few of them. It is not
necessary to study all such ornaments in
the world. So is true in the case of mud
and earthenwares, etc. Upaniṣads are
intent on imparting the knowledge of
Brahman. For this purpose it discusses
anātmā or *jagat* only to the extent
necessary. Just as Brahman can be made
known by five elements, so also it is
possible to do so with the help of three
elements. Therefore Uddālaka thought it
enough to mention only three elements.
The entire Creation is born from
Brahman. Therefore through the means
of anything from Creation the *sat*
(Brahman) can be made known. Thus the
mention of only three elements here, is
not a defect.

The narration of the Creation
continues further. 'That fire considered,
let me become many. It created the
water' (*Ch.U.6-2-3*). How can the inert
fire think and create? Such a question is
natural. Actually what is meant by 'the
fire thought', etc., is that the same *sat*
(Brahman) having now the *upādhi* of the
element fire, continued the Creation at
its every stage. The *Brahmasūtra*
(*Br.Sū.2-3-13*) ascertains the propriety
of this rule.

तेजसोऽचेतनत्वेऽपि

तेजः कञ्चुकसंयुतम् ।

तद्ब्रह्म पूर्ववद् वीक्ष्य संकल्पात्

ससृजे ह्यपः ॥४७॥

तेजसः अचेतनत्वे अपि - though the principle of fire is inert in nature तेजः कञ्चुकसंयुतम् - the (*sat*-Brahman) endowed with the garb, (i.e. *upādhi*) of fire तद्ब्रह्म - the same Brahman पूर्ववत् - as earlier वीक्ष्य - having considered संकल्पात् - by its will हि - only अपः - the element water ससृजे- created – (47)

47. Though the principle of fire is inert in nature, the same Brahman endowed with the garb, (i.e. *upādhi*) of fire having considered as earlier created the element water by its will only.

Further the *śruti* says: The water created *annam*, (i.e. the earth) (*Ch.U.6-2-4*).

अप्कञ्चुकं ब्रह्म पृथ्वीमन्नहेतुमकल्पयत् ।
तेजोऽबन्नेभ्य एतेभ्यो देहबीजानि जज्ञिरे ॥४८॥

अप्कञ्चुकं ब्रह्म - Brahman having the *upādhi* of water अन्नहेतुम् - the producer of food पृथ्वीम् - the earth अकल्पयत् - created एतेभ्यः - from these तेजोऽबन्नेभ्यः - from elements fire, water and earth देहबीजानि - the causes (seeds) of bodies (or bodily species) जज्ञिरे- were born – (48)

48. Brahman having the *upādhi* of water created the earth, the producer of food. From these elements fire, water and earth the causes (seeds) of bodies (or bodily species) were born.

Here the *śruti* has described the earth as *annam* (food) (*Ch.U.6-2-4*) because the earth is the cause or the producer of food. Further we find the earth called 'black' (*kr̥ṣṇa*) colour also (*Ch.U.6-4-1* to 4 and 6). To refer to a cause by the word denoting its effect is quite proper. The '*Pr̥thivyadhikārādhi-karaṇa*' (*Br.Sū.2-3-12*) has discussed this topic.

It is said here that the bodily species are born of three elements fire, water and earth. It indicates other two, space and air also. It is said that the bodily species were born. This statement is only in anticipation that they will be born in due course. Because, the grossified elements by the process of *trivṛtkaraṇa* (indicating *pañcīkaraṇa*) is necessary for the actual birth of bodies. It should be noted that more often than not the *śruti* is not particular about the chronological order or aggregate number of entities.

The names of those bodily species are enumerated in the first line of the next verse. The second line suggests the consideration on the part of Brahman to enter the bodies in the form of *jīvas*.

जरायुजाण्डजोद्भिज्जानीति बीजत्रयं खलु ।
जीवरूपप्रवेशार्थमैक्षत ब्रह्म देवताः ॥४९॥

जरायुजाण्डजोद्भिज्जानि - species born from the womb (viviparous), born from egg (oviparous) such as birds, reptiles, etc., and germinating (as a plant) इति - so बीजत्रयम् खलु - are the three types of species ब्रह्म - Brahman (*sat*) जीवरूपप्रवेशार्थम् - to enter in the form of *jīva* देवताः - deities ऐक्षत - thought of—(49)

49. The three types of species are those born from the womb (viviparous) born from egg (oviparous) such as birds, reptiles, etc., and germinating (as a plant). Brahman thought of deities (viz. fire, water and earth) to enter in the form of *jīva*.

The species of bodies *jarāyuja*, etc., mentioned here are only three in numbers. There is a fourth one called *svedaja* (born of warm vapour or sweat, said of insects). It can be included in the *aṇḍaja* category. The word *devatāḥ* (in the accusative plural) or deities refers to the three elements (fire, water and earth) already created. This word is used by the author in accordance with the statement of the *śruti*. Therein, even *sat* (Brahman) is indicated separately by the word ‘*devatā*’ only. The consideration (*īkṣaṇa*) so as to become many continues as told by the verb *aikṣat* (thought of) in the second line because the final

bahubhavana (becoming many) was still to be accomplished.

The actual *īkṣaṇa* of Brahman to enter the bodies in the form of *jīva* is: ‘The *devatā* (Brahman) under discussion considered. Well, myself having entered these three *devatās* (fire, water, earth) in the form of *jīva* will create *nāma-rūpa* (names and forms) (*Ch.U.* 6-3-2)’. Here entering the element fire, etc., means entering the bodies of different species after their grossification when all individual bodies are created.

The *īkṣaṇa* on the part of *sat* (Brahman) continues further to triplicate (effecting the *trivṛtkarāṇa* of elements) and enter the bodies made thereafter (*Ch.U.*6-3-3).

दृष्ट्वा भूय इहोत्पन्नास्तेजोबन्नाख्यदेवताः ।
एकैकां त्रिवृतं तासु कुर्वे देहादिसृष्टये ॥५०॥

इह उत्पन्नाः - born here in Creation तेजोबन्नाख्यदेवताः - *devatās* called fire, water and earth दृष्ट्वा - having seen भूयः - again तासु - in them एकैकाम् - each देहादिसृष्टये - to create gross body, etc. त्रिवृतम् - threefold, triplicate कुर्वे - I shall make (इति सा इयं देवता ऐक्षत) - (thus Brahman considered)—(50)

50. Having seen *devatās* called fire, water and earth born in Creation (Brahman considered) again: ‘I shall

make each of those three (elements) threefold (triplicate) to create gross body, etc.’

‘Having seen the elements fire, etc.’, means ‘having considered the purpose for which those elements were created’. The process of *trivṛtkaraṇa* (triplication) is to grossify the elements by mixing them in a specific proportion. How it is done will be explained in the next verse. The gross bodies, sense-objects and the gross world is made of grossified elements. The word ‘*ādi*’ (etc.) in ‘*dehādi*’ (gross body, etc.) signifies the sense-objects and the gross world. Only the subtle bodies are made from subtle elements.

The *trivṛtkaraṇa* suggested in the above verse (and *Ch.U.6-3-3*) is explained.

तेजस्यबन्नयोरंशावल्पौ प्रक्षिप्य मिश्रणात् ।
तेजस्त्रिवृत्कृतं तद्वदन्ययोरपि योज्यताम् ॥५१॥

तेजसि - in the element fire अबन्नयोः
- of water and the earth अल्पौ अंशौ -
smaller portions प्रक्षिप्य - having blended
मिश्रणात् - by such mixing तेजः - the fire
त्रिवृत्कृतम् - is triplicated तद्वत् - similarly
अन्ययोः - (*trivṛtkaraṇa*) of the other two
अपि - also योज्यताम्- be arranged—(51)

51. Having blended the smaller portions of water and the earth in the element of fire, the fire is triplicated as a

result of such mixing. Similarly the (*trivṛtkaraṇa*) of the other two also be arranged.

The mixing of three elements in a specific proportion is *trivṛtkaraṇa* (triplication). On mixing of a half portion of fire with the quarter portions of water and the earth, the triplicated element fire is obtained. Because of predominance of fire portion, it is also called fire and its function will be that of fire only. But on account of the other elements being present in it, the same becomes gross and hence can be perceived by the sense-organs. The subtle elements are imperceptible. The *trivṛtkaraṇa* of other elements should be understood in the same trend. This mixing of elements is done by *Īśvara* and not by *jīva*. This is clear from the *īkṣaṇa* of Brahman (vs.50, *Ch.U.6-3-3*). It is also ascertained by *bhāṣyakāra* in his commentary on *Brahmasūtra* (*Br.Sū.2-4-20*).

Contextually, it should be understood that *trivṛtkaraṇa* indicates *pañcīkaraṇa*. There being total five elements the grossification of all the five is necessary for creating gross bodies and the gross world. Uddālaka has mentioned here only three elements with forms because it becomes easier to show the false nature of the *jagat*. The other two subtle and formless (*amūrta*)

elements - space and air - were taken for granted. In the process of grossification, one element is predominant whereas the others are in smaller measure. All of them are not in same proportion like the strands of a rope. There is some difference of opinion among the *ācāryas* about the actual proportion of the constituting elements in the grossified ones. But *bhāṣyakāra* is silent on this topic since it is of secondary importance.

The senses, *antaḥkaraṇa* and *prāṇas* are made of subtle elements. The gross bodies, sense-objects and the physical world is made of gross elements. Subtle elements can be known only through the *śāstra* since they are imperceptible. Therefore this topic of subtle elements and their grossification is beyond the range of reasoning.

ENTRY OF BRAHMAN

After the grossification process, the different types of gross bodies were created. Then Brahman entered them as planned earlier (vs.49, *Ch.U.6-3-2*).

तेजोऽबन्नैस्त्रिवृद्भूतैरण्डजादि वपुंष्यम् ।
निर्माय जीवरूपेण प्राविशत् तेषु सर्वतः ॥५२॥

अयम् - this Brahman त्रिवृद्भूतैः
तेजोऽबन्नैः - by the triplicated fire, water
and earth अण्डजादि वपुंषि - the physical
bodies such as oviparous, etc. निर्माय -
having created तेषु - in them सर्वतः -

completely up to the tips of nails
(*A.Pr.13-111*) जीवरूपेण - in the form of
jīvas प्राविशत् - entered – (52)

52. Brahman having created the physical bodies such as oviparous, etc., from the triplicated fire, water and earth, entered into them completely up to the nails (*A.Pr.13-111*) in the form of *jīvas*.

The topic of entry on the part of Brahman has been discussed in the earlier chapters. *Tādātmyādhyāsa* (identity with the embodiment by superimposition) or availability of *cidābhāsa* in the *antaḥkaraṇa* is the entry of Brahman. Therefore ‘the knowledge of one enables the knowledge of all’ is not restricted to elements and elementals contained in the *jagat*, but it also means that *jīva* becomes known by the knowledge of *sat*. The *jagat* is the effect born of *sat* (Brahman). Therefore it becomes known on knowing its cause the *sat*. The nature of *jīva* itself is *sat*. So it is proper that the knowledge of *sat* is that of *jīva*.

The nature of *jīva* is described now and its abidance in all bodies is pointed out.

अहङ्कारस्तु चैतन्यसंयुक्तः

प्राणधारणात् ।

जीवः स्यात् सर्वदेहेषु

व्याप्नोत्यापादमस्तकम् ॥५३॥

चैतन्यसंयुक्तः - permeated with *caitanya* (pure awareness) अहङ्कारः तु - *ahaṅkāra* ('I' notion) only प्राणधारणात् - because of sustaining the *prāṇas* जीवः - *jīva* (the individual entity) स्यात् - is (सः - that *jīva*) सर्वदेहेषु - in all bodies आपादमस्तकम् - from the foot to the head व्याप्नोति - extends all over - (53)

53. *Ahaṅkāra* ('I' notion) only permeated with *caitanya* (pure awareness) is *jīva* (the individual entity). The *jīva* extends all over from the foot to the head in all bodies.

The *cidābhāsa* in the *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* having the notion that the entire body is 'I', called *ahaṅkāra*, is itself *jīva*. This topic was already seen in the second chapter verse 104. The experience of 'I' that we gain along with our entire embodiment is the experience of *jīva* as 'I am such and such entity'. The *prāṇas* function in our bodies because of this *jīva*. This *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* is dormant in the sleep, swoon, etc. It crops up again on waking up. That is why *prāṇas* function in the sleep. This *jīva* is present all over the body with a uniform notion of 'I'ness. Actually this *jīva* is *sat* only, but due to erroneous identification with the body, born of ignorance appears as *saṃsārī jīva*. Therefore by the knowledge of *sat* the knowledge of true nature of all *jīvas* becomes known.

APAVĀDA (REFUTATION) OF SUPERIMPOSED (ADHYĀROPITA) CREATION

With the entry of Brahman in the bodies as *jīvas*, the description of Creation superimposed on Brahman is over. Now to show the false nature of *kāryarūpa-jagat* (*jagat* in the form of effect from *sat*), the effect is reduced to its cause which alone is real at that level. Further such cause on inquiry can be traced to have originated from *māyā* which in turn is nothing but its basis *sat*. Thus *sat* is finally proved to be the ultimate real principle and the rest everything, *māyā* onwards up to the gross *jagat* as false. This method of *adhyāropa-apavāda* (superimposition of Creation on Brahman and its refutation) was adopted even in *Aitareyopaniṣad* (A.Pr.1). Before starting such inquiry, its purpose is highlighted.

सद्वस्तुन्येवमारोपात् संसारो मायया कृतः ।
अविचारकृतारोपनिवृत्त्यर्थं विचार्यताम् ॥५४॥

सद्वस्तुनि - in the *nirupādhika* (upādhiless) *sat* Brahman एवम् - as described earlier (जगतः) आरोपात् - by the superimposition (of *jagat*) संसारः - the sorrowful transmigratory existence मायया कृतः - is created by *māyā* अविचारकृतारोपनिवृत्त्यर्थं - to end the superimposition erroneously projected (*avicāra-kṛta*)

विचार्यताम् - inquiry should be conducted
–(54)

54. The sorrowful transmigratory existence is created by *māyā* through the superimposition (of *jagat*) in the *nirupādhika* Brahman as described earlier. The inquiry should be conducted to end the superimposition (thus) erroneously projected (*avicāra-kṛta*).

Āropa (superimposition) on or attributing the *samsāra* to *sat* Brahman is for want of appropriate inquiry. Such erroneous notion can be ended only by proper inquiry as guided by the Upaniṣads. *Adhyāropa-apavāda* is one of such methods adopted by the scriptures. The inquiry to refute the *āropa* starts now up to the verse 70.

The Upaniṣad begins the inquiry by considering the gross fire (say a flame) which is constituted of subtle element fire (*tejas*), water (*āp*) and earth (called *annam*). If you scrutinize the flame, it is seen as a mixture of red, white and black colours. The red form is that of *tejas* (subtle fire), white of *āp* (subtle water) and black of *annam* (subtle earth). Therefore the real nature of what is called gross fire is only these three subtle elements whereby its status as a distinct entity, ‘gross fire’, disappears except that verbal expression used for *vyavahāra*. The false (*mithyā*) nature of ‘gross fire’ gets exposed retaining the

real *tejas*, *āp* and *annam* (earth) (*Ch. U. 6-4-1*). In the same manner the Upaniṣad shows the scrutiny of other things also. As seen earlier just as the earthenwares are not different from the mud, similarly the grossified (*trivṛtkṛta*) elements are nothing but the subtle (*atrivṛtkṛta*) ones only. From the standpoint of reality, their appearance as gross elements is *mithyā* (false only). Thus the entire gross world made of gross elements is false only. This is being explained to show finally the *sat* only is real and the superimposed Creation is *mithyā*.

त्रिवृत्करणमग्न्यादौ स्पष्टं तावद् विचारिणः ।
प्रसिद्धे तैजसेऽप्यग्नावबन्नांशाववस्थितौ ॥५५॥

विचारिणः - discerning persons तावत्
- indeed अग्न्यादौ - in the gross elements
such as fire, etc. त्रिवृत्करणम् - triplication
of subtle elements स्पष्टम् - clearly
perceive प्रसिद्धे - (in the) well-known
तैजसे अग्नौ - in the intense fire अपि - also
अबन्नांशौ - the portions of subtle water
and earth अवस्थितौ - are (visibly) present
–(55)

55. Indeed the discerning persons clearly perceive the triplication of subtle elements in the gross ones such as fire, etc. The portions of subtle water and earth are (visibly) present in the intense fire also.

The actual triplication is pointed out in the flame of fire.

ज्वालायां रोहितं रूपं

बहुलं तत्तु तेजसः ।

किञ्चित् शुक्लमपामेतत् किञ्चित्

कृष्णं तु भूमिगम् ॥५६॥

ज्वालायाम् - in a flame (यत् - whatever) बहुलम् - abundant रोहितम् - red रूपम् - form (दृश्यते - is seen) तत् - that तु - only तेजसः (रूपम्) - is the form of the subtle fire (यत् - whatever) किञ्चित् - little शुक्लम् - white एतद् - this अपाम् (रूपम्) - the form of subtle water तु - whereas किञ्चित् - (whatever) little कृष्णम् - black (form) भूमिगम् - belongs to the subtle earth - (56)

56. The abundant red form seen in a flame is the form of subtle fire only. The little of white form that is there is that of subtle water whereas the little of black form seen (therein) belongs to the subtle earth.

The result of demonstrating the triplication of fire is to prove the fact that the effect (*kārya*) is identical with the cause (*kāraṇa*) and not distinct from it.

रूपत्रये भूतगते विविक्ते भौतिकोऽनलः ।

कारणव्यतिरेकेण वाचैवारभ्यते वृथा ॥५७॥

भूतगते रूपत्रये - the three forms pertaining to the gross element (fire) विविक्ते - when separated by an inquiry भौतिकः अनलः - the entity called gross fire वाचा एव आरभ्यते - is expressed through words only कारणव्यतिरेकेण - (therefore in

reality, what is called an effect *kārya*) distinct from its cause (here the three subtle elements) वृथा - has no existence - (57)

57. The entity called gross fire gets reduced to a verbal expression only when its three constituting subtle elements are separated by an analytical inquiry. (Therefore in reality, what is called an effect - *kārya*) distinct from its cause (here the three subtle elements) has no existence.

When from the gross fire its constituting subtle elements of *tejas*, *āp* and *pṛthivī* are identified individually by their colours red, white and black respectively and thus separated in our understanding as specific subtle elements, there is nothing left out as an entity called gross fire. Only three subtle elements remain there. They are real, but what is called the gross fire does not exist independently except for its verbal expression. Thus, the cause is real and its effect is false. By extending this inquiry to trace the successive causes of all effects and their causes the *bhūtas* (elements) what remains at the end is only the *sat* as the ultimate reality. All the rest effects turn out to be false. This is hinted in the second line of verse 59 and concluded in the verse 71.

Before proceeding further with this inquiry of ascertaining the ultimate

cause, the author here answers the question ‘why this Upaniṣad speaks of only the three elements that are *mūrta* (with forms) excluding air and space which are *amūrta* (formless)?’

जगतश्चाक्षुषस्येत्थं मिथ्यात्वं वक्तुमादितः ।
तेजोऽबन्नत्रयस्यान्न चाक्षुषस्योदिता जनिः ॥५८॥

चाक्षुषस्य - of the visible जगतः - of the world इत्थं - thus मिथ्यात्वं - falsity वक्तुम् - to describe अत्र - in this Upaniṣad चाक्षुषस्य - of the visible तेजोऽबन्नत्रयस्य - of the three types of elements fire, water and earth जनिः - Creation आदितः - at first उदिता- was told – (58)

58. Thus in this Upaniṣad, to describe the falsity of the visible world, the Creation of visible three types of elements comprising fire, water and earth was told first.

Describing the falseness of visible elements as demonstrated so far becomes easy. The space and air themselves are not visible. Therefore their false nature cannot be shown concretely. That is the only reason why this Upaniṣad speaks of only the *mūrta* three elements as an indicatory description of all five of them.

To generalize the rule that the *kārya* (effect) is always false in nature, the *śruti* extends the inquiry conducted with reference to the gross fire to *Āditya*

(sun), *Candra* (moon) and *Vidyut* (lightning) (*Ch.U.6-4-2 to 4*).

आदित्यचन्द्रविद्युत्सु

मिथ्यात्वं वह्निवन्नयेत् ।

गृहीत्वैतावता व्याप्तिं

कार्यमिथ्यात्वमूह्यताम् ॥५९॥

आदित्यचन्द्रविद्युत्सु - in the sun, moon and the lightning वह्निवत् - as in the case of gross fire मिथ्यात्वं - falseness नयेत् - be ascertained एतावता - by such extensive observation व्याप्तिं गृहीत्वा - having known the rule कार्यमिथ्यात्वम् - the falseness of all effects ऊह्यताम् - be noted – (59)

59. As in the case of gross fire, the falseness of sun, moon and the lightning be ascertained. By such extensive observation having known the rule, the falseness of all effects be noted.

The *śruti* has demonstrated the triplication of only fire whose unique feature is form (*rūpa*). It is applicable not only to the triplication of water and earth but also that of air and space (when *pañcīkaraṇa* is considered). The demonstration of triplication in the case of water and earth is not possible because smell (*gandha*) and taste (*rasa*) unique features of earth and water are not in the fire. Besides that, the smell and taste cannot be demonstrated distinctly like the forms. Similarly the grossification of air and space having the

unique features of touch and sound respectively is not possible because these features cannot be demonstrated distinctly like the form.

Taking recourse to the red, white and black colours in the sun, moon and the lightning when their constituents *tejas*, *āp* and *pṛthivī* are isolated as three distinct subtle elements what remains behind as the sun, etc., is only a verbal expression, false in nature. This rule that the cause is real and the effect is false should be known beyond any trace of doubt. Thereby the false nature (like that of dream) of the entire Creation can get firmly rooted in our mind. Then only the mind can be redirected to the pursuit of gaining *Brahmajñāna* fruitfully.

The ascertainment of the effect (*kārya*) to be false with respect to *drśya jagat* is concluded by showing the purpose of its necessity to do so. These findings are further corroborated by quoting the same facts as discovered by ancient great masters.

तेजोऽबन्नाख्यकार्याणां मिथ्यात्वे स्याद् सदद्वयम्।
कारणं सत्यमेषां तु पूर्वेषां ज्ञानिनां मतिः ॥६०॥

तेजोऽबन्नाख्यकार्याणां मिथ्यात्वे - because of the false nature of effects called subtle fire, water and the earth एषां कारणम् - the cause of these अद्वयम् - the non-dual सत् - *sat* (Brahman) सत्यं तु - real only स्यात् - should be (इति - so is) पूर्वेषाम् -

of earlier ज्ञानिनाम् - of *Brahmajñānīs* मतिः - doctrine - (60)

60. Because of the false nature of effects called subtle fire, water and the earth, their cause the non-dual *sat* (Brahman) should necessarily be real. (So is) the doctrine of past *Brahmajñānīs*.

The entire *jagat* is produced from three elements as told here or actually from five of them. These elements being the effects are proved to be false. Their cause or basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) *sat* alone is real. The appearance of false *jagat* cannot attribute duality to the real entity, the *sat*. The only non-dual entity being limitless is always indestructible. It never ceases to exist. That makes it *satya* (*real*).

The doctrine of past great masters (*Ch.U.6-4-5*) based on their *aparokṣānubhava* (direct experience) is quoted to inculcate *śraddhā* in the *mumukṣus*. What is proved till now by the Upaniṣad is not some neo-theory waiting for its dismissal by the invention of another one. It is the timeless truth.

Now the body is proved to be made of *bhūtas* (elements) because it is made from food, sustained by food and finally perishes to become food again. This is to demonstrate that it is also false in nature and not real.

APAVĀDA – PHYSICAL BODY ANALYSED

दृश्ये बाह्ये भौतिकत्वमस्तु देहे तु नो तथा ।
इति मूढमतेर्नुत्यै देहे भौतिकतोच्यते ॥६१॥

बाह्ये दृश्ये - in the external perceptible things भौतिकत्वम् अस्तु - let there be elemental (*bhautika*) nature देहे तु - but in the physical body तथा न उ - it is not at all so इति मूढमतेः नुत्यै - to dispel such wrong notion देहे भौतिकता - the elemental nature of physical body उच्यते - is described – (61)

61. Let there be elemental (*bhautika*) nature in the external perceptible things. But it is not at all so in the physical body. To dispel such wrong notion the elemental nature of physical body is described.

We know that the food in general is born from earth. It is also a well-known fact based on the universal experience and reasoning that the body is made from the assimilated food. The *śruti* describes that the grossest ingredient of the digested food becomes the excreta, the middle or the central one goes in the making of flesh and the subtlest portion becomes the mind (*Ch.U.6-5-1*). This portion of the *śruti* is described in the next verse in a reverse order.

यदन्नं पार्थिवं भुक्तं

तद्धीमांसपुरीषकैः ।

सूक्ष्ममध्यस्थूलभागैर्देहेऽस्मिन्

परिणम्यते ॥६२॥

यत् - whatever पार्थिवम् - terrestrial (grown in the soil) अन्नम् - food भुक्तं - eaten तत् - that सूक्ष्ममध्यस्थूलभागैः - by (its) subtle, central and the gross parts अस्मिन् - in this देहे - (in the) body धीमांसपुरीषकैः - in the form of the mind, flesh and faeces परिणम्यते - gets transformed – (62)

62. The subtle, central and the gross parts of the terrestrial (grown in the soil) food eaten get transformed respectively in this body as the mind, flesh and faeces.

The *śruti* further describes how the water that is drunk and the fatty food that is eaten goes into the constitution of the body (*Ch.U.6-5-2* and 3).

प्राणलोहितमूत्रांशौरपां

परिणतिस्त्रिधा ।

वाङ्मज्जास्थिविभेदः स्याद्

घृततैलादितेजसः ॥६३॥

अपां - of water (that is drunk) परिणतिः - transformation प्राण-लोहित-मूत्रांशैः - in the form of vital airs, blood and urine त्रिधा - in three parts (takes place) घृततैलादितेजसः - the fatty food such as ghee, oil, etc., (when eaten) वाङ्मज्जास्थिविभेदः स्यात् - modifies as speech, marrow

and bones – (63)

63. The transformation of water (that is drunk) (takes place) in the form of three parts such as vital airs, blood and urine. The fatty food (when eaten) modifies as speech, marrow and bones.

The subtle, central and grossest portions of water that is drunk transform respectively into vital airs, blood and the urine. So also the subtle, central and the grossest portions of fatty food such as ghee and oil, etc., (which have in themselves fire content in abundance) on eating modify respectively as speech, marrow and bones. Thus the entity called body gets reduced to elements of fire, water and earth. This topic teaches the seeker who thinks that the body is real though the world is made of elements.

The eaten food goes into the making of body can be verified by our experience and reasonings. It will be experimentally demonstrated later that the terrestrial (*pārthiva*) food is the main cause that makes the mind. All sense-organs have their food in terms of sense-objects which has a bearing on the quality of the mind. Yet, the prominent role of food on the quality of the mind cannot be denied. If the food is *sāttvika*, the mind also will become *sāttvika*. The factors such as who saw the food with what intention, who cooked it with what attitude, where and when it was cooked

and the fair or foul means of earning the money that procures the provision necessary to prepare the food, etc., have a good or bad influence on the mind. Therefore purity of food (*āhāra-śuddhi*) is indispensable to get the purity of mind (*citta-śuddhi*). *Prāṇas* are sustained by water can be verified by remaining thirsty. *Bhāṣyakāra* points out that consumption of oil and ghee which are rich in fire content makes the voice powerful.

It can be clearly understood that the earth, water and fire happen to be the causes of gross and central (middle) modifications in the body. But it may be objected that these elements as the causes of subtle aspects such as the mind, *prāṇa* and speech cannot be verified. The *śruti* answers this by the illustration of curds (yoghurt) (*Ch.U.6-6-1 to 5*). This is discussed in the next three verses.

स्थूले च मध्यमे भागे कारणानुगतिः स्फुटा ।
धीप्राणवाक्षु सन्देहं दधिदृष्टान्ततोऽनुदत् ॥६४॥

स्थूले च मध्यमे भागे - with respect to the portions of gross and middle elemental modifications कारणानुगतिः - the inherence of (elements as the) cause (in the body) स्फुटा - is clear धी-प्राण-वाक्षु - pertaining to the mind, *prāṇas* (vital airs) and the speech सन्देहं - doubt दधिदृष्टान्ततः - by the illustration of curds

(yoghurt) अनुदत् - dispelled – (64)

64. The inherence of (elements as the) cause (in the body) with respect to the portions of gross and middle elemental modifications is clear (whereas) the doubt pertaining to the mind, *prāṇas* and the speech is dispelled by the illustration of curds (yoghurt).

The illustration of curds (yoghurt) is explained.

घृते विलीनो दध्यंशोऽनुगतो भाति न स्फुटः ।
तथापि दधिकार्यत्वं विद्यते सर्वसम्मतम् ॥६५॥

घृते - in the ghee विलीनः - that has got liquefied दध्यंशः - the part of curds (yoghurt) अनुगतः - inheres in it (ghee) स्फुटः - (but) clearly न भाति - is not perceived तथा अपि - even then दधिकार्यत्वं विद्यते - ghee is the effect of curds (yoghurt) सर्वसम्मतम् - (is) universally accepted – (65)

65. The part of curds (yoghurt) that has got liquefied in the ghee inheres in it, but that part is not perceived clearly. Even then the ghee is the effect of curds (yoghurt). (This fact is) universally accepted.

The ghee that was originally present in the milk and thereafter abiding in the curds is separated as butter by churning it. On melting the butter by heat we get the liquefied ghee. To the person who knows this process it is very clear

that the part of curds (yoghurt) is truly present in the ghee though not directly seen. But the person who does not know the process will not be able to know the part of curds (yoghurt) in the ghee. This shows that the inherence of cause in the effect is not evident on its own at many places unless explained properly. But the fact that the cause inheres in the effects always holds good.

The above findings of the illustration are applied to the illustrated mind, etc., to show them as the effect of the food, etc.

तथा मनःप्राणवाचां भवत्वन्नादिकार्यता ।
अतीन्द्रियत्वात् प्रत्यक्षा कारणानुगतिर्न हि ॥६६॥

तथा - similarly मनःप्राणवाचां - of the mind, vital airs and speech अन्नादिकार्यता - the nature of being the effect of food, etc. भवतु - let it be there अतीन्द्रियत्वात् - (but) because of the imperceptible nature (of the mind, *prāṇas* and speech) कारणानुगतिः - the inherence of cause (in them) न हि प्रत्यक्षा - is not at all perceptible – (66)

66. Similarly, let the mind, *prāṇas* and speech be the effects of food, water and the ghee, oil, etc. But the inherence of cause (in them) is not at all perceptible because of the imperceptible nature (of the mind, *prāṇas* and speech).

Thus the mind, *prāṇas* and speech are *mithyā* (false) because they

get reduced to their immediate cause, the food, etc., which in turn are nothing but elements. This proves that the body made of elements is as false as the *jagat* that is elemental in nature.

APAVĀDA – ANALYSIS OF THE MIND

The entire next section of the Upaniṣad (*Ch.U.6-7*) ascertains the mind as the effect of food by the method of *anvaya-vyatireka* (continuance and discontinuance). The *tārkika* maintains that the mind is not an effect of food, (i.e. elements), but it is an eternal substance (*nitya dravya*). He is also taught in the next four verses.

नित्यद्रव्यं मनो नान्नकार्यमित्याह तार्किकः ।
स एषोऽङ्गारदृष्टान्तद्वारेण प्रतिबोध्यते ॥६७॥

मनः - the mind नित्यद्रव्यं - is an eternal substance अन्नकार्यं न - not a product of food, (i.e. elements) इति - so तार्किकः - the *tārkika* आह - says सः एषः - the *tārkika* who has such view अङ्गारदृष्टान्तद्वारेण - by the illustration of cinder (burning charcoal) प्रतिबोध्यते - is taught—(67)

67. The *tārkika* says that the mind is an eternal substance (and) not a product of food, (i.e. elements). He is taught by the illustration of cinder (burning charcoal).

The *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* schools

of thought have originated from *ṛṣis* Gautama and Kaṇāda. They totally rely on reasoning (*tarka*). Therefore they are called *tārkikas*. They consider the mind to be eternal, non-elemental, and atomic substance. According to them every *ātmā* (as per their concept) has one exclusive mind. They also say that minds are endless and *ātmās* also are endless. Uddālaka points out that their concept is wrong.

The illustration of burning charcoal is explained to show how the mind depends on the assimilated food.

यथा खद्योतमात्रः स्यादङ्गारः
काष्ठसंक्षये ।

काष्ठवृद्धौ ज्वलत्यग्निस्तथा
विद्यान्मनोन्नयोः ॥६८॥

यथा - just as काष्ठसंक्षये - when the fuel (wood) is exhausted अङ्गारः - cinder खद्योतमात्रः - as small as the glow-worm (firefly) स्यात् - remains काष्ठवृद्धौ - when the fuel (wood) is increased अग्निः ज्वलति - fire becomes intense तथा - similarly मनोन्नयोः विद्यात् - there is growth and decline between the mind and the food – (68)

68. Just as the cinder as small as the glow-worm (firefly) remains when the fuel (wood) is exhausted, and the fire becomes intense when the fuel (wood) is increased, similarly there is a growth and

decline between the mind and the food.

It is well-known that when the fuel in the form of wood gets exhausted the cinders having small size remain. When even one of them is tended with dry grass and further by more and more wood, it blazes. Similarly the power of the mind decreases with the decrease in the food and increases when the intake of food is more.

To drive home this point the *śruti* devises a method. It conceives the mental energy of an individual having sixteen equal parts. When this energy is in full measure the person is able to take to all activities such as seeing, hearing, thinking, knowing, doing, etc. But with the decline of the food all the activities also decline. This proves that the mind is the product of food. To convince Śvetaketu of this fact by his own experience the father Uddālaka asks him to fast for fifteen days with drinking plenty of water to sustain the *prāṇas*. On the sixteenth day when the fifteen parts of his mental energy have ebbed away with only one part being left out, father asks him to chant the Vedas. Śvetaketu pleads his inability to recall them. He is asked to eat the food gradually. After eating he remembered everything. Thus the fifteen parts of the mental energy declined for want of food. After eating the food, the remaining one part got

nourished to restore the original power of the mind. This demonstrates that the mind is the product of food. The next two verses describe this experiment employing the method of *anvaya-vyatireka*.

त्यक्तेऽन्ने पञ्चदशसु

दिनेषु क्षीयते मनः ।

तेन स्मर्तुं न शक्तोऽभूच्छ्वेतकेतुः

स किञ्चन ॥६९॥

त्यक्ते अन्ने - when the eating of food is given up पञ्चदशसु दिनेषु - within fifteen days मनः - the mind क्षीयते - wanes तेन - therefore सः श्वेतकेतुः - Śvetaketu who had fasted for fifteen days किञ्चन स्मर्तुं - to remember anything न शक्तः अभूत् - was unable - (69)

69. When the eating of food is given up the mind wanes within fifteen days. Therefore Śvetaketu who had fasted for fifteen days was unable to remember anything.

The above case describes the *vyatireka* (discontinuance/absence) of food. It proves, ‘no food, no mind’. The following verse shows the *anvaya* (continuance/presence) of food. The declined mind revives on eating the food after fifteen days of fasting.

अन्नेन पुष्टे मनसि वेदान् सस्मार तत्क्षणात् ।
अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां मनोऽन्नमयमिष्यताम् ॥७०॥

अन्नेन - by the food मनसि पुष्टे - when

the mind got nourished (श्वेतकेतुः - Śvetaketu) तत्क्षणात् - instantly वेदान् सस्मार - remembered the Vedas अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां - by *anvaya-vyatireka* (of food) मनः - the mind अन्नमयम् - is the effect (*kārya*) of food (इति - so) इष्यताम् - be accepted – (70)

70. When the mind got nourished by the food, Śvetaketu remembered instantly the Vedas. Let it be accepted by *anvaya-vyatireka* (of food) that the mind is the effect (*kārya*) of food.

Thus the entire *dr̥śya* (perceptible) *jagat* including the body, mind, *prāṇas*, etc., is nothing but elements in reality. They appearing different from the elements is false. Further these elements themselves have no distinct existence apart from their cause, the *sat* (Brahman). Ultimately *sat* alone is real and even the elements are false. This inquiry called *apavāda* to refute all that is superimposed (*adhyasta*) as *mithyā* (false) and ascertain the final reality is now concluded.

APAVĀDA CONCLUDED – SAT ALONE IS REAL

भौतिकत्वेऽखिलस्यैवं स्थिते भूतातिरेकतः ।
तन्नास्ति तद्ब्रह्मतानि नैव सद्व्यतिरेकतः ॥७१॥

एवम् - thus अखिलस्य - of entire perceptible *jagat* including the body, etc. भौतिकत्वे स्थिते (सति) - when the

elemental nature is established तत् - that (*jagat* including the body, etc.) भूतातिरेकतः - apart from elements न अस्ति - does not exist तद्वत् - similarly भूतानि - all elements सद्व्यतिरेकतः - distinct from *sat* (Brahman) न एव (सन्ति) - do not exist at all – (71)

71. When the elemental nature of entire perceptible *jagat* including the body, etc., is established, that *jagat* (including the body, etc.) does not exist apart from elements. Similarly all elements distinct from *sat* (Brahman) do not exist at all.

The effect (*kārya*) is identical with the cause (*kāraṇa*) and not different from it. The appearance of effect distinct from its cause is false. Based on this rule it is established that the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) *sat* (Brahman) is real and the entire Creation superimposed on it is false.

Śvetaketu could discover this truth following his father's teaching. Yet, his problem of *samsāra* still persists. What he found is not the final remedy against *samsāra*.

जगतः कारणं यत्सदद्वैतं तद्विज्जिवान् ।
श्वेतकेतुस्तावतास्य जीवत्वं न निवर्तते ॥७२॥

श्वेतकेतुः - Śvetaketu जगतः - of *jagat* कारणं - cause यत् - whatever सदद्वैतम् - non-dual *sat* तत् - that one विज्जिवान् -

ascertained तावता - by knowing that much अस्य - his जीवत्वं - state as *saṃsārī jīva* न निवर्तते - did not end - (72)

72. Śvetaketu ascertained the cause of *jagat*, the non-dual *sat* Brahman the only real entity. (But) by knowing that much his state as *saṃsārī jīva* did not end.

Śvetaketu on receiving the teaching had no doubt about the real entity, the *sat* as the cause of *mithyājagat*. But the question, ‘who am I?’, still did persist. Am I *sat* or its false effect? If I am not *sat*, how am I related to *sat*? If ‘I’ exist independent of *sat*, the *jagat* also must be so in which case it will not be false. If I am not at all related to *sat* then the knowledge of *sat* cannot be the knowledge of myself. In that case the declaration, ‘knowledge of one makes all known’ will be wrong. The main thrust of Vedānta is to solve problems related to ‘I’. The *jagat* is considered only because I have to interact with it. All that I want is perpetual happiness and freedom from sorrows. If I do not get it, whether the nature of *jagat* is real or false is a matter of secondary importance. By knowing the true nature of *jagat*, the problems of individual do not get solved by themselves. Keeping this fact in view, the Upaniṣad now proceeds to reveal the truth that ‘I am not the *saṃsārī jīva* but the *asaṃsārī* Brahman’. Without this

direct (*aparokṣa*) knowledge, there can never be the total freedom from *saṃsāra*.

The gist of the topic that is going to follow is introduced first.

‘SVAPITI’ (ASLEEP) SHOWS THE TRUE NATURE OF JĪVA AS SAT

स्वस्य ब्रह्मत्वबोधेन

जीवत्वमपगच्छति ।

इत्यभिप्रेत्य तं शिष्यं

पुनः प्रोत्साहयत्यसौ ॥७३॥

जीवत्वम् - the state of being a *jīva*
स्वस्य ब्रह्मत्वबोधेन - by the direct knowledge that ‘I am Brahman’ अपगच्छति - goes away इति - so अभिप्रेत्य - having intended असौ - *ācārya* Uddālaka तं शिष्यम् - his disciple Śvetaketu पुनः - once again प्रोत्साहयति - entuses to listen (the advice) – (73)

73. Having intended that the state of being a *jīva* goes away by the direct (*aparokṣa*) knowledge that ‘I am Brahman’, the *ācārya* Uddālaka once again entuses his disciple Śvetaketu to listen (the advice).

The purpose of Uddālaka's teaching to his son who has now become a disciple is to liberate him from *saṃsāra*. So long as the *upādhis* of *jīva* and *Īśvara* are not inquired into, it is not possible to know even cursorily that ‘I

am Brahman'. It was told earlier that by knowing the mud, all earthenwares are known because all of them are identical with the mud. Similarly the oneness of both *jīva* and *Īśvara* must be known. If the *nāma-rūpa* (name-form) of both are not taken into consideration at all, what remains is one homogeneous mass of *cit* (pure awareness). This is the identity of *jīva* and *Īśvara*. It can never be so with their *upādhis* of *nāma-rūpa*. In the sixth chapter of the Upaniṣad and so in this chapter, the first topic the real nature of *dr̥śya jagat* was established as *sat*. Now in the forthcoming topic the identity of *jīva* and Brahman will be revealed. This division of topics is to present the lengthy teaching in a manner easy to grasp. Therefore the chapter begins with 'Sad eva somya idamagre āsīt' (Oh, dear Śvetaketu, this Creation before its birth was *sat* only). The teaching concludes with 'tat tvam asi' (you are that Brahman). In between the topic of *trivṛtkarāṇa* is only secondary in nature.

For practical purpose the sorrowful *saṃsāra* of the *jīva* with some joy in between here and there is projected by its mind during the waking and the dream. During the sleep the function of the mind is no more there because it gets merged in its immediate cause the *avidyā* (self-ignorance). At that time what remains is almost the true

nature of *jīva* except for the intervening *avidyā*. There are no other features of *saṃsāra* in the deep sleep. Thus the sleep is an effective means to show the true nature of *jīva*. Uddālaka describes sleep so as to explain the *sat* as the true nature of *jīva*. He says: 'Oh, dear Śvetaketu, please know from me the deep sleep when this *puruṣa* (*sat*) who has entered this body as a *jīva* is said to be asleep. At that time this *jīva* becomes one with *sat* (Brahman) (and thereby) gains one's true nature. Therefore he is called 'svapiti' because he gains (*apitaḥ bhavati*) oneself (*svam*)' (Ch.U.6-8-1). This is being explained.

स्वप्नावसानं जानीहि मम

व्याकुर्वतो मुखात् ।

स्वस्य स्वरूपं सत्त्वमिति

सुप्तौ स्फुटं खलु ॥७४॥

मम - my व्याकुर्वतः मुखात् - through the means of explanation स्वप्नावसानम् - deep sleep जानीहि - please know सुप्तौ - in the deep sleep स्वस्य - of oneself स्वरूपं - true nature सत् तत्त्वम् - the principle of *sat* इति - so खलु - certainly स्फुटम् - (becomes) clearly known – (74)

74. Through the means of my explanation please know the deep sleep. Therein certainly the true nature of oneself as the principle of *sat* (Brahman) (becomes) clearly known.

The Upaniṣads begin with the theories of Creation. Thereafter, pointing out *Īśvara*, the identity between *jīva* and *Īśvara* is revealed. Then only the true nature of *ātmā* becomes clear by exposing the false nature of Creation. By mere ascertaining the true nature at the individual *jīva* level, the *sarvātmā* or oneself as the basis of entire Creation cannot be known. In that case *mokṣa* is not possible. Therefore it is indispensable that one's identity with *sat*, the cause of Creation, should be known.

How one's nature is identical with *sat* becomes clear by knowing the deep sleep state is being shown step by step.

यदा सुषुप्तिमाप्नोति

पुमानेतं तदा जनाः ।

स्वपितीत्याहुरेतस्य तात्पर्यं

प्रविचिन्त्यताम् ॥७५॥

जनाः - the common people यदा - when पुमान् - an individual *jīva* सुषुप्तिम् आप्नोति - gets deep sleep तदा - then एतम् - that person स्वपिति - 'svapiti' ('is sleeping' or 'is asleep') इति - so आहुः - (they) say एतस्य - of this statement तात्पर्यं - meaning प्रविचिन्त्यताम् - should be inquired into—(75)

75. When an individual gets deep sleep, the common people say that the person 'svapiti' ('is sleeping' or 'is

asleep'). The meaning of this statement (viz. 'svapiti') should be inquired into.

The word 'svapiti' can be taken as a verb or a noun. Its thorough scrutiny as a noun indicates the true nature of *jīva*.

तिङन्तं पदमज्ञानां सुबन्तं

तु विवेकिनाम् ।

स्यान्निद्राणस्य नामैतद्

वस्तुतत्त्वावभासकम् ॥७६॥

अज्ञानां - to the ignorant persons पदम् - the word 'svapiti' तिङन्तं - is a verb विवेकिनां तु - whereas from the standpoint of the discriminating persons सुबन्तं स्यात् - it is a noun निद्राणस्य - of the sleeping *jīva* एतत् - this नाम - name (svapiti) वस्तुतत्त्वावभासकम् - is indicative of his true nature—(76)

76. The word 'svapiti' is a verb to the ignorant persons whereas from the standpoint of the discriminating persons it is a noun. This name (svapiti) of the sleeping *jīva* is indicative of his true nature.

According to the celebrated grammarian Pāṇini the *tiṅ* (तिङ्) suffixes are used to conjugate the verbal roots (*dhātus*). Therefore *tiṅanta* (तिङन्त) means a verb. If the word 'svapiti' is taken as a verb according to the common people, it means '(*jīva*) is sleeping or is asleep'. But the *śruti* with the help of the same letters contained in the word

'*svapiti*' proves that *ātmanā* is free from the gross and subtle bodies (*upādhīs*) with their all attributes and projections in the state of deep sleep. When an ignorant person takes '*svapiti*' as a verb meaning '*jīva* is sleeping or asleep' he has the concept that 'the *jīva* is doing the action of sleeping (*svāpam karoti iti*)' in accordance with the meaning of the verbal root '*svap*'. But a *vivekī* (discriminating person) inquires as to what this 'act of sleeping' is? The sleep is possible when all the activities at the physical or mental level are given up. Then how can the sleeping be an action? Which organs of action function in the sleep? Therefore he concludes that the sleep cannot be an action and so '*svapiti*' cannot be a verb. He considers '*svapiti*' as a noun (*subanta*) expressing the name of the *jīva* who is asleep (*nidrāṇasyanāma*). According to *Pāṇinīya* grammar, '*sup*' suffixes are added to substantives as declensional cases. Therefore '*subanta*' means a noun. Thus a *vivekī* takes '*svapiti*' as the name of the sleeping *jīva* indicative of his true nature. An action involves a change (*vikāra*) but the name reveals the changeless (*avikārī*) nature of the entity referred to.

How the word '*svapiti*' as a noun indicates the true nature of *jīva* as *sat* (Brahman) is being explained in the next three verses.

स्वप्नजागरयोर्जीवः सत्तत्त्वाद् भिन्नवद्भवेत् ।
सुषुप्तौ सम्यगेकत्वं याति सद्द्वस्तुना सह ॥७७॥

जीवः - the *jīva* (though in reality *sat* in nature) स्वप्नजागरयोः - during the dream and waking states सत् तत्त्वात् - from the *sat* principle भिन्नवत् - as though different भवेत् - appears सुषुप्तौ - in the deep sleep state सद्द्वस्तुना सह - with the ultimate real principle *sat* सम्यक् - completely एकत्वं याति - becomes identical - (77)

77. The *jīva* (though in reality *sat* in nature) appears as though different from the *sat* principle during the dream and waking states. (But the same *jīva*) becomes completely identical with the ultimate real principle *sat* in the deep sleep state.

The ever-existent principle *sat* which is 'I' and the only non-dual real entity is totally *nirupādhika* (free from adjuncts). Even *avidyā* or *māyā* does not belong to it. But for practical purpose in the waking state the 'I' as *jīva* appears to be endowed with *upādhīs*, their features and functions. That is how we experience ourselves as 'I see', 'I sit', 'I walk', 'I talk', 'I eat', 'I think', etc., distinct from the true 'I' *sat*, which is totally free from all these features. In the dream state also we experience ourselves as featured by all dream experiences. This is what *Kāthopaniṣad*

describes *ātmā* as ‘*sarveṣu bhūteṣu gūḍhaḥ*’ (Kṭ.U.1-3-12). *Ātmā* is concealed in all beings from *Hiranyagarbha* to any insignificant creature by attributing itself all the functions such as seeing (*darśana*), hearing (*śravaṇa*), etc., the misapprehensions projected by *avidyā* (Kṭ.U.Bh.1-3-12). *Ātmā* is concealed (*gūḍha*) and has adapted itself (*anūpraviṣṭa*) to the *upādhis* and their features (Kṭ.U.Bh.1-2-12). These misapprehensions are called *granthis* or *avidyā-pratyayas* (experiences produced by the self-ignorance) such as ‘I am this body’, ‘this is my wealth’, ‘I am happy’, ‘I am sorrowful’, etc. (Kṭ.U.Bh.2-3-15). Thus *jīva* appears to be different from its true nature ‘*sat*’ in its waking and dream states. In the deep sleep state these misapprehensions are not there. It shows that they are not the intrinsic feature of *ātmā*. If they were really so, they should be invariably experienced in the deep sleep also because one's true nature is never given up (*sva-svabhāvāt na nivṛttiḥ*). Thus *jīva* becomes completely identical with its real nature *sat* in the deep sleep.

When the gold ornaments are melted, on seeing the molten gold it is understood that those ornaments are nothing but gold at base. Similarly it is known from the experience of deep sleep that all the misapprehensions such as ‘I

am seer’, ‘I am doer’, etc., are basically *sat*. But they are not the intrinsic features of *ātmā* like the names and forms of golden ornament are not intrinsically in gold. A *vivekī* knows that even ‘the molten form’ is not the intrinsic feature of gold, but it is another form of gold like that of any other ornament. So also deep sleep state itself is not the true nature of *ātmā* because ignorance (causal body) is present therein along with *sat*. Yet inquiry into that state is very helpful to ascertain the true nature of *ātmā*. Like seeing molten gold free from names and forms of ornaments is useful to know the gold.

In the deep sleep all the specific forms of ‘I’ (*ātmā*) cease to be there and ‘I’ alone am free from all superimposed specific forms. But they manifest again in the waking and dream states. That means they merge in ‘I’ in sleep and emerge in the other two states. It is just like ornaments merging in the molten gold and again produced from it. Thus, the inquiry into ‘*svapiti*’ shows that in the deep sleep we give up all our specific superimposed manifest forms and remain in our true nature. The ignorance is certainly present therein. It is the causal *upādhi* whereas all manifest *upādhis* have ceased in the deep sleep. The causal *upādhi*, the self-ignorance can end only in the direct (*aparokṣa*) experience of ‘I’ (*ātmā*), the *sat* (Brahman).

Here is a doubt that can be asked. *Jīva* is the one who sustains the *prāṇas* which serve as its *upādhis*. How can the *sopādhika jīva* be identical with *nirupādhikasat* ('I')?

जीवत्वमात्मनः प्राणधारणान्न

स्वभावतः ।

सद्रूपत्वं स्वतस्तत्तु स्फुटं

स्वपिति नामतः ॥७८॥

आत्मनः - of *ātmā* (whose true nature is *sat*) प्राणधारणात् - because of sustaining the *upādhi* of *prāṇas* जीवत्वम् - the form as a *jīva* न स्वभावतः - (but) not by its nature स्वतः - by its nature सद्रूपत्वम् - (*ātmā*) is *sat* only तत् तु - on the other hand that (*ātmā* who is *sat* by nature) स्वपिति नामतः - by the name '*svapiti*' स्फुटम् - (becomes) very clear - (78)

78. The form of *ātmā* (whose true nature is *sat*) as a *jīva* is because of sustaining the *upādhi* of *prāṇas*, but not by its nature. (*Ātmā*) is *sat* only by its nature. On the other hand, that (*ātmā* who is *sat* by nature) (becomes) very clear by the name '*svapiti*'.

The true nature of *ātmā* is *sat, cit, ānanda*. All forms other than that are erroneous because of being attributed to it by *upādhis*. Even its form as a *jīva* is because of *upādhi*. *Ātmā* is not *jīva* by nature. Just as there remains 'I' even if a person is blind, dumb, lame, etc., so also

ātmā remains there even while not wielding or not identified with the *prāṇas*. If sustaining the *prāṇas* were the real nature of *ātmā*, then *jīva* will never get *mokṣa*. *Ātmā* in reality is *sat, cit, ānanda*. In the deep sleep, the experiences such as 'I breathe', 'I sustain *prāṇas*', 'I am hungry', 'I am thirsty' are not there. *Ātmā* is available without those experiences shows that *prāṇas* cannot be the intrinsic features of *ātmā*.

Adhyātma-śāstra considers the inquiry into the deep sleep as very important though the *jīva* has the state of sleep on par with waking and the dream. In the waking and the dream states, *ātmā* appears as though mixed with the overt manifestations of *saṃsāra*. Therefore it is very difficult to discern *ātmā* distinct from all of them in these two states. But in the deep sleep all these manifest experiences of *saṃsāra* get naturally excluded. Therefore the true nature of *ātmā* can be easily scrutinized in the deep sleep.

The etymological interpretation of the word '*svapiti*' as a noun is given to show that the *jīva* gains its true nature in the deep sleep.

स्वमपीतीति नाम्नोऽस्य

निरुक्तिरवगम्यताम् ।

स्वरूपं वास्तवं सुप्तौ

प्राप्यमित्युदितम्भवेत् ॥७९॥

स्वम् - *ātmā* (oneself) अपीति - gains
 इति - so अस्य नाम्नः - of this name (*svapiti*)
 निरुक्तिः - etymological interpretation
 अवगम्यताम् - be understood सुप्तौ - in the
 deep sleep वास्तवं - real स्वरूपं - nature
 प्राप्यम् - i.e. प्राप्तम् - is gained (by *jīva*) इति -
 so उदितम् भवेत् - it is told – (79)

79. Please understand the etymological interpretation of this name (*svapiti*) as ‘gains *ātmā* (oneself)’. Accordingly it is told that (the *jīva*) gains its real nature (*ātmā*) in deep sleep.

As seen earlier, there are two interpretations of the word ‘*svapiti*’. The ignorant person takes it as a verb to mean ‘is asleep’ (does the action of sleeping). According to a *vivekī* as a noun it is considered as ‘gains oneself (*ātmā*)’ or ‘the *jīva* merges in *ātmā*’. The word ‘*sva*’ here means *ātmā*. *Bhāṣyakāra* has clarified this in *sūtrabhāṣya* (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-9*). He says: The word ‘*sva*’ as used here means *ātmā*. The *jīva* becomes ‘*apīta*’ (merged) in the entity *sat* whose topic was begun. The verb ‘*i-eti*’ with prefix ‘*api*’ means merging. It can be verified from the phrase ‘*prabhavāpyayau*’ (birth and destruction/*laya*-merging)..... The *jīva* appears as though merged in *ātmā* in the deep sleep when both the gross and subtle *upādhis* have ceased to be there with the absence of their specific

features.... The *śruti* shows by etymological interpretation that (the *jīva* in the deep sleep) merges ‘in oneself’ meaning ‘in *ātmā*’ called *sat* (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-9*). The individual *jīva* has to gain the *nirupādhika ātmā* only. Its effortless gain in the deep sleep in spite of the presence of ignorance gives so much of happiness, then what to speak of its limitless happiness when the veiling of ignorance is totally removed.

SAMŚĀRA IS ON ACCOUNT OF UPĀDHIS

The *jīva* on getting tired in the waking and dream states goes to sleep wherein the *upādhis* of gross and subtle bodies are non-functional. So the *jīva* gains its true nature *ātmā/sat* to end the tiresomeness. Rest is possible only in the natural state and not when engaged in work. The *śruti* highlights this point with the illustration of a bird. A fowler ties one leg of a bird by a string and holds its other end in his hand. Or consider a bird tied in a similar manner to a post. The bird flies in all directions to free itself, but is unable to do so because of being tied. Finally getting tired, returns to the fowler, or the post to rest. Similarly the *jīva* roams all around to seek happiness during waking and the dream states. But not finding happiness being tired the *jīva* reaches *ātmā* to rest. (*Ch.U. 6-8-2*). This is explained in the next five verses.

उपाधेर्मनसो जाग्रत्सुप्त्यवस्थे हि नात्मनः ।
इत्यभिप्रेत्य शकुनिदृष्टान्तः प्रोच्यते धियः ॥८०॥

जाग्रत्सुप्त्यवस्थे - the states of waking and the dream हि - surely उपाधेः मनसः - (take place) because of the *upādhi* of mind आत्मनः न - they are not the natural states of *ātmā* इति अभिप्रेत्य - having thought so धियः - with reference to the mind शकुनिदृष्टान्तः - illustration of a bird प्रोच्यते - is described—(80)

80. The states of waking and the dream surely take place because of the *upādhi* of mind. They are not the states of *ātmā*. Having thought so, an illustration of a bird with reference to the mind (and thereby a *jīva*) is described.

शकुनिः सूत्रबद्धो यः स गच्छन् विविधा दिशः ।
अलब्ध्वाधारमाकाशे बन्धनस्थानमाव्रजेत् ॥८१॥

यः - the one who सूत्रबद्धः - is tied up by a string शकुनिः - the bird सः - that one विविधा दिशः - in all directions गच्छन् - flying (to free itself) आकाशे - in the sky आधारम् - support (to rest) अलब्ध्वा - having unobtained बन्धनस्थानम् - to the post where it is tied आव्रजेत् - returns—(81)

81. The bird tied up by a string (to a post) flies (to free itself) in all directions. Having unobtained any support (to rest) in the sky it returns finally to the post where it is tied.

The illustration is applied to the

illustrated. Here the mind as a *jīva* is in the place of the bird. The principle of *sat/ātmā* represents the post the place of binding. The *māyā* signifies the string.

सत्तत्त्वे मायया बद्धं मनो

जागरणं व्रजेत् ।

अलब्ध्वा तत्र विश्रान्तिं सत्तत्त्वे

लीयते पुनः ॥८२॥

सत् तत्त्वे - in the principle of *sat/ātmā* मायया - by the *māyā* बद्धम् - tied मनः - the mind (to experience joys, etc.) जागरणम् - to the waking (and also dream) व्रजेत् - goes to तत्र - there anywhere विश्रान्तिम् - repose (happiness) अलब्ध्वा - having unobtained पुनः - again (during the sleep) सत् तत्त्वे - in the principle of *sat (ātmā)* लीयते - merges, becomes identified with—(82)

82. The mind (as a *jīva*) (to experience joys, etc.) goes to the waking (and also dream). Having unobtained the repose (happiness) there anywhere, again (during the sleep) merges (becomes identified with) in the principle of *sat (ātmā)*.

The word 'mind' is used to indicate *jīva* because it is the prominent one among the *upādhis* in the form of *kārya* (effect). It actually makes the *jīva* suffer the *saṃsāra*. Otherwise the *kāraṇa-upādhi* (causal *upādhi*) *avidyā* (ignorance) by itself does not give

sorrows. That is why there is no trace of sorrow in the deep sleep in spite of the presence of ignorance. The *saṃsāra* in the form of *śoka* (sorrow) and *moha* (delusion) is experienced only during the waking and dream states. There is only happiness in the deep sleep. The mind, etc., are not always associated with *ātmā*. This can be verified from the deep sleep. The real nature of *ātmā* is *sat* only. The mind (as a *jīva*) is tied to *ātmā* by the string of *avīdyā* (*māyā*) in the form of self-ignorance. This explains why the mind (*jīva*) cannot find happiness that can make oneself ever-contented in both waking and the dream and why it finally merges in *ātmā/sat* which is its true nature. During the deep sleep, the gross and the subtle *upādhis* are merged in *ātmā* in a seed-form only to manifest repeatedly to breed sorrows. Complete freedom from them can only be, when self-ignorance is destroyed by *Brahmajñāna/ātmajñāna*.

As seen so far, *saṃsāra* becomes functional at the mental level which is experienced because of *cidābhāsa* in it. On account of ignorance, the *saṃsāra* gets attributed to the *cidābhāsa* who with the accompanying gross and subtle *upādhis*, is nothing but *jīva*. Thus through *jīva* the *saṃsāra* gets superimposed on *ātmā*.

आत्मच्छायापि मनसा

सदाऽऽगच्छति गच्छति ।

गत्यागती तु संसारः स च

स्वात्मनि कल्पितः ॥८३॥

आत्मच्छाया - the reflected *caitanya* (*cidābhāsa*, i.e. *jīva*) अपि - also मनसा (सह) - along with the mind सदा - always आगच्छति - returns (to *sat* in sleep) गच्छति - goes out (from *sat* to the waking and dream) गत्यागती - such departure and return तु - on the other hand संसारः - is *saṃsāra* सः - that *saṃsāra* (projected by the mind and attributed to the *jīva*) च - moreover स्वात्मनि - in *ātmā* कल्पितः - is superimposed—(83)

83. Along with the mind, the reflected *caitanya* (*cidābhāsa*, i.e. *jīva*) also always returns to *sat* (in sleep) and goes out (from *sat* to the waking and dream). On the other hand, such departures and returns is the *saṃsāra*. Moreover that *saṃsāra* (projected by the mind and attributed to the *jīva*) is superimposed on *ātmā*.

There is another reading of ‘*saha āgacchati*’ in the place of ‘*sadā āgacchati*’. In that case the word *saha* (along with) need not be supplemented to the word ‘*manasā*’ (*vide* the translation).

The entire *saṃsāra* is projected by the mind. But it is inert in nature. Yet

the *saṃsāra* comes to the level of experience because of *cidābhāsa* (called *ātmacchāyā*) which is a basic constituent of false *jīva*. The winding up of the functions in the deep sleep and unwinding in the dream and waking (called *saṃsāra*) belonging to the inert mind get attributed to the *jīva* on account of *cidābhāsa*. That *saṃsāra* in turn is erroneously superimposed on *ātmā* because of *avidyā*. Though the phrase *gati-āgati* (coming and going) is used in the context of three states of consciousness (deep sleep, waking and dream) it can refer to transmigration also.

In short at practical level it is the mind which projects the *saṃsāra*. ‘No mind’ means ‘no *saṃsāra*’ for *ātmā*. The deep sleep state bears the testimony to this fact.

मनोलयेऽनुपाधिः सन्नात्मा संसारवर्जितः।
स्वेन वास्तवरूपेण सुषुप्ताववतिष्ठते ॥८४॥

सुषुप्तौ - in the deep sleep मनोलये - when the mind is extinct आत्मा - *ātmā*
अनुपाधिः सन् - being free from the *upādhi*
of mind संसारवर्जितः - devoid of *saṃsāra*
स्वेन वास्तवरूपेण - in its true nature अवतिष्ठते
- remains – (84)

84. *Ātmā* remains in its true nature devoid of *saṃsāra* being free from the *upādhi* of mind when it is extinct in the deep sleep state.

Thus it is proved that at the practical level the *saṃsāra* is on account of gross and subtle *upādhis*. The mind is the prominent among them. Interaction and the preoccupation with the *upādhis* can never give the limitless happiness that *ātmā* is. The direct (*aparokṣa*) experience of *ātmā* totally free from all the *upādhis* including the ignorance (causal one) alone can reveal its nature of limitless happiness. The deep sleep state is only an illustration to describe the nature of *mokṣa* (liberation), but it is not *mokṣa* because the cause, the ignorance is still present in it. If, all the features of *saṃsāra* end temporarily, when the manifest states of *upādhis* in waking and dream are extinct, it is needless to say that the *saṃsāra* will end once for ever when the ignorance also ends by *ātmajñāna*. Thus, the inquiry into the nature of deep sleep state reveals that the true nature of *jīva* is the *sat, cit, ānanda* totally free from all limitations, *nāma* (name), *rūpa* (form) and *karma* (action).

MEANS OF GAINING ĀTMAJÑĀNA

It was seen in the context of verse 72 that by mere ascertainment of the cause of *jagat* to be *sat* and the *dr̥śya jagat* as false in itself does not end the *saṃsāra*. But one has to know directly that the *jīva* in reality is *Brahmasvarūpa*.

Or, in other words, the knowledge of *jīveśvara-aikya* should be gained. For this purpose, as an introduction to this topic, three means of gaining *ātmajñāna* are enumerated now with their source in the next two and half verses.

चिच्छाया च वपुः

स्थूलमिन्द्रियाण्यात्मबोधने ।

द्वाराणीत्याह मन्त्रोऽयं रूपं

रूपमिति स्फुटम् ॥८५॥

‘रूपं रूपं’ इति अयं मन्त्रः - the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka mantra* beginning from ‘*rūpam rūpam*’ (*Br.U.2-5-19*) चिच्छाया - *cidābhāsa* स्थूलं वपुः - gross body इन्द्रियाणि - senses च - and आत्मबोधने - to gain the knowledge of *ātmā* द्वाराणि - means इति - so स्फुटम् - clearly आह - has described – (85)

85. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka mantra* beginning from ‘*rūpam rūpam*’ (*Br.U.2-5-19*) has clearly described the *cidābhāsa*, gross body and the senses as the means to gain the knowledge of *ātmā*.

The referred *Bṛhadāraṇyaka mantra* which suggests the three means of gaining *ātmajñāna* is: *rūpam rūpam pratirūpo babhūva* (*Parameśvara* got reflected in each body), *tadasya rūpam praticakṣaṇāya* (that reflected form is to reveal the true nature of *nirupādhika ātmā*), *Indraḥ māyābhiḥ pururūpaḥ īyate* (*Parameśvara* because

of innumerable *upādhis* in the form of *buddhis* or because of identification with all bodies having different names and forms is known as having innumerable forms) *yuktāḥ hi asya harayaḥ* (in his body are yoked innumerable horses, i.e. senses called horses) (*Br.U.2-5-19*). What aspects of this *mantra* suggests the three means (*sāadhanās*) to gain *ātmajñāna* is enumerated in the next one and a half verses.

देहे देहे प्रतिच्छायारूपोऽभूत्

स्वात्मबुद्धये ।

मायाभिरिन्द्रो बहुधा देहोऽभूत्

स्वात्मबुद्धये ॥८६॥

स्वात्मबुद्धये - to reveal the *ātmajñāna* देहे देहे - in each body - (परमेश्वरः - *Parameśvara*) प्रतिच्छायारूपः अभूत् - got reflected स्वात्मबुद्धये - to reveal the *ātmajñāna* इन्द्रः - *Parameśvara* मायाभिः - by the means of manifold *māyā* बहुधा - in different forms देहः अभूत् - became bodies – (86)

86. *Parameśvara* got reflected in each body to reveal the *ātmajñāna*. *Parameśvara* by the means of manifold *māyā* (also) became bodies in different forms for the same purpose.

The first line of this verse gives the gist of the portion ‘*rūpam rūpam pratirūpo babhūva*’ from the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka mantra* (*Br.U.2-5-19*).

As for the second line, it is the content of 'Indraḥ māyābhiḥ pururūpaḥīyate' from the same *mantra*. The word 'svātmābuddhaye' (to reveal *ātmajñāna*) found in the both lines of this verse and also 'svātmāvabuddhaye' in the next verse summarizes the phrase 'tad asya rūpam praticakṣanāya' of that *mantra*. *Māyābhiḥ* (by the *māyā's*) is in the plural sense. It refers to the innumerable *upādhis* in the form of *buddhis* or the identification with all bodies having different names and forms. The third aspect of wielding the *indriyas* (senses) to impart the knowledge of *ātmā* is enumerated in the next verse.

इन्द्रियाश्चास्तेन युक्तास्तच्च

स्वात्मावबुद्धये ।

छायामाश्रित्य तत्रात्मा बोधितः

सुप्तिवर्णनात् ॥८७॥

इन्द्रियाश्चाः - the senses as though horses तेन - with that body युक्ताः - are yoked तत् च - and that (yoking of senses with the body) स्वात्मावबुद्धये - (serves as the means) to gain *ātmajñāna* तत्र - among the three (*cidābhāsa*, body and the senses) छायाम् आश्रित्य - with the help of *cidābhāsa* आत्मा - *ātmā* सुप्तिवर्णनात् - by the description of the deep sleep state बोधितः - was made known—(87)

87. With the bodies assumed by *Parameśvara*, the senses as though

horses are yoked. And that (yoking of senses with the body) (serves as the means) to gain *ātmajñāna*. Among the three (*cidābhāsa*, body and the senses) *ātmā* was made known with the help of *cidābhāsa* by the description of the deep sleep state (vs.74 to 84).

Indriyas (senses) are called *hari* (horses) (*Br.U.2-5-19*) because they rob away (*haraṇāt*) the mind to the sense-objects (*viśayas*). *Kāthopaniṣad* (*Kt.U.1-3-4*) also describes *indriyas* as horses.

Cicchāyā (vs.85) or *ātmacchāyā* (vs.83) called *chāyā* (vs.87) meaning *cidābhāsa*, the reflection of *caitanya* (*cit*) in the mind (*antaḥkaraṇa*) as the means to gain *ātmajñāna* was already described (vs.74 to 84) while ascertaining the etymological interpretation of the noun 'svapiti'. So long as the mind is present, the *cicchāyā* is invariably present as in the waking and dream states. *Cicchāyā* in the mind is the basic constituent of *jīva*. Here the usage of the word *cicchāyā* instead of mind is very purposeful. The *cicchāyā* is born of *adhyāsa* (superimposition) between *anātmā* mind (*antaḥkaraṇa*) and *ātmā* (*cit*). If *anātmā* aspect from this is made extinct from *cicchāyā* what remains is not *chāyā* (reflection of *ātmā*) but *ātmā* itself.

The body as the means to gain

ātmajñāna will be explained in the verses 88 to 103 whereas *indriyas* (senses) as the means for the same is told in the verses 104, 105.

THE BODY AS THE MEANS OF GAINING *ĀTMAJÑĀNA*

The *śruti* further says: ‘Oh dear Śvetaketu, please know from me the nature of *aśanāyā* and *pipāsā*, etc.’ (Ch.U.6-8-3). Though the hunger (*aśanāyā*) and the thirst (*pipāsā*) are the functions of *prāṇas*, they manifest only in relation to the body. Now the *satsvarūpa ātmā* is unfolded by inquiry into the body wherein the hunger and thirst are centred. For this purpose, the etymological interpretation of *aśanāyā* and *pipāsā* is considered.

