

ANUBHŪTIPRAKĀŚA

ŚRĪ VIDYĀRĀṄYA MUNI

(ESSENCE OF 12 UPANIṢADS)

अनुभूतिप्रकाशः

श्री विद्यारण्यमुनिप्रणीतः

AITAREYA

TAITTIRĪYA

CHĀNDOGYA

MUNḌAKA

PRAŚNA

KAUṢĪTAKĪ

MAITRĀYANĪ

KAṬHA

ŚVETĀŚVATARA

BṚHADĀRĀṄYAKA

KENA

NṚSIMHOTTARATĀPANĪYA



TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY BY
SWĀMĪ ŚUDDHABODHĀNANDA SARASWATĪ

स्वामी शुद्धबोधानन्द सरस्वती

VOLUME III

ॐ

अनुभूतिप्रकाशः
(श्री विद्यारण्यमुनिप्रणीतः)

ANUBHŪTIPRAKĀŚA
By Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

BY

SWĀMĪ ŚUDDHABODHĀNANDA SARASWATĪ
स्वामी शुद्धबोधानन्द सरस्वती

VOLUME - III

(Śvetāśvatara and Brhadāranyaka 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>an</u> thill)*	
इ i (<u>it</u>)	ड ḍa (<u>d</u> art)*	
ई ī (<u>bee</u> t)	ढ ḍha (<u>god</u> head)*	
उ u (<u>pu</u> t)	ण ṇa (<u>un</u> der)*	
ऊ ū (<u>pool</u>)		
ऋ ṛ (<u>rhythm</u>)*	त ta (<u>th</u> irst)*	} tongue on teeth
ए e (<u>play</u>)	थ tha (<u>th</u> umb)	
ऐ ai (<u>high</u>)	द da (<u>fath</u> er)*	
ओ o (<u>toe</u>)	ध dha (<u>breathe</u> here)*	
औ au (<u>loud</u>)	न na (<u>n</u> umb)*	
◌ 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>looph</u> ole)*	
क ka (<u>sk</u> ate)	ब ba (<u>bin</u>)	
ख kha (<u>block</u> head)*	भ bha (<u>abh</u> or)*	
ग ga (<u>g</u> ate)	म ma (<u>m</u> uch)	
घ gha (<u>log</u> hut)*	य ya (<u>y</u> oung)	
ङ ṅa (<u>sing</u>)	र ra (<u>d</u> rama)	
च ca (<u>ch</u> unk)	ल la (<u>l</u> uck)	
छ cha (<u>catch</u> him)*	व va (<u>in-between</u> <u>w</u> ile and <u>y</u> ile)	
ज ja (<u>J</u> ohn)	श śa (<u>sh</u> oe)	
झ jha (<u>hedg</u> ehog)*	ष ṣa (<u>bush</u> el)	
ञ ña (<u>bun</u> ch)	स sa (<u>s</u> o)	
	ह ha (<u>h</u> um)	
	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>vijñānamayakośa</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>sṛṣṭi</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>Svapiti</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>Pratiṣṭhā</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

Prajāpatividyaṅprakāśa (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>sṛṣṭi-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>adhikāri</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 (Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad)

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 (Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad)

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***Āśvalāyanādimunibodha (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</i> (<i>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>hr̥di</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



CHAPTER - XII

ŚVETĀŚVATARA-VIVARAṆAM (ŚVETĀŚVATAROPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[The *Śvetāśvataropaniṣat* from *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda* is taught by Śvetāśvatara Mahārṣi. It begins with the discussion among wise men learned in the Vedas on the cause of *jagat*. Though the Vedas proclaim that the cause is Brahman, what is it exactly? They consider the following questions. What is the cause of this *jagat*? From what are we born? On account of what do we continue to live? What do we eventually merge into? Under whose directions do we enjoy or suffer? They ruled out the possibility of either anyone or all of *Kāla* (time), *svabhāva* (intrinsic nature), *niyati* (a rule), *yadr̥cchā* (chance), five elements, *pradhāna* (power as *prakṛti*) and *jīva* as the ultimate cause. These are ruled out as they cannot be the ultimate cause. They are themselves born from some cause. The ṛṣis unable to find the *jagatkāraṇa* by mutual discussion resorted to *dhyāna* in order to get some inner vision from *Īśvara*. Therein they came to know the cause to be the *māyā-śakti* of Brahman which neither fits in the category of ‘is’ or ‘is not’. Brahman becomes the cause of this *jagat* because of this power. Though, at the empirical level the cause of *jagat* can be traced up to two or three stages from different views, when probed further one has to resort to the answer ‘I do not know’. Such ignorance itself is inexplicable *māyā*. Like magic, it shows that which is next to impossible and makes us believe that it is true.

The Upaniṣad unfolds the principle of Brahman free from the *aḥaṃkāra-upādhi* of *jīva* and *māyā-upādhi* of *Īśvara*. By meditating on *Brahma-svarūpa* in and through the *nāmarūpātmaka jagat*, the delusion of *jagat* ends. On accomplishing the identity between *jīva* and Brahman, the erroneous *jīvahood* disappears. When the *advaya* Brahman is meditated upon, the *vāsanās* of bodily identification and the notion of mineness in things belonging to the body get eliminated. By the exhaustion of the *jñānī's prārabdha*, his body disappears forever, never to take rebirth. Thus, the

māyā ends totally. *Ātmadhyāna* by *praṇava* (*Om*) called *yoga* is the means to know that everything is Brahman. The auxiliaries to *dhyāna* such as *āsana*, place, etc., are also described at length.

The first chapter of *Śvetāśvataropaniṣat* deals with the unfoldment of *ātmā*. With this exposition only the best eligible seeker gains the knowledge. Those who cannot get it because of their unsteady mind are given *yoga* in the second chapter. The *manda* (mediocre) seeker who cannot get the knowledge by the above two means is introduced to *saguṇa-brahmopāsanā* (devotion to *Īśvara*) in the third chapter. Prayers being an important means to such seekers, the same are recommended. The fourth chapter mainly contains prayers as the means to invoke *Īśvara's* grace (*dhātuprasāda*) to gain *nirākāra-Brahmajñāna*. In this chapter *ātma-vicāra* is introduced and the means to overcome obstacles on the path are given.

The fifth chapter of the Upaniṣad has two purposes. Though the third chapter did describe ‘*tat*’ and ‘*tvam*’ *padas* (*jīva* and *Īśvara*), it was not adequate. Both of them are further described here. In the fourth chapter the means to earn the *prasāda* (grace) of *Īśvara* (*dhātā*) were described. Along with that the unique features (*asādhāraṇa mahimā*) of *Īśvara* also need to be described. That is accomplished in the fifth chapter.

The sixth chapter sums up the teaching imparted in the earlier five chapters. The topic of *sādhanā* (means) is further clarified. The reader is reminded of the initial topic namely *kāla*, etc., cannot be the final cause of *jagat*, only *Īśvara* can be such cause and this is spelt out and elaborated upon. In conclusion, the Upaniṣad highlights that the devotion to *Paramātmā* and *guru* is the greatest asset of an eligible *mumukṣu* in gaining the *Brahmavidyā* to the finale of *Brahmānubhava*. Only to such a devoted person the teachings of Upaniṣad get revealed to the point of *aparokṣa Brahmānubhava*.]

INTRODUCTION

The *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* belongs to *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda*. It consists of six chapters. The topics dealt with therein are: ‘*Jīveśvara aikya*, the cause of *sṛṣṭi*, the nature of *māyā*, the means to gain the

Brahmajñāna, the nature of *jīva* and *Īśvara* besides many invocations to *Parameśvara*’. Many *mantras* from this Upaniṣad are discussed in *Brahmasūtras* even though there is no separate *bhāṣya* on it. Though one *Śāṅkara-bhāṣya* on

this Upaniṣad is available, it is not accepted to be authentic by many research scholars. There are *dīpikās* on it by Śrī Śaṅkarānanda and Nārāyaṇa. Swāmī Śaṅkarānanda has explained this in detail in the *Ātmapurāṇa*. There are glosses on this Upaniṣad by Śrī Upaniṣad-brahmayogī and Śrī Vijñānabhagavat. Śvetāśvatara is a great ṛṣi by whose name this Upaniṣad is recognized.

The author now declares that he is going to expound the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*.

श्वेताश्वतरनामा यो

यजुःशाखाप्रवर्तकः ।

सोऽत्याश्रमिभ्यः प्रोवाच विद्यां

व्याचक्ष्महेऽत्र ताम् ॥१॥

यः - the one who श्वेताश्वतरनामा - by name Śvetāśvatara यजुःशाखाप्रवर्तकः - the originator of a recension in the *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda* सः - he अत्याश्रमिभ्यः - to the *vividīśā sannyāsīs* of *Paramahaṃsa* order विद्यां - *Brahmavidyā* प्रोवाच - taught thoroughly तां - that *vidyā* अत्र - in this chapter व्याचक्ष्महे - will be expounded - (1)

1. Ṛṣi Śvetāśvatara by name who is the originator of a recension in the *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda* taught thoroughly *Brahmavidyā* to the *vividīśā sannyāsīs* of *Paramahaṃsa* order. That *vidyā* will

be expounded thoroughly in this chapter.

Brahmacarya, gārhastya, vāna-prastha and *sannyāsa* are the four *āśramas* (stages) of life. Among the further divisions in the order of *sannyāsa* the top one is *Paramahaṃsa* who is also called *antyāśramī, atyāśramī*. *Paramahaṃsas* are of two types. Those who have intense yearning to gain *Brahmajñāna* and live a life of service to *guru* with *śama, dama*, etc., and take to *śravaṇa, manana, nididhyāsana* are called *vividīṣus*. The others are those who already have *Brahmasākṣātkāra* and therefore they are *jīvanmuktas*. They are called *vidvat sannyāsīs*. *Vividīṣu paramahaṃsa* is the main eligible person to listen to the teaching of Śvetāśvatara.

The Vedas are well-known since eternity having many many recensions. The *mantra-draṣṭā ṛṣis* (seers of Vedic hymns) at different times having got the vision of *mantras* from *Parameśvara* by invoking him with rigorous *tapas* propagated them through their disciples. There are some who were not *mantra-draṣṭās* and yet have got the Vedic *śākhās* (recensions) by pleasing *Parameśvara* or some deities by the means of *tapas* and propagated in this world. For example, *Yājñavalkya* got the *vājasaneyī-śākhā* from the Lord Sun. Śvetāśvatara ṛṣi also was an originator of a *śākhā* from *Yajurveda*.

DISCUSSION ABOUT BRAHMAN

The Upaniṣad begins with the statement, ‘*Brahma-vādināḥ vadanti*’ (wise men learned in the Vedas discuss among themselves). It continues: ‘Oh learned in the Vedas (*brahmavidāḥ*), please ascertain the following topics (*vyavasthām [vidhehi]*). What is the cause of this *jagat*? (*kim kāraṇam*). From what are we born? (*kutaḥ jātāḥ sma*). On account of what we continue to live? (*kena jīvāma*). Where do we merge back? (*kva ca sampratiṣṭhā*). Under whose direction do we enjoy or suffer? (*kena adhiṣṭhitāḥ sukhetareṣu vartāmahe*). The answer to all these questions is, Brahman’ (*Śv.U.1-1*).

Brahman needs to be known by inquiry only. A mind purified by *karma*, *upāsanā* including *bhakti* (intense love towards *Bhagavān*) alone can take to serious inquiries such as, ‘who am I?’ ‘What is the purpose of my existence?’ ‘What is this *saṃsāra*?’ , etc. An impure mind at times may be curious about such queries. But it is never keen to take to them seriously. Such investigations do need a thorough discussion by people learned in the scriptural lore.

In the *dharmajijñāsā* (inquiry into the nature of *karmakāṇḍa*) *śravaṇa* (exposure to its teaching) alone is the means because all that needs to be

known is what the *śāstra* has to say because there is no other means to know it except the *śāstra*. But in the case of *Brahmajijñāsā* (inquiry into the nature of Brahman) besides *śravaṇa*, the *manana* and *svānubhava* (*ātmānubhava*) have an important role to play. The distinction between the inquiry into *dharma* and Brahman is drawn in the *sūtrabhāṣya* (*Br.Sū.Bh.2-1-4*). It is true that the Veda is the common *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) for both *dharma* and Brahman. And yet the Veda cannot be the only *pramāṇa* in the inquiry of Brahman unlike *dharma*. Because the existence of *cit*, *caitanya*, Brahman can be inferred as the *sākṣī* of all thoughts, or the sentience principle which enables inert *prāṇas*, senses, the mind, etc., to function. It can be experienced as *sopādhika* ‘I’. In all our 24x7 experiences what we experience is *ātmā* with *upādhis*. In them the varying features of experiences belong to the *upādhis* whereas the basic common experience principle is that of self-evident self-experiencing principle *ātmā*. Free from *upādhis* in the case of every experience what remains is *anubhava-svarūpa* (self-experiencing) *ātmā* which itself is self-evident. Thus the existence of *cit ātmā*, Brahman can also be known by the means other than the Veda though it has a specific role as the means of knowledge in revealing its

real nature.

The result of *Brahmavidyā* which ends *avidyā* and is the means for *mokṣa* culminates in *anubhava* (experience of Brahman) or called *anubhavāvasāna*. It is *dr̥ṣṭphala* (experiential result). So it is established. It is verifiable here. The *jīvanmuktas* bear its testimony. *Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad* exhorts that ‘*ātmā draṣṭavyaḥ*’. The ‘*darśana*’ therein means the *aparokṣa anubhava* (direct experience). This shows the distinction between *dharma* and *Brahmajijñāsā*. That is why *Brahmaniṣṭha* alone is considered as the capable person to teach *Brahmavidyā*.

The Veda is certainly the final *pramāṇa*. But to determine the mode of inquiry as to how it reveals the existent entity to be known does need other *pramāṇas*, *vidvadanubhava*, etc. Without such inquiry the knowledge of Brahman cannot be gained. *Brahmajijñāsā* is gained by exposing to the teaching from a competent *guru* after gaining expected eligibility. Mere acceptance or understanding of *śāstra* or *guru's* teaching by itself cannot end *avidyā*. The discussion (*vāda*) referred to here is for the ascertainment of the final cause of *jagat*. It is not to win over the other.

The discussion of the learned people in Vedas is presented now.

ये वेदवादिनस्ते तु मीमांसन्ते मुमुक्षवः ।
जगतः कारणं ब्रह्मेत्येवं वेदेषु घुष्यते ॥२॥

ये वेदवादिनः - those who accept what is expounded in the Vedas is true ते तु मुमुक्षवः - they being *mumukṣus* मीमांसन्ते - (having gathered together) conduct the sacred inquiry जगतः कारणं - the cause of *jagat* ब्रह्म - is Brahman इति एवं - thus वेदेषु - in the Vedas घुष्यते - it is clearly declared—(2)

2. Those who accept what is expounded in the Vedas is true and being themselves *mumukṣus* (having gathered together) conduct the sacred inquiry. (They consider :) ‘The cause of *jagat* is Brahman thus it is clearly declared in the Vedas’.

उत्पत्तिस्थितिनाशाः स्युर्यतस्तत्कारणं त्विति ।
सामान्यमेव विज्ञातं विशेषस्तु न बुध्यते ॥३॥

यतः - that from which उत्पत्ति-स्थितिनाशाः - the birth, sustenance and destruction (of *jagat*) स्युः - take place तत् तु कारणं - that is certainly the cause इति - thus सामान्यम् एव - in general only विज्ञातं - is known तु - but विशेषः - the real nature of the cause Brahman न बुध्यते - is not known. (Hence the need of this inquiry) —(3)

3. That from which the birth, sustenance and destruction (of *jagat*) take place that is certainly the cause.

Thus it is known in general only, but the real nature of the cause namely the Brahman is not known. (Hence the need of this inquiry).

कस्माद् वस्तुविशेषान्नो जन्म

केन च जीवनम् ।

लयः कस्मिन् व्यवहृतौ सुखादौ

को नियच्छति ॥४॥

कस्मात् वस्तुविशेषात् - from what specific entity नः - our जन्म - birth (takes place) केन च - and by what जीवनम् - life (continues) कस्मिन् - in what entity लयः - (our life) ends व्यवहृतौ सुखादौ - in the matters of joys and sorrows कः - who नियच्छति - regulates – (4)

4. From what specific entity are we born and by what the life (continues)? (Our) life ends in what entity? Who regulates in the matter of joys and sorrows? (Let these be inquired into).

The word ‘*brahmavādī*’ used in the Upaniṣad is commented here as ‘*Vedavādī*’ because one of the meanings of the word ‘*brahma*’ is the Veda. A *vedavādī* is a person whose main field of study or inquiry is the Veda, who conducts oneself according to the tenets in the Vedas and follows the means advised by the Vedas to accomplish *puruṣārthas*. Their interest in the Vedas is not born of some curiosity but such persons are committed to what is told

therein. Among the *vedavādīs* those who are keen to fulfill the desires for gains here and hereafter take to the inquiry of *karmas* and *upāsanās* called *dharmajijñāsā* but *mumukṣus* opt for the inquiry into the nature of Brahman which is the cause of *jagat*.

At places in the scriptures (especially in *Purāṇas*) *mukti* called *sālokyā*, *sāmīpyā*, *sārūpyā*, etc., are also described because such heavenly abodes are relatively free from sorrows that people suffer on earth. They are gained by *karmas* and *upāsanās*. There is a return from such abodes. *Kaivalya mokṣa* can be gained only through *aparokṣa-brahmajjñāna* signifying *jīveśvara* identity wherein duality ends totally. Only those who want to get rid of bondage in the form of duality which breed perennial sorrows take to such *mīmāṃsā* which is a sacred inquiry. Conducting the inquiry with an attitude of reverence towards the subject-matter, means of knowledge employed therein and the result thereof is called *mīmāṃsā* (*pūjita-vicāra*). The *mīmāṃsā* enables the seekers to ascertain the purport (*tātparyā*) of the Vedas. The subject-matter of inquiry that leads to *mokṣa* is *Paramātmā* - Brahman. Its *aparokṣa-jjñāna* gives *mokṣa*. The Vedas repeatedly declare that the cause of *jagat* is Brahman. But that itself does not make us wiser or remove the *saṃsāra*.

Among all questions to which the answer is going to be Brahman the first one is about the entity from which we are born. The problem of entire *jagat* or calamitous *samsāra* is for us the *jīvas* and no one else. Therefore it is more necessary to know our cause rather than that of five elements such as space, etc. Though we are within the sphere of *jagat* and its cause is necessarily our cause, the *ātma-jijñāsā* of a *mumukṣu* being centred on oneself, the search is begun from one's cause. The final cause of external things upto a certain limit is possible for us to determine from our observation, but the cause from which we are born is something imperceptible (*atīndriya*). We can know the cause of our gross body but left to ourselves it is not possible to know the cause because of which we are parading as *bhoktās* of joys and sorrows. Only the proper inquiry as guided by the *śruti* can reveal us the cause. There must be some principle which is the cause of all these. The *ṛṣis* referred to in the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* were thus engaged in the *mīmāṃsā*.

The answer given by lay persons is discarded now after consideration.

पितृभ्यामन्नतो रोगादपि जन्मादयस्त्रयः ।
नियामकश्च राजेति वचनं बालभाषितम् ॥५॥

पितृभ्यां (जन्म भवति) - (birth takes

place) from the parents अन्नतः (स्थितिः भवति) - (the sustenance is) on account of food रोगात् अपि (नाशः भवति) - by diseases, etc., (the death occurs) इति - thus) जन्मादयः त्रयः - the causes of our birth, sustenance and death (are accounted) नियामकः च - and the one who controls all राजा - is the King इति वचनं - such answers (to the questions asked) बालभाषितम् - is a prattle of a child. (Therefore unacceptable) – (5)

5. (Our) birth takes place from the parents, (the sustenance is) on account of food (and) the death occurs by diseases, etc. Thus the causes of our birth, sustenance and death (are accounted). The one who controls all is the King. Such answers (to the questions asked) are prattles of a child. (Therefore unacceptable).

पितृराजाद्यशेषस्य जगतश्चिन्त्यतेऽधुना ।
कारणं तच्च शास्त्रैकगम्यं शास्त्रं तु नैकथा ॥६॥

अधुना - now पितृराजाद्यशेषस्य जगतः - of the entire *jagat* including parents, king (food, disease), etc. कारणं - cause चिन्त्यते - is inquired into तत् च - but that (type of cause which is the cause of entire *jagat*) शास्त्रैकगम्यं - can be known only by the scripture शास्त्रं तु - but the scripture is एकथा न - is in various ways – (6)

6. Now what is inquired into is the cause of the entire *jagat* including parents, King (food, disease), etc. That (type of cause which is the cause of entire *jagat*) can be known only by the *śāstra* (scripture) but the *śāstra* is in various ways.

The reason why the causes mentioned in the fifth verse are not acceptable is told in the sixth one. The causes specified in the earlier verses themselves have a series of further causes. They themselves being the products (effects) contained in the *saṃsāra*, cannot be its cause. No entity whether an individual or a thing can be the cause of *saṃsāra*. No *jīva* was present at the time of Creation to see how and from what it is produced. Even if *jīvātmā* is considered *nitya* (eternal) it had no body, etc., to know Creation at the time of its birth because *jīvātmās* were yet to come into existence. Therefore it cannot know the cause. Inference also can operate when there is a *vyāpti* (invariable concomitance). There is no basis to have a *vyāpti* about an imperceptible entity. It is made very clear in *Brahmasūtras* that Brahman the cause of birth, sustenance and destruction of *jagat* is '*śāstrayoni*' which means it can be known only by the *śāstra*. But the *śāstra* speaks of many entities as the cause of *jagat*. It becomes difficult to ascertain that cause without proper inquiry. Therefore *mīmāṃsā* has

to be conducted to ascertain the purport (*tātparya*) of *śāstra* to know the *jagatkāraṇa*.

The question was presented in the first *mantra* of the Upaniṣad. The second *mantra* enumerates the possible causes envisaged by different masters well-versed in different *śāstras*. They deliberated: 'Time (*kāla*), intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*), a rule (*niyati*), chance (*yadṛcchā*), five elements (*bhūtāni*), *prakṛti* or power (*yoniḥ*), *jīva* (*puruṣa*) thus it is worthy to be considered (*iti cintyam*). A combination of all these (*eṣām saṃyogaḥ*) also is not possible (*na*). On the other hand (*tu*) if sentient *jīva* is taken as the cause (*ātmabhāvāt*) that *jīva* also is not competent (*ātmā api anīśaḥ*) because itself is subjected to joys and sorrows helplessly (*sukhaduḥkhaheṭoḥ*) (*Śv.U.* 1-2). This is told now.

कालः स्वभावो नियतिर्यदृच्छा

भूतपञ्चकम् ।

प्रधानं जीव एतानि मतान्युक्तानि

शास्त्रिभिः ॥७॥

शास्त्रिभिः - by those learned in different *śāstras* कालः - time स्वभावः - intrinsic nature नियतिः - a rule यदृच्छा - chance भूतपञ्चकम् - five elements प्रधानं - power (*prakṛti*) जीवः - *jīva* (इति - thus) एतानि - these मतानि - views उक्तानि - were declared—(7)

7. By those learned in different *śāstras* the views such as (the principle of) time, intrinsic nature, a certain rule, chance, five elements, power (*prakṛti*), *jīva* were declared (as the cause of *jagat*).

One view is that the principle of time is the cause of everything because they take place in time only. Some others opine that at a given time different things take place. Therefore time is not the cause but the *svabhāva* (intrinsic nature) of everything is the cause. For example, under the same parental roof children of different characters grow. The other views refer to a certain rule or ‘chance’ as the cause of *jagat*. Taking into account that the entire *jagat* is made of five elements the same are considered as the cause by still others. The followers of Sāṅkhya school of thought profess that the *pradhāna* or called *prakṛti* which is the state of equilibrium of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamogūṇas* is the cause of *jagat*. They do not accept the necessity of any sentient entity for *prakṛti* to change to become *jagat*. The followers of *karmakāṇḍa* consider that the *jīva* through its *karmaphalas* creates the *jagat* for its *bhoga*. They do not say that the entire Creation is made by *jīva*. Without accepting the *pralaya* and then from it the birth of Creation, they think that the *jagat* continues to be so ‘just like that’ but in it the chances of producing and destroying are in accordance with

the *karmaphalas* of *jīvas*. These are the main views considered while ascertaining the final cause of Creation. The same views are presented in the next four verses with a demonstration.

ऋतुकाले भवेद्गर्भो वर्षर्तौ सस्यसम्भवः ।
उदाह्रियत इत्यादि बहुधा कालवादिना ॥८॥

गर्भः - foetus ऋतुकाले - during the period favourable for conception भवेत् - is conceived वर्षा ऋतौ - during the monsoon सस्यसम्भवः - grains are produced इत्यादि - and so on कालवादिना - by those who consider time as the cause of *jagat* बहुधा - variously उदाह्रियते - is illustrated – (8)

8. Those who consider the time as the cause of *jagat* give various illustrations such as the foetus is conceived during the period favourable for conception (called *ṛtukāla*). Grains are produced during the monsoon and so on.

This view belongs to astrologers. *Ṛtukāla* is the period of sixteen nights from menstrual discharge. Conception is possible only during that period. Varieties of grains can grow only during the monsoon. Thus conception or agriculture can be possible only during a specific period but not otherwise. Any number of such examples can be given. Based on such experiences they say that the cause of *jagat* is time.

स्वभाववाद्यग्निमुष्णं जलं द्रवमुदाहरत् ।
रूपज्ञानं चक्षुषैवेत्याहुर्नियतिवादिनः ॥९॥

स्वभाववादी - the one who proclaims the intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*) as the cause of *jagat* उष्णं अग्निं - fire is hot द्रवं जलं - water is running, (i.e. flowing) उदाहरत् - illustrated नियतिवादिनः - those who argue that a certain ordained rule is the *jagatkāraṇa* चक्षुषा एव - by eyes only रूपज्ञानं - knowledge of form (is possible) इति आहुः - so they say – (9)

9. The one who proclaims the intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*) as the cause of *jagat* illustrates that the fire is hot and water flows. Those who argue that a certain ordained rule is the *jagatkāraṇa* say that eyes only can gain the knowledge of form, (i.e. can see) (and not other sense-organs).

The fire is hot by its nature. The water by its nature flows. From such experiences they conclude that the intrinsic nature is the *jagatkāraṇa*. A form can be seen only by the eyes and not by ears, etc. Eyes can only see but cannot hear, etc. From such observed rules some think that certain ordained rule is the *jagatkāraṇa*. *Svabhāva* is the nature of every individual entity whereas the *niyati* (ordained rule) pertains to the mutual relation between two or more entities. *Svabhāva* is independent, but *niyati* has dependence

on other related entities.

धनिकत्वादिव्यवस्था यदृच्छावादिनोच्यते ।
भूतवादी देहगतकाठिन्यादीनुदाहरत् ॥१०॥

यदृच्छावादिना - by those who say that the *jagat* is born 'by chance' धनिकत्वादि व्यवस्था - the states of wealthiness, (poverty), etc. उच्यते - is cited (as an example to prove that 'yadṛcchā' is the *jagatkāraṇa*) भूतवादी - the votary of five elements as the *jagatkāraṇa* देहगतकाठिन्यादीन् - the hardness, etc., (the features of five elements such as earth, etc.) found in the body उदाहरत् - illustrated – (10)

10. Those who say that the *jagat* is born 'by chance' cite the states of wealthiness, (poverty), etc., (as an example to prove that 'yadṛcchā' is the *jagatkāraṇa*). The votary of five elements as the *jagatkāraṇa* illustrates the hardness, etc., (the features of five elements such as earth, etc.) found in the body (as the proof of elements being constituents of the body).

Without any outward evident cause some people are seen to be born in rich family and some others in totally poor ones. This is considered as 'by chance' by some thinkers and they say that 'chance' (*yadṛcchā*) is the *jagatkāraṇa*. In all things the sound (*śabda*), touch (*sparsā*), form (*rūpa*),

taste (*rasa*), smell (*gandha*) as their *guṇas* (attributes) are found. These indicate the presence of five great elements in them. Even in our body the earth, etc., are seen as its constituents. From this it is concluded by some that the five great elements happen to be the *jagatkāraṇa*.

प्रधानवादी पुरुषान् सात्त्विकादीनुदाहरत् ।
जीववादी कर्मवशाज्जन्म देवाद्युदाहरत् ॥११॥

प्रधानवादी - those who consider *pradhāna* as the *jagatkāraṇa* सात्त्विकादीन् पुरुषान् - people who are *sāttvika*, etc. उदाहरत् - referred to as an example जीववादी - those who opine the *jīva* as the *jagatkāraṇa* कर्मवशात् - on account of *karmaphalas* देवादि जन्म - the birth of divine beings, etc. उदाहरत् - cited as an example—(11)

11. Those who consider *pradhāna* as the *jagatkāraṇa* referred to those who are *sāttvika*, etc., as an example. Those who opine the *jīva* as the *jagatkāraṇa* cite the births of divine beings, etc., as an example.

People have *sāttvika*, *rājasika* and *tāmasika* dispositions. Thus it is concluded that these three *guṇas* are the cause. Therefore Sāṅkhya school of thought says *pradhāna* which is the state of equilibrium of three *guṇās* is the cause of *jagat*. *Karmavādīs* argue that varieties

of births such as divine beings, humans, animals, birds, reptiles, trees, etc., are taken according to one's *pāpa-punya karmas*. The *jīvas* do them. Therefore they say that the *jīva* is the *jagatkāraṇa*. Thus every proponent has some favourable arguments. Therefore it is necessary to conduct a *mīmāṃsā* to find out the actual cause of *jagat*.

In the *mantra* (Śv.U.1-2) all these causes put together as one cause was also suggested by the phrase ‘*eṣāṃ samyogaḥ*’. This view is now presented and then refuted being wrong.

सर्वत्र युक्तेर्दृष्टत्वात् किं
तत्त्वमिति चिन्त्यते ।
सर्वेषामनिवार्यत्वात् तत्संघोऽस्त्विति
चेन्न तत् ॥१२॥

सर्वत्र - in all the aforesaid views युक्तेः दृष्टत्वात् - because the corroborating reasonings are seen किं तत्त्वं - what is the reality इति - thus चिन्त्यते - (it) is inquired into सर्वेषां - of all views अनिवार्यत्वात् - because of their necessity तत्संघः - their combination अस्तु - let (it) be the *jagatkāraṇa* इति चेत् - if it is said so तत् न - that view is not correct—(12)

12. In all the aforesaid views because the corroborating reasonings are seen, it is inquired into as to what is the reality. Because of the necessity of all views if it is said that their combination

be the *jagatkāraṇa*, that view is not correct.

The reason for non-acceptance of this is given in the next verse.

स्वतन्त्रे चेतने जीवे सति कालाद्यचेतनाः ।
समप्रधानभावेन कथं संधीभवन्ति ते ॥१३॥

स्वतन्त्रे चेतने जीवे सति - when the independent sentient *jīva* is there ते - those कालाद्यचेतनाः - inert entities such as time, etc. कथं - how समप्रधानभावेन - with equal predominance संधीभवन्ति - can (they) get combined? – (13)

13. When the independent sentient *jīva* is there how can the inert entities such as time, etc., get combined with equal predominance?

Every participant in the discussion justifies his view. Seeing this someone wants to reconcile with all views by combining them together as the *jagatkāraṇa*. If this has to hold good all causes must have equal predominance. Otherwise the one that is predominant will be the main cause and rest of them will become the secondary causes. The causes from 'time' (*kāla*) to '*pradhāna*' are inert in nature. They need a motivator to make them function. They cannot be the cause because they are dependant on some sentient entity. This may lead to the conclusion that the *jīva* can be the *jagatkāraṇa* because it is sentient

and therefore independent. Next verse explains why the *jīva* cannot be the *jagatkāraṇa*.

In the second *mantra kāla* (time), etc., cannot be the cause was suggested by 'na' (न). Their combination as the cause was refuted by '*ātmabhāvāt*' (because of the presence of sentient entity *ātmā*, i.e. *jīva*) (*Śv.U.1-2*). The phrase '*ātmā (jīva)*' shows that even the *jīva* is incompetent because it is the victim of joys and sorrows' (*ātmā api anīśaḥ sukha-duḥkha-hetoḥ*). This portion is now explained.

तर्हि जीवो हेतुरस्तु

तन्न दुःखादिदर्शनात् ।

स्वतन्त्रः स्वात्मनो दुःखं कुर्वन् दृष्टो

न हि क्वचित् ॥१४॥

तर्हि - in that case, (i.e. if *kāla*, etc., individually or collectively cannot be the *jagatkāraṇa*) जीवः हेतुः अस्तु - let the *jīva* be the *jagatkāraṇa* तत् न - that is not possible दुःखादिदर्शनात् - because the *jīva* is seen experiencing sorrows, etc. स्वतन्त्रः - an independent entity स्वात्मनः - of oneself दुःखं कुर्वन् - subjecting to sorrow न हि क्वचित् - certainly nowhere दृष्टः - is seen – (14)

14. In that case (if *kāla*, etc., individually or collectively cannot be the *jagatkāraṇa*), let the *jīva* be the *jagatkāraṇa*. That is not possible

because the *jīva* is seen experiencing sorrows, etc. Certainly nowhere it is seen that an independent entity subjecting oneself to sorrows.

The *jīva* because of its sentience does not depend on any other sentient principle for its existence. And yet it is seen that the *jīva* suffers sorrows perforce. The word *ādi*, (etc.), in the phrase ‘*duḥkhādi*’ (sorrows, etc.) refers to anxiety, fear, etc. No one willingly invites sorrows for oneself. Therefore *jīva* cannot be the *jagatkāraṇa*. If the *jīva* is considered as the cause through *karma*, the problem arises as to who executes the laws of *karma*. *Jīva* does not know the specific result of a given *karma*. It cannot be the regulator. *Pūrva-mīmāṃsakas* do not accept *Īśvara*. If *svabhāva* (nature) is considered as the cause of dispensing *karmaphalas* the earlier defect of its being inert crops up again. Moreover if *svabhāva* is considered as the regulator of *karmaphala*, it should necessarily be the cause in every case as the *jagatkāraṇa*. In that case the *karma* and through it the *jīva* postulated as the cause of *jagat* cannot be accepted. This shows that the *jīva* through the means of *karma* and *svabhāva* cannot be the *jagatkāraṇa*. Therefore it is proved that the *kāla*, etc., put together cannot be the cause of everything.

MĀYĀDARŚANA

The *ṛṣis* being unable to decide the *jagatkāraṇa* by discussion resorted to *dhyāna* (meditation). The third *mantra* tells us what they discovered. Those *ṛṣis* (*te*) having become totally introvert by the single-pointed concentration of the mind (*dhyānayogānugatāḥ*) discovered (*apaśyan*) power of *Paramātmā* (*devātmaśaktim*) concealed (*nigūḍhām*) by one's *guṇas* (*svaguṇaiḥ*). The one who (*yaḥ*)(is) *Paramātmā* though non-dual in nature (*ekaḥ*) controls (*adhitiṣṭhati*) all (*nikhilāni*) those (*tāni*) from *kāla* to *ātmā* (*jīva*) (*kalātmayuktāni*) causes (*kāraṇāni*) (Śv.U.1-3). The next six verses will explain this topic.

दोषान् सर्वेषु पक्षेषु

पश्यन्तो बहुधा तदा ।

मायाशक्तिमनिर्वाच्यामपश्यन्

ध्यानयोगतः ॥१५॥

सर्वेषु पक्षेषु - in all views बहुधा - various दोषान् - defects पश्यन्तः - seeing तदा - then ध्यानयोगतः - by the means of *dhyāna* अनिर्वाच्याम् - inexplicable मायाशक्तिम् - power called *māyā* अपश्यन् - the *ṛṣis* discovered – (15)

15. (The *ṛṣis*) seeing various defects in all views finally discovered the inexplicable power called *māyā* by the means of *dhyāna*.

Here *dhyāna* is not any meditation

on some *upāśya daivata* (deity) but intense reflection on the topic under discussion with a single-pointed mind to the exclusion of all other external pursuits and thoughts. Those *ṛṣi munis* could not arrive at an ascertainment by mutual discussion. When an inquiry conducted with full *śraddhā* fails the only resort is to focus the mind on the principle under consideration single-pointedly. There is bound to be a break through and a new light or a solution dawns. Whether you call it intuition or favour of *Paramēśvara*, it is so. A story from *Kenopaniṣad* can be an illustration in this context. When Indra reached near the *Yakṣa* (a celestial being) the *Yakṣa* disappeared. But Indra did not give up. He stood at the same place where *Yakṣa* disappeared pondering intensely with *śraddhā* as to what it could be. Seeing his *bhakti* and determination, *Brahmavidyā* appeared there in the form of *Bhagavatī Umā*. She told him that it was Brahman itself appeared in that resplendent form to teach you all a lesson. Similarly here the *ṛṣis* unable to find the *jagatkāraṇa* by mutual discussion resorted to *dhyāna* so that they can get some inner vision. They came to know the *māya-śakti* of *Paramātmā* which neither fits in the category of 'is' or 'is not'. Brahman becomes the cause of *jagat* because of this power. There is no other cause. The causes of *jagat* that we consider are actually from the realm of

jagat only, but real cause is Brahman alone. It presides over all other interim causes existing in this *jagat*.

Though from the worldly standpoint, many entities appear to be the causes, in reality nothing other than the inexplicable *māyā* can be the ultimate *jagatkāraṇa*. This is deduced from the universal observation in the next two verses.

द्वित्रिकक्षासु युक्तीनां सत्त्वेऽप्यन्ते न सन्ति ताः ।
न जानामीत्येवमन्ते विषीदन्ति हि वादिनः ॥१६॥

द्वित्रिकक्षासु - up to two or three stages (of any cause-effect relation) युक्तीनां सत्त्वे अपि - even if favourable reasonings appear to be there अन्ते - finally ताः - those reasonings न सन्ति - are not available हि - because (if probed further) वादिनः - disputants अन्ते - at the end न जानामि - 'I do not know' इति एवम् - thus विषीदन्ति - they despair - (16)

16. Even if favourable reasonings appear to be there up to two or three stages (of any cause-effect relation) finally those reasonings are not available. If probed further at the end the disputants despair saying 'I do not know'.

Superficially cause and effect relation can be established from different standpoints up to a few stages. If further asked, 'why', 'how', 'when',

etc., those proponents have to submit, 'I do not know'. It shows their ignorance. They totally rely on the reasoning and despair because they have to accept their ignorance. Wise people accept ignorance because that is the cause whereas others insist that there must be some other cause than ignorance. This fact is also told in Pañcadaśī (Ch.6-143, 146).

In fact the unavoidable submission, 'I do not know' by all disputants itself reveals *māyā* the *jagatkāraṇa*. This is specified now.

यदन्ते शरणं सर्ववादिनामविवादतः ।

तदज्ञानमनिर्वाच्या मायेत्याहुर्विपश्चितः ॥१७॥

अन्ते - finally सर्व वादिनाम् - of all disputants अविवादतः - unanimously यत् - whatever that शरणं - is the refuge तत् अज्ञानं - that ignorance (itself) अनिर्वाच्या - is inexplicable माया - *māyā* इति - thus विपश्चितः - wise people आहुः - say - (17)

17. Finally whatever that is unanimously the refuge of all disputants, that ignorance (itself) is the inexplicable *māyā*. Thus the wise people say.

All disputants at one stage or the other necessarily consider that they do not know. Then there cannot be any occasion of further arguments because that is their final answer. This is undisputed. All are unanimous about their ignorance of the cause of *jagat*.

Vedānta accepts that ignorance itself is the *jagatkāraṇa*. That itself is called *māyā* which is neither *sat* (ever-existent) nor *asat* (never-existent). It is not *sat* because it ends. It is also not *asat* because it is evidently experienced. Thus being distinct from both *sat* and *asat*, *māyā* is undefinable or inexplicable, (i.e. *anirvācyā*).

In spite of unanimity about the ignorance as *jagatkāraṇa* which is universally experienced, an obstinate disputant questions how *māyā* can be the cause of *jagat*. It is obvious that he wants to know ignorance as the cause by some reasoning instead of experience. Ignorance is inaccessible to reasoning (*tarka*). And yet, if one wants to apply reasoning to ignorance, he is a person who is totally unreasonable. The author retorts on such a person.

अनिर्वाच्येऽपि युक्तिं चेदन्विच्छति स मूढधीः ।
न रूपं चक्षुषा द्रष्टुमिच्छत्येवाऽतिमोहितः ॥१८॥

अनिर्वाच्ये अपि - even in the matters that are inexplicable युक्तिं - reasoning अन्विच्छति चेत् - if one searches for सः - that मूढधीः - stupid person अतिमोहितः - because of being totally deluded रूपं - form द्रष्टुम् इच्छति - wants to see न चक्षुषा एव - (but) certainly not by the eyes! - (18)

18. Even in the matters that are inexplicable if one searches for reasoning, certainly that stupid person

because of being totally deluded wants to see the form but not by the eyes!

When all inquirers of *jagatkāraṇa* finally reach the stage of ignorance which is experienced by all of them, a desire to know that stage by reasoning is useless. The form can be seen by eyes and not by any other means. To insist that the knowledge of form will be accepted only when seen by any sense-organ other than the eyes is a sign of utter stupidity. Similarly on knowing the limitations of reasoning, any expectation to know by reasoning the stage of ignorance with respect to *jagatkāraṇa* is only a sign of foolishness. Thoughtful persons will never do that.

Experiential ignorance or *māyā* is beyond the realm of reasoning. This is shown now.

सर्वकार्येषु शक्तत्वान्मायाऽऽक्षेपं न साऽर्हति ।
दुर्घटस्यैव घटने स्वभावः सर्वसंमतः ॥१९॥

माया - *māyā* सर्वकार्येषु - in doing everything शक्तत्वात् - because of being capable सा - that *māyā* आक्षेपं - any query or censure न अर्हति - does not deserve (तस्याः - of *māyā*) सर्वसंमतः - unanimous स्वभावः - nature दुर्घटस्य - of that which is impossible घटने एव - is in the accomplishment alone—(19)

19. *Māyā*, because it is capable of doing everything, does not deserve any

query or censure. Its unanimous nature is certainly the accomplishment of that which is impossible.

‘*Ākṣepa*’ can mean queries such as ‘why did *māyā* do that?’, ‘how could *māyā* do that’, etc., or censure. Accomplishing the things that can never happen or impossible to do is the nature of *māyā*. When an impossible thing is made possible whatever that is considered as its cause itself is called *māyā* and the same thing is experienced by us in the form of ‘not known’. Magic illustrates the nature of *māyā*. Not knowing how a magician does an impossible feat is his *māyā*. Similarly the ignorance of a *jīva* is called *māyā* from the standpoint of *Īśvara*. *Māyā* does everything. Therefore it is useless to be surprised by its handiwork. *Māyā* itself is such that it is capable of doing surprising things. Such nature of *māyā* becomes very clear in statements such as ‘*māyā* is highly skillful in accomplishing that which has never happened’ (*aghāṭita ghaṭanā paṭīyasī māyā*). When a power (*śakti*) is known through its inconceivable effect then effect (*kāryas*) can never be impossible for that *māyā*. The person who does not know this simple fact is certainly foolish.

Māyā being inert in nature it cannot create on its own and so independently it cannot be the

jagatkāraṇa. But it becomes fit to do so on borrowing the sentience from Brahman (*Paramātmā*). This is told now.

तथाविधायां मायायां परात्मा प्रतिबिम्बितः ।
अवान्तराणि वस्तूनि कालादीन्यधितिष्ठति ॥२०॥

तथाविधायां मायायां - in the *māyā* of that type, (i.e. as described earlier) परात्मा - Brahman, *Paramātmā* प्रतिबिम्बितः - is reflected (सः - he) कालादीनि - *kāla* (*svabhāva, niyati*), etc. अवान्तराणि वस्तूनि - secondary causes अधितिष्ठति - presides over (controls) – (20)

20. *Paramātmā* (Brahman) is reflected in the *māyā* that was described earlier. He (*Paramātmā*) presides over (controls) the secondary causes such as *kāla* (*svabhāva, niyati*), etc.

‘To reflect’ is to correspond in appearance or effect to an original entity. The reflected entity is totally independent of the reflection, reflecting medium and its attributes though the reflecting medium produces a semblance of the original reflected entity. There is no real connection between the two. But to those who are ignorant of the real nature of the original entity it appears outwardly as though they are intimately connected to each other with reciprocal transference of their features. The original entity is called *bimba* of the reflection which is

pratibimba. *Māyā* and *Paramātmā* seemingly appear to be connected to each other in a similar way. It appears as though inert *māyā* is sentient and the changeless (*nirvikārī*) Brahman is changing (*vikārī*) in nature. Thus there appears to be the possibility of *jagat* coming into existence because *māyā* no more appears to be inert and *Paramātmā* also appears to be *vikārī*. But because the relation between the *māyā* and *Paramātmā* is not real, the changeless (*nirvikārī*) nature of *Paramātmā* remains intact. The secondary causes such as *kāla* (time), *svabhāva* (nature), etc., which fall in the category of *jagat* are the products of *māyā*. Therefore *Paramātmā*, because of whom *māyā* appears sentient, seemingly becomes the controller of *kāla*, etc., or the one who presides over them. But the number of secondary causes in the innumerable cause-effect series being countless, it becomes difficult to know that *māyā* only is the *jagatkāraṇa*.

WHEEL OF SAṂSĀRA AND RIVER OF SAṂSĀRA

The fourth *mantra* (Śv.U.1-4) describes Brahman as the wheel of *saṁsāra* whereas the fifth one (Śv.U.1-5) as a river.

मायाविशिष्टमीशानं जगदाकारतां गतम् ।
संसारचक्रमित्याहुः संसाराख्यनदीति च ॥२१॥

जगदाकारतां गतम् - the one who has

attained the appearance of *jagat* मायाविशिष्टम् ईशानं - *Īśvara* who is endowed with *māyā* संसारचक्रम् - as a wheel of *saṃsāra* इति आहुः - so those who know the scriptures describe संसाराख्य नदी च इति - and (also) as the river of *saṃsāra* – (21)

21. Those who know the scriptures describe *Īśvara* who is endowed with *māyā* as the one who has attained the appearance of *jagat* in the form of a *saṃsāra-wheel* and also as the river of *saṃsāra*.

पुनः पुनर्जायमानश्चक्रवत्परिवर्तते ।
अविच्छेदेन संसारो नदीवत् प्रवहेत् सदा ॥२२॥

पुनः पुनः - repeatedly जायमानः संसारः - the *saṃsāra* that is being born चक्रवत् - like a wheel परिवर्तते - revolves अविच्छेदेन - (and) non-stop सदा - always प्रवहेत् - flows नदीवत् - like a river – (22)

22. The *saṃsāra* that is being born repeatedly revolves like a wheel (and) always flows non-stop like a river.

Both the illustrations of a wheel with respect to the ever-changing external phenomenal world and that of a non-stop flowing river for the one and the same perennial entity *jīva* in the form of internal *kartā-bhoktā* with changing bodies in each birth are very apt. The external things are born and get destroyed, but the internal *kartā-bhoktā* is non-stop continuous in spite of ever-

changing activities and *bhoga*.

BOTH *JĪVA* AND *ĪŚVARA* ARE BRAHMAN IN REALITY

Brahman itself appears as *jīva* and *Īśvara* on account of different *upādhis*.

जीवोऽहंकारोपहितश्चक्रवद् भ्राम्यते सदा ।
मायोपहित ईशानो जन्मसु प्रेरयेदमुम् ॥२३॥

जीवः - the *jīva* अहंकारोपहितः - endowed with the *upādhi* in the form of *ahaṃkāra* चक्रवत् - like a wheel सदा - always भ्राम्यते - revolves in terms of transmigration मायोपहितः - endowed with the *upādhi* of *māyā* ईशानः - *Īśvara* अमुम् - this *jīva* जन्मसु - in (different) births प्रेरयेत् - throws – (23)

23. The *jīva* endowed with the *upādhi* in the form of *ahaṃkāra* always revolves in terms of transmigration like a wheel. *Īśvara* endowed with the *upādhi* of *māyā* throws this *jīva* in (different) births.

Brahman itself appears to gain the role of *jīva* on account of *avidyā* by identifying with *anātmā* in the form of *ahaṃkāra* as its *upādhi*. The same Brahman appears as *Īśvara* because of *upādhi* in the form of *māyā*. Just as the persons sitting in the swings of a giant wheel go on revolving because of setting the device to revolve by an operator, so does the *jīva* is always on the move being

subjected to transmigration by *Īśvara*. When does the *samsāra* end is told in the next verse.

उपाधिद्वयहीनं तु ब्रह्म वेदेषु बोध्यते ।
इत्थं वेदरहस्यज्ञा भवेयुर्ब्रह्मतत्पराः ॥२४॥

उपाधिद्वयहीनं - free from both *upādhis* of *avidyā* (as *ahaṁkāra*) and *māyā* तु - certainly ब्रह्म - Brahman वेदेषु - in the Vedas बोध्यते - is unfolded इत्थं - thus वेदरहस्यज्ञाः - those who know the secret of Vedas ब्रह्मतत्पराः - exclusively committed to Brahman भवेयुः - should become – (24)

24. In the Vedas Brahman free from both *upādhis* of *avidyā* (as *ahaṁkāra*) and *māyā* is certainly unfolded. Thus those who know the secret (*tātparyā*-purport) of Vedas should become exclusively committed to Brahman.

The end of this *samsāra* is in *Brahmasākṣātkāra* which is totally *nirupādhika* Brahman in its real nature as ascertained by the *tātparyā* of the Vedas. An eligible *mumuksū* with full *śraddhā* should get his mind absorbed in *nirupādhika* Brahman. The verses 23 and 24 give the gist of 6th and 7th *mantras* (*Śv.U.1-6, 7*).

The next *mantra* says: *Īśvara* sustains (as the *adhiṣṭhāna*-basis) simultaneously the entire Creation comprising both the destructible *jagat* (as an effect) and its (relatively)

indestructible cause, the *māyā*. The *jīva* gets bound by considering oneself as the *bhoktā* because of the ignorance of its identity with *Īśvara*. But it gets liberated on knowing the *Īśvara* in reality is its real nature (*Śv.U.1-8*). This is pointed out in the next verse.

जगत् स्याद् व्यक्तमव्यक्तं

सृष्टिसंहारयोः क्रमात् ।

बिभर्ति द्वयमीशानश्चिदात्मा तु

विमुक्तिभाक् ॥२५॥

जगत् - *jagat* सृष्टिसंहारयोः - in both Creation and its destruction क्रमात् - respectively व्यक्तम् - manifest अव्यक्तम् - unmanifest स्यात् - becomes ईशानः - *Īśvara* द्वयम् - both बिभर्ति - sustains चिदात्मा तु - whereas *ātmā* whose nature is *cit* विमुक्तिभाक् - is ever-liberated – (25)

25. In both Creation and destruction the *jagat* becomes manifest and unmanifest respectively. *Īśvara* sustains both (as their basis) whereas *ātmā* whose nature is *cit* is ever-liberated.

Īśvara alone is the one who sustains the *jagat* as its basis whether it is in the state of manifest or unmanifest. *Ātmā* by its nature itself is ever-liberated. Oneself is considered as bound (*baddha*) on account of *avidyā*. But by gaining the *sākṣātkāra* of changeless (*nirvikārī*) *upādhiless ātmā* its ever-liberated nature

free from all bondage is directly known.

The next *mantra* says: *Īśvara* (*Īśa*) and *jīva* (*anīśa*) are both birthless (*ajau*). So it is well-known in the Vedas (*hi*). Another unborn (*ajā*) is *māyā*. It always projects *bhoktā* (*jīva*) and *bhogārtha* (joys, sorrows and their means). *Ātmā* appears as all forms (*viśvarūpa*), limitless in nature (*ananta*) and is non-doer (*akartā*). These three (*māyā*, *jīva*, *Īśvara*) are superimposed on Brahman (*Śv.U.1-9*). This is summarized now.

ईशानीशावज्ञतज्ज्ञौ भोक्ता भोजयिता च तौ ।
तयोर्निर्वाहिका माया ब्रह्मण्यारोपितं त्रयम् ॥२६॥

ईशानीशौ - *Īśvara* and *jīva* (*anīśa*)
अज्ञतज्ज्ञौ - are respectively *jñānī* (*tajjñā*)
and ignorant (*ajñā*) तौ - those two are
भोजयिता - one who makes undergo *bhoga*
भोक्ता च - and one who undergoes *bhoga*
(in the same order) माया - *māyā* is तयोः - of
these statuses of *jīva* and *Īśvara* निर्वाहिका
- the one who projects त्रयम् - these three
(*māyā*, *Īśvara*, *jīva*) ब्रह्मणि - on Brahman
आरोपितं - are superimposed – (26)

26. *Īśvara* and *jīva* (*anīśa*) are respectively *jñānī* (*tajjñā*) and the ignorant one (*ajñā*). They are *bhoktā* (*jīva* who undergoes *bhoga*) and the one, (i.e. *Īśvara*) who makes (*jīva*) undergo the *bhoga*. *Māyā* is the one who projects these statuses of *jīva* and

Īśvara. These three (*māyā*, *Īśvara*, *jīva*) are superimposed on Brahman.

Though *Īśvara* is endowed with the *upādhi* of *māyā* its veiling power (*āvaraṇa-śakti*) cannot rob away *Īśvara* the knowledge of his real nature, viz. Brahman. *Īśvara* has always *Brahmajñāna*. The veiling power of *māyā* does cover the *ātmajñāna* of *jīva*. The *jīva* itself undergoes *bhoga* whereas *Īśvara* makes it undergo the *bhoga*. Both *vyavahāras* (*bhokṛtva* and *bhojayitṛtva*) are products of false *māyā* and so they are false in nature. *Māyā* itself gets superimposed on Brahman besides the statuses of *jīva* and *Īśvara*.

Here it is worth considering if *avidyā* is a distinct entity from *māyā*. In this context we find in the Upaniṣads words such as *prakṛti*, *tama*, *svadhā* (illusion), *māyā*, *avidyā*, *avyakta*, etc. To make the novice understand easily, it is told at places that the *upādhi* of *Īśvara* is *māyā* and that of *jīva* is *avidyā*. *Paiṅgalopaniṣad* from *Śuklayajurveda* takes for granted *māyā* and *avidyā* as the *upādhis* of *Īśvara* and *jīva* respectively. *Sarasvatī-rahasyopaniṣad* presents *māyā* as *prakṛti* with predominant *sattvaguṇa*. But this distinction is not highlighted in the *Brahmasūtras*, *bhāṣya*, *vārtika*, *Pañcapādikā*, etc. In this Upaniṣad the *śruti* is describing that it is *māyā* only who projects both

jīva and *Īśvara* without any separate mention of *avidyā*. Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni has distinguished these two at places. He has also made it clear that *prakṛti* with the predominance of pure *sattva* is *māyā* whereas the same with the predominance of *rajas* and *tamas* is *avidyā* (P.1-15, 16). Though he has accepted this method to help the dull *mumukṣu* on the same pattern of *prakṛti* accepted by *Sāṅkhya*, he does subscribe to the view that *māyā* projects both the *jīva* and *Īśvara*. This is clear from his statements, ‘*Jīva* and *Īśvara* are falsely projected by *māyā*’ (P.6-212) and ‘*Jīva* and *Īśvara* are two calves of the same *kāmadhenu* (heavenly cow yielding all desires) called *māyā*’ (P.6-236). These passages show that both *jīva* and *Īśvara* are the projections of one and the same *māyā*.

The next *mantra* advises *abhidhyāna* (meditation of myself including the entire *jagat* as Brahman), *yojana* (by intense *abhidhyāna* getting rid of *jīveśvara* distinction) and *tattvabhāva* (non-dual nature having total extinction of self ignorance and delusion of duality which corresponds to total freedom from the body called *videhamukti*) (Śv.U.1-10). This is suggested now.

जगद्भ्रमं जीवभेदं वासना देहधारणम् ।
चतुष्टयं निराकुर्याद् अभिध्यानादिभिः क्रमात्॥२७॥

जगद्भ्रमं - the delusion of *jagat*
जीवभेदं - mutual distinction among *jīvas*
वासनाः - *vāsanās* comprising the impressions such as the body is ‘I’ and the things belonging to body are mine, etc.
देहधारणम् - wielding the body
चतुष्टयं - (these) four अभिध्यानादिभिः - by ‘*abhidhyāna*’, etc., (i.e. *yojana* and *tattvabhāva*)
क्रमात् - one after the other
निराकुर्यात् - should be totally ended – (27)

27. The four entities, viz. the delusion of *jagat*, the mutual distinction among *jīvas*, *vāsanās* comprising the impressions such as the body is ‘I’ and the things belonging to the body are ‘mine’, etc., and wielding the body should be totally ended one after the other by *abhidhyāna*, etc., (i.e. *yojana* and *tattvabhāva*).

The *jagat* being a product that is falsely projected by equally false *māyā* is a delusion. The *jīva* though *asamsārī* in its real nature (*svarūpa*) is falsely projected as *samsārī* with *upādhis*. They appear to be different on account of different *upādhis* though in reality all *jīvas* are *ātmā* only. *Jagat* in the form of *nāma* and *rūpa* is unreal but we mistakenly consider to be real. This is how the *jagat* is a delusion. The next two verses explain the nature of the means *abhidhyāna*, etc., and what all they destroy.

MEANS TO END *BHRAMA* (DELUSION)

अभितो ब्रह्मरूपत्वध्यानाद्

याति जगद्भ्रमः ।

ब्रह्मत्वे योजिते स्वस्य

जीवभावोऽपगच्छति ॥२८॥

अभितः - entirely ब्रह्मरूपत्वध्यानात् - by meditating on the nature of Brahman in and through the *nāma-rūpātma* *jagat* जगद्भ्रमः - delusion of *jagat* याति - ends स्वस्य - of oneself, the mistaken *jīva* ब्रह्मत्वे योजिते - when the identity with Brahman is accomplished जीवभावः - the state of being a *jīva* अपगच्छति - disappears—(28)

28. By meditating on the nature of Brahman in and through the entire *nāma-rūpātma* *jagat* the delusion of *jagat* ends. When the identity of oneself, the mistaken *jīva*, with Brahman is accomplished, the state of being a *jīva* disappears.

The *jagat* is defined as having ‘existence’ (*asti, sat*), knowledge-principle (*bhāti, cit*), happiness (*priyam, ānanda*), name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*, the feature by which an entity is identified). The triad of first three (*sat, cit, ānanda*) is the nature of Brahman and the pair of remaining two is the feature of *jagat* (*S.R.U.58; Dr.Dr. Vi.20*). By Vedānta *śravaṇa, manana*, etc., when

the mind is centred on Brahman to the exclusion of *nāma-rūpa jagat*, the delusion of *jagat* ends. When the *jīva-brahma* identity is accomplished through *sākṣātkāra* the status of *saṃsārī jīva* also disappears. What remains is *nirupādhika Brahman alone*.

The indispensable stepping stone for the above is the *tvam-padaśodhanam* (the experience of *nirupādhika ātmā* as obtains in the *nirvikalpa antaḥkaraṇa*) which is the basis of *sopādhika jīva*. In the absence of *ahaṃkāra* during the deep sleep, there is no experience of any limitations or calamitous *saṃsāra*. In contrast to sleep, during the *samādhi* there is the clear experience of *nirupādhika paramānanda svarūpa* even without *tripuṭī* which itself is the experience of *śodhita tvam pada* (*nirupādhika sākṣī caitanya ātmā*). By close scrutiny of sleep and the practice of *samādhi* it is possible to give up that the *jīva* is distinct from *Īśvara* or Brahman. In *samādhi dhyeyaika-gocara* or *ātmagocarā vṛttis* (*vṛttis* - conforming to *dhyeya* or meditated entity which is *ātmā* in this case) are there (*P.1-55, 56*). Though they belong to the category of *upādhi*, they do not pose any obstruction in *ātmānubhava* (experience of *ātmā*) just as the actual mirror while you are seeing your face in it. In fact those *ātmagocarā vṛttis* have total semblance

with *nirupādhika ātmā*. They are the only means to experience *ātmā* in its real *nirupādhika* nature in the case of hitherto *jīva* while continuing with the human body. They also drop away in *sākṣātkāra* or intense *jñāna-niṣṭhā* (*Vedāntasāra*). Finally what remains in such residual *antaḥkaraṇa* is *ātmā* and *ātmā* alone which itself is Brahman as per *mahāvākya pramāṇa*. Then ends the distinct status of *jīva* cast by *upādhis*.

अद्वये भाविते तत्त्वे वासना विनिवर्तते ।
आरब्धान्ते देहहानिर्मायैवं क्षीयतेऽखिला ॥२९॥

(एवं - similarly) अद्वये तत्त्वे - when the non-dual principle of Brahman भाविते - is meditated upon वासना - impressions such as taking the body as ‘I’, and the things belonging to the body are ‘mine’, etc. विनिवर्तते - totally cease आरब्धान्ते - when the *prārabdha* gets exhausted देहहानिः - the *jñānī's* body gets destroyed forever never to take rebirth एवं - thus

अखिला माया - *māyā* in its entirety क्षीयते - ends – (29)

29. (Similarly) when the non-dual principle of Brahman is meditated upon the impressions (*vāsanās*) such as taking the body, etc., as ‘I’, ‘mine’, etc., totally cease. When the *jñānī's* or *jīvanmukta's prārabdha* gets exhausted, his body gets destroyed forever, never to take rebirth. Thus the *māyā* in its entirety ends.

More about the nature of *vāsanās* was seen earlier in different chapters. They are past impressions in the *antaḥkaraṇa* which display or convince us to be what we are not in reality. They make us believe that the *jagat* that we perceive is real (*satya*) and the body is ‘I’, etc. They end when the mind is absorbed in the non-dual Brahman (*advaya-tattva*) for a sufficient period by repeated practice of *nididhyāsana* until they cease to be there.

The phrase ‘*akhilā māyā kṣīyate*’ (*māyā* in its entirety ends) is described in the Upaniṣads ‘*viśvamāyā-nivṛtīḥ*’. It is commented upon by different *ācāryas* differently. All those interpretations are correct because they are in accordance with the *śāstra*. Let us see some of them. The word ‘*nivṛtī*’ means cessation or disappearance. The word ‘*viśva-māyā*’ can be viewed differently.

- i) At the moment when *ātmajñāna* is born, the entire *saṃsāra* comprising joys, sorrows and erroneous notions ends totally.
- ii) *Viśva* means contrary or false appearance. Its cause is *māyā*. That which is both *viśva* and also *māyā* is *viśva-māyā*. Non-availability of both in any form is their

nivṛtti (cessation).

- iii) First the *avidyā* that veils the knowledge of identity between Brahman and *aparokṣa ātmā* gets destroyed. Thereby the *māyā* which projects the dualistic notion of pluralistic world gets destroyed. What remains is its trace which gives the appearance of duality and enables the *vyavahāra* of *Brahmajñānī* during the period of *prārabdha-karma*. When the *prārabdha* gets over on account of *vidyā* even the residual trace of *avidyā* or *māyā* ends. Thus the entire *māyā* of *Brahmajñānī* ends.

PĀŚA-HĀNIḤ (FETTERS ARE DESTROYED)

After gaining liberation there is no rebirth. The eleventh *mantra* tells this. ‘By *aparokṣa* (direct) experience of self-luminous Brahman (*devam jñātvā*) all fetters get destroyed (*sarva-pāśā-pahāniḥ*). By the destruction of sufferings (*kleśas* such as likes-dislikes, *punya-pāpa*) birth and death get destroyed. (*kleśaiḥ kṣīṇaiḥ janma-mṛtyu-prahāniḥ*). By thorough meditation of Brahman (*abhidhyānāt*) having discovered oneself to be Brahman when the present body drops off (*dehabhede*) becoming non-dual (*kevalaḥ*), full and complete *paramānanda* (*āptakāmaḥ*) one gains total overlordship (*viśvaiśvāyam*) being oneself identical with *Īśvara*’ (*Śv.U.1-11*). The gist of this portion is given in the next verses.

ब्रह्मज्ञानात् पाशहानौ क्षीणक्लेशो न जन्मभाक् ।
पाशाश्चतुर्विधाश्चैव शास्त्रेषु प्रतिपादिताः ॥३०॥

ब्रह्मज्ञानात् - by *Brahmasākṣātkāra*

पाशहानौ - when the fetters get destroyed
क्षीणक्लेशः - the *Brahmajñānī* whose sufferings have stopped
जन्मभाक् न - is not liable to take birth
चतुर्विधाः - four types of
पाशाः - fetters
शास्त्रेषु एव - in the scriptures themselves
प्रतिपादिताः - are told
–(30)

30. When by *Brahmasākṣātkāra* fetters get destroyed the *Brahmajñānī* whose sufferings have stopped is not liable to take birth. There are four types of fetters told in the scriptures themselves.

The four types of fetters with their meaning are narrated in the next two verses.

मलो माया कर्म

तत्त्वतिरोधानं च ते मताः ।

मलो ज्ञानक्रियाशक्त्योश्छादको

दोष इष्यते ॥३१॥

ते - those fetters
मलः - impurity
माया - *māyā*
कर्म - *karma*
तत्त्वतिरोधानं च -

and veiling of the nature of *ātmā* मताः - are considered मलः - impurity (*mala*) ज्ञानक्रियाशक्त्योः - of *jñāna-śakti* and *kriyā-śakti* (of power of knowledge and action) छादकः दोषः - defect of veiling इष्यते - is considered—(31)

31. Those fetters are considered to be *mala* (impurity), *māyā*, *karma* and veiling of the nature of *ātmā*. The defect of veiling both *jñāna-śakti* (power of knowledge) and *kriyā-śakti* (power of action) is considered as impurity (*mala*).

रागादिहेतुर्मायोक्ता कर्म पुण्यं च पातकम् ।
मूढैस्तत्त्वतिरोधानं सर्वैरप्यनुभूयते ॥३२॥

रागादिहेतुः - the cause of love for sense-objects or liking माया उक्ता - is called *māyā* कर्म - *karma* is पुण्यं च पातकम् - *punya* and *pāpa* सर्वैः अपि मूढैः - certainly by all ignorant persons तत्त्वतिरोधानं - veiling of *ātmasvarūpa* अनुभूयते - is experienced—(32)

32. The cause for love for sense-objects or liking is called *māyā*. The *karma* happens to be the *pāpa* and *punya*. The veiling of *ātmasvarūpa* (real nature of *ātmā*) is certainly experienced by all ignorant persons.

Knowing (being aware of) *ātmā* in its real nature totally free from ignorance of itself and all *upādhis* is *mokṣa*. There is no occasion of rebirth for a *jñānī* in the

absence of ignorance and *pāpa-punya* or identification with the body. *Samsāra* is *mithyā*. *Ātmā* is one (*eka*) and non-dual (*advaya*). Endless *jīvas* are seen by falsely projected *upādhis*. Therefore *mokṣa* is ever-existent. Here the four *pāśas* (fetters) are described according to *Śaivaśāstra*. Brahman is omniscient (*sarvajña*) and omnipotent (*sarvaśaktimān*), but in the form of *jīva* it experiences oneself to be *alpajña* and *alpaśaktimān* (as having limited knowledge and power). This defect is *mala*.

The fetter called *māyā* produces *rāga* and *dveṣā* (love for sense-objects or hatred for them) called likes and dislikes. This is because of the ignorance that in reality everything is nothing but Brahman. Everyone has limitless love for oneself. *Rāga* and *dveṣa* are entities other than myself. *Rāga* and *dveṣa* induce us to do *karmas*. They in turn breed *pāpa* and *punya*. *Karmas* enjoined by the *śāstra* yield *punya* and those prohibited by them produce *pāpa*.

Karma (*pāpa* and *punya*), *rāga-dveṣa* (produced by *māyā*) and the veiling of *jñāna-kriya-śakti* (called *mala*) are possible only when the *paramārtha tattva* (ultimate reality-Brahman) is veiled - not known. This is universally experienced by *avivekīs*. They know not their real nature which is non-dual *paramānanda*. But *Vivekīs* by

inquiry on the guidelines of scriptures experience in *aparokṣa* one's real nature. Therefore it is said that the veiling of *ātmatattva* is experienced by all *mūḍhas* (*avivekīs*).

The Upaniṣadic *mantra* (*Śv.U.1-11*) mentions the destruction of *kleśa*. Therefore the meaning of *kleśa* according to Patañjali is mentioned in the next verse.

क्लेशान् पतञ्जलिः प्राह तेष्वविद्यादिरस्मिता ।
द्वितीया द्वेषरागौ चाभिनिवेशस्तु पञ्चमः ॥३३॥

पतञ्जलिः - Patañjali क्लेशान् - sufferings प्राह - has described तेषु - among them अविद्या आदिः - *avidyā*, (i.e. *aviveka* or erroneous contrary notions) is the first one अस्मिता - *asmitā* (delusion in the form of *ahaṃkāra* or notion of identity between sentience and inert entity) द्वितीया - is the second one द्वेष रागौ च - dislikes and likes (are the third and the fourth respectively) अभिनिवेशः तु - whereas longing or earnest desire such as 'let me never die' पञ्चमः - is the fifth one - (33)

33. Patañjali has described sufferings. Among them *avidyā*, (i.e. *aviveka* or erroneous contrary notions) is the first one. *Asmitā* (delusion in the form of *ahaṃkāra* or notion of identity between sentience and inert entity) is the second one. Dislikes and likes (are the

third and the fourth respectively) whereas longing or earnest desire such as 'let me never die' is the fifth one.

Patañjali in his *yogasūtras* mentions five types of *kleśas*. They have to be understood according to the terminologies of that tradition called *Hairanyagarbha*. For example, *avidyā* does not mean what Vedānta describes. It means *aviveka* (lack of discrimination) according to them.

Avidyā as specified by Patañjali is an erroneous contrary notion about an entity. For example, heavens, sense-objects, etc., are *anitya* (impermanent). Considering them to be permanent is *avidyā*. The other examples are: 'The notion of taking the impure body consisting of flesh, blood, marrow, faeces, urine, etc., as pure. The notion of pleasing nature in the sorrow-breeding *viśayas* (sense-objects). The firm conviction that the body, etc., *anātmā* are *ātmā*'.

The cause of *avidyā* is *asmitā*. The knower principle (*drkśakti*) is *puruṣa* and the knowledge faculty (*darśanaśakti*) is the *sāttvika antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*. They are distinct from each other as *bhoktā* (enjoyer or sufferer) and *bhogyā* (objects of *bhoga*). Yet, there is a notion of identity between *antaḥkaraṇa* and *puruṣa* (*drkśakti*) as '*aham*' ('I'). That is *asmitā* according to them.

Having remembered the past experiences of joy the hankering for such joys and their means is *rāga*. Whereas on remembering the past sorrows the censure or anger towards such sorrows and their means is *dveṣa*. Based on the *saṃskāras* of dying experiences in the past lives the constant earnest desire with fear such as ‘let me never die’ is called *abhiniveśa*.

THE MEANS TO GAIN BRAHMAJÑĀNA

The *pāśa* (fetter) in the form of ‘*tattva-tirodhāna*’ can be ended only by *Brahmajñāna* wherein Brahman identical with *ātmā* gets revealed in its self-evident, *nirupādhika*, *paramānanda* nature. That *Brahmajñāna* is summarized in this Upaniṣad in its twelfth *mantra* : ‘This principle (*etat*) identical with *ātmā* alone (*ātmasaṃstham eva*) should be known always by *aparokṣa-brahmānubhava* (*nityamjneyam*). Certainly or because other than this there is nothing else that is to be known or experienced (*hi ataḥparam kiñcit veditavyam na*). The *jīva* (*bhoktā*), *jagat* (*bhogya*) and the ruler *Īśvara* (*preritāram*) is Brahman in reality (*Brahman*). Having known this (*matvā*) these threefold things told (*etat sarvam trividham proktam*) (should be known in their real nature to be Brahman)’ (Śv.U.1-12). The next (thirteenth) *mantra*

describes *Omkāra* (*praṇava*) as the means to gain *ātmajñāna* with the illustration of fire. The fourteenth one provides the mode of meditation using the illustration of *araṇi* (wooden blocks used to kindle the sacrificial fire). The first chapter ends by describing the *ātmajñāna* in the sixteenth *mantra*. This portion is suggested in the next three verses.

भोक्ता भोग्यं प्रेरकश्च

त्रयं ब्रह्मेति तत्त्वधीः ।

उपायेन ब्रह्मधीः

स्यादरणिस्थाऽग्निलाभवत् ॥३४॥

भोक्ता - *jīva* भोग्यं - entities to be enjoyed or suffered (everything in Creation that is meant for *jīva* and Created by *Īśvara* प्रेरकः च - and the ruler *Īśvara* त्रयं - the triad ब्रह्म - is Brahman इति - so तत्त्वधीः - is the knowledge of ultimate reality (*Brahmajñāna*) ब्रह्मधीः - such *Brahmajñāna* अरणिस्थाऽग्निलाभवत् - like the kindling of fire contained in the *araṇis* (by churning them) उपायेन - by proper means स्यात् - is accomplished –(34)

34. The triad of *bhoktā* (*jīva*), *bhogya* the entities to be enjoyed and suffered (everything in Creation that is meant for *jīva*, Created by *Īśvara*) and the ruler (of all) *Īśvara* is Brahman. This is *Brahmajñāna* (the knowledge of

ultimate reality). Such *Brahmajñāna* is accomplished by proper means like the kindling of fire contained in the *araṇis* (by churning them).

उपायः प्रणवेनात्मध्यानं तेनैष लभ्यते ।

तिलात् तैलादयो यद्वल्लभ्यास्तत्तदुपायतः ॥३५॥

प्रणवेन - by the means of *Omkāra*

(*praṇava*) आत्मध्यानं - meditation of *ātmā*

उपायः - is the means to gain *Brahmajñāna*

तेन - by that meditation एषः - this *ātmā*

लभ्यते - is gained यद्वत् - just as तत् तत्

उपायतः - by different means तिलात् तैलादयः

- (things such as) extraction of oil

from sesame seeds, etc. लभ्याः - are

accomplished—(35)

35. The meditation of *ātmā* by the means of *praṇava* (*Omkāra*) is the means to gain *Brahmajñāna* just as by different means (the things such as) the extraction of oil from sesame seeds, etc., are accomplished.

सर्वव्यापिनमात्मानं क्षीरे सर्पिरिवार्पितम् ।

आत्मविद्यातपोभ्यां तमुपलभ्य विमुच्यते ॥३६॥

क्षीरे - in the milk अर्पितम् - that

inheres all over सर्पिः इव - like the ghee तम्

- that सर्वव्यापिनं आत्मानं - all pervading

ātmā आत्मविद्यातपोभ्यां - by the means of

ātmavidyā and *tapas* (in terms of

praṇava-dhyāna) उपलभ्य - having gained

विमुच्यते - one gets liberated—(36)

36. Like the ghee that inheres in the milk all over, having gained the all pervading *ātmā* by the means of *ātmavidyā* and *tapas* (in terms of *praṇava-dhyāna*) one gets liberated.

Bhoktā is the one who undergoes the *bhoga* in terms of enjoyment or suffering. *Bhogyā* is the object of *bhoga*. *Preraka* is the overlord *Īśvara* who makes *bhogyā* available to *bhoktā*. All these three in reality are Brahman alone. This triad is the handiwork of *māyā*. The reality is only Brahman and nothing else. This is *tattvadhī* or *tattvajñāna* (*Brahmajñāna*).

Araṇis are made from specified wood which always contains the principle of fire. By seeing or touching *araṇi* the fire cannot be obtained. One who knows the exact process of churning them to kindle sparks and tend it by a piece of cotton only can get the fire from them, but not otherwise. Similarly Vedānta declares that Brahman is all pervasive in the *jagat* as its basis. But by looking at *jagat* no one can discover it. By simply knowing the fact based on Upaniṣads that ‘Brahman is everything’ by itself is not going to end our sorrowful *samsāra* or make us discover Brahman in reality. The method to know it directly free from all *adhyasta jagat* needs to be followed meticulously. To reveal a concealed entity, the different types of

processes have to be adopted. Fire can be obtained from the wood by rubbing it to generate a powerful friction to yield the sparks. Sesame seeds have to be crushed

to obtain the oil. To get the ghee the milk has to be made curds first and then churn it in a diluted form. One process is not useful for the other job.

The *praṇavadhyāna* (also referred to as *tapas*) is going to be explained as *yoga* (vs.37 to 47). It is also called *pañcīkaraṇa-dhyāna* which is actually the regression of the actual process of *pañcīkaraṇa* during the Creation. It is a meditation wherein Creation is withdrawn in the reverse order with the help of *praṇava* (*Om*) and what is retained finally is only *cit ātmā*. Actually the process is *apañcīkaraṇa*. Such meditation is found in different Upaniṣads such as *Paiṅgala* (Ch-3), *Amṛtanāda* (Ch.2, 3), *Nṛsimhottara-tāpanīya* (1-1), *Praśna* (5-5), *Kaṭha* (1-2-15 to 17), *Taittirīya* (1-8), *Muṇḍaka* (2-2-3 to 6), and *Māṇḍūkya*. The actual framework of *praṇava-dhyāna* is drawn from *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣat*.

The word *Om* (ॐ/ओम्) is spelt as *a* (अ) *u* (उ) *m* (म्). The syllable *a* (अ) stands for the waking state, *caitanya* identified with it called *viśva* with their macrocosmic counterpart *Vaiśvānara*. During the waking state the entity who undergoes *bhoga* is the *bhoktā* (*viśva*), gross objects are *bhogyā* and the one who connects the *bhoktā* to *bhogyā* is *Vaiśvānara* who is the *prerayitā* (ruler) during the waking state. *U* (उ) of *Om* signifies the dream state, the dreamer called *taijasa* and their macrocosm (*samaṣṭi*) *Hiranyagarbha*. The *bhoga* in the dream is subtle without corresponding gross objects. *M* (म्) of *Om* stands for deep sleep state, sleeper (*cit* identified with deep sleep state) and the *samaṣṭi* *Īśvara*. In sleep *ānanda* (happiness) is the *bhogyā* and the *prerayitā* (regulator) is *Īśvara*. There is no other experience of *samsāra* other than these three states of consciousness. The state of swoon, etc., can be clubbed in these three only. The entire Creation consists of these three states only and they are superimposed (*adhyasta*) on *ātmā*. With the means of *Om a* (अ) the gross is merged in subtle *u* (उ) by seeing the truth that the effect (*kārya*) gross *prapañca* is nothing but its cause the subtle one. Similarly in meditation the subtle *prapañca* is merged in the causal one and finally the causal also is merged in its *adhiṣṭhāna* the *caitanya* which is *nirupādhika*. By repeated practice of this meditation the mind gets absorbed in non-dual *ātmā/Brahman*.* Just as *araṇis* have to be churned to kindle the fire, sesame seeds need to be crushed to extract the oil, milk has to be made curds and churned to get the ghee, similarly to gain the *ātmāsākṣātkāra/ Brahmasākṣātkāra* the *praṇava-dhyāna* is indispensable. With this the first chapter is over.

* Vide 'OM BASED MEDITATION' by this commentator.

YOGA

The second chapter of this Upaniṣad is going to be summarized in the next eleven verses. This chapter describes the *dhyāna-yoga*. The next verse summarizes the first seven *mantras*.

यदुक्तं प्रणवध्यानं स

योगस्तत्र यत्नवान् ।

मनो ब्रह्मणि युञ्जानस्तत्साक्षात्कुरुते

धिया ॥३७॥

यत् - whatever प्रणवध्यानं - mediation based on *Omkāra* उक्तं - was referred to (vs.35) सः - that योगः - is called *yoga* तत्र यत्नवान् - one who practices *yoga* with great care and commitment मनः - the mind ब्रह्मणि - in Brahman युञ्जानः - making it absorbed in it धिया - by *buddhi* तत् - Brahman साक्षात्कुरुते - directly experiences (without *tripuṭīs*) - (37)

37. Whatever meditation based on *Omkāra* that was referred to (vs.35) is called *yoga*. The one who practices *yoga* with great care and commitment making the mind absorbed in Brahman directly experiences it by one's *buddhi* (without *tripuṭīs*).

The meditation based on *Omkāra* is a very useful means to gain *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. Having equipped oneself with intense *sādhana-catustaya-sampatti*, after having taken to repeated

śravaṇa and *manana* the *mumukṣu* who takes to the consistent practice of such meditation gains *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. Thereby he discovers that *bhoktā*, *bhogya* and *Īśvara* are one and the same *sat cit ānanda* Brahman. Just as in you, the one entity, your dream with all distinct and different features is centred so is this *jagat*, *jīva* and *Īśvara* in Brahman. Just as you know the reality of dream only on waking up but not in the dream, so is the truth that Brahman alone is there and not the falsely *adhyasta jagat*, etc., on gaining *Brahmasākṣātkāra*, but not in the state of *avidyā*. But constant and consistent industrious efforts with great care are required for a sufficiently long period.

Based on the eighth and the ninth *mantras* certain external means including *prāṇāyāma*, etc., are told in the next three verses.

उरोंऽसमूर्धस्थानेषु त्रिषु देहं

समुन्नतम् ।

अवस्थाप्यासनं जित्वा

प्रत्याहारं समाचरेत् ॥३८॥

त्रिषु - in the three उरः अंस मूर्धस्थानेषु - places of chest, shoulder and the head समुन्नतम् - vertically erect देहं - body अवस्थाप्य - having placed आसनं जित्वा - having accomplished a comfortable and steady *āsana* (sitting posture) प्रत्याहारं - *pratyāhāra* (withdrawal of senses from

their sense-objects) समाचरेत् - should be practiced thoroughly – (38)

38. Having placed body vertically erect in the three places of chest, shoulder and the head, besides having accomplished a comfortable āsana (sitting posture) with steadiness pratyāhāra (withdrawal of senses from their sense-objects) should be practiced thoroughly.

हृद्यक्षाणां निरोधो यः प्रत्याहारः स उच्यते ।
जयेत् प्राबल्यमक्षाणां प्राणायामेन धैर्यवान् ॥३९॥

यः - the one that is अक्षाणां - of senses हृदि - in the antaḥkaraṇa निरोधः - restraint सः - that प्रत्याहारः उच्यते - is called pratyāhāra धैर्यवान् - the one who is firm in one's pursuit अक्षाणाम् - of indriyas प्राबल्यम् - force प्राणायामेन - by prāṇāyāma जयेत् - should control – (39)

39. The restraint of senses (indriyas) in the antaḥkaraṇa is called pratyāhāra. The seeker who is firm in one's pursuit should control the force of indriyas by prāṇāyāma.

प्राणाधीनव्यापृतीनामक्षाणां प्राणरोधनात् ।
निरोधः स्यात् ततश्चित्तं धारयेताऽप्रमादतः ॥४०॥

प्राणाधीनव्यापृतीनां - whose function is dependant on prāṇas अक्षाणां - of senses (indriyas) निरोधः - restraint, control प्राणरोधनात् - by prāṇāyāma स्यात् - takes place ततः - thereafter चित्तं - the mind

अप्रमादतः - with alertness धारयेत - should be restrained (should practice dhāraṇā) – (40)

40. The control of indriyas whose function is dependant on prāṇas takes place by prāṇāyāma. Thereafter with alertness the mind should be restrained (should practice dhāraṇā).

To practice yoga first of all the seeker has to take to good conduct and value structure as specified in yama and niyama by Patañjali and take to the practice of āsana until it is steady (sthira) and sukha (comfortable). Sitting in such posture for a required period of time with spinal column, neck and the head held vertically erect is necessary. It is called āsana-jaya. Any bodily movement disturbs the mind. This is difficult in the beginning. Without sthira-āsana, dhyāna is not possible. In a standing position the mental attention is necessary to keep the body standing and the fear of a fall is there if one goes to dhyāna. The meditator has to be alert because a relaxed body induces sleep which is a major obstacle. After āsanajaya the pratyāhāra has to be practiced. Pratyāhāra is withdrawal of senses from their sense-pursuits and make them abide in the antaḥkaraṇa as if they conform to it. Vāsanās prompt the senses towards their objects. By a powerful flow of saṃskāras (impressions) about the

nature of *ātmā* developed through the exposure to *ādhyātma-śāstra*, *viṣaya-vāsanās* should be restrained. That helps the practice of *pratyāhāra*. The meditator has to be alert by avoiding the *pramāda* (carelessness) by thinking of sense-objects (*viṣaya-cintana*). Once started, the *viṣaya-cintana* becomes a continuous flow. The *ādhyātmika* literature is so vast. By following its guidelines getting engrossed in it the *viṣaya-cintana* can be curbed. Then only the extrovert mind can be made introvert which is very essential.

The practice of *prāṇāyāma* helps to withdraw the *indriyas* from their sense-pursuits which is called *nirodha* (restraint). That helps the mind to take to *ātmā-cintana*. After *pratyāhāra* comes the role of *dhāraṇa* wherein the mind is fixed in a particular place. Though Patañjali speaks of different internal or external places, it is *ātmā-svarūpa* in Vedānta where the mind has to be fixed. Just as more alertness and skill is required in driving a chariot to which unruly horses are yoked, so also a *vivekī* has to engage the mind in *dhāraṇā* with great alertness (Śv.U.2-9).

The tenth *mantra* (Ch.2-10) describes the suitable place to practice *yoga* (*dhyāna*). The next verse describes it.

समे शुचौ शर्करादिमशकादिविवर्जिते ।
मनोज्जुकूलेऽवस्थाय देशे ध्यानं समाचरेत् ॥४१॥

समे - in an even शुचौ - in a clean शर्करादिमशकादिविवर्जिते - free from sand, etc., and mosquitoes, etc. मनोज्जुकूले - pleasing to the mind देशे - in a place अवस्थाय - remaining ध्यानं - meditation समाचरेत् - should be practiced properly
-(41)

41. Remaining in a place which is clean, free from sand, etc., and mosquitoes, etc., besides pleasing to the mind the meditation should be practiced properly.

On an uneven place one cannot sit erect besides there is a fear of falling. Therefore the place of sitting for meditation must be even. The place must be pure by nature or should be made clean and pure. Sand, etc., prick or the dust disturbs by flying in the air. Mosquitoes either bite or make sound near the ear. Flies, gnats or other insects also disturb. Though solitary, the place must be free from the fear of wild animals, sound of water flowing or dropping. The place of meditation must be pleasing to the mind. It is the mind which has to meditate. If the place is repulsive to the mind it will not be able to meditate. It is true that to get an ideal place for meditation is difficult. Yet meditation should be started in whatever

place available which is least disturbing.

When the *yogi* is progressing properly and is going to accomplish the *yoga* soon there appear certain signs. Prior to the revealing of *nirupādhika* Brahman, the forms such as mist, smoke, sun, fire, air, glow worms, lightning, crystal and the moon appear in the form of only the manifestation of *nāḍīs* (nerves) (Śv.U.2-11). The gist of this *mantra* is told now.

नाडीरूपाणि नीहारधूमान्यत्र विभान्ति चेत् ।
ब्रह्मसन्निधिमाप्ता धीरिति निश्चीयतां तदा ॥४२॥

अत्र - in *dhyāna* नाडीरूपाणि - in the form of manifestation of *nāḍīs* नीहारधूमानि - mist, smoke, etc. विभान्ति चेत् - if (they) appear तदा - then धीः - *buddhi* (intellect, *antaḥkaraṇa*) ब्रह्मसन्निधिम् - proximity or appearance of Brahman आप्ता - has attained इति - thus निश्चीयतां - it should be ascertained—(42)

42. If in *dhyāna* the mist, smoke, etc., appear in the form of manifestation of *nāḍīs* it should be ascertained that the *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) has attained the proximity or appearance of Brahman.

These forms such as mist, smoke, etc., mentioned in the *śruti* are manifestation of *nāḍīs* in those forms. They are not the external entities. For example, the sun is seen means only the light is seen. The sight of fire means

feeling some warmth. In other cases also such signs are seen. The appearance of such forms has not much importance. They only indicate that the *yoga* is progressing in the right direction. Some people by methods such as pressing between the eyebrows, etc., happen to see red light and meditate on it by considering it to be Brahman or *Paramātmā*. This is totally wrong. They are the forms of *nāḍīs* as clarified by the *śruti*.

The twelfth *mantra* mentions that when the body of a *yogi* becomes *yogāgnimaya*, (i.e. resplendent on account of *dhyāna* since *yoga* is *dhyāna*) he does not get diseases, old age and *mṛtyu* (death). This does not mean that his body will not end. It can be seen in two ways. He will not get subjected to *saṃsāra* characterized by death. Or death means travel of *prāṇas* to next birth by giving up the earlier body. That is not there for this *yogi* because by virtue of *ātmajñāna* that he is sure to get, his *prāṇas* disintegrate here itself without travel (*saṅkramaṇa*). The next *mantra* describes certain signs that appear as an indication that the *yoga* is going to be accomplished soon. They are: ‘oneself feeling light, health, absence of hankering for sense-objects, elegance, sweet voice, fragrance, less quantity of urine and faeces’. This is told now.

निर्जरत्ववितृष्णात्वशुभगन्धादि

चेद् भवेत् ।

योगसिद्धिः प्रवृत्तेति ज्ञात्वा

योगे स्थिरो भवेत् ॥४३॥

निर्जरत्व वितृष्णात्व शुभगन्धादि - non-aging, (i.e. health), absence of hankering for sense-objects, fragrant smell, etc. चेत् भवेत् - take place योगसिद्धिः - accomplishment of *yoga* प्रवृत्ता - has begun इति - thus ज्ञात्वा - having known योगे - in the practice of *yoga* स्थिरः भवेत् - one should be steadfast – (43)

43. If in the case of practitioner of *yoga* the signs such as non-aging, (i.e. health), absence of hankering for sense-objects, fragrant smell, etc., take place, (then) having known that the accomplishment of *yoga* has begun the *yogī* should be steadfast in its practice.

Figuratively *yoga* is like fire. Just as the smelted golden ore becomes pure by discarding its froth, so does the *yoga* make the body pure by eliminating its maladies born of *pāpa*. With the cleansing of *pāpa* the mind becomes steady and *sāttvika*. Much more aging than the natural influence of actual age is because of mental afflictions which *yogī* does not have. So he keeps good health. He is enthusiastic and alert without getting exhausted soon. Hankering for sense-object makes the mind extrovert. The *yogī* has overcome it. Fragrance

emits from him and not the bad smell. Whatever limited food eaten by him gets digested to a very great extent and therefore faeces and urine become less. These signs give an indication that the *yogī* is on the right track. This is also an indication that more efforts be put forth with much more alertness avoiding all lapses. Closer the goal of accomplishing the *yoga* greater must be the efforts and alertness. Otherwise the adverse effects also can be drastic.

The next *mantra* (*Śv. U.2-14*) tells that a soiled metal such as gold that was buried in the mud when cleansed with suitable cleansing agent shines in its pristine form. Similarly *jīva* becomes freed from sorrows and all accomplished by *ātmasākṣātkāra*. This is explained with the help of a different illustration.

मेघच्छन्नं चन्द्रबिम्बं

मेघापायेऽतिनिर्मलम् ।

तथैव बुद्धिचाञ्चल्यशान्तावात्मा

प्रसीदति ॥४४॥

मेघच्छन्नं चन्द्रबिम्बं - the lunar disc covered by the clouds मेघापाये - when the clouds pass away अतिनिर्मलम् - (becomes) very clear तथा एव - in the same manner बुद्धिचाञ्चल्यशान्तौ - when the unsteadiness of *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) becomes calm (which is a state of *nirvikalpa samādhi*) आत्मा - *ātmā* प्रसीदति - brightens up (as it were) in its real nature, (i.e. *Yogī* gains

ātmasākṣātkāra) – (44)

44. The lunar disc covered by the clouds becomes very clear when the clouds pass away, in the same manner when the unsteadiness of *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) becomes calm (which is a state of *samādhi*) *ātmā* brightens up (as it were) in its real nature, (i.e. *Yogī* gains *ātmasākṣātkāra*).

The moon covered by clouds becomes obscure. But the same moon on passing away of clouds shines brightly in its original resplendence. The unsteadiness of *buddhi* is in the place of clouds. Except in the case of a *kṛta upāsti* the knowledge gained on listening *mahāvākya*, is clouded by other *vṛttis*. As a result *ātmā* is not clear in its real nature. This knowledge of *ātmā* does not conform to it in its *nirupādhika* nature. When the unsteadiness of *buddhi* gets pacified by the practice of *yoga*, the *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* becomes a replica of *ātmā* and steady. Then only *ātmā* is known true to what it is in reality. This is also the ‘*śodhita tvam-pada*’ (*nirupādhika tvam*, i.e. ‘I’ - *ātmā*).

Having told the result of *dhyāna* and *samādhi*, the identity in *aparokṣa*, (i.e. directly) between *jīva* and Brahman is suggested in the next *mantra* through the means of *śodhita* (*upādhiless*) ‘*tat*’ (*nirupādhika* Brahman) and ‘*tvam*’ (*nirupādhika jīva*). When in this body in

the present state of *saṃsāra* of this *jīva* the *ātmatattva* (*nirupādhika jīva*) is directly (*aparokṣatayā*) known to be identical with *nirupādhika* Brahman like the light of two lamps and thereby having known by *sākṣātkāra* (*jñātvā*) the unborn (*aja*), non-changing (*dhruva*) Brahman (*deva*) the *jīva* gets liberated from all fetters (*sarva-pāśas*) (Śv.U.2-15). The illustration of lamp shows that both Brahman and *jīva* free from their *upādhis* are one and the same principle *caitanya*. A thousand watt bulb is bright and brilliant. A twenty-five watt bulb is dull and dim. Yet light is one and the same in both the cases. When both are lit side by side, there is no occasion of light originating from the thousand watt bulb illuminating that from the twenty-five watt bulb. The light being the same there is no subject-object relation between the light coming from both. The same is the case with Brahman and *jīva* in their *śodhita* (*nirupādhika*) nature. That is how *tripuṭī* is absent in *Brahmasākṣātkāra* wherein *anubhava* (experience) of *anubhava-svarūpa* (self-experiencing principle) *cit* Brahman alone is there. This is told briefly in the next two verses.

स्वात्मतत्त्वप्रसादेन ब्रह्मतत्त्वं
प्रसीदति ।

शास्त्राद् बुद्धं ब्रह्मतत्त्वम्

आत्मत्वेनानुभूयताम् ॥४५॥

स्वात्मतत्त्वप्रसादेन - by the clarity (in terms of *aparokṣānubhava*) of *nirupādhika ātmā* ब्रह्मतत्त्वं - the real nature of Brahman (free from all *upādhis*) प्रसीदति - becomes very clear शास्त्रात् - from *adhyātma*-scriptures बुद्धं - known (indirectly - *parokṣatayā*) ब्रह्मतत्त्वम् - the nature of Brahman आत्मत्वेन - through the means of *nirupādhika ātmā* (*śodhita tvam pada*) अनुभूयताम् - should be experienced in *aparokṣa* – (45)

45. By the clarity (in terms of *aparokṣānubhava* of *nirupādhika ātmā* the real nature of Brahman (free from all *upādhis*) becomes very clear. The nature of Brahman known (indirectly - *parokṣatayā*) from *adhyātma*-scriptures should be experienced through the means of *nirupādhika ātmā* (*śodhita tvam pada*).

First the ‘*śodhita tvam pada*’ (*upādhiless ātmā*) needs to be experienced directly. Then only *śodhita* (*upādhiless*) Brahman will be known clearly. What is available to us presently is self-evident (*aparokṣa*) ‘I’ (*ātmā*). May be it is misapprehended as a *samsārī* because of ignorance. But existence of either *Īśvara* or Brahman is known to us now in the state of ignorance only through *śāstras*. It is *parokṣa* (indirect). Therefore it is difficult to know Brahman unless *ātmā* (‘I’) in its real *upādhiless* nature is

experienced. The nature of Brahman which is *sat cit ānanda* also happens to be that of *ātmā*. When the *buddhi* is made very pure and so it conforms to the real nature of *ātmā* as its reflection, it becomes clear from the *śāstra* that the reflection of *ātmā* so experienced is identical with that of Brahman. Though what is known is only a reflection or replica of *ātmā* in its real nature, it makes us know *ātmā* since *pratibimba* (reflection) is exactly like the *bimba* (the original entity). Based on this only Brahman in its real nature can be known directly. It is true that the *śāstra* is indispensable and is the ultimate *pramāṇa*. But it is also equally true that the *antaḥkaraṇa* or the *buddhi* must be very pure and steady to enable to experience the *śodhita tvam pada* - the *nirupādhika ātmā* (‘I’). Otherwise it is only a *parokṣa jñāna* with *samsārī* being intact like a *paśu* (animal, cattle).

अजं ध्रुवं मायिकैस्तैः कार्यैः सर्वैर्विवर्जितम् ।
ज्ञात्वा देवं परात्मानं सर्वपापैर्विमुच्यते ॥४६॥

अजं - unborn ध्रुवं - changeless तैः सर्वैः - by all those मायिकैः कार्यैः - by the products of *māyā* विवर्जितम् - is totally free from देवं परात्मानं - divinity principle *Paramātmā* ज्ञात्वा - having known by *sākṣātkāra* सर्वपापैः - from all sins विमुच्यते - the seeker gets liberated – (46)

46. Having known by *sākṣātkāra*

the divinity principle *Paramātmā* who is unborn, changeless, and totally free from all those products of *māyā*, the seeker gets liberated from all sins.

There is another reading of ‘*sarvapāśaiḥ*’ in the place of ‘*sarvapāpaiḥ*’. It means the seeker gets liberated from all fetters. That phrase is in accordance with *śruti* (Śv.U.2-15).

Paramātmā (Brahman) is unborn. Neither it is born nor anything is born from it. It is *dhruva* means *nirvikāra* - free from changes or modifications. Even though the ever-changing Creation is superimposed on it, in reality Brahman is changeless. Brahman is not a principle wherein changes or attributes come and go as some people think. It is totally free from entire *jagat* created by *māyā* and superimposed on it. Votaries of different views propound different principles as the constituents of *jagat*. The number of these has gone upto thirty-six. But all of them are products of *māyā* superimposed on Brahman which is untouched by them. By knowing the *sat cit ānanda* nature of Brahman the seeker gets totally freed from all *pāpas* (sins) including *pūnyas* and *avidyā*.

The sixteenth *mantra* describes the *sarvātmabhāva*, (i.e. Brahman is everything). It is all quarters and sub-quarters. The first born *Hiraṇyagarbha* abides in it. It is in the form of all *jīvas*

and all sentient and inert entities that are going to be born, besides the *pratyagātmā* of all. The next *mantra* describes *Paramātmā* as abiding in entities such as fire, water, grains, trees and in the entire cosmos. Unto that divinity principles repeated salutations are offered (Śv.U.2-16, 17). This is summarized now.

एष देवः सर्वदिक्षु वहन्यादिष्वखिलेषु च ।
वर्तते तं विचिन्त्याथ प्रणमेत् सर्वदैवतम् ॥४७॥

एषः देवः - this divinity principle सर्वदिक्षु - in all quarters वहन्यादिषु अखिलेषु च - and in all entities such as fire, etc. वर्तते - abides तं विचिन्त्य - having meditated on it अथ - thereafter सर्वदैवतम् - the divinity principle in all that is divine प्रणमेत् - one should salute - (47)

47. This divinity principle abides in all quarters and in all entities such as fire, etc. Having meditated on it, one should salute this divinity principle in all that is divine.

All pervasiveness is in the feature of that entity which is everywhere and in everything. It means that such an entity namely the divinity principle called *Paramātmā* (Brahman) is the real nature of everything and there is nothing other than it. Anything and everything that we come across has this *Paramātmā* principle as its basis. Knowing it directly

bereft of *upādhi* of anything and everything is itself the offering of salutations to it. Ultimate reality is only *Paramātmā*. On account of ignorance it appears as *jagat* comprising *nāma* and *rūpa*. The *śruti* exhorts us to offer salutation (*namaḥ* - नमः). The meaning of the word *namaḥ* is *tyāga* (giving up). This is told by *Padmapādācārya* in his gloss on *Pañcākṣarī*. ‘The *tyāga* indeed is the meaning of *namaḥ*’ (*‘tyāgo hi namaso vācyaḥ’*). Whatever that is the superimposed *nāma-rūpa* called *jagat* is to be discarded and the remaining *sat cit ānanda* principle is to be sought. It is well-known that *jagat* consists of ‘*asti (sat), bhāti (cit), priya (ānanda), nāma and rūpa*’. The first triad is Brahman and the remaining two are *jagat* (*S.R.U.58; Dṛ.Dṛ.Vi.20*). Therefore when the *jagat* in the form of *nāma, rūpa* is discarded what remains is Brahman. That means all *adhyasta upādhis* including ignorance need to be given up and the *adhiṣṭhāna* Brahman alone is to be retained. The original *mantra* in its phrase ‘*tasmai devāya namo namaḥ*’ (repeated *namaḥ* unto that *Paramātmā*) mentions *namaḥ* twice. It signifies *ādara* (devotion, *śraddhā*, earnest efforts). With this ends the second chapter.

SOPĀDHI – BRAHMAN (ĪŚVARA)

The purpose of next chapter is

being told now.

तत्त्वयोगौ समुद्दिष्टवृत्तमस्याधिकारिणः ।
अथ सोपाधिकं वस्तु मन्दं प्रत्यभिधीयते ॥४८॥

उत्तमस्याधिकारिणः - to an excellent eligible seeker तत्त्वयोगौ - (in the earlier two chapters) the real nature of *ātmā* and the *yoga* as the means of gaining it समुद्दिष्टौ - were thoroughly told अथ - now (in the chapter 3) मन्दं प्रति - to the mediocre seeker (*manda adhikārī*) सोपाधिकं वस्तु - Brahman with *upādhi* अभिधीयते - is taught – (48)

48. (In the earlier two chapters) the real nature of *ātmā* and the *yoga* as the means of gaining it were thoroughly told to an excellent eligible seeker. Now (in the third chapter of this Upaniṣad) Brahman with *upādhi*, (i.e. *Īśvara*) is taught to the mediocre seeker (*manda adhikārī*).

The first chapter of this Upaniṣad mainly deals with the unfoldment of *ātmā* in its real nature. An excellent eligible seeker who is a *kr̥topāsti* (one who has successfully done the *upāsana* to the stage of gaining the *sākṣātkāra* of *upāsya daivata*) can gain *ātmasākṣātkāra* by that much teaching only. But the seeker who has unsteadiness of *citta* (mind) and influence of certain *pāpas*, will not be able to gain the *ātmasākṣātkāra*

by *śravaṇa* alone. He will have to accomplish the steadiness of mind by *yoga*. For such seeker the *yoga* was taught on the guidelines of Vedānta. Thus having taught to the best and the good eligible seeker in the first two chapters the mediocre (*manda*) eligible seeker is addressed now. The *manda* seeker is not in a position to give up the *upādhi*. The *upādhi*less divinity principle is beyond his ken. To such seekers the Brahman with *upādhi*, (i.e. *Īśvara*) is being taught now in the next two verses. This is the summary of first two *mantras* of second chapter wherein *Īśvara* is also referred to as *Rudra*.

ऐन्द्रजालिकवन्मायाजालवान्

एक ईश्वरः ।

नियच्छन् शक्तिभिर्लोकान्

सृजते संहरत्यपि ॥४९॥

मायाजालवान् - one who is wielding the illusion of *māyā* एकः - one ईश्वरः - overlord शक्तिभिः - by one's powers एन्द्र जालिकवत् - like a magician लोकान् - different *lokas* (fields of experiences) सृजते - Creates नियच्छन् - keeps regulated संहरति अपि - and destroys – (49)

49. *Īśvara* the only overlord wielding the illusion of *māyā* by his powers like a magician Creates, keeps regulated and destroys the different *lokas*.

The principle of *Īśvara* or *Parameśvara* who Creates, sustains and destroys the *jagat* is called *sopādhika Brahman*. To those to whom *nirupādhika* Brahman is beyond their grasp, the *sopādhika* Brahman needs to be taught first. That is why *Īśvara* is being described here. The *nirupādhika Paramātmattva* was described to be *aja* (unborn) (vs.46). It is neither born nor anything is born from it. In spite of this fact if it is said that from *Paramātmā* (Brahman) the *jagat* is born it must necessarily be a false projection or the product of *māyā* like the rope appearing as a snake, garland, stick, etc. There cannot be any Creation in reality. A *manda adhikāri* is the one who cannot grasp unborn entity all of a sudden. So he is first told that the Creator of this *sr̥ṣṭi* (Creation) endowed with the power of *māyā* is *Īśvara*.

Īśvara is one but the *māyā* has manifold powers. When it is understood from the *śāstras* and reasoning in accordance with it that there is no other independent cause of Creation, then it becomes clear that *Īśvara* alone is its cause. The *manda adhikāri* is not a dullard. He knows *śāstra*, etc. He has devotion towards *Īśvara* and busy in required *sādhanas*. But he is unable to understand that the experiential dualistic world is *asatya* (false) and *sat cit ānanda*

Brahman alone is the truth. He knows that *kāla* (time), *svabhāva* (nature), etc., cannot be the cause of Creation. By taking *Īśvara* alone as its cause, he can grasp that such cause is *aja* (unborn), etc., in course of time.

The only Creator *Īśvara* is further pointed out to be the *pratyagātmā* of all. This also shows *Īśvara* as the *antaryāmi* of all.

एक एवेश्वरस्तादृक्द्वितीयो
नैव विद्यते ।

जनानां प्रत्यगात्मासौ

जगत्सृष्ट्यादिकार्यपि ॥५०॥

तादृक् - of that type ईश्वरः एकः एव - *Īśvara* is one only द्वितीयः - second entity न विद्यते एव - is not there at all असौ - this *Īśvara* जगत्सृष्ट्यादिकारी अपि - in spite of being the Creator of *jagat* जनानां - of all *jīvas* प्रत्यगात्मा - is the *pratyagātmā* (real nature) – (50)

50. That type of *Īśvara* is one only. The second entity is not there at all. In spite of being oneself the Creator of *jagat*, *Īśvara* is the *pratyagātmā* (real nature) of all *jīvas*.

The statement, '*Īśvara* is one without the second' by its assertion of one and the negation of any second proves beyond any trace of doubt that *Īśvara* is non-dual. To prove further the non-dual nature of *Īśvara* it is also

pointed out that the real nature of all *jīvas* is identical with that of *Īśvara*. Therefore not only there is no second *Īśvara* but also there is no *jīva* distinct from *Īśvara*. Whatever that is considered as 'I', is in reality *pratyagātmā* only. That is *Īśvara* alone. Just as *Īśvara* Created the entire *jagat*, so also he entered all the individual bodies in the form of *jīva*. The *jagat* became *bhogyā* and the *jīva* became *bhoktā*. Therefore in reality there is nothing other than *Īśvara*. This is all the play of *Īśvara* through the means of his *māyā-śakti* (power of *māyā*). It is a known fact that the *śaktimān* (the one who has the power) and *śakti* (power) are inseparably identical and not two distinct entities. Though it is true that *śaktimān* can exist without the *śakti*, but *śaktimān* invariably includes *śakti*. Therefore *Īśvara* is described here as one without the second, (i.e. non-dual) because the *māyāśakti* cannot cast any duality in *Īśvara*.

The third *mantra* of second chapter of the Upaniṣad describes that *Rudra* (*Īśvara*) himself as *Virāṭ* having all eyes, mouths, arms, legs, etc. This is suggested in the next verse.

स विराड्रूपतां प्राप्य विश्वतश्चक्षुरादिमान् ।
सर्वेषां चक्षुराद्या ये तदीया एव तेऽखिलाः ॥५१॥

सः - That *Īśvara* विराट् रूपतां प्राप्य - having taken to the form of *Virāṭ* विश्वतः -

everywhere चक्षुरादिमान् - (became) the one who has eyes, etc. सर्वेषां - of all *jīvas* ये - whatever चक्षुराद्याः - eyes, etc., (are there) ते अखिलाः - all of them तदीयाः एव - belong to *Īśvara* only – (51)

51. That *Īśvara* having taken to the form of *Virāt* (became) the one who has eyes, etc., everywhere. All of eyes, etc., of all *jīvas* belong to *Īśvara* only.

Īśvara only becomes *Virāt* by assuming *samaṣṭi* (macrocosmic) *sthūla śarīra* (gross body). One and the same *cit* Brahman is *Īśvara* with the causal body, *Hiraṇyagarbha* with the subtle body and *Virāt* by taking to the gross body. Though *Hiraṇyagarbha* is not told here separately, the same gets included by the mention of all sense-organs (*indriyas*). *Virāt* includes all sense-centres (*indriya-golakas*) whereas *Hiraṇyagarbha* contains all senses (*indriyas*). The subtle entity, the *Hiraṇyagarbha*, comes into existence first and then the gross one *Virāt*. By the mention of *Virāt* the existence of *Hiraṇyagarbha* is taken for granted. The entire gross world is the body of *Virāt*. Our gross body is a part and parcel of *Virāt* though on account of ignorance we consider ourselves as separate individual entity. Similarly our *indriyas*, *prāṇas*, *antaḥkāraṇa*, (i.e. subtle body) is part of *Hiraṇyagarbha* which is the deity of *samaṣṭisūkṣma*

śarīra (macrocosmic subtle bodies). On account of *prārabdha* we get our physical body as the abode of *bhoga*, (i.e. *bhogāyatana*) and the subtle body as the means of *bhoga*, (i.e. *bhogasādhana*). But the fact is that both of them belong to *Virāt* and *Hiraṇyagarbha* respectively.

The fourth *mantra* of Upaniṣadic third chapter is a prayer to *Rudra* (*Īśvara*) to bless us with pure *antaḥkāraṇa*. The fifth *mantra* prays *Rudra* to reveal his real nature by *sākṣātkāra*. The sixth *mantra* is a prayer beseeching *Rudra* who is *Īśvara* as the deity of annihilation not to kill living beings and make his arrows propitious. The next verse tells us the usage of these three *mantras*.

यो देवानाम् इति प्रोक्तैस्त्रिभिर्मन्त्रैस्तमीश्वरम् ।
मुमुक्षुः प्रार्थयेतैव सदा बुद्धिविशुद्धये ॥५२॥

मुमुक्षुः - a *mumukṣu* सदा - always बुद्धिविशुद्धये - for the purity of *antaḥkāraṇa* 'यो देवानाम्' इति - 'yo devānām', etc. प्रोक्तैः त्रिभिः मन्त्रैः - by the three *mantras* told तम् ईश्वरम् - to that *Īśvara* (described earlier) प्रार्थयेत एव - should pray by all means – (52)

52. A *mumukṣu* should pray by all means always to *Īśvara* (described earlier) by the three *mantras* 'yo devānām', etc., to gain the purity of *antaḥkāraṇa*.

A *mumukṣu* should always surrender to *Īśvara*. *Upāsanā* of other deities is of no use on the path of *mokṣa*. Here the prayer to *Īśvara* who was described as the wielder of *māyā* and who assumes *Virāṭ* form is exhorted. Prayer to *Īśvara* purifies the mind which is indispensable to gain *Brahmajñāna*.

The first *mantra* is:

यो देवानां प्रभवश्चोद्भवश्च
विश्वाधिपो रुद्रो महर्षिः ।
हिरण्यगर्भं जनयामास पूर्वं स नो
बुद्ध्या शुभया संयुक्तु ॥

‘The *Īśvara* is the one who produces *devatās* and bestows various riches and powers on them and totally protects Creation. He is the destroyer of all sorrows and omniscient. He produced *Hiranyagarbha* at the beginning of Creation. May that *Īśvara* favour us with pure *antaḥkaraṇa*’.

Īśvara is a *prabhava* (the cause of birth) of all *devas* (deities). In addition he is the source of riches, powers and glories of *devas*. The word ‘*deva*’ as an indicatory word signifies entire Creation. There is another reading of ‘*Viśvādhiko*’ in the place of ‘*Viśvādhipo*’. Thus *Īśvara* is not only the protector of entire Creation, but is also beyond its realm and independent of it. ‘*Rud*’ (रुद्) means sorrow. *Īśvara* is called *Rudra* because he destroys all sorrows.

He is the only refuge of all *jīvas* who are caught up in the sorrows of *samsāra*. He is *maharṣi* because of being omniscient. The one who knows past, present, future besides that which *indriyātīta* (imperceptible) and beyond the realm of reasoning is called *maharṣi*. He created *Hiranyagarbha* (*sūtrātmā*) in the beginning of Creation. To such *Īśvara* the earnest prayers are offered to bless us with *cittasuddhi* so that we can gain *Brahmajñāna*.

The second *mantra* is:

या ते रुद्र शिवा तनूरघोराऽपापकाशिनी ।
तया नस्तनुवा शन्तमया गिरिशन्ताऽभिचाकशीः ॥

‘Oh *Rudra* residing on the top of the mountain and who grants *mokṣa* (*Giriśanta*)! Whatever your outward form (*tanu*) which gives auspiciousness, joy including liberation, (i.e. the form that is *Śiva*), which is not fierce with the wielding of weapons (*aghora*) besides which manifests as *punya* even to the extent of *Brahmātmajñāna* opposed to *punya* and *pāpa* by that form which is of the nature of *paramānanda* (*śantamaya*) look at us benevolently, (i.e. please ensure that we get the highest good *mokṣa*)’, (*abhicākaśiḥ*).

Abhicākaśiḥ also means ‘reveal to us your real nature by *sākṣātkāra*’. *Rudra* or *Śiva* has both benevolent (*aghora*) and fierce (*ghora*) appearances

called *tanu* (body). To those who are *dhārmika mumukṣus*, devotees, he is *aghora* (pleasing). To those who indulge in *adharma* and have no devotion or at the time of *pralaya* he is fierce (*ghora*) wielding the weapons. It is like the good and terrific facets of fire or electricity. They are very useful to us if handled properly. Otherwise they can cause disaster.

The third *mantra* is:

यामिषुं गिरिशन्त हस्ते बिभर्ष्यस्तवे।

शिवां गिरिन् तां कुरु मा हिंसीः पुरुषं जगत् ॥

‘Oh *Giriśanta* (*Rudra* who protects the mountain or uplifts those who seek you)! Whatever arrow (*iṣu*) you are holding (*bibharṣi*) in your hand (*haste*) to throw (*astave*) at sinful or wicked people, please make that arrow propitious, (i.e. please do not kill people or destroy other things)’.

The second and the third *mantras* appear in *Rudrapraśna* hymn. *Rudra* being the manifestation of *Īśvara* as the deity of destruction he is appeased so that we derive from him only the good. It is well-known that in any creation along with its birth and sustenance, the destruction also is an inevitable part. We should conduct ourselves in such a way that we get *mokṣa* and get once forever freed from the realm of calamitous *samsāra*.

Prayer with *śraddhā* (trust) and devotion is a very effective *karma* for gains here and hereafter for all. As for *mumukṣus* it is indispensable until one gets totally absorbed in Brahman. It wards off the slips between the cup and the lip during the pursuits of gaining *Brahmajñāna* besides procuring the prerequisites necessary to gain *mokṣa*. At times seemingly it appears as if the prayers are not working. But the fruitfulness of prayers depend on many factors such as *śraddhā* in *Īśvara* and love (devotion) for him, intensity of prayers, past drag of adverse *karmas*, righteous conduct in life, etc. It is said that genuine prayers result in four types of responses from *Īśvara* as the case be. (i) ‘Come on, take this what you want’. (ii) ‘It is not yet time to get what you ask for’. (iii) ‘My dear, what you ask for is not good for you’. (iv) ‘My child, I have better plans for you’. But we are so obsessed with the fulfilment of desires that we totally ignore the other possibilities. What is needed is full confidence with a sense of total security in what *Īśvara* does for us. It is for our good in the long run. Our trust in *Īśvara* must be deep rooted as in the case of a gigantic tree that is evergreen and not superficial roots like that of paddy plants which dry the moment the field becomes dry. At the final level, *Īśvara* alone can be claimed by us as ‘my’ with the hand

on our chest, who is our infallible friend, philosopher and the guide. If it appears that we are not yet favoured by *Īśvara*, better introspect ‘what do I lack?’

After the description of *Īśvara* in *saguna* form and its utility the seventh *mantra* (*Śv.U.* 3-7) tells us the *nirguna* nature of *Īśvara* along with the result of gaining its knowledge. The next verse describes it.

ततः शुद्धमतिर्ब्रह्म

सर्वभूतेष्ववस्थितम् ।

अन्तर्बहिश्च संव्याप्तं ज्ञात्वा

स्यान्मृतिवर्जितः ॥५३॥

ततः - after शुद्धमतिः - becoming the one of pure *antaḥkaraṇa* (by prayers) सर्वभूतेषु - in all beings अवस्थितम् - the one who abides अन्तःबहिः च - besides who is inside and outside संव्याप्तं - everywhere pervades thoroughly ब्रह्म - Brahman ज्ञात्वा - having known by *sākṣātkāra* मृति वर्जितः स्यात् - the *jñānī* becomes free from death, i.e. gets liberated – (53)

53. After becoming the one of pure *antaḥkaraṇa* (as a result of prayers) having known by *sākṣātkāra* the Brahman who abides in all beings and pervades everywhere thoroughly, the *jñānī* becomes free from death, i.e. gets liberated.

After gaining the purity of *antaḥkaraṇa* the seeker becomes

eligible to gain *Brahmasākṣātkāra* in *nirguna* form. Brahman abides in all beings and therefore abides in ‘me’ also. Therefore its *sākṣātkāra* (direct experience) is possible. Brahman not only abides in all objects and beings but also inside and outside of everything. For example, to begin with it appears that the space is in the mud-pot. After further thinking it is known that the space is outside the pot also. Further inquiry shows that the material cause ‘mud’ of mud-pot through its successive causes of water, fire and air is nothing but space only. Thus everything is known to be space. Similarly suppose a basket is made of ice with the help of a suitable mould and after filling up with water it is placed in a small lake. Now all that is there is water inside, outside and the ice-basket itself. Similarly Brahman is everywhere inside and outside the world including in the form of *adhiṣṭhāna* of all *adhyasta upādhis* called *jagat*. In this non-dual experience there is no fear because something other (duality) which is the source of fear is not there. Because of the knowledge of real nature of oneself free from even the least trace of any *upādhi* the *aparokṣa-jñānī* has no transmigration. By the *upāsanā* of *sopādhika Brahma* one goes to *Brahmaloka* and gains *kramamukti*. Thus by the knowledge of *Īśvara* one becomes deathless.

Lest someone thinks that such Brahman is not experiential, the ṛṣi Śvetāśvatara narrates his *aparokṣa-anubhava* of identity between *jīva-brahma* by declaring ‘I know self-luminous Brahman beyond the realm of ignorance. Anyone else can get freed from *samsāra* characterized by death for which there is no other means than gaining this *aparokṣa-jñāna*’ (Śv.U.3-8). This *mantra* appears in the famous *Puruṣa-sūkta* also. It is summarized in the next verse.

श्वेताश्वतरनामाऽहं पुरुषं

वेद्मि तं प्रभुम् ।

अन्योऽपि तं विदित्वैव

मृत्युमत्येति नान्यथा ॥५४॥

अहं श्वेताश्वतरनामा - I, called Śvetāśvatara तं - that प्रभुं पुरुषं - ever-existing Brahman वेद्मि - know directly (*aparokṣatayā*) अन्यः अपि - any other person also तं विदित्वा एव - having known it alone मृत्युम् अत्येति - goes beyond the realm of death अन्यथा न - not by any other means—(54)

54. I, called Śvetāśvatara know directly (*aparokṣatayā*) the ever-existing Brahman. Any other person also having known it alone goes beyond the realm of death (called *mokṣa*). (But) it is not possible to gain it by any other means.