अशनायापिपासोक्त्या देहमाश्रित्य बोध्यते ।

अशनायापिपासाख्याद्वयं स्वपितिनामवत् ॥८८॥

अशनायापिपासोक्त्या - by the mention of hunger and thirst (in the *śruti*, Ch.U.6-8-3) देहम् आश्रित्य - based in the body (आत्मा - *ātmā*) बोध्यते - is revealed अशनायापिपासाख्याद्वयं - the two names *aśanāyā* and *pipāsā* स्वपितिनामवत् - are like the name ‘*svapiti*’ (expressing the name of the sleeping person) – (88)

88. *Ātmā* is revealed (in the *śruti*, Ch.U.6-8-3) by the mention of *aśanāyā* (hunger) and *pipāsā* (thirst) based in the body. The two names *aśanāyā* and

pipāsā are like the name ‘*svapiti*’ (expressing the name of the sleeping person).

By the etymological interpretation it was seen that the word ‘*svapiti*’ as a noun expresses the name of a sleeping person (*nidrāṇasya nāma*, vs.76). Similarly it is going to be shown that the word *aśanāyā* means water and the word *pipāsā* as fire though common people take these two words as hunger and thirst respectively. The import of the *śruti* beginning with *aśanāyāpipāse* (Ch.U.6-8-3) and ending with *sanmūlāḥ soṃya imāḥ sarvāḥ prajāḥ sadāyatanāḥ satpratiṣṭhāḥ* (Oh dear, all people are born of *sat*, exist in *sat* and finally merge back in *sat*) (Ch.U.6-8-4) is being given up to the verse 96.

अशनाया जनैः प्रोक्ता क्षुधावस्तुविवेकिभिः ।
नयन्त्यशितमित्येवमप्सु निर्वचनं भवेत् ॥८९॥

जनैः - by the common people अशनाया (इति) - by the word ‘*aśanāyā*’ क्षुधा - hunger प्रोक्ता - is called वस्तुविवेकिभिः - according to those who ascertain the reality अशितम् - eaten (food) नयन्ति - carry इति - so अप्सु - in the water निर्वचनं - etymological interpretation एवम् भवेत् - should hold good – (89)

89. The word ‘*aśanāyā*’ is called hunger by the common people. (But) according to those who ascertain reality,

the etymological interpretation of 'aśanāyā' specifies water because it carries the eaten food.

According to the direct meaning as understood by people the word *aśanāyā* means hunger. But etymologically it means the one that carries the eaten food. It is applicable to only water, both the actual one and in the form of saliva, enzymes, etc. This will be further explained in the next verse.

पीता आपोऽशनं भुक्तं द्रवीकृत्य नयन्त्यतः ।
अशनायेति शब्दोक्ता विण्मांसोत्पत्तिरन्नतः ॥९०॥

पीता: आपः - the water that is drunk
भुक्तं - eaten अशनम् - food द्रवीकृत्य - having liquidized नयन्ति - carries अतः (आपः) - therefore the water अशनाया *aśanāyā* इति शब्दोक्ताः - is called by this word अन्नतः - from the food विण्मांसोत्पत्तिः - faeces and flesh (are) produced – (90)

90. The water that is drunk, having liquidized the eaten food carries (the chyle to the different parts of the body). Therefore the water is called 'aśanāyā' (etymologically). The faeces and flesh are produced from the (eaten) food.

The common words used in the world in some cases when inquired into etymologically reveal great secrets. We have seen this in the case of 'svapiti' as a noun. Similarly *aśanāyā* and *pipāsā*

indicate water and fire in addition to their usual meanings of hunger and thirst. Some other words having the same category of etymological derivation as that of 'aśanāyā' are *gonāyaḥ* (cowherd who tends the cattle), *aśvanāyaḥ* (the person who tends the horses) and *puruṣanāyaḥ* (the king or the army-chief who leads the people), etc.

From the eaten food so liquidized after digestion faeces and flesh get produced. They actually indicate the physical body. By tracing its cause further in succession till the ultimate cause the *sat* will be discovered.

Uddālaka further exhorts Śvetaketu to find out the cause of this body which is an effect from its cause like a sprout from a banyan seed. The body cannot be causeless (*Ch.U.6-8-3*). To do this, the mode of inferring the cause by the means of its effect is being shown now.

विण्मांसहेतुरन्नं यदेतस्योत्पादकं

जलम् ।

जलस्योत्पादकं तेजस्तस्य

चोत्पादकं च सत् ॥९१॥

विण्मांसहेतुः - the cause of faeces and the flesh, (i.e. the cause of the body)
अन्नम् - is the food यद् - verily एतस्य - of this food उत्पादकम् - cause जलम् - is the water जलस्य उत्पादकम् - the cause of the water तेजः - the fire तस्य च - and its (of

fire) उत्पादकम् - cause च - certainly सत् - is *sat*—(91)

91. The cause of the body (indicated by faeces and the flesh) is the food. Verily the cause of this food is the water. The cause of the water is fire and its cause is certainly the *sat* (Brahman).

The food as the cause of the body is well-known fact. Water is indispensable for the growth of food. The cause of water as the fire and its cause as *sat* was already seen in the context of Creation.

The cause is certainly inferred by its effect. In the context of ascertaining the *sat*, the final cause of everything, the role of inference is highlighted.

अनुमायात्र कार्येण ज्ञेयं

तत्कारणं परम् ।

सन्मूलकारणं ज्ञेयं स्याद्

विश्वासोऽनुमानतः ॥९२॥

अत्र - here in the context of ascertaining the cause of the body (which can never be causeless) कार्येण - by the means that it is an effect (*kārya*) of (food) (कारणम् - cause) अनुमाय - having inferred (the immediate cause) तत् परं कारणाम् सन्मूलकारणम् - that ultimate cause, the *sat* ज्ञेयम् - should be known अनुमानतः - by the means of such inference विश्वासः - trust स्यात् - is developed—(92)

92. In the context of ascertaining the cause of the body (which can never be causeless) having inferred (its immediate cause) by the means that it is an effect (*kārya*) of (food), that ultimate cause (which can never be reduced to an effect) should be known. By the means of such inference, the trust is developed (in the truth which is otherwise known through the *śruti*).

Considering the cause-effect phenomenon is an essential aspect of inquiry to determine the truth, the body as an effect is clearly known because it has birth and destruction. Its immediate cause the food is also easily understandable. In the same trend, its further causes should be ascertained until we reach that ultimate cause which cannot be an effect any further. That is the non-dual *sat* the ever-existent principle which alone remains when all effects with reference to their immediate causes are reduced to their ultimate cause. Though the *śruti* has declared in the very beginning that before Creation this *jagat* was nothing but *sat*, such inferences in accordance with the *śruti* help us to develop an attitude of trust in those statements of the *śruti*.

The inquiry into the ultimate cause of the body is further elaborated step by step.

पुरीषाद्यन्नकार्यं स्यात्
 सत्येवान्नेऽस्य सत्त्वतः ।
 सत्यामेव यथा कुम्भो मृदि
 दृष्टो न चान्यथा ॥९३॥

अन्ने सति एव - only when the food is there अस्य सत्त्वतः - because of the existence of this body पुरीषाद्यन्नकार्यम् - faeces, etc., the effects of food स्यात् - take place यथा - just as मृदि सत्याम् एव - only when the mud is there कुम्भः - pot दृष्टः - is seen अन्यथा न च - and not otherwise—(93)

93. Only when the food is there the effects of the food such as faeces, etc., take place because of the existence of this body. (It is) just as the pot is seen only when the mud is there and not otherwise.

The above proves the body to be the effect of the food. Further, the causes of the food and water are inferred by the method of *anvaya* and *vyatireka*.

ब्रीह्याद्यन्नं सतीष्वेव
 दृष्टमप्सु न चान्यथा ।
 आपश्च स्वेदरूपा स्युः
 सत्येवोष्णे हि तेजसि ॥९४॥

अप्सु सतीषु एव - only when the water is there ब्रीह्याद्यन्नं - the food in the form of rice, etc. दृष्टम् - is seen (to be growing) च - and न अन्यथा - not otherwise, (i.e. it does not grow where there is no water) स्वेदरूपाः - in the form of

vapours (or sweat) आपः च - and the water उष्णे हि तेजसि सति एव - only when there is fire (*tejas*) which has the nature of heat (*uṣṇa*) स्युः - comes into existence—(94)

94. Only when the water is there, the food in the form of rice, etc., is seen (to be growing) and not otherwise, (i.e. it does not grow, where there is no water). The water is in the form of vapours (or sweat). It comes into existence only when there is fire (*tejas*) which has the nature of heat (*uṣṇa*).

These are all universally known facts. The food in the form of grains, vegetation cannot grow without the water. Fire in the form of heat is necessary for vapours or sweat which indicate the water. Thus this verse shows water as the cause of food and fire as that of water. Finally the cause of fire which happens to be the ultimate cause is determined.

तेजश्च भावरूपत्वात्
 संभवेन्न सता विना ।
 सतस्तूत्पत्तिराहित्यात् नान्वेष्यं
 कारणान्तरम् ॥९५॥

तेजः च - further the fire भावरूपत्वात् - being existent in nature सता विना - without the cause *sat* (ever-existent principle Brahman) न संभवेत् - cannot be born तु - but सतः उत्पत्तिराहित्यात् - because *sat* is unborn कारणान्तरम् - its

cause न अन्वेष्यम्- is not to be investigated any further – (95)

95. Further the principle of fire being existent in nature, it cannot be born without the cause *sat* (ever-existent principle Brahman). But because the *sat* is unborn, its cause is not to be investigated any further.

The principle of fire (*tejas*) being an element existent in nature is experienced as ‘is’. Its cause also must be the principle *sat* that always ‘is’. It cannot be the *asat* which never exists and is referred to as ‘is not’. *Sat* is the principle having ceaseless existence. It is unborn. Therefore it has no cause.

The gist of verses 93 to 95 is as follows. Every *kārya* (effect) has its *kāraṇa* (cause) because it is something produced from its original entity. It is like a mud-pot, etc., born from mud. Thus in general having inferred a cause of an effect the cause of the body to be food, that of food as water, of water as fire and of fire as *sat* was ascertained by the method of *anvaya* and *vyatireka*. As for *sat*, being unborn, there cannot be a cause.

In this inquiry the cause of *teja* (fire) is directly traced to *sat* by taking into account the existence aspect because this Upaniṣad speaks of only elements beginning from fire onwards.

When the actual five elements as described in the *Taittirīyopaniṣad* are taken into account the cause-effect relation between fire, *vāyu* (air), *ākāśa* (space) and *sat* also can be verified by the methods of *anvaya* and *vyatireka*. Fire burns only when there is oxygen (indicating the *vāyu*). The *Vāyu* needs space to exist like in the case of any other things. Therefore without space which is accommodative in nature, the *Vāyu* cannot exist. The ‘is’ness of space (*ākāśa*) is possible only when the ever-existent *sat* principle is there.

This inquiry of ascertaining the ultimate cause by inference (vs.93-95) is now concluded in the next two verses.

सन्मूलाः सकला देहा इदानीं च
सति स्थिताः ।

अन्ते सत्येव लीयन्ते

विद्यात् सत्तत्त्वमद्वयम् ॥९६॥

सकलाः - all देहाः - bodies सन्मूलाः - originate from *sat* इदानीं च - and now (during their period of existence) सति स्थिताः - abide in *sat* अन्ते - on their destruction सति एव - only in *sat* लीयन्ते - merge (back) (तस्मात् - therefore) सत् - *sat* अद्वयम् - non-dual तत्त्वम् - is real in nature विद्यात् - it should be known – (96)

96. All bodies originate from *sat* and now (during their period of existence) abide in *sat*. On their

destruction they merge (back) in *sat* only. Therefore it should be known that *sat* is real and non-dual in nature.

The effect which is born from an entity, in which it exists as an effect and finally on destruction it merges back in the same entity. That effect can never exist independent of that entity. The entire *jagat* from all the bodies onwards did exist as 'is' (*sat*) before Creation. It continues to be there as 'is' (*sat*) during its continuance and merges back in *sat* after its destruction and remains as 'is' (*sat*). Such ceaseless existent principle is the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of everything. Therefore the transient *jagat* is false (*mithyā*) in nature and the ever-existent principle *sat* alone is real.

यथा भूतातिरेकेण भौतिकं नैव विद्यते ।
भूतानि च सतोऽन्यानि तथा नेत्युपपादितम् ॥९७॥

यथा - just as भूतातिरेकेण - distinct from the three, (i.e. five) subtle elements भौतिकं - elementals (things made of elements) न एव विद्यते - do not exist at all तथा - similarly सतः अन्यानि - distinct from *sat* भूतानि - elements च - also न - do not exist इति - thus उपपादितम् - it has been proved (by inquiry) – (97)

97. Just as the elementals (things made of elements) distinct from three, (i.e. five) elements do not exist at all,

similarly elements also do not exist distinct from *sat*. Thus it has been proved (by inquiry).

This concludes the inquiry to reveal *ātmā* (*sat*) conducted with the analysis of *aśanāyā* based in the body which was introduced in the verse 88. Having reiterated the same, the knowledge of *sat* (*ātmā*) is being imparted through the means of the etymological interpretation of the word '*pipāsā*'.

अशनायामुखेनेत्थं सत्तत्त्वे धीः प्रवेशिता ।
पिपासामुखतोऽप्यस्मिन् सति धीरवतार्यते ॥९८॥

इत्थम् - thus अशनायामुखेन - through the means of the word '*aśanāyā*' सत्तत्त्वे धीः - the knowledge of *sat* principle प्रवेशिता - is revealed पिपासामुखतः - through the means of the word '*pipāsā*' अपि - also अस्मिन् सति धीः - the knowledge of *sat* (*ātmā*) अवतार्यते - is being revealed – (98)

98. Thus, the knowledge of *sat* principle is revealed through the means of the word '*aśanāyā*'. (Now) through the means of the word '*pipāsā*' (thirst) also the knowledge of *sat* (*ātmā*) is being revealed (in the next three verses) (*Ch.U.6-8-5*).

The commonly known and the etymologically derived meanings of the word '*pipāsa*' are enumerated first.

उदन्येति पिपासायाः पर्यायस्तं विवेकिनः ।
उदकं नयतीत्येवं तेजस्येवं प्रयुञ्जते ॥९९॥

‘उदन्या’ इति - (for the common people) the word ‘*udanyā*’ पिपासायाः - of thirst (*pipāsā*) पर्यायः - is synonym (तु - but) विवेकिनः - the discriminating persons तम् - that word ‘*udanyā*’ उदकं नयति इति - as ‘the one who dries up the water’ एवं - thus तेजसि एवं - in the sense of fire प्रयुञ्जते - use – (99)

99. (For the common people) the word ‘*udanyā*’ is the synonym of thirst (*pipāsa*), (but) the discriminating persons use it in the sense of fire as ‘the one who dries up the water’.

The phrase ‘*udakam nayati*’ literally means ‘the one who carries the water’. Here the verb ‘carry’ is in the sense to ‘dry up’ (*śoṣayati*).

पीतं जलं शरीरस्थं तेजसा जीर्यते ततः ।
मूत्रं रक्तं च निष्पन्नं द्रवत्वाज्जलजे उभे ॥१००॥

पीतं जलं - the water that is drunk शरीरस्थं - present in the body तेजसा - by the heat (fire) (abiding in the body) जीर्यते - is digested or consumed (dried up) ततः - from that digested water मूत्रं - urine रक्तं - blood च - and निष्पन्नं - are produced द्रवत्वात् - because of being liquid in nature उभे - both of them (urine and blood) जलजे - are born from water (in the body) – (100)

100. The water that is drunk and

present in the body is digested (dried up) by the heat (fire) abiding in it. From the digested water the urine and blood are produced. Both of them are born from the water (in the body) because of being liquid in nature.

ताभ्यामापोऽनुमीयन्ते

ताभिस्तेजस्ततस्तु सत् ।

व्याप्तिं गृहीत्वा सर्वत्र

योजनायोदितं पुनः ॥१०१॥

ताभ्याम् - by the means of those two (urine and the blood) (present in the body) आपः - water अनुमीयन्ते - is inferred ताभिः - by the water तेजः - fire (is inferred) ततः - from that fire तु - indeed सत् - *sat* (is inferred) व्याप्तिं - the rule of invariable co-existence गृहीत्वा - having understood सर्वत्र - in all cases (of *kārya*/effect) योजनाय - to apply (it to every effect invariably identical with its cause) पुनः - once again उदितम् - told (by the Upaniṣad in spite of ascertaining it [earlier] by the means of ‘*aśanāyā*’)- (101)

101. By the means of those two (urine and blood) (present in the body) the water is inferred. The (cause) fire is (inferred) by the (effect) water. From the fire indeed the *sat* (is inferred). This is told once again (by this Upaniṣad) in spite of ascertaining it (earlier) by the means of ‘*aśanāyā*’ to apply (it to every effect invariably identical with its

cause) having understood the rule of invariable co-existence in all cases (of *kārya*/effect).

Ascertaining the cause from the effect by means of inference was earlier undertaken with the help of ‘*aśanāyā*’ as a noun. Then why does the Upaniṣad repeat it in the case of *pipāsā* as *udanyā* (the one who carries the water in the sense dries it up)? The answer is given in the second line of this verse. It is to show the applicability of the rule (*vyāpti*) of invariable co-existence between the cause and its effect whereby the cause can be inferred from its effect.

It was shown in the verses 55 to 59 (*Ch.U.6-4*) that all external *drśya viśayas* (objects) are made of elements. Similarly, the elemental nature of the body also was established in the verses 61 to 63 (*Ch.U.6-5, 6-6*). Now in the context of describing the body as a means to gain *Ātmajñāna*, the elemental nature of limbs (which are part and parcel of the body) also is reiterated in the next one and a half verses (*Ch.U.6-8-6*) lest someone thinks them born from some other cause.

देहे येऽवयवाः सन्ति पदार्थाः सन्ति ते बहिः ।
तेषु सर्वेषु सन्मात्ररूपत्वमवधार्यताम् ॥१०२॥

ये अवयवाः - those limbs which
देहे सन्ति - abide in the body ते - they
बहिः (उपलब्धाः) - externally available (तेज

आदि) पदार्थाः - things such as fire, etc., and entities made from them सन्ति - are तेषु सर्वेषु - in all those (limbs within the body and the things outside it) सन्मात्ररूपत्वम् - their true nature as non-dual *sat* only (इति) अवधार्यताम् - so it should be ascertained – (102)

102. The limbs that abide in the body are same as externally available things such as fire, etc., and entities made from them. In all those (limbs within the body and the things outside) it should be ascertained that their true nature is non-dual *sat* only.

The limbs in the body and the things outside it being elementals, the ascertainment of their true nature as *sat* is a conclusion based on what was established earlier regarding both the elements and elementals. The elemental nature of the limbs in the body is specifically shown like that of external objects to complete the description of the body with all its aspects to show it as a means of ascertaining the *Ātmajñāna*.

Contextually, a doubt needs to be answered here. Followers of *Vaiśeṣika* school of thought and *Paurāṇikas* (versed in the legends of the past) opine that the bodies of the inhabitants in different *lokas* (field of experiences) are made from different single elements. They say: ‘*Śarīram ekabhūtārabdham*

syāt' (body is made from single element). There is no basis in the *śruti* to substantiate this claim. On the contrary this Upaniṣad has very clearly established that the external objects and the body are made from all elements after their grossification (vs.55 to 59 and 61 to 63; *Ch.U.6-4, 6-5, 6-6*). Therefore this doubt gets answered by what has been already established. This is brought to our notice in the first line of the next verse. Its second line introduces the senses (*indriyas*) as the means to know *ātmā*.

भौतिकत्वं पुरा प्रोक्तं तदुक्तं देहबाह्ययोः ।
इन्द्रियद्वारतो बोद्धुं प्रोच्यते मरणक्रमः ॥१०३॥

देह बाह्ययोः - of the body and the external objects (यत् - whatever) भौतिकत्वं - the elemental nature पुरा प्रोक्तम् - described earlier तद् - the same description उक्तम् - is told now (in answer to the claim that bodies in the different *lokas* are made from different elements) इन्द्रियद्वारतः - through the means of senses बोद्धुम् - to reveal *ātmā* मरणक्रमः - the course of death प्रोच्यते - is described—(103)

103. (Whatever) the elemental nature of the body and external objects was described earlier, the same is told now (in answer to the claim that bodies in different *lokas* are made from different elements). The course of death

is (now) described to reveal *ātmā* through the means of senses (*indriyas*).

The entire gross Creation whether the gross bodies or the external world is made up of grossified elements only. Therefore there is no occasion that any body is made from any single element. This should be very clear from the elemental nature of bodies and the external world established earlier.

So far the *citcchāyā* and the physical body were described as the means of gaining the knowledge of *ātmā/sat*. Now the remaining senses (*indriyas*) as the means of knowing *ātmā* is being described.

SENSES (*INDRIYAS*) AS THE MEANS OF GAINING *ĀTMAJÑĀNA*

Considering the course of death in the light of the rule, 'effect merges in the cause', it is going to be shown that the final cause of *indriyas*, the mind, *prāṇa* and *teja* is *sat* (Brahman) only. The Upaniṣad says: 'The speech indicating the *indriyas* of the person on the verge of death merges (gets withdrawn) in the mind, the mind in the *prāṇas*, the *prāṇas* in the *teja* and the *teja* in the principle of *sat* (*ātmā*/Brahman)' (*Ch.U.6-8-6*). When the speech merges in the mind, the relatives say that he is not talking. But the mind still functions. When the mind merges in the *prāṇas*, the

people around say that he is not able to recognise as in sleep. Then his *prāṇas* wherein all *indriyas* and mind have merged start gasping for breath. All vital parts are as though uprooted from the body. The person stretches the hands and legs in agony.

In such conditions the *prāṇas* gradually merge in the *teja*. Here the word *teja* means the *jīva* (*vijñāna-svarūpa*) endowed with all elements. Further that *jīva* merges in the five elements indicated by *teja* that serve as the seed for the next embodiment to be born. Thus ‘*prāṇaḥ tejasi*’ (the actual merging of *prāṇas* in *teja*) is through *jīva*. This is in accordance with *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (*Br.U.4-3-38, 4-4-2*). The word *tejasi* (in the *teja*) should not be taken literally in the element fire only, but it is *upalakṣaṇa* (indicative) of all the five elements. This has been thoroughly ascertained so in ‘*adhyakṣādhikaraṇa*’ (*Br.Sū.4-2-4 to 6*). The cause of five elements indicated by *teja* is *sat* (Brahman).

In such merging of *jīva* with all senses, *prāṇas*, the mind and elements in *sat* the *jīva* loses its nature of *jīva* and remains itself as the ultimate cause *sat*. *Jīva* in reality is always identical with *sat* but due to *upādhis* and identification with them, appears to be different from *sat*. But when the mind merges in *sat*

without *aparokṣānubhava* of *sat* (Brahman) on account of ignorance it is in a sleep-like condition and gets subjected to transmigration. But if the mind/*jīva* merges totally in *sat* with *aparokṣa Brahmajñāna* it results in *videhamukti* (bodiless liberation). Thus taking recourse to the course of death, the principle of *sat* (*ātmā*) is revealed through the means of *indriyas* in the next two verses.

प्रियमाणस्य वागादि वृत्तिर्मनसि लीयते ।
मनोवृत्तेर्लयः प्राणे प्राणवृत्तेस्तु तेजसि ॥१०४॥

प्रियमाणस्य - Of the person who is on the verge of death वागादिवृत्तिः - functions of the organ of speech, etc. मनसि - in the mind लीयते - merge (get withdrawn) मनोवृत्तेः - of the mental function प्राणे - in the *prāṇa* लयः - merging (takes place) प्राणवृत्तेः तु - whereas the functions of *prāṇas* तेजसि - (merge in) *teja* (which indicates *jīva* with elements to begin with and finally in all the five elements that serve as the seed for the next body)–(104)

104. Of the person who is on the verge of death the functions of the organ of speech, etc., merge (get withdrawn) in the mind. The merging of the mental function takes place in the *prāṇa* whereas the functions of *prāṇas* (merge in) *teja* (which indicates *jīva* with

elements to begin with and finally in all the elements that serve as the seed for the next body).

श्वासस्योपरतावुष्णं स्पृष्ट्वा जीवननिश्चयम् ।
कुर्वन्त्युष्णं तु तत्तेजः सद्वस्तुनि विलीयते॥१०५॥

श्वासस्य उपरतौ - when the breath stops उष्णं स्पृष्ट्वा - having felt the warmth of the body जीवननिश्चयं कुर्वन्ति - determine whether the person is alive or dead तत् उष्णं तु - but that warmth (is) तेजः - the element of fire सद्वस्तुनि - in the entity having the nature of *sat* विलीयते - merges (finally)–(105)

105. When the breath stops, (the people) determine whether the person is alive or dead by feeling the warmth of the body. But that warmth (is) the element of fire (which) finally merges in the entity that is *sat* in nature.

We consider ourselves as ‘seer’, ‘hearer’, ‘eater’, ‘walker’, etc. But these roles are possible on account of *indriyas* (senses) only which are the *upādhis*. Therefore it is imperative that the *indriyas* need to be inquired into like the body and the mind. They are also not distinct from *sat* in reality. The senses are elementals (the effects of elements). That also proves their real nature as *sat* like the final nature of the five elements as seen earlier.

Just as the help of ‘deep sleep’

was taken to know *sat/ātmā* through the means of *cicchāyā*, so also the course of death needs to be considered here to ascertain *sat* through the means of *indriyas*. Death also is a state of *jīva* like the waking, dream and deep sleep. Therefore it also is required to be inquired into.

The course of death considered here is as found in the case of natural death though it is not so in the case of sudden deaths. First of all the speech becomes slurred. Then the person slowly loses consciousness. No more the mind functions. There is gasping for breath. Finally the body becomes cold. There is no more warmth (heat) in it. At this stage it is concluded that the person is dead. But even then the *sat* principle continues to be there. Therefore it is said that the *teja* (element fire) merges in *sat*. In sleep the senses and the mind merge together. As a result a clear order of their merging cannot be known. That is why the course of death is considered by the *śruti* to ascertain *sat* through the means of *indriyas*.

TAT TVAM ASI – YOU ARE SAT (BRAHMAN)

Having thus ascertained the *sat* as the basis of entire Creation, the father Uddālaka teaches to Śvetaketu the *mahāvākya* – the statement that reveals the identity of *jīva* and *Īśvara*. He

continues: ‘The principle of *sat* ascertained so far is the most subtle, totally imperceptible as if atomic (*aṇimā*). This entire *jagat* (*idam sarvam*) has this *sat* only as its *ātmā*, the true nature. Its existence is because of this *sat* alone (*aitadātmīyam*). That ultimate cause of everything called *sat* is *satyam* (absolute reality). That itself is *ātmā* (*saātmā*), the true nature of this erroneously projected world like the rope in the case of a mistaken snake. (It may be the true nature of everything, but what do I get out of it?). Oh Śvetaketu, you are that Brahman called *sat* (*tattvam asi*)’ (*Ch.U.6-8-7*). This teaching which removes the notion that ‘I am a *jīva*’ and makes one discover ‘I am Brahman’ is explained in the next six verses.

छायादेहेन्द्रियद्वारैः पदार्थो योऽत्र बोधितः ।

स एष सर्वजगतोऽणिमा वस्त्वन्तरं न तु ॥१०६॥

अत्र - here in this chapter छाया देहेन्द्रियद्वारैः - through the means of *cicchāyā*, body and the senses यः पदार्थः - the entity (called *sat*) बोधितः - was taught सः एषः - the same entity (called *sat*) सर्वजगतः - of entire *jagat* अणिमा (कारणम्) - is the most subtle cause वस्त्वन्तरम् न तु - there is nothing else other than *sat* that can be the cause of *jagat*—(106)

106. The entity (called *sat*) that was taught here in this chapter through the means of *cicchāyā*, body and the

senses itself is the most subtle cause of entire *jagat*. There is nothing else other than *sat* that can be the cause of *jagat*.

Sat, the ultimate cause and the basis of *jagat*, was taught through the three means: (i) *Cicchāyā* (reflected *caitanya*) by taking recourse to the deep sleep and analyzing the word ‘*svapiti*’ (vs.74 to 84), (ii) Body by analyzing ‘*aśanāyā*’ and *pipāsā* (vs.88 to 102), (iii) *Indriyas* (senses) by considering the course of death (vs.104,105).

That *sat* is the basis or the ultimate cause of the *jagat*. It is the most subtle and therefore totally imperceptible. It is totally free from the attributes such as *śabda* (sound), *sparsā* (touch), *rūpa* (form), *rasa* (taste) and *gandha* (smell). Greater the number of these attributes an entity has, grosser it becomes and thereby more perceptible. For example, the earth which has all the five attributes is the grossest and can be perceived by all the five sense-organs. As the number of attributes in an entity decreases it becomes subtler depending on the loss of number of attributes. It becomes less perceptible correspondingly. The space has only one attribute - sound. It is the most subtle entity in Creation. It is available for only one perception, namely, hearing which is the unique feature of the sound. Since *sat* is free from all the five attributes it is quite

natural that there is nothing subtler than it. Hence it is totally imperceptible. Thus the word *aṇimā* (the most subtle) fits in well for *sat*. There is no other cause of Creation such as *paramāṇu*, etc., as imagined by *Vaiśeṣikas*, etc.

The meaning of the word *aṇimā* from the *śruti* (Ch.U.6-8-7) is explained in the next one and a half verses by pointing out the perceptibly available *nāmarūpātma jagat* and the imperceptible non-dual *sat* (Brahman).

स्थूलत्वाणुत्वरूपाभ्यां

वस्त्वेकम्भासते द्विधा ।

स्थूलमिन्द्रियगम्यत्वान्नामरूपात्मकं

जगत् ॥१०७॥

सदद्वैतम्भवेत् सूक्ष्ममिन्द्रियाविषयत्वतः ।

एतदात्मकतैवास्य स्थूलस्येतीह युज्यते ॥१०८॥

एकम् - one वस्तु - entity (called *sat*) स्थूलत्वाणुत्वरूपाभ्याम् - because of gross and subtle forms द्विधा - twofold भासते - appears स्थूलम् - the gross one इन्द्रियगम्यत्वात् - because it is perceptible by the senses नामरूपात्मकं जगत् - is the *jagat* having names and forms – (107)

सूक्ष्मम् - the subtle (aspect of that entity) इन्द्रियाविषयत्वतः - because of being not an object of senses अद्वैतम् - non-dual सत् - *sat* भवेत् - is इह - in this Creation अस्य स्थूलस्य - of this gross (*jagat*) एतदात्मकता - *ātma* (true nature) is this subtle *sat* एव -

only युज्यते - it is proper according to the *śruti* and *yukti* (reasoning) – (108)

107-108. The one entity (called *sat*) appears twofold because of its gross and subtle forms. Because the gross form is perceptible by the senses, it is the *jagat* having names and forms. Because of being not an object of senses (*indriyas*), the subtle aspect of that entity is the non-dual *sat*. The true nature (*ātma*) of this gross *jagat* is this subtle *sat* only (*etadātmakā*). It is proper (to determine so because) it is according to the *śruti* and *yukti* (reasoning).

The second line of the verse 108 explains ‘*aitadātmamidam sarvam*’ from the *śruti* (Ch.U.6-8-7). The statement that one and the same entity (*sat*) appears twofold with the gross form as *jagat* and the subtle one as the non-dual *sat* gives an impression that the *sat* is dualistic in nature. This is dispelled by pointing out the false nature of the gross *jagat* which cannot attribute duality to the non-dual *sat* that is subtle in nature. Therefore the Upaniṣad describes further the *sat* as ‘*tat* (that *sat*) *satyam*’ (absolute reality) (Ch.U.6-8-7). This is explained by describing the nature of subtleness (*aṇutva*) and grossness (*sthūlatva*) mentioned in the verse 107.

अणुत्वं वस्तुनः प्रोक्तं

यत् तत्सत्यमबाधनात् ।

स्थूलत्वं मायया क्लृप्तं

ज्ञानेनैतस्य बाधनात् ॥१०९॥

यत् वस्तुनः - of which entity अणुत्वम् - subtleness प्रोक्तम् - was told (vs.107) तत् - that (entity) सत्यम् - is ever-existent principle अबाधनात् - because it never gets destroyed in the three periods of time स्थूलत्वम् - grossness of the same entity (in the form of *jagat*) मायया क्लृप्तम् - is falsely projected by *māyā* ज्ञानेन - by the direct knowledge of its basis *sat* एतस्य बाधनात् - because this (*jagat*) gets sublated - (109)

109. The entity whose subtleness was told (vs.107) that (entity) is ever-existent principle because it never gets destroyed in the three periods of time. The grossness of the same entity (in the form of *jagat*) is falsely projected by *māyā* because it gets sublated by the direct knowledge of its basis *sat*.

The *sat* that is *aṇu* (subtle) exists ceaselessly and never ceases to be there. Thus being indestructible it must necessarily be limitless because any limitation spells destruction. Being limitless the *sat* must necessarily be non-dual in nature. Therefore even if the gross *jagat* appears to be distinctly available, it should necessarily be false. This fact gets confirmed because the

jagat is projected by false *māyā* with *sat* as its basis. The *sat* as the basis or the true nature (*ātmā* as *svarūpa*) of *jagat* is confirmed by the Upaniṣadic statement, (*'sa ātmā'*) (*Ch.U.6-8-7*). This is explained in the first line of the next verse whereas the second line reveals the truth that 'I' in every one is this non-dual principle called *sat*. It gives the meaning of *mahāvākya 'tat tvam asi'* (you are *sat* Brahman) (*Ch.U.6-8-7*, etc.).

अबाध्यो यः स एवात्मा सर्वस्य न तु कल्पितः ।
श्वेतकेतो यदद्वैतं तदसि त्वं न मानवः ॥११०॥

यः - the one who अबाध्यः - is non-destructible सः एव - that principle alone सर्वस्य - of the entire *jagat* आत्मा - is *ātmā* in the sense of true nature (*svarūpa*) न तु कल्पितः - but (it is) not falsely projected श्वेतकेतो - Oh Śvetaketu यत् - whatever अद्वैतं (सत्) - non-dual *sat* is there तत् - that (*sat*) त्वं - you असि - are न मानवः - you are not a human - (110)

110. The non-destructible principle (*sat*) alone is the true nature (*ātmā*) of the entire *jagat*. But, it is not falsely projected. Oh Śvetaketu, the principle of non-dual *sat* (Brahman) is you. You are not a human.

The problem of *sukha-duḥkhātma* *samsāra* is self-centred. The fact that the true nature of the entire *jagat* is indestructible *sat* is not going to solve

individualistic problem of *saṃsāra*. Lest Śvetaketu thinks so, he is directly told that the entire *jagat* includes himself, the individual also. Therefore Śvetaketu was told that his true nature (called *ātmā*) is also *sat* in contrast to his hitherto erroneous notion that he is a *saṃsārī jīva* parading as a human. The teaching *tat* (that *sat* unfolded so far) *tvam* (you) *asi* (are) is called *mahāvākya* - a statement (*vākya*) of *śruti* which reveals (*bodhaka*) the oneness or identity (*akhaṇḍārtha*) of *jīva* and *Īśvara* in their real nature. *Jīva* and *Īśvara* free from their respective *upādhis* of *avidyā* and *māyā* are one and the same principle called *sat* or Brahman which is nothing but non-dual, all pervasive *caitanya* (pure awareness or consciousness principle).

What is first required is the direct experience of ‘*tvam*’ (you the *jīva*) free from all *upādhis* including *tripuṭīs* (otherwise called *śodhita* or *nirupādihika tvam pada*). Then, the *śruti pramāṇa* operates revealing ‘this I’ as being experienced now free from all *upādhis* is *sat, cit, ānanda*, Brahman itself.

Without the direct experience of *śodhitatvam pada* (word), ‘*tat tvam asi*’ equation will not be valid and the *mahāvākya* will not operate.

The purpose of ‘*tat tvam asi*’ can be viewed in another way secondarily. The phrase ‘*aitadātmyam*’ (vs.108, line

2; *Ch.U.6-8-7*) shows the true nature of every thing as *caitanyarūpa sat*. The same statement coupled with ‘*tat*, (i.e. *sat*) *satyam*’ exposes the *mithyā* (false) nature of *jagat* projected by *māyā* and thus proves the non-dual nature of *sat*. This also proves the declaration that by the knowledge of one (cause) the knowledge of all (effects) is gained. Then the question is ‘why *tat tvam asi*’ is taught to Śvetaketu? It can be viewed as an extended application to Śvetaketu's present state of understanding in the light of the truth discovered so far. He was very arrogant after his study of the Vedas. Here, it is pointed out that the arrogance belongs to *ahaṃkāra* with *cidābhāsa*, (i.e. *jīva*) and not to *ātmā* (his true nature) who is aware of that state.

चिच्छायावानहङ्कारोऽधीते

वेदचतुष्टयम् ।

त्वं तु साक्ष्येव तस्यातः

सदसि त्वं न चेतः ॥१११॥

चिच्छायावान् अहङ्कारः - the ‘I’ notion (*ahaṃkāra*) endowed with *cidābhāsa* (reflected *caitanya*) वेदचतुष्टयम् - the four Vedas अधीते - studies त्वम् - you (are) तु - but तस्य - its (of *ahaṃkāra*) साक्षी - illuminator एव - only अतः - therefore त्वम् - you सत् असि - are *sat* न च - not at all इतरः - the other one (*ahaṃkāra* endowed with *cidābhāsa*) – (111)

111. The 'I' notion (*ahaṃkāra*) endowed with *cidābhāsa* studies the four Vedas. But you are its (of *ahaṃkāra*) illuminator only. Therefore you are *sat* and not at all the other one (*ahaṃkāra* endowed with *cidābhāsa*).

Śvetaketu is told that the one who had arrogance of remembering the Vedas is not your true nature. You are merely its *sākṣī*. Śvetaketu was identifying with the knower (*pramātā*) who is endowed with the *upādhi*. Now he is told that he is not the *pramātā* having *upādhi* but its *sākṣī* independent of all *upādhis*. 'Oh Śvetaketu, you are that *cit* by whose reflection the mind appears as sentient, but you are not that *cidābhāsa* (reflected *cit*)'.

MANANA – REFLECTION

We find in the Upaniṣad that after this much of teaching, Śvetaketu has appealed eight times to his father who is his *guru* now to teach him further. The father Uddālaka also explains the same truth with different illustrations and repeats '*tat tvam asi*' every time. Thus we have this *mahāvākya* repeated totally nine times. From the answers the questions in the mind of Śvetaketu can be inferred. That shows that he was reflecting (doing *manana*) after *śravaṇa*. It is imperative that a *mumukṣu* after self-inquiry (*śravaṇa*) clears his doubts and vagueness about one's true nature and the ultimate truth. For this the help of

guru, other Vedāntic masters, *co-mumukṣus* and Vedāntic texts can be taken. This portion of reflection is explained till the verse 138 (*Ch.U.6-9 to 6-16*). First of all the result of this teaching gained by Śvetaketu is described and then his doubts are answered one by one.

भिन्नोऽभूद्धृदयग्रन्थिः श्वेतकेतोर्विवेकतः ।
धीदोषं संशयं मार्ष्टुं भूयो ब्रूहीत्यवोचत ॥११२॥

विवेकतः - by investigation श्वेतकेतोः - of Śvetaketu हृदयग्रन्थिः - the mutual superimposition (*adhyāsa*) between *ātmā* (*cit*) and *anātmā* (*jada*, inert) (literally called the knot of the heart) भिन्नः अभूत् - got eliminated धीदोषम् - error in knowing संशयम् - (in the form of) doubt मार्ष्टुम् - to dispel भूयः ब्रूहि - please teach me again इति - so अवोचत - (he) requested—(112)

112. By the investigation, the mutual superimposition (*adhyāsa*) between *ātmā* (*cit*) and *anātmā* (*jada*) of Śvetaketu got eliminated. But to dispel the error in knowing (in the form of doubts), he requested (the father) to teach him again.

The phrase '*hṛdayagranthi*' literally means the knot of the heart. It is the mutual superimposition between *ātmā* and *anātmā* or *cit* and *jada* (inert). Because of it we consider ourselves as 'knower' (*pramātā*), experiencer

(*anubhavitā*), doer (*kartā*), etc. Neither the inert body, mind, etc., can function on their own nor *nirupādhika ātmā* can do so. But the *ahaṅkāra*, an inert *antaḥkaraṇavṛtti* bearing the *cidābhāsa* in it, appears as sentient and erroneously considers itself as the knower, etc. This erroneous notion born of *ātmānātma-adhyāsa* is the *granthi* (knot). It surfaces in *antaḥkaraṇa* which has *hr̥daya* (heart) as its seat. Therefore it is called *hr̥dayagranthi*.

The lack of clarity in knowledge is the *dhīdośa*. It is in the form of doubts. The knowledge with doubts cannot yield the promised result. The knowledge is gained by self-inquiry (*śravaṇa*) whereas doubts can be resolved by *manana* (reflection). That prompts Śvetaketu to request his father to explain repeatedly. As stated earlier, Śvetaketu's doubts are not mentioned in the Upaniṣad expressly. They are implied in his repeated requests. *Bhāṣyakāra* also specifies them. Śvetaketu's first question is why are we not aware of our oneness with *sat* in sleep when such merging takes place? He is not doubting such oneness but wants to know the reason why it is not cognized.

सता संपद्यते जीवः

सुषुप्तावित्युदीरितम् ।

तथा चेत् सति संपन्नोऽहमित्यस्य

कुतो न धीः ॥११३॥

जीवः - the *jīva* सुषुप्तौ - in the deep sleep सता संपद्यते - becomes one with *sat* इति - so उदीरितम् - described तथा चेत् - if it is so अहम् सति सम्पन्नः - I have become one with *sat* इति - thus अस्य - of this *jīva* धीः कुतः न (भवति) - why does he not know? - (113)

113. It was described that the *jīva* becomes one with *sat* in the deep sleep (vs.74 to 76; *Ch.U.6-8-1*). If it is so, why does the *jīva* not know as 'I have become one with *sat*'?

The *guru* replies

नानावृक्षरसैक्येन संपन्ने

मधुनि स्थितः ।

न बुध्यते रसोऽस्येति तथा

सर्वलयान्न धीः ॥११४॥

नाना वृक्षरसस्य ऐक्येन - by the mixing of juice belonging to many trees सम्पन्ने मधुनि - in the honey so made स्थितः - abiding रसः - juice अस्य इति - 'I belong to such and such tree' न बुध्यते - does not know तथा - similarly सर्वलयात् - because all means of knowledge have merged in the deep sleep धीः न - (the *jīva*) has no knowledge that it has merged in the *sat* - (114)

114. The (sweet) juice (from the flowers) of a specific tree abiding in the honey made by the mixing of the juices belonging to many trees does not know

that 'I belong to such and such tree'. Similarly (the *jīva*) has no knowledge that it has merged in the *sat* because all the means of knowledge have merged in the deep sleep.

It is well-known that the honey-bees gather the sweet juices from the flowers of different trees and deposit them in a bee-hive without any distinction. No single juice can know itself as belonging to a specific tree in the sense none can know the individual juices distinctly for want of appropriate means of knowledge. Similarly all *jīvas* and their means of knowledge such as *indriyas*, mind, *buddhi*, *ahaṅkāra*, etc., with the entire *antaḥkaraṇa* merge in the sleep. The means of knowledge merge in their immediate cause *avidyā* whereas the *jīva* merges in *sat* Brahman. As a result of such non-availability of the means with the presence of *avidyā*, the *jīva* knows not its becoming one with *sat*. In the absence of cognitional means the *jīva*, though sentient in nature, appears as though insentient. In pitch darkness we cannot see anything, but we do not say that there is nothing. Similarly in the deep sleep we are unable to know anything for want of cognitional means because of ignorance which is present therein. But, it cannot be said that we were not at all one with *sat*.

If in sleep all *jīvas* are one with *sat*, then why do they not get liberated?

Or why should they wake up in the same body? How do they continue to be the *jīvas* in the same *upādhi* (body) on waking up? The Upaniṣad says that the *jīva* continues to be the same entity such as tiger, lion, fox, pig, insect, moth, gnat, mosquito, etc., even after waking up from sleep (*Ch.U.6-9-3*). The reason for such occurrence is now given.

जीवोपाधिलयेऽप्यत्र

तद्वीजस्यावशेषतः ।

तदुपाधिक एवास्मिन्

देहेऽन्येद्युः प्रबुध्यते ॥११५॥

अत्र - in the deep sleep जीवोपाधिलये
अपि - though the *upādhi* of *jīva* gets merged
तद्वीजस्य - of its (of *jīvas upādhi*)
seed (cause) (viz. *avidyā*) अवशेषतः -
because of the remainder तदुपाधिकः -
having the same *upādhi* as earlier एव -
only अस्मिन् देहे - in that body अन्येद्युः - the
next day प्रबुध्यते - awakes – (115)

115. Though the *upādhi* of *jīva* gets merged in the deep sleep, because of its (of *jīva's upādhi*) remaining cause (viz. *avidyā*) the *jīva* awakes the next day having the same *upādhi* as earlier in that body only.

In the deep sleep the gross and the subtle bodies are not available. They cease to function. Yet, their cause the *avidyā* (self-ignorance) persists. This is the ignorance which denies the knowledge of Brahman (*sat*) in spite of

jīva merging in *sat* Brahman. That is why the sleep is not the state of liberation and the *prārabdha-karma* of the present *upādhi* continue to be operative. Once the individual *jīva's prārabdha-karma* of sleep of that day is over the individual entity awakes again in the same body having the same *upādhi* that was there before going to sleep. Thus this merging of *jīva* in *sat* during the deep sleep is along with the self-ignorance. What is necessary for liberation is the destruction of ignorance by gaining *aparokṣa* (direct) *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna*.

The *guru* Uddālaka has already ascertained what needs to be taught by revealing the identity of *jīva* and *Īśvara* through the means of ‘*tat tvam asi*’ *mahāvākya*. Thereafter the disciple's doubts are resolved by apt illustrations. But the ultimate reality is one and the same as taught in ‘*tat tvam asi*’. Therefore the *guru* repeats the same *mahāvākya* after every illustration not to give any room to a wrong concept that something new is taught. This intention of the *guru* along with the necessity of *manana* (reflection) is told in the next two verses.

चित्तैकाग्र्याय तच्छङ्का परिहार्या तु वस्तुषु ।
पूर्वोक्तमेव तद्बोद्धुं तदेवाह पुनर्गुरुः ॥११६॥

वस्तुषु - in the absolute real entity *sat* Brahman चित्तैकाग्र्याय - to make the

mind get absorbed by concentration तु - certainly तच्छङ्का - the doubts or questions of the disciple परिहार्या - should be answered गुरुः - *guru* पूर्वोक्तम् - whatever that was taught earlier एव - only तद् बोद्धुम् - to advise the principle तद् एव - that principle alone पुनः आह - repeated—(116)

116. Certainly the questions of the disciple should be answered to make the mind get absorbed by concentration in the absolute real entity *sat* Brahman. The *guru*, to advise the principle, repeated that alone which indeed was taught earlier.

Besides *śravaṇa* and *manana*, the *nididhyāsana* wherein the mind is made to get absorbed in *ātmā* to the exclusion of *anātmā* - thoughts is necessary. This needs the concentration of the mind. That is why getting the doubts resolved is indispensable. The *mahāvākya* ‘*tat tvam asi*’ was first advised in the verse 110 (*Ch.U.6-8-7*). It is now repeated (*Ch.U.6-9-4*) and will be done so until end of the chapter till all questions are answered to show that the *sat* principle unfolded through different illustrations, is one and the same.

What prompted Śvetaketu to ask repeated questions will be clear from his disposition that is being restated in this context.

प्राज्ञमन्यतया तत्त्वमविश्वस्य
स्वशङ्कया ।

पुनः पुनरपृच्छत् तं
प्रत्याहासौ पुनः पुनः ॥११७॥

प्राज्ञमन्यतया - because of considering himself to be wise तत्त्वम् - the principle of *sat* अविश्वस्य - having distrusted स्वशङ्कया - on account of his doubts पुनः पुनः - repeatedly अपृच्छत् - asked questions असौ - his *guru* Uddālaka तं - unto him पुनः पुनः - repeatedly प्रत्याह - answered (giving illustrations) – (117)

117. (Śvetaketu), because of considering himself to be wise having distrusted the principle of *sat*, repeatedly asked questions on account of his doubts. His *guru* Uddālaka (also) repeatedly answered unto (giving illustrations).

It was told in the beginning itself that Śvetaketu after his studies of the Vedas became arrogant and conceited thinking himself to be an unparalleled scholar (vs.2, Ch.U.6-2-2). Because of such disposition he lacked the required *śraddhā* in his *guru's* teaching. That prompted him to question the teaching repeatedly. On the other hand, Uddālaka having known fully the plight of his disciple, answered all questions.

A person slept in the house wakes up and goes to another city. He knows

that he has come from his home. Then why not all know after waking up from deep sleep that they have returned from *sat*? This is the second question.

सुषुप्तौ बुद्ध्यभावेऽपि
पुनर्जागरणेऽस्ति धीः ।

आगच्छं सत इत्येवं तदा
कस्मान्न वेत्यसौ ॥११८॥

सुषुप्तौ - in the deep sleep बुद्ध्यभावे अपि - even though *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) is not functioning (and therefore cannot know the identity of *jīva* with *sat*) पुनः जागरणे - on waking up धीः - *buddhi* अस्ति - is functional तदा - then असौ - this *jīva* (who slept earlier and now awake) सतः - from *sat* आगच्छं - 'I have returned' इति एवम् - thus कस्मात् - why न वेत्ति - does not know – (118)

118. Even though in deep sleep the *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) is not functioning (and therefore cannot know the identity of *jīva* with *sat*), it is functional on waking up. Then why does this *jīva* (who slept earlier and now awake) not know, (i.e. recollect) its return from *sat* (as 'I have returned from *sat* Brahman')?

The *antaḥkaraṇa* or the *buddhi* because of its merging in *avidyā* during the deep sleep is non-functional. Therefore though the *jīva* has become

one with *sat* therein, it cannot know. This is accepted by Śvetaketu. But his question is why does not the *jīva* on waking up know or recollect its return from *sat* in spite of a functioning *buddhi* being present? The next two verses explain *guru's* reply.

सुप्तौ सदूपमज्ञात्वा सदैक्यं प्राप्तवांस्ततः ।
सतो नागमनं स्मार्यमपामस्मरणं यथा ॥११९॥

(असौ जीवः - this *jīva*) सुप्तौ - in the deep sleep सत् रूपम् - (its) *sat* nature अज्ञात्वा - without knowing सदैक्यम् - one with *sat* प्राप्तवान् - became, obtained ततः - therefore (because the identity with *sat* was not known) (बोधानन्तरम् - on waking up) सतः आगमनम् - return from *sat* न स्मार्यम् - not available for recollection यथा - just as अपाम् अस्मरणम् - lack of remembrance on the part of water – (119)

119. (This *jīva*) became one with (its) *sat* nature without actually knowing it. Therefore (because the identity with *sat* was not known) (on waking) the return from *sat* was not available for recollection just as the lack of remembrance on the part of water.

The entity who experiences alone can be the rememberer with the help of *saṃskāras* (impressions) gained by the earlier experience. In the absence of *antaḥkāraṇa* in the sleep, the experience of having become one with *sat* is not

experienced. As a result such memory is not possible. Therefore it is natural that the waker cannot remember as 'I came from *sat*'. The illustration of water is explained in the next verse.

गङ्गाजलं प्रविश्याब्धौ
मेघेनाकृष्य सिच्यते ।
नाज्ञातत्वात् स्मृतिस्तत्र तद्वदत्र
स्मृतिर्न हि ॥१२०॥

गङ्गाजलम् - the waters of river Ganges अब्धौ - in the ocean प्रविश्य - having entered मेघेन - by clouds आकृष्य - having carried along सिच्यते - are poured down (in the form of rain) तत्र - there in the ocean अज्ञातत्वात् - because of not knowing (the oneness) स्मृतिः न - such memory (of coming from the ocean) is not there तद्वत् - Similarly अत्र - here in the case of becoming one with *sat* स्मृतिः न - such memory (of returning from *sat*) is not there. हि - (so it is) well-known – (120)

120. The waters of river Ganges having entered the ocean (and then) having carried along by clouds are poured down (in the form of rain). There in the ocean because of not knowing (the oneness of Ganges waters and the ocean) such memory (of coming from the ocean) is not there. Similarly here in the case of becoming one with *sat*, corresponding memory (of returning

from *sat*) is not there. This is a well-known fact.

The waters of Ganges merging in the ocean can neither know the entry in the ocean nor recollect the departure from it while becoming clouds by evaporation. It is true that water is inert by its nature and hence cannot know. But the *jīva* is unable to cognize in sleep for want of means to do so. Irrespective of this difference the absence of knowing is common in both illustration and the illustrated.

As in the case of illustration of river, all *jīvas* because of ignorance during the deep sleep know not on waking up that they had become one with *sat* or are returning from *sat*. As told earlier (vs.115, *Ch.U.6-9-3*) they return to their embodiment that was there before sleeping and continue their sojourn as the same *jīvas*.

व्याघ्रादिः सुप्त एवात्र बुध्यते वासनावशात् ।
न नष्टा वासनेत्येवं विवक्षित्वोच्यते पुनः ॥१२१॥

व्याघ्रादिः - the tiger, etc. सुप्तः - which was asleep वासनावशात् - on account of *vāsanās* (past *saṃskāras* or impressions) अत्र एव - here in the same body (where it was awake earlier) बुध्यते - wakes up (as 'I am a tiger', etc.) वासना - *vāsanās* न नष्टा - are not destroyed (in the sleep when the *jīva* has merged in *sat*) इति

एवं विवक्षित्वा - having intended to tell this (fact) पुनः उच्यते - (what was told earlier) is repeated here in the Upaniṣad – (121)

121. The tiger, etc., which was asleep wakes up (as 'I am a tiger', etc.) here in the same body (where it was awake earlier) on account of *vāsanās*. (Those) *vāsanās* are not destroyed (in the sleep when the *jīva* has merged in *sat*). Having intended to tell this fact (what was told earlier alone) is repeated here in the Upaniṣad.

Earlier (vs.115, *Ch.U.6-9-3*) it was told that on account of ignorance *jīvās* awake from the sleep in their bodies that were there before sleeping. There the thrust of the statement was to tell that the same *jīva* awakes in the same body without getting liberated in spite of merging in *sat* because the *avidyā*, the root-cause of all these, still persists. Here in this verse (*Ch.U.6-10-2*) the earlier illustration of tiger, etc., is repeated to tell that the *vāsanās* of the *jīva* do not get destroyed even when the *jīva* has merged in *sat* during the sleep with persisting ignorance. The second line of this verse tells this purpose.

In the ocean the waves big and small, foam, bubbles, etc., born of water get destroyed when they merge back in the water. As for the *jīvas* even though they merge in their cause *sat* daily in

sleep or during death and the dissolution of Creation, how is it that they do not get destroyed? With an intention to know this Śvetaketu requests his *guru* to teach again. This is the third question.

जीवस्य नश्वरस्यैक्यं न

नित्येन सतेति चेत् ।

जीवो न नश्यति क्वापीत्येवं

वृक्षवदीक्ष्यताम् ॥१२२॥

नश्वरस्य - of the destructible जीवस्य - of the *jīva* नित्येन सता - with the ever-existent *sat* ऐक्यम् - oneness न - is not there इति चेत् - if it is said so जीवः - the *jīva* न क्व अपि - never नश्यति - gets destroyed इति एवम् (आह) - Uddālaka replied thus वृक्षवत् - like a (big) tree ईक्ष्यताम् - let it be looked upon - (122)

122. If it is said that the destructible *jīva* does not become one with the ever-existent (*nitya*) *sat*, Uddālaka replied: the *jīva* never gets destroyed. Let it be looked upon like a (big) tree.

The notion that '*jīva* is destructible' is based on the common observation that every individual is born, lives for certain years and then dies. In fact the main obstacle in knowing the '*tat tvam asi*' *mahāvākya* is this notion that 'I am subject to birth and death'. Then how can 'I' be *nitya* (ever-existent) *Parameśvara*? The reply is

given here. The birth and death are not for the *jīva*, but for the gross body. When the *jīva* is identified with the body, it becomes alive and the body becomes lifeless when the *jīva* withdraws from it. When the pilgrims stay in a wayside rest house, it becomes full and empty when they leave. But the pilgrims who leave it do not get destroyed only because they have left the rest house. Similarly the *jīvas* do not get destroyed after leaving their earlier bodies. They take the next body according to their results of *karmas* and *upāsanaś* (*Kṛ.U.2-2-7*). The birth and death is like changing the clothes on the part of *jīva* (*B.G.2-22*). The *jīva* being *ātmā* in reality is free from destruction. This is explained by the illustration of a live tree. It is elaborated in the next verse (*Ch.U.6-11-1 to 3*).

शाखां वृक्षे जीवपूर्णे जीवस्त्यजति यामसौ ।
शुष्येन्नान्या तथा जीवेऽपगते म्रियते वपुः ॥१२३॥

जीवपूर्णे वृक्षे - in a live tree यां शाखां - whichever branch जीवः - the *jīva* त्यजति - leaves असौ - that branch (only) शुष्येत् - dries up अन्या न - not the other which is not left by the *jīva* तथा - similarly अपगते जीवे - when the *jīva* has departed वपुः - that body म्रियते - dies (but not the *jīva*) - (123)

123. In a live tree whichever branch the *jīva* leaves, that branch only dries up (but) not the other which is not

left by the *jīva*. Similarly when the *jīva* has departed (from a particular body) that body dies (but not the *jīva*).

It is well-known that the plant kingdom belongs to the living category. Every tree, plant or a creeper is a *jīva* wielding that specific body. When a particular branch of a tree is cut or totally infected the *jīva* leaves that portion as a result of which that branch becomes completely dry. But the remaining parts are intact. Or when it is cut at the root, middle or at the top, the tree will give up that portion which will dry, but it will continue as a cut tree with the remaining parts sucking the water and the sap from the earth through the roots. This shows that the entity *jīva* in the tree is distinct from the actual body of the tree and it continues even if the tree is cut except the roots. When the roots also are dried up, that *jīva* who was wielding the tree as the body gets subjected to further transmigration. So is the case with humans and all living beings. The death is not for the *jīva* but for the body. The *jīva* is indestructible in nature. It can give up its erroneous concept about itself by *Brahmasākṣātkāra* and discover oneself to be identical with Brahman. The false *jīvahood* can end in the wake of knowledge.

The next two verses describe the fourth doubt and its answer.

नामरूपयुतं स्थूलं तद्धीनात्

सदणोः कथम् ।

उत्पन्नमिति चेत् बीजाद्

वटवृक्षवदीक्ष्यताम् ॥१२४॥

नामरूपयुतम् - that which has names and forms स्थूलम् (जगत्) - the gross (world) तद्धीनात् - from the one that is free from them सदणोः - from the most subtle *sat* कथम् - how is it उत्पन्नम् - born इति चेत् - if it is asked so (the answer is) बीजाद् वटवृक्षवत् - like a banyan tree from a seed ईक्ष्यताम् - let it be looked upon - (124)

124. How is it ever possible that the gross world having names and forms is born from the most subtle *sat* which is free from them (names and forms)? If it is asked so (the answer is), let it be looked upon like a banyan tree from a seed.

All know that the world is gross having names and forms. In contrast, the *śruti* declares that the *sat* (Brahman) is the most subtle principle totally free from names and forms. Since the cause inheres in the effect, Śvetaketu's contention is that the world emerged from the subtle *sat* must also be subtle. Therefore how can the gross world come from the subtle *sat*? The *guru* asks the disciple to bring a banyan fruit, cut it and see what is there inside. Further he is asked to split one seed and see if any trace of banyan tree that can be born

from it is seen in it. On getting the answer in the negative, he is advised that such a tiny seed gives birth to a huge banyan tree means that future tree must be in this as an imperceptible subtle essence. So is the gross world (*jagat*) present in the subtle *sat* only to emerge from it at the right time.

REFLECTION - ŚRADDHĀ (FAITH)

The purpose of selecting a banyan seed is obvious. Among the trees, the banyan is a very big one whereas its seed is very tiny. It appears almost impossible that a gigantic tree can be born from a tiny seed. All that a lay person can expect from a tiny seed as that of banyan tree is a tiny plant. And yet the fact of a huge banyan tree taking birth from a tiny seed can be verified. The birth of the gross world from *sat* can be known only through the *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) of the Vedas though we can understand it to an extent through reasoning in accordance with the Vedas. Therefore the disciple is exhorted now to have *śraddhā* (faith) in this matter (*śraddhatsva somya*) (*Ch.U.6-12-3*).

न्यायागमाभ्यां सिद्धं च

श्रद्धाहीनः पराङ्मुखः ।

न बुध्यते श्वेतकेतो

श्रद्धत्स्वान्तर्मुखो भव ॥१२५॥

श्रद्धाहीनः - A person having no *śraddhā* पराङ्मुखः - extrovert in nature च - and न्यायागमाभ्याम् - by the means of reasoning and the *śruti* सिद्धम् - established न बुध्यते - does not know the thing (therefore the *guru* says) श्वेतकेतो - Oh Śvetaketu श्रद्धत्स्व - have *śraddhā* (and) अन्तर्मुखः भव - be introvert—(125)

125. A person having no *śraddhā* and extrovert in nature does not know the thing established by the means of reasoning and the *śruti*. (Therefore the *guru* says): ‘Oh Śvetaketu, have *śraddhā* and be introvert.’

Ātmā, the principle of *sat* (Brahman) being attributeless and imperceptible (*atīndriya*) cannot be known by the senses or an extrovert mind preoccupied in the sense-objects. Until one gains *Brahmasākṣātkāra* and verifies for oneself the ultimate divinity principle, *śraddhā* in the *śāstra* and the teaching of *guru* in accordance with it becomes indispensable. The *śraddhā* ensures the composure of the mind to gain the knowledge. The mind preoccupied in the sense-objects cannot take to *ātmavicāra* (self-inquiry). The direct knowledge (*aparokṣajñāna*) also needs a *vṛtti* (thought) conforming to *ātmā*/Brahman, free from all the superimposed attributes. Therefore the mind has to be introvert by withdrawing

itself from the external sense-objects. In the light of this the *guru* emphasises the need of *śraddhā* and introvertedness.

The fifth question is like this. If the *sat* unfolded so far is the cause of *jagat* which is everywhere, why it is not readily available for all to know? The answer is demonstrated by an experiment. Even an existent entity in some cases can be known only by a specific means depending on its nature and therefore not by all and sundry without such means. The next two verses describe this question and its answer.

सत्सर्वत्र स्थितं कस्मात् न सर्वे विदुरीदृशम् ।
मुमुक्षुस्तु कथं वेत्तीत्यत्र दृष्टान्त उच्यते ॥१२६॥

सर्वत्र - everywhere स्थितम् सत् - the *sat* that exists सर्वे - all कस्मात् - why न विदुः - do not know ईदृशम् (सत्) - such *sat* तु - whereas मुमुक्षुः - a *mumukṣu* (seeker) कथम् - how वेत्ति - does (he) know इति अत्र - in this respect दृष्टान्तः - an illustration उच्यते - is told – (126)

126. Why all do not know such *sat* that exists everywhere whereas how does a *mumukṣu* know it? In this respect an illustration is told.

There is another reading of *tat* ('that' referring to the noun *sat*) in the place of *sat*. The cause can be easily known in and through its effects. All can know the mud in the mud pots, gold in its ornaments, and threads in the cloth, etc.

As for the *jagat*, it is everywhere and we cannot miss it even for a single moment. The *śruti* says that all pervasive *sat* is its cause. Then why we are unable to know readily such an omnipresent entity, at least, when the *śruti* declares so and draws our attention to it? This is Śvetaketu's doubt. The experiment that is being suggested now shows that a specific means which is determined by the nature of an entity is necessary to know it.

लवणस्य घनं नीरे विलीनं वेत्ति न त्वचा ।
जिह्वया वेत्ति तद्वत् सदुपायेनैव बुध्यते ॥१२७॥

लवणस्य घनं - a lump of salt नीरे - in the water विलीनं - dissolved त्वचा - by the sense of touch न वेत्ति - one does not know जिह्वया - (but) by the tongue (sense of taste) वेत्ति - one knows तद्वत् - similarly सत् - *sat* (Brahman) उपायेन एव - only by the proper means बुध्यते - is known – (127)

127. One does not know the lump of salt dissolved in the water by the sense of touch, but knows it by the tongue (sense of taste). Similarly the *sat* (Brahman) is known only by the proper means.

Uddālaka asks his son to put a lump of salt in the water in a pot at night. The next morning he was asked to bring back that lump of salt. Naturally because of having got dissolved in the water, it is neither seen nor is available to touch it as

a lump. Śvetaketu is asked to sip a little water from the top, middle and the bottom. All along it was saline. He was asked to throw that water and come after washing his mouth. Then the *guru* told him that though the salt was in and through the water all the time, it could be known only through the sense of taste and not by touching or seeing. Similarly though the *sat* principle is in all living beings and everywhere, it cannot be perceived by the senses. It needs a specific means to gain its knowledge.

In the light of the above answer, the next question is: ‘what is that specific means by which *sat* can be known?’ The question and its answer follow in the next three verses.

REFLECTION – UPADEŚĀ (TEACHING) IS INDISPENSABLE

सति सर्वेन्द्रियागम्ये क उपायः स उच्यते ।
उपाय उपदेशोऽत्र भवेद् गन्धारमार्गवत् ॥१२८॥

सर्वेन्द्रियागम्ये सति - (to know) the *sat* totally imperceptible by the senses कः उपायः - what is the means? सः उच्यते - it is told अत्र - here, i.e. in gaining the knowledge of *sat* गन्धारमार्गवत् - like the route to the country called Gandhāra उपदेशः - instruction उपायः - the means भवेत् - is - (128)

128. What is the means (to know)

the *sat* totally imperceptible by the senses? The answer is: The instruction (teaching) is the means like (describing) the route to the country called Gandhāra (modern Kandahara in Afghanistan).

What is the instruction regarding the route to Gandhāra is answered (*Ch.U.6-14-1* and 2).

गन्धाराद् यो वने

नीतस्तस्करैर्बद्धनेत्रकः ।

तस्य बन्धं विमुच्यात्र

कृपालुर्मार्गमादिशत् ॥१२९॥

यः - the one who तस्करैः - by thieves बद्धनेत्रकः - was blindfolded गन्धारात् - from the country Gandhāra वने नीतः - was taken to a forest अत्र - then कृपालुः - a kind person तस्य - his बन्धम् - blindfold विमुच्य - having untied मार्गम् आदिशत् - told him the route (to Gandhāra) - (129)

129. A citizen of Gandhāra was blindfolded by thieves, waylaid and left in a forest. Then a kind passerby removed his blindfold and told him the route (to Gandhāra).

Since the person was blindfolded he did not know the route from Gandhāra to the forest. Therefore he did not know the way back besides his blindfold, which he was unable to untie since his hands also were tied. Totally sorrow-ridden by hunger, thirst, fear of wild animals, thieves, etc., he cried for help. A

passerby took pity on him and instructed him the return route after removing the blindfold. After receiving the instruction what is expected of him to reach his place and how this illustration applies to a *mumukṣu* will be clear from the next verse.

तेनादिष्टमविस्मृत्य धीमान् गन्धारमाप्तवान् ।
अविद्ययावृतं तत्त्वं वेत्त्येवमुपदेशतः ॥१३०॥

धीमान् - intelligent one तेन - by him
आदिष्टम् - advised (route) अविस्मृत्य -
without forgetting (having remembered
well) (accordingly) गन्धारम् आप्तवान् -
reached Gandhāra एवम् - similarly (a
mumukṣu) अविद्यया - by the self-ignorance
आवृतम् - covered तत्त्वम् - sat the true
nature of oneself उपदेशतः - on receiving
the teaching of a competent *ācārya*
(spiritual teacher) वेत्ति - knows directly
(*aparokṣatayā*)—(130)

130. That (waylaid) intelligent person without forgetting the advised (route) (accordingly) reached Gandhāra. Similarly (a *mumukṣu*) on receiving the teaching of a competent *ācārya*, knows directly *sat* the true nature of oneself, (hitherto) covered by the self-ignorance (*avidyā*).

The word *dhīmān* (intelligent person) corresponds to the word '*medhāvī*' (one who has good memory, intelligent) used in the Upaniṣad in

addition to '*paṇḍitaḥ*' (who is capable of grasping the directions given) (*Ch.U.* 6-14-2). These qualifications on the part of that person in distress are very important. First of all he should have *śraddhā* in the words of that guide besides understanding well the directions and guidelines given to him. Then he has to go on ascertaining the correctness of his route from village to village without going astray.

Let us see the parallels of this illustration as applicable to a *mumukṣu*. *Bhāṣyakāra* vividly describes: The *jīva* is kidnapped away from *sat*, the real nature of *jagat* by the thieves of *pāpa*, *punya*, etc., to the forest of the body produced by the five elements. The forest of body is infested with many difficulties such as the three humours of the body, blood, fat, flesh, bones, marrow, semen, worms, urine, faeces, pairs of opposites in the form of heat, cold, joys and sorrows, etc.

His eyes are blindfolded by *avidyā* (self-ignorance) and tied up by the fetters of incessant hankering for sense-objects such as wife, children, wealth, and relatives. His perpetual cries with concern are such as 'I am the son of so and so', 'these are my relatives', 'I am happy', 'I am sorrowful', 'I am silly', 'I am a scholar', 'I am righteous', 'I am born', 'I am dead', 'I am old', 'I am a

sinner', 'my son is dead', 'I lost my wealth', 'alas, I am ruined', 'how will I live?', 'What is my plight?', 'who is my protector?', etc.

In such a plight, somehow by the past intense *punya* he finds a very compassionate *Brahmajñānī*, liberated from bondage and steadfast in that knowledge. Out of only compassion (and not for any gains in return), that *Brahmajñānī* describes him the route of *nivṛtti* (withdrawal from *saṃsāra*). 'Oh ceaseless traveller, all the sense-objects of this *saṃsāra* are defective because they are destructible. You develop dispassion towards all of them. You are not a *saṃsārī* characterized by son, etc. You are that *sat*, Brahman'. Thus freed from the blindfold of *avidyā*, that *mumukṣu* like the waylaid person from Gandhāra who returns to his place, directly realises his true nature as *sat* that is everlasting happiness (*Ch.U.Bh.* 6-14-2).

Just as a guide was necessary to the waylaid person to reach his native place, an *ācārya* is indispensable to regain the original nature for the *jīva* who is led astray by *avidyā* from its true nature *sat* (Brahman). So the *śruti* says '*ācāryavān puruṣo veda*' (Only the eligible person who has a competent teacher can know one's identity with Brahman) (*Ch.U.* 6-14-2).

REFLECTION – DESTRUCTION OF *KARMAS*

If an eligible *mumukṣu* who has the teaching of a competent *ācārya* gains his oneness with *sat* by knowledge, how come body continues and does not become one with *sat*? This question surfaces from the standpoint of an ignorant observer who sees *jñānī* continuing to live in the world. Actually from *jñānī*'s vision he has discovered his identity with *sat* at the time of *aparokṣa Brahmajñāna* itself. And yet accepting the observation of an ignorant person at its face value, the Upaniṣad replies: 'the delay (*ciram*) for such a *ācāryavān (tasya)* person to become one with *sat* is only (*eva*) until (*tāvat*) his body ends *prārabdhakarmakṣaya (yāvāt na vimokṣe)*. Then (*atha*) he becomes one (*sampatsye*) with *sat* (called *videhamukti*)' (*Ch.U.* 6-14-2). Thus, though the *śruti* accounts for the *prārabdha-karma* of a *jñānī*, it is silent about the course of *sañcita* and *āgāmī karmas*. The author of this text accounts for those two *karmas* also while explaining the above statement of the *śruti* about *videhamukti*.

अश्लेषनाशौ विदुषः संचितागामिकर्मणोः ।
प्रारब्धे भोगसंक्षीणे मुच्यते न तु जायते ॥१३१॥

विदुषः - of the *Brahmajñānī*
संचितागामिकर्मणोः अश्लेषनाशौ - destruction

of accumulated (*sañcita*) and the disunion of future (*āgāmī*) *karmaphalas* (take place) प्रारब्धे भोगसंक्षीणे - when the *prārabdha* (already begun) *karmaphala* is exhausted by undergoing its experience मुच्यते - (the *Brahmajñānī*) gets liberated without the body तु - certainly न जायते - is not born (again) –(131)

131. In the case of a *Brahmajñānī*, the destruction of *sañcita* and the disunion of *āgāmīkarmaphalas* (take place). When the *prārabdha karmaphala* is exhausted by undergoing its experience, he gets bodiless liberation (*videha-mukti*). Certainly he is not reborn.

Karmaphalas belong to the *ahaṃkāra* who has erroneously come into existence by mutual superimposition of *sat, cit* aspect of *ātmā* and ‘I’ notion (*vṛtti*) belonging to *buddhi* on one another. Neither actionless (*niṣkriya*) and *upādhiless* (*nirupādhika*) *ātmā* nor inert embodiment including *buddhi* can be responsible for results of actions (*karmaphalas*).

On gaining *Brahmajñāna* there being no identification with the body, the *ahaṃkāra* the *kartā* (doer) is extinct. Since *kartā* alone has to be the *bhoktā* (experiencer) there remains none who

can be subjected to the *bhoga* (experiences) of *karmaphalas*. As a result the *karmaphalas* which are categorized as *sañcita* (accumulated in the past), *āgāmī* (future ones after gaining the knowledge) and *prārabdha* (already begun as present embodiment) become ineffective as follows in the case of a *Brahmajñānī*.

Sañcita-karmas get destroyed because there is no *ahaṃkāra* to whom they can be subjected to. *Āgāmī-karmas* cannot be attached to *jñānī* since he has no more *ahaṃkāra*. *Prārabdha-karmas* get exhausted on their own by *bhoga* till the end of the body. They cannot affect *jñānī* as in the state of ignorance, as he is no more identified with body in the light of *aparokṣānubhava* (direct experience free from *tripuṭī*) of *ātmā* /Brahman. This topic of *karmaphalas* is discussed in detail and ascertained in the *Brahmasūtras* (*Br.Sū.4-1-13 to 19*).

Brahmajñāna alone can destroy all *karmas*. A *Brahmajñānī* with *niṣṭhā* (steadfastness) in the knowledge lives as a *jīvanmukta*. He is liberated from *samsāra* (unaffected by the joys and sorrows produced by his *prārabdha*) even while remaining with the body. The availability of *jīvanmuktas* which is established in accordance with the *śāstras*, *vidvadanubhava* (*aparokṣa Brahmanubhava* of *jñānīs*) and of

Brahmaniṣṭhas as the *gurus* prove that the Vedānta *pramāṇa* is a verifiable one unlike the *karmakāṇḍa* portion of the Vedas regarding heavens which is non-verifiable.

When the body of the *jīvanmukta* ends by the exhaustion of his *prārabdha-karma* he gets *videhamukti* (bodiless liberation). This is implied in the above quoted Upaniṣadic statement (*tasya tāvat eva ciram yāvat na vimokṣe atha sampatsye*) (*Ch. U. 6-14-2*). A *Brahmajñānī* who has *niṣṭhā* in the knowledge is liberated even while living in the body, is also shown by the statement ‘*vimuktaśca vimucyate*’ (liberated now while living, and gets liberated after this body ends) (*Kṛ. U. 2-2-1*). Here in this sixth chapter of *Chāndogya* the main thrust of teaching is on describing the means of gaining the knowledge of Brahman (*Sat*). Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni has discussed and described in detail the topic of *jīvanmukti* in his text ‘*Jīvanmukti-viveka*’.

Śvetaketu's seventh question is to know the mode by which the *jñānī* becomes one with *sat* (*satsampatti*). He wants to know whether a *jñānī* dies in the same manner as that of an *ajñānī*. Is there any route such as *arci*, etc., that is followed to be one with *sat*? Generally an ignorant person undergoes a lot of

pain at the time of death. Is it the case with a *jñānī*? The answer follows that there is no distinction between the mode of death of both.

कीदृशी मृतिरस्येति चेद् वागादिलयाद्यथा ।
मूढस्य तद्वदेवास्य वैलक्षण्यं न किञ्चन ॥१३२॥

अस्य - of a *jñānī* कीदृशी मृतिः - of what type is the death इति चेत् - if it is asked so यथा - just as मूढस्य - of an *ajñānī* वागादिलयात् (मृतिः) - death by merging of speech in the mind, etc. तद्वत् - similarly एव - only अस्य - of this *jñānī* वैलक्षण्यं - distinction न किञ्चन - not at all – (132)

132. If it is asked: what is the type of a *jñānī's* death? It is just as that of an *ajñānī* only by merging of speech in the mind, etc. There is no distinction at all in the mode *jñānī's* death.

The mode of a *jñānī's* death is similar to that of an *ajñānī*. As told in the *śruti* the speech merges in the mind, the mind in the *prāṇa*, the *prāṇa* in the *teja*, the *teja* in *sat* (Brahman) (*Ch. U. 6-15-2*). The pain and sorrows until death are determined by *prārabdha* in both the cases. There can be *jñānīs* who may have painful death or even die in coma. But even the absence of *tattvacintana* or being aware of one's *Brahmasvarūpa* at the time of death does not destroy their *Brahmajñāna*. It is just like not losing what one has studied only because it is

forgotten during the dream and sleep (P.2-106, 107).

Though the mode of death is similar in both the cases, the difference lies after death. An *ajñānī* returns to *samsāra* getting subjected to transmigration because of his desires and *karmaphalas*. *Jñānī* has no rebirth. He remains as *sat*, his real nature. In his case, the *karmaphalas* that can give birth have ended. Only those who have no *Brahmasākṣātkāra* travel. Those who have good *karmas* go to heavens. *Upāsakas* go up to *Brahmaloka* by *devayāna* route. Sinners go to hell. Ordinary *jīvas* wander from one womb to the other as insignificant creatures. Only those who have *Brahmasākṣātkāra* have no nucleus to travel. Their subtle bodies get disintegrated at the time of death. The state of *jīva* is no more in the case of *jñānīs*.

Śvetaketu's eighth and last question is to know the reason why a *jñānī* gets liberated and *ajñānī* continues to be bound in spite of similar mode of death. The next five verses reply this question.

REFLECTION – MOKṢA (LIBERATION)

समानायां मृतावेको मुक्तो नान्यः कुतो वद ।
सत्यानृताभिसंधत्वं वैषम्यं ज्ञानिमूढयोः ॥१३३॥

समानायां मृतौ - when the mode of

death is similar एकः मुक्तः - one is liberated अन्यः न - the other is not liberated कुतः वद - please tell why is this so? ज्ञानिमूढयोः - between a *jñānī* and an *ajñānī* सत्यानृताभिसंधत्वं - committedness to the truth and the falsehood वैषम्यं - is the distinction—(133)

133. Please tell why the one is liberated and the other is not when the mode of death is similar to both. (The answer is:) The committedness to the truth and the falsehood is the distinction between a *jñānī* and an *ajñānī*.

Though the mode of death is one and the same it is the knowledge of Brahman and its ignorance that makes the difference. It is like a peasant selling a diamond for a song whereas a jeweller makes a big fortune out of it. Similarly a *jñānī* by the virtue of his direct discovery that he is Brahman gets liberated after death without further birth. But an *ajñānī* because of his erroneous identification with the body and the involvement in the sense-pleasures continues his transmigration. This is explained further with the help of an illustration.

तस्करातस्करौ चौर्यशङ्कया तलरक्षकैः ।
गृहीतौ न कृतं चौर्यमित्याहतरुभावपि ॥१३४॥

तलरक्षकैः - by the security guards
चौर्यशङ्कया - on the suspicion of theft

तस्करातस्करौ - a thief and another (actually) non-thief गृहीतौ - were arrested चौर्यं न कृतं - 'I have not stolen' इति - so उभौ अपि - both of them आहतुः - said - (134)

134. On the suspicion of theft, a thief and another (actually) non-thief were arrested by the security guards (and were brought before the King or a judge). Both of them denied the charge of theft.

The King or the judge orders to bring a red-hot axe consecrated by some *mantra* or charm. Both of them are subjected to this red-hot axe test backed up by some divine power. When such an axe is held by the hand, it does not burn the hand of the person who has spoken the truth. He is acquitted of the theft. On the contrary if the hand gets burnt he is proved to be a liar, is convicted of the charge and punished. The results of such test and its consequences in the case of both the arrested suspects are told now.

गृहीतः परशुं तप्तं तौ

तयोस्तस्करोऽनृतम् ।

अभिसन्धाय दग्धः सन्

हन्यते तलरक्षकैः ॥१३५॥

तौ - Both of them तप्तं परशुं - red-hot axe गृहीतः - caught hold of तयोः - among those two तस्करः - (actual) thief अनृतम् - a lie अभिसन्धाय - having told दग्धः सन् - having got (his hand) burnt तलरक्षकैः

- by the security guards हन्यते - is punished - (135)

135. Both of them caught hold of red-hot axe. Among those two the (actual) thief having got (his hand) burnt because of lying is punished by the security guards.

अतस्करः सत्यसन्धो न

दग्धो मुच्यते च तैः ।

अज्ञान्यनृतसन्धोऽत्र सत्यसन्धस्तु

तत्त्ववित् ॥१३६॥

अतस्करः - the non-thief सत्यसन्धः - (being) truthful न दग्धः - does not get his hand burnt तैः च - by those security guards मुच्यते - is released अत्र - in the context of common mode of death अज्ञानी - the person who is ignorant of one's true nature अनृतसन्धः - is steeped in falsehood तत्त्ववित् तु सत्यसन्धः- whereas *Brahmajñānī* is truthful - (136)

136. The non-thief (being) truthful does not get his hand burnt. (Therefore) he is released. In this context of common mode of death, the person who is ignorant of one's true nature is steeped in falsehood whereas the *Brahmajñānī* is truthful.

With the first line of this verse the illustration of red-hot axe is over. In accordance with it, the second line draws the contrast between *jñānī* and *ajñānī*. The *jñānī* is truthful to one's true nature.

An *ajñānī* is immersed in *avidyā*, its effects such as identification with body, etc., and sense-pleasure as a *saṃsārī jīva* totally being impervious to his real nature that is *sat, cit, ānanda ātmā*. The distinction between the two is further elaborated in the next verse.

मर्त्योऽहमिति सन्धाय म्रियते जायते च सः ।
ब्रह्माहमिति सन्धाय मुच्यते न च जायते ॥१३७॥

सः - he (*ajñānī*) अहं मर्त्यः इति - 'I am a mortal' सन्धाय - having conceived म्रियते - dies जायते च - and is born (again) अहम् ब्रह्म इति - 'I am Brahman' सन्धाय - having recognised (the *jñānī*) मुच्यते - gets liberated न च जायते - and is not reborn—(137)

137. The *ajñānī* having conceived 'I am a mortal' gets subjected to transmigration. But the (*jñānī*) having recognised 'I am Brahman' gets liberated and is not reborn.

Thus it is the *Brahmajñāna* that liberates. A *jñānī* has neither routes such as *arci*, etc., nor travels in terms of transmigration. They are for *karmis* and *upāsakas*. The mode of death of a *jñānī* is a matter of inconsequence for liberation. The liberation from future bodies is gained at the time of *Brahmasākṣātkāra* itself. The present body ends on its own when its *prārabdhakarmas* are over. It is not destroyed by *Brahmajñāna*.

Videhamukti (bodiless liberation) is gained at the time of *Brahmasākṣātkāra* itself if the meaning of 'deha' (body) in the word '*videha*' is taken as only the future bodies. The *śruti* passages such as '*abhayam vai Janaka prāptaḥasi*' (Oh Janaka, you have got liberation now itself, *Br.U.4-2-4*), '*etāvad are khalu amṛtatvam*' (Oh Maitreyi, liberation is indeed this much, i.e. right now, *Br.U.4-5-15*) corroborate this. If the present body also is included in the word '*deha*' contained in '*videha*' then *videhamukti* happens after the end of present body. 'The delay in becoming one with *sat* is only until the present body (of a *jñānī*) ends' (*Ch.U.6-14-2*) can be quoted in this respect. There is no contradiction, but it is only a difference in the viewpoint. Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni has discussed this in detail and ascertained in his text *Jīvanmuktiviveka* (*Jī.Mu.Vi.2*).

CONCLUSION

The teaching started with the declaration that the knowledge of one (the cause of the *jagat*) accounts for the knowledge of all (effects called *jagat*). Further it was shown that the division of seer (*draṣṭā*) and seen (*drśya*) is because of *māyā* whereas the ultimate reality is non-dual in nature and identical with *pratyagātmā*. This was clarified with the help of many illustrations. The chapter is being concluded now.

बुद्धिदोषं समाधातुं दृष्टान्तास्तैस्तवात्र किम् ।
त्वं सदेवेत्यभिप्रेत्य नवकृत्व उपादिशत् ॥१३८॥

(तव - Your) बुद्धिदोषं - doubt समाधातुं
एव - (only) to clear दृष्टान्ताः (उक्ताः) -
illustrations (were given) अत्र - with
respect to your true nature तैः तव किम् -
what is the use of those illustrations to
you? त्वम् - you सत् एव - (are always) *sat*
only इति अभिप्रेत्य - having thought so
नवकृत्वः - nine times उपादिशत् - (Uddālaka)
taught (*tat tvam asi*) – (138)

138. (Oh Śvetaketu,) (only) to
clear (your) doubt, (these) illustrations
(were given). What is the use of those
(illustrations) to you with respect to your
true nature? You (are always) *sat* only.
Having thought so, Uddālaka taught '*tat
tvam asi*' nine times.

Illustrations are only meant for
dispelling doubts. This was told earlier
(vs.116). They cannot alter one's true
nature even to the least extent. The true
nature that was there before teaching
continues to be so even after teaching
and clearance of doubts. By removal of
doubt, no new knowledge gets born, but
earlier knowledge only becomes
effective to end the ignorance. *Ātmā* is
liberated even in the state of ignorance or
before teaching. It continues to be
liberated even after teaching or when
one gains its knowledge. The difference
of bondage and liberation is for the *jīva*

and not for *ātmā*. Earlier the *jīva* mistook
oneself to be bound and now after
gaining knowledge discovers that it was
never bound but ever liberated. The
repetition of '*tat tvam asi*' nine times
proves that the truth established by
Upaniṣads is only one: 'the *jīva* in reality
is the non-dual *sat* and *jagat* is false'.

The Upaniṣad on its part
concludes its teaching in its statement,
'*tad ha asya vijajñau*' (Śvetaketu
directly came to know *ātmā* distinct
from *māyā* and its effects as 'I am *sat*
alone' through the father's teaching of
'*tat tvam asi*' supplemented by
illustrations and reasonings) (*Ch.U.6-
16-3*). This conclusion is explained in
the next verse.

भिन्नग्रन्थिः श्वेतकेतुर्मननाच्छिन्नसंशयः ।
सदद्वैतं स्वमात्मानं विशेषेणावबुद्धवान् ॥१३९॥

भिन्नग्रन्थिः श्वेतकेतुः - Śvetaketu
whose *ātmānātmādhyāsa* had got
eliminated मननात् छिन्नसंशयः - by
reflection (vs.113 to 137) having got
freed from doubts स्वम् आत्मानम् - his true
nature सत् अद्वैतम् - (that is) non-dual *sat*
विशेषेण - distinctly with *jīvabrahmaikya*
[identity between his (*jīva*'s) true nature
and Brahman] अवबुद्धवान् - recognised (by
Brahmasākṣātkāra) – (139)

139. Śvetaketu whose *ātmānātmā-
dhyāsa* had got eliminated and who

having got freed from doubts by reflection (vs.113 to 137) distinctly recognised (by *Brahmasākṣātkāra*) his true nature, (that is) non-dual *sat* with *jīvabrahmaikya*.

Granthi (knot) or called *hṛdayagranthi* (knot of the heart) is the mutual superimposition (*adhyāsa*) between *ātmā* (*cit*) and *anātmā* (*jada*, inert) (vs.112). It was already told in the verse 112 that Śvetaketu's *hṛdayagranthi* got eliminated by *śravaṇa*. The same is referred to here to describe further his final accomplishment wherein he directly recognised *sat* Brahman as his true nature which ends the mistaken notion of oneself as *saṃsārījīva*.

The finale of *Vedāntasāstra* is that an eligible *mumukṣu* (*adhikārī*) gains the *ātmajñāna* (*pramā*) through *mahāvākya* such as ‘*tat tvam asi*’ which serves as the *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge). If in spite of, eligibility by having *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti* and exposure to *śravaṇa* the promised result of knowledge by ending *avidyā* does not take place, the only conclusion is that there are obstructions such as *saṃśaya* (doubts), and *viparyaya* (habitual misapprehension such as ‘I’ notion in the body, mind, etc., and the *jagat* is real). They have to be eliminated by *manana* (reflection) and *nididhyāsana* (meditating on *ātmasvarūpa*

to the exclusion of *anātmā* thoughts). But those two do not produce new knowledge. They only remove the obstructions that were hindering the knowledge already produced by *śravaṇa*.

It is quite natural that a person who is not eligible (*anadhikārī*) cannot get knowledge in spite of *śravaṇa*. He has to equip himself with fourfold qualifications and take again to *śravaṇa*. As for eligible person after the proper *śravaṇa*, taking to *manana* and *nididhyāsana* alone is important. Śvetaketu had ascertained his *sat* nature by *śravaṇa*. The moment his doubts were dispelled, he got unobstructed direct *Brahmajñāna*.

Actually the results of ending the *hṛdayagranthi*, dispelling of doubts and extinction of all *karmas* are told as the result of *Brahmasākṣātkāra* (*Mu.U.* 2-2-8). Even then from the standpoint of eliminating the doubts pertaining to *Vedāntapramāṇa* and its *prameya* (the nature of *sat*), here the elimination of *granthi* as first, then the removal of doubts, and finally the direct recognition of *sat* (the Brahman) are told as a sequence.

This teaching of *sat-vidyā* (the knowledge of *sat*) as taught to Śvetaketu in *Chāndogya* is pre-eminent in the teachings of Vedānta. The ‘*tat tvam asi*’

mahāvākya contained therein proclaims itself as a ‘great equation’ presented by Upaniṣads to the world. At a cursory glance ‘*tat tvam asi*’ *mahāvākya* which declares the *jīveśvara-aikeya* (identity between *jīva* and *Īśvara*) appears to be a statement next to impossible to be true like the famous Vedāntic statement, ‘by the knowledge of one, all else are known’ appears to be unbelievable. It needs *śraddhā* to inquire into it thoroughly because the teaching comes from the Vedas which has the status of being the highest *pramāṇa* in the matters that are *apauruṣeya* (inaccessible to the human intellect on their own). It is given to reasoning and is verified by the *vidvadanubhava* (direct experience of *jīvanmuktas*). Therefore as humans with the prerogative of *buddhi* (intellect which is denied to other species of beings), it is our foremost duty to gain the knowledge revealed by ‘*tat tvam asi*’. There alone lies the consummation of human life.

The chapter is concluded now.

श्वेतकेतोर्ब्रह्मविद्या व्याख्याता स्फुटमेतया ।
तुष्टोऽस्माननुगृह्णातु विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः ॥१४०॥

स्फुटम् एतया - by this clear exposition श्वेतकेतोः - of Śvetaketu ब्रह्मविद्या - *Brahmavidyā* व्याख्याता - explained (अनेन

- by this) तुष्टः - pleased विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः - my guru (or *Parameśvara* who is the abode of all *vidyās* including *Brahmavidyā*) अस्मान् - all of us अनुगृह्णातु - may he bless – (140)

140. By this clear exposition, the *Brahmavidyā* taught to Śvetaketu is explained. May my guru (or *Parameśvara* who is the abode of all knowledge including *Brahmavidyā*) be pleased by this and bless us all!

Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni has explained the knowledge of *sat* from *Chāndogya* with utmost clarity though in brief. Further details are available in *bhāṣya*, etc. But this exposition is enough to know the main teaching of the Upaniṣad. Following the scriptural tradition the author as in the case of other chapters offers this work to guru and *Parameśvara* invoking their blessings. There can be many obstacles on the path of gaining *Brahmavidyā*. Therefore the blessings of guru and *Parameśvara* are essential.

इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिविरचिते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
श्वेतकेतुविद्याप्रकाशो नाम तृतीयोऽध्यायः ।

॥ ॐ ॥



CHAPTER - IV

SANATKUMĀRAVIDYĀPRAKĀŚA

(CHĀNDOGYOPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[*Sanatkumāravidyāprakāśa* deals with the content of the seventh chapter (*Adhyāya*) of *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. *Sanatkumāravidyā* is the *Brahmavidyā* taught by Sanatkumāra to the celebrated *devarṣi* Nārada who was a celebrity in the field of learning and looked up to by all as an ideal. But he found himself sorrow-ridden in spite of all his spectacular worldly achievements. He found no solution on his own. That made him consider seriously the statement of great masters that an *ātmajñānī* gets total freedom from sorrows (*tarati śokam ātmavit*). As a disciple he approached Sanatkumāra to learn *Brahmavidyā* from him.

Sanatkumāra remarked that Nārada had known so far only everything that is present in this external world by its *nāma* (name). The name is nothing but the verbal expression of effect (*vikāra*) of its cause. That effect is false. It is not the reality (*avikārī* - changeless principle). To understand the real cause of everything the mind has to become introvert. To make the disciple introvert, the *guru* put him on *upāsanās* beginning from ‘*nāma* (name) as Brahman’. It ended in a successive superior order with ‘*āśā* (desire) as Brahman’. On practising these *upāsanās*, Nārada observed that they were not capable of ending all his sorrows. On the contrary they added sorrows because of the exertion involved in practising them. Therefore, he asked for still superior means.

The *guru* at that stage found Nārada fit to gain *ātmajñāna*. As a preparatory step he advised *upāsanās* on the *prāṇa* - the closest representative of *ātmā* - superior to the rest of the entities advised so far. The *śruti* gives the reasons why the *prāṇa* is the most superior. Nārada concluded that *prāṇa* is *ātmā*. He found that in sleep, the *prāṇa* alone was there to the exclusion of *nāma* onwards up to *āśā* comprising the *jagat*. And yet, there was no trace of sorrow in it. Nārada's main problem was his sorrow. He believed that he had arrived at the ultimate solution to get freed totally

from his sorrows. That prevented him from asking for any further superior principle. Sanatkumāra realized that Nārada had reached the wrong conclusion. He knew well that Nārada was one of the most eligible disciples to get *ātmajñāna*. He did not want Nārada to stop in his pursuit. With the compassion of a Guru, even though unasked by Nārada, he taught Nārada that the *aparokṣa* (direct) knowledge of *satya*, the ever-existent *ātmā* (*bhūmā*), is the final and most exalted accomplishment. One cannot gain it by the practice of *upāsanās*. The means to gain it are: *Vijñāna* (the exact knowledge of *satya* free from doubts and errors), *manana* also called *mati* (reflection by reasoning), *śraddhā* (the firm conviction that the promised result is guaranteed), *niṣṭhā* (commitment to the pursuit which is seen indirectly from the way the disciple carries out *guruśuśrūṣā* - serving the competent *guru*), *kṛti* (efforts to make the mind single pointed) and *sukha* (the knowledge that there is happiness in liberation). Each of the subsequent means is the cause of the previous one.

Whatever is *bhūmā* (limitless, infinite) is *sukha* (happiness). There is no *sukha* in *alpa* (limited or finite entities). *Bhūmā* is everything. Nothing can exist independent of it. It is free from *tripuṭī* (knower, knowledge-*vṛtti*, known). This is the first step of advice (*ādeśa*) called *bhūmādeśa*. But one may think that *bhūmā* may be a principle existing in my proximity, but is different from 'I'. To remove this wrong concept, the '*ahaṃkāradeśa*' says that 'I' itself is *bhūmā*. But 'I' (*ahaṃkāra*) is with the *upādhi* of 'I' notion (*vṛtti*). To show *bhūmā* to be totally *nirupādhika*, the next advice is '*ātmādeśa*'. It points out that *bhūmā* is *ātmā*.

Bhūmā abides in its *mahimā* (glory) in the realm of Creation, but left to itself, it is the independent self-existing principle without any support or basis. The *jñānī* who has got '*aparokṣa jñāna*' of *bhūmā* and is steadfast in it becomes a *jīvanmukta*. The intensity of absorption of his mind in *bhūmā* is inversely proportional to the intensity of his *prārabdha-bhoga*. The *jīvanmukta* whose *prārabdha-bhoga* is dormant (*supta*) is on par with the *tripuṭiless* experience of *bhūmā* in *videhamukti* (bodiless liberation). A *videhamukta* is *upādhiless bhūmā/Brahman*. He is the basis for the *sarga*, *sthiti* and *laya* of Creation.

All our pursuits are for *sukha-prāpti* (acquisition of happiness) and *duḥkha-nivṛtti* (freedom from sorrows). Here is the *Sanatkumāravidyā* of *Chāndogya* which gives the ultimate solution: '*Tarati śokam ātmavit*' (*ātmajñānī* gets freed from sorrows totally) and '*bhūmā eva sukham, na alpe sukham asti*' (limitless principle *bhūmā/ātmā* alone is happiness, there is no happiness in the limited entities).]

INTRODUCTION

Sanatkumāravidyā is the *Brahmavidyā* taught by Sanatkumāra to the celebrated *devarṣi* (divine sage) Nārada. It is the content of the seventh chapter of *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. Sanatkumāra is one of the mind-born sons of Brahmā (one of the *trimūrti*) called *Sanatkumāras*. Having produced them, they were asked to propagate the progeny to run the wheel of Creation (*srṣṭi*). They replied: ‘All living beings invariably suffer in *Saṃsāra*. Therefore it is not correct to keep Creation continued’. Finding them of no use in his mission of propagating the progeny Brahmā dismissed them. They went to *Bhagavān Śiva* to seek *Brahmavidyā*. He taught them this highest knowledge by taking the form of Dakṣiṇāmūrti.

Nārada also is a mind-born son of Brahmā. He is a master of various fields of learning. To mention but a few of the subjects mastered by him are: the four Vedas, *Itihāsa* (history), *Purāṇas* (which has the status of fifth Veda), grammar, *pitryam* (the *śrāddha*-ritual), mathematics, *daivam* (the science of portents or omens), *nidhi* (chronology and the art of finding the hidden treasure), *tarkaśāstra* (logic), *ekāyana* (the science of ethics and politics), etymology, phonetics, *kalpa* (the science of rituals), prosody, *bhūtavidyā*

(physical science, science of elements), archery, astrology, charm against (snake) poison, aromatics, dance, music, *vādya* (playing the musical instruments), *śilpa* (mechanics), etc. He was a role model to all. And yet, he found himself sorrow-ridden in spite of all his accomplishments. He could find no solution on his own to his problem. That made him consider seriously the statement of great masters that an *ātmajñānī* gets freed from sorrows totally (*tarati śokam ātmavit*, *Ch.U.7-1-3*). Finally he approaches Sanatkumāra as a disciple to gain *ātmajñāna*.

The instance of Nārada demonstrates that even the best accomplishments in this *jagat* are incapable of granting the total freedom from sorrows. *Ātmajñāna* alone has to be resorted to for gaining total freedom from sorrowful *saṃsāra*. This reminds us of the declaration about the sorrowful nature of the *jagat* and its remedy by none other than *Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa* in *Bhagavadgītā* (9-33). He says: Having got this world of momentary (*anitya*) existence and devoid of happiness, (i.e. *asukham*), seek me the *ātmā*, *Paramātmā*, Brahman or called *Parameśvara*. Thus *Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa* has fixed a permanent big name-plate on this *jagat* displaying it as ‘ANITYA AND ASUKHA’ (momentary and without

happiness). And yet, we always expect permanence and lasting happiness from it only to get disappointed sooner or later. Therefore the only remedy recommended is to seek *Parameśvara* or in other words to gain *ātmajñāna*.

Nārada approaches the sage Sanatkumāra with an earnest request saying: Oh revered master, this is that Nārada very highly learned drowned in sorrows. Please help me to cross over the sorrow (*Ch.U.7-1-3*). The author of this text introduces now this teaching which is also famous as '*bhūmavidyā*'.

सनत्कुमारश्छान्दोग्ये नारदायोपदिष्टवान् ।
विद्यामेतां प्रवक्ष्येऽत्र सर्वशोकनिवृत्तये ॥१॥

सनत्कुमारः - Sage Sanatkumāra छान्दोग्ये - in the seventh chapter of *Chāndogyopaniṣad* नारदाय - to Nārada उपदिष्टवान् - taught (*bhūmavidyā*) एतां विद्याम् - the same teaching सर्वशोकनिवृत्तये - for ending of all sorrows अत्र प्रवक्ष्ये- I shall explain it here in this chapter – (1)

1. Sage Sanatkumāra taught (*bhūmavidyā*) to Nārada in the seventh chapter of *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. I shall explain the same teaching here in this chapter for ending of all sorrows.

On gaining this *vidyā* all sorrows end instantly. It is not a fancy or an arbitrary supposition. That is the criterion of *aparokṣa* (direct)

knowledge. Till then the *mumukṣu* has to continue the efforts with more and more prepared frame of mind. With *parokṣa* (indirect) *ātmajñāna* all sorrows do not end.

On hearing Nārada's request for *ātmajñāna*, Sanatkumāra asks him to tell him all that he has studied so far with an assurance that he will teach thereafter (*Ch.U.7-1-1*). The gist of Nārada's reply is given in the following verse along with the diagnosis of his sorrows.

पुराणपञ्चमान् वेदान् शास्त्राणि विविधानि च ।
ज्ञात्वाप्यनात्मवित्त्वेन नारदः शोकमाप्तवान् ॥२॥

नारदः - Nārada पुराणपञ्चमान् वेदान् - the four Vedas with *Purāṇas* as the fifth one विविधानि शास्त्राणि च - and varieties of scriptures ज्ञात्वा अपि - in spite of having known अनात्मवित्त्वेन - because of the ignorance of *ātmā* शोकम् आप्तवान् - got subjected to grief – (2)

2. Nārada in spite of having known the four Vedas with *Purāṇas* as the fifth one and varieties of scriptures got subjected to grief because of the ignorance of *ātmā*.

R̥k, *Yaju*, *Sāma* and *Atharva* are the four Vedas. To know the Vedas thoroughly, the study of *Purāṇas* also is necessary. Therefore all *Purāṇas* put together are called the fifth Veda. The varieties of scriptures were mentioned to

describe the stature of Nārada. The greatness of Nārada is that he was not conceited because of his exalted learning. Based on the declarations of great masters he could discern for himself that his lack of *ātmajñāna* is the cause of his sorrows notwithstanding his academic excellence.

Nārada could also find out that his learning the Vedas, etc., is contributing to the sorrows that exist universally. That also prompted him to take to *ātmajñāna* seriously on priority basis.

वेदाभ्यासात्पुरा तापत्रयमात्रेण शोकिता ।
पश्चात्त्वभ्यासविस्मारभङ्गगर्वेश्च शोकिता ॥३॥

वेदाभ्यासात् पुरा - before the study of the Vedas तापत्रयमात्रेण - only by the three types of afflictions शोकिता - sorrow was there पश्चात् तु - but after their studies अभ्यास - on account of daily Vedic recensional repetition विस्मार - forgetfulness भङ्ग - humiliation, discomfiture गर्वः च - and by pride शोकिता - sorrow arises—(3)

3. Before the study of the Vedas the sorrows were there only because of three types of afflictions (*tāpatraya*). But after their studies (further) sorrows arise on account of daily Vedic recensional repetition, forgetfulness, humiliation and pride.

Having been born in this world, everyone has to face sorrows and afflictions originating from one's body (*ādhyātmika*), other beings besides surroundings (*ādhibhautika*) and phenomenal powers (*ādhidāivika*). But after the Vedic studies there arise additional sorrows. After the study of the Vedas belonging to one's *śākhā* (traditional recension) they need to be repeated daily. It is a laborious exercise by itself. If because of some other pressing preoccupation or for any other reason, if it is not recited, there is a sense of guilt or discomfort on that day. Forgetting the studied portion of the Vedas gives rise to serious sin. Therefore there is a fear of forgetting it. There is humiliation if one gets defeated in the Vedic arguments in front of equals or inferiors. There is a possibility of developing pride or superiority complex on studying the Vedas and other scriptures. Such persons expect honour and recognition from others. But the people at large do not care for them. This leads to disappointments and complaints all the time. Thus such learned persons have more sorrows than others.

Nārada had the full *śraddhā* in the Vedas that they have solutions for all human problems. He could find from the Vedas the passages such as 'the innermost *ātmā* is beyond the realm of hunger and thirst, sorrow, ignorance, old

age and death' (*Br.U.3-5-1*); 'ātmā is free from all sorrows belonging to the *buddhi*' (*Br.U.4-3-22*) 'where is the occasion for sorrow or delusion in the case of a *jñānī*?' (*Ī.U.7*); 'having known *ātmā* the *jñānī* gets freed from joys and sorrows' (*Kṛ.U.1-2-12*); 'the knower of Brahman gets freed from sorrows' (*Mu.U.3-2-9*); which declare that the freedom from sorrows can be gained by the knowledge of *ātmā*. He could also know from the Vedas that *ātmajñāna* can be gained only through a *guru* who is well-versed in the *ādhyātmika* scriptures (*śrotriya*) and steadfast in *Brahmajñāna* (*Brahmaniṣṭha*). This prompted him to approach Sanatkumāra as a disciple.

शोकं तरत्यात्मवेदीत्यभिज्ञेभ्यः श्रुतं वचः ।

शोकपारं नयेत्युक्त्वा नारदो गुरुमाप्तवान् ॥४॥

आत्मवेदी - *ātmajñānī* शोकं तरति - gets freed from sorrows totally इति - so अभिज्ञेभ्यः - from the wise people वचः - statement श्रुतम् - is learnt 'शोकपारं नय' - please free me from sorrows इति उक्त्वा - having requested so नारदः - Nārada गुरुम् आप्तवान् - approached *guru* (Sanatkumāra)–(4)

4. 'It is learnt from the statement of wise people that an *ātmajñānī* gets freed from sorrows totally. (Therefore) please free me from sorrows'. Having requested thus Nārada approached *guru* (Sanatkumāra).

ADVICE OF UPĀSANĀS

On inquiry from the *guru*, Nārada tells him all that he has learnt. The *guru* remarks that all that he has known so far is only *nāma* (name) the verbal expression of effect (*vikāra*) which is the false and not the real (*avikārī* - changeless). Sanatkumāra puts Nārada on *upāsanās* to make him totally fit to gain *ātmajñāna*.

The prerequisites for *ātmajñāna* are *śuddha antaḥkaraṇa* (pure mind) that can display *ātmā* in its true nature as a replica, and *cittanaiścalya* (single pointedness of the mind) that can withdraw the mind totally from pre-occupation in all that is *anātmā* and make it absorbed in *ātmā*. There is no doubt that Nārada was a sincere and earnest *mumukṣu*. But Sanatkumāra could find out that Nārada's mind was totally preoccupied in what he has learnt so far. Such a mind cannot know at once the principle of *ātmā*. Therefore to withdraw the mind from its present pre-occupations and make it introvert the *guru* advises him to take to *upāsanā* even though he had requested for *ātmajñāna*. In *upāsanā* a lower entity is viewed and meditated upon as a higher principle to the exclusion of other thoughts. For example, an idol is meditated upon as *Bhagavān* Viṣṇu. Thus Sanatkumāra starts initiating

Nārada into *upāsanās* in a sequential order beginning from ‘*nāma* as Brahman’ upto ‘*āśā* (desire) as Brahman’ (vs.15).

बहुग्रन्थाभ्यासतस्ते महती शब्दवासना ।

नामब्रह्मेत्युपास्वात इति प्रोवाच तं गुरुः ॥५॥

गुरुः - *guru* तम् - to Nārada प्रोवाच - replied बहुग्रन्थाभ्यासतः - because of studying many texts महती शब्दवासना - deep impressions of textual words (जाता - are born) ते - in your mind अतः - therefore ‘नाम ब्रह्म’ - on ‘*nāma*’ (name) as Brahman इति उपास्व - so you meditate (do *upāsanā*)—(5)

5. The *guru* replied to Nārada: Because of studying many texts, deep impressions (*vāsanās*) of textual words (are born in your mind). Therefore meditate on *nāma* (name) as Brahman.

The mind gets absorbed in the entity that it loves. The *guru* first figures out where the interest of a competent disciple is centred. Then the *upāsanā* is initiated with that entity as the *ālambana* (base). Earlier the *guru* had remarked that Nārada's study was confined only to *nāma* the aggregate of all words. It includes words meaning action, doership, relation, duty, etc. All words put together is to be considered as one entity called ‘*nāma*’. Considering it as Brahman (in accordance with the statement of the Vedas), one has to

meditate that the *nāma* is Brahman.

The *Śabdavāsanā* constitutes the deep impressions of the textual words predominantly pre-occupying the mind. As a result, the mind is not available to take to the pursuit of gaining *ātmajñāna* fruitfully. These *vāsanās* (*saṃskāras*) need to be replaced by the *saṃskāras* (impressions) capable of taking to higher and higher pursuits. A similar context is found in the *Taittirīyopaniṣad* (*Tai.U.1-3-1*). The student of Vedic studies because of his total pre-occupation of the mind in the volumes of the Vedas comprising words is asked to take to *upāsanās* of *saṃhitā* (combination or closest proximity of letters) related to the words to enable it for higher pursuits.

The intention of the *guru* in advising *nāmopāsanā* in spite of disciple's request to impart *ātmajñāna* is told clearly in the next verse.

स्वशब्दवासनां त्यक्त्वा प्राप्स्यसि ब्रह्मवासनाम् ।
पश्चाद् ब्रह्मण आत्मत्वं वक्ष्यामीति गुरोर्मतिः ॥६॥

स्वशब्दवासनां त्यक्त्वा - having given up your *saṃskāras* of words ब्रह्मवासनाम् - *Brahmavāsanā* प्राप्स्यसि - you will gain पश्चात् - thereafter ब्रह्मणः आत्मत्वम् - the identity of Brahman with *ātmā* वक्ष्यामि - I shall teach you इति - so गुरोः मतिः - (is) the thought of the *guru*—(6)

6. The *guru* Sanatkumāra

thought: ‘(Oh Nārada), having given up your *saṃskāras* of words, you will gain thereafter the *Brahmavāsanā*. Thereafter, I shall teach you the identity of Brahman with *ātmā*’.

By the meditation of ‘*nāma* as Brahman’ the *saṃskāras* of Brahman become predominant and those of *nāma* get relegated to the back. Because in such meditation Brahman is prominent and the *nāma* becomes secondary. It is just like the meditation of idol as Viṣṇu. The idol becomes secondary and Viṣṇu the main. Thus making the *mumukṣu* progress step by step enables him to fructify his pursuit at the final level. Otherwise the advice at a higher level without the preparation of the mind becomes futile. Therefore the teaching of *ātmajñāna* is to be given only after the mind is ready. Sanatkumāra had this point in mind when he asked Nārada to do *nāmopāsanā*.

The Upaniṣadic *upāsanās* are not meant for getting results hereafter such as going to heavens, etc., though at places some such results are mentioned. The result of *Brahmavidyā* is right now here and not hereafter. Nārada did know that it results in getting a total freedom from sorrows. Finding no such results from the *upāsanā* of *nāma* as Brahman, he asks further if there is any superior means.

ब्रह्मदृष्ट्या नाममात्रध्यानान्नापैति शोकिता ।
इत्यभिप्रेत्य नाम्नोऽस्मादधिकम्पृष्टवानसौ ॥७॥

ब्रह्मदृष्ट्या नाममात्रध्यानात् - by mere meditation of *nāma* itself as Brahman शोकिता - sorrow न अपैति - does not end इति अभिप्रेत्य - having intended so असौ - that (Nārada) अस्मात् नाम्नः - than this *nāmopāsanā* अधिकम् - superior (means) पृष्टवान् - asked—(7)

7. Nārada having intended that mere meditation of *nāma* itself as Brahman does not end sorrow, asked for a superior (means) than this *nāmopāsanā*.

A *mumukṣu* must put forth full efforts as advised by his *guru*. Then only he can ask for further means. Thus one can gradually gain the knowledge of ultimate principle. But mere listening the advice without putting in the required efforts cannot confer the promised result. Therefore *kṛtopāstih* (one who has done sufficient *upāsanās*) alone is the main eligible seeker (*adhikārī*) in gaining *ātmajñāna* (*Jī.Mu.Vi.Ch.2*). Upaniṣads and other Vedāntic texts prescribe appropriate remedial measures. This is decided by listening to the questions posed by the student from time to time which indicate the level of preparedness of the seeker. Following this tradition, Sanatkumāra in *Chāndogyopaniṣad* advises advanced

means to Nārada stepwise. At one stage Nārada became silent and did not ask any further question. He thought he had gained the highest knowledge. Sanatkumāra knew that his disciple had not reached the final goal. He as a teacher picked up the thread with Nārada without waiting for Nārada to ask him.

At present considering the appropriateness of Nārada's asking for an advanced means than the *nāmopāsana*, the *guru* chooses to reply.

वाङ्नाम्नः कारणत्वेनाधिकेति

ब्रह्मदर्शनम् ।

वाचि प्राह गुरुः शिष्यः पूर्ववत्

पृष्टवान् पुनः ॥८॥

वाक् - organ of speech नाम्नः - of name, (i.e. words) कारणत्वेन - because of being the cause अधिका - superior इति - therefore गुरुः - *guru* वाचि - in the organ of speech ब्रह्मदर्शनम् - view that *vāk* is Brahman प्राह - advised शिष्यः - the disciple पूर्ववत् - as earlier (finding no desired result by the *upāsana* of *vāk* as Brahman) पुनः - furthermore पृष्टवान् - asked (higher means) – (8)

8. Because of being the cause, the organ of speech is superior to name (words). Therefore the *guru* advised the *upāsana* of *vāk* (organ of speech) as Brahman. The disciple furthermore asked (higher means) as earlier (finding

no desired result by the *upāsana* of *vāk* as Brahman).

The organ of speech (*vāk*) is that sense-organ which operates to pronounce all letters by remaining at eight places from *jivhāmūla* (base of the tongue) to lips. Nārada took to the *upāsana* of *vāk* by viewing it as Brahman. But the result of freedom from sorrows was now here there. He went on asking the higher means at every stage finding the *upāsana* taken to, as not fruitful. This also shows his *śraddhā* in his *guru* and the teaching. Sanatkumāra went on replying every question by specifying higher and higher principles. Thus we get fourteen of these principles at the first stage. They are: *nāma*, *vāk*, *mana*, *saṅkalpa*, *citta*, *dhyāna*, *viññāna*, *bala*, *anna*, *jala*, *teja*, *ākāśa*, *smara* and *āśā* in the order of superiority. Each of them had to be meditated upon by viewing it as Brahman. Then *prāna* is the second stage of higher principle. Further *satya*, *viññāna*, *mati*, *śraddhā*, *niṣṭhā*, *kṛti* and *sukha* are in the third stage. The final principle is *bhūmā*. These are in the order of successive superiority. This fact is told first and thereafter the reason why the succeeding principles is superior to the preceding ones is explained.

आप्राणमित आरभ्य पूर्वस्मादुत्तराधिके ।

प्रवर्तते शिष्यगुर्वोः प्रश्नोत्तरपरम्परा ॥९॥

आप्राणम् इतः आरभ्य - having begun from here ending with *prāṇa* पूर्वस्मात् उत्तराधिके - with respect to the superior entity than its preceding one शिष्यगुर्वोः - of disciple and *guru* प्रश्नोत्तरपरम्परा - a series of question and answer प्रवर्तते - takes place – (9)

9. Having begun from here ending with *prāṇa*, a series of question and answer of disciple and *guru* takes place with respect to the superior entity than its preceding one.

Just as the *vāk* is superior to *nāma*, so are all the forthcoming entities superior to the preceding ones. The cause is always superior to and more pervasive than its effect. Here is a series of higher and higher causes which finally culminates in *ātmā* or Brahman called *bhūmā*. When the *upāsanā* of *nāma*, etc., as Brahman becomes intense, whatever *nāma*, etc., one comes across will be considered as Brahman only. It is just as a devout person seeing *Bhagavān* Viṣṇu in an idol with four arms carrying a conch, disc, mace and lotus whereas an atheist will see only stone in it. *Vāk* is superior and cause of *nāma*. It includes in itself its effect *nāma*. When the *upāsanā* of *vāk* as Brahman becomes intense, all *vāk* will be considered as Brahman. Here more and more superior entities that are mentioned being the causes include in themselves

the prior effects. This rule is applicable up to the mention of the *upādhi* in the form of *prāṇa*.

Nārada further finds that the *upāsanā* of *vāk* as Brahman could not free him from sorrows. So he asks for higher means. Its reply is given.

इच्छात्मकं मनोवाचोऽधिकं तत्कारणत्वतः ।
सत्यामेव विवक्षायां वक्तुमारभते पुमान् ॥१०॥

इच्छात्मकम् मनः - the mind composed of desires वाचः - than the organ of speech अधिकम् - (is) superior तत्कारणत्वतः - because of being the cause of *vāk* पुमान् - a person सत्याम् एव विवक्षायाम् - only when there is a desire to speak वक्तुम् आरभते - starts speaking – (10)

10. The mind composed of desires is superior to the organ of speech (*vāk*) because of being the cause of *vāk*. A person starts speaking only when he has a desire to speak.

Here *mana* (mind) signifies the *antaḥkaraṇa vṛtti* having the desire to speak. No one speaks without such desire. Therefore the mind having a desiring thought is the cause of *vāk* and superior to it. The Upaniṣad describes that the *nāma* and *vāk* are contained in the mind just as small two fruits such as *āmalaka* (Emblic Myrobalan), black pepper, etc., can be held in a fist. By mind, one intends to recite or learn the

Vedas, etc., or thinks 'let me do such and such thing' and does it; or aspires to gain something here and hereafter and works for it. The mind is also called *ātmā (jīva)* because one can do and experience something on account of mind but not otherwise. The mind is also called *loka* (field of experience) because through it alone *lokas* are desired for and their means are taken to. Such a mind with a desire is to be meditated as Brahman.

By the above mentioned *upāsanā* also, sorrows did not come to an end. So even higher means were asked for. Now the cause of the mind having desire as *saṅkalpa* and further its cause as *cittam* are specified.

सङ्कल्पेदं सम्यगिति

तदिच्छति पुमांस्ततः ।

सङ्कल्पो हेतुरिच्छायाश्चित्तं

सङ्कल्पकारणम् ॥११॥

इदं सम्यक् - 'this is agreeable/pleasant' इति - thus सङ्कल्प्य - having resolved mentally or considered पुमान् - a person तत् - that considered thing इच्छति - desires ततः - therefore सङ्कल्पः - mental resolve इच्छायाः - of desire हेतुः - (is) cause चित्तम् - the faculty of seeing the pros and cons सङ्कल्पकारणम् - is the cause of *saṅkalpa* - (11)

11. Having resolved mentally or considered 'this is agreeable (pleasant)',

a person desires the considered thing. Therefore the mental resolve is the cause of desires. The *cittam*, the faculty of seeing the pros and cons (which belongs to *antaḥkaraṇa*) is the cause of *saṅkalpa*.

Before desiring something, we find out if it is agreeable or proper (*samyak*), etc. When we are convinced about its propriety according to our norms (which may or may not be actually right) we desire for it. This faculty of *antaḥkaraṇa* to decide the correctness of a thing is called *saṅkalpa*. In fact the word '*saṅkalpa*' means all mental functions (*manovyāpāra*). Therefore its actual meaning is decided based on the context. Here *saṅkalpa* stands for that analysis or discrimination whether such and such a thing is to be done or not. Then only, one intends to do or not to do the specific thing (*Ch.U.Bh.7-4-1*).

Nārada did the *upāsanā* of *saṅkalpa* as Brahman only to find out lack of result of total freedom from sorrows. On his request, the higher means of 'cittam as Brahman' was advised. *Cittam* here is the faculty of understanding a thing as 'such and such' in a specific context. It is the capacity that describes the utility of a given thing in future based on similar instances in the past (*Ch.U.Bh.7-5-1*). For example,

the meal that was eaten earlier was a means of contentment and nutrition; so the meals in future also will have same utility. Such power of investigation is *cittam*. It is the cause of *saṅkalpa* and therefore superior to it. All individuals investigate first the thing that they come across. Then does the *saṅkalpa* to take (or reject) it. Thereafter the individual intends, then speaks, employs the name (*nāma*). In the *nāma* all *mantras* get included. *Mantras* contain all *karma* (*phalas*). Thus *saṅkalpa* to *karmaphalas* are merged in *citta* (*Ch.U.7-5-1*).

Even the *citta* was not the solution to get freed totally from sorrows. The further consecutive three higher *upāsanās* are told in the next verse.

विक्षिप्तचित्तादैकाग्र्यं ध्यानमभ्यधिकं ततः ।
ध्येयविज्ञानमधिकं ज्ञानादभ्यधिकं बलम् ॥१२॥

विक्षिप्तचित्तात् - than the *citta* that is distracted एकाग्र्यं ध्यानम् - concentration on the meditated deity called *dhyāna*-meditation अभ्यधिकम् - is superior ततः - than the *dhyāna* ध्येयविज्ञानम् - the knowledge of the *dhyeya* (the deity that is meditated upon) according to the *śāstras* (scriptures) अधिकम् - is superior ज्ञानात् - than the knowledge of the *dhyeya* बलम् - the physical strength अभ्यधिकम् - is superior – (12)

12. The concentration on the meditated deity called *dhyāna* - meditation is superior to the *citta* that is distracted. The knowledge of the *dhyeya* (the deity that is meditated upon) according to the *śāstras* (scriptures) is superior to *dhyāna*. (Further) the physical strength is superior to the knowledge of the *dhyeya*.

The continuous flow of thought of deities, etc., as told by the *śāstras* is *dhyāna* (meditation). *Citta* (as described above) needs concentration to function which is provided by the *dhyāna*. Thus *dhyāna* becomes the cause of *citta*. The *upāsanā* of *dhyāna* as Brahman could not end all sorrows. Therefore the next higher *upāsanā* of *vijñāna* (knowledge of *dhyeya*) as Brahman was advised. *Vijñāna* is superior and is the cause of *dhyāna* because in its absence the *dhyāna* itself is not possible. If *dhyāna* is taken to without the correct knowledge of *dhyeya* by the means of *pramāṇa*, it is erroneous. As usual the *upāsanā* of *vijñāna* as Brahman could not end sorrows. So the *upāsanā* of *bala* (physical strength) as Brahman was advised. *Bala* also includes mental strength (born of eaten food) because of which one can know what needs to be known. The strength is required to serve the *guru* and take to *tapas* also. Even a hundred intelligent persons together are

afraid of an elephant.

On finding the *upāsanā* of *bala* as Brahman could not end sorrows, Nārada requested for a higher means. Sanatkumāra also obliged by continuing to advise higher *upāsanās*. Thus we get further *upāsanās* of three successive superior causes in the next verse after the mention of why *bala* is superior to *viññāna*.

ज्ञानहेतुर्देहबलं बलं स्यादन्नकारणम् ।
आपोऽन्नहेतवोऽपां तु तेजः कारणमीरितम् ॥१३॥

ज्ञानहेतुः - the cause of *viññāna* (knowledge of *dhyeya*) देहबलं - is the physical strength बलं - the strength अन्नकारणं स्यात् - is produced by the food आपः - water अन्नहेतवः - is the cause of food तु - but तेजः - principle of fire अपां कारणम् - is the cause of water इति ईरितम् - Thus it was told (in the earlier chapter 6 of *Chāndogyopaniṣad*)—(13)

13. The cause of *viññāna* (knowledge of *dhyeya*) is the physical strength. The strength is produced by the (eaten) food. But the water is the cause of the food. Thus it was told (in the earlier chapter 6 of *Chāndogyopaniṣad*).

It is well-known that the body becomes weak without the food for some days and the food can grow only because of water. The principle of fire as the cause of water was told in the earlier

chapter (*Ch.U.6*). Similar to all the earlier *upāsanās*, three more *ālambanas* (basis), namely *anna* (food), *āpa* (water) and *teja* (principle of fire) are advised as *upāsanās* viewing that they are Brahman. These *upāsanās* also were incapable of ending sorrows. The subsequent and the last three of them are described in the next verse.

हेतुः सवायुराकाशस्तेजसो

वियतः पुनः ।

स्रष्टव्यस्मृतिरीशस्य सृष्ट्याशा

स्मृतिकारणम् ॥१४॥

सवायुराकाशः - the space with the *vāyu* (air) तेजसः - of fire-principle हेतुः - is the cause पुनः - further ईशस्य - of *Īśvara* स्रष्टव्यस्मृतिः - memory of *jagat* that is going to be Created वियतः (कारणम्) - is the cause of space सृष्ट्याशा - (*Īśvara's*) desire to Create (the *jagat*) स्मृतिकारणम् - is the cause of that type of (*Īśvara's*) memory—(14)

14. The space (*ākāśa*) with the *vāyu* (air) is the cause of fire-principle. Further *Īśvara's* memory of *jagat* that is going to be Created is the cause of space. (*Īśvara's*) desire to Create (the *jagat*) is the cause of that type of (his) memory.

In the order of Creation the *vāyu* as the cause of *teja* and *ākāśa* as the cause of *vāyu* should have been told. Creation was shown to begin with *teja*

with Brahman as its cause in the earlier chapter of *Chāndogya*. Here the *ākāśa* with *vāyu* is presented as the cause of *teja*. The space is necessary for the air to blow. The air needs to be blown to tend the fire. This order of cause and effect is in accordance with our experience. The sun, moon, lightning and stars, etc., which signify the *teja* abide in the space only. The existence of all things and activities are possible only in the space. Thus the space is very important. And yet its *upāsanā* did not end the sorrow of Nārada.

The next symbol (*pratīka*) for *upāsanā* is described by the Upaniṣad as ‘*smara*’ which *Bhāṣyakāra* defines as the feature of *antaḥkaraṇa* called *smaraṇa* (memory) pertaining to all *jīvas*. The entities in the *jagat* including *ākāśa* are utilized by the *jīva* only when it remembers them. Therefore ‘*smara*’ is considered as the cause of *ākāśa* and also superior to it. But Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni gives the meaning of ‘*smara*’ as the *Īśvara's* memory of *jagat* that is going to be Created.

The importance and superiority of all *ālambanas* (*pratīkas* or symbols) can be understood by the worldly (*laukika*) *pramāṇas*. But each subsequent symbols can be better understood mainly with the help of *śruti*.

Īśvara created the *jagat* with

the same features which were present in the past *kalpas*. They are recollected first. It is said in the *śruti*: *Dhātā yathāpūrvam akalpayat* (Creator produced this *jagat* as in the past *kalpas*) (*Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad*, 5-7). Therefore, the memory of past Creation precedes the Creation of the next one by *Īśvara*. *Īśvara's* memory of past Creation becomes the cause of *ākāśa*. That memory becomes productive in doing something related to it when there is an *āśā* (desire) to do so by *Īśvara*. Thus *śṛṣṭyāśā* (*Īśvara's* desire to Create *jagat*) is the cause of that memory in the sense it makes that memory active.

With the above, the advice to take to *upāsanās* of specified symbols other than *ātmā* as Brahman is over. Now begins the topic of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* because *prāṇa* though *anātmā* in nature is an entity which resembles very closely. But before that the author mentions passingly about the results that are gained by earlier *upāsanās* of *nāma* to *āśā* as Brahman.

नामाद्याशान्ततत्त्वेषु ब्रह्मदृष्टिं करोति यः ।
स पुमान् लभते सर्वं तत्र तत्रोदितं फलम् ॥१५॥

यः - the person who नामाद्या-
शान्ततत्त्वेषु - with respect to principles
beginning from *nāma* and ending with
āśā ब्रह्मदृष्टिं करोति - does *upāsanā* by
viewing them as Brahman सः पुमान् - that

person सर्वं तत्र तत्र - with respect to each of those *upāsanās* उदितम् - told फलम् - result लभते- gains –(15)

15. The person who does the *upāsanā* of *nāma* to *āśā* as Brahman gains the results told therein.

All these *upāsanās* are aiming at *Brahmadṛṣṭi* (the vision of Brahman) everywhere. Each of those *upāsanās* is unique with its unique results. Though the teaching sought was to get totally freed from sorrows, these in between means with secondary results were prescribed to equip an *upāsaka* to get *ātmajñāna* and thereby be totally free from sorrows. If the seeker does not succeed in gaining the final knowledge in this life, these secondary results become useful to him hereafter. Of course by his continued efforts, such seeker does get *ātmajñāna* in future births. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa assures: ‘Arjuna, such a person does not get a bad lot here or hereafter’ (*B.G.*6-40).

TEACHING ABOUT PRĀṆA

Nārada observed that though these *upāsanās* from *nāma* to *āśā* have their results, they are incapable of ending all sorrows. On the contrary they add more sorrows because of the exertion involved to practice those *upāsanās*. Therefore he asks for still superior means.

प्रतीकोपासनैरेतैर्बह्वायासैः

प्रशोचति ।

न शोकं तरतीत्युक्त्वा ह्यपृच्छत्

सोऽधिकं पुनः ॥१६॥

एतैः - by these बह्वायासैः - (by) very strenuous प्रतीकोपासनैः - (by) *upāsanās* of symbols प्रशोचति - (the *upāsaka*) suffers more शोकं - (but) sorrow न तरति - does not get freed from इति उक्त्वा - having told so सः - Nārada पुनः - again अधिकं हि - still superior means (of ending sorrows totally) अपृच्छत् - asked –(16)

16. Nārada, having told Sanatkumāra that the *upāsaka* suffers more by these very strenuous *upāsanās* of symbols instead of getting freed from sorrows, asked for still superior means (of ending sorrows totally).

Upāsanās need to be done strictly in accordance with the scriptures. It is a strenuous task which increases the sorrow instead of reducing it. That is why Nārada repeatedly asks the sure means of ending sorrows totally. Having sought a competent *guru*, complete *śraddhā* in him is inevitable. It is the *guru* who decides what means to be advised when. Asking for a few number of means from the *guru* as alternatives to choose one of them is a sign of *aśraddhā* (lack of *śraddhā*). Nārada was asking for higher and higher means only after the practice of the previous one found to be

ineffective. He had full *śraddhā* that the *guru* will advise him the sure means at the appropriate time. On finding the *upāsanā* of *āśā* as Brahman also to be futile, he asked for still higher means. Sanatkumāra is convinced now that Nārada is an eligible *mumukṣu*. So he changes the course of his further advice and teaches about *prāṇa*. The reason for doing so is told in the next verse.

पराक्पदार्थध्यानेषु फलेषु च
विरक्तितः ।

दृढां प्रत्यग् विविदिषां दृष्ट्वा
प्राणमुपादिशत् ॥१७॥

पराक् पदार्थध्यानेषु - in the *upāsanās* of external entities as symbols फलेषु च - and in their results विरक्तितः - because of dispassion दृढां - firm प्रत्यग्विविदिषाम् - desire to know *pratyagātmā* दृष्ट्वा - having seen (in Nārada) प्राणम् - *prāṇa* उपादिशत् - advised—(17)

17. Because of the dispassion in the *Upāsanās* of external entities as symbols and their results, having seen (in Nārada) a firm desire to know *pratyagātmā*, (Sanatkumāra) advised him about *prāṇa*.

All the symbols (*pratīkas*) beginning from *nāma* to *āśā* are distinct from oneself. They can never be *ātmā*. They being external to oneself (*pratyak*) are called *parāk*. *Upāsanā* of external

entities cannot end sorrows. Nārada was not interested in the results of those *upāsanās* also. It is noteworthy here that the result of *upāsanā* of ‘*āśā* as Brahman’ is getting all desires fulfilled and *upāsaka's* all prayers become fruitful (*Ch.U.7-14-2*).

But a desire for any sense-pleasure here or hereafter is a sign of extrovert mind. An extrovert mind preoccupied in the sense-objects can never hope to get *ātmajñāna*. That is why Nārada was asking for higher means at every step of the advised *upāsanās* after its practice. The eligibility to gain *ātmajñāna* entirely depends on the perfection of *vairāgya* or total disinterestedness in all sense-objects. The mind steeped in sense-objects to seek pleasure cannot take to *ātmajñāna* because it is totally misfit for this pursuit. Only when one sees the futility of all sense-pleasures on gaining the maturity of the mind because they lead finally to sorrow invariably, the person becomes fit to gain *ātmajñāna*.

Ācārya Śaṅkara declares in ‘*Upadeśa-sāhasrī*’ (*Ch.1-2*) that the role of *Brahmavidyā* begins only after the ending of all *karmas* (*samāpayya kriyāḥ sarvāḥ*). Even taking to the *karma* meant for others makes *mumukṣu's* mind extrovert. Sanatkumāra was happy to find Nārada eligible to gain *ātmajñāna*.

So he advised Nārada about *prāṇa*. Even then what is the reason for teaching about *prāṇa* when Nārada wants to gain *ātmajñāna*? The next verse gives the answer.

न मुख्यं प्रत्यगात्मत्वं यद्यपि प्राणवस्तुनः ।
तथाप्यात्मप्रतिनिधिः सम्भवेदात्मलक्षकः ॥१८॥

यदि अपि - even though प्राणवस्तुनः - the entity called *prāṇa* मुख्यं प्रत्यगात्मत्वं - the nature of *ātmā* in the primary sense न - is not तथा अपि - yet आत्मप्रतिनिधिः - a representative of *ātmā* आत्मलक्षकः - the one who indicates *ātmā* सम्भवेत् - can be - (18)

18. Even though the entity called *prāṇa* does not have the nature of *ātmā* in the primary sense, yet it can be a representative of *ātmā* as its indirect indicator.

The word *mukhya* (primary, main) in this context means that which is not an effect of some cause or that which is *nirupādhika*. *Prāṇa* is made of five elements and inert by itself whereas *ātmā* is self-existent knowledge-principle (*cit*). Even then the *prāṇa* serves as a representative of *ātmā*. It indicates *ātmā*. Therefore *prāṇa* is called *ātmā* secondarily. So long as *prāṇa* is present in the body, the manifest presence of *ātmā* in it becomes evident. Though *ātmā* is all pervasive, its

presence in the body can be known only when *prāṇa* abides in it.

The entities beginning from *nāma* to *āśā* with a cause-effect relation have successive superiority. They have their nature of existence because of *smṛti* (memory) and are tied up together by the ropes of *āśā* (desire). Thus all these put together called *jagat* are centred in *prāṇa* like the stalk of lotus in its fibres. That *prāṇa* pervades inside and outside of everything. The entire *jagat* is strung in *prāṇa* and held in check by it like the beads in a string. Such a *prāṇa* is superior to *āśā* (*Ch.U.Bh.7-15-1*). How it is the representative of *ātmā* is explained by the Upaniṣad with the help of illustrations (vs.19 to 22, *Ch.U.7-15-1* to 3). First a corroborative passage from *Praśnopaniṣad* is quoted.

कस्मिन्नुत्क्रान्त उत्क्रान्तो

भविष्यामि स्थिते स्थितः ।

इति वीक्ष्यासृजत् प्राणं

परमात्मेति हि श्रुतिः ॥१९॥

कस्मिन् उत्क्रान्ते - on whose departure (from the physical body) उत्क्रान्तः भविष्यामि - I shall get departed स्थिते - on whose abidance (in it) स्थितः - (I) remain therein इति - so वीक्ष्य - having thought परमात्मा - *Paramātmā* प्राणं - *prāṇa* असृजत् - created इति हि श्रुतिः - so says the Upaniṣad (*Pr.U. 6-3, 4*) - (19)

19. *Paramātmā* having thought, ‘on whose departure (from the physical body) I shall get departed [and] on whose abidance [in it] I remain therein?’ created *prāṇa*. So says the Upaniṣad (*Pr.U.6-3,4*). (Therefore the *prāṇa* is the representative of *Paramātmā*).

The entry and exit of *Paramātmā* in an individual body is on account of *prāṇa-upādhi* as the coming and going of *jīva*. So long as *jīva* is functioning in the body because of *prāṇa*'s presence, it is said that *ātmā* is therein. When *jīva* departs along with its *upādhi* the *prāṇa*, people consider that *ātmā* is no more in the body. Actually the all pervasive *ātmā* neither enters nor departs. But it appears so because of the *prāṇa-upādhi* as *jīva* enters and departs. People also say that *jīva* is still there or it has gone. It is like the entry of the sun in a bucket of water because of its reflection in it and departure when the water is thrown away. Or it is like the all pervasive space entering a pot when it is born and departing from it when the pot is broken. It is well-known that the *ātmā* is called *jīva* because it sustains the *prāṇa*, (i.e. *prāṇadhāraṇa*). Thus the statement from *Praśnopaniṣad* establishes the *prāṇa* as the representative of *ātmā*.

The *Chāndogyopaniṣad* itself elaborates the *prāṇa* as the representative of *ātmā* by its description as an

indispensable entity required for *jagat* as if *ātmā* itself.

चक्रस्यारा यथा

नाभावाश्रिताश्चक्षुरादिकम् ।

आश्रितं निखिलं प्राणे

ततस्तस्यात्मता भवेत् ॥२०॥

यथा - just as चक्रस्य - of a wheel नाभौ - in the hub अराः - the spokes originating from its rim आश्रिताः - are centred (तथा - Similarly) चक्षुरादिकम् - eye, etc. निखिलम् - everything प्राणे - in the *prāṇa* आश्रितम् - is centred ततः - therefore तस्य - of *prāṇa* आत्मता - nature of *ātmā* as the basis of everything भवेत् - is proper – (20)

20. Just as the spokes of a wheel originating from its rim are centred in its hub, similarly everything such as eye, etc., is centred in the *prāṇa*. Therefore *prāṇa* (in its feature) having the nature of *ātmā* as the basis of everything is proper (*Ch.U.7-15-1*).

One can see clearly in the case of bicycle, bullock-cart or chariot that the spokes from the rim of the wheel are centred in the hub. The wheel rotates by the rotation of the hub. Similarly all the senses (*indriyas*) along with the mind are centred in the *prāṇa* and they function so long as the *prāṇa* is active in the body. Even when any of the sense-organs and organs of action get damaged or cease to

function or even if there is a mental disorder, the person continues to live so long as the *prāṇa* functions. But when the *prāṇa* leaves, the body dies, as a result the senses and the mind no longer survive in that body. It is just like the moving of a wheel even if some of its spokes are broken, but it totally stops when the hub is broken. Thus because of *prāṇa* the senses, mind and the body are able to function. This proves that the *prāṇa* is the basis of body, senses and the mind and their functions. *Prāṇa* appears itself as *ātmā*. However in reality *ātmā* alone is the basis of everything including the *prāṇa*.

All activities are possible because of *prāṇa* is explained further with illustrations.

अश्वेन याति पुरुषो दत्ते

विप्राय गां पुमान् ।

प्राण एवाश्वादिशब्दैरुक्तो न तु

शवः क्वचित् ॥२१॥

पुरुषः - a person अश्वेन याति - travels by riding on a horse पुमान् - a donor विप्राय - to a Brahmin गां दत्ते - gives a cow in charity प्राणः - (in these statements) the *prāṇa* एव - only अश्वादि शब्दैः - by the words such as the horse, person, donor, Brahmin and the cow उक्तः - is described तु - but न क्वचित् - nowhere शवः - (the words horse, etc.), refer to the dead body - (21)

21. In the statements such as, ‘a person travels by riding on a horse’, ‘a donor gives a cow in charity to a Brahmin’ the words such as the horse, person, donor, Brahmin and the cow refer to *prāṇa* only, but nowhere to their dead bodies.

The running of a horse is possible only because of *prāṇa* abiding in it. None rides on a dead horse nor can a dead person ever ride. A dead cow is not given in charity or a dead Brahmin cannot receive it. Therefore all activities (*vyavahāra*) and their doership have to be attributed to *prāṇa* only in whose absence those dead corpses can never take to any action. That means *prāṇa* by its power enables all *vyavahāra* (activities).