It is true that the Veda is the *pramāṇa*. Yet, when a person known to us affirms it based on his direct experience of the ultimate reality it becomes easy for us to ascertain it. That is why in the Vedas at places ṛṣis cite the evidence of their *aparokṣa-anubhava*. A *śrotriya brahmaniṣṭha guru* who teaches also corroborates the teaching by his *aparokṣānubhava*. Ṛṣi Śvetāśvatara refers to himself as the hitherto *jīva* by the word ‘I’ and declares the identity of its real nature with the ever-existing Brahman, based on his experience. The real nature of everyone is Brahman only. Therefore anyone else who follows meticulously the means laid down by the *sāstra* also can find the same truth. There is no other means than *Brahmasākṣātkāra* to gain the *mokṣa*. This is not just the ascertainment of Śvetāśvatara ṛṣi only but that of all *Brahmajñānīs*. This *mantra* also appears in *Puruṣa-sūkta*. There the *draṣṭā* is ṛṣi Nārāyaṇa. His experience is also the same. The experience of such *Brahmajñānīs* proves that the *Brahmajñāna* alone is the means of *mokṣa*.

The ninth *mantra* says that there is nothing more exalted than Brahman. So also there is nothing smaller (or subtler) or greater than it. Entire cosmos is filled up with Brahman (Śv.U.3-9).

The tenth *mantra* says that Brahman is the most exalted entity free from forms and sorrows. The one who knows this ultimate reality discovers oneself to be immortal and those who know not continue to suffer the sorrow (Śv.U.3-10). These two *mantras* are explained now.

यस्मात्परं नापरं वा किञ्चिदस्ति तदद्वयम् ।
वृक्षवन्निश्चलं तेन पूर्णं सर्वमिदं जगत् ॥५५॥

यस्मात् परं - superior (more exalted) to whom अपरं वा - or inferior to it किञ्चित् न अस्ति - nothing is there तत् - that entity अद्वयम् - is non-dual in nature वृक्षवत् - like a motionless tree in a breezeless place निश्चलं - steady तेन - by that entity (Brahman) इदं सर्वम् जगत् - this entire jagatपूर्ण - filled up - (55)

55. Non-dual is that entity which has no other distinct entities either superior (more exalted) or inferior to it. It is steady like a motionless tree in a breezeless place. By that non-dual Brahman this entire *jagat* is filled up.

The word '*para*' means 'distinct'. Therefore '*yasmāt param*' means 'distinct from whom'. But the words *para* and *apara* also mean superior and inferior. Therefore the phrase means that there is nothing distinct from Brahman which is either superior or inferior to it. Such an entity alone can be non-dual.

To show the changeless (*nirvikāri*) nature of such an entity an illustration is given of a steady tree which is stationary by nature and has motionless branches, twigs and leaves in the absence of even the breeze. Such changeless Brahman being the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of *jagat*, it is in and through the *adhyasta jagat* because the *adhiṣṭhāna* pervades the *adhyasta* entity.

एतद्विदुर्मृत्युहीनास्ते स्युर्ये तु न तद्विदुः ।
ते दुःखमेव गच्छन्ति न तत्सोपाधिकेक्षणे ॥५६॥

ये - those who एतद् विदुः - know this Brahman ते - they मृत्युहीनाः स्युः - they are free from death, (i.e. *samsāra*) (ये) तु - whereas those तत् - that Brahman न विदुः - do not know ते - they दुःखम् एव - only sorrow गच्छन्ति - get तत् - that sorrow सोपाधिकेक्षणे - on knowing *Īśvara* (who is endowed with *upādhi*) न - is not there - (56)

56. Those who know Brahman get freed from death (*samsāra*) whereas those who do not know get sorrows only. But that sorrow cannot be there on knowing *Īśvara* (who is endowed with *upādhi*).

The death or the calamitous *samsāra* is in the realm of *upādhi* which is the product of self-ignorance. On gaining *Brahmasākṣātkāra* there is neither ignorance nor *upādhis* breeding

death or *samsāra*. There is only *paramānanda* without any trace of sorrow. As for others who continue to be ignorant with their identification with their bodies it is obvious that the sorrowful *samsāra* continues. But there is an exception. Those also get freed from sorrows in due course who have discovered that the *sopādhika Brahma*, (i.e. *Īśvara*) is the basis of entire *jagat* and that *Īśvara* alone on account of *māyā* manifests as *jagat*.

From the eleventh *mantra* onwards the Upaniṣad (Śv.U.3-11 to 18) describes the *sopādhika* form of *Īśvara* which is suggested now.

दुर्लक्ष्यो निरुपाध्यात्मा सूक्ष्मधीवर्जितैर्नरैः ।
सुलक्ष्य एव सोपाधिस्तस्मादेवं स्मरेदमुम् ॥५७॥

सूक्ष्मधीवर्जितैः नरैः - to those who do not have the subtle *buddhi* (pure *antaḥkaraṇa*) capable of comprehending the imperceptible (*atīndriya*) entity निरुपाध्यात्मा - *upādhiless ātmā* दुर्लक्ष्यः - is very difficult to know सोपाधिः (आत्मा) - (but) *sopādhī-ātmā (Īśvara)* एव - alone सुलक्ष्यः - is not that much difficult to ascertain तस्मात् - therefore एवं - in the manner that is going to be told अमुम् - that *sopādhika ātmā* स्मरेत् - should be known - (57)

57. To those who do not have the subtle *buddhi* (pure *antaḥkaraṇa*) capable

of comprehending the imperceptible (*atīndriya*) entity the *upādhiless ātmā* is very difficult to know. The *sopādhika-ātmā (Īśvara)* is not that much difficult to ascertain. Therefore that *sopādhika-ātmā* should be known in the manner that is going to be told (in vs.58; Śv.U.3-11 to 18).

It is very difficult to know the *upādhiless ātmā* because it needs indispensably the pure and steady *antaḥkaraṇa* called subtle *buddhi (sūkṣma dhī)* which alone can gain the *sākṣātkārā* of *nirupādhika* imperceptible (*atīndriya*) *ātmā*. Without that it is impossible to know the real nature of both *Īśvara* and *jīva* also in their *nirupādhika* nature. Even *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa tells that it is more difficult to have *Paramātma-sākṣātkāra* because the identification with the body needs to be given up. As for knowing *Īśvara dehābhimāna* ('I'ness in the body) is taken for granted (B.G.12-5).

सर्वाननशिरोग्रीवः

सर्वभूतगुहाशयः ।

वशी सर्वस्य लोकस्य

स्थावरस्य चरस्य च ॥५८॥

सर्वानन-शिरो-ग्रीवः - *Īśvara* has all mouths, heads and necks, (i.e. they belong to *Īśvara*) सर्वभूतगुहाशयः - he abides in all *antaḥkaraṇa* सर्वस्य - of entire स्थावरस्य चरस्य च - of mobile and

immobile लोकस्य - of world वशी - the ruler – (58)

58. *Īśvara* has all mouths, heads and necks, (i.e. they belong to *Īśvara*). He abides in all *antaḥkaraṇa* and rules the entire world consisting of mobile and immobile entities.

A lay person can easily know that he is so and so, he is tall, etc., by taking the physical body as ‘I’. But it is very difficult to know who that ‘I’ is free from body, senses, *prāṇa*, the mind and intellect. With great effort he may know that ‘I am the knower, experiencer, enjoyer, sufferer, etc.’ But it is not possible for him to know *sākṣī* distinct from *buddhi*. At best it may be possible to infer based on an inquiry into the deep sleep state that ‘I am some entity distinct from *antaḥkaraṇa*’. Similarly it is easy to understand *Īśvara* as the Creator, sustainer and destroyer of *jagat*. But it is difficult to know *Īśvara* free from *upādhi* as *sat cit ānanda* alone. Therefore the *śāstra* describes at many places *Īśvara* or *sopādhika* Brahman. *Īśvara* is described as having all mouths, heads, etc. Though we cannot see all of them, we can certainly know that our mouth, head, body, etc., belong to him. So also it is *Īśvara* who is abiding in our *antaḥkaraṇa* and enables all of our functions. He is the regulator, the ultimate master of everything. Whether

it is inert or sentient, it is *Īśvara* alone, and the entire cosmos is under his rule. By knowing and remembering in this form finally releases the *mumukṣu* from the bondage of *samsāra*.

The nineteenth *mantra* points out that *Īśvara* in his real nature is without hands, legs, eyes, ears, etc. Yet, he can seize, run, see, hear, etc., in the sense all these faculties belong to him only and *indriyas* borrow them from him. He knows everything but no one can know him as an object. He is called *mahān* (great) and *agrya* (the first one). This is told in the next verse.

विश्वाकारजनेः प्राक् च सर्वव्यवहृतिक्षमः ।
अपाणिपादो जवनो गृहीता सर्वशक्तियुक् ॥५९॥

विश्वाकारजनेः प्राक् - before the birth of *jagat* having all forms was born च - also सर्वव्यवहृतिक्षमः - (this *ātmā*) is capable of taking to all functions (in the *jagat*) अपाणिपादः (अपि) - without the hands and legs also जवनः गृहीता - he runs fast (without legs) and catches (without hands) सर्वशक्तियुक् - he is endowed with all powers, (i.e. omnipotent) – (59)

59. *Ātmā* is capable of taking to all functions (in the *jagat*) even before it (*jagat*) was born. It catches without hands and runs without legs. It is endowed with all powers, (i.e. omnipotent).

Īśvara is described as omnipotent

(*sarvaśaktiyuk*). He has all powers to Create, sustain and destroy the *jagat*. Even before the *jagat* was born he has all powers in him for what needs to be done to Create without depending on the *jagat*. It is the power of *māyā*. It is there even before Creation. It is just like we having the power of walking even when we do not walk. Similar fact is described in a figurative way that he runs without the legs, etc. Thus for *manda adhikārī* though *nirupādhika Brahmajñāna* is difficult, he can gain the knowledge of *sopādhika-Brahma* without much difficulty.

The twentieth *mantra* of third chapter describes that *ātmā* is smaller than the smallest and bigger than the biggest that one can imagine. It abides in the cave of *hṛdaya (antaḥkaraṇa)* of all. The seeker who sees *ātmā* by the grace of *Īśvara (dhātuprasādāt)* gets freed from sorrows. This is told now.

अणोरणीयान् दुर्लक्ष्यो

महीयान् महतः स्फुटः ।

इत्यात्मानं शास्त्रदृष्ट्या पश्यतो

नास्ति दुःखिता ॥६०॥

शास्त्रदृष्ट्या - in accordance with the guideline of *śāstra* आत्मानं - *ātmā* is अणोः अणीयान् - smaller than the small, (i.e. *nirupādhika*) दुर्लक्ष्यः - (and therefore) very difficult to know (for a *manda adhikārī*) महतः महीयान् - (so also) is

bigger than the big, (i.e. *sopādhika*) स्फुटः - (and therefore) is very clear to know इति - thus पश्यतः - to the one who knows दुःखिता - being sorrowful न अस्ति - is not there - (60)

60. To the one who knows in accordance with the *śāstra* that *ātmā* is smaller than the small, (i.e. *nirupādhika*) (and therefore) very difficult to know (for a *manda adhikārī*), (so also) is bigger than the big, (i.e. *sopādhika*) (and therefore) is very clear to know. To the one who knows thus sorrows are not there.

The words small and big are used in the sense of dimension. *Paramātmā* is said to be smaller than the small. In the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣat* (5-9) the minute size of the *jīva* is demonstrated as follows. A hair is divided into hundred parts and this process is continued hundred times by splitting further one of the hundred part at every stage. The minutest size one gets at last is said to be the size of *jīva*. This should not be misunderstood that the actual size of *jīva* is being measured. It is an imaginary method only to show that *jīva* in its real nature *ātmā* is imperceptible (*atīndriya*). We know that smaller an entity, it is less visible. *Ātmā* is also described to be *vibhu* (all pervasive) in nature. This shows that *aṇu* (small) cannot be taken literally. The *jīva* is *sopādhika* whereas

ātmā is *nirupādhika*. That shows the *ātmā* to be more *aṇu* than the *aṇu*. We cannot comprehend even *brahmāṇḍa*. Then how is it possible for us to know by our methods the *Īśvara* who is infinite in nature? Yet, it is possible to know if we proceed as guided by the *śāstra* by preparing our mind, etc. That is why it is told *Śāstra-drṣṭyā sphuṭaḥ* (very clearly known when pursued as guided by the *śāstra*). One who knows the identity between *pratyagātmā* and *paramātmā* in accordance with the *śāstra* becomes totally sorrowless. There is no occasion for sorrow in our non-dual real nature which is directly known to be 'I'. Sorrows are possible when there is something other than 'I'.

The explanation of the third chapter is now concluded by suggesting the means to know the formless, *upādhiless* Brahman after knowing the *sopādhika* one which was hinted in the *mantra* twenty (*Śv.U.3-20*) as *dhātuprasādāt*.

स्थूलदर्शी तु साकारे सार्वान्त्ये वासिते सति ।
निराकारं ततो बोद्धुं प्रार्थयेतैश्वरं वपुः ॥६१॥

स्थूलदर्शी तु - but the seeker who knows the gross *jagat* as *Īśvara* साकारे सार्वान्त्ये - in the *Īśvara* with form who is the *ātmā* of all वासिते सति - when the mind is made to get absorbed by the intensity of such *saṃskāras* ततः - thereafter निराकारं

- formless Brahman बोद्धुं - to know ईश्वरं वपुः - the form of *Īśvara* प्रार्थयेत - should pray to - (61)

61. But the seeker who knows the gross *jagat* as *Īśvara*, after making his mind get absorbed in it (*Īśvara*) with form who is the *ātmā* of all by the intensity of its *saṃskāra* should pray to the form of *Īśvara* to know the formless Brahman.

'*Sthūladarśī*' is the one who knows that the macrocosmic gross *Virāṭ-body* is the body of *Īśvara* and takes it as one's *upāsya* (the entity to be meditated upon). Gradually he develops firm impression that the *Īśvara* with the form is everything. Until such conviction gets deeply rooted the *sādhaka* should pursue *sākāra-brahmopāsanā* (*Īśvaropāsanā*) intently. One should not be content with mere vision (*darśana*) of *Īśvara*. The prayers and *upāsanās* about *Īśvara* are advised only to get the eligibility to gain *nirākāra-brahma-sākṣātkāra*. It is a first step so that *nirguṇa* Brahman reveals its real nature.

ĀTMA-VICĀRA (SELF-INQUIRY)

The fourth chapter of the Upaniṣad mainly contains prayers as the means to invoke *Īśvara's* grace (*dhātuprasād* - *Śv.U.3-20*) to gain *nirākāra-brahmajñāna* as exhorted in

the earlier verse. Here the prayers are not meant for gains here or hereafter. They ascertain the real nature of *jīva* and *Īśvara* in different ways with prayers to know the following facets.

- i) *Īśvara* is the cause of *jagat* on account of *māyā*.
- ii) *Jīva* only is bound being under the control of *māyā*.
- iii) *Jīva* and *Īśvara* are identical in reality.
- iv) Ignorance is the cause of duality.
- v) Self-ignorance is *mithyā*. Therefore it is fit to be discarded.
- vi) Non-dual Brahman alone is worthy to be sought.

With this in view the next verse tells the purpose of the first four *mantras* (Śv.U.4-1 to 4).

य एकोऽवर्ण इत्यादि

स्तुवन्मन्त्रचतुष्टयात् ।

प्रार्थ्याथ मायाजीवौ च

बुद्धसुप्तौ विचारयेत् ॥६२॥

‘यः एकः अवर्णः’ - (by) the *mantra* ‘*yaḥ ekaḥ avarṇaḥ*’ इत्यादि - etc. मन्त्रचतुष्टयात् - by the (first) four *mantras* स्तुवन् - praising (*Īśvara*) प्रार्थ्य - having prayed to अथ - thereafter मायाजीवौ - *māyā* and *jīva* च - and बुद्धसुप्तौ - the one who is awake, (i.e. *Īśvara* who has knowledge) and the other who is asleep, (i.e. ignorant *jīva*) विचारयेत् - should be inquired into - (62)

62. By the first four *mantras* beginning from ‘*yaḥ ekaḥ avarṇaḥ*’, etc., having prayed to *Īśvara* (to favour with *Brahmajñāna*) by praising him, thereafter *māyā* and *jīva* besides *jñānī* *Īśvara* and *ajñānī jīva* should be inquired into.

The first *mantra* (Śv.U.4-1) is as follows wherein the *mumukṣu* by describing the nature of *Īśvara* prays to him to favour with *Brahmajñāna*.

‘यः एकः अवर्णः बहुधा शक्तियोगात् वर्णान्
अनेकान् निहितार्थः दधाति ।
वि च एति च अन्ते विश्वम् आदौ सः देवः सः नः
बुद्ध्या शुभया संयुनक्तु ॥’

‘*Īśvara* is one (*eka*) non-dual in nature. There is nothing other than him. Without being the second he is the *adhiṣṭhāna* of entire duality. *Īśvara* cannot be described (*avarṇa*). To describe any entity words have to be employed. But words can operate only in the field of *jāti* (species), *guṇa* (attributes), *kriyā* (action), *rūḍhi* (conventional meaning) and *sambandha* (relation) which are not there in *Īśvara*. Even then he is endowed with many powers (*śaktiyoga*) by the means of which he can be described. He assumes (*dadhāti*) innumerable (*anekān*) names and forms (*varṇān*) without any utility (*nihitārthaḥ*). If at all any purpose of Creation is there it is only to serve as

the means to gain *Brahmajñāna*. Finally the *jagat* merges back into *Īśvara* because he is its *upādāna kāraṇa*. Himself having become *jīva*, *Īśvara* Creates *jagat* to give *karmaphalabhoga*. He gives *mokṣa* also by casting the reflection of his real nature in *Brahmākāra-vṛtti*. The same *Īśvara* is prayed to bless us with the *buddhi* which gives *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. That *buddhi* alone can be auspicious (*śubhā*).

In the second *mantra* (*Śv.U.4-2*) the *Īśvara* with the glories of *ādhi-daivika samaṣṭi upādhis* projected by inexplicable *māyā* is described. Thereby the meditation of these *upādhis* as Brahman is also suggested.

‘तत् एव अग्निः तत् एव आदित्यः
तत् वायुः तत् उ चन्द्रमाः ।
तत् एव शुक्रं तत् ब्रह्म
तत् आपः तत् प्रजापतिः ॥’

‘That *Īśvara* principle itself is the fire, sun, air, moon, *śukra* (planet Venus or stars which are bright or self-luminous knowledge-principle Brahman itself), *Hiranyagarbha*, water, *Virāṭ*’.

Thus the *Īśvara* is described as all names and forms.

The third *mantra* (*Śv.U.4-3*) describes the Creation of *vyaṣṭi upādhis* and points out that the entity that abides in all of them as *cidābhāsa* like the

reflected moon in the water is *Īśvara* himself.

‘त्वं स्त्री त्वं पुमान् असि
त्वं कुमारः उत वा कुमारी ।
त्वं जीर्ण दण्डेन वञ्चसि
त्वं जातः भवसि विश्वतः मुखः ॥’

This is a statement of a *mantra-draṣṭā* after direct knowledge of Brahman through praise and meditation. Therefore the divinity principle Brahman or *Īśvara* is addressed in second person (*madhyama puruṣa*) as ‘you’. So the *mantra* means:

‘You are woman, man, *kumāra* (boy of 5-6 years), *kumārī* (girl of 5-6 years), old person walking with a stick. You having taken birth (in terms of *upādhis*) become the one who has endless mouths’.

The fourth *mantra* (*Śv.U. 4-4*) describes *Īśvara* in the various forms such as insects, animals, birds, lightning, seasons, etc., to show his *sarvātma* nature (as the basis of everything).

नीलः पतंगः हरितः लोहिताक्षः
तडिद् गर्भः ऋतवः समुद्राः ।
अनादिमत् त्वं विभुत्वेन वर्तसे
यतः जातानि भुवनानि विश्वा ॥

‘The *Īśvara* who is causeless (*anādimat*) from whom all *lokas* (*bhuvanāni*) are born, himself appears as blue or black bee, green coloured parrot

with red eyes, horses, etc., the cultivated animals, clouds having lightning in itself, seasons, oceans. You (*Īśvara*) remain pervading everything’.

Īśvara is described here as *anādimat*. It means he has neither any cause for himself nor is he the cause of anything. And yet, if it is said that the *jagat* is born out of *Īśvara* it only means that Creation is *vivarta* on account of *māyā* (just an appearance without itself undergoing any change) like the appearance of a snake in a rope because of its ignorance. Or it can be considered as the glory of *Īśvara* who appears in terms of expanse of all false *upādhis* all the time remaining in its *paramānanda svarūpa* without any change in oneself.

After taking to the prayer by these four *mantras* an inquiry has to be conducted about the nature of *māyā* and *jīva* besides that of one who knows *Brahmasvarūpa* (a *jñānī*) and the *nitya-jñānī Īśvara*, and the one who is asleep to one's real nature (*ajñānī jīva*). Thus by inquiry it needs to be ascertained that *Paramātmā* (Brahman) is all names and forms. The entire Creation is in reality Brahman only. This fact has to be discovered. Otherwise there is the possibility of slipping into *sūnyavāda* (nihilism) of *bauddhas*. It is also necessary to know that *māyā* is the

power of *Īśvara*. Or else it will be like the *prakṛti* of *sāṅkhya*, independent of their concept of *puruṣa*. Mere inquiry in *māyā* may also establish that everything is the product of *māyā* but it will not be able to prove Brahman as the *satya adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) of *jagat*. The *satya* Brahman can be revealed only by *śruti* and the reasoning in accordance with the *śruti*. Therefore prayer is first advised which inevitably presupposes the existence of *Īśvara*/Brahman.

AJĀ (FEMALE GOAT AND THE BIRTHLESS)

The fifth *mantra* describes *māyā* and *jīva* with the help of a metaphor of female goat (*ajā*) as *māyā* and male one as the *jīva* (*aja*). The etymological meaning of *ajā* is birthless (in the feminine gender). ‘One male goat sleeps keeping a carnal company with a female goat having red, white and black colours who produces many offsprings similar to itself. But another male goat who has already enjoyed such company with it discards the same’ (*Śv.U.4-5*). This *mantra* is explained now.

लोके काचिदजा

वर्णत्रयोपेता बहुप्रजाः ।

सृजते तामजः कश्चित्सेवतेऽन्यस्तु

तां त्यजेत् ॥६३॥

लोके - in the world काचित् - some
वर्णत्रयोपेता - having three colours अजा -

female goat बहुप्रजाः - many offsprings
सृजते - produces ताम् - it कश्चित् अजः - some
male goat सेवते - enjoys carnally अन्यः तु -
whereas some other one तां त्यजेत् -
discards it – (63)

63. In the world some female goat
having three colours produces many
offsprings. Some male goat enjoys it
carnally whereas some other one
discards it.

तेजोऽबन्नात्मिका तद्वन्माया

वर्णैस्त्रिभिर्युता ।

आसक्तो भजते मायां

विरक्तस्तु विमुञ्चति ॥६४॥

तद्वत् - similarly तेजोऽबन्नात्मिका माया -
is the *māyā* in the form of fire, water and
earth (*anna*) त्रिभिः वर्णैः - by three colours
युता - endowed with आसक्तः - the *jīva*
engrossed in sense-pleasures मायां भजते -
enjoys *māyā* विरक्तस्तु विमुञ्चति - but the
dispassionate (*virakta*) *jīva* discards it
– (64)

64. Similarly the *māyā* is
endowed with three colours in the form
of fire, water and earth (*anna*). The *jīva*
engrossed in sense-pleasures enjoys
māyā but the dispassionate (*virakta*)
discards it.

Goat is a well-known mammal.
Generally they have black and white
colours. But at times some have red

colour also in addition. Female goat
produces many offsprings. Such a
female goat symbolizes *māyā* which is
also denoted by the word *ajā*. *Īśvara*
Creates the *jagat* by the means of *māyā*.
Like a female goat the effects of *māyā*
are always being produced incessantly.
Just as a male goat enjoys the female one
carnally the *jīva* also indulges intently in
the *māyākārya* the *jagat*. In reality the
jīva being changeless (*nirvikārī*) and the
māyā being false, there is no occasion of
any indulgence. Yet it appears so
because of erroneous notions. Those
jīvas who have developed *viveka* and
vairāgya by the exposure to the
teachings of *śāstra* and *ācārya* discover
the futility of sense-objects and so turn
away from the *jagat* of *nāma* and *rūpa*.
This is indicated by the fact that some
male goats discard the female one
enjoyed hitherto. The *jīva* who has
discarded the *bhoga* of *māyā* gives up
māyā also and discovers one's real
nature by taking to *śravaṇa*, *manana*
and *nididhyāsana*. *Chāndogyopaniṣad*
describes the three colours of *māyā*
through its three effects of red coloured
teja (fire), white coloured water and the
dark one *pṛthivī* (called *anna* therein)
(*Ch.U.6-2-3, 4; 6-3-1 to 4*).

The *jīva* falls for *māyā* because of
āsakti (love for sense-objects) and gives
it up by *virakti* (*vairāgya*). The ultimate

purport (*tātparyā*) of *śāstra* is to free us from the thralldom of *māyā* and not to continue its *bhoga*. *Avivekī* thinks that the *jagat* or *samsāra* is meant for *bhoga* whereas the *vivekī* knows it to be worthy of discarding. The *jīva* attached to sense-objects gets entangled in the *bhoga* of *māyā* and remains bound but the *vairāgyavān* ends for oneself the existence of *māyā* itself and gets liberated. *Mokṣa* is possible only by discovery that *māyā* truly does not exist. Thus *māyā* and the *jīvas* with *āsakti* and *virakti* were described.

SUPARṆAU (JĪVA AND ĪŚVARA AS TWO BIRDS)

The sixth and the seventh *mantras* point out with the means of a metaphor that *ajñāna* (self-ignorance) binds and *ātmajñāna* liberates. 'Two birds friendly with each other who always dwell together perch in proximity on the same tree (of *samsāra*). One of them (the *jīva*) undergoes the *bhoga* of one's *karmaphalas* with relish (in the sense it does not attempt to stop it) whereas the other bird, (i.e. *Īśvara*) without undergoing the *bhoga* (simply) witnesses. On the one and the same tree helplessly ensnared, the *jīva* (bird) being deluded (by *māyā*) grieves. (But) when it seeks the other one (bird) *Īśvara* and gains *sākṣātkāra* of his real glorious nature, it gets totally freed from

sorrows forever (only by that much accomplishment) (*Śv.U.4-6, 7*). This is explained in the next four verses.

विरक्तः कर्त्रकर्तारौ

विचिन्त्यात्स्वस्य विग्रहे ।

चिच्छायावानहंकारः कर्ता

चिद्भाति केवला ॥६५॥

विरक्तः - dispassionate seeker स्वस्य विग्रहे - in one's body कर्त्रकर्तारौ - the doer (*kartā*) and the non-doer (*akartā* the *cit* or *Īśvara*) विचिन्त्यात् - should ascertain चिच्छायावान् अहंकारः - the 'I' notion in the body called *ahaṃkāra* endowed with *cidābhāsa* (reflection of *cit*) कर्ता - is the doer (*jīva*) चित् - (but) *sākṣī caitanya* केवला - unattended by *upādhis* भाति - illuminates (as knowledge-principle) –(65)

65. A dispassionate seeker should ascertain in one's body the doer (*kartā*) and the non-doer (*akartā* the *cit* or *Īśvara*). 'I' notion in the body called *ahaṃkāra* endowed with *cidābhāsa* (reflection of *cit*) is the doer (*jīva*). But the *sākṣī caitanya* (*cit*) unattended by *upādhis* (which) illuminates (as knowledge-principle) (is not *kartā*).

पादपे क्षुधितः पक्षी

फलमत्तीतरः पुनः ।

पश्यन्नास्ते तथा

विद्याद्भोक्तृत्साक्षिणावुभौ ॥६६॥

पादपे - on the tree क्षुधितः पक्षी - the hungry bird, (i.e. *jīva*) फलम् - the fruit, (i.e. *karmaphala*) अत्ति - eats (undergoes the *bhoga*) पुनः - further इतरः - the other bird, (i.e. *Īśvara* or *cit*) (who is not hungry) पश्यन् आस्ते - remains witnessing (without eating) तथा - accordingly भोक्तृ-तत्साक्षिणौ - *bhoktā (jīva)* and its *sākṣī उभौ* - both विद्यात् - should be known – (66)

66. The hungry bird, (i.e. *jīva*) on the tree (of *samsāra*) eats (undergoes the *bhoga*) the fruit, (i.e. *karmaphala*). Further the other bird, (i.e. *Īśvara* or *cit*) (who is not hungry) remains witnessing (without eating). Accordingly both *bhoktā (jīva)* and its (*sākṣī*) should be known.

The inquiry such as who is *kartā* (doer) and who is the *akartā* (non-doer) can be taken to by only a *virakta* (dispassionate) *mumukṣu*. A *viṣayāsakta* (engrossed in sense-objects) has neither any interest nor leisure to conduct such inquiry. All of a sudden if the seeker is told that ‘you are *akartā*’ then the question ‘who is the *kartā*?’ crops up in the mind. Further such an inquiry has to be conducted about ‘me’ as an entity with reference to my body because there are many factors in ‘me’ that are involved in any action. *Cit* in me is *nirvikāra* (changeless) and *nirupādhika*. It cannot do *karmas*. My body, senses,

prāṇa, mind, *buddhi*, etc., being inert cannot be the doer. But when in *cit* the inert *ahaṃkāravṛtti* (‘I’-notion in the body) gets *adhyasta* and reciprocally in the *ahaṃkāra* the *cit* (through *cidābhāsa* the reflected *cit* in the ‘I’ notion) gets *adhyasta*, there appears the sentient *ahaṃkāra* by such mutual superimposition. It is this entity the *ahaṃkāra* with *cidābhāsa* who does *karma* and plays the role of *kartā* only to attract *karmaphalas* for future *bhoga*. Because of same reason the *ahaṃkāra* coupled with *cidābhāsa* only is the *bhoktā* (enjoyer and sufferer).

Only a hungry bird eats the fruits and not the one who has no hunger though it may be a witness to the eating of others. Similarly *jīva* on account of *āsakti* (love for sense-object) wants to have them and enjoy. This is how the *jīva* becomes *kartā-bhoktā*. An *anāsakta* (dispassionate) person neither desires for anything nor wants its *bhoga*. Therefore he is *akartā* (non-doer) and *abhoktā* (non-enjoyer or sufferer). This shows that the *cit* whose reflection is *cidābhāsa* in the *ahaṃkāra* is only an illuminator who enables *ahaṃkāra* to do *karmas* or have *bhoga*. But *cit* whose nature is *paramānanda* is only a *sākṣī* (illuminating witness) and can never be a *kartā* or *bhoktā* because it has no *āsakti* (love for sense-objects). The *sākṣī* is a

facet of *Īśvara*. It is *akartā* and *abhoktā* because of *anāsakti*. In the absence of *karṭṛtva* and *bhokṭṛtva* the *jīva* is no more distinct from *Īśvara*. This inquiry as to who is *kartā-akartā* and who is *bhoktā-abhoktā* leads to the ascertainment that 'I' (*ātmā*) is *akartā-abhoktā*. Such *aparokṣa-jñāna* gives *mokṣa*.

VĪTASOKAḤ (GETS FREED FROM SORROWFUL SAMŚĀRA)

In the metaphor of two birds it was suggested that the *jīva* on knowing the real nature of *Īśvara* as the nature of oneself gets freed from bondage. That is explained now.

चिच्छायागतभोक्तृत्वं

साक्षिण्यारोप्यते भ्रमात् ।

अनीश्वरोऽयं साक्षीति

शोको भवति मोहतः ॥६७॥

चिच्छायागतभोक्तृत्वं - the *bhokṭṛtva* belonging to the *cidābhāsa* in the *ahaṃkāra* भ्रमात् - erroneously साक्षिणि - on the *sākṣī* आरोप्यते - is superimposed मोहतः - by which error (delusion) अयं - this साक्षी - *sākṣī* अनीश्वरः - is powerless इति - thus शोकः भवति - sorrow befalls—(67)

67. The *bhokṭṛtva* (status of being a *bhoktā*) belonging to the *cidābhāsa* in the *ahaṃkāra* is erroneously superimposed on the *sākṣī* by which

error (delusion) the sorrow such as this *sākṣī* is powerless befalls.

Desire, *karṭṛtva*, *bhokṭṛtva*, etc., actually belong to *cidābhāsa* present in the *ahaṃkāra*. They do not belong to *cit* which is free from *antaḥkaraṇa* and its any *vṛtti*. It is just like the reflection of sun appearing in dirty and shaking pool of water whereas the actual sun is totally free from the dirt, shaking and the reflecting medium the water. So is *cit sākṣī* free from *karṭṛtva*, etc., and yet by error they are superimposed on *sākṣī*. In fact 'I' (*cit*) is *sākṣī*. But identifying with the *cidābhāsa* (reflected *cit*) in 'I'-notion *ahaṃkāra*, 'I' mistake myself to be *kartā*, etc., the *samśārī*. This gives rise to the wrong notion that 'I am powerless', 'I am helpless', etc. Such powerlessness is never in the actual *cit* which is found in its reflection (*cidābhāsa*). The notions of *karṭṛtva*, etc., are always changing in nature. But *cit* is the knowledge-principle free from them. It makes us aware of all changing phenomenon. If *cit* were also to undergo changes, the changes will not be known because a changeless principle is indispensable to know all changes. From childhood state we grow to become old persons undergoing varieties of innumerable experiences. But there is one changeless entity as a common denominator in all these changing experiences. It is *cit* (*sākṣī*) the real 'I' and not the notional

‘I’, the *ahaṃkāra*. Therefore, the notion of *jīva*'s powerlessness, etc., is in the *ahaṃkāra* falsely projected on account of *cidābhāsa*. It is erroneously considered to be a feature of *sākṣī* but in reality it is not so. This error makes us get drowned in the sorrows.

नित्यतृप्तेश्चरत्वं यत्साक्षितत्त्वं तदीक्षते ।
यदा तदा वीतशोको महिमानमवाप्नुयात् ॥६८॥

यत् - whatever that is नित्यतृप्तेश्चरत्वं - the nature of *Īśvara* being ever-contented is there तद् - that itself साक्षितत्त्वं - is the real nature of *sākṣī* यदा - when (an eligible *mumukṣu*) ईक्षते - knows it तदा - then वीतशोकः - becoming free from all sorrows महिमानम् - glory of one's real nature अवाप्नुयात् - gains - (68)

68. The ever-contented nature of *Īśvara* itself is the real nature of *sākṣī*. When (an eligible *mumukṣu*) knows it, becoming free from all sorrows he gains the glory of one's real nature (*paramānanda* totally free from sorrows).

Our real nature *sākṣī* is totally free from all *upādhis* which breed sorrows. It is *paramānanda* without any *vikāra* (change), desires and powerlessness. Therefore to such a person who is in a desireless, ever-contented state which can be gained by the knowledge, all varieties of *ānanda* on account of *viśayas* are as good as

gained as in the case of a ‘*śrotriya* and *akāmahata*’ described in *ānanda-mīmāṃsā* (*Tai.U.* 2-8; *Br.U.* 4-3-33). The one who is totally desireless on account of *ātma-jñāna* is ever-contented. Because of his *paramānanda* nature which is evident to him, he has nothing that needs to be gained or nothing that is not gained. That makes him *nitya-tṛpta* (always contented). In reality, he is identical with *Īśvara*. Therefore he never feels helpless or powerless. He has known directly (*aparokṣatayā*) the glory of his real nature and is obviously *vītaśoka* (free from sorrows).

The purpose of entire Veda is to reveal the knowledge of identity between the *jīva* and *Īśvara*. Other things told therein are secondary means to gain this knowledge. So the next *mantra* says: ‘All deities are centred in the *akṣara* Brahman called *parama vyoma* which is unfolded by the *ṛks* (text, *mantras*) of the Vedas. If that Brahman is not known then there is no worthwhile purpose that can be served by those *ṛks*. Those who know Brahman only are totally accomplished persons’ (*Śv.U.* 4-8). The gist of this *mantra* is given now.

ऋचो देवाश्च शब्दार्था

यस्मिन्नात्मनि कल्पिताः ।

यस्तं न वेद तस्यर्चा किं स्याद्

यो वेत्यसौ कृती ॥६९॥

ऋचः - *mantras*, Vedic texts

शब्दार्थाः - the meaning of *ṛk*, etc. देवाः च - and the deities यस्मिन् आत्मनि - in which *ātmā* कल्पिताः - are falsely projected तं - that *ātmā* यः न वेद - the one who knows not तस्य ऋचा किं स्यात् - what does he accomplish by the Vedic text? (nothing) यः वेत्ति - the one who knows *ātmā* असौ - that person कृती - is totally accomplished one - (69)

69. What does a person accomplish by the Vedic texts (or *mantras*) who knows not *ātmā* in whom the *mantras*, their meaning and deities, etc., are falsely projected? (Nothing). (On the contrary) the one who knows *ātmā* is a totally accomplished person.

The *śāstrayonitvādhikaraṇa* (*Br.Sū.1-1-3*) establishes that the cause of all the Vedas is Brahman. Therefore *ṛks*, etc., the entire Vedas are superimposed on Brahman. The Vedas unfold the means to acquire desired things, avoid undesirable ones such as sorrows and gain *mokṣa*. The portion that deals with *dharma* describes *pāpa-puṇya* with their means, but the Upaniṣads reveal *ātmā*-Brahman. Since desires, *karṭṛtva*, *bhokṭṛtva* are superimposed on *ātmā*, the means of fulfilling desires also are superimposed therein. The *śāstra* which teach those means and the deities invoked also are superimposed on *ātmā* only. In fact not

just the Vedic *mantras*, etc., only, but also all words with their meanings are superimposed therein. Gaining of *Brahmajñāna* is the main goal of human life and its unfoldment is the final purport (*tātparya*) of Vedas. If that knowledge is not gained, then the full advantage of Vedas is not derived. The person who has *aparokṣajñāna* of Brahman is *kṛtakṛtya* (one who has accomplished the final goal of life).

ENTRY OF ĪŚVARA IN THE INDIVIDUAL BODIES AS JĪVA

The next *mantra* (*Śv.U. 4-9*) points out that *Īśvara* wielding the *māyā* Creates the entire cosmos in the past, present and future including all *jīvas*. The ignorant person having the erroneous notion of oneself to be distinct from *Īśvara* gets bound by *māyā* because of not knowing the identity of *jīva* and *Īśvara*. The next verse suggests this.

छन्दांसि यज्ञानन्यच्च

मायावी सृजतेऽखिलम् ।

जीवात्मना प्रविश्यास्ते

सन्निरुद्धो वपुष्ययम् ॥७०॥

मायावी - *Īśvara* who wields the *māyā* छन्दांसि - the Vedas यज्ञान् - sacrifices अन्यत् च - and everything else that is in the past, present and future अखिलम् - the entire Creation सृजते - produces अयम् - the same *Īśvara* or Brahman जीवात्मना - in

the form of *jīva* वपुषि - in the body प्रविश्य - having entered सन्निरुद्धः आस्ते - remains bound—(70)

70. *Īśvara* who wields the *māyā* produces the entire Creation consisting of Vedas, sacrifices and everything else that is in the past, present and future. The same *Īśvara* or Brahman having entered the body in the form of *jīva* remains bound therein.

Brahman as *Īśvara* wields the *māyā* keeping it in his control. Thus *māyā* characterized by *avidyā* projects itself in the form of *saṃsāra* with *Īśvara* as the overlord. The *śruti* points out that *Īśvara* creates ‘us’ the ‘*jīvas*’ also. The purport of this is explained by the statement *Īśvara* enters the individual embodiments in the form of *jīva* by casting the *cidābhāsa* in the *antaḥkaraṇa* which gives a semblance of a distinct entity with individual *upādhis*. This much alone is the creation of *jīvas* and not like that of space, air, etc., Creation includes the Vedas and sacrifices described therein. To gain the eligibility to acquire *Brahmajñāna* the performance of sacrifices, *karmas*, etc., with *karmayoga* attitude is necessary. For that reason the Vedas elaborate sacrifices, *karmas* and *dharma*, etc. Viewed in its right perspective the entire Creation is for the *bhoga* and *mokṣa* of *jīvas* who are themselves an erroneous

appearance of *Īśvara*. In reality *Īśvara* has no purpose because of which he Creates. It is his nature by which on account of ignorance there crops up the appearance of *jagat* as a product of *māyāśakti*. *Īśvara* himself appears as *jīva* in Creation. For himself as *jīvas* only Creation happens to be there. It is similar to our dream which has no real purpose. Thus *Īśvara* having entered body remains bound there until knowledge is gained. As the *sākṣī* he is always liberated but as *pramātā* or *ahaṃkāra* he appears to be bound until *Brahma-sākṣātkāra* is gained by *mahāvākya*. The bondage of a specific gross body ends with death but subtle body continues with transmigration until the ignorance continues. Therefore ending of self-ignorance is the highest goal of human life. More about entry of *Īśvara*/Brahman will be discussed in the next chapter (*A.Pr.* 13-103, etc.).

The *māyā* and *māyāvī* (*Īśvara*) are further explained (*Śv.U.* 4-10).

मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम् ।
तस्यावयवभूतैस्तु व्याप्तं सर्वमिदं जगत् ॥७१॥

मायां तु - certainly *māyā* प्रकृतिं विद्यात् - be known as *prakṛti* (an entity capable of Creating splendidly) मायिनं तु - whereas the one wields the *māyā* महेश्वरं - (be known to be) supreme master तस्य अवयवभूतैः - by his parts (in the form of

jīvas) तु - indeed इदं सर्वं जगत् - this entire Creation व्याप्तं - is filled up – (71)

71. Certainly *māyā* be known as *prakṛti* (an entity capable of creating splendidly) whereas the *māyī* (the one who wields *māyā*) (be known to be) supreme master (*Maheśvara*). This entire Creation indeed is filled up by his parts (in the form of *jīvas*).

Māyā is described as *prakṛti*. It means an entity or power capable of creating incessantly anything with excellence which keeps man entangled in it incapacitating him to inquire into the nature of *Paramātmā* (*Īśvara*). As a result, human is always extrovert at the cost of introvertedness that is necessary to gain *Brahmajñāna*. It is said that the entire *jagat* is filled up by the parts of *Īśvara/Paramātmā* who in fact is *niravayava* (partless). It is just like considering the pot-space, room-space, hall-space, etc., as the parts of partless space. The *jīvas* are nothing but *Īśvara* who entered in all individual embodiments. They are considered to be the parts of *Īśvara*. They are all *sopādhika Īśvara*. *Cit* is one homogeneous all pervasive limitless non-dual entity. But the distinction is in *jīvas* which is because of various *upādhis*. In reality the entire *jagat* is pervaded by *Īśvara/Brahman*.

The eleventh *mantra* brings to

our notice the means by which everlasting peace, (i.e. *mokṣa*) can be gained. ‘One and the same *Īśvara* abides in varieties of embodiments as their very *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis). In him this entire *jagat* gets withdrawn and then gets manifest in various forms. He gives boon and is worthy of praise by all. He is the regulator of entire *jagat*. By knowing *Īśvara* in *aparokṣa*, the *jñānī* gets the everlasting peace enjoyed by all *jīvanmuktas*’ (*Śv.U.4-11*). This is suggested in the next verse.

ईशो यः स्वत एकः सन्

जीवाकारैरनेकशः ।

योनिं योनिं ब्रजत्येतम् ईशम्

ज्ञात्वा न संसरेत् ॥७२॥

ईशः - *Īśvara* यः - the one who स्वतः - himself एकः सन् - being one non-dual जीवाकारैः - in the form of *jīvas* अनेकशः - frequently and in various ways योनिं योनिं - different embodiments ब्रजति - takes to एतम् ईशं ज्ञात्वा - having known that *Īśvara* directly (to be oneself) न संसरेत् - (*jīva*) does not transmigrate – (72)

72. *Īśvara* himself being one non-dual takes to different embodiments in the form of *jīvas* frequently and in various ways. (But) the (*jīva*) does not transmigrate having known that *Īśvara* directly (to be oneself).

Īśvara, the master of *māyā*, though

one alone, appears as innumerable *jīvas* because of getting himself reflected in varieties of *upādhis* in the form of *cidābhāsa*. It is just like one sun appearing as many in different pools of water. Brahman (*Īśvara*) though one because of being reflected in endless *antaḥkaraṇa* appears as endless reflections, (i.e. *cidābhāsa*) called *jīvas*. All features of *upādhis* appear to be those of *jīvas* though Brahman (*cit*) is totally free from them. *Jīvas* taking to *pāpa-puṇya* roam in endless *yonis* (embodiments). Irrespective of heavenly or hellish embodiments the entity *jīva* therein is invariably the reflection of *Īśvara* alone, but appears differently because of assuming erroneously the features of *upādhis* unto itself. And yet, *Īśvara*/Brahman the original entity (*bimba*) is *nirvikārī* (changeless) in its own glory of *sat cit ānanda*. By *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *Īśvara* the transmigration of *jīvas* end once forever never to return to the calamitous *samsāra*. Such knowledge of identity between *jīva* and *Īśvara* wherein *upādhi*less Brahman alone remains is everlasting peace. That itself is *mokṣa*.

OVERCOMING OF OBSTACLES

There can be many obstacles on the path of gaining *ātmajñāna*. It is said ‘*Śreyāṃsi bahuvighnāni*’ (there are many obstacles in the pursuit of good

things). The presiding deities obstruct because they do not like the humans to gain *Brahmajñāna* whereby they lose their services in terms of offering oblations to them, etc. It is said in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (1-4-10) that human is the *paśu* (animal) of *devas*. The unruly mind and the senses who used to rule the roost so far may refuse to cooperate. *Brahmajñāna* or *mokṣa* is just impossible so long as the seeker is extrovert. There may be some adverse *prārabdha* also. Therefore to overcome such obstacles the grace of *Īśvara* becomes inevitable since one's efforts alone become not adequate enough. For this purpose the Vedas give prayers at many places. This Upaniṣad also has given such prayers in the next two *mantras* (*Śv.U.* 4-12, 13). The next two verses suggest them.

प्रतिबन्धस्य बाहुल्याद्यो देवेत्यादिमन्त्रतः ।

पुनः पुनर्भजेतेशं प्रतिबन्धनिवृत्तये ॥७३॥

प्रतिबन्धस्य बाहुल्यात् - because of the abundance of obstacles ‘यो देव’ इत्यादि मन्त्रतः - by the *mantra* ‘*yo devānām*’, etc. प्रतिबन्धनिवृत्तये - to ward off the obstacles पुनः पुनः - repeatedly ईशं भजेत् - *Īśvara* should be prayed to – (73)

73. Because of the abundance of obstacles, to ward them off *Īśvara* should be prayed to repeatedly by *mantras* such as ‘*yo devānām*’, etc.

The *karmaphalas* accumulated in the births since *anādi* (beginningless time) become the cause of obstacles. Even the deities can obstruct only when such adverse *karmas* are yielding their results. *Īśvara* is the *karmaphaladātā* dispenser of *karmaphala* according to his laws only. Prayers serve as the counteracting *karmas* to eliminate our *pāpa-karmas* of the past. Generally *Īśvara* does not interfere in the laws of *karmas*. Yet, on account of results of our prayers depending on their intensity and *śraddhā* he does help *mumukṣus* to overcome their obstacles on the path of gaining *Brahmajñāna* which we cannot remove otherwise. Thus prayers become indispensable to *mumukṣus*.

The first *mantra* ‘*yo devānām*’, etc. (Śv.U.4-12), is the same as the fourth one of chapter three of this Upaniṣad. It was elaborated in the context of verse 52. There the reading was ‘*Hiraṇyagarbham janayāmāsa pūrvam*’ (first of all *Īśvara* created *Hiraṇyagarbha*) whereas here it is ‘*Hiraṇyagarbham paśyata jāyamānam*’ (‘*Īśvara* saw *Hiraṇyagarbha* being born’ which means *Īśvara* is primordial). The thirteenth *mantra* is as follows.

‘यो देवानां अधिपः यस्मिन्
लोकाः अधिश्रिताः ।
यः ईशे अस्य द्विपदः चतुष्पदः
कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम ॥’

‘*Īśvara* is the overlord of all

devatās (deities). In him all *lokas* are centred (superimposed). He controls all creatures such as bipeds, quadrupeds, etc. Unto that *pramānanda-svarūpa* Brahman (*kasmai*), in the form of *Īśvara* we offer our service in the form of oblations’ (Śv.U.4-13).

Īśvara is the ever-existent original entity as Brahman. Because of his powers deities are able to function and not independently. When we discover that the one and the same non-dual Brahman only produces all *devatās* and empowers them, we can give up the subservience to *devatās* and surrender to *Īśvara*. Our mind and senses also are governed by their presiding deities who are under the control of *Īśvara* alone in the form of *ātmā* in our body who is *ānanda-svarūpa*. This knocks down our wrong notion that sense-objects give happiness. By knowing this our extrovertedness and dependence on sense-objects can be ended. *Īśvara* is the overlord of entire cosmos, animate and inanimate. The greatest oblation or service that we can offer to *Īśvara* is the surrendering of our *ahaṅkāra*. Offering of all our *karmas* to *Īśvara* can help us to end our desires for sense-objects. Repeated *japa* of these two *mantras* with the understanding of their meaning removes obstacles on the path of gaining *Brahmajñāna*.

Obstacles are of two types. The means of their redressal also differs.

The next verse tells us this.

अदृष्टप्रतिबन्धो यो निवर्त्य भजनेन तम् ।
दृष्टो यः प्रतिबन्धस्तं विचारेण जयेत्पुनः ॥७४॥

यः अदृष्टप्रतिबन्धः - whatever unknown obstacle born of past *pāpa* is there तम् - that one भजनेन - by prayers to *Īśvara* निवर्त्य - having removed यः दृष्टः प्रतिबन्धः - whatever known obstacle is there तं - that one पुनः - further विचारेण - by inquiry जयेत् - should overcome – (74)

74. Having removed the unknown obstacle born of past *pāpa* by prayers to *Īśvara*, the (*mumukṣu*) should overcome the known obstacles by inquiry (in accordance with the *śāstra*).

The unknown obstacles are caused by past *pāpas*. We cannot know its exact nature. We can only infer that such a cause is there. These are overcome by prayers to *Īśvara* called '*bhajana*'. In prayers our *ahaṅkāra* should be surrendered to *Īśvara* knowing fully well our helplessness. The second type of obstacles are experienced by us in terms of doubts such as 'how can I be identical with *Īśvara*?', 'how can I the miserable *samsārī* be *sat cit ānanda* or Brahman the *adhiṣṭhāna* of Creation?', etc. These have to be removed by the right type of inquiry called *manana* (reflection) involving reasoning also in accordance with the *śruti*. By *manana* all doubts need to be resolved. Human mind

does not accept anything that is not given to reasoning. Therefore it has to be convinced based on the right type of reasoning. The verses 75 to 79 (*Śv.U.4-14 to 22*) deal with such *vicāra* (inquiry). The next *mantra* says: 'Having gained *aparokṣa-jñāna* of Brahman (*Īśvara*) who is subtler than the subtle, abiding in the formidable *avidyā* and its effects, the Creator of entire *jagat* who has endless forms, who is the only entity that pervades Creation, the *jñānī* gains unsurpassing peace (called *mokṣa*)' (*Śv.U.4-14*). This is summarized in the next verse.

ĪŚVARA-VIVEKA

सूक्ष्मेभ्यः परमाणुभ्योऽप्यतिसूक्ष्मो
न लक्ष्यते ।

बहिर्मुखैः स्वतस्सोऽयं
विश्वं व्याप्यावतिष्ठते ॥७५॥

(This *ātmā*/Brahman) सूक्ष्मेभ्यः परमाणुभ्यः - than the infinitesimal particles or atoms अपि - even अतिसूक्ष्मः - is much more subtle बहिर्मुखैः - by the extroverted persons न लक्ष्यते - is not known सः अयं - the same *ātmā* स्वतः - itself विश्वं व्याप्य - having pervaded Creation अवतिष्ठते - remains – (75)

75. (This *ātmā*/Brahman) is much more subtle than even the infinitesimal particles or atoms. It is not known by extroverted persons. The same *ātmā* remains itself having pervaded Creation.

More and more subtle entity becomes less and less perceptible to the senses. Therefore the statement that *ātmā* is much more subtle than an atom is not meant to determine its dimension but only to emphasize that it is imperceptible (*atīndriya*). *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa also states the same fact when he declares the *paramānanda ātmā* is *buddhigrāhyam* (can be known by *buddhi* conforming to *ātmā*) but it is *atīndriya* (imperceptible) (*B.G.* 6-21). To gain such a state of *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) is just impossible to extrovert persons. An extrovert mind engrossed in the sense-objects is always in a state of agitation. It cannot know *ātmā*. Lay people say that whatever that is not perceived outside does not exist. They obviously miss the entity that enables the *indriyas* to function which they can never objectify. Some others say that *Īśvara* or *Paramātmā* abides in some heaven. It is Vedānta alone which tells the final truth: ‘You are *Paramātmā*, Brahman’. Therefore to say *Paramātmā* (*Īśvara*) does not exist is as good as “I do not exist”. All know that this is impossible. Even an atheist asserts ‘I am’. In this sense there are no atheists at all because the entity ‘I’ itself in reality is the divinity principle or *Īśvara*. Therefore if you search *Paramātmā* outside, you cannot ascertain it. But when ‘I’ is inquired into on the guidelines of Vedānta, it culminates in *Paramātmā* only. Therefore what is our real nature needs to be inquired into. The same *Paramātmā* pervades entire Creation. The existence (‘is’-ness) aspect is present in and through everything. *Cit* the knowledge aspect manifests wherever the *antaḥkaraṇa* is there. Anything that pleases us reveals the *ānanda* aspect of *ātmā*/Brahman. Thus because *ātmā* pervades entire Creation, the phenomena ‘it is’, ‘it is known’ and ‘*priya*’ (pleasing disposition) are possible.

The existence of Brahman is justified based on reasoning. ‘That Brahman (as *Īśvara*) is the overlord of Creation and abides in every being as *antaryamī* (one who remains concealed in everyone and enables them to function). During the continuance (*sthiti*) of Creation that divinity principle alone protects it. *Brahmarṣis* (*brāhmaṇas* who know the imperceptible Brahman) and deities are absorbed in it by the means of *yoga*. They have cut as under the

fetters of bondage by its knowledge’ (*Śv.U.*4-15).

जगतः पालनेनाऽयम् अस्तीत्यादौ विबुध्यताम् ।
ब्रह्मर्षयो देवताश्च योगेनैतं विजानते ॥७६॥

आदौ - in the beginning जगतः पालनेन - because the sustaining (*sthiti*) of *jagat* is seen ‘अयम् अस्ति’ - *Īśvara* (Brahman) is इति - so विबुध्यताम् - should be known ब्रह्मर्षयः देवताः च - *Brahmarṣis* and *devatās* (deities) एतं - that *Īśvara*

(Brahman) योगेन - by the means of
yoga विजानते - experience in *aparokṣa*
(directly)–(76)

76. In the beginning it should be

known that *Īśvara* (Brahman) does exist
because the sustaining (*sthiti*) of *jagat* is
seen. *Brahmarṣis* and *devatās* experience
Īśvara (Brahman) in *aparokṣa* (directly)
by the means of *yoga*.

Creation may be a false (*mithyā*) projection of equally false *māyā*. And yet, there is an order in it. All functions at all levels are carried on with precision in a regulated manner. Wherever the law and order is seen, a strict administrator though not seen must necessarily be there. Thus from the perfect orderliness in Creation, it can be easily inferred that there is a controller. That entity is called *Īśvara*. In the Upaniṣads such as *Chāndogya*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Śvetāśvatara*, *Muṇḍaka* and *Kaṭha* the *Īśvara* is called ‘*setu*’ who holds everything in their limits like a bund that holds the water in check. To know *Īśvara* (Brahman) *yoga* which makes the mind totally introvert is necessary. *Brahmarṣis* are *brāhmaṇas* who have become *ṛṣis* like Sanaka, Sanandana, Sanatkumāra, Śuka, Vāmadeva, etc. *Brāhmaṇas* have *śama*, *dama*, etc., and less desires. Therefore they shine in the field of knowledge. *Devatās* are also highly *sātvika*. It is easy for them to gain knowledge. The statement, ‘*brahmarṣis* and *devatās* know it’ means that eligible *mumukṣus* should have their preparedness of mind, like them, but it does not mean that humans cannot know *Īśvara* (Brahman).

Though what meets our eyes is only *prapañca* (*jagat*), even then by proper means *niṣprapañca* (free from *jagat*) Brahman needs to be known. Just as the cream that settles on the top of curds is its essence, so is the cream or essence (called *maṇḍa*) that settles on the boiled liquid ghee which is cooled immediately with the help of ice. It is very tasty. Similarly the ultimate essence of *prapañca*, the Brahman, is *paramānanda-svarūpa*. It is in and through the *prapañca* (Creation) but needs to be obtained by appropriate means like the ghee that is all over in the milk needs to be separated from it. One who has *sākṣātkāra* of that Brahman gets freed from all fetters (Śv.U.4-16). Next verse tells this while explaining the meaning of *yoga* told in the earlier verse.

क्षीरे घृतनिमित्तं

यत्सारं तद्धीमतेक्ष्यते ।

तथा वृत्तिनिरोधिन्या सूक्ष्मं

वस्तु धियेक्ष्यताम् ॥७७॥

क्षीरे - in the milk घृतनिमित्तं - on

account of ghee यत्सारं - whatever essence

is there (everywhere in it) तत् - that

धीमता - by a *vivekī* (only) (यथा) ईक्ष्यते - just

as it is seen तथा - similarly वृत्तिनिरोधिन्या धिया - by the *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) wherein *vṛttis* (thoughts) are ended सूक्ष्मं वस्तु - the most subtle entity (the imperceptible Brahman) ईक्ष्यताम् - should be known—(77)

77. (Just as) a *vivekī* (only) sees the essence on account of ghee that is present everywhere in the milk, similarly by the *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) wherein *vṛttis* (thoughts) are ended, (i.e. *niruddha*) the most subtle entity (the imperceptible Brahman) should be known.

Ghee is certainly present in the milk but it cannot be known by seeing or smelling or tasting or touching the milk. The process of curdling the milk, churning the curds, taking out the butter, and finally heating it is involved. Otherwise ghee cannot be obtained though always present in the milk. Similarly though Brahman is everywhere in and through the *jagat* as its *adhiṣṭhāna*, it cannot be known by the *buddhi* preoccupied in the *drśya jagat*. One has to take to *śravaṇa* (self-inquiry), *manana* (reflection) and *nididhyāsana* (*ātma-cintana*). But the mind preoccupied in sense-objects cannot take to inquiry because always it gets scattered in *anātmā-thoughts*. It has to be withdrawn from all other preoccupations so as to conform to

ātmā/Brahman to become *ātmākāra* or *Brahmākāra*. In the corresponding Upaniṣadic *mantra* the illustration of *maṇḍa* (essence of hot liquid ghee) when cooled suddenly is given. The same illustration is given in this verse as the ghee in the milk. To illustrate the all pervasiveness of *ātmā* earlier (Śv.U.1-16; vs.36) the presence of ghee all over in the milk was told.

The *mantra* sixteen (Śv.U.4-18) points out that day and night, etc., no longer continue on ending the *avidyā* whereas the next one says that Brahman cannot be caught hold of in any direction and there is no illustration which can fit in Brahman. The gist of these two *mantras* is given now.

दिवा रात्रिस्तमश्चान्यद्यस्मिन्नास्ति न किञ्चन ।
नोर्ध्वं न तिर्यगतद्वस्तु न दृष्टान्तोऽस्य विद्यते ॥७८॥

यस्मिन् - the entity in which दिवा - day रात्रिः - night तमः - darkness अन्यत् च - and anything else न अस्ति - all these are not there न ऊर्ध्वं - no above न तिर्यक् - no horizontal न किञ्चन - (certainly) there is nothing whatsoever तत् वस्तु - that is the ever-existing Brahman अस्य - of that Brahman दृष्टान्तः न विद्यते - there is no suitable illustration—(78)

78. The entity in which day, night, darkness and anything else are not there; (even) there is nothing such as above,

horizontal, etc., is the ever-existing Brahman. It has no suitable illustration. ('Such Brahman should be sought' is to be added from the next verse).

When by *Brahmajñāna* the *avidyā* is destroyed what is experienced in that *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is the self-evident (*svayaṃ-jyoti*) *cit* and *cit* alone having no trace of Creation. Obviously all features such as day, night, above, below, etc., belonging to Creation are totally absent. We do experience somewhat similar state in the deep sleep accompanied by ignorance. To illustrate a thing or a phenomenon some other entity with at least a few similar features must be there. In the non-dual Brahman that is totally *upādhi*less, there is no occasion at all to give any illustration. This verse is connected to the next one.

The twentieth *mantra* of fourth chapter points out that Brahman is *atīndriya* (imperceptible) and therefore can be known only by the mind (*manasā*) absorbed in the ultimate essence or the basis of everything the Brahman, (i.e. *hṛdā*). Those who know Brahman thus gain *mokṣa*. In the twenty-first *mantra* the seeker afflicted with *saṃsāra* takes refuge in Dakṣiṇāmūrti, the benign form of *Bhagavān Śiva*. In the twenty-second *mantra*, *Rudra* (Śiva) is propitiated not to destroy anyone. The

next verse suggests the import of these three while concluding the fourth chapter of this Upaniṣad.

दृग्गोचरे तस्य रूपं

नास्त्यतः कोऽपि नेक्षते ।

अजात इति मन्त्राभ्यामन्तर्दृष्ट्या

भजेत तम् ॥७९॥

तस्य - of Brahman (*Īśvara*) रूपं - form दृग्गोचरे न अस्ति - is not an object of sight अतः - therefore न कः अपि - no one (तम्) ईक्षते - can see him 'अजातः' इतिमन्त्राभ्याम् - by the two *mantras*, 'ajāta' (unborn), etc., and the next one अन्तर्दृष्ट्या - by the introvert mind तम् भजेत - the *mumukṣu* should resort to him – (79)

79. The form of Brahman (*Īśvara*) is not an object of sight. Therefore no one can see him. The *mumukṣu* should resort to him with the means of two *mantras*, 'ajāta' (unborn), etc., and the next one, having an introvert mind.

Brahman is not an object of sight means it is imperceptible by all senses. It is not a perceptible object. The word 'rūpa' (form) also means that by which an entity is described or defined. Therefore sound, touch, taste, etc., are considered as 'form' because they can describe entities. Brahman is free from features such as form, taste, smell, sound, touch, etc. An imperceptible

entity can never have features. Some people think that Brahman has features but they are not perceptible to humans. To dispel such doubt the Upaniṣad clearly says ‘*na kaścana*’ (no one without any exception). The purpose of describing Brahman as imperceptible is to highlight its nature as *nirupādhika* (*upādhiless*) rather than to describe its actual nature by giving *svarūpa-lakṣaṇa*. Because of being *upādhiless* the extrovert mind cannot know it. Thus *antardṛṣṭi* (introvert mind) becomes indispensable.

One of the two *mantras* advised to propitiate *Īśvara* is: ‘Oh *Rudra*, you are unborn. Therefore *mumukṣus* who are frightened about the calamitous *saṃsāra* seek you. Protect me always by your southern face (called *Dakṣiṇāmūrti*)’ (Śv.U. 4-21). All effects of *māyā* are born. They have six *vikāras*. Brahman is unborn. It is not in the category of *māyā*. *Bhagavān Śiva* has five faces. The southern one bestows *ātmajñāna* whereas the worldly gains can be procured from other faces. So *Śiva* as *Dakṣiṇāmūrti* only can rescue us from *saṃsāra*. Therefore *Dakṣiṇāmūrti* is prayed to with surrender for protection.

The next *mantra* (Śv.U. 4-22) seeks protection of *Rudra* (*Śiva*) from his terrific (*ghora*) facet. He is requested

not to destroy, children, grandchildren, our longevity, cows, horses, relatives (*vīrān*) who help and stand by us, etc., with an assurance that we will worship him always. This *mantra* is viewed in two ways. In the first instance, the earlier *mantra* is considered as meant for *sannyāsī mumukṣus* whereas this is meant for *grhastha* (householder) *mumukṣus*. Or this *mantra* is also meant for *sannyāsīs* by taking figurative meaning of children, grand children as disciples, grand disciples, etc., so that in their lineage all become *jñānīs*. In this case cows are taken as sense-organs, horses as organ of action and *vīra* (valourous persons) as those who help us in our pursuit of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. With this verse the fourth chapter of this Upaniṣad ends.

JĪVEŚVARA-VIVEKA

The fifth chapter of the Upaniṣad has two purposes. Though the third chapter did describe ‘*tat*’ and ‘*tvam*’ *padas* (*jīva* and *Īśvara*), it was not adequate. Both of them are further described here. In the fourth chapter the means to earn the grace (*prasāda*), of *Īśvara* (*dhātā*) was described. Along with that the unique features (*asādhāraṇamahimā*) of *Īśvara* also need to be described. That is done in this fifth chapter. The first *mantra* describes

that in Brahman which is more exalted than even the *Hiraṇyagarbha*, both *vidyā* and *avidyā* abide. *Avidyā* binds whereas *vidyā* liberates. The entity who regulates these two is distinct from them.

पुनश्चैवं विवेक्तव्यं विद्याविद्ये निजात्मगे ।
अविद्यया बद्धयतेऽसौ विद्यया तु विमुच्यते ॥८०॥

पुनः च - repeatedly एवं - in this manner विवेक्तव्यं - should be ascertained विद्याविद्ये - both *vidyā* and *avidyā* निजात्मगे - are centred in one's *ātmā* and their subject-matter is *ātmā* only असौ - this *ātmā* (or *jīva*) अविद्यया - by *avidyā* बद्धयते - is bound तु - whereas विद्यया - by *vidyā* विमुच्यते - is liberated—(80)

80. Repeatedly it should be ascertained in this manner. Both *vidyā* and *avidyā* are centred in one's *ātmā* and their subject-matter is *ātmā* only. This *ātmā* (or *jīva*) is bound by *avidyā* whereas it is liberated by *vidyā*.

Our experiences, 'I have self-ignorance' and 'I have knowledge of *ātmā*' reveal that both *vidyā* and *avidyā* are centred in *ātmā* only. It also shows that *ātmā* alone is their subject-matter. The second line of this verse gives the characteristic feature of *vidyā* as the one that liberates, and *avidyā* as the one that binds. By such repeated ascertainment we will take to the means to gain *ātmajñāna* by avoiding those pursuits

that bind. Whether it is *ātmajñāna* and self-ignorance or bondage and liberation, they belong to *buddhi*, (i.e. *antaḥkaraṇa*). They cannot be the intrinsic feature of *nirupādhika ātmā*. And yet it is said that both of them are centred in *ātmā* because of the superimposition (*adhyāsa*) of *buddhi* in *ātmā*.

Forthcoming verses describe *jīva* and *Īśvara*. This topic is introduced in the next verse.

अविद्याकल्पितोपाधिभेदाद् ईशत्वजीवते ।
चैतन्यस्य भवेतां ये कथ्येते ते क्रमादिह ॥८१॥

अविद्याकल्पितोपाधिभेदात् - on account of *avidyā* and the distinctions in the falsely projected *upādhis* ये ईशत्वजीवते - whatever forms of *Īśvara* and *jīva* चैतन्यस्य भवेतां - appear in *caitanya* ते - both of them इह - henceforth क्रमात् - in the order described by the Upaniṣad कथ्येते - are described—(81)

81. On account of *avidyā* and the distinction in the falsely projected *upādhis* whatever forms of *Īśvara* and *jīva* appear in *caitanya*, both of them are described henceforth in the order described by the Upaniṣad.

Actually the *avidyā* itself is the *upādhi*. This will be told as 'the status of *Īśvara* is projected by *avidyā*' (vs.85) and 'the status of *jīva* is projected by

avidyā' (vs.86). But it projects these two by appearing itself as two different *upādhis*. Therefore here 'the distinctions in the falsely projected *upādhis*' also is included as the cause of two distinct appearances in the form of *jīva* and *Īśvara*. Both *Īśvara* and *jīva* are *ātmā* alone in reality, but both these statuses or forms are projected by *upādhis*. *Upādhis* themselves are false because they are falsely projected by false *avidyā*. *Īśvara* (Brahman) is present in every atomic particle and at every moment. All are *upādhis* of Brahman only. But because of varied *upādhis* it appears as though there are endless *ātmās* (*jīvas*). The notions such as 'these are my mind and the body, etc.', whereas 'those are his mind and the body, etc.', are induced by *upādhis*. We consider the *ātmā* limited by body and the mind as *jīva* and the one who rules entire Creation as another distinct entity called *Īśvara*. But in reality both are one and the same *ātmā*/Brahman whose nature is nothing but *caitanya* (self-evident, self-experiencing knowledge-principle). It is non-dual in nature. There is no *pramāṇa* to prove the existence of another *caitanya*. The knower is sentient (*sacetana*). The known entity is inert (*acetana*). 'I know' or 'I am' itself is the experience of sentience (*cetana*). *Caitanya* always remain as 'I' and can never become 'this' as an object of

knowledge or experience. All these erroneous notions of one thing distinct from the other are on account of *upādhis* which is superimposed on *ātmā*. Therefore the experience that there are endless *jīvas* and *Īśvara* is distinct from them is on account of *upādhis*. Now this will be explained by pointing out the *upādhis*. *Īśvara* will be described in the verses 82 to 85 and *jīva* in verses 86 to 90. The second to fifth *mantra* of Upaniṣadic chapter 5 describes *Īśvara*. It is summarized in the next four verses.

हिरण्यगर्भमुत्पन्नमादौ ज्ञानैर्बिभर्ति यः ।
एकैकमन्तःकरणं बहुधा विकरोत्ययम् ॥८२॥

यः - the (*Īśvara*) who आदौ उत्पन्नं - the first born हिरण्यगर्भं - *Hiraṇyagarbha* ज्ञानैः - by the knowledge contained in the Vedas बिभर्ति - nourishes अयम् - he, (i.e. *Īśvara*) एकैकं - one by one अन्तःकरणं - *antaḥkaraṇa* बहुधा - in many ways विकरोति - makes manifest - (82)

82. The *Īśvara* who nourishes the first born *Hiraṇyagarbha* by the knowledge contained in the Vedas, makes manifest one by one *antaḥkaraṇa* in many ways.

First of all *Īśvara* creates *Hiraṇyagarbha* and nourishes him by the knowledge contained in the Vedas. Here the word '*jñānaiḥ*' (knowledge in the plural sense) from the Upaniṣad is commented upon by many *ācāryas* as

knowledge, *dharma*, *vairāgya* and *aiśvarya*. The *upādhi* of *Hiraṇyagarbha* contains *samaṣṭi* (macrocosmic) *antaḥkaraṇa*. Our *antaḥkaraṇa* are its *vyasṭi* (microcosmic) parts. *Īśvara* makes all individual *antaḥkaraṇas* distinct and various with varying *guṇas* in each in accordance with the past *saṃskāras* and *karmas* of *jīvas*. The different manifestations in varied *antaḥkaraṇas* are directed by the *saṃskāras* and *karmas* gathered by *jīvas* in the past *kalpa*. The motivation is by *Īśvara* but the script is provided by *jīvas*. Since *saṃskāras* give rise to varieties of manifestations, it is said that the *antaḥkaraṇa* undergoes changes or manifests differently. In this verse *Īśvara* is described as the one who imparts the knowledge and projects the individual *antaḥkaraṇas*. The meaning of the next *mantra* (*Śv.U.5-4*) is told now.

अधश्चोर्ध्वं दिशः सर्वा भ्राजतेऽसौ प्रकाशयन् ।
भारं वहेद्यथाऽनड्वान्जगद्भारं वहेतथा ॥८३॥

असौ - this *Īśvara* अधः - below ऊर्ध्वं
- above सर्वाः दिशः च - and in all directions
प्रकाशयन् - manifesting (or illuminating)
भ्राजते - shines यथा - just as अनड्वान् - a bull
भारं - load वहेत - carries तथा - similarly
जगद्भारं - the burden of the *jagat* वहेत -
(*Īśvara*) bears – (83)

83. *Īśvara* shines manifesting (or illuminating) above, below and in all

directions. Just like a bull carries the load, similarly *Īśvara* bears the burden of the *jagat*.

The *śruti* has used the word ‘*anaḍvān*’ which generally means the bull. But commentaries on Upaniṣad describes this word as the sun. Both meanings can be clubbed here. *Īśvara* illumines the entire *jagat* like the sun and bears its burden like a bull. Just as the *jñāna*, etc., in *Hiraṇyagarbha* is given by *Īśvara* only, so also the illuminating power in the sun is from *Īśvara* alone. It is *Īśvara* only who enables everyone to function lending them such power and requisite knowledge. In other words it is *ātmā* limited by *māyā* bears the burden of the world.

The fifth *mantra* (*Śv.U.5-5*) describes *Īśvara* as the one who presides over Creation effecting the behavioural pattern and modifications in various entities by employing the *guṇas*.

यो भवान् क्षीरबीजादीन्
दधिवृक्षादिरूपतः ।
परिणामं नयेत् सोऽयं गुणांस्त्रीन्
विनियोजयेत् ॥८४॥

यः - the (*Īśvara*) who क्षीरबीजादीन् -
milk, seeds, etc. भवान् - entities
दधिवृक्षादिरूपतः - in the form of curds,
trees, etc. परिणामं नयेत् - transforms into सः
अयं - the same *Īśvara* त्रीन् गुणान् - the three
guṇas विनियोजयेत् - employs (in different

functions in different beings) – (84)

84. The *Īśvara* who transforms milk, seeds, etc., in the form of curds, trees, etc., himself employs the three *guṇas* (in different functions and different beings).

A seed alone becomes a tree. An atheist may say that it is a natural process. But whatever that is referred to as ‘nature’ is the power of *Īśvara* which makes a specific cause manifest in its effect. We think that we do many things. But the fact is that it is *Īśvara* who enables us to do so. The influence and manifestation, etc., of *sattva*, *raja* and *tama* is by his rule. He is the overall controller. This is the unique glory of *Īśvara*.

The sixth *mantra* (Śv.U.5-6) describes Brahman, the real nature of *Īśvara* as concealed in the Upaniṣadic portions of the Vedas and those who get its *aparokṣajñāna* become immortal (*mukta*). While giving its meaning the next verse concludes the topic of *Īśvara*.

अविद्याकृतमीशत्वं तदिदं स्पष्टमीरितम् ।
वेदगुह्योपनिषदा तस्य तत्त्वमुदीरितम् ॥८५॥

तदिदं - the topic under discussion namely अविद्याकृतं - effected by *avidyā* ईशत्वं - the form of *Īśvara* स्पष्टम् - clearly ईरितम् - is told तस्य तत्त्वम् - its (of *Īśvara*) real nature वेदगुह्योपनिषदा - by the secret

portion of the Vedas called Upaniṣad उदीरितम् - is described – (85)

85. The topic under discussion namely the form of *Īśvara* effected by *avidyā* is clearly told (Śv.U. 5-2 to 5; vs.82 to 84). Its (of *Īśvara*) real nature is described by the secret portion of the Vedas called Upaniṣad (Śv.U.5-6).

The appearance of *Īśvara-status* in *caitanya* is on account of *avidyā*. Here the word ‘*avidyā*’ is used instead of *māyā* to eliminate any distinction between both of them. If asked about the Creator (*Īśvara*) of *jagat*, the common man conceives it to be some unknown sentient entity. It shows that the ‘unknown *caitanya*’ or the *caitanya* with the *upādhi* of *avidyā* is *Īśvara*. The author has used the word ‘*Īśatā*’ (the form or the status of *Īśvara*) instead of ‘*Īśvara*’. This is to show that the real nature of *Īśvara* is *ātmā*/Brahman whereas *Īśvara* is only an appearance in it projected by *avidyā*/*māyā*. All features of *Īśvara* are *aupādhika* (belong to *upādhis*) and so they belong to the *jagat* projected by *avidyā*. The real nature of *Īśvara* is unfolded in the Upaniṣads. They are called *guhya* (secret) portions of the Vedas because people steeped in desires cannot know it. For them the portions of *karma* and *Upāsanās* are enjoined. Only eligible *mumukṣus* with staunch *vairāgya* and rest of the

eligibility alone can know it. Thus the topic of *Īśvara* ends.

The next four *mantras* (*Śv.U.5-7* to 10; vs.86 to 90) describe the *jīva*. The seventh *mantra* describes *jīva* as the one having connection to *guṇas*, does *karmas* to have the *bhoga* of their results, plays the role of waker-consciousness (*viśva*) during the waking state, endowed with three *guṇas*, traveller on the three routes such as *devayāna*, etc., wields *prāṇas* and transmigrates in accordance with one's *karmaphalas*. This is told in the next two verses.

अविद्याकृतजीवत्वम् अथ स्पष्टमुदीर्यते ।

सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चेति गुणैर्जीवः समन्वितः ॥८६॥

अथ - now (after describing *Īśvara*) अविद्याकृतजीवत्वम् - the *jīvahood* effected by *avidyā* स्पष्टम् - clearly उदीर्यते - is being told जीवः - *jīva* सत्त्वं रजः तमः च इति गुणैः - by *guṇas* such as *sattva*, *raja* and *tama* समन्वितः - is connected to (is endowed with)–(86)

86. Now (after describing *Īśvara*) the *jīvahood* effected by *avidyā* is being told clearly. The *jīva* is connected to *sattva*, *raja* and *tamogūnas*.

Īśvara principle was described first as it is difficult to know being remote. Of course it is adorable and the *upāsya* (subject of *upāsanā*). But the *jīva* is *ātmā* by its nature and therefore 'I

itself. Its *jīvahood* is falsely projected by *avidyā*. *Jīva* and *Īśvara* are not falsely projected like the *jagat* but their statuses are projected so. Therefore in the *śruti* statement, '*sarvam khalu idam Brahman*' (everything is Brahman) is a juxtaposition (*samānādhikarṇya*) with the sublation (*bādha*) of *jagat* where as 'you are Brahman' (*tat tvam asi*) is a main juxtaposition. *Īśvara* is the activator of *guṇas*, but he is never bound by it. But *jīva* is bound by *guṇas* and therefore identified with them as 'I am *sāttvika*', etc.

The *jīva* is not only connected to *guṇas*, but also considers oneself to be *kartā* and *bhoktā*. Scriptures also enjoin the practice (*vidhi*) and prohibition (*niṣedha*) of *karmas* as the means' taking for granted the *kartr̥tva* and *bhoktr̥tva* temporarily to uplift the *jīva* by making it eligible to gain knowledge. In accordance with *karmaphalas* the *jīva* also gets subjected to transmigration. This aspect of seventh *mantra* is described in the next verse.

स फलार्थं कर्म कुर्याद् भुङ्क्ते तस्यैव तत्फलम् ।
दक्षिणोदगधोमार्गैः संसरत्येष कर्मभिः ॥८७॥

सः - that *jīva* फलार्थं - for the *bhoga* of *karmaphalas* कर्म कुर्यात् - does *karma* तस्य एव - of that *karma* performed by it तत्फलम् - the resultant *pāpa-puṇya* भुङ्क्ते - enjoys or suffers एषः - this *jīva* कर्मभिः - on

account of one's *karmas* दक्षिण-उदक्-अधः मार्गः - by routes of northern and southern solstices besides the lower one संसरति - gets caught up in the cycle of transmigration – (87)

87. The *jīva* does the *karma* for the sake of *karmaphala-bhoga* and as a result enjoys or suffers the resultant *pāpa-punya*. This *jīva* gets caught up in the cycle of transmigration by the routes of northern and southern solstices besides the lower on account of one's *karmas*.

The *jīva* has past *saṃskāras* (impressions) of sense-indulgence. Prompted by them the individual desires sense-objects for which *karma* becomes inevitable. *Karmas* taken to are *sāttvika*, *rājasika* or *tāmasika* according to the *saṃskāras*. *Bhagavadgītā* has described different types of *yajñas*, *tapas* based on division of *guṇas*. Results of these also are gained accordingly. The rebirths also are according to one's *karmas*. Those who perform scriptural *karmas* to the exclusion of relevant *upāsanās* go to heaven by southern path whereas those who do the required *upāsanās* in addition to *karma* go to higher heavens by the northern path. They live there for a long period and return to take further births as per their other *karmas* or *upāsanās*. Those who do not take to

scriptural *karmas* or *upāsanās* but indulge in *adharmic* deeds travel by lower path to take to repeated birth and death with short duration of life and suffer much sorrows. These routes are described in *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (5-10-8; 4-15-5) and *Bhagavadgītā* (Ch.8, 24, 25). In this Upaniṣad these routes are suggested by just an adjective 'trivartmā' (one who follows three routes) of *jīva*.

The eighth *mantra* describes *jīva* as 'the one who is self-luminous like the sun having the size of the thumb, endowed with desires and erroneous 'I'-notion (*ahaṃkāra*) in the embodiment, appears to have the features of both *buddhi* and *ātmā*, having a dimension of the tooth of an awl (cobbler's pointed tool to pierce the leather)'. This is described in the next two verses.

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रहृन्निष्ठः स्वप्रकाशः

स सूर्यवत् ।

अहंकारोपाधिकः सन् संकल्पान्

कुरुते बहून् ॥८८॥

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रहृन्निष्ठः सः - the *jīva* who abides in the heart having the size of a thumb सूर्यवत् - like the sun स्वप्रकाशः - (in reality) is self-luminous (*caitanya*) अहंकारोपाधिकः सन् - being endowed with the *upādhi* of *ahaṃkāra* बहून् - abundant संकल्पान् - desires, resolves, etc. कुरुते - entertains – (88)

88. The *jīva* of the size of a thumb who abides in the heart in reality is like the sun, (i.e. self-luminous *caitanya*). Being endowed with the *upādhi* of *ahaṃkāra*, it entertains many desires, resolves, etc.

बुद्धिवृत्त्यात्मचैतन्यसंयोगाद्

एष चेतनः ।

स संकोचविकासाभ्यां

तैस्तैर्देहैस्समो भवेत् ॥८९॥

एषः - the *jīva* बुद्धिवृत्त्यात्म-
चैतन्यसंयोगात् - by the combination of
buddhi-vṛtti (*antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) and
ātmā, (i.e. by their mutual *adhyāsa*) चेतनः
- (becomes) sentient सः - the *jīva*
संकोचविकासाभ्यां - (as though) by the
diminution and expansion of that
sentience, (i.e. by the permeation of
cidābhāsa all over the specific
embodiments wielded by the *jīva*) तैः तैः
देहैः समः - identical with different bodies
(taken to) भवेत् - becomes—(89)

89. The *jīva* becomes (appears) sentient by the combination of *buddhi-vṛtti* (*antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) and *ātmā*, (i.e. by their mutual *adhyāsa*). It becomes identical with different bodies (taken to) (as though) by the diminution and expansion of that sentience, (i.e. by the permeation of *cidābhāsa* all over the specific embodiment wielded by the *jīva*).

Nirupādhika ātmā or *Īśvara* (Brahman) can never have any dimension such as the size of a thumb. Even then *ātmā* as a *jīva* is described at places in *śruti* as having a size of a thumb. The heart is the seat of *antaḥkaraṇa*. Therefore the size of the heart as that of a thumb is considered to be the size of *ātmā* abiding therein called *jīva*. Human heart is of the size of a thumb. Since the Vedas or *adhyātma-śāstra* is addressed to humans who are eligible entities, the size of their heart is considered as that of *jīva*. The *pramitādhikaraṇa* (Br.Sū.1-3-24, 25) ascertains that the *aṅguṣṭhamātra-puruṣa* is *Īśvara* only and not truly of the size of a thumb. It is referred to as *jīva* at places to show the identity of *jīva* and Brahman like that in 'tat tvam asi'. Though it is *ātmā* only, it is called *jīva* because of identification between *ātmā* and *ahaṃkāra*. This identity happens to be between *buddhi-vṛtti* and *ātmā*. At other places such identity is called *cit-jadagranthi* (knot between sentient *cit* and inert *upādhi*). *Ahaṃkāra* appears to be self-luminous because of such identity, but really it is not so. This becomes clear from the deep sleep wherein the *ahaṃkāra* is absent and yet the knowledge-principle continues. Thus *ātmā* is the self-luminous *caitanya* the knowledge-principle like the self-luminous light-principle, the sun. *Ātmā*

on account of *ahaṃkāra-upādhi* as a *jīva* takes to *saṅkalpa* in the form of desires, resolves, consideration, varieties of thoughts in terms of all mental functions (*manovyāpāra*).

The so called *saṅkoca* (संकोच) and *vikāsa* (diminution and expansion) of *jīva* is because of *antaḥkaraṇa* which through the *ahaṃkāra-vṛtti* with *cidābhāsa* in it permeates the entire body whether it is of the size of an ant or that of an elephant. It is like space appearing big or small in big or small pots. Thus it is the *cidābhāsa* that appears to contract or expand which is attributed to *jīva*. *Ātmā* can neither increase nor decrease. If it does then *ātmā* will be destructible.

In the *mantra* 8 (Śv.U. 5-8) the *jīva* or *ātmā* was described as having the dimension of the tooth of an awl (*ārāgramātra*). That was only to show its subtle nature and not any dimension. Its subtle nature is illustrated with another example in the ninth *mantra*. It also shows that by *Brahmajñāna* the real nature of such *jīva* to be limitless can be known. The tenth *mantra* points out that the *jīva* is neither feminine nor masculine, but it appears so based on the gross body wielded by it. The eleventh *mantra* describes different causes that lead to the taking of varieties of bodies. The twelfth *mantra* points out that the *jīva* takes various bodies in accordance

with one's *saṃskāras*, *karmaphalas*, etc. It is *Īśvara* as the *karmaphaladātā* makes it possible. The thirteenth *mantra* reveals that the knowledge of the Creator (*Īśvara*) destroys the fetters of *saṃsāra* whereas the fourteenth one suggests the means of gaining *ātmajñāna*. The next verse gives the gist of the tenth *mantra*. The topics of *mantras* eleven to fourteen pertain to *Īśvara*. The discussion on them is not included in the context of the topic pertaining to *jīva*.

नैव स्त्री न पुमानेष नैव चायं नपुंसकः ।
यद्यच्छरीरमादत्ते तेन तेन स कथ्यते ॥१०॥

एषः - this *jīva* स्त्री न एव - is not feminine by gender न पुमान् - not masculine अयं - this *jīva* नपुंसकः न च एव - not at all neuter यद् यद् शरीरम् आदत्ते - whatever body it takes to तेन तेन - in accordance with those bodies स कथ्यते - it is described – (90)

90. The *jīva* is devoid of feminine, masculine or neuter genders. It is described in accordance with the features of whatever various body it takes to.

The distinction of genders is according to the gross body obtained in accordance with one's *karmaphalas*. It is not there in even subtle body or *ahaṃkāra*. It is impossible to be there in *ātmā* which is *upādhi*less. Whatever

body the *jīva* identifies with, it takes its gender as that of oneself. With this verse the exposition on the fifth chapter of this Upaniṣad ends.

In the sixth chapter of the Upaniṣad while summing up the teaching imparted so far, the topic of *sādhana* (means) is also clarified. In the beginning of the Upaniṣad what all cannot be the cause of *jagat* was told. Reminding the same, only *Īśvara* (Brahman) can be the cause is told and elaborated.

MĀYĀ THE GLORY OF ĪŚVARA

अविद्याधीनजीवेशावुक्तौ

यत्तत्त्वमेतयोः ।

तद्विद्यासिद्धये कालस्वभावादीन्

विचारयेत् ॥९१॥

अविद्याधीनजीवेशौ - the *jīva* and *Īśvara* projected by (or dependant on) *avidyā* उक्तौ - were described एतयोः - of these two the products of *avidyā* यत् तत्त्वम् - whatever real nature तद्विद्यासिद्धये - to gain its knowledge कालस्वभावादीन् - the time, nature, (etc., as the causes of *jagat*) विचारयेत् - should be inquired into (again) –(91)

91. The *jīva* and *Īśvara* projected by (or dependant on) *avidyā* were described. To know the real nature of these two, the products of *avidyā* the

time, nature, (etc., as the causes of *jagat*) should be inquired into (again).

The distinction of *jīva* and *Īśvara* with their *vyavahāra* is until *avidyā* exists. When *avidyā* ends there is neither *jīva* nor *Īśvara*. Therefore both of them are described as *adhīna* (dependant) on *avidyā*. The real nature of both is free from *avidyā*. By the *aparokṣa jñāna* of *jīveśvara* the *mokṣa* is gained. For this purpose it is necessary to know their basis to be the cause of the *jagat*. People by mistake consider time (*kāla*), nature (*svabhāva*), etc., as the cause. This is not correct. So an inquiry into these is required. Such an inquiry was conducted in the beginning of this chapter. None of these commonly known entities can be such cause though they can be the secondary ones. Only *Īśvara* (*ātmā*/Brahman) can be the final cause. An entity which itself is an effect and yet happens to be the cause of something is a secondary (*avāntara*) cause. But the entity which is not an effect of anything but is independent and serves as the cause of all secondary causes is the final (*mukhya*) cause. That ultimate cause is *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* *ātmā*/Brahman. It is the real nature of *jīva-Īśvara*.

How the inquiry regarding *kāla*, etc., is to be conducted is being told.

मूलकारणतैतेषां न

युक्ता जनिमत्त्वतः ।

देवस्य महिमा योऽसौ

मायाख्यस्तस्य युज्यते ॥१२॥

एतेषां - of these *kāla* (time), etc.

मूलकारणता - status of being the ultimate cause (of *jagat*) जनिमत्त्वतः - because of being born न युक्ता - is not proper यः असौ - whatever that is देवस्य - of *Īśvara* मायाख्या महिमा - glory called *māyā* तस्य - its (status of being the ultimate cause of *jagat*) युज्यते - is proper –(92)

92. *Kāla* (time), etc., cannot be the ultimate cause (of *jagat*) because they themselves are born. It is proper (to ascertain) that the glory of *Īśvara* called *māyā* is the cause.

Time, etc., are themselves born. They have their causes. Therefore they cannot be the final cause of *jagat* even though they are the secondary ones. The final cause must necessarily be the glory of *Īśvara* (*sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* in reality) called *māyā*. Because the *avidyā* (ignorance) of *ātmā* gives rise to the false expanse of *jagat*, it is called *māyā*. This does not mean that *ātmā/Paramātmā* is not the final cause. It only means that unknown *Paramātmā* becomes the cause of *jagat* just as unknown rope is the cause of mistaken snake, etc. This *māyā* as the final cause is

said to be ‘proper’ (*yuktā*) because it is ascertained after thorough inquiry in *Brahmasūtras*, etc. The dream also can help us to understand this.

The second *mantra* describes that this entire Creation is covered by *Īśvara* coupled with his glory, *māyā*. This is explained in the next three verses.

तन्महिम्नाऽऽवृतं सर्वं कालं च कलयत्यसौ ।
भूतभव्यादिरूपेण भिन्नोऽसौ जायते ततः ॥१३॥

तन्महिम्ना - by the glory of *Īśvara* सर्वं - the entire *jagat* आवृतं - is covered असौ - this glory of *Īśvara* called *māyā* कालं च - *kāla* also कलयति - projects/produces भूतभव्यादिरूपेण भिन्नः - (because the time) is distributed in the form of past, future, etc., (i.e. present) (and therefore a changing limited entity which has to be an effect of some cause) असौ - that (time) ततः - from *Īśvara/māyā* जायते - is born –(93)

93. The entire *jagat* is covered by the glory of *Īśvara* called *māyā*. The *māyā* projects the time principle also. That time is born from *Īśvara/māyā* (because it is) distributed in the form of past, future, etc., (i.e. present) (and therefore a changing limited entity which has to be an effect of some cause).

The glory of (*mahimā*) of *Īśvara* is *māyā* as told in the earlier verse. Everything is covered or limited by it

because any cause covers its effect. The cause is more pervasive than its effect. The time (*kāla*) onwards all the secondary causes are covered by *Īśvara's* glory, *māyā*. Therefore none of them can be the final cause of *jagat*. It is well-known that everything is born at one time or the other. But on inquiry the time itself is a born entity. Bādarāyaṇācārya himself tells this in *Brahmasūtra* (2-3-7): ‘All *vikāras* (changes of forms) like the pot, pitcher, etc., made of mud are seen to be distinct from one another. Therefore the space (*ākāśa*) which is distinct from earth, etc., is certainly born of Brahman’. That shows that whatever that is distinct from something or the other is necessarily a *vikāra* (change) and therefore a *kārya* (effect). What applies to space is applicable to time also. *Bhāṣyakāra* while commenting on this *sūtra* says that by such distinction between different entities it is also explained that ‘quarters (*dik*), time (*kāla*), atoms (*paramāṇus*), etc., are effects (*kārya*)’. That is why it is told in this verse that the divisions of time into past, present and future proves it as a born entity. Vaiśeṣikas imagine an ‘indivisible time’. It is not based on any valid *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) or sound reasoning. Earlier *ācāryas* have clarified this while investigating the nature of *kāla* (time). If at all as a category such time has to be considered

it can only be *avidyā* as described by Vedānta. That is why *Śrī* Madhusūdana Saraswati says in *Siddhāntabindu* (vs.8) that ‘*Kāla* is *avidyā* only because that only is the power which sustains the entire *jagat*’. *Nyāyaratnāvalī* brands ‘*mahākāla*’ (great time) accepted by Vaiśeṣikas as ‘*pramāṇahīna*’ (baseless). The time having the divisions of past future, etc., is born from *Īśvara* endowed with the glory of *māyā*. Only a sentient entity can know that such and such occasion is already past whereas these events are yet to take place, etc. Thus the *kāla* is a secondary cause.

In the beginning of the Upaniṣad besides the time, *svabhāva* (nature), etc., were also mentioned as the causes of *jagat*. They also cannot be the cause is being shown now.

जलाग्न्यादिसमुत्पत्तौ

स्वभावः सह जायते ।

यदृच्छा पञ्चभूतानि प्रधानं

चेति मायिकम् ॥९४॥

जलाग्न्यादिसमुत्पत्तौ - while the water, fire, etc., are born सह - along with them स्वभावः - their unique nature (also) जायते - is born यदृच्छा - chance पञ्चभूतानि - five elements प्रधानं च - and *pradhāna* (the first effect of *māyā* or the state of equilibrium of three *guṇas*) इति - all these मायिकम् - are born of *māyā* – (94)

94. Along with the birth of water, fire, etc., their unique nature (also) takes birth. All entities such as ‘chance’, five elements and *pradhāna* (the first effect of *māyā* or the state of equilibrium of three *guṇas*) are born of *māyā*.

The water, etc., are born, so their ‘nature’ also is born along with them. If ‘nature’ (their *svabhāva*) were the cause, they should exist even before water, etc., are born. Therefore nature (*svabhāva*) cannot be the original cause of *jagat*. Similarly the ‘chance’ also cannot be the cause. The cause of something when not known is said to be ‘by chance’. But the possibility of ‘chance’ arises when other connected things are there and there arises an occasion such as ‘do not know why’. The ‘chance’ vanishes the moment the cause is known. Thus chance is born of some already existing circumstances or things. It cannot be the cause of everything. The *śruti* itself declares that the five great elements are born. Therefore they cannot be the final causes. *Pradhāna* as the state of equilibrium of *sattva*, etc., the three *guṇas*, is a concept of Sāṅkhya school of thought. They profess that *pradhāna* is the cause of *jagat*. How this is wrong is established at many places in *Brahmasūtras* in the first and second chapters. The *guṇas* such as *sāttvika*, etc., are the features found in objects.

They are born with objects which are themselves the effects of *māyā*. Thus none of *kāla*, etc., can be the final *jagatkāraṇa*.

This inquiry is concluded now by pointing out that *māyā* only can be the final *jagatkāraṇa*.

मूलकारणतास्त्येव मायाया जन्यभावतः ।
अवान्तरं कारणत्वं कालादीनां भवत्विदम्॥१५॥

जन्यभावतः - because of the absence (*abhāva*) of birth (*jani*) मायायाः - of *māyā*
मूलकारणता - status of being the original cause of *jagat* अस्ति एव - certainly is there
कालादीनाम् - of time, etc. इदम् कारणत्वं - the status of being the cause of *jagat* अवान्तरं भवतु - let it be secondary in nature – (95)

95. *Māyā* is certainly the original cause of *jagat* because it has no birth. Let time (*kāla*), etc., be the secondary causes of *jagat*.

The phrase ‘*janyabhāva*’ from the verse can be viewed in two ways. As the *abhāva* (absence) of *jani* (birth), it applies to *māyā*. Another meaning of ‘*janyabhāva*’ can be ‘*kāryatva*’ the status of being *kārya* (effect) of some cause because it has birth (*jani*). Or it can also mean an entity that comes into existence after being born (called *janya*). Both these meanings apply to *kāla*, etc., which are born and so can only be the secondary causes of *jagat*.

Māyā is the Creative power of Brahman. It can be referred to as distinct from Brahman, but it has no independent existence apart from it. ‘*Māyā* is the cause of *jagat*’ means Brahman creates the *jagat* by *māyā*-power. Whatever that is seen as the cause in the world is a secondary cause because of its birth. According to *śruti* the unknown (*ajñāta*) Brahman is the original cause of *jagat*.

The third *mantra* of Upaniṣadic sixth chapter mentions numerically the causes of the body from which one gets liberated on gaining *mokṣa*. It is natural that when one gets freed from these causes, their effect, the body, also ends with no longer transmigration.

एकं प्रधानं द्वे पुण्यपापे सत्त्वादिकास्त्रयः ।
अष्टौ प्रकृतयो भूमिमुख्यास्तैर्जायते वपुः ॥९६॥

एकं प्रधानं - the one that is *pradhāna*, (i.e. *avidyā* or *māyā*) द्वे पुण्यपापे - two in the form of *pāpa* and *puṇya* सत्त्वादिकाः त्रयः - the three *guṇas* such as *sattva*, *raja* and *tama* भूमि मुख्याः - beginning from earth अष्टौ प्रकृतयः - the eightfold *prakṛti* (consisting of five elements, mind, *buddhi* and *ahaṃkāra* - (B.G.7-4) तैः - by these वपुः - body जायते - is born – (96)

96. The body is born from the following constituents. The one that is *pradhāna*, (i.e. *avidyā* or *māyā*), two in

the form of *pāpa* and *puṇya*, the three *guṇas* such as *sattva*, *raja* and *tama*, the eightfold *prakṛti* beginning from earth [consisting of five elements, mind, *buddhi* and *ahaṃkāra* - (B.G.7-4)].

When the *avidyā* or *māyā* is ended by *Brahmasākṣātkāra*, none of the subsequent secondary causes that produce the body or causes transmigration can exist. That is the state of liberation.

The fourth *mantra* points out that the dedication of one's *karmas* to *Īśvara* can destroy their results and make one gain *Īśvara* in course of time. The fifth *mantra* describes *Īśvara* who was referred to as the final cause of *jagat*. This *mantra* is described in the next verse.

यो मायावी स सर्वेषामादिः कालत्रयात्परः ।
विश्वरूपं स्वचित्तस्थं तमुपास्य प्रसादयेत् ॥९७॥

यः मायावी - the one who is the master of *māyā* सः - he सर्वेषाम् आदिः - is the cause of all कालत्रयात् परः - totally unconnected to the three periods of time तम् - that *Īśvara* विश्वरूपं - who is the real nature of entire Creation स्वचित्तस्थं - (and) who abides in the *antaḥkaraṇa* of everyone उपास्य - having meditated upon प्रसादयेत् - the *mumukṣu* should please (him) – (97)

97. The *Īśvara* who is the master

of *māyā* is the cause of all besides totally unconnected to the three periods of time. The *mumukṣu* should please that *Īśvara* having meditated upon him who is the real nature of entire Creation (and) who abides in the *antaḥkaraṇa* of everyone.

Māyāvī is the *caitanya* limited by *māyā* which itself is the master of that *māyā* called *Īśvara*. That is the main cause of *jagat* whereas the rest of the causes are only secondary in nature. Even the *kāla* (time) is born from that *māyāvī* only which is ever-existent entity beyond the realm of time having past, present and future divisions. Something ‘was’ means now it does not exist; something ‘will be’ also means it is not now. *Īśvara* is beyond these norms because of being *nitya*.

Īśvara is *viśvarūpa* means he is *sarvarūpa* (all forms and names). The entire Creation is his form. He abides in our *antaḥkaraṇa* (*citta*) in the form of *sākṣī*. The *sākṣī* of *ahaṁkāra* itself takes the form of Creation by the means of *māyā*-power. Therefore the cause of *jagat*, the *māyāvī* *Īśvara*, is present in our *antaḥkaraṇa*. The *upāsanā* (meditation) of that *Īśvara* who is in the form of *sākṣī* has to be taken to.

The sixth *mantra* also glorifies *Īśvara* and reveals that by knowing *Īśvara* one attains the abode (*dhāma*) of

cosmos (*viśva*) which is the *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) of everything. This is told in the next verse.

संसारवृक्षात् कालादिशाखायुक्तात् परो ह्ययम् ।
धर्मावहं पापनुदं स्वचित्तस्थं तमीक्ष्यताम् ॥९८॥

अयम् - this *Īśvara* हि - as is well-known in the *śruti* and *smṛti* कालादिशाखायुक्तात् - from (the entity) endowed with branches such as *kāla* (time), etc. संसारवृक्षात् - from the *samsāra* called a tree (*vṛkṣa*) परः - different तं - him धर्मावहं - founder or the source of *dharma* पापनुदं - destroyer of *pāpa* स्वचित्तस्थं - abiding in everyone's *antaḥkaraṇa* ईक्ष्यताम् - should be known directly by *sākṣātkāra* – (98)

98. *Īśvara* is different from the *samsāra* called a tree (*vṛkṣa*) endowed with branches such as *kāla* (time), etc. That *Īśvara* who is the founder or the source of *dharma*, the destroyer of *pāpa* and abiding in everyone's *antaḥkaraṇa* should be known directly by *sākṣātkāra*.

The illustration of calamitous *samsāra* as a tree is well-known in the *śruti* (*Kṛ.U.2-2-1*) and *smṛti* (*B.G.15-1,2*). The *kāla*, *svabhāva*, *niyati*, etc., mentioned earlier are branches of *samsāra* - tree as it were. *Īśvara* is distinct from this tree of *samsāra*. He is *dharmāvaha* (founder of *dharma*). By living a life of *dharma* only a seeker can

gain the eligibility to know him. He is opposed to *pāpa* and destroys it. That is why *Īśvara* takes *avatāra* to protect *dharma* and destroy *adharmā*. Though present everywhere, the *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *Īśvara* can be gained only in *citta* (*antaḥkaraṇa*). It is like the clear reflection of sun in a clean, steady mirror. Only a pure and steady *antaḥkaraṇa* can have the capacity to gain *Brahmasākṣātkāra* through *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana*.

The seventh *mantra* describes *Īśvara* as the most exalted *Īśvara* (*Maheśvara*), *Parama-daivata*, master of all masters, free from Creation. Such *Īśvara* is implored to by the prayer that ‘we experience him in *aparokṣa* as ‘I’ (in *sākṣātkāra*)’. It is summarized now.

विष्वादीनामीश्वराणां परमं तं महेश्वरम् ।
देवानां परमं देवं विदामोऽस्य प्रसादतः ॥९९॥

तं - that one विष्वादीनाम् ईश्वराणां - of great masters such as *Bhagavān* Viṣṇu, etc. परमं - superior to (more exalted than) महेश्वरं - the most exalted *Īśvara* (*Maheśvara*) देवानां - of all deities परमं देवं - the most exalted deity अस्य प्रसादतः - by the favour of *Maheśvara* विदामः - we can know in *sākṣātkāra* – (99)

99. We can know (or may we know) in *sākṣātkāra* the *Maheśvara* (the most exalted *Īśvara*) by his favour only,

who is superior to or more exalted than the great masters such as *Bhagavān* Viṣṇu, etc., and who is the most exalted deity of all deities.

Very highly potent *trimūrtis* (*Brahmā*, Viṣṇu, *Rudra/Śiva*) also is called *Īśvara*. To distinguish from them, the *Īśvara* principle is called *Maheśvara* or *Parameśvara* meaning superior or the most exalted *Īśvara*. Deities such as Indra, etc., adore *Maheśvara* only. By his favour alone we can know him. *Īśvara/Brahman* cannot be known as a *prameya* (object of knowledge) by any *pramāṇa* including Vedānta though it is the only *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) to know *Īśvara/Brahman*. Because in *Brahmasākṣātkāra* the *pramātā* whose real nature itself is Brahman himself drops and so there is no occasion of Brahman becoming its *prameya*. Even the Vedānta *pramāṇa* becomes *apramāṇa* like *dream-pramāṇa* because the field of operating the *pramāṇa*, the *antaḥkaraṇa* is not there. What remains is *nirupādhika* self-luminous Brahman and Brahman alone in its own glory of *paramānanda* (*B.G.Bh.2-69*). Therefore we have to seek *Īśvara's prasāda* (favour) by the means described earlier.

The next verse describes *Īśvara* as depicted in the *mantra* eight of the Upaniṣad (Ch.6).

न तस्य वपुरक्षं च विद्यते

तत्समोऽपि न ।

पराऽस्य शक्तिर्विविधा

बलज्ञानक्रियादिका ॥१००॥

तस्य - of that *Maheśvara/Īśvara*
वपुः - body अक्षं च - and eye, (i.e. senses) न
विद्यते - is not there तत्समः अपि न - there is
none equal to him अस्य - of that *Īśvara* परा
शक्तिः - the most exalted power विविधा -
manifold बल ज्ञान क्रियादिका - in terms of
icchāśakti (desiring power) *jñānaśakti*
(power of knowledge) and *kriyāśakti*
(power of action), etc. – (100)

100. *Īśvara* (*Maheśvara*) has no
body and eye, (i.e. senses). There is none
equal to him. His most exalted power,
(i.e. *māyā*) is manifold in terms of
icchāśakti (इच्छाशक्ति - desiring power),
jñānaśakti (power of knowledge) and
kriyāśakti (power of action), etc.

The Upaniṣad says that *Īśvara*
has no ‘*kārya*’ and ‘*karāṇa*’. Their
meaning is given here as ‘body’ and
‘senses’ respectively. There is nothing
impossible for him on his own.
Therefore he does not need means such
as body, etc. There is no illustration that
can illustrate *Īśvara* because there is
none equal to him leave alone any entity
superior to him.

His Supreme power is described
to be manifold. Here ‘*bala*’ is the power

of desiring (*icchāśakti*). The power of
knowledge (*jñānaśakti*) is on account
of reflection of *Īśvara* (*cit, caitanya*) in
the *antaḥkaraṇa* as *cidābhāsa*. The
kriyāśakti (power of action) also is
from *Parameśvara* or *prāṇaśakti*. These
are the prominent three powers. His
powers are endless. Anything and
everything that is happening anywhere
and everywhere is because of *Īśvara's*
power.

The ninth *mantra* says that *Īśvara*
is the overlord of all. There is none who
can rule over him. This is told in the next
verse.

सोऽधिष्ठानतया सर्वकारणं

करणाधिपाः ।

ये जीवा अधिपस्तेषां

नान्योऽस्याधिपतिर्भवेत् ॥१०१॥

सः - *Maheśvara* अधिष्ठानतया - in the
form of *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) सर्वकारणं - is
the cause of everything ये - those who are
करणाधिपाः जीवाः - *jīvas* owning the senses
(or identified with them) तेषां अधिपः - (he
is) their master अस्य - of *Maheśvara* अन्यः
अधिपतिः - another master न भवेत् - is not
there – (101)

101. *Maheśvara* (the most
exalted *Īśvara*) is the cause of everything
in the form of *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis). (He is)
the master of all *jīvas* owning the
senses (or identified with them). (But)

Maheśvara has no master.

Īśvara is the *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) of *Jagat* on which it is superimposed (*adhyasta*). Such concept of Brahman as *adhiṣṭhāna* and the *jagat* as *adhyasta* is so long as the self-ignorance prevails over. Until then only *Īśvara* appears to be the non-differentiated material and efficient cause (*abhinna-nimitta-upādāna-kāraṇa*) of *jagat*. *Vārtikakāra* also has said that Brahman is said to be the cause of *jagat* because of its seeming appearance as *adhiṣṭhāna* in the realm of ignorance. The *jīvas* who are identified with their bodies and senses are functioning by the powers belonging to *Īśvara* only. But the *jīva* considers oneself as the doer, etc., because of erroneous identification with the *upādhi*. Actually *Īśvara* is the master of all masters. Here ends the description of *Īśvara*.

ADVAITA(NON-DUAL)

In the tenth *mantra* the *mantra-draṣṭa ṛṣi* prays to *Īśvara* to favour him with *Brahmajñāna*. Therein the *Īśvara* is described giving an example of a spider. It weaves a web from its saliva and hides itself in it. Similarly *Īśvara* projects the net of *jagat* in terms of *nāma*, *rūpa* and *karma*. Because of identification with the individual *upādhis* on the part of *jīvas*, *Īśvara* gets concealed from them. By seeing the spider it is not possible to

know how the web was in it. All that can be said is that the web was *avyakta* (unmanifest) in it. So is the net of *saṃsāra* unmanifest in *Īśvara* and when it gets manifest, it covers *Īśvara*. This manifestation is described in the *mantra* as naturally (*svabhāvataḥ*) which shows that *Īśvara* is independent in projecting this *saṃsāra*. He is neither bound by anything nor has any personal utility of it. By the same *mantra* *Īśvara* is prayed to bestow on us *Brahmajñāna*. This is suggested in the first line of the next verse. Then the eleventh *mantra* is explained up to the end of verse 103.

यस्तन्तुनाभ इत्यादिमन्त्रेण

प्रार्थयेत् ततः ।

एको देवः सर्वदेहे गूढो

व्यापी च सर्वतः ॥१०२॥

सर्वप्राण्यन्तरात्माऽसावध्यक्षः

सर्वकर्मणाम् ।

सर्वभूताश्रयः साक्षी

निर्गुणः शुद्धचिद्ध्रुपुः ॥१०३॥

ततः - because of what was told in the earlier three verses ‘यः तन्तुनाभः’ इत्यादिमन्त्रेण - by *mantras* such as ‘*yaḥ tantunābhaḥ (iva)*’ [*Īśvara* (like) a spider] प्रार्थयेत् - *Īśvara* should be prayed to एकः - the one non-dual (*advaya*) principle देवः - resplendent knowledge-principle सर्वदेहे - in all embodiment गूढः - is concealed सर्वतः च - and everywhere

व्यापी - pervasive सर्वप्राण्यन्तरात्मा - the *pratyagātmā* of all living beings असौ सर्वकर्मणाम् अध्यक्षः - witness of *pāpa-punya* of all beings सर्वभूताश्रयः - the resort of all beings by lending them existence (*sattā*) and knowledge (*sphūrṭi*) साक्षी - *sākṣī* (one who illumines everything independently) निर्गुणः - free from all *guṇas* (*sattva*, *raja* and *tama*) शुद्धचिद्वपुः - pure non-dual *caitanya* (pure consciousness) free from all that is *adhyasta* – (102, 103)

102, 103. Because of what was told in the earlier three verses, *Īśvara* should be prayed to by *mantras* such as ‘*yaḥ tantunābhaḥ (iva)*’ [*Īśvara* (like) a spider] (*Śv.U.6-10*). *Īśvara* is one non-dual resplendent knowledge-principle, concealed in all embodiments, present everywhere, (i.e. all pervasive), the *pratyagātmā* (the real ‘I’) of all living beings, the witness of *pāpa-punya* of all beings, the resort of all beings by lending them existence (*sattā*) and knowledge (*sphūrṭi*), the *sākṣī* (one who illumines or makes known everything independently), free from all *guṇas* (*sattva*, *raja* and *tama*) the pure non-dual *caitanya* (pure consciousness) free from all that is *adhyasta*.

Īśvara abides in all, both *vyāṣṭi* and *samaṣṭi* without any exception. Even then he is all pervasive. Just as a spider

itself is the web and the one who is surrounded by it, *Īśvara* also is both *saṃsāra* and the one concealed by it. The spider can withdraw the web unto itself at any time, so also *Īśvara* can withdraw Creation at will in himself as in *pralaya* (dissolution). He is not concealed like the grains in a pot. The pot and the grains have an independent existence having the same degree of reality whereas Creation has no existence of its own. *Īśvara* is concealed in Creation like the gold in a golden ring. In this Creation *Īśvara* is present in each and every minutest particle at every moment. But we see only Creation or *saṃsāra* and miss *Īśvara* just like missing the gold with the mind focussed on the name and form of the ring. Description of *Īśvara* to be all pervasive can give a notion that he may be some inert pervasive entity like the space or some remote thing. This notion is removed by the description that *Īśvara* or *antarātmā* is the *ātmā* in all but not any entity *anātmā*. This also can give another wrong notion that *Īśvara* is subjected to joys and sorrows of all and so is a big *saṃsārī* compared to an individual *jīva* whose *saṃsāra* is individualistic. The words *karmādhyaḥkṣa* (witness of all *pāpa-punya*) and *sākṣī* (illuminator of all joys and sorrows experienced) show that he is free from all that is witnessed or illumined.

The *jīva* who is identified with

antaḥkaraṇa suffers *samsāra* as *kartā* and *bhoktā* whereas *sākṣī*, *ātmā* / *Īśvara* is aloof from it. The word *sākṣī* besides *karmādhyakṣa* suggests that *Īśvara* is not only the *sākṣī* of *karmas* and their *bhogas* but also of all *jīvas* who are *kartā* and *bhoktā*. He dispenses the *karmaphalas*, but by real nature is mere *cit* and *cit* alone free from all *guṇas*. The *jīva* is *caitanya* with *upādhi* whereas *Īśvara* in reality, (i.e. *Paramātmā*) is *caitanya* totally free from *upādhi*. The description of *Paramātmā* (real nature of *Īśvara*) ends here.

PHALA (RESULT OF BRAHMAJÑĀNA)

The twelfth *mantra* describes *Īśvara* as the ruler of everything who makes *avyakta* (unmanifest) in the form of the seed of Creation that is manifest in manifold ways. Those who gain the knowledge of him gain *śāśvata-sukha* (ever-lasting happiness). The thirteenth *mantra* tells that the Brahman the *nitya cit* is the cause of *jagat*. Its knowledge can be gained through *sāṅkhya* (*jñāna*) and *yoga* (meditation). Such knowledge snaps the fetters of *samsāra*. The summary of these two *mantras* is given in the next verse.

ये तु पश्यन्ति तं धीरास्तेषां

स्याच्छाश्वतं सुखम् ।

नित्यं तं चेतनं बुद्ध्वा

प्राप्नुयाच्छान्तिमक्षयाम् ॥१०४॥

ये तु - those who धीराः - are *vivekīs* तं पश्यन्ति - have the *sākṣātkāra* of Brahman तेषां - to them शाश्वतं सुखम् - the ever-lasting happiness स्यात् - takes place तं - that नित्यं चेतनं - ever-existing *caitanya* बुद्ध्वा - having known अक्षयाम् - indestructible शान्तिं - peace (called liberation) प्राप्नुयात् - can be gained –(104)

104. Those *vivekīs* who have the *sākṣātkāra* of Brahman gain the ever-lasting happiness. Having known the ever-existing *caitanya*, the indestructible peace (called liberation) can be gained.

Dhīra is the seeker who is a *vivekī*, intelligent and also the one who pursues the *sādhana* undeterred in spite of not gaining the result even after its long practice. One who is totally committed to this pursuit with required eligibility alone can gain this the *ātmajñāna* and discover one's *paramānanda* nature wherein all desires drop. Desires are the causes of agitation. On knowing Brahman there are no desires, and hence no *asānti* (lack of peace). Then only the ever-lasting peace called *mokṣa* can be gained. There is no other means to gain ever-lasting peace and happiness than *ātmajñāna*.

In the earlier *mantra* it was told that Brahman can be known through *sāṅkhya* and *yoga* (*sāṅkhya-yogādhigamyam*) (Śv.U.6-13). To explain its meaning the topic is introduced

in the next verse.

अशक्यं यत् सुखं वक्तुं तदेतदनुभूयते ।
इति तत्त्वविदः प्राहुरुपायः श्रूयतामिह ॥१०५॥

यत् सुखं - whatever that is *ātmasukha* (happiness that is the real nature of *ātmā*) वक्तुं - to describe अशक्यं - is impossible तत् - that happiness एतत् (इति) अनुभूयते - is experienced in *aparokṣa* (as 'I') इति - so तत्त्वविदः - *Brahmajñānīs* प्राहुः - declare उपायः - the means (of experiencing that *ātmasukha*) इह - now श्रूयताम् - listen - (105)

105. The *ātmasukha* (happiness that is the real nature of *ātmā*) is impossible to describe. So the *Brahmajñānīs* declare. Listen now the means (of experiencing the *ātmasukha*).

Everyone in the state of ignorance does experience the sense-pleasures. But they know not that it is infinitesimal particle of limitless *ātmānanda*/*Brahmānanda* which has got limited on account of *upādhi*. *Ānanda* that is the real nature of *ātmā* is *atīndriya* (imperceptible). It is *buddhigrāhya* (can be experienced by the *antaḥkaraṇa* that conforms to *nirupādhika ātmā*) (B.G. 6-21). It is not *drśya* (perceptible). Words can describe the *drśya-jagat* only with the help of its features such as *jāti* (species), *guṇa* (features), *kriyā* (action), *rūḍhi* (conventional meaning) and *sambandha* (relation) which are

available only in the realm of dualistic *drśya*. *Ātmā* which is *advaya* and so free from all *drśyas* can never be described by the words. And yet *Brahmajñānīs* declare that the experience of this *ātmasukha* is possible because it is our self-evident real nature free from all *upādhis*. All that needs to be done is to end the *adhyāsa* (superimposition) of *upādhis* including ignorance (B.G.Bh. 18-50; Br.U.Bh.1-4-10).

THE MEANS (UPĀYA) TO EXPERIENCE ĀTMASUKHA

The phrase '*sāṅkhya-yogādhi-gamyam*' is explained.

विवेकयोगस्तद्धेतुस्तत्त्वविवेकतः ।
यथाशास्त्रं विविच्यानुभवन्ति दृढयोगतः ॥१०६॥

विवेकयोगः - *viveka* and *yoga* (*viveka* to gain *parokṣa-jñāna* if the eligibility is not there and *yoga* for *aparokṣānubhava*) तद्धेतुः - is the means to gain the *aparokṣa ātmajñāna* यथाशास्त्रं - in accordance with *śāstra* तत्त्वविवेकतः विविच्य - having inquired into 'tat' and 'tvam' to ascertain what is *ātmā* and what is *anātmā* दृढयोगतः - by intense practice of *yoga* अनुभवन्ति - gain *aparokṣa-ātmānubhava* - (106)

106. *Viveka* and *yoga* (*viveka* to gain *parokṣa-jñāna* if the eligibility is not there and *yoga* for *aparokṣānubhava*) constitute the means to gain the *aparokṣa ātmajñāna* in accordance with *śāstra*.

Having inquired into 'tat' and 'tvam' to ascertain what is *ātmā* and what is *anātmā*, *mumukṣus* gain the *aparokṣa-ātmānubhava* by intense practice of *yoga*.