The Upaniṣad further describes that the father, mother, brother, sister, *ācārya*, etc., are *prāṇa* itself in the sense that what they are now is because of *prāṇa* alone. If it is asked, how can father, etc., be *prāṇa* giving up the direct meaning of those words, the *śruti* answers by pointing out the difference in the conduct of people in relation to father, etc., when *prāṇa* is present (*anvaya*) or absent (*vyatireka*) in them. The words father, etc., are used or the expected proper relations are maintained with them so long as the *prāṇa* abides in their bodies. The moment the *prāṇa*

leaves those bodies, the *vyavahāra* as father, etc., stops. Suppose a person replies any of them with harsh words or treats any with contempt, the nearby people who follow *dharma* put him to shame or scold him for such detestable conduct. They even accuse him as the murderer of father, etc. (*Ch.U.7-15-1, 2*). On the contrary, if after the death, the corpse of the father, etc., is burnt by using a dart to gather the limbs together or break the skull for proper burning, none considers it as a heinous act. This is so because the entity called father, etc., is no more in the body after death when the *prāṇa* has already left. People may refer to the body without *prāṇa* as father, etc., but it is only secondary because the name continues even in the absence of the entity. Thus by *anvaya* (presence) and *vyatireka* (absence) of *prāṇa* it is proved that the names such as father, etc., primarily refer to *prāṇa* only (*Ch.U.7-15-3*). This is summarized in the next verse with its conclusion.

पितृमात्रादिशब्दैश्च प्राणः

प्रोक्तो शवो न तु ।

तस्मात् सर्वात्मकः प्राणः

परमात्मेति निश्चयः ॥२२॥

पितृमात्रादिशब्दैश्च - further by the words such as father, mother, etc. प्राणः - *prāṇah* (एव - only) प्रोक्तः - is described तु - but न शवः - not the corpse तस्मात् -

therefore सर्वात्मकः - one who is the nature of all प्राणः - the *prāṇa* परमात्मा - is *Paramātmā* इति - so निश्चयः - is the ascertainment—(22)

22. By the words such as the father, mother, etc., the *prāṇa* only is described, but not the corpse. Therefore it is certain that the *prāṇa* who is the nature of all (both mobile and immobile) is the *Paramātmā*.

If the bodies themselves were father, etc., they will never be cremated. But the entities such as father, etc., are so only because of *prāṇas* abiding in them. The *prāṇa* is the basis of all beings, and functions, like *ātmā*. It is well-known that *ātmā* itself is *Paramātmā*. Thus the *prāṇa* serves as a representative to indicate the nature of *ātmā-Paramātmā*.

ATIVĀDĪ (ASSERTOR OF THE MOST EXALTED)

The *upāsaka* who does the *upāsana* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* to the point of fruition becomes an '*ativādī*'. The word *ativādī* literally means talkative, very eloquent, verbose, the one who exclusively establishes his own assertion or the one speaks exaggerated things or talks exaggeratedly. But here it means the one who speaks of or asserts the entity that transcends *nāma* to *āśā* as *ātmā* (vs.24).

यो बुभुत्सुरसौ प्राणमेवं

पश्यन् गुरुक्तिः ।

युक्त्या धिया च वै

चिन्वन्नातिवादीति कथ्यते ॥२३॥

यः असौ - the *mumukṣu* who is
बुभुत्सुः - intent on knowing *ātmā* गुरुक्तिः
- by the advice of the *guru* एवम् - as told
so far प्राणं पश्यन् - sees the *prāṇa* as *ātmā*
(‘I’) युक्त्या - by reasoning धिया - by one's
intelligence च - and वै - truly चिन्वन् -
ascertains (सः - he) अतिवादी इति कथ्यते - is
described as *ativādī*.—(23)

23. The *mumukṣu* who is intent on
knowing *ātmā* by the advice of the *guru*,
sees as told so far the *prāṇa* as *ātmā* (‘I’)
and by reasoning coupled with one's
intelligence truly ascertains it, is
described as *ativādī* (assertor of the most
exalted).

An intense *mumukṣā* (desire to
get freed from sorrow-ridden *saṃsāra*)
has to get transformed into *jijñāsā* or
what is called *bubhutsā* (an intense
desire to gain *ātmajñāna*) by knowing
well that knowledge of oneself alone is
the final remedy against *saṃsāra*. The
phrase ‘*evam prāṇam paśyan*’ (having
seen *prāṇa* as told so far) means ‘having
experienced the promised result of
upāsanā’ wherein the *prāṇa* is meditated
as *ātmā* (‘I’). Further the ascertainment
of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* of all ‘by reasoning
coupled with one's intelligence’ is

separately told because without such
firm ascertainment of the fact the result
of *upāsanā* cannot be experienced. The
word *ativādī* is going to be explained in
the next verse.

नामाद्याशान्ततत्त्वानि यः

प्राणोऽतीत्य वर्तते ।

तमात्मानं वक्ति यस्मादतिवादी

भवेत् ततः ॥२४॥

यः प्राणः - the *prāṇa* who
नामाद्याशान्ततत्त्वानि - the entities beginning
from *nāma* and ending with *āśā* अतीत्य
वर्तते - transcends तम् - that (*prāṇa*) यस्मात्
- because आत्मानं वक्ति - calls *ātmā* (‘I’) ततः
- therefore अतिवादी - *ativādī* भवेत् -
becomes—(24)

24. The *prāṇa* transcends the
entities beginning from *nāma* and
ending with *āśā*. Because of calling that
prāṇa to be *ātmā* (‘I’)(such a person)
becomes *ativādī*.

The prefix ‘*ati*’ when used with
nouns or pronouns means ‘beyond’ or
‘superior to’ whereas *vādī* means ‘a
speaker or expounder’ or the ‘one who
asserts’. The *prāṇa* is superior to all the
rest of the things in the world, and this
upāsaka asserts it to be *ātmā*. Therefore
he is considered as *ativādī* (assertor of
the most exalted). All entities from *nāma*
to *āśā* depend on *prāṇa* for their
existence. The *prāṇa* itself manifests in

terms of those different forms. Instead of taking the modifications of *prāṇa* such as *nāma*, etc., as *ātmā* or Brahman, here is a person who takes the exalted *prāṇa* itself as *ātmā*. That makes him superior. Lay people cannot consider anything other than their bodies as *ātmā*. Those who view the subtler principles such as *nāma* to *āśā* are superior to the ordinary people. Still superior is the *upāsaka* who meditates on *prāṇa* as *ātmā* ('I'). Therefore Upaniṣad calls him *ativādī*.

Such a status of being *ativādī* is neither an exaggeration nor an egoistic concept about oneself. It is a statement of fact. Therefore, the *śruti* advises such person to stick to his guns without concealing it, if assailed by others to dismiss his claim of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* (*Ch.U.7-15-4*).

तर्काद् विप्लावकेभ्योऽयं निर्भीः

सन् स्वातिवादिताम् ।

अङ्गीकुर्यादेव यस्मात्सन्देहो

नात्र विद्यते ॥२५॥

अयं - this *upāsaka* तर्कात् - by resorting to the reasoning divorced from the *śruti* विप्लावकेभ्यः - from those who confuse निर्भीः सन् - becoming fearless स्वातिवादिताम् - one's status as *ativādī* अङ्गीकुर्यात् - should accept एव - certainly यस्मात् - because अत्र - in this matter सन्देहः - doubt न विद्यते - (he) does not have – (25)

25. This *upāsaka* becoming fearless of those who confuse by resorting to reasoning divorced from the *śruti* should certainly accept his status *ativādī* because he has no doubt in this matter.

Tārkikas (logicians) may try their best by their self-imagined reasoning to prove what this *upāsaka* says as wrong. But on the strength of the *śruti*-statement and the experience of the result of this *upāsanā*, the *upāsaka* should not swerve from his status of being an *ativādī*.

So far Nārada being not happy with the results of earlier *upāsanās* up to that of *āśā* as the means to get totally freed from sorrows was asking for the higher means repeatedly. But after listening to the *upāsanā* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* ('I') and taking to its practice he kept quiet. The reason for this is given in the next two verses.

नामादीनामनात्मत्वं स्पष्टमित्यत्र नारदः ।

असन्तुष्टोऽधिकं तत्त्वं पप्रच्छैव पुनः पुनः ॥२६॥

नारदः - Nārada नामादीनाम् - of *nāma*, etc., (up to *āśā*) अनात्मत्वम् - the nature of being not *ātmā* स्पष्टम् - is very clear इति (हेतोः) - because of this reason अत्र - in this respect, as to this असन्तुष्टः (सन्) - being unhappy पुनः पुनः - repeatedly अधिकं तत्त्वम् एव - exactly the higher principle पप्रच्छ - asked – (26)

26. Nārada, because of the reason that the nature of *nāma*, etc., (up to *āśā*) being not *ātmā* is very clear, being unhappy in this respect repeatedly asked exactly the higher principle.

प्राणात्मत्वं तु सम्भाव्यं

सम्यक्तस्योपपादनात् ।

शोकश्च सुप्तौ प्राणस्य न

दृष्टोऽतस्तुतोष सः ॥२७॥

प्राणात्मत्वं तु - but *prāṇa* as *ātmā* सम्भाव्यम् - is possible तस्य - its सम्यक् - thorough उपपादनात् - because of ascertainment सुप्तौ च - and in the sleep प्राणस्य - of *prāṇa* शोकः - sorrow न दृष्टः - is not seen अतः - therefore सः - he (Nārada) तुतोष - was happy – (27)

27. But the *prāṇa* as *ātmā* is possible because of its thorough ascertainment (by the *śruti* or Sanatkumāra) (*Ch.U.7-15-1* to 3). Further in the sleep the *prāṇa* having sorrow is not seen. Therefore Nārada was happy (thinking that he got the means of getting freed from sorrow totally and thereby did not ask further questions).

‘I’-ness in the *nāma* to *āśā* is not possible though it is advised so (as Brahman) for *upāsana*. Actually they are experienced as ‘mine’. It is so in the case of *prāṇa* also and yet its indispensability for our existence and the nature of being everywhere make one accept that the

prāṇa is *ātmā*. Moreover though in sleep the *prāṇa* alone is present to the exclusion of *nāma* to *āśā*, there is no trace of sorrow. Nārada's main problem was that of sorrow. He thought that he got the ultimate solution to get freed from sorrows totally. That made him desist from asking further questions. Citing the contentment of Nārada at the level of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* (‘I’), some contend that *prāṇa* alone is the ultimate reality. This is dismissed thoroughly in the ‘*bhūmādhikaraṇa*’ of *Brahmasūtra* (1-3-8,9).

THE ADVICE OF THE ENTITY SUPERIOR TO *PRĀṆA* WITH THE MEANS TO KNOW IT

Sage Vālmīki has said: ‘Saintly people impart the *ātmajñāna* to the eligible person by force even if unasked’ (*Yo.Vā.Ni.Pū.66-3*). Sanatkumāra follows this age-old wise counsel finding Nārada to be a fit disciple. The reason for continuing the teaching even if unasked by Nārada is told now.

श्रद्धालुं योग्यशिष्यं तमुद्धरामीत्यसौ गुरुः ।
अपृष्टोऽप्यधिकं तत्त्वं स्वयमेवोपदिष्टवान् ॥२८॥

असौ गुरुः - the *guru* Sanatkumāra तम् - him श्रद्धालुम् - full of faith योग्यशिष्यम् - eligible disciple उद्धरामि - I shall deliver from sorrows इति - having thought so अपृष्टः अपि - even though unasked अधिकं तत्त्वम् - the principle well-known in the

śruti and superior to *prāṇa* स्वयम् एव - truly of one's own accord उपदिष्टवान् - advised—(28)

28. Even though unasked, the *guru* Sanatkumāra having thought, 'I shall deliver Nārada, who is full of faith and an eligible disciple, from sorrows' truly advised of one's own accord the principle well-known in the *śruti* and superior to *prāṇa*.

Śraddhā (faith) is the attitude of trust in the scripture and the teaching of the *guru* in accordance with it. There is a reason to have such acceptance of Upaniṣadic teaching because it is based on the solid foundation of three cardinal criteria. They are the *śruti*, *yukti* (reasoning) and the *aparokṣa-anubhava* (direct experience of oneself free from doubts and vagueness). It is not a new imaginary invention of some superb brain, but the verified truth by the galaxy of great masters from time immemorial. It is a well-trodden path for ages. Vedānta is a verifiable *pramāṇa* unlike that of heavens. Though *śraddhā* is included in the *yogyatva* or *adhikāritva* (eligibility) of the disciple, it has been mentioned separately to highlight its unique importance. The eligibility of a *mumukṣu* is determined by the adherence to *dharma*, having *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-saṃpatti*, *citta-śuddhi*, *cittanaiścalya*, and the other

means such as *amānitva*, etc. (*B.G.Ch.* 13-7 to 11).

The general norm of conduct is: '*nāpṛṣṭaḥ kasyacit brūyāt*' (never tell or teach unasked) (*M.S.*,2-110). But correcting an erring disciple without hurting him or imparting the proper guidance to an eligible *jijñāsu* who may otherwise continue to meander in the sorrowful *saṃsāra* is an exception to this rule. Nārada was convinced that the *prāṇa* is *ātmā*. If he were not to be corrected, his sorrowful *saṃsāra* would have continued. That prompted the *guru* Sanatkumāra to teach Nārada the principle superior to *prāṇa* though unasked for. It was spontaneous decision on his part to deliver Nārada from sorrows totally.

The *anātmā* nature of *prāṇa* is established now.

आत्मोपलक्षकः प्राणो न

त्वात्मैषोऽनृतत्वतः ।

नामरूपात्मकः प्राणो

माययोत्पादितो ह्यसौ ॥२९॥

प्राणः - *prāṇa* (is) आत्मोपलक्षकः - is the one who indicates *ātmā* तु - but एषः - this *prāṇa* अनृतत्वतः - because of (itself) being false (*mithyā*) in nature न आत्मा - cannot be *ātmā* मायया - by *māyā* उत्पादितः - because it is produced असौ प्राणः - this *prāṇa* (is) हि - certainly नामरूपात्मकः - of the nature of *nāma* and *rūpa*—(29)

29. The *prāṇa* is the one who indicates *ātmā*, but it cannot be *ātmā* because of (itself) being false in nature. Certainly this *prāṇa* (is) of the nature of *nāma* and *rūpa* because it is produced by *māyā*.

The *prāṇa* being the product of false *māyā*, is equally false in nature like any other entity in Creation. Earlier the *prāṇa* was said to be *ātmā* only because it can indicate *ātmā* very effectively. If the *jijñāsu* is convinced that the *prāṇa* is *ātmā* because of its many features closely resembling *ātmā*, it becomes easy to know *ātmā* once the *anātmā* nature of *prāṇa* is exposed. If it were told in the beginning itself that ‘actually *prāṇa* is not *ātmā*, but you consider it to be so’ the disciple will not take it so seriously. In reality *prāṇa* is not *ātmā*, but it can certainly make us know *ātmā*. The power to keep the inert body, limbs, etc., alive is the *rūpa* (form) of *prāṇa* whereas the word ‘*prāṇa*’ is its name. In the phrase *nāmarūpa* the word ‘*rūpa*’ (form) is that which describes the referred entity.

Ātmā is *satya* (ever-existent principle) whereas the *prāṇa* is false. If it is asked ‘how can a false entity ever indicate the *satya ātmā*?’ the answer follows in the next verse.

अनृतोऽप्येष सत्यस्य लक्षकः प्रतिबिम्बवत् ।
मुखस्य प्रतिबिम्बेन मुखं स्वस्योपलक्ष्यते ॥३०॥

एषः - this *prāṇa* अनृतः अपि - even though false in nature प्रतिबिम्बवत् - like a reflection (indicating the original entity) सत्यस्य - of the real entity (*ātmā* or called *bhūmā*) लक्षकः - indicator मुखस्य - of the face प्रतिबिम्बेन - by the reflection स्वस्य - one's मुखम् - the face उपलक्ष्यते - is indicated. – (30)

30. The *prāṇa* even though false in nature is the indicator of the real entity (*ātmā* or called *bhūmā*) like a reflection (indicating the original entity). (It is well-known that) one's face is indicated by its reflection.

The reflection of one's face in the mirror or in any reflecting surface is false. It is not the original one. Yet the reflection certainly makes us know our face in its entirety. So is the case with the *prāṇa*. The Upaniṣad has already given the guidelines how the *prāṇa* can indicate *ātmā*.

If the inert *prāṇa* an entity in Creation belonging to the category of *anātmā* can indicate *ātmā*, then why is it not possible for entities from *nāma* to *āśā* of the same category to indicate *ātmā*? The answer is given now.

आत्मेदंबुद्धिगम्यैस्तैराशान्तैर्नोपलक्ष्यते ।
प्राणोऽहंबुद्धिगम्येषु स्थितत्वादात्मलक्षकः ॥३१॥

आत्मा - *ātmā* इदं बुद्धिगम्यैः - by the entities known as ‘this’ तैः - by those

आशान्तैः - (beginning from *nāma* and) ending with *āśā* न उपलक्ष्यते - cannot be indicated प्राणः - *prāṇa* अहंबुद्धिगम्येषु - in the entities known as 'I' स्थितत्वात् - because of being situated आत्मलक्षकः - is the indicator of *ātmā* - (31)

31. *Ātmā* cannot be indicated by those entities (beginning from *nāma* and) ending with *āśā* which are known as 'this'. *Prāṇa* is the indicator of *ātmā* because of being situated in the entities known as 'I'.

Everyone without any exception knows for certain that the entity called 'I' is sentient (*sacetana*) in nature even if he knows not its true nature. All of *nāma* to *āśā* being always inert in nature fall in the category of 'this' like pot, etc. They can never indicate the sentient 'I' (*ātmā*) though they are available as symbols of *upāsanās* as detailed by the *śruti*. The case with the physical body, senses (*indriyas*) and *prāṇa*, etc., is different. Though by themselves they are inert in nature for practical purpose they appear to be sentient in all living beings because of the availability of 'cidābhāsa' (reflected *cit/ātmā*) in them. As a result they are universally mistaken as 'I'. Thus they belong to the category of those that are known as 'I' also. Among these senses, *prāṇa*, etc., the *prāṇa* is prominent because of its superiority (*adhikatva*) described earlier (*Ch.U.7-*

15-1 to 3 vs.19 to 22). Therefore though *anātmā* in nature, *prāṇa* only can indicate *ātmā* and not the entities beginning from *nāma* to *āśā*.

As seen so far the *prāṇa* is inert and false in nature. It is considered as *ātmā* only secondarily as its representative for teaching purpose. Therefore becoming *ativādī* as the result of taking to the *upāsanā* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* is in the secondary sense. Only the *jñānī* who has the *aparokṣajñāna* of *ātmā* (*bhūmā*) can be *ativādī* in the primary sense (*Ch.U. 7-16-1*). This fact is mentioned in the next verse.

अत एवातिवादित्वमस्ति

प्राणात्मवेदनात् ।

अमुख्यं तच्च मुख्यं तु भवेत्

सत्यात्मवेदनात् ॥३२॥

अतः एव - for this very reason (that *prāṇa* is false in nature) प्राणात्मवेदनात् - by doing *upāsanā* by *prāṇa* as *ātmā* अमुख्यम् - secondary अतिवादित्वम् - the status of becoming *ativādī* अस्ति - occurs तु - but सत्यात्मवेदनात् - by the direct (*aparokṣa*) knowledge of *satya* (ever-existent) *ātmā* (*bhūmā*) तत् च - that (*ativāditva*) मुख्यम् - foremost भवेत् - happens to be - (32)

32. For this very reason (that *prāṇa* is false in nature) by doing *upāsanā* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā*, the secondary status of becoming *ativādī* (assertor of

the most exalted) occurs. But by the direct (*aparokṣa*) knowledge of *satya* (ever-existent) *ātmā* (*bhūmā*) that (*ativāditva*) happens to be the foremost.

From the standpoint of the ultimate reality (*satya*) *ātmā*, the inert and false *prāṇa* cannot be considered as actual *ātmā* though it has an exalted status in comparison with the rest of Creation. Therefore the *upāsaka* who has done the *upāsana* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā* fruitfully can be *ativādī* only secondarily. The *jñānī* who knows *ātmā* (*bhūmā*) alone is the true *ativādī*. It is just like the prime minister of a kingdom being called as king secondarily because he is superior to other ministers and the rest of the employees. But he himself is secondary in relation to the king.

By revealing the knower of *satya ātmā* alone as the foremost *ativādī*, Sanatkumāra knocked down the complacency from Nārada's mind of having become *ativādī* by knowing *prāṇa* as *ātmā*. As expected, this prompted Nārada to aspire to gain the direct knowledge of *satya ātmā* and become the *ativādī* in the true sense. So he requests *guru* accordingly.

कारुण्यातिशयं दृष्ट्वा सन्तुष्टो नारदोऽब्रवीत् ।
सत्येनैवातिवादी स्यामनृतस्यात्मतां त्यजन् ॥३३॥

कारुण्यातिशयम् - exceeding compassion
(on the part of *guru*) दृष्ट्वा - having seen

सन्तुष्टः - pleased नारदः - Nārada अब्रवीत् -
requested अनृतस्य - of the false *prāṇa*
आत्मताम् - the notion of taking it to be
ātmā त्यजन् - giving up सत्येन - by knowing
the *satya ātmā* एव - only अतिवादी - assertor
of the most exalted स्याम् - I want to
become—(33)

33. Having seen the exceeding compassion (on the part of *guru*) the pleased Nārada requested him: ‘Giving up the notion of taking the false *prāṇa* to be *ātmā*, I want to become the *ativādī* by knowing the *satya ātmā* only’.

Nārada could find out now that total freedom from sorrows is possible only by knowing *satya ātmā* and not even by the *upāsana* of *prāṇa* as *ātmā*. This also tallied with what he had come to know from great masters that *ātmājñānī* alone gets freed from sorrows totally. Sanatkumāra continues his teaching. He advises the means of knowing *satya* one by one, keeping in view the difference between the mode of taking to *upāsana* and the means that are indispensable to know *satya*. Therefore he first draws the contrast between these two distinct pursuits.

विचारणीयं तत्सत्यं विज्ञानमननादिभिः ।
ध्यानवन्नोक्तिमात्रेण बुध्येतेत्यब्रवीद् गुरुः ॥३४॥

तत् - that सत्यम् - *satya* विज्ञान-
मननादिभिः - by (the means of) *vijñāna*,

manana, etc. विचारणीयम् - should be inquired into ध्यानवत् - like meditation (*upāsanā*) उक्तिमात्रेण - by (my) statements alone न बुध्येत - one cannot know इति - thus गुरुः - the *guru* अब्रवीत् - replied – (34)

34. The *guru* replied: That *satya* should be inquired into by (the means of) *vijñāna*, *manana*, etc. One cannot know it by (my) statements alone like *upāsanā*.

Till now Nārada was accustomed to practice the *upāsanās* by implicit obedience to the *guru's* instruction without any inquiry into them. This method is effective only in the realm of *sādhana-sādhyā* (do something and achieve its result). But it is inapplicable in knowing an entity in its true nature. To know an entity needs an inquiry guided by the valid means of knowledge, (i.e. *pramāṇa*), elimination of doubts with the help of reasoning in accordance with the *śruti* culminating in its direct cognition free from contrary notions. That is why Sanatkumāra cautions Nārada that *satya ātmā* cannot be known merely through my statements. It needs an earnest inquiry on the part of *mumukṣu* as guided by the Upaniṣads and the *guru's* teaching. Thus to become the foremost *ativādī* (assertor of the most exalted) the necessary means are *vijñāna* (exact knowledge of *satya* free from doubts and error), and *manana*

(reflection by reasoning), etc. The subsequent means referred to by the word 'etc.' are: *śraddhā*, *niṣṭhā*, *kṛti*, *sukha* (vs.35 to 38, Ch.U.7-16 to 7-22). Each of these will be explained. The Upaniṣad has enumerated them in such an order that the subsequent one serves as the cause of the preceding one.

The meaning of the word '*vijñāna*' is explained.

संशयं च विपर्यासं

निराकृत्य विशेषतः ।

यदा जानाति विज्ञानात्

सत्यवादी भवेत् तदा ॥३५॥

यदा - when a *mumukṣu* संशयम् - doubt च - and विपर्यासम् - error निराकृत्य - having eliminated completely विशेषतः - exactly in its true nature जानाति - knows (*satya*) (that is called *vijñāna*) तदा - then विज्ञानात् - by *vijñāna* सत्यवादी भवेत् - he becomes a *satyavādī* – (35)

35. When a *mumukṣu* having eliminated completely the doubt and error knows (*satya*) exactly in its true nature, (that is called *vijñāna*). Then by that *vijñāna* he becomes a *satyavādī*.

What needs to become a *satyavādī* is the direct (or called *aparokṣa*) knowledge of *ātmā* (*Bhūmā*). It is said to be direct because unlike the knowledge of the objective world there is no *tripuṭī* of *pramātā* (knower), *pramā* (*jñāna*-

vṛtti) and the *prameya* (the entity that is known by *pramātā* as one's object). What remains there is only the self-evident (*svayam-prakāśa*) *ātmā* (*bhūmā*). Even the last trace of the entity from the Created world in the form of *ātmākāra-vṛtti* has dropped having served its purpose of ending *avidyā*. This is also called *Brahmasākṣātkāra* or *aparokṣa Brahmajñāna*. This is described here as *vijñāna*. The one who has the knowledge of *satya* in this manner is *satyavādī*. The same person was referred to earlier as 'satyena ativadati' (*Ch.U.7-16-1*). He knows *satya* and therefore is the true or foremost *ativādī*.

The *śruti* enumerates further the subsequent means necessary to accomplish *vijñāna*. They are: *manana*, *śraddhā*, *niṣṭhā*, *kṛti* and *sukha*, (i.e. the knowledge of happiness) (*Ch.U.7-18-1* to *7-22-1*). The next three verses ascertain their nature indicating how the

subsequent means is the cause of the previous one.

विज्ञानहेतुर्मननमन्वयव्यतिरेकभाक् ।

श्रद्धामननहेतुः स्यादागमाचार्यवाक्ययोः ॥३६॥

अन्वयव्यतिरेकभाक् - the one having the *anvaya* (continuance) and *vyatireka* (discontinuance) method of reasoning (as its nature) मननम् - reflection विज्ञानहेतुः - is the cause of *vijñāna* मननहेतुः - the cause of *manana* आगमाचार्यवाक्ययोः - in the statements of the *śruti* and the teaching of *ācārya* श्रद्धा - *śraddhā* (faith) स्यात् - is - (36)

36. *Manana* (reflection) having the *anvaya* (continuance) and *vyatireka* (discontinuance) method of reasoning (as its nature) is the cause of *vijñāna*. The cause of *manana* is the *śraddhā* (faith) in the statements of the *śruti* and the teaching of *ācārya*.

The reasoning in accordance with the *śruti* (*śrutisammata*) is the back-bone of *manana*. Four types of reasoning are primarily employed, as well as others derived from these. They are all based on the method of *anvaya* and *vyatireka*. *Anvaya* stands for continuance (*anuvṛtti*) or relation (*saṃbandha*), while *vyatireka* stands for discontinuance or absence (*abhāva*). Both these are invaluable assets in the system of reasoning. The cause-effect relationship can be established on their basis. These modes of reasoning lead to the ascertainment of the *sāhacarya niyama* called *vyāpti* (invariable concomitance or co-existence) which is indispensable for inference (*anumāna*). The identity (*aikya*) or distinction (*bheda*) of two things is verily known through them.

The following are the four kinds of reasoning (*Siddhāntabindu* – Śrī Madhusūdana Saraswatī).

i) *Dṛgdṛśyānvaya-vyatirekaḥ* – The mode of reasoning where there is *anvaya* (continuance, relation) of *dṛk*, and *vyatireka* (absence) of *dṛśya*.

Dṛk is the cognitive principle, the knowledge-principle in general. *Dṛśya* stands for all known things. *Dṛk* exists independent of *dṛśya*. *Dṛk* is the cognitive principle by its very nature, but the *dṛśyas* like pot, cloth, etc., are by nature made of five elements or their causes. They are not *dṛśyas* by nature since they have no independent existence as *dṛśya* without being related to *dṛk*. They get the status of being *dṛśya* by virtue of their relation with *dṛk* and not otherwise. Therefore *dṛk* exists at all times and has continuance (*anvaya*) in *dṛśya*, (or has relation with *dṛśya*) whereas *dṛśya* has absence (*vyatireka*) because it is transient and is subject to discontinuance. *Dṛśya* does not have the status of being *dṛśya* all the time because its status is only in relation to *dṛk*. A thing that appears to exist at certain times and not at others is false (*mithyā*) in nature. Thus *dṛśya* is false. The same logic applies to the other modes of *anvaya-vyatireka*.

ii) *Sākṣīsākṣyānvaya-vyatirekaḥ* – The mode of reasoning where there is *anvaya* (continuance) of *sākṣī* and *vyatireka* (absence) of *sākṣya*.

Sākṣī is the cognitive illuminating principle in each and every one of us. It is the principle that makes things known in particular. *Sākṣya* is the illumined, the thing made known by *sākṣī*. The status of *sākṣya* is possible only in relation to *sākṣī*. *Sākṣya* is false (*mithyā*) since it does not have the status of being *sākṣya* all the time. But *sākṣī* is real because of always being a very *dṛk* – the cognitive principle. It is invariably related to *sākṣya*. Thus *sākṣī* has *anvaya* whereas *sākṣya* has *vyatireka*.

iii) *Āgamāpāyī-tadavadhyanvaya-vyatirekaḥ* – The mode of reasoning where there is the *anvaya-vyatireka* connection between the transitory (*āgamāpāyī*) thing having birth (beginning) and destruction (end), and its outermost limit or basis (*tadavadhi*).

Take for instance the mud pot and mud. The mud pot is made of mud and is subject to destruction. It is called *āgamāpāyī*. The mud is the outermost limit (*tadavadhi*) or basis of the mud pot. The mud pot is false (*mithyā*) because it is transitory (*āgamāpāyī*) whereas its basis, mud, always exists in the relative sense. This reasoning helps to ascertain the false nature of inert Creation in contrast to the ever-existing nature of Brahman.

iv) *Duḥkhi-paramapremāspadānvaya-vyatirekaḥ* – The mode of reasoning where there is an *anvaya-vyatireka* connection between *duḥkhittvam* – the state of being sorrowful – and one's true nature, the locus of limitless love. *Ātmā* is limitless happiness. Therefore, it is the locus of limitless love. This nature of *ātmā* continues even in the state of sorrow. However, sorrow is totally absent in the direct cognition of *paramapremāspada* or *paramānandarūpa ātmā*. Therefore the state of sorrow is false. If this were not so, sorrow would be experienced even in the direct knowledge of *ātmā*, in which case *mokṣa* would be impossible.

The above four (and other similar) methods of reasoning are based on *anuvṛtta-vyāvṛttānvaya-vyatirekaḥ* – a mode of reasoning where there is the *anvaya* of *anuvṛtta* (uninterrupted presence) and *vyatireka* of *vyāvṛtta* (non-existence in something). *Dr̥k* continues to be in *dr̥śya* whereas *dr̥śya* is absent in *dr̥k*. *Sākṣī* is present in *sākṣya*, but *sākṣya* is not in *sākṣī*. The basis (*tadavadhi*) of a transitory (*āgamāpāyi*) thing continues to be in that transitory thing whereas the transitory thing ceases to be in its basis. The locus of limitless love (*paramapremāspadaātmā*) is ever present in the sorrowful person (*duḥkhī*), but the *duḥkhī* is not present in *paramapremāspada*.

These modes of reasoning are in accordance with the truth enunciated in the Upaniṣads. Bādarāyaṇa (Vyāsa) also employed them while composing the *Brahmasūtras* to ascertain the import of Upaniṣadic statements.

The cause of *manana* is *śraddhā*. It is the firm conviction that the promised result is bound to take place. The *bhāṣya* describes it as ‘*āstikya-buddhi*’ (attitude of trust with respect to the ultimate reality, scriptures and teaching of the *guru*). More about the *śraddhā* was discussed in the context of verse 28.

श्रद्धायाः कारणं निष्ठा सदा

शुश्रूषणं हि सा ।

चित्तैकाग्र्यकृतिर्यासौ निष्ठायाः

कारणं भवेत् ॥३७॥

श्रद्धायाः - of *śraddhā* कारणम् - cause निष्ठा - is *niṣṭhā* सा - that (*niṣṭhā*) हि - indeed (is) सदा - always शुश्रूषणम् - serving the competent *guru* या - whatever चित्तैकाग्र्यकृतिः - *kṛti* (doing) in the form of efforts to make the mind single pointed असौ - that (*kṛti*) निष्ठायाः - of *niṣṭhā* कारणम् - cause भवेत् - becomes – (37)

37. *Niṣṭhā* is the cause of *śraddhā*. That *niṣṭhā* indeed (is) always serving the competent *guru*. Whatever *kṛti* (doing) in the form of efforts to make

the mind single pointed becomes the cause of *niṣṭhā*.

The word *niṣṭhā* means firm adherence or commitment. Here it is towards gaining the *Brahma-vijñāna*. Its nature is described by *śuśrūṣaṇam* or what is called *śuśrūṣā*. According to the usage the *śuśrūṣā* is service, but etymologically it means 'the desire to listen'. Both meanings are applicable in this context. The listening to the scriptures through the teachings of the *guru* attentively is to grasp it correctly. Then only the resultant *saṃskāras* (impressions) become firm leading to one's conduct accordingly. Only then the *mumukṣu* can develop firm adherence to the pursuit of *Brahma-vijñāna*. That enhances the required *śraddhā* in the goal and the means. Otherwise the person can get drifted away easily from one's goal by other distractions.

The *śuśrūṣā* as the service of the *guru* who is *śrotriya* and *Brahmaniṣṭha* lends an added advantage to be in his proximity besides listening to the teaching. That provides more opportunities of listening and getting the doubts clarified. The exemplary conduct of the *guru* even under the adverse circumstances shows his steadfastness in the *ātma-svarūpa*. This develops the *śraddhā* in the goal of *Brahma-vijñāna* and its means. Thus *niṣṭhā* as *śuśrūṣā*

(service to the *guru*) is also the cause of *śraddhā*.

The *niṣṭhā* in the goal of gaining *ātmajñāna* cannot be gained by the extrovert mind preoccupied in the sense-pursuits and the senses galloping towards the sense-objects. Therefore the single pointed application of the mind (*cittaikāgrya*) and mastery (*saṃyama*) of the senses (*indriyas*) running after the *viśayas* (sense-objects) is unavoidable. The efforts to accomplish the *indriya-saṃyama* and *cittaikāgratā* is *kṛti*. By the effectiveness of *kṛti* only other means from *niṣṭhā* to *vijñāna* can be fruitful.

After all a human is utilitarian. The mind and the senses long for sense-objects and become extrovert only because of the hope that some joy will be available therein. Everyone works for happiness and not for sorrow. Naturally the question arises as to what am I going to get in return if the means from *kṛti* to *vijñāna* are taken to? In the absence of some spectacular and higher reward than the sense-pleasures, there cannot be any motivation to practice the means such as *kṛti*, etc. When the *mumukṣu* comes to know that in *vijñāna* called *mukti* there is limitless, independent, everlasting happiness totally free from sorrows, he takes to *kṛti*, etc., with all zeal. Therefore the *śruti* presents the understanding of

such *sukha* (called *bhūmā*) as the cause of *kṛti* (*Ch.U.7-22-1*). This statement of the *śruti* is explained.

सुखमस्तीति धीर्मुक्तौ कृतेस्तस्याः प्रयोजिका ।
तद्विहीनो यमाद्यैर्नो चित्तैकाग्र्यङ्करोति हि॥३८॥

मुक्तौ - in the liberation (called *vijñāna*) सुखम् अस्ति - there is limitless happiness (called *bhūmā*) इति धीः - such an understanding तस्याः कृतेः - of that *kṛti* प्रयोजिका - is the cause तद्विहीनः - the person who lacks that understanding यमाद्यैः - by the disciplines such as *yama*, etc. चित्तैकाग्र्यम् - single pointedness (or concentration) of the mind न उ करोति - does not practice at all हि - certainly - (38)

38. There is limitless happiness in *mukti* (liberation called *vijñāna*). Such an understanding is the cause of that *kṛti*. The person who lacks that understanding, certainly does not practice at all the single pointedness (or concentration) of the mind by the disciplines such as *yama*, etc.

Only on being convinced totally that the *cittaikāgratā* and *indriya-samyama* will finally lead to limitless happiness, a person takes to their means called *kṛti*. Without the accomplishment of the subsequent means the earlier ones cannot be taken to. As a result the *vijñāna* cannot be gained. On the

contrary when the subsequent means such as *kṛti*, etc., are accomplished, the prior ones become practicable easily. Then the *vijñāna* of *satya* takes place naturally. In that case no separate efforts are necessary to gain *vijñāna*. *Yama*, *niyama*, etc., are the *aṅgās* (essential requisites) of *aṣṭāṅgayoga* which is a means to attain *samādhi*.

BHŪMAVIDYĀ

Nārada by now could find out that the nature of *sukha* (happiness) needs to be known. So he expresses his desire to know *sukha* (*Ch.U.7-22*). Sanatkumāra in reply discloses the topmost secret which every human is expected to know. He replies: 'Whatever that is *bhūmā* (limitless, infinite) that is *sukha* (happiness). There is no *sukha* in whatever that is *alpa* (finite)' (*Ch.U.7-23*). The synonyms of *Bhūmā* are *mahat* (infinite, limitless), *niratiśaya* (most excellent, most happy), *bahu* (plentiful, abundant). That which is inferior to it because of being subject to increase and decrease (*sātiśaya*) is *alpa* (finite). Therefore there is no *sukha* (happiness) in *alpa*. It is the cause of more and more *trṣṇā* (desire, hankering, greed). *Trṣṇā* (or *alpa*) is the cause of sorrow. A source of sorrow cannot be *sukha*. Therefore it is appropriate that there is no *sukha* in *alpa*. *Bhūmā* alone is *sukha*. In *bhūmā*, there cannot be *trṣṇa*, etc., which

produce sorrows (*Ch.U.Bh.7-23-1*). This topic is now being explained.

सुखं किमिति चेद् भूमा

सुखमल्पे तु तन्न हि ।

क्लिश्यत्यल्पधनोऽन्यस्मिन्

धनबाहुल्यदर्शनात् ॥३९॥

सुखं किम् - what is *sukha*? इति चेत् - if it is asked so, (listen) भूमा - *bhūmā* is *sukha* अल्पे - in the *alpa* तु - but तत् सुखम् - that *sukha* न हि - certainly (is) not there अन्यस्मिन् - in another person धनबाहुल्यदर्शनात् - because of seeing abundance of wealth अल्पधनः - person with less wealth क्लिश्यति - suffers – (39)

39. If it is asked what is *sukha* (happiness)? Please listen: ‘*Bhūmā* (limitless, infinite) is *sukha*’. But, certainly *sukha* is not there in the *alpa* (finite). For example, the person with less wealth suffers because of seeing abundance of wealth in another person.

The word *bhūman* in the masculine gender literally means plenty or abundance. But primarily it means *Virāṭ puruṣa* or Brahman itself as used here. In the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* the word *bhūmā* is used for the principle of *Bhagavān (Parameśvara)* (5-18-30). Grammatically by adding the suffix ‘*imanic*’ (इमनिच्) in the abstract sense to the adjective *bahu* (plentiful, abundant) the noun ‘*bhūman*’ is derived. But the

plentiful (*bahu*) that is limitless, independent and everlasting can only be Brahman and that itself is *sukha*. How the *alpa* (finite) is the source of sorrow is demonstrated by the illustration of more and less rich persons. *Alpa* breeds desires, hankering and sorrows. Therefore anything that is finite is not worth procuring. A mature person must long for the limitless that is *bhūmā* having the nature of infinite happiness. That alone is the source of all sense-pleasures which are invariably limited and fleeting in nature whether enjoyed by *Hiranyagarbha* or any insignificant creature. Therefore sense-pleasures are not worth striving for except the minimum use of sense-objects for the upkeep of the body until the *Brahmajñāna* is gained.

What exactly is the nature of *bhūmā* and *alpa* is further explained in the format of question and answer based on the *śruti* (*Ch.U. 7-24-1*).

भूमः सुखत्वे भूमा कः किमल्पमिति चेत् शृणु ।
ज्ञातृज्ञेयज्ञानहीनो भूमा विच्छेदवर्जनात् ॥४०॥

भूमः सुखत्वे - if *bhūmā* is having the nature of *sukha* भूमा कः - who exactly is *bhūmā*? अल्पं किम् - what is *alpa*? इति चेत् - if it is asked so शृणु - please listen ज्ञातृज्ञेयज्ञानहीनः - the entity free from the knower (*ahaṃkāra*), the object known and the *viśaya-vṛtti* (thought

conforming to the object known) which imparts the knowledge भूमा - is *bhūmā* (because) विच्छेदवर्जनात् - it has no divisions (limitations) whatsoever (such as that of time, space and objects, etc.)—(40)

40. If the nature of *bhūmā* is *sukha* who exactly is *bhūmā*? What is *alpa*? If it is asked so, please listen. The entity free from the knower (*ahaṃkāra*), the object known and the *viśaya-vṛtti* (thought conforming to the object known) which imparts the knowledge is *bhūmā* (because) it has no divisions (limitations) whatsoever (such as that of time, space, objects and *tripuṭī*, etc.).

It is necessary to know exactly what *bhūmā* and *alpa* are to get freed from the sorrows of *alpa*. All types of knowledge we can gain from this world is through the medium of *tripuṭī* consisting of knower (*jñātā*, *pramāta*, *ahaṃkāra*), known (*jñeya*, *prameya*) and the *vṛtti* (thought) which makes it known (*jñāna-vṛtti*). Therefore all objective knowledge gained by the entity knower (*ahaṃkāra*) is bound to be limited leading to sorrow. Only the knowledge of *ātmā/bhūmā* is limitless because *tripuṭī* is not there in it. *Bhūmā* is self-evident *ātmā* only. The second line of this verse is the explanation of *śruti*-statement, ‘*bhūmā* is that wherein nothing else is seen, heard or known’

(*Ch.U.7-24-1*) which points out the total absence of *tripuṭī* in it (*bhūmā*).

The three constituents of *tripuṭī* are distinct from one another. ‘In the state of *avidyā* (self-ignorance) one sees, hears, knows different entities by the means quite different from the seer and the seen, etc.’ That is *alpa* (*Ch.U.7-24-1*). This is elaborated in the next verse.

ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयरूपं मायाकार्यमिदं जगत् ।
बहुविच्छेदयुक्तत्वादल्पमित्यभिधीयते ॥४१॥

इदम् - this ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयरूपम् - consisting of *tripuṭī* comprising the knower (*ahaṃkāra*), *vṛtti* conforming to the object, and the known object मायाकार्यम् - effect of *māyā* जगत् - *jagat*, world बहुविच्छेदयुक्तत्वात् - because of having many divisions (or limitations) अल्पम् - *alpa* (finite) इति - so अभिधीयते - is called—(41)

41. This *jagat*, the effect of *māyā*, consisting of *tripuṭī* comprising the knower (*ahaṃkāra*), the *vṛtti* conforming to the object and the known object is called *alpa* (finite) because of having many divisions (or limitations).

The *tripuṭī* casts limitations. There is expanse or more precisely the all pervasiveness only in *tripuṭī*'s absence. *Ātmā*/Brahman alone can be the all pervasive principle since it transcends even the space. Everything other than it is the product of *māyā*

having *tripuṭī* and so is invariably destructible on account of unavoidable limitations such as space, time and objects. Therefore the *dr̥śya jagat* is *alpa*. In short the entity free from the limitations such as space, time, etc., is Brahman called *bhūmā* whereas the *jagat* having manifold limitations is *alpa*.

The *śruti* draws another contrast between *bhūmā* and *alpa*. It says that the nature of *bhūmā* is *amṛta* (immortal, indestructible) where as *alpa* is *martya* (mortal, destructible) (*Ch.U.7-24-1*). This phrase is explained by quoting the statement of *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa (*B.G.2-24*) in the first line of the next verse.

अच्छेद्योऽयमदाह्योऽयमक्लेद्योऽशोष्य एव च ।
भूमा तस्मादमर्त्योऽयमल्पं मर्त्यमतद्विधम् ॥४२॥

अयम् - this (*bhūmā*) अच्छेद्यः - cannot be cut अयम् - this (*bhūmā*) अदाह्यः - cannot be burnt अक्लेद्यः - cannot be made wet अशोष्यः - cannot be dried up च - and एव - certainly तस्मात् - therefore भूमा - *bhūmā* अमर्त्यः - is immortal अयम् - this अल्पम् - finite (*alpa*) मर्त्यम् - is mortal अतद्विधम् - (because) it is dissimilar—(42)

42. This *bhūmā* certainly cannot be cut, burnt, made wet and dried up. Therefore it is immortal, but this *alpa* being dissimilar is mortal.

The cutting, burning, wetting

leading to decay and destruction, and drying up indicate all means of destruction. These means can operate only in the realm of Created world which is the product of *māyā*. No means of destruction has any access in *ātmā/bhūmā*. Therefore it is *amṛta* (immortal). *Alpa* is full of limitations is *martya* (mortal) in nature.

How the *jagat* is *alpa* and mortal (*martya*) in nature is proved.

संसारकाल एवास्ति न मुक्तावल्पता ततः ।
मुक्तौ ज्ञाननिवर्त्यत्वान्मर्त्यं जगदितीर्यते ॥४३॥

अल्पता - finitude संसारकाले - during the period of *saṃsāra* एव - only अस्ति - is there मुक्तौ - in the *mukti* न - it is not there ततः - therefore मुक्तौ - in *mukti* ज्ञाननिवर्त्यत्वात् - because (it) disappears by *ātmajñāna* जगत् - the *jagat* मर्त्यम् इति - as mortal ईर्यते - is said—(43)

43. The finitude exists only during the period of *saṃsāra*, (but) not in the *mukti*. Therefore the *jagat* is called mortal because it disappears in *mukti* by *ātmajñāna*.

The *alpa* (finite) is that which is inferior to *bhūmā*/Brahman. An entity other than non-dual *bhūmā* can only be the falsely superimposed *jagat* projected by the *avidyā*. That alone can be finite (*alpa*) because of having birth, destruction, changes, etc. In the

non-dual *bhūmā* there is no scope for anything that is *alpa*. In the wake of *ātmajñāna* which is synonymous with *mukti* (liberation) *avidyā* ceases to be there along with its effect the *jagat*. Therefore the finite (*alpa*) *jagat* alone is mortal (*martya*). It cannot exist for ever. In fact by *ātmajñāna* it is found that *samsāra* or *jagat* truly cannot be there at any time. It gets *bādhita* (sublated).

The reason why *bhūmā* is *amṛta* (immortal) is told.

संसारमोक्षयोर्भूमा विद्यते

सोऽमृतस्ततः ।

अखण्डैकरसानन्दः सोऽयमात्मा

स्वयंप्रभः ॥४४॥

भूमा - *bhūmā* संसार मोक्षयोः - in both the *samsāra* and *mokṣa* (liberation) विद्यते - is there (without any change) ततः - therefore सः - that (*bhūmā*) अमृतः - is immortal सः - *bhūmā* (itself) अयम् आत्मा - this is *ātmā* स्वयंप्रभः - it is self-evident अखण्डैकरसानन्दः - limitless non-changing happiness – (44)

44. *Bhūmā* is there (without any change) in both the *samsāra* and *mokṣa* (liberation). Therefore it is immortal (*amṛta*). *Bhūmā* itself is the *ātmā*. It is self-evident (*svayam-prakāśa*) limitless non-changing happiness.

Bhūmā is the ceaseless ever-existent non-dual principle without any

change or limitation. Such an entity is necessarily immortal. It is identical with *ātmā*. If it were not so, *ātmā* will cast limitation to it as another entity. In that case on account of such limitation, *bhūmā* will get reduced to *alpa* (finite). Its nature is self-luminous limitless happiness that never changes. It is *akhaṇḍa* because of being free from *tripuṭī* and other limitations. It is *svayam-prabha* because it is self-knowing principle that does not need anything else to know it.

Some may question the *amṛta* (immortal) nature of *bhūmā/ātmā* because it is not known in the swoon and sleep. Therefore its self-evident nature is clearly described.

मूर्च्छासुप्त्योस्तादृशोऽयमज्ञानेन तिरोहितः ।
समाधिसुप्तिमूर्च्छासु भासते साधनं विना ॥४५॥

तादृशः अयम् - *ātmā* (*bhūmā*) of such nature, (i.e. self-evident limitless *ānanda*) मूर्च्छासुप्त्योः - in the swoon and sleep अज्ञानेन - by self-ignorance तिरोहितः - is concealed समाधिसुप्तिमूर्च्छासु - in the *samādhi*, sleep and swoon साधनं विना - without any other means भासते - is evident – (45)

45. (Even though), the *ātmā* (*bhūmā*) is of such nature, (i.e. self-evident limitless *ānanda*) it is concealed by self-ignorance in the state of swoon and sleep. It is truly evident in the (states

of) *samādhi*, sleep and swoon without any other means.

Though *ātmā* is truly present as self-evident knowledge-principle in the sleep and swoon, its presence therein is not clearly understood by the lay people. In fact only because of its presence is everyone able to recollect afterwards that ‘I slept well, I did not know anything’ or ‘I had fainted, now I have revived’. Such a recollection on the contrary proves the presence of self-cognitive principle *ātmā* therein even in the absence of the usual means of knowing such as the mind, *indriyas*, etc. This fact is highlighted in the second line of this verse. The *antaḥkaraṇa* (mind, intellect) and senses are absent in *samādhi*, etc. Even then, *ātmā* reveals their absence therein. In the *nirvikalpa samādhi* the self-evident *ātmā* alone shines cognitively on its own in the absence of the entire *dṛśya prapañca* superimposed on it by *avidyā/māyā*.

What is told in the earlier verse is further explained with the help of an illustration.

मेघेनाच्छादितः सूर्यो यथा तद्वत् स्वयंप्रभः ।
अज्ञानेनावृतो भूमा प्राणिभिर्न विभाव्यते ॥४६॥

यथा - just as मेघेन आच्छादितः - covered by the cloud सूर्यः - the sun (is not seen) तद्वत् - similarly स्वयंप्रभः - self-evident भूमा - *bhūmā* अज्ञानेनावृतः -

covered by the ignorance प्राणिभिः - by the people न विभाव्यते - is not known – (46)

46. Just as the sun covered by the cloud is not seen, similarly the self-evident *bhūmā* covered by the ignorance is not known by the people.

When we say that the clouds have covered the sun, it means that our sight is covered by the clouds. The self-luminous sun cannot be covered by the clouds. On the contrary the presence of clouds or that it is a day and not a night in spite of no sunshine is known only because of the sun being present. Similarly the ignorance of oneself covers the *buddhi* (intellect). As a result, the *ātmā/bhūmā* because of which all our *vyavahāras* such as all the activities and experiences take place is not known. Our life itself is possible because of *bhūmā* and yet it is not known in its true nature.

Knowledge is opposed to ignorance. Then how can the *ātmā* which is the limitless knowledge-principle be covered by the ignorance? The answer follows.

स्वप्रकाशात्मचैतन्यमज्ञानस्य न बाधकम् ।
भासकं प्रत्युतैतस्य स्वानन्दस्य यथा तथा ॥४७॥

स्वप्रकाशात्मचैतन्यम् - *ātmā* in the form of self-luminous *caitanya* (pure awareness principle) अज्ञानस्य - of self-ignorance बाधकम् - opposing न - is not प्रत्युत - on the contrary एतस्य - of this

(ignorance) भासकं - illuminator (one who makes it known) यथा - just as स्वानन्दस्य - (it is the illuminator of) one's nature of happiness (in sleep) तथा - so (it does illuminate the ignorance in sleep)–(47)

47. *Ātmā* in the form of self-luminous *caitanya* (pure awareness principle) is not opposed to self-ignorance. On the contrary it is the illuminator (one who makes it known) of this ignorance. Just as (it is the illuminator of) one's nature of happiness (in sleep), so (it does illuminate the ignorance therein).

आनन्दाऽज्ञानयोः सुप्तौ

चैतन्येनावभासनात् ।

उत्थितः सुखमस्वाप्सं न

जानेऽन्यदिति स्मरेत् ॥४८॥

सुप्तौ - during the sleep आनन्दाऽज्ञानयोः - of both happiness and ignorance चैतन्येन - by *caitanya* अवभासनात् - because of being illuminated उत्थितः - the person having woken up सुखम् अस्वाप्सम् - 'I slept happily' अन्यत् न जाने - 'I did not know anything else' इति - so स्मरेत् - is able to recollect–(48)

48. During the sleep, because of both happiness and ignorance being illuminated (made known) by *caitanya*, the person having woken up is able to

recollect, 'I slept happily, I did not know anything else'.

The self-luminous knowledge-principle (*caitanya*) *ātmā* is the illuminator of entire *dr̥śya anātma prapañca* without any exception including the ignorance. It is an universal experience that the ignorance and happiness are invariably experienced in the deep sleep wherein no other means of experience such as mind, etc., are functioning. In their absence the only principle that enables the experience of ignorance and happiness nature of oneself is *caitanya ātmā* which is also the self-experiencing principle (*anubhava-svarūpa*). That is how all who wake up from sleep recollect: 'I slept happily, I did not know anything'. Therefore self-luminous knowledge-principle *ātmā* is not opposed to ignorance. On the contrary, it illumines it. Thus even the self-luminous *ātmā* is concealed by ignorance.

If ignorance covers the knowledge-principle *ātmā*, the rule 'knowledge destroys the ignorance', that is universally accepted will be null and void. No, this is not the case. 'How is it so?' is explained in the next two verses.

Before proceeding further it is advisable to know how the sacred fire meant for sacrifices is kindled. Two *araṇis* are used for this purpose. An

araṇi is a piece of wood (of the *śamī* tree) used for kindling the sacred fire by attrition. The upper *araṇi* in the form of a churning rod is called *uttarāraṇi*. The lower one in the form of a flat wooden block with a semi-spherical scoop in the center is called *adharāraṇi*. The *uttarāraṇi* is churned vigourously by placing its lower end in the scoop of *adharāraṇi*. By friction the sparks are produced which are tended by cotton or camphor to kindle the sacred fire. The verse 49 gives the illustration (*dr̥ṣṭānta*) of *araṇi* whereas the verse 50 deals with the *dār̥ṣṭānta*.

अरणिस्थो यथा वह्निर्न दहेदरणिं तथा ।
पश्चान्मथनजातोऽसौ साकल्येनारणिं दहेत् ॥४९॥

यथा - just as अरणिस्थः - the one inherent in the *araṇi* वह्निः - the fire अरणिम् - *araṇi* न दहेत् - does not burn तथा - as well as मथनजातः असौ - that (fire) kindled by attrition पश्चात् - subsequently अरणिम् - the *araṇi* साकल्येन - entirely दहेत् - can burn – (49)

49. Just as the fire inherent in the *araṇi* does not burn it, but the fire kindled by attrition (of the same *araṇis*) subsequently can burn the *araṇi* entirely (so is the case with knowledge-principle *ātmā* in the form of *caitanya* and the ignorance – vide vs.50).

तथा वेदान्तवाक्योत्थधीवृत्तौ

प्रतिबिम्बितम् ।

स्वप्रकाशात्मचैतन्यं कृत्स्नाज्ञानस्य

बाधकम् ॥५०॥

तथा - similarly वेदान्तवाक्योत्थधीवृत्तौ - in the *antaḥkaraṇavṛtti* (conforming to the real nature of *ātmā*) born by the *śravaṇa* of *Vedāntamahāvākya* (such as *tat tvam asi*) प्रतिबिम्बितम् - reflected स्वप्रकाशात्मचैतन्यम् - *ātmā* in the form of self-illuminous *caitanya* कृत्स्नाज्ञानस्य - of the entire self-ignorance बाधकम् - (becomes) the one which ends – (50)

50. Similarly, (i.e. as in *araṇi*) the *ātmā* in the form of self-illuminous *caitanya* reflected in *antaḥkaraṇavṛtti* (conforming to the real nature of *ātmā*) born by the *śravaṇa* of the *Vedāntamahāvākya* (such as *tat tvam asi*) ends the self-ignorance.

The fire-principle abiding in the *araṇi* (or any piece of wood) is not opposed to it. It does not burn the *araṇi*. But when the same is kindled or bursts into flame it can burn the *araṇi* entirely. Thus fire is both unopposed and opposed to the wood. Similar is the case with the self-evident knowledge-principle *ātmā* and the ignorance.

Actually it is *ātmā* that makes us

know any ignorance that abides in the *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*). Thus it is not opposed to ignorance. But the same *ātmā* reflected in the *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* having the form or the specification of the entity to be known, (i.e. *tattadākāra-vṛtti* or *viṣayākāra-vṛtti*) ends its ignorance. According to Vedānta, both *jñāna* and *anubhava* of anything are basically the *ābhāsa* appearing in the related *vṛttis*. The *vṛttis* impart features of the entity known or experienced to the *ābhāsa* contained in them. Such a *vṛtti* having the form of the entity to be known is called *jñāna* (knowledge) secondarily because it determines or distinguishes that particular knowledge to be gained. This is told so in the *Vivarāṇa* text (*Ve.P.B.*).

A question can crop up in this context. A *vṛtti* having the form and features of the object to be known is possible because the object has them. But *ātmā* is formless (*nirākāra*) and attributeless (*nirviśeṣa*). Therefore a *vṛtti* (thought) cannot be like *ātmā* which can end its ignorance. This question is answered by *bhāṣyakāra* in his commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* verse (18-50). He says: ‘*Ātmā* is completely *nirmala* (pure – free from all that is *adhyasta*/superimposed), *svaccha* (clear – completely unconnected to the virtues and vices of all the *dr̥śyas* illuminated by it) and *sūkṣma* (subtle – *nirguṇa* – free from the *guṇas*). It is possible for *buddhi*, (i.e. *antaḥkarana*) to assume a form that is exactly like *ātmacaitanya* (as its replica) because it is capable of conforming to the nature of the absolute purity, clarity and subtlety of *ātmā*. Such a *vṛtti* is called *ātmākāra*, *Brahmākāra* or *akhaṇḍākāra*. It is this *vṛtti* secondarily called *jñāna*, bearing the replica of *ātmā* ends the self-ignorance. This is said to be *jñāna* (knowledge) which ends *ajñāna* (ignorance) though the knowledge- principle *caitanyaātmā* by itself is not opposed to ignorance.

The nature of *bhūmā* as *amṛta* (immortal) begun from the verse 44 is concluded. Or from another standpoint the ending of *avidyā* described above is corroborated by the direct experience of a *jñānī*.

तस्माद् विज्ञानसहितः

समाधावनुभूय हि ।

भूमानन्दं यथाशास्त्रं स्मृत्वा

व्युत्थाय वक्ति च ॥५१॥

तस्मात् - therefore विज्ञानसहितः -
having *ātmākāra* or *bhūmākāravṛtti*
(विद्वान् - *jñānī*) समाधौ - in the *samādhi*
भूमानन्दम् - *bhūmānanda* अनुभूय - having
experienced हि - only व्युत्थाय - having got
out from it स्मृत्वा - having remembered
bhūmānanda यथाशास्त्रम् - according to
the scriptures च - and वक्ति - describes (it)
–(51)

51. (Because the *ātmā* coupled with *ātmākāra-vṛtti* destroys *avidyā*) therefore (the *jñānī*) with such a *vṛtti* having experienced *bhūmānanda* on in

the *samādhi*, after getting out from it remembering the same describes it according to the scriptures.

The word *vijñāna* as *ātmasākṣātkāra* signifies the *aparokṣa-anubhava* (direct experience without *tripuṭī*) of *ātmā/bhūmā/Brahman*. In *ātmākāra* or *akhaṇḍākāra vṛtti* which is a replica of *ātmā* there is no room for any *anātma-vṛtti*. It is precisely defined by the *śāstras*. It ends the *avidyā* of *ātmā*. Such a person who has ascertained the true nature of *ātmā* by Vedānta *pramāṇa* when accomplishes *samādhi* which has the total absorption of *antaḥkaraṇa* in *ātmā*, there being no other *vṛtti* the *jñāna* becomes steadfast. Such a steadfastness of *akhaṇḍākāravṛtti* to the total exclusion of other *vṛttis* is very essential in the beginning. Thereafter even the appearance of some *anātma-vṛttis* does not affect the *ātmajñāna*. The correctness of the experience in the *samādhi* as *ātmasākṣātkāra* needs to be verified in accordance with the *śāstra-pramāṇa*. That is why when *jñānī* expresses his experience of *bhūmānanda* (*ātmānanda/Brahmānanda*), it tallies with the description in the *śāstras*. If it does not, it can be easily concluded that his claim of having experienced the *bhūmānanda* or having got *aparokṣānubhava* of *ātmā* is not correct.

If *ānanda* in the form of *bhūmā/ātmā* is the true nature of all including the *ajñānī's*, then why is it experienced by only *jñānī*, but not by *ajñānīs*? Here is the answer.

ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयरूपा त्रिपुटी स्वप्नजाग्रतोः ।
भूमानन्दं तिरोधत्ते विद्वांस्त्वभिभवत्यमुम् ॥५२॥

ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयरूपा - having the nature of knower (*jñātā*), specific objective knowledge (*jñāna*) (*vṛtti*) and the object known (*jñeya*) त्रिपुटी - a trio स्वप्नजाग्रतोः - in the waking and the dream (अविदुषाम् - of *ajñānī's*) भूमानन्दं - *bhūmānanda* तिरोधत्ते

- conceals तु - but विद्वां - *jñānī* अमुम् - that (trio) अभिभवति - overcomes—(52)

52. The trio having the nature of knower (*jñātā*), specific objective knowledge (*jñāna*) (*vṛtti*) and the object known (*jñeya*), conceals the *bhūmānanda* (of *ajñānī's*) in the waking and the dream states, but the *jñānī* overcomes that (trio).

Though the *ānanda* is the true nature of everyone, the self-ignorance and its effects conceal it. Therefore its experience is not available for all. In *Brahmajñāna* the ignorance ends and as

its result the *jñānī* is able to experience it. *Ānanda* manifests in *samādhi* because the *tripuṭī* is not functional therein. Though *tripuṭī* is absent in the deep sleep state the *ānanda* is concealed by ignorance. Though there is some experience of *ānanda* in sleep it is not evidently manifest because of being covered by the ignorance. There being *tripuṭī* along with the covering of ignorance in both the waking and the dream states, the *bhūmānanda* (which is distinct from *viṣayānanda* – sense-pleasures) is not at all cognized. In *bhūmā* there is no *tripuṭī* which divides experience into three parts. While the *tripuṭī* is there in the waking and dream, it is absent in the *samādhi* and deep sleep.

In course of this discussion, the precise nature of *tripuṭī* comprising *jñātā*, *jñāna* and *jñeya* is explained.

चिच्छायावानहङ्कारो ज्ञाता स्याच्चक्षुरादिजा ।
बुद्धिवृत्तिर्भवेज्ज्ञानं ज्ञेया रूपरसादयः ॥५३॥

चिच्छायावान् - one who has *ābhāsa*
अहङ्कारः - thought having the 'I' notion
ज्ञाता - the knower स्यात् - is चक्षुरादिजा - born
of eyes, etc. बुद्धिवृत्तिः - *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*
ज्ञानम् भवेत् - is *jñāna* रूपरसादयः - the
sense-objects such as form, taste, etc.
ज्ञेयाः - (are) the things to be known – (53)

53. The thought (*vṛtti*) in the form

of 'I' notion coupled with *ābhāsa* is the *jñātā* (knower). The *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* born of eyes, etc., is *jñāna* (knowledge). The sense-objects such as form, taste, etc., are *jñeyas* (things to be known).

The word '*jñātā*' means the knower. The *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* having the form of 'I' notion imbued with inseparable *ābhāsa* is the *jñātā*. In the absence of *vṛtti* having 'I' notion in the deep sleep state, there is no *jñātā* even if the sentience is present. There is no experience of 'I know' in sleep. The one who is aware of a specific knowledge newly born is a *jñātā* or also called *pramātā*. But *ātmā* is the ever-existent knowledge-principle. It is not the knowledge of a specific entity that gets born. Therefore *ātmā* is not *jñātā* or *pramātā*. A mere *vṛtti* inert in nature cannot be *jñātā*. It should have *ābhāsa* in it.

The word '*jñāna*' in the context of *tripuṭī* signifies the *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* conforming to the sense-objects perceived through the *indriyas*. With *ābhāsa* in it, such a *vṛtti* ends the ignorance of that object and gives its knowledge. The *antaḥkaraṇa* goes to the sense-object through the channel of appropriate sense-organ and takes its form. It is called *viṣayākāra-antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*. Mere sense-objects without the *antaḥkaraṇa* cannot impart

such *jñāna*. This can be verified by statements such as, ‘my mind was elsewhere, therefore I did not hear’. That is why at places the mind is grouped together with the five *indriyas* as the sixth one (B.G.15-7).

What is known through the *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* is *jñeya*. The form, taste, smell, sound, etc., are *jñeyas*. Their receptacles where these are contained are also *jñeyas* because the total distinction between the attributes and their loci is not accepted.

The concept and the attitude of a *jñānī* towards the *tripuṭī* is described.

त्रिपुटी मायिकी मिथ्येत्येवं विज्ञाय तत्त्ववित् ।
तामुपेक्ष्य करोत्येव भूमानन्दे भरं सदा ॥५४॥

तत्त्ववित् - *Brahmajñānī* त्रिपुटी - the trio of *jñātā*, *jñāna* and *jñeya* मायिकी - is *māyākārya* (effect of *māyā*) (अतः - therefore) मिथ्या - is false इति एवम् - thus विज्ञाय - having known for certain ताम् - that (*tripuṭī*) उपेक्ष्य - having disregarded सदा - always भूमानन्दे - in *bhūmānanda* भरं करोति - abides steadfastly (gains *niṣṭhā*) एव - certainly – (54)

54. A *Brahmajñānī* having known for certain that the trio of *jñātā*, *jñāna* and *jñeya* is *māyākārya* (effect of *māyā*) and therefore false in nature disregards it completely. (Instead), certainly he always abides steadfastly

(gains *niṣṭhā*) in *bhūmānanda*.

This *tripuṭī* comprising *jñātā*, *jñāna* and *jñeya* is a projection of *māyā*. So it is false (*mithyā*) in nature. These three come and go repeatedly in the presence of *sākṣī* which is nothing but *ātmā* considered as all illuminating principle at the individual level of *jīva*. Because of such transient nature of *tripuṭī* also its *mithyā* nature can be verified. There is no *tripuṭī* in *Brahmasākṣātkāra*.

After gaining *Brahmasākṣātkāra* the *mithyā* nature of *tripuṭī* becomes very evident. Earlier in the state of ignorance the *tripuṭī* because of its divisions used to conceal *Brahmānanda*. But after *niṣṭhā* in *bhūmānanda*, even at times due to *prārabdha* of the *jñānī* if *tripuṭī* seemingly appears to be there, it can no longer obstruct *bhūmānanda*. It is just like seeing a snake-like form even after seeing clearly the rope that is the basis of the mistaken snake. Such an appearance cannot frighten. Similarly the *bādhita* (sublated) *tripuṭī* cannot conceal *bhūmānanda* or give the afflictions of *samsāra*.

PRATISHṬHĀ (BASIS) OF BHŪMĀ

Having listened to the nature of *bhūmā*, Nārada asks its basis. Sanatkumāra replies: ‘either *bhūmā* is based in its greatness (glory) or in no

greatness (glory) whatsoever' (*Ch.U.7-24-1*). This is explained up to the verse 63.

अखण्डैकरसं भूमानन्दं श्रुत्वा स नारदः ।
भूम्यसम्भावनां मत्वा पप्रच्छाधारमस्य हि ॥५५॥

सः नारदः - the well-known Nārada
अखण्डैकरसम् - the non-divisible (full)
and changeless (stable) भूमानन्दम् -
bhūmānanda श्रुत्वा - having listened to
भूमि असम्भावनां मत्वा - considering the
existence of such *bhūmā* to be
impossible अस्य - of *bhūmā* आधारम् -
basis हि - verily पप्रच्छ - asked—(55)

55. The well-known Nārada having listened to the non-divisible (full) and changeless (stable) *bhūmānanda*, considering the existence of such an entity to be impossible asked verily its basis.

Why did Nārada think the existence of *bhūmā* to be impossible? The reason is told now.

सत्याधारे परिच्छेदो निराधारो

न बुध्यते ।

यद्यद् घटादिकं लोके तत्सर्वं

क्वचिदाश्रितम् ॥५६॥

आधारे सति - if *bhūmā* has some
basis परिच्छेदः (स्यात्) - it gets limited (by
that basis) निराधारः - if (*bhūmā*) has no
basis न बुध्यते - it cannot be known लोके -
(because) in the world यद्यत् - whatever

(entities) घटादिकम् - (such as) pot, etc. तत्
सर्वम् - all of them क्वचित् - in some causes
आश्रितम् - based in—(56)

56. If *bhūmā* has some basis, it gets limited (by that). If it has no basis, it cannot be known. (Because) in the world whatever (entities) (such as) pot, etc., (that are there), all of them are based in some causes.

It is known from our experience that whatever that we perceive or know is based in something other than itself. So it cannot be limitless and all pervasive. All entities distinct from one another are limited in nature and not pervasive. But here is *bhūmā* totally distinct from all that we know. How can it be limitless and all pervasive entity whether it is called *bhūmā* or *Brahman* or *Paramātmā*? It is the *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) of the entire Creation, which is non-different from everything in Creation that is superimposed on it. Such a principle cannot fit in the norms of things in Creation. Even *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa describes the relation between himself and the *jagat* as *Paramātmā* by using paradoxical statements. He says: 'This entire *jagat* is pervaded by me who is imperceptible. All beings from *Hiranyagarbha* up to any insignificant creature are abiding in me. But I am not abiding in them. In reality all these beings are not in me at all' (*B.G. 9-4,5*).

This is so because the *jagat* is truly not there, but is perceived certainly. On the contrary, in reality there is nothing but *Paramātmā-tattva* to the total exclusion of everything else called *anātmā*. Yet it is not known. To know it is very difficult. The worldly standards cannot fix it. That prompted Nārada to ask for the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of *bhūmā*. His problem was that *bhūmā* must be based in something in which case being not all pervasive and being limited, it cannot be *bhūmā*. An entity without a basis cannot be conceived in the normal course. Sanatkumāra solves the riddle gradually.

व्यवहारदशायां किमाधारः पृच्छयतेऽथवा ।
वस्तुतो व्यवहारे तु महिम्येवायमाश्रितः ॥५७॥

(नारदः - Oh Nārada) किम् आधारः - (your question) ‘what is the basis of *bhūmā*?’ व्यवहारदशायाम् - in the realm of *vyavahāra* (transactional/empirical world) पृच्छयते - is asked अथवा - or वस्तुतः (परमार्थतः) - from the absolute standpoint? व्यवहारे - in the realm of *vyavahāra* तु - but, (i.e. in contrast to the absolute standpoint) अयम् - this *bhūmā* महिम्नि - in (its) glory (greatness) एव - only आश्रितः - is based—(57)

57. Oh Nārada, is your question, ‘what is the basis of *bhūmā*?’ asked in the realm of *vyavahāra* (transactional/empirical world) or from the absolute standpoint? In the realm of *vyavahāra* in

contrast to the absolute standpoint, this *bhūmā* is based in (its) glory (greatness) only.

The question, ‘what is that *mahimā*?’ is answered based on the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣat* (6-8).

परास्य शक्तिर्विविधेत्येवं

श्रुत्यन्तरेरिता ।

भूमन्ः शक्तिर्भवेन्माया

तदुत्थो महिमाखिलः ॥५८॥

अस्य - of this *Paramātmā* परा - the most exalted शक्तिः - power विविधा - is manifold इति एवं - thus श्रुत्यन्तरे - in another Upaniṣad ईरिता - is told भूमन्ः - of *bhūmā* शक्तिः - power माया भवेत् - can be only *māyā* तदुत्थः - born of it अखिलः - the entire Creation महिमा - is the glory—(58)

58. The most exalted power of this *Paramātmā* is manifold. Thus it is told in another Upaniṣad (*Śvetāśvatarā* 6-8). The power of *bhūmā* can be only *māyā*. The entire *prapañca* (Creation) is the glory (of *bhūmā*). (In that glory *bhūmā* abides).

The manifold power (*parāśakti*) consists of *jñāna-śakti* (power of knowledge), *bala-śakti* (power of desire) and *kriyāśakti* (power of action). The phrase, ‘*tu mahimni eva*’ in the verse 57 corresponds to ‘*sve mahimni eva*’ (in its glory only) of Upaniṣad (*Ch. U.7-24-1*). The word ‘*mahimā*’ (glory, greatness)

in this context refers to the inconceivable power of Creation called *māyā* and its *kārya* (effect) or projection called *prapañca*, the world. *Māyā* projects the impossible as possible. The power which makes the impossible as possible is generally considered as glory in the world. Any power (*śakti*) is inferred through its effects. The effect such as this vast *jagat* is the proof to conclude the *māyā* as a power that is nothing short of glory. *Māyā* is natural to Brahman. It is not born from any cause. It is *anādi* (beginningless) but ends in *Brahmajñāna*.

How can *māyā* be glory if it projects the limitless all pervasive *bhūmā* which is limitless *ānanda* as the limited sorrow-ridden *jagat*? Is it not a great blemish that produces the calamitous *saṃsāra*? The answer follows.

महिमाख्ये जगत्यस्मिन् य आनन्दोऽवभासते ।
स भूमास्य परिच्छेदो व्यवहारे न दुष्यति ॥५९॥

अस्मिन् - in this महिमाख्ये - called glory जगति - in the *jagat* यः - whatever आनन्दः - *ānanda* अवभासते - that is experienced सः - that भूमा - is *bhūmā* व्यवहारे - during the existence of the *jagat* अस्य परिच्छेदः - its (of *bhūmā*) limitation न दुष्यति - does not make it suffer damage – (59)

59. In the *jagat* called the glory (of *bhūmā*) whatever *ānanda* that is experienced is *bhūmā*. Its (of *bhūmā*) limitation during the existence of the *jagat* does not make it (*bhūmā*) suffer damage.

The limited *viśayānanda* (sense-pleasure) available in the world in reality is *bhūmā* only just as the pot-space, pitcher-space, etc., limited in nature are total space only. This is so because the limiting factor (*upādhi*) itself is false (*mithyā*) in nature. It is not there in reality. Therefore the limited *ānanda* we experience in the world is nothing but the limitless *ānanda* that is the basis of Creation. The false *tripuṭī* makes it appear as if it is limited in nature. Thus *bhūmā* does not suffer any damage in its nature only because the sorrow-ridden *jagat* appears to be there. For example, a person stabs a girl who succumbs to her injuries. He is called a murderer. Another person stabs a girl and shows the bleeding wound. But next moment he shows that the girl has not even a scratch there. He is applauded as a great magician for his skill. So is *māyā* which is called the glory of *Bhūmā*. It makes *bhūmā* appear as if limited in the form of *jagat* with its nature always intact. That is why *māyā*, with its effect, is considered as the glory of *bhūmā* in the realm of Creation.

The reply given so far from the second line of verse 57 pertains to Nārada's question in the sense, 'what is the basis of *bhūmā* in the realm of *vyavahāra*?' If the basis of *bhūmā* is asked from the standpoint of *paramārtha daśā* (*vastutaḥ* – absolute nature of *bhūmā*), the answer is: '*bhūmā* has no basis' (*na mahimni*) (*Ch.U.7-24-1*). This is explained in the next two verses.

वस्तुतत्त्वविचारे तु न

महिम्नि प्रतिष्ठितः ।

महिमा स्याद् गवाश्चादिभूमनो नाधार

एव हि ॥६०॥

वस्तुतत्त्वविचारे - if the true nature of *bhūmā* is inquired into तु - in contrast to *bhūmā* in the realm of *vyavahāra* महिम्नि - in any glory न प्रतिष्ठितः - is not based गवाश्चादिः - cows, horses, etc. महिमा - glory स्यात् - considered to be भूमनः - of *bhūmā* आधारः - power of sustaining in the sense of its basis न हि एव - certainly cannot be – (60)

60. If the true nature of *bhūmā* is inquired into in contrast to it in the realm of *vyavahāra*, it is not based in any glory (whatsoever). Certainly the entities such as cows, horses, etc., (generally) considered to be glory cannot be the power of sustaining *bhūmā* in the sense of its basis.

In the world the entities such as cows, horses in the sense of wealth, properties, power, possessions, education, etc., are considered as one's glories. Depending on these that are other than oneself, a person becomes glorious. But *bhūmā* has no such dependence.

The further reason why *bhūmā* is not based in anything whatsoever is explained in accordance with the *śruti*: 'a given entity is based in something other than itself' (*Ch.U.7-24-2*).

अन्यस्मिन् हि महिम्यन्यो

राजादिः प्रतितिष्ठति ।

भूमनो नान्यद्वस्तु तस्मात्

कुत्रासौ प्रतितिष्ठति ॥६१॥

अन्यः राजादिः - a king, etc., distinct from the glory हि - it is well-known अन्यस्मिन् महिम्नि - in the glory different from oneself प्रतितिष्ठति - abides भूमनः अन्यत् - other than *bhūmā* वस्तु - entity न - is not there तस्मात् - therefore असौ - this *bhūmā* कुत्र प्रतितिष्ठति - where can it abide? (nowhere) – (61)

61. It is well-known that a king, etc., distinct from the glory abides in the glory different from oneself. (But) an entity other than *bhūmā* does not exist at all. Therefore where can this *bhūmā* abide? (nowhere).

Any glory is an advantageous

feature belonging to an individual. It certainly involves duality. In non-dual *bhūmā* such a relation is impossible. Therefore *bhūmā* cannot have a basis (*pratiṣṭhā*).

One of the concepts that prompted Nārada to ask the question regarding the basis *bhūmā* was that anything that has no basis cannot be known according to worldly standards (vs.56). Therefore he had concluded that anything which has no basis does not exist at all. This is not true is explained based on our common observation.

यथा लोके निराधार आकाशोऽस्ति

तथा कुतः ।

भूमा न स्यादतो युक्त्या

निराधारोऽपि बुध्यताम् ॥६२॥

यथा - just as लोके - in the world
निराधारः - supportless आकाशः - space अस्ति
- is there तथा - similarly भूमा - *bhūmā* कुतः
- why न स्यात् - not (*bhūmā*) be known?
अतः - therefore निराधारः अपि - even though
bhūmā is without a basis युक्त्या - by
reasoning in accordance with the *śruti*
बुध्यताम् - should be known – (62)

62. Just as in the world the supportless space is there, similarly why not (*bhūmā*) be known? Therefore even though *bhūmā* is without a basis, it should be known by reasoning in accordance with *śruti*.

Ākāśa (space) is that which accommodates other entities in itself. It is an empty place. To the superficial observer it appears to be contained in a box, pot, room, etc. But the fact is the box, etc., themselves abide in space. The space itself is not contained in anything like the fruit in a basket. It is not even resting on the earth because the earth itself is suspended in the space. All of the solar systems, stars, galaxies and milky ways abide in the space. It has no support. It does not exist in anything other than itself. The space though supportless, is known by all. Therefore it is a good example to show that the supportless *bhūmā* also can be known. In Pañcadaśī (2-42) also a similar argument is given. It is said: ‘Just as the space totally free from the four elements, earth to air, is known by you by inference and not by perception, similarly why can't you grasp the mere *sat* (Brahman) even free from space?’ Where the *indriyas* are inadequate to know, the sound reasoning based on the *śruti* has to be used. The ultimate reality *bhūmā* has to be known through the *Veda-pramāṇa*, but to get convinced about its rationality a reflection based on reasoning is necessary. One should understand that *bhūmā* is *nirādhāra* (supportless) because it is the cause of everything without any exception and therefore there cannot be the existence of anything

other than it which can be its cause.

Bhūmā is certainly the existent entity though it is uncaused or without any basis was established so far. It can be known directly is elaborated now. To say that *bhūmānanda* cannot be known or experienced because it is not an entity from the empirical world is a wrong notion.

व्यावहारिक आनन्दे व्युत्पत्तेः

शून्यता न हि ।

व्युत्पन्नो यौक्तिकश्चैष ऐकाग्र्ये

भासते स्वयम् ॥६३॥

व्यावहारिके आनन्दे - in the pleasure experienced in the empirical world
 व्युत्पत्तेः - because the etymological derivation (of the word *bhūmā*) fits in
 शून्यता न हि - (*bhūmā*) is not non-existent
 व्युत्पन्नः - etymologically derived (as the pleasure found in this world) यौक्तिकः
 च - and ascertained by the inferential analysis of experiences एषः - this
bhūmānanda ऐकाग्र्ये - in the single pointed state of mind centred in
akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti to the total exclusion of dissimilar thoughts स्वयं भासते -
 manifests itself—(63)

63. *Bhūmā* is not a non-existent entity because the etymological derivation (of the word *bhūmā*) fits in the 'pleasure' experienced in the

empirical world. This *bhūmānanda* is etymologically derived (as the pleasure in the world), ascertained by the inferential analysis of experiences and it manifests itself in the single pointed state of mind centred in *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* to the total exclusion of dissimilar thoughts.

The word *bhūmā* is etymologically derived from *bahu* (plenty). Its meaning is in *vyāvahārika sukha* because it means *mahat* (great), *niratisaya* (most exalted) and *bahu* (abundant, plenty). These meanings put together signify the *sukha* (sense-pleasure) available in the world which is limited in nature. The same *sukha* when freed from its limitations is limitless *ānanda* which is nothing but *bhūmā* unfolded by the *śruti* as the ultimate cause of entire *jagat*. Therefore *bhūmā* (Brahman) cannot be *śūnya* (non-existent entity) when its part (*aṃśa*) is the sense-pleasure experienced by all. The word *bhūmā* was discussed earlier in the introduction to the verse 39.

All our experiences in the waking and dream are accompanied by the *tripuṭī* which spells limitations. As a result, the pleasure we can get is limited and there are sorrows in plenty. But in sleep and *samādhi* in the absence of *tripuṭī* and sense-objects, there is *ānanda* totally free from sorrows.

Therefore, the limitless uncaused *bhūmā* that is totally free from the *jagat* superimposed on it and thus is *tripuṭiless*, must necessarily be *ānanda* free from all sorrows. It is well-known that sense-pleasure which we experience is a part of *bhūmānanda*. Such inference also establishes the existence of *bhūmā*.

Bhūmā is available for direct (*aparokṣa*) experience in the state of mind free from *tripuṭī*. In *nididhyāsana* when the *ātmākāra* or *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* is steadily maintained to the total exclusion of *anātma-pratyayas* (thoughts of *anātmā*), the self-evident *bhūmānanda* is directly experienced by the *jñānī* without *tripuṭī*. This is confirmed by *jīvanmuktas*. Such experience of *Brahmajñānī* called *vidvadanubhava* is a proof that *advaya* (non-dual) Brahman (*bhūmā*) is the truth. *Advaya* Brahman is not a utopia spun by some splendid brains. It has passed the three cardinal tests: *Śruti* (Upaniṣads the highest Vedic *pramāṇa*), *yukti* (reasoning) and *vidvadanubhava*.

THE MODE OF GAINING BHŪMAVIDYĀ

The Upaniṣad further declares that *bhūmā* itself is above, below, behind, in the front, on the right, on the left. In short it is everything. There is nothing else in it which can be its basis (*pratiṣṭhā*) (*Ch.U.7-25-1*). If *bhūmā* is

everything, 'I' (*ahaṃkāra*) also must be *bhūmā* alone. Yes, it is true. If this is not told, one may think *bhūmā* to be alien to oneself. Therefore the teaching continues in the form of *ahaṃkāradeśa*: 'I am above, I am below, I am behind, I am in the front. I am on the right, I am on the left. I am everything. Thus the identity of *bhūmā* and *draṣṭā* (knower principle) called *jīva* is told' (*Ch.U.7-25-1*). But *avivekīs* (people who lack discrimination) can mistake the *ahaṃkāra* as the assemblage of physical body, *prāna*, the mind, etc. Therefore it is revealed further by *ātmādeśa* (teaching of *ātmā*) that *bhūmā* itself is *ātmā*. Thus the teaching continues further: '*Ātmā* is above, *ātmā* is below, *ātmā* is behind, *ātmā* is in the front, *ātmā* is on the right, *ātmā* is on the left. In short, *ātmā* is everything' (*Ch.U.7-25-1*). This teaching is explained up to the verse 72.

बोधक्रमो बुभुत्सूनां

विस्पष्टमभिधीयते ।

चतुर्दिक्ष्वथ ऊर्ध्वं च भूमा

बोद्धव्य आदितः ॥६४॥

बुभुत्सूनाम् - to *jijñāsus* (those who are desirous of knowing *ātmā* directly) (श्रुतौ - in the Upaniṣad) बोधक्रमः - the order in which the *aparokṣānubhava* of *ātmā* can be gained विस्पष्टम् - very clearly अभिधीयते - is taught आदितः - (to begin

with) by the first advice (called *bhūmādeśa*) चतुर्दिक्षु - in the four quarters अधः - below ऊर्ध्वं - above च - and भूमा - *bhūmā* (only is there) बोद्धव्यः - (so) it should be known – (64)

64. The order in which the *aparokṣānubhava* of *ātmā* can be gained is very clearly taught (in the Upaniṣad) to *jijñāsus* (those who are desirous of knowing *ātmā* directly). (To begin with) by the first advice (called *bhūmādeśa*), it should be known that *bhūmā* (only is there) in the four quarters, below and above.

The *ādeśa* (teaching or advice) is given in three phases as: *Bhūmādeśa*, *aḥṃkāraśeśa* and *ātmādeśa*. Why so will be explained while introducing the next *ādeśa*.

But what we perceive all around is elements such as earth, water, etc., objects and beings. *Bhūmā* is not seen anywhere. Then how to know that *bhūmā* is everywhere? This is explained in the next two verses. *Bhūmā* is synonymous with *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* *svarūpa ātmā*. By the method of *anvaya* and *vyatireka* it can be verified that everything in the *jagat* exists because of *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* which itself is *bhūmā*, otherwise the five elements and their effect the *jagat* cannot come into existence. This shows that *bhūmā* is the true nature of all.

सत्ताभानप्रीतयोऽत्र वीक्ष्यन्ते सर्ववस्तुषु ।
सच्चिदानन्दरूपोऽतो भूमा सर्वत्र तिष्ठति ॥६५॥

अत्र - in this world सर्ववस्तुषु - in all entities सत्ताभानप्रीतयः - aspects of existence ('is'ness), knowledge (*cit*) and pleasure (*ānanda*) वीक्ष्यन्ते - are seen (experienced) (भूमा च - whereas *bhūmā* has) सच्चिदानन्दरूपः - the nature of *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* अतः - therefore भूमा - *bhūmā* सर्वत्र - in everything तिष्ठति - abides – (65)

65. In this world in all entities the aspects of existence ('is'ness), knowledge (*cit*) and pleasure (*ānanda*) are seen (experienced) whereas *bhūmā* has the nature of *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda*. Therefore *bhūmā* abides in everything.

The 'is'ness (*sat*) aspect of *bhūmā* is easily experienced in everything, but not the other two. Otherwise there will not be the division of sentient and inert besides joy and sorrow. Though it appears so at a cursory glance, the non-experience of *cit* and *ānanda* everywhere is not because of their absence. First of all, let us understand that *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* are not three attributes of an entity called *ātmā*. The one and the same nature of *ātmā* appears as *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* from the standpoint of non-existence, inertia and sorrow. Actually *sat* itself is *cit*, and *cit* itself is *ānanda*, and *ānanda* itself is *sat*. While *sat* aspect is manifest everywhere, *cit* needs *antaḥkaraṇa* and *ānanda* needs

priya, moda and *pramoda vṛttis* to manifest. Even when a person complains that he suffers sorrow, even then and there the *ānanda* is actually present though not manifest because the *cit* that made him aware of sorrow is itself *ānanda*. Therefore *bhūmā* having the nature of *sat, cit* and *ānanda* is everywhere, in and through everything.

One may ask: ‘Let the existence and knowledge aspects be the intrinsic features of everything. What role *bhūmā* has therein?’ It is not so. Everything in this world is falsely superimposed (*adhyasta*) on the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*), the *bhūmā* synonymous with Brahman. Its *sat* and *cit* aspects may appear to be there in everything. Even then, if *bhūmā* were not there, none can have existence and knowledge, not to speak of *ānanda*. This is proved because *bhūmā* (Brahman) is the only basic principle of *sat, cit, ānanda*. Nothing from the world has independent existence, knowledge and happiness.

भूमनो वियोगे वस्तूनि नैव सन्ति न भान्ति च ।
प्रियत्वं दूरतस्तेषां भूमा सर्वात्मकस्ततः ॥६६॥

भूमनः वियोगे - when separated from *bhūmā* वस्तूनि - things न एव सन्ति - are not at all there न च भान्ति - and are not known तेषाम् - their प्रियत्वम् - pleasing nature दूरतः - is a utopia ततः - therefore भूमा -

bhūmā सर्वात्मकः - is the nature of everything – (66)

66. Things neither exist nor are known when separated from *bhūmā*. (Without *bhūmā*) their pleasing nature is a utopia. Therefore *bhūmā* is the nature of everything.

When a thing is non-existent, there is no occasion of gaining its knowledge. No one can even think of happiness nature of a non-existent and unknown entity. The very fact that we find existence, knowledge and happiness nature in everything from the world proves the non-dual *bhūmā* as the true nature of everything.

The *bhūmādeśa* describing *bhūmā* is everywhere and everything ends the notion that the *jagat* is distinct from *bhūmā*. But one may think that *bhūmā* is somewhere distinct from *ātma*. To ward off such notion that it is alien to oneself existing somewhere in the proximity, the *śruti* employs *ahaṃkāraśeṣa* (the teaching that *bhūmā* is ‘I’).

जगद्भ्रान्तिं निवार्यास्य ताटस्थविनिवृत्तये ।
अहङ्कारेण भूमानुसन्धेयः सर्वदिक्ष्वसौ ॥६७॥

अस्य - of this *bhūmā* जगद् भ्रान्तिं - the erroneous notion that the *jagat* is different from *bhūmā* निवार्य - having warded off ताटस्थविनिवृत्तये - to end the

wrong concept that it is alien to 'I' असौ भूमा - this *bhūmā* सर्वदिक्षु - in all quarters अहङ्कारेण - in the form of 'I' अनुसन्धेयः - should be ascertained – (67)

67. Having warded off the erroneous notion that the *jagat* (world) is different from *bhūmā*, to end the wrong concept that it is alien to 'I', this *bhūmā* should be ascertained (as present) in all quarters in the form of 'I'.

The word '*tāṭasthya*' suggests that *bhūmā* is not known as 'I' but mistaken as something alien to me or present in my proximity. Even the entity 'I' due to ignorance appears as *parokṣa* (remote or different from me). That is how lay people take '*ātmā*' as something different from oneself. Therefore 'I am *bhūmā*' needs to be ascertained.

The experience of 'I' is considered to be limited as distinct from all others that are not me. Then how can it be known that 'I am all pervasive *bhūmā*'? The answer follows.

सन्त्येव सच्चिदानन्दा

देहादिष्वपि बाह्यवत् ।

भूमाहङ्कारयोग्योऽतोऽहं सर्वमिति

वा श्रयेत् ॥६८॥

बाह्यवत् - like in the case of external things देहादिषु - in the body, (senses, *prāṇas*), etc. अपि - also सच्चिदानन्दाः - the aspects of *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* सन्ति एव - are

certainly there अतः - therefore भूमा - *bhūmā* (अपि - also) अहङ्कारयोग्यः - is fit to be taken as 'I' अहं सर्वं - (because of this) 'I am everything' इति - thus वा - also श्रयेत् - should be resorted to – (68)

68. Like in the case of external things, the aspects of *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* are certainly there in the body, (senses, *prāṇas*), etc. Therefore *bhūmā* (also) is fit to be taken as 'I'. (Because of this) it should be resorted to as 'I am everything' also.

What is experienced by us as 'I' is along with the *upādhis* of body, etc. Just as the external things such as pot, etc., are *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* in nature, so are our *upādhis* whether gross or subtle. Earlier the entire *jagat* was shown to be *bhūmā*. The same is true for individual *upādhis* also. They are *bhūmā*. 'I' is taken as body, etc., whereas the body, etc., is *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* like the external world. So 'I am *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* *bhūmā* that is everywhere and everything. Thus it should be ascertained.

The entity 'I' is confined to the individual embodiment consisting of body, etc. How can it be *bhūmā* that is everything and everywhere? This is answered with the help of an illustration.

गृहैकदेशेऽवस्थाय सार्वभौमोऽहमित्यसौ ।

राजाभिमन्यते तद्वत् भूमाहमिति नो कुतः ॥६९॥

असौ राजा - this king गृहैकदेशे - in a part of the palace अवस्थाय - having lived (अपि - also) अहम् - I am सार्वभौमः - the emperor इति - so (यथा - just as) अभिमन्यते - considers तद्वत् - similarly अहं भूमा - 'I am *bhūmā*' इति - so न उ कुतः - why should it not be considered? – (69)

69. (Just as) the King having lived in a part of the palace (also) considers, 'I am the emperor', similarly why should it not be considered as 'I am *bhūmā*'? (Certainly it is possible).

The emperor has the concept that through his rule he is present everywhere in the entire empire though in fact he is in his capital sitting on a throne wielding his scepter in one part of the palace. Thus abiding in *antaḥkaraṇa* the concept 'as *bhūmā* I am everywhere and everything' is possible. The ascertainment that *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* is all pervasive and myself as *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* 'I am everywhere' is in accordance with the *śruti* and *yukti*. Therefore as 'I' whatever little limitation that appears to be there is immaterial. As *ābhāsa* 'I' am in the *antaḥkaraṇa*, but as 'ātma' whose reflection is *ābhāsa*, 'I' am everywhere and everything.

After the '*ahaṃkāra*deśa', the '*ātmādeśa*' is given. What is its purpose will be clear from the next verse.

आभिमनिकमेवेदं भूमात्मत्वमिति भ्रमम् ।
निराकर्तुं सर्वदिक्षु भूमनो ज्ञेयं चिदात्मता ॥७०॥

इदम् - this भूमात्मत्वम् - (statement) 'I am *bhūmā*/everything' (vs.68) आभिमनिकम् - is a supposition (or belief) एव - only इति भ्रमम् - such a wrong concept निराकर्तुम् - to refute सर्वदिक्षु - present in all quarters भूमनः - of *bhūmā* चिदात्मकता - the nature as *cit* free from all *upādhis* ज्ञेयम् - should be known – (70)

70. To refute the wrong concept that the (statement) 'I am *bhūmā*/everything' (vs.68) is only a supposition (or a belief), the nature of *bhūmā* as *cit* free from all *upādhis*, (i.e. as *ātmā*) present in all quarters should be known.

In the statement 'I am *bhūmā*' the word 'I' refers to *ahaṃkāra* which is *ātmā* with the *upādhi* in the form of 'I'-*vṛtti* (thought). If this 'I' thought is not sublated (*bādhita*) then 'I am *bhūmā*' will be an *upāsanā* only based on a supposition and not *pramā* (correct knowledge) of *bhūmā*. Not to give any room for such wrong notion, the *śruti* introduces *ātmādeśa* wherein by using the word '*ātmā*', the earlier '*ahaṃkāra*' is reduced to its true nature in the form of *cit* and *cit* alone totally free from all *upādhis* including 'I'-*vṛtti*. Therefore *ātmādeśa* is necessary after the *ahaṃkāra*deśa.

To prove the real nature of *bhūmā* or to show how *bhūmā* is the true nature

of all the meaning of the word 'I' is analysed.

अहंशब्दश्चिदात्मानं साहङ्कारं ब्रवीति हि ।
अहंकारे बोधलीने चिदात्मैवावशिष्यते ॥७१॥

अहं शब्दः - the word 'aham' (I) साहङ्कारम् - together with *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) चिदात्मानम् - *ātmā* having the nature *cit* ब्रवीति - indicates हि - because अहङ्कारे - when the *ahaṃkāra* बोधलीने (सति) - disappears by *Brahmajñāna/ātmajñāna* चिदात्मा - *ātmā* having the nature *cit* एव - alone अवशिष्यते - remains - (71)

71. The word 'aham' (I) together with *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) indicates *ātmā* having the nature *cit* because when the *ahaṃkāra* disappears by *Brahmajñāna/ātmajñāna*, *ātmā* having the nature *cit* alone remains.

The meaning of the word 'aham' (I) is the *ahaṃkāra-vṛtti* ('I' notion) with inherent *ābhāsa* in it. In the *ātmāsākṣātkāra* or the direct knowledge of *ātmā*, the *ahaṃkāra-vṛtti* which is a modification (called *vṛtti* or thought) of *antaḥkaraṇa* (or *buddhi*) disappears. Because in the *ātmajñāna* the ignorance of *ātmā* with its effect the entire *adhyasta* (superimposed) *upādhis* including *antaḥkaraṇa* and *ahaṃkāra-vṛtti* ends. It is just like the appearance of mistaken snake that ends the very

moment its base the rope is clearly seen in the light. Thus what remains after *ātmajñāna* is *cit-svarūpa ātmā* free from entire *jagat*. This *cit-svarūpa ātmā* (called *bhūmā*) is the true nature of all. It is the actual reality and not a supposition or belief. This is strictly in accordance with the *śruti pramāṇa* and there is no room for any error.

The result that can be gained by the *aparokṣa jñāna* that 'I (*ātmā*) is *bhūmā*' is described.

क्रमेणानेन यस्तत्त्वं पश्यन्

शास्त्रविचारतः ।

युक्त्या मत्वा धिया वेत्ति

जीवन्मुक्तो भवेदसौ ॥७२॥

यः - the *mumukṣu* who अनेन क्रमेण - in this order (told earlier) तत्त्वम् - the principle of *bhūmā* पश्यन् - directly knowing by its *sākṣātkāra* (that is to say) शास्त्रविचारतः - by the inquiry into the scriptures (Upaniṣads) युक्त्या - by reasoning मत्वा - having reflected धिया - by *nididhyāsana* वेत्ति - knows (*bhūmā*) directly by *sākṣātkāra* असौ - that *mumukṣu* जीवन् - while living मुक्तः भवेत् - becomes liberated - (72)

72. The *mumukṣu* who in this order directly knowing the principle of *bhūmā* by its *sākṣātkāra* (that is to say) by the inquiry into the scriptures (Upaniṣads), having reflected by

reasoning, (further) by *nididhyāsana* knows (*bhūmā*) directly by *sākṣātkāra*, (that *mumukṣu*) becomes liberated while living (itself).

The order of inquiry referred to is *bhūmādeśa*, *ahaṅkārādeśa* and *ātmā-deśa* as detailed earlier. But this is not the only mode of inquiry to gain *Brahmajñāna*. The Upaniṣads adopt different modes of inquiry to suit the different temperaments of *mumukṣus*. That is why the author generalizes the method of gaining *Brahmajñāna* by specifying *śravaṇa* with different modes of inquiries as described in the *śāstra*, reflection by reasoning in accordance with the *śruti* and repeated *nididhyāsana* excluding all *anātmā* thoughts and maintaining the flow of *ātmākāra-vṛtti* leading to *ātmā-sākṣātkāra*. By *niṣṭhā* (steadfastness) in this knowledge, the person gets liberated even while living in this body. Such a person is called *jīvan* (while living) *muktaḥ* (liberated). He is unaffected by the joys and sorrows that his *prārabdha* makes him undergo.

The phrase from ‘*śāstravicārataḥ*’ up to ‘*vetti*’ is the explanation of the beginning phrase of this verse ending with ‘*paśyan*’.

JĪVANMUKTA (PERSON LIBERATED WHILE LIVING)

The Upaniṣad describes the

jīvanmuktas in terms of their four types of conduct in life depending on their *prārabdha*. They are: ‘*ātmarati*, *ātmakrīḍā*, *ātmamithuna* and *ātmānanda*’ (*Ch.U.* 7-25-2). Each of them will be explained one by one.

जीवन्मुक्तो रतिक्रीडामिथुनानन्दलक्षणान् ।
व्यवहारान् क्रमेणैति प्रारब्धस्यानुसारतः ॥७३॥

जीवन्मुक्तः - *jīvanmukta* (person liberated while living) रतिक्रीडामिथुनानन्द-लक्षणान् - characterized by *ātmarati*, *ātmakrīḍā*, *ātmamithuna* and *ātmānanda* व्यवहारान् - conducts, behaviours प्रारब्धस्य अनुसारतः क्रमेण - in course of *prārabdha* एति - takes to – (73)

73. The *jīvanmukta* takes to conducts characterized by *ātmarati*, *ātmakrīḍā*, *ātmamithuna* and *ātmānanda* in course of *prārabdha*.

Rati (delight, *prīti*/love), *krīḍā* (sport), *mithuna* (joy born of two) and *ānanda* (happiness) are the manifestation of happiness in different degrees. In the case of an ignorant person, these totally depend on the external objects, beings and events which fit in the category of *anātmā*. As for a *jīvanmukta* all these are centred in *ātmā* only. In the state of ignorance, one's *prārabdha* is responsible in getting the sense-pleasures. The degree of happiness gained by a *jīvanmukta* is also governed

by his *prārabdha* only.

To explain the fourfold conducts of a *jīvanmukta*, his fourfold *prārabdha* is enumerated first.

सुखदुःखप्रदारब्धकर्म-

वेगश्चतुर्विधः ।

तीव्रो मध्यो मन्दसुप्तौ चेति

तस्य विधा मताः ॥७४॥

सुखदुःखप्रदारब्धकर्मवेगश्चतुर्विधः - the driving force or momentum of *prārabdha-karma* that yields the joys and sorrows is fourfold तीव्रः - intense मध्यः - moderate मन्दसुप्तौ - weak and dormant च - and इति - so तस्य - its (of *prārabdha-karma*) विधाः - types मताः - are known - (74)

74. The driving force or momentum of *prārabdha-karma* that yields the joys and sorrows is fourfold. Its types are known to be: intense, moderate, weak and dormant.

Prārabdha-karma is that collection of *karmaphalas* which begins to yield its result through the birth of the present body up to its end. It is the cause of joys and sorrows in life. It happens to have varying driving force in giving the *bhoga* (experience) of joys and sorrows.

The *jīvanmukta* who is an *ātmarati* (who has love only for *ātmā*) is now described. *Rati* is to be happy with oneself without any external means.

तीव्रवेगे स पश्चादितुल्यो नात्मानमीक्षते ।

आत्मनि प्रीतिरस्तीति भवेदात्मरतिस्तदा ॥७५॥

तीव्रवेगे (सति) - when the driving force of *prārabdha* is intense सः - *jīvanmukta* पश्चादितुल्यः - is on a par with any living creature (such as animals, etc.) आत्मानम् - *ātmānanda* the true nature of oneself न ईक्षते - does not experience thoroughly (किन्तु - but) आत्मनि - in *ātmā* (only) प्रीतिः - excessive love (without delight in the sense-objects or other beings) अस्ति - is there, (i.e. he has) इति - because of this reason तदा - then (सः - he) आत्मरतिः भवेत् - becomes an *ātmarati* - (75)

75. The *jīvanmukta* whose driving force of *prārabdha* is intense is on a par with any living creature (such as animals, etc.). He does not experience thoroughly *ātmānanda* the true nature of oneself, but he has excessive love (only) in *ātmā* (without delight in the sense-objects or other beings). Then he becomes an *ātmarati*.

Actually such a *jñānī* is called *jīvanmukta* secondarily. Because of his intense *prārabdha*, he gets carried away by the impact of *bhoga* whether *sukha* or *duḥkha*. As a result he is unable to experience *ātmānanda*. Yet, because of gaining *ātmajñāna* he does not delight in

external objects and beings as in the state of ignorance. His love for *ātmā* is to the exclusion of delight in any other things

unlike the common man who also loves oneself, but has interest in many other things.

An accomplished *jīvanmukta* is the one who does not lose sight of *ātmānanda* in and through the vagaries of *prārabdha bhoga*. He is unaffected by them. In spite of *tattvajñāna* (*aparokṣaātmajñāna*) if one is not able to enjoy *jīvanmukti*, the only diagnosis is that he lacks *manonāśa* (anihilation of mind) and *vāsanākṣaya* (exhaustion of *vāsanās*). Such a person has to accomplish *manonāśa* and *vāsanākṣaya* by specific efforts.

The main eligible person (*adhikārī*) expected by Vedānta is the one who is *sādhana-catustaya-saṃpanna* (one who has the fourfold qualifications such as *viveka*, *vairagya*, etc.), and *kṛtopāsti* (one who has taken to successful *upāsanā*/meditation to the point of *upāsyasākṣātkāra* - direct vision of the deity meditated upon). Such *mumukṣus* have got *manonāśa* and *vāsanākṣaya* by virtue of their *upāsanā* with finale. The moment they get *tattvajñāna* by means of *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana*, they are able to get absorbed in *ātmā*. They do not need any separate practice to get *manonāśa* and *vāsanākṣaya*.

There are others who are *akṛtopāsti* (*upāsanā* not done to the point of finale) but because of their over eagerness to gain *ātmajñāna* take to *śravaṇa*, etc. They also develop temporary *manonāśa* and *vāsanākṣaya*. Thereby they do get *tattvajñāna* which cannot be dismissed because there is no higher *pramāṇa* than the *śruti* and the *avidyā* (self-ignorance) once destroyed cannot come back. Though such *jñānīs* do get *videhamukti*, for want of thorough *manonāśa* and *vāsanākṣaya* they cannot gain *niṣṭhā* in *tattvajñāna*. Therefore *jīvanmukti* is beyond their reach. They have to practice the means to perfect their *manonāśa* and *vāsanākṣaya*. In this sense the one who is going to be described as *ātmānanda* (vs.78) alone is the *jīvanmukta* in the true sense. The author has discussed this topic in detail in his another text *jīvanmukti-viveka*.

The next verse describes *ātmakrīḍa* (who sports in *ātmā*). In sports, the happiness is gained with external means.

मध्यवेगे तु भोगानां प्राधान्यं

स यदा तदा ।

कृत्वाऽवकाशमात्मानं वदन्

ऋडति बालवत् ॥७६॥

मध्यवेगे - when the driving force of *prārabdha* is moderate तु - on the other hand यदा - when भोगानाम् - of experiences (of joys and sorrows) or of sense-pleasures प्राधान्यम् - predominance (is there) तदा - then सः - *jīvanmukta* अवकाशम् कृत्वा - having made room for some time आत्मानं वदन् - speaking about *ātmā* बालवत् - like a child क्रीडति - sports—(76)

76. On the other hand, when the driving force of *prārabdha* is moderate, when there is the predominance of *bhoga* (experiences of sense-pleasures), then he (*jīvanmukta*) having made room for some time sports like a child speaking about *ātmā*.

In this case the external *drśyas* (perceived objects) are employed to appreciate *dr̥k* (*ātmā*) principle. Or words from *adhyātma-śāstra* are made use to dwell on *ātmā*. Teaching the disciples or writing texts on *ātmavidyā* also can help to cognize *ātmā*. The *jagat* is also used to merge it in its successive causes in the reverse order of the Creation to get absorbed in its *adhiṣṭhāna*. Thus external means are employed to contemplate on *ātmā*/Brahman. That is considered as sport to meditate on *ātmā*. The word *bālavat* (like a child) indicates that the *jīvanmukta* is free from concern for *saṃsāra* or he lives in the present.

There is another reading of '*kr̥tvāaprakāśam*' in the place of '*kr̥tvāavakāśam*'. In that case it has to be taken as withdrawing the attention from external means to take to contemplation on *ātmā* only.

The *jīvanmukta* is described as *ātmamithuna* (who experiences happiness in *ātmā* as in the company of two) in the next verse.

मन्दवेगे तिरस्कृत्य भोगान् प्रायेण चिन्तयन् ।
धियात्मानं द्वन्द्वसुखं प्राप्नोति मिथुने यथा॥७७॥

मन्दवेगे (सति) - when the driving force of *prārabdha* is weak भोगान् - sense-pleasures तिरस्कृत्य - having set aside प्रायेण - mostly धिया - by his *buddhi* आत्मानं चिन्तयन् - meditating on *ātmā* द्वन्द्वसुखं - happiness born of a pair प्राप्नोति - gains यथा - just as (in the world) मिथुने - in the company of a pair—(77)

77. When the driving force of *prārabdha* is weak (the *jīvanmukta*) having set aside the sense-pleasures, mostly meditating on *ātmā* by his *buddhi* gains the happiness born of a pair just as (in the world) one gets in the company of a pair.

When the driving force of *prārabdha* is weak one can be indifferent towards the *bhoga* on the strength of *vairāgya*. Because of *prārabdha* one's connection with *bhoga*

is certainly going to be there but importance is not given to it. Instead having withdrawn from *bhogas* the mind is turned towards *ātmacintana* (meditation on *ātmā*). Even in sorrows, their impact becomes less by knowing for certain their transient nature. Just as sense-pleasure prompts extrovertedness to pursue it, the sorrow also makes one extrovert to get away from it. But here is a *jñānī* who being indifferent towards them takes to meditation on *ātmā* only.

The word ‘*prāyeṇa*’ indicates that at times he may be carried away by *bhoga*, but most of the time he is engrossed in the meditation as his top priority. The word ‘*dvandvasukha*’ (happiness born of a pair) is used because there is no third factor involved in his meditation other than *dhyātā* (meditator) and *dhyāna* (meditation). These two have not yet totally merged in the *dhyeya* in the form of *ātmā*. Though the *dhyāna* is still *savikalpa* (with duality) in nature, there is the absence of other *anātma-pratyayas* (thoughts of *anātmā*). Thus the happiness in such meditation is between the *dhyātā* and actual *dhyāna*. Therefore the illustration of *mīthuna* (pair or couple) is given. Their joy is because of them only. Both of them are the causes and experiencers of that joy.

The *jīvanmukta* called *ātmānanda*

is described now.

सुप्तवेगेऽतिनिर्विघ्नो

निर्विकल्पसमाधिभाक्।

आत्मानन्दावशेषः सन्

आस्ते मुक्तवदद्वयः ॥७८॥

सुप्तवेगे (सति) - when the driving force of *prārabdha* is dormant अतिनिर्विघ्नः - (*jīvanmukta*) being totally free from obstructions निर्विकल्पसमाधिभाक् (भवति) - experiences the *nirvikalpa-samādhi* (totally gets absorbed in the true nature of *ātmā*) अद्वयः आत्मानन्दावशेषः सन् - (in that state) remaining as the non-dual *ānanda* of *ātmā* मुक्तवत् - like a *videhamukta* (one who has bodiless liberation) आस्ते - becomes - (78)

78. When the driving force of *prārabdha* is dormant, (the *jīvanmukta*) being totally free from obstructions experiences the *nirvikalpa-samādhi* (totally gets absorbed in the true nature of *ātmā*). Remaining (in that state) as the non-dual *ānanda* of *ātmā* (he) becomes like a *videhamukta* (one who has bodiless liberation).

The *prārabdha* of such a *jīvanmukta* is almost dormant. ‘Almost’ because he does undergo the waking state. Totally dormant *prārabdha* is the state of sleep. Even in the state of waking the *prārabdha* is such that there are no joys and sorrows. The senses and the

mind also do not get attracted to any *anātmā*. The attraction towards *anātmā* is the obstruction on the path of liberation. *Jñānī* does not have attraction on account of *rāga* and *dveṣa* – likes and dislikes towards sense-objects. At the time of residual *bhoga*, some *anātmadr̥ṣṭi* (concept of *anātmā*) may be there, but not otherwise. His experience of *ātmā* without *tripuṭī* in *nirvikalpa samādhi* is such that what he remains is, as only the non-dual *ānanda* that is *ātmā*. His experience tallies with that of *videhamukta*. Only the difference is that the *jīvanmukta* has the body because of *prārabdha* whereas *videhamukta* is without the body since his *prārabdha* is totally over.

This *jīvanmukta* who himself is called *ātmānandaḥ* because he is mostly absorbed in the non-dual *ātmānanda*, appears to be a truly liberated (*mukta*). Once the dormant *prārabdha* also gets over, his body drops off and what remains is *ātmā* and *ātmā* alone. With reference to his hitherto body he is called *videhmukta* (the liberated one without the body). In comparison with this liberated person called *ātmānanda*, the earlier three types of *jīvanmuktas* having intense, moderate and weak driving force of *prārabdha* appear as though not liberated though they are actually liberated. The *ānanda* experienced by

all, in spite of its varying degree, is on account of *ātmā* only and not from the sense-objects.

CONTRAST OF *JĪVANMUKTA*, *VIDEHAMUKTA* AND AN *AJÑĀNĪ*

The Upaniṣad further tells the eminence of a *jīvanmukta* after the end of his body which is his last one as an individual *jīva*. It says: ‘He becomes the *svarāt* (self-sovereign). He is called *kāmacāra*, the one who has free and unhindered movement and conduct in all *lokas*’ (*Ch.U.7-25-2*). This statement has to be understood in its right perspective because this person now as *videhamukta* has no physical body. His subtle body has got disintegrated when his last body died. There are no *karmaphalas* of any type belonging to him. All that it means is the happiness that all these *lokas* can confer on him as a *jīva* earlier and which he was hankering till now is figuratively at his command and within his reach. It is not physically because he has no more bodies. It only means that he is the principle *bhūmā* the basis of all these *lokas*. As *bhūmā* he is the limitless happiness, the basic source of all happiness that all these coveted *lokas* can together offer. The *śruti* portion of *kāmacāra* (*Ch.U.7-25-2*) should be understood in the manner of ‘*sarvakāmāptiḥ*’ of *Taittirīyavidyā-*

prakāśa (A.Pr.2-23,29), but not literally. This result and what exactly it means is elaborated in the next three verses.

स्वराट् स्यात् पतिते देहे नान्याधीनो विमूढवत् ।
तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवेत् खलु ॥७९॥

पतिते देहे - when the body (of the *jñānī*) drops off स्वराट् स्यात् - he becomes self-sovereign विमूढवत् - like an *ajñānī* अन्याधीनः न - (he) is not dependant on anyone else सर्वेषु लोकेषु - in all *lokas* खलु - indeed तस्य - his कामचारः - free and unhindered movement भवेत् - becomes—(79)

79. On dropping the body, (the *jñānī*) becomes self-sovereign. He is not dependant on anyone like an *ajñānī*. Indeed, he has free and unhindered movement in all *lokas*.

After describing the different stages of *jīvanmukta* during the period of *prārabdha*, the *videhamukta* is described. During *prārabdha* the *jīvanmukta* has to encounter some or other *dṛśya* to some extent in great or less degree. Once the body of a *jīvanmukta* drops off by the end of his *prārabdha*, what remains is *ātmā* and *ātmā* alone in its *ānandasvarūpa* without any hindrance or destruction of any type. From this standpoint *videhamukta* is self-sovereign without dependence on

anyone or anything. He remains in the form of *cit* only. The liberated one is described as having free and unhindered movement and conduct in all the *lokas* like a king in his kingdom. What does this mean when it is well-known that the liberated one has no *upādhi* or embodiment at all? The next two verses answer this question.

मायया कल्पिता लोकास्ते

सर्वे भूमरूपताम् ।

मुक्तस्य प्राप्नुवन्त्येव

सर्वलोकात्मकस्ततः ॥८०॥

लोकाः - all *lokas* मायया - by *māyā* कल्पिताः - are falsely projected ते सर्वे - all of them मुक्तस्य - (in accordance with the *aparokṣānubhava*) of the liberated one भूमरूपताम् प्राप्नुवन्ति - get reduced to the nature of *bhūmā* एव - certainly ततः - therefore (the liberated one) सर्वलोकात्मकः - (becomes) the *ātmā* (nature) of all *lokas*—(80)

80. All *lokas* are falsely projected by *māyā*. All of them certainly get reduced to the nature of *bhūmā* (in accordance with the *aparokṣānubhava*) of the liberated one. Therefore (the liberated one) (becomes) the *ātmā* (nature) of all *lokas*.

On seeing the basis rope in the bright light, the mistaken snake gets reduced to rope automatically. Similarly

when the *jñānī* is absorbed in the direct experience of his true nature *ātmā/bhūmā* without *tripuṭī*, there remains no trace of any *lokas* or entire *prapañca* (Creation) till now superimposed (*adhyasta*) on him. The false nature of all *lokas* and Creation disappears in its *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) *bhūmā*. That is the true nature of the liberated one. In the wake of his discovery that he is *bhūmā*, he is known as the true nature of all *lokas*. With this background the *kāmacāra* of the liberated one can be understood properly.

कामचारोऽतिविस्मम्भः

प्रतिबन्धविवर्जितः ।

सर्वस्य स्वस्वरूपेऽस्ति प्रतिबन्धो

न कोऽपि हि ॥८१॥

(Because of what was told in the earlier verse) (of this liberated one) **कामचारः** - movement and conduct at will **अतिविस्मम्भः** - (is) with total confidence **प्रतिबन्धविवर्जितः** - (that is to say) free from all obstructions **हि** - because **सर्वस्य** - in the case of everyone **स्वस्वरूपे** - as for their true nature **प्रतिबन्धः** - obstruction **न कः अपि अस्ति** - is not there at all – (81)

81. (Because of what was told in the earlier verse) the movement and conduct at will called *kāmacāra* (of this liberated one) is with total confidence.

That is to say (his *kāmacāra*) is free from all obstructions. Because, in the case of the true nature of everyone, there is no obstruction at all.

In the place of ‘*ativisrambhaḥ*’ other readings such as ‘*ativisrabdhaḥ*’, ‘*ativiśrambhaḥ*’ are there. The words ‘*visrambhaḥ*’, ‘*visrabdhaḥ*’, ‘*viśrambhaḥ* and *viśrabdhaḥ*’ (meaning confidence) are synonyms. The liberated one who is free from the body is nothing but the principle *bhūmā* which is limitless happiness. *Bhūmā* is the basis of all *lokas* and the *ātmā* of all living beings. Therefore the liberated one is the basis of all these. His true nature of limitless happiness alone is the happiness in bits and pieces that all *lokas* can confer and all living beings can enjoy as sense-pleasures. Therefore all these belong to him in the sense they are his nature. That is what the Upaniṣad wants to explain by the phrase ‘he is *kāmacāra* in all *lokas*’. It is an attempt on the part of the *śruti* to explain the truth of the transcendental realm by making use of the words and phenomena of the terrestrial world familiar with the ignorant people.

To highlight the exaltedness of a *jñānī*, the *śruti* describes the dependence of an *ajñānī*: ‘Further those who know contrary to the knowledge gained by *jñānīs*, they have other masters who rule

over them, their *lokas* are impermanent in nature, they have no free and unhindered movements in all *lokas*' (Ch.U. 7-25-2). This plight of an *ajñānī* is described in the next verse.

भूमात्मानं न जानाति मूढः किं त्वन्यथेक्षते ।
जीवोऽहमीश्वराधीनो धर्माधर्मयुतस्त्विति ॥८२॥

मूढः - *ajñānī* भूमात्मानं - the all pervasive *ātmā* (*bhūmā*) न जानाति - does not know किं तु - but अन्यथा - in another manner (as *ātmā* to be limited in nature) ईक्षते - considers अहम् - (his contrary concept is) I am जीवः - a *jīva* ईश्वराधीनः - who is dependant on *Īśvara* तु - and धर्माधर्मयुतः - bound by *pāpa* and *puṇya* इति - so - (82)

82. The *ajñānī* does not know the all pervasive *ātmā* (*bhūmā*), but considers oneself in another manner. (His contrary concept is): 'I am a *jīva* who is dependant on *Īśvara* and bound by *pāpa* and *puṇya*'.

The contrary notion of an *ajñānī* about oneself is further elaborated.

तस्येश्वरो भवेद्राजा लोकः कर्मार्जितः क्षयी ।
कामचारस्तु लोकेषु सर्वथास्य न संभवेत् ॥८३॥

ईश्वरः - *Īśvara* तस्य - his (of the ignorant person who knows not *bhūmā*) राजा - ruler, Lord भवेत् - is कर्मार्जितः - procured by *karmaphalas* लोकः - (his) *loka* क्षयी - (is) destructible

(impermanent) in nature अस्य - of such ignorant person लोकेषु - in (all) the *lokas* (fields of experiences) कामचारः - free and unhindered movement at will तु सर्वथा - certainly न सम्भवेत् - is not possible - (83)

83. *Īśvara* is the ruler or the Lord of the ignorant person who knows not *bhūmā*. His *loka* procured by *karmaphalas* is destructible (impermanent) in nature. Free and unhindered movement at will in all the *lokas* is certainly not possible for him.

The ignorance of one's true nature of oneself is the root of the entire *samsāra* that the *jīva* suffers. The ignorance gives rise to the identification with the body breeding all limitations. To be free from limitations the individual strives hard to procure the desired sense-objects and get rid of sorrows. This leads to *karma*, *kartṛtva* (doership), *karmaphala*, *bhokṛtva* (status of an experiencer), travel to different *lokas* transient in nature, continuous transmigration with repeated birth and death. He has to depend on the *jagat* as a result he is under the rule of *Īśvara* through the laws of *karma*. The *lokas* that he gains can be enjoyed only through wielding different embodiments subject to laws of *karma* governed by *Īśvara*. He has no *kāmacāra*.

To praise the *Brahmavidyā*, the

jīvanmukta himself is presented as the *sraṣṭā* (Creator). Before gaining *ātmasākṣātkāra*, the *sṛṣṭi* was known to be born from *sat* (Brahman) considered to be an entity different from oneself because of ignorance. On gaining the *Brahmajñānaaparokṣatayā* (directly) it is discovered that the birth of Creation is from *sat* which itself is my true nature *ātmā*. Thus from the true nature of *jīvanmukta* the *sṛṣṭi* is born (*Ch.U.Bh.7-26-1*). This is hinted here.

जीवन्मुक्तस्तत्त्वविद्यः

शास्त्रयुक्त्यनुभूतिभिः ।

तस्य प्राणादिकर्मान्तं जगत्स्वात्मन

उद्भूतम् ॥८४॥

यः - the one who शास्त्रयुक्त्यनुभूतिभिः

- through the means of scriptures (*śravaṇa*), reasoning (*manana*) and *aparokṣānubhava* (direct experience) of *ātmā* तत्त्ववित् - (has become a) *Brahmajñānī जीवन्मुक्तः* - and *jīvanmukta* तस्य आत्मनः - from his *ātmā* प्राणादिकर्मान्तं जगत् - the entire *jagat* beginning from *prāṇa* and ending with *karma* स्वात्मनः - from me (*ātmā*) उद्भूतम् - is born – (84)

84. The entire *jagat* beginning from *prāṇa* and ending with *karma* is born from the *ātmā* of the one who through the means of scriptures (*śravaṇa*), reasoning (*manana*) and *aparokṣānubhava* (direct experience) of

ātmā has become a *Brahmajñānī* and *jīvanmukta*.

The description of a *jīvanmukta* in the context of *videhamukta* shows that *jīvanmukti* and *videhamukti* are one and the same with the only difference being the presence or absence of *prārabdha*. The *jīvanmukta* or a *jñānī* becomes *videhamukta* only on the ending of *prārabdha*. Experientially both the *jīvanmukti* at the stage of *ātmānanda* and *videhamukti* are one and the same. As seen earlier in the introduction of this verse that the *jagat* is considered as born from *sat* distinct from oneself. On gaining the *Brahmajñāna* the *jīvanmukta* discovers that the *sat* is himself only. ‘From me (*ātmā*) only the *jagat* is born, it exists and functions in me and merges back in me (*ātmā*) on dissolution. This is what the Upaniṣad declares that from the standpoint of *jīvanmukta*'s vision all of *prāṇa*, *āśā*, *smara*, *ākāśa*, *teja*, *āpa*, manifestation (*āvirbhāva*), extinction (*tirobhāva*), *anna*, *bala*, *vijñāna*, *dhyāna*, *citta*, *saṅkalpa*, *mana*, *vāk*, *nāma*, *mantra* and *karma* exist because of *ātmā*. Not only these, the entire *saṃsāra* exists because of *ātmā* (*ātmata eva idam sarvam*)’ (*Ch.U.7-26-1*). This does not mean that the *jīvanmukta* becomes the actual *Īśvara* in the *vyāvahārikajagat* wielding the powers of omniscience and

omnipotence. He is identical with *Īśvara* only in real nature which is free from all *upādhis*.

In the light of the above, the *jīvanmukta* has nothing to do with the *upāsanās* of *prāṇas*, etc., recommended earlier and their results. They are of no use to him. He is ever-contented.

तस्मात् प्राणादिवस्तूनां

ध्यानेनास्य फलेन वा ।

जीवन्मुक्तस्य नार्थोऽस्ति कृतकृत्यः

सुखी ह्यसौ ॥८५॥

तस्मात् - therefore प्राणादिवस्तूनाम् - of entities such as *prāṇa*, etc. ध्यानेन - by the *upāsanā* (meditation) अस्य - its फलेन - by the result वा - or जीवन्मुक्तस्य - of a *jīvanmukta* अर्थः - advantage न अस्ति - is not there हि - because असौ - he कृतकृत्यः (सन्) - having attained the highest goal of life सुखी - is (always) happy – (85)

85. Therefore a *jīvanmukta* has no advantage on account of the *upāsanās* (meditations) of entities such as *prāṇa*, etc., or results produced by them. Because he is (always) happy having attained the highest goal of life, (i.e. *mokṣa*).

Any result of *upāsanā* or *karma* can give some tinsel of happiness through the means of entities from the world. That pleasure is borrowed from the limitless *ānanda* that the *jīvanmukta*

himself is. Even the entities that appear to give happiness are false projections from his true nature *ātmā*. Under such circumstances, he has no advantage whatsoever to get from the result of those *upāsanās*. All worldly accomplishments are meant for becoming happier than what one is and ward off sorrows. The *jīvanmukta* is directly experiencing his *paramānanda-svarūpa* totally free from *upādhīs* and the consequent sorrows. He has nothing to be done, nothing to be accomplished and there is nothing that he has not accomplished because he is limitless happiness (*paramānanda*) totally free from sorrows. Therefore he is always happy under all circumstances. He is called *kṛtakṛtya* – the one who has accomplished the highest goal of life. A *kṛtakṛtya* is always contented. He has no lack and so no wants. He has nothing to gain or nothing to lose from the entire Creation.

How can a *jīvanmukta* be *kṛtakṛtya* when he is exposed to diseases, sorrows and death? *Chāndogyopaniṣad* which is a *brāhmaṇopaniṣad* answers this question by quoting a *mantra* and thereby justifies the *kṛtakṛtya* nature of a *jīvanmukta*. ‘Such a *jñānī* does not experience death, disease and sorrow, but experiences all of them as *ātmā* only. Thus by all means he becomes one with

all including the hitherto considered as adverseries in their real nature of *ātmā*' (Ch.U.7-26-2). The death, disease and sorrow are centered in the limited *upādhis* whereas the *jñānī* is absorbed in *ātmā* which is *nirupādhikabhūmā*.

न मृत्युं पश्यति ज्ञानी न रोगं
नापि दुःखिताम् ।
सर्वं स्वात्मतया बुद्ध्वा
सर्वमाप्नोति सर्वथा ॥८६॥

ज्ञानी - *jñānī* मृत्युम् - death न पश्यति - does not see न रोगम् - does not see the disease दुःखिताम् अपि - even sorrow न - does not see सर्व - everything स्वात्मतया - in their nature of *ātmā* बुद्ध्वा - having known सर्वथा - entirely सर्वम् - everything आप्नोति - becomes – (86)

86. The *jñānī* does not see death, disease and even sorrow. Having known everything in their nature of *ātmā*, he becomes everything entirely.

The *jñānī* does not have identification with the body. Because of his total absorption of the mind in *ātmā* free from all *upādhis*, he is not aware of the body itself, leave alone its conditions such as disease, sorrows, etc. This is not the case of a lip-service of uttering 'I am not the body', but it is the direct experience of *ātmā* wherein there is no room for the body, mind, etc., and their conditions. The entire Creation has no

existence at all apart from him, the *ātmāsvarūpa*. That is how the *jñānī* becomes everything entirely.

After describing the glory of a *jīvanmukta*, the *śruti* proceeds to describe that of a *videhamukta*. It says: 'The *videhamukta* (who is *nirupādhika* Brahman) itself is one without the second (non-dual) before Creation, then he becomes threefold as *teja*, *āp*, *anna* (earth) and thereafter as the manifold *jagat*' (Ch.U.7-26-2). Of course he becomes again one without the second after dissolution. This is only an appearance on account of false projection. In reality he is all along non-dual Brahman alone.

विदेहमुक्तो ब्रह्मत्वात् सर्वं सृजति मायया ।
येन यद् वीक्ष्यते तस्मै तद्रूपं स्वं प्रदर्शयेत् ॥८७॥

विदेहमुक्तः - The *videhamukta* ब्रह्मत्वात् - because of being Brahman itself in his true nature मायया - by *māyā* सर्वम् - entire *jagat* सृजति - Creates येन - by whosoever यत् - whatever (form) वीक्ष्यते - is seen or conceived तस्मै - to him तत् - that स्वम् - belonging to oneself रूपम् - form प्रदर्शयेत् - shows – (87)

87. The *videhamukta*, because of being Brahman itself in his true nature Creates the entire *jagat* by *māyā*. By whosoever whatever (form) is seen or conceived, he shows to him that very

form belonging to oneself. (This is an inconceivable power of a *videhamukta*).

Brahman on account of *māyā* is the cause of *janma* (birth), *sthiti* (sustenance) and *bhaṅga* (destruction) of Creation. The liberated one being nothing but Brahman, it is appropriate to consider him as the cause of birth, etc., of Creation. He is no more under the sway of *māyā*, but *māyā* is under his control who is Brahman. As Brahman, on account of *māyā*, all forms are his forms and the experiences of all are his experiences. He is the *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) of Creation. And yet, he is free from them; he is unaffected by them. That is the glory of a *videhamukta* who is actually Brahman, but called so (as *videhamukta*) with reference to his earlier state as a bound *jīva*.

BRAHMAVIDYĀ - PURSUIT BEGINS WITH ĀHĀRA-ŚUDDHI

Thus the *Brahmavidyā* is praised by highlighting its result to inspire the *mumukṣus* to take to it earnestly. Finally the *śruti* tells the indispensable means to gain *Brahmavidyā* with total clarity like seeing the reflection of the face in a clean mirror. Thereafter the connected narrative (*ākhyāyikā*) with which Sanatkumāra's teaching started is concluded. The *śruti* says: ‘*Āhāraśuddhau sattvaśuddhiḥ, sattvaśuddhau dhruvā smṛtiḥ, smṛtilambhe*

sarvagranthīnām vipramokṣaḥ, tasmai mṛditakaṣāyāya tamasaspāram darśayati bhagavān sanatkumāraḥ’ (Ch.U.7-26-2). *Bhāṣyakāra* explains this: *Āhāra* is that which is eaten (*āhriyate*) in the wider sense of all perceptual experiences of sense-objects (called *viśaya-vijñāna*). Therefore the *āhāraśuddhi* (purity of *āhāra*) means the *viśaya-vijñāna* free from the defects of likes (*rāga*), dislikes (*dveṣa*) and infatuation (*moha*). When such purity of *āhāra* (*viśaya-vijñāna*) is accomplished, one gains *sattvaśuddhi*, the purity of *antaḥkaraṇa* capable of displaying Brahman as a replica. On gaining the *sattvaśuddhi*, the steadfastness in terms of continuous remembrance called *smṛti* of the knowledge of *bhūmā* already gained takes place. On gaining such continuous remembrance of *bhūmā* in its true nature, the total destruction of *hṛdaya-granthis* (deeply rooted calamitous fetters produced by *avidyā* that bind the *ātmā* to *saṃsāra* which have hardened because of experiences of past endless births and are deeply rooted in the *antaḥkaraṇa*) takes place. Since all the subsequent accomplishments have their basis in *āhāraśuddhi*, it should be practiced assiduously. Having taught thoroughly the *śruti* concludes the *ākhyāyika* (connected narrative) by saying Sanatkumāra revealed the

ultimate reality (*bhūmā*) to Nārada who had fit *antaḥkaraṇa* to gain that knowledge' (*Ch.U.Bh.7-26-2*). This topic is summarized in the next two verses.

विषयाहरणं शुद्धं रागद्वेषादिविवर्जनात् ।

ततः शुद्धधियात्मानं भूमानं सर्वदा स्मरेत् ॥८८॥

रागद्वेषादिविवर्जनात् - by giving up likes and dislikes, etc. विषयाहरणम् - sense-indulgence (perceptual experience) शुद्धम् - (becomes) pure ततः (जातया) - by the one born from that शुद्धधिया - by the pure *antaḥkaraṇa* आत्मानं भूमानम् - *ātmā* that is *bhūmā* सर्वदा - always स्मरेत् - can be remembered (known) – (88)

88. On giving up likes and dislikes, etc., the sense-indulgence (perceptual experience) becomes pure. By the pure *antaḥkaraṇa* that is born from pure sense-indulgence, *ātmā* that is *bhūmā* can be remembered (known) always.

The word 'ādi' (etc.) in the phrase 'rāgdveṣādi' refers to the infatuation (*moha*). Vedānta invariably highlights the necessity of *vairāgya* (absence of *rāga/āsakti/prīti*/love for sense-objects). But there are at times some unavoidable *prārabdha-viṣayabhogas* which one has to undergo or those sense-indulgence such as food, clothing, shelter which are necessary for the

upkeep of the body. In these cases, the defects of *rāga* (like) *dveṣa* (dislike), *moha* (infatuation) have to be given up. That leads to the purity of mind. The *śruti* uses the word *āhāra* for what is called in this verse as *viṣayāharaṇam* (sense-indulgence). Though generally the word *āhāra* means the food and drink it also signifies all perceptions of sound, touch, form, taste and smell. The *āhārasuddhi* (purity of *āhāra*) leads to *śuddhāntaḥkaraṇa* or called *sattvasuddhi*. Such pure mind is capable of bearing the replica of *nirguṇa* Brahman which is called *prajñā* or *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti*. It ends the ignorance of oneself culminating in *ātmasākṣātkāra* wherein that *vṛtti* also drops. The continued disposition of *śuddhāntaḥkaraṇa* thereafter helps to maintain the steady remembrance of *ātmā* (*bhūmā*). This is *niṣṭhā* in the *ātmajñāna*. Thus *āhārasuddhi* leads to the subsequent higher and higher accomplishments.

शोकादिसर्वग्रन्थीनां भूम्नः स्मृत्या विमोक्षणात् ।
शुद्धधीर्नरदस्तस्मै तमःपारमदर्शयत् ॥८९॥

भूम्नः स्मृत्या - by the remembrance of *bhūmā* शोकादिसर्वग्रन्थीनाम् - of all seeming perversions of truth (or falsely superimposed entities) such as sorrow, etc., called the knots of the heart विमोक्षणात् - by ending, unfastening नरदः -

Nārada शुद्ध धीः - (became) the person of pure *antaḥkaraṇa* तस्मै - to him (Sanatkumāra) तमःपारम् - *bhūmā* that is beyond the realm of ignorance अदर्शयत् - revealed—(89)

89. By ending (unfastening) all seeming perversions of truth (or falsely superimposed entities) such as sorrow, etc., called the knots of the heart by the remembrance of *bhūmā*, Nārada became the person of pure *antaḥkaraṇa*. To him (Sanatkumāra) revealed *bhūmā* that is beyond the realm of ignorance.

Sorrows, erroneous notions about oneself, *Īśvara* and the *jagat* are called knots of the heart. They are the products of self-ignorance. They end only in the direct knowledge of oneself called *bhūmā*. To gain this knowledge a highly prepared mind is necessary. Nārada developed it. To such an eligible Nārada, the *guru* Sanatkumāra revealed *bhūmā* wherein there is no trace of ignorance (*māyā*) and its effects resulting in sorrows. Nārada's request was to free him from all sorrows. Sanatkumāra did it by imparting the knowledge of *bhūmā* which is our real nature of limitless *ānanda* without any sorrow.

CONCLUSION

This chapter is concluded now.

सनत्कुमारविद्यायास्तात्पर्यं स्पष्टमीरितम् ।
तेन कुर्यान्मयि कृपां विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः ॥९०॥

सनत्कुमारविद्यायाः - of *Sanatkumāra-vidyā* तात्पर्यं - purport or explanation स्पष्टम् - clearly ईरितम् - is told तेन - By that विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः - *Parameśvara* in the form of *Vidyātīrtha* मयि - to me कृपां कुर्यात् - may he bless—(90)

90. The purport (or the explanation) of *Sanatkumāravidyā* is clearly told. By that, may the *Parameśvara* in the form of *Vidyātīrtha* bless me.

This teaching is called *Sanatkumāravidyā* because it was taught by Sanatkumāra. It is also called *bhūmavidyā* because its subject is the limitless *bhūmā*. The author invokes the blessings of *Parameśvara*. Thus ends the fourth chapter, *Sanatkumāravidyā*.

इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिविरचिते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
छान्दोग्ये सनत्कुमारविद्याप्रकाशो नाम
चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ।

॥ ॐ ॥



CHAPTER - V PRAJĀPATIVIDYĀPRAKĀŚA (CHĀNDOGYOPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[*Chāndogyopaniṣat* is very important because it unfolds entirely all the three *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* aspects of Brahman in its sixth, eight and seventh chapters (*Adhyāyas*) (*A.Pr.3, 5, 4*) respectively. *Prajāpatividyāprakāśa* is the exposition of the eighth chapter of *Chāndogyopaniṣat*. It deals with the *ātmavidyā* as taught by *Prajāpati* to Indra and Virocana. The teaching is imparted progressively in four stages. Virocana was Asura king. His mind was ill prepared to gain *ātmavidyā*. In spite of carrying out 32 years of *gurusevā* he misunderstood the teaching in the first instance. He concluded that the physical body is *ātmā*. He did not realize his mistake. On the contrary he propagated that the body is *ātmā*. Indra, the king of the Devas, had a *sāttvika* mind. He could find out the mistakes at every stage in what he had concluded as *ātmā* and continued to do *gurusevā*. Finally, he got the knowledge by exposure to the teaching received in four stages after carrying out *gurusevā* for a total of 101 years.

Prajāpati once declared in his royal court that ‘*ātmā* is free from *pāpa*, *puṇya*, old age, death, sorrow, hunger, thirst and it is *satyasaṅkalpa* and *satyakāma*. It should be inquired into until its direct knowledge (*viññāna*) in terms of *ātmasākṣātkāra* is gained. Such a *jñānī* gains all *lokas* and fulfills all desires as *sarvātmā*’. Having known this declaration, both Indra and Virocana approach *Prajāpati*.

After they served *Prajāpati* for 32 years, he taught them for the first time by taking recourse to the eye as the *jāgratsākṣī* (illuminator of the waking state). *Prajāpati* taught: ‘The limitless entity called *puruṣa* (*cit*) seen by *yogīs* in the eye is *ātmā*. It is seen in its true nature by *yogīs* who have totally withdrawn their senses from the sense-objects and have destroyed their past sins called *duritas*. By its direct knowledge, one attains all *lokas* and sense-pleasures. That is immortal, limitless.

Being non-dual, it is free from fear (*saṃsāra*) and therefore it is primordial Brahman'. Both of them did not tally the teaching with *Prajāpati's* first declaration regarding *ātmā*. They mistook the shadow of the body in the eye and thereby considered the physical body itself as *ātmā*. Both returned with a vain satisfaction that they had got *ātmajñāna*. Virocana reached his kingdom and propagated his *Āsurī Upaniṣad* that the body is *ātmā*. But Indra on his way back reflected over his understanding. He discerned that the body with all its shortcomings such as hunger, thirst, diseases, sorrows cannot be *ātmā*. He returned and placed his problem in front of *Prajāpati* who confirmed that the physical body is not *ātmā*. Indra had to serve the *guru* for a further 32 years.

On the completion of the second term of *seva*, *Prajāpati* taught Indra that *svapna-sākṣī* (the illuminator of dream state) is *ātmā*. Indra immediately jumped to the conclusion that the dreamer is *ātmā* because in the dream state he was free from sorrows arising from the physical body in its waking state. But he got disillusioned later on finding that the dreamer also experiences sorrow. After further *seva* of 32 years, in the third stage of teaching, the *susupti-sākṣī* was pointed out as the *ātmā*. Here also instead of discerning the *cit* that illuminates the causal body to be *ātmā*, Indra mistook the deep sleeper as *ātmā*. He found that the sleeper who is ignorant of everything cannot give the promised result of *ātmajñāna*. Finally, at the fourth stage of teaching, when Indra's mind was fully ready after the total 101 years of service to the *guru*, he got *ātmajñāna*. He was taught that *ātmā* is totally *asārīra* (free from the threefold body) and hence *asaṃsārī*. This is the same *sākṣī-ātmā* at the levels of the three states of *jīva* – waking, dreaming and sleeping – taught in the first three stages. This *sākṣī* is the most exalted (*uttama*) in comparison with the other three states of *jīva* where ignorance (the cause) and the body (the effect) are present. It is totally free from the erroneous status of *jīva*. It is Brahman itself. It is called *uttama puruṣa*.