Vivekayoga can be viewed in two ways. Self-inquiry (*viveka*) itself as the means (*yoga*) to gain *aparokṣajñāna* of *ātmā*. This is possible for *uttama adhikāri* (highly eligible *mumukṣu*) who has such a pure and steady mind that in *śravaṇa* (*viveka*) itself he can experience *śodhita tvam pada* (*nirupādhika* 'you', i.e. 'I') which is pointed out by

mahāvākya to be Brahman. If such eligibility is not there *śravaṇa* will be able to give only *parokṣajñāna*. Further by *yoga* depending on what types of means are required to command a pure and steady *antaḥkaraṇa*, the *śodhita 'tvam' pada* can be experienced which gives *Brahmajñāna* as indicated by *mahāvākya*. This is strictly in accordance with what *bhāṣyakāra* comments upon *jñāna* as the scriptural knowledge and *vijñāna* as one's intense experience according to what is learnt from *adhyātma-sāstra* (*B.G.Bh.3-41; 6-8*).

VEDĀNTA-PRAMĀṆA, ĀTMĀNUBHAVA, SAMĀDHI, MYSTICISM

It has become a rhetoric nowadays in certain circles of Vedānta to condemn the necessity of *ātmānubhava* or *Brahmānubhava* (experience of *ātmā/Brahman*) in gaining the *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna* not knowing the exact nature of the *aparokṣa* entity the 'I' *ātmā* and its *aparokṣajñāna* distinct from the knowledge of *parokṣa* (remote entities) or that of *pratyakṣa* (directly perceptible entities).

The word '*aparokṣa*' finally means the innermost independent self-existent '*pratyak*' *ātmā* only. This can be arrived at from the *bhāṣya* on the famous *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat* statement: '*Yat sākṣāt aparokṣāt, (i.e. aparokṣam) brahma yah ātmā sarvāntarah*' (*Bṛ.U.3-4-1, 3-5-1*). '*Sākṣāt*' means '*avyavahitam*' (not separated by anything intervening) or immediate. This word '*sākṣāt*' shows Brahman to be neither a *pratyakṣa* (perceived) object (*dṛśya*), nor a *parokṣa* (remote) entity or an *upāśya* (something else such as *mana*, *āditya*, etc., considered as *brahma* for *upāsanā*). The *pratyakṣa* objects are within the contact of *indriyas* (*akṣnaḥ prati*). '*Parokṣa* is that which is outside the range of *indriyas*. By saying *aparokṣa*, there is the possibility of Brahman being a *pratyakṣa* (perceptible) object. This is refuted by the word *sākṣāt* (not separated by anything). Therefore Brahman is neither *pratyakṣa* nor *parokṣa*. Such an entity has to mean necessarily the 'I' which is not secondary (*agaṇa*) to '*draṣṭā*' (the knowledge-principle / experience-principle). That is called

‘*aparokṣa*’ which the *śruti* describes as *yaḥ ātmā sarvāntaraḥ* (the innermost *ātmā*). Thus the *ātmā* whose real nature is simultaneously *anubhava-svarūpa*, *jñapti-svarūpa* and the ever-existence (*sat*) principle is described by the *śruti* to be *aparokṣa*. Therefore in the *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *ātmā* or in *Brahmasākṣātkāra* which is a state of *antaḥkaraṇa* though free from *avidyā* and its effects in terms of *upādhis*, the *anubhava* (experience) *svarūpa* (nature) of *ātmā*/Brahman free from *tripuṭis* persists. That is the *ātmānubhava* or *Brahmānubhava*. Without it the *aparokṣa-ātmajñāna* is an impossibility. The wrong concept that *ātmajñāna* does not need *ātmānubhava* is born of either the ignorance of *ātmā* as *anubhava-svarūpa* (by itself the self-experiencing principle) or its implication when all *upādhis* including *avidyā* are dropped as in the case of *aparokṣajñāna*.

Ātmā enables the *adhyasta tripuṭī* to gain the experience in the waking and dream states. To say that the ‘experience without *tripuṭī* is not possible and therefore *ātmānubhava* will have *tripuṭī* is not a correct statement. If this is true the same norm will apply to the knowledge (*jñāna*) also. It will have the *tripuṭī* of knower, knowledge (*vṛtti*) and the known. This cannot be the *jñāna* of *tripuṭiless ātmā*. Thus *ātmajñāna* will be ever-impossible because according to them the knowledge without *tripuṭī* is not possible. That is against the *śruti*. The fact is that the experience is possible even without the *tripuṭī* as in the case of deep sleep and the *nirvikalpa-samādhi*.

The votaries of non-experiential *ātmajñāna* also say that *Brahmānanda* is not experiential though the same *Brahmānanda* is available for experiencing as *viśayānanda* (sense-pleasures). They give the example that eye can see all forms but not itself. Here also they have overlooked the fact that eyes are inert by themselves whereas *Brahmānanda* being Brahman itself, is self-luminous (*svaprakāśa*) principle of experience. *Anubhava-svarūpa ātmā*/Brahman is simultaneously self-evident or self-experiencing as *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* and not severally.

‘I’ (*ātmā*) is self-evidently experiential always being itself the *anubhava-svarūpa* (self-experiencing principle). *Ātmā* being *nirupādḥika* (*upādḥiless*) there is no *tripuṭī* cast by *ahaṃkāra* or *pramātā* such as *pramātā*, *pramāṇa-vṛtti* and *prameya* which is akin to the subject-object relation from a lay man's view. The popular concept of those who deny the experience of *ātmā*/Brahman is that the Vedānta is a *pramāṇa* like the eyes to see an object and therefore does not need any experience. They also refer to the so called experience of *ātmā* as mystic and brush it aside as

unnecessary. When they brand the *ātmānubhava* as mystic they obviously have in their mind the experience of *nirvikalpa samādhi*. This needs an investigation. Nowhere in the *adhyātma-śāstra* or *pramāṇa-śāstra* (epistemology) it is said that a *pramāṇa* gives knowledge invariably without an experience conforming to the entity to be known.

The Vedānta is a *pramāṇa* is an undisputed fact. But to say that all *pramāṇas* without any exception give knowledge without the relevant experience is a wrong statement. For example, the direct perception of an inferred entity by the inference as the means of knowledge is not possible, it is not directly perceived or experienced. But in the case of *pratyakṣa pramāṇa* (direct perception) to say that the form seen by the eyes is not experienced is wrong. Whatever we see, hear, taste, touch and smell is first experienced and thereafter one may or may not know what it is. If not known, a *vṛddha-vacana* or an *āpta-vākya* (the statement of an elderly person or a reliable one) who knows it can give its knowledge. But the basis of the perceptible knowledge is the experience conforming to the object perceived.

Consider a born blind child whose eye-sight is restored by some surgery. Now, if we hold a rose in front of it, the child does experience or is aware of something, but does not know what exactly it is. It needs to be told: ‘what you see is the form of a rose flower’. Without such basic experience of the form the knowledge of a rose is not possible. The eye is said to be *pramāṇa* for sight because it is the only means which can register the visual form in the *antaḥkaraṇa* experientially which is not possible in the case of inference as *pramāṇa*. Therein the knowledge gets restricted only to the existence of the inferred entity and not its direct perception. For example, seeing the smoke we infer the existence of fire. But we see only the smoke and not the fire. In view of this to say that Vedānta is a *pramāṇa* like eyes and therefore does not need experience is not a correct statement or an illustration.

In gaining the knowledge whether corresponding experience is required or not is determined by the nature of the entity to be known or its availability for experiencing at the time of its knowing. It is determined by the *pramāṇa*. What applies to *pratyakṣa* is true for *aparokṣajñāna* because *ātmā*, ‘I’, whether in the state of *ajñāna* or *jñāna* is ever experienced. All experiences of *saṃsāra* are through *adhyasta antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* depicting all *adhyasta upādhis* with their features in different conditions. *Bhāṣyakāra* tells while commenting on *mahāvākya* ‘*aham Brahmāsmi*’ (*Br.U.* 1-4-10) that all that is needed to gain the *Brahmajñāna* is to end

this *adhyāsa*. In the *Bhagavadgītā-bhāṣya* (18-50) he says that *antaḥkaraṇa* is so designed by *Īśvara* that such a state of *antaḥkaraṇa* free from all *adhyasta-upādhis* in terms of *nirupādhika ātmānubhava* can be accomplished. Such experience free from the experience of calamitous *saṃsāra* alone can be the state of *aparokṣa ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna* with the help of *śruti pramāṇa* which introduces that this experience which is *Paramānanda* is of *ātmā* in its real *upādhi*less nature and that itself is Brahman. Without such *aparokṣa ātmānubhava* the *avidyā*, desires, *karmaphalas*, transmigration or in short *saṃsāra* can never end. Without the direct *darśana* (*sākṣātkāra*) of *adhiṣṭhāna* Brahman, to label the *saṃsāra* as *mithyā* cannot eliminate *saṃsāra*.

Without the *aparokṣātmānubhava*, mere understanding of what is told in the Vedāntic scripture cannot reduce the *saṃsāra* to its *mithyā* nature. The *adhyasta* (superimposed) *drśya jagat* is *mithyā* cannot be ascertained without the *sākṣātkāra* (direct *darśana* - experience) of *satya-adhiṣṭhāna* Brahman. The mistaken snake can get reduced to *mithyā* (false) nature only when its basis the rope is seen in bright light. Instead of this, to say ‘the mistaken snake to be *mithyā*’ without direct verification because a reliable person told is only a *parokṣa* (indirect) information. Parroting some scriptural statements and saying that ‘*sat* (*asti*), *cit* (*bhāti*) and *ānanda* (*priya*) is Brahman and it is my real nature whereas *nāma*, *rūpa* is *jagat*, and it is *mithyā* whereas ‘I am free from it’ by itself is verbose Vedānta. It cannot end my experiential *saṃsāra*. If I experience ‘I am hungry’ the solution is only in the counter experience, ‘my hunger is appeased’. If ‘I’ am experiencing myself to be sick, the solution is in the final experience that ‘I am healthy’. The principle underlying this rule will be told later as shown by the Sage Vasiṣṭha. Consoling myself that hunger or sickness is *mithyā* and ‘I in reality’ is ‘*asti*, *bhāti*, *priyam*’ is not the solution. If I am experiencing *saṃsāra* in *aparokṣa* (direct), I am least concerned about its labelling as *satya* or *mithyā*. Only the *aparokṣa* experience that ‘there is no trace of *saṃsāra* in me; I am *paramānanda*’ can end the *saṃsāra*. The Vedānta *pramāṇa* should finally lead me to this. If not, it means that I do not have yet the eligibility required or I am indulging in verbose Vedānta keeping *saṃsāra* intact on account of not knowing the exact nature of *Brahmajñāna* by mistaking the *parokṣajñāna* to be the *aparokṣa* one.

For *aparokṣānubhava* the *mumuksu* must be *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-saṃpanna* with *śuddha* and *niṣcalāntaḥkaraṇa*. Then only *śravaṇa* can yield promised result. We have already seen at many places how *aparokṣajñāna* takes place. Here comes the role of ‘*tvam pada śodhana*’ (experience of *upādhi*less *ātmā* in its self-evident real

nature). Certainly such experience happens to be the *samādhi* however momentary it may be. This is where some modern *ācāryas* pooh-poooh *samādhi* as some unnecessary mystic experience as if it is a great blasphemy or something untouchable (*aspr̥śya*). Really it is a matter of great wonder if they have investigated into the meaning of the word ‘mystic’ and whether Upaniṣads and *Bhagavadgītā* describe *samādhi* with its means or not.

It is a well-known fact that the means to *samādhi* such as *praṇava-dhyāna* (*Mu.U.2-2-3,4*), *yoga* (*Kṛ.U.2-3-10, 11*), *adhyātmayoga* (*Kṛ.U.Bh.1-2-12*), *Pañcīkaraṇa* meditation by Ādi Śaṅkara and its *Vārtika*, *cit-jada viveka* (*S.R.U.; Dr.Dr.Vi.*), *aṣṭāṅgayoga* are described in Upaniṣads, *Bhagavadgītā* and *prakaraṇa granthas* such as *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, etc. *Bhāṣyakāra* emphasizes the need of a cleansed (purified) mind by *samādhi* when he comments on *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa's statement ‘*ātmanā* (समाधिपरिशुद्धेन अन्तःकरणेन) *ātmānam* (परं चैतन्यं) *paśyan* (उपलभमानः) (directly experiencing *ātmā* through the mind cleansed by the means of *samādhi*)’ (*B.G.Bh. 6-20*). The *yoga* is ‘दुःखसंयोगवियोग’ (separation of union with sorrow). It is defined in *Gītā* (*B.G.Bh.6-19 to 23*) as a state of *samādhi* in *nirupādhika ātmā*.

The entire description of *sthita-prajñā* (*B.G.2-53 to 72*) is that of a person who is steadfast in *samādhi* with absorption in *ātmā*. *Bhagavān* tells Arjuna that when his mind remains steadfast in *ātmā* (called *samādhi*), then he will get *yoga* (*viveka-prajñā samādhi*) (*B.G.Bh.2-53*). Arjuna uses this opportunity to ask the description of such a *sthitaprajñā* (means *sthira-prajñā* the one whose *prajñā* has become *sthira* means steady). *Prajñā* in this context is defined as the *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* which objectifies (or conforms to) the oneness of *nirupādhika* Brahman and *ātmā*, which is also *nirvikalpa* (free from divisions such as *tripuṭī*, etc.), besides its nature is totally *cit* and *cit* alone, (i.e. replica of *upādhiless cit*) (*Adhyātmopanīṣat*, 42-44). Arjuna also refers to a *sthitaprajñā* by adding its synonym *samādhista* (*B.G.2-54*). The foregoing discussion proves the inevitable role of *nirvikalpa samādhi*, universally known to be experiential, in gaining *ātmajñāna* is in accordance with Vedāntic *saṃpradāya* (methodology of traditional teaching) as employed in Upaniṣads, *Bhagavadgītā*, *Yogavāsiṣṭha* which have originated from the Vedas or *Bhagavān*, and great sages including *Bhāṣyakāra*. It is not simply the traditional teaching but *Bhagavān* Śiva himself demonstrates by going into *samādhi* while teaching the fifth to seventh stages of the *jñānabhūmikās* to sage Vasīṣṭha (*Yo. Vā.Ni.Pū.34*).

Notwithstanding all these and the well-defined nature of *ātmānubhava*

including its means the votaries of non-experiential *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna*, in their ignorance present the knowledge that is *parokṣa* in nature as *aparokṣa* one. With such erroneous concept they scornfully brand the *samādhi* required for *ātmānubhava* as accepted by *Vedānta śāstra* and *bhāṣyakāra* as ‘mystic’. Then they will have to clarify as to what they mean by ‘mystic’ in the context of *ātmānubhava/Brahmānubhava* or ‘*śodhita tvam pada*’ which involves *nirvikalpa samādhi* free from the experience of all *adhyasta* (superimposed) entities. It is needless to say that *samādhi* whose nature and the means are well defined in the *śāstras* is not any psychedelic experience or ecstasy.

Let us consider the history and evolution of the word ‘Mysticism’. The Encyclopedia Britannica gives the following meanings until that traditional conception of mysticism was finally abandoned by academic scholars in the 1970s. ‘The word mysticism means the practice of religious ecstasies (religious experiences during alternate states of consciousness), together with whatever ideologies, ethics, rites, myths, legends, and magic may be related to them. The term ‘*mystic*’ derived from the Greek noun ‘*mystes*’, originally designated an initiate of a secret cult or mystery religion. In Classical Greece (5th - 4th century BCE) and during Hellenistic Age (323 BCE - 330 CE), the rites of the mystery religions were largely or wholly secret. The term ‘*mystes*’ is itself derived from the verb *myein* (“to close”, especially the eyes or mouth) and signified a person who kept a secret. Early Christianity appropriated the technical vocabulary of Hellenistic mysteries but later disavowed secrecy, resulting in a transformation of the meaning of *mystes*..... The soul's ecstasy, or rapture, in contemplation of God was termed a ‘spiritual marriage’ by St. Bernard of Clairvaux, the greatest mystical authority of the 12th Century. In 13th century the term *uniomystica* (Latin: “mystical union”) came into use as a synonym. During the same period the range of objects of contemplation was increased to include the passions of Christ, vision of saints and tours of heaven and hell. In the 17th and 18th centuries the enthusiasms of quaking, shaking, and other infusions of the Holy Spirit were also called mystical..... The competition between the perspectives of theology and science resulted in a compromise in which most varieties of what had traditionally been called mysticism were dismissed as merely psychological phenomena and only one variety, which aimed at union with the absolute, the infinite, or God and thereby the perception of its essential unity or oneness - was claimed to be genuinely mystical. The historical evidence, however, does not support such a narrow conception of mysticism..... In South Asian traditions, some mysticism can indeed be

defined successfully in terms of the experience or perception of unity with the divine. The Sanskrit texts known as Upaniṣad are examples in this respect....’

As for the experience of unity with divine others offer more information about mysticism in modern times: “In modern times, ‘mysticism’ has acquired a limited definition, with broad applications, as meaning the aim ‘at the union with the absolute, the infinite, or God’. In Hinduism various *sādhanas* aim at overcoming ignorance (*avidyā*) and transcending the limited identification with the body, mind and ego to attain *mokṣa*. Hinduism has a number of interlinked ascetic traditions and philosophical schools which aim at *mokṣa*. With the onset of British colonisation of India, those traditions came to be interpreted in western terms such as ‘mysticism’, drawing equivalents with western terms and practices. Classical Vedānta gives philosophical interpretations and commentaries of the Upaniṣads. *Advaita* Vedānta, as expounded by Śaṅkara, states that there is no difference between *ātman* and Brahman with *māyāvāda*. *Advaita* Vedānta has acquired a broad acceptance in Indian culture and beyond, as the paradigmatic example of Hindu spirituality”. It is well-known that Upaniṣads and *Upāsanā* are called *rahasya* (secret) which is an aspect of the word ‘mysticism’. The word ‘mystic’ according to OXFORD Dictionary means a person who tries to become united with God and so reach truth beyond the human understanding.

Thus two prominent meanings of ‘mysticism’, old and modern, emerge from what we have seen so far. In view of this the old meaning of ‘mysticism’ or ‘mystic’ does not apply to *ātmanubhava* at all whereas the modern meaning is totally applicable to *ātmanubhava* which is *atīndriya* (imperceptible) and beyond the realm of the mind and words. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa describes the unsurpassed *ātmasukha* (*sukhamātyantika*) as *atīndriya* and it is experienced (*vetti - anubhavati*, *B.G.Bh.6-21*). It is a matter of common sense which does not need much intelligence or an interpretation that happiness is first experienced and then known. So is the case with sorrow. And yet *bhāṣyakāra* explains ‘*vetti*’ (knows) as *anubhavati* (experiences). Therefore to say that through the Vedānta-*pramāṇa* ‘I know that I am *ātyantika* (unsurpassed) *sukha* (happiness) totally free from the sorrows of *saṃsāra* but it is to be understood not experiential’ is a palpable contradiction of a prejudiced mind that refuses to see the reality. Scriptural verbosity is not *mokṣa*. *Bhāṣyakāra* repeatedly points out that the result of *Brahmavidyā* is *pratyakṣa* (experienced here itself) and not later or after death. Ending of sorrows and experiencing *paramānanda* is right

now here on gaining *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. (अनुभवारूढं/प्राप्तानुभवं तु ज्ञानफलं... अनुभवारूढं एव च विद्याफलं न क्रियावत् कालान्तरभावी इति असकृत् अवोचाम) (*Br.Sū.Bh.* 3-3-32; 3-4-15).

As told earlier ‘the knowledge gained by the means of all *pramāṇās* do not require an experience of the entity to be known’ is nowhere said either in Vedānta or in *pramāṇa-śāstra* (branch of knowledge that verifies the correctness of both the means of knowledge called *pramāṇa* and the knowledge gained thereby) which corresponds to ‘Epistemology’. It is true that such experiences are not possible in the case of some *pramāṇas* such as inference (*anumāna*), presumption (*arthāpatti*), the knowledge of Vedic *karmas* through *śabda/āgama* as the means to gain heavens, etc., (yet to be gained) and *anupalabdhi*. But the *pramāṇas* in the case of *pratyakṣa*, *upamāna* (illustration) wherein the entities to be known are in contact with the *indriyas*, the corresponding experience is invariably possible. In the case of *śabda* or *āgama pramāṇa*, (i.e. Vedānta) with respect to *ātmajñāna*, the *anubhava* of *ātmā* is certainly possible because *ātmā* is always self-evident, self-experiencing principle. All that is required is to end the *adhyāsta avidyā* with its effect by *Brahmavidyā* as detailed in the *adhyātma-śāstra*.

Knowledge in general can also be erroneous or incomplete. There is no rule that an experience is always erroneous since such an impression is given by some people by giving the example such as ‘the sun moves from east to west is an experience’ and ‘the sun is stationary’ is the knowledge. It is an example of ‘*bhrama*’ (delusion) or *ayathartha anubhava* (an experience not tallying with the truth) just as a snake seen in the place of a rope is considered by the viewer as knowledge. The fact which is not true. It is a *bhrama* (error) or it is not in conformity with the actual entity that is there which can get exposed to be wrong only after seeing its base the rope. But in the case of *ātmānubhava* we are talking about the experience of *ātmā* in conformity with its *nirupādhika* real nature in contrast to its 24x7 *sopādhika* experience which is a perennial *bhrama*.

It is an irrevocable fact that wherever the entities to be known are available for experience their direct knowledge necessarily needs a direct experience true to the object perceived or *aparokṣa ātmā* as the case be. In both the cases the entities to be directly known are available for experience. Such knowledge is about a *bhūta-vastu-viṣaya* (an existing entity available for experiencing). In the case of *pratyakṣa pramāṇa*, the experience true to the nature of the object perceived is by the means of direct perception (*pratyakṣa*). As for *ātmajñāna* the experience of *ātmā*

(*ātmānubhava*) is because the *ātmā* itself is *nitya* self-experiencing principle (*anubhava-svarūpa*). We have seen earlier the modus operandi of gaining *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna*. There is no occasion of *jīva* or *jagat* becoming Brahman. When a *jīva* with means suggested by *Vedānta śāstra* drops off the *adhyasta jīvahood* and the *jagat* with their cause *avidyā*, what remains is self-evident, self-experiencing principle *ātmā/Brahman*. That is *ātmānubhava/Brahmānubhava*. Earlier in the state of ignorance occasionally the *jīva* and *jagat* might have been in *avyakta* (unmanifest) state. On gaining *Brahmajñāna* in the absence of *avidyā* or *māyā* all that remains there is *cit* Brahman and Brahman alone without any *avyakta*. Once the *prārabdha* of *jñānī* gets over, only *cit* Brahman totally free from all that is *adhyasta* continues to exist from the standpoint of hitherto *saṃsārī jīva*. That is called *videha-mukti* in contrast to *jīvanmukti*. Prior to that till the *prārabdha* of a *jñānī* continues, depending on one's intensity of *jñānaniṣṭhā* in terms of fifth to seventh stages of *jñāna*, he shuttles between the state of absorption of mind in *ātmasvarūpa* and the perceptible *dr̥ṣya-jagat*. But in *Brahmasākṣātkāra* Brahman the *adhiṣṭhāna* of *jagat* totally free from *jagat* and sorrows which itself is *paramānanda* is experienced without *tripuṭīs*. The *nāmarūpātmaka jagat* also gets *bādhita*. *Bādhā* means the knowledge that it does not exist in three periods of time (*trikālāsattva-bodha*). That reduces the *jagat* to its *mithyā* nature. Without such experience of *sākṣātkāra*, labelling the *nāma-rūpa* to be *mithyā* is mere verbal phonetic understanding of scriptural statements. It is no better than a mere lip-service. It is incapable of ending the sorrows of *saṃsāra* and gaining of *paramānanda*. It requires the corresponding experience. Not only that, the desires like a crocodile will catch such *mumukṣu* by neck at opportune moments because he is still unaware of his *Brahmānanda* nature which alone can end the desires totally. In spite of having *vairāgya*, the *rasa* (*rāga, āsakti*, love) for sense-objects continues which can end only in *darśana* of *parabrahma* (*Brahmasākṣātkāra; B.G.2-59*). This should make us understand that the understanding of Vedāntic scripture called *parokṣajñāna* is not the final remedy of *saṃsāra* like *aparokṣa-jñāna* or *Brahmasākṣātkāra*.

No doubt, the *Brahmajñāna* is born of *pramāṇa* but it is also in conformity with the entity to be known (यथाभूतविषयम्, i.e. nature of Brahman) (*Br.Sū.Bh. 3-2-21*). Even the nature of *saṃsāra-bhrama* (delusion of *saṃsāra*) displayed as 'I am *saṃsārī*' makes the *aparokṣa nirupādhika ātmānubhava* indispensable in gaining *Brahmajñāna*. Sage Vasiṣṭha proves it beyond any trace of doubt.

The notion ‘I am *saṃsārī*’ is a *saṃvit* (*caitanya* conditioned by an *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*). This *saṃvit* is subjective knowledge (*prātibhāsika jñāna*) during the period of the ignorance of *ātmā*. It is just like the knowledge ‘this is silver’ in the example of a sea-shell mistaken for silver. The existence of the notion ‘I am a *saṃsārī*’ cannot be ended without a direct experience in the form ‘I am free from sorrowful *saṃsāra*’. It is similar to the mistaken impression of the existence of silver coming to an end through the experience that what exists is in fact a shell. Sage Vasiṣṭha vividly brings out the principle underlying this phenomenon. Some contenders object that ‘experience’ alone cannot be the basis for the ‘knowledge’ of the existence of an entity, as seen in the case of silver which, though experienced in the sea-shell, is found to be non-existent. In reply the principle is enunciated: ‘Any entity whatsoever known internally (subjectively - *prātibhāsikatayā*) by a *saṃvit* (by way of *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* which has invariably *cidābhāsa* in it) is experienced by it (*saṃvit*) exactly as known, irrespective of the fact that the knowledge of the entity thus gained is true or false. In short, what is known thus (subjectively), whether true or false, is established by experience’ (*Yo. Vā. Ni. U. 79-31*). The outcome of this implies that any deeply rooted erroneous knowledge of an entity, which is subjectively experienced (e.g. the notion that ‘I am a *saṃsārī*’) cannot be terminated without the correct experience of that entity. This should make it amply clear that to know “I” (*ātmā*) as *paramānanda* free from *saṃsāra-sorrows*, the corresponding experience becomes inevitable.

If *ātmānubhava* (experience of *ātmā* in its *nirupādhika* real nature) is inevitable, the question arises as to what role the Vedānta *pramāṇa* has in gaining *ātmajñāna*? In the absence of Vedānta *pramāṇa* it is impossible to know ‘this is *ātmā*’ and its identity with Brahman in spite of having its first hand experience free from *upādhis* as found in the case of *nirvikalpa samādhi*. That *samādhi* will not be *viveka-prajñā samādhi* but akin to *andha-samādhi* wherein *cit-jada-viveka* with respect to the mind is not accepted, the identification with body persists, with the reality of the mind and *jagat* without any inkling in the fact that ‘I’ (*ātmā*) in reality is Brahman, the *adhiṣṭhāna* of *jagat*. Only Vedānta can point out that the *tripuṭiless* experience of *upādhiless* ‘I’ is the experience of *ātmā* in its real nature or ‘*sodhita tvam pada*’ which itself is Brahman. It is just like the impossibility of gaining the impression of any visual form in the *antaḥkaraṇa* without the eyes. This is verified in the case of a born blind person. It is in this sense that the Vedānta is the *pramāṇa* in gaining *Brahmajñāna*. The Vedānta as the *pramāṇa* does not deny the necessity of gaining *ātmānubhava* as a prerequisite in accomplishing such knowledge.

The fourteenth *mantra* of the sixth chapter of the Upaniṣad highlights that the luminaries such as the sun, etc., cannot reveal Brahman. On the contrary they themselves are capable of illuminating on account of Brahman only. This shows that *ātmā*/Brahman whose real nature is limitless happiness is itself self-luminous knowledge-principle. It also proves what was told in the earlier *mantra* namely the *ātmā*/Brahman is the sentience in all the sentient entities.

सूर्यचन्द्रादयः सर्वभासका

अपि तत्सुखम् ।

नैव भासयितुं शक्ता भास्यन्ते

किन्तु तेन ते ॥१०७॥

सूर्यचन्द्रादयः - the luminaries such as the sun, moon, etc. सर्वभासकाः अपि - even though all illuminating in nature तत्सुखम् - that *paramānanda* (limitless happiness that is the nature of *ātmā*/Brahman) भासयितुं - to illumine न शक्ताः एव - are not at all capable किन्तु - but ते - they (the sun, moon, etc.) तेन - by that (*ātmā* whose nature is *paramānanda*) भास्यन्ते - are illumined—(107)

107. The luminaries such as the sun, moon, etc., even though all-illuminating in nature, are not at all capable to illumine (make known) that *paramānanda* (limitless happiness that is the nature of *ātmā*/Brahman). But

they (the sun, moon, etc.), are illumined by that (*ātmā* whose nature is *paramānanda*).

चित्सुखात्मा स्वप्रकाशो भासते

प्रथमं स्वयम् ।

सूर्यादयस्तस्य चिता भासन्ते

न चितान्यया ॥१०८॥

स्वप्रकाशः - self-luminous चित्सुखात्मा - *ātmā* having nature of *caitanya* (knowledge-principle) and happiness स्वयम् - spontaneously (of one's own accord) प्रथमम् - first भासते - exists सूर्यादयः - the sun, etc. तस्य चिता - by the *caitanya* the nature of *ātmā* भासन्ते - appear to be there अन्यया चिता न - not by any other *caitanya*—(108)

108. First of all the self-luminous *ātmā* having the nature of *caitanya* (knowledge-principle) and happiness exists spontaneously (of one's own accord). The sun, etc., appear to be there by the *caitanya* the nature of *ātmā* and not by any other *caitanya*.

A known entity itself cannot objectify the knowledge-principle by which it is known. The sun, etc., are known entities. They cannot objectify the *ātmā* because of which they are known. The sun, moon, fire, etc., are referred to because they are the luminaries which illumine the entire world whereas they cannot be illumined

by objects illumined by them which are non-luminous in nature. Just as the entities known on account of the sun, etc., cannot illumine them, so also the entire *drśya prapañca* known on account of *ātmā* cannot objectify *ātmā*. On the contrary the all *drśyas* are known because of *ātmā*. The *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* corresponding to the objects to be known which reveal them are illumined by *caitanya* through the means of *cidābhāsa*. Thus everything is known on account of *caitanya ātmā* only and by no other knowledge-principle which in fact does not exist at all.

The next *mantra* (Śv.U.6-15) describes Brahman as '*haṃsa*' which etymologically means the *Parameśvara* or *Paramātmā* who destroys (*hanti iti*) the duality by the means of *ātmajñāna*. He is in everything. The knowledge of identity with *Īśvara* or *ātmajñāna* alone can give liberation. Its meaning is given now.

एकाकी सूर्यवद्योज्यं सर्वं

व्याप्नोति भासयन् ।

तं यो वेत्ति स एवेशो

नास्त्यन्यो हेतुरीशने ॥१०९॥

यः अयं - the one who (is *citsukhātmā* Brahman) एकाकी सूर्यवत् - like the solitary sun सर्वं भासयन् - revealing (making known) everything व्याप्नोति - pervades all तं यः - that Brahman

वेत्ति - the one who knows सः एवः ईशः - he alone is *Īśvara* ईशने - to be the overlord of all अन्यः हेतु - any other means न अस्ति - is not there - (109)

109. The *citsukhātmā* Brahman pervades all revealing (making known) everything like the solitary sun. He who knows that Brahman alone is *Īśvara*. There is no other means to be the overlord of all.

The sun pervades or covers the world by illumining it through the rays. Similarly, Brahman pervades everything by making them known on account of its nature the knowledge-principle. The *jñānī* who has *aparokṣa-jñāna* of Brahman discovers oneself to be Brahman. The same Brahman alone as *Īśvara* is the overlord of entire Creation. It lends the *sattā* (existence) and *sphūrṭi* (knowledge-principle) to Creation. It enables everyone to function being *antaryāmī* itself. It is the overlord of Creation. The *saṃsāra* on its own has neither existence nor the knowledge aspect. But they appear to be there in it because of *Īśvara*.

The sixteenth *mantra* describes *Īśvara* to be the Creator of cosmos, omniscient, uncaused, Creator of time, the master of *guṇas*, *prakṛti* and *jīvas* besides the cause of *saṃsāra*, *mokṣa*, sustenance of *jagat*, and bondage. Now

the *jñānī* himself in reality as *Īśvara* with the above features is described.

ज्ञान्येव विश्वकृत्कालकालः

सत्त्वादिभासकः ।

प्रधानजीवयोः स्वामी

हेतुस्संसारमोक्षयोः ॥११०॥

ज्ञानी एव - *jñānī* himself (as *Īśvara*)

विश्वकृत् - is the Creator of everything

कालकालः - Creator of time सत्त्वादिभासकः -

the illuminator of *guṇas* such as *sattva*,

etc. प्रधानजीवयोः - of *prakṛti* and *jīvas*

स्वामी - master संसार मोक्षयोः - of *saṃsāra*

and *mokṣa* हेतुः - is the cause—(110)

110. The *jñānī* himself (as *Īśvara*) is the Creator of everything including time (*kāla*), the illuminator of *guṇas* such as *sattva*, etc., and the master of *prakṛti* (*māyā*, unmanifest). He is the cause of *saṃsāra* and *mokṣa*.

A *jñānī* is identical with *Īśvara* in reality. Therefore the unique features of *Īśvara* are described as belonging to a *jñānī*. There is no other Creator of *jagat* other than *Īśvara* and the *jñānī* is identical with him. *Adhyasta jagat* cannot have any other cause than its *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) Brahman/*Paramātmā*. All are in the womb of time but *Īśvara*/Brahman is even its cause and beyond its (of time) realm (vs.97). The time is the devourer of everything

whereas *Paramātmā* destroys even the time. The effect merges back in the cause only. So the time merges in *Paramātmā* only. In *Brahmajñāna* the time gets *bādhita*. The *guṇas* such as *sattva*, etc., are inert by themselves. Brahman alone illumines their ramification in terms of Creation. *Pradhāna* (*prakṛti*, *māyā*) functions deriving its power from Brahman-*Īśvara*. Thus *Īśvara* is its overlord. The *jīva* is a reflection (*pratibimba*) of *ātmā*/Brahman as its *bimba* (original entity). This shows clearly the status of *Īśvara* as the master of all *jīvas*. The *cidābhāsa* as the reflection of *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* Brahman appears as *jīva* endowed with its *upādhi*. *Īśvara* is the ultimate controller of calamitous *saṃsāra* characterized by the transmigration of *jīvas*. That alone is the *avikārī* (changeless) principle which serves as the basis for the ever-changing phenomenon of *jagat*. The one and the same Brahman becomes the cause of bondage in the state of ignorance whereas in the state of knowledge that alone happens to be the cause of liberation.

Having found from the Upaniṣad that this sentient and insentient *jagat* is nothing but Brahman, and *jīva* also is *sat cit ānanda* Brahman, the *saṃsārī* people may feel complacent that they have

understood themselves to be Brahman and the *jagat* to be *mithyā*. Thus they may take to Vedānta without *sādhana-catuṣṭaya* and *śuddhāntaḥkaraṇa*. Here is a caution for such people.

विद्याफलमिदं बाह्यधियो

न स्यात्कदाचन ।

तद्धीशान्त्यै प्रार्थयेत तं यो

ब्रह्माणमीश्वरम् ॥१११॥

बाह्यधियः - to the extrovert mind that is engrossed in the sense-objects इदं - this विद्याफलं - the result of *Brahmajñāna* न कदाचन - never स्यात् - occurs तद्धीशान्त्यै - (therefore) to pacify the mind (to have the mastery over the mind by *śama*) तं ईश्वरं - that *Īśvara* यो ब्रह्माणं - (by the *mantra*) ‘yo *Brahmāṇam*’, etc., (the one who Creates first the *Hiraṇyagarbha*, etc.) प्रार्थयेत - should be prayed to – (111)

111. (The person having) the extrovert mind that is engrossed in the sense-objects can never (hope to) get the result of *Brahmajñāna*. Therefore to pacify the mind (to have the mastery over the mind by *śama*), *Īśvara* should be prayed to (by the *mantra*) ‘yo *Brahmāṇam*’, etc., (the one who Creates first the *Hiraṇyagarbha*, etc.) (Śv.U. 6-18).

The fact that an extrovert person engrossed in sense-objects or *anātmā* can never gain *Brahmajñāna* was seen

earlier. In its absence to gain its result liberation is impossible. To check such extrovertedness of mind without a mastery over it, (i.e. by *śama*) is not possible. *Ātmasākṣātkāra* cannot be gained without the *sādhana-catuṣṭaya*. Prayer to *Īśvara* is a very important means to make the mind introvert. That is why daily, the *śānti-pāṭhas* (peace-invocations) are recited. The *mantra* ‘yo *Brahmāṇam*’ refers to Upaniṣadic *mantra* (Śv.U.6-18). Its meaning is given in the next verse.

PRAYER

हिरण्यगर्भं सृष्ट्वादौ

वेदांस्तस्मै ददाति यः ।

तं भासकं स्वात्मधियो मुमुक्षुः

शरणं भजे ॥११२॥

यः - the one who आदौ - at the beginning of Creation हिरण्यगर्भं सृष्ट्वा - having created *Hiraṇyagarbha* (the deity of macrocosmic subtle bodies) तस्मै - to him वेदान् ददाति - imparts the Vedas तं - to him स्वात्मधियः भासकं - illuminator of one's own *antaḥkaraṇa* मुमुक्षुः - as a *mumukṣu* शरणं भजे - I surrender to – (112)

112. I surrender to *Īśvara* who is the illuminator of our *antaḥkaraṇa* who at the beginning of Creation having created *Hiraṇyagarbha* (the deity of macrocosmic bodies) imparts the Vedas to him.

The word *svātmadhī* (one's own *buddhi-antaḥkaraṇa*) refers to the *buddhi* of all. The *Sākṣī* is non-dual and the same in all, but *sākṣya* (entities illumined) differ. By *cit* only the *buddhi*, senses, etc., are capable of gaining knowledge and act. *Īśvara* alone is our main refuge, protector and abode. To consider anything or anyone else as our refuge, etc., is only an exhibition of our ignorance. Once the king Janaka was asked by a sage: Is this palace yours? The king replied, 'yes'.

'Did you construct it?'

'No, it belongs to us since ten generations'.

'Before you, did anyone stay in this?'

'Yes, all my past generations stayed here'.

'Did they all leave behind this palace here itself?'

'Yes'.

'Are you going to take this with you after your death?'

'No. It will be left behind'.

'Then who is going to stay in this?'

'My descendents'.

'Then how can this belong to you? You can say that it is a charitable guest house, wherein those who come, stay for some days, and go'.

The king Janaka understood. Our real abode is *cit* and *cit* alone from where we never depart at no time. Other than that entities from *ahaṅkāra*, body, house up to external objects can never be our main refuge, protector or abode. That *cit* alone is ever-existent in nature. Everything else including our body, mind and *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* are transient. The common 'I' in the three states of consciousness that we know by the faculty of recollection (*pratyabhijñā*) refers to this *cit* only. To surrender to it which is the principle of *Īśvara* is to withdraw by *vairāgya* from other pursuits and be committed to the pursuit of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. Thereby the extrovertedness of the mind quietens and it becomes calm and composed. In such mind only *Īśvara* can get revealed.

The nineteenth *mantra* describes the nature of *Paramātmā* to be prayed to. The next two verses explain it in a slightly varied manner.

निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यं निरञ्जनम् ।
भजे स्वयं भासमानं तं दग्धेन्धनवह्निवत् ॥११३॥

तम् - that *Paramātmā* who is
निष्कलं - partless निष्क्रियं - actionless
निरवद्यं - faultless निरञ्जनम् - uncaused
दग्धेन्धनवह्निवत् शान्तं - calm like the fire that
has consumed its fuel स्वयं भासमानं -
self-luminous knowledge-principle भजे

- I seek – (113)

113. I seek that *Paramātmā* who is partless (*niravayava*), actionless, faultless, uncaused, calm like the fire that has consumed its fuel and self-luminous knowledge-principle.

निष्कलोऽवयवैर्हीनो

हेतुहीनो निरञ्जनः ।

निरिन्धनाग्निसाम्यं तु

मायातत्कार्यवर्जनात् ॥११४॥

अवयवैः हीनः - devoid of limbs
निष्कलः - is *niṣkala* (partless) हेतुहीनः - that which has no cause निरञ्जनः - is called *nirañjana* निरिन्धनाग्निसाम्यं तु - whereas the similarity with the fire having no fuel मायातत्कार्यवर्जनात् - is because of being free from *māyā* and its effect the *jagat* – (114)

114. *Niṣkala* is that which is devoid of limbs. That which has no cause is called *nirañjana* whereas the similarity with the fire having no fuel is because of being free from *māyā* and its effect the *jagat*.

The word *kalā* means limbs or parts. The non-dual, *upādhi*less *Paramātmā* cannot have any limbs, parts or divisions. It is neither connected to any action nor can be subjected to it. In other words, it is changeless (*avikārī*). The fire becomes calm when it consumes totally its fuel. Similarly *Paramātmā* is calm (*śānta*) always. The

peace experienced by *jīvas* is keeping the fuel of *avidyā* intact. But the peace of *Paramātmā* is without any trace of *avidyā* and its effect the *jagat*. The meaning of the word '*nirañjana*' is given as the entity that has no cause (*hetu*). Certain things may be pure by themselves but they are considered to be impure because of having an impure cause. But *Paramātmā* is pure by its nature itself and being causeless there is no occasion of its becoming impure on account of that. Or '*hetu*' (cause) can mean a 'veiling' which causes the delusion of *saṃsāra*. *Paramātmā* on its part is never veiled by the power of *māyā*. In this sense also it can be considered as '*hetuhīna*' or *nirañjana*. Thus *Paramātmā* is pure by all means and self-luminous knowledge-principle. Therefore *Paramātmā* is worthy to be sought by one and all.

MOKṢA CAN BE GAINED ONLY BY BRAHMAJÑĀNA

The next *mantra* (*Śv.U.6-20*) highlights the indispensability of *Brahmajñāna* to end the calamitous sorrows of *saṃsāra*. It is explained in the next two verses.

तादृशं परमात्मानं

विदित्वैव विमुच्यते ।

विना ज्ञानं न मुक्तिः स्यादितरैः

कोटिसाधनैः ॥११५॥

तादृशं परमात्मानं - the *Paramātmā* of such a kind विदित्वा एव - by knowing in *Brahmasākṣātkāra* only विमुच्यते - (the *jīva*) gets liberated from bondage ज्ञानं विना - without *Brahmajñāna* इतरैः कोटिसाधनैः (अपि) - (even) by crores of other means मुक्तिः - liberation न स्यात् - cannot be gained – (115)

115. (The *jīva*) gets liberated from bondage by knowing the *Paramātmā* of such a kind in *Brahmasākṣātkāra* only. Without *Brahmajñāna* the liberation cannot be gained (even) by crores of other means.

यदा चर्मवदाकाशं

वेष्टयिष्यन्ति मानवाः ।

तदा देवमविज्ञाय मुक्तिर्न त्वस्ति

तद् द्वयम् ॥११६॥

यदा - when मानवाः - humans आकाशं - the sky चर्मवत् - like the skin वेष्टयिष्यन्ति - will fold or cover up तदा - then देवम् अविज्ञाय - without *Brahmajñāna* मुक्तिः - liberation can be gained तु - but तद् द्वयम् - both of them न अस्ति - are not possible – (116)

116. When humans will fold or cover up the sky like the skin, then the liberation can be gained without *Brahmajñāna*. But both of them are not possible.

Mokṣa (liberation) can be gained

only by *Brahmajñāna*, but not otherwise. This is the declaration of the Vedas without any ambiguity. The *śruti* also gives an illustration to impress upon this fact: ‘Just as partless sky cannot be folded like the skin or a mat, similarly the gaining of *mokṣa* without *Brahmajñāna* is just next to impossible’.

CONCLUSION

The twenty-first *mantra* describes that Śvetāśvatara *Maharṣi* by his *tapas* pleased *Paramātmā* and by his grace got the *Brahmajñāna* which he shared with other *ṛṣis*. This is summarized now.

तपसा देवमाराध्य

श्वेताश्वतरनामकः ।

अत्याश्रमिभ्यः प्रोवाच

ब्रह्मविद्यामृषिप्रियाम् ॥११७॥

श्वेताश्वतरनामकः (महर्षिः) - the *maharṣi* by name Śvetāśvatara तपसा - by his *tapas* देवम् आराध्य - having propitiated *Paramātmā* ऋषिप्रियाम् ब्रह्मविद्याम् - the *Brahmavidyā* which is the most dear to *ṛṣis* अत्याश्रमिभ्यः - to the most adorable *sannyāsīs* प्रोवाच - taught – (117)

117. The *maharṣi* by name Śvetāśvatara having propitiated *Paramātmā* by his *tapas* taught to the most adorable *sannyāsīs* the *Brahmavidyā* which is the most dear to *ṛṣis*.

Śvetāśvatara *maharṣi* propitiated *Paramātmā* and got himself the

Brahmajñāna. *Tapas* can mean single-pointedness (*ekāgratā*) of the mind and the senses, *Vedānta-vicāra* (inquiry into *ātmā* as guided by Vedānta), *svādhyāya-pravacana* and performance of one's own *karmas* according to *varṇa* and *āśrama*. Here in this context, *tapas* mainly means *Vedānta-vicāra*. The verbal root 'tap' (तप्) has also the meaning, 'ālocana' (considering thinking, i.e. inquiry). Such an inquiry is called as 'tapas' in *Taittirīyopaniṣad* (Ch.3) also. *Vedānta-vicāra* is the best propitiation of *Paramātmā* because it is the means to know oneself identical with *Paramātmā*. It pleases *Īśvara* the most. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad-gītā* that a *jñānī* is most dear to him (B.G.7-17, 18). By the grace of *Īśvara*, Śvetāśvatara got *Brahmasākṣātkāra*. *Ṛṣis* may know and teach many branches of knowledge. But *Brahmavidyā* is the most dear to them. This *vidyā* was taught to 'atyāśramīs'. The *sannyāsīs* who have gone beyond the realm of all *āśramas* (stages in life) are called *atyāśramī*. The *sannyāsa* is the fourth *āśrama* with four divisions of *kuṭicaka*, *bahūdaka*, *haṃsa* and the last one *paramahaṃsa*. This *paramahaṃsa* is called *atyāśramī*. He has grown out of external signs of *sannyāsa* with only one preoccupation of getting absorbed in *Brahmasvarūpa*. He will never do any wrong thing. He has grown out of *karmas*. Even if he

does them, they are in accordance with the *sāstras*. Only such *paramahaṃsa* can have *niṣṭhā* (steadfastness) in *Brahmajñāna*. That is why Śvetāśvatara taught *Brahmavidyā* to such *paramahaṃsas* called *atyāśramīs*.

The twenty-second *mantra* describes the eligibility required to gain the *Brahmajñāna*. It is almost repeated here.

वेदान्ते परमं गुह्यं

नानोपाख्यानवर्णितम् ।

नाप्रशान्ताय दातव्यं देयं

शिष्याय धीमते ॥११८॥

वेदान्ते - in the *Vedānta-sāstra* परमं गुह्यं - the highest secret नानोपाख्यानवर्णितम् - is described through various narrations अप्रशान्ताय - to the one who has no mastery over the senses and the mind न दातव्यं - should not be given धीमते शिष्याय - to the wise disciple देयं - should be taught –(118)

118. In the *Vedānta-sāstra* the highest secret is described through various narrations. It should not be given to the restless one who has no mastery over the senses and the mind. It should be taught (only) to the wise disciple.

The *Vedānta-sāstra* refers to the Upaniṣads. The real nature of *jīva*, *jagat* and *Īśvara* is beyond the realm of words and the mind. Its unfoldment is

through different methods devised by *jīvanmuktas* who get absorbed in Brahman and also at times interact with the world on account of their *prārabdha*. Since they had no better means than using the frail words to describe the indescribable, the unfoldment is like a great secret. It is much more so to those who are extrovert and as a result lack the prerequisites. Therefore *mīmāṃsā* (sacred inquiry) becomes necessary.

The teaching of Vedānta is to reveal Brahman and not enjoin *vidhi-niṣedha* (do's and don'ts). *Karmas* and *upāsanās* can yield their results only after their performance. But *Brahmajñāna* itself is *mokṣa*. After gaining *Brahmajñāna* there is no duty whatsoever. The purpose of story, narration, reasoning, etc., found in the Upaniṣad is to establish the *jīva-brahma* identity, to highlight its means, and to caution against the possible obstructions. This teaching should not be imparted to those who have no mastery over their mind and the senses. Instead of knowing the purport of Upaniṣads they may even misunderstand them to their detriment. On the contrary this should be invariably taught to an eligible disciple. The *śruti* expects this from every competent *ācārya*. The purpose is not to deny *Brahmajñāna* to any competent *mumukṣu* and at the same time the

teaching tradition should be kept continued for posterity. Śvetāśvatara *Maharṣi* has demonstrated this by teaching *Brahmavidyā* to *atyāśramīs*.

The devotion to *Paramātmā* and the *guru* is the greatest asset of an eligible *mumukṣu* in gaining *Brahmavidyā* to the finale of *Brahmānubhava* is highlighted in the last *mantra*. That *mantra* is quoted in the next verse.

यस्य देवे परा भक्तिर्यथा

देवे तथा गुरौ ।

तस्यैते कथिता ह्यर्थाः

प्रकाशन्ते महात्मनः ॥११९॥

यस्य - the one who देवे - to *Paramātmā* परा भक्तिः - has exceeding devotion यथा देवे - as is towards *Paramātmā* तथा गुरौ - so is in the case of *guru* (also) तस्य महात्मनः - to that exalted person एते - these कथिताः अर्थाः - things described हि - certainly प्रकाशन्ते - get revealed to the point of *aparokṣa* *Brahmānubhava*—(119)

119. The one who has exceeding devotion to *Paramātmā* (and) similar to the *guru* (also), to that exalted person these things described (here) certainly get revealed to the point of *aparokṣa* *Brahmānubhava*.

The *parā bhakti* (exceeding devotion) is defined in Nārada *bhakti-sūtra* as ‘*param-prema-svarūpa*’

(having the nature of total love). So long as there is love for things other than *Īśvara*, the love towards him no doubt is devotion, but not total devotion. Those who have *parā-bhakti* have the eligibility to gain *Brahmajñāna*. Since a competent *guru* is like the manifest *Īśvara*, the same degree of devotion to *guru* also becomes indispensable. To such *mumukṣus* only it is possible to gain non-dual *Brahmānubhava*. The *Śvetāśvataropaniṣat* ends with this *mantra* quoted here as the verse 119.

The chapter is concluded now with a prayer.

अन्तः प्रविष्टः शास्तेति

योऽन्तर्यामी श्रुतीरितः ।

सोऽस्मान्मुख्यगुरुः पातु

विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः ॥१२०॥

अन्तः - within प्रविष्टः - the one who has entered शास्ता - ruler इति - thus यः - the one who अन्तर्यामी - *antaryāmī* श्रुतीरितः - declared in the Vedas सः - he विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः मुख्यगुरुः - the first *guru* (*ādiguru*) in the form of *Maheśvara* called Vidyātīrtha अस्मान् - us पातु - may he protect—(120)

120. May the *antaryāmī* declared in the Vedas as the one who enters within the body as its ruler and who is the *ādiguru* in the form of *Maheśvara* called Vidyātīrtha protect us.

The *antaryāmī brāhmaṇa* in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, etc., describes *Īśvara* or Brahman as the ruler in the sense who abiding within the body enables the body, etc., to function. *Antaryāmī* as the *Sākṣī* of *buddhi* makes the body, *prāṇa*, mind, intellect take to their respective functions without which the body is a dead mass. The same principle rules the external world as the *Īśvara*. *Mukhyaguru* means *ādiguru*, the first *guru*, the *Īśvara* whether he is called *Sadāśiva* or *Nārāyaṇa*. Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni considers his *guru* Vidyātīrtha in the form of *Maheśvara* (*Sadāśiva*) and prays to him for protection.

इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिविरचिते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषद्विवरणो नाम द्वादशोऽध्यायः ॥

॥ ॐ ॥



CHAPTER - XIII

KĀṆVAVIDYĀPRAKĀŚA

(BṚHADĀRAṆYAKOPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[*Kāṇvavidyā* unfolds *Brahmavidyā* as taught by Sage Kāṇva in the fourth *brāhmaṇa* of the first chapter (*Adhyāya*) of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. It is called *śṛṣṭyādi sarvarūpatā brāhmaṇa* and contains ‘*aham Brahmāsmi*’ *mahāvākya*. Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni calls this *brāhmaṇa* as *ātmabrāhmaṇa* in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika Sāra* as well as in this chapter. The author explains *ātmabrāhmaṇa* under five sections. They are: (a) The result of *karma* and *upāsanā*; (b) *Avyākṛta-śruti*; (c) *Vyākṛta-śruti*; (d) *Vidyāsūtra*; (e) *Avidyāsūtra*.

The chapter, *Kāṇvavidyā*, begins with a passing reference to the *upāsanās* of *Virāṭ*, *Hiranyagarbha*, etc., only to point out their worthlessness. This section contains other topics such as the nature of *ātmā* which appears in the form of *Virāṭ*; the pursuit of gaining *Virāṭ* - status; identification with the body is the diagnosis of *saṃsāra*; *ātmavicāra* conducted by *Virāṭ*; *Brahmajñāna* alone can end the *saṃsāra*; fear arises from duality; *Virāṭ* does not need a *guru* and the glory of *Virāṭ*. The purpose of describing *Virāṭ* in the *brāhmaṇa* teaching *Brahmavidyā* is to encourage the ignorant *upāsakas* to take to such *upāsanās* and dissuade *mumukṣus* from the same *upāsanās*. A *mumukṣu* has to withdraw totally from all sense-pursuits. He should know that the *dvaita* (dualistic) *jagat* is caused by *māyā*. Without knowing this *advaya* (non-dual) knowledge is not possible. The ignorance of *ātmā* becomes the cause for *saṃsāra* through seven factors, viz. body, *adr̥ṣṭa* (*karmaphalas*), *karma* (actions), *kartā* (doer), *rāga* (love for sense-objects), *adhyāsa* (superimposition) and *artha* (sense-object).

Avyākṛta-śruti points out that before the birth of this Creation, there was self-ignorance or *māyā* or unmanifest (*prakṛti*). It is thoroughly discussed to show that *ātmā* is to be known and ignorance of it has to be discarded. This *śruti* also points out

the nature of *ātmā*.

Vyākṛta-śruti describes the *jagat* after its birth. The two modes of availability of *cit* (*ātmā*) in the body are discussed with the ascertainment of its entry therein. In spite the entry of *ātmā* in the body which can be easily cognized through *cidābhāsa* (reflected *caitanya*) or sentience in the body, *ātmā* is actually unknown.

The *śruti* exhorts that *ātmā* should be known directly. This is referred to as *Vidyāsūtra* wherein *apavāda* (refutation) of *adhyasta* (superimposed) *anātmā* is done. Explaining the word *ātmā*, it is shown to be *nirupādhika* (free from adjuncts). *Ātmajñāna* is *ātmābhimukhadhīvr̥tti* (a *vr̥tti* or thought that totally conforms to the nature of *ātmā* as its replica). The word अहं ('I') in the *mahāvākya* '*aham Brahmāsmi*' (I am Brahman) is not the *saṃsārījīva*, but the *śodhita* (*upādhiless*) '*tvam pada*' or 'I'. The one who gains the *aparokṣajñāna* as revealed by '*aham Brahmāsmi*' discovers '*sarvātmabhāva*' (becomes everything) in the sense his true nature (*ātmā*) is the true nature of everyone. Therefore, everyone has to gain *ātmavidyā*.

The pursuit of *ātmavidyā* expects the giving up of certain things. This is elaborated in the *avidyāsūtra*. Though *avidyā* (self-ignorance) is the cause of *saṃsāra*, for practical purpose, it is centred on desires. A desire-ridden person has to follow *varṇāśrama dharma* and invoke deities, etc. He becomes a resort or servant of all these. Because of his concept of duality that deities, etc., are different from himself, he knows not the truth. Therefore, desires need to be discarded by developing intense *vairāgya*.]

INTRODUCTION

As the name itself suggests, the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* is the biggest Upaniṣad. It has been summarised in chapters 13 to 18 in this text *Anubhūtiprakāśa*. *Kāṇvaividyaṅprakāśa* is called *Ātmavidyāṅprakāśa* also. Each Veda is divided into three portions. The main text of the Vedas where the *mantras* or hymns are given is its *saṃhitā* or *mantra* portion. The other two portions are called the *brāhmaṇa* and *āraṇyaka*. The *āraṇyaka* portions of the Vedas explain the philosophical subjects of the *saṃhitās* or *mantras*. Literally, the word *āraṇyaka* means that which belongs to the forest. The following two definitions convey how the meaning of this word should be understood.

1) अरण्ये अनूच्यमानत्वात् आरण्यकम् ।

Tr. *Āraṇyaka* is that which is composed or taught or studied in the forests.

2) अरण्ये अध्ययनादेव आरण्यकम् उदाहृतम् ।

Tr. It is called *āraṇyaka* because of being studied in the forest.

Going to the forest means withdrawing from all other pursuits than the studies, observing *mauna* or silence and engaging oneself solely in the pursuit of Vedānta. Observing silence is a great ascetic practice capable of conferring the right composure of the mind which is indispensable to assimilate the subtle and deep philosophical truths of Vedānta. Great sages of the past used to go to the forests and live in quietude for Vedāntic pursuits with such attitude. Thus the name *āraṇyaka* is quite appropriate to this portion.

The *brāhmaṇa* portions are the explanations or elaborations of whatever that is given in the *saṃhitā* or *mantra* portions, whether pertaining to rituals or to *adhyātma vidyā* (Vedānta). It is that portion of the Vedas which states the rules for the employment of the hymns in various sacrifices, their origin and detailed explanations, at times with long illustrations in the form of legends or stories. This is true not only for the ritualistic portion but also for the Vedāntic topics as well. In short, *brāhmaṇa* is that portion of the Vedas which elaborates and explains the *mantras* contained in the Vedas. The word *brāhmaṇa* is also used for a part of *brāhmaṇa*. For example, in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, each *adhyāya* (chapter) has sections called *khaṇḍa* or *brāhmaṇa*.

Each Veda has its own *brāhmaṇa*. The *Ṛg Veda* has two *brāhmaṇas*. One is *Aitareya brāhmaṇa*, also called *Āśvalāyana brāhmaṇa*. The other is *Kauśītakī brāhmaṇa* also called *Sāṅkhyāyana brāhmaṇa*. The *brāhmaṇa* of *Śukla-yajurveda* is called *Śatapatha brāhmaṇa*. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* is found in this *brāhmaṇa*. *Sāmaveda* has totally eight *brāhmaṇas*. *Atharvaveda* has *Gopatha brāhmaṇa*, etc.

The Vedas have *śākhās* or recensions. *Śākhā* (branch) or recension means the way of presentation when the same *āraṇyaka* is presented by two or more authors. There is likely to be some difference in those *brāhmaṇas*. This gives rise to the different *śākhās*. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* has two *śākhās* - the *kāṇva-śākhā* of *Kāṇva Muni* and the *mādhyandina-śākhā* of *Mādhyandina Muni*. Ādi Śaṅkarācārya has commented upon the *kāṇva* recension, though at places, where some inadequacy is found in this recension, topics are borrowed from the *mādhyandina* recension to make it complete. This methodology of ascertaining the exact purport of the Vedas by taking into consideration the different recensions and similar topics and features from the other parts of the Vedas by the means of *mīmāṃsā* (a sacred inquiry) is called

Upasaṃhṛtiḥ or *guṇopasaṃhāra*.

The first three *brāhmaṇas*, (viz. *aśvamedha*, *agni* and *udgītha*) in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* contain *upāsanās* (meditations). Vidyāraṇya Muni has not included them in his exposition on this Upaniṣad (*A.Pr.*13 to 18) since *ātmavidyā* (self-knowledge) is not their topic. They are indirectly useful for promoting *cittanaiścalya* (steadiness of the mind). *Kāṇvavidyāprakāśa* is contained in the fourth *brāhmaṇa* called *sṛṣṭyādi-sarvarūpatā* of the first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. This *brāhmaṇa* contains ‘*aham Brahmāsmi*’ *mahāvākya* (*Bṛ.U.*1-4-10) and it emphasizes that the *Brahmavidyā* (knowledge of Brahman) is the only means of *mokṣa* (liberation). This is the subject-matter of *Kāṇvavidyāprakāśa*.

This *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* is found in the *āraṇyaka* of the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* of the *Śukla-yajurveda* and constitutes *adhyāyas* (chapters) one to eight of this *brāhmaṇa*. Chapters three to eight of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* are called *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. This Upaniṣad therefore has six chapters in all. There is room for some confusion here. It is important to bear in mind this numbering scheme clearly. This confusion becomes worse when at places the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* is referred to as *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. So we should be clear of what is being referred to. For example, the first chapter of the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* corresponds to the third chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. The first two chapters of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (not included in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*) deal with what is called *Pravargya karma*, a ceremony preliminary to the *Soma* sacrifice. This portion also is called *āraṇyaka* because of its complicated nature which necessitates its study in the forest only.

The *sṛṣṭyādi-sarvarūpatā brāhmaṇa* of *kāṇva* recension contains seventeen *mantras*. These have been elaborated in *Kāṇvavidyāprakāśa* containing three hundred and two verses. The *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* is ‘*br̥hat*’ (the great), both in extent and the subject matter. Ādi Śaṅkarācārya has written an extensive *bhāṣya* (commentary) on this Upaniṣad. Sureśvarācārya, the direct disciple of *bhāṣyakāra*, has composed a monumental exposition called *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya-vārtika*, a metrical exposition, examining and elaborating what is said, what is not thoroughly said or not at all said in the *bhāṣya*. This *vārtika* has been condensed by Vidyāraṇya Muni in his *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-vārtikasāra*. He has further condensed the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-vārtikasāra*, topic-wise in the chapters 13 to 18 of *Anubhūtiprakāśa* of which this *Kāṇvavidyāprakāśa* (Ch. 13) is the first one of the series.

KĀṆVAVIDYĀ UNFOLDS BRAHMAVIDYĀ

Kāṅvavidyā is based on the fourth *brāhmaṇa* of the first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. The mature persons who have discovered themselves and are convinced that the gains here and hereafter cannot end the sorrowful existence of transmigration called *samsāra* are told herein that the direct knowledge of Brahman identical with *ātmā* (our true nature) alone is the means of liberation.

काण्वो याजुषशाखायां नानाख्यानोपबृंहिताम् ।
ब्रह्मविद्यामुवाचेमां सङ्ग्रहेण ब्रवीम्यहम् ॥१॥

काण्वः - the sage Kāṅva नानाख्यानोप-
बृंहिताम् - enriched by many stories
याजुषशाखायां - in the Kāṅva recension of
the *Śukla-yajurveda* ब्रह्मविद्याम् - the
knowledge of Brahman उवाच - taught
अहम् - I इमाम् - this (*Brahmavidyā*)
सङ्ग्रहेण - summarily ब्रवीमि - I (shall)
narrate—(1)

1. The sage Kāṅva taught *Brahmavidyā* in the Kāṅva recension of the *Śukla-yajurveda* which is replete with many stories. I (Vidyāraṇya Muni, the author of *Anubhūtiprakāśa*) shall narrate it summarily.

The sage Kāṅva is the author (called *pravartaka*) of the Kāṅva recension of the *Śukla-yajurveda*. This

Śukla-yajurveda recension like many others, is full of legends to drive home the teaching. Vidyāraṇya Muni states that he is going to impart this knowledge of Brahman as taught by Kāṅva. This narration is going to be the summary of the original teaching focusing only on the principle aspects without entering into arguments to establish the doctrine. This enables a common spiritual seeker, to assimilate the teaching easily.

Vidyāraṇya Muni starts his teaching in this composition from the fourth *brāhmaṇa* of the first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* omitting the first three. This is because the fourth *brāhmaṇa* contains the famous *mahāvākya* ‘*aham brahmāsmi*’ (*Bṛ.U.1-4-10*). He does not dwell on the *upāsanās* contained in the earlier three *brāhmaṇas* except that they indirectly help to gain the steadiness of the mind indispensable in gaining the direct knowledge of Brahman.

THE DESCRIPTION OF VIRĀṬ AND HIRAṆYAGARBHA, ETC. TO HIGHLIGHT THEIR WORTHLESSNESS

The earlier three *brāhmaṇas* of the first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* contain many *upāsanās* (meditations). The highest result that can be gained through these *upāsanās* taken either exclusively or coupled with certain

karmas is to attain the position of *Prajāpati/Hiranyagarbha* or to attain to the *loka* (world) of *Hiranyagarbha*. *Hiranyagarbha* is the presiding deity of the macrocosmic subtle bodies. The next best that can be gained through such *upāsanās* is to attain the position of *Virāt*. *Virāt* is the presiding deity of the macrocosmic gross bodies, the entire cosmos. It must be remembered that macrocosmic subtle and gross bodies are the aggregates of all the individual subtle and gross bodies of all the species of living beings and hence they include bodies of each of us. The total always contains the individual. *Virāt* is the gross body of *Īśvara* the Creator principle. The *Īśa* Upaniṣad says, ‘all the sentient and inert entities in the entire Creation should be covered by (or reduced to) *Īśvara*’. The true nature of everything is *Īśvara*. Through the ignorance of our true nature we isolate ourselves from the *jagat* (world) and believe that we are limited entities and pay the price in terms of suffering this *samsāra*. The highest results of *upāsanās* such as the position of *Hiranyagarbha* or *Virāt* or living in *Brahmaloka* have some deficiencies. To highlight finally their drawbacks, *Virāt*, etc., are discussed again briefly in the fourth *brāhmaṇa*.

बृहदारण्यकप्रोक्तैः विराट्सूत्राद्युपासनैः ।
स्याद्विराडादिरूपत्वं स विराडिह कथ्यते ॥२॥

बृहदारण्यकप्रोक्तैः - by the (*upāsanās*) described in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*
विराट्सूत्राद्युपासनैः - by (undertaking) *upāsanās* such as *Virāt*, *Sūtra*, etc.
विराडादि रूपत्वम् - position (of) *Virāt*, *Hiranyagarbha*, etc. स्यात् - is gained
सः - that विराट् - *Virāt* इह - here (in this *Kāṇvavidyāprakāśa*) कथ्यते - is described
- (2)

2. By taking to meditations (*upāsanās*) of *Virāt*, *Hiranyagarbha*, etc., described in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, one can gain the positions of *Virāt*, *Hiranyagarbha*, and others. That *Virāt* is described here.

These *upāsanās* are described in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. *Hiranyagarbha* is called *sūtra* or *sūtrātmā*. *Sūtra* literally means a thread. A thread in a garland passes through all its flowers. So is *Hiranyagarbha* present in all the living beings. The subtle body comprising of *prāṇas* (vital airs) and *antaḥkaraṇa* (mind, intellect, I notion and memory) are a part of *Hiranyagarbha*. The physical bodies of all the living beings form a part of *Virāt*. The word *ādi*, (etc.), in *Virāt sūtrādi* refers to the other deities meditated upon according to the specific type of *upāsanā*. Depending on the correctness and the intensity of the *upāsanā*, the *upāsaka* (meditator) gains the result such as the positions of

Hiranyagarbha, *Virāṭ* or the dwelling in the *Brahmaloka*, etc., as the case be.

As a prerequisite to gain the direct knowledge of Brahman a disposition totally withdrawn from the preoccupations in the sense-pursuits and sense-enjoyments is indispensable. The description of *Virāṭ* in the following portion has twofold purpose according to the maturity of the seeker.

उपास्तेर्महिमा तेन भात्युपासनमिच्छतः।
मुमुक्षुस्तु विराडादिदोषान्दृष्ट्वा विरज्यते ॥३॥

उपासनम् इच्छतः - to the one who is desirous of taking to *upāsanā* तेन - by that (description of *Virāṭ*) उपास्तेः - of the *upāsanā* महिमा - glory भाति - becomes known तु - on the contrary मुमुक्षुः - the one who is intently desirous of getting liberated from *samsāra* विराडादि - (of) *Virāṭ* and others दोषान् - defects दृष्ट्वा - having seen विरज्यते - becomes dispassionate - (3)

3. To one who is desirous of taking to *Virāḍupāsanā*, its glory becomes known by the description of the nature of *Virāṭ*. On the contrary, a *mumukṣu* having seen the defects in the positions of *Virāṭ*, etc., develops *vairāgya* (dispassion) towards them.

The status of *Virāṭ* or its description is one and the same. Yet, here is a person who is fascinated by it and is

eager 'to take' to such *upāsanā* so that one day he also can become *Virāṭ*. A *mumukṣu* on the contrary, due to his maturity of the mind takes into account the drawbacks even in the highest status. This right perspective generates dispassion in him. It is true that *Hiranyagarbha* and *Virāṭ* get *mokṣa* (liberation) by *ātmajñāna* without the need of any *guru*. Or certain *upāsanās* do confer the dwelling in *Brahmaloka* coupled with gradual liberation (*krama-mukti*) at the end of the cosmos (*śṛṣṭi*). But these accomplishments with delayed liberation are much more difficult than getting immediate *mokṣa* by direct knowledge of *ātmā*/Brahman. Moreover, there are many contestants for the post of *Hiranyagarbha* or *Virāṭ* and only the best among them is appointed. Even the duration of these posts as well as the abode in *Brahmaloka* runs into millions of *devatā*-years. A *mumukṣu* prefers to gain direct self-knowledge. Now the description of *Virāṭ* follows.

अध्यायस्य तृतीयस्य चतुर्थब्राह्मणे श्रुतम् ।
वैराजं वपुरेतच्च शरीरान्तरकारणम् ॥४॥

वैराजं वपुः - *Virāṭ*-embodiment तृतीयस्य अध्यायस्य - of the third chapter (of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*) चतुर्थब्राह्मणे - in the fourth *brāhmaṇa* श्रुतम् - is described by the Vedas च - and एतत् - this (वपुः - *Virāṭ*-

embodiment) शरीरान्तरकारणम् (भवति) - becomes (serves as) the cause of all the gross bodies – (4)

4. The Vedas describe the *Virāt*-embodiment in the fourth *brāhmaṇa* of the third chapter of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. This *Virāt*-body serves as the cause of all the gross bodies.

The third chapter referred to here is that of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. It corresponds to the first chapter of the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. *Kāṇvavidyāprakāśa* is a commentary on the fourth *brāhmaṇa* of the first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. Vidyāraṇya Muni is a teacher par excellence. He anticipates doubts of the students, analyses them and provides the answer.

The word *śrutam* literally means ‘heard’. But *śrutam* here signifies the narration of *śruti* (the Vedas). The one who appears in the various forms (*vividham rājate*) is *Virāt*. *Īśvara* the Creator principle is Brahman (the all pervasive pure awareness principle) the basis of cosmos, conditioned by *māyā*, the Creative power. When *Īśvara* principle appears (as though) embodied with various gross forms, the same is called *Virāt*. In other words, *Īśvara* identified with the macrocosmic gross bodies is *Virāt* principle. The same *Īśvara* when identified with the macrocosmic subtle bodies becomes the

Hiraṇyagarbha principle. *Virāt* is the presiding deity of the macrocosmic gross bodies (*samaṣṭi sthūla śarīras*), whereas *Hiraṇyagarbha* is that of macrocosmic subtle bodies (*samaṣṭi sūkṣma śarīras*).

The body of *Virāt* is the cause of all other gross embodiments contained in the eighty-four lacs of species of living beings. To begin with our parents are the cause of our gross bodies. This is true for all gross embodiments. The cause of the bodies of parents are their parents and so on. If we retrace this way, we can find the cause of all the bodies of all the species in this Creation to be *Virāt*. This will be explained now by commenting on *ātmāivedamagra āsīt puruṣavidhaḥ* (*Br.U.1-4-1*). This statement reveals that before this manifold gross embodiments came into existence (*idamagre*) *ātmā* having the human form alone was there. In the *Aitareyopaniṣad* (1-1) and *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (6-2-1) somewhat similar statements are found. But the word *ātmā* used in *Aitareya* refers to the disembodied *ātmā* (pure awareness, *sat-cit-ānanda*) whereas *sat* mentioned in *Chāndogya* is the indestructible Brahman. Now follows the description of the earlier state just before the actual gross manifestation.

इदं नरगवाश्चादिवपुस्तत्सृष्टितः पुरा ।
आत्मासीत्पुरुषाकारो ब्रम्हाण्डाख्यशरीरभृत् ॥५॥

इदं - this (aggregate of) नरगवाश्चादिवपुः
 - gross embodiments in the form of
 humans, cattle, horses, etc. तत्सृष्टितः पुरा -
 prior to their actual manifestation
 ब्रह्माण्डाख्यशरीरभृत् - one having the gross
 bodies of the entire cosmos called
Brahmāṇḍa पुरुषाकारः - having the form
 of a human being आत्मा - *ātmā* आसीत् - was
 –(5)

5. Just before the actual gross
 manifestation, this (aggregate of) gross
 embodiments such as humans, cattle,
 horses, etc., was *ātmā* endowed with the
 human form having the macrocosmic
 gross bodies called *Brahmāṇḍa*.

The word *idam* (this) refers to the
 aggregate of all the gross bodies in the
 eighty-four lacs of species of living
 beings including the plant and animal
 kingdoms indicated here by the phrase
naragavāśvādi (human beings, cattle,
 horses, etc.). This state prior to their
 actual manifestation refers to the
 immediate preceding state of manifest
 gross world. It is not the original cause
 existing at the very beginning of
 Creation. There are a few stages that
 intervene between the first starting of
 Creation and wielding a macrocosmic
 human form called *ātmā* (here) having
 the macrocosmic gross bodies which
 serves as the source of all manifest gross
 forms.

Since the human race itself is
 evolved from the *Virāṭ-puruṣa*, it cannot
 know its origin the *Virāṭ*. This topic
 is *apauruṣeya* - beyond the scope of
 human intellect. *Śruti* alone is the last
 resort in this matter. The *Aitareya*
Upaniṣad declares: ‘आत्मा वा इदमेक
 एवाग्र आसीत् । Before Creation, this
jagat (cosmos) was non-dual *ātmā*
 alone without any of the created entities
 (*Ai.U.1-1-1*)’. This is corroborated by
 the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*: ‘My dear
 (Śvetaketu), before Creation, this *jagat*
 was non-dual *sat* principle alone devoid
 of all created entities (सदेव सोम्येदमग्र
 आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्) (*Ch.U.6-2-1*)’. *Sat*
 is the never-changing, ever-existent all
 pervasive pure awareness (knowledge)
 principle called Brahman. When the
 results of actions (*karmaphalas*) of all
 the individual entities (called *jīvas*)
 from the past *kalpas* (aeons) are on the
 verge of undergoing *karmaphala-bhoga*
 (experiences of *karmaphalas*), Brahman
 wielding the Creative power *māyā*
 assumes the status of *Īśvara*. Thereafter,
 in succession, five great subtle elements,
Hiranyagarbha, grossified five great
 elements, *Virāṭ-puruṣa* having the body
 called *Brahmāṇḍa* come into existence.

THE NATURE OF *ĀTMĀ* WHO APPEARS AS *VIRĀṬ*

The nature of *ātmā* and how it
 appears as *Virāṭ* is described in the
 verses 6 to 9.

प्रत्यग्रूपः पराग्रूपाद् व्यावृत्तोऽनुभवात्मकः।
प्रथते यः स आत्मेति प्राहुरात्मविदो बुधाः॥६॥

आत्मविदः - the knower of *ātmā*
बुधाः - well-versed in Vedānta यः - the
one who प्रत्यक् रूपः - the most interior
पराक् रूपात् - from the adverse *anātmā*
(not self) व्यावृत्तः - is distinguished
(separated) अनुभवात्मकः - having the
nature of experience प्रथते - manifests
सः - that आत्मा इति - as *ātmā* (the true I)
प्राहुः - define—(6)

6. The learned knowers of *ātmā* define *ātmā* (the true I) as that principle which manifests as the most interior (entity) distinct from the adverse *anātmā* (not self), and is self-experiencing in nature.

Ātmā—pure awareness/consciousness is the self-evident or self-revealing (*svaparakāśa*) cognitive principle. It is *anubhava-svarūpa* (self-experiencing) and simultaneously *jñapti-svarūpa* (self-knowing) in nature. *Ātmā* enables all varieties of experience, knowledge and activity in all the embodiments. Just as the various electrical gadgets function in the presence of electricity, so do the physiological, physical and psychic functions in all the living beings without an exception take place in the manifest presence of *ātmā* in the bodies. Without such a presence called *cidābhāsa* - reflection of *ātmā* in the *antaḥkaraṇa* -

all bodies would be a dead mass. *Ātmā* alone enlivens all the living beings. *Pratyagātmā*, *pratyakcetana*, *cit*, *caitanya* are the synonyms of the word *ātmā*.

This *jagat* (world) can be clearly divided into categories of ‘I’ (*aham*) and ‘this’ (*idam*). Whatever that is distinct from ‘I’ called the self is ‘this’ or not self which is inert in nature. Whether we know the true nature of ‘I’ or not, one thing is certain based on the universal experience that ‘I’ is a sentient entity which always exists - at least verified so during one's life-span. This norm is very useful in ascertaining the true nature of ‘I’. The physical body, vital airs (*prāṇas*), mind, intellect and ignorance are all inert by themselves. They cannot be ‘I’. The knower principle ‘I’ is different from all the known entities. The physical body ceases to exist from our cognition in the states of dream and sleep. The dream body ceases to be there in the sleep and the waking. The mind and intellect are out of cognition in the sleep. Though *prāṇas* continue to be there during the life-time, they are inert in themselves. This can be verified from the fact that *prāṇas* though present during our sleep, know not what is going on around. Our experiences invariably vary during the waking and dream states. During the sleep there is one homogeneous experience of ignorance

of everything including oneself coupled with happiness. From our recollection after waking up we know that 'I' is present in the sleep. In and through all these varieties of experiences the entity 'I' is changeless, the same which makes us aware of all the panorama of experiences passing down in its presence. This data draws the conclusion that the entity 'I' is the awareness principle which enables all experiences and knowledge. The Vedas reveal the fact in the Upaniṣads when they declare that *ātmā* the true 'I', is *cit* (चित्) or *caitanya* (चैतन्य) the pure awareness principle, cognitive in nature. It is *nitya*, ever-existent in nature without birth and death. The physical body onwards all the *anātmā* are destructible. They are the sources of sorrow. Even when they perish *ātmā* continues to be. That is why *ātmā* is *pratyak* (the inner most) that is contrary to all that is *anātmā* (not self) which is *parāk* (the external), adverse in nature because of being the source of sorrow. Joys and sorrows are presented by thoughts and are brought to the level of our experience by the ultimate knowledge-principle *ātmā*. But joys and sorrows are alien to *ātmā*. *Ātmā* simply makes us aware of them as the illuminating principle by its presence without being involved in what is illuminated – made known. The knower principle is not affected

by what is known.

Ātmā in its true nature is absolute happiness without any trace of sorrow. When you are not asleep and your mind is totally free from the cognition of all the duality, the happiness that you experience is the true nature of *ātmā*. *Ātmā* is ever-existent principle (*sat*), the knowledge-principle free from attributes (*cit*), and absolute happiness (*ānanda*). This *ātmā* (the true 'I'), is called the divinity principle, God principle, the principle of *Bhagavān* or *Parameśvara*. In this sense there is no atheist because no one can deny the existence of 'I'. The following definitions of *ātmā* clarify its nature further.

'*Caitanya* (pure awareness) separated (or distinct) from the mind is called the most interior *ātmā* (*pratyagātmā*). It is totally free from all the mental functions. The blemish of self-ignorance and its product the *saṃsāra* are absent in *ātmā*' (*Yo.Vā.Upa.50-21*).

'*Ātmā* or *pratyagātmā* is that which (i) is all pervasive (*āpnoti*), (ii) withdraws (*ādatte*) Creation unto itself during the dissolution being its basis, (iii) undergoes the experiences (*atti*) of sense-objects as a *jīva*, (iv) exists uninterruptedly (*atati, santata-*

bhāva) in Creation' (*Liṅga Purāṇa* 70-96, *Kṛ.U.Bh.2-1-1*).

The *ātmā* described so far is distinct (*vyāvṛttaḥ*) from the external gross forms (*parāk rūpāt*) which includes the gross embodiments of all the living beings in the entire *jagat*, including our embodiments and inanimate things. As already seen the *pratyak rūpa* is the inner most self the "I" which can never become 'this'. *Ātmajñānīs* try to describe the *ātmā* by such modes because the nature of *ātmā* is beyond the scope of words and the mind. The sense-organs, mind or intellect cannot objectify *ātmā* because it is the very sentient principle that enables all of them to function. *Caitanya-rūpa ātmā* and the *jagat* are opposed to each other. The *jagat* is *jaḍa* (inert) and subject to *ṣaḍ-vikāras*, the six modifications, viz. is, born, exists, grows, undergoes metamorphosis, declines, and perishes. On the contrary, *Caitanya-rūpa ātmā* has no birth, is changeless, has no destruction and it is the self-experiencing principle.

If the self-experiencing pure awareness principle *ātmā* is the true 'I' in all of us, we should be able to know it easily. If it is absolute happiness, we should experience that happiness all the time. *Ātmā* ('I') being the most interior totally distinct from the external sorrow-breeding *anātmā*, no sorrow should

befall us. But this is quite contrary to the universal suffering. Further if 'I' is the ever-existent principle without birth and death how are we victimized by the transmigration? The next verse specifies the nature of disposition that is indispensable to gain the direct knowledge of *ātmā* besides the invariable consequence due to self-ignorance.

बहिर्मुखेन न ज्ञातं प्रत्यक्तत्त्वमिति विना ।
यदज्ञातं परं तत्त्वं तद्भवेत्सर्वकारणम् ॥७॥

प्रत्यक्तत्त्वमिति विना - without (*vinā*) the direct experience/ cognition of *ātmā* (called *sākṣātkāra*) बहिर्मुखेन - by an extroverted person (आत्मा - *ātmā*) न - (is) not ज्ञातं - known यद् - which अज्ञातं - not directly known परं तत्त्वं - the most exalted principle (*ātmā*) तद् - that सर्वकारणम् - the cause of entire Creation भवेत् - becomes. - (7)

7. An extroverted person cannot know *ātmā* without the *ātmāsākṣātkāra*. The most exalted principle *ātmā* due to its ignorance becomes the cause of the entire Creation.

It is imperative to know how exactly the *ātmajñāna* takes place. To know what is *pratyak tattvamati* is and understand why an extroverted person cannot know *ātmā*, the modality of gaining direct perceptual knowledge (*pratyakṣa*) is helpful in this context.

Water in a lake assumes the shape of a field when it flows out through an opening such as a canal and enters a field. Similarly the *antaḥkaraṇa* (inner instrument consisting of the mind, intellect, faculty of recollection and erroneous 'I' notion called *ahaṃkāra*) made up of *sattvaguna* capable of acquiring knowledge assumes the form of a sense-object such as a pot when it emerges through sense-organs such as the eyes and envelops the sense-object. Thereby the *antaḥkaraṇa* assumes the form of the pot. This state of the *antaḥkaraṇa* is called *viṣayākāra-vṛtti* - a thought conforming to the object to be known (*Ve.P.B.*). To generalize; the direct knowledge of an entity needs the thought corresponding to that entity. Such a thought is called *tattadākāra-vṛtti*. This thought terminates the ignorance of that object. The *cidābhāsa* (reflected *caitanya/ātmā* in the *viṣayākāra-vṛtti*) makes the object known to us. In the case of *ātmā* though it is attributeless without any form, the *antaḥkaraṇa* can be as pure (*nirmala*), transparent (*svaccha*) and subtle (*sūkṣma* - attributeless) as *ātmā* (*B.G.Bh.*18-50). Therefore such a *vṛtti* (thought) is possible. It is called *ātmākāra*, *Brahmākāra* or *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* which is just a replica of *ātmā*. The *ātmākāra-vṛtti* puts an end to the self-ignorance. Unlike an inert object, the self-evident knowledge-principle *ātmā*

does not need the *cidābhāsa* in *ātmākāra-vṛtti* to illumine itself, (i.e. *ātmā*). The repeated practice of *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* leads to the steadfastness of self-knowledge. At such a stage, the *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* also drops and what remain is *ātmā*/Brahman totally free from self-ignorance and its effect the *saṃsāra*. This is *ātmasākṣātkāra*/*Brahmasākṣātkāra* (*Ve.Sā.*). This is *pratyak tattvamati* as referred to in this verse.

Direct knowledge of an entity is true to the nature of the entity known (*yathābhūta-viṣayam*, *Br.Sū.Bh.* 3-2-21). An entity is brought to the level of our cognition by the thought (*antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) conforming to the entity to be known. To directly know the attributeless *ātmā* the *ātmākāra-vṛtti* which is necessarily attributeless is indispensable. An extroverted mind can never be attributeless. Therefore, an extroverted person can never know *ātmā*.

There is an alternate reading of *pratyak tattvam vinā mitim*. The word *miti* means the accurate knowledge. It does not make much difference because the word *miti* is used in the place of *mati* direct experience/cognition of *ātmā*.

The ignorance of an entity can lead to its misapprehension. A rope not perceived as the rope due to insufficient

light may be mistaken as a snake or a garland, etc. Similarly, *ātmā* conditioned by the self-ignorance becomes the cause of the entire Creation. In the series of innumerable cause-effect relations each effect may have its unique cause. Yet the ultimate cause of all these interim causes is *ātmā*.

Virāḍātmā alone was there before all the vivid embodiments of all the living beings were born. But the existence of *virāḍātmā* without *caitanya-rūpa ātmā* was not possible. Therefore, the nature of *ātmā* was discussed. Now it is shown that *ātmā* alone appears as *Virāḍ* due to the results of specific *karmas and upāsanās*.

विराडपि ततो जज्ञे त्रैलोक्यात्मकदेहवान् ।
यथोक्तज्ञानकर्मभ्यामेवं प्रत्यग्विराडभूत् ॥८॥

त्रैलोक्यात्मकदेहवान् - one who is embodied with the entire universe
विराडपि - even the *Virāḍ* ततः (प्रतीचः) -
from that *ātmā* जज्ञे - was born एवम् - in
this manner (अज्ञानोपाधिः) प्रत्यक् - the
innermost *ātmā* (conditioned by self-
ignorance) यथोक्तज्ञानकर्मभ्याम् - by the
means of specific *upāsanās* and *karmas*
described (in the earlier *āranyakas*) विराट्
अभूत् - became *Virāḍ*—(8)

8. Even the *Virāḍ* who is embodied with the entire Universe was born from *ātmā*. In this manner, the *ātmā*

conditioned by self-ignorance became *Virāḍ* by the means of *karmas* and *upāsanās* as described in the earlier *āranyakas*.

Virāḍ is not the first born entity in the Creation. Prior in the sequence of Creation *Īśvara*, five subtle elements, *Hiranyagarbha*, five gross elements have already come into being. *Virāḍ*'s gross body consists of the entire Creation or the universe. It is roughly divided into three *lokas* or the regions of the universe. They are *bhūḥ* (the earth and the nether regions called *pātālas*), *bhuvah* (the intervening space) and *svah* (the heavens above). According to fuller classification, the *lokas* are fourteen. *Bhūḥ, bhuvah, svah, mahah, janah, tapaḥ* and *satyam (Brahmaloka)* rising from the earth one above the other, and seven lower regions, descending from the earth one below the other called *atala, vitala, sutala, rasātala, talātala, mahātala* and *pātāla*. *Virāḍ* being the presiding deity of all the macrocosmic embodiments, it is natural that his body consists of the universe.

Prior to the birth of *Virāḍ*, he was also an ordinary *jīva*, as product of *avidyā* (self-ignorance). But by the performance of *upāsanās* and *karmas* as prescribed in the earlier *āranyakas* the same *jīva* became the *Virāḍ*. It is only a higher status and not a state of perfection.

The *śruti* now pities the plight of *samsārī Virāṭ* who in reality is nothing but *asamsārī sat cit ānandarūpa Pratyagātma*.

स एष परमोऽप्यात्मा कोशपञ्चकधारणात् ।
संवृत्तः पुरुषाकारः कामाविद्याद्युपप्लुतः ॥९॥

सः एषः - the same आत्मा - *ātmā* (described earlier) परमः - free from all *upādhis* अपि - even though कामाविद्याद्युपप्लुतः - assailed by desires, self-ignorance, etc. कोशपञ्चकधारणात् - because of the identification with the five sheaths पुरुषाकारः - the form of *Virāṭ* having a human form संवृत्तः - happens to take – (9)

9. The same *ātmā*, even though free from all *upādhis*, assailed by desires, self-ignorance, etc., assumes the form of *Virāṭ* having a human form due to the identification with the five sheaths.

Ātmā was described to be the pure awareness (knowledge) principle, ever-existent and limitless happiness in nature, totally free (*vyāvṛtta*) from all the external entities called *anātmā*, and itself the self-experiencing principle. None of the entities from the Creation including the embodiments at gross, subtle and causal levels or their characteristics can be its intrinsic feature. That is why *ātmā*, is described as *pratyak* (innermost) totally distinct from

anātmā. And yet if *anātmā* is mistaken as the true 'I' (*ātmā*), it is only due to the ignorance of one's true nature. This is how the *Virāṭ* came into existence by the erroneous identification with the embodiment, described in this verse as *kośapañcaka* (five sheaths). The five *kośas* are: *annamaya-kośa* (food sheath/gross body), *prāṇamaya-kośa* (vital air sheath), *manomaya-kośa* (mental sheath), *vijñānamaya-kośa* (intellectual sheath) and *ānandamaya-kośa* (bliss sheath/the state of total ignorance as in sleep). A *kośa* (sheath) is a covering that denies the full cognition of the entity concealed in it. The five sheaths cover as if the true nature of *ātmā* since each of them is mistaken universally as 'I'. They serve as the *upādhi* of *ātmā*. An *upādhi* in Vedānta is generally defined as a thing which imparts (as it were) its attribute to a proximate thing. This is how all the sorrow-breeding intrinsic features of *anātmā* get attributed to *ātmā* due to self-ignorance giving rise to a *samsārī jīva*. *Virāṭ* is not an exception though exalted by the virtue of his status.

Anyone ignorant of one's true nature (*ātmā*) is invariably assailed (*upapluta*) by desires, actions, results of actions, sorrows and the transmigration unless the direct self-knowledge (*ātmavidyā/Brahmavidyā*) is gained.

THE ORIGIN OF ERRONEOUS 'I' NOTION

The root cause of *samsāra* is self-ignorance. But at practical level, the erroneous notion of 'I' notion in one's embodiment, called *ahaṃkāra* is the kingpin. The *ahaṃkāra* came into existence as follows:

सोऽनुवीक्ष्यात्ममोहोत्थं

वैराजं रूपमात्मनः ।

नापश्यदपरं

किञ्चित्सोऽहमस्मीत्यथाभ्यधात् ॥१०॥

सः - He (*Virāt*) आत्ममोहोत्थम् - born of self-ignorance (*moha*) आत्मनः - one's वैराजम् - belonging to *Virāt* रूपम् - (physical) form अनुवीक्ष्य - having gazed at अपरम् - another किञ्चित् - a little न - not अपश्यत् - saw अथ - afterwards सः - he अहम् अस्मि - I am इति - thus अभ्यधात् - he said—(10)

10. *Virāt* having gazed at his own physical form born of self-ignorance did not see any other form even a little one. Thereafter he said 'I am' (having identified with the macrocosmic gross body as 'I').

Here is a primordial soliloquy which unfortunately has resulted in every living being mistaking the inert embodiment to be the sentient 'I'. The entity 'I' is sentient in nature is a matter of universal experience. The

embodiments of all are inert by themselves. But in practice while alive all of them are invariably infused with sentience due to the in and through availability of reflected *caitanya* (pure awareness, the true 'I') called *cidābhāsa*. The ignorant person not knowing the nature of the true 'I' (*ātma*) to be free from all the external (*parāk*) embodiments categorized as 'this' invariably mistakes the body (*anātmā* in nature) to be 'I'. This is what happened even to *Virāt* when the emergence of individual bodies belonging to eighty-four lacs of species was yet to take place from his macrocosmic gross body. This is the handiwork of self-ignorance irrespective of one's status, high or low. This erroneous 'I' notion is called *ahaṃkāra*, the CEO of individual *samsāra*.

The same mistaken appellation continues even today in all the living beings whose source is the macrocosmic body of *Virāt*. Here is the reason why all people refer to 'I' before telling their names.

अहमित्येव नामास्य संपन्नं तेन लौकिकाः।
तत्पृष्ठाः स्वं स्वमात्मानमहमित्यभिचक्षते ॥११॥

अस्य - of *Virāt* नाम - name अहम् इति एव - as 'I' only संपन्नं - got rooted तेन - therefore लौकिकाः - the worldly people तत्पृष्ठाः - whose name is asked स्वं स्वं

आत्मानम् - themselves अहम् इति - as 'I'
अभिचक्षते - refer to—(11)

11. The name of *Virāṭ* got rooted as 'I' only. Therefore the worldly people whose name is asked refer to themselves as 'I'.

The name 'I' that got firmly established in the case of *Virāṭ* faithfully follows in his progeny of varieties of embodiments. It is clearly expressed through the speech by people. There is another reading of तत्सृष्टाः (*tena virājā sṛṣṭāḥ*) in the place of *tat-prṣṭāḥ*. It means that those who are created by *Virāṭ*.

Whom does this name belong to? Does it belong to *ātmā* devoid of *upādhis* (embodiments)? Or does it belong to mere inert embodiments independent of *ātmā*? Here is the answer.

कोशपञ्चकयुक्तस्य प्रत्यक्तत्त्वस्य नाम तत् ।
विराजा कृतमित्येतत्सर्वसाधारणं मतम् ॥१२॥

तत् - that ('I' notion) कोशपञ्चक-
युक्तस्य - of the one who is endowed with
five sheaths प्रत्यक्तत्त्वस्य - of *pratyak* (the
innermost) *ātmā* नाम - name विराजा - by
Virāṭ कृतम् - given इति एतत् - because of
this reason सर्वसाधारणं - common to all
मतम् - is considered—(12)

12. That name (I) given by *Virāṭ* belongs to *pratyagātmā* endowed (or identified) with five sheaths. Because

of this reason that name, (i.e. 'I') is considered to be the common name of all (which precedes the proper name).

Ātmā is totally free from the entire *jagat* (world) that is *anātmā* (not self). The body is totally unconnected to it. Therefore, there is no occasion for *ātmā* to take the totally alien body as 'I'. The body is inert by nature. It cannot take itself as 'I' which is self-experiencing principle. Therefore, this 'I' notion can only belong to the embodiment which appears to be sentient because of borrowed sentience through the *cidābhāsa* - the reflected *ātmā* (*cit*) in the *antaḥkaraṇa*. *Ātmā* identified with the embodiment due to the self-ignorance parades the erroneous notion, 'I am the body'. It is an unholy combination of *sat* (existence principle) and *cit* (knowledge-principle) aspects of *ātmā* and the inert thought (notion) aspect belonging to *antaḥkaraṇa* in the embodiment (*Ātmabodha*-25).

This erroneous notion breeds perpetual sorrows called *saṃsāra* unless the direct self-knowledge (*ātmajñāna*/*Brahmajñāna*) is gained.

Ātmā, the pure awareness, the true 'I' in all is totally free from all sorrows. This can be verified very easily. Irrespective of the causes of sorrows, we experience them only in the waking or dream states. There is no experience of

sorrow in deep sleep. A sorrow is a *vṛtti* (thought) of *antaḥkaraṇa* depicting distress, discomfort, affliction, pain, etc., the undesirable experiences. There is no experience of sorrow in the absence of such a thought in spite of its cause being present. This does happen when the mind is totally engrossed elsewhere. In fact, in the case of all experiences, their specific features are reported by the *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis*. They are illumined (made known) by *ātmā*, the self-evident knowledge-principle. A sorrow is the characteristic feature of *antaḥkaraṇa*. It does not belong to *ātmā*. In contrast to this, the limitless happiness is the intrinsic nature of *ātmā*. Happiness is not a feature of *antaḥkaraṇa*.

All our individual embodiments are born from *Virāṭ*. The features of a given cause inheres in its effect. Thus all beings refer themselves by the common name 'I'. Thereafter follows the unique names of their individual embodiments. This is explained now.

असाधारणदेहस्य तत्तत्पित्रादिना कृतम् ।
देवदत्तादिकं नाम जघन्यं पूर्वनामतः ॥१३॥

तत् तत् - those देवदत्तादिकं - Mr. Devadatta, etc. नाम - name(s) पित्रादिना - by one's parents, etc. कृतम् - given असाधारणदेहस्य - of the individual bodies (भवति - belongs to) [तस्मात्/तत् - therefore that (name)] with respect to पूर्वनामतः -

original name जघन्यं - latter one (भवति - becomes) – (13)

13. Those names such as Mr. Devadatta, etc., given by the parents (or guardians) belong to the individual bodies. Therefore, the individual name becomes the latter one (or secondary) with respect to the original name 'I'.

A child is given the proper name for the sake of identification. But *Virāṭ*, the original father of all living beings has given the common name, the pronoun 'I', to everyone. The individual names enable us to carry on our transactions in the empirical world. Otherwise, specifying an individual will be impossible.

The universal usage of both the words is now demonstrated.

कस्त्वमित्येष पृष्ठः सन्नादावहमिति ब्रुवन् ।
पश्चाज्जघन्यं नामेदं वक्ति जिज्ञासवे जनः ॥१४॥

एषः जनः - these people कः त्वम् - who are you? इति - thus पृष्ठः सन् - being asked आदौ - first अहम् - 'I' इति - so ब्रुवन् - telling पश्चात् - thereafter इदम् - this जघन्यम् नाम - latter name जिज्ञासवे - to the one who wants to know वक्ति - says – (14)

14. These people when asked 'who are you?' by a person who wants to know their names, first refer to them as 'I' and then tell their individual names.

Invariably everyone introduces oneself with the pronoun 'I' and then continues with the proper name. Thus the answer to the query 'who are you?' is always, 'I am so and so' irrespective of the language that is spoken. This is because *Virāṭ* the original father of the embodiments of all the living beings referred to his body as 'I'. We, his descendants, follow the same practice.

The next verse points out the miserable state of *ātmā* due to self-ignorance notwithstanding its nature of self-evident knowledge-principle and absolute happiness.

चिदेकरस आत्मैव कश्मले कोशपञ्चके ।
एकतामभिसंपन्नोऽहंकरोत्यभिमानतः ॥१५॥

चिदेकरसः - pure awareness and itself the only happiness principle आत्मा - the Self, the true 'I' एव - very एकतामभिसंपन्नः - having identified with कश्मले - in the disgraceful कोशपञ्चके - in the five sheaths अभिमानतः - because of misconception अहंकरोति - takes them to be 'I'—(15)

15. The very *ātmā*, the pure awareness and itself the only happiness principle having identified with the disgraceful five sheaths takes them to be 'I' due to misconception.

In the entire Creation, *ātmā* is the only self-luminous (*svaprakāśa*)

knowledge-principle and itself is happiness in its real nature. All the rest called *anātmā* in Creation is inert. It is illumined (made known) by *ātmā*. It is well-known that the illuminator is distinct and unaffected by what it illumines. For example, the sun illumines the entire world, but the features of the illumined world have no bearing on him. So is the case with *ātmā* distinct and aloof from the entire perceived world that is inert and sorrow-ridden in nature. At the individual level the embodiment consisting of five sheaths is afflicted with birth, death, diseases, sorrows, ignorance, etc. Its illuminator *ātmā* is quite contrary to the features of the embodiment. Yet, *ātmā* suffers as a *saṃsārī jīva* due to the ignorance-born misconception about oneself and the consequent identification with the five sheaths. The *antaḥkaraṇa* abiding in a living embodiment is made of subtle (*apañcīkṛta*) five great elements (*pañca mahābhūtas*) - space, air, fire, water and earth. The subtle elements have in themselves the capacity to reflect the *cit* (knowledge-principle) aspect of *ātmā*. This reflection is called *cidābhāsa*. It imparts the semblance of sentience to the inert gross body as a result of which the inert physical body appears to be sentient. The ignorant person knows not that *ātmā*, the true 'I' is totally free from

gross, subtle and causal bodies. Based on his partial observation that the true 'I'/*ātmā* is a sentient entity, he jumps to the conclusion that the seemingly sentient gross body is *ātmā* 'I'. This mistake serves as an invitation to the sorrowful *samsāra*. This is where we find ourselves to be at present in the state of ignorance.

THE PURSUIT OF GAINING THE *VIRĀṬ*-STATUS

The means of accomplishing the status of *Virāṭ* is being described now.

बहवोऽतीतकल्पेऽन्य आसन्यद्यप्युपासकाः।
तथापि भावनाधिक्यादेक एव विराडभूत् ॥१६॥

अतीतकल्पे - in the immediately preceding *kalpa* (aeon) यद्यपि - even though अन्ये - others बहवः - many उपासकाः - aspirants (for the post of *Virāṭ*) आसन् - were there तथापि - even then भावनाधिक्याद् - owing to the very intense *upāsanā* (specific meditation) एकः - one individual एव - only विराड् - *Virāṭ* अभूत् - became—(16)

16. Even though there were many aspirants (for the post of *Virāṭ*) in the previous *kalpa*, only one (among them) became *Virāṭ* owing to his very intense *upāsanā*.

In the past *kalpa*, many *jīvas* were aspiring for the post of *Virāṭ*. It is commonly known that in the case of

such appointments the best amongst them succeeds. Though all the aspirants had taken to the required *upāsanā* (meditation) the present *Virāṭ* excelled others in the intensity of the *upāsanā* and secured the post.

Virāṭ is also known as *Prajāpati*. *Virāṭ* was a *jīva*, and is even now so to begin with after donning the post of *Virāṭ*. Naturally due to self-ignorance he has the notion of 'I'ness in the five sheaths.

Based on the Upaniṣad, Vidyāranya Muni clarifies now that the eligibility to become *Virāṭ* needs the rigorous performance of the required *sādhana* in many many lives.

निःशेषेणासुरं पापं

दग्धवान् बहुजन्मभिः ।

ततो विराडभूदन्योऽप्येवं

दग्धवा भवेद् विराट् ॥१७॥

बहुजन्मभिः - in many births निःशेषेण - totally आसुरं - demoniacal पापं - sins दग्धवान् - (he) burnt ततः - thereafter विराट् - *Virāṭ* अभूत् - (he) became अन्यः - any other aspirant अपि - also एवं - thus (पापं - sins) दग्धवा - having burnt विराट् - *Virāṭ* भवेद् - can become—(17)

17. (The successful aspirant) totally burnt his demoniacal sins in many lives by totally getting himself rid of all sins. Thereafter he became *Virāṭ*.

Similarly, any other aspirant also can become *Virāt* by burning one's sins.

The *karmas* and *upāsanās* meant for attaining the position of *Virāt* need to be taken to in many lives. There are many aspirants for only one vacancy. There can be lapses in the *sāadhanās* that can thwart the intended accomplishment. In spite of the long duration of *karmas* and *upāsanās* they themselves being limited in nature their results also are limited. As the cause so the effect. There is a beginning and end to the tenure of *Virāt*. It is transitory. Though *Virāt* gains *ātmajñāna*, he has to wait till the end of the *kalpa* for his *prārabdha-karma* to get over. These limitations inculcate in the minds of mature people the need of *vairāgya* and pursue the *ātmajñāna* directly.

THE DIAGNOSIS OF SAṂSĀRA

All the glories and powers of *Virāt*, resulting from the performance of the Vedic *upāsanās* and *karmas* belong to the mundane existence due to self-ignorance. Therefore, he too is exposed to fear and dissatisfaction.

दग्धपापोऽप्यनात्मज्ञो

देहादावभ्यमन्यत ।

ततः स्वनाशमाशङ्क्य

सोऽबिभेदस्मदादिवत् ॥१८॥

दग्धपापः अपि - (*Virāt*), in spite of burning his sins अनात्मज्ञः (सन्) - being

ignorant of *ātmā* देहादौ - with body, mind, etc. अभ्यमन्यत - identified ततः - therefore स्वनाशम् - one's own destruction आशङ्क्य - doubting सः - he (*Virāt*) अस्मदादिवत् - like anyone of us अबिभेत् - feared - (18)

18. Being ignorant of *ātmā*, *Virāt* in spite of burning his sins identified himself with his body, mind, etc., because he did not know his *svarūpa*. Therefore doubting his destruction he feared like anyone of us.

Attaining the status of *Virāt* after destroying all sins is a great achievement. Yet, self-ignorance takes its own toll. The bodily identification, the natural outcome of self-ignorance, did not spare even *Virāt* from fearing the destruction of his own body. In this sense he is no better than us.

How the ignorance causes such fear is explained now with an illustration.

स्रजं हि कल्पयित्वास्ते तद्भयादाकुलेन्द्रियः ।

एवं नश्वरदेहादि प्रतीच्यारोप्य कम्पते ॥१९॥

स्रजं - the garland हि - indeed (अहिः इति - as a snake) कल्पयित्वा - having imagined तद्भयाद् - due to that fear आकुलेन्द्रियः - with afflicted senses (सन्) आस्ते - (one) remains एवं - in the same manner नश्वरदेहादि - destructible body, etc. प्रतीचि - in *pratyagātmā* आरोप्य - having

superimposed कम्पते - gets frightened
–(19)

19. Having falsely projected a snake on a garland its seer remains with afflicted senses. In the same manner, *Virāt* gets frightened, having superimposed the destructible body, etc., on *pratyagātmā*.

Here is the diagnosis of *saṃsāra* of all the living beings. The famous Vedāntic illustration of rope being mistaken for a snake explains this phenomenon.

There is another reading as *srajyahim* (*sraji ahim*) in the place of *srajam hi*. This version is in accordance with *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-vārtikasāra* (1-4-27) by the same author. The same verse occurs therein. If we take this reading, we get the meaning directly as ‘having projected a snake in the place of a garland’. Otherwise in the present reading a phrase in accordance with the famous rope-snake illustration will have to be supplemented to complete its sense. So the cause of fear of an individual is identification with one's embodiment and this has originated from *Virāt* himself.

ĀTMAVICĀRA CONDUCTED BY VIRĀṬ

Virāt is not an ordinary person like any one of us. He solved the problem

of fear himself. He could do so because of his brilliant *upādhi* which was born as a result of his intense *karmas* and *upāsanās* performed in his previous births. The *karmas* and *upāsanās* are not the direct means of conferring the self-knowledge. But they can produce the *śuddha-antaḥkaraṇa* (pure mind) and *citta-naiścalya* (steadiness of the mind) indispensable for gaining the *ātmajñāna*.

आलोचयेत्स्रजस्तत्त्वं भीतिध्वस्त्यै यथा नरः ।
विराडालोचयत्तद्वत् प्रतीचस्तत्त्वमादरात् ॥२०॥

यथा - just as नरः - a person
भीतिध्वस्त्यै - to get rid of the fear स्रजस्तत्त्वम्
- the true nature of the garland आलोचयेत् -
should inquire into तद्वत् - in the same way
विराड् - *Virāt* प्रतीचस्तत्त्वम् - true nature of
pratyagātmā आदरात् - carefully आलोचयत्
- (he) inquired into –(20)

20. Just as a person frightened of (delusory) snake inquires into (its basis) the nature of the garland, so did *Virāt* inquire carefully into the true nature of *pratyagātmā*.

A garland can never become a snake. Yet, if a garland or rope, etc., is mistaken for a snake, all that needs to be done is to actually see the garland, etc., as they are by bringing a powerful light. There is no other way of getting rid of such assumed fear than to ascertain the actual basis of the erroneously

superimposed entity. *Virāt* could discern on his own the mistake that gave rise to fear. He inquired into his true nature, the *ātmā*, only to discover that it is totally alien to fear and sorrows. But how could *Virāt* directly discover his true nature (*ātmā*) without the guidance of a *Guru*? This topic will be discussed later. As for the present we should know that *Virāt's antaḥkaraṇa* was highly purified and therefore he was able to discern the problem of *samsāra* on his own.

The self-inquiry of *Virāt* resulted in *ātmaññāna* (self-knowledge), the knowledge of truth (*tattvajñāna*). This is explained in the next verse.

आलोचयन् यथातत्त्वमपास्तध्वान्ततद्भयम् ।

अनन्यानुभवं साक्षाद्दर्शकात्म्यमात्मनि ॥२१॥

यथातत्त्वम् - according to (one's) true nature आलोचयन् - inquiring into (oneself) (विराट् - *Virāt*) आत्मनि - in *ātmā* अपास्तध्वान्ततद्भयम् - totally free from self-ignorance and its consequent fear अनन्यानुभवम् - self-evident/self-luminous non-dual ऐकात्म्यम् - oneness, identity साक्षात् - evidently/directly ददर्श - cognised/ experienced – (21)

21. Inquiring into oneself according to one's true nature, *Virāt* evidently cognised (experienced) the oneness with *ātmā* which is self-evident, non-dual and totally free from self-ignorance and its consequent fear.

Virāt conducted the self-inquiry in accordance with the true nature of *ātmā*. He could discern that *ātmā* is self-evident pure awareness principle totally free from all that gets known in its presence. The embodiment and its features are in the realm of the 'known'. *Ātmā* is totally unaffected by them. They are born and perish. Therefore, being transient, they are false (*mithyā*) in nature. *Ātmā* is the ever-existent principle.

Apāsta means discarded or abandoned. *Dhvāntam* signifies self-ignorance though literally it means darkness. *Tadbhayam* means the fear born of that (self-ignorance). Thus the phrase *apāsta-dhvānta-tadbhayam* refers to the true nature of oneself that is totally free from self-ignorance and its product the fear called *samsāra*. *Ātmā* is *ananyānubhavam* in the sense that it is self-evident self-experiencing/ self-knowing principle (*anubhava-svarūpa/jñapti-svarūpa*).

Thus, *Virāt* got rid of the identification with the *pañca-kośas* and directly experienced one's true nature, *ātmasvarūpa*. As a consequence, the hitherto fear vanished from his *antaḥkaraṇa*. The *tattvajñāna* (self-knowledge) itself is the highest accomplishment (*puruṣārtha*) called

mokṣa (liberation). The next two verses narrate this.

प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यविज्ञानशिखिप्लुष्टमहातमाः ।
आप्ताशेषपुमर्थोऽयं सोऽमन्यत ततो विराट् ॥२२॥

अयं - this *Virāt* प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यविज्ञान-
शिखिप्लुष्टमहातमाः - the one who has burnt
(*pluṣṭa*) to ashes the *ajñāna* (*mahā-
tamas*, self-ignorance) by the fire
(*śikhi*) of the direct knowledge (*vijñāna*)
of the true nature (*yāthātmya*) of
pratyag-ātmā आप्ताशेषपुमर्थः - the one
who has accomplished (*āpta*) the
complete (*aśeṣa*) *puruṣārtha*, (i.e.
mokṣa/ liberation) ततः - thereafter सः - he
विराट् - *Virāt* अमन्यत - thought (as narrated
in the next verse) – (22)

22. *Virāt* having burnt his self-
ignorance by the fire of self-knowledge
(*pratyak-yāthātmya-vijñāna*) and thus
having attained the ultimate *puruṣārtha*
(liberation) thought (as narrated in the
next verse).

Pratyak-yāthātmya is the true
nature of *ātmā*. The word *vijñāna* in
general means any knowledge. But in
the context of *ātmañāna* it means
ātmasākṣātkāra/Brahmasākṣātkāra - the
direct experience of *ātmā/Brahman*
wherein the self-ignorance and its effect
the *jagat* including all the *vṛttis* are
totally absent. This knowledge is called
śikhi (fire) because it destroys the entire
saṃsāra. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa also refers to

the self-knowledge as *jñānāgni* - the fire
of knowledge (*B.G.4.37*).

Puruṣārtha is a worthwhile
accomplishment sought by humans.
They are four:

- Artha* - Wealth, riches, securities,
etc., earned.
- Kāma* - The fulfilment of desires
permitted by the scriptures.
- Dharma* - Leading a life according
to the prescribed code of conduct,
enjoined by the Vedas.
- Mokṣa* - Liberation.

Humans are not satisfied with the
fulfilment of any or all the first three
of them. Only in the accomplishment
of *mokṣa*, the other three lose their
relevance. Hence *mokṣa* is described
as *aśeṣapumartha* - the complete
puruṣārtha.

देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धि-

भावाभावादिसाक्षिणः ।

प्रतिचोऽन्यत्किमप्यत्र नास्ति

कस्माद् बिभेम्यहम् ॥२३॥

अत्र - here देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धि-
भावाभावादिसाक्षिणः - (other) than the
illuminator (साक्षिणः) of the body and the
senses (देहेन्द्रिय), the mind (मनः), the
intellect (बुद्धिः), (their) birth (भाव) (and)
destruction (अभाव) आदि - etc., the other
changes (विकार), प्रतिचः - (other) than the
pratyagātma अन्यत् - another किमपि -

whatsoever नास्ति - is not there कस्माद् - on account of what अहम् बिभेमि - do I fear? –(23)

23. Here there is nothing other than *pratyagātmā*, the illuminator (*sākṣī*) of the body, senses, mind, intellect and their birth and destruction including the other changes (*vikāras*). On account of what do I fear?

As a result of *ātmavicāra* (self-inquiry) *Virāṭ* directly experienced the total absence of everything else other than *ātmā*. This is the direct knowledge (*aparokṣajñāna/aparokṣānubhava*) of *ātmā/Brahman*. The criterion of *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna* that you are not asleep; at the same time you do not perceive the *jagat*. ‘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*).

Ātmā is described as the *sākṣī* (illuminator) of the body, senses, mind, intellect, their birth and destruction, etc. *Sākṣī* is defined as that which directly makes us know everything independent of anything else. Suppose you are listening to the teaching. To begin with the ears enable you to hear. But the ears themselves have to depend on many other entities such as the mind, intellect and finally the thought (*antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) corresponding to the sound that is

being heard. Yet, the hearing is not possible because this *vṛtti* is inert in nature. It needs to be illumined (made known) by the only independent knowledge-principle ‘*ātmā*’ through its reflection (*cidābhāsa*) in the *vṛtti* (thought) corresponding to the sound heard. You cannot see an object in pitch darkness however sharp your eyes may be. You need a source of light. So is *ātmā* necessary to know, experience or perceive everything.

Being a self-existing and self-evident knowledge-principle, *ātmā* makes everything known directly and independently. Obviously the *sākṣī ātmā* is totally free from and unaffected by the *sākṣya* - the things that are made known by it. Thus *pratyagātmā* is totally devoid of all the external (*parāk*) entities called *anātmā* with its accompanying transmigration, fear, sorrow, limitations, etc., - popularly known as *saṃsāra*.

In the waking state we are aware of the presence of our physical body, senses, mind, etc. During the dream we are aware of the dream-body and the dream-world. During the sleep there is an experience of homogeneous nothingness. The experience of the presence or absence of all these is made possible by the *sākṣī ātmā*.

Having directly known oneself to be *ātmā* and not the embodiment, *Virāṭ*

found that there is nothing that can create fear in him. He discerned that his earlier fear was due to his identification with his body which is destructible. Fear is caused by the *dvaita* (duality). This will be discussed later. The pure awareness principle (*pratyagātma*) is non-dual and therefore free from *samsāra* implied by the word fear. Thus did *Virāṭ* reason out and overcome his fear.

One may think that *Virāṭ*'s embodiment was very highly exalted. That must have enabled him to get the self-knowledge. People like us may not be eligible to get the *ātmajñāna*. This is not the case. By developing *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti* (fourfold) qualifications all those who take to self-inquiry can gain the direct *ātmajñāna*. The next verse tells us that this direct knowledge of *ātmā*/Brahman is easy for

other eligible seekers also who take to the *ātmavicāra* properly.

अन्वय व्यतिरेकाभ्यां स्वमात्मानं यदा पुमान् ।
प्रतीच्येवानुसन्धते ब्रह्मास्मीति तदेक्षते ॥२४॥

यदा - when पुमान् - an aspirant after liberation (*mumukṣu*) अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्याम् - by the method of continuance (presence) and discontinuance (absence) स्वमात्मानम् - one's own self (the true nature) प्रतीची - in the innermost pure awareness एव - intently अनुसन्धते - inquires into तदा - then ब्रह्मास्मि - 'I am Brahman' इति - as ईक्षते - experiences, directly cognises – (24)

24. When a *mumukṣu* inquires intently into one's own true nature in the innermost pure awareness (*ātmā*) by the means of *anvaya* and *vyatireka*, then he experiences (directly cognises) as 'I am Brahman'.

The methodology of *anvaya-vyatireka* is adopted to distinguish *ātmā* from *pañca-kośas* or the entire *anātmā*. The *anvaya* (*anuvṛtti*), the continuance of *ātmā* is determined by its cognition (*pratīti*) in all the states of experience. The *vyatireka* (*vyāvṛtti*), the discontinuance of the five sheaths is ascertained by their non-cognition (*apratītiḥ*) at varied times. This method of inquiry shows the everlasting nature of *ātmā* irrespective of the presence or absence of the sheaths or *anātmā*. They being fleeting in nature get negated at one stage or the other. Thus *ātmā* is distinct from all of them.

The universal observation is that the entity called 'I' is always sentient and never ceases to be. In contrast, either *pañcakośas* or all the things called *anātmā* are transient and perishable because of being inert in nature. Even if *anātmā* appears to be sentient at times, it is not on its own. Naturally, *ātmā* is distinct from all of them and

their nature which induces *saṃsāra*. Such passing things and beings are false (*mithyā*) in their nature though they appear to be there temporarily during their period of existence. The criterion of reality is to be ever-existent in nature. Everything other than *ātmā* does not fulfill this standard.

The actual *Brahmajñāna* (*ātmajñāna*) is verbalized in the statement ‘*Brahma asmi*’. The conjugated verb *asmi* means ‘I am’. In the phrase ‘*Brahma asmi*’, the pronoun *aham* (I) is silent. The actual sentence is ‘*aham Brahmāsmi*’ (*Br.U.1-4-10*). This is a *mahāvākya* - the sentence which reveals the identity of *jīva* and Brahman. Such a knowledge is *Brahmajñāna* synonymous with *ātmajñāna*.

An investigation into the exact nature of *Brahmajñāna* is necessary to know clearly what is expected of a *mumukṣu* at the final level of gaining it in the sequential pursuit of *śravaṇa* (self-inquiry), *manana* (reflection) and *nididhyāsana* (intense meditation).