The narrative (*ākhyāyikā*) connected to this teaching imparts three lessons:

- i) The service of the *guru* removes the sin that obstructs the acquisition of *ātmavidyā* and enables the *mumukṣu* to gain it.
- ii) In spite of having a great *guru* such as *Prajāpati*, *ātmajñāna* can never be gained unless the obstruction is totally removed.
- iii) As exemplified by *Prajāpati*, the *guru* should favour an eligible disciple who has approached him by teaching compassionately and repeatedly in entirety and, on observing that the disciple has endured the exertion involved in order to learn *ātmavidyā*.]

INTRODUCTION

The *Brahmavidyā* taught in the last three chapters (6 to 8) of *Chāndogyopaniṣat* is very important because of its entirety by unfolding all the three *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* aspect of Brahman. Its sixth chapter (*A.Pr.3*) unfolds *sat* (existence, 'is'ness) aspect of Brahman whereas *ānanda* and *cit* aspects are unfolded in the seventh and eighth chapters (*A.Pr.4* and *5*) respectively. The *sat* aspect of Brahman is manifest in everything. It can be ascertained easily by *vicāra*. But to experience the 'ānanda' aspect the single pointed concentration is indispensable. That is why Nārada was asked to practice *upāsanās* of *nāma* to *āśā* as Brahman.

Chāndogyopaniṣat unfolded in the sixth and the seventh chapters the non-dual *sat* Brahman free from the limitations of space, time, etc. Further, it was established that *ātmā* alone is everything. It is difficult to know it directly for those who are less eligible because their *buddhi* is totally pre-occupied in the duality of space, time, objects, etc. Yet, without *Brahmajñāna* liberation is not possible. So, even less eligible people have to be helped to redirect their mind to gain this knowledge. With this in view, this Upaniṣad advises *daharavidyā*, an

upāsanā of meditating on Brahman abiding in the lotus of heart by attributing to it some *guṇas* (features) because such people are more at home with *saguna* Brahman. It needs more maturity to take to the knowledge of *nirguna* Brahman. So also *Brahmajñānīs* naturally withdraw themselves from all types of sense-indulgence. Even then the hankering (*tr̥ṣṇā*) for sense-object which is born of sense-indulgence in the past innumerable lives does not stop all of a sudden. To them a life of *brahmacarya*, *gurukulavāsa*, etc., have to be advised. Unlike *jñānīs* who have no travel after their *prārabdha* gets over, the *upāsakas* of *saguna* Brahman do have transmigration. They need the guidance about the mode of their travel. Taking into account all these factors *Chāndogyā śruti* starts its eighth chapter (*Ch.U.Bh. 8-1-1*).

The subject matter of this text *Anubhūtiprakāśa* being *nirguna* Brahman only, Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni omits *daharavidyā*, and elaborates on *Prajāpatividya* unfolding *nirguna* Brahman by ascertaining its *cit* aspect. After that the Upaniṣad deals with a few remaining aspects also which are not included in this chapter. Just as *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad* unfolds *ātmā* as *avasthātraya-sākṣī* (illuminator of three states of consciousness), here also the

same is going to be taught, but with a different mode of analysis.

The chapter begins now by declaring its content.

प्रजापतिः स्वात्मविद्यां छान्दोग्ये बहुधाऽब्रवीत् ।
विरोचनाय चेन्द्राय तां वक्ष्ये सुखबुद्धये ॥१॥

प्रजापतिः - *Prajāpati, Brahmājī*
छान्दोग्ये - in the eighth chapter of
Chāndogyopaniṣad विरोचनाय - to
Virocana (king of demons) इन्द्राय च - and
to Indra (king of celestials) स्वात्मविद्याम् -
the knowledge of oneself बहुधा -
repeatedly अब्रवीत् - taught ताम् - that
(*svātmavidyā*) सुखबुद्धये - for an easy
understanding वक्ष्ये - I shall explain – (1)

1. *Prajāpati (Brahmājī)* in the (eighth chapter of) *Chāndogyopaniṣad* taught repeatedly the knowledge of oneself to Virocana (king of demons) and to Indra (king of celestials). I shall explain that (*svātmavidyā*) for an easy understanding.

This *vidyā* (knowledge) makes us know our true nature to be *ātmā*/Brahman in contrast to our present mistaken notion as *samsārī jīva*. That is why it is called *svātmavidyā*. The teaching is imparted repeatedly by *Brahmājī* until the eligible disciple gains *ātmajñāna*. Virocana considered his mistaken notion as the actual *ātmā* and returned to his kingdom only to

propagate that the body is *ātmā*. But Indra on repeated discovery that what he has learnt is not the correct knowledge of *ātmā*, places again and again his problem in front of *Prajāpati (Brahmājī)* in turn, out of compassion, teaches him repeatedly. That teaching is explained here with clarity for an easy grasp of *ātmavidyā*.

PRAJĀPATI'S DECLARATION

Indra and Virocana were both kings living in royal comforts. What prompted them to gain this knowledge discarding their royal sense-pleasures? The reason is traced in the description of *ātmā* and the results that can be gained by *ātmajñāna* as described by *Prajāpati* sometimes in his assembly. The declaration of *Prajāpati* is: The *ātmā* that is (*yaḥātmā*) free from *pāpa* and *punya* (*apahatapāpmā*), free from old age (*vijarah*), death (*vimṛtyuḥ*), sorrows (*viśokaḥ*), hunger (*vijighatsaḥ*), thirst (*apipāsah*), whose desires are always fruitful (*satyakāmaḥ*) and whose volitions (*saṅkalpas*) always come true (*satyasaṅkalpaḥ*) should be inquired into (*anveṣṭavyaḥ*) and gain its direct knowledge in terms of *sākṣātkāra* (*vijijñāsitavyaḥ*). The one who having inquired, (i.e. *anuvīdya*) in accordance with the scriptures and *guru's* teaching into *ātmā* knows it directly (*vijānāti*). Such a *jñānī* (*saḥ*) gains (*āpnoti*) all

lokas and fulfills all desires as *ātmā* the true nature and basis of all (*Ch.U.8-7-1*). This declaration is going to be explained up to the verse 11.

असंसार्ययमात्माऽसावन्वेष्टव्यो मुमुक्षुणा ।
प्रजापतिरिति प्राह प्रसङ्गेन स्वसंसदि ॥२॥

अयम् आत्मा - this *ātmā* असंसारी - is free from *saṃsāra* मुमुक्षुणा - by every *mumukṣu* असौ - this *ātmā* अन्वेष्टव्यः - should be investigated into इति - thus प्रजापतिः - *Prajāpati* स्वसंसदि - in his assembly प्रसङ्गेन - in some context प्राह - declared – (2)

2. This *ātmā* is free from *saṃsāra*. The same should be investigated into by every *mumukṣu*. Thus *Prajāpati* declared in his assembly in some context.

A *mumukṣu* strives to gain *mokṣa* wherein total freedom from sorrows is there. This is possible only by gaining *aparokṣa ātmajñāna* which itself happens to be the knowledge of the single principle that is the real nature of ‘I’ the individual *jīva*, *jagat* the total and *Īśvara* the Creator. Obviously the purpose of *Prajāpati* to declare about taking to *ātmavicāra* (self-inquiry) was to highlight its indispensability as the only means to gain liberation.

The gist of the declaration is as follows.

यो निष्पापोऽजरो

मृत्युशोकक्षुत्तृडिववर्जितः ।

सत्योऽस्य कामः संकल्पश्चासंसारी

स ईश्वरः ॥३॥

यः - the one who is निष्पापः - free from *pāpa* (and *puṇya*) अजरोः - free from old age मृत्यु-शोक-क्षुत्-तृडिववर्जितः - free from death (and birth), sorrow, hunger and thirst अस्य कामः - whose desire सत्यः - comes true सङ्कल्पः च - and volition (comes true) असंसारी - free from *saṃsāra* सः - he ईश्वरः - is *Īśvara* – (3)

3. The *ātmā* who is free from *pāpa* (including *puṇya*), old age, death (and birth), sorrow, hunger and thirst, whose desire and volition come true, and who is free from *saṃsāra* is *Īśvara*.

Niṣpāpaḥ means sinless for which the *śruti* has used the word *apahatapāpmā*. *Pāpa* (sin) here indicates *puṇya* also. *Ātmā* is free from *pāpa* and *puṇya* means he is not connected to any *karma* and *karmaphalas* because of being *aśarīra* (bodiless) or *nirupādhika* (free from all *upādhis*). Without the embodiment, performance of *karma* or becoming *akartā* (doer) is not possible. *Saṅkalpa* (volition, will) is the cause of *kāma* (desire) (*kāmahetavaḥ saṅkalpāḥ*, *Ch.U.Bh.8-1-5*). The *śruti* uses the words *satyakāmaḥ* and *satyasāṅkalpaḥ*

to describe *ātmā* (as *Īśvara*) whose *saṅkalpa* and desires are infallible in contrast to those of *jīva* which are in vain. The entire *jagat* is as per *Īśvara's saṅkalpa*. The author of this text gives the meaning of *kāma* as *Īśvara's* desire to Create the *sr̥ṣṭi* and *saṅkalpa* as the volition that the *sr̥ṣṭi* must be as the one in the past (vs.6, 7). Finally the *ātmā* is not the *saṃsārī jīva* but *Īśvara* in reality.

Each of these words describing the nature of *ātmā* is explained one by one by showing how it is so.

पापं कर्तुरकर्तात्मा चिन्मात्रः पापवान् कथम् ।
जरामृत्यू देहधर्मो विद्येते न चितस्ततः ॥४॥

पापं - the sin (belongs) कर्तुः (भवति)
- to the doer (*kartā*) आत्मा - *ātmā* is
अकर्ता - non-doer चिन्मात्रः - knowledge-
principle alone (without *upādhi*) कथम् -
how पापवान् (भवेत्) - can it be sinful?
जरामृत्यू - both old age and death देहधर्मो
विद्येते - are the characteristic features of
the physical body ततः - therefore चितः न -
they do not belong to *ātmā* who is
caitanya (cit) only – (4)

4. The sin (belongs) to the doer (*kartā*). Non-doer *ātmā* is the knowledge-principle alone (without *upādhi*). How can it be sinful? Both old age and death (including birth) are the characteristic features of the physical body. Therefore they do not belong to

ātmā who is *caitanya (cit)* only.

Ātmā is the ever-existent knowledge-principle *cit* and *cit* alone. It is *aśarīra* (bodiless). Therefore there is no occasion for it to get identified with its non-existing body to become *kartā* (doer) leave alone doing any *karmas* or to get attached to their *phalas* (results). Because it is bodiless, it does not have old age and death or birth which belong to the body. Even otherwise *ātmā* never ceases to exist. It is changeless.

The next verse explains *śoka-kṣut-tr̥ḍvivarijitaḥ* (vs.3) corresponding to the words *viśokaḥ*, *vijighatsaḥ* and *apipāsaḥ* used in the Upaniṣad.

शोकः स्यान्मनसो धर्मः क्षुत्तृष्णो प्राणगे उभे ।
चिद्रूपस्यात्मनो नैव सन्ति शोकादयस्त्रयः ॥५॥

शोकः - sorrow मनसः धर्मः - the
feature of the mind स्यात् - is क्षुत्तृष्णो उभे -
both hunger and thirst प्राणगे - belong to
the *prāṇa* शोकादयः त्रयः - the trio of
sorrow, hunger and thirst चिद्रूपस्य आत्मनः
- of *ātmā* whose nature is *cit* नैव सन्ति - are
not at all there (in the true nature of
ātmā) – (5)

5. Sorrow is the feature of the mind. Both hunger and thirst belong to the *prāṇa*. (Therefore) the trio of sorrow, hunger and thirst are not at all there in the *cit* nature of *ātmā*.

The *nirupādhika ātmā* having

the nature of *cit* only is free from the mind and *prāṇas*. Therefore their features such as sorrow (*śoka*), hunger (*kṣut*, *jighatsā*), thirst (*trṣṇā*, *pipāsā*), etc., do not belong to *ātmā*. *Śoka* is the anguish or the suffering (*santāpaḥ*) at the mental level (*mānasaḥ*) born of separation from the near and dear ones, etc., (*iṣṭādiviyoga-nimittaḥ*) (*Ch.U.Bh.* 8-1-5). It includes *moha* (absence of discrimination, *vivekābhāvaḥ*). *Śoka* and *moha* are there during the waking and dream states when the mind is present. But in the sleep, when the mind is absent, they are not there. This proves that *śoka* and *moha* belong to the mind. These three pairs of *śoka-mohau*, *jarāmṛtyū* and *kṣutpipāse* belonging to the mind, the body and *prāṇa* respectively are called six *ūrmis* (recurring waves of ocean). *Ātmā* is free from them. All the sorrows of *samsāra* originate from the body, mind and the *prāṇas*. *Ātmā* is nothing but *ānanda* totally free from sorrows. That is why in the deep sleep when the mind, *prāṇas* and the physical body are beyond the cognitive range of the sleeping person, there is not even a trace of sorrow. On the other hand *nirviṣaya* (objectless) *ānanda* the nature of *ātmā*, is experienced though coupled with self-ignorance. This proves that *ātmā* is *asamsārī*.

By the method of negation the

existence of an entity can be established without the means of *upādhis*. But if the same is to be proved in relation to the world, the *upādhis* need to be employed. Therefore *ātmā* as *Īśvara* is shown as *satyakāmaḥ* and *satyasankalpaḥ*. Here the word *satya* (true) is in the sense of *vyāvahārika satya* (empirically true) and not absolutely. These two words from *Prajāpati's* declaration are elaborated in the next two verses.

चिन्मात्रस्याप्यस्ति माया

कामसङ्कल्पकारिणी ।

स्रक्ष्यामि जगदित्यादि कामो

मायाविनोऽस्ति हि ॥६॥

चिन्मात्रस्य अपि - belonging even to *ātmā* who is nothing but the knowledge-principle *cit* and *cit* alone कामसङ्कल्पकारिणी - producer of desire and volition (will) माया - *māyā* (Creative power) अस्ति - is there मायाविनः - belonging, the wielder of *māyā* (*Īśvara*) जगत् - *jagat* स्रक्ष्यामि - 'I shall create' इत्यादि कामः - such desire अस्ति - is there हि - so it is well-known in the scriptures – (6)

6. Even the *ātmā* who is nothing but the knowledge-principle *cit* and *cit* alone has *māyā* (Creative power) who produces the desire and volition (will). It is well-known in the scriptures that the wielder of *māyā* (*Īśvara*) has desires such as 'I shall create (*jagat*)'.

आकाशादिपदार्थास्तु यथापूर्वं
भवन्त्वह ।

सङ्कल्पोऽस्ति ततो ज्ञेया

व्यावहारिकसत्यता ॥७॥

आकाशादिपदार्थाः तु - as for the entities such as space, etc. इह - in this *sṛṣṭi* यथापूर्वं - as in the past Creation भवन्तु - let them be born (इति - so) सङ्कल्पः - (*Īśvara's*) *saṅkalpaḥ* (consideration) अस्ति - is there ततः - (because the *kāma* and *saṅkalpa* produced by false *māyā* are equally false) therefore व्यावहारिकसत्यता - (the *sṛṣṭi* Created by *Īśvara*) has empirical reality (and not absolute reality) ज्ञेया - (so) it should be known – (7)

7. As for the entities such as space, etc., in this *sṛṣṭi* (Creation), ‘let them be born as in the past Creation’ (so) *Īśvara's* *saṅkalpa* (consideration) is there. (Because the *kāma* and *saṅkalpa* produced by false *māyā* are equally false) therefore it should be known that (the *sṛṣṭi* Created by *Īśvara*) has empirical reality (and not absolute reality).

The *vyavahāra* of a *jīva* is enabled by the *upādhis* such as body, mind and *prāṇa*, etc. But *Īśvara's* *vyavahāra* is on account of *māyā* which is the cause of all *upādhis*. It is well-known in the *śruti* and *smṛti* that many

vyavahāras such as the desire to Create *sṛṣṭi*, the *saṅkalpa* (consideration) that it should be similar to the past ones, the actual *sṛṣṭi*, dispensing the *karmaphalas* of *jīvas*, etc., belong to *Īśvara*. *Māyā* is known for its skill of making the impossible appear to be acutally possible. That makes *Īśvara* *satyakāma* and *satyasāṅkalpa*. His desires and volitions always come true. They are infallible. *Jīvas* can desire, but its fruition is not guaranteed. They are not strong enough to get fulfilled always. During the *pralaya* (dissolution) the *karmaphalas* of all *jīvas* are in a dormant form. When they are due for fructification, to provide the required fields of experience, *Īśvara* desires ‘let me create the *jagat*’. *Māyā* or any power can be inferred by its effect only. The effect in terms of *jagat* proves the existence of *māyā*. Otherwise the presence of any *jagat* in the non-dual Brahman is next to impossible. Thus the perception of *jagat* itself is the *pramāṇa* for the existence of *māyā*. *Īśvara's* desire to Create the *jagat* is *kāma* whereas his desire that the *sṛṣṭi* should be similar to the past ones is called his *saṅkalpa*. Both the *kāma* and *saṅkalpa* being the products of false *māyā* their nature of being *satya* (true) is empirical (*vyāvahārika*) but not *pārmārthika* (not absolute).

Having described the nature of *ātmā*, *Prajāpati* exhorts: ‘*saḥ anveṣṭavyaḥ, saḥ vijijñāsitavyaḥ*’ (Ch.U.8-7-1). The verse eight explains the word ‘*anveṣṭavyaḥ*’ whereas ‘*vijijñāsitavyaḥ*’ will be explained in the ninth verse.

अन्वेष्यः परमात्मायं माया तत्कार्यलक्षितः ।

गुरुशास्त्रकृतो बोधस्तस्यान्वेषणमुच्यते ॥८॥

मायातत्कार्यलक्षितः - the one who is indicated by *māyā* and its effect (*jagat*, etc.) अयम् - this *aparokṣa* (truly as ‘I’) परमात्मा - *Paramātmā* अन्वेष्यः - is worthy to be inquired into (should be sought) गुरुशास्त्रकृतः - given by *śrotrīya-brahmaniṣṭha guru* in accordance with the Upaniṣads तस्य बोधः - his advice (teaching) अन्वेषणम् - inquiry उच्यते - is called—(8)

8. This *aparokṣa* (truly ‘I’) *Paramātmā* is worthy to be inquired into (should be sought). The advice (teaching) given by *śrotrīya-brahmaniṣṭha guru* in accordance with the Upaniṣads is called inquiry.

ततोऽनुभूत्या विज्ञातुमेष्टव्यो

धीनिरोधतः ।

ध्यायन् युक्त्या च मन्वानः

स्वात्मानुभवमाप्नुयात् ॥९॥

ततः - thereafter धी निरोधतः - by excluding all *anātmā-pratyayas*

(thoughts related to *anātmā*) from the *antaḥkaraṇa* and maintaining a steady flow of *ātma-pratyayas* (thoughts conforming to the nature of *ātmā*) therein अनुभूत्या - by one's direct (*aparokṣa*) experience विज्ञातुम् एष्टव्यः - is fit to be known युक्त्या मन्वानः - taking to *manana* (reflection) by reasoning ध्यायन् च - and meditating (in terms of *nididhyāsana* by *dhīnirodha*) स्वात्मानुभवम् - direct (*aparokṣa*) experience of one's true nature *ātmā* आप्नुयात् - should be gained—(9)

9. Thereafter *ātmā* (*Paramātmā*) is fit to be known through one's direct (*aparokṣa*) experience by excluding all *anātmā-pratyayas* (thoughts related to *anātmā*) from the *antaḥkaraṇa* and maintaining a steady flow of *ātma-pratyayas* (thoughts conforming to the nature of *ātmā*) therein. (Thus) by taking to *manana* (reflection) with the means of reasoning and meditating (in terms of *nididhyāsana* by *dhīnirodha*) direct (*aparokṣa*) experience of one's true nature *ātmā* should be gained.

Prajāpati's exhortation by the means of two phrases ‘सः अन्वेष्टव्यः’ (*saḥ anveṣṭavyaḥ*) and ‘सः विजिज्ञासितव्यः’ (*saḥ vijijñāsitavyaḥ*) describes in a nutshell the stages and the process of gaining *aparokṣa* (direct) *Brahmajñāna/ātmajñāna*. These two verses elaborate it.

In the common world an understanding about entity passes as its knowledge. But in the case of *pratyakṣajñāna* (perceptual knowledge through senses) and the *aparokṣa ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna* (direct knowledge of *ātmā*/ Brahman) the *jñāna-vṛtti* (the thought that imparts the knowledge of the entity) has to conform to the entity to be known. This corresponds to its direct experience true to its nature because the knowledge is defined as: ‘ज्ञानं तु प्रमाणजन्यं यथाभूतविषयं च’ (*Br.Sū.Bh.3-2-21*). It means: Direct knowledge of an entity is born of *pramāṇa* and has as its object the true nature of the entity (known, *yathābhūta-viṣayam*).

Mere understanding of *ātmā*/Brahman, though essential in the beginning is endowed with the features of *tripuṭī* characterized by the understander (*jñātā* or *pramātā*), understanding (a *vṛtti* as the *jñāna-vṛtti* which serves as *pramāṇa*) and the understood (*jñeya*). But *tripuṭī* is not the feature of *ātmā*. In the *aparokṣātmajñāna* the *pramātā* (*jñātā*) ends and the *pramāṇa* ceases to be so. ‘After *ātmā* has been directly cognized, *pramāṇa-prameya-vyavahāra* is not possible. Vedānta, the highest *pramāṇa*, terminates the status of *ātmā* as a *pramātā* and itself ceases to be *pramāṇa*, just as the *pramāṇa* during the state of dream ceases to be *pramāṇa* upon waking’ (*B.G.Bh.2.69*). Thus so long as the understander (*pramātā*) is present, whatever that is understood as *ātmā* based on Vedāntic scriptures and the teaching of a *guru* is only the *parokṣa* (indirect) knowledge of *ātmā*. This is referred to as *guruśāstrakṛtaḥ bodhaḥ* (vs.8).

If the *mumukṣu* is an *uttama adhikārī* (totally eligible) having *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti*, *śuddha-citta* besides a *kṛtopāsti* (who has taken to the *upāsana* to the point of *sākṣātkāra* of *upāsya*), he can get then itself by such *bodha* the *ātmāsākṣātkāra* wherein direct (*aparokṣa*) *anubhava* of *ātmā* free from all *adhyasta* including the *tripuṭī*. Otherwise the *manana* by reasoning and *nididhyāsana* described as *dhīnirodhataḥ dhyāna* have to be practiced to gain *svātmānubhava* (direct experience of one's true nature *ātmā* free from all *upādhis*) (vs.9).

Bhāṣyakāra explains *anveṣṭavyaḥ* as *ātmā* should be known by the teaching (advice) of a competent *ācārya* in accordance with the *śāstras* (शास्त्राचार्योपदेशैः ज्ञातव्यः). As for *vijijñāsitavyaḥ* he comments: ‘One should strive to know *ātmā* with excellence (*viśeṣeṇa*), that is to say the direct experience of *ātmā* should be gained (विशेषेण ज्ञातुम् एष्टव्यः स्वसंवेद्यताम् आपादयितव्यः) (*Ch.U.Bh.8-7-1*).

This shows that direct experience (*aparokṣānubhava*) of *ātmā* is indispensable to gain *ātmajñāna* without which it is only the *parokṣa* (indirect)

knowledge. *Parokṣajñāna* cannot end the *saṃsāra-bhrama* experienced directly (*aparokṣatayā*).

Sage Yājñavalkya also exhorts in *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (2-4-5) that *ātmā* has to be seen very clearly (*draṣṭavyaḥ*). What is meant by *darśana* here is not seeing with the eyes because *ātmā* is formless but it means ‘*samyak-darśana*’ – knowing *ātmā* in its true nature. Such knowledge amounts to *ātmānubhava* because *ātmā* is self-experiencing principle free from *adhyasta jagat/saṃsāra*. Anything experienced short of it mixed with the features of *adhyasta* entities is not its *darśana*. The means recommended therein are *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana*. Together practice of these alone can culminate in the *darśana* of *ātmā*. *Bhāṣyakāra* comments: यदा एकत्वम् एतानि (श्रवणमनननिदिध्यासन साधनानि) उपगतानि तदा सम्यक् दर्शनं ब्रह्मैकत्वविषयं प्रसीदति न अन्यथा श्रवणमात्रेण । (When *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* are combined together through their practice, then the exact knowledge of identity with Brahman is gained, but not otherwise by only *śravaṇa*) (*Br. U. Bh. 2-4-5*).

Ātmajñāna in its true nature is always with the accomplishment of *aparokṣātmānubhava* (direct experience of *ātmā* in its true nature). But *mumukṣus* tend to conclude mere scriptural knowledge without *aparokṣānubhava* as *ātmajñāna*. Therefore we find at places the distinction drawn between them by the use of *jñāna* and *vijñāna* by *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa himself. *Bhāṣyakāra* explains their distinction very clearly.

- i) ज्ञानं शास्त्रतः आचार्यतः च आत्मादीनाम् अवबोधः । (*Jñānam* is the knowledge gained through the *adhyātma-śāstra* and the teacher). विज्ञानं विशेषतः तदनुभवः (तस्य ज्ञानस्य अनुभवः) । (*Vijñānam* is the intense experience of that which is learnt from *adhyātma-śāstra* and the teacher) (*B. G. Bh. 3-41*).
- ii) ज्ञानं शास्त्रोक्तपदार्थानां परिज्ञानं (A thorough understanding of what is expounded in the Vedāntic scriptures). विज्ञानं शास्त्रतः ज्ञातानां तथैव स्वानुभवकरणम् । (One's own experience in accordance with what is known through the scriptures) (*B. G. Bh. 6-8*).
- iii) ज्ञानं शास्त्रार्थज्ञानम् । (Knowledge gained through the scriptures). सविज्ञानं स्वानुभवसंयुक्तम् । (Endowed with one's experience) (*B. G. Bh. 7-2*).

Thus *ātmajñāna* has to be *aparokṣa* which needs *aparokṣānubhava* of *ātmā*. Without that the knowledge is only *parokṣa* (indirect) in nature. Notwithstanding this, some people claim that *ātmajñāna* does not need any experience because the

Veda is the *pramāṇa*. This concept is totally based on hearsay. Unfortunately these people have not tried to find any corroboration from the *śāstras* to this claim. Actually there is a *pūrvapakṣa* (contrary view) akin to this better argued by *Pūrvamīmāṃsakas*. They contend that the Veda is the common *pramāṇa* for *dharmajijñāsā* (inquiry into the nature of the *karmakāṇḍa* portion of the Veda) and *Brahmajijñāsā* (inquiry to know Brahman).

Dharma (*karma*) does not need any experience and reasoning (*manana*) once the knowledge of *anuṣṭhāna* (performance of *karmas*) is gained. So is the case of *Brahmajñāna* according to them. This is incorrect. The modes of gaining (or imparting) knowledge in *dharmajijñāsā* and *Brahmajijñāsā* differ even though the *Veda-pramāṇa* is common. The *dharma* (*karma*) does not need experience not because the Veda is *pramāṇa*, but because at the time of gaining the knowledge of *karmas* their results, the heavens, are yet to be procured. Therefore their experience is not possible. But self-evident and ever-existent Brahman is available for experience all along.

Brahmajijñāsā does not produce Brahman but points it out in its true nature free from *adhyasta prapañca* with the means to know it wherein the spontaneous self-evident experience of Brahman in its true nature is manifest. The *sūtra-bhāṣya* highlights the necessity of *Brahmānubhava* in gaining the *Brahmajñāna* with valid reasons:

न धर्मजिज्ञासायां इव श्रुत्यादयः एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम् । किन्तु श्रुत्यादयः अनुभवादयः च यथासंभवम् इह प्रमाणम्, अनुभवावसानत्वात् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वात् च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य । (ब्र.सू.भा. १-१-२)

Tr. For the inquiry into Brahman, *śruti* and the rest are not the only means of knowledge, unlike in the case of *dharmajijñāsā*. In addition to *śruti* (with *liṅgam*, etc.), direct experience, (reflection and contemplation in accordance with the *śruti*) are (also) the *pramāṇas* as appropriate (to the context required) because the knowledge of Brahman culminates in (direct) experience and concerns an already existent entity (*Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-2*).

Two important texts, *Pañcapādikā* of Śrī Padmapādācārya and *Vivaraṇa-prameya-saṅgraha* of Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni answer the above contrary view of *pūrvamīmāṃsakas* at length and further corroborate the need for experience and reasoning in gaining *Brahmajñāna*.

Prajāpati further describes the result gained by such an *ātmajñānī*: ‘He gains all *lokas* and fulfills all desires (discovering himself as *sarvātmā* - *ātmā* of all)’ (*Ch.U.8-7-1*). The next two verses explain the import of this result.

य एवं वेत्त्यसौ सर्वान् लोकान्
कामांश्च विन्दते ।
लोकाधिष्ठानरूपत्वात्
सर्वलोकात्मता भवेत् ॥१०॥

यः - the one who एवम् - thus वेत्ति - gains the *svātmānubhava* (*aparokṣa* experience of *ātmā*) असौ - that person सर्वान् - all लोकान् - *lokas* कामान् - desires, (i.e. sense-pleasures) च - and विन्दते - attains (सर्व) लोकाधिष्ठानरूपत्वात् - because of being the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of all *lokas* सर्वलोकात्मता - the true nature of all *lokas* भवेत् - (he) becomes – (10)

10. The person who thus gains the *svātmānubhava* (*aparokṣa* experience of *ātmā*) attains all *lokas* and desires, (i.e. sense-pleasures). He becomes the true nature of all *lokas* because of being their basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*).

The individual *jīva* because of self-ignorance was desiring different sense-pleasures including those available only in different types of heavens (*lokas*). In this verse the word *kāma* (desire) is used in the sense of sense-pleasure (*viṣayajanya-sukha*). On

gaining *svātmānubhava* (*aparokṣa* experience of *ātmā*) the same *jīva* who has directly known oneself as *ātmā* now, discovers that as *ātmā* he is truly the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of all *lokas*. As a result there cannot be any longer the desire to attain those *lokas*. They are so good as attained by him. Thus the second line of this verse explains the original *śruti* ‘*sarvān lokān āpnoti*’ (attains all *lokas*) (*Ch.U.8-7-1*). But one may argue that the desire to gain those heavens were not meant for the sake of heavens only, but to enjoy the *bhogas* (sense-pleasures) therein. Then what is the use of merely attaining those *lokas* in the above manner? This is answered by the *śruti* statement ‘*āpnoti sarvān ca kāmān*’ (gains all sense-pleasures) (*Ch.U.8-7-1*). How so will be explained in the next verse.

कामास्तु विषयानन्दाः

स्वात्मानन्दस्य तेऽखिलाः ।

लेशास्ततः सर्वकाम-

प्राप्तिरात्मविदोऽस्ति हि ॥११॥

कामाः - desires (referred to in the *śruti* ‘*sarvān ca kāmān*’) तु - indeed विषयानन्दाः - are sense-pleasures (born of sense-objects) ते - they अखिलाः - all (sense-pleasures) स्वात्मानन्दस्य - of the happiness (*ānanda*) that is the nature of *ātmā* लेशाः - (are) particles ततः - therefore आत्मविदः - for an *ātmajñānī* सर्वकामप्राप्तिः -

fulfilment of all sense-pleasures अस्ति हि - certainly holds good – (11)

11. Indeed the desires (*kāmāḥ*) (referred to in the *śruti* ‘*sarvān ca kāmān*’) are sense-pleasures (born of sense-objects). All the sense-pleasures (collectively) are the particles of happiness (*ānanda*) that is the nature of *ātmā*. Therefore the fulfilment of all sense-pleasures certainly holds good for an *ātmajñānī*.

Generally the word ‘*kāma*’ means desire. But it is also used in the sense of sense-object (*viśaya*) or sense-pleasure (*viśayajanya-sukha*). Here the *śruti* uses the word *kāma* as sense-pleasure. Just as the *sat*, *cit*, *ātmā* alone is the basic ‘existence’ and ‘knowledge’ principle, it is also the basic ‘happiness’ (*ānanda*) principle. The entity called *ātmānanda* or *Brahmānanda* or *bhūmānanda* is limitless non-dual *ānanda*. All the happiness experienced by *viśayendriya-saṁbandha* (contacts between senses and sense-objects) is only a particle of *ātmānanda* (*Br.U.4-3-32*). If *ātmānanda* is an ocean, all the sense-pleasures put together cannot be even a drop of it. Therefore for an *ātmajñānī* who is abiding in his nature of limitless happiness, the hitherto fascinating sense-pleasures have no relevance. Naturally they get included in the *ātmānanda* that is his true nature. This is

how an *ātmajñānī* fulfills all desires or enjoys all sense-pleasures and not in the literal sense like an ignorant person. The word ‘*hi*’ in the verse can also mean ‘*śāstra-prasiddhi*’ (so it is well-known in the *adhyātma-śāstra*. ‘*Yugapat sarvakāmāpti*’ (simultaneous fulfilment of all desires/sense-pleasures; *Tai.U.2-1, A.Pr.2-23 to 29*) and ‘*sarvalokeśu kāmācāra*’ (free movement at will in all *lokas*; *Ch.U.7-25-2, A.Pr.4-79 to 81*) also can be considered in this respect.

INDRA AND VIROCANA BECOME THE DISCIPLES OF PRAJĀPATI

The celestials (*devas*) and demons (*asuras*) came to know about the declaration by *Prajāpati*. They were enamoured by the result of gaining all the sense-pleasures and *lokas*. Indra the King of celestials and Virocana (विरोचन) the king of demons sought the consent of their subjects to gain such precious knowledge from *Prajāpati* so that they can share it with them. With their consent, as their representatives, both of them left for *Satyaloka*, but vying with each other without any communication or mutual good will. There in *Satyaloka*, they served *Prajāpati* as disciples for 32 years. Though both of them had enmity with each other in the initial stages, they gave it up totally on account of high estimation of *ātmavidyā* and its

importance. After 32 years *Prajāpati* asked them the purpose of their coming and chose to teach *ātma-vidyā* (Ch. U. 8-7-2,3). This content of the *śruti* is told now.

एतत् प्रजापतेर्वाक्यं श्रुत्वा देवासुरास्तदा ।
उभयेऽपि बुभुत्सन्तः परमात्मानमादरात् ॥१२॥

प्रजापतेः - of *Prajāpati* एतत् - this वाक्यम् - statement श्रुत्वा - having heard तदा - then देवासुराः - *devas* (celestials) and *asuras* (demons) उभये - both अपि - even परमात्मानम् - *Paramātmā* आदरात् - with earnestness बुभुत्सन्तः - desired to know - (12)

12. After having heard this statement of *Prajāpati*, even both the *devas* and demons desired to know *Paramātmā* with earnestness.

Every individual *jīva* irrespective of its status and accomplishments in life has an irresistible urge to get freed totally from old age, death, hunger, thirst and sorrows besides having a hankering for the fulfilment of all desires. Even *devas* and *asuras* enjoying heavenly pleasures are not exception to this urge. Therefore they promptly decided to gain *ātma-vidyā* and chose their king as their representative to learn it from *Prajāpati*.

देवराजोऽसुरेशश्च तौ द्वविन्द्रविरोचनौ ।
सत्यलोकं प्राप्य तस्मिन्नसेवेतां प्रजापतिम् ॥१३॥

देवराजः - the king of *devas* असुरेशः

च - and the king of *asuras* तौ द्वौ - those two इन्द्रविरोचनौ - viz. Indra and Virocana सत्यलोकम् - *Satyaloka* प्राप्य - having reached तस्मिन् - therein प्रजापतिम् - *Prajāpati* असेवेताम् - both of them served - (13)

13. Indra, the king of *devas* and Virocana, the king of *asuras* having reached *Satyaloka*, took to the service of *Prajāpati* therein.

The life of *brahmacarya* or the service of a competent *guru* who is both *śrotriya* and *Brahmaniṣṭha* is an indispensable means in gaining *ātma-vidyā* which is advised by the scriptures since the Vedic age. It tunes up the mind of the disciple with that of the *guru* enhancing *śraddhā* in him. Both Indra and Virocana because of their learning, knew this prerequisite. Therefore they on their own started serving *Prajāpati*.

After their service of thirty-two years, the pleased *Prajāpati* asked them the purpose of their service. On knowing it he chose to teach them *ātma-vidyā*.

द्वात्रिंशद्वर्षसेवातः प्रसन्नोऽसौ प्रजापतिः ।
अक्षिलक्षितमात्मानं ताभ्यां द्वाभ्यामवोचत ॥१४॥

असौ प्रजापतिः - that *Prajāpati* द्वात्रिंशद्-वर्षसेवातः - by their service for 32 years प्रसन्नः - being pleased ताभ्यां द्वाभ्याम् - to both of them अक्षिलक्षितम् आत्मानम् -

ātmā indicated by the eye अवोचत - taught—(14)

14. *Prajāpati* being pleased by their service of 32 years taught to both of them, the *ātmā* indicated by the eye (representing all the senses-*indriyas*).

After 32 years of service, when *Prajāpati* asked the purpose of their service, both of them referred to his declaration about *ātmavidyā* with its result, and showed their eagerness to gain it. *Prajāpati* accepts their request considering them to be fit to gain *ātmavidyā*.

JĀGRATSĀKṢĪ

Prajāpati opts to unfold to them the *ātmāsvarūpa* by taking recourse to all *indriyas* (senses) indicated by the eye. The entity that enables all *indriyas* who are inert by nature to function is *ātmā*. It is available as their *sākṣī* (illuminator). He says: ‘*Yah eṣahakṣiṇi purṣah dṛśyate, eṣahātmā etad amṛtam abhayam etad brahma*’ (The limitless entity *cit* called *puruṣa* seen by *yogīs* in the eye is the *ātmā*)(*Ch.U.8-7-4*). It is seen (directly experienced) in its true nature by *yogīs* (meditators) who have totally withdrawn their senses from the sense-objects and have destroyed their past sins called *duritas* (*mṛdita-kaśāyaih*). That is the *ātmā* which I (*Prajāpati*) had declared in the past by whose direct

knowledge one attains all *lokas* and sense-pleasures. That itself is immortal called *bhūmā* (limitless). Being non-dual, it is free from fear, (i.e. *samsāra*) and therefore that itself is primordial Brahman (*Ch.U.Bh.8-7-4*). Referring to *ātmā* as the *puruṣa* in the *indriyas* indicated by the eye is akin to the teaching of *Kenopaniṣad*. There, the *ātmā*/Brahman is described as the ear of the ear, the mind of the mind, the *prāṇa* of the *prāṇa*, the eye of the eye, etc., indicating the principle that enables all of them to function. This first advice of *Prajāpati* is explained in the next three verses.

पूर्णत्वात् पुरुषो योऽस्ति

परमात्मायमक्षिणि ।

जाग्रत्साक्षितया स्थित्वा

विद्वद्भिः सुविभाव्यते ॥१५॥

पूर्णत्वात् - because of being full (limitless) पुरुषः - is *puruṣa* अयम् - this *aparokṣa* (I) principle अक्षिणि - in the eye स्थित्वा - having abided जाग्रत्साक्षितया - as the illuminator of the waking state यः - the one who परमात्मा - *Paramātmā* अस्ति - is (सः - he) विद्वद्भिः - by the *Brahmajñānīs* सुविभाव्यते - directly and very clearly experienced—(15)

15. *Puruṣa* is the one who is full (limitless). This *aparokṣa* (I) principle (called *Puruṣa*) having abided in the eye

as the illuminator of the waking state is the *Paramātmā* (himself) who is directly and very clearly experienced by the *Brahmajñānīs*.

Puruṣa is the entity that is limitless and so full. It is nothing but the principle of *ātmā*, *Paramātmā*, Brahman. *Puruṣa* also means the one who abides in the body (*puri*). The perception of sense-objects through the senses (including carrying out of actions) is the waking state (इन्द्रियैः अर्थोपलब्धिः जागरितम्।). The statement of *Prajāpati* that the *Puruṣa* (*Paramātmā*) who is seen in the eyes is an indicative phrase. It signifies the *Puruṣa* abiding in all sense-organs and organs of action because of whom only all of us are able to function. That means the *Puruṣa* alone is the experiencer of entire waking state. The reference to the eye as the place of abidance is only for the sake of clear understanding because eye is the most prominent among all senses (*Ch.U.Bh.* 8-12-4). The right eye being the most prominent one, is considered in *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* as the seat of *Paramātmā* (*Puruṣa*) signifying *cit* because of which all perceptions and *karmas* are possible. *Puruṣa* is called *sākṣī* because of its illuminating or revealing everything in the waking without depending on anything else. The

aparokṣa Brahmajñānīs with their mind totally withdrawn from all the extrovert pursuits and made to get absorbed in *cit* (*Puruṣa*) entirely to the total exclusion of *adhyasta anātmā* can directly experience *Puruṣa/Paramātmā* in its true nature.

The *sākṣī* itself is *Parabrahman* (*Puruṣa*) and not the individual *jīva* endowed with doership (*kartr̥tva*) and *bhoktr̥tva* (the state of being an experiencer) is highlighted now.

चिच्छायावानहंकारो

मूढैरात्मेति भाव्यते ।

कर्ता भोक्ता स जीवः स्यात्

परब्रह्मैव साक्ष्यसौ ॥१६॥

मूढैः - by the ignorant people
चिच्छायावान् अहंकारः - the *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) having *cidābhāsa* (reflection of *cit*)
आत्मा - as *ātmā* इति भाव्यते - is considered
सः - that *ahaṃkāra* coupled with *cidābhāsa*
कर्ता - doer भोक्ता - experiencer
जीवः - *jīva* स्यात् - happens to be असौ - (but) this साक्षी - *sākṣī* परब्रह्म एव - (is) *Parabrahman* itself - (16)

16. The *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) having *cidābhāsa* (reflection of *cit*) is considered as *ātmā* by the ignorant people. That *ahaṃkāra* (coupled with *cidābhāsa*) happens to be the *kartā*, *bhoktā jīva*. But this (*aparokṣa*) *sākṣī* is *Parabrahman* itself.

By referring to the *Puruṣa* abiding in the eye, *Prajāpati* speaks of *cicchāyā* (reflection or *pratibimba* of *cit*) because through reflection (*pratibimba*) only its *bimba* (the original entity) *sākṣī*/Brahman can be known. Though the *sat* (existence) aspect of Brahman is available for cognition everywhere as 'is'ness, its *cit* aspect can be known in the state of ignorance only through its reflection in *antaḥkaraṇa* called *cicchāyā* or *cidābhāsa*. Generally the cognition of *ātmā* is along with *upādhi*. Its *nirupādhika* nature can be known only through *śuddhāntaḥkaraṇa* which conforms to the real nature of *ātmā* and ends its ignorance. Therefore lay people take *ātmā* as the *jīva* having *saṃsāra* characterized by *karṭṛtva*, *bhokṭṛtva*. In reality, *ātmā/sākṣī* is Brahman only.

How *ātmā*/Brahman is *amṛta* (immortal) and *abhayam* (fearless) is deduced.

ब्रह्मणो मरणाभावादमृतत्वं तद्वितीयते ।

अद्वितीयतया भीतिहेत्वाभावाच्च निर्भयम् ॥१७॥

मरणाभावात् - because of the absence of death ब्रह्मणः अमृतत्वं - Brahman is immortal तद् - that (Brahman) अद्वितीयतया - there being nothing other than it भीतिहेत्वाभावात् - because of the absence of any cause of fear च - also निर्भयम् - fearless इति - so ईर्यते - is said
-(17)

17. Brahman is immortal because of the absence of its death. There being nothing other than it, Brahman is said to be fearless in the absence of any cause of fear.

The body has the death, but the Brahman is bodiless (*aśarīra*). Therefore it is immortal (*amṛta*). The fear is always on account of something other than oneself. Brahman is *advaya* (non-dual). There cannot be any other thing in it. Then how can there be any occasion of fear in it? Thus that *puruṣa* identical with Brahman abiding in the eye is immortal and fearless. It is also the *ātmā* who happens to be the *sākṣī* of the waking state. By its direct knowledge *mokṣa* (liberation) is gained. This is what *Prajāpati* (who is *Brahmājī*, the one of the *trimūrti*) taught to both of them in the first instance.

MISUNDERSTANDING OF BOTH DISCIPLES

Unfortunately Indra and Virocana could not grasp the correct import of *Prajāpati's* teaching in spite of 32 years of service to the *guru*. Here is the reason for their lapse.

प्रजापत्युक्तितात्पर्यं नाबुद्ध्येतामुभावपि ।

राज्यवासनया चित्तं तदीयं राजसं खलु ॥१८॥

उभौ अपि - both of them प्रजापत्युक्ति-
तात्पर्यम् - the purport of *Prajāpati's*

teaching न अबुद्ध्येताम् - did not grasp तदीयम् - their चित्तम् - mind राज्यवासनया - by its preoccupation in their kingdoms राजसं खलु - (was) indeed *rājasika* in nature—(18)

18. Both of them did not grasp the purport of *Prajāpati's* teaching. Their minds were indeed *rājasika* in nature because of the preoccupation in their kingdoms.

Acquisition of *ātmajñāna* needs a highly *sāttvika* mind which is calm, composed, non-reactive and capable of inquiring into the pros and cons of the teaching to ascertain its exact import. In the case of Indra and Virocana, it becomes clear now that their minds were far far from being *sāttvika* in nature. In spite of their 32 years of service with a life of *brahmacarya*, they were still *rājasika* and so agitated in their dispositions. Such a mind cannot grasp the import of Vedāntic teaching in its right perspective.

How did they misunderstand the teaching is described now.

अन्यदेहस्य या छाया सा चक्षुष्युपलभ्यते ।
तामेवात्मतया प्राहेत्येषा बुद्धिरभूत् तयोः ॥१९॥

या - the one that is अन्यदेहस्य
छाया - the reflection of another person
(standing) in front सा - that reflection

चक्षुषि - in the eye उपलभ्यते - is seen ताम् - that reflection एव - only आत्मतया - as *ātmā*
प्राह - (*Prajāpati*) said इति एषा - such तयोः - of both बुद्धिः अभूत् - understanding took place—(19)

19. The reflection of another person standing in front is seen in the eye. *Prajāpati* said that reflection only as *ātmā*. Thus both of them understood.

When a person is standing in front of you, both the bodies get reflected in the eyes of the opposite person. Since they were told that the *Puruṣa* abiding in the eye is *ātmā*, both Indra and Virocana mistook their reflection cast in the other's eye, indicating one's body, itself as *ātmā*. It is well-known that the reflection (*pratibimba*) of anything in reality is the original entity (*bimba*). Having ascertained so erroneously, both of them decided to find out the correctness of their knowledge by asking *Prajāpati* to confirm what they have known is true. They asked: ‘Oh revered master, (you told us that the *Puruṣa* seen in the eye is *ātmā*, but) *Puruṣa* is seen in the water and the mirror, etc. Then, which of them is *ātmā*?’ *Prajāpati* replied: ‘This very same *Puruṣa* abiding in the eyes is perceived in everything’ (*Ch.U.7-8-4*). This misunderstanding of the both disciples is told.

छायात्मानं दृढीकर्तुं

पुनः पप्रच्छतुर्गुरुम् ।

अप्स्वादर्शं च दृष्ट्वा छायात्मा

सोऽयमेव किम् ॥२०॥

छायात्मानम् - the reflection of one's body in the eye to be *ātmā* दृढीकर्तुं - to confirm पुनः - again गुरुम् - to *Prajāpati* the *guru* पप्रच्छतुः - both of them asked (यः - the one who) अप्सु - in the water आदर्शं - in the mirror च - and (in any other reflecting surface) छायात्मा - *ātmā* in the form of reflection दृष्टः - is seen सः - that one अयम् एव किम् - is it the same as the one seen in the eye? – (20)

20. To confirm the reflection of one's body in the eye to be *ātmā*, both of them asked *Prajāpati* the *guru* once again: (Revered master), is the *ātmā* seen in the form of reflection in the water, mirror and (in any other reflecting surface) the same as the one seen in the eye?

Obviously *Prajāpati* came to know that both of them have misunderstood his advice. While *Prajāpati* meant the *sākṣī* to be *ātmā*, they misunderstood one's body as *ātmā* whose reflection is seen in the eye of the person standing in front. Now it is the responsibility of *Prajāpati* to correct the erring disciples. But he not only does not correct them, on the contrary it appears

as though he confirms what they say. What is the reason behind such an objectionable behaviour of *Prajāpati* is made known in the next two verses.

CLARIFICATION

तदीयमन्यथाज्ञानं बुद्ध्वापि न निराकरोत् ।
सभामध्ये मानभङ्गो बुद्धिभ्रंशो भवेदिति ॥२१॥

तदीयम् - of those two अन्यथाज्ञानम् - misunderstanding बुद्ध्वा अपि - even after knowing न निराकरोत् - (*Prajāpati*) did not refute सभामध्ये - in the assembly मानभङ्गो (सति) - if they get insulted बुद्धिभ्रंशः - dejection or hurt भवेत् - will take place इति (हेतोः) - because of this reason – (21)

21. (*Prajāpati*) did not refute them even after knowing that they have misunderstood (his teaching) because they will get hurt (or dejected) if they get insulted in the assembly.

Prajāpati is a flawless teacher. How can he consent to the misunderstanding of his disciples? True, but it is not actually so. He knew that both Indra and Virocana considered themselves to be highly learned and were also famous. If they are told in the assembly that they are dull and have mistaken the teaching, they will be sad. Thereby they are bound to get dejected and their enthusiasm to gain *ātma vidyā* will be lost. Their interest in *ātma vidyā* needs to be sustained. *Prajāpati* had a

plan to correct them by a demonstration with a shallow dish filled up with water.

In response to their query (vs.19) *Prajāpati* confirms that this (*eṣaḥ*), (i.e. *puruṣa* that I pointed out abiding in the eye as the *sākṣī*) is perceived in all these (such as the water, mirror, etc.) (*Ch.U.* 8-7-4). The intention of this reply by the *guru* is now shown.

स्वेनाक्षिण्युपदिष्टो यः स सर्वत्रापि तिष्ठति ।
इत्युक्त्वोपायतस्तौ द्वौ बोधयामीत्यमन्यत ॥२२॥

स्वेन - by himself, (i.e. *Prajāpati*)
यः - the one who अक्षिणि उपदिष्टः - was taught as abiding in the eye सः - that one सर्वत्र अपि - in all also तिष्ठति - remains इति - so उक्त्वा - having replied उपायतः - by a demonstration तौ द्वौ - to both of them बोधयामि - I shall teach इति - so अमन्यत - (*Prajāpati*) considered – (22)

22. Having replied that the *puruṣa* taught by himself (*Prajāpati*) who abides in the eye remains in all the others also, (*Prajāpati*) considered: ‘I shall teach to both of them by a demonstration’.

From the beginning of his teaching *Prajāpati* refers to the *Puruṣa* abiding in eye as ‘*sākṣī*’ by the pronoun ‘*etad*’ (this, i.e. *eṣaḥ*). In the subsequent stages of teaching also the phrase ‘*eṣaḥ u (उ) eva*’ (verily this only) is invariably used. The *sākṣī Puruṣa* is

the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of everyone and everything. Therefore it is there in the *Puruṣa* seen in the water, mirror, etc., also. He also uses the word ‘*eṣaḥ*’ (this) to mean what is there in his mind that he is going to describe to make others know it. Naturally, it is more proximate to him being in his mind than that of the one to whom it is going to be told. Perhaps this pronoun ‘*eṣaḥ*’ was mistaken by both as the reflected *Puruṣa* in the eye, water, mirror, etc. In either case, one may tend to accuse *Prajāpati* for opting an ambiguous word such as ‘*eṣaḥ*’ (this). There is nothing wrong in *Prajāpati*'s teaching. Indra and Virocana had come to him to gain *ātmajñāna* only after being inspired by the declaration of *Prajāpati*. In his statement it was made amply clear that *ātmā* is *apahatapāpmā* (free from *pāpa-puṇya*) *vijarah* (has no old age), etc. When *Prajāpati* started teaching, both the disciples should have tallied what they have understood to be *ātmā* with its description in the original declaration. The notion of taking the reflection (*pratibimba*) of one's body as *ātmā*, amounts to take its original entity, (i.e. *bimba*), the body as *ātmā*. It is very clear that the body cannot be free from *pāpa-puṇya*, old age, death, sorrow, hunger and thirst besides it cannot be *satyakāma* and *satyasankalpa*. Therefore it cannot be *ātmā*. They never thought of this. They have repeated the

same mistake when *Prajāpati* gave a demonstration with the help of a shallow dish filled with water to make them think in the right direction.

In order to make them discover their mistake, *Prajāpati* asks them to see themselves in a dish filled with water and report to him what they have not known about *ātmā*. But both of them were so convinced that the body is *ātmā*, they failed to see the deficiencies in the body that disqualifies it from being the *ātmā*. They did not report anything to the *guru*. So he himself asked them, ‘What do you see there in the water?’ They replied: ‘We are seeing the *ātmā* that we are from hair to nails’. Having found that his plan has failed, *Prajāpati* again tells them: ‘What you have seen now is yourselves as the *brahmacārīs* (celibate students). Now you shave your hair, cut your nails and after wearing your royal attire once again see yourselves in that water.’ The intention was to bring to their notice the change in the reflection which corresponds to that in the body which they have mistaken as *ātmā*. Since *ātmā* is changeless they should give up the wrong notion of *ātmā* as body. When they saw once again themselves in the water after being well-dressed, etc., *Prajāpati* asked them what they are seeing in the water. They replied

that they are seeing themselves well-dressed, etc. Even this demonstration failed to make them know that the changing mortal body cannot be *ātmā* that is changeless, immortal, etc. That shows their mind is not yet ready enough to gain *ātmavidyā*. They had some strong obstructions in their mind. Though *Prajāpati* could know this, he was not inclined to ask them to continue further the life of *brahmacarya* since he was sure that they will be dejected. He thought that one day or the other they will find the defect in their ascertainment of body as *ātmā* because it is not free from *pāpa-punya*, old age, death, etc. Just to complete his teaching of the *sākṣī puruṣa* in the eye as *ātmā* that was taught by him in the beginning, he added that this *ātmā* as taught by him (and not the one wrongly ascertained by Indra, Virocana) is *aṃṛta*, *abhaya* and itself Brahman. He was sure that if this aspect of *ātmā* is considered, no one can accept the body or its reflection as *ātmā*. And yet, both of them overlooked the correct application of *Prajāpati*'s teaching in the context of body as *ātmā*. Considering what they had concluded to be correct with a sense of fulfilment of having gained the *ātmavidyā*, they took leave of *satyaloka* to return to their kingdoms (*Ch.U.8-8-3*). This portion of

the *śruti* is summarized now.

शरावे जलयुक्ते वा केवलौ
वीक्ष्य तौ पुनः ।

सालङ्काराववेक्ष्याथ छायां
नात्मेति बुध्यताम् ॥२३॥

जलयुक्ते शरावे - in a shallow dish filled up with water वा - as well as केवलौ - exclusively (as *brahmacārīs*) वीक्ष्य - Having seen अथ - thereafter तौ - both of them पुनः - once again सालङ्कारौ - wearing royal ornaments अवेक्ष्य - having seen छायाम् - reflection of the body (and thereby the body) आत्मा - *ātmā* न इति बुध्यताम् - let them both understand that (it) cannot be—(23)

23. Having seen themselves exclusively (as *brahmacārīs*) (reflected) in a shallow dish filled up with water (and) thereafter once again having seen (in the water) both of them wearing royal ornaments, let them both understand that the reflection of the body (and thereby the body) cannot be *ātmā*.

छायाया अन्यथात्वं स्यात्
साक्षी चैकविधः स्थितः ।

आत्मत्वं निर्विकारस्य
शक्यते बोद्धुमञ्जसा ॥२४॥

छायायाः - of the (bodily) reflection अन्यथात्वम् - change स्यात् - takes place साक्षी - *sākṣīātmā* च - but एकविधः स्थितः - is of the same nature निर्विकारस्य - of the

changeless entity आत्मत्वम् - nature to be *ātmā* अञ्जसा - correctly बोद्धुम् शक्यते - is possible to know—(24)

24. The bodily reflection is prone to change, but *sākṣīātmā* is of the same nature. (Thus) it is possible to know correctly that the changeless entity is *ātmā*.

The above two verses reveal the purpose of *Prajāpati's* demonstration and the reason why the bodily reflection and thereby the body cannot be *ātmā* which Indra and Virocana have wrongly concluded. *Ātmā* is always free from six changes (*ṣaḍvikāras*). It is entirely changeless (*nirvikārī*).

The spiritual (*ādhyātmika*) development cannot be thrust on the seeker from outside. One has to be introvert having withdrawn from the extrovertedness and inquire. The *śāstras* and *gurus* can certainly help but they cannot force the introvertedness on anyone. Therefore *Prajāpati* did not correct them on his own that the changing reflection or the body can never be *ātmā*. It does not fulfill the nature of being free from *pāpa-puṇya*, etc. On the contrary, he gave them the opportunities to find out the flaw on their own. *Prajāpati* follows this method afterwards also while teaching Indra who returns having found what he had concluded is wrong. Only when the

disciple has found his mistake and questions the answer is given. Otherwise he is given opportunities to think on the right guidelines. May be in this method there is a risk of the disciple remaining with his wrong notions all along. That is what happened to Vīrocana. But without the maturity of the disciple, even such correction on the part of *guru* can remain as only an academic information without the actual *ātmaññāna* which ends the *saṃsāra*. Unlike *Prajāpati* there can be some other types of *gurus* also who repeatedly warn, chastise and correct the disciple as in the case of Ṛbhu and Nidāgha. Even then what is indispensable is the disciple's ready and mature mind. In this teaching we get the criterion of *ātmā* as a changeless entity. Anything that changes is not *ātmā*. Based on this test all that is changing gets discarded as *anātmā*. Then only the mind can get absorbed in *ātmā*.

The *guru* expected both of them to know that the reflection cannot be *ātmā*. But they failed. The reason is given.

THE DELUSION OF REFLECTION AS *ĀTMĀ*

तथापि पापबाहुल्य—

प्रतिबद्धधियावुभौ ।

छायात्मतां शरावोक्त्या दृढां

कृत्वात्यतुष्यताम् ॥२५॥

तथा अपि - in spite of demonstration पापबाहुल्यप्रतिबद्धधियौ उभौ - both of them whose *buddhi* was obstructed because of the predominance of sins शरावोक्त्या - by the teaching centred on the shallow dish (filled up with water) छायात्मताम् - the notion that the reflection is *ātmā* दृढां कृत्वा - having corroborated अत्यतुष्यताम् - they became very happy (thinking they got *ātmavidyā*)—(25)

25. In spite of the demonstration, both of them whose *buddhi* was obstructed because of the predominance of sins, having corroborated the notion that the reflection is *ātmā* by the teaching centred on the shallow dish (filled up with water), became very happy (thinking they got *ātmavidyā*) (and returned to their kingdoms hurriedly).

There is no deficiency in the exalted *guru* such as *Prajāpati*, the Veda as the *pramāṇa* and *ātmā* the *prameya*. It was certainly in both the *pramātās* the disciples. The 32 years of service as *brahmacārīs* was inadequate to annul their sin because of its excessiveness. That is why they misunderstood the teaching. Not only that, they mistook the demonstration meant to correct their misunderstanding of its corroboration. Thus they became very happy that they got the *ātmavidyā*. That is why it is said that *ātmavidyā* taught to a person who is

not eligible, (i.e. *anadhikārī*) can be damaging. *Bhāṣyakāra* refers to this episode of Indra and Virocana to highlight the necessity of *śuddha-antaḥkaraṇa* in the absence of which the teaching of *ātmā* can fail to impart the *jñāna* or can result in the misunderstanding (*Ke.U.Bh.4-8*).

PRAJĀPATI NEGLECTS

The reasons why *Prajāpati* did not stop them from returning to their kingdom in spite of their misunderstanding and why were they in a hurry to return is shown in the next two verses.

कालेन प्रतिबन्धस्य क्षये सत्यथ तं पुनः ।
उपदेशं शरावाख्योपायं चालोच्य मोक्षयते ॥२६॥

इत्युपेक्ष्य गुरुस्तस्थौ तौ

राज्यत्यागतश्चिरम् ।

प्रयासं प्राप्य सहसा

जग्मतुः स्वस्वलोकयोः ॥२७॥

कालेन - in the course of time
प्रतिबन्धस्य क्षये सति - when their obstruction ends
अथ - then पुनः - again तम् उपदेशम् - that advice (of *Puruṣa* abiding in the eye)
शरावाख्योपायं - the demonstration of a shallow dish (filled up with water) च - and आलोच्य - having reflected मोक्षयते - will be liberated इति - with this intention उपेक्ष्य - having disregarded (their leaving) गुरुः - the *guru Prajāpati* तस्थौ - remained

silent तौ - both of them चिरम् - for a long time राज्यत्यागात् - because of giving up the pleasures enjoyed in the kingdom प्रयासं प्राप्य - having found the stay with the *guru* (*gurukula-vāsa*) to be difficult सहसा - immediately स्वस्वलोकयोः - to their respective *lokas* जग्मतुः - departed - (26-27)

26-27. The *guru Prajāpati* disregarded their leaving and remained silent. He thought that they will get liberated in due course of time when their obstruction will end by taking to the reflection of the advice (of *Puruṣa* abiding in the eye) and the demonstration of a shallow dish (filled up with water). However both of them had given up the pleasures enjoyed in the kingdom for a long time. They found their stay in the *gurukula* to be difficult. That prompted them to depart immediately to their respective *lokas*.

The teaching received from the *guru*, discussed with co-students and fortified by one's reflection becomes more and more clear in the course of time. The obstructions in gaining *ātmavidyā* do not end at one stroke. When the *prārabdha karmas* causing distractions yield their inevitable results, the obstructions also get reduced on their own. Therefore *prārabdha* is said to be one of the deciding factors in gaining *ātmajñāna*. Unless the powerful adverse

prārabdha gets over, the *śama*, *dama*, etc., cannot be efficient. *Prajāpati* thought: ‘Indra and Virocana are kings. By *prārabdha* they have many duties and responsibilities because of which they cannot avoid extrovertedness. In the course of time when the impact of powerful *prārabdha* gets reduced, they will reflect upon my teaching and find out their mistake or they will ask me for the clarity. No purpose can be served by trying it further now’. The criterion to ascertain *ātmā* namely ‘all that changes is *anātmā* and *ātmā* is changeless (*avikārī*) *sākṣī* (vs.24)’ was already made known to them. Therefore *Prajāpati* kept quiet and did not stop them from returning in spite of their misunderstanding the teaching.

Though *Prajāpati* did not stop them from leaving, he did sound a caution which he was sure will be known by them one day just as they had come to know his first declaration. He declared: ‘Both of them are going without knowing *ātmā* as I taught and without gaining its direct knowledge. Whosoever, whether *devas* or *asuras*, follow their teaching will be deprived of the ultimate good’ (*Ch.U.8-8-4*). This declaration is explained now.

एतौ प्रजापतेः शिष्याविति भ्रान्त्या विपर्ययम् ।
तदीयं प्राप्य नश्येयुरिति सोऽघोषयद् गुरुः ॥२८॥

सः गुरुः - that most exalted *guru* *Prajāpati* अघोषयत् - declared एतौ - these

two (Indra and Virocana) प्रजापतेः शिष्यौ - are the disciples of *Prajāpati* इति भ्रान्त्या - with such wrong notion, (that they have got *ātmajñāna* from *Prajāpati*) तदीयम् - belonging to them, (i.e. taught by them) विपर्ययम् - misapprehension, erroneous knowledge प्राप्य - having got नश्येयुः - will come to ruin इति - thus – (28)

28. That most exalted *guru* *Prajāpati* declared: Considering wrongly that these two (Indra and Virocana) are the disciples of *Prajāpati* (from whom they have got *ātmajñāna*) (and therefore those) who get (learn) the erroneous knowledge taught by them will come to ruin.

Prajāpati knew for certain that Indra and Virocana will be famous in the world as those who have returned from *Prajāpati* having got the *ātmavidyā*. People will have full *śraddhā* in their words. In fact they are already famous in their own capacity and to add to it now they have lived life of *brahmacarya* for 32 years with *Prajāpati* and claim to have gained *ātmavidyā* from him. Therefore their greatness will get further enhanced. It is a mass psychology to trust immediately those who are held in very high esteem. To save people from such peril, *Prajāpati* declared beforehand the precautionary statement that those who follow their teaching will come to ruin.

ĀSUROPANIṢAT

Virocana on his part with an overconfidence that he has got *ātmavidyā* reached his kingdom and taught all *asuras* (demons) the so called *ātmavidyā*. He said: ‘The body is *ātmā*. The body alone is to be worshipped, attended and served. By worshipping (adoring) and serving the body, one gains (enjoys) both the *lokas*, here and hereafter’. Therefore even today people who have no *śraddhā* in the scriptures and do not take to charitable acts or sacrifices are considered to be *asuras*. This is the Upaniṣad that belongs exclusively to *asuras*. They have a custom of decorating the corpse with perfumes, flowers, superior clothes and ornaments. They keep food near the dead body. They think that by such adoration of the dead one, the departed person gets a better lot hereafter (*Ch.U.8-8-4*). The next three verses explain this teaching of Virocana.

विरोचनस्तामसत्वाच्छीघ्रं

तानसुरान् प्रति ।

गत्वा देहात्मतां तेभ्यः

उपादिक्षन्निजेच्छया ॥२९॥

विरोचनः - Virocana तामसत्वात् - because of his predominant *tamogūṇa* शीघ्रम् - quickly (without reflecting upon the teaching) तान् असुरान् प्रति गत्वा - having

reached his subjects the *asuras* तेभ्यः - to them निजेच्छया - of his own accord देहात्मताम् - the body itself is *ātmā* उपादिक्षत् - taught – (29)

29. Virocana because of his predominant *tamogūṇa* quickly (without reflecting upon the teaching) having reached his subjects the *asuras* taught to them of his own accord that the body itself is *ātmā*.

Virocana being an *asura* had *tāmasika* disposition. The person who is always busy in pampering his own *prāṇas* in the sense of eating, drinking, making merry as the only goal of life is an *asura*. The sensualism coupled with *tamogūṇa* obstructs their power of discrimination (*viveka*). They eat, drink anything and everything without any concept of purity. Virocana never cared to reflect upon what was taught to him by *Prajāpati*.

Prajāpati had pointed out the *sākṣī puruṣa* seen in the eye (which indicates all the senses) as *ātmā* and not the body that is seen in the eye as *ātmā*. How did Virocana teach that the body itself is *ātmā*? He thought that without the actual body its reflection in the eye is not possible and therefore the reflection indicates its original entity, the body. This way of Virocana's thinking is explained with his advice to *asuras*.

अक्षिच्छाया देहजन्या तथा देहोपलक्षणात् ।
देह आत्मा स्वस्वदेहं सदा पूजयतासुराः ॥३०॥

अक्षिच्छाया - the reflection of the body in the eye देहजन्या - is cast by the body तथा - by that reflection देहोपलक्षणात् - because the body is indicated देहः - the body आत्मा - is *ātmā* (अतः - therefore) असुराः - Oh *asuras* सदा - always स्वस्वदेहम् - one's individual body पूजयत - worship - (30)

30. The reflection of the body in the eye is cast by the body. By that reflection the body is indicated. The body is *ātmā*. (Therefore) Oh *asuras*, always worship one's individual body.

How the worship of one's body is the means for enjoyments here and hereafter according to Virocana is elaborated further.

देहे दृढेऽत्र भोगोऽस्ति मुक्तिः स्याच्छवपूजया ।
इत्यासुरः सम्प्रदायः प्रायेणाद्यापि दृश्यते ॥३१॥

देहे दृढे - if the body is strong अत्र - in this world भोगः - sense-enjoyment अस्ति - is possible शवपूजया - by the worship of the corpse मुक्तिः स्यात् - the liberation is gained इति - thus आसुरः - belonging to *asuras* सम्प्रदायः - firm conviction प्रायेण - generally अद्य - today अपि - even दृश्यते - is seen - (31)

31. Sense-enjoyment in this

world is possible provided the body is strong. The liberation is gained by the worship of the corpse. Thus, generally the firm conviction belonging to *asuras* is seen even today.

The liberation (*mukti*) referred to by Virocana is not the actual one which Upaniṣads expound, but is some better lot hereafter. Here is a glaring example of how the Vedāntic teaching received by a person who is not eligible (*adhikārī*) for it can be highly damaging. Mere an exalted *guru* by himself is not the guarantee of gaining *ātmavidyā*. This highlights the indispensability of *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti* in gaining *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *ātmā*. Generally this is the way of thinking of the materialistic people who have not undergone the disciplines of the scriptures. According to them to gratify the body by means fair or foul, alone is the goal of life. Even today there is no dearth of such people. Thus Virocana was busy in propagating *Āsuropaniṣad* erroneously conceived by him. But, at some stage in his life, it seems that Virocana did get the *ātmajñāna* according to Yogavāsiṣṭha though the details of how and from whom he got the knowledge are not known. It is well-known that emperor Bali was Virocana's son (whereas the superstar devotee Prahlāda was his father). Bali gets totally disgusted with

the sense-enjoyments after undergoing it for a very long period and thus develops *vairāgya* for it. He starts investigating if there is a higher and consummate goal of life. Then Bali remembers that his father Virocana had taught him once in the past the *ātmajñāna* in its true nature (and not *Āsuropaniṣad*) which he had overlooked because of his preoccupation in the empire and the sense-enjoyments. He goes to their *guru* Śukrācārya and gets it validated. This shows that Virocana did get the *ātmajñāna* in the latter part of his life (*Yo. Vā. Up. Ch. 22 to 26*).

INDRA'S VIVEKA

In contrast to Virocana, Indra on the other hand because of his *sāttvika* disposition on his way back reflected upon what he considered to be *ātmā*. He found the defect in taking bodily reflection or the body to be *ātmā*. He returns to his *guru Prajāpati* as a disciple only and reports his findings. The *guru* confirming his findings asks him to live the life of *brahmacarya* for further 32 years after which the earlier advice on *ātmavidyā* will be continued. Here is the further account regarding Indra.

इन्द्रस्तु सात्त्विकत्वेन

मननं कुरुतेऽध्वनि ।

आन्ध्यादयोऽपिच्छायामलङ्कारादयो

यथा ॥३२॥

इन्द्रः - Indra तु - on the other hand सात्त्विकत्वेन - because of his *sāttvika* disposition अध्वनि - on his way back मननं कुरुते - reflects upon (the *guru's* teaching) यथा - just as अलङ्कारादयः - ornaments, etc., (transient features) छायायाम् - (are found) in the bodily shadow (similarly) आन्ध्यादयः - blindness, etc. अपि - also (are found) – (32)

32. On the other hand, Indra because of his *sāttvika* disposition on his way back reflects upon (the *guru's* teaching). (He thought:) ‘Just as the ornaments, etc., (transient features are found) in the bodily shadow, (similarly) blindness, etc., also (are found therein)’.

एवं सत्यभयं ब्रह्म देहच्छाया कथं भवेत् ।
एवं मत्वा समागत्य गुरोरग्रे तथावदत् ॥३३॥

एवं सति - when this is so देहच्छाया - bodily shadow अभयम् - fearless ब्रह्म - Brahman कथं भवेत् - how can it be? एवम् मत्वा - having thought so समागत्य - having returned गुरोः अग्रे - in front of his *guru* तथा अवदत् - told accordingly – (33)

33. When this is so, how can the bodily shadow be fearless Brahman? Considering so, having returned, he told accordingly in front of his *guru*.

Indra being *sāttvika* in his disposition, even if temporarily overpowered by the *rajas* and *tamoguna*

the *sattva guṇa* got the upper hand finally. Though he was eager to return to his kingdom, on starting his return journey that preoccupation in his mind got relegated to the back and he started reflecting upon the *guru's* teaching. He could find that in contrast to his reflection wearing the dress of a *brahmacārī* with grown hair and nails, the reflection in royal attire, ornaments and trimmed hair, etc., was much different. This shows that the reflection changes. It cannot be changeless (*avikārī*) *ātmā* with all other features as declared by *Prajāpati* in his first declaration.

Though *Prajāpati's* teaching was the same Indra took the bodily reflection to be *ātmā* whereas Virocana took the body indicated by reflection as *ātmā*. *Bhāṣyakāra* gives the reason for such varied interpretation. He says that the people ascertain the scriptures and the teaching of *ācāryas* in accordance with the virtues and defects of their mind (*Ch.U.Bh.8-9-2*). That is why even the opposed interpretations of one and the same text are found. Not that such people are cheats. But they try to express what they have understood according to the texture and standard of their intellect. This makes it more essential that a *mumukṣu* must equip oneself with intense *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-saṃpatti*,

etc., to get thoroughly benefited by the Vedāntic scriptures and the teachings of *ācāryas*.

Indra was very clear that the reflection can never be *ātmā* and by knowing it the promised result of *ātmavidyā* cannot be gained. He returns to his *guru Prajāpati* as a disciple only and reports his findings. The *guru* confirms what he has said, but finding Indra still not ready to gain *ātmajñāna*, asks him to live the life of ascetic practice to eliminate the obstruction that hinder him from knowing *ātmā* (*Ch.U.Bh.8-9-3*).

पापक्षयाय द्वात्रिंशद्वर्षाणि तपसे वस ।
पूर्वोपदिष्टं भूयोऽपि ब्रवीमीत्याह तं गुरुः ॥३४॥

पापक्षयाय - to end the sins (that obstruct the *ātmajñāna*) द्वात्रिंशद्वर्षाणि - for 32 years तपसे वस - live (here) a life of ascetic practices पूर्वोपदिष्टम् - whatever that was taught earlier भूयः अपि - even elaborately ब्रवीमि - shall teach इति - so तम् - to him गुरुः - *guru* आह - said—(34)

34. The *guru* told him (Indra): ‘Live (here) a life of ascetic practices for 32 years to end the sins (that obstruct the *ātmajñāna*). I shall teach you even elaborately whatever that was taught earlier’.

Indra had full *śraddhā* in his *guru* and was intent on gaining *ātmajñāna*. He

did not find any fault with the *guru's* teaching and owned his mistake. Since his mind was not yet pure, the *guru* asks him to live the life of service in the *gurukula* with *brahmacarya*. Indra's readiness to continue service for another 32 years shows his firm resolve in gaining the knowledge.

SVAPNASĀKṢĪ IS ĀTMĀ

As promised, *Prajāpati* teaches Indra further after the second term of 32 years service. *Prajāpati* said: 'The *ātmā* that is free from *pāpa-puṇya* (*apahatapāpmā*), etc., and the one whom he has taught as the *sākṣī Puruṣa* abiding in the eye is the one who undergoes the varieties of experiences in the dream state'. *Prajāpati* meant the *sākṣī* (illuminator) of dream to be *ātmā*. But Indra mistook it to be the dreamer who is identified with the subtle *upādhi*. He could know easily that the dreamer is totally free from the limitations and sorrows of bodily reflection or the gross body itself as *ātmā*. This made him conclude immediately the dreamer to be *ātmā*. Indra with a vain satisfaction that he got the *ātmajñāna* starts his return journey to heaven (his kingdom). But on the way back he could find the mistake in his ascertainment of dreamer as *ātmā*. Though the dreamer is totally free from the defects of the physical body such as being blind, handicapped, injured, etc.,

the same one appears to get subjected to the varieties of sorrows. There is no possibility of gaining the result of *ātmajñāna* by knowing the dreamer as *ātmā*. Indra returns to *Prajāpati* and reports his observations to him. Confirming it to be true, he is asked to undergo another term of 32 years of service (*Ch.U.8-10-1* to 4). This is explained now.

जाग्रति स्थूलदेहेन साङ्कर्यं

शङ्क्यते ततः ।

स्वप्ने यश्चरतीवासौ

साक्ष्यात्मेत्यवगम्यताम् ॥३५॥

जाग्रति - in the waking state
स्थूलदेहेन - with the gross body साङ्कर्यम् -
the confusion as *ātmā* शङ्क्यते - is
doubted ततः - therefore यः - the one (who
is free from *pāpa-puṇya*, etc., and who
was pointed out as the *sākṣī Puruṣa* in
the eye) स्वप्ने - in the dream चरति इव - as
though undergoes the varieties of dream
experiences असौ - that one साक्षी आत्मा - is
the *sākṣīātmā* इति - so अवगम्यताम् - it
should be understood – (35)

35. *Prajāpati* says: In the waking state the confusion with the gross body as *ātmā* is doubted. Therefore the one who (is free from *pāpa-puṇya*, etc., and who was pointed out as the *sākṣī Puruṣa* in the eye) as though undergoes the varieties of dream experiences is the

sākṣīātmā. So it should be understood.

In the waking state the *sākṣīātmā* whose knowledge is to be gained is in association with the gross, subtle and the causal bodies. Therefore it is difficult to ascertain *ātmā*. Less the *upādhi*, more it becomes easy to know *ātmā*. Therefore *Prajāpati* pointed out the *sākṣī* of dream state wherein only the subtle and the causal bodies to the exclusion of the gross one are there. Therefore the gross body and its shadow which were mistaken as *ātmā* are not there in the dream. When *ātmā* is described as the *sākṣī* of the dream, the dream body gets automatically excluded as not *ātmā*. But Indra mistook the *sākṣī* along with the *upādhi* of the dreamer as *ātmā*. The word 'iva' (as though) is to emphasize that the *sākṣī* does not actually undergo the dream experiences since it is only the illuminator free from even them. What made Indra to conclude the dreamer to be *ātmā* is explained.

आन्ध्यरोगादयो दोषाश्छायायां देहबिम्बगाः ।
भान्ति स्वप्ने तु नैवेति तुष्टो वराज पूर्ववत् ॥३६॥

छायायाम् - in the bodily reflection
देहबिम्बगाः - abiding in its original entity
the physical body आन्ध्यरोगादयः -
blindness, disease, etc. दोषाः - defects
भान्ति - are seen स्वप्ने तु - but in the dream
नैव - (those defects belonging to the
physical body) are not at all there इति

तुष्टः - thus pleased (Indra considering the
dreamer as *ātmā*) पूर्ववत् - as in the past
वराज - departed (to his kingdom) – (36)

36. In the bodily reflection the defects such as blindness, disease, etc., abiding in its original entity the physical body are seen. But in the dream (those defects belonging to the physical body) are not at all there. Thus pleased, (Indra considering the dreamer as *ātmā*) departed to his kingdom as in the past.

Whether it is the waking state or the dream one, the *sākṣīātmā* who enables the cognition of the bodies therein along with the accompanied experiences is distinct from them. *Prajāpati's* teaching is based on this fact. But Indra missed this point. For the second time he committed the same mistake of taking *anātmā* as *ātmā*. So he returned as usual. Once again he finds the defects in his concept that the dreamer is *ātmā*.

मन्वानः सन्नन्यदोषानपश्यत्
स्वप्न आत्मनि ।
चोरव्याघ्रादयो घ्नन्तीत्यादीनागत्य
चाब्रवीत् ॥३७॥

मन्वानः सन् - (Indra) while reflecting
(on his return journey) स्वप्ने आत्मनि - in the
dreamer considered as *ātmā* चोरव्याघ्रादयः -
thief, tiger, etc. घ्नन्ति - kill इत्यादीन् - etc.
अन्यदोषान् - other defects अपश्यत् - saw आगत्य

च - and having returned to *Prajāpati* अब्रवीत् - told (him the defects in the dreamer as *ātmā*)—(37)

37. (Indra) while reflecting (on his return journey for the second time) saw in the dreamer considered as *ātmā* other defects such as thief, tiger, etc., even kill him, etc. Having returned to *Prajāpati*, he told (him the defects in the dreamer as *ātmā*).

Indra realised that dreamer body as *ātmā* gets subjected to varieties of sorrows such as fear, pain, sickness, hunger, thirst including at times the death. Therefore by knowing it as *ātmā* the result of *ātmajñāna* as declared by *Prajāpati* cannot be gained. So he returns to his *guru* and narrates. The *guru* asks him to live 32 years of *Brahmacarya* life for the third time.

SUṢUPTI-SĀKṢĪ IS ĀTMĀ

At the end of the third term of *brahmacarya* life for 32 years, the *guru* teaches him the *sākṣī* of deep sleep is *ātmā*. He says: ‘The one who was *sākṣī* *Puruṣa* in the waking, who undergoes as it were the varieties of experiences in the dream is the one who in deep sleep is totally free from all the afflictions born of both the sense-contacts with the external sense-objects, and the experiences of dream is *ātmā*’ (*Ch.U.* 8-11-1).

स्वप्नेऽपि वासनादेहः शङ्क्येतेति सुषुप्तिगम् ।
साक्षिणं प्रोक्तवांस्तस्मै द्वात्रिंशद्वर्षसेविने ॥३८॥

स्वप्ने अपि - even in the dream वासनादेहः - the body projected by the *vāsanās* (that is present) शङ्क्येत - can be doubted to be *ātmā* इति (हेतोः) - because of this reason तस्मै - to Indra द्वात्रिंशद्वर्षसेविने - who has served (the *guru*) for 32 years (for the third time) सुषुप्तिगम् - abiding in the deep sleep साक्षिणम् - *sākṣī* प्रोक्तवान् - taught (as *ātmā*)—(38)

38. Even in the dream the body projected by the *vāsanās* (that is present) can be doubted to be *ātmā*. Because of this reason *Prajāpati* taught to Indra who has served him for 32 years (for the third time) the *sākṣī* abiding in the deep sleep (as *ātmā*).

Ātmā is associated with the gross, subtle and the causal bodies in the waking state whereas in the dream the association is only with the subtle and the causal bodies. Just as the physical body which is prominent can be mistaken for *ātmā* in the waking, in the dream also the dream body projected by one's *vāsanās* (latent psychic impressions) also can be considered to be *ātmā*. Generally, dream body is known to be false on waking up. Yet, Indra mistook it to be *ātmā*. The mind is prominent in the dream which can also be mistaken as *ātmā*. Therefore

Prajāpati pointed out the *sākṣīātmā* in the deep sleep state wherein both gross and subtle body are absent. Even then Indra failed to realise *sākṣī* distinct from the causal body (ignorance) to be *ātmā*. He mistook again the *sākṣī* identified with the causal body called *prājñā* or sleeper consciousness as *ātmā*. He was happy because there are no sorrows at all in the sleeping person. He returned finding his folly in his conclusion that he has got *ātmajñāna*.

तुष्टोऽगच्छत् सुषुप्तिस्थे जाड्यं दोषमवैक्षत ।
विनष्टसदृशः सुप्तावात्मेत्यागत्य चाब्रवीत् ॥३९॥

तुष्टः - pleased (with the last advice) अगच्छत् - (Indra) left (for his kingdom) सुषुप्तिस्थे - in a sleeping (person), (i.e. *prājñā*) जाड्यं - inertness or ignorance दोषम् - defect अवैक्षत - observed आत्मा - *ātmā* सुप्तौ - in the state of deep sleep विनष्टसदृशः - is like a non-existing entity इति - thinking so आगत्य - having returned (to the *guru*) च - and अब्रवीत् - narrated (his problem) – (39)

39. Indra, pleased (with the last advice) left (for his kingdom). (But on his way back) he observed the defect of inertness or ignorance in a sleeping person (*prājñā*). He observed that *ātmā* is like a non-existing entity in the state of deep sleep. Thinking so, on his return to the *guru* he narrated (his problem) to him (*guru*).

On his way back for the third time, Indra while reflecting upon the *sākṣī* of deep sleep as *ātmā*, observed that the sleeping person (*prājñā*) whom he considered to be *ātmā* neither knows oneself as ‘I am of such and such nature’ nor knows anything else. That so called *ātmā* is like a non-existing entity. By knowing it the promised result of *ātmajñāna* is not possible. Though there is no sorrow in it, that cannot be a desirable state because of total ignorance. Being almost a non-existing entity, how can it ever be immortal, fearless and *ānanda*? (*Ch.U.8-11-1*). *Prajāpati* consented to what Indra said and assured him that he will teach further the same *ātmā* that he has already taught and there is no other *ātmā* than it. But he asked him to live the life of *brahmacarya* for further five years. At the end of total 101 years of his *brahmacarya* life, *Prajāpati* teaches him at length (*Ch.U.8-11-3*).

This portion of the *śruti* is summarized now in the next two verses.

अमूर्तं कारणं देहं

बोद्धुम्पापक्षयादसौ ।

शक्तोऽभूदिति सन्तुष्टः

पुनः प्रोवाच तं गुरुः ॥४०॥

असौ - this (Indra) पापक्षयात् - by the ending of his (most of the) sins अमूर्तम् - formless कारणं देहम् - causal body

(*kāraṇa śarīra*) बोद्धुम् - to know शक्तः अभूत् - became capable इति संतुष्टः - thus pleased गुरुः - *guru* तम् - to him (Indra) पुनः - again प्रोवाच - said (as follows) – (40)

40. This Indra became capable to know the formless causal body (*kāraṇa śarīra*) by ending of his (most of the) sins. Thus pleased, the *guru* (*Prajāpati*) again said to Indra (as follows).

पञ्चवर्षाणि सेवस्व

पापशेषक्षयाय ते ।

इत्युक्त्वा सेविने तस्मै गुरुः

स्पष्टमुपादिशत् ॥४१॥

ते - your पापशेषक्षयाय - to end the residual *pāpas* पञ्चवर्षाणि - for five years more सेवस्व - serve (as *brahmacārī*) इति उक्त्वा - having told so तस्मै सेविने - to him who had served thus (for total 101 years) गुरुः - the *guru* *Prajāpati* स्पष्टम् - with further clarity उपादिशत् - taught – (41)

41. (Oh Indra), to end your residual *pāpas* serve (as *brahmacārī*) for five years more. Having told so, to Indra who had served thus (for total 101 years) the *guru* *Prajāpati* taught with further clarity.

Though Indra misunderstood *ātmā* even at the third stage of teaching, by his reflection, he could discern the formless causal body (*kāraṇa śarīra*) having the nature of nothing but

ajñāna (ignorance of oneself). *Prajāpati* was very happy because this by itself is a substantial achievement. *Prājñā* (sleeper consciousness) is a miniature of *Īśvara* at microcosmic level. The causal body being formless is difficult to understand in comparison with the gross and the subtle ones. It is called *kāraṇa* (causal) *śarīra* (body) because it is the cause of gross and subtle bodies.

Moreover Indra could not find the promised result of *ātmajñāna* by knowing the *kāraṇa śarīra* in the form of ignorance. Though there is no sorrow in it, he could find that being ignorant of even oneself is not a desirable state. Upaniṣads declare that *ātmā* is *paramānanda*. But such direct cognition which is the highest *puruṣārtha* is not found in sleep. The absence of mere sorrows is not the final goal of life. The acquisition of happiness (*sukha-prāpti*) and getting freed from sorrows (*duḥkha-nivṛtti*) constitute the fundamental urge in all the living beings. This pursuit can never stop unless the individual in *ātmajñāna* directly (*aparokṣatayā*) experiences without the *tripuṭī* one's true nature that is limitless happiness. That is *mokṣa* (liberation). Indra had progressed very much. Yet, some residual obstructions were still there because of which he could not get the *ātmajñāna* even at the third stage of

teaching. *Prajāpati* asks him to live for further five years the life of *brahmacarya* which Indra obeys implicitly. At the end of it, he is taught with still more clarity.

The episode of Indra and Virocana confirms that *ātmajñāna* can never be gained even by the best of teaching of an equally exalted *guru* such as *Prajāpati* unless the mind of the *mumukṣu* is totally prepared. This is what the sage *Vasiṣṭha* emphasizes in his statement: ‘Approaching a *guru* and exposing oneself of his teaching is only a formality in terms of observing the norms of the scriptures. The primary means of gaining *Brahmajñāna* is *prajñā* (the *akhaṇḍākāravṛtti*) born in the pure *antaḥkaraṇa* (*śuddha citta*) of the disciple’ (*Yo. Vā. Ni. Pū. 83-13*).

TURĪYA-ĀTMĀ

Finally Indra has become an excellent eligible person (*uttama adhikārī*) to gain *ātmajñāna* because of cleansing of his all sins and obstructions by the *gurukula-vāsa* (life of *brahmacarya* in the *gurukula*) for 101 years. He has also proved himself to be an epitome of *śraddhā*. Therefore the *guru* teaches him directly. *Prajāpati* teaches now *ātmā* in its true nature free from all *upādhis* generally referred to as *turīya-ātmā* distinct from the falsely superimposed three states of

consciousness. He says: ‘Oh Indra, this body with senses, the mind and the causal state of ignorance is mortal in nature. It is always afflicted by the principle of change, the death. This body is the abode for *bhoga* of *ātmā* who is limitless happiness, immortal and free from the body. But the bodiless *ātmā* because of the erroneous identification with the body always gets subjected to pain and pleasure (called *samsāra*). The pain and pleasures of the entity identified with the body can never end. But the pain and pleasure can never affect the bodiless *ātmā* in its true nature’ (*Ch. U. 8-12-1*). This advice is explained in the verses 42 to 47.

मघवन् यत् त्वया बुद्धं शरीरं तत् त्रिधा स्थितम् ।
स्थूलं सूक्ष्मं कारणं च तत्तु सर्वं विनश्वरम् ॥४२॥

मघवन् - Oh Indra यत् शरीरं - the body which त्वया बुद्धम् - (wrongly) known by you (as *ātmā*) तत् - that one स्थूलं सूक्ष्मम् - gross, subtle कारणं च - and causal bodies त्रिधा स्थितम् - conforms to the threefold तत् सर्वम् - all those तु - but विनश्वरम् - are destructible – (42)

42. Oh Indra, the body which was wrongly known by you (as *ātmā*) conforms to the threefold gross, subtle and causal bodies. But all those are destructible in nature.

Maghavan is a name of Indra. *Prajāpati* is telling Indra that what he

considered as *ātmā* during the earlier three sessions of teaching is *anātmā* in the form of gross, subtle and causal bodies. They cannot be *ātmā*. At the first instance he had mistaken the bodily reflection to be *ātmā*. The reflection indicates the original entity the physical body. Therefore the reflection considered to be *ātmā* is included here in the gross body itself. That which is made up of five gross elements, perceived by the sense-organs and serves as the abode of *bhoga* (joyous and sorrowful experiences) is the gross body. That which is made up of subtle five elements, activates the gross body and serves as the means of knowledge and bodily actions is the subtle body. The ignorance which is the cause of both these bodies and the entire *jagat* is called causal body. Indra mistook these bodies one by one as *ātmā* because *ātmā* is available identified with these exclusively in the waking, dream and deep sleep. That is how he considered the disease, etc., in the waking, fear and sorrows, etc., in the dream and total ignorance in the sleep as the features of *ātmā*.

The purpose of this threefold body is described and it is pointed out that it cannot be *ātmā*.

अनश्चरात्मतत्त्वस्य प्रवेष्टुर्जीवरूपतः ।

भोगाधिष्ठानमेवैतत् वपुर्नास्यात्मतास्ति हि॥४३॥

एतत् - this वपुः - threefold body

अनश्चरात्मतत्त्वस्य - of the indestructible *ātmā* जीवरूपतः - in the form of *jīva* प्रवेष्टुः - of the one who enters भोगाधिष्ठानम् - the place (abode) of undergoing *bhoga* (experiences of joys and sorrows) एव - only अस्य - of this body आत्मता - nature of being *ātmā* न हि अस्ति - is not at all there—(43)

43. For the indestructible *ātmā* who enters the body in the form of a *jīva* this threefold body is the place of undergoing *bhoga* only. It can never be *ātmā*.

The topic of *ātmā* (*Parameśvara*) entering the body in the form of *jīva* was described in the *Aitareyopaniṣad-vivaraṇam* (*A.Pr.*1-12 to 15). The body is only a place for *ātmā* to undergo *bhoga* in the form of a *jīva*. The *jīva* cannot have *bhoga* without the threefold body. While the physical body is the abode (place) of *bhoga*, (i.e. *bhogāyatana*) the subtle body serves as its means (*bhoga-sādhana*). Without the ignorance neither the gross and subtle bodies nor the identification with them essential for *bhoga* is ever possible. Thus the threefold body serves as the place for *ātmā* as a *jīva* to undergo *bhoga* according to individual *karmaphalas*. But *ātmā* is always indestructible in contrast to the destructible body. Therefore the destructible limited threefold body can never be the

indestructible, limitless *ātmā*.

If the body cannot be *ātmā*, then who is *ātmā*? The answer follows.

जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तेषु भासयेद्
यो वपुस्त्रयम् ।

स साक्ष्यात्मा ब्रह्मतास्य

सुखदुःखादिवर्जनात् ॥४४॥

यः - the one who जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तेषु - in the waking, dream and the deep sleep वपुस्त्रयम् - the three bodies भासयेत् - illuminates (makes them known) सः - that one साक्षी आत्मा - is the *sākṣīātmā* सुखदुःखादिवर्जनात् - because of being free from *saṃsāra* characterized by joys, sorrows, etc. अस्य ब्रह्मता - this *sākṣīātmā* itself is Brahman – (44)

44. The one who illuminates (makes known) the three bodies in the waking, dream and the deep sleep is the *sākṣīātmā*. That itself is Brahman because of being free from *saṃsāra* characterized by joys, sorrows, etc.

The illumination by *ātmā* is to make them known and enable to take to activities through the medium of *cidābhāsa* (reflected *cit*) cast in the three bodies. This *sākṣīātmā* alone was described by *Prajāpati* as *apahata-pāpmā*, etc., and not the bodies. *Sākṣī* is changeless (*nirvikārī*). That which is *savikārī* (subject to change) cannot be *sākṣī*. It is the *jīva*, identified with the

bodies, experiences joys and sorrows of *saṃsāra*, but not the *upādhiless* (*nirupādhika*) *sākṣīātmā*. Therefore *ātmā* itself is Brahman.

If *ātmā* does not undergo the *bhoga* of joys and sorrows, who is the one who suffers the *saṃsāra* characterized by the *bhoga*? Actually it is the *jīva* who suffers the *saṃsāra*. To show this the *jīva* with its identification with the body, (i.e. *saśarīra*) is contrasted with the *sākṣī* who is *aśarīra* (without the bodily identification). At first the nature of *jīva* that was shown earlier (*A.Pr.2-33*) based on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka śruti* is told once again.

आत्मनः प्रतिबिम्बो यः सोऽयं देहे प्रविष्टवान् ।
प्रतिरूपो बभूवेति श्रुत्यन्तरसमीरणात् ॥४५॥

यः - the one who is आत्मनः प्रतिबिम्बः - the reflection of *ātmā* (called *cidābhāsa*) सः अयं - the same देहे - in the body प्रविष्टवान् - entered (and is available as 'I' the *jīva*) प्रतिरूपः बभूव - became replicas (in accordance with the body) इति - so श्रुत्यन्तरसमीरणात् - because it is said (so) at other place in the *śruti* (*Br.U. 2-5-19*) – (45)

45. The reflection of *ātmā* (called *cidābhāsa*) entered the body (and is available as 'I' the *jīva*). Because it is said (so) at other place in the *śruti*

(Br.U.2-5-19) by the statement: (Brahman through its *māyā*) became replicas (in accordance with the body).

The illustration of reflection explains very clearly the phenomenon of Brahman entering the body. The face appears as if it has entered the reflecting surface such as the mirror or water, etc. Yet it is distinct from such reflecting media and their features. So also Brahman appears as though abiding in the body, but it is always independent with no connection with it. The reflected entity appears as if it has the features of the reflecting medium, but actually it is free from it. The reflection coupled with the features of the reflecting medium appears as though real but it is not so. Similarly *ātmā*/Brahman is totally free from the attributes of the body and the *saṃsāra* that is suffered by the *jīva* which is its reflection. The word ‘*pratirūpa*’ (replica) shows that *ātmā* appears in accordance with the individual body just as the space that appears to have entered pot, etc., by taking their shapes.

Ātmā is free from the threefold body and the joys and sorrows therein. But its identification with the three bodies itself is called *saśarīratva* of *ātmā*. That gives rise to the *bhoga* of pain and pleasure, (i.e. *saṃsāra*).

स भोक्ता त्रिषु देहेषु

तादात्म्यमभिमन्यते ।

सशरीरः स्वकर्मात्थे

भुङ्क्तेऽवश्यं प्रियाप्रिये ॥४६॥

(यः - the one who) त्रिषु देहेषु - in the three bodies तादात्म्यम् - erroneous identity अभिमन्यते - believes (to be true) सः - that (*jīva*) भोक्ता - is the experiencer of pain and pleasure (of *saṃsāra*) सशरीरः - the entity identified with the body स्वकर्मात्थे - born of one's *karmaphala* प्रियाप्रिये - pain and pleasures अवश्यम् - certainly भुङ्क्ते - undergoes – (46)

46. The *jīva* who believes the erroneous identity in the three bodies (to be true) is the experiencer of pain and pleasure (of *saṃsāra*). The entity identified with the body certainly undergoes the pain and pleasure born of one's *karmaphalas*.

Bhāṣyakāra defines *saśarīratva* as the erroneous notion that ‘I am the body itself and the body is certainly I’ on the part of bodiless (*aśarīra*) *ātmā* on account of *aviveka* (lack of discrimination born of self-ignorance) (*Ch.U.Bh.8-12-1*). Pains and pleasures (*priyāpriye*) are centred in the bodies. *Sākṣīātmā* is totally distinct from them. Yet, because of ignorance the three bodies are mistaken as I. This makes the *ātmā* appear as *saṃsārī jīva* for practical

purpose. The *jīva* who takes the bodies as I necessarily becomes *kartā* (doer). The *kartā* only is required to undergo the *bhogas* of one's *karmaphalas* as a *bhoktā* (experiencer). This is how *ātmā* truly *asaṃsārī* (free from *saṃsāra*) in nature suffers as if *saṃsārī jīva* on account of bodily identification born of ignorance. There is no escape from it unless *ātmajñāna* is gained. The *kartā* should necessarily be the *bhoktā* is the infallible rule.

In contrast to *saśarīra jīva* (identified with the body) the *aśarīra* (bodiless) *sākṣīātmā* is described with the further distinction between the two.

अशरीरं साक्षिणं तु

स्पृशेते न प्रियाप्रिये ।

संसारतदभावौ द्वौ

सुस्थितौ कर्तृसाक्षिणोः॥४७॥

अशरीरम् - to the one who is not identified with the three bodies साक्षिणम् - *sākṣī* तु - on the contrary प्रियाप्रिये - pain and pleasure न स्पृशेते - do not affect कर्तृसाक्षिणोः - in the case of *kartā* (*jīva*) and *sākṣī* (*ātmā*) संसारतदभावौ - *saṃsāra* and its absence द्वौ - both सुस्थितौ - hold good (respectively) without fail – (47)

47. On the contrary, the pain and pleasure do not affect the *sākṣī* (*ātmā*) who is not identified with the three bodies. Both *saṃsāra* and its absence

hold good (respectively) without fail in the case of *kartā* (*jīva*) and the *sākṣī* (*ātmā*).

The phrase ‘*priya-apriya*’ used by the *śruti* signify the pain and pleasure or the joys and sorrows (*sukha-duḥkha*), etc., the characteristic features of *saṃsāra*. The *saṃsāra* is centred in the realm of *upādhis*. *Ātmā* is *nirupādhika* (free from all *upādhis*). Therefore *ātmā* can never be a *saṃsārī*. *Ātmā* is always *asaṃsārī* can be ascertained in another way also. All the experiences of *saṃsāra* get presented to the *jīva* through the gross *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* or the subtle ones such as *avidyā-vṛttis* and *priya, moda*, etc. All *vṛttis* which are inert in nature can come to the level of experience with their varieties of features only when illuminated by the self-evident knowledge-principle *sākṣīātmā* which itself is self-experiencing happiness principle. It is well-known that the illuminating principle is distinct from all that is illumined. This shows that *sākṣīātmā* is totally free from all illumined *vṛttis* which feature the *saṃsāra*.

Even when the *sākṣī ātmā* as erroneous *jīva* because of the identification with the three bodies appears to suffer *saṃsāra*, it is only a superimposed delusion like the rope appearing as snake. Even at that time, the *sākṣīātmā* the basis

of the *jīva* suffering *saṃsāra* is always *asaṃsārī*. It never becomes *saṃsārī*. Even the *jīva* in reality is *asaṃsārī* only. So long as the erroneous identification is there, the experience of *saṃsāra* can never be stopped. Thus *kartā* (doer) *jīva* has *saṃsāra* but *akartā* (non-doer) *sākṣīātmā* is always free from *saṃsāra*.

How does an ignorant person suffer the *saṃsāra* is further explained.

एवं व्यवस्थितेऽप्यज्ञः कर्तृदेहेषु साक्षिणम् ।
अशरीरं प्रवेश्याशु सुखं दुःखं च मन्यते ॥४८॥

एवं व्यवस्थिते अपि - even when thus it is established (that the *sākṣīātmā* is always *asaṃsārī* and the *saṃsāra* belongs to the *kartā* who is identified with the three bodies) अज्ञः - the ignorant person (not knowing the true nature of *sākṣīātmā*) अशरीरं साक्षिणम् - *sākṣīātmā* who has no identification with the three bodies कर्तृदेहेषु - in the three bodies that are mistaken as *kartā* (doer) प्रवेश्य - having superimposed with identity आशु - immediately सुखं दुःखं च - joys and sorrows मन्यते - believes (that they belong to *sākṣīātmā*)—(48)

48. Thus even when it is established (that the *sākṣīātmā* is always *asaṃsārī* and the *saṃsāra* belongs to the *kartā* who is identified with the three bodies), the ignorant person (*ajñānī*) [not knowing the true nature of

sākṣīātmā who has no identification with the three bodies, (i.e. who is *aśarīra*)] (and yet) having superimposed *ātmā* in the threefold bodies that are mistaken as *kartā* (doer) immediately believes (that joys and sorrow belong to *sākṣīātmā*).

Whether a person knows one's true nature *ātmā* or not, universally it is known without any exception that 'I' am a sentient (*sacetana*) entity. Actually the three bodies are by themselves inert in nature. Therefore they cannot be the principle of sentience (*cit*) 'I', *ātmā*. But because of the reflection of *cit* (*ātmā*) that gets cast in the *antaḥkaraṇa* called *cidābhāsa*, all the three bodies (or *pañcakośas*) appear to be sentient. Thereby the threefold sentient body is mistaken as 'I', *ātmā*. This *cidābhāsa* is an instance of *aśarīra ātmā* being superimposed (*adhyasta*) on *anātma-antaḥkaraṇa* and thereby on all the three bodies. This happens because of the ignorance of oneself (*ātmā*) as distinct from *anātma* comprising three bodies or *pañcakośas*. This is *aviveka* (lack of discrimination) between *ātmā* and *anātma*. As a result the inert three bodies are mistaken as *kartā* (doer) and *bhoktā* (experiencer). Thus *kartṛtva* (doership) and its results being the joys, sorrows and all the varieties of experiences called *saṃsāra* get attributed to 'I', *ātmā*. This is what everyone believes that, 'I am a

saṃsārī. Thus by *aviveka* between *ātmā* and *anātmā* the ignorant person believes that 'I' (*ātmā*) undergo the experience of *saṃsāra* in the form of *sukha*, *duḥkha*, etc. The remedy to get freed from this *saṃsāra* is to develop *ātmānātma-viveka* leading to *aparokṣa ātmajñāna*. The next verse describes how such *viveka* leads to the freedom from *saṃsāra*.

विवेके सति साक्ष्येव शरीरेभ्यः समुत्थितः ।
स्वाभाविकेन ब्रह्मात्मरूपेण व्यवतिष्ठते ॥४९॥

विवेके सति - when *ātmā* is discerned to be totally distinct from *anātmā* शरीरेभ्यः समुत्थितः - the one who has given up the identity with the three bodies साक्षी एव - the *sākṣīātmā* only free from all the superimposed *anātmā*, (i.e. *nirupādhika*) स्वाभाविकेन ब्रह्मात्मरूपेण - in its true nature as *ātmā* identical with Brahman व्यवतिष्ठते- is ascertained – (49)

49. When *ātmā* is discerned to be totally distinct from *anātmā*, the *sākṣīātmā* only who has given up the identity with the three bodies and who is *nirupādhika* (free from all the superimposed *anātmā*) is ascertained in its true nature as *ātmā* identical with Brahman.

The Upaniṣads provide different means to distinguish *ātmā* ('I') from all the *upādhis* called *anātmā* which are

experienced as 'this' and not 'I'. Prominent among them are *pañcakośa-viveka*, *avasthātrayasākṣī-viveka*, *ḍṛk-ḍṛśya-viveka*, etc. It should be clearly understood that *sākṣīātmā* can never become *saṃsārī jīva* though it is experienced so because of self-ignorance and consequent error of identity with the three bodies. Therefore there is no occasion of *ātmā* being *saṃsārī* first and then becomes Brahman after taking to *viveka* and gaining the *ātmajñāna*. *Ātmā* is all along Brahman. In the state of ignorance it was not known because of identification with the three bodies. But on gaining the self-knowledge (*ātmajñāna*), it becomes known in the absence of identity with the bodies. Thus the difference is of ignorance and knowledge.

In the state of identity between *sākṣīātmā* and the three bodies they appear as if a single entity of threefold sentient body because the inert body by its nature is mistaken to be sentient. By taking to *ātmānātma-viveka*, both of them are found to be diametrically opposed to each other on ending the identity of *sākṣīātmā* with the gross, subtle and causal bodies. This reveals that *ātmā* is totally free from the three bodies and their characteristic features. Such *sākṣīātmā* abiding in its true nature wherein the identity with the three

bodies is given up is described figuratively as the one ‘who has risen up from the (three) bodies’ (*śarīrebhyaḥ samutthitah*).

The *śruti* explains the phenomenon of *sākṣīātmā* rising above the threefold body by giving up the identity with it and thereupon remaining in its real nature that is Brahman with the help of illustrations: “The air, cloud, lightning and the thunder have no body such as having the head, hands and legs, etc. Before the monsoon they are one with the space without their distinct features. During the summer on account of the scorching heat of the sun, separated from the space for the purpose of raining they manifest as though taking to their corresponding nature such as fore-wind, etc., mountainous forms of clouds, flashing streak of brilliant light and the sound of roaring with rumbling. Similarly the *sākṣīātmā* presently is one with the threefold body because of erroneous identification born of self-ignorance. It gets revealed in its true nature of *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* identical with Brahman on account of ‘*mahāvākyopadeśa*’ (advice of identity between *jīva* and Brahman) by a competent *guru*. That itself is ‘*uttama Puruṣa*’ (the most exalted entity full and complete without any lack or limitations)” (*Ch.U.8-12-2,3*). This is explained now.

SAMPRASĀDAḤ-ĀTMĀ FREE FROM ALL AFFLICTIONS

अस्मिन्नर्थे साक्षितुल्या दृष्टान्ता देहवर्जिताः ।
वाय्वभ्रविद्युतां नास्ति हस्तपादादिमद्वयः ॥५०॥

अस्मिन् अर्थे - to drive the above point home साक्षितुल्याः - similar to the giving up of erroneous identification by the *sākṣī* and gaining one's true nature देहवर्जिताः - bodiless दृष्टान्ताः - illustrations (of air, cloud and the lightning are there) वाय्वभ्रविद्युताम् - of air, cloud and the lightning हस्तपादादिमद्वयः - the body having hands, legs, etc. न अस्ति - is not there – (50)

50. To drive the above point home the illustrations of bodiless air, cloud and lightning similar to the giving up of erroneous identification by the *sākṣī* and gaining one's true nature (are there). Air, cloud and the lightning have no body having hands, legs, etc.

Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni omits the illustration of *stanayitnu* (thunder) given by the *śruti* as the fourth one. Though air, etc., have their own forms such as varieties of wind, etc., they do not have the forms of bodies having hands, legs, etc. Even when the gross forms of the things are not visible their subtle forms must necessarily be there. The clouds, etc., manifest in the space in their actual form during the monsoon. That means

they were there in the space even before in their subtler forms. Otherwise they cannot manifest.

अदेहाः वृष्टिसिद्ध्यर्थम्

आकारान् कांश्चिदाप्नुवन् ।

वृष्टिनिष्पादकस्तत्तदाकारो

व्योम्नि दृश्यते ॥५१॥

अदेहाः - (though) bodiless वृष्टि-सिद्ध्यर्थम् - for the sake of raining कांश्चित् आकारान् - certain forms आप्नुवन् - they assume वृष्टिनिष्पादकः - the one that produces the rain तत्तदाकारः - the different form व्योम्नि - in the sky दृश्यते - is seen - (51)

51. (Air, etc., though) bodiless assume certain forms for the sake of raining. (Their) different form that produces the rain is seen in the sky.

Their actual different forms such as fore-wind, etc., mountainous cloud-forms, flashing streak of brilliant light are well-known.

आकारा वृष्टिकालात् प्राग् व्योम्नि

गूढा न तु स्फुटाः ।

ततो व्योम्नः समुत्थाय

निदाघे ज्योतिराप्नुवन् ॥५२॥

आकाराः - the specific forms (of air, etc.) वृष्टिकालात् प्राक् - before the monsoon व्योम्नि - in the space गूढाः - are concealed तु - and न स्फुटाः - are not manifest ततः -

thereafter निदाघे - in the summer व्योम्नः समुत्थाय - having got separated from the space ज्योतिः आप्नुवन् - (they) become one with the common heat - (52)

52. The specific forms (of air, etc.), are concealed in the space before the monsoon and are not manifest. Thereafter, in the summer having got separated from the space they become one with the common heat (of the summer).

What happens further is described.

सन्तापाख्यं परं ज्योतिः प्राप्य तेन दृढीकृताः ।
वृष्टिकाले स्वस्वरूपं स्फोरयन्तीति दृश्यते ॥५३॥

सन्तापाख्यम् - (further) what is called *santāpa* परं ज्योतिः - scorching heat प्राप्य - having got, (i.e. having become one with) तेन - by that (scorching heat) दृढीकृताः - make their actual forms concrete वृष्टिकाले - while raining स्वस्वरूपम् - their individual actual forms स्फोरयन्ति - they reveal इति दृश्यते - so it is seen - (53)

53. Further (the air, etc.), having got, (i.e. having become one with) the scorching heat called *santāpa*, thereby make their actual forms concrete. So also it is seen that they reveal their individual actual forms while raining.

With the above, the description of the illustration is over. The purpose of

this illustration is to show that a concealed entity reveals its real form by an appropriate specific means. Now the illustrated portion corresponding to the above illustration is being explained.

तथायमशरीरः सन् साक्ष्यज्ञानतिरोहितः ।
देहेऽन्तर्भूय वपुषो विवेकेन समुत्थितः ॥५४॥

तथा - in that manner of earlier illustration अयम् - this साक्षी - *sākṣī* अशरीरः - being bodiless अज्ञानतिरोहितः - concealed by the self-ignorance देहेऽन्तर्भूय - abiding in the body विवेकेन वपुषः - by distinguishing it from the body समुत्थितः - rises above the body, (i.e. is known to be distinct and independent of the body) – (54)

54. In that manner of earlier illustration, this bodiless *sākṣī* concealed by the self-ignorance (appears as if) abides in the body. (But) by distinguishing the *sākṣī* from the body it rises above (the

earlier identity with the body), (i.e. is known to be distinct and independent of the body).

परंज्योतिर्ब्रह्मरूपं प्राप्य वाक्योत्थबोधतः ।
स्वेन वास्तवरूपेण निर्द्वैतेनावभासते ॥५५॥

वाक्योत्थबोधतः - (this *sākṣīātmā*) by the *aparokṣa-ātmajñāna* born of *mahāvākya* परंज्योतिः ब्रह्मरूपम् - Brahman in the form of *nirupādhika* self-evident knowledge-principle प्राप्य - having gained (having discovered oneself to be) स्वेन - by its निर्द्वैतेन वास्तवरूपेण - by the non-dual real nature अवभासते - becomes manifest – (55)

55. (This *sākṣīātmā*) having gained (having discovered oneself to be) Brahman in the form of *nirupādhika* self-evident knowledge-principle by the *aparokṣa-ātmajñāna* born of *mahāvākya* becomes manifest.

The *sākṣīātmā* is always in its true nature of Brahman. Even then, on account of its ignorance it appears to be concealed. It is experienced as an entity endowed with an embodiment in spite of its being bodiless. By *ātmānātma viveka* in a pure (*śuddha*) and steady (*niścala*) mind (*citta*) the bodiless *sākṣī* is directly experienced as the distinct and independent *cit-ātmā*. This is *nirupādhika*. It is called *śodhita* (*nirupādhika*) *tvam pada* (the word ‘you’ referring to ‘I’ in reality). Here the *pramāṇa* of *mahāvākya* operates by pointing out that this ‘*nirupādhika*’ ‘I’ that is experienced directly without *tripuṭī* is itself the non-dual Brahman. This is how the *sākṣīātmā* concealed by ignorance manifests in its true nature of Brahman which is the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of entire Creation.

The parallels between the illustration of air, cloud, etc., and the illustrated

sākṣīātmā are as follows.

- i) The air, cloud, etc., are *aśarīra* (bodiless); *sākṣīātmā* also is bodiless.
- ii) The air, etc., were identical with the space; *sākṣīātmā* appears identical with the threefold body.
- iii) The air, etc., got separated from the space because of the scorching heat; *sākṣīātmā* is clearly known to be distinct and independent of the threefold body by the means of *ātmānātmaviveka*.
- iv) The air, cloud, etc., reveal their actual nature while raining. Similarly the *sākṣīātmā* becomes manifest in its real nature as non-dual Brahman on realizing its true self through *mahāvākya*.

The real nature of *sākṣī* referred to as *saṃprasāda* in the *śruti* is ascertained in the next six verses.

स्वतः साक्षी सम्प्रसादः

कालुष्येण विवर्जनात् ।

अविद्यया स्यात् कालुष्यं

देहतादात्म्यविभ्रमात् ॥५६॥

साक्षी - *sākṣīātmā* स्वतः - in its true nature (without any connection with *upādhis*) सम्प्रसादः - is entirely the peace (delight) कालुष्येण विवर्जनात् - because it is totally free from the defect of afflictions and sorrows अविद्यया देहतादात्म्यविभ्रमात् - because by the ignorance there is an erroneous identification with the body कालुष्यम् - the defect of sorrows and affliction स्यात् - is experienced (in *ātmā* on account of ignorance only) – (56)

56. *Sākṣīātmā* in its true nature (without any connection with *upādhis*) is entirely the peace (delight) (called

saṃprasāda) because it is totally free from the defect of afflictions and sorrows (called *kāluṣya*). Because there is erroneous identification with the body by ignorance the *kāluṣya* is experienced (in *ātmā* on account of ignorance only).

Kāluṣya literally means foulness, dirtiness, muddiness (figuratively also). It signifies all the sorrows of *saṃsāra*. It is a great defect because no one wants sorrows. All the sorrows are centred in the three bodies. Because of ignorance of oneself and the consequent identification with the bodies, they are mistakenly experienced as the intrinsic features of *ātmā*. In reality there is no defect or *kāluṣya* in *sākṣīātmā*. If it appears to be there, it is only on account of ignorance. All defects are based in the bodies onwards to *ahaṃkāra*. They are erroneously superimposed on *sākṣī*. Total freedom from all defects itself is the true nature of *ātmā* called

samprasāda. It is the total peace, the total delight. Further the varying intensities of *kāluṣya* in the three states of consciousness is explained one after the other.

जागरे स्थूलसूक्ष्माभ्यां

तादात्म्याद् व्याधयोऽखिलाः ।

आधयश्चास्य सन्तीदं

महत्कालुष्यमिष्यते ॥५७॥

जागरे - in the waking state
स्थूलसूक्ष्माभ्याम् - with the gross and the subtle bodies तादात्म्यात् - because of the identity (being experienced) अखिलाः - entire व्याधयः - ailments of the gross body आधयः - mental afflictions च - and अस्य - of this *sākṣī* सन्ति - are there इदम् - this महत् कालुष्यम् - a great defect इष्यते - is accepted—(57)

57. Because of the identity (being experienced) with the gross and the subtle bodies in the waking state, the entire ailments of the gross body and the mental afflictions belong to this *sākṣī*. This is accepted as a great defect.

It is a matter of universal experience that during the waking state, both the gross and the subtle bodies are completely within the ambit of our experience moment by moment. Naturally all the ailments and afflictions (*ādhis* and *vyādhis*) belonging to both bodies are also experienced. The *kāluṣya* born of *dehatādātmya* (identity with the

threefold body) includes in itself all the experiences of joys and sorrows born by sense-contacts with the sense-objects (*viṣayendriya-samyoga*). The sum total of all these is the share of our *saṃsāra* during the waking state. Unfortunately the identity with the bodies effected by the ignorance makes us believe that ‘I’ the *sākṣīātmā* undergoes these experiences of joys and sorrows. Thus the *kāluṣya* is at its peak in the waking state.

During the dream state the gross body with its accompanying *kāluṣya* is out of our experiential range. As a result these afflictions get eliminated in the dream. On the other hand in the deep sleep, both bodies with their inevitable *kāluṣya* get excluded from the range of our experience. The outcome of these two phenomena in the dream and deep sleep is described now.

ईषत् कलुषता स्वप्ने सूक्ष्ममात्राभिमानतः ।
सुप्तौ तेनापि हीनत्वादयमात्मा प्रसीदति ॥५८॥

स्वप्ने - during the dream state
सूक्ष्ममात्राभिमानतः - because of the identity with only the subtle body ईषत् - to some extent कलुषता - *kāluṣya* (is there) सुप्तौ - during the deep sleep तेन अपि हीनत्वात् - because the identity with the subtle body also is abandoned अयम् - this *sākṣī* आत्मा - *ātmā* प्रसीदति - is at peace (delight) considerably—(58)

58. During the dream state because of the identity with only the subtle body there is *kāluṣya* (afflictions) to some extent. (But) during the deep sleep because the identity with the subtle body also is abandoned, this *sākṣīātmā* is at peace (delight) considerably.

During the dream only the identity with the subtle body is there. Thus the *kāluṣya* in the dream gets confined to only those arising from it. Therein the awareness of the physical body with its *kāluṣya* is totally absent. Therefore the *kāluṣya* in the dream is only to some extent compared to its prominence in the waking. In the deep sleep state both the sources of *kāluṣya* (afflictions) are totally absent. Therefore it is said ‘*ātmā prasīdati*’ (*ātmā* is at peace [delight] considerably). But why in deep sleep the *prasāda* (peace, delight) is only to a considerable extent and not the *saṃprasāda*, the total freedom from all defects which itself is total peace or delight characterized by the abidance in the true nature of *ātmā*? The answer follows.

कालुष्यबीजमज्ञानम् अस्त्यत्राऽथ विवेचितः ।
बीजेनापि विहीनत्वात् सम्यगेव प्रसीदति ॥५९॥

अत्र - in the deep sleep (even if the identity with the gross and subtle bodies is not there) कालुष्यबीजम् - the seed (cause) of *kāluṣya* अज्ञानम् - the self-

ignorance in the form of causal body अस्ति - still persists अथ - but विवेचितः - (*ātmā*) that is ascertained by *ātmānātma-viveka* (discrimination between *ātmā* and *anātmā*) बीजेन अपि विहीनत्वात् - because of being totally devoid of even the cause of *kāluṣya* (viz. the ignorance) सम्यक् एव - in entirety only प्रसीदति - is at peace (delight)–(59)

59. In the deep sleep (even in the absence of identity with the gross and subtle bodies) the seed (cause) of the *kāluṣya*, the self-ignorance in the form of causal body still persists. But (*ātmā*) that is ascertained by *ātmānātma-viveka* (discrimination between *ātmā* and *anātmā*) is at peace (delight) in entirety only because of being totally devoid of even the cause of *kāluṣya*, (viz. the ignorance).

Though the *kāluṣya* (the sorrows and afflictions) is unmanifest during the causal state in the form of deep sleep its existence is invariably there. That is why the *ādhi* and *vyādhi* (physical ailments and mental afflictions) manifest unabatedly on waking up. Therefore ignorance, the cause of all sorrow, is in the form of a seed during the deep sleep. All possibilities of sorrows coming into existence end only when *ātmā* is cognized as distinct from the ignorance in the form of causal body along with the

subtle and gross ones. This is possible only through *ātmānātma-viveka*. In ending this ignorance alone, *ātmā* in its true nature of limitless happiness, peace called *saṃprasāda* gets revealed.

Though an ignorant person can experience this *saṃprasāda* only after ending the ignorance, *ātmā* is always so in its true nature even during the state of ignorance. Defects are in the *upādhis*, but *ātmā* is always defectless. To experience the *saṃprasāda* state of *ātmā* in the form of limitless peace and *ānanda*, the *samutthāna* as described hereafter is necessary.

स्वतः साक्षी संप्रसादस्तत्स्वरूपानुभूतये ।
समुत्थानं भवेदस्य देहादिभ्यो विवेचने ॥६०॥

साक्षी - *ātmā* स्वतः - in its true nature सम्प्रसादः - is limitless *ānanda* and peace (totally free from all sorrows of *saṃsāra*) तत्स्वरूपानुभूतये - to experience that true nature of oneself the *ātmā* अस्य - of this *sākṣī* देहादिभ्यः विवेचने (सति) - when ascertained (in terms of experience) distinct from the body, etc., with their features समुत्थानं - total freedom from the bodily identification भवेत् - takes place
-(60)

60. *Ātmā* is always in its true nature of limitless *ānanda* and peace (totally free from all sorrows of *saṃsāra*) (called *saṃprasāda*). When

ātmā is ascertained (in terms of experience) distinct from the body, etc., with their features (called *samutthāna*), its total freedom from the bodily identification takes place.

It is true that during the deep sleep the experience of both the gross and subtle bodies with their attending *kāluṣya* is absent. That certainly shows that they are not inherent features of *ātmā*. Otherwise they can, never get separated from *ātmā*. The rule is that the true nature of an entity can never be given up. Yet because of the presence of ignorance in the deep sleep there is no positive experience of *ātmā* free from ignorance and the two bodies besides their *kāluṣya*. This is possible only by the means of *ātmānātma-viveka* culminating in the direct (*aparokṣa*) experience of *ātmā* as distinct from all *upādhis*. It is called *samutthāna* of *ātmā*. It literally means the rising of *ātmā* above the threefold bodies with the ignorance. This *samutthāna* proves the true nature of *ātmā* distinct from *upādhis*. Without such *aparokṣa-anubhava* (direct experience of *ātmā* without the *tripuṭī*) to say that *ātmā* is free from all *upādhis* is only a borrowed statement from the *śruti* without one's verification. Such an *aparokṣa-anubhava* of *ātmā* is called 'śodhita

(*nirupādhika*) *tvam pada*’, the *tvam* or ‘you’ referring to ‘I’ from ‘*tat tvam asi*’ *mahāvākya*. If this ascertainment of direct experience of *nirupādhikaātmā* is not gained, what gets referred to by *tvam* is literal meaning (*vācyārtha*) only. Then it means the *samsārī* ‘I’. In this case the equation ‘you are that Brahman’ will not hold good since the *sopādhikasamsārī* ‘I’ as it is, cannot be Brahman as indicated by the *mahāvākya* ‘*tat tvam asi*’. That is true.

But here is a doubt. When the *samutthita sākṣīātmā* or the direct (*aparokṣa*) experience of *nirupādhika ātmā* without the *tripuṭī* is gained, is it not the finale of *ātmajñāna*? The real nature of *ātmā* as *nirupādhika* cannot be questioned because it is in accordance with the *śruti pramāṇa* that *ātmā* is *nirupādhika*, *nirviśeṣa* (attributeless) and *nirguṇa*. Then what is the necessity of *mahāvākya* even after the *samutthita sākṣīātmā* (*ātmā* in its real *nirupādhika* nature) is directly experienced? The next verse answers this doubt.

समुत्थितस्य जीवत्वनिवृत्तयै ब्रह्मरूपताम् ।
महावाक्यानि सर्वाणि बोधयन्त्यतियत्नतः ॥६१॥

समुत्थितस्य - of the *sākṣīātmā* ascertained to be distinct from the three bodies जीवत्वनिवृत्तयै - to end its notion of being a *jīva* सर्वाणि - all महावाक्यानि - *mahāvākyas* अतियत्नतः - with

great earnestness ब्रह्मरूपताम् - the nature of *sākṣī* is Brahman बोधयन्ति - teach—(61)

61. To end the notion that the *sākṣīātmā* ascertained to be distinct from the three bodies is a *jīva*, all *mahāvākyas* teach with great earnestness that the nature of *sākṣī* is Brahman.

After the *samutthāna* of *sākṣī*, that is to say after the ascertainment of *sākṣī* as distinct from the three bodies there remains no identity with the three bodies. Even then, there lingers the notion of being a *jīva* and the cause of the *jagat* as something different from me. Such wrong notions are dispelled by the Upaniṣadic *mahāvākyas*. The direct (*aparokṣa*) ascertainment of *sākṣī* distinct from the three bodies is indispensable for the *mahāvākyas* to be effective. Because this is *śodhitatvam pada* without accomplishing which the declaration ‘You are Brahman’ cannot hold good. The word *atīyatna* (great efforts) on the part of *mahāvākyas* is their earnestness. The *atīyatna* on the part of the *guru* is to teach from different angles. As for the disciple it means prepared frame of mind by the *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti* with focus on the staunch *vairāgya*.

UTTAMAPURUṢA

The *śruti* describes that this *sākṣīātmā* identical with Brahman is

uttama Puruṣa. This is explained in the next four verses.

परं ज्योतिर्ब्रह्मरूपं प्राप्य वाक्यार्थबोधतः ।

उत्तमः पुरुषः स स्याद्यः पुराक्षिणि वर्णितः॥६२॥

वाक्यार्थबोधतः - (this *sākṣīātmā*) by *aparokṣa-jñāna* born of *mahāvākyas* परं ज्योतिः ब्रह्मरूपम् - Brahman in the form of *nirupādhika* self-evident knowledge-principle प्राप्य - having gained (having discovered oneself to be) यः - the one who पुराः - earlier अक्षिणि - as (*Puruṣa* seen) in the eye वर्णितः - was described सः - that entity itself उत्तमः पुरुषः - *uttama Puruṣa* (the most exalted entity that is full and complete) स्यात् - is - (62)

62. This *sākṣī*, which was described earlier (*Ch.U.8-7-4*) as the *Puruṣa* seen in the eye, having gained, (i.e. discovered oneself to be) Brahman in the form of *nirupādhika* self-evident knowledge-principle is itself the *uttama Puruṣa* (the most exalted entity that is full and complete).

Before gaining the knowledge because of erroneous notion the *sākṣī* was mistaken as *saśarīra* (identified with the three bodies). On gaining the knowledge of its true nature that it is distinct and independent of the three bodies it was referred to as *saṁprasāda*. The Upaniṣad describes that itself to be

‘*uttama Puruṣa*’. This *uttama Puruṣa* only on account of *upādhi* of gross, subtle and the causal bodies plays the role of *akṣi-puruṣa*, *svapna-puruṣa* and *susupta-puruṣa* respectively. But free from *upādhis* in its real nature it is *uttama*, the most exalted that is full and complete.

Prajāpati had taught in his four sessions of teaching one and the same *ātmā* which is free from old age, death, etc., as described in his original declaration. Indra could know it correctly only at the end and not in the earlier sessions. By the knowledge of *mahāvākyas* it gets ascertained that ‘I’, the *sākṣīātmā*, is identical with Brahman which is the cause of the birth, sustenance and dissolution of the *jagat*. Thus ‘I am Brahman’; ‘Brahman is I’. Until the nature of *sākṣī* distinct from the three bodies is directly experienced this identity cannot hold good because the *saśarīra saṁsārī jīva* cannot be one with Brahman being diametrically opposed. Brahman is *param jyoti* – the self-evident *nirupādhika* knowledge-principle. It does not depend on anything else. All others depend on it. That itself is *uttama Puruṣa*.

The reason why or how the *sākṣīātmā* is *uttama*, the best or the most exalted is explained.

देहादज्ञानतः कार्यात् कारणाच्चायमुत्तमः ।
जीवत्वहानाद् ब्रह्मत्वभावाच्चोत्तमतोचिता॥६३॥

अयम् - this *sākṣī* कार्यात् देहात् - than the effects in the form of both gross and subtle bodies कारणात् अज्ञानतः - than the cause the self-ignorance च - and उत्तमः - the best जीवत्वहानात् - because of giving up the form of *jīva* ब्रह्मत्वभावात् - because in its nature it is Brahman च - and उत्तमता - the status of being the best उचिता - is appropriate – (63)

63. This *sākṣī* is the best among the effects in the form of both gross and subtle bodies and their cause the self-ignorance. Its status of being the best is (also) appropriate because of giving up the form of *jīva* and because in its nature it is Brahman only.

The *sākṣī* that is discovered as distinct and independent of all *upādhis* is *uttama* (the best) because it is free from all the afflictions and sorrows of *upādhis*. Further that itself is *pūrṇa* (full and complete). Another reason that makes the *sākṣī* *uttama* is that it is no more the mistaken *jīva*. The *jīva* mistakes oneself to be *kartā* (doer) and *bhoktā* (experiencer). This ends only in the wake of *jñāna* when 'I' as Brahman is discovered. The wrong notion of oneself as a *jīva* born of ignorance does not end by the performance of any *karma* because the *karma* itself is the

product of ignorance. Only *ātmajñāna*/*Brahmajñāna* can end it. The *sākṣī* as *uttama* (best) is certainly appropriate because it is the entity that is absolutely real (*paramārtha satya*) and ever free from *saṃsāra*. Its most exaltedness (*uttamatā*) is not something that is gained in which case it can be lost. The nature of *sākṣī* got veiled by the ignorance. It was revealed in its true nature by knowledge.

The *uttama Puruṣa sākṣī* is the common basis of *akṣi-Puruṣa*, *svapna-Puruṣa* and the *susupta-Puruṣa* in the waking, dream and deep sleep respectively. The *sākṣī* who abides in its true nature in *turiya* state totally free from all the features of three states of consciousness is the *uttama Puruṣa*. Here the *upādhi* of *Puruṣa* (*sākṣī*) in the waking and the dream is *kṣara* (changing or destructible moment by moment) and *vyākṛta* (manifest) whereas its *upādhi* in the deep sleep is relatively *akṣara* (changeless or indestructible) because as the cause *ajñāna* it is all along uniform except it ends in the knowledge. It is also *avyākṛta* (unmanifest). But *uttama Puruṣa sākṣī* is totally unaffected and independent of these both *kṣara* and *akṣara upādhis*. This fact that *sākṣīātmā* is *uttama Puruṣa* is corroborated by quoting *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa (*B.G.15-16, 17*). But there is slight difference in the presentation in the *Bhagavadgītā*. Here

the word *Puruṣa* is used for *sākṣīātmā* all along. But there the word ‘*puruṣa*’ in the first two instances is used for the categories called *kṣara* (destructible changing) or *vyākṛta* (manifest) and the *akṣara* (relatively indestructible or changing) or *avyākṛta* (unmanifest). The common point of illustration is that the *sākṣīātmā* at the individual level and the *Paramātmā* at the totality as *uttama Puruṣa* are totally unaffected by the *kṣara/vyākṛta* and *akṣara/avyākṛta upādhis* which are also the *kārya* (effect) and *kāraṇa* (cause) *upādhis*.

द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च ।

क्षरः सर्वाणि भूतानि कूटस्थोऽक्षर उच्यते ॥६४॥

लोके - in this world क्षरः - *kṣara*
च - and अक्षरः - *akṣara* च - and इमौ - (thus)
these द्वौ - two एव - indeed पुरुषौ - (are)
two categories or collections सर्वाणि - all
भूतानि - multitudes of changing entities
क्षरः - (are called) *kṣara* (destructible)
कूटस्थः - the one that is non-changing
like a heap or the one who is deceitful
in the form of *māyā* अक्षरः - *akṣara*
(indestructible) उच्यते - is called—(64)

64. In this world the *kṣara* and the *akṣara* are the two categories. All the multitudes of changing entities are called the *kṣara* (destructible). The one that is non-changing like a heap or the one who is deceitful in the form of *māyā* is called *akṣara* (indestructible).

The *kṣara puruṣa* refers to all that is there in the *jagat* which is ever-changing in nature and destructible. The *akṣara puruṣa* is the immediate cause of all changing entities. It is *māyā* which lasts long as the cause of *saṃsāra* until it is destroyed by *Brahmajñāna*. Thus the *kṣara* and *akṣara puruṣas* mean the manifest and repeatedly destructible *jagat* at the gross and subtle levels, and their unmanifest cause called *māyā* or *prakṛti* which is relatively indestructible.

The entity totally distinct and unaffected by these *kṣara* and *akṣara puruṣas* (or *upādhis*) is called *uttama Puruṣa* by *Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa*. That *Puruṣa* is *Paramātmā* itself who is *nitya* (ever-existent), *śuddha* (free from *avidyā* and its effect Creation), *buddha* (self-luminous knowledge-principle) and *mukta* (ever-liberated) in nature.

उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः परमात्मेत्युदाहृतः ।

इत्याह भगवान् कार्यकारणाभ्यां तमुत्तमम् ॥६५॥

अन्यः तु - on the other hand the other one in respect of these two परमात्मा - *Paramātmā* उत्तमः पुरुषः - the best *Puruṣa* इति - so उदाहृतः - is said इति - thus भगवान् - *Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa* तम् - that *sākṣī Puruṣa* कार्यकारणाभ्याम् - from the standpoint of effect (manifest *jagat*) and its cause (unmanifest *māyā*) उत्तमम् - the best आह - said—(65)

65. On the other hand the other one in respect of these two, the *Paramātmā*, is said to be the best *Puruṣa*. Thus *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa said that the *sākṣī Puruṣa* is the best from the standpoint of effect (the manifest *jagat*) and its cause (unmanifest *māyā*).

Paramātmā is described as different (*anyaḥ*) from both *kṣara* and *akṣara Puruṣa*. The word ‘*Parama*’ (most exalted) shows its distinct nature and superiority to the gross and the subtle body mistaken as *ātmā* on account of *avidyā*. The word *ātmā* shows its nature of being the innermost *cit* in all the beings. Therefore according to Vedānta, the *nirupādhika sākṣī Puruṣa* is both *Paramātmā* and *uttama* (the best).

THE RESULT OF ĀTMAJÑĀNA

Here crops up a doubt. It is clear that a *jñānī* discovers oneself to be *uttama Puruṣa* who is *Paramātmā*. But it is equally true that an ignorant person also in reality (*paramārthataḥ*) is nothing but *uttama Puruṣa* identical with *Paramātmā*. Then what advantage does a *jñānī* derive from the knowledge? The *śruti* answers this question by pointing out the *sarvātmabhāva* (the discovery of oneself as the *ātmā* of all) of a *jñānī* whereby the happiness enjoyed by all becomes his own. This is explained by a question and its answer.

उत्तमोऽयं पुमान्

मूढप्राणिनामपि विद्यते ।

तत्र तत्त्वविदः कोऽतिशयः

स्यादिति चेच्छृणु ॥६६॥

अयम् - this उत्तमः पुमान् - *uttama Puruṣa* मूढप्राणिनाम् अपि - even in the case of ignorant persons विद्यते - is present तत्र - then तत्त्वविदः - in the case of a *jñānī* कः - what अतिशय - excellence स्यात् - is there इति चेत् - if asked so शृणु - please listen –(66)

66. This *uttama Puruṣa* is present even in the ignorant persons. (Therefore) if it is asked, ‘what excellence the *jñānī* has?’ please listen.

The Upaniṣad says: ‘That *saṃprasāda* (the hitherto *jīva* who has now given up the identification with the three bodies and who having discovered its identity with Brahman is now *uttama Puruṣa*) abiding in oneself as the *ātmā* of all (*sarvātmā*) moves around at places as Indra, etc., laughing or eating, sporting, rejoicing with kinsmen, women, vehicles (only figuratively but not physically because there are no bodies), but does not remember the body (*upajana*) which is the source of sorrow’ (*Ch.U.8-12-3*). This *śruti* portion has to be understood figuratively and not literally. It is like ‘*sarvakāmāptiḥ*’ (*Tai.U.2-1*; *A.Pr.2-23,29*) and ‘*kāmācāra*’ (*Ch.U.7-25-2*;

A.Pr.4-79 to 81). The *Brahmasūtras* (4-4-5,6) ascertain that this *śruti* shows the absence of sorrows and the sporting, etc., is only a praise of *Paramānanda* that the *jñānī* is. This portion of the *śruti* is now being explained.

स तूत्तमब्रह्मरूपं तत्त्ववित् स्वात्मवस्तुनि ।
पर्येति स्वात्मबुद्ध्यैतं सर्वदेहस्थमीक्षते ॥६७॥

सः - he तत्त्ववित् - *ātmajñānī* तु -
as for *Prajāpati* स्वात्मवस्तुनि - in the
pratyagātmā (the true 'I') उत्तमब्रह्मस्वरूपम्
- the best (*uttama*) *Puruṣa* in the form of
Brahman पर्येति - sees in all सर्वदेहस्थम् -

(that is to say) abiding in all the bodies
एतम् - this *uttama Puruṣa* स्वात्मबुद्ध्यै - by
the discernment such as 'this is truly my
ātmā' ईक्षते - experiences - (67)

67. The *ātmajñānī* sees in all the
pratyagātmā (the true 'I') who is the
uttama (best) *Puruṣa* in the form of
Brahman (and who is totally unknown
to the *ajñānīs*). (That is to say), he
experiences this *uttama Puruṣa* abiding
in all the bodies by the discernment such
as 'this is truly my *ātmā*'.

'*Svātmavastu*', the *pratyagātmā* whose nature is *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda*, is common in all. It is experienced as 'I' by both *jñānīs* and *ajñānīs* because it is *anubhava-svarūpa* (self-experiencing principle). But what they experience as 'I' is totally opposed to each other. *Jñānī* experiences *nirupādhika ātmā* without the *tripuṭī*, in its *Paramānanda* nature free from the three bodies and their attending *kāluṣya* (sorrows of *saṃsāra*) whereas *ajñānīs* experience the *sopādhika*, *ḍṛśyasahita ātmā*. In the case of a *jñānī* the self-evident experience of *ātmā* is without the trace of any *adhyasta* (superimposed) entity including the ignorance. As for *ajñānīs*, their all experiences are that with all *adhyasta* accompanied by their features such as sorrows, transmigration, etc., popularly known as *saṃsāra*. That is why the *bhāṣyakāra* emphasizes that to gain *ātmajñāna* what needs to be done is to end the *adhyāsa* from the range of one's experience (*B.G.Bh.* 18-50; *Br.U. Bh.* 1-4-10).

Adhyāsa is *anubhava-siddha* (is proved by experience). The end of *adhyāsa* can be verified only by the experience of *nirupādhika ātmā* totally free from all that was *adhyasta* hitherto. Without such experience mere borrowed statements from the *śruti* such as '*ātmā* is *nirupādhika* and *nityamukta* (ever-liberated), Creation is *mithyā* (not real) and this is told by the highest *pramāṇa* of the Vedas', etc., cannot end the *saṃsāra*.

Our fundamental urge to gain happiness (*sukha-prāpti*) and to end the sorrow (*duḥkha-nivṛtti*). This can end for ever only with *ātmānubhava* or *Brahmānubhava*. Therein *Paramānanda* free from even the least trace of sorrow is directly (*aparokṣatayā*) experienced without the *tripuṭī*. The *saṃsāra* is an experiential problem. It can end only by opposite experiential solution of *ātmānubhava*/*Brahmānubhava* which is totally free from the *saṃsāra*.

The *ātmajñānī* as *sarvātmā* (the *ātmā* of all) is as good as the recipient of enjoyments in all the embodiments is shown with a sample description.

इन्द्रराजादिदेहेषु

नानाखाद्यानि भक्षयन् ।

बालैः साकं हसन् स्त्रीभिः

कदाचित् रमते सह ॥६८॥

यानैः क्वापि ज्ञातिभिश्च सहितो मोदते खलु ।

न कदाचित् स्मरत्येतत् वपुर्जनसमीपगम् ॥६९॥

इन्द्रराजादिदेहेषु - in the bodies of Indra, kings, etc. नानाखाद्यानि - varieties of food भक्षयन् - eating बालैः साकम् - with the children हसन् - playing and laughing कदाचित् - at times स्त्रीभिः सह - with ladies रमते - rejoices क्व अपि - sometimes यानैः - with vehicles ज्ञातिभिः च सहितः - with kinsmen and friends खलु - indeed मोदते - is delighted न कदाचित् - (but) never एतत् - this जनसमीपगम् वपुः - body that interacts with the people स्मरति - thinks of
—(68,69)

68, 69. (The *ātmajñānī* as *ātmā/caitanya* in all is available) in the bodies of Indra, kings, etc., eating

varieties of food, playing and laughing with children, at times rejoicing with the ladies, sometimes indeed is delighted with vehicles, kinsmen and friends, but he never thinks of this body that interacts with the people.