The notion ‘I am *saṃsārī*’ is a *saṃvit* (pure awareness conditioned by an *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*). ‘Any entity whatsoever known internally (subjectively) by a *saṃvit* (by way of an *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) is experienced by it (*saṃvit*) exactly as known, irrespective of the fact that the knowledge of the entity is true or false. In short, what is known thus (subjectively), whether true or false, is established by experience’ (*Yo.Vā.Ni.U.79-31*). The outcome of this principle implies that any deeply rooted erroneous knowledge of an entity which is subjectively experienced (e.g. the notion that ‘I am a *saṃsārī*’) cannot be terminated without the correct experience of that entity. Thus the knowledge ‘I am Brahman’ should necessarily be the experience totally conforming to the true nature of Brahman. Brahman is free from all *upādhis* and their attributes. Then how can Brahman be equated to the ‘I’, in ‘I am Brahman’ because ‘I’ is *saṃsārī jīva*. This is not so. The ‘I’ referred to in the sentence ‘I am Brahman’ is the true ‘I’ the *ātmā* (pure awareness principle) totally free from all the attributes erroneously superimposed on it. This can be verified by the nature of *ātmākāra-vṛtti* (*akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti*) which is the replica of *ātmā* in total conformity with it. *Ātmā* being the self-experiencing principle, this experience of *ātmā*, (i.e. *ātmānubhava*) at its mature stage is without the trio of subject (the knower - *jñātā*), the actual *ātmākāra-vṛtti* called *jñāna* (which has dropped in the steadfastness of self-knowledge) and the known object (*jñeya*). These three factors called *tripuṭī* always accompany the empirical knowledge. They are the dualistic features of the

antaḥkaraṇa. In *ātmānubhava* which is steadfast, *tripuṭīs* are absent. This *ātmānubhava* directly identifies the true *ātmā* according to the Upaniṣads - the only *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) to know *ātmā*/Brahman. What remains in the *ātmānubhava* is *ātmā* and *ātmā* alone totally free from self-ignorance (*avidyā*) and its effects - the Creation/*saṃsāra*. This is called *śodhita tvam* (the word 'you' in *tat tvam asi mahāvākya*).

Then the Upaniṣad (*śruti*/Veda) *pramāṇa* reveals that this *ātmā* so experienced is itself Brahman, the basis of the Creation. This is the *aparokṣa* (direct) *anubhava/jñāna* of *ātmā*/Brahman. Anything short of it, based on the mere understanding of Vedānta is at best the *parokṣa-jñāna* (indirect knowledge). *Brahmajñāna* is not a matter of verbosity. *Bhāṣyakāra* highlights the indispensability of *anubhava* in gaining the *Brahmajñāna*. He says: 'For the inquiry into Brahman (*Brahmajñāna*), in addition to *śruti*, direct experience (reflection and contemplation in accordance with *śruti*) are (also) the *pramāṇas* as appropriate (to the context required) because the knowledge of Brahman culminates in (direct) experience (*anubhavāvasānatvāt*) and concerns an already existent entity (*bhūtavastu- viṣayatvāt ca Brahmajñānasya, Br.Sū.Bh.1-1-4*)'. Perceptual knowledge and the knowledge of Brahman have their basis in the experience true to the nature of the entity. This is an irrevocable rule.

Bhāṣyakāra summarily describes the means of directly knowing Brahman as follows:

a) The termination of self-ignorance and its effect (*saṃsāra*) alone (*ajñānādhyāropaṇa - nivṛttireva*) is verbalized in the statement, '*Virāṭ* knew *ātmā* (his true nature 'I'). It does not mean that *ātmā* was objectified as an object of knowledge (*Br.U.Bh.1-4-10*).

b) Hence to gain the knowledge of *ātmā*, what has to be accomplished is simply the withdrawal (*nivṛtti*) from all the superimposed *anātmā* characterised by name and form (*nāmarūpādyanātmādhyāropaṇa-nivṛtṭiḥ eva kāryā, B.G.Bh.18-50*).

c) All that is required for gaining *Brahmajñāna* is the termination of self-ignorance and its effect (*avidyādhyāropaṇa-nirākaraṇa-mātram Brahmaṇi Kartavyam, B.G.Bh.18-50*).

Such termination (*nivṛtti*) is accomplished by *akhaṇḍākāra/ātmākāra/Brahmākāra vṛtti*.

The result of *Brahmajñāna* is as follows.

प्रत्यग्दृष्ट्या तदज्ञानं न तज्जं चेक्षते स्वतः ।
ब्रह्मप्रतीचोरैकात्म्यात् तद्दूरीकृत्य गर्जति ॥२५॥

ब्रह्मप्रतीचोः - of Brahman and *ātmā* स्वतः - by oneself, natural ऐकात्म्यात् - due to the identity प्रत्यग्दृष्ट्या - by *aparokṣātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna* तदज्ञानम् - ignorance of *ātmā* तज्जं च - and effects born of self-ignorance न ईक्षते - does not experience तद्दूरीकृत्य - having dispelled them (self-ignorance) and its effects गर्जति - (*Virāṭ*) declares – (25)

25. *Virāṭ* does not experience the self-ignorance and its effect (*saṃsāra*) by the means of the direct knowledge revealing the natural identity between *ātmā* and Brahman. Having dispelled them he declares (what is said in the next verse).

The identity between *ātmā* and Brahman is natural and not assumed or produced. It is just like the oneness of pot-space and the total space. *Virāṭ* was, is and ever shall be Brahman. In the state of ignorance he mistook his embodiment as ‘I’ disregarding his true nature that is Brahman. Thereby he got subjected to *saṃsāra* indicated by fear. In the state of self-knowledge he discovered himself to be Brahman by discarding the erroneous identification with his embodiment. The

difference is in terms of ignorance and knowledge. The true nature is all along the same and unchanged. So is the case with all of us. *Aparokṣātmajñāna* ends forever the ignorance and its effect the *saṃsāra*. At the sunrise there is no room for the darkness and the horrors of the night. So is the fate of *saṃsāra* when the *ātmajñāna* is born. *Virāṭ* declares as follows his discovery about himself born of direct experience of his true nature that is *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* totally free from *saṃsāra*.

प्रत्यक्ता ब्रह्मणो रूपं ब्रह्मता चात्मनः स्वतः ।
एवं सति कुतो मे भीरिती विद्वान्ब्रह्मपायते ॥२६॥

प्रत्यक्ता - the nature of *ātmā* ब्रह्मणः - of Brahman रूपं - nature च - and ब्रह्मता - the nature of Brahman स्वतः - by itself आत्मनः (रूपं) - (the nature) of *ātmā* एवं सति - this being so मे - for me कुतः - from what cause भीः - fear इति - thus विद्वान् - *Brahmajñānī* (knower of the Truth) ब्रह्मपायते - is ashamed – (26)

26. The nature of *ātmā* is the nature of Brahman, and the nature of Brahman is that of *ātmā*. This being so, from what cause do I fear? Thus a *Brahmajñānī* is ashamed.

The identity between *ātmā* and Brahman is not some union brought about between two distinct entities. The nature of *ātmā* itself is Brahman.

Reciprocally, the nature of Brahman itself is *ātmā*. *Caitanya*, the pure awareness principle is self-existent in nature. It is the only ultimate knowledge-principle and itself the primary happiness. *Caitanya* (*cit*) is all pervasive in nature. This principle as the basis of entire Creation - like the rope for a mistaken snake - is called Brahman. The very same *caitanya* as the underlying principle in an individual is called *ātmā*. Irrespective of the names Brahman or *ātmā*, the reality in both of them is the same *caitanya*. The *jñānī* (knower of *ātmā*/Brahman) who has accomplished this direct vision has nothing else but only this all pervasive *caitanya* in his purview. How can there be any room for fear which implies *saṃsāra*? In the state of his ignorance, he was victimized by fear due to his own erroneous projections. The direct knowledge of his true nature, *ātmā*/Brahman, makes him ashamed of his earlier foolishness of having fear. A *jñānī* is totally free from *saṃsāra* and therefore, has every reason to be satisfied and contented. But he has nothing to boast his superiority over others because he knows that all are one and the same Brahman that he is. It may be true that majority of them know it not, but it does not alter his vision which is the truth. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa describes this: *jñānīs* have the vision of one and the

same Brahman in and through a learned and humble Brahmin, cow, elephant, dog and an outcast (*B.G.5-18*).

BRAHMAJÑĀNA ALONE CAN END SAṂSĀRA

Can there be other methods to overcome the *saṃsāra* indicated by the word fear? Here is the answer.

ब्रह्मविद्यामृते नान्यद्भयहेतुविनाशकृत् ।
अतोऽवबोधादेवास्य भयं वीयाय सर्वतः ॥२७॥

ब्रह्मविद्यां - knowledge of Brahman
ऋते - except अन्यत् - other भयहेतुविनाशकृत् -
that which ends the cause of fear न - (is)
not अतः - therefore अवबोधात् - by
Brahmajñāna एव - alone अस्य - *Virāṭ's*
भयम् - fear सर्वतः - completely वीयाय -
disappeared—(27)

27. Except for *Brahmavidyā* there is no other remedy that can end the cause of fear (called *saṃsāra*). Therefore, by *Brahmajñāna* alone *Virāṭ's* fear disappeared completely.

Except for the knowledge of the identity between Brahman and *ātmā*, there is no other means whatsoever that can end the cause of fear. This statement seems prima facie to be fanatic. It is not so when the diagnosis of fear is considered. Although the self-ignorance is the root cause of fear, it operates at the level of erroneous bodily identification. Any means (*sādhana*) that is based on

the identification with the body will only strengthen it instead of its elimination. The well-known *sādhana*s such as *karma*, *bhakti* and *aṣṭāṅga-yoga* are indirectly useful in gaining self-knowledge. But they cannot end the *dehatādātmya* (bodily identification) by themselves because such an identification itself is indispensable for them. On the contrary the first casualty of *ātmajñāna* is *dehatādātmya*. There cannot be any fear/*saṃsāra* without the *dehatādātmya*. Thus *Brahmavidyā* alone can destroy both the cause of fear and its cause the self-ignorance is a statement of fact.

FEAR ARISES FROM DUALITY

कस्मादभेष्यदीशोऽयं द्वितीयात् खलु तद्भयम् ।
द्वितीयो नेश्वरस्यास्ति ततो निर्भय एव सः ॥२८॥

अयम् - this ईशः - *Īśvara*, (i.e. *Virāṭ*)
कस्मात् - from what (cause) अभेषद् - feared
द्वितीयात् - from a second entity (other than oneself) from duality खलु - certainly, indeed तद् - that भयम् - fear (भवति - arises)
ईश्वरस्य - of *Īśvara* (*Virāṭ*) द्वितीयः - second entity न - not अस्ति - is ततः - therefore सः - he निर्भयः - fearless एव - really, truly (अभवत् - became) - (28)

28. From what cause did this *Virāṭ* fear? Certainly fear arises from a second entity other than oneself. But *Virāṭ* has no entity other than oneself.

Therefore (on knowing this), he really became fearless.

Īśvara means the overlord. Here the word *Īśvara* signifies *Virāṭ* who is certainly the overlord of the macrocosmic gross bodies. In verses 21 to 23 it was seen that *Virāṭ* by the means of self-inquiry directly experienced his identity with *ātmā* wherein nothing else whatsoever exists. Earlier he had feared by mistaking transitory body as oneself the *ātmā*. Now in his direct cognition of the true nature of non-dual *ātmā*, there is no duality at all. Fear is from something other than oneself. No one is afraid of oneself. This is how in the wake of *Brahmajñāna/ātmajñāna* *Virāṭ* found that there is no occasion to fear. *Bhayam* (fear) stands for *saṃsāra*. *Saṃsāra* is characterized by fear or the principle of death (*mṛtyu*). Any other person also can equip oneself with *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti*, discover the fearlessness by *ātmajñāna*, and be the master of oneself.

VIRĀṬ DOES NOT NEED A GURU

Here one doubt is possible. How did *Virāṭ* gain the knowledge without the help of a *guru* and the *śāstra*? This question is raised in the verse 29 and answered thereafter.

ननु प्रजापतेरैक्यदर्शनं कुत उद्भवौ ।
शास्त्राचार्यादितद्धेतोरसत्त्वान्तदसम्भवः ॥२९॥

ननु - certainly, indeed प्रजापतेः - of *Virāṭ* ऐक्यदर्शनम् - the knowledge of identity कुतः - how उद्भवौ - did arise (तदा - then) शास्त्राचार्यादि - scriptures, *gurus*, etc. तद् हेतोः - the means of self-knowledge असत्वात् - being not there तद् असम्भवः - that (the ending of fear) is impossible –(29)

29. Certainly how did *Virāṭ* gain the knowledge of identity? The scriptures and *gurus* which are the means of self-knowledge were not there at that time. (For want of self-knowledge) the ending of fear is impossible.

Prajāpati is another name for *Virāṭ*. This entire verse expresses a doubt. How did *Prajāpati* gain this knowledge in the absence of *ādhyātmika* (Vedāntic) lore and a *guru*? They are indispensable to gain self-knowledge. The scriptures themselves guide the *mumukṣus* the means to be adopted such as: ‘*ātmā* should be directly experienced (for which) one has to take to self-inquiry, reflection and meditation’ (*Br.U.2-4-5*). ‘To gain the *ātmajñāna* the seeker should approach a *guru*’ (*Mu.U.1-2-12*). ‘Know the means of gaining *ātmajñāna* by taking refuge of a *guru* with a supplicant attitude, salutations, earnest inquiry and the service of the *guru*’ (*B.G.4-34*). There

were no other living beings and the scriptures when fear arose in *Prajāpati*. Then how could he take to *śravaṇa* (self-inquiry) *manana* (reflection) and *nididhyāsana* (meditation)? The self-knowledge is not possible without these means. Fear cannot end without this knowledge. Further, if *Prajāpati* could get the knowledge without the indispensable means, why can't we? The answer follows:

उच्यते महता पुण्यपुञ्जपाकेन तत्पदम् ।
वैराजं लब्धवांस्तेन ज्ञानमस्योद्भवौ स्वतः॥३०॥

उच्यते - it is replied महता - by great पुण्यपुञ्जपाकेन - by the fructification of enormous *puṇya* (religious merit) वैराजम् - of *Virāṭ* तत्पदम् - that position लब्धवान् - he attained तेन - by that unique *puṇya* अस्य - of *Virāṭ* ज्ञानम् - knowledge of Brahman स्वतः - on its own उद्भवौ - took place –(30)

30. Here is the reply. *Virāṭ* got his position by the fructification of his enormous *puṇya* (religious merit). He gained *Brahmajñāna* on his own by the virtue of his unique *puṇya*.

We have seen in the verse 8 that prior to becoming *Virāṭ*, he was an ordinary ignorant *jīva*. As an aspirant for the position of *Virāṭ* he performed the specific *upāsana*s and *karma*s over a span of many births. That enabled him to become the presiding deity *Virāṭ*. As a

result of enormous accumulated *punya*, he was endowed with an *antaḥkaraṇa* which was so pure and mature that when he inquired into the cause of his fear, he got the knowledge of Brahman on his own without the help of scriptures and *guru*. That is not the case with others. Others do need the means of Vedānta and a *guru*. *Bhāṣyakāra* corroborates this fact with the help of a *smṛti* passage (*Br.U.Bh.1-4-2*). Its source is not known. Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni quotes the same in the next verse.

‘ज्ञानमप्रतिघं यस्य वैराग्यं च जगत्पतेः ।
ऐश्वर्यं चैव धर्मश्च सहसिद्धमिति स्मृतिः॥३१॥

यस्य जगत्पतेः - of the master of the gross Creation अप्रतिघम् - unobstructed, infallible ज्ञानम् - knowledge वैराग्यम् - dispassion च - and ऐश्वर्यं - overlordship च - and धर्मश्च - *punya*, righteousness सहसिद्धम् - innate, inborn, natural एव - quite इति स्मृतिः - the *smṛti* says so – (31)

31. The unobstructed knowledge, dispassion, overlordship and *punya* of *Virāṭ*, the master of the gross Creation are quite inborn, so says the *smṛti*.

The adjective unobstructed (*apratigham*) is applicable to the words knowledge (*jñānam*), dispassion (*vairāgyam*), overlordship (*aiśvāryam*) and *punya* (*dharmah*). They are inborn in him. *Virāṭ* is described as the master of

the world because he is the presiding deity of the entire gross Creation. All these features are inborn in him.

If the knowledge was inborn in *Virāṭ*, how did he get the fear that ends in the wake of knowledge? This question is inapplicable. The word ‘inborn’ or ‘innate’ (*sahasiddha*) does not mean that the self-knowledge was present from the time of his birth. It only points that unlike others, his knowledge does not depend on any other means such as *guru* and scriptures, etc. If a *guru* is not necessary, then the scriptural instructions to serve the *guru*, etc., will be redundant. Yes, they are so for those who can gain the knowledge on their own. For example, we need the light to see the objects in darkness, but not a cat. It has an inborn faculty to see in darkness without any light. Thus the rule is that the accepted means (*sādhanās*) are redundant to those who can accomplish their results without them, whereas they are inevitable for others (*Br.Vā.Sā.1-4-42* to 46).

एवं सति स्वयंभातवेदत्वाद्बुद्धवान्
स्वयम् ॥३१ १/२॥

एवं सति - in such a case स्वयंभातवेदत्वाद् - because of (*Virāṭ* being a person to whom) the Vedas got revealed spontaneously (of one's own accord) स्वयम् - by oneself बुद्धवान् - he got the knowledge – (31½)

31½. In such a case, because of being a person to whom the Vedas got revealed spontaneously, *Virāt* got the self-knowledge by oneself.

Thus *Virāt* got the *ātmajñāna* without a *guru*, etc. Now the manifestation of the gross world begins.

VIRĀT CREATES THE GROSS WORLD

बोधध्वस्तात्ममोहस्याप्यरतिस्समजायत ॥३२॥

बोधध्वस्तात्ममोहस्यापि - even in the case of *Virāt* whose self-ignorance was destroyed by the knowledge of *ātmā* अरतिः - discontent, regret समजायत - was born – (32)

32. In spite of having destroyed the self-ignorance by the knowledge of *ātmā*, he became discontented.

The reason why *Virāt* became discontented will be seen later. Before that what is discontentment (*aratiḥ*) is defined.

स्वाभीष्टवस्त्वलाभेन चेतसो

यानवस्थितिः ।

अरतिः सा सिसृक्षोः सा

वस्त्वलाभादजायत ॥३३॥

या - whatever स्वाभीष्टवस्त्वलाभेन - by the non-availability of desired object चेतसः - of the mind अनवस्थितिः - unease, restlessness (स्यात् - takes place) सा - that अरतिः - discontent (भवति - is) सा - that

(restlessness) सिसृक्षोः - in the *Virāt* desirous of Creating the gross world वस्त्वलाभात् - due to that non-availability of the means of Creation अजायत - was born – (33)

33. The restlessness of the mind that is born due to the non-availability of a desired object is called *aratiḥ* (discontent, restlessness). *Virāt*, desirous of Creating the gross world became restless due to the non-availability of the means of doing so.

The author first explains the cause of any discontent or regret. This state of restlessness is the result of the agitation in the mind induced by the non-availability of a desired object. *Virāt*, desirous of effecting the gross Creation got subjected to discontent. The origin of discontentment is the self-ignorance. The ignorance of oneself gives rise to desire. When that desire is not fulfilled, it gives rise to discontent. Discontent therefore, is the product of self-ignorance. This is the general rule. In the case of *Virāt*, he had the desire to Create beings and the gross world. But he did not have the means to do so.

There is another reading, ‘*vadhvalābhāt*’ in the place of ‘*vastvalābhāt*’. This second reading is in accordance with *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Vārtikasāra* by the same author. It means ‘due to the non-availability of a young woman’. *Virāt*

desired to produce the offspring. But he was a lone person without any female entity. Obviously his mission was hampered. So he became restless.

Virāt (also called *Prajāpati*), got the knowledge of *ātmā* on his own. He has infallible knowledge, dispassion, overlordship and *punya*. Being a *jñānī* to him the limitless happiness of *ātmā* is directly evident like the day light. Then how could he entertain a desire in the first instance? *Ātmajñāna* and desires cannot co-exist like the light and darkness. This topic is being investigated now.

ननु विज्ञानविध्वस्तावविद्यायाः

कुतोऽरतिः।

ध्वस्तान्धस्यापि सा चेत् स्यात्

अनिर्मोक्षः प्रसज्यते ॥३४॥

ननु - here is a query अविद्यायाः - of the self-ignorance विज्ञानविध्वस्तौ - destruction by *Brahmasākṣātkāra* (सत्याम् - takes place) अरतिः - discontent कुतो - how (सम्भवेत् - is it born?) सा - that (discontent) ध्वस्तान्धस्यापि - even in the case of the one whose ignorance of oneself is destroyed स्यात् चेत् - if could arise अनिर्मोक्षः - contingency of no liberation प्रसज्यते - arises – (34)

34. Here is a query: How can there be a room for discontent (*aratiḥ*) when *avidyā* (self-ignorance) is

destroyed by *Brahmasākṣātkāra*? If discontent is born in the case of a person who has destroyed the self-ignorance, there arises the contingency of liberation being impossible.

Here is a valid doubt. A *jñānī* is nothing short of *ātmā*/Brahman. Brahman is absolute (self-existing, limitless) happiness. Without its direct experience (*Brahmasākṣātkāra*), the *Brahmajñāna* itself is not possible. Then how can a *jñānī* entertain any desires to gain the sense-pleasures which are the products of *avidyā*? There will be nothing called *mokṣa* (liberation) in case desires do crop up even after gaining *Brahmajñāna*. What is told now by this contrary view is totally correct. Yet, there is an entirely different cause which induces seeming desires in the *jñānīs*. These desires are not meant for their sense-enjoyments. *Jñānīs* are full and complete without any need of the world for their happiness. The next two verses answer this question.

अप्युत्पन्नात्मबोधानामधिकारासमाप्तितः।

अरत्यादि यथा दृष्टं तथैव स्यात्प्रजापतेः ॥३५॥

उत्पन्नात्मबोधानाम् - in the case of persons in whom *ātmajñāna* is born अपि - also अधिकारासमाप्तितः - until his post of authority or his *prārabdha-karma* is over यथा - just as अरत्यादि - dissatisfaction, etc. दृष्टं - are seen तथा एव - in the same way

प्रजापतेः स्यात् - is the case with *Virāt*—(35)

35. Just as in the case of a *jñānī* (such as Indra, Yama) discontent, etc., are seen till his post of authority or *prārabdha-karma* is over, so is the case with *Prajāpati*.

As described so far, the Creation of the *jagat* had come upto the level of the gross general form of *Virāt* (*Prajāpati*). According to *Īśvarā's saṅkalpa* (will) *Hiraṇyagarbha* the macrocosmic presiding deity of the entire subtle bodies had come into existence prior to *Virāt*. But the subtle body alone is not sufficient to gain the *bhogas* (sense-enjoyments). A gross body is also needed. As a first step towards the Creation of the gross bodies, *Virāt* who has the entire gross world as his human embodiment came into existence. At first he was frightened that he was alone. On self-inquiry he discovered on his own that his fear was due to his identification with his body. He discovered that his *svarūpa* (true nature) is *caitanya*, the pure awareness principle and he was totally free from his embodiment and its accompanying sorrows. As a result of this discovery, he was free from fear. In spite of getting this knowledge, he desired to create the gross world but got dissatisfied for want of proper means. A *jñānī* entertaining desires, acting to fulfill them like a

samsārī is a contradiction in itself. The cause of such contrary conduct is diagnosed now.

The seeming features such as desires, discontent, etc., are seen in the case of a *jñānī* until his *prārabdha-karma* gets exhausted. The same rule applies to *Prajāpati* (*Virāt*). *Adhikāra* means the post of an authority. The deities such as *Virāt*, *Hiraṇyagarbha*, Indra, Varuṇa, Yama, etc., including some sages are deputies or executives appointed by *Īśvara* in the administration of the Universe. Of course, as *jīvas*, they did aspire for these posts and became eligible by the successful performance of the requisite *upāsānās* and *karmas*. In spite of gaining *Brahmajñāna* after donning their posts, they have their duties until the tenure of their posts (determined by their *prārabdha-karma*) gets over. If the *jñānī* is not an *adhikārī*, (a person appointed to execute a specific function) then the word *adhikāra* can be taken directly as his *prārabdha-karma*.

The *karmaphalas* (results of actions) are grouped under three categories - *sañcita* (accumulated in the beginningless past births), *āgāmī* (arriving in future) and *prārabdha* (which has already fructified in the form of the present embodiment). The results of actions belong to the doer (*kartā*) of actions (*karmas*). They cannot belong to

the non-doer (*akartā*) *āṭmā* who cannot perform any *karmas* being free from embodiments/*upādhis*. They also cannot belong to the embodiments which are inert by themselves and hence cannot act. Therefore, *karmaphalas* belong to the erroneous *ahaṃkāra* ('I' notion) who can survive only in the realm of self-ignorance. *Ahaṃkāra* is the account holder of *karmaphalas*. In the *āṭmajñāna*, the 'I' notion (*ahaṃkāra*) gets destroyed. The *sañcīta* and *āgāmī-karmas* become non-functional because they cannot be attached to anyone other than *ahaṃkāra*. *Prārabdha-karma* has already taken the concrete form of *jñānī's* embodiment. *Ātmajñāna* can destroy ignorance but not the body. *Jñānī* has to undergo the experiences of *prārabdha-karma* until it lasts. *Prārabdha* is like an arrow that is already shot. You can neither retract it nor redirect. It has to stop on its own after its momentum is over. This is what is described as *adhikārasamāptitaḥ*.

A *jñānī* becomes a *jīvanmukta* (liberated even while living) when his knowledge becomes steadfast. A *jīvanmukta* when absorbed in his *svarūpa* (true nature) is not aware of his body leave alone the world. *Arati* (discontentment), etc., surface in a *jñānī*, depending on the nature of *prārabdha-karma* when he is conscious of his

body. They are passing in nature. They cannot subject the *jñānī* to bondage once again. In some cases the *adhikāra* of such cosmic deputies may involve more than one birth, retaining the earlier embodiment or shedding it. They do get liberation after their *adhikāra* (*prārabdha*) gets over. This is ascertained in the *Brahmasūtra* (3-3-32).

Prārabdha of a *jñānī* is of three types. *Icchā-prārabdha* contains bare minimum desires to sustain the body (when he is aware of it) such as bathing, clothing and eating. Or it can be a desire to serve the humanity (*lokasaṅgraha*). *Anicchā-prārabdha* is not desired by him but cannot avoid them. These are sickness, pain, honour, dishonour, etc., *Parecchā-prārabdha* comprises what people at large expect from him. This has a bearing on the life of a *jñānī*.

Brahmavidyā is the subject matter of the fourth chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* which forms the basis of this chapter called *Kāṇvavidyā*. Then why the description of *Virāṭ* is given here? This will be discussed later. For the time being suffice it to know that to gain *Brahmajñāna*, we need not struggle to gain the post of *Virāṭ* which demands the performance of rigorous *upāsana*s and *karmas* in many births. Even after gaining knowledge, the

responsibilities on account of *prārabdha* are colossal. The root cause of *Virāt's arati* (discontent) was *parecchā-prārabdha*. The *jīvas* were demanding the Creation, the field of *karmabhoga* (experiences of *karmaphalas*). *Īśvara* has to provide it. *Virāt* was appointed to look after the physical Creation. He himself has aspired for it. Now he cannot desert his duty.

The concept that a *jñānī* may not be liberated if he gets subjected to desires, discontent, etc., is refuted now.

अधिकारो यस्य यावान् भुक्ते भोगे स तावति ।
कुतो न मुच्यते मुक्तिप्रतिबन्धस्य संक्षयात् ॥३६॥

यस्य - of a *jñānī* यावान् - so long as अधिकारः - the post of authority or *prārabdha-karma* (अस्ति - is there) सः - he तावति - when that much भोगे - experiences as per *prārabdha karma* भुक्ते (सति) - (when) experienced मुक्तिप्रतिबन्धस्य - of the obstruction of liberation संक्षयात् - by the total ending कुतः - for what reasons न - does (he) not मुच्यते - get liberated—(36)

36. In the case of a *jñānī*, once the experiences (*bhoga*) according to the post of authority or *prārabdha-karma* are undergone, why should he not get liberated? (Certainly, he will be liberated) because the obstruction of

his liberation viz. post of authority/*prārabdha-bhoga* has totally ended.

The life of *jñānīs* is like a switched off electric fan which continues to revolve until its momentum is over. After gaining the *Brahmajñāna*, their lives, whether they have any post of authority or not, is totally governed by their *prārabdha*. The accomplishment of *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma* has no relevance to them. By gaining *Brahmajñāna*, they are already *muktas* (liberated). Therefore, there is no *puruṣa-prayatna* (self-effort) on their part to gain any *puruṣārtha* (fourfold human accomplishments). *Prārabdha* frames their remaining life. That is why there is no uniformity in the behaviour of different *jñānīs*.

Brahmajñāna (*tattvajñāna*) cannot confer *videha-mukti* (bodiless liberation) immediately because of the presence of *prārabdha*. It has to be undergone until the body lasts. A *jñānī* can remain unaffected by the ups and downs of life during the period of *prārabdha* by gaining *jīvanmukti* (liberation even while living in the embodiment). This needs the accomplishment of *manonāśa* (the state of no mind) and *vāsanākṣaya* (destruction of erroneous impressions in the mind) in addition to *tattvajñāna*. Irrespective of gaining the *jīvanmukti* or not, a *jñānī* does get *videha-mukti* once the course of *prārabdha* is over.

An inference as the *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) to prove the existence of *adhikāra* (post of authority or *prārabdha*) in the case of a *jñānī* is furnished in the next verse.

सत्यात्मप्यात्मविद्यायां यो दोषो न निवर्तते ।
तेन दोषेणानुमेयोऽधिकारो विदुषामसौ ॥३७॥

आत्मविद्यायां - *ātmajñāna* सत्याम् अपि
- even when gained यः - whatever दोषः -
defect न - does not निवर्तते - cease, come to
an end तेन - by that दोषेण - (by that) defect
विदुषाम् - of *jñānī's* असौ - this अधिकारः - the
post of authority / *prārabdha* अनुमेयः -
must be inferred – (37)

37. In spite of gaining *ātmajñāna*, if defects (such as desire, discontent, etc.), persist, it must be inferred that those *jñānīs* have *adhikāra* (post of authority/*prārabdha*).

There must be bright and brilliant light everywhere when the sun is shining overhead. If not, the only cause is the overcast sky. Fire must burn unless its burning power is prevented by some *maṇi* (a specific stone), or *mantra* (charm) or *auśadhi* (a particular herb). These conclusions are infallible. So is the case with *ātmavidyā* which is nothing short of direct experience of Brahman, when this is gained by the total destruction of self-ignorance, there is no occasion for desires, discontent, anxiety,

etc., which are the common traits of a *saṃsārī*. In spite of *ātmavidyā* if these defects appear in a *jñānī*, the only inference is that the said *jñānī* has *adhikāra*. Janaka was undoubtedly a *jñānī*. Yet, he had to rule the Kingdom. This shows that his *prārabdha* was so.

The incidental discussion on *adhikāra* is over. *Virāṭ* is now creating the physical embodiments of various species of living beings.

प्रबलारब्धवेगेन कामुकः

सन् प्रजापतिः ।

एकं देहं स्वभोगार्थमसृजत्

मिथुनात्मकम् ॥३८॥

प्रजापतिः - *Prajāpati* प्रबलारब्धवेगेन -
by the powerful force of *prārabdha*
karma कामुकः - lustful सन् - being
मिथुनात्मकं - having the form of a couple
एकं - one देहं - body स्वभोगार्थम् - for his
enjoyment असृजत् - he produced, created
– (38)

38. *Prajāpati* (*Virāṭ*), becoming lustful by the powerful force of his *prārabdha-karma*, created another body having the form of a couple for his enjoyment.

तद् द्वेधापातयद् देहमभूतां दम्पती उभौ ।

मनुः पुमान् वधूर्जेया शतरूपात्र नामतः ॥३९॥

तद् - that देहम् - body द्वेधा आपातयत् -
divided into two उभौ - both दम्पती -

husband and wife अभूताम् - became अत्र - here पुमान् - the male मनुः - by name Manu वधूः - the female शतरूपा - Śatarūpā नामतः - by the name ज्ञेया - to be known – (39)

39. *Prajāpati* divided that body (in the form of a couple) into two. Both parts became husband and wife. Here (in the body having the form of a couple) the male was named Manu and the female was known as Śatarūpā.

Manu and Śatarūpa were the first couple created. They are the original parents. Actually both are nothing but *Virāṭ* (*Prajāpati*) who assumed this twofold form.

Upaniṣad says that *Prajāpati* himself became the body in the form of a couple (*sa ha etāvān āsa*, *Br.U.1-4-3*). *Prajāpati* became the new bodies keeping his earlier body intact. It is not like milk becoming the curd. This was possible for him because he is a *satyasaṅkalpaḥ* - true in resolve. His wishes come to pass. Many of such exalted deities have this power.

Now, further propagation of progeny starts from human beings onwards to other species according to their *karmaphalas*.

तयोः सम्भोगतो जाता मनुष्या दम्पती पुनः ।
नानादेहानगृहीतां ताभ्यां द्वन्द्वानि जज्ञिरे ॥४०॥

तयोः - of those two सम्भोगतः - by

the union मनुष्याः - human beings जाताः - were born पुनः - further दम्पती - the couple नानादेहान् - different/varieties of embodiments गृहीताम् - assumed ताभ्याम् - from those द्वन्द्वानि - couples जज्ञिरे - were born – (40)

40. By the union of that couple, human beings were born. Further, that couple assumed different embodiments. From those different embodiments, many couples were produced.

By the union of Manu and Śatarūpa human beings were born. Further, that couple assumed different embodiments of various species and produced those progenies. There are eighty-four lacs of species. These embodiments are hinted in the next verse.

गवाश्वरासभाजाविप्रमुखा

आपिपीलिकम् ।

प्राणिनो मिथुनात्मानो जाताः

कर्मानुसारतः ॥४१॥

गो - Cow अश्व - horse रासभ - donkey अजा - goat अवि - ram प्रमुखाः - headed by आपिपीलिकम् - upto an ant मिथुनात्मानः - in the form of couples consisting of male and female प्राणिनः - living beings कर्मानुसारतः - in accordance with their *karmas* जाताः - were born – (41)

41. The living beings ranging from cow, horse, donkey, goat and ram onwards upto an ant were born in the form of couples in accordance with their *karmaphalas*.

Virāṭ assumed the bodies of various living beings and produced their progenies. These embodiments are determined in accordance with the results of *jīva's karmas* and *upāsanās* (Kṛ.U.2-2-7). The human embodiment is the best among all the species. It is designed to get the *Brahmajñāna*. To be born as human is difficult and rare. This embodiment is not meant to fritter away in the sense-enjoyments.

Now *Virāṭ* creates four *varṇas* and their presiding deities from his different limbs.

मुखबाहूरूपादेश्यो वह्नीन्द्रवसुभूमिकाः ।
देवता असृजद्ब्रह्मा चातुर्वर्ण्यनियामिकाः॥४२॥

ब्रह्मा - *Virāṭ* मुखबाहूरूपादेश्यः - from the mouth, hand, thigh and foot
वह्नीन्द्रवसुभूमिकाः - Agni, Indra, Vasu and *Prthvī devatās* चातुर्वर्ण्यनियामिकाः - who control the four *varṇas* देवताः - presiding deities असृजद् - created – (42)

42. *Virāṭ* created Agni, Indra, Vasu and *Prthvī devatās*, the presiding deities of four *varṇas* from his mouth, arms, thighs and feet respectively.

Brahmā is another name of *Virāṭ* besides *Prajāpati*. The word *Brahmā* is in masculine gender whereas Brahman, the all pervasive *caitanya*, is neuter. The distinction between these two words must be known clearly.

Cāturvarṇya is highly misunderstood nowadays. It is a system of social classes enjoined by the Vedas based on *guṇas* (mental traits) and *karmas* (duties). *Guṇas* are three - *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. Their features are as follows:

a) *Sattva* : Knowledge, mental peace, mastery over the senses, the study and teaching, taking to ascetic practices.

b) *Rajas* : Hankering after sense-objects and love for them, agitated mind, likes, dislikes, greed, envy, hurting others, desires, wavering of the mind, snatching away the wealth and properties of others.

c) *Tamas* : Lack of clear understanding, fear, dejection, grief, sleep, drowsiness, anger, miserliness, atheism, ignorance, cruelty, jealousy, foolishness, shamelessness, partiality, deceit.

The four *varṇas* are:

i) *Brāhmaṇa* : Has predominant *sattva*; knows *Brahmatattva* (at least

indirectly, if not directly), studies and teaches the Vedas, takes to the performance of rituals, etc., as told in the Vedas, fosters progressively in spiritual and moral life, helps others in their spiritual pursuit, has mastery over mind and the senses;

ii) *Kṣatriya* : Has predominant *rajas* and secondary *sattva*; stands by and guards a sound political system with law, justice as well as welfare, moral order and the prosperity of the country; checks the wicked and immoral; rescues the weak and distressed;

iii) *Vaiśya* : Has predominant *rajas* and secondary *tamas*; looks after the agriculture and trade;

iv) *Śūdra* : Has predominant *tamas* and secondary *rajas*; lays the foundation of human welfare by service activities. Like the feet that are engaged in going about on all kinds of activities, the *śūdras* are ever-engaged in the basic tasks of society.

The peace and happiness of the society will suffer even if a single *varṇa* is slack in its task. The four *varṇas* are like the limbs of the same body. All *varṇas* are worth-while and valuable, as all limbs are important. There is no higher or lower (*Gītā-Vāhini*, by Śrī Sathya Sai Bābā). Naturally, *guṇa* wise there is bound to be a degree of superiority and inferiority in the *varṇas*, but not dutywise. All have to discharge their duties in dedication to *Īśvara* as worship with devotion. Thereby all do get *siddhi* (*jñāna-niṣṭhā-yogyatā*, i.e. the eligibility to be steadfast in *ātmajñāna*) irrespective of their *varṇas* (*B.G.18-46*). The *varṇa* system might have suffered a setback due to human selfishness and the resultant exploitation. That is not the fault of *Cāturvarṇya* system. This drawback is common to all established systems such as democracy, monarchy, etc. All these are good so long as they are not exploited.

This verse describes how from the different limbs of *Virāṭ* the four *varṇas* and their presiding deities were born. The *brāhmaṇa varṇa* and its deity Agni, *kṣatriya* and the deity Indra, *vaiśya* and the deity Vasu, *śūdra* and its deity *Bhūmi-devatā* emerged respectively from *Virāṭ*'s mouth, arms, thighs and feet. The famous *Puruṣa Sūkta* appearing in all the four Vedas corroborates this.

Here one may wonder at what is being described so far to be a theory of Creation. It is a fact that no two theories of Creation provided by various Upaniṣads tally with each other. It is true. These are only interim explanations given to the questioning minds of *mumukṣus* suiting to their temperaments. In fact, the Creation is inexplicable. Yet, these theories are given as a means (*upāya*) to reveal (*avatārāya*) the ultimate truth, Brahman (*Mā.Kā.3-15*). It is accepted that these theories have

inherent defects. But what is to be considered is their capacity to impart *Brahmajñāna*. Sureśvarācārya points out this in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-bhāṣya-vārtika* (1-4-402). The same is quoted here in the verse 108 of this chapter. Scientists or scholars of ancient scriptures, may explain the how of Creation up to a certain point. If probed further, they have to accept their ignorance (P.6-143&146). Vedānta exhorts all to know directly Brahman, the basis of Creation, and not to get entangled in the Creation.

Swāmī Rāmatīrtha pinpoints the mistake in this regard: When you are trying to probe this world with questions like ‘when’, ‘why’, ‘where’, etc., really speaking you have already started the Creation. The very question ‘when’ refers to a point in time and ‘where’, a place in space. So you have already taken for granted the space-time structure. Your question ‘why this Creation’ itself presupposes a Creation with a cause-effect relationship. Therefore, this question cannot be totally answered. Certainly, to some extent an explanation can be given and may even be useful, but a foolproof explanation is impossible. He gives an interesting example to illustrate this. A small child, say 2 to 3 years old, who, on being told that there is another child in the mirror, exactly like itself, goes to the mirror to verify it and finds that it is indeed so. It replicates his every movement. Being totally convinced, it tells this to the mother. To remove this wrong notion, the mother pulls the child to a side and asks it to view the mirror from an angle. There is no reflection of the child. Similarly the very attempt to investigate casts the Creation. It is like the replica of the child by going near to the mirror. The majority of people do not grasp the fact that time, space and causation themselves are the parts of Creation. The only solution for this riddle is to directly discover its truth, the Brahman. In the example of a rope being mistaken for a snake, can there ever be a true snake?

Now a wrong notion of those who follow blindly the *Karma-Kāṇḍa* portion of the Vedas prompted by their intense desires, is set right.

तत्रेन्द्रादीन् भिन्नदेवान् मन्यन्ते यागभूमिषु ।
कर्मिणस्तदसज्ज्ञेयं विराडेवाखिला इमे ॥४३॥

तत्र - in that context यागभूमिषु - in the subject matter of sacrifices कर्मिणः -

those who follow the *karma-kāṇḍa* इन्द्रादीन् - Indra and the other presiding deities भिन्नदेवान् - (as) distinct deities मन्यन्ते - they consider तद् असद् - that is wrong ज्ञेयं - (so) should be understood इमे - these अखिलाः - all (deities) विराड् - (are) *Virāt* एव - only - (43)

43. As for the subject matter

(*bhūmiṣu*) of sacrifices, the followers of the *karma-kāṇḍa* (ritualistic portion) of the Vedas consider Indra, etc., as the distinct presiding deities. That is wrong. All these deities should be known as one and the same *Virāṭ*.

We have seen that the entire progeny, *Cāturvarṇya* and their presiding deities are produced from *Virāṭ* only. Therefore, they in their nature are nothing but *Virāṭ*. The ritualist people (*Karminah*) carried away by the results that can be procured from different presiding deities, mistake them to be distinct personages. The Upaniṣad corrects this wrong notion (*Br.U.1-4-6*). What is told in the *Karma-Kāṇḍa* is not the final truth. The content therein is addressed to the common people having taken for granted their self-ignorance and bodily identification. It is only a temporary solution in the realm of *samsāra* for those who are riddled with desires. The *Jñāna-Kāṇḍa* (the section of *Brahmajñāna* in the Vedas) establishes the final truth by dismissing the *karma* section. This fact is expressly told in the next verse.

अविद्वदधिकारित्वात् कर्मणां भिन्नदेवताः ।

उच्यन्तां कर्मकाण्डेन वस्तुतस्तु न तत्तथा॥४४॥

कर्मणाम् - of *karmas* अविद्वदधिकारित्वात्

- because *ajñānī* is the eligible person

कर्मकाण्डेन - by the *karma-kāṇḍa* भिन्नदेवताः

- different presiding deities उच्यन्तां - let them be described तु - but वस्तुतः - in reality तत् - that तथा - so न - is not - (44)

44. The ignorant person is eligible to perform *karmas*. Therefore, let *karma-kāṇḍa* speak of different presiding deities. But it is not so in reality.

Every one of us, including all the species of animals, human beings and the presiding deities are the manifestation of *Virāṭ*. *Virāṭ* has come from *Hiraṇyagarbha*, and *Hiraṇyagarbha* from *Īśvara* and finally *Īśvara* from Brahman. Therefore, all these presiding deities are nothing but *Virāṭ*. *Virāṭ* has no independent existence apart from *Īśvara*. *Īśvara* is from Brahman. In view of this, it is a grave mistake to take deities to be distinct from one another. Brahman is the only independent ever-existent entity and all the others including *Īśvara*, *Hiraṇyagarbha*, *Virāṭ-puruṣa* and the Creation depend upon it for their existence. In the presence of Brahman, the other entities are born and disappear. Whatever that begins and ends is false like our dream even if it appears to be there in between (*Mā.Kā.2-6, 4-31*). *Īśvara* is also so, though it may appear blasphemous in the first instance. This should be understood in its right perspective. So long we take this world

and our embodiment to be real, *Īśvara* is also equally real. The moment the mind gets absorbed in *ātmā*/Brahman, impervious to the world and one's body, *Īśvara* also disappears. That is because what remains is the basis of *Īśvara* and that is Brahman the *cit*. Till then *Īśvara* is indispensable. In fact, *Īśvara* has nothing to gain from us. He is always the giver. We should make good use of him. However, *Īśvara* does not want us to be his permanent devotees. All he wants is you to discover your true nature and put an end to this cycle of births and deaths.

Now the discussion on *Virāt* is wound up with a question. Is *Virāt* a *jīva* or *Paramātmā* (Brahman)? In our earlier discussions, we have seen that he was a *jīva* in the earlier *Kalpa*. He performed specific *karmas* and *upāsānās* and earned such a purity of mind and *punya* that he got the position of *Virāt*. Although at first he had self-ignorance, he sorted it out and gained the self-knowledge. He could Create all beings and presiding deities. Hence the question is *Virāt* a *jīva* or *Paramātmā*? The answer is, both are true and depends from what standpoint you view him. He is a *jīva* from the *upādhi* (embodiment) standpoint and *Paramātmā* from the standpoint of his true nature. This is true of all of us also. From our *upādhi* standpoint, we are *jīvas* and *Paramātmā*

from the standpoint of our true nature. That is what *śruti* (the Vedas) wants us to discover as conveyed in the verses 45 to 47.

विराजो जीवतामाहुः केचिदन्ये परात्मताम् ।
उभयं युक्तमेवैतत् विवक्षायाः विशेषतः ॥४५॥

केचिद् - some people विराजः - of *Virāt* जीवताम् - status of *jīva* आहुः - speak अन्ये - others परात्मताम् - status of Brahman (आहुः - speak) विवक्षायाः - in the sense of (in standpoint) विशेषतः - due to difference एतत् - these उभयं - both (views) युक्तम् - are correct (unopposed) एव - only, quite - (45)

45. Some people say that *Virāt* is a *jīva* whereas others say that he is *Paramātmā* (Brahman). Both these views are quite correct (unopposed) due to the difference in their standpoints.

सोपाधिकविवक्षायां जीव एव विराट् भवेत् ।
निरुपाधिकविवक्षायां परमात्मैव नेतरः ॥४६॥

सोपाधिकविवक्षायाम् - from the standpoint of the *upādhi* (embodiment) विराट् - *Virāt* जीवः - *jīva* एव - alone भवेत् - is निरुपाधिकविवक्षायां - from the standpoint of disembodied nature (विराट् - *Virāt* is) परमात्मा - *Paramātmā* (Brahman) एव - only इतरः - the other (viz. *jīva*) न - not - (46)

46. *Virāt* is a *jīva* alone from the

standpoint of his embodiment. But he is Brahman and not a *jīva* in his disembodied nature.

The above truth equally applies to all the *jīvas* as in the case of *Virāt*. All the *jīvas* are Brahman in their true nature. This fact is confirmed now.

वयमप्येवमेवेति यद्युच्येत

तथास्तु तत् ।

सृष्ट्वा विराट् भोक्तृवर्गं

भोग्यमन्नमचीक्लृपत् ॥४७॥

वयम् - we (are) अपि - also एवम् एव - certainly as told earlier इति - thus यदि - if उच्येत - it is said तत् - that तथा - so अस्तु - let it be विराट् - *Virāt* भोक्तृवर्गं - the class of experiencers सृष्ट्वा - having created भोग्यम् - object of enjoyment अन्नम् - food अचीक्लृपत् - (he) created – (47)

47. If it is said that we are also Brahman as said earlier in the case of *Virāt*, it is correct. *Virāt*, having created the class of *bhoktās* (experiencers endowed with embodiments), (further) created the food fit for their consumption.

The identity between the individual *jīva* and Brahman is revealed unequivocally by all the Upaniṣads. It is established to be true by reasoning also. Much more than that the *jīvanmuktas* who are steadfast in *Brahmajñāna* have directly experienced it very vividly. The Upaniṣads provide means to the

mumukṣus at their different stages of development to prepare their mind to gain *Brahmasākṣātkāra* - the direct experience/knowledge of *ātmā*/Brahman.

First, *Virāt* created different embodiments suited to different *jīvas* required for them to undergo varieties of *bhogas* (experiences of joys and sorrows according to their *prārabdha-karma*). But *bhoga* is possible provided *bhogyas* (objects of enjoyment or suffering) are there. *Virāt* made good this deficiency by creating *bhogyam annam* - whatever that is necessary for consumption at the physical, perceptual and mental levels. The word *annam* (food) used here is in a wider sense and not restricted to edible food only. All our intakes (*āhāra*) at different levels of our personalities are *bhogyam annam*. The form that we see is the *āhāra* (food) for the eyes; the sound we hear is the food for the ears, etc. The joys, sorrows, emotions and mental turmoil, etc., that is experienced is also *bhogyam annam*.

THE GLORY OF VIRĀT

Now the glory of *Virāt* is highlighted in the next two verses to conclude the topic of his description.

पूर्वजन्मनि मर्त्यः सन्

कृत्वासौ ज्ञानकर्मणी ।

अमृतानसृजद् देवान्

यद्यप्येतत् महाद्भुतम् ॥४८॥

यद्यपि - although असौ - this (*Virāt*)
 पूर्वजन्मनि - in his previous birth मर्त्यः -
 mortal (human) सन् - being (तथापि - even
 then) ज्ञानकर्मणी - *upāsanās* and *karmas*
 कृत्वा - having undertaken अमृतान् -
 (relatively) immortal देवान् - presiding
 deities असृजत् - created एतत् - this (is)
 महा - a great अद्भुतम् - wonder – (48)

48. Although a mortal human being in his previous birth, even then having performed (specific) *upāsanās* and *karmas*, *Virāt* created the (relatively) immortal deities. This is a great wonder.

Even though an ordinary *jīva* in the past lives, *Virāt* could create the mighty and extra ordinary deities such as Indra, *Varuṇa*, etc. This is a great wonder because it can be accomplished by only a divine entity. In this context, the word *jñāna* means *upāsanā* and not *ātmajñāna*.

सृष्ट्वाखिलमवेत् सृष्टमहमस्म्यखिलं जगत् ।
 ईदृशो महिमा ज्ञेयः कृतयोर्ज्ञानकर्मणोः ॥४९॥

अखिलम् - the entire (*jagat*) सृष्ट्वा -
 having created (मया - by me) सृष्टम् - the
 created अखिलम् - the entire जगत् - the
 Creation अहम् - I अस्मि (इति) - am (thus)
 अवेत् - recognized कृतयोः - of performed
 ज्ञानकर्मणोः - of *upāsanās* and *karmas*
 ईदृशः - of this kind महिमा - glory ज्ञेयः - one
 should know – (49)

49. Having created the entire Creation, he (*Virāt*) recognized: I myself is the entire *Jagat*. Such is the glory (*mahimā*) of *upāsanās* and *karmas* undertaken. By the by ‘*mahimā*’ is a masculine word.

Virāt not only created the stupendous gross world, but he could also discover the created *Jagat* is not different from him.

THE REASON WHY *VIRĀT* IS DESCRIBED IN THE SECTION OF *BRAHMAVIDYĀ*

Kāṅvavidyā is *Brahmavidyā*. The description of *Virāt* in the section of *Brahmavidyā* is an obvious digression. What is the purpose of its description here? The answer follows.

वर्णितेत्थं प्रयत्नेन ज्ञानकर्मफलोर्जितिः ।
 उपासितुः प्रवृत्त्यर्थं निवृत्त्यर्थं मुमुक्षुतः ॥५०॥

उपासितुः - of an *upāsaka* प्रवृत्त्यर्थं - to
 urge (to strive for the *Virāt*-position)
 मुमुक्षुतः - from a *mumukṣu* निवृत्त्यर्थं - to
 dissuade the *mumukṣu* from the pursuit
 of gaining the status of *Virāt* इत्थं - thus
 ज्ञानकर्मफलोः - of the results of *upāsanās*
 and *karmas* जितिः - gaining प्रयत्नेन - with
 great efforts, specially वर्णिता - is
 described – (50)

50. Thus gaining the results of *upāsanās* and *karmas* is described

specially (in the section of *Brahmavidyā*) to urge an *upāsaka* to strive for the *Virāt*-position and to dissuade the *mumukṣu* from the pursuit of gaining the status of *Virāt*.

The description of *Virāt* given here is to enthuse an *upāsaka* to take to the practice of specific *upāsana*s and *karma*s so that he can gain that status. The same description turns away a *mumukṣu* from taking to it because of the difficulties of practicing them, which often lasts for several lifetimes. It helps a *mumukṣu* to develop *vairāgya* (dispassion) for the post of *Virāt*. It becomes clear to him that the everlasting *mokṣa* can be easier to gain quickly compared to *Virāt* status provided a staunch *vairāgya* is there. Such a *mumukṣu* develops the fourfold qualification, takes to *śravaṇa*, *manana*, *nididhyāsana* and gets freed from *samsāra* by gaining *Brahmajñāna*. How one and the same description inspires the *upāsaka* and *mumukṣu* differently is being discussed now by showing their distinct dispositions.

सृष्ट्वैश्वर्ये स्वतन्त्रत्वं तत्कामी बहु मन्यते ।
दोषानेव विवेक्यत्र बहूनुत्प्रेक्षते धिया ॥५१॥

तत्कामी - one who is desirous of *Virāt* post सृष्ट्वैश्वर्ये - with respect to the overlordship of Creation स्वतन्त्रत्वम् -

independence बहु मन्यते - esteems/rates highly अत्र - with reference to the same description (of *Virāt*) विवेकी - a discriminating person धिया - by his intelligence बहून् - many दोषान् - defects एव - alone उत्प्रेक्षते - sees—(51)

51. The aspirant of *Virāt*-position rates highly the independence with respect to the overlordship of Creation. (But,) a discriminating *mumukṣu* by his intelligence sees many defects in the same description (of *Virāt*).

A person desirous of the *Virāt*-post, gives prime importance to the powers and mastery that he can wield over everything. This he considers a great achievement. On the other hand, a person who discriminates between the everlasting (*nitya*) and the ephemeral (*anitya*), is able to detect the major flaws in accomplishing the status of *Virāt*. He is not fascinated by it. Prima facie *Virāt*-post has defects seems to be very surprising. Here is a detailed investigation.

अविद्या पटसंवीतचक्षुषामियदेव हि ।
वैदिकं साधनं ज्ञेयं ज्ञानकर्मस्वभावकम् ॥५२॥

अविद्या पटसंवीतचक्षुषाम् - for those who are blindfolded by the self-ignorance हि - indeed, surely इयत् एव - only this much, to this extent ज्ञानकर्मस्वभावकम् - of the nature of *upāsana* and *karma* वैदिकम् -

(is) the Vedic साधनम् - the means ज्ञेयम् - should be understood – (52)

52. It should be understood indeed that the only Vedic means available for those who are blindfolded by the self-ignorance is to the extent of *upāsanā* (called *jñānam*) and *karma*.

The ignorant persons are naturally identified with their embodiments. Having taken for granted such an erroneous identification, the only Vedic means at their disposal are *upāsanās* and *karmas* to accomplish different results as specified in the Vedas. The highest result that can be accomplished by these Vedic means is the post of *Hiranyagarbha* with *Virāṭ* as the second in the order. These people are not available for *ātma-vicāra* (self-inquiry) because of their mind-set is full of desires. The word *jñānam* is

used for *upāsanā* at times. The defects in the *Virāṭ*-post are enumerated in the following verses.

तच्च कर्त्रादिसापेक्षं विरिञ्च्यन्तफलप्रदम् ।
जन्मादिविक्रियाषट्कयुतं सातिशयं जडम् ॥५३॥

तत् - that Vedic means (*sādhanā*) च - and कर्त्रादिसापेक्षं - depends on the doer (*yajamāna*), etc., (i.e. materials, wealth) विरिञ्च्यन्तफलप्रदम् - gives the result upto the post of *Virāṭ* (*Viriñci*) जन्मादिविक्रियाषट्कयुतं - endowed with the six changes / modifications such as birth, etc. सातिशयम् - having gradations जडम् - inert – (53)

53. Those Vedic *sādhanās* are dependant on the doer (*yajamāna*, etc.). Their result is the post of *Viriñci* (*Virāṭ*). That embodiment has six changes such as the birth, etc., has gradations, and is inert in nature.

The author is enumerating the defects one by one.

- i) All the Vedic *karmas* and *upāsanās* are dependant on various factors. First of all a doer (*Yajamāna*) is necessary. Mere knowing the mode of performance of *karmas* and *upāsanās* is not enough. Their practice is indispensable. Varieties of materials (*sāmagrīs*) are necessary which require the wealth. The *upāsaka* needs a competent *guru* for initiation. *Yajamāna* in certain cases needs the *ṛtviks* (Vedic priests).
- ii) At best, the result of these Vedic means can be the post of *Viriñci* (*Virāṭ*). Though the post of *Hiranyagarbha* is higher than that of *Virāṭ*, contextwise the referred Vedic means pertain to the post of *Viriñci*.
- iii) The embodiments have *ṣaḍvikāras* - six changes. They are *jāyate* (born), *asti* (exists empirically), *vardhate* (grows), *vipariṇamate* (modifies), *apakṣyate*

(decays) and *vinaśyati* (gets destroyed). The results of *karmas* and *upāsanās* are always transient in nature.

- iv) *Sātiśayatvam*, the gradations in the results giving rise to varying embodiments is another defect.
- v) The embodiment is inert (*jaḍa*) by itself.

दुःखानि च विचित्राणि सन्त्येव बहुजन्मसु ।
अनेन क्लेशयुक्तेन दुर्लभं तपसा विना ॥५४॥

post of *Virāt*) दुर्लभं - (is) difficult to attain
- (54)

च - and बहुजन्मसु - in many births
विचित्राणि - varieties दुःखानि - difficulties
सन्ति एव - are certainly there क्लेशयुक्तेन -
full of troubles अनेन - by this तपसा -
penance विना - without (विराट्पदम् - the

54. Further, there are certainly varieties of difficulties in many births. (The post of *Virāt*) is very difficult to attain without the penance full of troubles.

- vi) These *upāsanās* and *karmas* have to be performed over a span of several lives which means that the *upāsaka* has to undergo the suffering of so many births and deaths. In between there can be diseases and problems of all kinds which further aggravate the suffering.
- vii) The penance involving the specific *karmas* and *upāsanās* is full of troubles.

कथंचित् साधितेऽप्यस्मिन्
परानन्दघनं प्रभुम् ।
अन्तर्भाव्य विराट्पिण्डे स्थातव्यं
हि जुगुप्सिते ॥५५॥

this जुगुप्सिते - detestable विराट्पिण्डे - in the
body of *Virāt* अन्तर्भाव्य - concealing,
confining हि - indeed स्थातव्यं - has to
remain - (55)

कथंचित् - somehow साधितेऽपि -
even if (*Virāt* post) is attained परानन्दघनं -
having the nature of limitless happiness
प्रभुम् - *Paramātmā* (Brahman) अस्मिन् - in

55. Even if somehow the post of *Virāt* is attained, indeed he has to remain in the detestable body of *Virāt*, having concealed the *Paramātmā* who is the embodiment of limitless happiness.

- viii) Let us now see the plight of *Virāt* after accomplishing that status by tremendous efforts. As already seen, he does get *Brahmajñāna* by his *ātma-vicāra*. He directly knows that he is Brahman (*Paramātmā*) who by very nature is *paramānanda* (limitless happiness). But what is the use? He as

paramānanda-svarūpa Paramātmā has to remain encaged in his detestable body upto the end of this *Kalpa* until his *prārabdha* is over. All along he has to discharge his duties. He has landed in such a situation in spite of being a *Brahmajñānī* because of his hitherto intense desire to be *Virāt* for which he worked during many lives facing all difficulties. Can it ever be a wise pursuit? Instead, had he worked directly for *Brahmajñāna*, the gaining of *mokṣa* could have been an easy pursuit. This shows how a desire can delude an individual who lacks *viveka* (discrimination).

Virāt's embodiment has been described as *jugupsita* (detestable).

As stated earlier, it is a macrocosmic embodiment containing all the species of living beings ranging from deities to an insignificant worm crawling in the filth.

The defects pertaining to the post of *Virāt* are described further.

न केवलं पिण्डवासस्तादात्म्यं चाभिमानतः ।
ततो भयं भक्षणाय पितुर्मुखविदारणात् ॥५६॥

न - not केवलं - only पिण्डवासः - the abode in the macrocosmic embodiment (किन्तु - but also) अभिमानतः - because of 'I' notion in the body तादात्म्यं - (the resultant) identification (with it) च - and ततः -

thereby भक्षणाय - for eating पितुः - of father (viz. *Hiranyagarbha*) मुखविदारणात् - because of opening the mouth भयं - (he got) fear - (56)

56. Not only *Virāt* resided in the macrocosmic embodiment, but also got identified with it due to the 'I' notion therein. Thereby, he got frightened when (his) father (viz. *Hiranyagarbha*) opened his mouth to eat (him).

ix) As a result of his abidance in the body, *Virāt* identified with it due to his 'I' notion in the body. Thereby he got subjected to fear when *Hiranyagarbha* (his father) opened his mouth to eat him. This fear is an additional defect.

The incident of father trying to eat his son sounds very strange. This topic needs a thorough investigation. As seen earlier, *Īśvara* creates *Hiranyagarbha*, the deity of macrocosmic subtle bodies. He has no physical body. During the process of Creation, he produced by his will *Virāt* in the form of a child. The purpose was to propagate the Creation through *Virāt*. In the common parlance, *Hiranyagarbha* can be considered as the father of *Virāt*. It was the primitive stage of Creation. Food was yet to be created. *Hiranyagarbha* being very hungry opened his mouth to eat the child, (i.e. *Virāt*). The frightened child cried making a sound as '*bhāṇ*'. This was the

origin of speech (*Br. U. 1-2-4*). The fear of self-extinction is a major defect that *Virāṭ* had to undergo. Of course *Hiraṇyagarbha* desisted from eating it on hearing the cry. Another reason was the meagerness of the food. No one eats the seed that can produce abundant crop. Later he produced abundant food for all beings through *Virāṭ*. Whatever it may be, the fact remains that *Hiraṇyagarbha* tried to devour *Virāṭ* subjecting him to fear.

The questions arise:

- How can a father try to eat his own progeny? *Hiraṇyagarbha* is a highly evolved entity, even superior to *Virāṭ*. He is not a cannibal.
- Hiraṇyagarbha* does not have a physical body. Where is the occasion of opening his mouth?

As for the first question, Sureśvarācārya, one of the senior disciples of *Bhāṣyakāra* Ādi Śaṅkarācārya, throws much light on the nature of hunger in his *magnum opus Brhadāranyakopaniṣad-Vārtika*. He says, hunger transgresses all the norms of decency. It does not consider even the lineage. He exclaims: Who will not resort to even the unbecoming means for the sake of this wretched stomach? (*Br. U. Vā. 1-2-182, 183*). The second question itself implies that the actual opening of the mouth is just impossible for the one who has no physical body. All that happened was a subjective projection, just as in a dream (*Br. U. Vā. Sā. 1-2-145*). Fear is bound to be there even if it was a dream. *Virāṭ* cannot avoid this defect. The seriousness of this defect is further highlighted.

चण्डालानां तु नेयं भीः किन्तु
पन्नगजन्मनः ।
को भेदः स्याद् विराड्जन्मन्युरगात्
पुत्रभक्षिणः ॥५७॥

चण्डालानां - for the outcastes तु - undoubtedly इयं - this भीः - fear न - (is) not किन्तु - but पन्नगजन्मनः - for the offspring of serpents (इयं भीः भवति - this fear is there) विराड्जन्मनि - in the birth of *Virāṭ* पुत्रभक्षिणः - from the one who devours its progeny उरगात् - from the

serpent को - what भेदः - difference स्याद् - is there? - (57)

57. This fear (of being devoured by the father) is not at all there in the case of outcastes, but (it is there) for the offspring of serpents. What (indeed) is the difference between the birth of *Virāṭ* and that of an offspring of a serpent (who devours its progeny)?

It seems that a snake eats its own eggs. So the offspring of a snake has the

fear of being eaten by its parent. Even the outcastes do not have this problem. Then what greatness is there in being born as *Virāt* whose plight is no better than that of an offspring of a serpent. This is an instance of *arthavāda* - an exaggerated statement to highlight a point. Here it is in the sense of censure and not praise. The purpose is to dissuade a *mumukṣu* from aspiring for the post of *Virāt*.

The next defect in the post of *Virāt* is as follows.

कृच्छ्राद्भये प्रशान्तेऽपि जग्राहाथारतिग्रहः ।
क्रियमाणे प्रतिकारे गर्दभादिशरीरता ॥५८॥

कृच्छ्राद् - with great difficulty भये - when the fear प्रशान्तेऽपि - even though warded off अथ - thereafter अरतिग्रहः - the grip of discontentment जग्राह - seized him प्रतिकारे - when remedial measure क्रियमाणे - was taken to गर्दभादिशरीरता - (all and sundry) embodiments such as donkey, etc., (प्राप्ता - he got) - (58)

58. Even after the fear (of being eaten) was warded off with great difficulty, the grip of discontentment seized him. When it was remedied (by effecting the gross Creation), he got (all and sundry) embodiments of donkey, etc.

- x) No sooner *Virāt* could ward off his fear of being eaten by his father, he got seized in the grip of discontentment. As a duty, he had to effect the gross Creation, and yet, there was no ready means at his disposal (vide verses 32 to 35).
- xi) Finally he did create the gross world. His embodiment being the macrocosmic gross bodies, he had no choice but to get endowed with all and sundry detestable bodies such as donkey, worm, etc.

The unending vow that is in store for *Virāt* by having these embodiments is being hinted now by a retort.

एकयोनौ सकृज्जातः क्लेशं
सोढुं न शक्नुयात् ।
अनन्तयोनिष्वसकृज्जायमानस्य
का कथा ॥५९॥

(यदि - if) एकयोनौ - in a given embodiment/species सकृत् - once जातः - born क्लेशं - suffering सोढुं - to bear /

endure न शक्नुयात् - is incapable (तर्हि - then) अनन्तयोनिषु - in the endless embodiments असकृत् - repeatedly जायमानस्य - of the one who is being born (विराजः - of *Virāt*) का कथा - how much more (will be the plight)? - (59)

59. If (a *jīva*) born once in a given embodiment is unable to bear the suffering therein, how much more will be the plight of *Virāt* who is being born repeatedly in the endless embodiments?

It is a well-known fact that the suffering which each living being has to undergo during the journey from birth to death is unbearable. Then how much colossal must be the suffering of *Virāt* who is having all the endless embodiments with their unending repeated cycles of birth and death?

The above may sound as a misplaced criticism. By the very virtue of his post, *Virāt* is a *Brahmajñānī* with *niṣṭhā* (steadfastness) in it. As seen in the verse 31, he has by nature the unobstructed self-knowledge, unshakable dispassion, unquestioned overlordship and unrestrained *punya*. He can never get afflicted by the unending suffering in the endless embodiments. Yes, this is totally true. But *Brahmajñāna* can be gained directly without inviting all the above defects by donning the post of *Virāt*. The status of *Virāt* is not necessary to gain the *Brahmajñāna*. *Brahmānanda* (the limitless happiness) gained by *Brahmajñāna* surpasses the happiness contained in the post of *Virāt*. It can be directly gained without the hassles of *karmas* and *upāsanās* in many lives with final burden of *Virāt-prārabdha*. How gaining the *Brahmajñāna* through the post of *Virāt* is a foolish proposition is demonstrated in the next verse by an interesting illustration.

निस्तरेद् विद्यया चेत् किं

बकबन्धप्रयासतः ।

अथ विद्यामुपेक्ष्योर्ध्वं किं

विद्या प्रार्थयिष्यते ॥६०॥

विद्यया - by self knowledge/
Brahmajñāna (दुःखं - sorrows) निस्तरेद् -
should be crossed over (इति वदसि) चेत् - if
(you say so) बकबन्धप्रयासतः - by
(circuitous method / futile efforts) of
catching a crane किं (प्रयोजनम्) - what
(purpose is served?) अथ - then (आदौ - at
first) विद्याम् - *Brahmavidyā* उपेक्ष्य -
having, disregarded (at first) ऊर्ध्वम् -
afterwards विद्या - *Brahmavidyā* किं - why
प्रार्थयिष्यते - will it be longed for? – (60)

60. If the sorrows (of *samsāra*) should be crossed over by the *Brahmajñāna* (then) what purpose is served by (this) circuitous method of catching a crane? In that case, having first disregarded the *Brahmajñāna* why is it longed for afterwards?

If the *upāsaka* aspiring for the post of *Virāt* knows for certain that the *Brahmajñāna* alone is the remedy for the sorrows of *samsāra*, why does he desire that post and work for it strenuously? Why does he expect the *Brahmajñāna* to destroy the sorrows of *samsāra* only after becoming *Virāt*? Why does he not opt for the *Brahmajñāna* in the first instance? To become *Virāt* first, and

then get liberated by the virtue of the *Brahmajñāna* gained therein is as foolish as trying to catch a crane by a circuitous method.

It seems a so-called genius suggested the following method to catch a crane. First keep a ball of butter on the head of the crane. It will melt by the heat of the sun. The melted butter will blind the crane. Then it can be caught easily. This is the height of foolishness. The person who succeeds in keeping the ball of butter on the head of a crane can easily catch it then and there directly without resorting to the butter-trick. Similarly, instead of becoming *Virāt* after many lives and then seek the *Brahmajñāna*, a *mumukṣu* should take to the means of gaining it right now in this life. It can be gained by comparatively less efforts than the efforts required to be *Virāt*. The author tenders this advice to the *mumukṣu* in the following verse.

क्लेशेन महतोपास्य बहुयोनीः प्रविश्य च ।
विद्यान्वेषणतः श्रेय इदानीमेव वेदनम् ॥६१॥

महता क्लेशेन - with great suffering
उपास्य - having practiced *upāsanās*
बहुयोनीः - many wombs (embodiments)
प्रविश्य - having entered च - and विद्यान्वेषणतः
- than seeking *Brahmajñāna* इदानीम् -
now एव - only (itself) वेदनम् - (gaining
the) knowledge श्रेयः - preferable, the best
-(61)

61. It is preferable to gain the *Brahmajñāna* now itself, than seeking it after suffering the practice of *upāsanās* in many births.

Gaining the self-knowledge right now here is always preferable because it saves a lot of unnecessary strenuous efforts and many births necessary to become *Virāt*. All that is indispensable to begin with is an intense *vairāgya* (dispassion) including that for the post of *Hiranyagarbha* and *Virāt*. Thus the description of *Virāt* so far proves that it is not worth accomplishing proposition at the cost of gaining the *Brahmajñāna* directly.

THE *ADHIKĀRĪ* (ELIGIBLE PERSON) OF *BRAHMAJÑĀNA*

एवं विचार्य बहुशस्तूर्णमेव मुमुक्षति ।
निवृत्तः सर्वबाह्यार्थात् प्रमेयं मातुमर्हति ॥६२॥

एवं - thus बहुशः - in manifold ways
विचार्य - having inquired into (विवेकी -
person of discrimination) तूर्णम् एव - very
quickly मुमुक्षति - desires to gain liberation
सर्वबाह्यार्थात् - from all the external sense-
objects निवृत्तः - having withdrawn प्रमेयं -
the true nature of *ātmā* (*ātmātattva*)
hitherto unknown मातुम् - to know अर्हति -
deserves - (62)

62. Thus having inquired into (the position of *Virāt*) in manifold ways, the *vivekī* desires to gain liberation very

quickly. Having withdrawn from all external sense-objects, he becomes eligible to know the *ātmatattva* (hitherto unknown).

The highest and the best gain that can be accomplished in the realm of this entire Creation is to become *Hiraṇyagarbha* with the second best as *Virāṭ*. But they have their own shortcomings besides requiring to take resort in rigorous *upāsanās* in many lives without the guarantee of sure success. Even their positions are riddled with defects. They also can get totally freed from *saṃsāra* only by *Brahmajñāna*. If this is the plight of the highest gains, what to speak of lesser gains! Thus a *vivekī* (person with the faculty of discrimination) develops disinterest for them. This is *vairāgya* (dispassion). Thereby he desires to gain *mokṣa* (liberation) even by disregarding the heavenly covetable posts.

Mere desiring to get liberated is insufficient by itself. Deservedness is also indispensable. A mind preoccupied in the world of sense-objects is unfit to gain *Brahmajñāna* and thereby the liberation. Therefore, the total withdrawal of the mind from the sense-objects is an imperative requirement. The person who has *vairāgya* and has withdrawn from the extroverted preoccupation deserves to pursue

mokṣa by taking to *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana*. Such a *mumukṣu* is eligible (*adhikārī*) to gain *Brahmajñāna*. This topic of *adhikārī* is concluded now.

अधिकारी साधितः स्यादेवं

फलविचारतः ॥६२ १/२॥

एवं - thus फलविचारतः - by inquiring into the results of *Virāṭ-upāsanās*
अधिकारी - the eligible person for *mokṣa*
साधितः स्यात् - is proved – (62½)

62½. Thus, the eligible person for *mokṣa* is proved after inquiring into the results of *Virāṭ-upāsanās*.

THE TOPICS TO BE KNOWN BY A MUMUKṢU

तेन प्रमातुं यद्योग्यं तदिदानीं निरूप्यते ॥६३॥

तेन - by him, (i.e. by the eligible *mumukṣu*) यद् - whatever प्रमातुं - to know योग्यं - fit तद् - that इदानीं - now निरूप्यते - is being described – (63)

63. Whatever that is fit to be known by the eligible *mumukṣu* is being described now.

What is to be known directly by a *mumukṣu* is *ātma*/Brahman. But the nature of *ātma*/Brahman is such that it is non-dual in nature. Yet, we cannot escape the perceptible *Jagat* (world) or the experience of *saṃsāra*. Therefore, it is necessary to fix first the worth abandoning nature of the world with its

cause so that the remedial measures to end *samsāra* can be taken to. Then only the direct knowledge of Brahman is possible.

उपादेयस्य मेयस्य वाच्या संभावना यथा ।
हेयसंसारहेतुश्च वक्तव्यो यत्नतस्तथा ॥६४॥

यथा - just as उपादेयस्य - that which is fit to be gained मेयस्य - of the entity to be known संभावना - possibility वाच्या - should be told तथा - in the same manner हेयसंसारहेतुश्च - the cause of *samsāra* which is fit to be given up यत्नतः - carefully, zealously वक्तव्यः - has to be told—(64)

64. Just as the worthy entity to be known should be specified, so also the cause of *samsāra* which needs to be given up has to be told carefully.

संसाराख्यमहाव्याधेः किं

मूलमिति चिन्तिते ।

तद्ध्वस्तये चिकित्सेयं

तदा फलवती भवेत् ॥६५॥

संसाराख्यमहाव्याधेः - of the great disease called *samsāra* (our perennial suffering) किं - what मूलम् - the root cause इति - thus चिन्तिते - when it is inquired into तदा - then इयं - this चिकित्सा - remedial measure तद्ध्वस्तये - for its destruction फलवती - fruitful भवेत् - will become—(65)

65. If the root cause of the great

disease called *samsāra* is inquired into then the remedial measure for its destruction will be effective.

Diseases do cause suffering in varying degrees depending on their intensity. They continue for varying periods depending on their nature. Incurable diseases continue until they take away the lives of patients. *Samsāra* is called the great disease (*bhavaroga*) because it is much more dreaded than any other severe diseases. It is beginningless and does not end even after many *Kalpas* unless *Brahmajñāna* is gained. Maximum suffering is in the link of births and deaths forming the chain of transmigration. The height of tragedy is that most of the people know not that *samsāra* is calamitous. A *samsārī* can take to the remedial measures only on knowing its root cause.

Except for one manuscript, verses 66 to 78 are not found anywhere else. But they are there in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtikasāra*.

अविज्ञातनिदानेन भिषजा यच्चिकित्सितम् ।
तद् अनर्थकरं यद्वत् प्रकृतेऽप्यवगम्यताम् ॥६६॥

यद्वत् - just as अविज्ञातनिदानेन - without knowing the diagnosis भिषजा - by a physician यत् - whatever चिकित्सितम् - treatment given तद् - that (treatment) अनर्थकरं - harmful (तद्वत् - in the same way)

प्रकृतेऽपि - in the present case (of ending *saṃsāra*) also अवगम्यताम् - let it be understood – (66)

66. Just as the treatment given by a physician without diagnosing correctly can be harmful, so it is true in the present case (of ending *saṃsāra*).

It is well-known that any therapy without the correct diagnosis of the disease may be even fatal to the patient. So is the case with this great *saṃsāra* having maximum sorrows with scanty tinsels of fleeting joys in-between. Therefore, a *mumukṣu* should know clearly the root cause of *saṃsāra* in the first instance.

मायामूलं द्वैतमेतदित्यज्ञाते

कथं त्विदम् ।

अद्वैतं बुद्धिमारोहेत् स्यादतोऽन्या

तु नैव धीः ॥६७॥

एतद् - this द्वैतं - world of duality मायामूलम् - is the effect of *māyā* इति - thus अज्ञाते (सति) - if not known कथं - how तु - indeed इदम् - this अद्वैतं - non-duality बुद्धिम् आरोहेत् - can be known? अतः - thereby, (i.e. because of not knowing the duality as the effect of *māyā*) अन्या (बुद्धिः) - the other (erroneous) notion, (i.e. the notion that duality is real) स्यात् - will persist तु - on the contrary, nevertheless (अद्वैत) धीः - the knowledge of non-duality नैव - never (can be there) – (67)

67. How indeed can the non-duality, (i.e. Brahman) be known without knowing the dualistic world to be the effect of (false) *māyā*? Thereby, the notion that the duality, (i.e. world) is real will persist. On the contrary, (in such a case) the knowledge of non-duality can never take place.

Māyā is the Creative power. It depends on Brahman. For practical purpose, it does exist. But, in reality it is not. In the direct experience of Brahman in its true nature, there is not even the trace of *māyā*. Yet, it appears to be there invariably so long as the world is perceived. Brahman conditioned by *māyā* appears as *Īśvara* who creates, sustains and destroys the *Jagat*. Brahman is non-dual pure awareness principle. It has no attributes whatsoever of the world. So long as dualistic *jagat* mistaken to be real is perceived, there is no *Brahmajñāna* - the knowledge of non-dual Brahman. ‘There is no perception of *jagat* in *Brahmajñāna*, while so long as the *Jagat* is perceived there is no *Brahmajñāna* (*Yo.Vā. Ni.U.40-9*)’.

Māyā is the ignorance of Brahman. It projects and presents non-dual Brahman with an appearance of dualistic world. The word *māyā* literally means ‘that which is truly not’. But it has

tremendous power of convincing all the things that are never there or next to impossible to be true. It is just like the ignorance of a rope in semi-darkness presenting it as a snake, etc. *Māyā* being false in nature, its product, the dualistic *Jagat* is equally false. The word *māyā* is used at the totality level with respect to Brahman. The same entity is called in some texts as *avidyā* or *ajñāna* (self-ignorance) at the individual level of *ātmā*. The words *māyā*, *avidyā*, *ajñāna*, *prakṛti*, *avyākṛta* are synonyms.

As stated in the verse, by not knowing that the world of duality is the product of *māyā*, not only the *mumukṣu* will not know that the effect of false *māyā* is equally false, but also will get the contrary notion that the world is real. Thereby he will not be convinced that *Brahmajñāna* needs to be gained. The dream appears to be real until it lasts, but gets falsified on waking up. So is the reality of the *jagat* in the realm of self-ignorance. On gaining *Brahmajñāna*, the same *jagat* gets reduced to falsity. Thus ascertaining the true nature of *jagat* is as important as the direct knowledge of non-dual Brahman.

How exactly does this *māyā* or self-ignorance function in effecting the unending *saṃsāra* is being described now.

देहादृष्टक्रियाकर्तृ-

रागाध्यासार्थसप्तकात् ।

द्वारा संसारहेतुः स्यादात्माज्ञानं

तु लोकवत् ॥६८॥

आत्माज्ञानम् - self-ignorance तु - indeed देह - body अदृष्ट - result of actions (*pāpa-punya*) क्रिया - action (*karma*) कर्तृ - doer of *karma* राग - love for sense-objects (and hatred) अध्यास - superimposition or false evaluation अर्थ - sense-objects सप्तकात् द्वारा - through these seven means संसारहेतुः - cause of *saṃsāra* स्यात् - becomes लोकवत् - as in common life - (68)

68. The ignorance of *ātmā* becomes the cause of *saṃsāra* through the seven means of body, results of action, *karma*, doer (*kartā*), love (*āśakti*) for sense-objects, *adhyāsa* (the superimposition of false values in the form of good and bad) *artha* - sense-objects. This is as found in common life.

The self-ignorance which was specified as *māyā* in the previous verse operates through seven means described above. How exactly these means function will be elaborated in the verses 71 to 75. In the world we find that a person who embarks on an adventure without assessing oneself properly in terms of strength, riches, resources and knowledge, etc., can land in severe problems. This is what is meant by the

phrase *lokavat* - as found in common life. The next verse gives a concrete example in regard to this.

आत्माज्ञानमनर्थानां मूलं लोकेऽपि नेतरत् ।
स्वपराक्रममज्ञात्वा युध्यन् म्रियत एव हि ॥६९॥

लोके - in this mundane world
अपि - also आत्माज्ञानम् - the ignorance of one's capacity अनर्थानां - of calamities मूलं - the cause इतरत् - the other न - not स्वपराक्रमम् - one's prowess अज्ञात्वा - not knowing युध्यन् - fighting म्रियते - dies एव हि - certainly –(69)

69. In this mundane world also the ignorance of one's capacity is the cause of calamities, and nothing else. The person who fights without assessing his prowess certainly dies.

Here the ignorance of oneself referred to is not that of *ātmā*. It means one's own capacities or capabilities, both mental and physical, with reference to the task undertaken. For example, a King can get killed if he fights with the enemy without assessing his strength in relation to that of his enemy. We get many such examples in Mahābhārata and Ramāyaṇa. Bakāsura overestimated his strength thinking Bhīma to be an ordinary human and got killed. Duryodhana ruined all the Kauravas relying on the strength of Bhīshma, Droṇa, Kṛpa, Shalya and his vast army. He underestimated Pāṇḍavas

and especially Kṛṣṇa though unarmed. Rāvaṇa destroyed his entire clan despising Rāma to be an ordinary prince. Similarly, the person who interacts with the world without knowing his true nature is bound to continue his miserable *samsāra*.

एवं स्वात्मानमज्ञात्वा संसारानर्थमाप्नुयात् ।
अनर्थाज्ञानयोः कार्यकारणत्वं प्रपञ्च्यते ॥७०॥

एवं - in the same manner स्वात्मानम् - one's true nature अज्ञात्वा - not knowing संसारानर्थम् - the calamity in the form of *samsāra* आप्नुयात् - one gains अनर्थाज्ञानयोः - of *samsāra* and self-ignorance कार्यकारणत्वं - cause-effect relationship प्रपञ्च्यते - is being elaborated –(70)

70. As illustrated in the earlier verse, because of ignorance of *ātmā*, one gets subjected to the calamitous *samsāra*. (Now) the cause-effect relationship between self-ignorance and calamity (in the form of *samsāra*) is being elaborated.

Whatever that is not *artha* is *anartha*. *Artha* is that which is sought for (*arthyate/prārthyate*) by everyone. *Anartha* means that which is never sought after. No one wants suffering, sorrows, pain, sickness, birth, old age, death, calamities, tiresomeness, poverty, problems, ignorance, etc. These are *anarthas*. The nonstop flow of these is the actual *samsāra*. If not anything, there is bound to be at least the cyclic

hunger and thirst which can put us out of gear. This is the price we are paying for being ignorant of our true nature *ātmā* which is the ever-existent principle free from birth and death, the self-evident knowledge-principle totally free from ignorance and the self-experiencing limitless happiness without even the trace of sorrow. How exactly the ignorance of *ātmā* serves as the cause of *samsāra* through the seven-means beginning from body onwards is elaborated in the verses 71 to 75.

जिहासितस्यानर्थस्य हेतुः

स्यात् सशरीरता ।

न प्रियाप्रियविच्छेदः सशरीरस्य

कस्यचित् ॥७१॥

सशरीरता - identification with the body जिहासितस्य - of the one that is desired to be discarded अनर्थस्य - of calamitous *samsāra* हेतुः - cause स्यात् - is सशरीरस्य - of the one who is identified with the body कस्यचित् - of anyone प्रियाप्रियविच्छेदः - the destruction of joys and sorrows न - (is) not (possible)–(71)

71. The identification with the body is the cause of calamitous *samsāra* that is desired to be discarded. No one who is identified with the body can ever destroy joys and sorrows.

To begin with, a body is the first means to suffer the *samsāra* effected

by self-ignorance. The word *śarīra* (body) as used in this context indicates senses, mind and intellect besides the physical body. *Saśarīratā* is the notion of identification with the body. *Saśarīratā* is the person who is identified with the body and not the one who simply has a body. The body by itself does not become the source of joys and sorrow unless one identifies with it. During the waking and dream we identify with our embodiment. Thereby we reap the harvest of joys and sorrows born of *viśayas* - sense-objects. In the deep sleep or in *Samādhi*, due to absence of bodily identification, we have no sense-pleasures or sorrows. The happiness we experience in sleep or *Samādhi* pertains to the nature of *ātmā*. It is not born of sense-objects. No one can get rid of joys and sorrows so long as one's identification with the body persists. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* declares: destruction of joys and sorrows is just impossible for the one who is identified with the body. (On the other hand), joys and sorrows can never affect the one who has no such identification (*Ch.U.* 8-12-1).

Joys and sorrows alternate. Joy is an interval between two sorrows. Practically speaking, sorrows are more than the joy. The body, whether gross or subtle, is perennially the potential source of sorrow. The experience of joy (sense-

pleasure) is not possible without a body. Having only joy to the total exclusion of sorrows is just impossible unless there is direct experience of one's true nature, *ātmā* that is limitless happiness.

The body as the means employed by self-ignorance/*māyā* to produce calamitous *saṃsāra* is established so far. Let us see now the cause of our body.

धर्माधर्मौ च देहस्य योनिरित्यागमोऽब्रवीत् ।
विहितं प्रतिषिद्धं च कर्म मूलं तयोरपि ॥७२॥

आगमः - the Vedas च - moreover देहस्य - of the body योनिः - the cause धर्माधर्मौ - *pāpa* and *puṇya* इति - thus अब्रवीत् - have stated तयोः - of these two मूलं - the cause अपि - also विहितं - enjoined प्रतिषिद्धं - prohibited च - and कर्म - action (इति अपि आगमः अब्रवीत्) - so also the Vedas have stated – (72)

72. Moreover, the Vedas have stated that *pāpa* (results of bad actions) and *puṇya* (results of good actions) are the causes of the body. The Vedas also say that the enjoined and the prohibited *karmas* (actions) are the causes of *pāpa* and *puṇya*.

Actions (*karmas*) have seen (*dr̥ṣṭa*) and unseen (*adr̥ṣṭa*) results (*karmaphalas*). While we can see the seen results directly, the unseen results have to be revealed by the Vedas. The Vedas serve as the *pramāṇa* (the valid

means of knowledge) in the case of topics that are *apauruṣeya* (beyond the purview of human intellect). Thus we have to rely on the Vedas to find out the causes of body and *pāpa-puṇya*. The Vedas guide us in the matters of do's and don'ts to avoid future *pāpa* and earn *puṇya*. These are meant to safeguard our interest in the long run instead of falling for immediate quick gains at the cost of *dharma* (code of conduct enjoined by the Vedas). The *adhārmika* acts finally result in future sorrows.

Further, the doer (*kartā*), love and hatred (*rāga-dveṣa*) and the superimposition of false evaluation as the means employed by self-ignorance to produce *saṃsāra* is depicted now.

कर्तुरिव भवेत्कर्म रागद्वेषाच्च कर्तृता ।
शोभनाशोभनाध्यासौ रागद्वेषप्रयोजकौ ॥७३॥

कर्म - action कर्तुः - from a doer एव - only भवेत् - is (possible) कर्तृता - the status of being a doer रागद्वेषाच्च - by the likes and dislikes (भवति - comes into existence) शोभन - the idea that 'this is good' अशोभन - the idea that 'this is bad' अध्यासौ - the false evaluation रागद्वेषप्रयोजकौ - the causes of likes (love) and dislikes (hatred) (भवतः - become) – (73)

73. Action originates from a doer. The doer-ship is born from likes and dislikes. The false evaluations such as 'this is good', 'this is bad' are the causes

of *rāga* (likes, love) and *dveṣa* (hatred).

A doer (*kartā*) is indispensable to perform any action just as a machine needs an operator to function. The doer is an entity identified with the embodiment. A desire to do something is born from desire to acquire something or to get rid of some other thing. Such desires are prompted by likes (love) or dislikes (hatred) for things, beings and events. Love (*rāga*) and hatred (*dveṣa*) are prompted by attribution (*adhyāsa*) of notions of *śobhana* (pleasing) or *aśobhana* (faulty, displeasing), giving rise to the concepts of ‘this is good’ or ‘this is bad’. These are based on the subjective (value-structure), which need not be the intrinsic features of objects, etc. An object of one's like may be disliked by another. Thus the attributions of ‘this is good/pleasing’ or ‘this is bad/displeasing’ are the causes of *rāga* (likes) and *dveṣa* (dislikes).

Further, there must be external objects (*artha/vastu*) to have the concepts, ‘this is good or pleasing’ and ‘this is bad or not pleasing’. In the absence of external objects, there cannot be such conceptual evaluations. This fact is brought to our notice now.

उक्ताध्यासोऽप्यन्यवस्तुसद्भावात्
स्यान्न चान्यथा ।
वस्त्वन्तरस्य सद्भाव आत्माज्ञानेन
कल्पितः ॥७४॥

उक्ताध्यासः - the attribution/false evaluation which was described अपि - also अन्यवस्तु - other objects सद्भावात् - because of the existence of स्यात् - is (possible) अन्यथा - otherwise न - not च - and वस्त्वन्तरस्य - of other object सद्भावः - existence आत्माज्ञानेन - by the ignorance of *ātmā* कल्पितः - is falsely projected – (74)

74. The said attribution (*adhyāsa*) also is possible because of the existence of other objects and not otherwise. The (empirical) existence of other objects is falsely projected by the ignorance of *ātmā*.

The word object (*vastu/artha*) used in this verse signifies the entire Creation including all beings and events. Without the existence of objects, etc., the evaluation itself is not possible. *Ātmājñāna* (self-ignorance) referred to here is the same as *māyā* (Creative power) specified in the verse 67. The topic how *ātmājñāna* becomes the cause of calamitous *saṃsāra* through seven means beginning from body onwards is being concluded in the next verse.

एवं

देहादिवस्त्वन्तसप्तकव्यवधानतः ।

संसारानर्थहेतुः

स्यादात्माज्ञानं जगत्सृजत् ॥७५॥

आत्माज्ञानं - ignorance of *ātmā* एवं - as described so far देहादिवस्त्वन्त-

सप्तकव्यवधानतः - through the intervenient seven means beginning from the body and ending with object जगत्सृजत् - creating the world संसारानर्थ हेतुः - the cause of calamitous *saṃsāra* स्यात् - becomes - (75)

75. As described so far, the ignorance of *ātmā* creating the *jagat* becomes the cause of calamitous *saṃsāra* through the intervenient seven means beginning from the body onwards ending with objects.

From verses 68 to 74, it was shown how the ignorance of *ātmā* becomes the cause of our miserable existence called *saṃsāra* through the intervenient seven factors. They are: The body with senses, mind and intellect; the unseen results of *karmas* (actions) called *pāpa* and *puṇya*; *karma*; *kartā* (doer); *rāga* (like, love) and *dveṣa* (dislike, hatred); *adhyāsa* - the attribution of false subjective values on the objects, beings and events; lastly the sense-objects comprising the entire *jagat*. In short, *ātmājñāna* or *māyā* dependant on Brahman ramifies the calamitous *saṃsāra* through the above seven means or stages.

The main diagnosis of *saṃsāra* is *ātmājñāna/māyā*. Any degree of ending the intervening means keeping intact the roots of ignorance cannot end the

saṃsāra. Consider hypothetically that the world of objects (*artha, vastu*) is ended. Then the attribution (*adhyāsa*) of subjective values on the objects cannot be there. No *adhyāsa* means no *rāga-dveṣa*. In the absence of *rāga-dveṣa* the *kartā* (doer) cannot come into existence. The *karmas* (actions) are not possible without the *kartā*. No *karmas* mean no *pāpa-puṇya*. The individual body cannot be born without one's *pāpa* and *puṇya*. Without the body, the experiences of *saṃsāra* comprising *anartha* (undesirable sorrows more than the tinsels of joy) is not possible. But this is not the total cessation of *saṃsāra*. It is only a temporary phase. We do experience such cessation every day in the deep sleep. In this state the individual *jīva* is very close to *ātma-svarūpa*/Brahman. That is why the sleep is defined as the state, wherein the individual (*jīva*) attains one's true nature, *ātmā* (*Ch.U.6-8-1*). But the intervening ignorance is still there. That is why sleep is not the total freedom from *saṃsāra*. *Ātmājñāna* (self-knowledge) alone can end the *saṃsāra* with its cause.

The exact nature of *jagat* is described in the next verse.

प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यसंमोहात् जगत्सदिव भासते ।
प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यसंबुद्धौ न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते ॥७६॥

प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यसंमोहात् - because of

ignorance of the nature of true 'I' जगत् - the world सदिव - as though real भासते - appears प्रत्यगयाथात्म्यसंबुद्धौ - when the knowledge of one's true nature is gained तत् - that (world) न - neither सत् - existent न असत् - nor non-existent उच्यते - is said - (76)

76. Because of the ignorance of the nature of true 'I', the world appears to be real. (But) on gaining the knowledge of one's true nature, the (same) world is said to be neither existent nor totally non-existent, (i.e. it is *mithyā* - false in nature).

Pratyak signifies *pratyagātmā*, the true 'I', in contrast to the notional 'I' born of identification with any of the five sheaths (*pañca-kośas*). *Yāthātmya* is the real nature. It is the ignorance (*sammoha*) of the true nature of *ātmā* that gives rise to the appearance of *jagat* just as the ignorance of a rope can give rise to the mistaken notion that it is a snake, etc. The moment you see the rope in the bright light the hitherto mistaken snake disappears. Similarly, the *jagat* continues to be there so long as the *ajñāna* (ignorance) of *ātmā* persists. In the direct knowledge of *ātmā*, the *jagat* disappears totally. Thus the *jagat* cannot be called *sat*, the ever-existent entity, because it ends in self-knowledge. It is not *asat* (totally non-existent) also

because it appears to be there, during the realm of ignorance. The *jagat* is called *mithyā* (false) because of being distinct from both *sat* and *asat*. On gaining self-knowledge it is no more. What remains is *ātmā* and *ātmā* alone. Thus the destruction of self-ignorance alone is the remedy to end the *jagat* or calamitous *samsāra*.

अशेषानर्थरूपस्य प्रत्यगज्ञानरूपिणः ।
ध्वस्तौ ध्वस्तिरनर्थानामानन्दश्च समाप्यते ॥७७॥

अशेषानर्थरूपस्य - of the nature of nothing but sorrows प्रत्यगज्ञानरूपिणः - of the ignorance of *ātmā* ध्वस्तौ - when destroyed अनर्थानाम् - of all the sorrows ध्वस्तिः - destruction (स्यात् - does take place) आनन्दश्च - and happiness that is one's true nature समाप्यते - is totally gained - (77)

77. On the destruction of *ātmajñāna* (self-ignorance) which is the very source of calamitous *samsāra*, the entire (sorrowful) *samsāra* ends. Thereupon, the happiness (that is the true nature of *ātmā*) is directly experienced.

Ignorance of oneself (*pratyag-ātmā*) is the final cause of all the sorrows irrespective of all the external intermediary causes. Whenever we are sorrowful, we can attribute the cause of sorrow externally to some object, being or event. You may say: I suffered because of that person, or because of

that thing, or because of that event. That is true, but the root cause is the ignorance of your true nature and the consequent *dehatādātmya* (identification with the body). In the absence of *dehatādātmya* which is the product of ignorance, the world by its joys and sorrows cannot affect you the pure awareness (*cit*) principle (called *ātmā*). This was seen earlier as declared by *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (8-12-1). It was verified by drawing the contrast between the homogeneous experience of absence of everything during the deep sleep without *dehatādātmya* and varied experiences of joys and sorrows with *dehatādātmya* in the waking and the dream.

The destruction of self-ignorance obviously ends its effect also including the *dehatādātmya*. What remains is our *svarūpa* (true nature) which is independent, ever-existing and limitless *ānanda* (happiness). Contrastingly the *viśayānanda* (sense-pleasure) depends on the resources, sense-objects, senses, mind and intellect, the actual experience and the body, etc. *Ātmānanda* (happiness that is our true nature) is self-evident (*svaprakāśa*), self-experiencing (*anubhava-svarūpa*). All that is necessary to own it is the destruction of self-ignorance with its effects by direct *ātmajñāna* (the knowledge of true *ātmā*).

We can ascertain our true nature to be *ānanda* (happiness) from our daily observation. In the deep sleep the individual (*jīva*) is in union with one's true nature (*ātmā*) with the intervention of only self-ignorance. Universally, everyone recollects the experience of happiness in deep sleep. There are no sources of *viśayasukha* (sense-pleasure) therein due to the absence of senses and sense-objects. This proves that our true nature is happiness. If at all the sorrow were our intrinsic feature, invariably it should be experienced in the sleep. But it is never so. No one can ever give up one's true nature. Whatever that can be given up cannot be its true nature. The Sun is self-luminous. Have you ever seen the Sun to be dark? Therefore, the sorrow can never be our true nature. The next verse categorically points out what we have seen just now that *ātmānanda* is limitless in nature unlike *viśayānanda*. The Upaniṣads also declare this fact.

निरस्तातिशयानन्दरूपता

प्रत्यगात्मनः ।

यो वै भूमा तत्सुखं

स्यादित्यादि श्रुतिसंमता ॥७८॥

प्रत्यगात्मनः - of the true 'I' आनन्द-
रूपता - the nature of happiness निरस्तातिशया
- (is) unexcelled, unsurpassed यः - that
which is वै - indeed भूमा - limitless,
infinite तत् - that सुखं - happiness स्याद् - is

इत्यादि - etc. श्रुतिसंमता - (is) in accordance with the *śruti* (the Vedas) – (78)

78. The happiness that is the nature of *ātmā* is unexcelled. This is in accordance with the Vedas: ‘That which is limitless is happiness’ (*Ch.U.7-23-1*), etc.

Lest one concludes that the nature of happiness (*ānandarūpatā*) of *ātmā* is limited like any *viṣayānanda* (sense-pleasure), the author hastens to clarify that it is *nirastātiśayā* - unparalleled. There is no happiness that can excel *ātmānanda*. Many Upaniṣads declare this truth. This verse gives the corroboration from *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. ‘*Yo Vai bhūmā tat sukham* - that which is infinite/limitless (*bhūmā*), that is happiness (*sukham*)’ (*Ch.U.7-23-1*). The limitless (*ananta*) *bhūmā* can only be Brahman. The words *bhūmā* and Brahman are synonyms. The word *bhūmā* (limitless) used as an adjective of *sukha* elevates it to the status of limitless happiness instead of its literal meaning of limited sense-pleasure. Upaniṣads employ the words such as *bhūmā*, Brahman, *anantam* (limitless), *śāśvatam* (eternal), *ātyantikam* (endless), *parama* (primary, best), *uttamam* (exalted), etc., to remove the limitations inherent in different words meaning happiness when used to describe the ‘*ānanda*’ nature of *ātmā*/Brahman. Some of the other *śruti*

(Vedic) - statements that describe the nature of *ātmā*/Brahman as limitless happiness are: ‘*Vijñānam ānandam Brahma*’ - (the limitless) Brahman is simultaneously the knowledge-principle and happiness (*Br.U.3-9-28*); ‘*ānando Brahma*’ - Brahman is happiness that is limitless/*ananta* (*Tai.U.3-6*), etc.

Here is an obvious question. If our true nature (*ātmā*) is limitless *ānanda*, why do we not experience it? On the contrary, why do we experience so much of sorrows? The answer follows.

स्वत आनन्दयाथात्म्येऽप्यबोधाद्

दुःखसंप्लुतिः ।

सोऽबोधोऽनर्थहेतुत्वान्निर्देष्टव्यश्चिकित्सितुम्

॥७९॥

स्वतः - *ātmā* by its nature आनन्दयाथात्म्ये - in reality is (nothing but) happiness अपि - even though अबोधात् - due to self-ignorance दुःखसंप्लुतिः - (there is) flood of sorrows सः - that अबोधः - self-ignorance अनर्थहेतुत्वात् - being the cause of sorrow चिकित्सितुम् - to heal/end निर्देष्टव्यः - has to be described – (79)

79. Though *ātmā* in reality is (nothing but) happiness, there is a flood of sorrows due to self-ignorance. (This) self-ignorance has to be described to heal/end it because it is the cause of calamitous *saṃsāra*.

In spite of being unexcelled happiness by true nature what we the *jīvas* experience is a flood of sorrows called *saṃsāra*. This is because of ignorance of our true nature, *ātmā*. It was seen earlier that the main cause of *saṃsāra* is the ignorance of oneself (*ātmajñāna*). Unless the ignorance is destroyed it is next to impossible to know *ātmā* directly to end the *saṃsāra* so that we can experience our true nature, the limitless *ānanda* without any trace of sorrow. To destroy the ignorance of *ātmā*, first of all we should know its exact nature.

To know the self-ignorance is one of the two topics that a *mumukṣu* is supposed to know beforehand. The other topic is the description of *ātmatattva* (the true nature of *ātmā*) to be directly cognised (vide verse 64). The second topic to be known is named again.

अबुद्धमात्मनस्तत्त्वं प्रमातुं योग्यमागमैः ।
निर्देष्टव्यं तदप्यत्र संभावयितुमञ्जसा ॥८०॥

आत्मनः - of *ātmā* अबुद्धम् - not known तत्त्वं - the real nature आगमैः - through the Upaniṣads प्रमातुं - to know योग्यम् - worthy of (तस्मात् - therefore) तद् - that (principle of *ātmā*) अपि - also अञ्जसा - correctly संभावयितुम् - to reveal अत्र - in this text निर्देष्टव्यं - should be described - (80)

80. The true nature of *ātmā*

(hitherto) unknown is worthy to be known through the Upaniṣads. That also should be described here to reveal it properly.

It was told in the verse 64 that a *mumukṣu* should know *ajñāna/māyā* the cause of *saṃsāra* to discard it, and nature of *ātmā* to cognise it directly. The same topic is concluded now after thorough elaboration and ascertainment.

Where can we find these two descriptions? The source material is now pointed out.

AVYĀKRĪTA - ŚRUTI DESCRIBES ĀTMĀ TO BE KNOWN AND AJÑĀNA TO BE DISCARDED.

तमबोधं तच्च मेयमव्याकृतगिरा श्रुतिः ।
निरदिक्षच्छ्रुतिः सा तु न्यायेनात्र विचार्यते ॥८१॥

तम् - that अबोधं - ignorance of one's own true nature तत् - that मेयं - *ātmatattva* to be known च - and श्रुतिः - the Upaniṣad अव्याकृतगिरा - by the statement *avyākṛta* निरदिक्षत् - has pointed out सा - that श्रुतिः - statement of the Upaniṣad तु - and now अत्र - here न्यायेन - suitably विचार्यते - is inquired into - (81)

81. The *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* by its statement '*avyākṛta* (*Br.U.1-4-7*)' has pointed out both the ignorance and the true nature of *ātmā*. And now, that statement is suitably inquired into.

The reader is aware that this chapter ‘*Kāṇvavidyāprakāśa*’ is an elaboration of the fourth *Brāhmaṇa* of chapter one in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (1-4-7). The statement referred to is: तद् ह इदं तर्हि अव्याकृतम् आसीत् । The word *tad* here means the Creation in its seed-form before it actually came into existence. ‘*Ha*’ is a particle - which means, ‘this is the fact’. ‘*Idam*’ (this) refers to perceptibly available manifest world. ‘*Tarhi*’ connotes ‘then’. ‘*Avyākṛtam āsīt*’ means ‘the unmanifest state of the Creation was there’. Thus the phrase means: Before the Creation, the same was in an unmanifest state. *Avyākṛta* finally means self-ignorance, *māyā* or *prakṛti*.

It will be shown later that this very same *śruti*-statement describes the true nature of *ātmā* which we have to know directly. The author also assures that he is going to inquire into the *avyākṛta-śruti* suitably.

The referred *śruti*-statement is quoted now in the words of the author to inquire into it in detail.

तद्धेदं तर्ह्यविस्पष्टमासीदव्याकृताभिधम् ।
इत्येतस्मिन् श्रौतवाक्ये पदार्थस्तावदीर्यते ॥८२॥

तावत् - to begin with तद् - the Creation in the causal state ह - the fact is इदम् - this manifest world तर्हि - then अविस्पष्टम् - indistinct अव्याकृताभिधम् - called unmanifest आसीत् - was there इति

एतस्मिन् - in this श्रौतवाक्ये - *śruti*-statement (*Br.U.1-4-7*) (कथितः - narrated) पदार्थः - the meaning of words ईर्यते - is told - (82)

82. To begin with, the meaning of words narrated in the statement of the *śruti*, ‘Then this manifest world was the indistinct causal state called ‘*avyākṛta*’ (*Br.U.1-4-7*)’ is told.

So far it was established that gaining knowledge of our true nature *ātmā* is indispensable. It was also pointed out that it is imperative to know what the ignorance of *ātmā* is. Ignorance has to be known because the entire *jagat* is nothing but the effect of ignorance. *Ātmā* is non-dual but every moment the dualistic *jagat* is experienced. The presence of dualistic *jagat* denies the non-dual nature of *ātmā*. It means that *ātmā* is not non-dual. Such a conclusion is opposed to *śruti* and the direct non-dual experience of *ātmā* gained by the *jñānīs*. This riddle gets solved on knowing the *jagat* to be *mithyā* (false) because its cause *ajñāna/prakṛti/māyā* is so. Therefore, besides knowing *ātmā*, the false nature of *māyā*, the cause of *jagat* should also be known. Then only the non-dual nature of *ātmā* will be established and the *ātmajñāna* will be complete.

To describe what is *ātmā* and its ignorance, the author is inquiring into *avyākṛta-śruti* (*Br.U.1-4-7*). He begins

the inquiry with the word-meaning of the said statement.

‘तद् ह इदं तर्हि अविस्पष्टम् अव्याकृताभिधम् आसीत्’ is a restatement of *avyākṛta-śruti* in the words of the author (verse 82, first line). The indistinct (*avispaṣtam*) causal state of the Creation is called *avyākṛtam*. Now the word by word meaning of this *śruti*-statement is being given.

WORD - MEANINGS OF AVYĀKṚTA-ŚRUTI

अज्ञानात्मन्यशेषेण लीनं बीजस्वरूपधृक् ।
तच्छब्देन जगत्प्रोक्तं परोक्षार्थाभिधायिना ॥८३॥

अज्ञानात्मनि - in the *ātmā* conditioned by self-ignorance अशेषेण - totally लीनम् - merged बीजस्वरूपधृक् - which is in the form of a seed जगत् - world परोक्षार्थाभिधायिना - by the one which expresses a ‘remote’ sense तच्छब्देन - by the word ‘that’ (*tat*) प्रोक्तं - is conveyed – (83)

83. The *jagat* (Creation) which is in the form of a seed being totally merged in the *ātmā* conditioned by self-ignorance is conveyed by the pronoun ‘that’ (*tat*) which expresses a ‘remote’ sense.

The demonstrative pronoun *tat* (that) indicates something that is remote in time, space or ignorance-wise. In this *śruti*-statement that (*tat*) refers to the unmanifest state of the Creation merged

totally in *ātmā* conditioned by self-ignorance. That state before the actual Creation is compared to a seed because it has in itself all the latent potentialities to create the manifest *jagat*.

The use of the word *tat* (that) by the *śruti* expressing a remoteness is justified in the following verse.

अव्याकृतस्य जगतो
भूतकालाभिसंगतेः ।
बुभुत्सुं प्रति पारोक्ष्यात्
तच्छब्दस्तत्र युज्यते ॥८४॥

भूतकालाभिसंगतेः - because of being related to the past अव्याकृतस्य - of the unmanifest जगतः - of the world बुभुत्सुं प्रति - with respect to the person desirous of knowing पारोक्ष्यात् - because of being remote तत्र - there in the *śruti* ‘तत्’ - ‘that’ शब्दः - word युज्यते - is appropriate – (84)

84. Because the unmanifest world is something remote being in the past with respect to the person desirous of knowing it, the use of the word *tat* (that) in the *śruti* is (quite) appropriate.

Time is a concept of the intellect. It signifies the interval between two events. Obviously the concept of time can exist only in the realm of Creation. Therefore, there is no time in the unmanifest state of *jagat*. Yet, from the present level of understanding of an inquirer who is brought up in the space-

time concepts, the unmanifest *jagat* is something related to the past before the actual *jagat* came into existence. Considering such remoteness, *śruti* is quite justified in using the pronoun *tat* (that) for the unmanifest *jagat*.

Now the author is going to explain the particle 'ह' from the *śruti*.

ऐतिह्यार्थे हशब्दः स्यात् सुखेनार्थावबुद्धये ।
तर्केणोक्ते धियः क्लेशः परमाण्वनुमानवत् ॥८५॥

'ह' शब्दः - the particle 'ha'
सुखेनार्थावबुद्धये - to grasp the meaning easily
ऐतिह्यार्थे - in the sense of traditional instruction
स्यात् - is तर्केणोक्ते - if established on the basis of (mere) reasoning
परमाण्वनुमानवत् - like the conjecture of atoms
धियः - of the intellect
क्लेशः - distress (स्यात् - will be there)
-(85)

85. The particle 'ha' is (used) for the easy grasp in the sense of a traditional instruction. If it is established only on the basis of reasoning, it will be distressful to the intellect (in understanding) like the conjecture of atoms (by the *Naiyāyikas* and *Vaiśeṣikas*).

The particle 'ha' is used in the sense of *aitihya* - a traditional instruction. *Aitihya* is regarded as one of the *pramāṇas* (the means of knowledge) by the *paurāṇika*. But here the tradition referred to is that of Upaniṣads (the

Vedas) which is the highest *pramāṇa*. Many Upaniṣads declare this state of the unmanifest (*avyākṛta*) Creation. The word *aitihya* is somewhat akin to the word *itihāsa*. Though *itihāsa* means history, literally it is: *iti* (thus) *ha* (indeed) *āsa* (it was). It speaks of a fact rather than any imagination. Such an evidence of what is told facilitates the understanding.

On the other hand the things told based on the reasoning of conjecture alone give room for many doubts or obscurity. One has to struggle hard to find out how and why of it. The example given to this effect is that of Indian atomism called *paramāṇu* by *Naiyāyikas* and *Vaiśeṣikas* schools of thought. They imagine that the *jagat* consists of tiny individual particles called *paramāṇus* (different from the atoms described by physics).

Further drawback of resorting to mere reasoning is now pointed out. Not only it is difficult to grasp, but also there is no final conclusiveness.

अचिन्त्याः खलु ये भावाः न तांस्तर्केण योजयेत् ।
नाप्रतिष्ठिततर्केण गम्भीरार्थस्य निश्चयः ॥८६॥

ये - those खलु - indeed अचिन्त्याः - inconceivable भावाः - entities तान् - them तर्केण - by reasoning न योजयेत् - should not fix अप्रतिष्ठिततर्केण - by the reasoning which has no finale गम्भीरार्थस्य - of an inscrutable entity निश्चयः - ascertainment

न (भवति) - (is) not possible – (86)

86. Indeed, do not fix the inconceivable entities by reasoning. (Because) the ascertainment of an inscrutable entity is not possible by reasoning as it has no finale.

Human intellect is confined to the field of only known things. It relies on the feed received from the senses. Both the intellect and the reports that it receives from senses have their own limitations. Any conclusions arrived at by mere reasoning can be toppled down by a more powerful reasoning. *Bhāṣyakāra* drives home this point in his remark: False dialectical reasoning (*kutarka*) can never have any finale (*pratiṣṭhā*) (*Kṭ.U.Bh.* 1-2-8). Reasonings have no access to the entity that is imperceptible and hence inconceivable. Therefore, the author tenders a piece of advice that the entities that are inconceivable should never be subjected to inquiry based on mere reasoning. It is a futile attempt. In such matters, we have to resort to *śruti-pramāṇa*.

The word ‘*idam*’ (this) from the *śruti* is now taken for elaboration.

नामरूपादिविकृतं पराङ्मानेन भासितम् ।
इदंशब्देन निखिलं जगदेतदुदीर्यते ॥८७॥

नामरूपादिविकृतं - manifest as name and form, etc. पराङ्मानेन - by external (worldly means of knowledge) भासितम् -

perceived, known एतद् - this निखिलं - entire जगत् - the Creation ‘इदम्’ - ‘this’ शब्देन - by the word उदीर्यते - is referred to – (87)

87. This entire Creation (*jagat*), manifest as name and form, etc., (and) known by worldly (*laukika*) *pramāṇas* (means of knowledge), is referred to by the word ‘*idam*’ (this).

The word *vikṛta* means changed or modified in the sense of manifestation. Further although the word *rūpa* means a visual form, it is used here in the sense of nature of an entity because of which it gets specified as such and such entity. The entire world perceptibly available and with which we interact moment by moment is referred to by the word ‘*idam*’ (this) in the said *śruti* - statement. The *pramāṇas* (means of knowledge) employed to know the external world (other than ‘I’, *ātmā* and *apauruṣeya* entities) is called *parāk-māna*. They are: *pratyakṣa* (direct perception), *anumāna* (inference), *upamā* (illustration), *arthāpatti* (presumption), *anupalabdhi* (non-apprehension). *Śruti* (the Vedas) is the final *pramāṇa* to know *ātmā* and all other things that are *apauruṣeya* (not accessible to the human intellect).

The relation between ‘*ta*’ (the unmanifest state) and ‘*idam*’ (manifest state) is now shown.

सामानाधिकरण्येन तदिदम्पदयोः श्रुतम् ।
कार्यकारणयोरैक्यं व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मनोः ॥८८॥

तदिदम्पदयोः - of the words 'tat' (that) and 'idam' (this) सामानाधिकरण्येन - by the use of same declensional case (*vibhakti*) कार्यकारणयोः - of the effect (*kārya*) and the cause (*kāraṇa*) व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मनोः - having the nature of manifest (*vyākṛta*) and unmanifest (*avyākṛta*) ऐक्यं - identity श्रुतम् - is established by the *śruti* – (88)

88. By the use of the same declensional case (*vibhakti*) of the words 'tat' (that) and 'idam' (this), the *śruti* has established the identity between the manifest and the unmanifest Creation.

The words 'tat' (the unmanifest Creation) and 'idam' (the manifest Creation) are from the *śruti* statement under discussion. By using these two words in a grammatical formation called *sāmānādhikarāṇya* the *śruti* points out one and the same entity. *Sāmānādhikarāṇya* is a grammatical formation in which two different words having different meanings are used in the same declensional case to point out one and the same entity. In the *śruti* sentence, the words 'tat' and 'idam' are both in the nominative case. Their meanings are different. 'Tat' stands for the unmanifest world, whereas 'idam' is the manifest world. Both the words are

put in the nominative case in the same sentence. It means they indicate one and the same thing, the Creation (*jagat*). What is pointed out thereby is the identity between the cause (unmanifest *jagat*) and the effect (manifest *jagat*).

Here a pertinent doubt is possible. If the cause and effect are identical, how can we distinguish one from the other? Further, the cause needs some agents (*kāraṇas*) which transform it into effect. For example, for the seed to be a tree, the agents such as earth, water, minerals, sunlight, etc., are necessary. If the cause and effect remain the same, the agents (*kāraṇas*) will never be able to function. The seed will never become a tree. This is not so. What is meant by the identity between unmanifest and manifest *jagat* is explained in the next two verses.

एकस्य जगतोऽवस्थे व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मके ।
अवस्थयोर्विभेदेऽपि तद्धर्मी न हि भिद्यते ॥८९॥

व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मके - the manifest and unmanifest natures एकस्य - of one and the same entity जगतः - of Creation/*jagat* अवस्थे - two states (स्तः - both are) अवस्थयोः - of these two states विभेदेऽपि - even though there is distinction तद् - that धर्मी - entity to which both states belong न हि भिद्यते - does not differ – (89)

89. The nature of manifest and

unmanifest are the two states of one and the same *jagat*. Even though (these) two distinct states are admitted, the entity (viz. *jagat*) to which these two states belong, does not differ.

An entity remaining one and the same, can take to different states. Functioning of the *kāraṅkas* (agents) can change only the states but never the entity. The following illustration will clarify it further.

बाल्ययौवनभेदेऽपि देवदत्तो न भिद्यते ।
ततो जगदभेदेन सामानाधिकरण्यगीः ॥९०॥

बाल्ययौवनभेदे अपि - even though the childhood and the youth differ देवदत्तः - Mr. Devadatta न भिद्यते - does not differ ततः - therefore जगदभेदेन - considering the sameness of *jagat* सामानाधिकरण्यगीः - the statement of identity (*sāmānādhikarāṇya*) (युज्यते - holds good) – (90)

90. Even though the childhood and the youth differ, Mr. Devadatta remains the same. Therefore, considering the sameness of *jagat*, the statement (*gīḥ*) of *sāmānādhikarāṇya* (identity) holds good.

Mr. Devadatta was a child, then he grew to become a boy, youth and now an elderly person. But the person Mr. Devadatta has remained one and the same. This means the entity (*dharmī*), is one and the same whereas states

(*dharmas*) have changed. Similarly the entity *jagat* is the same whereas its manifest and unmanifest states differ.

So far the author has given the meaning of the words ‘*tat*’, ‘*h*’ and ‘*idam*’. Now the word ‘*tarhi*’ is taken up for explanation. ‘*Tarhi*’ generally means ‘in that case’, but here it is in the sense of ‘then’. It refers to the unmanifest state of *jagat*.

नामरूपाद्यभिव्यक्तेः प्राक्तनः काल उच्यते ।
तर्हीत्यनेन शब्देन स कालो लोककल्पितः ॥९१॥

तर्हि इति - ‘*tarhi*’ अनेन शब्देन - by this word नामरूपाद्यभिव्यक्तेः - of the manifestation of the name and form, etc. प्राक्तनः - prior कालः - time उच्यते - is told सः - that कालः - time लोककल्पितः - is imagined by people – (91)

91. By the word ‘*tarhi*’ the time prior to the actual manifestation of the *jagat* having names and forms, etc., is told. That time is imagined by the people.

The word ‘*tarhi*’ refers to the period before the actual *jagat* came into existence. Why and how that time is not an actual one, but imagined is going to be explained in the next verse.

यद्यप्यव्याकृते कालव्यक्तिर्नास्ति तथाप्यमी ।
लोकाः प्रलयकालत्वव्यवहारं प्रकुर्वते ॥९२॥

यद्यपि - even though अव्याकृते

(जगति) - in the unmanifest (*jagat*)
 कालव्यक्तिः - manifestation of time न अस्ति
 - is not there तथापि - nevertheless अमी -
 these लोकाः - people (living in the
 manifest world) प्रलयकालत्वव्यवहारं -
 consider and speak it as the period of
 dissolution प्रकुर्वते - (they) express –(92)

92. Even though there is no manifestation of time in the unmanifest state of Creation (*jagat*), nevertheless these people living in the manifest world consider and express the unmanifest state as the period (*kāla*) of dissolution (*pralaya*).

Time is a concept of intellect. It can exist only in the manifest *jagat*. Time does not exist in the unmanifest condition of *jagat*. But the thinking of people in the manifest world is universally conditioned by the parameters of space, time and cause effect. They want to know where, when and how (in the sense of cause-effect) of everything. In spite of the absence of time in the unmanifest condition, they attribute the period of dissolution to it and express it accordingly. Taking into account this concept of people *śruti* uses the word ‘*tarhi*’ in the sense of ‘then’ - at the time of unmanifest *jagat*.

Now the word ‘*avyākṛta*’ from *śruti*-statement is taken up for explanation. *Śruti* has used this word

‘*avyākṛta*’ with two meanings: i) The unmanifest world which includes its cause, the self-ignorance, *māyā*, *prakṛti*. ii) The *cit-vastu* (pure awareness principle, *ātmā*, Brahman). Verses 96-97 will clarify this point.