The experience of *sarvātmabhāva* reveals that the *caitanya* (*ātmā*) present in the King of *devas* Indra, a king on earth, a bird, an elephant, an ant, etc., is the *caitanya* that is in me. Therefore the experiences of enjoyment fall at the altar of *caitanya* in those respective bodies. It is the same *caitanya* that the *jñānī* is. Therefore the joys enjoyed by all beings without exception are as good as his experiences. As told earlier this description is to be taken figuratively and not literally. The *Paramānanda*, the nature (*svarūpa*) of *jñānī* includes all *viśayānanda* (sense-pleasures) enjoyed by all.

If it is so, then the sorrowful experiences suffered by all beings should also fall at the altar of *caitanya* and they should necessarily belong to the *jñānī*. This does not hold good at all

because the *jñānī* is so absorbed in *caitanya* (*ātmā*) that is the real nature of everyone including himself that he is not at all aware of his body or any other's body. As a result the sorrows that manifest at the body level are not experienced by him at all. He forgets his body and those of all others. This fact is explained further.

एतदेहेन तादात्म्यभ्रान्त्या दुःखमभूत् पुरा ।
विवेकेन भ्रमेऽपेते तद्दुःखं नाद्य वीक्ष्यते ॥७०॥

पुरा - earlier (before gaining the firm abidance [*niṣṭhā*] in *ātmajñāna*) एतत् देहेन - with one's body तादात्म्यभ्रान्त्या - by the erroneous identification दुःखम् अभूत् - sorrow was suffered विवेकेन - by *ātmānātma-viveka* भ्रमे अपेते - when that error is ended अद्य - now in the state of knowledge तद् दुःखम् - those bodily sorrows न वीक्ष्यते - does not experience as 'these are my sorrows'—(70)

70. The sorrow was suffered earlier (before gaining the firm abidance [*niṣṭhā*] in *ātmajñāna*) by the erroneous identification with one's body. Now, in the state of knowledge when that error is ended by *ātmānātma-viveka*, (the *ātmajñānī*) does not experience those bodily sorrows as 'these are my sorrows'.

इन्द्रराजादिदेहेषु न तादात्म्यं पुरापि च ।
अतो न तद्देहदुःखशङ्काप्यस्य तु विद्यते ॥७१॥

इन्द्रराजादि देहेषु - in the bodies of Indra, the king, etc. तादात्म्यम् - identity पुरा - earlier (in the state of ignorance before gaining the *ātmajñāna*) अपि - also न - was not there च - and (now in the state of knowledge also it is not there) अतः - therefore अस्य - to the *ātmajñānī* तद्देहदुःखशङ्का - the thought of sorrows of all those bodies अपि - even न तु विद्यते - is not possible—(71)

71. (In the case of an *ātmajñānī*) earlier (even in the state of ignorance before gaining the *ātmajñāna*) there was no identity with the bodies of Indra, the king, etc., and (now in the state of knowledge also it is not there). Therefore even the thought that the sorrows of all those bodies can affect the *jñānī* is not possible.

The doubt that the sorrows suffered by all should necessarily be experienced by a *jñānī* cropped up because of not knowing as to who gets subjected to sorrows. Even the *ajñānī* suffers sorrows only when he is identified with the body. In the sleep there is no sorrow in the absence of identification with the gross or subtle body. Thus identification with the body is the cause of suffering. As *ātmajñānī* has no such identification with his or other's body, the sorrows of none can affect him. He had no identification with

all the bodies such as those belonging to Indra, etc., even in the state of ignorance. There is no occasion now of identifying with them after gaining *ātmajñāna*. The *jñānī* had identified with his body in the state of ignorance as a result he was suffering the sorrows. Now, in the wake of *jñāna* the identification with his body has dropped. There is no possibility whatsoever of identifying with any other bodies. Therefore the *jñānī* does not get subjected to any sorrows.

If *jñānī* can gain joys of Indra, etc., without identifying with their bodies, should he not gain the sorrows also in them? What stops him from experiencing those sorrows? The answer follows.

सुखानि तद्देहगानि साक्षी

सर्वाण्यवेक्ष्यते ।

साक्ष्यात्मत्वाभिमानी सन् ज्ञानी

तान्यभिमन्यते ॥७२॥

साक्षी - *sākṣī* (the *caitanya* illuminating all experiences in an individual *jīva*) तद्देहगानि - belonging to the bodies of Indra, etc. सर्वाणि - all सुखानि - pleasures अवेक्ष्यते - illuminates ज्ञानी - *jñānī* साक्ष्यात्मत्वाभिमानी सन् - considering the *sākṣī* as 'I' तानि - those pleasures अभिमन्यते - assents to as belonging to oneself—(72)

72. The *sākṣī* (the *caitanya*

illuminating all experiences in an individual *jīva*) illuminates all pleasures belonging to the bodies of Indra, etc. The *jñānī* considering the *sākṣī* as 'I' assents to those pleasures as belonging to oneself.

दुःखान्यपीक्षते साक्षी तथाप्येतेषु तत्त्ववित् ।
नाभिमानमुपादत्ते दुःखानां मायिकत्वतः ॥७३॥

साक्षी - *sākṣī* दुःखानि - sorrows अपि - also ईक्षते - illuminates तथा अपि - even then एतेषु - in these sorrows तत्त्ववित् - *jñānī* अभिमानम् न उपादत्ते - does not consider as belonging to himself दुःखानाम् मायिकत्वतः - because the sorrows are the effects of (false) *māyā*—(73)

73. The *sākṣī* illuminates sorrows also. Even then the *jñānī* does not consider these sorrows as belonging to himself because the sorrows are the effects of (false) *māyā*.

The changeless (*nirvikārī*) *sākṣī* illuminates (makes known) both the joys and sorrows alike without any mine-ness in them. It is the *jīva* identified with the threefold body becomes happy or sorrowful. But the *jñānī* who has no identification with the bodies identifies with one and same *sākṣī* in all which is his *ātmā* also. Though *sākṣī* illuminates joys and sorrow alike he considers joy as akin to oneself being of the same nature as *sākṣīātmā* but not the sorrows which are the effects of (false) *māyā*.

The sense-pleasures manifest through eating, sporting in different bodies is a limited form of *ātmā* whose real nature is *Paramānanda*. Therefore the *jñānī* owns it as his nature. But sorrows being the products of *māyā*, they have got sublated (*bādhita*) by *ātmajñāna*. Therefore he has no connection with them. Even the sporting, eating, etc., are also *bādhita* (sublated). But the *śruti* mentions the joys born of them only to praise *Brahmavidyā*. Mention of sorrows does not fit in the praise. So they are clearly negated.

It should be kept in the mind that the *jñānī* who abides in his real nature with *niṣṭha* has no connection with bodies including his and the *dr̥śya jagat*. This should make it amply clear that the Upaniṣadic portion under discussion is only a praise of *Brahmavidyā*.

The appropriateness of *jñānī* discarding the sorrow and considering only the joy as his is shown now. Or if sorrows are the effects of *māyā*, are not the *viśayānanda* (sense-pleasures) the same? The answer follows.

ब्रह्मानन्दस्य लेशाः स्युरानन्दा विषयोत्थिताः ।
अतस्तत्त्वविदः पक्षपातो ह्येतेषु विद्यते ॥७४॥

विषयोत्थिताः आनन्दाः - sense-pleasures born of sense-objects ब्रह्मानन्दस्य - of *Brahmānanda* लेशाः - particles स्युः - are

अतः - therefore हि - indeed एतेषु - in these joys तत्त्वविदः - of a *jñānī* पक्षपातः - preference विद्यते - is there - (74)

74. Sense-pleasures born of sense-objects are particles of *Brahmānanda*. Therefore the *jñānī* has a preference in these joys.

The only source of *ānanda* is Brahman. It is available in bits and pieces for the experience of *jīva* through its reflection in the *vṛttis* called *priya*, *moda* and *pramoda* born of sense-indulgence (*viśaya-bhoga*). Ignorant people mistake that happiness as being born of sense-objects. The *ānanda* (happiness) enjoyed in all embodiments is akin to a drop in the ocean of happiness that is Brahman (*Br.U.4-3-32*). *Taittirīyopaniṣad* (2-7) describes Brahman as *rasa* (*ānanda*) which alone delights all living beings in accordance with their *puṇya*. The *pakṣapāta* (preference) of happiness on the part of a *jñānī* does not mean that he wants to have more and more sense-pleasures (*viśaya-sukha*). The preference is the acceptance of his true nature which is nothing but *ānanda*. On the other hand the products of *māyā* such as *dr̥śya-jagat* including *viśayas* (sense-objects) and sorrows in it get discarded as *mithyā* by *ātmajñāna*.

In the *Saptānna brāhmaṇa* from

Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad (1-5-20) also it is said that the *jñānīs* have consideration of only happiness but no identification with sorrow. In fact the statement referred to here to corroborate what was described so far is from the standpoint of *Prajāpati* (*Hiraṇyagarbha*) *upāsanā* and the *upāsanās* of other deities. Even when identified with *Prajāpati* or other *upāsya* deities they have only good (happiness) and not bad (sorrows). Then how much more it should be true that *jñānīs* have only happiness to their lot and not sorrows? The next two verses summarize the corroborative passage from the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*.

पुण्यमेवामुमाप्नोति न देवान् पापमाप्नुयात् ।
इति श्रुत्यन्तरं ब्रूते सुखं सर्वात्मदर्शिनः ॥७५॥

अमुम् - to him (*Prajāpati*, i.e. *Hiraṇyagarbha*) पुण्यम् एव - only *punya*, (i.e. good results) आप्नोति - befalls देवान् - to deities पापम् - sin न आप्नुयात् - does not befall इति - so श्रुत्यन्तरम् - another *śruti* सर्वात्मदर्शिनः - for the *jñānī* who sees *ātmā* in all सुखं ब्रूते - describes of gaining (only) happiness—(75)

75. The *Prajāpati* gains only *punya* (good results) (because) deities do not get sin. So, another *śruti* describes that the *jñānī* who sees *ātmā* in all, gains (only) happiness.

प्रजाः शोचन्ति यत् किञ्चित्
तासामेव भवेदिदम् ।
न सर्वात्मदृशोऽस्तीति
प्राहैतदपि सा श्रुतिः ॥७६॥

यत् किञ्चित् - whatever that प्रजाः - people शोचन्ति - bewail, (i.e. suffer) इदम् - this, (i.e. that) तासाम् एव भवेत् - belongs to them only सर्वात्मदृशः - to the *jñānī* who sees *ātmā* in all न अस्ति - does not belong इति - thus एतद् अपि - even this सा श्रुतिः - that *śruti* प्राह - declared—(76)

76. Whatever that people suffer, that belongs to them only. It does not belong to the *jñānī* who sees *ātmā* in all. The same *śruti* has declared even this.

The *upāsaka* of *saptāṇna upāsanā* (*Br.U.1-5*) gains the status of *Hiraṇyagarbha* as a result of which he becomes the *ātmā* of all beings. There it is said that the grief of people remains with them only but their good results accrues to *Hiraṇyagarbha* (also). The sorrows resulting from sins do not go to the share of deities. *Hiraṇyagarbha* is the macrocosmic embodiment of all deities. There is no occasion of his getting sins of people (*Br.U.1-5-20*). *Hiraṇyagarbha* is the *ātmā* of all beings in the sense of *saviśeṣa* (with attributes). The individual (microcosmic-*vyaṣṭi*) subtle bodies (*sūkṣma-śarīras*) are part and parcel of macrocosmic subtle bodies (*samaṣṭi-sūkṣma-śarīras*) which is the

body of *Hiranyagarbha* since he is its deity. This corroborates that the *jñānī* who is the *ātmā* of all (*sarvātmā*) at the *nirupādhika* or *nirviśeṣa* (attributeless) level has to be necessarily free from the sorrows of all people. *Īśavāsyopaniṣad* (7) also declares that the *jñānī* who directly knows the one non-dual *ātmā* has no grief and ignorance. Thus though the *jñānī* is the *ātmā* of all such as Indra, etc., he is untouched by their sorrows.

The fact that the *jñānī* though *sarvātmā* is totally unconnected to the sorrows and defects of all bodies but only their happiness falls in his lot is further substantiated by the experience of the great masters of the past (called *vidvadanubhava*) in the next two verses.

सर्वात्मत्वेऽपि देहादिदोषलेपो न मेऽस्ति हि ।
अदुष्टा सूर्यभा यद्वच्चण्डालादिस्पृगप्यसौ ॥७७॥

सर्वात्मत्वे अपि - though I am *sarvātmā* (*ātmā* of all) देहादिदोषलेपः - the smearing, (i.e. connection) of the defects of the body, etc. मे - to me न हि अस्ति - is not at all there यद्वत् - just as असौ - this सूर्यभा - sunlight चण्डालादिस्पृक् अपि - even if in touch with the (unholy) *cāṇḍāla*, etc. अदुष्टाः - is free from blemish – (77)

77. ‘Though I am *sarvātmā* (*ātmā* of all), I am not tainted by (or connected to) the defects of the body, etc., just as this sunlight is free from blemish even if

in touch with the (unholy) *cāṇḍāla*, etc.’

This verse is a statement of some ancient *ācārya* (Vedāntic teacher) based on his *ātmānubhava*. The sunlight is simultaneously in the direct touch with everything that is in its ambit. The things and beings that it comes in touch with may be holy or unholy, good or bad, etc. But the sunlight is always pure. It is never contaminated by the entities on which it falls. Similarly the *jñānī* as the *ātmā* of all abides in all embodiments alike. But it has no connection whatsoever with their defects. *Parameśvara* abides in all bodies alike as *antaryāmī* and yet is unconnected to their defects. Similarly the *jñānī* also is free from the defects of all bodies in spite of being *sarvātmā*. A murderer commits a murder in the sunlight. But the sun who illuminates it does not become sinful. Similarly the *jñānī* as *sākṣīātmā* in all is not at all the partner of defects that belong to *sākṣya* (illuminated) body, etc. *Sākṣīātmā* is always *nirvikāri* (changeless) ever rooted in its real nature free from all *upādhis*, though it appears to abide in them. Thus sorrows belong to *upādhis*. *Ātmā* is always free from them.

ब्रह्माद्याः स्थावरान्ता ये प्राणिनो

मे वपु स्मृताः ।

कामक्रोधादयो दोषा जायेरन्

मे कुतोऽन्यतः ॥७८॥

ये - all those प्राणिनः - living beings
 ब्रह्माद्याः - beginning from *Brahmājī* (one
 of the *trimūrti*) स्थावरान्ताः - ending with
 any (insignificant) stationary being such
 as grass मे - my (who is *cit* only) वपुः -
 body स्मृताः - are ascertained कामक्रोधादयः
 दोषाः - defects such as desire, anger, etc.
 अन्यतः - are born on account of other
 entities कुतः - from what cause (in the
 absence of anything other than me) मे - in
 me *cit* जायेरन् - will they be born? – (78)

78. All those living beings
 beginning from *Brahmājī* (one of
 the *trimūrti*) upto any insignificant
 stationary being such as grass are
 ascertained to be my (who is *cit* only)
 body. The defects such as desire, anger,
 etc., are born on account of other entities.
 (Therefore in the absence of anything
 other than me) from what other cause
 will they be born in me (the *cit*)?
 (Certainly not possible).

The defects such as desire, anger,
 etc., need some entities other than
 oneself. Only when something other
 than oneself is there, the desire for it can
 be born or one can be angry with it.
 When the *sarvātmā* has none other than
 himself the *cit* (*ātmā*), what can he
 desire for or with whom can he be
 angry with or by what can he get
 subjected to sorrows? He, as the *cit*, is
 the *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) of the entire *śrṣṭi*

(Creation). Therefore the Creation from
Brahmājī to any insignificant creature
 is a falsely superimposed (*adhyasta*)
 body on him who is non-dual *cit*. It has
 no independent existence apart from the
jñānī who is *cit*. He (*jñānī*) has neither
 desire for oneself nor can get angry with
 oneself. The desire, anger, etc., need the
 notion of duality. He being *nirupādhika*
 non-dual *cit*, sorrows and afflictions,
 etc., are not possible in him.

इत्याचार्या ब्रह्मबोधकुशला

अभवन् पुरा ।

सुखमात्रग्राहिणोऽत्र दृष्टान्ताः

सन्त्यनेकशः ॥७९॥

इति - thus ब्रह्मबोधकुशलाः - adept in
Brahmajñāna आचार्याः - *ācāryas* पुरा - in
 the past अभवन् - were there अत्र - in this
 respect (of *jñānīs* having preference for
 only happiness to the exclusion of
 sorrows) अनेकशः - many सुखमात्रग्राहिणः -
 those who select only joy दृष्टान्ताः -
 examples सन्ति - are there – (79)

79. Thus there were in the past
ācāryas adept in *Brahmajñāna*. In this
 respect (of *jñānīs* having preference
 for only happiness to the exclusion of
 sorrows) there are many examples
 wherein only joy is selected.

Many *ācāryas* in the past
 diligently had gained the *niṣṭhā*
 (steadfastness) in the *Brahmajñāna* and

have clearly expressed that the *jñānī* is absorbed in all that is happiness to the total exclusion of sorrows. The original question was that if the *jñānī* because of his nature of *sarvātmā* (being *ātmā* in all) gains happiness enjoyed by all, he should necessarily suffer their sorrows also. This has been answered so far based on *śruti*, *yukti* (reasoning) and *vidvadanubhava*. The *jñānī* owns his real nature that is *Paramānanda*, totally untouched by sorrow. Now two worldly examples are given to show that only the desirable is opted for when confronted with both the desirable and undesirable.

वृक्षे मधुकरः पुष्परसं गृह्णाति नेतरत् ।
यतिर्भिक्षामुपादत्ते नाशौचं कस्यचिद् गृहे ॥८०॥

मधुकरः - honey-bee वृक्षे - in a tree
पुष्परसं - the honey in the flower गृह्णाति -
takes इतरत् न - (but) not the other things
(such as leaves, twigs, etc.) यतिः - a
sannyāsī कस्यचित् गृहे - from anyone's
house भिक्षाम् - alms उपादत्ते - accepts न
अशौचं - (but) not their impurity – (80)

80. The honey-bee takes (only) the honey in the flower from a tree (but) not the other things (such as leaves, twigs, etc.). A *sannyāsī* accepts only the alms from anyone's house (but) is not connected to their impurity.

A honey-bee opts only for the honey in the flower and nothing else from many other things in the tree.

Similarly the *jñānī* though abides in all as *ātmā* takes only happiness discarding their sorrows. This is a gross example highlighting the acceptance of the desirable thing. The second example of a *sannyāsī* is from the viewpoint of the scripture. It highlights the non-acceptance of the undesirable entity. The scriptures state that a *sannyāsī* does not get connected to the impurity or the defilement of a householder from whom he receives the alms. The body is made up of food. Therefore honey-bee has preference for its food the honey, whereas the *sannyāsī* accepts only *bhikṣā*, his food. The real nature of a *jñānī* is happiness and so he prefers happiness only and not sorrow.

If it is argued that the ignorant person also has preference for happiness, it is true. Therefore let him also gain *ātmajñāna*. Thereby his identity with the threefold body will end. This will result in the experience of only happiness to the total exclusion of sorrows. ‘What makes a *jñānī* superior to an *ajñānī*?’ was asked in the verse 66. Having answered it to a great extent the means to accomplish it is now suggested to an ignorant person also, in the next two verses.

मूर्खस्यापि सुखे

पक्षपातोऽस्तीत्युच्यते यदि ।

तर्हि तस्य प्रसिद्ध्यर्थं

तत्त्वं सोऽप्यवगच्छतु ॥८१॥

यदि - if मूर्खस्य अपि - even for an ignorant person (*ajñānī*) सुखे - for happiness पक्षपातः - preference अस्ति - is there इति - so उच्यते - is said तर्हि - in that case तस्य - of that happiness unsullied by sorrows प्रसिद्ध्यर्थम् - for fulfilment सः - that *ajñānī* अपि - also तत्त्वम् - the principle of *ātmā* अवगच्छतु - let (him) know directly –(81)

81. If it is said that even an ignorant person (*ajñānī*) has a preference for (only) happiness (it is true). In that case let him also know directly (*aparokṣatayā*) the principle of *ātmā* for the fulfilment of that happiness unsullied by sorrows.

तत्त्वे बुद्धे स्वदेहेन तादात्म्यं न स्मरत्यसौ ।
तेन दुःखे विनष्टेऽथ सुखमेव सदेक्षते ॥८२॥

तत्त्वे बुद्धे - on directly knowing his real nature *ātmā* असौ - he (who was hitherto an *ajñānī* but now has become a *jñānī*) स्वदेहेन तादात्म्यम् - identity with his body न स्मरति - does not think of तेन - thereby दुःखे विनष्टे - the sorrows get destroyed अथ - then सदा - always सुखम् एव - only happiness ईक्षते - he experiences –(82)

82. He (who was hitherto an *ajñānī* but now has become a *jñānī*) does not think of the identity with his body. Thereby the sorrows get destroyed

and then experiences always only the happiness.

The word ‘fool’ (*mūrkhā*) (vs.81) in the context refers to an ignorant person (*ajñānī*) who knows not his real nature even if, he is a highly learned in other branches of knowledge. *Brahmavidyā* is called ‘*tarāṇa-vidyā*’, the knowledge that enables one to cross over the ocean of *samsāra*. No other knowledge including that of the *karma-kāṇḍa* portion of the Vedas can accomplish it.

One may ask: ‘if like an *ajñānī*, the *jñānī* also prefers the joy all the time, in what way does he differ from an *ajñānī*?’ Here is the answer. The *jñānī* does not desire the joys born of sense-objects but enjoys the limitless happiness that is his true nature. On the contrary the *ajñānī* desires many things but fulfills some with the accompanying sorrows. His limited joy is mixed with sorrows. He is not independent in experiencing only happiness to the total exclusion of sorrows like a *jñānī*. *Ajñānī* has to strive hard to fulfill his desires whereas the *jñānī* (with *jñāna-niṣṭhā*) is effortlessly absorbed in his true nature that is limitless happiness without even the trace of sorrow.

An ignorant person does not know his real nature of limitless happiness. He gets subjected to the incessant sorrows because of his

erroneous identification with the threefold body. The *jñānī* who is *jīvanmukta* has no such erroneous identification with the body and as a result no sorrows arising from it can even afflict him. The threefold body by itself does not give the sorrows. But the identity with it, born of mutual *adhyāsa* (superimposition) between *ātmā* and *anātmā*, the product of self-ignorance gives sorrows. *Ātmavidyā/ Brahavidyā* alone can end this sorrow called *saṃsāra* for ever.

JĪVANMUKTĪ

The subsequent portion of the Upaniṣad gives an illustration. Just as a horse or bull is tied (yoked) to a cart or a chariot, similarly this *prāṇa*, (i.e. *ātmā* itself identified with the *upādhi* having the power called *jñāna-śakti* and *kriyā-śakti* namely the subtle body) is employed in this body (to make its inhabitant experience the results of one's actions/*karmas*) (*Ch.U.8-12-3*). This is explained in the next four verses in a different manner than what the *bhāṣya* has said which will be seen later.

तादात्म्यस्याऽस्मृतौ देहनिर्वाहो नेति चेच्छृणु ।
अश्वादिनेव प्राणेन प्रेरितं रक्ष्यते वपुः ॥८३॥

तादात्म्यस्य अस्मृतौ - if the identity with the body is forgotten देहनिर्वाहः - sustenance of the body न - is not possible इति चेत् - if it is urged (so) शृणु - please

listen अश्वादिना इव - like by the (trained) horse, etc. प्राणेन - by the *prāṇa* प्रेरितम् - impelled वपुः - body रक्ष्यते - is protected - (83)

83. If it is urged that the sustenance of the body is not possible if the identity with the body is forgotten, please listen. Like the (trained) horse, etc., the body impelled by the *prāṇa* is protected.

An ignorant person firmly believes by identifying with the body that he as the body takes to all the activities in life. Therefore the person who knows not the mechanism that *Īśvara* has provided in every body for its function is bound to doubt that a *jīvanmukta's* body cannot function in the absence of bodily identification. Though an *ajñānī* thinks that when awake he does everything, it is not true. The indispensable bodily functions required to sustain it do not come to a halt in the sleep and swoon even if there is no identity with the body. This shows that there is some other entity who runs the bodily sustenance. It is the *prāṇa* who undertakes the bodily activities of all beings. The illustration of a (trained) horse or a bull explains how the body is sustained even in the absence of identity with it. The next verse explains the illustration.

रथे प्रयोगयोग्योऽश्वः शिक्षितः
सारथिं विना ।

स्वयमेव सदाऽभ्यासाद् गन्तव्यं
प्रापयेत् खलु ॥८४॥

रथे - to a chariot प्रयोगयोग्यः - fit to be yoked शिक्षितः - trained अश्वः - horse सारथिं विना - without the charioteer स्वयमेव- on its own सदा अभ्यासात् - by daily practice गन्तव्यम् - destination खलु - certainly प्रापयेत्- takes to—(84)

84. A trained horse fit to be yoked to a chariot by daily practice on its own certainly takes the (chariot) to the destination without the charioteer.

The trained horse or the bull because of previous practice takes the chariot or the cart to the routine destination such as house, etc., without anyone driving it. Mere training is not sufficient, but repeated practice also is necessary. Similarly the *prāṇa* prompts the body of the *jīvanmukta* to undergo its *prārabdha-bhoga*. Actually it is so in the case of everyone.

‘Who does appoint the *prāṇa* to do all the activities in all bodies?’ This question is answered besides showing the applicability of the illustration (*dr̥ṣṭānta*) to the illustrated topic, (i.e. *dār̥ṣṭānta*).

ईश्वरेणास्य देहस्य प्रेरणाय नियोजितः ।
प्राणस्तत्तद्भोगदेशे देहं नयति कर्मणा ॥८५॥

अस्य देहस्य - of this body प्रेरणाय - for the activity ईश्वरेण - by *Īśvara* प्राणः - *prāṇa* नियोजितः - is appointed कर्मणा - (that *prāṇa*) in accordance with one's *prārabdha-karmaphalas* तत् तत् भोगदेशे - to the different places of ordained *bhogas* (experiences) देहम् - body नयति - brings—(85)

85. The *prāṇa* is appointed by *Īśvara* for the activity of this body. It brings the body to the different places of ordained *bhogas* (experiences) in accordance with one's *prārabdha-karmaphalas*.

The word *prāṇa* as used in the Upaniṣad is not confined to only the vital airs. It refers to the *caitanyarūpa ātmā* identified with the subtle body which has the powers of *jñāna-śakti* and *kriyā-śakti*. The *bhāṣya* describes it as *prajñātmā* having the *upādhi* of five functions of *prāṇa*, sense-organs and organs of action, the mind and intellect (*Ch. U. Bh. 8-12-3*). The *prārabdha-bhoga* of all *jīvas* does not depend on their willingness or unwillingness. If the activities of this bodily assemblage were entirely decided by us, we should not land in sorrows. Therefore whether a person is a *jñānī* / *jīvanmukta* or an *ajñānī*, the sustenance of the body and its activities are carried out by the *prāṇa* according to one's *prārabdha* and not by the identification with the body.

It is true that the *ajñānī* mistakenly thinks himself as the doer of many things because of erroneous identity with the threefold body. Even then he does exert to earn his livelihood, etc. But a *jīvanmukta* is impervious of such efforts required for the upkeep of his body because the absorption of his mind in *ātmā* is his main pre-occupation. Then how can his body continue? There is no such problem. His *prārabdha* only takes care of all these. This is explained with another example.

गर्भस्थानां च बालानां

निर्वाहो वपुषो यथा ।

जीवन्मुक्तस्य देहेऽपि निर्वाहः

स्यात् तथा न किम् ॥८६॥

यथा - just as गर्भस्थानाम्- of foetuses च - and बालानाम् - of infants वपुषः - of the body निर्वाहः - sustenance (takes place without their efforts) तथा - similarly जीवन्मुक्तस्य - of a *jīvanmukta* देहे - in the body अपि - also निर्वाहः - sustenance किम् न स्यात् - why should it not be? – (86)

86. Just as the sustenance of the bodies of foetuses and infants (takes place without their efforts), similarly why should it not be so in the case of *jīvanmukta's* body? (Certainly it is possible).

Foetuses and infants grow without any efforts on their part. It is

taken care of according to their *prārabdha*. So is the case with the *jīvanmukta's* body. It is totally governed by their *prārabdha*.

The *bhāṣyakāra* explains this illustration of a horse or a bull as follows. The question that crops up is how did *Prajāpati* describe the bodiless (*aśarīra*), sinless (*apahatapāpmā*) *ātmā* as the *Puruṣa* abiding in the eye? This is answered by the illustration of horse, bull, etc., yoked to vehicles such as chariot, cart. This body is in the place of chariot and the *prāṇa* is fastened to it or is appointed as its functionary. The word *prāṇa* stands for the subtle body comprising *jñānaśakti* (power of knowledge) and *kriyāśakti* (power of action) which includes the *prāṇa* having five functions, sense-organs, organs of action, the mind and the intellect (*buddhi*). Just as a king appoints an executive capable of undertaking various activities, in the same manner, *Īśvara* has appointed *prāṇa* for enabling the body to take to different functions such as seeing, hearing, doing, etc. Therefore the sense-organ the eye is a part of *prāṇa* (subtle body). The Upaniṣad indicates all the sense-organs and organs of action by the word 'eye' (*caṅṣu*). It also suggests the entity namely *ātmā* at whose altar all *indriyas*

(senses), mind, etc., present the knowledge of sense-objects and actions. The principle which enables *indriyas*, etc., to function is *ātmā*. Thus the *indriyas*, mind, etc., through their respective functions indicate the presence of *ātmā* described as *aśarīra*, *apahatapāpmā*, etc., by *Prajāpati* in his first declaration.

The commentators on this portion of *bhāṣya* give an inference to prove the existence of *ātmā*. Just as a sentient entity such as a charioteer yokes the horse to run the chariot, so also for carrying out the functions of the body, the *prāṇa* is appointed by some sentient entity distinct from them all who by themselves are inert. This proves the existence of *ātmā* totally distinct from the assemblage of threefold body. To add further, just as the chariot can run on account of some sentient entity, the bodily functions also can be possible because of a sentient entity distinct from the body. This also proves the existence of *aśarīra* (bodiless) *ātmā*. Śrī Vidyāranya Muni in this text gives an alternative explanation which fits in the context of *jīvanmukta*.

The main topic of discussion from the verse 67 was what excellence the *jñānī* has in contrast to an *ajñānī* when the *uttama Puruṣa* is common to both (vs.66). In between, two points, how an *ajñānī* can also experience limitless happiness to the total exclusion of sorrows and how a body of a *jīvanmukta* continues to survive were discussed. Now the answer to that question (vs.66) is concluded.

समाधावात्मरूपेण व्युत्थाने

भोग्यरूपतः ।

सर्वानन्दान् सदा भुङ्क्ते

मुक्तस्यातिशयो ह्ययम् ॥८७॥

समाधौ - (a *jīvanmukta*) in *samādhi*
 आत्मरूपेण - in the form of *ātmā* व्युत्थाने -
 (and) on coming out of *samādhi*
 भोग्यरूपतः - in the form of the objects of
 enjoyment सदा - always सर्वानन्दान् - entire
 happiness भुङ्क्ते - experiences अयम् - this
 हि - indeed (is) मुक्तस्य - of a *jīvanmukta*
 अतिशयः - excellence—(87)

87. (A *jīvanmukta*) always experiences the entire happiness in the form of *ātmā* in *samādhi* and in the form of the objects of enjoyment on coming out of *samādhi*. This indeed is the excellence of a *jīvanmukta*.

A *jīvanmukta* in the state of *samādhi* remains in his true nature of self-experiencing *ātmā* that is limitless happiness free from the cognition of any *drśya jagat*. *Samādhi* is the state of mind (*antaḥkaraṇa*) wherein by repeated practice the

notions of *dhyātā* (I am the meditator) and *dhyānam* (this is meditation) are gradually given up by the mind and it gets absorbed in (or becomes a replica of) *dhyeya* (entity meditated upon, i.e. *ātmā* in this case) (P.1-55). Thus in the *samādhi* a *jñānī* is exposed directly to his *anubhava-svarūpa paramānanda*. On coming out from the *samādhi*, (i.e. in *vyutthāna*) he has the enjoyment of sense-objects as described earlier. He knows that such joy also is *Brahmānanda* in nature and not from the sense-objects. Both in *samādhi* and in *vyutthāna* his *ānanda* is the same *Brahmānanda*. In *samādhi* the happiness is without any *bhogyā* (objects of enjoyment), but in *vyutthāna* that happiness comes to him in the form of *bhogyā*. *Jñānī* cognizes *ātmā*/Brahman everywhere but *ajñānī* cannot. Otherwise there is no difference between a *jñānī* and an *ajñānī*.

In this context of *ātmajñāna* the relevance of *samādhi* has to be understood properly in contrast to what is called *jaḍa* or *andha-samādhi* which is founded on the wrong notion that the *jagat* and the *citta* (mind) are real, oneself is the entity called the body and *ātmajñāna* is not necessary. The adjective *andha* (blind) in the phrase ‘*andha-samādhi*’ shows that it is *vivekahīna* (devoid of *ātmānātma-viveka*).

Sage Vasiṣṭha draws a clear contrast between the Vedāntic *samādhi* and the *andha-samādhi* in his teaching called *Yogavāsiṣṭha (Utpatti Prakaraṇa, Ch-1)*. Therein he justifies the need of describing the *utpatti* (birth) of Creation. The gist of chapter is that the Brahman itself gets revealed by the *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* (which is a replica of Brahman free from all *drśyas*). This *vṛtti* is born in pure (*śuddha*) and steady (*niścala*) *antaḥkaraṇa* (mind) through the means of *mahāvākyas* such as ‘*aham Brahmāsmi*’, etc. This means that Brahman gets revealed to the *Brahmajñānī* in its true ever-liberated nature, free from *avidyā* and all *drśyas* (perceived entities). It also means for one's liberation no other means than *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* born of *mahāvākya* is required. How is it so? Because, like the objects and beings experienced in the dream, in the waking state also all *drśyas* such as our bodies, senses and the five elements, etc., in the form of bondage having got superimposed on Brahman identical with *ātmā* are experienced by us. The dream-bondage that is experienced cannot end by any means other than waking up from it wherein dream-experiences end. Similarly, for the *sākṣātkāra* (direct knowledge free from superimposed *drśyas* including the *tripuṭī*) of *ātmā*/Brahman there is no other means than the *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* born in *śuddhāntaḥkaraṇa* through *mahāvākyas*. How is it useful to us? It is reassuring that anytime whosoever is eligible can gain the *sākṣātkāra* of

Brahman in its true nature as 'I am Brahman' by the means of *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana*. The *jñānī* experiences the result of *mokṣa* (liberation) even while living in the form of *pūrṇa* (full, limitless), *nitya* (ever-existent), *mukta* (ever-liberated, never bound) knowledge-principle Brahman. Because of being free from all *drśyas* (perceived entities with *tripuṭī*), it is obvious that such *sākṣātkāra* has as its prerequisite the *samādhi* which is totally free from the *drśyas* perceived hitherto.

This bondage in the form of *saṃsāra* is experienced so long as *drśyas* are present. The bondage cannot continue once the *drśya* ends with its cause the ignorance. Whatever that is born or appears in the *jagat*, that alone grows, that alone gains *mokṣa* or heaven or hell (but not the *ātmā*). This entire perceptible *jagat* gets destroyed at the end of the *kalpa* (aeon) like the dream in the deep sleep. Thereafter, what remains is *sat* (ever-existent principle) that is actionless, limitless, nameless and formless. It is neither light nor darkness. That is of the nature of *caitanya* (pure awareness). On account of ignorance, it becomes the macrocosmic *jīva* in the form of *Hiraṇyagarbha*. Thereafter, because of predominance of *kriyāśakti* (power of action) it becomes *liṅgaśarīra* with the mind (*mana*). Forgetting its nature Brahman itself considers the features of mind as its own and itself becomes *Virāṭ* because of earlier *vāsanās*. Thereafter because of its *satya-saṅkalpa* (volition which comes true) creates different *lokas*, species of living beings, etc. Thus like the magic, *Hiraṇyagarbha* projects entire Creation (*sr̥ṣṭi*). Just as the form of a golden bangle is not different from the gold, so is what is called *jagat* not different from Brahman.

The words *avidyā*, *saṃsāra*, bondage (*bandha*), *māyā*, *moha* (ignorance), *mahat*, *tamaḥ* are all synonyms. It is better that one knows the nature of bondage (*bandha*) first. Thereafter the nature of liberation (*mokṣa*) can be known. Oh Rāma, the existence of *drśya prapañca* (perceptible world) is called the bondage of *draṣṭā* (seer, *jīva*). The *draṣṭā* is bound because of *drśya* and gets liberated on ending the *drśya*. The *jagat* comprising the false (*mithyā*) *tvam* (you), *aham* (I), etc., is called *drśya*. *Mokṣa* is not possible so long as this (experiential) *jagat* is there. If the absence of *mithyā drśya* is *mokṣa* some may think that the *drśya* should be negated as 'this is not true', 'this is not true' as and when it presents itself. Thereby *mokṣa* will be gained just as the health is gained by the negation of the disease. Then why should we take the trouble of gaining the *aparokṣa ātmajñāna* to end the *drśya*? By prattling in vain that this (experiential) *drśya* is not there, it will not get ended but on the contrary it will increase by additional *saṅkalpa* (*manovyāpāra*, mentation) required for such

prattling. Sage Vasiṣṭha continues. Oh you investigators! when the *drśya jagat* is present even by hundreds of reasonings, pilgrimages, disciplines, etc., not only the disease of *drśya* will not end but also additional disease of *drśya* will be born. Therefore the existence of *drśya* is not a matter to be disregarded but through inquiry it should be sublated, i.e. it should be discovered that it is not there in reality in three periods of time. If *drśya* were there in reality, the *jagat* can never be ended because it is an irrevocable rule that a non-existent entity can never exist and a really existent one can never cease to be. An ignorant individual is the potential seed of *drśya* in spite of his doing anything including the practice of *andha Samādhi* or going anywhere. His bondage can never end by such methods of do's and achieve. Therefore the statement that the *drśya jagat* is truly there and it has been ended by *tapas* (ascetic practices), meditation and *japa*, etc., is like becoming contented by sour gruel.

Here is an answer to the votary of the notion that the *nirvikalpa samādhi* that is independent of *ātmajñāna* can end the *drśya* forever. The statement such as 'I have wiped off the *drśya jagat* and here I am abiding in the *Samādhi* (called *andha-samādhi*)'. Thus in itself is the indestructible seed that can always give the memory of *saṃsāra* in the *samādhi*. Therein 'I' belongs to the person who is ignorant of one's true nature and hence identified with his *upādhi*. That itself is the perennial seed of *drśya jagat* as seen earlier. To the person for whom the *drśyajagat* exists truly, the *nirvikalpa samādhi* is just not possible. Because when he comes out of the *andha samādhi* the sorrows of this world are experienced by him continuously without fail like the sorrows being experienced after waking up from the deep sleep. Even if such *samādhi* is possible, the *saṃsāra* cannot end. Just as on waking up from the deep sleep one gets subjected to the sorrows of the world, so is the status quo restored after such *samādhi* gets ended. If the experientially available calamitous *saṃsāra* still persists, what is the use of such temporary joy in *samādhi*? If anyone hypothetically presumes that a non-ending *samādhi* can confer limitless happiness without *ātmajñāna*, it is no better than the sleep because the self-ignorance still continues. So long as this mind, itself a *drśya* continues in spite of great efforts to abide in *samādhi*, the *drśya jagat* is bound to remain unabated including transmigration and thus the delusion of *jagat* cannot end. Therefore if this *drśya* is real, it can never cease to be.

The notion that *tapas*, *japa*, *dhyāna* can end it is only an imagination of ignorant people. Just as there is a lotus creeper in the seed of a lotus, oil in the sesame seeds, fragrance in the flowers, etc., so is the *drśyabuddhi* (perception of *drśya*) in an

ajñānī draṣṭā (*jīva*). Let the camphor be anywhere, it emits fragrance invariably, similarly let the *ajñānī jīva* be anywhere, the *drśya* certainly emerges from it. Thus, even though there is *drśyavilaya* (ending of *drśya*) in *ātmasākṣātkāra*/*Brahmasākṣātkāra*, an *andha-samādhi* by itself is not a substitutable solution to remedy the *saṃsāra*. So asserts sage Vasiṣṭha. For further information, readers can refer to *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (*Utpattiprakaraṇa*, Ch.1).

Consider now the main stream of teaching. The Upaniṣad having shown *ātmā* as *aśrīra* (distinct from all *upādhis*), describes further its status in relation to different types of *upādhis*. ‘In the eye, *ātmā* becomes the *puruṣa* abiding in it with the eye as its means to see. The one who wants to smell is *ātmā*, the *ghrāṇa* (sense of smell) is its means to smell’. In the same trend the organ of speech, ear and the mind are described (Ch.U.8-12-4). In association with the *indriyas* the *ātmā* becomes *pramātā* (knower, perceiver) and as the *sākṣī* illuminates the *tripuṭī* (*pramātā*, *pramāṇa*, *prameya*). This topic that is intended to be described by the *śruti* is explained now.

CĀKṢUṢAḤ PURUṢAḤ (PURUṢAḤ / ĀTMĀ ABIDING IN THE EYE), ETC.

मुक्तेन बुद्धः साक्ष्येषु सर्वाक्षेषु विभाव्यताम् ।
तत्तदिन्द्रियसंयुक्तस्त्रिपुटी भासयत्यसौ ॥८८॥

मुक्तेन - by the liberated person बुद्धः
- known एषः - this साक्षी - *sākṣī* सर्वाक्षेषु - in
all *indriyas* (senses) विभाव्यताम् - becomes

visible, manifests असौ - it तत् तत्
इन्द्रियसंयुक्तः - associated with different
indriyas त्रिपुटीम् - the triple form भासयति -
illuminates – (88)

88. This *sākṣī* known by the liberated person manifests in all *indriyas*. Associated with different *indriyas*, it illuminates the triple form.

The *nirupādhika pratyagātmā* itself is *sākṣī*. The *jñānī* has gained its *sākṣātkāra*. The same *sākṣī* was described by *Prajāpati* as the *puruṣa* abiding in the eye which applies to its abidance in all *indriyas*. Here *ātmā* is described as both *sākṣī* and *pramātā*. Its association with the *indriyas* is the mutual identification on account of *adhyāsa* (superimposition). There cannot be any other relation between them. The *tripuṭī* is the trio of *pramātā* (knower), *pramāṇa* (*vṛtti*/thought that imparts the knowledge) and *prameya* (entity that is known). All these three are made known by *sākṣīātmā*. Though the knower (*pramātā*) is *sopādhika ātmā* (*ātmā* with *upādhi*) it is considered as an illuminated (*prakāśya*) entity from the standpoint of its *upādhi*.

How the inert *indriyas* are able to perceive or act is described.

भासमाने साक्षितत्त्वे तद्भासा भास्यमिन्द्रियम् ।
चक्षुर्वियत्यभिव्याप्य रूपं सर्वं प्रकाशयेत् ॥८९॥

साक्षितत्त्वे - when the ever-luminous knowledge-principle *sākṣī* भासमाने - illuminates तद्भासा - by its illumination, (i.e. *cidābhāsa*) भास्यम् चक्षुः इन्द्रियम् - the illumined sense-organ eye वियति - in the space अभिव्याप्य - having reached (through the means of an *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*, the form) सर्वम् - all रूपम् - form प्रकाशयेत् - reveals (makes one see) – (89)

89. When the ever-luminous knowledge-principle *sākṣī* illuminates, by its illumination, (i.e. *cidābhāsa*) the sense-organ eye having reached (through the means of an *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*, the form) in the space reveals (makes one see) all forms.

What is told about the eye making all see the forms applies to all *indriyas* including the mind taking to their respective functions. The fact that the inert eye, etc., can reveal their sense-objects establishes the existence of *ātmā* through the experiences of sense-objects. Superficially it appears that the senses themselves are perceiving or acting. But on inquiry it becomes clear that the capacity in them who are inert is on account of *cidābhāsa* (reflected

ātmā) inhering in them through the *antaḥkaraṇa* wherein the *cidābhāsa* gets cast first. It is just like the non-luminous water appears to be luminous so long as the sun is reflected in it. Therefore a *jñānī* cognizes *ātmā* in all perceptions knowing fully well that *indriyas* by themselves are incapable of doing it. The phrases ‘*viyati abhivyāpya*’ (having reached in the space) shows the phenomenon of *antaḥkaraṇa* reaching the form situated at a place through eyes and taking a shape of that form. The texts such as *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, etc., describe this with an illustration of canal-water let in the field taking its shape.

The *tripuṭī* (triple form) referred to in the verse 88 is described.

द्रष्टाहंकृत्यवच्छिन्नो दर्शनं चक्षुषः क्रिया ।
दृश्यं रूपमियं सर्वा त्रिपुटी भाति साक्षिणि ॥९०॥

अहङ्कृत्यवच्छिन्नः - (*ātmā*) limited by the *ahaṁkāra* (‘I’ notion) द्रष्टा - is the (*pramātā* in the form of) seer चक्षुषः - of the eye क्रिया - function (producing the *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* corresponding to the form/*rūpa*) दर्शनम् - is the (*pramāṇa* in the form of) seeing or sight रूपम् - is ocular form दृश्यम् - is the (*prameya* as a) (seen) object इयम् - this trio सर्वा - is the entire त्रिपुटी - *tripuṭī* साक्षिणि - in the ever-existing *sākṣī* भाति - shines (gets illuminated) – (90)

90. The *ātmā* limited by the *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) is the (*pramātā* in the form of) seer. The function of the eye (producing the *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* corresponding to the form/*rūpa*) is the (*pramāṇa* in the form of) seeing. The ocular form is the (*prameya* as a) seen object. This trio is the entire *tripuṭī*. It gets illuminated in the ever-existent *sākṣī*.

The *tripuṭī* that gets illuminated by *sākṣīātmā* appears with respect to each *indriya* such as eye, ear, etc., as *draṣṭā* (seer), *darśana* (seeing), *drśya* (seen form) and *śrotā* (hearer), *śravaṇa* (hearing), *śrāvya* (heard sound), etc. In general they are called *pramātā* (knower), *pramāṇa* (knowing), *prameya* (known). The *pramātā* can gain *pramā* (knowledge) only when it gets illuminated by *sākṣī*. But *pramātā* comes into existence only when the *buddhi* becomes a *vṛtti* in the form of *ahaṃkāra* on account of its identification with the threefold body. There is no *pramātā* in the absence of *ahaṃkāra* as in sleep.

The *sākṣī ātmā* is *sarvajña* (omniscient) because it perceives through all *indriyas* in all bodies whereas the *pramātā* is *alpajña* (entity having limited knowledge) since it operates only in a specific individual body. Having borrowed the sentience

from *sākṣī* the *pramātā* knows what is to be known and takes to action as a *kartā* (doer). The *vṛttis* of *antaḥkaraṇa* produced by the respective perceptual functions of different *indriyas* conforming to the entities perceived are certain modifications of *antaḥkaraṇa*. It has such capacity to form different *vṛttis* as required in quick succession. Thus, the function of *tripuṭī* proves the existence of *sākṣīātmā*. In its presence all *vyavahāras* (pursuits) take place, but *sākṣī* undertakes none.

The Upaniṣad has also described that the function of *tripuṭī* as told in the case of eye, equally holds good for *ghrāṇa* (sense of smell), *vāk* (organ of speech) and the mind (*mana*). But the question arises: 'If the *sākṣīātmā* is the only knowledge-principle that makes everything known, what is the need of all these *indriyas* and the mind in the process of perception?' Here is the answer.

साक्षिणो भासकत्वेऽपि रूपगन्धादिभित्तये ।
चक्षुर्घ्राणाद्यक्षजातं सर्वसाधारणं मनः ॥११॥

साक्षिणः - of *sākṣī* भासकत्वे अपि - even if (it) is the only illuminating knowledge-principle रूपगन्धादिभित्तये - to distinguish the form, smell, etc. चक्षुर्घ्राणादि अक्षजातम् - the group of *indriyas* such as eye, the sense of smell, etc., (is necessary) सर्वसाधारणम् - the

common means as an inner instrument to know them all मनः - is the mind – (91)

91. Even if the *sākṣī* is the only illuminating knowledge-principle, to distinguish the form, smell, etc., the group of *indriyas* such as eye, the sense of smell, etc., (is necessary). The common means as an inner instrument to know them all is the mind.

It is true that *sākṣīātmā* is the only ultimate knowledge-principle. But the sense-objects such as form, sound, etc., are distinct from one another. There is a need of means that specifies these distinct sense-objects with their characteristic features and present it in the presence of *sākṣī* for knowing. This function is done by all *indriyas*. It is just like one and the same electricity manifesting differently as breeze, light, cold, heat, etc. But this is possible only when corresponding gadgets such as fan, bulb, air conditioner, geyser, etc., are employed. The eyes, etc., are the unique (*asādhāraṇa*) means to know the form, etc. But they need a common means, the mind (a function of *antaḥkaraṇa*), which actually assumes itself the form of the object as its replica through the instrumentation of eyes, etc. Such thought corresponding to the object to be perceived is called *viṣayākāra-vṛtti* (thought conforming to the sense-object to be perceived). In general it

is also called *tattadākāra-vṛtti* (*vṛtti* conforming to the object under consideration). Without the mind the *indriyas* cannot operate. That is why at times we find the people saying ‘my mind was elsewhere, therefore I did not hear’ though the sound was within the audible range. We do come across similar statements with respect to form, smell, etc. It is equally true that the perception becomes erroneous when for some reason the mind registers a *vṛtti* at variance with the object perceived. That is how a rope is mistaken for snake and a shell for silver, etc. In gaining *ātmajñāna* also the mind has to conform to the attributeless *ātmā*. The *vṛtti* has to become *ātmākāra*. Thus the mind is the common means for all types of knowledge whereas the individual *indriya* is the means to know its corresponding sense-object.

This *sākṣī* who illuminates the *tripuṭī* is itself the *uttama Puruṣa* (*Ch.U.8-12-3*, vs. 62,63) is brought to our notice.

जिघ्राणीममहं गन्धमित्यादि

त्रिपुटीमिमाम् ।

सदा भासयते साक्षी स

एवात्मोत्तमः पुमान् ॥१२॥

अहम् - I इमम् - this गन्धम् - odour (fragrant or foul) जिघ्राणि - may I smell इत्यादि - etc. इमाम् - this universally

experienced त्रिपुटीम् - the triple form साक्षी - *sākṣīātmā* सदा - always भासयते - illuminates सः एव आत्मा - that (*sākṣī*) *ātmā* itself उत्तमः पुमान् - is the *uttama Puruṣa*—(92)

92. The *sākṣīātmā* always illuminates this universally experienced *tripuṭī* (triple form) in the form such as ‘let me smell this odour (fragrant or foul)’, etc. That (*sākṣī*) *ātmā* itself is the *uttama Puruṣa*.

The one who desires to perceive and therefore puts forth the efforts to perceive, is the *pramātā* who accomplishes the knowledge. The *tripuṭī* is present at the time of gaining all types of knowledge. But it is not clearly discernible. But at the time of desiring the knowledge the *pramātā*, *pramāṇa* and the *prameya* become clear. This is because the accomplisher who exerts to gain the knowledge prompted by a desire. He uses means such as *indriyas*. The result is the actual knowledge of the entity to be known. All these are distinctly cognizable. That is why, here, the *tripuṭī* is described while desiring the knowledge. The purpose of describing the *tripuṭī* is to show that it is illuminated by *ātmā*. It is more important to know that the *pramātā* is *sākṣībhāṣya* or illuminated by *ātmā* than knowing *pramāṇa* and *prameya* are also *sākṣībhāṣya*. The fact that the *pramātā* is

illuminated by *ātmā* can lead to the ‘*tvampada-śodhana*’ (ascertaining the *nirupādhika* ‘you’ of ‘*tat tvam asi*’ *mahāvākya*). ‘I am smelling the odour’ is the experience of *pramātā*, but the one who enables it is the *sākṣīātmā*. The *sākṣī* illuminates the *tripuṭī* simultaneously.

The *tripuṭī* is present in the waking and the dream being illuminated by *sākṣī* but it is absent in the sleep. Only ignorance remains therein which is illuminated by the *sākṣī*. The *sākṣī* is the self-illuminating (*svaprakāśa*) knowledge-principle. It illuminates the *tripuṭī* whenever present and only the ignorance in its absence. This *sākṣīātmā* itself is the *uttama Puruṣa* described earlier (vs.63).

The Upaniṣad further describes the extraordinary status of the mind in comparison with the *indriyas*. It is described as the ‘the extraordinary eye of *ātmā*’ (*manaḥ asya daivam cakṣuḥ*) (*Ch.U.8-12-5*). The sense-organ eye, etc., can know only what is there in the present whereas the mind is capable of knowing the past, present and future. The word ‘*cakṣuḥ*’ (eye) in the phrase ‘*daivam cakṣuḥ*’ is used figuratively as an extraordinary knowing faculty. The function of the mind is not confined to thinking only. The pure mind is the fit means for *Īśvara* to manifest or

ātmānubhava to take place. This also makes it extraordinary.

मनोऽस्य दैवं चक्षुः स्यात्
कालत्रयविभासनात् ।
तेन भुङ्क्ते ब्रह्मलोकस्थितान्
कामान्निजात्मनि ॥९३॥

मनः - the mind अस्य - of this (*ātmā*) दैवम् - extraordinary चक्षुः - eye स्यात् - is कालत्रयविभासनात् - because it can know the things in the three periods of time तेन - by that (extraordinary mind) ब्रह्मलोकस्थितान् - available in the *Brahmaloka* कामान् - sense-pleasures निजात्मनि - (*brahmajñānī*) in his true nature of all pervasive *caitanya* भुङ्क्ते - enjoys—(93)

93. The mind is the extraordinary eye of *ātmā* because it can know the things in the three periods of time. The *brahmajñānī* by that extraordinary mind enjoys in his true nature of all pervasive *caitanya* the sense-pleasures available in the *brahmaloka*.

The extraordinary nature of mind can be easily verified. For example, by certain astronomical calculation the mind can know the time of sunrise on a day after a few months. But the eyes can see it only on that day. Innumerable things such as sentiments, limitations, evaluation of diamonds, etc., can be known by the mind but not by

indriyas. Though the mind is the cause of bondage, it alone can gain *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. Its extraordinary nature gets limited by the *viṣayāsakti* (love for the sense-objects) and the consequent mentation (*manovyāpāra*).

The second line of this verse describes the result gained by the *ātmajñānī* as narrated by the *śruti*. It says: ‘The liberated person gains his true nature distinct from ignorance and its effects, namely, the body, senses and the mind. He becomes *sarvātmā* (the *ātmā* of all) and enjoys all sense-pleasures of *Brahmaloka* by this extraordinary mind (which was the instrument for *ātmāsākṣātkāra*) as *Īśvara* in his true nature of all pervasive *caitanya*’ (*Ch.U.8-12-5*). This is a figurative description as seen earlier to show that *ātmajñānī* owns up his *paramānanda* nature which was lost as it were by ignorance. He need not go anywhere to any *lokas* to experience *ānanda* but he being the illuminator of entire Creation, all sense-enjoyments become his own. On account of ignorance the *jīva* considers the sense-objects as different from oneself and hankers for them. In knowledge, in his *paramānanda* nature there is no possibility of any individual sense-pleasure being unavailable to him because he as *ātmā* in his true nature is

the only source of all sense-pleasures in the entire Creation. Thus Indra got the *ātmajñāna* finally.

CONCLUSION

The twelfth section of the eighth chapter of *Chāndogya* concludes that all deities having gained *ātmajñāna* through Indra became fulfilled in life as if they got all sense-pleasures and all heavenly *lokas*. So it is true for all others, who gain the *ātmāsākṣātkāra*.

देवाः सर्वे तमात्मानमुपास्य

प्राप्नुवन्त्यमून् ।

कामान् लोकांश्चात्मतत्त्वं बुद्ध्वा

सर्वात्मतां जगुः ॥१४॥

सर्वे - all देवाः - deities तम् आत्मानम् - that *ātmā* (whose knowledge Indra got as taught by *Prajāpati*) उपास्य - having known directly (*aparokṣatayā*) अमून् - these कामान् - all desired sense-objects लोकान् च - and the *lokas* प्राप्नुवन् - attained आत्मतत्त्वं बुद्ध्वा- having known the true nature of *ātmā* सर्वात्मतां जगुः - they became *sarvātmā* – (94)

94. All deities having known directly (*aparokṣatayā*) that *ātmā* (whose knowledge Indra got as taught by *Prajāpati*) attained all these desired sense-objects and the *lokas*. They became *sarvātmā* having known the true nature of *ātmā*.

Having learnt *ātmavidyā* from *Prajāpati*, Indra returned to *devaloka*. There he taught it to all deities by which they gained liberation the ultimate goal of life. The *śruti* has used the phrase ‘*ātmānam upāsate*’ (one who meditates on *ātmā* or does *upāsana*). It does not mean any *upāsana* like considering *śālagrāma* (a sacred stone) as *Bhagavān* Viṣṇu. ‘*Upa*’ prefix means proximity and ‘*āsanam*’ is remaining or sitting. The most proximate to everyone is *ātmā* as the ‘I’ itself. Thus the word *upāsana* (or *upāsanam*) is used in the sense of remaining in our true nature of *ātmā* identical with Brahman. In the state of ignorance we mistake ourselves to be different from *ātmā*/Brahman. Only *ātmajñāna* can end this mistake. To clarify the intended meaning of the word ‘*upāsate*’ used in the *śruti*, the author here explains the word ‘*upāsya*’ as used by him in the first line by the phrase ‘*ātmātattvam buddhvā*’ (having known the true nature of *ātmā*) in the second line.

One may doubt here, ‘perhaps the great *devatās* (deities) can gain the *ātmajñāna*, but how is it possible for us the short-lived humans with so so intellect?’ The *śruti* answers in general that it is possible for all to gain this knowledge and its result by taking to the means as told by the *śāstra*.

अन्योऽपि यस्तमात्मानमन्विष्य

गुरुशास्त्रतः ।

स्वानुभूत्या विजानाति स

तानाप्नोति देववत् ॥९५॥

यः अन्यः - any eligible person other than the deities अपि - also गुरुशास्त्रतः - by the means of teaching of the *guru* in accordance with the scripture तम् आत्मानम् - that *ātmā* (taught by *Prajāpati* and known by deities) अन्विष्य - having inquired into स्वानुभूत्या - by one's direct (*aparokṣa*) experience विजानाति - knows (gains the *ātmasākṣātkāra*) सः - that person देववत् - like the deities तान् - those (sense-objects and *lokas*) आप्नोति - gains - (95)

95. Any eligible person other than the deities, also knows (gains the *ātmasākṣātkāra*) by one's direct (*aparokṣa*) experience having inquired by the means of teaching of the *guru* in accordance with the scripture into that *ātmā* (taught by *Prajāpati* and known by deities). That person like the deities gains those (sense-objects and *lokas*).

The said *śruti* - statement shows that *ātmajñāna* and its result can be gained by anyone. The word *anviṣya* (having inquired into) points out that *ātmajñāna* does not produce *ātmā* but removes the erroneous concept about it who is the ever-existing entity.

Ātmā needs to be known as it is in its true nature without the *saṃsāra* superimposed on it which is experienced moment by moment. That is why the author emphasizes need of 'svānubhūti' (one's direct [*aparokṣa*] experience) for *vijñāna* (*ātmasākṣātkāra*). Therefore the self-experiencing (*anubhava-svarūpa*), self-evident (*svaprakāśa*) *ātmā* who enables all *saṃsārika* experiences is required to be reduced to its true nature by discarding all the features of superimposed *saṃsāra* including its ignorance. When this is accomplished what remains is only the *anubhava-svarūpa*, *svaprakāśa ātmā* in its original glory. This is *ātmānubhava/Brahmānubhava* which is indispensable to gain the *ātmavijñāna/Brahmavijñāna*. *Brahmānubhava* or *ātmānubhava* is defined as 'aviṣayatayā viṣayānuparakta citsphuraṇam' (the manifestation of *caitanya* and *caitanya* alone unobjectified [by the *pramātā* who is extinct in *jñāna*] which is totally free from *dṛśyas/viṣayas*). This topic was thoroughly discussed in the context of 'anubhūtyā vijñātum eṣṭvyah' (vs.9).

The *ākhyāyikā* (connected narrative) is concluded.

प्रजापतिरुवाचेत्थमिन्द्रायेदं पुनः पुनः ।
एकाधिकं वर्षशतं सेवित्वासौ च लब्धवान् ॥९६॥

प्रजापतिः - *Prajāpati* इत्थम् - thus
इन्द्राय - to Indra इदम् - this (*ātmavidyā*)

पुनः पुनः - repeatedly उवाच - taught असौ - this (Indra) च - also एकाधिकं वर्षशतम् - 101 years सेवित्वा - having served the *guru* लब्धवान् - got the *ātmajñāna* – (96)

96. Thus *Prajāpati* repeatedly taught *ātmavidyā* to Indra. Having served the *guru* for 101 years, Indra also got the *ātmajñāna*.

In many Upaniṣads *ākhyāyikās* are found. They enthuse the mature listeners to strive to gain *ātmajñāna*. The narrative of *Prajāpati's* teaching also prompts the *mumukṣus* to gain this knowledge. Perseverance is necessary until the knowledge is gained. Śvetaketu was taught nine times whereas Indra four times. This *ātmavidyā* is firmly established on the footing of three criteria – *śruti*, *yukti* (reasoning) and *vidvadanubhava* (*ātmānubhava* of past *jñānīs*). It is a tested path and not some neo-invention that gets dismissed within a short time. The *mumukṣu* should have courage and pursue it without giving up the efforts at any stage come what may. *Manana* (reflection) also is necessary. Virocana concluded the teaching wrongly because of no *manana*. Do discuss with the *guru* the points that you are unable to understand. Indra did say clearly without any hesitation, ‘*na aham atra bhogyam paśyāmi*’ (I do not find the promised result of *ātmajñāna* in what I have concluded as *ātmā*).

At the every stage of teaching to Indra, *Prajāpati* taught the same *ātmā* that was unfolded in the first round of teaching (*Ch.U.8-7-4*). He added further clarity subsequently taking into account more preparedness of Indra's mind (*Ch.U.8-10-1, 8-11-1, 8-12-1 to 5*). This is what is described as ‘*punaḥpunaḥ*’ (repeatedly) in this verse.

THE PURPOSE OF ĀKHYĀYIKĀ (CONNECTED NARRATIVE)

The next three verses highlight the three lessons that can be learnt from this *ākhyāyikā*. The first lesson is that the service of one's *guru* removes the sins that obstruct the acquisition of *ātmavidyā* and enables the *mumukṣu* to gain it.

गुरुशुश्रूषया पापं विद्यायाः

प्रतिबन्धकम् ।

अपैति विद्या लब्धा स्यादित्यत्रेन्द्रो

निदर्शनम् ॥९७॥

गुरुशुश्रूषया - by the service of the *guru* विद्यायाः - of *ātmavidyā* प्रतिबन्धकम् पापम् - obstruction in the form of sin अपैति - ends विद्या - (thereby) *ātmavidyā* लब्धा स्यात् - is gained इति अत्र - in this respect इन्द्रः - Indra निदर्शनम् - is an example – (97)

97. By the service of the *guru* the obstruction of *ātmavidyā* in the form of sins end. (Thereby) *ātmavidyā* is gained.

In this respect Indra is an example.

Ātmā is the ever-existent entity irrespective of ignorance or knowledge. It is not something to be produced by action. Its appearance as *samsārī* is due to ignorance. Vedānta is the highest *pramāṇa* to gain the knowledge of *ātmā* in its true nature free from ignorance and its effects. In spite of taking to such *pramāṇa* in the form of the teaching of a competent *guru*, if the *ātmajñāna* is not gained, surely it is because of the obstruction caused by the past sins in the form of an unprepared mind. The service of the *guru* by Indra for 101 years is a glaring example to show that the *gurusevā* (serving the *guru*) eliminates such obstruction. Though the *gurusevā* is not the direct means to gain the knowledge of *ātmā*, it certainly helps to get rid of such obstruction through developing *sādhana-catustaya-sampatti*.

The second lesson is that the knowledge of *ātmā* can never be gained unless the obstruction is totally removed. Virocana has demonstrated this through his wrong concept of *ātmā* in spite of the teaching of a great *guru* like *Prajāpati*.

सर्वज्ञेनोपदिष्टापि प्रतिबन्धक्षयं विना ।
न लभ्यतेऽत्र दृष्टान्तो विरोचन उदीरितः ॥९८॥

सर्वज्ञेन - by an omniscient (*guru*)

उपदिष्टा - taught अपि - also (विद्या - knowledge) प्रतिबन्धक्षयं विना - without the termination of its obstructions न लभ्यते - is not gained अत्र - in this respect विरोचनः - Virocana दृष्टान्तः उदीरितः - is cited as an illustration—(98)

98. Even if taught by an omniscient (*guru* such as *Prajāpati*) the *ātmajñāna* is not gained unless its obstructions are terminated. Virocana is cited as an illustration in this respect.

Gurusevā (service of one's *guru*) as a means to gain *ātmajñāna* becomes clear from Indra's episode. Similarly inadequate *gurusevā* cannot make the *mumukṣu* eligible to gain the *jñāna*. The example of Virocana amply proves this in spite of the fact that he and Indra had the same omniscient *guru*.

The third lesson is a suggestion for *jīvanmukta-gurus* who have no duties or anything to learn from anyone.

गुरुः कारुणिको भूत्वा सोद्वायासं पुनः पुनः ।
प्रजापतिरिव प्राप्ताननुगृहीत सर्वथा ॥९९॥

गुरुः - *guru* कारुणिकः भूत्वा - compassionately आयासम् - exertion सोद्वा - having endured प्राप्तान् - eligible disciples who have approached him पुनः पुनः - by repeated teaching सर्वथा - in its entirety by all means प्रजापतिः इव - like *Prajāpati* अनुगृहीत - should favour—(99)

99. The *guru* having endured the exertion should favour compassionately the eligible disciples who have approached him by repeated teaching in its entirety by all means like *Prajāpati*.

Ajīvanmukta who is also *śrotriya* besides being *Brahmaniṣṭha* (steadfast in the *Brahmajñāna*) teaches the competent disciples only out of compassion and there is no other motive behind it. Being himself full and complete *Paramānandasvarūpa*, he has nothing to gain from anyone or anywhere in the entire Creation. He has also nothing to lose being free from all the superimposed *upādhis* and the *dr̥śya jagat*. Instead of remaining absorbed in his true nature of limitless happiness, interacting with the world in relation to disciples, scriptures and teaching is figuratively an exertion for him because of being in exile as it were from his true nature by wielding the *bādhita* (sublated) identity with the body. Yet, the compassion prompts him to teach the disciples. If necessary different modes of teaching are employed with the only motive that disciples should gain the knowledge. This is demonstrated by the repeated teaching of *Prajāpati*.

The chapter is concluded now.

प्रजापतेरियं विद्या कथितानुग्रहाद् गुरोः ।
सच्छिष्याननुगृह्णातु विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः ॥१००॥

इयम् - this प्रजापतेः - taught by *Prajāpati* विद्या - *ātmavidyā* गुरोः - of *guru* अनुग्रहात् - by the grace कथिता - is commented upon विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः - *Parameśvara* in the form of *Vidyātīrtha* सच्छिष्यान् - the eligible disciples अनुगृह्णातु - may he bless – (100)

100. By the grace of *guru* I have commented upon this *ātmavidyā* taught by *Prajāpati*. May the *Parameśvara* in the form of *Vidyātīrtha* bless the eligible disciples.

Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni acknowledges that he got the *ātmajñāna* by the grace of his *guru* and he could comment upon it also because of his grace. He also prays to him to bless all the eligible disciples so that they also gain this knowledge by overcoming all obstructions that hinder the gaining of *ātmajñāna*.

इति श्री विद्यारण्यमुनिविरचिते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
प्रजापतिविद्याप्रकाशो नाम पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥

॥ ॐ ॥

All of us including all the living creatures without any exception seek happiness and shun sorrows whole lifelong. This is a universal fact. Invariably the method adopted is to do something and gain its result. But the annals of human history records that so far no one has ever accomplished the total fulfilment by such method. In spite of the best of achievements, there is always some lack or want to keep us discontented. No one can escape the inevitable painful death.

And yet, this perennial hunting unabatedly continues. Upaniṣads contained in the Vedas address this problem. The Veda is the highest body of knowledge. It serves as the *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) in the field of *aīndriya* (imperceptible) matters. The Veda begins where the empirical science ends. Upaniṣads called Vedanta constitute the radical teaching of the Vedas.

The Upaniṣads diagnose our mistaken identity as the root cause of above human problem, popularly known as *saṃsāra*. Erroneously we assume as I the actual inert mass of our embodiment (though seemingly sentient) riddled with calamitous sorrows. We are totally unaware of our real 'I' which happens to be the ever-existent, self-evident, ever-experiencing, *paramānanda* (limitless happiness) totally free from even the least trace of sorrows. It is pure awareness or pure consciousness principle called *cit* (चित्), *caitanya* (चैतन्य), *ātma*, Brahman. It enlivens all the inert embodiments. *Caitanya* is one and the same whether in the saint or sinner, in humans or all other living beings, in males or females, in theists or atheists, in heavenly enjoyers or hellish sufferers, in non-violent people or terrorists, irrespective of religion, caste, creed and nationality.

But, this true 'I', being imperceptible, the words fail to describe it with their literal meanings and the mind bounces being unable to objectify it as 'this'. Therefore, Upaniṣad resort to indirect methods of teaching which needs to be unfolded by competent masters. Envisaging this difficulty, the genius teacher Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni has taught with utmost clarity the twelve Upaniṣads in twenty chapters entitled *Anubhūtiprakāśa*. The lucid and precise English commentary does full justice to the subject-matter.



SRI VISWESWAR TRUST, MUMBAI

info @turiyabodha.com

website : www.turiyabodha.com

<https://rubhuvasishtha.wordpress.com>