जगतोऽस्यानभिव्यक्तिरव्याकृतगिरोच्यते।

न जगत्प्रागवस्थायां व्यक्तं गर्भस्थपुत्रवत् ॥९३॥

अस्य - of this जगतः - of (this)
 world अनभिव्यक्तिः - unmanifest state
 अव्याकृतगिरा - by the word ‘*avyākṛta*’ उच्यते
 - is told, conveyed गर्भस्थपुत्रवत् - like a
 child in the womb, (i.e. embryo)
 प्रागवस्थायां - in the earlier state जगत् - the
 world न - not व्यक्तं - (was) manifest –(93)

93. The unmanifest state of the world is conveyed by the word ‘*avyākṛta*’. Like an embryo, prior to the Creation, the world was not manifest.

Śruti describes the unmanifest state of the world by the word ‘*avyākṛta*’. This state of the world is illustrated by means of an example of an embryo in the mother's womb. During the embryonic state, the vivid features of the child are not manifest. So are the name (*nāmā*) and *rūpa* (form), etc., of the manifest *jagat* during its unmanifest state.

Now the meaning of the word ‘*āsīt*’ is being explained. ‘Was’ is the literal meaning of the word ‘*āsīt*’.

आसीदिति च सत्तत्त्वमधिष्ठानतयोदितम् ।
तथा च भावरूपत्वाज्जगद्व्याकृतिमर्हति ॥९४॥

‘आसीत्’ इति च - further, by the word ‘*āsīt*’ अधिष्ठानतया - as the very basis of the world सत् तत्त्वं - the existence principle उदितम् - is told तथा च - so also भावरूपत्वात् - because of being existent in nature जगत् - the Creation, the world व्याकृतिम् अर्हति - manifestation (*vyākṛti*) of *jagat* is possible – (94)

94. By the word ‘*āsīt*’, the existence principle as the basis of the world is told (by the *śruti*). So also, because of (its) existent nature the manifestation of the world is possible.

The verb ‘was’ (*āsīt*) is in the past tense. It signifies the existence (*sat*) principle as the very basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of the *jagat*. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* declares that before the actual Creation, this *jagat* was the ever-existing principle *sat* alone (*Ch.U.6-2-1*). We can verify this fact from our observation in the world. Everything in the world exhibits itself as ‘is’ (existent in nature). Even the absence of something ‘is’. This shows that the ultimate cause of the world is the ever-existent principle which manifests as the effect ‘is’, ‘is’, ‘is’. Further, the destruction of anything from the world ends in the existence (is) of something or the other. Even during the total dissolution (*mahā-pralaya*) when it is

said that there is nothing, it invariably proves that there is a principle because of which we are aware of the absence of everything. That principle is *cit* (pure awareness) which itself is *sat* - the ‘is’ principle.

An existent entity alone can be the cause of its effect. Nothing is born from non-existence. This earlier existence aspect of *jagat*, though in unmanifest state, justifies its possibility to get manifest.

अव्याकृतवचस्त्वेवमवतार्यास्य वर्णिताः ।
पदार्था अथ वाक्यार्थो न्यायेनैव निरूप्यते ॥९५॥

तु - indeed एवं - in this manner अव्याकृत वचः - *avyākṛta-śruti* अवतार्य - having introduced अस्य - of this *śruti*-statement पदार्थाः - meanings of the words वर्णिताः - were told अथ - now वाक्यार्थः - meaning of the entire *avyākṛta*-sentence न्यायेन एव - topic-wise or with due reasoning निरूप्यते - is now being described – (95)

95. Thus having introduced the *avyākṛta-śruti*, its word-meanings were told. The meaning of that sentence is now being described topic-wise (or with due reasoning).

The meaning of a sentence can be known clearly only after knowing fully its word-meanings. Having explained the individual words, the author makes

a statement (*pratijñā*) that he is now going to explain the meaning of the entire *avyākṛta*-sentence. The word *nyāya* means reasoning and also topic (*viṣaya*). The reasoning in Vedānta is in accordance with the Upaniṣads (*śruti-sammata*). *Ātmā* to be known, and the *ajñāna* to be discarded, are the two topics revealed by the *avyākṛta*-sentence. This is elaborated till verse 102.

MEANING OF AVYĀKṚTA - SENTENCE

यस्य वेदान्तमेयत्वं कारणं

जगतश्च यत् ।

अव्याकृतं तदेवात्र वाक्यार्थो

द्विविधं हि तत् ॥९६॥

अत्र - in this present context (of *avyākṛta*-sentence) वाक्यार्थः - the meaning of that sentence तदेव - (is) verily that अव्याकृतं - imperceptible or the unmanifest entity यस्य - which (is) वेदान्तमेयत्वं - is the thing to be known, (i.e. *prameya*) through the means of knowledge, (i.e. *pramāṇa*) of Vedānta यत् च - and which (is) जगतः - of the *jagat* कारणं - the cause (ignorance) तत् - that meaning of *avyākṛta*-sentence द्विविधम् - is twofold हि - so it is well-known in the *śruti* - (96)

96. In this present context of *avyākṛta*-sentence, its meaning is verily

that imperceptible or the unmanifest entity which is the thing to be known (*ātmā*) through the Vedānta *pramāṇa* and which is the cause of the *jagat*, (i.e. *ajñāna*). That meaning is twofold. In this way it is well-known in the *śruti*. (In short, the *avyākṛta*-sentence has two meanings).

- i) The first meaning of *avyākṛta* is the *ātmā* to be known through the *pramāṇa* of Vedānta. This shows that the nature of *ātmā* is covered by ignorance. Otherwise *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) has no function in the absence of ignorance with respect to self-knowing principle (*jñapti svarūpa ātmā*). This is how due to the conditioning of ignorance the *ātmā* in spite of being self-evident (*svaprakāśa*) knowledge-principle becomes the thing to be known (*prameya*) by the *pramāṇa* of Vedānta in the sense that this *pramāṇa* terminates only the ignorance, but cannot objectify *ātmā*. The reason is that the self-evident knowledge (*cit*) principle *ātmā* actually illumines (makes known) the *vṛttis* (thoughts) signifying *pramāṇa*, *prameya* and *pramātā*. The changeless *cit* (pure awareness) principle can

never be the object of any *pramāṇa* including Vedānta. On the contrary *pramāṇa* gets objectified by *ātmā*.

- ii) The second meaning of *avyākṛta* is the ignorance (*ajñāna*) of *ātmā* which is the cause of *jagat*. The ignorance does not need any *pramāṇa* or reasoning to establish it. It is accepted based on its experience until it is ended. It is *sākṣī-bhāṣya* (made known by *sākṣī*).

Thus *avyākṛta* is twofold. This fact is well-known in the Upaniṣads. How exactly it is so is narrated in the next verse.

चित्प्राधान्यादविद्यायाः प्राधान्याच्च द्विधाऽद्वयम् ।
यच्चिद्वस्तु प्रमेयं तदविद्या तु विकारकृत् ॥९७॥

चित्प्राधान्यात् - due to the prominence to *cit* (*ātmā*) अविद्यायाः प्राधान्यात् - due to the prominence to ignorance च - and (अव्याकृतं - the entity called *avyākṛta*) द्विधा (भवति) - (is) twofold अद्वयं - non-dual यत् - that which (is) चिद् वस्तु - *cit*, the pure awareness in nature तद् - that प्रमेयम् - the thing to be known (through Vedānta) तु - whereas अविद्या - self-ignorance विकारकृत् - (is) the Creator of entire manifest world – (97)

97. The entity called *avyākṛta* is twofold due to the prominence to either

cit (*ātmā*) or the self-ignorance (*avidyā*). *Cit* (*ātmā*) is the thing to be known whereas *avidyā* is the Creator of entire manifest world.

Avyākṛta is nothing but *ātmā* conditioned by ignorance. It is twofold. The *avyākṛta* that is centered in *ātmā* becomes the entity to be known through Vedānta-*pramāṇa*. The same *avyākṛta* when centered in *avidyā* becomes the cause of *jagat*. This is how Vedānta propounds *ātmā* conditioned by *avidyā* as the *abhinna-nimitta-upādāna-kāraṇa* (undifferentiated efficient and material cause) of *jagat*. With the predominance of *cit* (*ātmā*) it is the efficient cause of *jagat*. Whereas with the predominance of *avidyā* the same *avyākṛta* becomes the *upādāna* material cause. *Ātmā* free from the *upādhi* of *avidyā* (*māyā*) is not even the efficient (*nimitta*) cause because it requires *upādhi* with the predominance of *cit* (*ātmā*).

It is futile to ask the *pramāṇa* with respect to *avyākṛta*. The next verse gives the reason.

न चिद्वस्तु विवादाहं तेन सर्वार्थसिद्धितः ।
अज्ञोऽहमित्यविद्यापि प्रसिद्धैवानुभूतितः ॥९८॥

तेन (चिता) - by that (pure awareness principle) सर्वार्थसिद्धितः - because of accomplishment of existence and knowledge aspects of everything चिद्वस्तु - the pure awareness principle (*caitanya*)

विवादार्ह - matter of contention न - cannot be 'अज्ञः अहम्' - 'I am ignorant' इति अनुभूतिः - from such an experience अविद्या - ignorance अपि - also प्रसिद्धा एव - is certainly well-known—(98)

98. The existence of *cit* (pure awareness principle *ātmā*) cannot be a matter of contention because the existence and accomplishment of everything without an exception is accomplished by it. *Avidyā* (ignorance) also is certainly well-known from the universal experience: 'I am ignorant'.

'*Sarvārtha*' (everything) means the entire world of *anātmā* (not self). *Ātmā* (I, *cit*) is self-evident and self-existent. Its existence cannot be contended. *Anātmā* on its own can neither exist nor be known. It exists and is known on account of *ātmā* (*cit*). All have the experience of not knowing one thing or the other expressed as 'I do not know'. Not knowing itself is the ignorance. No one disputes it. It is accepted by all and sundry.

Notwithstanding the universal experience of ignorance as the proof of its existence, if anyone still demands *pramāṇas* to prove it, the same are given in the next verse.

नासदासीन्नो सदासीत् तम आसीदिति श्रुतिः ।
आसीदिदं तमोभूतमप्रज्ञातमिति स्मृतिः ॥९९॥

(सृष्टेः प्राक् - prior to the Creation) असत् - non-existence (as the cause of this *jagat*) न - not आसीत् - was there न उ - not indeed सद् - existence (belonging to the empirical world) आसीत् - was there तमः आसीत् - (the manifest *jagat*) was in the darkness of self-ignorance इति श्रुतिः - so is the statement of *śruti* इदं - this (*jagat* during the dissolution) तमोभूतम् - was merged in ignorance (*prakṛti*) अप्रज्ञातम् - unknowable आसीत् - was there इति स्मृतिः - so says the *smṛti*—(99)

99. Prior to the Creation, the non-existence (as the cause of this *jagat*) was not there. Indeed the existence (belonging to the empirical world also) was not there (*Nā.Sū.1*). (The manifest *jagat*) was in the form of darkness of self-ignorance (*Nā.Sū.3*). This *jagat* (during the dissolution) was merged in ignorance (*prakṛti*) and was unknowable. So says the *Manusmṛti* (1-5).

The *śruti* (Veda) referred to in the first line of this verse is *Nāsadīya-sūktam* (*Rigveda*, *aṣṭaka 8*, *maṇḍala 10*, chapter 11 and *sūkta 129*). The *Nāsadīya-sūktam* is a famous Vedic hymn on the Creation. The second line of this verse is from *Manusmṛti*.

In the verse 96, *avyākṛta* was described as both the entity to be known

(*meya*) through Vedānta and also the cause of the *jagat*. Now the reasons for the same are given.

अज्ञातत्वात् प्रमाणेन

ज्ञातव्यमिति मेयता ।

अज्ञानस्य विकारित्वात् कारणत्वं

च संभवेत् ॥१००॥

(अव्याकृतब्रह्मणः - of *ātmā*/Brahman in the form of *avyākṛta*) अज्ञातत्वात् - because of being not known प्रमाणेन - through proper means of knowledge ज्ञातव्यम् - should be known इति (हेतोः) - because of this reason मेयता (स्यात्) - has the status of being the entity to be known अज्ञानस्य - of ignorance च - and विकारित्वात् - because of its changing nature कारणत्वं - the status of being the cause संभवेत् - is possible—(100)

100. Because of being unknown, the *ātmā*/Brahman in the form of *avyākṛta* should be known. Therefore, it (*ātmā*/Brahman) gets the status of *prameyatā* (through the Vedānta-*pramāṇa*). Self-ignorance becomes the cause of this *jagat* because of its changing nature.

We know that *avyākṛta* is both ignorance (*māyā*, *prakṛti*) and Brahman (*ātmā*). Or *ātmā*/Brahman conditioned by self-ignorance (*māyā*, *prakṛti*) is *avyākṛta*. Out of these two aspects of *avyākṛta*, the *ātmā*/Brahman aspect

becomes Vedānta-*prameya* because it is unknown. To reveal the unknown entity is the function of a *pramāṇa*. It is also quite appropriate that *ajñāna* (ignorance) which is changing in nature is the cause of the *jagat*.

The claim that *ātmā*, ‘I’ which is identical with Brahman is an entity to be known (*meya*) can be questioned. All along our life, moment by moment, we do experience ‘I’ the self-evident sentient principle called *ātmā*. Then where is the need of knowing it? This is true. Such a universal experience cannot be denied. But, what we experience is *ātmā* mixed with all the attributes of body, senses, perception (in terms of seeing, hearing, tasting, etc.), vital airs (*prāṇa*), mind, intellect, *ahaṃkāra* with all their functions including birth and death. It is not the experience of *ātmā* in its true nature which is totally free from all these superimpositions. That is why *Kaṭhopaniṣad* declares: This *ātmā* is concealed (*gūḍhaḥ*) in all the beings and therefore, not known in its true nature as ‘I’ (*ātmā*) (*Kṛ.U.1-3-12*). This can be the handiwork of only ignorance/*māyā*. That is how the self-evident *ātmā* gets the false status of being a *prameya*.

As seen so far, the existence of ignorance (of *ātmā*) was established based on *śruti*, *smṛti* and experience. Further corroboration of *śruti* and *smṛti*

is given in the next verse. These show that *māyā* which is synonymous to ignorance is the cause of the *jagat*.

मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यादीशो मायीति हि श्रुतिः ।
दैवी ह्येषा गुणमयी मम मायेति च स्मृतिः॥१०१॥

मायां - *māyā* तु - itself, indeed प्रकृति
- material cause (*upādāna kāraṇa*) विद्याद्
- should know ईशः - *Īśvara* मायी - is the
one who wields *māyā* इति हि - so श्रुतिः -
(is) the *śruti* हि - verily एषा - this as
described earlier गुणमयी - constituted of
three *guṇas* दैवी - divine मम - my माया -
māyā (दुरत्यया - is very difficult to cross
over) इति च स्मृतिः - so is the *smṛti*
(*Bhagavadgītā*) – (101)

101. ‘Know for certain that *māyā* itself is the *prakṛti* and *Īśvara* is the one who wields *māyā*’, so is the *Śvetāśvatara śruti*. ‘Verily my divine *māyā* constituted of three *guṇas*, as described earlier, (is very difficult to cross over)’, is a *smṛti*-statement.

We have seen earlier that the words *ajñāna*, *māyā* and *prakṛti* are synonyms. The statement from the first line of this verse is from *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* (4-10). *Māyā*, the creative power of *Īśvara* is itself the *prakṛti*. Literally, the word *prakṛti* means one who has full potential to Create the entire *jagat*. *Prakṛti* also means the nature (*svabhāva*). It is the very nature of *Īśvara* to have

the creative power. The *Īśvara* who wields the power of *māyā* is called *māyī*.

The quotation in the second line is the statement of *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa as the principle of *Parameśvara* (B.G. 7-14). He declares that the *māyā* which belongs to Him is both *daivī* and *guṇmayī*. *Daivī* means divine in the sense that it belongs to *Deva*, the *Parameśvara*. *Māyā* depends on *Īśvara*. It cannot exist independently. It is made up of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamo guṇas*. Being inert in nature, *māyā* is wielded by *Īśvara*. That is how *Īśvara* gets the status of *Māyī*. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa further adds that only those who take refuge in Him (*Īśvara*) can cross over *māyā*. Otherwise it is very difficult to do so. This shows that the devotion (*bhakti*) to *Īśvara* is indispensable. *Īśvara-bhakti* gives that disposition which enables to gain *Brahmajñāna*. Both these quotations also point out that *avyākṛta* or Brahman conditioned by *māyā/avidyā* becomes the undifferentiated (*abhinna*) efficient (*nimitta*) and material (*upādāna*) cause (*kāraṇa*) of the *jagat*.

Avyākṛta-śruti was discussed thoroughly. First the word-meanings were given. Thereafter the import of the entire *avyākṛta*-sentence was narrated. *Avyākṛta* is the *ātmā*/Brahman conditioned by *māyā* (*avidyā*). The same sentence mainly reveals *ātmā*/

Brahman as *meya* (the entity to be known) and *avidyā* as the cause of the *jagat*. Now the discussion on *avyākṛta-vākya* is concluded so as to describe the *vyākṛta-śruti* (*śruti* portion on the manifest world) which is the next topic to be discussed in order.

इत्यव्याकृतवाक्यार्थो न्यायेन

सुनिरूपितः ।

अथ व्याकृतवाक्यार्थः क्रमात्

प्राप्तो निरूप्यते ॥१०२॥

इति - thus अव्याकृतवाक्यार्थः - the meaning of *avyākṛta*-sentence न्यायेन - topic-wise सुनिरूपितः - was thoroughly explained अथ - now क्रमात् - in order प्राप्तः - that has come व्याकृतवाक्यार्थः - the meaning of *vyākṛta*-sentence निरूप्यते - is being explained – (102)

102. So far the topic-wise meaning of the *avyākṛta*-sentence was thoroughly explained. Now, the meaning of *vyākṛta*-sentence (*Br.U.1-4-7*) that has come in order is being explained.

As explained so far, the *avyākṛta*-sentence (*Br.U.1-4-7*) reveals Brahman to be known (*meya*, *jñeya*) and the cause of *jagat* viz. *ajñāna* (self-ignorance). The former disclosure asserts that Brahman alone is to be known and nothing else. It needs an intense maturity of the mind and an impartial assessment of our present desires to know that *Brahmajñāna* alone is the highest

accomplishment in life. The latter one gives a great solace to the person who is totally distressed as to how this calamitous *saṃsāra* be ended. It assures such a person that the cause of *saṃsāra* is false and it can be ended totally by *Brahmajñāna*, wherein one discovers that there is no *saṃsāra* at all. Here is an interesting illustration to drive home this point (*Br.Vā.Sā.1-4-349,350*). A person was very much distressed when he heard someone shouting that many armed dacoits are approaching. But soon he got totally relieved. He found that such a problem is not at all there because the shouting person was actually in a dream! The cause of his distress was false. So are the *māyā/ajñāna* and *saṃsāra* truly not there on gaining *Brahmajñāna*. This is not a utopian statement (*Br.U.1-4-7*). It is the truth declared by the Upaniṣads (Vedānta), the non-refutable means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*). It is also established on a sound reasoning. Much more than that this truth is verified by great masters from time immemorial. Vedānta *pramāṇa* is verifiable like the direct perception. It is not a non-verifiable *pramāṇa* like that of heavens and their means.

VYĀKṚTA-ŚRUTI

After the description of the cause (*avyākṛta*), it is in order that its effect *vyākṛta* (manifest *jagat*) needs to be elaborated. The author is making the

statement that he is now going to elaborate the meaning of *vyākṛta*-sentence. The *vyākṛta-śruti* is:

तद् नामरूपभ्यां एव व्याक्रियते ।

Tr. That *avyākṛta* (*tat*) itself (*eva*) manifested (*vyākriyate*) as name (*nāma*) and the object specified by it, (i.e. *rūpa*) (*Br.U.1-4-7*).

व्याकृतं द्विविधं देहसृष्टिर्जीवप्रवेशनम् ।
देहादिर्विषयत्वेन प्रवेशात् पूर्वमुच्यते ॥१०३॥

व्याकृतं - the manifest *jagat* द्विविधं (भवति) - (is) twofold देहसृष्टिः - (the one is) the Creation of the body जीवप्रवेशनम् - (the other is) the entry of *jīva* देहादिः - the body, etc. विषयत्वेन - because of being the place (of entry) प्रवेशात् पूर्वम् - before the entry उच्यते - is described - (103)

103. The manifest *jagat* is twofold. (The one is) the Creation of the body (and the other is) the entry of *Jīva*. The body, etc., is described first before the entry because it is the place (field) of entry.

The entire *Brahmāṇḍa* (cosmos) beginning from the great five elements onwards to any insignificant entity is the manifest *jagat* emerged from 'avyākṛta'. But that entire Creation is not the topic that is being described here. What is relevant in the context of gaining *Brahmajñāna* is the freedom from *samsāra* which is centered in the gross

and subtle body. The manifestation of these two bodies referred to here as *dehasṛṣṭiḥ* is one aspect and the manifest *jagat* is the other one that are considered here.

Further this *Bṛhadāraṇyaka śruti* (1-4-7) says that after effecting the manifest Creation Brahman/*Paramātmā* entered all the embodiments from the tip of the nail up to the top of the head. This is called *praveśa-śruti* that describes the entry of Brahman in the embodiment. But this statement should not be taken too literally because only a limited entity can enter a place where it is not at present. Where is the unoccupied place to enter for Brahman that is not only all pervasive, but also transcends the space? What is meant by such an entry is the availability of Brahman/*Paramātmā* in all the embodiments as the individual entity (*jīva*) due to *cidābhāsa* (reflected *cit*) in every individual *antaḥkaraṇa*. The other Upaniṣads such as *Aitareya* and *Taittirīya* also speak of *praveśa* (entry). The purpose of *praveśa-śruti* is to reveal the true nature of *jīva* to be Brahman. This entry called *jīvapraveśanam* is another aspect of manifest *jagat*. It is considered here because it is useful in the means of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. Thus *dehasṛṣṭi* and *jīvapraveśanam* are the two facets of manifest (*vyākṛta*) *jagat* considered here. One of these two,

the Creation of body, etc., is described first because it provides *viṣaya* (place, field, and sphere) for the entry of *jīva*.

WORD-MEANINGS OF VYĀKṚTA-ŚRUTI

The individual word-meanings of *vyākṛta-śruti* are now given. The first word that is explained is ‘*tat*’.

अव्याकृतं यत्

पूर्वोक्तमरूपकमनामकम् ।

तदिदं नामरूपाभ्यामेव

व्याक्रियते स्वयम् ॥१०४॥

यत् - whatever that पूर्वोक्तम् - specified earlier अरूपकम् - formless अनामकम् - nameless अव्याकृतम् - the unmanifest *jagat* तद् - that (*avyākṛta*) इदं - (in the form of) this (manifest *jagat*) नामरूपाभ्यां - having the features of name (*nāma*) and the object specified by it (*rūpa*) स्वयम् एव - verily by itself व्याक्रियते - becomes manifest – (104)

104. That formless and nameless *avyākṛta* (unmanifest *jagat*) becomes manifest on its own in the form of this (*jagat*) having the features of name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*, i.e. the object specified by the name).

The pronoun *tat* (that) in the *vyākṛta-śruti* means the *avyākṛta* (the unmanifest *jagat*) described earlier. The statement ‘that’ (*tat*) signifying

unmanifest *jagat* is ‘this’ (*idam* - manifest *jagat*) points out that the manifest *jagat* is only a different state of the unmanifest but not totally different from it. The meaning of manifestation is to become clearly perceptible as names and forms. The word ‘form’ connotes the actual object specified by the name and not just the visual form. Manifest world was dormant in the unmanifest (*avyākṛta*) like the vivid features of a banyan tree in its seed. ‘*Svayam Vyākriyata*’ (manifested by itself) shows that the *avyākṛta* (unmanifest) became manifest easily on its own without the help of any external means. The things such as *karmaphalas* (results of actions) necessary for manifest Creation cannot be considered as external means. They are the very intrinsic aspects of *avyākṛta*. For example, a statement that ‘Mr. Gopal lifted the heavy weight on his own’ does not mean that he did not use his hands. It means that he did not take the help of any other person. *Avyākṛta* itself created the manifest world without the help of any other means is illustrated further.

सुषुप्तादुत्थिती राज्ञः स्वयमेव यथा तथा ।
जग्धाशेषजगन्मूर्तेरव्यक्तादव्याकृतिर्मुहुः ॥१०५॥

यथा - just as राज्ञः - of the king सुषुप्तात् - from the sleep स्वयम् - on his own एव - only उत्थिती - waking up तथा - in the same manner जग्धाशेषजगन्मूर्तेः - from the one who has devoured the entire

(previous) Creation अव्यक्तात् - from that unmanifest मुहुः - repeatedly व्याकृतिः (भवति) - manifestation (takes place) –(105)

105. Just as a king gets up from his sleep on his own, so also from the *avyākṛta* which has devoured in itself the entire (previous) Creation, the manifest *jagat* is born repeatedly.

A king may have bards, etc., but that is not the point. Waking up from the sleep on one's own is the topic of illustration. Again the illustration of a king's waking up is given and not that of a common man because in spite of having the services of many servants at his beck and call, he does not need them to wake up.

Sleep comes when our *karmas*, (i.e. *karmaphalas*) projecting the waking and dream states cease temporarily. At that time the individual *samsāra* or *jagat* of a *jīva* is merged in one's sleep or ignorance. The moment the *karmas* ordering the waking state are ready to manifest, the person wakes up automatically without any efforts or the help of external means. So is the case with the *avyākṛta* wherein the entire manifest *jagat* merges during the dissolution (*pralaya*) since the total (*samaṣṭi*) *karmas* ordering the manifest world have ceased temporarily so long as

pralaya continues. When the total *karmas* of all the *jīvas* revive again the field of experiences viz. the *jagat* happens to be on the verge of manifestation. This is when the *avyākṛta* on its own emerges as manifest *jagat*.

The word *muhuh* (repeatedly) shows that this process of becoming *avyākṛta* (unmanifest) and *vyākṛta* (manifest) is perennial one. Thereby it also hints that the Creation has no beginning. Being the product of self-ignorance, it ends only in *Brahmajñāna*.

Why does the *vyākṛta-śruti* tells the manifestation of names and forms instead of telling that of the *jagat* ? The meanings of name and forms will clarify this.

नामरूपे तु शब्दार्थौ

न ताभ्यामतिरिच्यते ।

जगत् किञ्चिद् घटादौ हि

द्वयमेव समीक्ष्यते ॥१०६॥

तु - but नामरूपे - name and form शब्दार्थौ - word and the object specified by it (भवतः - are) जगत् - the world ताभ्यां - from those two (name and form) न - not किञ्चित् - even a little अतिरिच्यते - surpasses हि - it is well-known घटादौ - in the pot, etc. द्वयमेव - only these two (name and form) समीक्ष्यते - are seen –(106)

106. The name and form are the word and the object specified by it. The

world is not even a bit different from those two (name and form). It is well-known that only these two are seen in the pot, etc.

The world is not available distinct from *nāma* (name) and *nāmī*, the entity who dons the name or the object specified by the name. At times *kriyā* (action) is mentioned separately from *nāma* and *nāmī*. But *kriyā* gets included in the *nāmī* because it is something specified by name. This *nāmī* is called *rūpa* in the present context. For example, there is nothing called pot other than that name and its form in terms of big or small belly and such type of neck, etc. If you scrutinize everything like this, the entire world gets reduced to name and form alone. Therefore, becoming manifest (*vyākṛta*) means getting endowed with name and form.

One may feel here that the process of manifest Creation from the unmanifest as told here is hasty. It is not step by step from the state of dissolution (*pralaya*) or *avyākṛta* found elsewhere. It is also observed that the theories of Creation propounded by different Upaniṣads are at variance with one another. After all, the source of Upaniṣads, the Vedas is one. They have originated from the Omniscient *Īśvara*. How can there be disharmony in them? Here we have to bear in mind that there

can be different modes or methods (called *prakriyā*) to accomplish a given goal. The modes may be easy or difficult, profitable or not, fast or slow, etc. It depends on the person to whom it is told. But what is invariably important is the accomplishment of the goal. Vedāntic *prakriyās* (modes of teaching) are not an exception to this rule. All that Upaniṣads are interested in is how best they can reveal Brahman to *mumukṣus* and not in establishing the theories of Creation. The theories of Creation are a means to the end, but not an end in themselves. Gauḍapādācārya tells the purpose in describing the mode of Creation: *upāyaḥ saḥ avatārāya*. That mode of Creation, (i.e. *saḥ*) is a means (*upāyaḥ*) to reveal the identity between *jīva* and Brahman, (i.e. *avatārāya*) (*Mā.Kā.3-15*).

The author answers the above query by quoting *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika* by Sureśvarācārya (1-4-401, adapted and 402).

प्रक्रियानियमो नात्र पुंव्युत्पत्तिप्रधानतः।
अतः श्रुतिषु सृष्ट्यादिविगानं बहुधेक्ष्यते॥१०७॥

अत्र - in the topic of describing the mode of Creation (सृष्टिप्रकारः)।
पुंव्युत्पत्तिप्रधानतः - gaining *Brahmajñāna* by *mumukṣus* being the chief purpose
प्रक्रियानियमः - a definite rule regarding the description of *jagat* न (अस्ति) - is not there
अतः - therefore श्रुतिषु - in the

different Upaniṣads सृष्ट्यादिविगानं - inconsistency in the description of Creation, sustenance and dissolution बहुधा - in many ways ईक्ष्यते - is seen –(107)

107. As for the topic of describing the mode of Creation (*srṣṭiprakāra*), gaining *Brahmajñāna* by *mumukṣus* being the chief purpose, there is no definite rule about it. Therefore in the different Upaniṣads inconsistency in the description of the Creation (*utpatti*), sustenance (*sthiti*) and dissolution (*laya*) is seen in many ways.

What is important is that the *mumukṣu* must get *Brahmajñāna*. The modes of teaching employed are secondary. There are inherent defects in all the modes of Vedāntic teachings because the nature of Brahman defies words and the means of communication.

यया यया भवेत् पुंसां

व्युत्पत्तिः प्रत्यगात्मनि।

सा सैव प्रक्रियेह स्यात्

साध्वी सा चानवस्थिता ॥१०८॥

यया यया (प्रक्रियया) - by whatever mode of Vedāntic teachings (*prakriyā*) पुंसां - to *mumukṣus* प्रत्यगात्मनि - of *pratyagātmā* व्युत्पत्तिः - knowledge भवेत् - is born सा सा प्रक्रिया - that particular *prakriyā* एव - alone इह साध्वी - correct, fruitful स्यात् - is च - but सा - that *prakriyā*

अनवस्थिता - not in order, inherently defective in nature –(108)

108. By whatever mode of Vedāntic teaching, (i.e. *prakriyā*) *ātmajñāna* is produced in *mumukṣus*. That particular *prakriyā* alone is fruitful, but that *prakriyā* is not in order.

A Vedāntic *prakriyā* is a particular mode or method of Vedāntic teaching. The *prakriyās* employed most often are *ātmānātma-viveka*, *pañcakośa-viveka*, *avasthātraya-viveka*, *ḍṛk-ḍṛśya-viveka*, *puruṣa-prakṛti vibhāga*, or *Kṣetra-Kṣetrajña-vibhāga*, *avidyā/ māyā-vāda*, *vāsanā-prakriyā*, *Vivartavāda*, *adhyāropāpavāda*, *kārya-kāraṇa-bhāva*, etc. These *prakriyās* are implied in the Upaniṣads and several Vedāntic texts, even if not referred to explicitly in them.

In view of the contrast between the nature of Brahman, which is totally free from the *jagat*, and the *ādhyātmic* 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 *Brahmajñāna*, without in any way dwelling on their inherent limitations. In ascertaining the genuineness of Vedāntic *prakriyās*, the *mumukṣus* should be guided by the above dictum (verse 107 and 108) from *Vārtikakāra* Sureśvarācārya. The criterion of correctness for a Vedāntic *prakriyā* rests

in its capacity to produce *Brahmajñāna*. It cannot be a subject of academic interest or a scholastic feat. It is not desirable to take an obstinate stand and condemn a *prakriyā* by reading into it an unstated meaning, disregarding its capacity to produce *Brahmajñāna*.

What exactly is the nature of becoming manifest indicated by the verb ‘*Vyākriyate*’ is now explained.

विस्पष्टत्वं व्याकृतत्वं

शुक्तिकारजतादिवत्।

स्पष्टमव्याकृतान्मोहात्

मिथ्याज्ञानमिदं जगत् ॥१०९॥

व्याकृतत्वं - the state of becoming manifest (च अत्र - in this *vyākṛata-śruti*)
 विस्पष्टत्वं - (is) the evident perceptibility
 शुक्तिकारजतादिवत् - (It is) like the very clear appearance of silver in the place of a sea-shell अव्याकृतात् मोहात् - on account of unmanifest ignorance (*moha*) स्पष्टम् - clearly visible इदं - this जगत् - the world मिथ्या - (is an) erroneous ज्ञानम् - concept –(109)

109. The state of becoming manifest (in this *vyākṛata-śruti*) is the evident perceptibility. It is like the very clear appearance of silver in the place of a sea-shell. This world which is clearly visible on account of unmanifest ignorance is an erroneous concept.

We are familiar with the

manifestations such as an embryo being born as a child, the sight of trees, houses, etc., at the daybreak, or the expressions of feelings expressed in clear words. What is the type of manifestation (*vyākṛti*) from *avyākṛta* (unmanifest)? It is like a piece of rope appearing as a snake or taking a sea-shell to be silver. In the rope-snake example the concept that there is something lying there is *avyākṛta*. ‘It is a snake’ is *vyākṛta*. In the example of shell and silver the unknown shell is *avyākṛta*. The clearly seen silver in its place is *vyākṛta*. Similarly, the unknown *ātmā*/Brahman (called *moha*) is *avyākṛta* (unmanifest) state. Instead, vivid perception of names and forms called the *jagat* is *vyākṛta* (manifest state).

In the verse 103, the twofold Creation was referred to. Out of them *dehasṛṣṭi* (Creation of *upādhi* such as body, etc.), was described. Now the meaning of *vyākṛta*-sentence is being concluded. Thereafter, the other Creation called *jīvapraveśa* (entry of *jīva*) is going to be described.

नामरूपाध्यास एवं व्याकृतः प्रतिपादितः।
 प्रवेश्यः तत्र जीवस्य प्रवेशः प्रतिपाद्यते ॥११०॥

एवं - thus नामरूपाध्यासः - superimposition of name and form, (i.e. *jagat*)
 व्याकृतः - (called) the manifest प्रतिपादितः - is expounded (सः एव - that alone) प्रवेश्यः -

the place fit for entry तत्र - therein जीवस्य - of *jīva* प्रवेशः - the entry प्रतिपाद्यते - is (being) described – (110)

110. Thus the superimposition of name and form called the manifest (*jagat*) is expounded. That manifest (embodiment) alone is the place fit for entry. Therein the entry of *jīva* is being described.

THE ENTRY OF *JĪVA* (*JĪVA-PRAVEŚA*)

It was shown in the verse 109 that the manifest *jagat* with all that it contains is an erroneous concept. It is a delusion (*bhrama*). The delusion having the appearance of distinct names and forms itself is called manifest (*vyākṛta*) *jagat*. When the *jagat* and embodiment, etc., contained in them are themselves delusive in nature; what to speak of the entry in them is nothing but a greater delusion.

Entry of *jīva* in the gross and subtle embodiment is actually the entry of Brahman in the form of *jīva*. It was already seen earlier that all pervasive Brahman cannot enter anywhere. The entry is the availability of *cidābhāsa* (reflected pure awareness) of *citsvarūpa*-Brahman (Brahman whose true nature is *cit*) in *antaḥkāraṇa*. Figuratively the reflection of moon in a lake can be called ‘the entry of moon in the lake’. The gross

and subtle bodies coupled with *cidābhāsa* is called *jīva*. The role played by *ātmā*/Brahman as a *saṃsārī jīva* is because of such an entry.

There is another reading (*pāṭhantara*) of this verse with *praveśyasya atra* (of the entity who wants to enter here) instead of *praveśyaḥ tatra* printed in this book. The latter reading is in accordance with *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika-sāra* which is more appropriate.

The entry of *jīva* is being elaborated further by explaining the *praveśa-śruti* - सः एषः इह प्रविष्टः आनखाग्रेभ्यः (*Br. U.1-4-7*).

This *śruti*-sentence means: ‘The *ātmā* conditioned by ignorance or the *ātmā* introduced as *Virāṭ* (in the beginning) is the one who has entered here in all the embodiments (from *Hiranyagarbha* to any insignificant creature) up to the tip of nails’.

सर्वशास्त्रारम्भ एव यदर्थस्तद् विबुध्दये ।
स एष इह देहेषु प्रविष्ट इति गीयते ॥१११॥

यदर्थः - to reveal whom एव - only सर्वशास्त्रारम्भः - (is) the undertaking of all the *ādhyātmika* (spiritual) scriptures तद् विबुध्दये - to know directly that divinity principle सः - that एषः - this (*paramātmā*) इह - here देहेषु - in all the embodiments (जीवरूपेण - in the form of *jīva*) प्रविष्टः - has

entered इति - so गीयते - (it) is said by the *śruti* – (111)

111. To reveal whom only is the undertaking of all the *ādhyātmika* scriptures, to know directly that divinity principle, the *śruti* declares (here) that the same *Paramātmā* has entered in all the embodiments in the form of *jīva*.

The purpose of entire scriptural lore is to impart *ātmajñāna* with its required means. The scriptural masters unequivocally declare that *ātmajñāna*/*Brahmajñāna* destroys the *saṃsāra* totally along with its cause, the self-ignorance (*Bṛ.U.Vā.Sā.1-4-407*).

The *praveśa-śruti* describes the entry of *Paramātmā* (Brahman) in all the embodiments as a means to impart the knowledge of the same Brahman. The phrase ‘*saḥ eṣaḥ*’ (that this) in this verse shows the identity of Brahman established and revealed in all the scriptures with the one who has entered all the embodiments.

The author now introduces the actual *praveśa-śruti* and promises to inquire into it after giving its word-meanings.

स एषोऽन्नानखाग्रेभ्यः

प्रविष्ट इति वेदगीः ।

व्याख्यायतेऽसौ पदशः आदौ

मीमांस्यते त्वथ ॥११२॥

सः - the *ātmā* presently under discussion एषः - (is) this one (who) अत्र - here (in the body) आनखाग्रेभ्यः - up to the tip of nails प्रविष्टः - has entered इति - so वेदगीः - (is) the *śruti*-statement असौ (वेदगीः) - that *śruti*-statement आदौ - at first पदशः - word by word व्याख्यायते - is explained अथ तु - then मीमांस्यते - the entire statement is inquired into – (112)

112. The *ātmā* presently under discussion is this one who has (actually) entered the body up to the tip of nails. So says the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka śruti*. That *śruti*-statement is first explained word by word. Then the entire statement is inquired into.

‘*Saḥ eṣaḥ atra ānakhāgrebhyah praviṣṭaḥ*’ is the *praveśa-śruti* with the word ‘*atra*’ in the place of original word ‘*iha*’. As stated, the word meanings are given first and then the entire statement is inquired into to ascertain the exact nature of entry (*praveśa*) and the entity who entered.

First of all, what does ‘*saḥ*’ (that) stand for is told.

स इत्यनेन शब्देन

प्रकृतार्थावमर्शिना ।

अव्याकृताध्यक्ष आत्मा यः

पुरोक्तः स उच्यते ॥११३॥

सः इति - ‘that’ अनेन - by this प्रकृतार्थावमर्शिना - by the one which refers

to the topic under discussion शब्देन - by the word यः - the one who is पुरा - earlier उक्तः - described अव्याकृताध्यक्षः - the illuminator (*sākṣī*) of unmanifest state आत्मा - *ātmā* सः - that उच्यते - is told –(113)

113. By the word ‘that’ (*saḥ*) which refers to the topic (of unmanifest) under discussion, the *ātmā* who is the illuminator of *avyākṛta* (unmanifest) and who was described earlier is told.

It was pointed out during the discussion on *avyākṛta-śruti* that *avyākṛta* is the *ātmā* conditioned by self-ignorance. It is not just the ignorance or unmanifest state. The same *ātmā* is referred to here as the ‘*adhyakṣa*’ (*sākṣī*, illuminator) of *avyākṛta*, the unmanifest state. Mere *avyākṛta* state without *ātmā* as *sākṣī* cannot be known. *Ātmā* has to be taken for granted though not told explicitly. Further the emergence of manifest (*vyākṛta*) state from the inert *avyākṛta* without *ātmā/Paramātmā* is just impossible. Any *sr̥ṣṭi* (Creation) presupposes the regulator (*niyantā*) the efficient cause. Thus *saḥ* stands for *ātmā/Paramātmā* who effected the unmanifest state into the manifest *jagat*. The same *Paramātmā/Brahman* entered all the embodiments.

Another meaning of *saḥ* is derived sensing a grammatical objection.

The *avyākṛta-śruti* starts with ‘*tad ha*’ (*Br.U.1-4-7*). The neuter word *tad* refers to *avyākṛta* (unmanifest) which is in neuter gender. But *praveśa-śruti* begins with ‘*saḥ eṣaḥ*’ wherein the word *saḥ* word is masculine. The objection is that nouns referred to by two pronouns in different genders cannot be one and the same entity. Actually this objection should not surface because it was made clear that *avyākṛta* (though neuter) stands for *avyākṛtādhyakṣa-ātmā*. It is in masculine gender like *saḥ* in *praveśa-śruti*. Notwithstanding this grammatical conformity, if anyone still objects, it is shown now that *saḥ* (the one who entered all the embodiments) can be fixed from another context without any radical difference with the entity (*Paramātmā/Brahman*) ascertained earlier. In this case this *saḥ* should be traced in ‘*ātmā eva idam agre āsīt*’ (*ātmā* as *Virāṭ* having the macrocosmic embodiments in a human form was there before the actual gross Creation) (*Br.U.1-4-1; A.Pr.13-5*).

यद्वा विराडधिष्ठानं ब्राह्मणादावुदीरितम्।
आत्मशब्देन तस्यात्र परामर्शो भविष्यति ॥११४॥

वा - or यद् - that which ब्राह्मणादौ - in the beginning of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka brāhmaṇa* (*Br.U.1-4-1*) आत्मशब्देन - by the word *ātmā* (यद् - whatever)

विराडधिष्ठानम् - the basis of *Virāt* उदीरितम् - was told तस्य - its अत्र - here परामर्शः - recollection, consideration भविष्यति - will be – (114)

114. Or the word *ātmā* described as the basis of *Virāt* at the beginning of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka brāhmaṇa* (*Bṛ.U.1-4-1; A.Pr.13-5*) will be recollected here (as the entity who entered).

Ātmā/Brahman is one and the same entity whether described as *avyākṛtādhyakṣa* (verse 113) or as *Virāt* by the phrase ‘*puruṣākāraḥ brahmāṇḍa-śarīrabhṛt*’ (verse 5). Thus both these references point out the same *ātmā*/ Brahman who entered all the embodiments as per *praveśa-śruti*.

Now an obvious doubt is spelt out in the next two verses to answer it in detail thereafter. The *praveśa* (entry) - *śruti* in its phrase ‘*saḥ* (that, he) *eṣaḥ* (this)’ speaks of *ātmā*/Brahman, the illuminator of *avyākṛta*, (i.e. *avyākṛtādhyakṣa*) referred to by ‘*saḥ*’ who enters the bodies and is identical with this (*eṣaḥ*) *jīva* who is abiding in the body after entry. This seems *prima facie* to be wrong because *ātmā*/Brahman is non-dual, free from *saṃsāra* and remote (*parokṣa*, unknown presently) whereas this *jīva* is dual, *saṃsārī* and evidently known. This is going to be discussed in detail.

तच्छब्देन परामृष्टः साक्ष्यव्याकृतभासकः ।
एतच्छब्देन कार्यस्थः प्रत्यक्ष उपदिश्यते ॥११५॥

तत् - that, i.e. *saḥ* in the *praveśa-śruti* शब्देन - by the word अव्याकृतभासकः - the illuminator of unmanifest (*avyākṛta*) साक्षी - *ātmā*/Paramātmā परामृष्टः - is referred to एतत् - this, i.e. *eṣaḥ* in *praveśa-śruti* शब्देन - by the word कार्यस्थः (साक्षी) - *ātmā* abiding in the embodiment, (i.e. *buddhi, antaḥkaraṇa*) प्रत्यक्षः - (i.e. प्रत्यक्षतया) - one who is directly known उपदिश्यते - is referred to – (115)

115. The word *saḥ* (*tat*) in the *praveśa-śruti* refers to *ātmā*/Paramātmā, the illuminator of *avyākṛta* whereas the word *eṣaḥ* (*etat*) (therein) (viz. *jīva*) directly refers to the *ātmā* abiding in the embodiment.

अद्वितीयमधिष्ठानं कार्यस्थः सद्द्वयस्तयोः।
स एष इत्यभेदोक्तिर्दुष्करेति न चोद्यताम् ॥११६॥

अधिष्ठानं - the basis of unmanifest (*avyākṛta*) *jagat* (referred to by *saḥ*) अद्वितीयम् - (is) non-dual कार्यस्थः (जीवः) - the *jīva* abiding in the embodiment (referred to by *eṣaḥ*) सद्द्वयः - is dual तयोः - of those two ‘सः एषः’ इति अभेदोक्तिः - the statement (उक्तिः) of identity (अभेद) by the phrase ‘that this’ (सः एषः) दुष्करा - (is) impossible इति - so न चोद्यताम् - (it) should not be urged (objected) – (116)

116. The basis of unmanifest *jagat* (viz. Brahman) is non-dual whereas the *jīva* abiding in the embodiment is dual in nature. (In view of this) please do not object to the statement of their identity revealed by the phrase ‘that this’ as impossible.

The contradictory nature of Brahman and *jīva* is obvious. The *śruti* also does not say that Brahman was non-dual first and then it became dual as *jīva*. It is emphatic that *jīva* and Brahman are always identical. There is a valid reason for such a statement by *praveśa-śruti*. *Jīva* is not truly dual or *samsārī*. It appears to be so due to self-ignorance. That is why the author requests us not to entertain any doubt about the identity between *jīva* and Brahman.

If one wonders how can self-ignorance project *jīva* as dual in spite of the truth that it is identical with non-dual Brahman, here is the answer: There is nothing that is impossible for ignorance. It can project anything that may appear as next to impossible in the normal course.

अज्ञातवस्तुतत्त्वस्य दुष्करं

नास्ति किञ्चन ।

नीलीकृतं नभः पश्येच्चक्षुषा

नीलवस्त्रवत् ॥११७॥

अज्ञातवस्तुतत्त्वस्य - for a person who knows not the real nature of an entity

किञ्चन - anything दुष्करं - impossible, difficult (to imagine) न अस्ति - is not there (आकाशस्वरूपस्य अनभिज्ञः - the person who does not know the true nature of sky) नीलवस्त्रवत् - like a blue cloth नीलीकृतं - appearing blue नभः - the sky चक्षुषा - by his eyes पश्येत् (i.e. पश्यति) - sees – (117)

117. For a person who knows not the real nature of an entity there is nothing that is impossible (to imagine). The person who does not know the true nature of sky sees by his eyes the blue appearing sky like seeing a blue cloth.

The verses 117 and 118 are from *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika* (1-4-499, 500). Sarvajñātma Muni in his *Saṅkṣepa-śārīrakam* (3-195) says: *bhramād alabhyam na ca kiñcit asti* (there is nothing that cannot be perceived by delusion or misapprehension). The expanse of so called blue sky is nothing but formless space. There is no blue surface at all and space is imperceptible to the eyes. And yet people see blue sky with their eyes. The power of delusion (*bhrama*) or erroneous notion is inconceivable indeed. Like the seeing of imperceptible space by the eyes, the experience of non-dual Brahman as limited dual *jīva* is quite natural due to delusion. There are no norms of proper or improper in the realm of ignorance and its consequent delusion. The next

verse explains this.

योग्यायोग्यव्यवस्थेयं मानव्यवहृतौ भवेत् ।
कल्पनामात्रनिष्पत्तेर्नापेक्षाज्ञानभूमिषु ॥११८॥

मानव्यवहृतौ - while operating the *pramāṇas* (means of knowledge) इयं - this योग्यायोग्यव्यवस्था - fixed rule (व्यवस्था) of proper (योग्य) and improper (अयोग्य)। भवेत् - can be there अज्ञानभूमिषु - in the field of ignorance (or consequent delusion) कल्पनामात्रनिष्पत्तेः - because whatever that appears is produced by mere imagination (योग्यतायाः - of properness) अपेक्षा - need न - (is) not there - (118)

118. While operating the means of knowledge there can be the fixed rule of proper and improper. But in the field of ignorance (or delusion) there is no need of properness because whatever that appears therein is produced by mere imagination.

We know that space is colourless and formless. It cannot be seen by the eyes. Even then people see with their eyes the blue sky which is an illusion and not true. Similarly, Brahman is non-dual and *asaṃsārī*. Though *jīva* is nothing but Brahman, people experience it to be dual and *saṃsārī*. Such an experience is totally wrong. It is a delusion. Therefore, the same is being subjected to inquiry through the means of

praveśa-śruti. It shows that all the erroneous concepts about *ātmā*/Brahman as dual *jīva* are falsely attributed (*adhyasta*) on Brahman. They will be negated (*apavāda*) to reveal the truth that *jīva* is truly Brahman.

Now the word ‘*iha*’ from the *praveśa-śruti* is going to be explained.

इहेत्यनेन सूत्रादिस्थाणुपर्यन्तविग्रहाः ।
उच्यन्ते तेषु जीवोऽयं विस्पष्टमुपलभ्यते ॥११९॥

सूत्रादिस्थाणुपर्यन्तविग्रहाः - the embodiments beginning from *Hiraṇyagarbha* up to immovable entities ‘इह’ इति - ‘here’ अनेन (पदेन) - by this (word) उच्यन्ते - are referred to अयं - this जीवः - *jīva* तेषु - in those (embodiments) विस्पष्टं - very clearly उपलभ्यते - is known/experienced - (119)

119. The embodiments beginning from *Hiraṇyagarbha* up to immovable entities (such as trees) are referred to by the word ‘here’. The presence of *jīva* is very clearly known in them.

‘*Iha*’ (here) stands for the embodiments of all the living beings. Irrespective of the embodiment whether it is that of *Hiraṇyagarbha*, *Virāṭ* or any tree or plant, the one who has entered them as *jīva* is one and the same entity, Brahman. Even *Hiraṇyagarbha* or *Virāṭ* having the macrocosmic embodiments are basically *jīvas*

because of identification with their embodiments to begin with. That they have *Brahmajñāna* and overlordship by Virtue of their embodiments is altogether a different aspect. The existence of *jīva* is very clearly (*vispaṣṭam*) experienced or cognized without the need of any means of knowledge. Everyone does experience: 'I am an entity subjected to joys, sorrows, birth, death, limitations, etc., wherever such an availability of *jīva* is available that is called a *vigraha* (embodiment) whether it is microcosmic or macrocosmic. These embodiments are referred to as *iha* in the *praveśa-śruti*.

The word *praviṣṭaḥ* - from the *praveśa-śruti* is now explained.

प्रविष्ट इतिशब्देन चिदाभासतमोजन्विता ।
जीवत्वेनोपलब्धिर्या चितः सैषाभिधीयते ॥१२०॥

चितः - of *caitanya* (pure awareness)
जीवत्वेन - in the form of a *jīva* (शरीरेषु - in the embodiments) या - whatever
चिदाभासतमोजन्विता - endowed with the reflection of *cit* (*cidābhāsa*) and self-ignorance (*tamaḥ*) उपलब्धिः - the direct experience सा एषा - that one प्रविष्टः - (Brahman) entered इति शब्देन - by the word (*praviṣṭaḥ*) अभिधीयते - is told/expressed - (120)

120. Whatever direct experience of *cit* endowed with *cidābhāsa* and

self-ignorance in the embodiments as a *jīva* is expressed by the word *praviṣṭaḥ*, (i.e. Brahman entered).

Praviṣṭaḥ means entered. The entity who entered according to the context is *ātmā*/Brahman. As seen earlier, the all pervasive Brahman cannot enter anywhere like water entering a pot or an individual entering a room. Further, an entity having a form alone can enter somewhere. The formless *citsvarūpa ātmā*/Brahman cannot have any entry. Therefore, the availability in the embodiments, of a limited direct experience of *cit* (pure awareness) endowed with *cidābhāsa* and self-ignorance is called *praveśa* (entry) by the *śruti*. It is just like saying the space has entered a pot or a face has entered the mirror. The experience of *cit* (*ātmā*) as a *jīva* who is *kartā* (doer), *bhoktā* (enjoyer or sufferer), *sukhī* (happy), *duḥkhī* (sorrowful), sustainer of *prāṇa* (vital air), subject to birth and death, etc., is what is meant by entry. *Jīva* has both the semblance of *cit* as *cidābhāsa* and all the limitations of the embodiments.

चिदाभासप्रवेशस्तु प्रत्यङ्मोहे स्वतो भवेत् ।
तत्कार्येष्वनुवृत्तः स उपाधिश्चित्प्रवेशने ॥१२१॥

चिदाभासप्रवेशः - the entry of *cidābhāsa* तु - whereas प्रत्यङ्मोहे - in the ignorance (*moha*) of *pratyagātmā* स्वतः (एव) - by itself only भवेत् - takes place

तत्कार्येषु - in the effects of ignorance such as intellect, body, etc. अनुवृत्तः - inhering सः - that (ignorance endowed with *cidābhāsa*, साभासमोहः) चित्प्रवेशने - for the entry of *cit* उपाधिः - adjunct (भवति - becomes)–(121)

121. The entry of *cidābhāsa* in the ignorance of *pratyagātmā* takes place by itself. The ignorance endowed with *cidābhāsa* inhering in the effects of ignorance such as *buddhi*, body, etc., becomes the *upādhi* (adjunct) for the entry of *cit* (in the embodiments).

Jīva is experienced as an entity related to ignorance (of *ātmā*), endowed with ignorance and expresses oneself as ‘I am an ignorant person (*ajñānī*)’. This experience is natural (*naisargika*) like the reflection of your face in a mirror. But *cit* (*ātmā*) is totally free from all these attributes and their experiences even though it is covered by ignorance.

The ignorance further produces *antaḥkaraṇa*, senses, gross body, etc. *Cit* (*ātmā*) does enter them also in succession. But this entry is on account of an *upādhi*. That *upādhi* is the ignorance of *ātmā* endowed with *cidābhāsa*. An *upādhi* is an entity that imparts (as it were) its attributes to a proximate thing. Thus the self-ignorance called *moha* of *pratyagātmā* is the cause of *citpraveśa* (entry of *ātmā*) at all loci.

It is well-known that *ātmā* is all pervasive. It cannot enter anywhere. If *cidābhāsa* enters the self-ignorance on its own as seen just now, why does the *śruti* repeatedly speaks of the entry of *cit-svarūpa ātmā*? The answer is as follows:

जपाकुसुमरक्तत्वं स्फटिके कल्प्यते यथा ।
चिदाभासप्रवेशोऽयं चित्यध्यारोप्यते तथा ॥१२२॥

यथा - just as जपाकुसुमरक्तत्वं - the redness of a hibiscus flower स्फटिके - in a proximate crystal कल्प्यते - is imagined तथा - so अयं - this चिदाभासप्रवेशः - entry of *cidābhāsa* चिति - in *ātmā* अध्यारोप्यते - is superimposed/attributed–(122)

122. This entry of *cidābhāsa* is superimposed on (attributed to) *ātmā* like the redness of the hibiscus flower (rose-mallow) that is imagined to be in a proximate crystal.

The colourless crystal appears to be red in the proximity of a red hibiscus flower. The redness belongs to the flower. But due to an error it appears to be in the crystal. Thus the red flower serves as an *upādhi* of that crystal. Similarly, the entry is that of *cidābhāsa* and yet the same is attributed to *cit-ātmā* due to ignorance. *Śruti* is also correct in the sense that *cit* enters in the form of its reflection (*ābhāsa*). It is like the face entering the mirror in the form of

reflection or the sun entering a lake through its reflection. Similarly, *cit* enters the ignorance in the form of *cidābhāsa*.

Now the sphere and the boundary of entry suggested by the phrase *ānakhāgrebhyah* in the *praveśa-śruti* is explained in the next two verses.

सूत्रादिस्थाणुपर्यन्तं जगत्सृष्ट्वा स्वमायया ।
स्वभासैकसहायेन स एव प्राविशत् परः॥१२३॥

परः - *Paramātmā/Parameśvara*
सूत्रादिस्थाणुपर्यन्तं जगत् - the *jagat* beginning from *Hiraṇyagarbha* upto an immobile creature (such as trees) स्वमायया - by one's *māyā* (Creative power) सृष्ट्वा - having created सः एव - the same *Paramātmā/Brahman* (तत् जगत् - that *jagat*) स्वभासैकसहायेन - with the help of his *cidābhāsa* प्राविशत् - entered—(123)

123. *Paramātmā* having created the *jagat* ranging from *Hiraṇyagarbha* (*sūtrātmā*) to an immobile (*sthāvara*) creature (such as trees), himself entered it with the help of his *cidābhāsa*.

The macrocosmic embodiment of *sūtrātmā* (*Hiraṇyagarbha*) manifests the macrocosmic power of knowledge and action (*jñānaśakti-kriyāśakti*). In the immobile embodiments these two powers are manifested to a least extent. The entry of *Paramātmā* is in both macrocosmic and microcosmic

embodiments. This describes the sphere of this entry.

आनखाग्रेभ्य इत्युक्त्या

मर्यादास्य प्रवेशने ।

उक्ता स्पर्शनं चैतन्यं

नखाग्रावधि लक्ष्यते ॥१२४॥

‘आनखाग्रेभ्यः’ - ‘upto the tip of nails’ इति उक्त्या - by this statement अस्य - of this (*Paramātmā*) प्रवेशने - in the entry मर्यादा - limit, boundary उक्ता - is told (शरीरे - in the body) नखाग्रावधि - upto the tip of the nail चैतन्यं - the *cit* - pure awareness principle स्पर्शनं - by the touch लक्ष्यते - is experienced, cognised—(124)

124. By the statement ‘upto the tip of the nails’ the boundary of *Paramātmā's* entry is told. The presence of *caitanya* in the body is experienced by the touch upto the tip of the nail.

If *Paramātmā/Brahman* enters all the embodiments, the question arises whether the entry is all over the body or is confined to a particular place in it? The phrase ‘up to the tip of nails’ shows that the entry is all over the body. We also find universally that awareness principle is experienced in every minutest particle of the embodiment and it is not confined to any limb or a part. The phrase ‘upto the tip of nail’ is from the standpoint of microcosmic bodies. It is a figurative statement to mean ‘all over the body’.

There need not be necessarily nails in that embodiment. The boundary from the macrocosmic body of *Sūtrātmā* is as far as *jñānaśakti* and *kriyāśakti* pervade.

TWO MODES OF *CIT* ABIDING IN THE BODY

Śruti describes two modes by which the *cit* (*ātmā*) abides in the body after its entry. They are: ‘*yathā kṣurah kṣuradhāne avahitaḥ syād, Viśvambharo vā Viśvambharakulāye*’. [Just as a razor (*kṣurah*) placed in a barber's kit (*kṣuradhāna*) is available at that particular place or fire (*Viśvambharah*) permeating the entire wood.] (*Br. U. 1-4-7*). The word *Kulāya* from the *śruti* means residence. The purport of these two examples is told first before explaining them.

सामान्येन विशेषाच्च

चिदेहं व्याप्य वर्तते ।

दृष्टान्ताभ्यां द्वयी

वृत्तिद्विविधाभ्यामिहोच्यते ॥१२५॥

चित् - *ātmā* (pure awareness principle) देहं - the body सामान्येन - in general च - and विशेषात् - in a specific manner व्याप्य - having pervaded वर्तते - remains द्वयी - (this) twofold वृत्तिः - mode of abidance द्विविधाभ्यां - by two types of दृष्टान्ताभ्यां - illustrations इह - here उच्यते - is described—(125)

125. *Cit* remains in the body

having pervaded it in general and in a specific manner. This twofold mode of abidance is described here by two types of illustrations.

The order of illustration given in the *śruti* is first a razor and then the fire. But considering the fact that they intend to explain the general and specific mode of abidance of *cit*, the illustration of fire is explained first.

दारु कृत्स्नमभिव्याप्य

यथाग्निर्दारुणि स्थितः ।

संव्याप्य तद्वदखिलं

देहमात्मा व्यवस्थितः ॥१२६॥

यथा - just as अग्निः - the fire कृत्स्नम् - the entire दारु - wood अभिव्याप्य - having permeated दारुणि - in the wood स्थितः - remains तद्वद् - in the same manner आत्मा - *cit-ātmā* or *jīva* अखिलं - the entire देहम् - body संव्याप्य - having pervaded totally व्यवस्थितः - abides—(126)

126. As the (dormant) fire (principle) remains in the wood having permeated it entirely, so does *ātmā* abide in the body having pervaded it totally.

The burning of entire wood proves that the dormant fire in it all over got manifest. Similarly, the touch of any part of the body or pain in corner of it shows that awareness principle is there in and through it. If it were not so, the body will start decomposing. Thus the

cit is in the body all over just as the fire in the wood. The next illustration will explain the specific abidance of *ātmā* with its utility.

तस्थावसंव्याप्य यथा

क्षुरपात्रं क्षुरस्तथा ।

श्रोत्रादिनाडिमध्यस्थस्तनुमव्याप्य

संस्थितः ॥१२७॥

यथा - just as क्षुरः - a razor क्षुरपात्रं - barber's kit असंव्याप्य - without occupying it completely तस्थौ - remains तथा - so श्रोत्रादिनाडिमध्यस्थः - (आत्मा/चित्) - the *ātmā* abiding in the nerves of ears, etc. तनुम् - the (entire) body अव्याप्य - without occupying संस्थितः - lives in it—(127)

127. As a razor remains in the barber's kit without occupying it completely so the *ātmā* abiding in the nerves of ears, etc., lives in the body without occupying it entirely.

Cit-svarūpa ātmā as a *jīva* has a specific presence in the nerves of ear, etc. The phrase 'ear, etc.', (*śrotrādi*) signifies sense-organs, organs of action and *prāṇas*, etc. The presence of *ātmā* in them enables the power of knowledge and action (*jñānaśakti* and *kriyāśakti*) to manifest. But such a specific presence is confined only to those places and not all over the body. It is just like saying that the razor is in the kit means it is in a particular place in it unlike the fire all

over in the wood. Though *cit* is one and the same, the distinct feature (*viśeṣa*) of abiding in a particular place is due to its distinct expressions such as seeing, hearing, smelling walking, talking, etc., depending on its corresponding places of abidance. Due to such distinct manifestations the place of its abidance also becomes specific (*viśeṣa*) and not general (*sāmānya*). This is explained further with the illustration of the razor.

क्षुरपात्रे स्थानभेदाद् विभिद्यन्ते यथा क्षुराः ।
चैतन्यानि विभिद्यन्ते तथा नाडीविभेदतः ॥१२८॥

यथा - just as क्षुराः - razors क्षुरपात्रे - in the barber's kit स्थानभेदात् - due to their different places विभिद्यन्ते - differ तथा - so नाडीविभेदतः - due to different nerves चैतन्यानि - specific types of awareness विभिद्यन्ते - differ—(128)

128. As different razors kept in the different places in a barber's kit differ (functionally) so the specific types of awareness differ due to their different places of abidance because of different nerves.

The word razor indicates other instruments used by a barber such as scissors, comb, brush, soap, etc. Razors and other means are kept in the different pockets of the kit. They differ because of their different functions and place that they occupy in the kit. Similarly, *cit*

though one, manifests in different nerves with specific functions. So it (*cit*) appears to be distinct due to different locations and manifestations.

The availability of *cit* in the general and specific modes is also described based on the three states of consciousness.

प्राप्नोति वृत्ति द्वे जीवः स्वप्नजाग्रदवस्थयोः ।
सामान्यवृत्तिमेवैकां सुषुप्ते प्रतिपद्यते ॥१२९॥

जीवः - *jīva* (*cit*) स्वप्नजाग्रदवस्थयोः - during the waking and dream states द्वे - two वृत्तिः - modes of abidance (of *cit*) प्राप्नोति - gets सुषुप्ते - during the deep sleep एकां - one एव - only सामान्यवृत्तिम् - the general mode of abidance प्रतिपद्यते - attains—(129)

129. *Jīva* (*cit*) gets both the modes of abidance (general and particular) during the waking and dream states whereas in the deep sleep it remains only in the form of general abidance.

It should be remembered that entry of *cit* (*ātmā*) in the embodiment is the entry of *cidābhāsa* endowed with self-ignorance being directly experienced as a *samsārī jīva* (vide verse 120). Therefore, the entry is attributed to any of *cit*, *ātmā*, *cidābhāsa* or *jīva*. The purpose served by these two modes of abidance of *cit* are now described.

सामान्यवृत्तिर्या साऽत्र जीवनायोपपद्यते ।
विशेषवृत्तयो देहे शब्दाद्यालोचनोद्यताः ॥१३०॥

अत्र - here (among the two modes of abidance of *cit*) या - the one सामान्यवृत्तिः - which is a general mode of abidance of *cit* सा - that जीवनाय - for living उपपद्यते - is meant for देहे - in the body विशेषवृत्तयः - the specific/particular abidances (of *cit*) शब्दाद्यालोचनोद्यताः - are engaged in the perception of sense-objects such as sound, touch, etc.—(130)

130. Among the two modes of *cit*-abidance the general mode is meant for living whereas the particular modes are engaged in the perception of sense-objects such as sound, touch, etc.

During the sleep the body remains alive. It is the general mode by which *cit* abides therein. But there is no perception of sense-objects or action. The same mode keeps the body alive in waking and dream also. The different sense-perceptions and actions take place in the waking due to specific *cit*-abidance in the body. The same is true during the dream also with a difference. The sense-perceptions and actions during the waking are objective born of interaction with the external world whereas they are subjective in the dream. Thus the entry of *cit* in the body through the means of *cidābhāsa* and its two modes of abidance were described. The

topic of *praveśa-sruti* is being concluded now.

प्रवेशवाक्यं पदशस्तात्पर्याच्च स्फुटीकृतम् ।
तदनुग्राहको न्याय इदानीं प्रविचार्यते ॥१३१॥

प्रवेशवाक्यं - the statement revealing entry पदशः - word by word तात्पर्यात् - with its import च - and स्फुटीकृतम् - was made clear तदनुग्राहकः - its conducive न्यायः - reasoning इदानीं - now प्रविचार्यते - is investigated thoroughly—(131)

131. The statement revealing the entry was explained clearly word by word with its import. Now its conducive reasoning is investigated thoroughly.

ASCERTAINMENT OF THE ENTRY (OF *CIT*)

The author is now undertaking the ascertainment of *cit-praveśa* on the touchstone of reasoning.

Here is a doubt about the entry of *cit* (*ātmā*) in the body.

देवदत्तः परिच्छिन्नः सांशश्चातो गृहं विशेत् ।
निरंशः सर्वगश्चात्मा कथं देहे विशेदसौ ॥१३२॥

देवदत्तः - Mr. Devadatta परिच्छिन्नः - (is) limited सांशः - has limbs (*sāvayava*) च - and अतः - therefore गृहं - the house विशेत् - (he) can enter आत्मा - *ātmā* निरंशः - (is) without limbs, indivisible सर्वगः - all pervasive च - and असौ - that (*ātmā*) देहे - in the body कथम् - how विशेत् - can it

enter—(132)

132. Mr. Devadatta is limited and has limbs. Therefore, he can enter the house. (But) *ātmā* is indivisible (without limbs) and all pervasive. How can it enter the body?

We had already discussed the impossibility of *ātmā* entering the body. The author takes it up now for discussion to ascertain the same beyond any trace of doubt. Here is the answer to the question posed in the verse.

अप्रविष्टस्वभावोऽयं

दिग्देशाद्यनभिप्लुतेः ।

कल्पितोऽस्य प्रवेशः स्याज्जलपात्रार्क

बिम्बवत् ॥१३३॥

दिग्देशाद्यनभिप्लुतेः - because of being not limited by space, direction (दिक्), portion, place (देश), etc., (i.e. time, object) अयं - this (*ātmā*) अप्रविष्टस्वभावः - (is) of such nature that actually it cannot enter anywhere (तथा अपि - even then) अस्य - of this *ātmā* कल्पितः - imaginary प्रवेशः - entry स्यात् - is possible जलपात्रार्कबिम्बवत् - like the entry of disc of sun in a pot filled up with water (through its reflection)—(133)

133. Though *ātmā* actually cannot enter anywhere because of being not limited by space, place, etc., even then its imaginary entry is possible like

the entry of the sun in a water-pot (through its reflection).

Ātmā is not limited by any directions such as east, etc., or by space. It is also not limited by any place, object or time. For example, the sun can enter (apparently) the east at sun-rise. You can enter a place such as a house. A day can enter the time called dawn and dusk. *Ātmā* being totally free from all these limitations its actual entry anywhere is just impossible. This is true. Yet, the following type of entry is possible. The solar or lunar discs cannot enter a mirror. And yet they appear to have entered due to reflection. The space appears to have entered a pot. Similarly, it is experienced that *ātmā* has entered the body, though in reality it is just impossible.

The validity of the illustration of the sun is questioned only to assert it after explaining the nature of an illustration. The objection is: The sun and the water or mirror are at different places. Both are with parts (*sāvayava*). Both face each other, (i.e. union *saṃyoga*) at times and not so, (i.e. separation, *viyoga*) at other times. So the reflection of the sun is possible. But *ātmā* being all pervasive is not far from any *upādhi* such as ignorance or body. *Ātmā* is partless (*niravayava*) and has no union or separation from the *upādhi*. Therefore, the reflection of *ātmā* in the

body is not possible. This is being answered.

विभागाद्यंशवैषम्येऽप्यस्ति

साम्यं विवक्षितम् ।

उपाधिस्थोपलब्ध्यादिसाम्यं केन

निवार्यते ॥१३४॥

विभागाद्यंशवैषम्ये अपि - in spite of disparity of different places, union and separation or having parts विवक्षितम् - intended साम्यं - similarity (between the illustration and the illustrated) अस्ति - is there उपाधिस्थोपलब्ध्यादिसाम्यं - the similarity of availability in *upādhi* (adjunct), etc. केन - by whom निवार्यते - is prevented? – (134)

134. In spite of disparity of different places, union and separation or having parts, the intended similarity between the illustration (*dr̥ṣṭānta*) and the illustrated (*dār̥ṣṭānta*) is (certainly) there. No one can prevent the similarity in terms of availability in *upādhi*, etc.

Total similarity between the illustration and the illustrated can never be there. If it is available, they are two identical entities unfit for illustration. The criterion of an illustration is the similarity of main points under consideration. Whether *ātmā* is near or far from *upādhi* is an irrelevant issue. Without undergoing any change in oneself entry or availability in the

upādhi is one of the main point under consideration. This holds good in the case of both reflection and the entry of *ātmā*. The other two similarities will be told in the next verse. There is no rule that only a limited thing with parts can get reflected because the reflection of indivisible and pervasive space is seen in water or mirror. Further in the case of reflected sun, the same is due to reflection of light-rays seen by the eyes. *Ātmā* is formless and therefore it is not an object of the eyes. The reflection of *ātmā* in the embodiment is the experience of its awareness aspect therein. All along such reflection *ātmā* remains changeless and totally free from embodiment all the time.

The word *ādi*, (etc.), from the above verse is explained now. Or the threefold similarity between the illustration of reflected sun and the entry of *ātmā* in the body is told.

उपाधावुपलभ्यत्वमन्यथात्वेन भासनम् ।
बहुत्वभानमित्येतद् दृष्टदार्ष्टान्तयोः समम् ॥१३५॥

उपधौ - in the *upādhi* उपलभ्यत्वम् - experiencing अन्यथात्वेन - different from what truly is भासनम् - an appearance बहुत्वभानम् - perception of many (in spite of being one) इति एतद् - these three (features) दृष्टदार्ष्टान्तयोः - between the illustration and the illustrated समम् - (are) similar – (135)

135. Experiencing in the *upādhi*, an appearance different from what truly is, and the perception of many (in spite of being one), these three are similarly (features) between the illustration and the illustrated.

The above three features alone explain the vivid aspects of *ātmā* entering the embodiment. The solar disc is in the sky. Yet, it appears as if present in the mirror or water-pool. *Ātmā* though all pervasive appears to be confined in the body. The reflected sun appears differently due to the conditions of the reflecting surface as that of mirror or water. The reflection can be dull, shaky or facing opposite side than the side that the sun faces. So does *ātmā* appear to be *saṃsārī* by taking unto itself the features of *upādhi*, though *asaṃsārī* in reality. One sun appears as if many in accordance with the number of reflecting media. Similarly, *ātmā* though one appears as innumerable *saṃsārī jīvas* in endless *upādhis*.

Out of these three similarities the first one is further explained in the next two verses. They also hint us indirectly how the entry of *ātmā* serves as the first step towards gaining the self-knowledge by convincing us that *ātmā* does exist.

तेजोऽधिकं रवेर्बिम्बमशक्यं द्रष्टुमञ्जसा ।
तथापि जलमध्ये तद्विम्बं सम्यगवेक्ष्यते ॥१३६॥

रवेः - of the sun बिम्बः - the disc अधिकं - highly तेजः - brilliant (अतः - therefore) अञ्जसा - directly द्रष्टुं - to see अशक्यं - impossible तथा अपि - even then जलमध्ये - in the water तद् बिम्बं - its (of the sun) disc सम्यक् - distinctly अवेक्ष्यते - is perceived – (136)

136. The disc of the sun is highly brilliant. Therefore, it is impossible to see it directly. Even then that (solar) disc is distinctly seen in the water.

स्वयंप्रकाश आत्मैवं नोपलभ्योऽनुपाधिकः ।
जडदेहाद्युपाधौ तु विस्पष्टमुपलभ्यते ॥१३७॥

एवं - thus स्वयंप्रकाशः - self-luminous आत्मा - *ātmā* अनुपाधिकः - without the *upādhi* न - not उपलभ्यः - perceptible तु - whereas जडदेहाद्युपाधौ - in the *upādhi* of inert body, etc. विस्पष्टं - very clearly उपलभ्यते - is experienced – (137)

137. Similarly, the self-luminous *ātmā* is not perceptible without the *upādhi* whereas (*ātmā*) is experienced very clearly in the *upādhi* of inert body, etc.

The word ‘similarly’ (*evam*) refers to the illustration of the sun given in the earlier verse. The knowledge of *ātmā* with *upādhi*, (i.e. *sopādhika*) is very helpful in the beginning to know directly the *nirupādhika* (without the *upādhis*) *ātmā*. *Svayamprakāśa* means

self-luminous as the knowledge-principle. The knowledge-principle is truly the nature of *ātmā*. For example, the sun is self-luminous, but the moon is not. It shines because of borrowed light from the sun. The sense-organs, mind and *buddhi*, etc., are luminous in the sense they impart knowledge. But that faculty is borrowed from *Svayamprakāśa ātmā* through *cidābhāsa*.

The gross body, subtle body and the causal body (exclusive state of self-ignorance) are all inert in nature. Yet, they appear to be *sacetana* (conscious). It is due to *cidābhāsa* inhering in them. This is how the presence of *ātmā* is very clearly experienced in the body. The existence of *ātmā* can be known by observing living embodiments, their interaction with the world, birth and the inert dead body.

The *śruti*-statement of entry discussed so far is concluded in the next two verses.

जीवत्वभ्रान्तिरेषैवं प्रत्यग्बोधोपयोगतः ।
जलपात्रार्कसाम्येन प्रवेश इति कल्प्यते ॥१३८॥

एवं - thus प्रत्यग्बोधोपयोगतः - because of being useful to gain self-knowledge एषा - this जीवत्व भ्रान्तिः - the delusion (erroneous notion) of ‘I am a (*saṃsārī*) *jīva*’ प्रवेशः इति - as (in the form of) entry कल्प्यते - is imagined जलपात्रार्कसाम्येन - by

taking recourse to the similarity between the entry of sun in the water-pot and that of *ātmā* in the body – (138)

138. Thus, because of being useful to gain *ātmajñāna*, this delusion of ‘I am a *saṃsārī jīva*’ is imagined as an entry by taking recourse to the similarity between the entry of sun in the water-pot and that of *ātmā* in the body.

Universally we experience the delusion of *saṃsāra*. *Śruti* (Upaniṣads) strives hard by adopting different methods to end it by making us discover directly that our true nature, *ātmā*, is ever-existent pure knowledge-principle totally free from *saṃsāra*. One of such modes of teaching is through the illustration of figurative entry. Truly there is no entry like water entering a pot. It is only a semblance of entry useful to reveal *ātmā* in its true nature.

The very nature of *ātmā* is such that truly it can never enter like the sun in the water-pot. If at all there seems to be some entry it is only false in nature. Seeming observations are certainly used to reveal the truth. This point is highlighted here.

यथा सृष्ट्यादयः कल्पताः

प्रवेशोऽपि तथेक्ष्यताम् ।

युक्त्या नैवोपपद्यन्ते सृष्ट्याद्याः

कल्पितास्ततः ॥१३९॥

यथा - as सृष्ट्यादयः - the Creation, etc. (प्रत्यक्तत्वावबोधाय - for gaining the self-knowledge) कल्पताः - are invented, imagined तथा - so प्रवेशः - the entry अपि - also ईक्ष्यताम् - should be considered सृष्ट्याद्याः - the Creation, etc. युक्त्या - by reasoning न एव - not at all उपपद्यन्ते - (are) possible ततः - therefore (ते - they) कल्पिताः - are invented, imagined – (139)

139. As the Creation, etc., are invented for the purpose of gaining self-knowledge, so the entry also should be considered. The Creation, etc., are not at all possible by reasoning. Therefore they are invented (imagined).

The word *ādi*, (etc.), in the phrase *srṣṭyādayaḥ* or *srṣṭyādyāḥ* stands for sustenance (*sthiti*), dissolution (*laya*), entry (*praveśa*-only in the case of second phrase), the statuses of *jīva* and *saṃsārī*, dispensing of *karmaphalas*, doership (*karṭṛtva*), and status of experiencer (*bhokṭṛtva*). The scriptures invent all such words and also the modes of teaching to reveal the true nature of non-dual *ātmā*/Brahman.

ĀTMĀ IS UNKNOWN IN SPITE OF ENTRY

Though imperceptible, if *ātmā* is so readily available in all the embodiments, it should be easily known by all. But that is not the case. *Śruti* also laments: ‘*tam na paśyanti*’ (people do

not know that *ātmā* directly) (*Br.U.1-4-7*). Further why at all *śruti* is compelled to tell that people are ignorant of their true nature. These topics are now being discussed.

नन्वेवं पर एवात्र

प्रविष्टश्चेत् तदा जनाः ।

पश्यन्त्येतं विना शास्त्रमिति

शास्त्रं वृथा भवेत् ॥१४०॥

ननु - not indeed, here is a doubt एवं - as described in the *praveśa-śruti* अत्र - in these embodiments परः - *ātmā/Paramātmā/Brahman* एव - alone प्रविष्टः - has entered चेद् - if तदा - then जनाः - people शास्त्रं विना - without Vedāntic scripture एतं - this *ātmā/Paramātmā* पश्यन्ति - can see इति (हेतोः) - because of this (reason) शास्त्रं - Vedānta, Upaniṣads वृथा - futile भवेत् - should become – (140)

140. Here is a doubt. As described in the *praveśa-śruti*, if *Paramātmā* (Brahman) himself has entered in these embodiments, then people can directly know him without the scripture (Vedānta). As a result, Vedānta should be redundant.

अहं प्राणिम्यहं वच्मि

पश्याम्येतच्छृणोमि तत् ।

मन्येऽहमित्यहंबुद्ध्याः दृष्ट

एवाखिलैः परः ॥१४१॥

अहं - I प्राणिमि - breathe अहं - I

वच्मि - speak एतत् - this पश्यामि - I see तत् - that शृणोमि - I hear अहं - I मन्ये - think इति - thus अहंबुद्ध्या - by the knowledge in the form of 'I' अखिलैः - by all people परः - *Paramātmā* दृष्टः एव - is certainly known (तर्हि शास्त्रेण किं प्रयोजनम् - then what is the use of scripture?) – (141)

141. 'I breathe, I speak, I see this, I hear that, I think', thus *Paramātmā* is certainly known by all people through the knowledge in the form of 'I'. (Then, what is the use of scriptures?)

If Mr. Devadatta has entered the house, those who have seen him present inside need not take to any other means to verify his entry. Similarly, *Paramātmā* has entered all the embodiments and all of us do experience him as 'I' all along. Then what is the purpose of *śruti*-statements such as 'Oh, Maitreyī, certainly *ātmā* should be known directly'? (*Br.U.2-4-5*) Can we not know him without inquiring into the Upaniṣads, where is the need of *ātma-vicāra* (self-inquiry)? Is it not futile? Earlier it was told that the same principle of Brahman/*Paramātmā* got manifest as *jagat* having name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*) (*Br.U.1-4-7*). In this case also the knowledge of *jagat* happens to be the knowledge of *Paramātmā*. Then why do we need the scriptures? To answer such questions *śruti* has said: People do not

know that *ātmā* directly (*Br.U.1-4-7*). The import of this *śruti*-statement is being elaborated now up to the verse 154.

उच्यते, तन्न पश्यन्ति

प्रविविक्तं स्वतो जनाः।

नो श्वासभाषणे दृष्टिश्रुती वा

स्तोऽस्य नो मतिः ॥१४२॥

उच्यते - (The answer to the question) is told जनाः - people स्वतः - on their own without inquiry into the scriptures तत् - that (*Paramātmā*) प्रविविक्तं - distinct (from breathing, speaking, seeing, etc.) न - do not पश्यन्ति - see, know अस्य - of this *Paramātmā*/Brahman श्वासभाषणे - breathing and speaking दृष्टिश्रुती - seeing and hearing वा - or न उ - not at all स्तः - are मतिः - thinking (also) न उ (अस्ति) - is not at all there – (142)

142. Here is the answer. People on their own without inquiring into the scriptures do not know *Paramātmā*/Brahman distinct from breathing, etc. (The features such as) breathing, speaking, seeing, hearing or thinking do not belong to *Paramātmā* (at all).

It is true that *ātmā* / *Paramātmā* who has entered in the body is known. And yet what is experienced or known is the *ātmā* characterized by *upādhi*, (i.e. *anātmā*) such as gross and subtle bodies. Their features do not belong to *ātmā*.

The breathing is the characteristic feature of *prāṇas* (vital airs) whereas speaking, seeing, etc., belong to the senses, and thinking is that of mind. Knowing these cannot be the knowledge of *ātmā*.

There is another reading of ‘*pravivikṣum*’ in the place of *praviviktam* (distinct). This is in accordance with *Brhadāranyaka-Vārtika-sāra*. ‘*Pravivikṣum*’ refers to *ātmā* who wants to enter in the sense who is still free from *upādhis* (*anātmā*) with their attributes. Another variation in the reading is ‘*tam na*’ as per *Vārtika-sāra* instead of ‘*tanna*’. On the whole this verse points that the true nature of *ātmā* free from *upādhis* is not known without *Vedānta-śāstra*.

The question can be that breathing, etc., belongs to *ātmā* who has entered the body as *cidābhāsa* or *jīva*. Therefore, is it not true that the knowing *ātmā* with these features is the knowledge of its real nature?

प्रविष्टस्यास्ति चेच्छ्वासभाषणाद्यस्तु

तावता ।

प्रवेष्टरि किमायातं शास्त्रबोध्यः

स एव हि ॥१४३॥

श्वासभाषणाद्यः - breathing, speaking, etc. प्रविष्टस्य - of the one who has entered (viz. *cidābhāsa*, *jīva*) अस्ति - is चेत् - if तु - but तावता - by that प्रवेष्टरि - in the one

who enters (*ātmā* / *Paramātmā*) किम् - what (difference) आयातं - comes सः - he (one who enters, *ātmā*) एव - only हि - certainly शास्त्रबोध्यः - (is) the one to be revealed by Vedānta-scriptures—(143)

143. If breathing, speaking, etc., belongs to the one who has entered the body (viz. *cidābhāsa*, *jīva*), let it be so. By that what difference is brought to the *ātmā* who enters? Certainly the *ātmā* who enters only is the one to be revealed by the scriptures (but not the one who has entered).

The one who enters, (i.e. *ātmā*) is totally free from the features of the *upādhi* that is entered and the entry itself. That *nirupādhika ātmā* is revealed by Vedānta. *Ātmā* with *upādhi* is known by everyone without the means of Vedānta. The true nature of *ātmā* is independent of *upādhis*. Only by revealing the true nature of *ātmā*, Vedānta can justify itself as the *pramāṇa* which imparts the knowledge of the unknown. The entered *ātmā*, (i.e. *jīva*) may be *kartā* (doer), *bhoktā* (experiencer) called *samsārī*. But *ātmā* in its true nature is not a *samsārī*. That does not mean that *jīva* and *ātmā* are two totally different entities. One and the same *ātmā* in its true nature is *akartā* (not a doer), *abhoktā* (not an experiencer) whereas with *upādhis* it is *kartā*, *bhoktā*. The topic called *takṣādhikaraṇa* in

Brahmasūtra (2-3-40) clarifies this point.

Notwithstanding the above explanation there can be still room for further doubt based on *śruti*-statement, ‘*sa eṣa iha praviṣṭaḥ*’ (the *ātmā* conditioned by ignorance or the *ātmā* introduced as *Virāt* is the one who has entered here in all the embodiments) (*Br.U.*1-4-7, verse 112). That means one who enters and the one who has entered are identical. This is in accordance with the general observation. Mr. Devadatta is one and the same whether you see him inside or outside the room. This doubt is addressed now.

प्रविष्टस्य प्रवेष्टुश्च रूपाभेदेऽपि भिन्नताम् ।
प्रविष्टत्वाप्रविष्टत्वधर्माभ्यां को निवारयेत्॥१४४॥

प्रविष्टस्य - of the one who has entered (e.g. reflected sun) प्रवेष्टुः - of the one who is going to enter (e.g. the original solar disc) रूपाभेदे अपि च - even though are identical in their true nature प्रविष्टत्वाप्रविष्टत्वधर्माभ्यां - on account of features due to entry or no entry (e.g. features of the reflected sun and the original solar disc (प्रसक्तम् - obtained) भिन्नताम् - distinction कः - who निवारयेत् - can ward off?—(144)

144. Even though the one who has entered (e.g. reflected sun) and the one who is going to enter (e.g. the

original solar disc) are identical in nature, no one can ward off their distinct features due to entry or the absence of it (e.g. the features of the reflected sun and the original solar disc).

The reflected sun has no independent existence apart from the original sun. The true nature of both is one and the same. Yet, for outward appearance the reflection in the water appears to be different from the original sun because of assuming unto itself the features of reflecting medium, the water. Similarly, the true nature of *jīva* and *ātmā* are identical. And yet the universal experience shows that the *jīva* is endowed with all the features of embodiments (as a *saṃsārī*) which is not the case with *ātmā*. Therefore, experiencing the entity *jīva* is not self-knowledge. The knowledge of *ātmā* in its true nature free from all the *upādhis* including self-ignorance alone is *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna*. This is proved with an illustration.

प्रविष्टं येऽत्र पश्यन्ति

नाप्रविष्टममी विदुः।

व्याधत्वेन प्रपश्यन्तो न

विदुः राजपुत्रताम् ॥१४५॥

ये - those अत्र (अविद्यादशायां) - here (in the state of ignorance) प्रविष्टं (आत्मानं) - *ātmā* as *jīva* पश्यन्ति - see, consider अमी - those people अप्रविष्टं (आत्मानं) - *ātmā* in its

true nature न - do not विदुः - know (यथा - as for example) व्याधत्वेन - as a hunter प्रपश्यन्तः (अपि) - even though they know very well राजपुत्रताम् - his status as prince न - do not विदुः - know - (145)

145. Those in the state of ignorance who consider *ātmā* as a *jīva* do not know it in its true nature. As for example even though, those who know very well that a specific person is a hunter, they do not know him in reality as a prince.

Those who know *prima facie jīva* in the state of self-ignorance know not *ātmā* in its true nature unless, they get rid of the ignorance. This is explained with an illustration. A king dies prematurely while fighting with the enemy. The child-prince was rescued and by fate was brought up by a hunter. He grew up as hunter; considered himself as a hunter. But in reality he was a prince. Similarly, though we know *ātmā* as *kartā* (doer), *bhoktā* (experiencer) *saṃsārī jīva*, due to ignorance, its knowledge as *sat, cit, ānanda*, and non-dual in reality is still unknown.

The distinction between the results of erroneous notion and the correct vision is drawn in the next two verses to make it very clear.

व्याधोऽयमित्यसावुक्तिर्योजयेत् प्राणसंकटे ।
राजदेवादिकोक्तिस्तु भवेद् बहुफलप्रदा ॥१४६॥

अयम् - this (child) व्याधः - is a hunter इति असौ उक्तिः - such a statement प्राणसंकटे - in the risk or danger to life योजयेत् - would expose राजदेवादिकोक्तिः - the statement, 'you are a king, Lord' तु - whereas बहुफलप्रदा - very highly rewarding भवेत् - would become - (146)

146. The statement that this child is a hunter would expose his life to risk or danger (while hunting) whereas the statement, 'you are a king, Lord' would become very highly rewarding.

तद्वत् प्रविष्टदृष्टिर्या सा

संसारे नियोजयेत् ।

अप्रविष्टात्मदृष्टिस्तु मोचयेत्

सर्वसंकटात् ॥१४७॥

तद्वत् - similarly या - the one which is प्रविष्टदृष्टिः - the notion of having entered, i.e. the notion of being a *jīva* सा - that (notion) संसारे - in *saṃsāra* नियोजयेत् - would expose तु - whereas अप्रविष्टात्मदृष्टिः - the knowledge of *ātmā* in its true nature सर्वसंकटात् - from the calamitous *saṃsāra* मोचयेत् - would liberate - (147)

147. Similarly the notion of being a *jīva* would expose us to *saṃsāra* whereas the knowledge that *ātmā* in its true nature would liberate the individual (*jīva*) from the calamitous *saṃsāra*.

So long as the child-prince is told that he is a hunter, he will act

accordingly. As he grows up he will roam in the forest and hunt for wild animals wherein one's life happens to be always in danger. On the contrary if convinced that he is a prince, the ruler of his subjects, he would try hard and find a way out to regain the ancestral kingdom and rule it. Similarly, if we are told that we are *kartā*, *bhoktā*, etc., we will continue *karmas*, and sense-pleasure to get subjected to transmigration as a *jīva*. Instead, if our true nature *ātmā* is pointed out we will get rid of *saṃsāra* once forever by directly discovering our *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda* nature. *Saṃsāra* is calamitous. Direct *ātmajñāna*/*Brahmajñāna* is total freedom from it.

Knowing *jīva*, the entered *ātmā* in its *saṃsārī* nature is not *ātmajñāna*. The *śruti* censures: '*akṛtsnaḥ hi saḥ*' (the entered *ātmā* who breathes, etc., is limited / deficient) (*Br.U.1-4-7*). The knowledge of *nirupādhika ātmā* alone is the correct knowledge.

अतोऽप्रविष्टदृष्ट्यर्थं निन्दते हि प्रविष्टदृक् ।
प्रविष्टदर्शनम् यत् स्यान्न तद्दर्शनमात्मनः ॥१४८॥

अतः - therefore अप्रविष्टदृष्ट्यर्थं - so as to reveal the knowledge (दृष्टि) of *nirupādhika* (अप्रविष्ट - not entered) *ātmā* प्रविष्टदृक् - the knower (दृक्) of actual *jīva* (प्रविष्ट) as *ātmā* हि - indeed निन्दते - is censured यत् - whatever that प्रविष्टदर्शनम् -

the knowledge (दर्शनम्) of *jīva* (entered *ātmā*) स्यात् - is तत् - that आत्मनः - of *pratyagātmā* दर्शनम् - knowledge न - (is) not –(148)

148. Therefore, so as to reveal the knowledge of *nirupādhika-ātmā*, indeed the knower of actual *jīva* is censured. The knowledge of actual *jīva* is not the knowledge of *pratyagātmā*.

The reason implied in the word *ataḥ* (therefore) refers to the statement, ‘according to *Vedānta-śāstra* a *mumukṣu* should strive hard to gain the direct knowledge of *nirupādhika-ātmā*, (i.e. not entered, *apraviṣṭaḥ*) because that only liberates’. What we know now about *jīva* is only a delusion and not the true knowledge of *ātmā*. Thus the concept of knowing actual *saṃsārī jīva* as the true knowledge of *ātmā* is despised. This enables the *mumukṣu* to take the accurate pursuit of gaining *ātmajñāna*.

There is a possibility of an objection to the above statement. After all the one who has entered in the form of *jīva* is none other than *ātmā* itself. Then how is it possible that the knowledge of *jīva* is not the knowledge of *ātmā*? The answer is:

स्वतः परोऽपि देहादौ प्रविष्टोऽकात्स्न्यदोषतः ।
दूषितो दर्शनं तस्य न भवेत् परदर्शनम् ॥१४९॥

(आत्मा - *ātmā*) स्वतः - in its true nature परः अपि - is although *Paramātmā* देहादौ - into the body, etc. प्रविष्टः - having entered अकात्स्न्य दोषतः - due to defects of incompleteness दूषितः (भाति) - appears defiled (अतः - therefore) तस्य - of the entered *ātmā* (*jīva*) दर्शनं - knowledge परदर्शनम् - the knowledge of *Paramātmā* न भवेत् - cannot be –(149)

149. Although *ātmā* in its true nature is *Paramātmā*, it appears defiled on entry into the body, etc., due to the defects of incompleteness (cast by the *upādhis*). Therefore, the knowledge of the entered *ātmā* (*jīva*) cannot be the knowledge of *Paramātmā*/Brahman.

The limitations or the defects of incompleteness cast by the *upādhis* can never be the intrinsic features of *ātmā*. The sun reflected in the muddy water appears to be dull and wavering. You cannot conclude that the sun has become so. The dullness, etc., are the features of water cast on the actual reflection, the reflected sun. All the attributes of the embodiments wherein *ātmā* enters belong to the reflection of *ātmā* called *cidābhāsa* or *jīva*. That is why the knowledge of *jīva* cannot be that of *ātmā* /*Paramātmā*. Those who argue that there is no need of a separate *ātmānubhava* because we have 24x7 *anubhava* (experience) of *ātmā* will be required to

consider the above fact. The experience that they are talking about is that of *sopādhika ātmā* which is a *bhrama* (erroneous experience) in the realm of *samsāra*. It is not the real nature of *ātmā*.

The *śruti* itself points out the changing features of entered *ātmā* called *jīva* in the form of *cidābhāsa* : ‘the entered *ātmā* (*jīva*) is called (*nāma bhavati*) the vital air (*prāṇa*) while breathing (*prāṇanneva*), the organ of speech (*vāk*) while speaking (*vadam*), the eyes (*caṅsuḥ*) while seeing (*paśyan*), the ear (*śrotram*) while hearing (*śṛṇvan*), the mind (*manaḥ*) while thinking (*manvānaḥ*). The same (*tāni etāni*) are just the functional names (*karmanāmāni eva*) of the entered *ātmā* (*jīva*) (*Br.U.* 1-4-7). These names indicate certain manifestations, but do not reveal the true nature of *ātmā*. This *śruti* portion of the functional names of *ātmā* while in the embodiment, are enumerated till the verse 153.

अकृत्स्नत्वं यथास्य स्याद्

व्यवहारे तथोच्यते ।

श्वासयोगात् प्राणिता स्याद्

वक्ता वदनयोगतः ॥१५०॥

व्यवहारे - during the interaction with the world अस्य - of this entered *ātmā* अकृत्स्नत्वं - imperfection यथा - as स्यात् - happens, manifests तथा - so उच्यते - is told, described श्वासयोगात् - by the association

(identification) with respiration प्राणिता - one who breathes स्याद् - becomes वदनयोगतः - because of association with mouth, (i.e. the organ of speech) वक्ता (स्याद्) - becomes the speaker – (150)

150. The manner in which the imperfection of this entered *ātmā* (*jīva*) manifests during its interaction with the world is described (now). By the association (identification) with respiration (it) becomes the one who breathes; because of association with the organ of speech, becomes the speaker.

द्रष्टा दर्शनयोगेन श्रोता श्रवणयोगतः ।

मन्ता मननयोगेन स्पृष्टादौ योजयेत् तथा ॥१५१॥

दर्शनयोगेन - by the association with seeing द्रष्टा - the seer श्रवणयोगतः - by the association with hearing श्रोता - the hearer मननयोगेन ; by the association with thinking मन्ता - the thinker (स्यात् - it becomes) तथा - in the same manner स्पृष्टादौ - in the case of one who touches, etc. योजयेत् - it should be fixed – (151)

151. (The entered *ātmā* becomes) the seer, hearer and the thinker by the association with seeing, hearing and thinking respectively. In the same manner it should be fixed in the case of one who touches, etc.

एवं चाहं प्राणितेति ज्ञाते वक्त्राद्यसंग्रहः ।

वक्ताहमित्यपि ज्ञाते प्राणित्रादेरसंग्रहः ॥१५२॥

एवं च - further in this manner अहं - I (am) प्राणिता - the one who breathes इति - so ज्ञाते (सति) - when known वक्त्राद्यसंग्रहः (भवति) - the speaker, etc., get excluded अहं - I (am) वक्ता - a speaker इति अपि - so also ज्ञाते (सति) - when known प्राणिनादेः - of the one who breathes, etc. असंग्रहः (भवति) - get excluded. – (152)

152. Further, in the same manner, when it is known that I am the one who breathes - the speaker, etc., get excluded. So also when it is known that I am a speaker, the one who breathes, etc., get excluded.

The followers of *Cārvāka* school of thought consider the physical body as *ātmā*. There are some others who take the senses as *ātmā*. All these people consider *ātmā* to be limited, deficient, imperfect. At the backdrop of these notions the observation in the above three verses shows that any one of those who breathe, speak, see, hear, think, etc., cannot be any one of the rest. One and the same entity viz. the entered *ātmā* cannot be all of them unless the same entity plays different roles with different costumes of different *upādhis*. Then the question is: ‘what is the true nature of the one who plays these different roles?’ Unless that entity is discovered the knowledge of any of these roles is always incomplete. It is not the correct

knowledge. This topic referred to in the verse 152 is explained with an illustration.

यतिदीक्षितचोरादिभूमिकां धारयेन्नटः ।
तत्र दृष्टे दीक्षितेऽन्ये द्रष्टा यत्यादयो न हि ॥१५३॥

नटः - an actor यतिदीक्षितचोरादिभूमिकां - the role (भूमिका) of *sannyāsī* (यतिः), sacrificial priest (दीक्षितः ऋत्विक्), thief (चोर), etc. (आदि) धारयेत् - may assume / play तत्र - among them दीक्षिते दृष्टे (सति) - when the role of sacrificial priest is seen अन्ये - the other द्रष्टा यत्यादयः न हि - the roles of *sannyāsī*, etc., are not seen – (153)

153. An actor may assume the roles of *sannyāsī*, sacrificial priest, thief, etc. Among them when the role of sacrificial-priest is seen, the other roles of *sannyāsī*, etc., are not seen.

A *dīkṣita* is the one who is initiated to perform religious ceremonies such as sacrifice, etc. He can be a sacrificial priest (*ṛtvik*) also. Though the actor may play different roles, he is none of them. He is present in all of them, but none belongs to him intrinsically. He is totally free from them. So is *ātmā* totally free from all the embodiments and their features. Therefore, the knowledge of seer, hearer, etc., cannot be the knowledge of *ātmā*. Thus the censure of knowing *jīva* itself as the complete knowledge of *ātmā* is now concluded.

प्राणनादिकृतां मध्ये एकैकं

यः समीक्ष्यते ।

न स जानात्यकृत्स्नत्वा-

देतदीक्षितवस्तुनः ॥१५४॥

(तथा - similarly) यः - the one who प्राणनादिकृतां मध्ये - among those who breathe, etc. एकैकं - one by one (आत्म इति - as *ātmā*) समीक्ष्यते - sees सः - he (पूर्ण आत्मानं - complete *ātmā*, *Paramātmā*) न - does not जानाति - know एतदीक्षितवस्तुनः - of the entity seen by this person अकृत्स्नत्वात् - because of being incomplete/limited - (154)

154. The one who sees one by one among those who breathe, etc., as *ātmā*, does not know the complete *ātmā*, (*Paramātmā*) because the entity (such as one who breathes, sees, hears, etc.), seen by that person is incomplete (limited).

Thus the knowledge of entered *ātmā* endowed with any one or more functions attributed to it by the embodiment cannot be that of true (*nirupādhika*) *ātmā*. *Ātmā* in its true nature is always free from embodiments, their features and functions even when it appears as if having *upādhis*.

Whatever *śruti* describes including *karmas* and *upāsanas* is aimed directly or indirectly at revealing *ātmajñāna*/*Brahmajñāna* for gaining *mokṣa* (liberation). The purpose of describing

the manifest *jagat* with its relevance to the further stage of self-inquiry is now told.

इत्युक्तं व्याकृतं सर्वं जडाजडविभागवत् ।
आरोपोऽयं तन्निवृत्त्यै विद्यासूत्रमिहोच्यते ॥१५५॥

इति - thus सर्वं - the entire जडाजडविभागवत् - having inert and sentient divisions व्याकृतं - the manifest *jagat* उक्तं - is told अयं - this (is) आरोपः - superimposition तन्निवृत्त्यै - for its termination इह - in the same context of superimposition विद्यासूत्रं - an aphorism on *ātmavidyā* (*ātmajñāna*) उच्यते - is cited - (155)

155. Thus the entire manifest *jagat* having inert and sentient divisions is told. Till now it is a superimposition. In this context to terminate it (superimposition) an aphorism on *ātmavidyā* is cited.

This Upaniṣad described first the *jagat* in the unmanifest (*avyākṛta*) form. Then the manifest (*vyākṛta*) *jagat* having name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*) was elaborated. This happens to be the inert world. Thereafter the entry of *ātmā* in all the embodiments was explained to show the phenomenon of sentience in the inert world. Truly speaking, there is no *avyākṛta* or *vyākṛta jagat* intrinsically belonging to the non-dual *ātmā*/*Brahman*. And yet moment by moment

we do experience the world. The only answer to this riddle is that *jagat* never exists truly, but its appearance is falsely attributed or superimposed (*āropita*, *adhyasta*) on *ātmā*/Brahman. It is like a rope that can never be a snake and yet may appear to be so in semi-darkness. Or a person suffering from cataract sees a sea-shell glittering in the sunshine as a piece of silver. A shell can never be silver. Even then it appears to be silver. These are the instances of superimposition or false attribution called *āropa*, *adhyāropa* or *adhyāsa*.

Āropa (superimposition) is the mistaken appearance or cognition of an entity on a basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) that is different from its own. For example, seeing silver in a piece of silver is knowledge. But seeing silver in a shell (distinct from silver) is an error. It is an instance of *āropa* (*adhyāsa*). Such as erroneous vision can be set right by the direct knowledge of the basis where the mistaken entity is superimposed. Seeing the rope in the bright light alone can end the mistaken appearance of the snake. The sight of the shell at close quarters only can terminate the wrong notion that it is silver. Such termination or ending of false entity is called *apavāda* (refutation). So is the case with the knowledge of *ātmā*. The *avyākṛta* which includes *māyā*/self-ignorance and the

entire *vyākṛta* (manifest *jagat*) or in other words, the entire *anātmā* (not self) is an *āropa*, a false appearance in the place of *ātmā*. Gaining the direct knowledge of *ātmā*/ Brahman is its *apavāda* (refutation) only to discover that the superimposed *jagat* was never there. In Vedānta, this method (*nyāya*) is called *adhyāropāpavāda-nyāya*. The Brahman which is entirely free from the Creation (*niṣprapañcam*) is unfolded (*prapañcyate*) by the method (*nyāya*) of *adhyāropāpavāda*.

VIDYĀSŪTRA (ĀTMĀ ITI EVA UPĀSĪTA)

Having concluded the narration of entire *anātmā* that is superimposed (*āropita*) on *ātmā*, the means of its termination (*apavāda*) is being advised. The author names it ‘*Vidyāsūtram*’ (an aphorism on *ātmavidyā*). It refers to the *śruti*-statement, ‘*ātmā iti eva upāsīta*’ (*pratyagātmā*) (alone should be known directly in its true nature) (*Br. U. 1-4-7*). This *sūtra* will be quoted in the next verse. Its thorough elaboration will continue upto the verse 250.

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 composition, has a clear and unambiguous meaning, contains the

essence or main points and at times yields more than one meaning. It is flawless and free of superfluous words.

In the present context the word *sūtra* can be viewed as a summarized statement (*saṅgraha - vākya*). The phrase, ‘*ātmā iti eva upāsīta*’ was first named *Vidyāsūtra* by the famous glosser Ānandgiri (1260-1320 CE) who has authored glosses on entire *prasthāna-trayī bhāṣya* of Ādi Śaṅkarācārya. Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni (1296-1386 CE), the author of this text has followed suit. The *Vidyāsūtra* is introduced now with an assurance that the same will be elaborated at length.

आत्मेत्येवमुपासीतेत्येतत्
सूत्रमुदाहृतम् ।

उक्त्वा पदार्थं सूत्रानुग्राहको
न्याय उच्यते ॥१५६॥

आत्मा - *Pratyagātmā* इति - in its true nature एवम् (i.e. एव) - exclusive of all *anātmā* उपासीत - should be known directly इति - so एतत् (वाक्यम्) - this sentence सूत्रम् - aphorism on *ātma vidyā* उदाहृतम् - is said पदार्थं - the word-meaning उक्त्वा - having told सूत्रानुग्राहकः न्यायः - the reasoning (*nyāya*) that promotes (ascertains) the *sūtra* उच्यते - is explained –(156)

156. The sentence ‘*Pratyagātmā*, exclusive of all *anātmā* in its true nature

should be known directly’ is said to be an aphorism on *ātma vidyā*. (First), having given its word meaning, (then) the reasoning that ascertains the *sūtra* is (going to be) explained.

The Upaniṣad has the word ‘*eva*’ instead of ‘*evam*’ as found in this text. The author has taken this liberty to conform to prosody. Later the meaning of the word ‘*eva*’ only will be explained.

From the next verse onwards the word-meanings of this *sūtra* will be elaborated up to the verse 174. Thereafter the exact import of the *sūtra* will be ascertained with corroborative reasoning.

VIDYĀSŪTRA - THE WORD ĀTMĀ EXPLAINED

Four definitions of the word *ātmā* are being enumerated now and each of them will be explained with the corroboration of *śruti-pramāṇa* upto the verse 167.

यच्चाप्नोति यदादत्ते

यच्चात्ति विषयानिह ।

यच्चास्य सन्ततो भावस्तस्मादात्मेति

कथ्यते ॥१५७॥

यत् - because आप्नोति - (it) pervades the *jagat* च - and यत् - because आदत्ते - (it) withdraws the *jagat* (unto itself), यत् - because च - and इह - here in this world विषयान् - sense-objects अत्ति - (it) eats, i.e.

experiences यत् - because च - and अस्य -
of this सन्ततः - everlasting, eternal भावः -
existence तस्मात् - therefore आत्मा इति -
ātmā कथ्यते - is called – (157)

157. *Ātmā* is called so because it
(i) pervades the *jagat*, (ii) withdraws the
jagat unto itself, (iii) experiences sense-
objects in the world (iv) and lasts forever
(eternally).

The word ‘yat’ means ‘yasmāt’ (because). This quotation is cited from *Liṅgapurāṇa* (1-70-96). It is also quoted in *kaṭhabhāṣya* (2-1-1). The word *ātmā* is derived in four different ways:

- i. A rope is the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of the false snake superimposed on it. In this sense the rope pervades in and through the mistaken snake. So is *ātmā* the basis of entire *jagat* constituted of name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*). Obviously *ātmā* as the basis pervades (*āpnoti*) the entire *jagat*. Thus it is called *ātmā* (*āpnoti iti ātmā*).
- ii. *Ādatte* means *saṃharati* - withdraws or destroys. During the sleep or *pralaya* (dissolution) the entire *jagat* gets merged in *ātmā*. The effect merges in its cause on destruction. Thus *ātmā* becomes the cause of *jagat*. In this sense that which withdraws (*ādatte*) unto itself the *jagat* is called *ātmā*.
- iii. The verb *atti* means ‘eats: Here it is used figuratively in the sense of experiencing. The experiences of sense-objects, whether joys or sorrow are experienced through the channels of thoughts (*antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis*) which need to be illumined (made known) by *cidābhāsa*. The *cidābhāsa* in *antaḥkaraṇa* originates from *cit* (*ātmā*) which is the self-experiencing principle (*anubhava-svarūpa*). Therefore, that which experiences (*atti*) the sense-objects, as the one who enables all experiences is called *ātmā*.
- iv. The *sat* nature of *ātmā* shows that it is the ever-existent principle without any changes (*vikāra*) in itself. Whatever that is falsely imagined (e.g. the snake on a rope) has no existence apart from the continuous existence of its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*). Because of such continuous existence forever (*santataḥ bhāvah*) in and through the false *jagat*, the word *ātmā* gets justified.

The first definition of *ātmā*, ‘yat | pervade’ is explained in the next two
ca āpnoti’ derived from the verb ‘āp-to | verses.

व्याप्नोत्यनवशेषेण सर्पादीन्
स्रगिवाखिलान् ।

कल्पनाधिष्ठानतया प्रत्यङ्ङात्मा
भवेत् ततः ॥१५८॥

स्रक् - a garland अखिलान् - all सर्पादीन् - the snake, etc. व्याप्नोति - pervades इव - like प्रत्यक् - the innermost entity *cit* कल्पनाधिष्ठानतया - as the basis of all that is imagined (on itself) अनवशेषेण - entirely, without leaving anything whatsoever (व्याप्नोति - pervades) ततः - from that आत्मा - the word *ātmā* भवेत् - is (derived) –(158)

158. Just as a garland pervades all the entities such as snake, etc., (superimposed on itself) so does the innermost entity *cit* (pure awareness) pervade completely all that is imagined (on itself) as their basis. From that the word *ātmā* is derived.

A garland lying in an insufficient light may be mistaken by people according to their imagination as a snake or a stick or a crack in the ground or an impression marked by the urine of a bull on a dusty road. Irrespective of what is imagined, the garland is present in and through all of them as their basis without any exception. A superimposed entity has no existence apart from its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*). Similarly, the *cit* pervades (*āpnoti*) the entire *jagat* as its basis.

Therefore, it is called *ātmā*.

The *Nṛsiṃhottara-tāpanīyopaniṣad* also confirms that *ātmā* whose nature is *sat* (ever-existence principle) is the *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis) of the entire *jagat*.

सर्वाधिष्ठानसन्मात्र इत्यशेषजगत्प्रति ।
अधिष्ठानतया व्याप्तिं श्रुतिर्ब्रूते सदात्मनः ॥१५९॥

सर्वाधिष्ठानसन्मात्रः इति - by the phrase ‘*sarvādhiṣṭhāna-sanmātraḥ*’ (*ātmā* having *sat* nature is the basis of everything) श्रुतिः - *śruti* सदात्मनः - of the ever-existence (*sat*) principle *ātmā* अशेषजगत्प्रति - with respect to the entire *jagat* (world) अधिष्ठानतया - as its basis व्याप्तिं - permeation, universal presence ब्रूते - tell, declares –(159)

159. The *śruti* by its statement ‘*sarvādhiṣṭhāna-sanmātraḥ*’ (*Nṛ.U. Tā.U. 2*) declares the universal presence (permeation) of *ātmā* having the *sat* nature as the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of the entire world.

The *Nṛsiṃhottara-tāpanīyopaniṣad* while describing the nature of *ātmā* in its second chapter, declares that it is the principle which is *sat* and the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of the entire Creation. This corroborates the first definition of *ātmā*.

The second definition of *ātmā*, ‘*yat ca ādatte*’ derived from the verb ‘*ā-dā*-to seize, withdraw’ is explained in the next two verses.

स्वचिदाभासमोहेन तदुत्थान्
अखिलान् यतः ।

आदत्तेऽनात्मनः प्राज्ञस्तत
आत्मेति तं विदुः ॥१६०॥

यतः - because प्राज्ञः - sleeper consciousness (*ātma* in the state of deep sleep) स्वचिदाभासमोहेन - through the means of self-ignorance (*moha*) endowed with the reflection (*ābhāsa*) of its (*sva*) true nature (*cit*) तदुत्थान् - born of ignorance (अविद्योत्थान्) । अखिलान् - all अनात्मनः - not self (स्वापादौ) - during the sleep and dissolution/*pralaya*) आदत्ते - withdraws unto itself ततः - therefore तं - it आत्मा इति - (by the word) *ātma* विदुः - (wise people) know – (160)

160. Because *prājña* (sleeper consciousness) through the means of self-ignorance endowed with its *cidābhāsa* withdraws (*ādatte*) unto itself (during the sleep and *pralaya*) all *anātmā* born of ignorance, therefore wise people know it by the word ‘*ātma*’.

All names and forms with embodiment and their experiences are withdrawn during the deep sleep. Therein they are merged in *ātma* conditioned by ignorance having *cidābhāsa*. We experience this during our sleep at the individual levels. Again they emerge during waking and dream states. The total dissolution (*pralaya*)

and the emergence of Creation is experienced by *Īśvara*. Because of such withdrawal (*ādāna*) unto oneself the *sat cit ānanda* (pure awareness) principle is called ‘*ātma*’. The *Praśnopaniṣad* (4-7) confirms such experience (*ādāna*) in *ātma* during the sleep.

परे आत्मनि सर्वेऽपि सम्प्रतिष्ठन्ते एकले ।
पृथिव्याद्या अनात्मान इति चाथर्वणे वचः ॥१६१॥

सर्वे अपि - all without any exception पृथिव्याद्याः - the earth, etc. अनात्मानः - the not self एकले - in the non-dual परे आत्मनि - (in) *Paramātmā* सम्प्रतिष्ठन्ते - abide (during the sleep) इति च - so वचः - a statement अथर्वणे - in the *Atharva-veda*, (i.e. in the *Praśnopaniṣad*) (अस्ति - is there) – (161)

161. There is a statement in the *Atharva-veda* that all *anātmā*, the earth, etc., without any exception, abide (during the sleep) in the non-dual *Paramātmā*.

The *Praśnopaniṣad* gives an illustration in this context. Just as birds perch on the tree during the night so does the individual world of *anātmā* abide in *ātma*. This statement of the Upaniṣad is with respect to sleep, but by implication (*upalakṣaṇa*) it applies to *pralaya* (dissolution) also. The entire *jagat* merges in *ātma* during the *pralaya* also.

The third definition of *ātma*, ‘*yat ca atti viṣayān*’ derived from the

verb 'ad (अद्) - to eat' is explained in the next two verses.

आत्माभासाः पराचीना

धीवृत्तीर्विषयोन्मुखाः ।

प्रत्यङ्ङत्ति यतोऽतोऽसावात्मेत्युक्तो

मनीषिभिः ॥१६२॥

यतः - because प्रत्यङ्ङ - the innermost *sat cit ānanda* (pure awareness) principle आत्माभासाः - those (thoughts) endowed with *cidābhāsa* पराचीनाः - extrovert, (i.e.) विषयोन्मुखाः - eager to indulge in the sense-objects धीवृत्तीः - *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* (thoughts) अत्ति - eats, i.e. experiences अतः - therefore असौ - it आत्मा - *ātmā* इति - so मनीषिभिः - by the wise persons उक्तः - called—(162)

162. The innermost *sat, cit, ānanda* (pure awareness) principle experiences (all) the extrovert thoughts endowed with *cidābhāsa* indulging in the sense-objects. Therefore it is called '*ātmā*'.

The words *ātmābhāsāḥ, parācīnāḥ, dhīvṛttīḥ* and *viṣayonmukhaḥ* are in accusative plural. The word *parācīnāḥ* (extrovert) is further explained by the term *viṣayonmukhaḥ* (directed towards or eagerly indulging in the sense-objects). We have seen how an experience takes place while discussing the verse 157. The specific *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttis* depicting the unique features of

viṣayas (sense-objects) indispensably have to be revealed (made known) by the only self-experiencing (*anubhava-svarūpa*) principle *ātmā* through *cidābhāsa*. Thus no experience is ever possible without their illumination by *ātmā*. This is what is termed figuratively as *atti* (eats, devours) leading to the derivation of the word *ātmā*. *Ātmā* enables all experiences will be more clear from the *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā* (1-3) quoted in the next verse.

विश्वो हि स्थूलभुङ्ङित्यं तैजसः

प्रविविक्तभुक् ।

आनन्दभुक् तथा प्राज्ञ इति

चागमशासनम् ॥१६३॥

विश्वः - the waker consciousness हि - so it is well-known in the scriptures, indeed नित्यं - always, so long as *ātmā* is *viśva* स्थूलभुक् - (is) the experiencer of gross sense-objects तैजसः - the dreamer consciousness प्रविविक्तभुक् - (is) the experiencer of subtle sense-objects (projected by *vāsanās*) distinct from the gross ones तथा - so also प्राज्ञः - the sleeper consciousness आनन्दभुक् - (is) the experiencer of *ātmasukha* (happiness that is one's true nature) in the absence of sorrows that hinder it इति च - so is आगमशासनम् - the scriptural or Vedic teaching—(163)

163. Indeed the *viśva* (waker

consciousness) always experiences the gross sense-objects. The *taijasa* (the dreamer consciousness) is the experiencer of the subtle sense-objects distinct from the gross ones. So also the *prājña* (sleeper consciousness) is the experiencer of *ātmasukha* (happiness that is one's true nature) in the absence of sorrows that hinder it. So is the Vedic teaching (*Mā.Kā.1-3*).

For the sake of teaching or, imparting *ātmajñāna*, *ātmā* is said to have four *pādas* (*viśva*, *taijasa*, *prājña* and *turīya*) in the sense four facets of one and the same entity. When the first three facets are ended from our cognition what remains is the true nature of *ātmā* called the fourth facet (*turīya*) relatively. It is the independent basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of earlier three states of consciousness. *Ātmā* identifying with the waking state (as its locus of identification) is *viśva*. Because of its indulgence in the external gross world it is *sthūlabhuk* - the experiencer of gross sense-objects. The same *ātmā* when identifies itself with the dream state born of waking state impressions (*vāsanās*) becomes the *taijasa* and experiences the subtle *viśayas* projected by one's *vāsanās* latent in the mind. *Prājña* is *ātmā* identified with the deep sleep state. The sleep experience is always effortless. Therein one experiences *ātmasukha* (the

happiness that is the true nature of *ātmā*) because in sleep the sorrows which hinder it are absent. Of course the self-ignorance still persists until self-knowledge is gained. This verse quoted from *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā* (1-3) proves that the specific experiences are enabled invariably by *ātmā* only in all the three states of consciousness. Thus the definition '*atti iti ātmā*' (that which eats/experiences is *ātmā*) holds good. As for the *turīya* (the fourth state) the earlier three states end therein totally including the self-ignorance. What remains is the self-experiencing principle (*anubhava-svarūpa*) *ātmā* in its true nature. That is *mokṣa* (liberation).

The fourth definition of *ātmā*, '*yat ca asya santataḥ bhāvah*' derived from the verb '*at* (अत्) - to be continuous' is elaborated in the next two verses.

अव्यावृत्ताननुगतः पूर्णः

स्वात्मन्यवस्थितः ।

यतोऽस्य सन्ततो भावस्तस्मादात्मेति

शब्दते ॥१६४॥

यतः - because अस्य - of this entity (*sat, cit, ānanda*) सन्ततः - continuous भावः - existence, presence अव्यावृत्ताननुगतः - (is) neither different from (*vyāvṛtta*), nor abiding in (*anugata*) anything पूर्णः - complete स्वात्मनि - in one's true nature अवस्थितः - one who abides तस्मात् -

therefore आत्मा - *ātmā* इति - so शब्दते - is called—(164)

164. The entity (*sat, cit, ānanda*) is called *ātmā* because it (i) has continuous existence (or universal presence), (ii) is neither different from nor abiding in anything, (iii) is complete and (iv) abides in its true nature, (i.e. is self-existent).

Ātmā is *pūrṇa* (complete) because there is nothing in reality other than it. It is non-dual. *Ātmā* is *avyāvṛtta* since it is not different (*vyāvṛtta*) from any of the falsely superimposed entity in the *jagat*. It is *ananugata* in the sense it does not abide in (*anugata*) anything for its existence. This is what *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavadgītā*, ‘all objects and beings abide in me for their existence, but I do not abide in them’ (*B.G.9-4*). Such an entity alone can be complete. That complete (*pūrṇa*) *Paramātmā* abides in itself only. It is self-existent.

In *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (7-24-1) the sage Nārada asks his *guru* : ‘where does *Bhūmā* (Brahman, *Paramātmā*) abide?’ The sage Sanatkumāra answers that it abides in its glory (*sve mahimni*) from the worldly standpoint, but in reality it is not so (*na mahimni*). That shows that *ātmā/Paramātmā* is self-existent. This is described here by the phrase, *svātmani avasthitaḥ* (abides in its

true nature). This is the changeless nature of *ātmā*. *Ātmā* may appear as *sthūlabhuk* (experiencer of gross world) in the waking, as *praviviktabhuk* (experiencer of subtle things) in the dream, and *ānandabhuk* (experiencer of *ātmasukha*) in the deep sleep state. Even then *ātmā* is changeless (*kūṭastha*). The basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) does not change because of the superimposed entities on it. The rope is unaffected by the snake superimposed on it. This is what is called continuous or universal changeless existence (*santataḥ bhāvaḥ*) of *ātmā* in and through the superimposed *jagat* totally unaffected by it. The basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) is *sat*, and rest all appearances are false beings superimposed (*adhyasta*). *Viśva, taijasa* and *prājña* are the false appearances of *ātmā* whereas its true nature is displayed in *turīya*.

The *ṛk* quoted in the next verse corroborates the continuous existence (*santataḥ-bhāva*) nature of *ātmā*.

तद्विष्णोरिति मन्त्रोऽपि विष्णोस्तत्परमं पदं ।
चक्षुर्वदाततं व्योम्नि व्याचष्टे प्रत्यगात्मनि॥१६५॥

तद् विष्णोः इति मन्त्रः - the *mantra* beginning with ‘*tad Viṣṇoḥ*’ अपि - also व्योम्नि - in the sky आततं - that pervades every where चक्षुवद् - like the sight विष्णोः - of *Viṣṇu* (all pervasive *Paramātmā*) तत् - that परमम् पदम् - the most exalted nature free from cause and effect प्रत्यगात्मनि

(एव व्याप्तम् इति) - (pervades) the *Pratyagātmā*-nature, so व्याचष्टे - tells –(165)

165. The *mantra* beginning with ‘*tad Viṣṇoḥ*’ also tells that the most exalted nature of *Viṣṇu* (all pervasive *Paramātmā*) which is free from cause and effect pervades the *Pratyagātmā*-nature like the sight pervades the entire sky.

The quoted *mantra* is: ‘*Tad Viṣṇoḥ paramam padam sadā paśyanti sūrayaḥ divi iva cakṣuḥ ātatam (R̥gveda, maṇḍala 1, sūkta 22, mantra 20)*. This *mantra* also appears at the end of *Nṛsiṃha-pūrva-tāpanīya-Upaniṣad*. *Viṣṇu* is the deity that sustains the *jagat*. Literally the name *Viṣṇu* signifies his true nature, the all pervasive principle, Brahman. The nature of *kārya* (effect) and *kāraṇa* (cause) is his manifest (*vyakta*) and unmanifest (*avyakta*) forms. Even the *cidābhāsa* comes under category of manifest form because it involves *upādhis*. The *paramam padam* stands for his true nature which is the most exalted one and free from *kārya-kāraṇa* (cause and effect), free from all limitations. Thus the *mantra* means: ‘Highly knowledgeable people (*sūrayaḥ; jñānīs*) always (*sadā*) see (*paśyanti*) that most exalted nature of *Viṣṇu* very clearly like the eyes (*cakṣu*) see the vast expanse of

sky’. All pervasiveness free from *upādhis* has to be non-dual continuous existence principle. It cannot brook any *anātmā*. And yet, if *anātmā* appears to be there, it has to be false (*mithyā*). This is illustrated by the vast expansiveness of the sight (*cakṣuḥ*) that visualizes the expanse of blue sky. Thus the non-dual nature, the all pervasive *parama pada* of *Viṣṇu* is identical with *pratyagātmā*. This justifies the derivation of the word *ātmā* from the verb ‘*at* - to be continuous’.

The purport of these four etymological derivations of the word *ātmā* is stated now.

चतुर्विधनिरुक्त्यात्र चत्वारोऽर्थाः प्रकीर्तिताः ।
अधिष्ठानं कारणत्वं जीवभावो विमुक्तता ॥१६६॥

अत्र - here (while explaining the *Vidyāsūtra*) चतुर्विधनिरुक्त्या - based on four types of etymological derivations चत्वारः - four अर्थाः - meanings प्रकीर्तिताः - are explained अधिष्ठानं - (They are:) *ātmā* is the basis कारणत्वं - the status of *ātmā* as the cause जीवभावः - appearance of *ātmā* as a *jīva* विमुक्तता - ever-liberated nature of *ātmā* –(166)

166. Here, while explaining the *Vidyāsūtra*, four meanings of the word *ātmā* based on four types of etymological derivations are explained. (They are:) (i) *ātmā* is the basis (of *jagat*)

(ii) the status of *ātmā* as the cause (of *jagat*) (iii) the appearance of *ātmā* as a *jīva* (iv) the ever-liberated nature of *ātmā*.

On hearing the word *ātmā*, these four meanings get revealed. The *jīvabhāva* (appearance as a *jīva*) refers to *viṣayabhoga* - experiences of sense-objects. The ever-liberated nature is the true one whereas the others are false.

The meaning actually applicable to the word *ātmā* used in the *Vidyāsūtra* (*ātmā iti eva upāsīta*) is shown now.

यन्मुक्तरूपं साक्षित्वाद् व्याकृतेऽव्याकृतेऽपि तत् ।
अतिरोहितमत्रात्मशब्देनैतत् हि सूत्रितम् ॥१६७॥

(आत्मनः - of *ātmā*) यत् - whatever मुक्तरूपं - liberated form तत् - that साक्षित्वाद् - because of being the direct illuminating principle व्याकृते अव्याकृते - in both the manifest and unmanifest states अपि - also अतिरोहितम् - not absent, (is) evident एतत् हि - that (liberated nature of *ātmā*) alone अत्र - in this *Vidyāsūtra* आत्मशब्देन - by the word '*ātmā*' सूत्रितम् - is referred to - (167)

167. Because of being the direct illuminating principle (*sākṣī*) the liberated form of *ātmā* is present (evident) in both the manifest and unmanifest states. That liberated form alone is referred to here in this *Vidyāsūtra* by the word '*ātmā*'.

The manifest or unmanifest states of *jagat* are known by *sākṣī-ātmā*. It is always self-evident in either of the states. This can be verified from the manifest waking and dream besides the unmanifest deep sleep states. It is like a lamp in a room which illumines the room always whether people are there or not. It does not get extinguished because people are not there. *Sākṣī-ātmā* is ever-liberated. The bondage (*bandha*) and liberation (*mokṣa*) have no relevance to *ātmā*. They belong to the mind/intellect endowed with *cidābhāsa*. The *cidābhāsa* superimposes *bandha-mokṣa* on *ātmā* which is nothing but non-dual *cit* alone.

The explanation of the word '*ātmā*' from the *Vidyāsūtra* is over. Now the purpose of the word '*iti*' used in the *sūtra* is being unfolded in the next two verses.

आत्मशब्दधियोरात्मा विषयो

नेति भाषितुम् ।

सूत्रेऽस्मिन्नितिशब्दोऽयं

यथैतत्स्यात् तथोच्यते ॥१६८॥

आत्मा - *ātmā* आत्मशब्दधियोः - of both the word *ātmā* and its concept, understanding विषयः - object न - (is) not इति - so भाषितुम् - to tell अस्मिन् - in this सूत्रे - in the *Vidyāsūtra* अयं - this इति - '*iti*', so शब्दः - word (प्रयुक्तः - is used) यथा एतत्

स्यात् - how this is so तथा - in that manner (अनन्तरश्लोके - in the next verse) उच्यते - is explained—(168)

168. To tell that *ātmā* is not an object of both the word *ātmā* and its understanding, in this *Vidyāsūtra* the word ‘*iti*’ (so) is used. How this is so is explained (in the next verse).

Bhāṣya (*Br. U. 1-4-7*) says that the use of ‘*iti*’ (so) after the word *ātmā* is to inform that in reality (*paramārthataḥ*) the true nature of *ātmā* is not an object of the word ‘*ātmā*’ or its understanding, (i.e. concept, *ātmapratyaya*). The *Vārtikakāra* Sureśvarācārya explains it further: ‘the word ‘*iti*’ (so) negates the possibility of knowing it through the literal meaning of the word (name) *ātmā* (*Br. U. Vā. 1-4-798*)’. For example, when we utter the name (*nāma*) ‘car’, there is a form (*nāmi*) understood in the form of a vehicle. If you say ‘tree’ there is a concrete entity from the plant kingdom. But the word *ātmā* cannot concretize in the manner what it wants to convey. Words can express only those entities which are endowed with any one or more of the following characteristics, namely, *jāti* (species), *guṇa* (quality), *kriyā* (action), *saṁbandha* (relation) and *rūḍhi* (conventional meaning). *Ātmā* does not conform to any of them. It is free from all of them because *ātmā* is not an entity from Creation having its name (*nāma*) and form (*nāmi, rūpa*).

Well, this may be so. But how does the word ‘*iti*’ (so) overcome the said drawback in the word *ātmā*? The next verse answers this query.

यत्रेति परशब्दः स्यात्तत्रोपचरितं वचः ।
ज्येष्ठं पितेति पश्यन्तीत्यादावेवमवेक्षणात्॥१६९॥

यत्र - wherever ‘इति’ - ‘so’, ‘as’
परशब्दः - subsequent or latter word स्यात् -
is तत्र - there वचः - that statement उपचरितं -
(is) secondary, figurative ज्येष्ठं (भ्रातरं) -
elder (brother) पिता इति - as the father
पश्यन्ति - is looked upon इत्यादौ - in such
statements एवम् - thus अवेक्षणात् - because
it is observed—(169)

169. Wherever the subsequent word happens to be ‘*its*’ (as), there that statement is in the secondary (or figurative) sense because it is observed so in statements such as ‘the elder brother is looked upon as father’.

Here is an illustration to show that the word ‘*iti*’ (as) is used to give a secondary sense to the word preceding it in certain cases. The statement, ‘Mr. Gopal looks on his elder brother as father’ clearly shows that the elder brother actually is not his father. Similarly, *śruti* points out by its statement ‘*ātmā iti upāsīta*’ that in reality the word *ātmā* cannot signify literally the ultimate existence principle.

Knowing the role of the word ‘*iti*’

as explained above is very important. Otherwise the *Vidyāsūtra* can be misunderstood as an injunction (*vidhi*) of *upāsānā* wherein a lower object is meditated upon as a higher principle. That is not the case here in this *sūtra*.

Having explained the words *ātmā* and ‘*iti*’ from the *Vidyāsūtra*, now the word ‘*eva*’ is elaborated.

व्याकृताव्याकृते ये द्वे कल्पिते ते विचारतः ।
एते वारयितुं सूत्रे एवकारमसूत्रयत् ॥१७०॥

ये - those द्वे - two व्याकृताव्याकृते - the manifest and unmanifest states of *jagat* ते - both of them (आत्मनि - on *ātmā*) कल्पिते - imagined, falsely attributed एते - these two विचारतः - by self-inquiry वारयितुं - to give up सूत्रे - in the *Vidyāsūtra* एवकारम् - the term ‘*eva*’ (alone) असूत्रयत् - is included as a component of the *sūtra* –(170)

170. Both the manifest and unmanifest states of *jagat* are falsely attributed on *ātmā*. To give them up by self-inquiry, the term ‘*eva*’ (alone) is included in the *sūtra* as its component.

There is another reading (*pāṭhāntara*) of तेऽविचारतः in the place of ते विचारतः. The word *avicārataḥ* means due to lack of discrimination (*viveka*) in the sense of ignorance. The manifest (*vyākṛta*) and unmanifest (*avyākṛta*) states of *jagat* are not the intrinsic features of *ātmā*,

but they are falsely superimposed on *ātmā* by ignorance (*avicārataḥ*). This was seen in the context of *avyākṛta* and *vyākṛta śruti*. Therefore, *eva* shows that the knowledge of *ātmā* has to be devoid of both falsely superimposed manifest and unmanifest. The cause-effect relations are falsely attributed to *ātmā*/Brahman. Therefore, *ātmā* in its exclusively pure nature has to be known directly, and not with imagined features. The self-inquiry (*vicāra*) is the means.

The last phrase in the *sūtra* is *upāsīta*. It consists of two aspects. The first is a prefix ‘*upa*’ (near) and the second is the verb ‘*āsīta*’ (let one remain). These two are being explained one by one.

उपेति सामीप्यवाची

तन्निष्ठा प्रत्यगात्मनि ।

कार्यकारणरूपाभ्यां प्रत्यङ्

नेदीय ईक्ष्यते ॥१७१॥

उप - ‘*upa*’ near इति (शब्दः) - this word सामीप्यवाची (अस्ति) - is the expresser of proximity तन्निष्ठा - its culmination प्रत्यगात्मनि (भवति) - takes place in the innermost *ātmā* (*pratyagātmā*) प्रत्यङ् - *pratyagātmā* (यस्मात् - because) कार्यकारण-रूपाभ्यां - than the embodiment (*kārya*) and its cause (*kāraṇa*) the five elements नेदीयः - more proximate ईक्ष्यते - is observed –(171)

171. The word 'upa' (near) expresses proximity. It culminates in *pratyagātmā*. It is observed that *pratyagātmā* is more proximate than one's embodiment and its cause the five elements.

'Far' is a concept based on remoteness in time and space. Nearness or proximity depends on physical closeness. But the self-evident *cit-ātmā* is ever-existent in whose presence not only the embodiment but also the entire *jagat* comes and goes. Therefore, *ātmā* happens to be the most proximate which continues forever and everywhere. It is also free from time and space which cast the concept of remoteness. Further, the identity of *pratyagātmā* with Brahman as revealed by Upaniṣadic *mahāvākyas* demonstrates the most proximate nature of *pratyagātmā*. Nothing can be remote from Brahman. Nothing can transgress Brahman (*Kṛ.U.2-6-1*) and exist independent of it. Because Brahman is the basis of anything and everything.

एतस्य ब्रह्मसामीप्यं तत्त्वमस्यादिनोच्यते ।
आसीतेति तु शब्देन कूटस्थत्वमसूत्रयत् ॥१७२॥

एतस्य - of this (*pratyagātmā*)
ब्रह्मसामीप्यं - proximity to Brahman तत् त्वम्
असि इत्यादिना - by *mahāvākyas* such as
'you are that Brahman' उच्यते - is
declared आसीत - let one remain इति - so

शब्देन - by the word तु - whereas कूटस्थत्वम्
- changelessness (*avikāritva*) असूत्रयत् - is
briefly suggested - (172)

172. The proximity of *pratyagātmā* to Brahman is declared by *mahāvākyas* such as 'tat tvam asi' (you are that Brahman) (*Ch.U.6-8 to 6-16*), whereas by the word 'āsīta', the changelessness (*avikāritva*) (nature of *ātmā*) (called *kūṭastha*) is briefly suggested.

The first line of this verse furnishes the *pramāṇa* to corroborate the most proximate nature of *pratyagātmā*. *Mahāvākyas* reveal the identity of *ātmā* and Brahman. It is well-known in the Upaniṣads that Brahman is non-dual, all pervasive and the basis of entire false *jagat* superimposed on it. There cannot be anything more proximate to an superimposed entity than its basis. Thus the meaning of the word *upa* (near) used in the *sūtra* culminates in *pratyagātmā*.

The meaning of *āsīta* from the phrase *upāsīta* is told in the second line of this verse. Though literally *āsīta* means 'let one remain' there is no occasion of remaining or sitting in the context of *pratyagātmā*. In the world remaining or sitting quietly does not involve any activities. So is *kūṭastha* (changeless) nature of *pratyagātmā* free from the states of cause-effect (*kārya-kāraṇa*). Thus the word *āsīta*

signifies the true nature of *pratyagātmā* called *kūṭastha*.

How to remain in the form of *kūṭastha* Brahman is explained by giving the meaning of combined phrase *upāsīta*.

व्युत्थाय कारणात् कार्यात् तत्त्वज्ञानवर्त्मना ।
उपेत्य कूटस्थमजमासीतापरिणामवान् ॥१७३॥

कार्यात् - from the manifest *jagat* or the waking and the dream states कारणात् - from the unmanifest condition or the deep sleep state (च) - and व्युत्थाय - having got out or given up the identification तत्त्वज्ञानवर्त्मना - by the means (route, वर्त्मना) of direct knowledge (तत्त्वज्ञान) of *Pratyagātmā* (*tat*) कूटस्थम् - changeless अजम् - unborn (*Pratyagātmā*) उपेत्य - having got absorbed in it अपरिणामवान् - being totally changeless आसीत - remain –(173)

173. Having given up the identification with the manifest and unmanifest *jagat*, having got absorbed in the changeless, unborn *Pratyagātmā* by the means of its direct knowledge remain being totally changeless.

In this context *kārya* means the manifest *jagat* and *kāraṇa* refers to ignorance. The same aspects from the individual *jīva* standpoint can be viewed as *kārya* means the waking and dream

states together, whereas *kāraṇa* is deep sleep. Human volition cannot end them. *Ātmajñāna* alone end *kāraṇa* and *kārya* in either sense. Therefore the path (*vartman*, i.e. means) to be taken to is the knowledge (*jñāna*) of the true nature (*tattva*) of *Pratyagātmā/Parameśvara* (*tat*). The word *upetya* literally means ‘having approached or obtained’. It means having got the mind absorbed in *kūṭastha* by knowledge and subsequent absorption therein. Thereafter what remains is not the *samsārī jīva* but our true nature *kūṭastha* which of course is changeless (*apariṇāmvān*).

The meaning of *Vidyāsūtra* given so far is being tested on the touchstone of reasoning to ascertain it further with greater clarity.

इत्यात्मसूत्रे शब्दार्थो

वाक्यार्थश्चोपवर्णितः ।

तदनुग्राहको न्यायः

आशङ्कापूर्वमुच्यते ॥१७४॥

इति - thus आत्मसूत्रे - in the *ātmāsūtra* (*Vidyāsūtra*) शब्दार्थः - the word-meaning वाक्यार्थः - the meaning of the entire sentence च - and उपवर्णितः - was described in detail तदनुग्राहकः - supporting the meaning given so far न्यायः - the reasoning आशङ्कापूर्वम् - with relevant doubts उच्यते - is elaborated –(174)

174. Thus the meanings of the words and the entire sentence in the *Vidyāsūtra* was described in detail. (Now) the reasoning supporting that meaning is elaborated with relevant doubts.

An explanation or interpretation of a Vedāntic text consists of telling the words separately, to give the word meaning, to show the mutual relationship of words, to tell the purport of the entire sentence, and finally bring out the relevant doubts and their clearance. The author has catered to these needs except doubts and their clearance. This is being attended to hereafter.

After the explanation of *Vidyāsūtra* (*ātmāsūtra*) given so far, there can be a doubt that its knowledge is not at all possible. *Ātmā* on its own is said to be complete (*pūrṇa*) and free from the *jagat* (*aprapañcam*). If such a principle is not available for knowledge, necessarily it must be a non-existing entity. If it is said that *ātmā* can be known certainly, then it has to be either in the sleep or in the waking and dream states. In the state of unmanifest (*avyākṛta*) state of *jagat* or in the deep sleep, it cannot be known because it is concealed by self-ignorance. Therein is the obstruction of ignorance. In the manifest (*vyākṛta*) state of *jagat* or in the waking and dream states, the things are no better. Here also there is the obstruction of ignorance and

the embodiment or the *jagat*. If *ātmā* cannot be known in the three states of consciousness, where else can it be known? (*Br. Vā. Sā. 1-4-573*; *Br. Vā. 1-4-711*). This doubt is voiced first and then the answer follows.

व्याकृताव्याकृताभ्यां तद्

वस्तुतत्त्वं तिरोहितम् ।

इति यच्छङ्कितं तन्न

स्वरूपस्यातिरोहितेः ॥१७५॥

तद् वस्तुतत्त्वं - the true nature of *ātmā* व्याकृताव्याकृताभ्यां - by the manifest (embodiment and the ignorance during waking and dream) and unmanifest (ignorance in deep sleep) तिरोहितम् - is concealed इति - so यत् - whatever (कैश्चित् - by some people) शङ्कितम् - is doubted तत् - that न - is not (correct) स्वरूपस्य अतिरोहितेः - because true nature of *ātmā* is never concealed—(175)

175. Some people doubt that true nature of *ātmā* is concealed by the manifest and unmanifest states. That is not correct. The true nature of *ātmā* is never covered.

Vyākṛta (manifest state) as used by the objector refers to the waking and dream states besides the embodiment with self-ignorance. *Avyākṛta* is taken as deep sleep state with self-ignorance. This is a universal doubt. What we face is the manifest *jagat* or sleep. None sees

ātmā as proclaimed by the Upaniṣads. To say so is not correct because 'self-evident knowledge-principle' *ātmā* is not covered by any entity whatsoever.

Verses 176 to 181 establish by question and answer that no entity can ever conceal *ātmā*.

स्वस्वरूपं तिरोधातुं न हि केनापि शक्यते ।
विस्फार्यतामिहाक्षाणि किमक्षैरपराध्यते ॥१७६॥

स्वस्वरूपं - one's true nature तिरोधातुं - to conceal केनापि - by anyone न हि - never शक्यते - is possible इह - here (in the context of gaining *ātmajñāna*) अक्षाणि - (let) sense-organs विस्फार्यताम् - function fully अक्षैः - by the sense-organs किम् - what अपराध्यते - wrong is done? – (176)

176. It is never possible for anyone to conceal one's true nature, (i.e. true nature of *ātmā*). Let the sense-organs function fully. What wrong is done by them?

Vedānta emphatically says that the true nature of *ātmā* can never be concealed. The 'is-ness' (*sat* existence), the knowledge or experience aspect (*cit*) and happiness (*ānanda*) that we experience in and through the world in the three states of consciousness is nothing but *ātmā*. The gold may appear as varieties of ornaments, but basically all the ornaments are nothing but gold. We may complain that, we don't know

that we are identical with *Īśvara*, the basis of *jagat* and totally free from *saṃsāra*. Yes, that is accepted. Vedānta has the remedial measure to end this ignorance. But on that score it cannot be said that *ātmā* is concealed.

Another doubt can be like this. When the sense-organs are operating, what is perceived are sense-objects and not *Paramātmā*, whereas in sleep when sense-organs are withdrawn, even the perception of sense-objects ceases to be. (*Br.Vā.Sā.* 1-4-576). The second line of this verse answers this doubt. There is no need of totally stopping the functions of the senses though mastery over the senses is indispensable.

आपादयेयुः शब्दादीन्

यद्यक्षाणि तदापि ते ।

का हानिस्तस्य शब्दादेरेव

तत्त्वं विबुध्यताम् ॥१७७॥

यदि - if अक्षाणि - sense-organs शब्दादीन् - sense-objects such as sound, etc. आपादयेयुः - perceive तदा अपि - even then ते का हानिः - what do you lose? तस्य - of that शब्दादेः - of sound, etc. एव - merely तत्त्वं - true nature विबुध्यताम् - be known – (177)

177. If the sense-organs perceive the sense-objects such as sound, etc., even then what do you lose? Know the true nature of sound, etc.

Though a person totally engrossed in sense-indulgence can never hope to gain *ātmajñāna*, perception by itself need not be a problem in knowing *ātmā* in its true nature. The total withdrawal from all perceptions is a concept borrowed from *Pātañjala Aṣṭāṅga-yoga*. Vedānta does accept *Aṣṭāṅga-yoga* as a technique. But there is also the most effective alternative means of *cit-jada-viveka*-discrimination (*viveka*) of pure awareness (*cit*) from the inert (*jaḍa*). It is also called *dr̥k-dr̥śya-viveka*-discrimination of seer (*dr̥k*) from the seen (*dr̥śya*). The attention is withdrawn from the name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*) of the object perceived. It is focussed instead on *sat-cit-ānanda ātmā* (S.R.U.59).

Śrī Madhusūdana Saraswatī, a doyen of Vedānta, explains the role of *cit-jada-viveka* in his ‘*Gūḍhārtha-dīpikā*’ gloss on *Bhagavadgītā* (6-29) after specifying the function of *Aṣṭāṅga-yoga samādhi* in the context of self-knowledge.

“The separation (*pr̥thakkarāṇam*) of the inherent (*anusyūta*) pure awareness (*caitanya*) in all the perceptions by distinguishing (*vivekena*) from its inert (*jaḍa*) counterpart is also a means (*hetu*) for the direct knowledge (*sākṣātkāra*) of the self-luminous true ‘I’ (*sākṣī*) like the *samādhi* (*cittavṛttinirodha*) of *Aṣṭāṅga-yoga*. Exclusive *Aṣṭāṅga-yoga* is not necessarily required. Therefore, sage Vasiṣṭha had said - ‘Oh Rāma! *Yoga* and *jñāna* (knowledge) are the two methods leading to the destruction of the mind. *Yoga* is stopping of thoughts and *jñāna* is through the ascertainment of the truth”. (*Yo.Vā.Upa.78-8*). ‘For some, *yoga* is very difficult to accomplish whereas for others the ascertainment of knowledge is so. Hence, the *Bhagavān* has prescribed two methods” (*Yo.Vā.Ni.Pu.13-8*).

“...Among the two, the first method is practiced by the followers of *Hairanyagarbha* school of thought who opine that the Creation is real. The followers of Ādi Śaṅkarācārya who conduct inquiry as guided by the Upaniṣads and who hold that the Creation is false, take only to the second means. On gaining the firmness (*dārdhya*) in the knowledge of pure awareness (the basis of *jagat*), they easily attain the extinction of the falsely projected (and so) sublated mind and its projection, the visible *jagat*. For that very reason Ādi Śaṅkarācārya has not justified anywhere the necessity of *yoga* for *Brahmajñānīs* who have *niṣṭhā* (steadfastness) in this knowledge. Therefore the followers of Upaniṣads who possess a thoroughly ready mind having approached a competent teacher engaged themselves in the inquiry as guided by Vedānta for gaining *Brahmajñāna/ātmajñāna*, and not in the practice of *Aṣṭāṅga-yoga*” (*B.G. Gūḍhārtha-dīpikā*, 6-29).

This method of *cit-jaḍa-viveka* prevails since the Vedic age. Goddess Saraswati had taught this to sage Āśvalāyana in *Sarasvatī-rahasyopaniṣad*, *Kṛṣṇa-yajurveda*. Śrī Bhāratīrtha has commented on it in his work *Drk-Drśya-Viveka*.

Thus the perception of the world by itself is not a problem in gaining self-knowledge. It can provide a field to make our mind absorbed in our true nature *ātmā* which itself is also the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of sense-objects.

The ignorant person who is still unable to ascertain the basis of sense-objects by using the perception of sense-objects is advised the means to be adopted for this purpose.

तैः शब्दादितया भाति तत्त्वरूपतया न तु।
इति चेदत एवैतद् वेदवाक्येन बुध्यताम् ॥१७८॥

तैः - by those (sense-organs)
(आत्मा - *ātmā*) शब्दादितया - in the form of
sound, etc. भाति - appears तु - but (तेषां)
तत्त्वरूपतया - in the form of (their) true
nature, (i.e. *ātmā*) न (भाति)- is not
(known) इति चेद् - if it is said so (श्रुणु -
please listen) अतः एव - for this very
reason एतद् - this principle (of *ātmā*)
वेदवाक्येन - through the Upaniṣadic
teaching बुध्यताम् - be known—(178)

178. If it is said that *ātmā* appears (only) in the form of sound, etc., by those sense-organs, but not in the form of their true nature, (i.e. *ātmā*); please listen, for this very reason this principle (of *ātmā*) be known through the Upaniṣadic teaching.

It is true that through the means of

sense-organs, only the sound, touch, form, taste, smell will be perceived, but it will not be known that their basis is *sat-cit-ānanda*. And yet, if the principle of *ātmā* is known through Upaniṣadic inquiry, it is possible to appreciate *ātmā* in and through the sense-perception as the true nature of sense-objects. The person who can identify gold can certainly know it in the golden ornaments. What a knowledgeable person can know easily is totally unknown to a ignorant one. To an *ātmajñānī* with the steadfastness in the self-knowledge, *ātmā* is clearly known in and through all the cognitions whether sense-perceptions or otherwise. This is in accordance with the *cit-jaḍa-viveka* or *drk-drśya-viveka* from *Sarasvatī-rahasyopaniṣad*. The *Kenopaniṣad* also declares, ‘*pratibodha-viditam-matam (jñātam)*-Brahman is known in and through the cognition of every thought’ (*Ke.U.* 2-4).

How is it possible to know directly (*aparokṣatayā*) the true nature of sense-objects as *ātmā* since the

knowledge gained through the Vedas can only be indirect (*parokṣa*)? The answer follows.

न परोक्षत्वमाशङ्क्यं

स्वस्वरूपत्वहेतुतः ।

शब्दादितत्त्वं यद् बोद्धुः

स्वरूपं तन्न चेतारम् ॥१७९॥

परोक्षत्वम् - the remoteness (indirectness) (of the knowledge of the true nature of sound, etc., gained through the Vedas) न आशङ्क्यं - should not be doubted स्वस्वरूपत्वहेतुतः - because (*ātmā* is) the true nature of oneself यद् - whatever that is बोद्धुः - of the knower स्वरूपं - true nature तत् - that (is) शब्दादितत्त्वं - the true nature of sound, etc. इतरम् - another न - not च - and - (179)

179. One should not doubt that the knowledge of the true nature of sound, etc., gained through the Vedas is indirect (*parokṣa*) because *ātmā* is the true nature of oneself. The true nature of 'the knower' (itself) is the true nature of sound, etc., and nothing else.

There is no rule that the knowledge gained through the Vedas (as *pramāṇa*) can only be indirect (*parokṣa*). The knowledge of an entity is true to its nature (*jñānam yathābhūta-viṣayam*) (*Br.Sū.Bh.3-2-21*). *Ātmā* is *aparokṣa* (direct), self-evident and self-experiencing knowledge-principle. Its knowledge also has to be *aparokṣa*. If

not, it is incorrect or incomplete knowledge consisting of some bits of information from the scriptures.

The true nature of *ātmā* is *sat-cit-ānanda*. So is the basis or the true nature of entire *jagat* including the sense-objects. One who knows *ātmā* correctly can identify it even when the same appears to be endowed with sense-objects perceived through the sense-organs. The true nature of both being one and the same there is no hindrance in knowing the sense-objects in their true nature as nothing but *ātmā*. Therefore, the sound, etc., are not different from *ātmā* in reality. If at all they appear to be so, it is only their *mithyā* (false) *nāma* (name) and *rūpa* (form).

Here is another doubt. The mind can know only one thing at a time. It can objectify the sense-objects, sound, etc., with the help of sense-organs and know them. But *sat-cit-ānanda ātmā* is free from all the five sense-objects (*Kṛ.U.1-3-15*). The sense-organs cannot objectify *ātmā*. Therefore, how can the mind pre-occupied in the perception of sound, etc., can simultaneously know the *ātmā* devoid of sound, etc.? Here is the answer.

एकस्याप्यत्र चित्तस्य सहकारिविभेदतः ।

ऋमेण ग्रहणं तत्त्वे शब्दादौ च कुतो न हि ॥१८०॥

सहकारिविभेदतः - because of its distinct associate means एकस्य चित्तस्य

अपि - of one and the same mind अत्र - here क्रमेण - one after the other तत्त्वे - about the true nature of sense-objects शब्दादौ - about the sound, etc. च - and ग्रहणं - knowledge कुतः - why न हि - can it not gain?—(180)

180. Why cannot the same mind know the sound, etc., and their true nature one after the other because of its distinct associate means? (Certainly it can know.)

The associate means of the mind are sense-organs in the case of perception where as Upaniṣadic teaching is the means in knowing true nature of sound, etc. The mind can gain both types of knowledge one after the other by two distinct associate means. Generally, it is accepted that the mind projects one thought at a time, even though in rapid succession. That is why the gaining of two types of knowledge is told to be *kramaṇa* (one after the other).

The answer given so far (upto verse 180) to the doubt raised (in the verse 175) is validated now.

इति शङ्कोत्तरं प्रोक्तमेतत्सूत्रेण सूचितम् ।
स्वरूपवाच्यात्मशब्दादतिरोधानभासनात्॥१८१॥

इति - thus एतत् - this प्रोक्तम् - whatever told (from the fourth quarter of verse 175 upto 180) शङ्कोत्तरम् - the answer to the doubt (raised in the verse

175) सूत्रेण - by the *sūtra* (*ātmā iti eva upāsīta*) सूचितम् - is suggested (कथम् - how is it so?) (उच्यते - here is the answer) स्वरूपवाच्यात्मशब्दात् - by the word *ātmā* which expresses its true nature अतिरोधानभासनात् - because the incessant (*atirodhāna*) cognitive nature (of *ātmā*) is revealed (*bhāsana*)—(181)

181. Thus the answer given (from the fourth quarter of verse 175 upto 180) to the doubt (raised in the verse 175) is suggested by the *sūtra* (*‘ātmā iti eva upāsīta’*). (How is it so? Here is the answer). Because, the incessant cognitive nature is revealed by the word *ātmā* which expresses its true nature.

The doubt raised in the verse is: *ātmā* is concealed in the manifest and unmanifest states characterised by the waking, dream, deep sleep (verse-175). This was answered in detail thereafter. Now the basis of this answer is shown. This answer is implied in the *Vidyāsūtra* itself. The word *‘ātmā’* expresses its true nature. It was told earlier that the ‘continued (incessant) existence (*santataḥ bhāvah*)’ is the meaning in which the word *ātmā* is used in the *sūtra* (vide verses 166-167). It is universal fact that one's true nature is never given up (*sva svabhāvāt-na nivṛtīḥ*). If given up it is not its true nature. Thus, *ātmā* is never concealed.

VIDYĀSŪTRA - ĀTMĀ IS PURE (NIRUPĀDHĪKA)

The *Vidyāsūtra* is immediately followed by the *śruti*-passage which unfolds the pure nature of *ātmā*. The said portion is: ‘*Atra* (in this *ātmā*) *hi* (indeed) (these *prāṇa*, senses, etc.), *sarve* (all) *ekam bhavanti* (merge losing their identity)’ (*Bṛ.U.1-4-7*). It is like the reflections of the sun in different pools of water merging in the sun when there is no more water. The author presents this, *śruti*-statement in the verse 183 in answer to the question posed in the verse 182.

ननु प्राणादियुक्तात्मबोधोऽकात्स्न्येन

दूषितः ।

सोऽकात्स्न्यदोषः शुद्धात्मबोधे

कस्मान्न संभवेत् ॥१८२॥

ननु - here is a doubt प्राणादियुक्तात्मबोधः - the *ātmajñāna* (self-knowledge) endowed with *prāṇa*, (i.e. one who breathes), etc. अकात्स्न्येन - because of incompleteness दूषितः - was censured सः - the same अकात्स्न्यदोषः - defect of incompleteness शुद्धात्मबोधे - to the knowledge of pure (*nirupādhika*) *ātmā* कस्मात् - why न संभवेत् - should it not be applicable? – (182)

182. If *ātmajñāna* endowed with *prāṇa*, (i.e. one who breathes), etc., was censured because of its defect of

incompleteness, why should not the same defect of incompleteness be applicable to the knowledge of pure (*nirupādhika*) *ātmā*, (which excludes *anātmā*)?

Earlier it was told (vide verses 152-154) that the knowledge of *ātmā* with the concepts such as ‘the *ātmā* is one who breathes, sees, hears, etc., is incomplete because it is devoid of the knowledge of *ātmā* in its true nature which is free from *upādhis*. With the same norm why not the knowledge of pure *ātmā* be incomplete because it lacks the knowledge such as *ātmā* is the one who breathes, etc.? It is obvious that the defect of incompleteness is common in both. Here comes the role of subsequent *śruti*-portion which is quoted now to answer this doubt.

इत्याशङ्कापनुत्त्यर्थमत्रेदं श्रूयते स्फुटम् ।

अत्र ह्येते सर्व एकीभवन्तीति श्रुतेर्वचः ॥१८३॥

इति - the said शङ्कापनुत्त्यर्थम् - to dispel the doubt अत्र - in this respect इदं - this स्फुटम् - clearly श्रूयते - is stated by the Upaniṣad अत्र - in *ātmā* हि - indeed एते - these (*prāṇa*, senses, etc.) सर्वे - all (without exception) एकीभवन्ति - merge losing their identity इति - so (is) श्रुतेः - of the Upaniṣad वचः - statement – (183)

183. To dispel the said doubt, the Upaniṣad states very clearly: In this *ātmā* indeed all these (*prāṇa*, senses,

etc.), merge losing their identity.

The one who breathes, sees, hears, etc., are all erroneous concepts about *ātmā* just as the sights of mistaken garland, snake, etc., in the place of rope. The knowledge of rope does not require the notion of garland, etc. So does the knowledge of *ātmā* in its true *nirupādhika* nature cannot include the erroneous notions such as one who breathes, etc. This is established till the first line of verse 188. The merging of *prāṇa*, senses, etc., in *ātmā* is explained with an illustration.

प्राणाद्युपाध्युपहिताः सर्वेऽप्यात्मान

ईश्वरे ।

शुद्धात्मन्येकतां यान्ति

पुत्रभ्रात्रादयो यथा ॥१८४॥

प्राणाद्युपाध्युपहिताः - those endowed with the *upādhis* of *prāṇa*, etc. सर्वे अपि - all without exception आत्मानः - the notional *ātmās* शुद्धात्मनि - in the pure (*nirupādhika*) *ātmā* ईश्वरे - in the *Paramātmā* (तत् तत् उपधिविहे - on relinquishing the different *upādhis*) एकतां यान्ति - become one यथा - just as पुत्रभ्रात्रादयः - concepts of oneself as a son, brother, etc. (एके एव नरे - merge in one person that he is) – (184)

184. All the notional *ātmās* endowed with the *upādhis* of *prāṇa*, etc., without exception become one with the

pure *ātmā* identical with *Paramātmā* (on relinquishing the different *upādhis*), just as (notions of) son, brother, etc., (merge in one person that he is).

All the *ātmās* (*sarve api ātmānaḥ*) means all the notional *ātmās* having a specific form imposed by *upādhis*. As seen earlier by breathing the *ātmā* is called *prāṇaḥ*, by speaking the speech (*vāk*), etc. (verses 150-151) (*Bṛ.U.1-4-7*). Therefore, *prāṇa*, *vāk*, etc., are *ātmās* related to *upādhis*. All these notional *ātmās* are one and the same pure (*nirupādhika*) *ātmā* when devoid of all the *upādhis*. Here the pure *nirupādhika* *ātmā* is called *Īśvara-Paramātmā*.

The illustration of ‘son, brother, etc.’, is explained in the next verse.

पुत्रो भ्राता पितेत्येको

भिद्यते प्रतियोगिभिः।

पुत्रादयस्तु एकस्मिंस्तस्मिन्

यान्त्येकतां स्वतः ॥१८५॥

पुत्रः - son भ्राता - brother पिता - father इति - so एकः (पुमान्) - one (person) प्रतियोगिभिः - by correlates, by view of relatives भिद्यते - differs पुत्रादयः - son, etc. तु - but (तु) एकस्मिन् - in one तस्मिन् (पुंसि) - in that person स्वतः - by themselves एकतां यान्ति - become one – (185)

185. One and the same (person) differs as son, brother, father by the

views of relatives. But the concept of son, etc., by themselves become one with that person.

One and the same person is viewed as a son from standpoint of parents, as the father with respect to children, as the husband in relation to wife, etc. The individual is changeless in spite of these superimposed views of relatives. The son, etc., becoming one with the person is to know him as an independent entity free from the specific roles of son, etc. So is *ātmā* in its true nature is free from all *upādhis* and roles thereby.

The question, ‘why should not the same defect of incompleteness be applicable to the knowledge of pure (*nirupādhika*) *ātmā*, exclusive of *anātmā*?’ is being answered.

आत्मनोऽनवशेषेण

संबन्धोऽनात्मवस्तुनः ।

रज्जुसर्पादिवन्नातः प्रतीचः

शिष्यते पराङ् ॥१८६॥

आत्मनः - of *ātmā* अनात्मवस्तुनः - of the entity called *anātmā* (च - and) संबन्धः - relation अनवशेषेण (भवति) - (is) inseparably one whole रज्जुसर्पादिवत् - like the rope and the mistaken snake, etc. अतः - therefore प्रतीचः - from *pratyagātmā* पराङ् - *anātmā* न शिष्यते - cannot be distinguished (as a separate entity) –(186)

186. The relation between *ātmā* and the entity called *anātmā* is inseparably one whole like the rope and the mistaken snake, etc. Therefore, *anātmā* cannot be distinguished (as a separate entity) from *pratyagātmā*.

A rope and the mistaken snake are not two distinctly existing different entities. The mistaken snake is the rope. The rope appears as the snake. If you consider one of them, there is no separate entity remaining independently apart from the other. You see the mistaken snake. That itself is the rope. There is no another rope apart from its basis. You see the basis rope. There is no snake any more. Similarly, the *pratyagātmā* itself appears as *jagat* and enters into it. Therefore, *jīva-jagat* are not some distinct entities from *pratyagātmā* on which they are superimposed. In the direct knowledge of *nirupādhika pratyagātmā*, both *jīva* and *jagat* disappear. There is no occasion for that knowledge to be incomplete.

The knowledge of a cause is as good as the knowledge of its effects. When the basis of all the superimposed or falsely attributed things is known, all of them are as good as known. Or there is no need of knowing them separately. On the contrary, the knowledge of superimposed things without the knowledge of their basis is no knowledge. In this age of science, a

common man thinks that the science is omniscient. It is only the seasoned scientists know their limitations. More they discover, still more ignorance they confront. This is because the *jagat* has no existence of its own. It is false. Only in the direct knowledge of *ātmā* everything will be known; nay, the *jagat* itself will not be there. This fact is implied in the merger-*śruti*, 'In this *ātmā* indeed all these merge losing their identity' (verse 183, *Br.U.1-4-7*). The same fact is now clearly told.

सर्वमज्ञातमेव स्यात्

यस्मिन्नज्ञात आत्मनि।

ज्ञाते ज्ञातं च कृत्स्नोऽसौ

तावत्वात् सर्ववस्तुनः ॥१८७॥

यस्मिन् आत्मनि - the *ātmā* which when (is) अज्ञाते - not known सर्वम् - everything अज्ञातम् एव - truly not known स्यात् - is (यस्मिन्) ज्ञाते - on knowing (whom) (सर्वम् - all) ज्ञातं च - is known असौ - that (*ātmā*) कृत्स्नः - is complete सर्ववस्तुनः - of all entities तावत्वात् - because their nature is only that much, (i.e. *ātmā*) –(187)

187. The *ātmā* when not known, everything is truly not known (and) on knowing whom all is (as good as) known. That (*ātmā*) is complete (non-dual) because the nature of all entities is only that much, (i.e. *ātmā* alone).

So long as *ātmā* is not known in its true *nirupādhika* nature the rest everything is truly unknown in terms of their real nature. When *ātmā* is known directly everything is known in the sense that all of them are nothing but *ātmā* wherein the so called 'everything' exists. When the self-ignorance ends in self-knowledge, where is the effect of ignorance to label it as 'known' or 'unknown'? Therefore, to know *ātmā* as seer, hearer, etc., is incomplete knowledge, but to know the *nirupādhika pratyagātmā* is complete because there remains nothing else to be known.

Everything is known on gaining the knowledge of *pratyagātmā* or *Pratyagātmā-jñāna* is complete in itself is the outcome of the merger-*śruti*, viz. in this *ātmā* indeed all these merge. (verse 183, *Br.U.1-4-7*). It is not an erroneous notion. An effect merges in its cause. When the cause is known, its effect is as good as known since the effect is not different from its cause. When the sun is known all its reflections are as good as known. There is no need of knowing the reflections to complete the knowledge of the sun. Thus the role of this *śruti* is told now.

प्रमाभासत्वमेतेन वक्ष्येनास्य निवारितम् ।
मात्वं संभाव्यते तस्य पदनीयत्ववाक्यतः ॥१८८॥

एतेन - by this वाक्येन - by the

statement of merger-*śruti* अस्य (ज्ञानस्य) - of this (knowledge, viz. by *ātmajñāna* everything else is known) प्रमाभासत्वम् - the status as invalid knowledge निवारितम् - is refuted पदनीयत्ववाक्यतः - by the forthcoming 'padanīyatva' (worth-knowing) statement तस्य - its मात्वम् - the status as valid knowledge सम्भाव्यते - is possible (to prove) - (188)

188. The invalidity of this knowledge (viz. by *ātmajñāna* everything else is known) is refuted by the statement of merger-*śruti*. The forthcoming 'padanīyatva' (worth-knowing) statement proves its (of *Pratyagātmā-jñāna*) status as valid.

Pratyagātmā-jñāna is complete in itself. There is no need of knowing everything else with distinct names and forms because they have no independent existence apart from *ātmā*. Having known the gold, all the golden ornaments are as good as known because they are nothing but gold. Having known the sun, all its reflections are as good as known. So is the case with *ātmā* and *jagat*. The names and forms of falsely attributed *jagat*, are irrelevant when their true nature *ātmā* is known. The merger-*śruti* refutes the objection that *Pratyagātmā-jñāna* is invalid, because of incompleteness. The fact that all the falsely attributed names and forms merge in their basis *ātmā*, (as seen in the

sleep) shows that they have no independent existence. The knowledge of the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*), is complete by itself because the superimposed entities are not at all real.

The following statement of *śruti* called *padanīyatva-vākya*, exhorts that the knowledge of *Pratyagātmā* should be gained. The *śruti* will never ask anyone to gain an invalid knowledge. The *padanīyatva*-sentence is: The *ātmā* that is being discussed and which abides in all is worthy to be known directly by all [*tadetat padanīyam asya sarvasya*, (i.e. *asmin sarvasmin*) *yad ayam ātmā*] (*Br.U.1-4-7*). *Padanīyam* means 'worthy to be known/gained'. The next two verses explain the *śruti* by giving the connection of its words, their meanings and the worthiness of *ātmajñāna*.

अस्य सर्वस्य जगत

आत्मेति यदुदीरितम् ।

तदेतत् पदनीयं स्यादिति

वाक्यस्य योजना ॥१८९॥

अस्य - of this perceptible सर्वस्य - of entire जगतः - of *jagat* यद् - that which आत्मा इति - as *ātmā* (true nature) उदीरितम् - is said by (the *śruti*) तद् एतत् - that one being discussed here now पदनीयं स्यात् - is worthy to be known इति - so (is) वाक्यस्य - of (*śruti*) statement योजना - connection, arrangement - (189)

189. The arrangement of the *śruti*-statement is that the *ātmā* (the true nature) of this entire perceptible *jagat* that is described (by the Vedas) and the same (*ātmā*) which is being discussed here now, is worthy to be known directly.

पदनीयेतिशब्देन प्रमातुं

योग्यतोच्यते ।

अज्ञातत्वात् पुमर्थत्वात्

प्रमातुं योग्यतात्मानः ॥१९०॥

पदनीय इति शब्देन - by the word (शब्देन) - 'padanīya' प्रमातुं - to know योग्यता - appropriateness उच्यते - is said अज्ञातत्वात् - because of being unknown पुमर्थत्वात् - because of being the highest accomplishment आत्मनः - of *ātmā* प्रमातुं - to know योग्यता - appropriateness (is there) - (190)

190. 'It is appropriate to know (*ātmā*)' is said by the word 'padanīya'. To know *ātmā* is appropriate because it is unknown and its knowledge is the highest accomplishment in life.

A hitherto unknown entity whose knowledge is both valid and beneficial alone is worthy to be known. *Ātmā* fulfills all these three conditions. Therefore, *ātmajñāna* is indispensable for all.

One of the reasons that *ātmā* should be known is its ignorance (*ajñāna*). How is it so is answered now.

अव्याकृतव्याकृतयोरज्ञानात्मकता

यतः ।

अतःआत्मातिरेकेण नाज्ञातार्थोऽस्ति

कश्चन ॥१९१॥

यतः - because अव्याकृतव्याकृतयोः - of unmanifest and manifest *jagat* अज्ञानात्मकता (भवति) - nature is ignorance अतः - therefore आत्मातिरेकेण - other than *ātmā* न कश्चन - nothing whatsoever अज्ञातार्थः - unknown entity अस्ति - is there - (191)

191. Because the nature of unmanifest and manifest *jagat* is ignorance, there is no other unknown entity than *ātmā*.

The *śṛṣṭi* (*jagat*) can be divided into *ātmā* and *anātmā*. The *anātmā* can be either *avyākṛta* (unmanifest *jagat*) or *vyākṛta* (manifest one). The *avyākṛta* is nothing but the ignorance of *ātmā*. The *vyākṛta* being the effect of *avyākṛta*, is also ignorance in its nature. The *ajñāta* is an unknown entity. It is the object of ignorance. The nature of *vyākṛta* and *avyākṛta* being ignorance itself, they cannot be the object of ignorance itself. Therefore, the remaining entity *ātmā*, alone can be the unknown - the object of ignorance. Further, the ignorance by itself is inert. An awareness principle is necessary to know it. The same can only be *ātmā*. The ignorance is centered in, or has its basis (*āśraya*) in *ātmā*.

We can ourselves verify that we

know not *ātmā*. The Upaniṣads declare that our true nature *ātmā* is free from embodiments, birth and death; it is limitless happiness without any trace of sorrow, etc. The *ātmajñānīs* have directly experienced this true nature of *ātmā* but our experience is quite contrary. That proves that we do not know *ātmā*.

Another reason why *ātmā* should be known is its nature of being the highest accomplishment in life. Out of the four *puruṣārthas* of humans (*dharma, artha, kāma, mokṣa*), the *mokṣa* (liberation) is the highest one. It can be gained only through *ātmajñāna*. This is brought to our notice.

ज्ञेयार्थानन्दयोर्यस्मात् समाप्तिः प्रत्यगात्मनि ।
परमः पुरुषार्थोऽत आत्मा भवति नेतरः ॥१९२॥

यस्मात् - because ज्ञेयार्थानन्दयोः - of the entity most worthy to be known and the perfection of happiness प्रत्यगात्मनि - in *pratyagātmā* समाप्तिः (भवति) - culminate अतः - therefore आत्मा - *ātmā* परमः - is the highest पुरुषार्थः - accomplishment to be sought भवति - is इतरः - other न - not - (192)

192. *Ātmā* is the highest accomplishment to be sought because the entity most worthy to be known and the perfection of happiness culminate in *pratyagātmā*.

Whatever that is sought (*arthyate*)

by the individual *jīva* (*puruṣa*) is *puruṣārtha*. They are: i) *Dharma* - earning of *puṇya* to the exclusion of *pāpa* (sin) by living a life of *dharma* as prescribed by the Vedas. ii) *Artha* - earning of money and securities necessary for a decent and dignified living. iii) *Kāma* - the fulfilment of righteous desires. iv) *Mokṣa* - liberation from *saṃsāra* by gaining *ātmajñāna*. The common feature in all these four is to gain happiness and avoid sorrow. But, the first three can never accomplish it to the point of perfection. Only the direct experience of *ātmā* which is ever-existent limitless happiness and totally free from sorrows called *mokṣa* is the ultimate solution. This is pointed out in this verse. Whatever knowledge we gain in life is directly or indirectly meant for acquisition of joy or avoidance of sorrow. Therefore, the author points out that the entity most worthy to be known and pursuit of perfect happiness culminates in *pratyagātmā*.

The next phrase in the *śruti*-statement is: ‘*anena hi etat sarvam veda*’ - ‘because (*hi*) a *ātmajñānī* on knowing *ātmā* (*anena*) knows (*veda*) all *anātmā* (*etat sarvam*)’ (*Br. U. 1-4-7*). This feature of *ātmajñāna* is highlighted.

अज्ञातत्वं पुरा

प्रोक्तमव्याकृतगिरा यथा ।

ज्ञेयार्थस्य समाप्तिं तां

वक्त्यनेनेति वाक्यतः ॥१९३॥

यथा - as पुरा - earlier 'अव्याकृत' गिरा - by the statement 'avyākṛta' (आत्मनः - of ātmā) अज्ञातत्वं - of ignorance प्रोक्तं - was told (तथा - so) 'अनेन' इति वाक्यतः - by the statement 'anena' (by this, i.e. by gaining this ātmajñāna) (Br.U.1-4-7) ज्ञेयार्थस्य - of the things to be known तां - that, i.e. well-known समाप्तिं - culmination वक्ति - signifies - (193)

193. Just as earlier (verses 81, 95, etc.), the ignorance of ātmā was told by the avyākṛta-statement, so does the statement 'anena', (i.e. by gaining this ātmajñāna) signifies the well-known culmination of the things to be known.

Earlier (verses 81, 95, etc.), in the context of avyākṛta śruti-statement it was told that ātmā is not known. It did not mean that ātmā can never be known. Self-ignorance ends; it is not an ever-existing entity. Thus the statement that ātmā is unknown is not an absolute one. Similarly, the present statement, everything else (other than ātmā) is known by gaining ātmajñāna is not to be taken literally. It does not mean that by ātmajñāna you will be able to know anything and everything in Creation or you will know all languages or you can spy who is doing what, etc. All that the statement means is, on directly knowing ātmā the erroneous notion that there is truly something else other than ātmā, gets totally ended. The jagat gets

reduced to a mithyā (false) entity. Like dream, in the absence of the wrong notion, that the world is real, there remains nothing to be known. What is important is the knowledge of the truth and not the information about the seeming world. After knowing the rope, the basis of mistaken snake, garland, stick, etc, the question of knowing the mistaken snake, etc., does not arise. On gaining ātmajñāna it is directly discovered that all that is there is only ātmā/Brahman and nothing else. Where is the occasion of knowing something else? This is the ultimate vision. This is the ultimate truth. To reveal this alone it was told by avyākṛta-statement that ātmā is not known.

In the verse 192, it was told that the culmination of all types of happiness also is in pratyagātmā. That is reiterated in the next verse to explain it later after attending an impending doubt regarding the resultant omniscience on gaining ātmajñāna.

अनेनैतत् वेद सर्वमित्यात्मज्ञानमात्रतः ।
सार्वज्ञ्यमुक्तमानन्दसमाप्तिस्तु प्रवक्ष्यते ॥१९४॥

अनेन - by this (ātmajñāna) एतत् सर्वम् - all that is there other than ātmā called anātmā वेद - (jñānī) knows इति - thus आत्मज्ञानमात्रतः - by mere ātmajñāna सार्वज्ञ्यम् - omniscience उक्तम् - was declared तु - but आनन्दसमाप्तिः - culmination of all happiness in ātmā (on

gaining *ātmajñāna*) प्रवक्ष्यते - will be told – (194)

194. A *jñānī* knows all that is there other than *ātmā* called *anātmā* by this *ātmajñāna*. Thus (by the statement ‘*anena*’ of the Upaniṣad) the (resultant) omniscience by gaining the mere *ātmajñāna* was declared. But, the culmination of all happiness (on gaining *ātmajñāna*) will be told (later).

The topic of gaining omniscience on directly knowing *ātmā* is concluded. Sequentially (as referred to in the verse 192) the culmination of all happiness in *ātmā* has to be elaborated. Yet it will be explained only in verses 200 to 209. Meanwhile doubts regarding the said omniscience are clarified.

अन्यज्ञानेन नान्यस्य क्वचिदस्त्यवबुद्धता ।
आत्मज्ञानेन सर्वस्य ज्ञानं कथमुदीर्यते ॥१९५॥

अन्यज्ञानेन - by the knowledge of a given entity अन्यस्य - of another अवबुद्धता - knowledge न क्वचित् - nowhere अस्ति - is (seen) (अतः - therefore) आत्मज्ञानेन - by *ātmajñāna* कथम् - how सर्वस्य - of everything (else other than *ātmā*) ज्ञानं - knowledge उदीर्यते - is stated – (195)

195. (Here is a doubt). By the knowledge of a given entity, gaining the knowledge of another one is nowhere seen. (Therefore) how is it stated that everything (else other than *ātmā*) is known by *ātmajñāna*?

The knowledge of a pot cannot give the knowledge of a cot. How can the knowledge of *ātmā* result in the knowledge of *anātmā*? This is a valid question with respect to different objects having the same degree of reality. But, this observation is inapplicable where one entity (basis - *adhiṣṭhāna*) is true and the others are falsely superimposed (*adhyasta*) on it. This question has cropped up because of not knowing such distinction. The answer follows.

सत्यमेवं भवेदेतद्यद्यात्माप्यन्य
इष्यते ।

आत्मासावन्य इति च

नानुन्मत्तस्य गीरीयम् ॥१९६॥

एतद् - this (objection) एवं - as told सत्यं - true भवेद् - would be यदि - if आत्मा - *ātmā* अपि - also (अनात्मनः - from *anātmā*) अन्यः - different इष्यते - is accepted असौ - this आत्मा - *ātmā* (अनात्मनः - from *anātmā*) अन्यः - different इति - so इयम् - this गीः - statement अनुन्मत्तस्य - of a sane person न च - never – (196)

196. The above objection would be true if *ātmā* also is accepted to be different from *anātmā*. The statement that this *ātmā* is different from *anātmā* can never be that of a sane person. (Only a mad or intoxicated person can say so.)

Like a pot different from cot, *ātmā* which itself appears as entire *jagat*

is not different from it (*jagat*). There is nothing else other than *ātmā*. In spite of any number of superimposed (*adhyasta*) entities, by the knowledge of the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) their (of *adhyasta* entities) knowledge becomes meaningless. In fact the knowledge of *adhiṣṭhāna* alone is the true one, whereas that of *adhyasta* is a delusion.

According to what is said so far, it can be accepted that on knowing true (*satya*) *ātmā* the entire false (*mithyā*) *jagat* becomes known. But here is a doubt. The means to know *satya* (true) *ātmā* are not available as there is no scope for them to abide in the non-dual *ātmā*. The means such as *śruti*, *guru*, *śravaṇa* (self-inquiry) can be of no use since they are in the realm of false *jagat*. Then, how can *ātmā* be known whose knowledge results in omniscience? In answer to this query, *śruti* (*Br. U. 1-4-7*) gives an illustration of the footprint or foot (*pāda*) of a horse. A horse is not its footprint. Yet, its footprint can lead to the tracing of a lost horse. Similarly, the *śruti*, *guru*, etc., though false in nature, can serve as a means to gain *ātmajñāna*. Or the illustration is explained in a slightly different way as presented by the author in this text. On seeing a foot of a horse, which is only a part of it, the entire horse can be identified as this is the horse. Similarly on knowing *ātmā* at the individual embodiment level, the same

as the basis of the entire *jagat* can be directly discovered. The next three verses explain this.

प्रत्यक् तत्त्वे परिज्ञाते जगत्तत्त्वं प्रबुद्ध्यते ।
इत्यत्र पददृष्टान्तो यथावत् स विविच्यते ॥१९७॥

प्रत्यक् तत्त्वे - When the true nature of *pratyagātmā* परिज्ञाते - is directly experienced without the *tripuṭī* जगत्तत्त्वं - the true nature of *jagat* प्रबुद्ध्यते - is clearly known इति अत्र - in this matter (यः) पददृष्टान्तः - whatever illustration of foot-step or foot (*pada*) (श्रुत्या प्रदर्शितः - is given by the *śruti*) सः - that illustration यथावत् - properly विविच्यते - is described - (197)

197. The true nature of *jagat* is clearly known when the true nature of *pratyagātmā* is directly experienced without the *tripuṭī*.

एकं पादं यथाश्वस्य दृष्ट्वाश्वत्वमशेषतः।
दृष्टवानेव भवति दृष्टोऽश्व इति वर्णनात्॥१९८॥

एवं स्वदेहमात्रस्थे साक्षितत्वेऽवलोकिते।
अशेषजगतस्तत्त्वं लभ्यतैव न संशयः ॥१९९॥

यथा - just as अश्वस्य - of a horse एकं - one पादं - foot दृष्ट्वा - having seen अशेषतः - in its entirety अश्वत्वम् - the entity called horse दृष्टवान् एव भवति - becomes truly seen अश्वः - horse दृष्टः - is seen इति - thus वर्णनात् - because of (such) statement - (198)

एवं - likewise स्वदेहमात्रस्थे - abiding in one's embodiment only साक्षितत्वे - the *sākṣī* principle *ātmā* अवलोकिते - when directly known अशेषजगतः - of the entire *jagat* तत्त्वम् - true nature लभ्यते एव - is certainly gained (known) (अत्र - about this) संशयः - doubt न - is not there – (199)

198, 199. Just as having seen the foot of a horse, the entity called horse truly becomes seen in its entirety because of the statement made, ‘the horse is seen’, likewise when only the *sākṣī* principle *ātmā* abiding in one's embodiment is directly known the true nature of the entire *jagat* is certainly gained (known). There is no doubt (about this).

The word *pada* means foot-print. It also means *pāda*, the foot. As seen earlier, the illustration holds good both ways. When the foot of a horse hidden in the bushes is seen, generally it is said that the horse is seen. It is quite appropriate to say that Mr. Gopal is seen on seeing his face. There is no need of seeing his entire body. The pure awareness principle, *sat-cit-ānanda* in nature as available in an individual embodiment, is called *sākṣī*. It enables all experiences, all knowledge, the awareness of all thoughts and the bodily functions. In the case of the illustration,

there is some difference between the horse and its foot-print or the foot. But there is no difference between *sākṣī* and the true nature of *jagat*. Both are one and the same *sat-cit-ānanda*. Therefore knowledge of *sākṣī* itself is the knowledge of *jagat* in its true nature.

VIDYĀSŪTRA - ĀTMĀ IS PRIYATAMAḤ (MOST DEAR)

There are varieties of sense-pleasures in the world. Why then *ātmā* alone has to be sought discarding all of them? The answer was already hinted in verses 192 and 194. All types of happiness culminate in *ātmā*. *Ātmā* is limitless happiness and itself the original source of all sense-pleasures and the most dear. It is well-known that whatever that is the most dear has to be sought by all means. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* declares: The principle of *ātmā* that is being unfolded now is dearer (*preyaḥ*) than the son (who is generally dear), more dear than the wealth, dearer than anything else that is held dear because *ātmā* is the most proximate entity, (more so than even the proximate embodiment). (*Bṛ.U.1-4-8*). The next ten verses establish this fact.

आनन्दस्य समाप्तिर्या प्रत्यगात्मनि साधुना ।
प्रदर्श्यतेऽनुभूत्यात्र स्पष्टं सार्वजनीनया ॥२००॥

प्रत्यगात्मनि - in *pratyagātmā*
आनन्दस्य - of happiness या - whatever

समाप्तिः - culmination or perfection (उक्ता - told) सा - that one अधुना - now सार्वजनीनया - by universal अनुभूत्या - (by) experience अत्र - here स्पष्टं - clearly प्रदर्श्यते - is shown - (200)

200. Now, here the culmination of (perfection) of happiness in *pratyagātmā* that was stated earlier (verses 192 and 194) is shown clearly by universal experience.

A dear entity is a source of happiness. But the dearer entity is a source of more happiness. The most dear one necessarily must yield the maximum happiness. *Ātmā* is now going to be proved as the most dear entity. That means *ātmā* in its nature is limitless happiness. *Ātmā* is also free from *upādhis*, changes, birth, death, etc., whereby there is no sorrow in it. Therefore, *ātmā* is worthy to be the highest *puruṣārtha*. This usefulness of *ātmajñāna* is one of the prerequisites to show that *ātmā* can be known through a valid *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge, verse 190). The other such requirement is unknownness (*ajñātātā*). It was shown by *avyākṛta*-statement (verse 81, 95, etc.).

The *śruti*-portion (*Bṛ.U.1-4-8*) describing *ātmā* as the most dear entity is explained now.

वित्तात् पुत्रः प्रियः पुत्रात्

पिण्डः पिण्डात् तथेन्द्रियम् ।

इन्द्रियेभ्यः प्रियः प्राणः

आत्मा प्रियतमस्ततः ॥२०१॥

पुत्रः - son वित्तात् - than wealth प्रियः - (is) dear पिण्डः - one's physical body पुत्रात् - than the son (प्रियः - is dear) तथा - so also इन्द्रियं - organ पिण्डात् - than the physical body (प्रियम् - is dear) प्राणः - vital air, life इन्द्रियेभ्यः - than the organs प्रियः - (is) dear आत्मा - *ātmā* ततः (प्राणात् प्रियः) - (is dear than) *prāṇa* (तस्मात् आत्मा - therefore *ātmā*) प्रियतमः - is the dearest - (201)

201. The son is dearer than wealth. One's physical body is dearer than the son. The organs are dearer than the physical body. The vital air is still dearer than the organs. *Ātmā* is dearer than the vital air. Therefore, *ātmā* is the dearest.

The above is a fact universally observed. The verse is similar to *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Vārtika* (1-4-8-1031). In general, it is seen that parents are ready to spend any amount of money to protect their progeny (though there may be rare exceptions). Again faced with no options, the organs are protected at the cost of other general parts of the physical body. According to *Śrī* Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the word *prāṇaḥ* in this verse stands for *antaḥkaraṇa* (mind). (*Si.Bi.1*).

Thus the vital air or *antaḥkaraṇa* (mind) is still dearer than the organs. *Ātmā* is the dearest. As a corollary, *āt̄mā* is proved to be limitless happiness. This is established based on reasoning. But many *śruti*-statements declare unequivocally that the nature of *āt̄mā*/Brahman is *ananta* (limitless) *ānanda* (happiness).

Ātmā is the dearest is further explained.

स्वात्मभोगस्य हेतुत्वात्
प्राणादौ प्रीतिरिष्यते ।
न स्वतोतो न सा मुख्या
वेश्याप्रीतिर्यथा तथा ॥२०२॥

प्राणादौ - for the vital air, etc. प्रीतिः - love स्वात्मभोगस्य - of one's utility (भोग) हेतुत्वात् - because of being the means इष्यते - is consented (सा प्रीतिः - that love) स्वतः - for the sake of themselves न - is not अतः - therefore यथा - just as वेश्याप्रीतिः - fascination towards an ill-reputed woman तथा - so सा - that (love towards *prāṇa*, etc.) मुख्या - primary न - (is) not –(202)

202. The love for *prāṇa*, etc., is consented because they are the means for one's utility. That love is not for the sake of *prāṇa*, etc. Therefore the love towards *prāṇa*, etc., is not primary like the fascination towards an ill-reputed woman.

The love for *prāṇa*, organs, physical body, son and wealth, etc., is there because they are useful. The love towards them is not for the sake of themselves. It is not primary without expecting something in return from them. The illustration of an ill-reputed woman explains this fact. Fascination towards her is for sense-gratification and it is not the genuine love that exists between husband and wife mutually committed to each other. Or the illustration can be taken the other way. The fascination of such a woman for a man is because of his youthfulness and wealth. It is not a true love.

The love for *āt̄mā* is without expecting anything in return. Therefore, it is the genuine love.

प्रतीचि निर्निमित्तैव
सर्वावस्थास्वपीष्यते।
प्रीतिरग्न्युष्णवत् तस्मान्मुख्यासाविति
गम्यताम् ॥२०३॥

प्रतीचि - towards *pratyagāt̄mā*, प्रीतिः - love सर्वावस्थासु अपि - under all circumstances निर्निमित्ता एव - natural, causeless alone इष्यते - is accepted अग्न्युष्णवत् - like the heat in the fire तस्मात् - therefore असौ - this (love for *āt̄mā*) मुख्या - (is) pre-eminent इति - so गम्यताम् - be understood –(203)

203. The natural love towards

pratyagātmā under all circumstances like the heat in the fire, is accepted. Therefore, know for certain that the love for *ātmā* is pre-eminent (in nature).

Ātmā is always dear (*priya*). Without any specific cause irrespective of any circumstances. It is never disliked (*apriya*). The nature of love and *ātmā* are inseparable like the fire and its heat. Therefore, the love for *ātmā* is natural or causeless. All circumstances refer to all states such as childhood, youth, middle age, old age, three states of consciousness, happy, sorrowful, deluded, etc. Such a spontaneous love can be only because *ātmā* is limitless *ānanda*.

While 'I' the *ātmā* is universally the most dear, a varying degree of love (*prema - tārātamyā*) towards all *anātmā* that are superimposed on *ātmā* is found. This is due to the differential nature of *adhyāsa*, or in other words, the different degrees of separation of superimposed entities, (i.e. the *anātmā*) from *ātmā* (*Si.Bi.1*). An entity more proximate to *ātmā* is dearer than the remote one. The verse 201 is testimony to this fact. The most proximate feature of *ātmā* is cited here as the reason for the causeless love towards it.

सर्वान्तरत्वेन युज्यते निर्निमित्ता ।
बाह्येषु सनिमित्तत्वं प्रीतेः स्पष्टं गवादिषु ॥२०४॥

सर्वान्तरत्वेन - because of (*ātmā*) being the most proximate (प्रतीचः) प्रीतेः - of the love (for *ātmā*) निर्निमित्ता - naturalness युज्यते - is proper बाह्येषु (विषयेषु) - for external objects प्रीतेः - of love सनिमित्तत्वं - (is) with motive (एतत् - this) गवादिषु - in the cow, etc. स्पष्टं - is clearly seen - (204)

204. The naturalness of the love for *ātmā* is proper because *ātmā* is the most proximate entity. The love for external objects is with motive. This is clearly seen in the case of cow, etc.

The word *āntar* (inner) signifies least remote or more close. Generally, the entities abiding in the body such as senses, *prāṇa*, the mind, ignorance are considered as inner. *Ātmā* is nearer than these all. This concept is commonly found in the description of five sheaths. In this sense, remote entities are considered to be external. According to this popular concept, *ātmā* is the most proximate. Truly, there is neither inner nor outer. According to the inference employed here, the love for *ātmā* is causeless (natural) because it is the most proximate, the love for these which are not proximate, such as cow, etc., is with motive. The cow is dear because it gives us milk, etc. It is sacred also according to our religion. Modern people may cite the

example of domestic pets such as cats and dogs.

The love for those other than *ātmā* continues so long as they are the sources of joy. But they are disliked even to the point of discarding when they turn out to be the sources of sorrow. Here is an example.

व्याध्याध्युपद्रुतो लोको मृतिमप्यभिवाञ्छति ।
निर्निमित्तप्रियत्वे तु देहादेस्तन्न युज्यते ॥२०५॥

व्याध्याध्युपद्रुतो - afflicted by diseases, etc. लोकः - people मृतिम् - death अपि - even अभिवाञ्छति - wishes देहादेः - for body, etc. तु - but निर्निमित्तप्रियत्वे - if the love were natural तत् - that (desire to die) न युज्यते - is not proper – (205)

205. People afflicted by diseases, etc., even wish to die. But, it is not proper if the love for body, etc., were natural.

Generally, in life, we think that our love for the body is natural because we never want to die. Actually, it is so until the body serves its purpose trouble-free. But faced with incurable diseases, etc., there is a strong wish to discard it with the hope to get free from pain, etc. This should not be the case if the love for the body were without any motive. The same norm applies to ‘I notion’ (*ahaṅkāra*). People even resort to intoxicants to forget the ‘I notion’ when it becomes unbearable. In fact, our daily

eagerness to have deep sleep itself shows that we want to get away from our facets of individuality from the physical body up to ‘I notion’. That means our love for them is not natural.

Notwithstanding what is established so far, lay people consider the entities distinct from oneself such as husband, wife, children, wealth, etc., only as dear. The *śruti* (*Bṛ.U.1-4-8*) warns such people which sounds as a curse or a piece of advice depending on the attitude of the listener. The *śruti* declares: Tell the person according to whom the entities other than *ātmā*, (i.e. *anātmās*) only are dear, that whatever he holds as dear will perish or make him weep. The one who knows for certain that *ātmā* only is the dearest is quite eligible to say so, because it will be so (*Bṛ.U.1-4-8*).

The above *śruti*-statement is explained.

अनात्मा प्रिय इत्येवं यो मुह्यति स पामरः ।
विनाशित्वमुदाहृत्य मूढं तं बोधयेद्बुधः ॥२०६॥

यः - the person who अनात्मा - entities other than *ātmā* प्रियः - (is) dear इति एवं - thus मुह्यति - mistakes सः - he पामरः - (is) a fool or (is) ignorant बुधः - *jñānī* तं - to that मूढं - ignorant person विनाशित्वम् - perishability उदाहृत्य - having cited बोधयेत् - should educate – (206)

206. The person who mistakes the

entities other than *ātmā* (such as husband, wife, etc.), as dear is a fool (or an ignorant person). A *jñānī* should educate such ignorant one by citing the perishability of *anātmā*.

A person who considers the perishable (*asat*) as imperishable (*sat*), impure as pure, *anātmā* as 'I' (*ātmā*) and great sorrow as happiness is certainly a fool. Obviously, it is the influence of self-ignorance. This *śruti* is explained in *Pañcadaśī* (12-63 to 69). When an *ācārya* (teacher) teaches the disciple what is actually dear and what is not so, he understands the truth of this statement and corrects his values in life accordingly. On the contrary, if an obstinate person refuses to accept this fact, he is bound to suffer when the things that are dear to him perish. Thus the same advice becomes a curse. Therefore, it is better not to argue with a *jñānī*. Try to understand him.

The sorrow-breeding nature of *anātmā* is elaborated.

अनात्मा भोगकालेऽस्य सुखं यावत् प्रयच्छति ।
तत्सहस्रगुणं दुःखं नाशकाले प्रयच्छति ॥२०७॥

अनात्मा - the entities other than *ātmā* अस्य (भोक्तुः) - to this experiencer भोगकाले - at the time of sense-enjoyment यावत् - whatever सुखं - pleasure प्रयच्छति - gives तत्सहस्रगुणं - its thousandfold दुःखं - sorrow नाशकाले - at the time of its

destruction प्रयच्छति - gives - (207)

207. Whatever pleasure that *anātmā* gives at the time of sense-enjoyment, its thousandfold sorrow awaits the enjoyer at the time of its destruction.

It is agreed that sense-objects do give some happiness at the time of its enjoyment. Being transient, the sense-objects are bound to perish plunging the person in sorrow. To love them or not, is left to our choice. But, having opted for them at one time or the other, the sorrow is inevitable. Invariably, *anātmā* gives more sorrow and less joy.

Therefore, *śruti* exhorts: 'the most dear *ātmā* only be sought' (*Br.U.1-4-8*). This is explained.

‘या प्रीतिरविवेकानां

विषयेष्वनपायिनी’ ।

व्युत्थाप्य विषयेभ्यस्तां

प्रतीच्येव निवेशयेत् ॥२०८॥

अविवेकानां - to the ignorant people विषयेषु - in the sense-objects या - whatever अनपायिनी - constant, imperishable प्रीतिः - love (भवति - is there) तां - that (love) विषयेभ्यः - from the sense-objects व्युत्थाप्य - having withdrawn प्रतीचि - in *pratyagātmā* एव - only निवेशयेत् - should be redirected - (208)

208. Whatever constant love that

the ignorant people have for the sense-objects, that love should be withdrawn and redirected to *pratyagātmā*.

The first line of this verse corresponds to the first line of the verse 1-20-19 of *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. It is Prahlāda's prayer to *Bhagavān* Viṣṇu. He implores that his love towards the *Bhagavān* must be as steady as that of lay people towards the sense-objects. In fact, love is something that is common in all in equal measure. But unfortunately, ignorant people squander it in the sense-objects. If it is totally redirected towards *ātmā/paramātmā* to seek HIM directly, one's true nature of *paramānanda* (limitless happiness) will be discovered.

The word 'love' (*prema*) is highly misused in the modern world. Nowadays, the lust is parading as love. According to *Bhagavān Śrī Satya Sai Bābā*, the word 'love' (*prema*) or devotion (*bhakti*) must be exclusively reserved for *ātmā/paramātmā/parameśvara*. Some different words will have to be used for love towards others. For example, the love of parents towards children is affection (*vātsalya*), between husband and wife is infatuation (*moha*) and between friends is friendship (*maitrī*), etc.

It was told in the verse 207 that *anātmā* that is held dear does give some happiness at the time of sense-

enjoyment; but it subjects the individual to tremendous sorrow on its destruction. Similarly, one may wonder that *ātmā* also can be a source of sorrow on its destruction. The *śruti* answers this doubt: The happiness (*ātmasukham*) of *ātmajñānī* never perishes (*Br.U.1-4-8*). This is brought to our notice.

विषया इव न

प्रत्यक्कदाचिदपि नश्यति ।

अतो दुःखप्रदत्वं तु शङ्कितुं

न च शक्यते ॥२०९॥

प्रत्यक् - *pratyagātmā* विषयाः इव - like the sense-objects न कदाचिदपि - never नश्यति - disappears/perishes अतः - therefore (तस्य - its) दुःखप्रदत्वं - nature as the source of sorrow तु - certainly शङ्कितुं - to doubt न च शक्यते - is not possible – (209)

209. Like the (perishable) sense-objects, *pratyagātmā* never disappears (perishes). Therefore, it can never be doubted that its (of *ātmā*) nature may be a source of sorrow.

All sense-objects invariably perish or get separated plunging those who love them, in sorrow. *Ātmā* is imperishable and inseparable. Therefore, its separation and resultant sorrow are just impossible.

Primarily the verb *naś* (नश) is in the sense of disappearance (*adarśana*).

The disappearance of an entity is its destruction. The perception of sense-objects takes place one after the other. It is never permanent. But *ātmā* because of whom all perceptions are possible exists forever without any disappearance. Thus the most dear *ātmā* can never give sorrow. The entity different from *ātmā* only can make one weep when it disappears, but not *ātmā*. This rule holds good even when we love *Paramātmā* with *upādhis*, attributes and form. When *Bhagavān* disappears after giving *darśana* (vision), sorrow is bound to be there. Rādhā, Gopīs, Nārada, etc., are examples in this respect. Of course *Bhagavān* uplifts them.

VIDYĀSŪTRA - ĀTMABODHAḤ (SELF-KNOWLEDGE)

Earlier it was told in the *śruti* (*Br. U. 1-4-7*) that all that is superimposed gets merged in *ātmā*. This was elaborated from verse 182 to 187. It was concluded that on gaining *ātmajñāna*, everything becomes known because everything (which is actually superimposed) is nothing but *ātmā*. That means by *ātmajñāna* wherein the ignorance has ended, the knower discovers himself (*ātmā*) to be *sarvātmā* (the true nature of everything). With an intention of elaborating this result of *ātmajñāna* (*ātmavidyā* or *Brahmavidyā*), the *śruti* introduces the forthcoming topic by voicing a question of *jijñāsus-mumukṣus*

who have very intense desire to know *ātmā*/Brahman directly. The author here introduces first the context of the question.

सूत्रार्थज्ञमनुष्याणां मतिं विज्ञाय केचन ।
मुमुक्षुवो गुरुम्प्राप्य चोदयन्त्यतिसंभ्रमात् ॥२१०॥

सूत्रार्थज्ञमनुष्याणाम् - of the eligible seekers who know the import of *Vidyāsūtra* मतिं - intention विज्ञाय - having understood केचन - some मुमुक्षवः - *mumukṣus* (those who have intense yearning to get liberated) गुरुम् - to *guru* प्राप्य - having approached अतिसंभ्रमात् - with great reverence चोदयन्ति - ask the question—(210)

210. Some *mumukṣus* having understood the intention of those eligible seekers who know the import of *Vidyāsūtra* approach their *guru* with great reverence and ask the (following) question.

The question posed by the *śruti* is as follows: ‘The *jijñāsus* ask: Seekers consider that by *Brahmavidyā* (the knowledge of Brahman) we become everything (*sarvam*). What did the Brahman know because of which it became everything?’

यद् ब्रह्मविद्यया सर्वभावाप्तिं

मन्वते नराः ।

तद् ब्रह्म किं विदित्वाभूत्

सर्वमित्येतदीर्यतां ॥२११॥

यद् - indeed ब्रह्मविद्यया - by *Brahmavidyā* सर्वभावाप्तिं - becoming everything नराः - eligible seekers मन्वते - think तद् - that ब्रह्म - Brahman किं - what विदित्वा - having known सर्वं - everything अभूत् - became इति एतद् - this ईर्यताम् - may please be told – (211)

211. Indeed, the eligible seekers think of becoming everything by *Brahmavidyā*. Having known what, did the Brahman become everything? This may please be answered.

The *śruti* is now describing the nature of *ātmajñāna* by posing this question. There is a catch in this question. If Brahman became everything by knowing some entity, the question arises: is Brahman limited or limitless (non-dual)? If it is limited and knows something else to become everything, it can no longer be Brahman because of its limited nature. If Brahman is limitless, there is no occasion of knowing something else because such a distinct entity itself is not there in non-dual Brahman. There is no ‘knower-known’ division also. Thus, there can be no occasion of Brahman knowing something to become everything. Therefore, the question needs further investigation. The question, ‘*kimu tad Brahma avet*’ (what did that Brahma know?) (*Br.U.1-4-9*) in

itself implies two further questions: i) what is that Brahman? ii) what did that Brahman know?, i.e. does it become *sarvam* (everything) by knowing itself or something else? All these aspects will be considered.

The *guru* obliges by replying to the question.

एवं मुमुक्षुभिश्चोद्ये कृते करुणया गुरुः ।
अनायासेन तच्चोद्यं परिहर्तुं वचोब्रवीत् ॥२१२॥

एवं - thus मुमुक्षुभिः - by *mumukṣus* चोद्ये कृते (सति) - when questioned गुरुः - *guru* करुणया - out of compassion तत् - that चोद्यं - question अनायासेन - easily परिहर्तुं - to answer वचः अब्रवीत् - said – (212)

212. When questioned thus by *mumukṣus*, the *guru* out of compassion said (as follows) to answer the question easily.

This reply continues upto the verse 227. Before that it is desirable to consider the reply from the original Upaniṣad. It says: Before gaining the knowledge of *ātmā*, Brahman, (i.e. Brahman who appears as *jīva*) was there. It (*tat*) knew its true nature of ever-existent knowledge-principle (*dr̥k*) free from all the transient superimposed notions as ‘I am Brahman’. By that direct knowledge that (*jīva*) became everything (*sarvam*) (*Br.U.1-4-10*). The first word ‘*Brahma*’ in this sentence

refers to an eligible *jīva* who in reality is nothing but Brahman. Though *jīva* is Brahman in reality, yet it appears as non-Brahman (*abrahma*) in the state of ignorance. Thus it means Brahman which was mistaken as *jīva* hither to by *avidyā* became Brahman.

The reply by the *guru* starts now in the text.

ब्रह्मैव बोधाद् प्रागजीवो भूत्वात्मानमवेत् पुनः ।
अहं ब्रह्मेति तद्वेधात् सर्वात्मकमभूत् तदा ॥२१३॥

जीवः - *jīva* (individual self) बोधात्
प्राक् - before gaining self-knowledge ब्रह्म
एव - Brahman only भूत्वा - having been
पुनः - when 'अहं ब्रह्म' - 'I am Brahman' इति
- so आत्मानम् - oneself अवेत् - ascertained,
knew तदा - then तद्वेधात् - by that
knowledge (of Brahman) सर्वात्मकम् -
nature of all; अभूत् - became—(213)

213. A *jīva* having been Brahman only before gaining the self-knowledge, when knew oneself as 'I am Brahman', then by that knowledge of Brahman (the hitherto *jīva*) became the nature of all (*sarvarūpa*).

This verse presents the reply in a nutshell. A *jīva* is a mistaken entity due to self-ignorance. In reality, it is Brahman even when it appears as *jīva*. On gaining the knowledge of its true nature, it discovered itself to be Brahman. *Jīva* was, is and shall ever be

Brahman. It appears to be different by ignorance. Truly there is no *jīva* becoming Brahman. Brahman itself became Brahman. This is possible when the erroneous notion about oneself is given up.

The word *punaḥ* used in this verse generally means 'again'. But, it has to be taken here as 'when' according to Medinī lexicon. Therein one of the meanings of '*punaḥ*' is *pakṣāntara* (another supposition). That yields the meaning of 'when' for '*punaḥ*'.

Here is a doubt. The one and the same entity cannot be the knower (subject) and the known (its object). The knower is always different from the known. In any knowledge, the knower (*jñātā*) knowledge (*jñāna*) and the known (*jñeya*) are different. Then how can the statement '*ātmānam aveṭ*' (the *jīva* knew itself) hold good? The answer follows.

अवेत् सोपाधिरात्मायमात्मानं निरुपाधिकम् ।
ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेय भेदात् न दोषोऽत्र मनागपि ॥२१४॥

अयं - this सोपाधिः - with *upādhis*
आत्मा - *ātmā* निरुपाधिकम् - free from
upādhis आत्मानं - *ātmā* (in the accusative)
अवेत् - knew अत्र - in this statement
ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेय भेदात् - on account of distinct
knower (*jñātā*), knowledge (*jñāna*) and
known (*jñeya*) मनाक् अपि - even (*api*) a

little दोषः - defect न - is not there – (214)

214. This *ātmā* with *upādhis* (called *jīva*) knew the *ātmā* totally free from *upādhis* (called Brahman). There is not even a little defect in this statement on account of distinct knower, knowledge and known.

Here the *upādhis* are the gross, subtle and causal bodies. *Ātmā* identified with these is a *jīva*. The *Jīva* directly became aware that in its true nature, it is free from *upādhis*. It knew itself to be Brahman. When you see your face in the mirror, there is a seeming distinction between the seer you and the seen you. Without the *upādhi* of mirror you are the seer whereas with mirror you become the seen. There is no rule that knower and the known difference must be real. With seeming difference between them also such practice (*vyavahāra*) takes place. Thus the *jīva* (*ātmā* with *upādhi*) as the knower and Brahman (*ātmā* devoid of *upādhi*) as the known is quite tenable.

In the process of Brahman knowing itself, the three essential features, viz. i) who is the knower? ii) what is the known? and iii) what is the knowledge? are being demonstrated.

अविविक्तस्तु देहाद्यैरात्मा

भवति वेदिता ।

विविक्तात्मा वेदितव्यो

धीवृत्तिर्वेदनं भवेत् ॥२१५॥

देहाद्यैः - with the body, etc.

अविविक्तः - identified आत्मा - *ātmā* वेदिता - knower भवति - is; तु - whereas (देहाद्यैः - with the body, etc.) विविक्तात्मा - unidentified / distinguished *ātmā* वेदितव्यः - the entity to be known (भवति - is) धीवृत्तिः - the thought conforming to Brahman वेदनम् - knowledge भवेत् - is – (215)

215. *Ātmā* identified with the body, etc., is the knower whereas the *ātmā* unidentified with them is the entity to be known. The thought conforming to Brahman is the knowledge (of Brahman).

The word ‘etc.’ in the phrase ‘body, etc.’, includes all the three bodies including *ahaṃkāra* (erroneous ‘I’ notion) and the self-ignorance. The knowledge (*jñāna*) of an entity is revealed by a thought (*antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) corresponding to the entity to be known. It ends the ignorance of the thing to be known. Though *ātmā* is itself the knowledge-principle, it is also the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of ignorance. *Ātmā* does not end the ignorance of anything. Ignorance belongs to *buddhi* (intellect). A *buddhivṛtti* (*antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) having the form of the entity to be known alone can end its ignorance. According to Vedānta, *ātmā* alone in the sense of *cidābhāsa* cast

in the *viṣayākāra-antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* corresponding to the thing to be known is its knowledge. Yet, for practical purpose the *viṣayākāra-vṛtti* (thought confirming to the thing to be known) is considered as its knowledge secondarily (*Ve.P.B.*). It is this *vṛtti* which depicts the exact features of the entity to be known.

Here a doubt is possible. *Ātmā* is self-luminous knowledge-principle. Why a separate *vṛtti* (thought) is required to gain its knowledge? In answer to this the function of the *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti* as seen above is shown.

अविद्यारोपनिहुत्यै तद् आत्मानम् अवेद् इति ।
आत्माभिमुखधीवृत्तिरात्मवेदनमुच्यते ॥२१६॥

अविद्यारोपनिहुत्यै - to end the superimposition of ignorance (अविद्या) तद् - Brahman (as *Hiraṇyagarbha* or the eligible *jīva*) आत्मानम् - one's true nature of pure awareness (*cit*) principle अवेद् - knew इति - so (श्रुतिः आह - the *śruti* said) आत्माभिमुखधीवृत्तिः - the *vṛtti* (thought) assuming or objectifying the true nature of *ātmā* (एव - alone) आत्मवेदनम् - *ātmajñāna* (the knowledge of *ātmā*) उच्यते - is called—(216)

216. Brahman, (i.e. *Hiraṇyagarbha* or the eligible *jīva*) knew *ātmā* (one's true nature). Thus (said the *śruti*). The

vṛtti assuming or objectifying the true nature of *ātmā* alone is called *ātmajñāna*.

For reasons already seen, to gain self-knowledge the *vṛtti* conforming to the true nature of *ātmā*/Brahman is indispensable. It is called *vṛtti-vyāpti* wherein the *vṛtti* (thought) objectifies the entity to be known by assuming its form. Like any thought, this thought (*vṛtti*) also has *cidābhāsa* (the reflection of *caitanya*) in it. It is called *phala*. The *phala* illumines (makes known) the inert objects to be known. This modus operandi is called *phala-vyāpti*, wherein the *phala* objectifies the thing to be known in order to reveal it. To know the self-luminous (*svayam-jyoti*) knowledge-principle *ātmā*/Brahman, the *phala*, even if present, is not necessary though *vṛtti-vyāpti* is indispensable. You do not need a torch to illumine the self-luminous sun. The *vṛtti*, conforming to *ātmā*/Brahman is called *ātmākāra*, *Brahmākāra* or *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti*. It is just a replica of *ātmā*/Brahman. It removes the self-ignorance whereby self-luminous *ātmā* Brahman is evident on its own without the need of anything else. On gaining the steadiness (*niṣṭhā*) in this state by the practice of maintaining *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* repeatedly, that *vṛtti* also drops finally. What remains is Brahman and Brahman alone, totally free

from all that is *adhyasta* (superimposed) on it. It is the direct experience of *ātmā*/Brahman without the experiencer, experience and experienced. This is *Brahmasākṣātkāra/ātmāsākṣātkāra*. This is the action replay of the process of gaining *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna*. This accomplishment is the finale of human existence.

The significance of the emphatic word ‘*eva*’ (alone) in the *śruti*, ‘*tad ātmānam eva avet*’ (*Bṛ.U.1-4-10*) is explained.

आत्मानमेव तद् अवेद् इत्युक्ताद् एवकारतः ।
निर्माल्यवत् परित्याज्यं देहादीत्यवगम्यते॥२१७॥

तद् - that (*Hiraṇyagarbha* or the eligible *jīva*) आत्मानम् - one's true nature एव - alone अवेत् - knew इति - so उक्ताद् - from the said statement एवकारतः - by the word *eva* (alone) देहादि - the body, etc. निर्माल्यवत् - like the flowers used for worship are cast off परित्याज्यम् - should be discarded इति - so अवगम्यते - is understood –(217)

217. By the word *eva* (alone) from the said statement, ‘*Hiraṇyagarbha* or the eligible *jīva* knew one's true nature *ātmā* alone’. It is understood that the body, etc., should be discarded like the flowers used for worship are cast off.

Ātmā alone implies the total exclusion of all that is other than *ātmā*, viz. *anātmā*. The *anātmā* at the individual *jīva* level ranges from the physical body onwards to *ahaṃkāra* and *avidyā* whereas the same at the level of totality encompasses the entire *dr̥śya jagat* upto *Hiraṇyagarbha*, its Creator and *māyā*. All these are not the intrinsic features of *ātmā*. They are superimposed (*adhyasta*) on *ātmā*/Brahman as their basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*). What can be discarded is *adhyasta anātmā* and not the basis *ātmā*. It is universally known that ‘I’ (*aham*) can never be given up, whereas it is possible to give up ‘this’ (*idam*)-whatever that is distinct from ‘I’.

The illustration given is that of *nirmālya*. The flowers used for floral decoration or worship of an idol, when removed are called *nirmālya*. Generally, they are totally removed daily either at night while going to bed or in the morning while giving bath. *Nirmālya* is not the intrinsic feature of an idol that is worshipped. It is to be removed totally but not the consecrated idol. It remains always, whereas the flowers used come and go.

In the illustration, the *nirmālya* can be discarded easily. But *anātmā* cannot be discarded physically. It is true. Yet, it can be totally discarded just like discarding the

superimposed snake from its basis, the rope. All that you have to do is to bring the light to dispel darkness. What you see then is the rope without any trace of snake. Similarly, the well-prepared mind by the Vedāntic discipline, such as *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti*, should take to *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* leading to the birth of *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti*. This *vṛtti* serves as the light of knowledge which dispels the darkness of self-ignorance. It is free from all *adhyasta anātmā* except itself which is a part of *adhyasta antaḥkaraṇa*. This is so in the initial stages of *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti*. By its repeated practice in its steadfastness (*niṣṭhā*) that *vṛtti* (the last trace of *adhyasta*) also drops. What remains is *ātmā*/Brahman alone, totally free from all *adhyasta anātmā* except the residual *saṃskāras* of the *antaḥkaraṇa*. It is like the idol wherein there is no trace of *nirmālya*.

From the foregoing elaboration, it must be understood very clearly that to gain *Brahmajñāna*, the ending of all *anātmā* that is *adhyasta* from the range of one's cognition is indispensable. *Bhāṣyakāra* emphasizes this need while commenting on 'aham Brahma asmi' (*Br.U.1-4-10*) even at the risk of repetition. Consider the following passages of *Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya*.

1. तद् ब्रह्म आत्मानम् एव नित्यदृक्स्वरूपम् अध्यारोपितानित्यदृष्टयादि-वर्जितम् अवेद् विदितवत् ।
(*Br.U. Bh.1-4-10*)

Tr. That Brahman (*Hiraṇyagarbha* or an eligible *jīva*) knew *ātmā* (oneself) alone whose nature is knowledge-principle totally free from all the superimposed transitory cognitions of *dr̥śya jagat* with *avidyā* and its effect (*kārya*).

This shows that in the knowledge of *ātmā*, there is no cognition of all that is superimposed from *avidyā* onwards to its entire *kārya* the *jagat*. *Akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* by its very nature aims at this exclusion of all that is superimposed.

2. अज्ञानाध्यारोपणनिवृत्तिरेव आत्मानम् एव अवेद् इति उक्तं न आत्मनः विषयीकरणम् ।
(*Br.U.Bh.1-4-10*)

Tr.What is meant by (it) knew *ātmā* (oneself) alone is truly the termination of ignorance and the consequent superimposition and not the objectification of *ātmā*.

3. अब्रह्माध्यारोपणापगमात् तत्कार्यस्य असर्वत्वस्य निवृत्त्या सर्वम् अभवत्। (*Br.U.Bh.1-4-10*).

Tr. Because of the disappearance (*apagama*) of the superimposed *anātmā* (by knowledge), the limitations (*asarvatva*) produced by the superimposition end. Thereby Brahman became everything.

Bhāṣyakāra highlights the termination of *adhyasta* in his commentary on *Bhagavadgītā* (18-50) also. After showing how *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* is possible, he emphasizes: To gain the knowledge of *ātmā*, what has to be accomplished is simply the withdrawal (*nivṛtti*) from all the superimposed *anātmā* characterized by name and form... All that is required for *Brahmajñāna* therefore, is the *nirākaraṇam* (disappearance) of *avidyādhyāropana*, namely, forgetting or expelling from cognition superimposed entities which are an effect of ignorance. 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).

The author affirms now that self-evident *ātmā* only remains on ending the entire *anātmā* that was superimposed on *ātmā* hitherto.

त्यज्यमाने तु

देहादावात्मैवैकोऽवशिष्यते ।

परित्यक्तुमशक्यत्वादात्मानं

निहुतेऽत्र कः ॥२१८॥

तु - and now देहादौ - the body, etc. त्यज्यमाने (सति) - when discarded एकः - single आत्मा एव - *ātmā* alone अवशिष्यते - remains आत्मानं - *ātmā* परित्यक्तुम् - to give up अशक्यत्वात् - because it is impossible अत्र - in this world कः - who (आत्मानं - oneself) निहुते - can deny? – (218)

218. And now, when the body, etc., are discarded, single *ātmā* alone remains because it is impossible to give up *ātmā*. In this world, who can deny oneself? (None).

The phrase '*aham Brahma asmi*'

(I am Brahman) (*Br.U.* 1-4-10) is explained up to the verse 225.

VIDYĀSŪTRA - AHAM BRAHMA ASMI (I AM BRAHMAN)

अहं ब्रह्मास्मि नो जीव इत्यवेद् ब्रह्मरूपताम् ।
शोधितस्याहमर्थस्य युज्यते ब्रह्मरूपता ॥२१९॥

अहं - I ब्रह्म - Brahman अस्मि - am जीवः - *jīvaḥ* न उ (अस्मि) - I am not at all इति - so (ब्रह्मस्वरूपः जीव - the Brahman who appeared as *jīva*) ब्रह्मरूपताम् अवेद् - knew its identity to be Brahman शोधितस्य - of the *upādhiless* (*nirupādhika*) अहमर्थस्य - of the entity 'I' ब्रह्मरूपता - the status of Brahman युज्यते - is proper – (219)

219. The Brahman who appeared as *jīva* knew its identity to be Brahman as, 'I am Brahman, I am not at all a *jīva*'. The status of Brahman of the *upādhiless* (*nirupādhika*) entity 'I' is proper.

In reality *jīva* is not different from Brahman, though it appears so because

of ignorance. It is like the reflection of the moon in muddy shaking water appearing as different from the original one or like the pot-space appearing limited in contrast to the total space. In the absence of reflecting water or when the pot is broken, all that is there is the original moon or the total space. One is real and the other is just a seeming appearance.

Notwithstanding the above explanation, if it is still argued that the limited *saṃsārī jīva* can never be identical with limitless *asaṃsārī* (free from *saṃsāra*) Brahman, the second line of this verse provides the answer.

The word ‘*śodhita*’ literally means purified or cleansed of impurities. Though *ātmā* being non-dual is ever-pure, the *jīva* having ignorance and its effect as its *upādhi* appears to be impure because of *saṃsāra*. The *upādhis* and their features are superimposed on *ātmā*. All perceptual knowledge and varieties of experiences get attributed to it. As a result *ātmā* appears to be impure. Therefore, ‘*śodhita aham*’ is the pure awareness (*cit*) *ātmā* free from all *upādhis* and their features. It is also called *śodhita tvam* in the context of ‘*tat tvam asi*’ *mahāvākya*. It is necessarily Brahman.

The *nirupādhika* oneself is Brahman. This truth is demonstrated.

ब्रह्मता नात्मनोऽन्यत्र नात्मता ब्रह्मणोऽन्यतः ।
तद्याथात्म्याप्रबोधात् तयोरेष विपर्ययः ॥२२०॥

आत्मनः अन्यत्र - anywhere else other than *ātmā* ब्रह्मता - the nature of Brahman न - is not there ब्रह्मणः अन्यतः - anywhere else other than Brahman आत्मता - the nature of *ātmā* न - is not there तु - but तद्याथात्म्याप्रबोधात् - due to the ignorance of their identity तयोः - between them, (i.e. Brahman and *ātmā*) एषः - this (universally experienced) विपर्ययः - mistake (of contrariety) (प्रतीयते - is perceived) –(220)

220. The nature of Brahman is nowhere else other than in *ātmā* (and) the nature of *ātmā* (*ātmātā*) is nowhere else than in Brahman. But due to the ignorance of their identity, this (universally experienced) mistake (of contrariety) (is perceived) between them, (i.e. Brahman and *ātmā*).

The true nature of both Brahman and *ātmā* is one and the same *cit* - pure awareness principle, totally free from all *upādhis* which breed the *saṃsāra*. The word *ātmā* is used for *cit* at the individual *jīva* level, whereas Brahman stands for *cit* at totality level. What is different from *ātmā* is *anātmā* which is inert. Therefore, *anātmā* cannot be Brahman, the *cit*. The entities other than all pervasive Brahman are limited in nature.

Being inert, they are *anātmā* such as pot, cot, etc., and hence cannot be *ātmā*. We know *ātmā* to be *cit*, but know not that it is all pervasive. In the same trend, we also know Brahman to be all pervasive, but know not that it is the inner most 'I'-*pratyagātmā*. Due to this ignorance we conclude, 'I am not Brahman, Brahman is not I'. Many devout persons say that *Paramātmā* is in every atom at every moment even if they do not accept that 'the same *Paramātmā* is in me, nay, it is truly me'. This is because of the ignorance of *ātmā* and Brahman in their true nature. Thus due to the ignorance of identity between *ātmā* and Brahman, both of them are perceived quite contrarily.

The means to uproot this contrary notion is being told.

अब्रह्मानात्मताहेतौ प्रत्यग्ध्वान्ते निवर्तिते ।
आत्मानमेव ब्रह्मेति निर्विघ्नं प्रतिपद्यते ॥२२१॥

अब्रह्मानात्मताहेतौ - when the cause of the notions that *ātmā* is not Brahman, and Brahman is not *ātmā* प्रत्यग्ध्वान्ते - (viz.) the ignorance of *pratyagātmā* निवर्तिते - when ended आत्मानम् एव - *ātmā* itself ब्रह्म - (is) Brahman इति - so निर्विघ्नं - without any obstruction प्रतिपद्यते - is known - (221)

221. When the ignorance of *pratyagātmā*, the cause of the notions

that *ātmā* is not Brahman, and Brahman is not *ātmā*, is ended, it is known without obstruction that *ātmā* itself is Brahman.

Pratyak is *pratyagātmā* which is generally called *ātmā*. *Sūtrabhāṣya* (*Br.Sū.Bh.*) describes *pratyagātmā* as *aviṣaya* in its phrase '*pratyagātmāni aviṣaye*'. *Aviṣaya* means that which can never be objectified as this. It is always 'I'. The *Upādhis* such as body, etc., cannot be defined as either *sat* (existent) or *asat* (non-existent). Contrarily, *ātmā* can be defined as *sat-cit-ānanda*. Thus the one who knows *ātmā* as having the nature opposed to *upādhis* is *pratyak* (the one who knows contrarily - *pratīpam añcati jānāti*). The one who is both *pratyak* and *ātmā* is *pratyagātmā* (*Bhāmati* gloss, by *Vācaspati Miśra* on *Sūtrabhāṣya*).

What we know as mere 'I' is *pratyagātmā*, the main 'I'. *Upādhis* fall in the category of 'this' (not 'I'). If *pañcakośas* which belong to 'this' variety are mistaken as 'I' (*ātmā*), they become *mithyā-ātmā* (false or secondary *ātmā*). *Pratyagdhvānta* is the ignorance of *pratyagātmā*. It is the cause (*hetu*) of erroneous notions such as '*ātmā* is *abrahma*' (not Brahman) and 'Brahman is *anātmā* (not *ātmā*, not 'I')'.

On ending the ignorance of *pratyagātmā* which is identical with Brahman, there is no obstruction

whatsoever in knowing directly, ‘*ātmā* itself is Brahman and there is nothing else called *ātmā* other than Brahman’.

The identity of Brahman and *ātmā* was established. Both are one and the same entity *cit* (pure awareness). Then why these two distinct words, *aham* and Brahman, are employed in the *mahāvākya* ‘*aham Brahma asmi*’ when its purpose is to reveal one and the same entity, *cit*? The answer follows.

निवर्त्यभेदाद् भिन्नोऽर्थो ब्रह्माहंपदयोर्भवेत् ।
अब्रह्मानात्मते वार्ये एकस्मिन्नेव वस्तुनि ॥२२२॥

ब्रह्माहंपदयोः - of the words Brahman and *aham* अर्थः - meaning भिन्नः भवेत् - is mutually different निवर्त्यभेदात् - because the factors to be eliminated from each of them are different एकस्मिन् एव - in one and the same वस्तुनि - (in the) entity अब्रह्मानात्मते - *abrahmatā* (limited nature) and *anātmatā* (remoteness being different from ‘I’) वार्ये - are to be discarded – (222)

222. The meaning of the words Brahman and *aham* is mutually different because the factors to be eliminated from each of them are different. The *abrahmatā* (limited nature) and *anātmatā* (remoteness) are to be discarded from one and the same entity (revealed by the *mahāvākya*).

It is true that ‘*aham Brahma*

asmi’ (I am Brahman) *mahāvākya* is meant to reveal one and the same entity *cit-ātmā*. In our present state of ignorance, *aham* (I) is considered to be limited in nature, (i.e. *abrahma*) whereas Brahman is taken for granted as something that is *apratyak* or *parokṣa* (remote, distinct from me). When in *mahāvākya*, both *aham* and Brahman are equated, it implies that the common factor *cit* alone from them has to be retained by discarding the opposing erroneous concepts. Otherwise, the equation intended by *mahāvākya* will not hold good. Thus, to highlight the discarding aspects, the use of two distinct words specifying the eliminable features is inevitable.

The superimposition of the limited nature (*abrahmatā*) and remoteness (*anātmatā*) in the same entity *cit* is shown now with their causes.

स्वानुभूत्यवसेयेऽस्मिन्

प्रतीच्यब्रह्मतां जनाः ।

आरोप्य शास्त्रगम्येऽस्मिन्

अनात्मत्वमकल्पयन् ॥२२३॥

जनाः - people स्वानुभूत्यवसेये - in (the one) that is ascertained by one's spontaneous experience अस्मिन् - in this प्रतीचि - in the *pratyagātmā* अब्रह्मतां - limited nature (as not Brahman) आरोप्य - having superimposed अस्मिन् - in this शास्त्रगम्ये (ब्रह्मणि) - (Brahman) to be

known by scriptural *pramāṇa* अनात्मत्वम् - remoteness (as not 'I') अकल्पयन् - imagined - (223)

223. People having superimposed the limited nature (as not Brahman) in this *pratyagātmā* that is ascertained by one's spontaneous experience, imagined remoteness (as not 'I') in Brahman to be known by scriptural *pramāṇa*.

In the state of self-ignorance, everyone feels oneself to be limited because of bodily identification. Brahman is such that it can never be known without the means of scriptural *pramāṇa*. Naturally due to its ignorance, it is taken as different from 'I'. These wrong notions can be ended only on gaining the direct knowledge as revealed by *mahāvākyas*.

अनुभूत्यवसेयोऽहं ब्रह्म शास्त्रसमर्पितं ।
अस्मीति बोधादारोपद्वयमत्र निवर्तते ॥२२४॥

अनुभूत्यवसेयः - (the one) that is ascertained by the direct experience अहं - 'I', *ātmā* शास्त्रसमर्पितम् - revealed by scriptural *pramāṇa* ब्रह्म - Brahman अस्मि - I am इति - so बोधात् - by the direct knowledge अत्र - here (on *aham* and Brahman) आरोपद्वयम् - the (earlier mentioned) two superimpositions निवर्तते - disappear - (224)

224. *Ātmā* ('I') is ascertained by

nirupādhika direct experience. By the direct knowledge that I am Brahman revealed by scriptural *pramāṇa*, the earlier mentioned two superimpositions about *aham* and Brahman disappear.

Ātmā is universally experienced every moment. But that experience is mixed with the features of superimposed embodiment; all perceptions and thoughts. It is not the experience of *ātmā* in its true nature, but that of *ātmā* as a *jīva* in the realm of *saṃsāra*. With that as *aham* ('I'), the equation 'I am Brahman' will not hold good. Therefore, *aham* (I) in its true nature as *ātmā* is to be ascertained by the experience of *nirupādhika* 'I' wherein even the three essentials of experiencer, an experience, namely, experience and experienced are absent. What remains there is only self-experiencing principle *ātmā* to the total exclusion of all *upādhis*. Then only scriptural *pramāṇa* of 'I am Brahman' becomes fruitful resulting in the disappearance of two superimpositions, viz. '*ātmā* is not Brahman (*abrahmatā*)' and 'Brahman is not *ātmā* (*anātmata*)'.

The import of the verb '*asmi*' (I am) from '*aham Brahma asmi*' *mahāvākya* is told.

अस्मीति वर्तमानोक्तेर्विद्याकालैव
मुक्तता ।

सिद्धातोऽसौ न साध्या

स्यादग्निहोत्रादिकार्यवत् ॥२२५॥

अस्मि इति - by 'asmi' (from 'aham Brahma asmi') वर्तमानोक्तेः - by the word (उक्तिः) in the present tense (वर्तमान); मुक्तता - mokṣa (liberation) विद्याकाला एव - (is) at the time of gaining Brahmajñāna सिद्धा - is proved अतः - therefore असौ - this liberation अग्निहोत्रादिकार्यवत् - like the results of agnihotra, etc. साध्या न स्यात् - is not something to be attained in course of time - (225)

225. By the word 'asmi' (from 'aham Brahma asmi' in the present tense, the gaining of liberation at the time of Brahmajñāna itself is proved. Therefore this liberation is not something to be attained in course of time like the results of agnihotra, etc.

The present tense in '(I) am Brahman' shows that the very moment when Brahmajñāna ends the self-ignorance, my nature that is Brahman gets revealed. That is liberation. It is not said that 'I shall become Brahman' or 'I was Brahman before the Creation'. I am all along Brahman. The ignorance covered my nature of Brahman. The knowledge uncovered it. Ignorance and knowledge belong to buddhi (intellect) and not to me the Brahman. It is just like saying the sun shines now when the clouds that cover your sight are blown away by the wind. The Sun was shining

all the while, but your sight got covered by the clouds and got uncovered when the clouds passed away. Similarly, bondage and liberation belong to the buddhi the seat of both ignorance and knowledge, but never to ātmā/Brahman. Ātmā is Brahman, and Brahman is ātmā forever. It is never otherwise.

The liberation is not like the results of Karmas such as agnihotra to aśvamedha yāga, which encompass all rituals and sacrifices. They yield their results in future at a specific place, but never at the time of their performance.

No knowledge can ever produce anything. It can only remove the ignorance and reveal the existing thing. So is Brahmajñāna. It does not produce Brahman. It only reveals our ever-existing Brahmasvarūpa that was disowned due to ignorance.

VIDYĀSŪTRA - SARVĀTMA-BHĀVA (BECOMING EVERYTHING)

In the verse 211, a question was asked: Mumukṣus want to become everything by knowing Brahman, but what did that Brahman know because of which it became everything? The answer was that the Brahman knew itself. The śruti further says that by this knowledge, the Brahman who appeared as jīva

hitherto by *avidyā* (ignorance) became everything (*Br.U.1-4-10*). This result is being explained now.

तस्मात् तत्सर्वमभवदिति वाक्येन वेदनात् ।
उच्यते सर्वभावाप्तिरसर्वत्वापवादतः ॥२२६॥

तस्मात् - by that (*Brahmajñāna*) तत् - that (Brahman which appeared as *jīva* hitherto) सर्वम् - everything अभवत् - became इति वाक्येन - by this statement वेदनात् - by *Brahmajñāna* असर्वत्वापवादतः - because of disappearance of limitedness सर्वभावाप्तिः - becoming everything उच्यते - is said – (226)

226. By the statement, ‘by that *Brahmajñāna*, the Brahman which appeared as *jīva* hitherto by *avidyā* became everything’, the becoming everything by *Brahmajñāna* because of disappearance of limitedness (*asarvatva*) is said (by the *śruti*).

Any knowledge can give immediately only that gain which was actually there but appeared to be lost by error. So the statement, ‘by *Brahmajñāna*, *jīva* became everything’ means that knowledge removed the delusion that ‘I am limited’ as a result, the truth ‘I am everything got revealed on its own’. ‘*Apavāda*’ in this context is the disappearance of the superimposed ‘limitedness’ (*asarvatva*). The same occurrence is expressly told in the

next verse.

स्वतः सर्वात्मकमब्रह्म
भात्यसर्वमिव भ्रमात् ।
विद्यया भ्रान्तिबाधेऽस्य
सर्वत्वमवशिष्यते ॥२२७॥

स्वतः - by one's very nature ब्रह्म - Brahman सर्वात्मकम् - (is) all forms भ्रमात् - by the erroneous notion असर्वम् - limited इव - as if भाति - appears विद्यया - *Brahmajñāna* भ्रान्तिबाधे (सति) - when the erroneous notion is dispelled अस्य - of this Brahman सर्वत्वम् - the whole nature अवशिष्यते - remains – (227)

227. Brahman by its very nature is all forms. But, by the erroneous notion, it appears as if limited in nature. When the erroneous notion is dispelled by *Brahmajñāna*, its whole nature remains.

The *śruti*-statement reads further as follows. ‘Among the presiding deities, whoever got the knowledge of Brahman became verily that Brahman. Similarly, among *ṛṣis* and humans, those who know Brahman became Brahman. (While in the womb) knowing this Brahman only *ṛṣi* Vāmadeva observed, ‘I was Manu, I was the Sun’. Even at present, whoever knows ‘I am Brahman’, himself becomes everything. Even the deities are incapable of taking away his glory of having become

everything because he is the *ātmā* (‘I’) of all these (*Br. U. 1-4-10*).

To explain the above *śruti*, a question is posed to which this *śruti* is the answer. It advances four reasons to object the becoming of everything by mere *Brahmavidyā*.

नन्वसौ सर्वभावाप्तिर्न विद्यामात्रतो भवेत् ।
विनोत्तमत्वानुष्ठानकालदेवाद्यनुग्रहम् ॥२२८॥

ननु - here is an objection असौ - this सर्वभावाप्तिः - becoming everything उत्तमत्व - superiority (of birth) अनुष्ठान - performance (of rituals, sacrifices, etc.) काल - appropriate time (such as *Satyayuga*) देवाद्यनुग्रहम् - favour of presiding deities, etc. विना - without विद्यामात्रतः - by mere *Brahmavidyā* न भवेत् - is not possible—(228)

228. Here is an objection. This becoming everything by mere *Brahmavidyā*, is not possible without the superiority (of birth), the performance (of rituals, sacrifices, etc.), appropriate time (such as *Satyayuga*), the favour of presiding deities, etc. The phrases such as *sarvabhāva*, *sarvātmakatva*, ‘becoming everything’, becoming the whole/all/full/ Brahman are synonyms. These four reasons are elaborated till verse 233.

विप्रस्य फलदो वेदो न शूद्रास्याधमत्वतः ।
देवादेरुत्तमस्यैव तथा विद्या फलप्रदा ॥२२९॥

वेदः - the Vedas विप्रस्य - for a Brahmin फलदः - fruitful, productive शूद्रस्य - for a *śūdra* (फलदः - fruitful) न - is not अधमत्वतः - because of lower birth तथा - similarly देवादेः - of deities, etc., only विद्या फलप्रदा - *Brahmavidyā* (भवति)- (becomes) fruitful—(229)

229. (The objection continues.) The Vedas are fruitful in the case of a Brahmin and not a *śūdra* because of lower birth. Similarly, the *Brahmavidyā* of deities, etc., becomes fruitful.

The superiority of birth also is one of the factors while considering the eligibility of an individual. The prince can order a minister, but not a merchant's son. In the Upaniṣads we find exalted entities such as Indra, *ṛṣis*, etc., gaining *Brahmavidyā*. How can an ordinary human get it? This is the gist of this question.

The concept of *anuṣṭhāna* as the means of *sarvabhāva* (becoming everything) is presented.

यागज्ञानमनुष्ठानाद् विना

न स्वर्गदं तथा ।

ब्रह्मज्ञानमनुष्ठानाद् विना

सर्वाप्तिदं कथम् ॥२३०॥

यागज्ञानम् - the knowledge about

the performance of sacrifice अनुष्ठानाद् विना
- without its performance स्वर्गदं न (भवति)
- does not produce the result of heaven
तथा - similarly अनुष्ठानाद् विना - without
(required) performance ब्रह्मज्ञानम् -
Brahmajñāna कथम् - how सर्वाप्तिदं (भवेत्)
- can produce *sarvabhāva*? – (230)

230. (The objection continues.)
(Mere) knowledge about the performance
of sacrifice does not produce the result of
heaven. Similarly, how can *Brahmajñāna*
produce *sarvabhāva* (limitlessness)
without (the required) performance?

Mere having the know-how
of a sacrifice does not yield the
promised result unless it is performed.
Similarly, *Brahmavidyā* is gained from
the Vedas. It also must have some
type of performance to give its result.
Otherwise, *Brahmajñāna* will have
no specific result. Like the *arthavāda*
statement (of praise or censure) found in
the Vedas. This is the opinion of those
who believe that *karma* alone is the
content of the entire Vedas.

The necessity about suitable time
is elaborated.

गर्भाधानमृतावेव नान्यकाले तथोत्तमे ।
विद्या कृतयुगे सर्वभावं यच्छति नान्यदा ॥२३१॥

गर्भाधानं - impregnation ऋतौ -
during the time favourable for
conception एव - only (फलप्रदं - is fruitful)

अन्यकाले - at other time न - is not तथा -
similarly उत्तमे - in the most exalted
कृतयुगे - during the *Kṛtayuga* विद्या -
Brahmavidyā सर्वभावं - the result of
becoming everything यच्छति - produces
अन्यदा न - (but) not at any other time
– (231)

231. (The objection continues.)
The impregnation is productive only
during the time favourable for
conception, but not at other time.
Similarly, *Brahmavidyā* produces
sarvabhāva only during the *Kṛtayuga*,
but not at other time.

A period of few days after the
menstrual discharge of a woman is
considered as the time favourable for
conception. It is called *ṛtukāla*. It is said
that the other time is not favourable
for conception. Similarly, some people
doubt that *sarvabhāva* (limitlessness)
may be possible only during the most
exalted *Satyayuga* but not in *Kaliyuga*,
etc.

The last reason necessitating the
favour of deities to accomplish the
sarvabhāva is put forth.

राज्ञा कृषिफलं यद्वत् करार्थं प्रतिबध्यते ।
सर्वभावस्तथा देवैर्यागभुग्भिर्निवार्यते ॥२३२॥

यद्वत् - just as राज्ञा - by the King
कृषिफलं - agricultural produce करार्थं - to
recover the unpaid tax प्रतिबध्यते - is

confiscated तथा - so यागभुग्भिः - by those who sustain themselves on the sacrificial offerings देवैः - by the deities सर्वभावः - becoming everything, limitlessness निवार्यते - is prevented—(232)

232. (The objection continues.) Just as the King confiscates the agricultural produce to recover the unpaid tax, so the deities who sustain themselves on the sacrificial offerings prevent the *sarvabhāva*.

It is well-known practice that any system of government brings an attachment on the properties of tax-defaulters. The government provides the administrative services to the citizens. The tax is a mode of repayment. Similarly, human beings are obliged to all presiding deities who act as the functionaries of different types of phenomenal powers. We are indebted to them. They get nourished by sacrifices performed by us. If a person gains *sarvabhāva*, being full and complete, he will not only abstain from sacrifices, but also lose the eligibility to perform them. It is natural that deities would not like humans gaining *sarvabhāva* lest they starve of their sustenance. Therefore, they will prevent such attainments. This is what this questioner has got in his mind.

The objection is concluded with

the description of its outcome.

तस्मादनुत्तमे जन्मन्यननुष्ठायिनः कलौ ।
युगे देवाद्यृणवतो न विद्या सर्वभावदा ॥२३३॥

तस्मात् - therefore अनुत्तमे जन्मनि - in lower birth अननुष्ठायिनः - to the non-performer of *karmas*, etc. कलौ युगे - in the *Kaliyuga* देवाद्यृणवतः - to the person indebted to deities, etc. विद्या - *Brahmavidyā* सर्वभावदा न (भवति) - does not give *sarvabhāva*—(233)

233. Therefore, *Brahmavidyā* cannot give *sarvabhāva* in the *Kaliyuga* to the person of lower birth who is a non-performer of sacrifices and is indebted to deities (*ṛṣis* and *pitṛs*). (The objection is concluded).

The outcome of this deliberation is that in this modern age, *Brahmavidyā* cannot give *sarvabhāva* because every *mumukṣu* has all the four shortcomings. By birth we are humans and not deities or *ṛṣis*. We are born in the *Kaliyuga* and not in *Satyayuga*. We are unable to perform sacrifices for want of requisite materials and trained *ṛtviks* (Vedic priests). As a result, the debt of deities, *ṛṣis*, etc., is not repaid and thereby they will not favour us. Therefore, the contender may conclude that the efforts of *śravaṇa*, etc., are futile. The elaboration of the question posed in the verse 228 is over here.

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka śruti* (1-4-10) answers each of these four bases of objections one by one. The said *śruti* was quoted while introducing the verse 228. The answer is introduced in the next verse and then elaborated upto the verse 249.

इति

चोदयितुर्येऽत्र चत्वारश्चोद्यहेतवः ।

तद्यो य इत्यादि

वाक्यैश्चतुर्भिस्तान्निरस्यति ॥२३४॥

इति - thus चोदयितुः - of the objector ये - whatever अत्र - here (in this question/objection) चत्वारः - four चोद्यहेतवः (सन्ति) - bases of objection that are there तान् - those 'तद् यः यः' - the *śruti* 'tad yah yah' (whoever) (*Br.U.1-4-10*) इत्यादि - etc. चतुर्भिः - by its four वाक्यैः - statements निरस्यति - refutes - (234)

234. Thus the *śruti* 'tad yah yah' by its four statements refutes whatever four bases of the objector that are there in this objection.

The *śruti* referred in this verse begins from 'tad yah yah' and ends with 'ātmā hi eṣām sa bhavati' (*Br.U.1-4-10*). These bases in the objection are refuted in the same order, therein. The next five verses (upto 239) refute 'the superior birth' as a means to gain *sarvabhāva*. The corresponding answer in the *śruti* is: Among the presiding deities whoever

got the knowledge of Brahman became verily that Brahman. Similarly, among *ṛṣis* and humans, those who know Brahman became Brahman (*Br.U.1-4-10*).

न तावदुत्तमं जन्म सर्वभावप्रयोजकम् ।
उत्तमस्यापि देवादेः सर्वत्वं ब्रह्मबोधतः ॥२३५॥

उत्तमं - superior जन्म - birth न तावत् - not really सर्वभावप्रयोजकम् - (is) the cause of *sarvabhāva* उत्तमस्य अपि (जन्मवतः) - even of those who have superior birth देवादेः - of deities, etc. ब्रह्मबोधतः (एव) - by *Brahmajñāna* alone सर्वत्वं (भवति) - *sarvabhāva* (is possible) - (235)

235. The superior birth is not really the cause of *sarvabhāva*. Even the deities, *ṛṣis* and *pitṛs* who have superior birth gain *sarvabhāva* by *Brahmajñāna* alone.

यो देवानां ऋषीणां वा मध्ये ब्रह्म व्यबुध्यत ।
असावसावेव सर्वमभून्नान्यस्तु कश्चन ॥२३६॥

यः - the one who देवानां ऋषीणां वा मध्ये - among the deities or *ṛṣis* ब्रह्म - Brahman व्यबुध्यत - directly discovered असौ असौ एव - only such persons सर्वम् - all अभूत् - became तु - but न अन्यः कश्चन - no one else - (236)

236. Only those among the deities or *ṛṣis* who directly discovered Brahman became all, but no one else.

मनुष्याणां तथा मध्ये ब्रह्मवित् सर्वभावभाक् ।
विद्याविद्ये एव तस्मात् सर्वत्वाल्पत्वकारणे ॥२३७॥

तथा - so also मनुष्याणां मध्ये - among humans ब्रह्मवित् (एव) - (only) *Brahmajñānī* सर्वभावभाक् (भवति) - gains *sarvabhāva*; (न तु अन्यः - but no one else) तस्मात् - therefore विद्याविद्ये - the knowledge of Brahman and its ignorance एव - alone सर्वत्वाल्पत्वकारणे - the causes of becoming everything and finitude (क्रमशः भवतः - become respectively)–(237)

237. So also among humans, only *Brahmajñānī* gains *sarvabhāva* but no one else. Therefore, *Brahmavidyā* is the cause of *sarvabhāva* whereas *avidyā* is that of finitude (*alpatva*).

ब्रह्म वा इदमग्रेऽभूदिति विद्याधिकारिता ।
श्रूयते ब्रह्मणो ब्रह्म सर्वजातिषु तत्समम् ॥२३८॥

‘ब्रह्म वा इदम् अग्रे अभूद्’ - before the Creation (or before gaining knowledge), Brahman (who appears as *jīva*) also was there (*Br.U.1-4-10*) इति - by this *śruti* ब्रह्मणः - of Brahman (who appears *jīva*) विद्याधिकारिता - the eligibility to gain *Brahmavidyā* श्रूयते - is stated by *śruti* तत् - that ब्रह्म - (who appears as *jīva*) सर्वजातिषु - in all *varṇas* समम् - is the same–(238)

238. By the *śruti*, ‘before the Creation Brahman (who appears as *jīva*) alone was there’ (*Br.U.1-4-10*),

Brahman itself (who appears as *jīva*) is said to be the eligible one to gain *Brahmavidyā*. That Brahman is the same in all *varṇas*.

Deities and ṛṣis attained *sarvabhāva* on gaining *Brahmajñāna* by their individual efforts and not by the virtue of their superior birth. The same is the case with human beings. *Brahmajñāna* can be gained only by the one's proper efforts.

According to the scriptural *varṇa*-system *Brāhmaṇa*, *Kṣatriya*, *Vaiśya* and *Śūdra* are the four categories in the human race. Here is a question. Are all of them eligible to gain *Brahmajñāna*? The author says ‘yes’ quoting the *śruti*. Brahman alone appears as all *jīvas*. All *jīvas*, without distinction can gain knowledge irrespective of their *varṇa*. They are Brahman in reality. Even a *śūdra* can gain this knowledge on acquiring the pre-requisites.

Can we apply this logic of eligibility of all *jīvas* to gain knowledge and *sarvabhāva* in the case of animals, birds and reptiles, etc.? The next verse answers this question.

न पश्चादेः सर्वभावप्रसङ्गो बोधवर्जनात् ।
शूद्रजातिश्च विदुरः सति बोधे त्वमुच्यत ॥२३९॥

पश्चादेः - in the case of animals, etc. बोधवर्जनात् - because of the absence of

Brahmajñāna सर्वभावप्रसंगः - the occasion of gaining *sarvabhāva* न - is not possible तु - but विदुरः - Vidura शूद्र जातिः च - belongs to *śūdra varṇa* बोधे सति - on gaining *Brahmajñāna* अमुच्यत - got liberated—(239)

239. Because of absence of *Brahmajñāna*, the occasion of gaining *sarvabhāva* in the case of animals, etc., is not possible. But Vidura who belongs to *śūdra varṇa* got liberated on gaining *Brahmajñāna*.

The embodiment of animals, birds, reptiles, etc., are not designed to gain *Brahmajñāna*. In general, their *buddhi* (intellect) is not well-developed for this purpose. That is why they are unable to gain knowledge and not because of mere birth. There are exceptional cases even among animals, etc., who are well-known for their *Brahmajñāna*. We do find many such examples in *Purāṇas*. As for human beings, everyone has the capability to gain this knowledge. Vidura of Mahābhārata fame was known to be a *śūdra* by birth. Even then he was a *Brahmajñānī*. There are other examples also in *Purāṇas* who are endowed with *Brahmajñāna* in spite of their inferiority from some different angles. Thus *Brahmajñāna* does not depend on superior birth.

The next three verses (240 to 242) establish that *Brahmavidyā* does not require the performance (*anuṣṭhāna*) of something to yield its result of *sarvabhāva*. The corresponding passage in the *śruti* is: (While in the womb) knowing this Brahman only ṛṣi Vāmadeva observed, ‘I was Manu, I was the Sun’ (*Br. U.1-4-10*).

यागविद्येवात्मविद्या नानुष्ठानमपेक्षते ।

फलदान इति ज्ञेयं वामदेवनिदर्शनात् ॥२४०॥

आत्मविद्या - *ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna* यागविद्या इव - like the knowledge of performing sacrifices फलदाने - to be fruitful अनुष्ठानम् - the performance (of *karma*, etc.) न अपेक्षते - does not require इति - so वामदेवनिदर्शनात् - by the illustration of ṛṣi Vāmadeva ज्ञेयं - should be learnt—(240)

240. *Ātmajñāna/Brahmajñāna* does not require the performance (of *karma*, etc.), to be fruitful like the knowledge of performing sacrifices. This should be learnt from the illustration of ṛṣi Vāmadeva.

Ṛṣi Vāmadeva could not get *Brahmajñāna* in the previous birth because of some strong obstruction of *prārabdha-karma*. Interestingly, that obstruction got cleared in the womb while awaiting the next birth as Vāmadeva. This illustration also appears

in the *Aitareyopaniṣad* (2-5) wherein an additional phrase, ‘while in the womb’ (*garbhe nu san*) is there. It needs to be supplemented to this *Bṛhadāraṇyaka śruti* (1-4-10). He had no occasion to take to *anuṣṭhāna* (the performance of *karma*, etc.), in the womb after he gained *Brahmajñāna*. Yet he could know the *sarvabhāva*. The *sarvabhāva* gained by Vāmadeva is elaborated.

ब्रह्मात्मत्वं वामदेवः पश्यन् मन्वादिरूपताम् ।
प्रतिपेदे ह्यनुष्ठानावसरस्तत्र को वद ॥२४१॥

वामदेवः - Vāmadeva ब्रह्मात्मत्वं - Brahman as the nature of oneself पश्यन् - directly cognising मन्वादिरूपताम् - the nature of Manu, the Sun, etc. प्रतिपेदे - attained अत्र - in this case अनुष्ठानावसरः - the occasion of *anuṣṭhāna* हि - indeed कः - what is it वद - please tell – (241)

241. Vāmadeva cognising directly Brahman as the nature of oneself attained the nature of Manu, the Sun, etc. In this case, please tell what indeed is the occasion of *anuṣṭhāna*?

The hunger gets appeased when we eat. There is nothing to be done between eating and the appeasement of hunger. Similarly, when *Brahmajñāna* is gained, the *sarvabhāva* naturally manifests. There is nothing further to be done there. The nature of Vāmadeva as that of Manu and the Sun, etc., is an

expression of *sarvabhāva* on gaining *Brahmajñāna*. It does not mean that Vāmadeva himself had taken to the embodiment of Manu and the Sun, etc. The precise nature of *Sarvabhāva* is explained in the next verse.

न चित्तो वामदेवे वा मनौ वान्येषु वा भिदा ।
तेन मन्वादिचिद्धामदेवेन प्रत्यपद्यत ॥२४२॥

वामदेवे - in Vāmadeva वा - or मनौ - in Manu वा अन्येषु - or in anyone else वा - or चित्तः - of *cit* (pure awareness) भिदा न - distinction is not there तेन - thereby मन्वादिचित् - the *cit* (*caitanya*) of Manu, etc. वामदेवेन - by Vāmadeva प्रत्यपद्यत - attained – (242)

242. There is no distinction of *cit* (pure awareness) abiding in Vāmadeva or Manu or anyone else. Thereby Vāmadeva attained the *cit* described as Manu, etc., (as oneself).

The necessity of best time to gain *sarvātmabhāva* is refuted from the next verse to 246. The *śruti* declares in this respect: Even at present (*etarhi*) whoever knows, ‘I am Brahman’, himself becomes everything (*Br.U.* 1-4-10).

यत्तु पुण्ययुगे सर्वभावो न तु कलावपि ।
तदसद्बोधसाध्यस्य पुण्यकालानपेक्षणात् ॥२४३॥

यत्तु - whatever (उक्तम् - was said) पुण्ययुगे - in the sacred age (*Satyayuga*)

सर्वभावः - *Sarvabhāva* (is gained) तु - but न कलौ - not in *Kaliyuga* अपि - also तद् - that असत् - is wrong बोधसाध्यस्य - the result of *Brahmajñāna* पुण्यकालानपेक्षणात् - because of being independent of sacred age – (243)

243. It was said that the *sarvabhāva* is gained in the sacred age (*Satyayuga*) but not in *Kaliyuga*. That is wrong because the result of *Brahmajñāna* does not depend on the sacred age (*Satyayuga*).

न सूर्यग्रहणापेक्षो बोधान्निद्राक्षयः क्वचित् ।
तथा न सर्वभावोऽयं कालभेदमपेक्षते ॥२४४॥

बोधात् - by waking up निद्राक्षयः (भवति) - the sleep ends - (तत्) न क्वचित् - (it) never सूर्यग्रहणापेक्षः - requires meritorious period such as solar eclipse तथा - so अयं - this सर्वभावः - *sarvabhāva* काल भेदम् - a specific time न अपेक्षते - does not depend upon – (244)

244. The sleep ends on waking up. It never requires meritorious period such as the solar eclipse. So, this *sarvabhāva* does not depend upon any specific time.

The duration of solar or lunar eclipses is considered to be favourable for religious practices. But, all that is required to end the sleep is to wake up. It has nothing to do with any specific

period. Similarly, the *sarvabhāva* needs *Brahmajñāna* wherein ignorance ends. Nowhere in the scriptures it is said that the result of *Brahmajñāna* can get obstructed by time factor. The result of knowledge is seen right now here like waking up from sleep. If at all certain obstructions delay *Brahmajñāna*, it is knowledge that is delayed and not its result once it is gained. *Sarvabhāva* is natural to a *Brahmajñānī*. All that it needs is the end of ignorance by *Brahmajñāna*. If at all it is said anywhere that gaining *Brahmajñāna* is not possible in the *Kaliyuga*, it is only to show its rarity. Otherwise, the statement of *śruti* that *Brahmajñāna* can be gained even ‘at present’ (*etarhi*) will be wrong. That is not possible.

य एतर्ह्यपि वेदाहं ब्रह्मस्मीति तदैव सः ।
इदं सर्वं भवत्येव यदिदं जगदीक्ष्यते ॥२४५॥

यः - the one who एतर्हि अपि - even at present अहं ब्रह्म अस्मि - I am Brahman इति - so वेद - knows सः - he तदा एव - then itself इदं - this सर्वं - all यद् इदं - whatever this जगत् - the world ईक्ष्यते - is perceived (तत् - that) भवति एव - becomes – (245)

245. The one who knows even at present, ‘I am Brahman’, he becomes this entire perceived world then itself.

The meaning of ‘becoming the entire world’ is explained in the next verse.

अविचारितरम्यस्य

नामरूपात्मकस्य यत् ।

जगतो वास्तवं रूपं सत्त्वं

ब्रह्म तद् भवेत् ॥२४६॥

यत् - whatever अविचारितरम्यस्य - of the one that is delightful till its true nature is inquired into नामरूपात्मकस्य - of the one who consists of name and form जगतः - of jagat वास्तवं रूपं - the true nature सत् तत्त्वं - principle of ever-existence तद् ब्रह्म - that *Brahmajñānī* भवेत् - becomes—(246)

246. The *Brahmajñānī* becomes the ever-existence (*sat*) principle that is the true nature of the world which is delightful till it is inquired into and which consists of names and forms.

The entire world may appear marvelous and delightful until its reality is not inquired into. Once inquired into, the whole world gets reduced to *sat cit ānanda* Brahman. There remains nothing called the world. What is there is Brahman and Brahman alone. This direct discovery is *sarvabhāva* or becoming everything.

The last argument that *sarvabhāva* depends on the favour of deities is refuted in the verses 247 to 249. The corresponding *śruti*-statement is: Even the deities are incapable of taking away

his glory of *sarvabhāva* because he is the *ātmā* ('I') of all these (*Br.U.* 1-4-10).

नराणामधर्मणत्वात् सर्वभावं दिवोकसः ।

वारयन्ति हविर्भोक्तुं तैर्दत्तमिति चेन्न तत् ॥२४७॥

नराणाम् - of humans अधर्मणत्वात् - because of indebtedness दिवोकसः - the deities तैः - by them दत्तम् - offered हविः - sacrificial oblation भोक्तुं - to partake of (तेषाम् - their) सर्वभावं - *sarvabhāva* वारयन्ति - prevent इति चेत् - if it is doubted so तत् न - that is wrong—(247)

247. It is wrong to doubt that due to the indebtedness of humans, the deities prevent their *sarvabhāva*, to partake of the sacrificial oblation offered by them.

तस्य ज्ञातात्मतत्त्वस्य प्रध्वस्ततमसो यतेः ।

इन्द्रादयोऽपि नैवालं सर्वभावाप्तिवारणे ॥२४८॥

ज्ञातात्मतत्त्वस्य - of the one who has gained *Brahmajñāna* प्रध्वस्ततमसः - of the one who has destroyed self-ignorance तस्य यतेः - of that *sannyāsī* सर्वभावाप्तिवारणे - to prevent the gaining of *sarvabhāva* इन्द्रादयः - Indra, etc. अपि - also न एव अलं - are totally incapable—(248)

248. Indra, etc., also are totally incapable to prevent the *sarvabhāva* of the *sannyāsī* who has destroyed self-ignorance on gaining *Brahmajñāna*.

यद्यपीशा नृणां

देवास्तथापि ब्रह्मवेदिनः ।

अनीशाः प्रत्युतैतेषामात्मा भवति

तत्त्ववित् ॥२४९॥

यद्यपि - though देवाः - deities नृणां - of humans ईशाः - are the masters तथा अपि - yet ब्रह्मवेदिनः - of a *Brahmajñānī* अनीशाः - are not the masters प्रत्युत - on the contrary तत्त्ववित् - the knower of Brahman एतेषाम् - of them, (i.e. of deities) आत्मा - true nature भवति - is – (249)

249. Though the deities are the masters of humans, yet, they cannot be the masters of a *Brahmajñānī*. On the contrary, the knower of Brahman is their *ātmā* (true nature).

It may be true that the favour of deities is necessary before gaining *Brahmajñāna*, but not so after gaining the knowledge. A *mumukṣu* must propitiate deities before gaining knowledge whereby they make such seekers eligible to gain knowledge. Their pursuit of gaining knowledge becomes unobstructed. *Bhāṣyakāra* emphasises on this need until *ādhyātmika* pursuit is taken to with staunch *vairāgya* and other preparedness (*Br.U.Bh.1-4-10*). The deities have mastery over *grahastās* (householders) but not on eligible *sannyāsīs* or *jñānīs*. It is true to an extent that the deities do obstruct those

who are riddled with desires, careless in discharging their religious duties, extrovert, slanderous and quarrelsome (vide verse 259). On the contrary, they help those who have *durita-kṣaya* (the destruction of their past sins), devotion to *Īśvara*, *vairāgya* and *sādhana-catuṣṭaya-sampatti*, etc. (*Br.U.Bh.1-4-10*). Therefore, it is not correct to say that deities will prevent the *sarvabhāva* of a *jñānī*.

With this the explanation of *Vidyāsūtra* (*ātmā iti eva upāsīta*) that was started in the verse 155 is over. Now the *Avidyāsūtra* is going to begin and its elaboration will be concluded in the verse 295.

AVIDYĀSŪTRA

इत्थमादेयविद्यायाः सूत्रवृत्ती उदाहृते ।
हेयाविद्या स्वकार्येण युक्ता सूत्रयति श्रुतिः ॥२५०॥

इत्थं - thus (as elaborated from the verse 156 until now) आदेयविद्यायाः - of *Brahmavidyā* worthy of acceptance सूत्रवृत्ती - aphorism and its exposition उदाहृते - were discussed (अथ - now, likewise) श्रुतिः - *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* स्वकार्येण - with its effect युक्ता - endowed with हेया - fit to be discarded अविद्या - the ignorance of *ātmā*/Brahman सूत्रयति - presents in the form of an aphorism – (250)

250. Thus the aphorism and its exposition of *Brahmavidyā*, worthy of acceptance were discussed. Now, *Brhadāranyakopaniṣad* presents *avidyā* (of *ātmā*) with its effect – fit to be discarded - in the form of an aphorism.

After discussing what needs to be acquired, the Upaniṣad also describes what needs to be discarded. *Brahmavidyā* is worthy of acceptance whereas self-ignorance (*avidyā*) and its effect have to be given up by all means. *Brahmavidyā* was presented by the *sūtra*, ‘*ātmā iti eva upāsīta*’ (*pratyagātmā* alone should be known directly in its true nature) (*Br.U.1-4-7*). Now the *śruti* presents the *avidyāsūtra* in its statement: ‘The person, who propitiates another deity (*pitṛ*, etc.), with the notion “that the deity is different and I am different from it”, does not know the truth about oneself. He is truly a reared animal of the deities. Just as the cattle serve humans, so also every ignorant person serves the deities. We dislike even a single animal being stolen away. What to speak of deities when one person equivalent to many animal is lost. Therefore, the deities do not like that humans gain *Brahmavidyā*’ (*Br.U.1-4-10*).

The author now introduces the *Avidyāsūtra* and starts explaining it in the subsequent verses.

स्वस्मादन्यां देवतां य उपास्ते

स्वं न वेद सः ।

इति सूत्रमविद्यायाः सकार्यायाः

श्रुतीरितम् ॥२५१॥

यः - the one who स्वस्मात् अन्यां - different from oneself देवतां - presiding deity उपास्ते - worships सः - he स्वं - oneself (*ātmā*) न वेद - does not know इति - so सकार्यायाः अविद्यायाः - of *avidyā* with its effects सूत्रम् - aphorism श्रुतीरितम् - its told in the *śruti* – (251)

251. ‘He who worships the presiding deity as different from oneself does not know oneself (*ātmā*)’. Thus the *sūtra* of *avidyā* with its effects is told in the *śruti* (*Br.U.1-4-10*).

We take Brahman the only divinity principle different from us because we know not our true nature. The golden ornaments cannot be different from gold. Similarly, the individual *jīva*, the Creator *Īśvara* and the presiding deities cannot be different from the non-dual Brahman. If they are distinct, they will get reduced to *anātmā*, inert in nature. That is not the case. Therefore, the notion of distinction (*bheda-buddhi*) between oneself and the presiding deity is born of *avidyā* (self-ignorance).

The description of *avidyā* referred to in the *sūtra* begins now.

अचिन्त्यशक्तिश्चिन्निष्ठा स्वाश्रयं
 मोहयेत् क्वचित् ।
 अविद्या साऽबोधनात् स्यात्
 जीवत्वभ्रान्तिकारिणी ॥२५२॥

(या - the one that) अचिन्त्यशक्तिः - inconceivable power चिन्निष्ठा - abiding in *cit* (*caitanya*) क्वचित् - in some places/cases स्वाश्रयं - its basis मोहयेत् - deludes अबोधनात् - because of its nature of being ignorance जीवत्वभ्रान्तिकारिणी स्यात् - produces the delusion of *jīva*-status सा - that one अविद्या - is self-ignorance – (252)

252. *Avidyā* is that inconceivable power abiding in *caitanya* (pure awareness) which deludes its basis in some places and because of its nature being ignorance, it produces the delusion of *jīva*-status (*jīvahood*).

The power of *avidyā* which projects the erroneous notions of *jīva* at individual level or *Īśvara* at totality level is twofold in terms of *adhyātma* (related to the individual body) and *adhidaiva* (related to the presiding deity). Both of them are being analysed (*Br.U.Vā.Sā.* 1-4-115-4). This verse describes *avidyā* at the *adhyātma* level. *Acintya* means immense or unbounded. It also means inconceivable because *avidyā* cannot be defined as either existent (*sat*) or non-existence (*asat*). *Avidyā* depends on *cit* for its existence and yet deludes *cit* to be an individual *jīva*. The word *kvacit* can

mean ‘at some places’ in the sense wherever *jīva* is manifest. Another meaning of *kvacit* is ‘at times’ signifying, ‘before gaining *Brahmajñāna*’. It also means ‘in some states’ referring to waking and dream states. Thus *avidyā* deludes *cit* as a *jīva*, before gaining *Brahmajñāna* and during the waking and dream states. During the deep sleep state, the effect of delusion is in dormant state. The nature of *avidyā* is ignorance (*abodhana*). Thereby it projects *cit* as *samsārī jīva*. This also suggests that the *jīvatva* (*jīvahood*) can be ended by *bodhana* (self-knowledge).

Avidyā at *adhidaiva* (presiding deity) level is described in the next verse.

नाश्रयं मोहयेद्यासावीश्वरत्वस्य कल्पिका ।
 वस्तुत्वभ्रान्तिरेवास्यां हेया सा त्ववतिष्ठते ॥२५३॥

या असौ - the same (*avidyā*) who आश्रयं - its basis न मोहयेत् - does not delude ईश्वरत्वस्य - of the status of *Īśvara* कल्पिका - one who projects (माया इत्यभिधीयते - is called *māyā*) अस्यां - in this *māyā* वस्तुत्वभ्रान्तिः - the wrong notion that it is real हेया - should be discarded तु - but सा - it अवतिष्ठते - remains – (253)

253. The same (*avidyā*) who does not delude its basis and who projects the status of *Īśvara* (in Brahman) (is called *māyā*). As for this *māyā*, the wrong notion that it is real is to be given up, but it continues to remain.

Like the erroneous concept of *jīva*, *avidyā* projects Brahman as *Īśvara*, but unlike *jīva*, it cannot delude *Īśvara*. *Jīva* is under the influence of *avidyā*, but not *Īśvara*. In the falsification of *avidyā* - by knowledge, the veiling of *jīva*'s true nature ends. As for *Īśvara*, there is no such veiling of true nature that needs to be ended. Though the effect in the form of *jagat* continues even after gaining *Brahmajñāna*, its cause *māyā* loses its reality. It becomes *bādhita* - negated or falsified (reduced to *mithyā*). To denounce an ascertained knowledge to be false by some other valid means is called *bādha* (बाधो नाम यदेवेदमिति निश्चितं विज्ञानं कारणान्तरेण मिथ्येति कथ्यते । शाबरभाष्य on *Jai.Sū.10-1-1*). Or *bādha* is the knowledge that an entity does not exist in three periods of time even if it appears to be there temporarily (त्रिकालासत्त्वबोधः - *Br.U.Vā.Sā.4-4-22*; 386). This continued appearance of *jagat* after gaining *Brahmajñāna* till *jñānī*'s *prārabdha* gets over is what is said by 'it, (i.e. *māyā*) remains' (*sā avatiṣṭhate*).

It is further explained that *avyākṛta*, (i.e. *māyā*) and *avidyā* are different facets of one and the same self-ignorance.

सृष्टिप्रकरणे तत्र मायाकारः

पुरोदितः ।

अव्याकृतिगिरा तस्य कार्यं

व्याकृतमीरितम् ॥२५४॥

तत्र सृष्टिप्रकरणे - there in the section of the Creation अव्याकृतिगिरा - by the word 'unmanifest' (*avyākṛta*) पुरा - earlier मायाकारः - the nature of *māyā* उदितः - was told तस्य - its कार्यम् - effect व्याकृतम् (इति शब्देन) - by the word 'manifest' 'vyākṛtam' ईरितम् - was told - (254)

254. Earlier in the section of the Creation (*sr̥ṣṭi*), the nature of *māyā* was told by the word 'avyākṛta' (verses 64

to 102; *Br.U.1-4-7*). Its effect was described by the word 'vyākṛtam' (verses 103 to 110; *Br.U.1-4-7*).

The self-ignorance as the cause of *jagat* and *Īśvara* is called *māyā*. It was described earlier by the name *avyākṛta* in the *sr̥ṣṭi*-section along with its effect, *vyākṛta jagat*. The effect of ignorance becomes manifest just as the subjective snake in the place of a rope which is not correctly known. Such a mistaken snake is nothing but rope. Similarly, the *jagat* which is born of Brahman due to its ignorance is nothing but Brahman.

The same self-ignorance as the cause of the individual *jīva* is called *avidyā*. This *avidyā* is being described in the section of *karma*.

कर्मप्रकरणे त्वस्मिन्नविद्याकार

ईर्यते ।

स्वस्माद् भिन्ना देवतेति

धीरविद्याविजृम्भिता ॥२५५॥

तु - but अस्मिन् - in this कर्मप्रकरणे - in the section of *karma* अविद्याकारः - the nature of *avidyā* ईर्यते - is told स्वस्माद् भिन्ना देवता - 'the deity is different from me' इति धीः - such a conviction अविद्याविजृम्भिता - is displayed by *avidyā* - (255)

255. But, the nature of *avidyā* is described in this section of *karma*. The conviction, 'the deity is different from me', is displayed by *avidyā*.

The word 'tu' (but) shows the distinction of *karma*-section wherein *avidyā* is described in contrast to the *sr̥ṣṭi*-section in which *māyā* (*avyākṛta*) with its effect was elaborated. *Jīva* the product of *avidyā*, is limited and hence is full of desires. *Karmas* invoking the presiding deities are inevitable because they are empowered by *Īśvara* to bestow the desired things to *jīvas*. Therefore, the portion describing *avidyā* is considered as the section of *karma*. It is quite appropriate. To consider the invoked *caitanya* called the deity as different from oneself the invoker *caitanya* is the effect of *avidyā*. This is the outcome of not knowing oneself and *Īśvara* in their true nature.

The pursuit of *karma* on account of such differential concept between oneself and the deities is further elaborated.

स्वस्यतत्त्वमविज्ञाय

यागदानादिकर्मभिः ।

स्वतोऽन्या देवताः पाति ह्यनड्वान्

वाणिजं यथा ॥२५६॥

(मनुष्यः - the human) स्वस्य - one's तत्त्वम् - true nature अविज्ञाय - not knowing यागदानादिकर्मभिः - by *karmas* such as sacrifice, charity, etc. स्वतः अन्याः - different from oneself देवताः - deities पाति - protects, serves यथा हि - just as अनड्वान् - the bull (serves) वाणिजं - the merchant - (256)

256. Not knowing the true nature of oneself, the human serves the deities different from oneself by the *karmas* such as sacrifice, charity, etc. It is just like the bull serving a merchant.

A bull serves its master (merchant) by ploughing the field and transporting the merchandise. The merchant in turn feeds and tends the bull. Similarly, the persons eligible to do sacrifices, etc., serve the deities by their *karmas* and get in turn their results pre-determined by *Īśvara*. Thus, *jīva* under the influence of *avidyā*, unaware of the true nature of oneself, deities and *Īśvara* as *cit-svarūpa* Brahman, suffers the *samsāra*. The very

notion of the individual taking oneself as limited entity with many deficiencies in contrast to the deities as endowed with superior powers is born of *avidyā*.

In the context of humans propitiating the deities the portion of the *śruti*, ‘the deities do not like that humans gain *Brahmavidyā*’ (*Br.U.1-4-10*), is explained (vs.257-259).

अपि भूरिपशोः पुंस एकस्मिन्नपि तस्करैः ।
हियमाणे पशौ दुःखं किमु सर्वापहारतः ॥२५७॥

भूरिपशोः पुंसः - of the person who owns many cattle अपि - also एकस्मिन् अपि - even when one of them पशौ - cow, animal (from the herd) तस्करैः - by thieves हियमाणे - when stolen दुःखं (भवति) - there is sorrow किमु - what to speak of सर्वापहारतः - on stealing all of them – (257)

257. There is sorrow even when one cow from the many cattle of the owner having many of them is stolen by thieves. (Then) what to speak of on stealing all of them!

The sorrow of losing even one animal or cow is too much for any owner. If all of them are lost, the sorrow becomes unbearable. The deities are not in a better position.

सर्वस्वतुल्ये नृपशौ

ब्रह्मधीपरिमोषिणा ।

हियमाणे महद्दुःखं सर्वेषां च

दिवौकसाम् ॥२५८॥

सर्वस्वतुल्ये नृपशौ - when a human being who is in the place of an animal (cow, etc.), and who is equivalent to the entire possession of the deities ब्रह्मधीपरिमोषिणा - by the thief called *Brahmajñāna* हियमाणे - when robbed away सर्वेषां च - to all of them दिवौकसाम् - the deities महद्दुःखम् - great sorrow (befalls) – (258)

258. When a human being likened to an animal (cow, etc.), and who is equivalent to the entire possession of the deities is robbed away by the thief called *Brahmajñāna*, all the deities become very sorrowful.

A merchant may have many animals such as bull, cow, buffalo, horse, etc., which serve him. But the deities get the service of only human beings. There may be trillions and trillions of human population. But there are only a few who are eligible to perform sacrifices, etc. Such people are likely to get the purity of mind necessary to gain *Brahmajñāna*. In the wake of knowledge they lose the eligibility to perform sacrifices, etc. As a result, even a single individual from these rare humans happens to be their entire possession. Losing such a precious person is a great loss to them. Therefore, *Brahmajñāna* appears as if a thief who robs them away of everything.

तस्मादेषां न प्रियं तद्यन्मनुष्या विजानते ।
ब्रह्मात्मत्वमतो देवाः प्रतिबध्नन्ति वेदनम् ॥२५९॥

तस्मात् - therefore एषां - to these (deities) तद् - it न प्रियं - do not like, (is) not pleasing यत् - that मनुष्याः - humans ब्रह्मात्मत्वं - identity of *jīva* and Brahman विजानते - know अतः - therefore देवाः - deities वेदनम् - knowledge प्रतिबध्नन्ति - prevent—(259)

259. Therefore, these (deities) do not like that humans know the identity of *jīva* and Brahman. Therefore, they prevent the *Brahmajñāna* of humans.

The presiding deities obstruct the human pursuits of gaining *Brahmajñāna* is a general fact. It was pointed out in the context of verse 248 that this practice is restricted in the case of those who do not adhere to *dharma* strictly and lack *vairāgya*. Otherwise they are helpful to those who have *durita-kṣaya*, devotion to *Īśvara*, *vairāgya*, etc. The *śruti* statement of deities preventing humans can also be viewed as a censure of those *samsārīs* who prefer to be the slaves of deities rather than discover their *Brahma-svarūpa* which is limitless happiness.

AVIDYĀSŪTRA - THE CREATION OF VARṆA, ĀŚRAMA, DEVA, DHARMA (KARMA)

The delusion of *jīva* as an entity

meant to perform *karmas* and dependant on the deities is due to self-ignorance. It ends in self-knowledge. Till then the dependence continues. In this context, the Creation of *varṇas* (such as *Brāhmaṇa*, etc.), *āśramas* (*brahmacarya*, etc.), deities (Lord Agni-fire, etc.), and *dharma* (the presiding deity of righteous conduct called *dharma* who controls all) (*Br.U.1-4-11 to 14*) is described briefly.

स्पष्टीकृतं पारतन्त्र्यं पशुदृष्टान्ततो नृणाम् ।
वर्णाश्रमादि तद्धर्मसृष्टिः कर्मार्थमीरिता ॥२६०॥

पशुदृष्टान्ततः - by the illustration of animals नृणाम् - of humans (अविद्याकार्यम्) पारतन्त्र्यम् - the dependence which is the effect of *avidyā* स्पष्टीकृतम् - was explained (इतः परं श्रुतौ - henceforth in the *śruti*) वर्णाश्रमादि तद्धर्मसृष्टिः - the Creation of *varṇa*, *āśrama*, etc., and their *dharma*, (i.e. duties) कर्मार्थम् - for performance of *karmas* ईरिता - is told—(260)

260. The dependence of humans which is the effect of *avidyā* was explained by the illustration of animals. (Henceforth in the *śruti*), the Creation of *varṇa*, *āśrama*, etc., and their *dharma*, (i.e. duties) are told for the performance of *karmas*.

It is true that the reared animals are dependant on their owner. But the owner takes care of their needs.

Similarly, humans may depend on the deities and the deities in turn fulfill their legitimate desires. They enable all functions such as physiological functions, sensory perception, physical actions, thinking, etc., in all the living beings. Living a life, as per the prescribed code of conduct by the Vedas (called *dharma*) becomes inevitable while performing sacrifices and Vedic *karmas*. Those who are not capable of directly knowing their true nature and be independent, will have to go through the above drill of discharging duties in accordance with *varṇa*, *āśrama*, etc. That is why the *śruti* describes these in the portion of *Brahmavidyā*. In the *śruti*-statement, there is no separate mention of *āśrama*. But it is implied. *Bhāṣyakāra* also includes it. The *varṇa* system comprising of *Brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya* and *sūdra* are based on the division of dispositions and *karmas* (*guṇa* and *karma* divisions). *Āśrama* system consists of four stages in life: *Brahmacarya*, *grhastha*, *vānaprastha* and *sannyāsa*.

This earnest description of *varṇāśrama* and deities, etc., as given by the *śruti* can lead to the following doubt.

नन्वेवं तस्य मुक्तिश्च स्यादेवात्मधियं विना ।
अज्ञानकर्मणोः श्रुत्या सादरेणोपवर्णनात् ॥२६१॥

ननु - here is a doubt श्रुत्या - by

the *śruti* अज्ञानकर्मणोः - of ignorance and *karma* सादरेण - earnestly (in detail) उपवर्णनात् - because of being described तस्य - of the individual *jīva* मुक्तिः च - liberation (*mukti*) also आत्मधियं विना - without *ātmajñāna* एवम् - verily स्यात् एव - should take place – (261)

261. Here is a doubt. Because the *śruti* has described earnestly (in detail) the ignorance and *karma*, the liberation (*mukti*) of individual *jīva* also should be without *ātmajñāna*.

After seeing the detailed description of *Karma*-section (*Karmakāṇḍa*), the above doubt is natural. One may think that *karma* is adequate to gain liberation. It is not so. By performance of *karma*, the favour of presiding deities is earned so that the pursuit of gaining *ātmajñāna* becomes unobstructed. But only after knowing the details of *karma* one can take to its performance leading to *cittaśuddhi* (purity of mind) and finally gaining *ātmajñāna*. That is why the *śruti* describes *karma*, etc.

In order to dispel the possible misunderstanding as voiced in this verse, the *śruti* on her own cautions that the direct knowledge of *ātmā* or *mokṣa* cannot be gained by mere *varṇāśrama*-practice. It states: The ignorant individual who dies from this world of *saṃsāra* without gaining the

direct knowledge, 'I am Brahman', does not protect oneself (from the *samsāra* or transmigration). It is just like deriving no benefits from the Veda that is not learnt or activities such as agriculture, etc., that are not taken to actually (*Br.U.1-4-15*). This *śruti* statement is explained upto the verse 265 in answer to the above doubt.

मैवमात्मा किमज्ञातो मुक्तिदः कर्म वा महत् ।
आम्नायकृषिवन्नायमज्ञातात्मा फलप्रदः ॥२६२॥

मा एवम् - Oh! do not say so किम् - is it आत्मा - *ātmā* अज्ञातः - without gaining its knowledge मुक्तिदः - gives liberation महत् - great कर्म - *karma* वा - or आम्नायकृषिवत् - like the Vedas (that are not learnt) and the agriculture (that is not cultivated) अयम् अज्ञातात्मा - *ātmā* that is not known न - are not फलप्रदः - fruitful – (262)

262. Oh! do not say so, (viz. liberation is possible without *ātmajñāna*). Is it that *ātmā* gives liberation without gaining its knowledge or some great *karma* grants it? *Ātmā* that is not known cannot give liberation like the Vedas (that are not learnt) and the uncultivated agriculture which are not fruitful.

Ātmā that is not known cannot liberate is explained up to the verse 265. *Mokṣa* (liberation) can be gained only by *ātmajñāna* which ends self-ignorance and by no other means. *Ātmā* by its nature is not the means of liberation. It is

unopposed to bondage. Otherwise there will be no bondage. Answer to the second question in this verse, (i.e. does some great *karma* grant liberation?) will be given in verses 266 and 267.

The author himself explains illustrations given in this verse (262).

अनधीतो यथा वेदो

नार्थज्ञानेन पालयेत् ।

अकृता वा कृषिः पाति

नाकर्तारं फलार्थिनम् ॥२६३॥

तथा स्वात्माप्यविज्ञातो

मुमुक्षुं मोक्षदानतः ।

न पालयत्यतो मुक्तिरज्ञस्य

न हि कस्यचित् ॥२६४॥

यथा - just as अनधीतः - not learnt वेदः - the Veda अर्थज्ञानेन - by the knowledge of its meaning न पालयेत् - does not protect the eligible person अकृता वा - or uncultivated कृषिः - agriculture फलार्थिनम् - the seeker of the harvest अकर्तारं - non-cultivator न पाति - does not protect – (263)

तथा - so स्वात्मा - one's *ātmā* अपि - also अविज्ञातः - not known in its true nature मुमुक्षुं - to a *mumukṣu* मोक्षदानतः - by granting him liberation न पालयति - does not protect अतः - therefore न हि कस्यचित् - no one whosoever अज्ञस्य - of an ignorant person मुक्तिः (भवति) - liberation takes place – (264)

263, 264. Just as the Veda not learnt does not protect the eligible person by the knowledge of its meaning, or the uncultivated agriculture does not protect the non-cultivator seeker of the harvest (by giving the harvest), so, one's *ātmā* also when not known in its true nature, does not protect the *mumukṣu* by granting him liberation. Therefore, an ignorant person cannot gain liberation.

The Vedas can benefit only when one studies them and conducts oneself accordingly. The agriculture can yield the harvest provided it is cultivated. So also *ātmā* can confer liberation only when directly known - by its *aparokṣa-jñāna*.

Here is the lot of those who die without gaining the direct knowledge of *ātmā*.

स्वात्माख्यलोकमज्ञात्वा यो देहाख्यस्वलोकतः ।
प्रैत्यसौ पुनरप्यन्यं देहलोकं व्रजेद् दृढम् ॥२६५॥

यः - the one who स्वात्माख्यलोकम् - the *loka* (field of experience) called one's *ātmā* अज्ञात्वा - not knowing देहाख्यस्वलोकतः - from the *loka* called the body प्रैति - dies असौ - that person पुनः अपि - again अन्यं - another देहलोकं - the *loka* called the body दृढम् - certainly व्रजेद् - gains - (265)

265. The individual who dies from this *loka* (the field of experience)

called the body without directly knowing the *loka* called one's *ātmā*, certainly gains another *loka* called the body.

Even if a person is *mumukṣu*, he can get liberated only after gaining *aparokṣa-jñāna*. The word 'loka' means a field of experience. *Ātmā* is called *loka* because its nature itself is self-experiencing, self-luminous (*svayam-jyoti*) knowledge-principle. Until we get the direct experience of *ātmā*, this body itself serves as the *loka* because our all contacts with this world of *saṃsāra* and the experiences therefrom are possible only through the means of this body. The one who dies without gaining the direct *ātmajñāna* is bound to take rebirth wielding another embodiment from the eighty-four lacs of species according to one's results of *karma* and *upāsana*. The one who knows directly oneself to be *cit* and *cit* alone, has no more identification with the present body. There is no occasion of his taking to future embodiments.

'Can *karma* give liberation?' was the second question asked in the verse 262. Some section of people trust in the capacity of *karmas* so much that they believe *karma* as the means of *mokṣa*. They are even ready to deny the existence of *Īśvara* itself and claim that

karma yields the result on its own. The *śruti* categorically dismisses this claim in its statement: ‘Even if a person ignorant of *ātmā*, performs a *karma* yielding great *punya*, it is bound to end one day finally’ (*Br.U.1-4-15*). The text explains the gist of this Upaniṣadic statement in verses 266-267 in answer to the second question posed in the verse 262.

अनात्मविन्महत्पुण्यमश्वमेधादिकं यदि ।

कुर्यान्नित्यफलायैतदथाप्यन्ते विनश्यति ॥२६६॥

यदि - in case अनात्मवित् - the one who knows not *ātmā* in its true nature महत्पुण्यं अश्वमेधादिकं - *aśvamedha*, etc., sacrifices capable of yielding a very great *punya* नित्यफलाय - for the sake of acquiring everlasting result of *karma* कुर्यात् - does तथा अपि - even then एतद् - this, i.e. that *punya* अन्ते - finally विनश्यति - ends, vanishes – (266)

266. In case the person ignorant of *ātmā* in its true nature does *aśvamedha*, etc., sacrifices capable of yielding a very great *punya* to gain the everlasting result of *karma*, even then, that *punya* ends finally.

The *aśvamedha* sacrifice is the top most in giving the *punya*. Even that cannot give everlasting result. As the cause, so the result. A cause that is limited cannot produce limitless effect.

However, great the *aśvamedha* sacrifice may be, it has a beginning and an end. Thus being limited in nature, its result also is limited in spite of being great. This aspect is explained with an illustration.

कृतस्य हि क्षयोऽवश्यं

कोष्ठागारादिवद्भवेत् ।

न मोक्षयादरस्तस्मात्

श्रुतावज्ञानकर्मणोः ॥२६७॥

कृतस्य - of the things accomplished by *karma* हि - indeed क्षयः - depletion, end अवश्यं भवेत् - is inevitable कोष्ठागारादिवत् - (it is like) store-house, treasury, etc. तस्मात् - therefore श्रुतौ - in the Vedas मोक्षाय - as the means to gain liberation अज्ञानकर्मणोः - of ignorance and *karmas* आदरः न - there is no consideration (or importance) – (267)

267. Indeed, the end of the things accomplished by *karma* is inevitable like store-house, treasury, etc. Therefore, the *śruti* does not consider ignorance and *karmas* as the direct means to gain liberation.

The *punya* is like a currency which buys the sense-enjoyments here and hereafter. With every sense-enjoyment, it gets reduced. However great one's *punya* may be, surely it is going to get exhausted finally.

Bondage is due to ignorance. *Karmas* are produced by ignorance.

They cannot destroy their cause, the ignorance. Only the knowledge of *ātmā* can end its ignorance. Therefore, there is no possibility of ignorance and *karmas* serving as the direct means of gaining *ātmajñāna*. *Ātmā* is ever-liberated. It gets revealed as it is the very moment when self-ignorance ends by self-knowledge. Knowledge can only reveal an entity as it is, but can never produce anything. Knowledge is not an action or *karma* though grammarians may say so. An action depends on the doer, but knowledge is dependant on the entity itself. It is made known as it is by the appropriate *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge).

If ignorance and *karmas* are not given importance as the means of gaining knowledge, why at all *śruti* refers to *avidyā* (ignorance) in ‘*atha yo anyām*’, etc. (*Bṛ.U.1-4-10*), and why does the author of this text elaborates it in *avidyāsūtra*? This question is answered.

किन्तु जीवन्मुक्तिकाले

बोधहेयं विवेचितम् ।

मुक्तिस्तु विद्यासूत्रेण

सूचिता स्याद्विचारतः ॥२६८॥

किन्तु - but जीवन्मुक्तिकाले - at the time of *jīvanmukti* बोधहेयं - the things to be discarded by knowledge (अविद्यासूत्रादिना - by *avidyāsūtra*, etc.) विवेचितम् - are

described विद्यासूत्रेण - by the *Vidyāsūtra* सूचिता - suggested मुक्तिः तु - whereas *mokṣa* (liberation) विचारतः - by inquiry leading to *ātmajñāna* स्यात् - takes place –(268)

268. (*Karmas*, etc., were not given importance as the means to gain liberation), but the things to be discarded by knowledge at the time of *jīvanmukti* were described by the *avidyāsūtra*, etc. The liberation (*mokṣa*) suggested by *Vidyāsūtra* can take place only by inquiry leading to *ātmajñāna*.

The description of *avidyāsūtra* after the *Vidyāsūtra* is to highlight the discarding of ignorance with its effects. All that the liberated person is free from is described in *avidyāsūtra*. An ignorant person can know from this description what all he is going to get freed from after liberation. The elaboration of *avidyāsūtra* is also useful because it dispels the wrong notion that *karma* can liberate.

AVIDYĀSŪTRA - ‘SEEK ONLY ĀTMĀ’

Keeping in view the limited feature of *karma-phala* (results of actions), the *śruti* exhorts one and all to seek *ātmā* only who is limitless ever-existent happiness and itself the knowledge-principle. The said statement is: ‘the *loka* called *ātmā* alone should be

inquired into. The result of *ātmajñāna* (called *karma* in the *śruti*) gained by such a person never ends. Whatever this *jñānī* desires, he fulfills them through this *ātmā* only (meaning all sense-pleasures get included in the limitless happiness that he is in reality. Actually, he has no desires. This is a praise of *ātmajñāna*) (*Br. U.1-4-15*). This portion is summarised now.

आत्मानमेव निर्द्वैतं

स्वप्रभं प्रविचारयेत् ।

विचारयति यस्तस्य फलं न

क्षीयते क्वचित् ॥२६९॥

निर्द्वैतं - non-dual स्वप्रभं - self-luminous आत्मानम् एव - *ātmā* alone प्रविचारयेत् - should be inquired into repeatedly (until *ātmajñāna* is gained) यः - the one who विचारयति - inquires into (like this) तस्य - his फलं - the result of *ātmajñāna* न क्वचित् - never क्षीयते - wanes, ends—(269)

269. The non-dual self-luminous *ātmā* itself should be inquired into repeatedly (until *ātmajñāna* is gained). The result of *ātmajñāna* of the one who inquires into it, never wanes.

The author gives the meaning of the word ‘*upāsita*’ from the *śruti* (1-4-15) as ‘*pravicārayet*’ - should be inquired into repeatedly. An *upāsanā* is a worship, propitiation or meditation.

The deity so adored reveals itself and or grants desired results to the *upāsaka* depending on the intensity of *upāsanā* and *śraddhā* (faith) therein. In the case of *ātmā*, the proper inquiry taken to repeatedly with a duly prepared mind alone can yield *ātmajñāna*. The *śruti* describes *ātmajñāna* as *karma* in the sense of *phala* (result) because it reveals the non-dual nature of *ātmā*. It is the highest accomplishment.

The covetable nature of this state of non-duality is described in accordance with the *śruti*.

कामी कामयते यद्यत् सुखं

स्वर्गादिजं पुमान् ।

अस्मादेवात्मनस्तत्तत् सृजते

कर्मपूजितात् ॥२७०॥

कामी पुमान् - person riddled with desires यद्यत् - whatever स्वर्गादिजं सुखं - the joy of heaven, etc. कामयते - desires तत् - all those कर्मपूजितात् - from the one adored by *karmas* अस्मात् एव आत्मनः - from this *ātmā* only सृजते - produces, gets—(270)

270. The person riddled with whatever desires such as the joys of heaven, etc., gets all of them only from this *ātmā* adored by *karmas*.

All the joys that the ignorant people can aspire for can be procured by a *jñānī*, without any separate efforts from

his true nature *ātmā* which is nothing but limitless happiness. This does not mean that *jñānīs* also have desires. It is only a praise of *ātmajñāna* and the nature of *ātmā*. It shows that the limitless happiness that *ātmā* is, encompasses and surpasses all joys born of sense-enjoyments. The source of all sense-pleasures is *ātmā* only. All happiness born of sense-objects contained in the entire Creation put together is infinitesimal part of *ātmānanda* - the limitless happiness that *ātmā* is. That is why a person of *viveka* (discrimination) should opt for *ātmajñāna* instead of running after the sense-objects through the means of *karmas* only to continue in the whirlpool of transmigration.

The liberation (*mokṣa*) called *phala* resulting from *ātmajñāna* never ends was told in the *śruti* (*na kṣīyate*, *Br.U.1-4-15*, and the verse 269). The same is established now.

अविनाशोऽखिलानन्दहेतुत्वं

चेत्यदो द्वयम् ।

न कर्मणां फले युक्तं युक्तं

विद्याफले तु तत् ॥२७१॥

अविनाशः - indestructibility अखिलानन्द-हेतुत्वं - being the source of all types of happiness च - and इति - so अदः द्वयम् - these two कर्मणां - of *karmas* फले - in the result न - is not युक्तं - proper तु - but तत् - that

विद्याफले - in the result of *ātmavidyā* युक्तम् - is proper - (271)

271. The indestructibility and being the source of all types of happiness is inapplicable to the results of actions, but they fit in the result of *ātmavidyā*.

The results of actions are limited and destructible. Therefore, the indestructibility suggested by '*na kṣīyate*' and the fulfilment of whatever desired ('*yad yad kāmayate*') told in the *śruti* (*Br.U.1-4-15*) (verses 269, 270) is relevant only in the case of *mokṣa* (liberation).

From verses 272 to 278 the topics such as permanence of *vidyāphala* (result of *ātmajñāna*, viz. *mokṣa*), the inclusion (*antarbhāva*) of all *viṣayānanda* (sense-pleasures) in *ātmānanda* (limitless happiness that *ātmā* is) and why *karmas* or sense-objects can give only a drop or infinitesimal portion of *Brahmānanda* (limitless happiness that *ātmā*/Brahman is), are derived one by one.

सिद्धस्य व्यञ्जिका

विद्याव्यक्तात्मा फलमुच्यते ।

न ह्यात्मनो विनाशोऽस्ति नित्यं

विद्याफलं ततः ॥२७२॥

विद्या - *ātmajñāna* सिद्धस्य (वस्तुनः) - of the existing entity व्यञ्जिका - is the revealer (विद्यया) व्यक्तात्मा - the *ātmā* manifest by *vidyā*, (i.e. the state of

having *ātmajñāna*) फलम् - the result of *ātmavidyā* (इति) उच्यते - is said to be आत्मनः - of *ātmā* विनाशः - destruction न हि - not at all अस्ति - is there ततः - therefore विद्याफलं - the result of *ātmajñāna* नित्यं - is everlasting—(272)

272. *Ātmajñāna* is the revealer of the existing entity (called *ātmā*). The *ātmā* manifest by *vidyā*, (i.e. the state of having *ātmajñāna*) is said to be the result of *ātmavidyā*. *Ātmā* never gets destroyed. Therefore, the result of *ātmajñāna* is everlasting.

Any direct knowledge reveals the entity to be known as it is. It never creates something a new. The entity revealed by *vidyā* described in *Vidyāsūtra* is said to be the result of that *vidyā*. The phrase used is ‘*ucyate*’ (is said to be) because truly there is nothing that is produced. Only the ignorance of *ātmā* is dispelled. Thereupon, *ātmā* in its true nature without any changes becomes known. *Ātmā* is indestructible. Therefore, it is proper to say that *vidyāphala* (the result of *ātmajñāna*) is indestructible.

The aggregate of all happiness born of sense-enjoyments in the entire Creation is not even a drop of the ocean called *Brahmānanda/ātmānanda*.

सार्वभौमादिकाः प्रोक्ता उत्तरोत्तरवृद्धितः।
हिरण्यगर्भपर्यन्ता आनन्दा आत्मबिन्दवः॥२७३॥

उत्तरोत्तरवृद्धितः - by successive growth (of hundredfold) प्रोक्ताः - described (in the *ānanda-mīmāṃsā* - the quantitative analysis of *viṣayānanda*) सार्वभौमादिकाः - beginning from the happiness of an ideal emperor, etc. हिरण्यगर्भपर्यन्ताः - ending with the happiness of *Hiraṇyagarbha* आनन्दाः - (whatever) varieties of happiness are there आत्मबिन्दवः - (they are) the drops of the ocean of happiness that *ātmā* is—(273)

273. Beginning from the happiness of an ideal emperor, etc., ending with that of *Hiraṇyagarbha*, whatever varieties of happiness that are described by successive growth of hundredfold (in the *ānanda-mīmāṃsā* - the quantitative analysis of *viṣayānanda*) are the drops of the ocean of happiness that *ātmā* is.

The infinite nature of *ātmānanda/Brahmānanda* is established by comparing it with the totally insignificant *viṣayānanda*. This is based on the quantitative analysis of *viṣayānanda* described in the Upaniṣads *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (4-3-33) and *Taittirīya* (2-8). The happiness that is enjoyed by an ideal, young, learned, smart, prosperous and mighty emperor ruling the entire earth is considered as one unit of maximum human *ānanda* (happiness). The King Yudhiṣṭhira (Dharmarāja of Mahābhārata), etc., can

be an illustration in this respect. Beginning from human happiness each successive higher embodiment enjoys the hundredfold that of the preceding one. The subsequent higher embodiments mentioned are : *manuṣya-gandharva, devagandharva, pitṛ, ājānaja-deva, karma-deva, deva, Indra, Bṛhaspati, Prajāpati* and *Hiraṇyagarbha*. The happiness enjoyed by *Hiraṇyagarbha* is the maximum among the beings who wield an embodiment. Even that is just nothing compared to *Brahmānanda*. All these happiness originate from *Brahmānanda*. The happiness enjoyed by all the embodied beings is negligibly insignificant portion of *Brahmānanda* (*Br.U.4-3-32*). One can fetch the water from the ocean according to the capacity of pot that is taken. Similarly, the happiness drawn by all the beings including that by *Hiraṇyagarbha* is determined by the type of their *karmas* and *upāsānās*. It is like the drops compared to the ocean.

ब्रह्मानन्दस्य भूतानि

मात्रां यान्तीत्युदीरणात् ।

तत्तत्कर्मानुसारेण ब्रह्मानन्दः

स्फुरेन्नृणाम् ॥२७४॥

भूतानि - all the living beings
ब्रह्मानन्दस्य - of *Brahmānanda* मात्रां - a
particle यान्ति - gain, (experience) इति
उदीरणात् - because it is said so by the *śruti*
नृणाम् - to the people तत्तत्कर्मानुसारेण -

according to their *karmaphalas* (results of actions) ब्रह्मानन्दः - *Brahmānanda* स्फुरेत् - manifests (in the form of *viṣayānanda*) - (274)

274. Because the *śruti* says that all the living beings experience a particle of *Brahmānanda*, it can be known that *Brahmānanda* manifests to them (in the form of sense-pleasures) according to their *karmaphalas*.

Inert sense-objects are totally devoid of having happiness on their own. It is our mind that conceals our nature *Brahmānanda* and that alone manifests it as limited sense-pleasure on the fulfilment of desires. The reason why *ātmānanda/Brahmānanda*, though eternal, is experienced only at times as a fleeting joy, can be seen now.

तत्तद्विषयकामेन

चित्तेऽस्मिन् व्याकुलीकृते ।

आनन्द आत्मभूतोऽपि स

तिरोधीयते नृणाम् ॥२७५॥

तत्तद्विषयकामेन - by the desires for different sense-objects अस्मिन् चित्ते - when this mind व्याकुलीकृते - is agitated आत्मभूतः अपि - even though the true nature of oneself सः आनन्दः - that *ātmānanda* नृणाम् - (from the experience) of people तिरोधीयते - is covered - (275)

275. Even though *ātmānanda* is the true nature of oneself, when the

mind is agitated by the desires for different sense-objects, the same *ānanda* (happiness) gets covered from the experience of people.

पुण्येन विषये लब्धे

चित्ते स्वास्थ्यमुपागते ।

आत्मानन्दः स्फुरेत् तावद्

यावन्न व्याकुलान्तरम् ॥२७६॥

पुण्येन - by *punya* (result of good *karma*) विषये लब्धे - when the desired sense-object is gained चित्ते - (as a result) when the mind स्वास्थ्यम् उपागते - (when it) is at ease यावत् - so long as व्याकुलान्तरम् न - agitation in the form of another desire does not rise up तावत् - till then आत्मानन्दः - *ātmānanda* स्फुरेत् - manifests - (276)

276. On gaining the desired sense-objects by *punya*, when the mind is at ease, *ātmānanda* manifests until agitation in the form of another desire does not rise up.

Though *ātmā* is *sat* (ever-existent principle - 'is'), *cit* (knowledge-principle), *ānanda* (absolute happiness), all of them are not manifest for our cognition or experience all the time. *Sat* ('is') aspect can be known all the time everywhere. *Cit* (knowledge) is experienced as *cidābhāsa* in the *antaḥkaraṇa vṛttis* (thoughts). But the *ānanda* aspect manifests only in the subtle *vṛttis* called *priya, moda,*

pramoda revealing happiness in a varying degree. They rise up in a calm mind. The common masses can expect such an ease in the mind only when their desires are fulfilled due to some past *punya*. Alas! it lasts only for a short while until the next desire disturbs the mind. The continuous effervescence of desire is common feature in all the ignorant humans. It is universally believed that more happiness is experienced by the fulfilment of more desires. But the scriptures declare, 'less desires, more happiness'. When no desire in the wake of *ātmajñāna*, all that is there is *ātmā* whose nature is limitless happiness (*ananta ānanda*). It is worth-noting by a mature person that the fulfilment of desires depends on many external factors and variables beyond our control whereas reducing the desires by *viveka* (discrimination) and gain *ātmajñāna* is totally a matter of our self-effort.

It is also better to keep in mind that sense-pleasure by itself is not happiness, but it is the resultant peace of mind that reveals our nature through *priya, moda, pramoda vṛttis*. The best thing to do is to own up directly our true nature by *ātmajñāna* wherein only limitless happiness is there without any intervention of sorrow-breeding *upādhis*, sense-objects and the mind.

एवं च विषयानन्दा ब्रह्मानन्दस्य बिन्दवः ।
सर्वानन्दनिधिर्विद्याफलमित्येतदीरितम् ॥२७७॥

एवं च - thus विषयानन्दाः - sense-pleasures ब्रह्मानन्दस्य - of *Brahmānanda* बिन्दवः - are drops (अतः - therefore) विद्याफलम् - the result of *ātmajñāna* सर्वानन्दनिधि - is the *ātmā* likened to the ocean of happiness from which all the sense-pleasures originate इति एतद् - this is what ईरितम् - is told (by the *śruti*) – (277)

277. Thus all sense-pleasures are drops of the ocean in the form of *Brahmānanda*. Therefore, this is what the *śruti* says: The result of *ātmajñāna* is the *ātmā* - likened to the ocean of happiness from which all sense-pleasures (*viṣayānandas*) originate.

It was doubted in the verse 261 that *mokṣa* can be gained without gaining *ātmajñāna* because *avidyā* and *karma* have been described by the *śruti* with earnestness. Its clarification was given till the verse 267 that *karma* cannot be the direct means of *mokṣa*. To specify what needs to be discarded in the state of *jīvanmukta*, the *śruti* has described *ajñāna* and *karma* (verse 268). Here is another purpose because of which the *śruti* describes *karmas*.

आनन्दबिन्द्वभिव्यक्तिहेतुकर्मप्रसिद्धये ।
ब्रह्मक्षत्रादिवर्णानां सृष्टिर्यत्नेन वर्णिता ॥२७८॥

आनन्दबिन्द्वभिव्यक्तिहेतुकर्मप्रसिद्धये - to

tell the means of *karmas* that produce the drops of *Brahmānanda* (in the form of *viṣayānanda*) (श्रुत्या - by the *śruti*) ब्रह्मक्षत्रादिवर्णानां - of *varṇas* such as *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, etc. सृष्टिः - the Creation यत्नेन - carefully, diligently वर्णिता - is described – (278)

278. The *śruti* has described carefully the Creation of *varṇas* such as *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, etc., to tell the means of *karmas* that produce the drops of *Brahmānanda* (in the form of *viṣayānanda*).

The description of *varṇas* and *karmas* given by the *śruti* is a stopgap arrangement. Since these means are strictly according to *dharma*, avoiding *adhārmika* life, they inculcate *viveka* (discrimination) in due course. This leads to *vairāgya*, *karmayoga* and *śuddhāntaḥkaraṇa*. The person becomes eligible to take to *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* and thereby gain *ātmajñāna* which is the owning up of *Brahmānanda*. Thus *karmas* serve as the indirect means to gain *ātmajñāna*.

AVIDYĀSŪTRA - JĪVA IS THE RESORT (OR SERVANT) OF ALL

The next *śruti* portion describes how a *jīva* by one's service in the state of ignorance becomes the resort of all – from deities up to insignificant creatures

such as ants. They also in turn nourish those householders (*grhasthas*) who serve them. This is why it was pointed out earlier that the presiding deities, etc., do not like that their votaries gain *Brahmajñāna*. This topic will be described until the verse 286. To enhance the *mumukṣā* (yearning for liberation) is the main purpose of this portion. But indirectly there is a guidance to those engrossed in *samsāra* that others should be served according to one's capacity. That is the lesson imparted by the Vedic culture. Now the first three verses describe how *grhasthas* serve all the beings.

वर्णाश्रमाभिमानी सन्नतत्त्वज्ञः पराङ्मतिः ।

देवादीनामाश्रयः स्यात् सर्वेषामपिपीलिकम् ॥२७९॥

अतत्त्वज्ञः - the ignorant one पराङ्मतिः - extrovert in nature वर्णाश्रमाभिमानी सन् - being identified with one's *varṇa* and *āśrama* (stages in life) सर्वेषां - of all देवादीनाम् - beginning from the presiding deities अपिपीलिकम् - up to the ant आश्रयः - resort स्यात् - becomes – (279)

279. The ignorant one, extrovert in nature, being identified with one's *varṇa* and *āśrama* (stages in life) becomes the resort of all beginning from the presiding deities up to the ants.

देवानां यागहोमाभ्यामृषीणां वेदपाठतः ।

पितृणाम् श्राद्धतो नृणां वस्त्रान्नगृहदानतः ॥२८०॥

पशूनां तृणनीराभ्यामुच्छिष्टकणधान्यतः ।

श्वाखुटिटिटिभमुख्यानामेवं सर्वाश्रयो गृही ॥२८१॥

यागहोमाभ्यां - by the performance of different types of sacrifices called *yāga* and *homa* देवानां - of deities (आश्रयः भवति - becomes resort or servant) वेदपाठतः - by reading/studying the Vedas ऋषीणां - of ṛṣis श्राद्धतः - by performing *śrāddha* (ceremony performed in honour of *pitṛs*-dead related individuals) पितृणाम् - of *pitṛs* वस्त्रान्नगृहदानतः - by providing clothes, food and accommodation नृणां - of humans तृणनीराभ्यां - by giving grass and water पशूनां - of animals (such as cattle, etc.) उच्छिष्टकणधान्यतः - by giving the leftover food (उच्छिष्ट) - and scattering broken grains (कणधान्यतः) । श्वाखुटिटिटिभमुख्यानां - of dogs, rats and birds such as *tiṭṭibha*, etc. एवं - thus गृही - a householder सर्वाश्रयः (भवति) - becomes the resort (servant) of all – (280), (281)

280, 281. A *grhastha* (householder) becomes the resort (or servant) of deities by the performance of *yāgas* and *homas*, of *ṛṣis* by reading the Vedas, of *pitṛs* by performing *śrāddha*, of humans by providing the food, clothing and shelter, of animals (such as cattle) by giving the grass and water, of dogs, rats and birds such as *tiṭṭibha*, etc., by giving leftover food and scattering broken

grains. Thus a householder becomes the resort (servant) of all.

Only those ignorant persons who follow *varṇa* and *āśrama* code of conduct according to *dharma* will be the resort of deities, etc., but not the others. There is no possibility of others serving deities, etc., because they neither accept them nor care for. If the person who follows *varṇāśrama dharma* becomes introvert and a *jñānī*, he will be absorbed in Brahman. As a result, he will not be able to serve deities, etc. But the extrovert persons who believe the world to be true and many desirable things can be procured from it, will take to the service of deities, etc., prompted by the rewards that can be obtained thereby.

The mode of serving the deities is *yāga* and *homa*. Adoration or worship of deities is *yāga* and offering the things in the fire is *homa*. Sacrificing the oblation for the sake of deities is *yāga*. The actual offering of sacrificed oblations in the fire is *homa*. The deities get nourished by *yāgas* and *homās*. *Ṛṣis* become contented by the study and repetition of the Vedas according to the injunctions and the rules laid down. *Pitṛs* become happy by the performance of *śrāddha* and propagation of species. The pleased deities, etc., bestow good on those who serve them. If needy people are served with food, clothing and shelter, they

become very happy. If a rich person takes care of the needs of the poor, they in turn wish for his prosperity and help that he can progress. But in spite of riches, if one is self-centred and neglects the needy people, they envy him and even may obstruct his progress.

A *dhārmika* person provides grass, fodder and water to animals not only owned by him, but also to others. He develops pasture lands for cattle to graze and digs water reservoirs so that animals can drink water. He disposes of leftover food and broken grains in such a way that ants, dogs, rats and birds get their foods. It is interesting to note that in olden days, there was a custom in India of putting '*rangoli*' at the threshold early morning after sweeping and swabbing the house. '*Rangoli*' is decorative designs having different patterns drawn by lines of grain-flour. It denotes auspiciousness and also serves as the food for ants. This practice has dwindled nowadays except in some villages. On festival days, many do put '*rangoli*'. But unfortunately, they use crushed stone-powder and coloured chemicals being unaware of its purpose. Thus a *dhārmika* householder by taking to the right means of serving the deities, etc., becomes their resort or servant.

Actually the householder by serving the deities, etc., does not oblige

them because it is their right to receive the repayment for the favours they have done to the householder. It is like pay the price and purchase the commodity. Naturally, the deities would not like losing the householder by his gaining *Brahmajñāna*. This is deduced in verses 282 to 286 based on the *śruti* (*Br.U.1-4-16*).

कर्मणा नार्जितो यस्मान्न

कश्चिदुपकारकृत् ।

गृही देवादिभिस्तस्मादर्जितोऽभूत्

स्वकर्मभिः ॥२८२॥

यस्मात् - because कर्मणा - by one's *karmas* न अर्जितः - not acquired कश्चित् - anyone उपकारकृत् न - does not oblige तस्मात् - therefore देवादिभिः - by the deities, etc. स्वकर्मभिः - by their *karmas* (favours) गृही - the *grhastha*, householder अर्जितः अभूत् - procured, earned – (282)

282. Because anyone not acquired by one's *karmas* does not oblige, therefore the householder is procured by the deities by their *karmas* (favours).

स्वस्वकर्मारजितत्वेन देवाद्याः

स्वस्वदेहवत् ।

अविनाशं सदेच्छन्ति गृहिणः

स्वोपकारिणः ॥२८३॥

स्वस्वकर्मारजितत्वेन - because of being procured by their individual *karmas* देवाद्याः - the deities, etc. स्वोपकारिणः - of the

person beneficial to oneself गृहिणः - of the householder सदा - always अविनाशं - non-destruction इच्छन्ति - desire for स्वस्वदेहवत् - like one's embodiment earned by own *karmas* – (283)

283. Because of being procured by their individual *karmas*, the deities, etc., always desire for the non-destruction of the householder who is beneficial to them like one's embodiment earned by own *karmas* (desired by all to remain without destruction).

What is the destruction of a householder that the deities, etc., have in mind is explained.

तत्त्वं बुध्वाननुष्ठानं नाशोऽयं

गृहिणो महान् ।

एष देवादिभिः सर्वे न हि

शक्यश्चिकित्सितुम् ॥२८४॥

(आत्म) तत्त्वं बुध्वा - having known the true nature of *ātmanā* अननुष्ठानं - the non-performance of *karmas* (by the householder) अयं - this itself गृहिणः - of the householder महान् - great, irreparable नाशः - destruction एषः - this (loss) सर्वे देवादिभिः - by all the deities, etc. चिकित्सितुम् - to remedy न हि शक्यः - is not possible – (284)

284. The non-performance of *karmas* on knowing the true nature of

ātmā is itself the great destruction of a householder. This (loss) cannot be remedied by all the deities, etc.

कर्मणामननुष्ठानं

मृतिरोगादिना तु यत् ।

नासावात्यन्तिको नाशो यस्मात्

पश्चात् करिष्यति ॥२८५॥

यत् - whatever तु - but मृतिरोगादिना - due to death, diseases, etc. कर्मणामननुष्ठानं - the non-performance of *karmas* (by the householder) असौ - that आत्यन्तिकः - total नाशः - destruction न - is not यस्मात् - because पश्चात् - afterwards करिष्यति - (he) will do – (285)

285. The non-performance of *karmas* (by the householder) due to death, diseases, etc., is not a total cessation (destruction) because (he) will do it afterwards.

मा भूत् सर्वस्वहानिर्नो ब्रह्मयाथात्म्यविद्यया ।
इति देवादयो विद्यां प्रतिबध्नन्ति यत्नतः ॥२८६॥

ब्रह्मयाथात्म्यविद्यया - by the direct knowledge of Brahman in its true nature नः - our सर्वस्वहानिः - loss of total possessions मा भूत् - let there not be इति (मत्वा) - (considering) so देवादयः - the deities, etc. (तेषां - there) विद्यां - *Brahmavidyā* यत्नतः - zealously प्रतिबध्नन्ति - obstruct – (286)

286. ‘Let there not be the loss of

our total possessions by householders gaining the direct knowledge of Brahman’, considering so the deities zealously obstruct their (of householders) *Brahmavidyā*.

The results of actions (*karmaphalas*) are gained according to *karmas*. This is the rule. It may be true that the householder serves the deities, etc. But he is also the beneficiary of their services in one way or the other. Therefore, the householder is like the total possession (*sarvasva*, verse 286) of deities. The fact is that no one in this Creation is totally independent. All are mutually interdependent. This is discussed in the sixteenth chapter of *Anubhūti-prakāśa* based on *Madhubrahmaṇa* (*Br.U.2-5*). The deities, etc., obstructing *Brahmavidyā* should be viewed in the proper perspective as discussed earlier (verses 248, 259).

AVIDYĀSŪTRA - DESIRE

It is true that due to *avidyā*, Brahman appears as if it undergoes the suffering of *saṃsāra* as a *jīva*. Becoming the servant of deities, etc., is one of the facets of *saṃsāra*. But *avidyā* (ignorance), though the root cause is not sufficient for the actual ramification of *saṃsāra*. Ignorance can only conceal but cannot prompt. At practical level it is the ‘desire’ (*kāma*) the effect of *avidyā* on which the *saṃsāra* gets centred. The

śruti says: In the beginning (before marriage) *ātmā* (as *jīva*) was single (as a *brahmacārī* - celibate). He desired, 'let me have a wife so that I can have progeny'. Further, he desired, 'let me have wealth (all types of securities) so that I can perform *karma*. Desire is for only this much'. (*Br.U.1-4-17*). All desires get included in these in one form or the other. *Jīva* thinks oneself to be incomplete without these. Thus the *avidyā*, the cause of calamitous *saṃsāra* gets reduced to 'desire' at practical level. This topic is discussed upto verse 295.

To begin with a doubt is posed in the verses 287 and 288.

नन्वनर्थकरे केन गृही त्वेवं प्रवर्तितः ।

पारतन्त्र्यम् ऋते नैव धीमानत्र प्रवर्तते ॥२८७॥

ननु - here is a doubt तु - but एवं - in this manner गृही - householder अनर्थकरे (मार्गे) - on the perilous, harmful useless path केन - by whom, by what cause प्रवर्तितः - is prompted पारतन्त्र्यम् ऋते - without subservience धीमान् - an intelligent person अत्र - here on such path न एव प्रवर्तते - does not proceed at all - (287)

287. Here is a doubt. In this manner prompted by what cause is this householder made to proceed on this harmful path of *saṃsāra*? An intelligent person does not proceed at all on such

path without subservience.

To serve the deities, etc., whole life long is a big shackle. Being oneself *sat-cit-ānanda*, what makes this householder *jīva* proceed on the perilous path of *saṃsāra*? Certainly he is under the spell of some specific cause which clouds his intelligence. Such a behaviour is not possible without being subservient to some entity. Perhaps the cause is *avidyā* (self-ignorance). According to the person who doubts thus, *avidyā* at best can veil the knowledge of an entity but cannot prompt anyone to take to *karmas*. This opinion is stated now.

देवादिपारतन्त्र्यं तु

गृहिणामधिकारिणाम् ।

मिथ्याधीमान्रहेतुत्वात् नाप्यविद्या

प्रवर्तिका ॥२८८॥

अधिकारिणाम् गृहिणाम् - of eligible householders देवादिपारतन्त्र्यं - the subservience to the deities, etc. तु - undoubtedly मिथ्याधीमान्रहेतुत्वात् - is only on account of erroneous notion of identification with one's embodiment अविद्या - the ignorance of oneself अपि - also (कर्मणि - to take to *karmas*) प्रवर्तिका न - is not the prompter - (288)

288. The subservience of eligible householders to the deities, etc., undoubtedly is only on account of erroneous notion of identification

with one's embodiment. *Avidyā* (the ignorance of oneself) also is not the prompter to perform *karmas* (because *avidyā* being a veiling power in nature cannot prompt).

Suppose, while walking in the darkness you fell down in a ditch. No doubt the darkness has the main role as the cause of your fall, yet, your walking is the actual cause. You do not fall only because you cannot see. Similarly, here it is wrong to say that ignorance makes householders the servants of the deities, etc., or prompts them to render them the service. The question asked in the verse 287 is answered.

तर्हि प्रवर्तकं ब्रूमः काम एव प्रवर्तकः ।

काम एष क्रोध एष इत्यादिस्मृतिवाक्यतः॥२८९॥

तर्हि - then प्रवर्तकं - prompter ब्रूमः - we shall tell कामः एव - the desire itself प्रवर्तकः - is the prompter एष कामः - this desire एष क्रोधः - this anger इत्यादि - etc. स्मृतिवाक्यतः - from the statement of *smṛti* (*B.G.3-37*) (this can be verified) – (289)

289. Then, we shall tell you the prompter. The desire itself is the prompter. (This can be verified) from the statement of *smṛti* (*B.G.3-37*), viz. ‘this desire, this anger’, etc.

The *śruti* describes this ‘desire’ as the prompter by its statement ‘he the single *brahmacāri jīva* desired (*saḥ*

akāmayata) (*Bṛ.U.1-4-17*). In an answer to Arjuna's question, *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa replies that the desire which itself transforms into anger is the cause of sinful *karmas* that bind the individual to *samsāra* (*B.G.3-37*). In the Vedas also we find at other place than *Bṛhadāranyaka*, the desire as the prompting factor that induces to the binding *karmas*. When the *yajamāna* (the performer of a sacrifice) who has performed a *yāga* to fulfill his desire gives the *dakṣiṇā* to *ṛtviks* (the Vedic priest), the latter says while receiving it: Who gave? To whom it was given? Desire gave it. It was given to desire. Desire is the giver. Desire is the receiver (*Yajurveda*, 7-48). This shows that the priest performed the sacrifice for the *yajamāna*, because he has a desire and now the receiver of that *dakṣiṇā* (fees) is that desire only.

As per the *yajamāna*, it is his desire that prompted the performance of that sacrifice. In this sense the giver of *dakṣiṇā* is also the desire.

The above fact is corroborated by the *Manusmṛti* (2-4).

अकामतः क्रिया काचिद्

दृश्यते नेह कस्यचित् ।

यद्यद्धि कुरुते जन्तुस्तत्तत्कामस्य

चेष्टितम् ॥२९०॥

इह - in this *samsāra* अकामतः -

without desire कस्यचित् - of anyone काचिद् - any क्रिया - *karma*, action न दृश्यते - is not seen हि - because यद्यद् - whatever जन्तु - man कुरुते तत्तत् - those things (are) कामस्य - of desire चेष्टितम् - work –(290)

290. In this *samsāra* any action of anyone is not seen without a desire. Because whatever the man does is nothing but the work of desire (*Manusmṛti* 2-4).

Doing good to others or charity prompted by compassion may appear to be an action not motivated by any desire. It is not so. Even in such a resolve, ‘let me help others’ is a desire. More than that, many times the distressed condition of the suffering people disturbs us. Even in such cases, the efforts on our part to ease their suffering is prompted by our desire to regain our mental peace. This explains how an eligible householder becomes the resort (*āśraya*) or servant of deities, etc., because he has many desires to be fulfilled.

What are those desires entertained by all and described by the *śruti*, ‘*etāvān vai kāmāh*’ (Desire is for only this much), (*Bṛ.U.*1-4-17)? They are enumerated here.

तस्मात् कामयते पूर्वं ब्रह्मचारी चतुष्टयम् ।
जाया मे स्यादथापत्यमथ वित्तमथ क्रिया ॥२९१॥

तस्मात् - therefore ब्रह्मचारी - a

celibate पूर्वं - at first चतुष्टयम् - fourfold need कामयते - desires जाया मे स्याद् - ‘let me have a wife’ अथ अपत्यम् - ‘thereafter let me have a progeny’ अथ वित्तम् - ‘then wealth’ अथ क्रिया - ‘then action/*karma*’ –(291)

291. (Because he felt single) therefore celibate at first desires the fourfold need. (They are:) ‘Let me have a wife’, ‘thereafter let me have a progeny’, ‘then wealth’, ‘then *karma*/action’.

A *brahmacāri* (celibate) enters the state of a *grhastha* (householder) because he wants to fulfill the above four desires. Otherwise there is no need for him to enter *grhasthāśrama*. ‘At first’ (*pūrvam*) is to indicate the fact of having the desire first and then becoming the householder. In the present age, the order of desiring may be slightly different. But, what is desired is the same. The word ‘*kriyā*’ means both the worldly activities to earn the livelihood and the Vedic *karmas* to procure heavens.

एतावानेव संसारे कामो

नातोऽधिकः क्वचित् ।

लोकान्तरं कर्मफलं

कर्मोक्त्यैवेरितं भवेत् ॥२९२॥

संसारे - in this *samsāra* एतावान् एव - only this much कामः (अस्ति) - desire (is there) अतः अधिकः - more than this न क्वचित् - nowhere (it is found) लोकान्तरं

कर्मफलं - earning of *punya* to procure heavens कर्मोक्त्या एव - by the mention of *karma* (action) itself ईरितम् भवेत् - is told –(292)

292. Only this much is the range of desire in this *samsāra*. More than this, it is not found anywhere. The earning of *punya* to procure heavens is told by the mention of action (*karma*) itself.

The desires entertained by people may be endless in numbers. But they can be clubbed in these four varieties. Elsewhere in *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (3-5-1, 4-4-22) all desires are grouped in three categories. They are, *putraīṣaṇā* (desire for son which includes the desire for wife), *vittaiṣaṇā* (desire for wealth for both living and performance of *karmas*, sacrifices, etc., to procure heavens) and *lokaiṣaṇās* (desire for name, fame in this world and heavens hereafter). In the absence of fulfilment of these desires due to incapacity or some other reasons, the individual considers oneself to be incomplete. To avoid such sense of incompleteness, the *śruti* recommends certain *upāsanās*.

असम्भवे तु

जायादेर्मनोवागादिषु क्रमात् ।

आत्मा जायादि सङ्कल्प्य

ध्यायेत् जायादिसिद्धये ॥२९३॥

आत्मा - the eligible *jīva* जायादेः - of

(accomplishing) the actual wife, etc. असम्भवे - in the case of impossibility तु - but मनोवागादिषु - in the mind, speech, etc. क्रमात् - in the order जायादि - wife, etc. संकल्प्य - having considered so जायादिसिद्धये - for the accomplishment of imagined wife, etc. ध्यायेत् - should meditate –(293)

293. In the case of impossibility of accomplishing the actual wife, etc., the eligible individual (called *ātmā*) should meditate on the mind, speech, etc., having considered them to be wife, etc., in the order (given by the *śruti*) for the accomplishment of imagined wife, etc.

According to the *śruti* (*Bṛ. U. 1-4-17*), in this *upāsanā* (meditation) the mind has to be looked upon as oneself (*ātmā jīva*), the speech as wife, vital airs (*prāṇas*) as the progeny, eyes and ears as the wealth and the body as the *karma*. This *upāsanā* is to get rid of the notion of incompleteness for want of wife, etc. It is not a means to get wife, etc. This *upāsanā* has no connection with *Brahmavidyā*. Therefore, the author of this text has not elaborated it.

There is another reading of this verse with *ātmājāyādi* as one word. In that case the meaning will be: Meditate by superimposing the individual *jīva*, wife, etc., on the mind speech and so on.

The answer to the question posed in the verse 287 is being concluded.

एवं कामप्रेरितः सन्
याति कर्माधिकारिताम् ।
अवरुन्धन्ति गृहिणं देवाद्या
अधिकारिणम् ॥२९४॥

एवं - thus (the *śruti* ascertained that) कामप्रेरितः सन् - being prompted by desires (गृहस्थः - the householder) कर्माधिकारिताम् - the eligibility to perform *karmas* याति - gets देवाद्याः- the deities, etc. अधिकारिणम् - the person eligible to perform *karmas*, (i.e. the person full of desires) गृहिणं - the householder अवरुन्धन्ति - obstruct from gaining *Brahmavidyā* –(294)

294. Thus the *śruti* ascertained that the householder being prompted by desires gains the eligibility to perform *karmas*. The deities, etc., obstruct the desire-ridden householder from gaining *Brahmavidyā*.

This does not mean that the life of a person who is not eligible to perform *karmas*, (i.e. not an *adhikārī* for *karmas*) will be a bed of roses. There is no possibility of such a person becoming *jñānādhikārī* (eligible to gain *Brahmajñāna*). Only a *karmādhikārī* who has purity of mind (*śuddha antaḥkaraṇa*) can become a

jñānādhikārī. There may be some who have already got the purity of mind by the *karmas* done in the past lives. Such persons take to the pursuit of *Brahmajñāna* directly without the performance of *karmas* in this life. This shows that only a few become *karmādhikārīs* and so it is natural that the deities, etc., desire that there is no further loss from these few by gaining *Brahmajñāna*.

The *avidyāsūtra* was begun in the verse 250. Now it is concluded by pointing out its purpose.

इत्यविद्यासूत्र उक्तोऽनर्थो यत्नेन विस्तृतः ।
अयं निवर्त्यो विदुषा जीवतेति श्रुतेर्मतिः ॥२९५॥

इति - thus अविद्यासूत्रे - in the aphorism on *avidyā* विस्तृतः - elaborated अनर्थः - calamitous topic of *saṃsāra* यत्नेन - with great effort उक्तः - is told (in verses 251 to 294) अयं - this calamity विदुषा - by the *vivekī* (mature person) जीवता - while living (itself) निवर्त्यः - should be ended इति - so (is) श्रुतेः - of the *śruti* मतिः - intention –(295)

295. Thus the calamitous topic of *saṃsāra* elaborated in the aphorism on *avidyā*, is told (in verses 251 to 294) with great effort. The *vivekī* should end this calamity of *saṃsāra* while living itself. This is the intention of the *śruti* (*Br.U.* 1-4).

CONCLUSION

कर्मोपास्तिफलं कण्वः

प्राहात्मब्राह्मणे तथा ।

अव्याकृतं व्याकृतं च

विद्याविद्ये ह्यतिस्फुटम् ॥२९६॥

कण्वः - the ṛṣi Kāṇva आत्मब्राह्मणे - in the *ātmabrāhmaṇa* (*Br.U.1-4*) कर्मोपास्ति-फलं - the result of *karma* and *upāsanā* तथा - as well as अव्याकृतं - the unmanifest Creation व्याकृतं - the manifest Creation च - and विद्याविद्ये - *vidyā* besides *avidyā* हि - indeed अतिस्फुटम् - very clearly प्राह - has described—(296)

296. Indeed ṛṣi Kāṇva, in *ātmabrāhmaṇa* has described very clearly the results of *karma* and *upāsanā* (verses 1 to 63), the unmanifest Creation (verses 64 to 102), the manifest Creation (verses 103 to 155), *Vidyā* (verses 156 to 249) and *Avidyā* (verses 250 to 295).

The text *Anubhūtiprakāśa* has six chapters (13 to 18) devoted to the teaching from *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. This thirteenth chapter is an exposition on the main Vedāntic teaching contained in the first chapter of the said Upaniṣad. The author now mentions the remaining five chapters. Repeated unfoldment of *Brahmavidyā* helps to gain the clarity and steadfastness in *Brahmajñāna*. The chapter-numbers specified in the following verses pertain to those from

Bṛhadāraṇyaka. Deducting two from them, the chapter-numbers of this Upaniṣad can be obtained.

अथाध्याये चतुर्थे च कण्वः पञ्चमषष्ठयोः ।

उपाख्यानानि बहुधा वक्ष्यत्यात्मावबुद्धये ॥२९७॥

कण्वः - ṛṣi Kāṇva अथ - hereafter चतुर्थे अध्याये पञ्चमषष्ठयोः च - in the fourth, fifth and sixth chapters of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* आत्मावबुद्धये - for gaining *ātmajñāna* बहुधा - in many ways उपाख्यानानि - narratives वक्ष्यति - will tell—(297)

297. Hereafter, ṛṣi Kāṇva will tell narratives in many ways for gaining *ātmajñāna* in the fourth, fifth and sixth chapters of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*.

The above mentioned chapters correspond to the second, third and fourth chapters of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad*.

अजातशत्रुमैत्रेयो

दध्यङ्ङित्युक्तनामभिः।

आख्यानान्यङ्ङिकतानि

स्युश्चतुर्थाध्यायगानि हि ॥२९८॥

चतुर्थाध्यायगानि - contained in the fourth chapter हि - as is well-known अजातशत्रुः मैत्रेयः दध्यङ्ङ इति उक्तनामभिः - by the names Ajātaśatru, Maitreya and Dadhyaṅg अङ्ङिकतानि - specified, called आख्यानानि - narratives स्युः - are—(298)

298. The narratives contained in

the fourth chapter of *āranyaka* (i.e. second of the Upaniṣad) are called by the names Ajātaśatru, Maitreya and Dadhyañ.

आश्वलश्चार्तभागश्च

भुज्यूषस्तकहोलकाः ।

गार्ग्यद्वालकशाकल्याः

पञ्चमाध्यायगा इमे ॥२९९॥

आख्यानान्येतदीयानि स्युः षष्ठाध्याय ईरितम् ।
जनकस्य ह्युपाख्यानं संग्रहाद्विस्तरादपि ॥३००॥

इमे - these आश्वलः - *Āśvala* च - and
आर्तभागः - *Ārtabhāga* च - and भुज्यूषस्त
कहोलकाः - *Bhujyu, Uṣasta, Kahola*
गार्ग्यद्वालक शाकल्याः - *Gārgī, Uddālaka* and
Śākalya पञ्चमाध्यायगाः (ब्राह्मणाः) - are the
Brāhmaṇas (sections) contained in the
fifth chapter of the *āranyaka* - (299)

(तेषु - in those *Brāhmaṇas*)
एतदीयानि - of similar types, (i.e. having
the topics of imparting *ātmajñāna*)
आख्यानानि - narratives स्युः - are there
षष्ठाध्याये - in the sixth chapter of the
āranyaka जनकस्य - of King Janaka हि -
famous उपाख्यानं - narrative संग्रहात् -
briefly अपि - and विस्तरात् - elaborately
ईरितम् - is told - (300)

299. *Āśvala, Ārtabhāga, Bhujyu, Uṣasta, Kahola, Gārgī, Uddālaka* and *Śākalya* are the *Brāhmaṇas* (Sections) contained in the fifth chapter of the *āranyaka*, (i.e. the third of the

Upaniṣad).

300. In these *Brāhmaṇas* (of the fifth chapter) narratives of similar types (of imparting *ātmajñāna*) are there. In the sixth chapter of *āranyaka*, (i.e. the fourth of the Upaniṣad) the narrative of Janaka is told briefly and elaborately.

उपाख्यानेषु सर्वेषु प्रत्येकं ब्रह्म वर्णितम् ।
श्रुतैरैतैरुपाख्यानैर्ब्रह्मविद्या दृढा भवेत् ॥३०१॥

सर्वेषु - in all उपाख्यानेषु - in
narratives प्रत्येकं - separately ब्रह्म -
Brahman वर्णितम् - is unfolded एतैः - by
these श्रुतैः - told in the *śruti* उपाख्यानैः - by
narratives ब्रह्मविद्या - *Brahmavidyā* दृढा -
firm, steady भवेत् - becomes - (301)

301. In all these narratives Brahman is unfolded separately. By listening to these narratives told in the *śruti*, *Brahmavidyā* becomes firm.

The thirteen chapter is concluded by offering it to the *Sadguru*.

यामात्मब्राह्मणे विद्यां कण्वः प्रोवाच सा स्फुटम् ।
व्याख्याता प्रीयतां तेन विद्यातीर्थ महेश्वरः ॥३०२॥

कण्वः - *ṛṣi Kāṇva* आत्मब्राह्मणे - in the
ātmabrāhmaṇa याम् - whatever विद्यां -
Brahmavidyā प्रोवाच - has taught
thoroughly सा - the same स्फुटम् - clearly
व्याख्याता - is explained तेन - by this effort
of mine विद्यातीर्थ महेश्वरः - my *Guru* (or
Parameśvara who is the abode of

Brahmavidyā) प्रीयतां - be pleased – (302)

302. Whatever *Brahmavidyā*, the ṛṣi Kāṇva has taught thoroughly in the *ātmabrāhmaṇa*, the same is explained clearly (here in this chapter). By this effort of mine, let my *Guru* Vidyātīrtha-Maheśvara (or *Parameśvara* who is the abode of *Brahmavidyā*) be pleased.

Certainly ṛṣi Kāṇva has taught *Brahmavidyā* clearly. But what the author means is that he has elaborated

the same to make it much more clear. As usual in every chapter of *Anubhūti-prakāśa*, Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni dedicates this chapter to his *Guru* to please him.

इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिविरचिते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
बृहदारण्यके काण्वविद्याप्रकाशो नाम
त्रयोदशोऽध्यायः।

॥ ॐ ॥



CHAPTER - XIV AJĀTAŚATRUVIDYĀPRAKĀŚA (BṚHADĀRAṆYAKOPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[The chapter, *Ajātaśatru-vidyāprakāśa* contains the teachings of the first three *brāhmaṇas* of second chapter (*Adhyāya*) of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat*. The first *brāhmaṇa* is the *Ajātaśatru-brāhmaṇam* wherein *ātmā* is established to be the entity distinct from *prāṇa*, etc., representing the entire *jagat* (vs. 2 to 65). The next one is the *Śiśu-brāhmaṇa* which describes the main *prāṇa* which is mistaken by the disciple Bālāki as Brahman (vs. 66 to 77). The third one, *Mūrtāmūrta-brāhmaṇa* unfolds the *niṣprapañca* Brahman (vs. 78 -119). The famous mode of teaching, ‘*neti, neti*’ is found here.

The teaching of Ajātaśatru to Bālāki is described in the fourth chapter of *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣat*. This has been explained in the ninth chapter of this text. But, Vidyāraṇya Muni explains this here again because this is from a different *śākhā* (recension). The present elaboration contains many aspects not covered in the earlier explanation.

Bālāki was a *prāṇopāsaka*. The *prāṇa* called *Sūtrātmā* or *Hiraṇyagarbha* is prominently highlighted in the *śāstras* because it is most proximate to Brahman. It plays the main role in all *vyavahāras* in Creation. Brahman is known in general as an entity that is all pervasive and sentient in nature. The common concept is that the sentience activates all. Thus, Bālāki mistook *prāṇa* which is the cause of *kriyā*, for Brahman itself. Ajātaśatru demonstrates that the *prāṇa* is inert. He calls a sleeping person by the well-known names of *prāṇa*, but he does not get up. When shaken by the hand the person gets up. *Prāṇa* though present in sleep was not aware of being called. In reality, it is inert and not Brahman whose nature is *caitanya*. During sleep the individual *jīva* gives up its identification with the body and withdraws into *ātmā*, one's real nature. It emerges from there on waking up. The illustrations of the spider

weaving the web from itself and sparks emerging from the fire are given to show that Creation emerges from *ātmā* only. The first *Brāhmaṇa* concludes by declaring that the teaching imparted is the Upaniṣad (secret name or mystical name). It makes a *jijñāsu jīva* reach Brahman. That Upaniṣad is the ultimate truth (*satya*) of the relative truth which is called *prāṇa* (indicating the entire Creation). *Prāṇas* are *satya* but *ātmā* is their *satya* ('*satyasatya*' or '*satyasya satya*'). The next two *brāhmaṇas* called '*śiśu*' and *mūrtāmūrta* explain '*satyasatya*'.

Prāṇas in the form of subtle body are true (*satya*), because they do not get destroyed until *mokṣa* is gained but *ātmā* continues even after *mokṣa*. In fact, *mokṣa* is *ātmā* itself free from *avidyā* and its effects. *Prāṇa* is described as *śiśu* (infant) because it has no attachment like an infant. A *prāṇopāsanā* is also described along with its result in the context of *prāṇa*.

The *mūrtāmūrta brāhmaṇa* (third) unfolds Brahman free from *prapañca* through the means of elaborating '*satya* of the *satya*'. Brahman cannot be described by words because it is formless and attributeless. And yet, Brahman is taught with the help of forms experienced by all in the realm of ignorance. These forms are projected by *māyā*. They are superimposed on Brahman. These *adhyasta* forms serve as the means to know directly their *adhiṣṭhāna*, Brahman. This method needs to be adopted because Brahman is *atīndriya* (imperceptible). The formless Brahman is said to have two forms. These two forms are explained in three different ways: (i) *Mūrta* (comprising earth, water, fire which have form) and *amūrta* (formless, i.e. air, space). (ii) *Prapañca (jagat)* with the earlier described *mūrta* and *amūrta* as one form, and its subtle *vāsanās* as another form. (iii) The *prapañca (mūrta* and *amūrta)* with *vāsanās* which is denoted as '*idam*' (this) as one form and whatever is '*anidam*' (that is, cannot be considered as '*idam*') namely the sentient entity (*pratyak caitanya*) is the other one. All *upādhis* are included in the two forms of Brahman called '*idam*' so that they may be negated to reveal Brahman in its *upādhiless* form (nature) called '*anidam*' (not this). This is accomplished by elaborating the famous teaching of '*neti neti*' which finally reveals Brahman by *lakṣaṇā* (implication).]

INTRODUCTION

The first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* was explained in the thirteenth chapter of *Anubhūtiprakāśa*. That contains the description of superimposition (*adhyāropa*). The second chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* deals with the *apavāda* (negation) of *adhyāropa*. The second chapter has three *brāhmaṇas*. They are

Ajātaśatru-brāhmaṇa dealing with the teaching of Brahman to Bālāki (vs.2 to 65); *Śiśubrāhmaṇa* describing the main *prāṇa* mistaken by Bālāki as Brahman (vs.66 to 77), and the *Mūrtāmūrta-brāhmaṇa* unfolding *niṣprapañca* Brahman (vs.78 to 119). These three *brāhmaṇas* constitute the subject-matter of this chapter of *Anubhūtiprakāśa*. The next two chapters of *Anubhūtiprakāśa* deal with the *ātma-vidyā* and *madhuvidyā* respectively contained in the fourth and fifth *brāhmaṇas* of the second chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. What is *ātmā* can be unfolded only after establishing that *prāṇa*, etc., cannot be the main *ātmā*. From this standpoint the dialogue between the king Ajātaśatru and Bālāki is explained first. Bālāki is also known as Gārgya since he was born to *Gargagotra* (lineage called Garga).

The teaching of Ajātaśatru to Bālāki as found in the fourth chapter of *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad* is explained in the ninth chapter of this text. Vidyāraṇya Muni explains this teaching once more. This is from a different *śākhā* (recension) of Vedas. It elaborates many aspects not found in *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad* (Ch. 9).

CONTEXT

अजातशत्रुर्ध्याये चतुर्थे ब्राह्मणैस्त्रिभिः ।
विद्यां बालाकये प्राह तां विस्पष्टमितो ब्रुवे ॥१॥

चतुर्थे अध्याये - in the fourth chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, (i.e. second chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*) त्रिभिः ब्राह्मणैः - through the first three *brāhmaṇas* अजातशत्रुः - the king Ajātaśatru बालाकये - to Bālāki (यां) विद्यां - whatever knowledge प्राह - taught तां - that one इतः - hence (now) विस्पष्टम् - very clearly ब्रुवे - I am going to explain – (1)

1. I am going to explain now very clearly the knowledge taught by the king Ajātaśatru to Bālāki in the fourth chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, (i.e. second chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*) through its

first three *brāhmaṇas*.

अजातशत्रुर्ब्रह्मात्मवेदनाच्छौर्यतोऽपि च ।
अन्तर्बहिश्च निःशत्रुः काश्यां राजा बभूव ह ॥२॥

ब्रह्मात्मवेदनात् - because of the *aparokṣajñāna* that oneself is Brahman शौर्यतः अपि च - and also on account of his prowess अन्तर्बहिः च - within and outside निःशत्रुः - without any enemies अजातशत्रुः - the Ajātaśatru काश्यां - in Kāśī राजा बभूव ह - was a famous king – (2)

2. Ajātaśatru was a famous king in Kāśī without any enemies within and outside because of *aparokṣajñāna* that oneself is Brahman and also on account of his prowess.

गर्गगोत्रजविप्रोऽयं बालाकिनैव तत्त्ववित् ।
किन्तु प्राणोपासकोऽयं दर्पेण महतावृतः ॥३॥

गर्गगोत्रजविप्रः - the brahmin born in Garga lineage, (i.e. Gārgya) अयं - this बालाकिः - Bālāki तत्त्ववित् न एव - was not at all a *Brahmajñānī* किन्तु - but अयं प्राणोपासकः (आसीत्) - he was an *upāsaka* of *prāṇa* महता दर्पेण आवृतः (च) - and was very much arrogant – (3)

3. The brahmin Bālāki, born in Garga lineage was not at all a *Brahmajñānī* but an *upāsaka* of *prāṇa*. He was very much arrogant.

The author says that he is going to explain this *Ajātaśatruvidyā* very clearly because of its importance. This teaching is found in both *Rgveda* and *Yajurveda*. Thereby the *śruti* itself is attaching an importance to it. Therefore its explanation once again is desirable to highlight those aspects that were not there in the *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad*. Here also the teacher is *Ajātaśatru* only. Literally his name means the one who has neither enemies nor himself an enemy of anyone. He was powerful and valorous. Therefore he had no external enemies since no one was ready to have enmity with him. Because of being a *Brahmajñānī* the internal enemies such as desire, anger, greed, etc., had no occasion to crop up. Such an unopposed king of Kāśī was the *guru*. Though Bālāki considered himself to be a *Brahmajñānī*, he was not so actually.

But he was only an *upāsaka* of *prāṇa*, (i.e. *Hiraṇyagarbha*) which is the highest one among all *upāsakas*. He was arrogant because of his *upāsana*. Besides he was an eloquent (*anūcāna*) person. To be arrogant is not a healthy sign of a spiritual aspirant. Therefore, the *śruti* censures him as *drpta* (full of arrogance).

Bālāki tells: ‘Oh king, I am going to teach you *Brahmavidyā*’. The king was eager to listen. Bālāki referred to twelve *upādhis* such as *āditya* (sun), *candra* (moon), *vidyut* (lightning), etc., and told that they should be known to be Brahman. The king being a *Brahmajñānī* and himself *prāṇopāsaka* brought to the notice of Bālāki that his understanding of *upāsana* was deficient. The *Brahmajñāna* cannot be gained by knowing the entities bound by *upādhis*. Bālāki became humble and requested the king to teach him *Brahmavidyā*. The king pointed out the *anātmā* nature of those *upādhis* wherein Bālāki did the *prāṇopāsana*. Thereafter he taught *Brahmavidyā*. Here in this chapter it is superfluous to describe what Bālāki mistook as Brahman. Therefore only the teaching of *Ajātaśatru* will be explained. Even then it is necessary to clarify the misunderstanding of Bālāki and how the king corrected him. For this purpose the gist of the prior dialogue between both of them is given first.

अध्यात्मम् अधिदैवं च ब्रह्म स्यात् प्राणदेवता ।
समष्टिव्यष्टिरूपाऽसाविति गार्ग्यस्य निश्चयः ॥४॥

प्राणदेवता - the deity of *prāṇa*, (i.e. *Hiranyagarbha*) ब्रह्म स्यात् - is Brahman असौ - this *prāṇa* अध्यात्मम् अधिदैवं च - abides in the body (*adhyātma*) and in the presiding deities (*adhidaiva*) समष्टिव्यष्टिरूपौ - as the individual microcosmic (*vyāṣṭi*, *adhyātma*) and the total macrocosmic (*samaṣṭi*, *adhidaiva*) इति - thus गार्ग्यस्य - of Gārgya (Bālāki) निश्चयः - ascertainment - (4)

4. The ascertainment of Gārgya was that the deity *prāṇa*, (i.e. *Hiranyagarbha*) is Brahman. This *prāṇa* abides in the body (*adhyātma*) and in the presiding deities (*adhidaiva*) as the individual microcosmic (*vyāṣṭi*, *adhyātma*) and the total macrocosmic (*samaṣṭi*, *adhidaiva*) respectively.

रव्याद्या व्यष्टयः प्रोक्ताः समष्टिस्तु विराड्भवेत् ।
न मुख्यब्रह्मतैतेषामिति राज्ञो विनिर्णयः ॥५॥

रवि आद्याः - the sun, etc. प्रोक्ताः - told (by Bālāki) व्यष्टयः - are individual entities समष्टिः तु - whereas (their) aggregate विराड् - *Virāt* भवेत् - is एतेषां - of both these (*vyāṣṭi* and *samaṣṭi*) मुख्यब्रह्मता - the main meaning of the word Brahman न - cannot be इति - thus राज्ञः - of the king विनिर्णयः - was the ascertainment based on *śāstras* - (5)

5. The king's ascertainment based on *śāstras* was that the sun, etc., told (by Bālāki) are individual entities whereas (their) aggregate is *Virāt*. Both of these (*vyāṣṭi* and *samaṣṭi*) cannot be the main meaning of Brahman.

The *prāṇa* called *Sūtrātmā* or *Hiranyagarbha* is prominently highlighted in the *śāstras* because of being most proximate to Brahman and its main role in all *vyavahāras* in Creation. Brahman is known in general as an entity that is all pervasive and sentient in nature. The common person's concept of sentience is with respect to those which take to actions (*kriyās*). Thus, Bālāki mistook *prāṇa* which is the cause of *kriyā* as Brahman. In *adhyātma* (in our bodies) known as *vyāṣṭi* the presence of *prāṇa* in a limited way is experienced by all. The same *prāṇa* is available in abundant measure in deities such as the sun, etc., which Bālāki considered to be *samaṣṭi* (macrocosmic) in nature. But the king knew that the sun, etc., though highly exalted ones, are in fact *vyāṣṭi* the individual entities only. He could know that Bālāki has mistaken the sun, etc., as *samaṣṭi*. *Virāt* is *samaṣṭi*. *Hiranyagarbha* is the *samaṣṭi* corresponding to the subtle *prāṇa* as *vyāṣṭi*. But Gārgya told only gross *upādhis*. Therefore the king refers to *Virāt* as the aggregate of the sun, etc. In Creation during the realm of

self-ignorance the gross and the subtle *jagat* are available wherein the subtle (*sūkṣma*) is considered as *amṛta* (indestructible) and the gross (*sthūla*) as *martya* (destructible). The *amṛta* is called ‘*prāṇa*’ or *Hiranyagarbha* by the *śāstra* whereas all gross entities in totality is described as *Virāṭ*. Actually, *Virāṭ* and *Hiranyagarbha* are not totally distinct from one another. They have a relation of being inner and outer like the bricks of a wall and its plaster. *Bhāṣyakāra* has explained this fact while introducing this *Ajātaśatru-brāhmaṇa* (*Bṛ.U.2-1*): ‘...The effect (*kārya* or *viśaya*) of *avidyā* is twofold (in the form of assembled gross and subtle bodies). The first *kārya* is *prāṇa* like the strengthening pillars of a house sustaining the gross body abiding within it. It is sentient (*prakāśaka*) and *amṛta* (relatively indestructible). The second *kārya* of *avidyā* is the external *prapañca*. It is inert (*aparakāśaka*) subject to growth and decay. It happens to be in the place of grass, kuśa grass and mud used for the walls of a house besides called ‘*satya*’ (in the earlier chapter). By nature the *prapañca* is ‘*martya*’ (mortal). The *prāṇa* called *amṛta* is covered by it. The same *prāṇa* (subtle body) is spread in terms of different external supports and (yet) it was told (in the earlier chapter) that ‘*prāṇa* (*Hiranyagarbha*) is one deity only’. Its external macrocosmic

body, *anātmā* in nature, is (also) one. It is referred to by the bodily words such as ‘*Virāṭ*’, ‘*Vaiśvānara*’, ‘*Ātmā*’, ‘*Puruṣavidha*’, ‘*Prajāpati*’, ‘*Ka*’ and ‘*Hiranyagarbha*’, etc. The sun, moon, fire, etc., are its distinct instruments (*karāṇas*’. In this sense the king considered the distinct entities such as the sun, etc., as *Virāṭ* which was mistaken by Gārgya to be *Hiranyagarbha*. In any case the intention of *Ajātaśatru* in naming the sun, etc., as *Virāṭ* was to point out that it is not Brahman defined by statements such as ‘*satyam, jñānam, anantam Brahma*’ (*Tai.U.2-1*), ‘*yato vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante.....tad Brahma*’ (*Tai.U.3-1*). Brahman is not microcosmic or macrocosmic Creation or a topic of *avidyā*, but it is the subject-matter of *vidyā* being the non-dual principle free from *prapañca*.

How did the king teach Bālāki is told now.

तस्मादुपासको गार्ग्यो न मुख्यं ब्रह्म वेत्त्यतः ।
अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां बोधयामास तं नृपः ॥६॥

तस्मात् - therefore गार्ग्यः - Gārgya
उपासकः - is an *upāsaka* मुख्यं ब्रह्म -
Brahman in reality न वेत्ति - knows
not अतः - therefore नृपः - the king तं - to
him अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां - by the method
of continuance and discontinuance
(*anvaya-vyatireka*) बोधयामास - taught
-(6)

6. Therefore Gārgya is an *upāsaka*. He does not know Brahman in reality. Therefore the king taught him (*Brahmavidyā*) by the method of continuance and discontinuance.

From the remarks of Ajātaśatru, Bālāki could know that he does not know Brahman. But he had got the purity of mind because of *upāsana*. Giving up his pride, he requested the king to teach him *Brahmavidyā* though a Brahmin learning from a *kṣatriya* was against the accepted custom. The king pointed out that the *prāṇa* by itself is inert and not sentient. It cannot be Brahman which is *nitya caitanya*. To clarify this point the king adopts the method of *anvaya-vyatireka*. The relation of invariably accompanying one another is *anvaya* and the absence of such mutual relation is *vyatireka*. The king intends to show the absence of knowledge in spite of the presence of *prāṇa* to prove it to be inert and so not the Brahman which is always knowledge-principle.

THE PLACE OF VIVEKA

The Upaniṣad says: ‘The king took Gārgya to a sleeping person and called him by the well-known names of *prāṇa*; but the person did not wake up. When shaken by the hand he got up’ (*Br.U.2-1-15*). The king clarified that the *prāṇa* though present in the deep sleep was not aware of being called.

Therefore, in reality it is inert and not Brahman whose nature is *caitanya*. This is explained now.

स्याद् विज्ञानमयो भोक्ता न प्राण इति जागरे ।
विवेको दुःशको यस्मादत्र द्ववपि सुस्थितौ ॥७॥

विज्ञानमयः - *vijñānamaya* (*ātmā* available in *buddhi* or *antaḥkaraṇa* as *jīva*) भोक्ता - is *bhoktā* (enjoyer or sufferer) प्राणः न - (but) not the *prāṇa* इति विवेकः - such *viveka* (as to who is inert and who is sentient) जागरे - during the waking state दुःशकः स्यात् - is difficult to accomplish यस्मात् - because अत्र - in the waking द्वौ अपि - both of them सुस्थितौ - are present functionally – (7)

7. The *viveka* such as ‘*vijñānamaya* (*ātmā* available in *buddhi* or *antaḥkaraṇa* as *jīva*) is *bhoktā* (enjoyer or sufferer), (but) not the *prāṇa*’, is difficult to accomplish during the waking state because both of them are present functionally in the waking.

यो विज्ञानमयः सुप्तावसावुपरतिं गतः ।
वर्तते पूर्ववत् प्राणो विवेकः सुशकस्तदा ॥८॥

सुप्तौ - during the sleep यः असौ विज्ञानमयः - this *vijñānamaya jīva* उपरतिं गतः - ceases to function प्राणः - (whereas) the *prāṇa* पूर्ववत् - as earlier during the waking state वर्तते - remains functional तदा - (therefore) then (in the case of sleep) विवेकः सुशकः - taking to the

discrimination (as to who is inert and who is sentient among the *prāṇa* and *viññānamaya*) is easily possible – (8)

8. The *viññānamaya jīva* ceases to function during the sleep (whereas) the *prāṇa* remains functional as earlier during the waking state. (Therefore) taking to the discrimination (as to who is inert and who is sentient among *prāṇa* and *viññānamaya*) with reference to the sleep is easily possible.

तस्मात् सुषुप्तं पुरुषमामन्त्र्य प्राणनामभिः ।
अप्रबोधादभोक्तृत्वं प्राणस्यास्पष्टयत् नृपः ॥९॥

तस्मात् - therefore नृपः - the king
सुषुप्तं पुरुषं - sleeping person प्राणनामभिः -
by the names of *prāṇa* आमन्त्र्य - having
called अप्रबोधात् - because of his not
waking up प्राणस्य अभोक्तृत्वं - *prāṇa* as
not a *bhoktā* (knower) अस्पष्टयत् - clarified
– (9)

9. Therefore the king having called the sleeping person by the names of *prāṇa* clarified that the *prāṇa* cannot be a *bhoktā* (knower) because of his not waking up.

The word *viññānamaya* means *pratyagātmā* who abides in the *buddhi* or *antaḥkaraṇa* and who on account of identification with it appears almost like *buddhi* by becoming *bhoktā*, the knower of enjoyment and suffering. In short, it means *jīva* as *kartā*, *bhoktā* displays its

sentience. The *viññānamaya* is called *prajñā* in the *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad* (Ch.3). Its threefold meanings will be given in the verses 17 to 21.

To know *cit*, *caitanya* as Brahman, we have to take to such an *upādhi* wherein the presence of *cit* can be recognized. It is just like identifying a person by looking at the picture of his face, but not the back, etc. In *viññānamaya*, the *sākṣī* can be identified, but not in *prāṇamaya*. Though *prāṇa* is an inert *upādhi* of *ātmā*, it cannot display knowledge or sentience. As a result Brahman cannot be known through it.

During the waking state many *upādhis* such as the mind, *prāṇa* senses, etc., are functional. Therefore it becomes difficult to ascertain which of them is capable of having knowledge or become *bhoktā*. In sleep, the mind, senses are dormant. So they are not functional but *prāṇa* continues to function. Therefore, it is possible to ascertain whether *prāṇa* has knowledge or the status of *bhoktā*. That is why the Vedānta *śāstra* takes into account all the three states of consciousness while ascertaining *ātmā*/Brahman. We equally identify with both the mind and *prāṇa* in the waking state. Therein when we consider our cognition that ‘I know’, the distinction whether the knowledge aspect belongs to the mind or *prāṇa* cannot be made. In

the deep sleep the *viññānamaya* or the mind with *ahaṃkāra* (the notion of 'I'-ness in the body) is absent, but the *prāṇa* continues with its function. To ascertain its inert nature, the king called *prāṇa* by its well-known names which are famous as the *aṅgas* (limbs) of *prāṇopāsanā*. The fact that the *prāṇa* could neither hear nor wake the person up shows that it cannot be a 'knower' or *bhoktā* because of being inert. This is clarified in the next verse.

ANVAYA-VYATIREKA

यदि भोक्ता भवेत् प्राणो

जाग्रद्वच्छब्दम् आगतम् ।

अश्रोष्यद् नाऽशृणोत् तस्माद् न

स्याद् भोक्तोपलादिवत् ॥१०॥

यदि - if प्राणः - *prāṇa* भोक्ता भवेत् - is *bhoktā* जाग्रद्वत् - like in the case of waking state आगतम् शब्दम् - the sound produced अश्रोष्यत् - could have heard न अशृणोत् - (but) did not hear तस्मात् - therefore उपलादिवत् - like inert stone, etc. भोक्ता न स्यात् - (*prāṇa*) cannot be the *bhoktā* (knower)–(10)

10. If the *prāṇa* were *bhoktā*, it could have heard the sound produced (during the sleep) like in the case of waking state. (But) it did not hear. Therefore (*prāṇa*) cannot be the *bhoktā* (knower) like an inert stone, etc.

If *prāṇa* were sentient having the

capacity to know, it could have heard when called by the king using its well-known names. It did not hear. How can it have other *bhogas* having suffering or enjoyments? It is just like an inert stone, etc., which cannot hear or experience joys or sorrows.

A question can be asked here. *Viññānamaya bhoktā jīva* was also there in the sleep. Why did it not hear the calling? This question is posed now and its answer is given.

श्रोत्रादीनाम् उपाधीनां सुप्तावुपरतत्वतः ।

यथा जीवो न वेत्येवं प्राणोऽपीत्यसदुच्यते ॥११॥

सुप्तौ - during the deep sleep श्रोत्रादीनाम् उपाधीनाम् - the *upādhis* such as ear, etc. उपरतत्वतः - because of the non-functioning of यथा - just as जीवः - *jīva* (called *viññānamaya*) न वेत्ति - does not know एवं - similarly प्राणः अपि - *prāṇa* also (does not know) इति - so असत् उच्यते - is wrongly said–(11)

11. The statement: 'Like the *jīva* (called *viññānamaya*) does not know during the sleep because of the non-functioning of the *upādhis* such as ear, etc., so also the *prāṇa* (does not know)' is wrong.

नेन्द्रियाणां भवेत् स्वापो

यदि प्राणप्रधानता ।

नामात्याः शेरते यस्माद् राज्ञि

स्वामिनि जाग्रति ॥१२॥

यदि - if प्राणप्रधानता - *prāṇa* is the prominent (*bhoktā*, *jīva*) (तर्हि - then) इन्द्रियाणां स्वापः - the sleep of senses न भवेत् - cannot be possible यस्मात् - because स्वामिनि राज्ञि जाग्रति - when the master such as a king is awake आमात्याः - ministers न शेरते - do not sleep—(12)

12. If *prāṇa* were the prominent (*bhoktā*, *jīva*) (then) the senses (*indriyas*) cannot sleep because when the master such as a king is awake the ministers do not sleep.

The *jīva* has *ahaṃkāra* ('I'-notion) in the entire body and not just in *prāṇa*. Therefore calling the *prāṇa* cannot be the addressing the individual *jīva*, say Mr. Devadatta. If you call 'Oh finger', 'Oh hand', etc., to wake up Mr. Devadatta, he will not consider that he is called. Similarly names of *prāṇa* do not apply to *vijñānamaya jīva*. If it is argued that in sleep the *jīva* who is identified with the entire body knows not its name, then 'who exactly is the *jīva*?' needs to be considered. Is the *jīva upādhiless cinmātra (cit alone)*? Or is it *sopādhika (with upādhi)*? The *kūṭastha (avikārī, changeless) jñaptimātra (the knowledge-principle alone) cit* has neither *bodha (knowledge of something)* nor *abodha (ignorance of something)*. But when the *jīva* is the *sopādhika cit*, the *boddhā (knower)*

himself is absent in the sleep because the *upādhis* such as *indriyas*, *antaḥkaraṇa* which are necessary to know something are dormant. That is why the *jīva* cannot know in sleep even if called by its names. But on that account to say that the functional *prāṇa* also does not know like the *jīva*, is wrong.

The person who considers the *jīva* as knower *bhoktā* can say that the *jīva* can know only through *indriyas* and therefore it cannot know when they are dormant in the sleep. On the contrary the person who considers the *prāṇa* as *bhoktā* (knower) cannot use this argument. *Indriyas* are subordinates of *jīva*. They stop their function when the *jīva* is asleep is quite understandable. But *prāṇa* continues to function in sleep. If *indriyas* were the subordinates of *prāṇa*, they will not cease to function when their master *prāṇa* is continuing its work. Thus, the fact that in sleep the active *prāṇa* is not a *bhoktā* (knower) indicates that the *vijñānamayajīva* is *bhoktā*. The *cit* gets reflected or manifests only in the *upādhi* of *antaḥkaraṇa*, but not in *prāṇa*.

It is agreed that the inert *prāṇa* cannot be *bhoktā*. But its presiding deity, *prāṇa-devatā* who is sentient in nature may be the *bhoktā*. It cannot be so. To deny the *prāṇa-devatā* to be the *bhoktā*, the names such as *Bṛhan*, *Soma*

(*Candra* - चन्द्र), etc., were used which are common to *prāṇa* and its presiding deity.

देवताप्रतिषेधार्थं बोध्यते चन्द्रनामभिः ।

तदबोधादभोक्तृत्वं देवतायाः सुनिश्चितम् ॥१३॥

देवताप्रतिषेधार्थम् - to deny the presiding deity of *prāṇa* as *bhoktā* चन्द्रनामभिः - by using the names such as *Candra*, (i.e. *Soma*), etc. बोध्यते - (the sleeping person) is woken up (by the king) तदबोधात् - because the *prāṇa* could not know देवतायाः - of the *prāṇa* which was considered as the presiding deity of *prāṇa* (*prāṇa-devatā*) अभोक्तृत्वं - nature as not a *bhoktā* सुनिश्चितम् - is well-ascertained—(13)

13. To deny the presiding deity of *prāṇa* as *bhoktā* (the sleeping person) is woken up (by the king) by using the names such as *Candra*, (i.e. *Soma*), etc. Because the *prāṇa* could not know it is well-ascertained that the *prāṇa* which was considered as its presiding deity cannot be a *bhoktā*.

It is true that the *prāṇa-devatā* is sentient and has identification with its body in the form of deity. But that deity is not identified with the bodies of any *jīvas*. Therefore, to say that, ‘the *upāsya prāṇa* is the sentient deity and therefore Brahman’, is not correct. The *prāṇa* in the body of individual *jīvas* is not the *prāṇa-deity* is proved by the absence of

its response when called by its names such as *Candra*, etc.

VIJÑĀNAMAYABHOKTĀ

Having clarified that *Prāṇa* cannot be *bhoktā*, the king now proceeds to explain the nature of *bhoktā*.

प्राणस्याभोक्तृतां गार्ग्यो व्यबुध्यत ततो नृपः ।

विज्ञानमयबोधाय चक्रे यत्नमुपायतः ॥१४॥

प्राणस्य - of *prāṇa* अभोक्तृतां - the nature of being not a *bhoktā* गार्ग्यः - Gārgya व्यबुध्यत - understood ततः - then नृपः - the king विज्ञानमयबोधाय - to teach that *vijñānamayajīva* is the *bhoktā* उपायतः - by a unique method यत्नं चक्रे - tried—(14)

14. Gārgya understood that *prāṇa* cannot be *bhoktā*. Then the king tried to teach him by a unique method that *vijñānamayajīva* is the *bhoktā*.

आपिष्यापिष्य बहुशः

सुप्तं राजा व्यबोधयत् ।

आपेषणोत्थसंक्षोभात्

ततोऽसौ प्रत्यबुध्यत ॥१५॥

राजा - the king सुप्तं - the sleeping person बहुशः - many times आपिष्य आपिष्य - having shaken him again and again व्यबोधयत् - awoke ततः - thereafter असौ - that sleeping person आपेषणोत्थसंक्षोभात् - by the disturbance born of shaking प्रत्यबुध्यत - woke up—(15)

15. The king awoke the sleeping

person many times having shaken him again and again. Thereafter that sleeping person woke up by the disturbance born of shaking.

The king had to resort to the unique method of shaking the sleeping person because the *viññānamayajīva* is not perceptible through the means of *indriyas*. It can be pointed out by the means of some effects on the part of a waking person. The method of *vyatireka* was shown in the sleep. Now *anvaya* method is used in the waking state. That is the unique method employed by the king. The entity that is not available for direct perception by the *indriyas* can be understood through indirect perceptible means. Thus the sleeping person was woken up by repeated shaking.

The lesson to be learnt by seeing the sleeping person awake is being told now.

मृतकल्पमिमं देहं

स्वचिताऽऽवेशयन्निव ।

ज्वलन्निव समुत्तस्थौ यः स

भोक्तेति गम्यताम् ॥१६॥

यः - the entity who इमं - this मृतकल्पं देहं - body which appears as if dead स्वचिता - by its nature of knowledge-principle *caitanya* आवेशयन् इव - as though entering it (thereby fill it up or possess it) ज्वलन् इव - (and making it)

as though aglow (with knowledge-principle) समुत्तस्थौ - got up itself सः - that entity भोक्ता - is *bhoktā* (knower) इति - so गम्यताम् - it has to be known – (16)

16. The entity who by its nature of knowledge-principle (called) *caitanya* as though entering this body which appears as if dead, (i.e. thereby fills it up or possesses it) and making it as though aglow (with knowledge-principle) got up itself that entity is *bhoktā* (knower). Thus it has to be known.

Though a sleeping person is very much alive because his *prāṇa* is functioning, to an onlooker his body appears as if a dead one. The moment the *viññānamayajīva* wakes up his entire body gets filled up with sentience and the person becomes a conscious entity immediately. It is like embers covered with ashes. Though the fire is in them, the same is unseen. The moment the ashes are removed, the fire is aglow. In sleep the consciousness is there, but it gets overpowered because of ignorance of everything. The same ignorance gets scattered like the ashes on waking up. The example also shows that unlike the death, in sleep the *bhoktā* and the power of knowledge are not totally extinct, but they are dormant. From the illustration of sleep it should be clear that the *bhoktā* (*jīva*, knower) is the one who was asleep and not the *prāṇa*.

On waking up of the sleeping person, the king asked Bālāki, ‘During the sleep where was this *vijñānamaya-puruṣa*? On waking up from where did he come?’ Now the three meanings of the word ‘*vijñānamaya*’ are given. The next verse gives the first meaning.

विज्ञानमन्तःकरणं तस्मिन्नात्मोपलभ्यते ।

राहुश्चन्द्रे यथा तद्वद् विज्ञानमयता ततः ॥१७॥

विज्ञानं - the word ‘*vijñāna*’
अन्तःकरणं - means the *antaḥkaraṇa* तस्मिन्
- in that आत्मा - *ātmā* उपलभ्यते - is
available/manifest यथा - just as राहुः - the
planet *Rāhu* चन्द्रे - (is seen) in the moon,
(i.e. in the lunar disc as a shadow)
(during the lunar eclipse) तद्वद् - like that
(*ātmā* is available in *antaḥkaraṇa*) ततः -
therefore विज्ञानमयता - (*ātmā* is)
vijñānamaya – (17)

17. The word ‘*vijñāna*’ means the *antaḥkaraṇa*. *Ātmā* is available/manifest in it like the planet *Rāhu* (is seen) in the moon, (i.e. in the lunar disc as a shadow) (during the lunar eclipse). Therefore, (*ātmā* is) *vijñānamaya*.

The word ‘*vijñāna*’ in the *vijñānamaya* is *antaḥkaraṇa* because there alone the knowledge-principle *ātmā* is very clearly experienced and not anywhere else. The heart is the seat of *antaḥkaraṇa* or *vijñāna* or *buddhi*. Though *ātmā* is all pervasive and yet

unseen, its availability as a reflection (*cidābhāsa*) is possible in *antaḥkaraṇa* which is made up of five non-grossified (*apañcīkṛta*) elements. The planet *Rāhu* is not seen anywhere in the sky. And yet, according to the mythological concept the shadow in the moon or the sun is considered as *Rāhu*. Even though *Rāhu* has no actual connection with the moon or the sun, it is seen there in them only. Similarly, the *ātmā* has no connection with *vijñāna* or *antaḥkaraṇa* and yet, its availability is in *vijñāna* only. Therefore, the suffix *mayat*, (i.e. *māyā*) in *vijñānamaya* means abundance (*prācurya*) and not its another meaning of modification (*vikāra*). According to *bhāṣya*, *ātmā* appears as though it is *antaḥkaraṇa/buddhi*. *Bhāṣyakāra* gives three meanings of *vijñānamaya* : ‘Availability of *ātmā* in the *buddhi*’, (*tasmin upalabhyatvam*) ‘*ātmā* can be known as distinct from body, etc., by *vijñāna* (*buddhi* only) (*tena ca upalabhyatvam*) and ‘the status of being the experiencer (*upalabdhr̥tvam*). The above verse has given the first meaning.

The availability of *ātmā* in *buddhi* is further explained to dispel the wrong notion that *ātmā* is placed in *buddhi* like the fruits in a basket. It also explains how the limitless *ātmā* appears as ‘I’ in the limited *buddhi*.

स्वाभासवदविद्योत्थबुद्ध्यादिव्याप्तिविभ्रमात् ।
तदात्मत्वाभिमानी सन्नहमित्युपलभ्यते ॥१८॥

स्वाभासवत् - endowed with one's (of *ātmā*) reflection अविद्योत्थ-बुद्ध्यादिव्याप्तिविभ्रमात् - because of the error of considering oneself as pervasive in the *buddhi* (and senses), etc., born of *avidyā* (self-ignorance) तदात्मत्वाभिमानी सन् - having become the one identified with *buddhi*, etc. अहम् इति - as 'I' उपलभ्यते - is experienced—(18)

18. (*Ātmā*) because of the error of considering oneself as pervasive in the *buddhi* (and senses), etc., endowed with one's reflection born of *avidyā* (self-ignorance), having become the one identified with them, (i.e. *buddhi*, etc.), is experienced as 'I'.

The word 'स्व' (one's) in 'svābhāsa' is *ātmā*. *Avidyā* itself is endowed with *cidābhāsa*. Therefore in all its effects the semblance of *ātmā* as sentience is experienced. The words *ābhāsa*, *chāyā*, etc., indicate *adhyāsa*. The 'ādi', (etc.), in '*buddhyādi*' stands for the mind, etc., and senses, etc. The *vibhrama* (error) of *vyāpti* (pervasiveness) means the pervasiveness of *ātmā* or its sentience experienced in the *buddhi* making it appear as sentient is itself the error because the inert *buddhi* is not sentient by its nature. This error can end only by *Brahmajñāna*. To consider

the *buddhi*, etc., as 'I' itself is called the availability of *ātmā* in them.

Here two errors (*bhramas*) are pointed out by the words *ābhāsa* (reflection) and *vibhrama* (error) in the case of *avidyā* and *buddhi* respectively. The reason is our identification with *avidyā* (the ignorance of non-dual *ātmā*/Brahman) continues even in the sleep and yet we are not aware of *avidyā* in sleep to such an extent that even if the existence of non-dual entity (Brahman) is told to us by someone, many find it to be impossible. In contrast to *avidyā* the experience of *buddhi* is clear to all even though there may be some difference of opinion about its (of *buddhi*) nature. '*Tadātmatva-abhimāna*' (becoming identified with the *buddhi* as 'that is I') is possible only with the *buddhi*, but not with *avidyā* (ignorance). *Buddhi* in the form of '*ahaṅkāra-vṛtti*' ('I'-notion) is considered as 'I', but ignorance is never taken as 'I'. Though, we have experiences such as 'I am ignorant', 'I have ignorance', no one experiences as 'Ignorance is 'I'. Therefore here the word '*abhimāna*' (identification), is used in addition to '*ābhāsa*' (reflection) and '*vibhrama*' (error). All these words are the vivid forms of *adhyāsa*.

The meaning of '*vijñānamaya*' given in *bhāṣya* as '*upalabdhr̥tvam*' (the

status of an experiencer) is clarified now.

यद्दोपलब्धिमात्रोऽपि

विज्ञानाध्यस्तकर्तृताम् ।

प्राप्योपलब्धा स्यात् तेन

विज्ञानमय उच्यते ॥१९॥

यद्वा - or उपलब्धिमात्रः अपि - even though (*ātmā* in reality) is mere knowledge-principle (*jñapti-mātra* and not a *jīva* being *kartā*, *bhoktā*, *jñātā*, etc.) विज्ञानाध्यस्तकर्तृताम् - the *karṭṛtva* (doership) superimposed by *vijñāna*, (i.e. *antaḥkaraṇa*) प्राप्य - having gained उपलब्धा - experiencer/knower स्यात् - becomes तेन - thereby विज्ञानमयः उच्यते - (*ātmā*) is called *vijñānamaya* (*jīva*) –(19)

19. Even though (*ātmā* in reality) is mere knowledge-principle (*jñapti-mātra* and not a *jīva* being *kartā*, *bhoktā*, *jñātā*, etc.), becomes the experiencer/knower having gained the *karṭṛtva* (doership) superimposed by *vijñāna*, (i.e. *antaḥkaraṇa*). Thereby (*ātmā*) is called *vijñānamaya* (*jīva*).

The doership (*karṭṛtva*, *jñātṛtva*), etc., are not superimposed on *ātmā* directly but it is through the association of *ātmā* with the *antaḥkaraṇa* which has the doership, etc., through its *vṛttis* having such features that are superimposed on it. Because of identification with such *antaḥkaraṇa* which has already the

karṭṛtva (doership) the *ātmā* assumes that doership as its own. *Ātmā* in its real nature is self-experiencing, self-knowledge-principle and not an experiencer or a knower. It appears as experiencer, etc., only because of identification with *antaḥkaraṇa*. Though during the state of *ātmānātma-viveka* we have to understand *ātmā* in the form of knower, finally in *aparokṣa-jñāna* we have to reach the *upādhi-less jñāna-svarūpa* (the nature of knowledge-principle) only.

How does the *upādhi-less* pure *ātmā* appear as experiencer/knower is explained now with an illustration.

स्फटिको रक्ततां प्राप्य जपाकुसुमकल्पिताम् ।
पद्मरागायते तद्वद् उपलब्धत्वम् आत्मनः ॥२०॥

(यद्वत्) स्फटिकः - (just as) a crystal जपाकुसुमकल्पिताम् - caused by the red hibiscus flower रक्ततां - redness प्राप्य - having gained पद्मरागायते - appears as a ruby तद्वत् - similarly आत्मनः - of *ātmā* उपलब्धत्वम् - the status of being a experiencer/knower –(20)

20. (Just as) a crystal appears as a ruby having gained the redness caused by (very proximate) red hibiscus flower, similarly *ātmā* appears to have the status of experiencer/knower.

‘*Japā-kusum*’ is a hibiscus flower which is generally red in colour. When in the close proximity of a red hibiscus

flower, the crystal appears red as if it is a ruby. Actually the crystal has neither become red nor a ruby. Yet there is delusion of taking the crystal first to be red and then a ruby. The phrase ‘*japākusumkalpitām*’ means that the red flower becomes the *upādhi* of crystal and thereby serves as the cause of error that it is red. ‘*Padmarāgāyate*’ means looks like a *padmarāga* (ruby). Just as the colourless crystal always remains so and yet becomes as if a ruby, so also *ātmā* is ever-changeless and yet appears as an experiencer, knower, *vijñāta*, etc.

The other definition of *vijñānamaya* as given by *bhāṣya* as ‘*tena ca upalabhyatvam*’ is now summarized.

यद्बोपलभ्यो देहादेर्विज्ञानेन विवेचितः ।

स्याद् विज्ञानमयस्तेन पुरुषः परिपूरणात् ॥२१॥

यद्बो - or विज्ञानेन - by the *buddhi*
देहादेः - (distinct from) the body, etc.
विवेचितः - ascertained (*ātmā*) उपलभ्यः -
can be known (in reality) तेन - therefore
विज्ञानमयः स्यात् - *ātmā* is called
vijñānamaya परिपूरणात् - because of
pervading everything पुरुषः - (*ātmā*) is
called *puruṣa* – (21)

21. Or *ātmā* can be known (in reality) when ascertained by the *buddhi* to be (distinct from) the body, etc. Therefore, *ātmā* is called *vijñānamaya*. *Ātmā* is called *puruṣa* because of pervading everything.

Because of erroneous identification, *ātmā* appears identical with the body, mind, *buddhi*, senses, etc. Its real nature can be known only when separated from the body, etc. Such separation can be done only by discrimination on the part of *buddhi* (*vijñānamaya*). Such *viveka* (discrimination) also is called *vijñāna* (*jñāna* in the form of *viveka*). This *ātmā* is referred to as *puruṣa* in the Upaniṣad (*Br.U.2-1-16*). The entire *samsāra* is filled up with *ātmā/paramātmā* just like the electricity fills up all electrical gadgets. Nothing can exist without it. *Ātmā* does not do anything on its own, but in its presence through *cidābhāsa* all *upādhis* gain the existence and knowledge-principle. Thus they become functional. The next verse explains the meaning of ‘*paripūraṇāt*’ (because of pervading everything).

अशेषान् कल्पितान् एष

विज्ञानादीन् अनात्मनः ।

आत्मा पूरयति प्रत्यक्सर्पादीन्

रशना यथा ॥२२॥

एषः प्रत्यक् आत्मा - this *pratyagātmā*
विज्ञानादीन् - the *antaḥkaraṇa*, etc. अशेषान् -
all without any exception अनात्मनः -
which are *anātmā* in nature पूरयति -
pervades यथा - just as कल्पितान् सर्पादीन् -
the mistaken snake, etc. रशना - the rope
(pervades) – (22)

22. This *pratyagātmā* pervades

all *anātmā* such as *antaḥkaraṇa*, etc., without any exception. It is just like the mistaken snake, etc., which are pervaded by their (basis) rope.

Though *bhāṣya* comments upon the word *puruṣa* as ‘*puri śayanāt*’ (because of abidance in the individual bodies) taking into account the beginning and the end of the topic, *Vārtikakāra* (2-1-192, 193) prefers to take here the other derivation of this word which is ‘*pūrayan puruṣa*’ (one who pervaded everything is *puruṣa*). The same meaning is accepted here in this chapter. *Ahaṅkāra*, *buddhi*, body, senses, etc., are inert and *anātmā* in nature. One who fills up and makes them sentient is *ātmā* only. On account of their identification with *ātmā* they get sentience, ‘I’ness, *jīvahood*. The rope is the basis for all entities such as snake, garland, stick, etc., that are erroneously superimposed on it. So is *ātmā*, the *adhiṣṭhāna*, that lends the existence to the entire delusive world. Minus the rope, there are no mistaken snake, etc. Without the *ātmā*, *buddhi*, etc., have no existence. Thus, the king explained that *ātmā* is referred to by the phrase ‘*vijñānamaya-puruṣa*’.

While introducing the verse 17, two questions based on the Upaniṣad (*Br. U.2-1-16*) were asked: (i) During the sleep where was this *vijñānamaya-*

puruṣa? (ii) On waking up, from where did he come? Now it is going to be clarified that in answer to these questions what is asked is the real nature of *ātmā*. This is being explained now.

यो विज्ञानमयस्तस्य

द्वैतधीः स्वप्नजाग्रतोः ।

अस्ति सुप्तौ तु सा नास्ति स्वभावोऽस्यात्र
को भवेत् ॥२३॥

यः विज्ञानमयः तस्य - the *vijñānamaya jīva* who expresses as ‘I’
स्वप्नजाग्रतोः - during the dream and waking states
द्वैतधीः अस्ति - has the notion of duality (such as *kartā*, *bhoktā*, etc.)
सा तु - but that (notion of duality) सुप्तौ न अस्ति - is not there in the deep sleep
अत्र - among these two features of *jīva*
अस्य - of *jīva* कः - what स्वभावः भवेत् - is the real nature? – (23)

23. The *vijñānamaya jīva* who expresses as ‘I’ has the notion of duality (such as *kartā*, *bhoktā*, etc.), during the dream and waking states. But it (notion of duality) is not there in the deep sleep. Among these two features of *jīva*, what is its real nature?

तस्य स्वभावं निर्णेतुं सुप्तौ क्वाभूदयं पुनः ।
कुत आगादिमं देहमित्येतदिह चिन्त्यते ॥२४॥

तस्य - its (of *jīva*) स्वभावं - real nature निर्णेतुं - to ascertain अयं - this *jīva*

सुप्तौ - during the sleep 'क्व अभूत्' - 'where did it remain?' पुनः - further इमं देहं - to this body 'कुतः आगात्' - 'from where did it return?' इति एतत् - this topic इह - here (now or in the *śruti*) चिन्त्यते - is inquired into—(24)

24. To ascertain the real nature of *jīva* the topic such as 'where did it remain during the sleep?' and 'from where did it return to this body?' is inquired into here (now or in the *śruti*).

The *viññānamaya* means the *jīva* endowed with the sentient *ahaṅkāra* who expresses as 'I'. The entity 'I' remains expressing itself in the waking and dream states. It is not known during the deep sleep. The notion of duality is experienced during the waking and the dream, but not in the deep sleep. The fact is that the dualistic notion is present so long as 'I' persists and it stops in its absence. Therefore it is worth inquiring as to what is the real nature of 'I'. Is it duality or non-duality? What is its natural state and what is the state projected by the *upādhis*? The king expressed this query by the two questions: (i) 'where was *viññānamaya* during the sleep?' and (ii) 'from where did it return on waking up?'

The *śruti* (*Br.U.2-1-17*) answers these questions: *viññānamaya* (*jīva*) sleeps in the *ākāśa* (space) that is

there in the heart which is the seat of *antaḥkaraṇa*. It sleeps having withdrawn the *viññāna* (*cidābhāsa*) along with the power of perception (and actions) of the senses. The senses are functional so long as *cidābhāsa* is in them. In its absence they become non-functional. While sleeping *ātmā* has no more identification with the senses caused by *adhyāsa*. This appears as though the *cidābhāsa* in them is withdrawn. To explain this, first the states of waking and dream are described in the next two verses and then it is corroborated by the description given in the *śruti* (*Br.U.2-1-17*).

बुद्धावक्षेषु चात्माऽयं चिद्रूपः प्रतिबिम्बति ।
तादृग्बुद्धीन्द्रियोपाधिर्जागत्यात्मेति भण्यते ॥२५॥

अयं - this चिद्रूपः आत्मा - *ātmā* having the nature of *caitanya* (knowledge-principle) बुद्धौ - in the *buddhi*, (i.e. *antaḥkaraṇa*) अक्षेषु च - and in the senses प्रतिबिम्बति - gets reflected तादृग्बुद्धीन्द्रियोपाधिः आत्मा - such *ātmā* having the *upādhis* of *buddhi* and senses with reflected *cit* in them जागर्ति - 'is awake' इति - so भण्यते - is said—(25)

25. *Ātmā* having the nature of *caitanya* (knowledge-principle) gets reflected in the *buddhi*, (i.e. *antaḥkaraṇa*). Such *ātmā* having the *upādhis* of *buddhi* and senses with

reflected *cit* in them is said to be 'awake'.

कर्मक्षये बुद्धिरक्षैः

सहाऽज्ञाने विलीयते ।

चैतन्यप्रतिबिम्बाश्च लीयन्ते

स्वाश्रयान् अनु ॥२६॥

कर्मक्षये - when the *karmas* (yielding the results in the waking and dream) are over अक्षैः सह बुद्धिः - the *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) along with the senses अज्ञाने - in the ignorance विलीयते - merges चैतन्यप्रतिबिम्बाः च - all the individual reflected *caitanya* (*cidābhāsa*) (in the *buddhi*, etc.), also स्वाश्रयान् अनु - after the merging of their basis of abidance (such as the *buddhi* and the senses) लीयन्ते - disappear—(26)

26. When the *karmas* (yielding the results in the waking and dream) are over, the *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) along with the senses merges in the ignorance. All the individual reflected *caitanya* (*cidābhāsa*) (in the *buddhi*, etc.), also disappear after the merging of their basis of abidance (such as the *buddhi* and the senses).

तदेन्द्रियाणां विज्ञानं धीविज्ञानेन संयुतम् ।

विज्ञानमय आदत्ते इति श्रुत्योपवर्ण्यते ॥२७॥

तदा - then विज्ञानमयः - the *vijñānamaya jīva* धीविज्ञानेन संयुतम् - along with the power of perception in

the *viṣayākāra-vṛttis* as the *cidābhāsa* इन्द्रियाणां विज्ञानं - the perceptual knowledge of the senses आदत्ते - withdraws unto itself इति - so श्रुत्या - by the *śruti* उपवर्ण्यते - is described—(27)

27. Then, the *vijñānamaya jīva* along with the power of perception in the *viṣayākāra-vṛttis* as the *cidābhāsa* withdraws unto itself the perceptual knowledge of senses. So it is described by the *śruti*.

The reflection of *ātmā* in the *buddhi* suggests that *cit* gets reflected in the *ahaṁkāra-vṛtti* which is predominant therein. Further, *ātmā* gets reflected in the senses also. Though there is no connection whatsoever between *ātmā* and *buddhi* with the senses, it appears as if identified with them. *Buddhi*, etc., can function so long as this identification is there. It is just like the electrical gadgets functioning only when they are connected to electricity. *Jīva* is awake until its *upādhis* such as *buddhi*, sense are identified with *ātmā*. A common man mistakes the *upādhi* itself to be the *jīva* or *ātmā* though it is *anātmā*. It is just like saying that the eyes see even if in fact it is *ātmā/cit* that sees through the eyes. This leads to the wrong notion that the body, etc., is *ātmā*. Similarly Gārgya also mistook the *prāṇa* to be Brahman. The deep sleep experience proves that *ātmā* is distinct from the

upādhis such as body, senses, the mind and *ahaṃkāra*, etc. The sleep takes place when the *prārabdha* still in balance ceases to yield its result temporarily. When it exhausts totally, the death occurs. During the sleep, *ātmā* does not appear as *kartā*, *bhoktā*. It means such as *indriyas*, *antaḥkaraṇa*, etc., merge in their immediate cause of ignorance and what remains there is only ignorance. It has to be accepted that *indriyas* have merged in sleep because they manifest once the *jīva* wakes up. They cannot manifest unless they were in an unmanifest state but not destroyed. When the *buddhi*, etc., are merged the reflection of *cit* in them also will have to be accepted as merged. It is just like the absence of reflected sun in a bucket which is emptied of its water. Figuratively, it may be said that the reflected sun returned to the original sun. But there is no such actual returning or coming out. Similarly during the waking, etc., there is reflected *cit* in *buddhi* and *indriyas*. The original entity *bimba* of such reflection is called *vijñānamaya jīva*. During the sleep in the absence of *buddhi* and *indriyas*, the hitherto reflected *cit* in them is said to be withdrawn unto itself by *vijñānamaya jīva*. So long as the *upādhi* is present, *ātmā* appears to be limited by it. When the *upādhi* is withdrawn, there is no limitation of *upādhi* in relation to *ātmā*.

The *upādhi-limitation* cannot be attributed to *ātmā*. Thus in its real nature, *ātmā* is *upādhi-less*.

DESCRIPTION OF ĀTMĀ

The result of the inquiry conducted so far is being told.

धीविज्ञानोपसंहारे विज्ञानमयताक्षतौ ।

निर्विकारात्मचैतन्यं केवलं परिशिष्यते ॥२८॥

धीविज्ञानोपसंहारे - when the *antaḥkaraṇa (buddhi)* and the knowledge of sense-objects (*viśaya-jñāna*) born through it उपसंहारे - (when) withdrawn विज्ञानमयताक्षतौ - (as a result) when the status of *ātmā* as a *vijñānamaya jīva* is no longer there केवलं - only (totally unconnected to the *jagat*) निर्विकारात्मचैतन्यं परिशिष्यते - changeless (*avikārī*) *ātmā* in the form of *caitanya* remains – (28)

28. When the *antaḥkaraṇa (buddhi)* and the knowledge of sense-objects (*viśaya-jñāna*) born through it is withdrawn, (as its result) when the status of *ātmā* as a *vijñānamaya jīva* is no longer there, only the changeless (*avikārī*) *ātmā* in the form of *caitanya* (totally unconnected to the *jagat*) remains.

एतदेव विवक्षित्वा प्रतिपादयति श्रुतिः ।

य एषोऽन्तर्हृदाकाशस्तस्मिन् शेते इतीदृशी ॥२९॥

एतद् एव विवक्षित्वा - with an intention to tell this fact only 'यः एषः अन्तः

हृदाकाशः तस्मिन् शेते' - 'this *ātmā* sleeps in the *ākāśa* (Brahman) abiding in the heart' इति ईदृशी श्रुतिः - such a *śruti* (*Br.U.2-1-17*) प्रतिपादयति - teaches – (29)

29. With an intention to tell this fact only, the *śruti* teaches that 'this *ātmā* sleeps in the *ākāśa* (Brahman) abiding in the heart' (*Br.U.2-1-17*).

Ātmā can be addressed as 'vijñānamaya' only when the *buddhi* and *indriyas* are functionally present. But *ātmā* continues to remain in its real nature without changing itself when the status of 'vijñānamaya' ceases to be there in the absence of *buddhi* and *indriyas*. The state of *ātmā* in the deep sleep is its nature. Though ignorance also is present therein, there is no functional *upādhi* except *prāṇa* in sleep. In reality the nature of *ātmā* is totally non-dual and it has no connection with the ignorance also. But to point out *ātmā* free from the manifest *upādhis*, it can be considered that *ātmā* is in its natural state in the sleep. The *ākāśa* in the *hṛdaya* (the Brahman in the space of *antaḥkaraṇa*/heart) is referred to by two pronouns: 'yaḥ (the one who, i.e. 'tat-pada' that indicates *Īśvara*) and eṣaḥ (this entity, i.e. 'tvam-pada' that indicates 'you' (*jīva*) from 'tat tvam asi', *mahāvākya*). Thus the *śruti* indicates the identity between the *jīva* and *Īśvara*. Generally *ātmā* is said to be present in

the heart (*hṛdaya*) which is the seat of *antaḥkaraṇa* (*buddhi*) wherein the *jīva* is manifest'. *Hṛdaya* is also said to be the seat of Brahman according to the *upāsanā* called 'daharavidyā'. Thus, there is the identity between the nature and the so called place of abidance of both *jīva* and *Īśvara* (Brahman).

Now the author himself explains the *śruti* statement: 'Ya eṣaḥ antarhṛdaya ākāśaḥ tasmin śete' (*Br.U.2-1-17*). The meanings of the words *hṛdaya* and *ākāśa* are given in the next three verses.

बुद्धिर्हृदयशब्देन हृन्निष्ठत्वाद्
विवक्ष्यते ।

आ समन्तात् काशतेऽयमित्याकाशोऽत्र
चिद्वपुः ॥३०॥

हृन्निष्ठत्वात् - because of its abidance in the *hṛt* (heart) बुद्धिः - the *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) हृदयशब्देन - by the word *hṛdaya* विवक्ष्यते - is meant (तथा - so also) अत्र - here अयम् आकाशः - this word *ākāśa* चिद्वपुः - is the principle of *caitanya* (pure consciousness) आ समन्तात् काशते इति - because it shines completely (as the knowledge-principle) – (30)

30. The *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) is meant by the word *hṛdaya* because of its abidance in the *hṛt* (heart). Here (in this *śruti*-statement), the word *ākāśa* refers to the principle of

caitanya (pure consciousness) because it shines completely (as the knowledge-principle).

बुद्धेरन्तः प्रतीचोऽन्यो नार्थः संभाव्यते यतः ।
तस्मादाकाशशब्देन प्रत्यगात्मेह गृह्यते ॥३१॥

यतः - because बुद्धेः अन्तः - within the *buddhi* प्रतीचः अन्य अर्थः - an entity other than *pratyagātmā* न सम्भाव्यते - is not possible to be there तस्मात् - therefore आकाशशब्देन - by the word *ākāśa* इह - in this *śruti-statement* प्रत्यगात्मा - *pratyagātmā* गृह्यते - is understood—(31)

31. It is not possible for any entity other than *pratyagātmā* to be within the *buddhi*. Therefore, the word *ākāśa* in this *śruti-statement*, *pratyagātmā* is understood.

प्राणादीनां यतो जन्म वक्ष्यते प्रत्यगात्मनः ।
तस्मादाकाशशब्देन ब्रह्मैवान्नाभिधीयते ॥३२॥

यतः - (to add further) because प्राणादीनां जन्म - the birth of *prāṇa*, etc. प्रत्यगात्मनः वक्ष्यते - is going to be told from *pratyagātmā* (*Br.U.2-1-20*) तस्मात् - therefore आकाशशब्देन - by the word ‘*ākāśa* अत्र - in this *śruti-statement* ब्रह्म एव - Brahman only अभिधीयते - is told—(32)

32. (To add further) the birth of *prāṇa*, etc., is going to be told from *pratyagātmā* (*Br.U. 2-1-20*). Therefore, in this *śruti-statement*, Brahman only is told by the word *ākāśa*.

By the phrase ‘*hṛnniṣṭha*’ (abiding in the heart) (verse 30), the *śruti* points out that the topic that is being discussed is the innermost (*pratyak*) *ātmā*. Though the word used is ‘*hṛdaya*’, it indicates *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa* abiding in it). The word ‘*ākāśa*’ generally means elemental space (*bhūtākāśa*). But here its etymological meaning needs to be considered. Thus, *ākāśa* has to be taken as *cit* and *cit* only that completely shines all around as the knowledge-principle. Whatever we refer to as ‘I’ is nothing but *cit* in the form of knowledge-principle only. It is a universally known fact that ‘I’ is the self-experiencing principle. *Brahmasūtra* (1-1-22) ‘*Ākāśaḥ talliṅgāt*’ ascertains that at places *śruti* used the word *ākāśa* for Brahman (*Tai.U.2-7*; *Ch.U.8-14-1*; *Tai.U.3-6*; *Ch.U.4-10-5*; *Br.U.4-1-1*, *Ṛk.samhitā* 1-164-39). Generally, *ākāśa* (space) is an element (*bhūta*) included in the five of them. It is said in the *Chāndogyopaniṣat* (1-9-1) that ‘*ākāśa* is the support of entire Creation. All the five elements are born from *ākāśa*; they merge back in *ākāśa* because it is more extensive, than the five elements. Further it is the final abode of all’. This *ākāśa* has to be Brahman only and not the elemental one because space cannot be born from the space itself and we know that the space (*ākāśa*) is born from Brahman which itself is called

ākāśa at some places in the *śruti*. Therefore, contextually it has to be decided as to where the word '*ākāśa*' is used for Brahman.

Elemental *ākāśa* (space) is an object of *buddhi* and so it is *bāhya* (external) to *buddhi*. Therefore, space cannot abide within *buddhi*. Even the '*tanmātrā*' (nascent form) of *ākāśa* (space) is a constituent of *buddhi* and so it also cannot be within the *buddhi* itself.

At places the meditation of *ākāśa* is suggested. It is neither a meditation on void nor *bhūtākāśa* (elemental space). It means the meditation of Brahman only. In the order of *upādhi* beginning from the gross body the innermost manifest *upādhi* is *buddhi* only. Inner to that only *ātmā* can be there. Even if we consider the *upādhi* of *ahaṃkāra*, the entity inner to it can only be *pratyagātmā*. It is appropriate to say that this *ātmā* itself is *Paramātmā* because the birth of *prāṇa*, etc., will be told (*Br.U.2-1-20*) as originating from this *ātmā* only. During the sleep, the *prāṇas*, etc., merge in this *ātmā* and emerge from it on waking up whereby the manifestation of *jagat* becomes evident. Thus, it becomes clear that the *pratyagātmā* is Brahman.

The word '*ākāśa*' that is being discussed refers to Brahman is further derived.

अधिष्ठानत्वमन्तस्त्वमपरिच्छिन्नवस्तुनः ।
अन्तर्बहिर्विभागोऽयं न मुख्य उपपद्यते ॥३३॥

अपरिच्छिन्नवस्तुनः - of the entity that is limitless अन्तस्त्वम् - the nature of being the innermost अधिष्ठानत्वम् - (should be known) as the basis of *jagat* (यतः - because) अयं - this अन्तर्बहिर्विभागः - division of inside and outside (of *hṛdaya*) मुख्यः - a real one न उपपद्यते - is not possible—(33)

33. The nature of the entity that is limitless (spacewise, timewise and objectwise) being the innermost (should be known) as the basis of *jagat* because (in the case of all pervasive entity) a real division of inside and outside (of *hṛdaya*) is not possible.

The statement such as 'the rope lies within the (mistaken) snake' does not mean that rope is within the stomach of snake. It only points out that the rope is the basis of the mistaken snake. Similarly here by the statement that *ātmā* is inner to even the almost innermost *buddhi* shows that *ātmā* is the *adhiṣṭhāna* of everything. That is why its nature as the *vivarta-kāraṇa* of *prāṇa*, etc., signifying the entire Creation that is going to be told (*Br.U.2-1-20*), is possible.

For example, elemental space is all pervasive. It cannot have divisions

such as inside, outside, etc. Even then such divisions are assumed with respect to the room, house, etc. Similarly the all pervasive Brahman has no such inner, outer divisions. And yet such divisions are taken for granted in *vyavahāra* with respect to the *upādhis* such as *buddhi*, body, etc. The status of Brahman as the *adhiṣṭhāna* of *jagat* is from the *vyāvahārika* (transactional) stand-point and not *pāramārthikatayā* (from the absolute reality stand-point).

The phrase ‘*ya eṣaḥ*’ (this one) (*Br.U.2-1-17*) is being explained in the next verse.

पराक् प्रमेयभूमिभ्यो मनसि व्युत्थिते सति ।
अनन्यबोधप्रात्यक्ष्याद्य एष इह भण्यते ॥३४॥

पराक् प्रमेय भूमिभ्यः - from the external *dr̥śya* entities that are in the form of *anātmā* मनसि व्युत्थिते सति - when the mind is withdrawn internally अनन्यबोधप्रात्यक्षात् - because the *sākṣātkāra* (direct experience) of self-evident, self-experiencing principle *ātmā* takes place इह - in this *śruti-statement* यः एषः - ‘*yaḥ eṣaḥ*’ (‘this one’) भण्यते - is said – (34)

34. Because the *sākṣātkāra* (direct experience) of the self-evident, self-experiencing principle *ātmā* (*cit* and *cit* alone) takes place when the mind is withdrawn internally from the external *dr̥śya* entities, here in this *śruti-*

statement, *ātmā* is referred to as ‘*yaḥ eṣaḥ*’ (‘this one’ as the most proximate entity).

The mind by its nature is extrovert (*Kṛ.U.2-1-1*). When it gives up its extrovertedness temporarily, it goes into sleep whereby it cannot know *ātmā* in its real nature. Therefore, to know *ātmā* by conscious deliberate efforts, the extrovert mind has to withdraw from its external preoccupations. After making it thus single-pointed, it should get absorbed in *ātmā* with steadiness. Then only the direct experience of *ātmā* called *ātmāsākṣātkāra* (*brahmacinmātrasāra-tvam*) without the dependence on anything else whatsoever takes place. In this state even the last trace of *ātmākāra-vṛtti* gets dropped. Since the *jñānīs* experience the self-luminous *ātmā* directly (*aparokṣatayā*), it (*ātmā*) is referred to by the two words ‘*yaḥ*’ and ‘*eṣaḥ*’ which point out a distinctly evident entity. The word ‘*yaḥ*’ (the one who) from the *śruti* can be taken as self-luminous ‘*taḥ*’ *pada* whereas ‘*eṣaḥ*’ (this) as the innermost (*pratyak*) ‘I’. Thus it suggests that one should gain the *sākṣātkāra* of *ātmā* in its real nature. Or the phrase ‘*yaḥ eṣaḥ*’ (the *ākāśa* that is within the heart) suggests that the *sākṣātkāra* of all pervasive *Paramātmā* be gained as *pratyagātmā*.

Thereafter the phrase ‘*tasmin*

śete' (the *jīva* sleeps in that *ākāśa*) appears in the *śruti-statement*. This is explained in the next three verses.

स्वतोऽवगमरूपेऽस्मिन्
कूटस्थे निर्द्वयात्मनि ।
कात्स्न्येनावस्थितिर्भोक्तुःशेत
इत्यभिधीयते ॥३५॥

अस्मिन् - in this स्वतः अवगमरूपे - in the self-evident knowledge-principle कूटस्थे - (in the) changeless निर्द्वयात्मनि - (in the) non-dual *ātmā* भोक्तुः - of *jīva* कात्स्न्येन - in entirety अवस्थितिः - abidance शेत - (the *jīva*) sleeps इति अभिधीयते - so it is said – (35)

35. The abidance of *jīva* in the self-evident changeless non-dual knowledge-principle *ātmā* in entirety is said as the *jīva* sleeps.

Like the states of waking and dream, the deep sleep is a specific state of *bhoktā jīva*. Only the difference is that there is *bhoktṛtva* in the waking and the dream states whereas in the sleep the *jīva* becomes one with Brahman. As a result there is neither *bhoktṛtva* nor sorrows. The seeming features of *jīva* that cast its distinction from *ātmā*/Brahman are not at all experienced in sleep. This is what is described as the identity of *jīva* with *ātmā* 'in entirety' (*kārtsnyena*) during the sleep. But it is not *mokṣa* because the self-ignorance still persists which

projects the *bhoktṛtva* and consequent *samsāra* again. *Ātmā* is always *kūṭastha* (changeless) both in the sleep and waking-dream states irrespective of its seeming connection with *anātmā* being present or not. Such connection with *anātmā* is experienced in the waking and dream. In the sleep such manifest connection is not there. Therefore it is not experienced. Thus, whether there is experience or no experience of *anātmā-jagat*, *ātmā*/Brahman is always *nirvikārī* (changeless). To highlight this, the *nirdvaya* (non-dual) nature of *ātmā* is pointed in sleep wherein no duality is experienced with no connection with them. Thus, *ātmā* is *kūṭastha* and *nirdvaya*. This is so even in the waking and the dream. And yet *ātmā* appears as if endowed with desires, greed, anger, etc., though it is always non-dual knowledge-principle. Abidance of *jīva* in knowledge-principle of such nature in spite of ignorance is called sleep (*śayana*) wherein the statuses as *jīva* and *jagat* are absent.

घटभङ्गो घटाकाशो महाकाशान्न भिद्यते ।
विज्ञानलोपे विज्ञानमयस्यैवं परात्मता ॥३६॥

घटाकाशः - the pot-space घटभङ्गो - when the pot breaks महाकाशात् - from the total space न भिद्यते - does not differ एवं - similarly विज्ञानलोपे - when the *upādhi* of *buddhi* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) is withdrawn

विज्ञानमयस्य - the status of *jīva* with *viññānamaya upādhi* परात्मता - the nature as *Paramātmā* (remains) – (36)

36. The pot-space does not differ from the total space when the pot breaks. Similarly when the *jīva's upādhi* of *buddhi* is withdrawn, its (of *jīva*) nature in the form of *Paramātmā* (remains).

The question ‘how can the *jīva* become one with *Paramātmā* only because of sleep wherein the *buddhi* is withdrawn?’ is answered here with an illustration. In the absence of pot, the pot-space becomes one with total space. Similarly the status of *jīva* appears because of *viññānamaya upādhi* just as the pot-space becomes available till the pot is present. In the absence of *viññānamaya*, the *jīvahood* does not continue and what remains is only *Paramātmā*. Because of the absence of *ahaṃkāra*, the product of *viññānamaya*, in sleep what remains is *Paramātmā*. And yet there is no *mokṣa* because the cause of *ahaṃkāra*, the ignorance still continues.

देहाद्यध्यक्षतां हित्वा

सुप्तौ स्वात्मनि वर्तते ।

इत्येतत् साध्यते श्रुत्या

समाख्यायाश्च युक्तिः ॥३७॥

(विज्ञानमयः जीवः - the *viññānamaya jīva*) सुप्तौ - during the sleep देहाद्यध्यक्षतां हित्वा - having given up the identification

with the body, etc. स्वात्मनि - in one's real nature (*ātmā*) वर्तते - remains इति एतत् - this fact श्रुत्या - by the *śruti* समाख्यायाः युक्तिः च - through the means of name, (i.e. sleeps-*svapiti*) and the reasoning साध्यते - is proved – (37)

37. During the sleep, (the *viññānamaya jīva*) remains in one's real nature *ātmā* having given up the identification with the body, etc. This fact is proved by the *śruti* through the means of name, (i.e. sleeps - *svapiti*) and the reasoning.

Ātmā identifies itself with the body, etc., during the states such as waking, etc. As a result, in the form of *jīva*, the *ātmā* undergoes the *bhoga* of joys and sorrows. Such identification ceases temporarily during the sleep and the *jīva* is not aware of anything. After the ending of *ahaṃkāra* in sleep, *ātmā* continues to be in its real nature of *cit* and *cit* only. The *śruti* explains this in twofold way. One is through the means of name of *ātmā* when asleep, and the other is with the help of reasoning.

The remaining portion of *śruti* (*Br.U.2-1-17*) states: ‘When the *viññānamaya puruṣa* (*jīva*) withdraws all the senses with the mind, it is called ‘*svapiti*’ (becomes completely identical with *ātmā*). At that time the sense of smell, organ of speech, eye, ear, the

mind, (etc.), get withdrawn'. The name 'svapiti' is already explained in the *Chāndogya-vivaraṇa*, *Śvetaketuvidyā-prakāśa* (Ch.3, vs.79 to 84). Therefore it is passingly referred to here in the next verse and in the first line of verse 39. Thereafter the reasoning (*yukti*) is elaborated.

सुप्तस्य स्वपितीत्येषा

समाख्या सर्वसंमता ।

निरुक्तिमाहुश्छन्दोगाः स्वमपीत

इतीदृशीम् ॥३८॥

सुप्तस्य - in the case of sleeping person स्वपिति - 'svapiti' (sleeps) इति एषा समाख्या - this name सर्वसंमता - is acceptable to all छन्दोगाः - the followers of *Chāndogya-śākhā* स्वम् अपीतः - has gained (or merged in) one's real nature इति ईदृशीम् - of such type निरुक्तिम् आहुः - tell the etymological derivation—(38)

38. The name 'svapiti' (sleeps) for a sleeping person is acceptable to all. The followers of *Chāndogya-śākhā* etymologically derive this word as *jīva* has gained (or merged in) one's real nature.

अतः समाख्यया सुप्तौ

स्वाभाविक्यात्मनि स्थितिः ।

युक्तिश्चोपाधिसंहारः

संसारित्वनिवृत्तये ॥३९॥

अतः - hence समाख्यया - in accordance

with this name सुप्तौ - in sleep (जीवस्य - of *jīva*) आत्मनि - in *ātmā* स्वाभाविकी स्थितिः - natural state संसारित्व निवृत्तये - to prove the absence of *samsāra* उपाधिसंहारः - the withdrawal from *upādhis* युक्तिः च - serves as the reasoning—(39)

39. Hence in accordance with this name the *jīva* has its natural state in *ātmā* during the sleep. The withdrawal from *upādhis* in sleep serves as the reasoning to prove the absence of *samsāra* therein.

वागाद्युपाधिसंबन्धात् संसारित्वमिवेक्ष्यते ।
ते तूपसंहृताः सर्वे ततोऽसंसारितात्मनः ॥४०॥

वागाद्युपाधिसंबन्धात् - on account of identification with the *upādhis* such as organ of speech, etc. संसारित्वम् इव ईक्ष्यते - (during the waking and dream) (*ātmā*) appears as if a *samsārī* in nature तु - but (in sleep) ते सर्वे - all of them उपसंहृताः - are withdrawn ततः - therefore आत्मनः - of *ātmā* असंसारिता - nature free from *samsāra* (is ascertained)—(40)

40. On account of identification with the *upādhis* such as organ of speech, etc., *ātmā* appears as if a *samsārī* in nature (during the waking and dream states). But in sleep all of those *upādhis* are withdrawn. Therefore the nature of *ātmā* free from *samsāra* (is ascertained).

Samākhyā means the name which also describes the nature of the entity

named by it. Though there is no rule that the name invariably corresponds to the nature of its entity, the names given by knowledgeable persons do have such features. The word 'apīta' or 'apyaya' means 'vilaya' (dissolution). All the rest entities getting dissolved in *sva* (oneself) are called 'svapiti'. Thus, the word 'svapiti' (sleeps) is a verb according to the common people. But from the standpoint of discriminating persons, 'svapiti' as a noun describes the *jīva* as the one who has become identical with *sat* (*ātmā*) (Ch.3, vs.76, etc.).

The sorrows of *saṃsāra* at the manifest level are invariably on account of *upādhis*. During the sleep, the manifest *upādhis* are not there. Therefore, there cannot be sorrows during the sleep. This serves as the reasoning to prove that *saṃsāra* cannot be the nature of *ātmā* or the *jīva* in reality. Though the sorrowful *saṃsāra* is experienced during the waking and dream states, it is not really the nature of *ātmā*. The author indicates this by using the phrase 'saṃsāritvam iva' (as though a *saṃsārī*).

It is true that in sleep, the *ātmā* is seen to be free from *saṃsāra*. Even then during the dream, *ātmā* is seen to be *sukha-duḥkhātmaka saṃsārī* in spite of *indriyas* being withdrawn. Therefore, it is doubted that the *asaṃsārī* nature of

ātmā cannot hold good. The next verse raises this doubt and it is answered thereafter in the subsequent two verses.

सर्वेन्द्रियवियोगेऽपि

सुखिदुःखित्वमात्मनः ।

स्वप्ने दृष्टमतः सङ्ग

आत्मनस्तात्त्विको भवेत् ॥४१॥

स्वप्ने - during the dream
सर्वेन्द्रियवियोगे अपि - in spite of separation from the senses (*indriyas*)
आत्मनः - of *ātmā*
सुखिदुःखित्वम् दृष्टम् - the nature of becoming happy and sorrowful is known
अतः - therefore
आत्मनः - of *ātmā*
सङ्गः - association with *saṃsāra*, (i.e. transmigration)
तात्त्विकः भवेत् - should be real—(41)

41. A contrary proposition (*pūrvapakṣa*): During the dream the nature of *ātmā* becoming happy and sorrowful is known in spite of separation from the senses (*indriyas*). Therefore the association of *ātmā* with *saṃsāra*, (i.e. transmigration) should be real.

मैवं मृषात्वात् स्वप्नस्य मनोमात्रविजृम्भणात् ।
बाह्येन्द्रियविलोपेऽपि न मनो लुप्यते तदा ॥४२॥

मा एवं - please do not say so
मनोमात्रविजृम्भणात् - because of the projection of mind only
स्वप्नस्य मृषात्वात् - the dream happens to be false in nature
तदा - during the dream
बाह्येन्द्रियविलोपे अपि - in spite of separation from the external

indriyas मनः - the mind न लुप्यते - is not lost – (42)

42. It is not so. Dream happens to be false in nature because of the projection of mind only. During the dream, the mind is not lost in spite of separation from the external *indriyas*.

महाराजादयस्तस्य

स्वप्नानुभवगोचराः ।

न वास्तवा इति ज्ञेयाः

शयानेभ्यः पृथक्त्वतः ॥४३॥

तस्य - of the *jīva* स्वप्नानुभवगोचराः - sense-objects experienced in the dream महाराजादयः - such as the emperor, etc. न वास्तवाः - are not real इति ज्ञेयाः - so it should be known शयानेभ्यः पृथक्त्वतः - because they are different from the body that is asleep – (43)

43. The sense-objects experienced in the dream such as oneself to be an emperor, etc., by the *jīva* are not real. It should be known thus because they are different from the body that is asleep.

Unlike in the deep sleep, *ātmā* is not totally free from all the *upādhis* in the dream state. The mind independent of *indriyas* and the physical body continues to project the dream experiences of varied objects and beings which are really not there. This is the universal experience. Therefore, if at all any association has to be accepted between

ātmā and joys-sorrows of the dream, it has to be *mithyā* (false) in nature. In fact, in the dream state, *ātmā* has the *upādhi* of mind and the association between the two. This also is at the level of *upādhi* only and hence not real. The dream-experiences are not real because the dream-objects experienced therein are really not there. Thus, the false joys and sorrows experienced in the dream cannot refute the *asam̐sārī* nature of *ātmā* established in the sleep.

The nature of *ātmā* as *asam̐sārī* is doubted from another standpoint and it is being answered now.

दृश्यं मिथ्यास्तु तद् द्रष्टृद्रष्टृता

वास्तवी ततः ।

दृश्यं साऽपेक्षतेऽप्येषा

शङ्कात्र विनिवार्यते ॥४४॥

दृश्यं - let the *dr̥śya* (perceptible entities) मिथ्या अस्तु - be false in nature तद् द्रष्टुः द्रष्टृता - its seer's (experiencer's) nature of being the seer (*draṣṭā* or experiencer or *bhokṭṛtva*) वास्तवी - can be real ततः - therefore सा - that (*bhokṭṛtva* - the nature of being the experiencer or *bhokṭā*) दृश्यं अपेक्षते - requires the *dr̥śya* एषा शङ्का अपि - this doubt अत्र - here विनिवार्यते - is answered – (44)

44. Doubt: Let the *dr̥śya* (perceptible entities) be false in nature. (But) its seer's (experiencer's) nature of

being the seer (*draṣṭā* or experiencer or *bhokṭṛtva*) can be real. Therefore that (*bhokṭṛtva* - the nature of being the experiencer or *bhoktā*) requires the *drśya*. This doubt is answered here.

The followers of *Sāṅkhya* school of thought consider *ātmā* to be *bhoktā* in reality. Accordingly the question arises: ‘Why not the *bhokṭṛtva* of *ātmā* be real who certainly undergoes the *bhoga* (experience) of *drśya* in spite of their being false?’ They contend that there is no rule emphasizing the need of *satya* (real) *drśya* only (and not *mithyā drśya*) to be a *draṣṭā* (experiencer, *bhoktā*). Therefore why *ātmā* cannot be a *bhoktā* (*samsārī*) in reality? The answer follows in the next verse.

न किञ्चन यदा वेद तदा

सुप्त इतीरणात् ।

आत्मनो ज्ञानकर्तृत्वं सुप्तौ

नास्तीति गम्यते ॥४५॥

यदा - when न किञ्चन वेद - (the *jīva*) knows nothing तदा - then सुप्तः - (the *jīva*) is asleep इति ईरणात् - because of saying so सुप्तौ - in the sleep आत्मनः - of *ātmā* ज्ञानकर्तृत्वं - the nature of being experiencer (*bhokṭṛtva*) न अस्ति - is not there इति गम्यते - so it is understood—(45)

45. Answer: Because of the statement that the *jīva* is asleep when it knows nothing, it is understood that the

nature of *ātmā* being the experiencer (*bhokṭṛtva*) is not there during the sleep.

It is true that *ātmā* appears as a *samsārī bhoktā* during the waking and dream states. If it were its real nature in the deep sleep also the *bhokṭṛtva* of *ātmā* should be there. But this is not so is proved by the fact that *ātmā* knows/experiences no *drśya* during the sleep. That shows that the *bhokṭṛtva* of *ātmā* seen in the waking and dream is on account of *upādhis* but not by its real nature. The real nature of *ātmā* as the knowledge-principle continues to be there in sleep also even in the total absence of manifest *drśyas*. This establishes that *ātmā* whose real nature is knowledge-principle is not *draṣṭā* (experiencer, *bhoktā*) by nature. That status is superimposed on it by the presence of *drśya-upādhi* including the mind, etc., as in the case of waking and the dream states. *Ātmā* is mere knowledge-principle in its real nature free from *upādhis*.

The next section of *śruti* (*Bṛ.U.2-1-18*) describes the dream state and thereafter (in *Bṛ.U.2-1-19*) the sleep is described along with the order in which the *jīva* goes to sleep. For this purpose the *nāḍīs* (nerves) by name ‘*hitā*’ are referred to. They are 72,000 in numbers and spread all over the body emerging from the heart. While going to sleep the

buddhi is withdrawn from its preoccupation in the sense-objects through the route of *nāḍīs*. The *jīva* remains only in the body severing its contact from the external world. In sleep all are in delight like the natural delight of an infant, an ideal successful emperor, a mature and learned *brāhmaṇa* (*Br.U.2-1-19*). The beginning portion, ‘the *jīva* knows nothing in the sleep’ (*Br.U.2-1-19*) is already told in the verse 45. Now the order in which the *jīva* goes to sleep is explained in the next five verses.

सुप्तौ केन क्रमेणायमुपाधिः प्रविलीयते ।
तत्क्रमस्यावबोधाय हृदयादि विविच्यते ॥४६॥

सुप्तौ - while sleeping केन क्रमेण - by what order अयम् - this उपाधिः - *upādhi* प्रविलीयते - gets withdrawn तत्क्रमस्य अवबोधाय - to inform that order हृदयादि - the heart, etc., (viz. dream, waking, etc.) विविच्यते - is described—(46)

46. (If the question is asked:) ‘In which order the *upādhis* get withdrawn while sleeping?’ to inform that order the heart, etc., (viz. dream, waking, etc.), is described.

आनाभितस्तथा कण्ठाद्बृहदयं
मध्यतः स्थितम् ।
सनालं पद्मकोशाभं
पञ्चच्छिद्रमधोमुखम् ॥४७॥

हृदयं - the heart आनाभितः तथा कण्ठात् मध्यतः - in between the navel and the neck

स्थितम् - is सनालं पद्मकोशाभं - it resembles the calyx of a lotus, (i.e. in the bud form) with a stalk पञ्चच्छिद्रम् - it has five apertures अधोमुखम् - it has its face downwards —(47)

47. The heart having five apertures is in between the navel and the neck. It resembles the calyx of a lotus, (i.e. in the bud form) facing downwards with its stalk.

कदम्बकुसुमोद्भूतकेसरा इव सर्वतः ।
प्रसृता हृदयान्नाड्यो बहन्नरसपूरिताः ॥४८॥

कदम्बकुसुमोद्भूतकेसराः इव - like the filaments emerging from the *kadamba* flower बहन्नरसपूरिताः - abundantly filled up with the essence of food नाड्या - nerves हृदयात् - from the heart सर्वतः प्रसृता - are spread all over the body—(48)

48. Like the filaments emerging from the *kadamba* flower the nerves abundantly filled up with the essence of food are spread from the heart all over the body.

निर्गत्य हृदयाद्बुद्धिस्तासु स्वप्नं प्रपश्यति ।
ताभिर्देहाद् बहिर्गत्वा जागर्तीत्यभिधीयते ॥४९॥

बुद्धिः - *buddhi* हृदयात् - from the heart निर्गत्य - having emerged तासु - in those nerves स्वप्नं प्रपश्यति - sees the dreams ताभिः - (*buddhi*) through those (nerves) देहाद् बहिः गत्वा - having gone out of the body जागर्ति - is awake इति

अभिधीयते - so it is called – (49)

49. The *buddhi* having emerged from the heart sees dreams in those nerves. When it goes out through those (nerves) the person is said to be awake.

पुनः प्रत्यवसृत्यैषा पुरीतद्वेष्टिते हृदि ।

प्रविश्य लीयते देहं व्याप्य सामान्यवृत्तितः ॥५०॥

एषा - this *buddhi* पुनः - again प्रत्यवसृत्य - having returned पुरीतद्वेष्टिते हृदि - in the heart covered by the cardiac peripheral surface considered as its wrapper (called *purītat*) प्रविश्य - having entered लीयते - disappears देहं - the body सामान्यवृत्तितः व्याप्य - having pervaded in the form of a general presence (called unmanifest state) – (50)

50. Again this *buddhi*, on return, having entered the heart covered by the cardiac peripheral surface considered as its wrapper (called *purītat*), disappears having pervaded the body in the form of a general presence (called unmanifest state).

Even though the actual topic under discussion is the real nature of *jīva*, the order of *upādhi-laya* is described because of its context. It is well-known that our heart is in between the regions of neck and the navel. Its appearance generally resembles to a lotus-bud with its stalk facing downwards. *Buddhi* having emerged

from the heart reaches upto the senses through the route of *nāḍīs* (nerves) and contacts the sense-objects. That state is called waking. When it abides only in the nerves of neck region, it is the dream state. On its disappearance having entered the heart, the state is called deep sleep. But during the sleep it pervades the entire body in the form of a *sāmānya-vṛtti* (general presence) which corresponds to its presence in the body in an unmanifest condition. It refers to its abidance in the ignorance to manifest again into waking or the dream as the case be according to *prārabdha karma*. Otherwise the body will die. Such state of *buddhi* is called causal body (*kāraṇa śarīra*). At death the *buddhi* leaves the body.

The illustrations of an infant (*kumara*), *mahārāja* (emperor) and a *mahābrāhmaṇa* (mature and learned *brāhmaṇa*) are explained in the next two verses to describe the natural delight experienced by a sleeping person.

सर्वसंसारदुःखानामत्यन्तोपरमात् तदा ।

आनन्दस्य परा निष्ठा दृष्टान्तैः सोपमीयते ॥५१॥

तदा - then (in the sleep) सर्वसंसार-दुःखानाम् - of all sorrows of *saṃsāra* अत्यन्तोपरमात् - because of total cessation (या) आनन्दस्य - of whatever happiness परा निष्ठा - exalted state सा - that one दृष्टान्तैः उपमीयते - is likened to illustrations – (51)

51. During the sleep, because of total cessation of all sorrows of *samsāra*, whatever exalted state of happiness is there that state is pointed out by the means of illustrations.

इन्द्रियस्याप्ररूढत्वात्

स्वेष्टप्राप्तेर्विवेकतः ।

नीरागणां बालराजब्राह्मणानां

ऋमात् सुखम् ॥५२॥

इन्द्रियस्य अप्ररूढत्वात् - because of undeveloped senses स्वेष्ट प्राप्तेः - because of the accomplishment of desired things विवेकतः - because of *viveka* (discrimination) नीरागणां बालराजब्राह्मणानां - of dispassionate persons such as infant, emperor and learned *brāhmaṇa* ऋमात् - respectively सुखम् - delight (is there) –(52)

52. Dispassionate persons such as infant, emperor and learned *brāhmaṇa* are delightful because of undeveloped senses, the accomplishment of desired things and *viveka* (discrimination) respectively.

An infant is not afflicted by worldly likes and dislikes. Its *indriyas* are not attracted towards sense-objects. It is delightful so long as its bodily needs are met with. A mighty emperor acquires whatever he wants. So he is happy free from anxiety and concern. A *vivekī brāhmaṇa* has *vairāgya* towards

ephemeral sense-objects. He is always happy because his mind is centred in *ātmā* only. These illustrations show the absence of longing for sense-pleasures, desires and preoccupation in *anātmā*. This proves that the happiness in sleep is not on account of sense-objects.

The reason why the *śruti* has given many illustrations is explained.

दुःखं रागद्वेषजन्यं तदभावे सुखं स्वतः ।

इति व्याप्तिगृहीत्यर्थं बहुदृष्टान्तवर्णनम् ॥५३॥

दुःखं - sorrow रागद्वेषजन्यं - is born from desires and aversions तदभावे - in their absence स्वतः सुखं - *ātmā* remains in its real nature that is happiness इति व्याप्तिगृहीत्यर्थं - to understand such rule बहुदृष्टान्तवर्णनम् - many illustrations are given (by the *śruti*) –(53)

53. Sorrows are born from desires and aversions. In their absence, *ātmā* remains in its real nature that is happiness. To understand such rule, many illustrations are given (by the *śruti*).

A *vyāpti* means *sāhacarya niyama* - an invariable concomitance or co-existence. In many persons such as infants, etc., it is seen that they are happy when free from desires and aversions, but get subjected to sorrows in their presence. A single example cannot prove *vyāpti* because it may be a coincidence

also. But when the same fact is seen in the case of many, the rule becomes clear. Even though *rāga* and *dveṣa* are possible in an emperor, here such a state is mentioned wherein he has fulfilled what he wants and there is none towards whom he has hatred. Thus, the connection of *rāga* and *dveṣa* with the sorrow is highlighted.

The topic discussed so far is now concluded to proceed with the inquiry further.

अद्वयानन्दरूपत्वमित्थं

सुप्तौ प्रदर्शितम् ।

एतावता स्वभावोऽस्य

निर्णीतः प्रत्यगात्मनः ॥५४॥

इत्थं - thus अद्वयानन्दरूपत्वं - the real nature of *ātmā* to be non-dual happiness सुप्तौ - in the deep sleep प्रदर्शितम् - was explained एतावता - so far अस्य प्रत्यगात्मनः - of this *pratyagātmā* स्वभावः - real nature निर्णीतः - was ascertained – (54)

54. Thus, the real nature of *ātmā* to be non-dual happiness was explained. So far the real nature of *pratyagātmā* was ascertained.

Ātmā is free from manifest *upādhis* in the sleep. Therefore during the sleep, it remains non-dual happiness principle alone. But during the waking and dream states it is available in association with the *upādhis*. Therefore

it appears therein as dual riddled with sorrows which is not its natural state.

SRṢṬI (CREATION)

क्वाभूदेष इति प्रश्नं निर्णीय कुत आगतः ।
इति प्रश्नं विनिर्णेतुमूर्णनाभ्यादिका श्रुतिः ॥५५॥

‘एषः क्व अभूत्’ - ‘where was this *jīva* during the sleep?’ (vs.24) इति प्रश्नं निर्णीय - having answered this question ‘कुतः आगतः’ - ‘from where did the *jīva* return?’ इति प्रश्नं विनिर्णेतुम् - to answer this question ऊर्णनाभ्यादिका श्रुतिः - the *śruti* begins the illustration of spider, etc. – (55)

55. Having answered the question ‘where was this *jīva* during the sleep?’ (vs.24), the *śruti* begins the illustration of spider, etc., to answer the question, ‘from where did the *jīva* return?’ (vs.24).

The answer to the question, ‘where was this *jīva* during the sleep?’ is given by ‘the *jīva* was abiding in Brahman in the form of Brahman’. The next question is ‘from where did the *jīva* return?’ To answer this the *śruti* states: ‘Just as the spider weaves a web from itself and identical with it, just as sparks emerge from the fire, similarly from *ātmā* all *indriyas*, all *lokas* such as *pṛthvī*, etc., all deities and all living beings emerge’ (*Br. U.2-1-20*). This *śruti* is now being explained.

यः सुप्तौ निश्चितः स्वात्मा

तस्य ब्रह्मत्वसिद्धये ।

जगत्सृष्टिर्वर्णयतेऽस्मात् सृष्टौ

दृष्टान्त उच्यते ॥५६॥

यः स्वात्मा - the real nature of *ātmā*
सुप्तौ निश्चितः - that was ascertained in the
sleep तस्य ब्रह्मत्वसिद्धये - to prove it to be
Brahman जगत्सृष्टिः वर्णयते - the Creation of
jagat is described अस्मात् - from this *ātmā*
सृष्टौ - about Creation दृष्टान्तः उच्यते - an
illustration is given – (56)

56. To prove the *ātmā* whose real nature was ascertained in the sleep itself to be Brahman, the Creation of *jagat* is described. An illustration is given about (the emergence of) Creation from this *ātmā*.

In the deep sleep, the *jīva* was identical with the unknown Brahman which is the cause of Creation. After the sleep is over it returns from that unknown Brahman only. The ignorance that prevails in the sleep is the causal *upādhi* whereas *sat* Brahman happens to be the *svarūpa* (real nature) of *jīva*. The *jīva* with the causal *upādhi* of ignorance becomes *vijñānamaya* having the *kāryopādhi* of *buddhi* on account of *karmaphalas*. The same *jīva* gets liberated when the *kāraṇopādhi* (ignorance) gets *bādhita* by *ātmajñāna*. From the unmanifest *upādhi* that was there in the deep sleep, the Creation

comprising name and form (*nāma-rūpa*) is born wherein *ātmā* appears to have entered on account of *ātmānātma adhyāsa*. This answers the question, ‘from where did the *jīva* return?’

The *śruti* gives the illustrations of spider and the sparks of fire to explain the Creation emerging from *ātmā* in the state of sleep. Brahman/*ātmā* is sentient in nature. How can an inert Creation be born from it? This is a question by *tārkikas* and *sāṅkhyas* who believe that cause-effect relation can be possible only in the things of similar nature just like the mud-pots from the mud or golden ornaments from the gold. This is answered by the example of spider weaving a web.

अचेतनो यथातन्तुरूर्णनाभेः सचेतनात् ।
जातश्चिदात्मनस्तद्वत् प्राणलोकाद्यचेतनम् ॥५७॥

यथा - just as सचेतनात् ऊर्णनाभेः - from a sentient spider अचेतनः - inert तन्तुः जातः - thread (web) is born तद्वत् - similarly चिदात्मनः - from *ātmā* who is *cidrūpa* (sentience principle) अचेतनम् - inert प्राणलोकादि (जातम्) - *prāṇa, loka*, etc., (are born) – (57)

57. Just as an inert web is born from a sentient spider, similarly the inert - *prāṇa, loka*, etc., are born from *ātmā* who is *cidrūpa* (sentience principle).

The body of a spider is alive but

the web spun by it is inert. A dead body of a spider cannot produce any web. Similarly, from *Īśvara* inert *jagat* is born. There is no rule that inert things can be born of inert entities only. This also refutes the concept of some people that everything is sentient only. According to the Vedas, everything is born from sentient *ātmā*, but there prevails a distinction of inert and sentient entities. The next illustration is that of sparks emerging from the fire both of which are of similar nature.

विस्फुलिङ्गा यथा

चाग्नेर्जायन्तेऽग्निस्वभावकाः ।

तथा सुप्तात्मनो जीवा

विज्ञानमयनामकाः ॥५८॥

यथा च - and just as अग्निस्वभावकाः - entities having the nature of fire विस्फुलिङ्गाः - sparks अग्नेः - from the fire जायन्ते - are born तथा - similarly सुप्तात्मनः - from *ātmā*/Brahman limited by the ignorance विज्ञानमयनामकाः जीवाः - *jīvas* called *vijñānamaya* (are born) – (58)

58. Just as sparks having the nature of fire are born from fire, similarly (sentient) *jīvas* called *vijñānamaya* are born from *ātmā*/Brahman that is limited by ignorance.

A spark may be tiny and limited. But it is fire only. Similarly from *caitanya-ātmā* sentient *jīvas* are born.

Ātmā is *upādhi*less and therefore limitless whereas *jīva* is with *upādhi* which makes it limited in nature because of identification with it. The limitation is bound to be there whether the *upādhi* is *vyāpti* (microcosmic) as in the case of individual *jīvas* or *samaṣṭī* (macrocosmic) one as found in the case of *Hiraṇyagarbha*. All *jīvas* with distinct *upādhis* are called as *vijñānamaya*. All of them are born from *ātmā* endowed with ignorance as in sleep.

Though the inert *jagat* and sentient *jīvas* are born from *ātmā*, there is a distinction in their nature whether they are completely *mithyā* (false) or partially so. This contrast is shown now.

स्वरूपतो जन्मतश्च

प्राणादिभ्रान्तिकल्पितः ।

जीवस्य कल्पितं जन्म स्वरूपं

तु न कल्पितम् ॥५९॥

प्राणादिः - the entire *prapañca* beginning from *prāṇa*, *indriyas*, etc. स्वरूपतः जन्मतः च - by its nature and birth भ्रान्तिकल्पितः - is falsely projected जीवस्य - of *jīva* जन्म - birth कल्पितं - is falsely projected स्वरूपं तु - but its real nature न कल्पितम् - is not erroneous (or *mithyā*) – (59)

59. The entire *prapañca* beginning from *prāṇa*, *indriyas*, etc., is falsely projected by its nature and the birth. The

birth of *jīva* is falsely projected but its real nature is not erroneous (or *mithyā*).

Both the nature and birth of *jagat* are falsely projected. They disappear totally in the *ātmajñāna*. The birth of *jīva* is false and its real nature is *satya* the ever-existent *ātmā*. If a rope is mistaken as a snake, its appearance and birth are both false (*mithyā*). When you see your face in the mirror, the reflection therein is false but not your face. It is real in contrast to its reflection. Thus, all *upādhis* are falsely projected, (i.e. *adhyasta*, superimposed) on the real entity *caitanya* as their basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*). The present *śruti* merely tells that Creation is from *ātmā*, but it does not tell the order in which it is born. The reason for this is given.

उद्भूतिस्थितिनाशाः स्युर्जगतोऽस्य प्रतिक्षणम् ।
अविद्यामात्रहेतुत्वान्नामीषां विद्यते क्रमः ॥६०॥

अस्य जगतः - of this *jagat*
उद्भूतिस्थितिनाशाः - birth, sustenance and
destruction प्रतिक्षणम् - every moment स्युः
- happen to be there अविद्यामात्रहेतुत्वात् -
because *avidyā* alone is the cause for
these अमीषां - of these three क्रमः - order न
विद्यते - is not there – (60)

60. The birth, sustenance and destruction of this *jagat* takes place every moment. There is no order because *avidyā* alone is their cause.

While waking up from the sleep, we do not find any order in which Creation appears to be there. The birth, etc., of Creation takes place every moment. It is futile to consider any order. All this is the handiwork of *avidyā* alone. Though, order is told in the *śruti* elsewhere the purport is that there is no utility in imagining an order in the matter which is *mithyā* (false). This mistaken snake in the place of rope is not born in any specific order or does not stay there because of some *karmaphala*, or does not die in a particular way. This is true for all that is *mithyā*. Śrī Śaṅkarānanda Swāmī in *Ātmapurāṇa* clarifies that whatever that is out of sight should be considered as destroyed and that which appears to be there as born again. The order accepted elsewhere in the *śruti* is to do the *bādha* (to know its absence in three periods of time) of Creation by the *prakriyā* (mode) of dissolution (*pravilāpana*). It is not to ascertain any actual order of Creation. This is explained in the *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā*, etc. Thus, from the unknown *citātmā*, the entire inert and sentient *śṛṣṭi* is born. This answers the king's question, 'from where did the *jīva* return?'

SATYASYASATYAM (THE TRUTH OF THE TRUTH)

The first *brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* chapter two

(2-1-20) concludes with the following note. ‘The earlier portion is the Upaniṣad (secret or mystical name) of that *ātmā*/Brahman (*tasya*) which makes a *jijñāsu jīva* reach Brahman. That Upaniṣad is the ultimate truth (*satya*) of the relative truth (*satya*) in *vyavahāra* called *prāṇas* (indicating the entire Creation). *Prāṇas* are *satya*, but this *ātmā* is their *satya*’. The next two *brāhmaṇas* ‘*śiśu*’ and ‘*mūrtāmūrta*’ are dedicated to explain this topic. The purport of the above topic is described here in the next five verses.

यस्माद् अविद्यैवात्मा प्राणक्षेत्रज्ञरूपभाक् ।
स्वतोऽतः स परं ब्रह्म तस्योपनिषदुच्यते ॥६१॥

यस्मात् - because आत्मा - *ātmā* अविद्यया
एव - by *avidyā* alone प्राणक्षेत्रज्ञरूपभाक् -
appears to have the nature of *prāṇa*, etc.,
the *jagat* (called *kṣetra*) and the *jīva*
(called *kṣetrajña*) अतः - therefore सः -
that *ātmā* (who appeared as *jīva*) स्वतः - on
its own (in its *upādhi*less form) परं ब्रह्म -
remains *Parabrahma* only तस्य - of that
Brahman उपनिषत् - secret doctrine or
mystical meaning (called Upaniṣad)
उच्यते - is being described – (61)

61. *Ātmā* appears to have the nature of *prāṇa*, etc., the *jagat* (called *kṣetra*) and the *jīva* (called *kṣetrajña*) on account of *avidyā* alone. Therefore, *ātmā* (who appears as *jīva*) remains

Parabrahma only on its own (in its *upādhi*less form). Its (of Brahman) secret doctrine or mystical meaning called Upaniṣad) is being described.

The word ‘*prāṇa*’ used here can be taken as the entire *jagat* in the form of *anātmā* called *kṣetra* in the *Bhagavadgītā* or it can be *liṅga-śarīra* (subtle-body). It refers to all *upādhis*. *Ātmā* on account of *avidyā* only appears as both *prāṇas* (all *anātmā*) and all the living beings (*jīvas*, *kṣetrajñas*). But in reality it remains Brahman only just as the rope remains all the time rope even when mistakenly seen as snake because of its ignorance. The Upaniṣad is also called *rahasyam* which can mean secret doctrine or mystical meaning or words of mystery. The next verse is going to define the word ‘Upaniṣad’.

यद्गुह्यं ब्रह्मणो नाम बोधायोपासनाय वा ।
तत्स्यादुपनिषच्छब्दवाच्यं तच्चात्र बुध्यते ॥६२॥

ब्रह्मणः - of Brahman बोधाय - to gain
(its) knowledge उपासनाय वा - or for (its)
upāsanā यत् - whatever गुह्यं नाम - secret
name तत् - that one उपनिषच्छब्दवाच्यं स्यात् -
is the meaning of the word ‘Upaniṣad’ तत्
च - that one अत्र - here in this *śruti* बुध्यते -
is told (made known) – (62)

62. The secret (*rahasya*) name of Brahman meant to gain its knowledge or for *upāsanā* is the meaning of the word

‘Upaniṣad’. That is told (made known) here in this *śruti*.

The name is called secret because its implication can be known only by an eligible person. Others will misunderstand the statement. The nature of being secret or mystical is also appropriate in the case of Upaniṣads considering the fact that the Brahman unfolded by them is imperceptible (*atīndriya*) and beyond the scope of words and the mind. In the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtikasāra* by this author, the reading ‘*buddhaye*’ (to gain the knowledge) is found in the place of ‘*budhyate*’ (is known). It means that the secret name is given to gain the *Brahmajñāna* and not for *upāsanā*. If it is used for *upāsanā*, it is meant to prepare the mind to gain *Brahmajñāna*, but not to gain worldly results. What is that secret name is specified in the next verse in accordance with the *śruti*.

सत्यस्य

सत्यमित्येतन्नामब्रह्मावबोधकम् ।

प्राणा आपाततः सत्याः सत्यं

ब्रह्मैव वस्तुतः ॥६३॥

‘सत्यस्य सत्यम्’ - ‘the truth of the truth’ इति एतत् नाम - this name ब्रह्मावबोधकम् - is the one which indicates Brahman प्राणाः - *prāṇas* आपाततः सत्याः - appear to be true at the first sight ब्रह्म एव - Brahman

only वस्तुतः सत्यं - is the truth in reality - (63)

63. The name ‘the truth of the truth’ (*satyasya satyam*) indicates Brahman. ‘*Prāṇas*’ appear to be true at the first sight. (But) Brahman is the ‘truth’ (*satyam*) in reality.

The *Parabrahma* is called the *satyam* (truth) of the truth (*satya*). This is the name of Brahman in the sense of its meaning. What is that *satya* (truth) in ‘*satyasya*’ (of truth) is explained in the next verse. Or how *prāṇas* are true at the first sight is told now.

असत्यो देह उदित

एकजन्मन्युपक्षयात् ।

सत्यः प्राणा लिङ्गरूपा

आमोक्षमनपक्षयात् ॥६४॥

देहः - the body एकजन्मनि उपक्षयात् - because it gets destroyed in one birth असत्यः - not true, (i.e. it is transient) (इति) उदित - (so) it is considered (told) लिङ्गरूपाः प्राणाः - *prāṇas* in the form of subtle body सत्यः - are true आमोक्षम् अनपक्षयात् - because they do not get destroyed until the *mokṣa* is gained - (64)

64. The physical body gets destroyed in one birth. Therefore, it is not considered to be true, (i.e. it is transient). *Prāṇas* in the form of subtle body are true (*satya*) because they do not

get destroyed until the *mokṣa* is gained.

To show the relative *satya* (true) nature of *prāṇas* as the subtle body, the physical body whose transient nature is very clearly known is shown first as destructible. Knowing the destructible nature of the body one should strive to seek the ultimate truth (*satya*). Though instead of *prāṇa* the entire *anātma-prapañca* can be considered as relatively true, here *prāṇa* only is taken as relatively true taking into account the fact that Bālāki was a *prāṇopāsaka*. Here the word *prāṇa* refers to the subtle body which can exist until the liberation is gained. So it is considered as true till then. Therefore, it is said that *prāṇa* is true *āpātataḥ* (at first sight) because on gaining *Brahmajñāna* its destructible nature gets exposed. Only Brahman can be the ultimate truth. It is the only *nitya* (ever-existent) principle among all *anityas*. By *tapas*, *upāsana*s, etc., heavens upto *Brahmaloka* can be gained. It is told so in the *śāstras* only. But the *Brahmaloka*, etc., are not *satya* though relatively they are taken to be so. Similarly *prāṇas* are taken as *satya* relatively. Now why *ātmā*/Brahman is the ultimate *satya* is explained.

मोक्षेऽप्यक्षीण आत्मा तु

सत्यसत्य उदाहृतः ।

सत्यस्य सत्यं प्रोवाच ब्रह्म

बालाकये नृपः ॥६५॥

आत्मा तु - but *ātmā* मोक्षे अपि - even in *mokṣa* अक्षीणः - does not get destroyed सत्यसत्यः उदाहृतः - (therefore) it is called the *satya* of *satya* (the ultimate truth) नृपः - (thus) the king Ajātaśatru बालाकये - to Bālāki सत्यस्य सत्यं ब्रह्म - Brahman that is the truth of truth प्रोवाच - taught – (65)

65. But *ātmā* does not get destroyed even in *mokṣa*. (Therefore) it is called the *satya* of *satya* (the ultimate truth). (Thus) the king Ajātaśatru taught to Bālāki the Brahman that is the truth of truth (the ultimate truth).

The *prāṇas* end in *mokṣa* but not the *ātmā*. In the *Vārtikasāra*, the reading ‘*satyāt satya*’ (the final truth than the relative truth) in the place of ‘*satyasatya*’ as found here. With this the first *Brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat* chapter two called *Ajātaśatru Brāhmaṇa* is over.

PRĀṆOPĀSANĀ (UPĀSANĀ OF PRĀṆA)

Ātmā is *pārmāthika* (highest truth, absolute reality) distinct from *vyāvahārika prāṇa*, etc. This fact was shown by using different methods culminating with ‘*satyasya satyam*’. This itself will be explained in the next two *brāhmaṇas*. Bālāki committed the mistake of taking *prāṇa* as *ātmā* because it is the *upādhi* which subjects *ātmā* appearing as *jīva* to transmigration.

The second *brāhmaṇa* elaborates that the *prāṇa* cannot be *ātmā*. Now *śiśubrāhmaṇa* (*Br.U.2-2*) begins. The next verse introduces the topic.

प्राणा वै सत्यमित्युक्तं यत् सत्यं व्यावहारिकम् ।
बालाक्यभिमतं तत्तु द्वितीयब्राह्मणे स्फुटम् ॥६६॥

यत् - whatever बालाक्यभिमतं - accepted by Bālāki व्यावहारिकम् सत्यं - *vyāvahārika* (transactional) reality 'प्राणाः वै सत्यम्' इत्युक्तं - described as 'prāṇas are real' तत्तु - and now that द्वितीयब्राह्मणे - in this second *brāhmaṇa* स्फुटम् - is (described) clearly – (66)

66. Whatever *vyāvahārika* (transactional) reality accepted by Bālāki and which was described as 'prāṇas are real' is now (described) clearly in this second *brāhmaṇa*.

Brahman with attributes, (i.e. *saguṇa-brahma*) also will have to be included in the category of '*vyāvahārika satya*' because that is also relative truth that lasts long.

The *śiśubrāhmaṇa* (*Br.U.2-2*) will be summarized till the verse 77. Its first statement gives the *upāsana* of *prāṇa* called *śiśu* (infant) in a specific way with its result. It says: 'The *upāsaka* who does the *upāsana* of *prāṇa* called *śiśu* with its *ādhāna* (body), *pratyādhāna* (head), *sthūna* (post in the form of the strength gained through

food and drinks) and *dāma* (the food as a string or rope) conquers the seven enemies situated in the head (in the openings of *indriyas*), (i.e. becomes *jitendriya*) (*Br.U.2-2-1*). This is explained till the verse 74. The next verse explains why the *prāṇa* is called *śiśu*.

शिशुवद्विषयासङ्गरहितः प्राण इष्यते ।
वागादीनामिव यतो विषयोऽस्य न दृश्यते ॥६७॥

शिशुवत् - like an infant प्राणः - the *prāṇa* विषयासङ्गरहितः - does not have attachment to any sense-objects इष्यते - is accepted यतः - because वागादीनाम् इव - as in the case of senses such as the organ of speech, etc. अस्य - of *prāṇa* विषयः - sense-object न दृश्यते - is not seen – (67)

67. It is an accepted fact that like an infant the *prāṇa* does not have attachment to any sense-objects because its sense-object (*viṣaya*) is not seen as in the case of senses such as the organ of speech, etc.

The *brāhmaṇa* starts with the metaphor of a *śiśu* (infant). So it is called *śiśu-brāhmaṇa*. An infant has no *viṣayāsakti* (attachment to sense-objects). Appeasing the hunger, protecting oneself from cold, etc., with whatever means available are not considered as attachment (*āsakti*). But insisting on specific things or indulging in unnecessary *bhoga* or accumulating things are the signs of

attachment. An infant drinks the milk, cries when feels cold, but becomes quiet the moment it is covered by woollen. Those are *bhogas* but they have no attachment. This is the distinct feature of *prāṇa*. *Indriyas* have attachment, but not *prāṇa*. *Indriyas* do only their respective functions. That can be considered as their attachment. But *prāṇas* do not restrict them to any specific work only. They do all functions. They sustain the entire body and all *indriyas*. Or speaking lies, etc., can be considered as *āsakti* of organ of speech. *Prāṇa* does not commit such mistakes. In *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (1-2) there is a detailed narration as to how presiding deities of *indriyas* fell a victim in the snare of *āsakti* spread by demons but not the *prāṇa*. On the contrary, the demons got destroyed. That shows that the *prāṇa* has no attachment. Here the same freedom from attachment on the part of *prāṇa* is shown with the illustration of an infant.

The *upāsanā* of *asaṅga* (unattached) *prāṇa* has to be done with its four features. The first of them is told now.

शरीरमस्याधानं स्याद् देहमापादमस्तकम् ।
सामान्यवृत्त्या संव्याप्य चेष्टयत्यनिशं यतः ॥६८॥

शरीरम् - the physical body अस्य - of this *prāṇa* आधानं स्यात् - is the place of abidance यतः - because आपादमस्तकम् देहं -

the entire body from the sole of the foot upto the top of the head सामान्यवृत्त्या - by its general function of keeping the body alive संव्याप्य - having pervaded अनिशं - ceaselessly day and night चेष्टयति - activates – (68)

68. The physical body is the place of abidance (*ādhāna*) of this *prāṇa* because having pervaded the entire body from the sole of the foot upto the top of the head by its general function of keeping it (the body) alive the *prāṇa* activates it (body) ceaselessly day and night.

Ādhāna means the place of abidance. The body remains alive so long *prāṇa* is present in the body all over. Keeping the body alive, in general is called the ‘*sāmānya-vṛtti*’ (general function of *prāṇa*).

The second feature of *prāṇa* meant for *upāsanā* is as follows.

प्रत्याधानं शिरो ज्ञेयं

प्रतिच्छिद्रं व्यवस्थितः ।

प्रसारयति नेत्रादीन् प्राणो

मूर्ध्नि व्यवस्थितः ॥६९॥

शिरः - the head प्रत्याधानं - special resort (of *prāṇa*) ज्ञेयं - so it is to be understood प्रतिच्छिद्रं व्यवस्थितः - (there in the head the *prāṇa*) abides in each opening or sense-centre (of all *indriyas*)

मूर्ध्नि - in the head व्यवस्थितः - having remained प्राणः - *prāṇa* नेत्रादीन् - eyes, etc. प्रसारयति - directs (or spreads to their function upto their *viśayas* (sense-objects)–(69)

69. It should be understood that the head is the special resort (of *prāṇa*). (There in the head, the *prāṇa* abides in each opening or sense-centre (of all *indriyas*). Having remained there in the head the *prāṇa* directs (or spreads) the eyes, etc., to their respective functions upto the *viśayas* (sense-objects).

The *jīva* takes to its maximum activities by the means of *karaṇas* (instruments) that abide in the head. So it is natural that the *prāṇa* has a special task of making them function by giving the required strength. The eyes, etc., are able to do their function of seeing, etc., because of the strength given to them by *prāṇa*. The strength required for these functions is much more than the one required to keep the body alive. That is why the continuous functioning of the *indriyas* produces fatigue which is not the case in keeping oneself alive in general. Such strength needs to be given to them by *prāṇa*. The special exertion of *prāṇa* to provide the much strength is considered as its special resort in the head. The *Vārtika* - reading of ‘*viśeṣataḥ*’ (especially) seems to be

better than ‘*vyavasthitaḥ*’ (abides).

The third feature of *prāṇa* for *upāsanā* is that it is with a post wherein cow, etc., are tied, (i.e. *sthūna*). That is described now.

प्राणस्य बन्धनस्तम्भः

शरीरबलमिष्यते ।

दौर्बल्ये सति देहस्य

प्राणोक्कान्तिर्हि दृश्यते ॥७०॥

शरीरबलम् - the physical strength प्राणस्य बन्धनस्तम्भः - is the post wherein the *prāṇa* is tied up इष्यते - is regarded as हि - because देहस्य दौर्बल्ये सति - when the body becomes emaciated प्राणोक्कान्तिः - departure of *prāṇas* from the body दृश्यते - is seen – (70)

70. The physical strength is regarded as the post wherein the *prāṇa* is tied up because the departure of *prāṇas* from the body is seen when the body becomes emaciated.

It is well-known that a calf runs away if the post to which it is tied breaks. Similarly *prāṇa* quits the body when it is totally emaciated even in the absence of any disease. Therefore in the case of *prāṇopāsanā* the physical strength is to be looked upon as the post to which the *prāṇa* is tied up.

The fourth feature is the rope that can tie *prāṇa* to the said post. The next two verses describe such rope.

बन्धनायास्य दामान्नं

वत्सबन्धनरज्जुवत् ।

अन्ने त्रिधा विभक्तेऽस्मिन्

भागाभ्यां बध्यते द्वयम् ॥७१॥

वत्सबन्धनरज्जुवत् - like the rope used to tie a calf अस्य बन्धनाय - to tie up this *prāṇa* अन्नं - the food दाम - is the rope अस्मिन् अन्ने - when this food is त्रिधा विभक्ते - (when) divided into three parts (on its digestion) भागाभ्यां - by two parts द्वयम् - both the *prāṇa* and the body बध्यते - are tied up - (71)

71. Like the rope used to tie a calf the food is the rope to tie up this *prāṇa*. When the food is divided into three parts (on its digestion) both the *prāṇa* and the body are tied up by the two parts.

स्थूलो भागः पुरीषं स्यान्मध्यमो देहपोषकः ।
प्राणं तर्पयते सूक्ष्म इति बद्धं वपुर्द्वयम् ॥७२॥

स्थूलः भागः - the most gross part (of the digested food) पुरीषं स्यात् - becomes the faeces मध्यमः - the middle part देहपोषकः (भवति) - sustains the body सूक्ष्मः - the subtle part प्राणं तर्पयते - nourishes the *prāṇa* इति - thus वपुर्द्वयम् - both the gross and subtle bodies बद्धम् - are tied up by the food - (72)

72. The most gross part (of the digested food) becomes the faeces. The middle part sustains the body. The subtle part nourishes the *prāṇa*. Thus both the

gross and subtle bodies are tied up by the food.

The body dies if not fed for a very long period. The food is considered as that rope which ties up the *prāṇa* in the body to the post of bodily strength. Here the illustration of a calf is given and not a cow because it may not run even when the rope that ties it to the post snaps off. Earlier the *prāṇa* was described as an infant. In the same trend here the word ‘calf’ is used. The digested food becomes threefold. This is described in the *Chāndogyopaniṣat*. The gross part is excreted as the faeces. The middle part sustains the physical body whereas the subtle one nourishes *prāṇa* or the subtle body. Thus both the gross and subtle bodies are tied to the post of physical strength with the means of rope in the form of food.

The result of such *prāṇopāsanā* is told now in the next two verses.

एवं विवेचितं प्राणं य

उपास्ते रुणद्धि सः ।

भ्रातृव्यान् द्विषतः सप्त मूर्ध्नि

छिद्रव्यवस्थितान् ॥७३॥

यः - the one who एवं विवेचितं - thus ascertained प्राणं - *prāṇa* उपास्ते - does *upāsanā* of सः - that *upāsaka* मूर्ध्नि - situated in the head छिद्रव्यवस्थितान् - abiding in opening of senses सप्त - seven द्विषतः - born hostile भ्रातृव्यान् - nephews

रुणद्धि - controls, conquers – (73)

73. The *upāsaka* who does the *upāsanā* of *prāṇa* thus ascertained conquers the seven hostile nephews abiding in the senses situated in the openings in the head.

भ्रातृव्याः स्युः सहोत्पत्तेः

शब्दाद्याः सङ्गवृत्तयः ।

द्विषन्ति च मुमुक्षुं ताः

प्रत्यग्दृष्ट्यापहारतः ॥७४॥

शब्दाद्याः सङ्गवृत्तयः - the *vṛttis* that breed attachment towards sense-objects such as sound, etc. सहोत्पत्तेः - because they are born along with the *indriyas* भ्रातृव्याः स्युः - are nephews ताः - they प्रत्यग्दृष्ट्यापहारतः - because of robbing the introverted mind (by making it extrovert) मुमुक्षुं च - toward *mumukṣus* द्विषन्ति - become hostile – (74)

74. The *vṛttis* that breed attachment towards sense-objects such as sound, etc., are (considered to be) nephews because they are born along with the *indriyas*. They become hostile towards *mumukṣus* because of robbing the introverted mind (by making it extrovert).

Though the context is that of *Brahmajñāna*, the enjoining of *upāsanā* is acceptable because its result is to conquer the attachment of *indriyas* towards their sense-objects. It checks the

extrovert mind and makes it introvert which is indispensable to gain *jñāna*. The word '*bhrātrvya*' means both an enemy or a nephew. Enemies are hostile by their nature. In that case, the adjective '*dviṣataḥ*' (hostile ones) will not be needed. Therefore the meaning 'nephew' has to be accepted here. Nephews can be friendly or hostile. Since '*dviṣataḥ*' adjective is there, we have to take them as hostile nephews. *Viṣayāsakti* is natural to *indriyas* because they are designed to be extrovert by *Īśvara*. That is described here as the attachments are born with the *indriyas* by describing them as hostile nephews. In other words *viṣayāsakti* is on account of *indriyas*. The openings (*chidra*) in the head occupied by *indriyas* are seven in number. Therefore, they are counted as seven. It does not mean that *indriyas* are only seven. Attachment to the sense-objects *viṣayāsakti* operates through *indriyas*. Therefore they are called hostile nephews. Attachment is natural whereas special effort is required to overcome it. Because of attachment the mind becomes extrovert which is a prominent obstruction in gaining *Brahmajñāna*. Without attachment the *indriyas* are like friendly nephews conducive in the spiritual pursuits.

Contextually another feature of *prāṇa* is told by which *upāsanā* the

inexhaustible food is gained (*Br.U.2-2-2*).

सेवन्तेऽक्षिस्थितं प्राणं सप्त रुद्रादिदेवताः ।
अक्षीणा इत्युपास्ते यः सोऽन्नमक्षयमश्नुते ॥७५॥

सप्त - seven रुद्रादिदेवताः - deities such as *Rudra*, etc. अक्षिस्थितं प्राणं - the *prāṇa* abiding in the eyes सेवन्ते - serve यः - the *upāsaka* अक्षीणाः इति उपास्ते - who does *upāsanā* with the understanding that those deities are imperishable सः - he अक्षयम् - inexhaustible अन्नम् - food (or desired objects) अश्नुते - gains – (75)

75. Seven deities such as *Rudra*, etc., serve the *prāṇa* abiding in the eyes. The *upāsaka* who does the *upāsanā* of those deities with the understanding that those deities are imperishable gains inexhaustible food (or desired objects).

The seven deities referred to are *Rudra*, *Parjanya*, the sun, the fire, *Indra*, the earth and heaven. They attend upon the *prāṇa* present in the eyes through pink lines in the eye, the water present in the eye, the pupil, the dark portion of the eye, its white portion and both eye-lids the lower and upper, respectively. Thus, they serve the *prāṇa* present in the eye through its different parts.

The Upaniṣad further (*Br.U.2-2-3*) describes the head as a *camas* (चमस् - vessel wherein *soma* juice is kept) with its opening in the form of mouth below.

Therein is kept the ‘*viśvarūpa yaśa*’ which is nothing but *prāṇa* only. At the outskirts of the head there are seven *ṛṣis*. *Prāṇas* themselves are called *ṛṣis* here. The *prāṇas* abiding in the seven openings of head are the seven *ṛṣis*. The *vāk* (speech) related to those words which unfold Brahman is counted as eighth *ṛṣi*. The others are: ‘*Prāṇas* present in the two ears called *Gautama* and *Bharadvāja*; in the eyes called *Viśvāmitra* and *Jamadagni*, in the nostrils called *Vasiṣṭha* and *Kaśyapa*, in the tongue *Atri* with respect to the taste. As told earlier the *vāk* is the eighth one with respect to the organ of speech abiding in the tongue only. The one who does *upāsanā* in this manner becomes the chief of all. This is summarized in the following two verses.

कर्णादिसप्तच्छिद्रेषु

गौतमाद्यृषिनामकाः ।

स्थिताः प्राणा इति ध्यायेद्

वाचं च ब्रह्मवादिनीम् ॥७६॥

कर्णादिसप्तच्छिद्रेषु - in the seven openings beginning with ear, etc. गौतमाद्यृषिनामकाः प्राणाः - the *prāṇa* called *Gautama*, etc., *ṛṣis* स्थिताः - abide इति ध्यायेत् - thus *upāsanā* has to be done ब्रह्मवादिनीम् वाचं च - and also one should do the *upāsanā* of speech that unfolds Brahman – (76)

76. In the seven openings beginning with ear, etc., the *prāṇas* called Gautam, etc., abide. Thus the *upāsanā* has to be done. One should do the *upāsanā* of speech (*vāk*) that unfolds Brahman also.

The next verse concludes the purport of *śiśubrāhmaṇa* after describing the result of above *upāsanā*.

हिरण्यगर्भरूपेण

सर्वभुक् स्यादुपासकः ।

इति गार्ग्यमतं ब्रह्म ब्राह्मणेऽस्मिन्

प्रपञ्चितम् ॥७७॥

उपासकः - the *upāsaka* who does the *upāsanā* as specified in the earlier verse हिरण्यगर्भरूपेण - in the form of *Hiranyagarbha* सर्वभुक् स्यात् - undergoes the *bhoga* of everything इति - thus अस्मिन् ब्राह्मणे - in this *śiśubrāhmaṇa* गार्ग्यमतम् ब्रह्म - the Brahman believed by Gārgya Bālāki, (i.e. the *prāṇa* as Brahman specified by the first word ‘*satya*’ in the phrase ‘*satyasya-satyam*’) प्रपञ्चितम् - is elaborated – (77)

77. The *upāsaka* who does the *upāsanā* as specified in the earlier verse undergoes the *bhoga* of everything in the form of *Hiranyagarbha*. Thus in this *śiśubrāhmaṇa* the Brahman believed by Gārgya Bālāki, (i.e. the *prāṇa* as Brahman specified by the first word ‘*satya*’ in the phrase ‘*satyasya-satyam*’)

is elaborated.

In the *śruti*, the result of this *upāsanā* is described as the *upāsaka* eats everything, and everything becomes his food. This is not possible in its primary sense. In no *upādhi* can one eat everything. Everything also can never become one's food. Both are impossible. Therefore, it has to be taken as the *upāsaka* by his identification with *Hiranyagarbha* who is macrocosmic *prāṇa* in nature becomes the *bhoktā* of everything, and everything becomes his *bhogyā*. Thus, it means that *upāsaka* gains the identity with Brahman, i.e. *Hiranyagarbha*. The Brahman known by Gārgya Bālāki was up to this level only. It was not the *nirupādhi* Brahman. Thus, *śiśubrāhmaṇa* describes Brahman that was known by Gārgya Bālāki.

DESCRIPTION OF MŪRTA AND AMŪRTA

The *śruti* says: ‘*Mūrta* and *amūrta* are the only two forms of Brahman, (i.e. appear to be there in the form of *jagat* during the period of ignorance). *Mūrta* is mortal (*martya*), limited (*sthita*) and directly perceptible (*sat*) whereas *amūrta* is immortal (*amṛta*), pervasive (*yat*) and remote (*tyat*)’ (*Br.U.2-3-1*).

The third *brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* chapter two is ‘*mūrtā-*

mūrta’ *brāhmaṇa* wherein two forms of Brahman are elaborated. Then by negating everything ‘the *satya* of the *satya*’ is ascertained.

This topic begins now with its connection to the earlier two *brāhmaṇas*.

गार्ग्योक्तं ब्रह्म विस्तृत्य तन्निरासाय सांप्रतम् ।
तृतीयब्राह्मणे प्राह राज्ञोक्तं ब्रह्म विस्तृतम् ॥७८॥

गार्ग्योक्तं ब्रह्म - the Brahman described by Gārgya Bālāki विस्तृत्य - having told तन्निरासाय - to refute it (as not Brahman) सांप्रतम् - now तृतीयब्राह्मणे - in the third *brāhmaṇa* राज्ञोक्तम् ब्रह्म - the (actual) Brahman taught by the king Ajātaśatru विस्तृतम् प्राह - is told elaborately – (78)

78. Having told the Brahman described by Gārgya Bālāki to refute it (as not Brahman) now in the third *brāhmaṇa*, the (actual) Brahman taught by the king Ajātaśatru is told elaborately.

प्रथमब्राह्मणे राजा ब्रह्म यद्यप्यशेषतः ।
उवाचाथापि सत्यस्य सत्यता नैव विस्तृता ॥७९॥

यदि अपि - though प्रथम-ब्राह्मणे - in the first *brāhmaṇa* राजा - the king अशेषतः - completely ब्रह्म उवाच - taught Brahman अथ अपि - even then सत्यस्य सत्यता - that itself is the truth of the truth, (i.e. its secret name Upaniṣad) न एव विस्तृता - was not at all elaborated – (79)

79. Though the king taught Brahman completely in the first *brāhmaṇa* even then that itself is the truth of the truth, (i.e. its secret name Upaniṣad) was not at all elaborated.

सत्यस्यसत्यत्वविस्तारमुखेन प्रतिपाद्यते ।
निष्प्रपञ्चब्रह्मतत्त्वं तृतीयब्राह्मणे स्फुटम् ॥८०॥

सत्यस्यसत्यत्वविस्तारमुखेन - through the means of elaborating ‘*satya* of the *satya*’ तृतीयब्राह्मणे - in the third *brāhmaṇa* निष्प्रपञ्चब्रह्मतत्त्वं - the principle of Brahman free from *prapañca* (Creation) स्फुटम् - very clearly प्रतिपाद्यते - is explained – (80)

80. Through the means of elaborating ‘*satya* of the *satya*’, in this third *brāhmaṇa* the principle of Brahman free from *prapañca* (Creation) is explained very clearly.

What was taught earlier is elaborated further to establish the secret name (*rahasyam nāma*) by explaining ‘*satyasya satyam*’.

द्वे एव ब्रह्मणो रूपे प्रपञ्चत्वमुपागते ।
मूर्तामूर्तात्मके याभ्यामरूपं ब्रह्म रूप्यते ॥८१॥

मूर्तामूर्तात्मके - having the nature of *mūrta* (with form) and *amūrta* (formless) द्वे एव - only two ब्रह्मणः रूपे - forms of Brahman प्रपञ्चत्वम् उपागते - appear to have become the *jagat* (or *saṃsāra* available in terms of *vyavahāra*) याभ्यां - by the

means of which अरूपं - attributeless ब्रह्म - Brahman रूप्यते - is taught (made known) –(81)

81. Only two forms of Brahman having the nature of *mūrta* (with form, shape) and *amūrta* (formless) appear to have become the *jagat* (or *samsāra* available in terms of *vyavahāra*) by the means of which the attributeless Brahman is taught (made known).

Brahman is formless (*arūpa*) and attributeless in reality. And yet, it is taught with the help of forms falsely projected by *māyā* which are experienced by all in the realm of ignorance. These superimposed (*adhyasta*) forms serve as the means to know directly their *adhiṣṭhāna* (basis). This method needs to be adopted because of the imperceptible (*atīndriya*) nature of Brahman. The two forms (*dve rūpe Brahmanah*) of Brahman has three meanings. The first is the entities with forms and without forms. All these three will be explained one by one.

The next verse gives the second and third category of two forms of Brahman.

मूर्तामूर्तप्रपञ्चश्च वासना चेति वा द्वयम् ।
सवासनमिदं रूपमनिदं चेति वा द्वयम् ॥८२॥

मूर्तामूर्तप्रपञ्चश्च - the *prapañca* with forms and without it (as one category)

वासना च - and *vāsanā* (of *prapañca*) (as another category) इति वा द्वयम् - or these two (as the other two forms of Brahman) (Or) सवासनं - with *vāsanās* इदम् रूपम् - the category of ‘this’ (*idam*) अनिदं च - and (with *vāsanās*) the other category of ‘not this’, (i.e. sentient) इति वा द्वयम् - or these two (are considered as still another two forms of Brahman)–(82)

82. Or both the *prapañca* with and without forms together (as one category) and *vāsanā* (of *prapañca*) (as another category) (are considered as the other two forms of Brahman). (Or) both the category of ‘this’ (*idam*, i.e. inert) (with *vāsanās*) and the other category of ‘not this’, (i.e. sentient) (with *vāsanās*) (are considered as still another two forms of Brahman).

The two forms of Brahman are explained in three different ways. (i) With form (*mūrta*) and without form (*amūrta*) (referring to earth, water and fire as *mūrta*, and air besides space as *amūrta* - vs.83). (ii) *Prapañca* and *vāsanā* (iii) Both the inert entities and sentient ones with *vāsanās*. Here to reveal the principle of Brahman that is being ascertained, all *upādhis* that are superimposed on it will have to be negated as ‘*neti neti*’ (none of these that are superimposed). Therefore all possible *upādhis* will have to be

included in the category of two forms that are ascribed to Brahman erroneously. If *amūrta* are considered as unmanifest (*avyakta*) *vāsanās* (subtle impressions), the *mūrta* will automatically mean the manifest (*vyakta*) *prapañca*. It is well-known that the *vāsanās* are unmanifest. The *bhāṣya* points out that by repeating ‘*neti neti*’ whatever (*anātmā*) that is experienced is negated without any exception as not the nature of Brahman to reveal *ātmā*/Brahman. Therefore the inclusion of *vāsanās* is quite appropriate. Though the *śruti* has commented on *mūrta* and *amūrta* as elements with and without forms the other two meanings are also acceptable because they are quite relevant.

The next three verses explain the words *mūrta* and *amūrta* in accordance with the *śruti*.

संनिवेशो नेत्रदृश्यो यस्य तन्मूर्तमुच्यते ।
क्षित्यम्बुअग्नित्रयं मूर्तममूर्तमितरद् द्वयम् ॥८३॥

यस्य - the one whose संनिवेशः - configuration (assemblage of parts) नेत्रदृश्यः - which can be seen by the eyes तत् - that entity मूर्तम् उच्यते - is called *mūrta* क्षिति अम्बु अग्नित्रयं - the trio of earth, water and the fire मूर्तम् - is called *mūrta* इतरत् द्वयम् - the other two elements (air, space) अमूर्तम् - are called *amūrta* – (83)

83. The entity whose configuration (assemblage of parts forming a figure) which can be seen by the eyes is called *mūrta*. The trio of earth, water and the fire is called *mūrta* whereas the other two elements (air, space) are called *amūrta*.

मूर्तं मर्त्यं शीघ्रनाशात् परिच्छेदात् स्थितं तथा ।
प्रत्यक्षत्वात् सदित्युक्तममूर्ते तु विपर्ययः ॥८४॥

मूर्तं - the *mūrta* शीघ्रनाशात् - because of its quick destruction मर्त्यं - is called *martya* (mortal) परिच्छेदात् - and because of its limitations स्थितं - is called *sthitam* (limited) तथा - so also प्रत्यक्षत्वात् - because of its perceptibility (by the sense-organs) सत् इति उक्तम् - it is called *sat* (perceived by *indriyas*) अमूर्ते तु - whereas in the case of *amūrta* विपर्ययः - reverse features are found – (84)

84. *Mūrta* is called *martya* (mortal), *sthita* (limited) and *sat* entity (perceived by *indriyas*) because of its quick destruction, limitations and perceptibility (by the sense-organs) respectively whereas in the case of *amūrta* the reverse features are found.

तन्नश्यति विलम्बेनेत्यमृतं

व्याप्तिमत्त्वतः ।

यत् परोक्षमतस्त्यत् स्यान्मूर्तामूर्तात्मकं
जगत् ॥८५॥

तत् - *amūrta* विलम्बेन - with delay नश्यति - gets destroyed इति अमृतं -

therefore it is called *amṛta* (immortal) व्याप्तिमत्त्वतः - because of being pervasive it is called *yat* (opposed to *sthita*) यत् परोक्षम् अतः त्यत् - because it is remote (*parokṣa*) (perceptibly not available) therefore it is called *tyat* (that one) (एवं - thus) जगत् - the *jagat* मूर्तामूर्तात्मकं स्यात् - is both *mūrta* and *amūrta* – (85)

85. *Amūrta* is called *amṛta* (immortal) because it gets destroyed with delay; it is *yat* (opposed to *sthita*) because of its pervasiveness and it is *tyat* (that one) because it is remote. Thus, the *jagat* is both *mūrta* and *amūrta*. (This itself is described as the form of Brahman).

‘*Sanniveśa*’ means an assemblage of parts forming a shapely figure. Generally, it is called *śarīra* (body). Earth, water and fire are seen. Their parts are also seen clearly. Therefore, they are called *mūrta* (with form). The space and air are invisible being formless. Their parts are not seen. Therefore, they are distinct from the rest of the three elements. Though the air may have parts, but they cannot be seen. The entire *jagat* is destructible. The figures of *mūrta* get destroyed quickly. Therefore they are called *martya*. The earth may continue to be there but its specific shapes such as houses, pots, etc., get destroyed quickly. The rivers, lakes get dried up. The flames

do subside. But the space and air have no shapes and therefore not seen being destroyed though they have destruction in *pralaya*.

‘*Sthita*’ means that which has stopped. The moving entities only can stop. Further the movement is possible only for the limited entities and not for that which is limitless. Therefore, ‘*sthitam*’ as described here means ‘limited’. The entity that exists (is) and can be perceived is generally called *sat* (is) because there cannot be any doubt about it whether ‘it is’ or ‘it is not’. Therefore *mūrta* is *sat*. *Amūrta* because of having opposed features in contrast to *mūrta* is *amartya* (relatively immortal) *yat* (*vyāpī*), *tyat* (*parokṣa*). What is referred to by the *śruti* as *amartya* is only relative indestructibility. Therefore it is explained as the entity that gets destroyed with delay (*vilambena naśyati*).

So far, the *śruti* described *mūrta* and *amūrta* with their characteristic features. Then their *rasa* or *sāra* (essence) in the sense of effect (*kārya*) at both *ādhidaivika* (total) and *ādhyātmika* (individual) levels are given. The *rasa* of *mūrta* in the *prapañca* is the solar orb (*sūrya-maṇḍala*) sun and that of *amūrta* is that aspect of *Hiraṇyagarbha* available in the *sūrya-maṇḍala* as the *puruṣa* identified with its subtle body.

Like the *mūrta* and *amūrta* in the macrocosm they are present in each body also. In the body, the vital air (*prāṇa*) and the empty space therein is the *amūrta* at the individual level. The remaining physical body born of five elements is the *mūrta*. In *adhyātma* (microcosm, individual level) the *rasa* (*kārya*) of *mūrta* is the eye and that of *amūrta* is the *puruṣa* (*jīva* identified with the *liṅga-śarīra*) abiding in the right eye (*Br.U.2-3-2* to 5). This is suggested in the next three verses.

अध्यात्ममधिदैवं च द्विधा सत्यं व्यवस्थितम् ।
प्रसिद्धमुभयत्रापि स्थूलसूक्ष्मवपुर्द्वयम् ॥८६॥

सत्यं - the (relative) *satya* (true entity) अध्यात्मं - *adhyātma* (individual *vyāṣṭi*/microcosmic body) अधिदैवं च - and the *adhidaiva* (presided over by *samaṣṭi*/macrocosm) द्विधा व्यवस्थितम् - happens to be twofold उभयत्र अपि - from the standpoint of both cases स्थूलसूक्ष्मवपुर्द्वयम् - both gross and subtle bodies प्रसिद्धम् - are well-known, (i.e. accepted by the *śruti*) – (86)

86. The (relative) *satya* (true entity) happens to be twofold: *adhyātma* (in the individual *vyāṣṭi*/microcosmic body) and the *adhidaiva* (in the body presided over by *samaṣṭi*/macrocosm). From the standpoint of both cases, both gross and subtle bodies are well-known, (i.e. accepted by the *śruti*).

स्थूलसारतया ज्ञेये चक्षुरादित्यमण्डले ।
मूर्तमर्त्यपरिच्छिन्नप्रत्यक्षत्वविशेषिते ॥८७॥

चक्षुरादित्यमण्डले - the eye and the solar orb (*āditya-maṇḍala*) स्थूलसारतया - as the *sāra* (effect, *kārya*) of gross (*mūrta*) ज्ञेये - should be understood मूर्तमर्त्यपरिच्छिन्न-प्रत्यक्षत्वविशेषिते - because they are characterised by the features of being *mūrta* (with form), *martya* (mortal), *paricchinna* (limited) and *pratyakṣa* (perceptible) – (87)

87. The eye and the solar orb (*āditya-maṇḍala*) should be understood as the *sāra* (*kārya*, effect) of gross (*mūrta*) because they are characterized by the features of being *mūrta* (with form), *martya* (mortal), *paricchinna* (limited) and *pratyakṣa* (perceptible).

अमूर्तामृतसंव्याप्तपरोक्षत्वैस्तु संयुतम् ।
उभयत्र स्थितं लिङ्गममूर्तरस उच्यते ॥८८॥

उभयत्र - in both *adhyātma* and *adhidaiva* स्थितं लिङ्गम् - subtle body that abides in them अमूर्तरसः - the effect (*kārya*) of *amūrta* उच्यते - is said to be तु - and अमूर्त-अमृत-संव्याप्त-परोक्षत्वैः - by the features of being *amūrta* (formless), (relatively) immortal, pervasive (*yat*) and remote (*tyat*) संयुतम् - is endowed with – (88)

88. In both *adhyātma* and *adhidaiva* entities, the subtle body that

abides in them is said to be the effect (*kārya*) of *amūrta* (formless) and (both the subtle bodies) have the features of being *amūrta* (formless), relatively immortal (*amṛta*), pervasive (*yāt*) and remote (*tyāt*).

‘*Satya*’ means the *kārya prapañca* (empirical *jagat*) which has *vyāvahārika* (transactional) reality. It contains both *sat* (earth, water and fire) and *tyāt* (air, space) and thus also it is called *satya* by combining *sat* and *tyāt*. It is available in both *adhyātma* (*vyāṣṭi*) and *adhidaiva* (*samaṣṭi*). *Vyāṣṭi* and *samaṣṭi* are relative positions. In fact, *vyāṣṭi* (individual) is included in the *samaṣṭi* (total) whereas *samaṣṭi* is not at all independent of *vyāṣṭi*. The *sāra* (*kārya*) of gross *adhyātma* is the eye whereas that of gross *adhidaiva* is *ādityamaṇḍala*. The *sāra* of subtle *adhyātma* is subtle body and that of subtle *adhidaiva* is *Hiraṇyagarbha*. Though the subtle body (*liṅga-śarīra*) is made of five subtle elements and not made of only two elements (air and space), even then because of its nature as *amūrta* (formless), etc., the word *tyāt* becomes applicable to it. The subtle body is considered to be *amṛta* (immortal) because it is indestructible till the gaining of *Brahmajñāna*. Even the *vyāṣṭi* subtle body is called *samvyāpta* (pervasive, *yāt*) because it pervades the gross *vyāṣṭi*. The subtle body is called *parokṣa* (*tyāt*, remote) because it is *sākṣibhāsyā* (made

known only by *sākṣī*) and not perceived by the sense-organs. Thus, the *mūrta* and *amūrta* are described.

The utility of above description is told in the next verse.

सारासारयुते रूपे मूर्तामूर्ते उदीरिते ।

अरूपं ब्रह्मरूपाभ्यां व्यवहारे निरूप्यते ॥८९॥

मूर्तामूर्तरूपे - *mūrta* and *amūrta* (entities with forms and formless) सारासारयुते उदीरिते - endowed with *sāra* (*kārya*, effect) and *asāra* (without *kārya*) were told अरूपम् - formless ब्रह्म - Brahman व्यवहारे - in the *vyavahāra* such as teaching रूपाभ्याम् - by these two forms निरूप्यते - is ascertained – (89)

89. *Mūrta* and *amūrta* (entities with forms and formless) endowed with *sāra* (*kārya*, effect) and *asāra* (without *kārya*) were told. By these two forms, the formless, (i.e. *nirupādhika*) Brahman is ascertained in the *vyavahāra* such as teaching.

Brahman is formless, (i.e. *upādhiless*). It cannot be ascertained without reference to its *upādhis*. Therefore, for its ascertainment the *upādhis* of *prapañca* at *vyāṣṭi* and *samaṣṭi* levels were described by distinguishing them in the categories of *mūrta* and *amūrta*. The *sāra* (*kārya*) of *mūrta* was described as *āditya* (sun). Thereby all *mūrta* other than *āditya*

becomes *asāra* (not *sāra*). Or the *amūrta* can be *sāra* (essence) because of being more durable and *mūrta* being quickly destructible can be considered as *asāra* (pithless). Under any circumstances, Brahman can be known only through the means of *upādhis*.

THE SECOND EXPLANATION OF 'MŪRTA AND AMŪRTA'

Another explanation of *mūrta* and *amūrta* was suggested in the verse 82. That is being explained now.

मूर्तामूर्ते ब्रह्मरूपे इति पक्षो निरूपितः ।
प्रपञ्चतद्वासने द्वे रूपे इत्येष वर्ण्यते ॥९०॥

मूर्तामूर्ते - *mūrta* and *amūrta* ब्रह्मरूपे - (are) the two forms of Brahman इति पक्षः - this standpoint निरूपितः - was described प्रपञ्चतद्वासने - the *jagat* and its *vāsanās* द्वे रूपे - are the two forms of Brahman इति एषः (पक्षः) - this standpoint वर्ण्यते - is being elaborated - (90)

90. The standpoint that *mūrta* (earth, water, fire) and *amūrta* (air, space) (are) the two forms of Brahman was described. The standpoint that the *prapañca* (*jagat* consisting of five elements with both *mūrta* and *amūrta* together) and its *vāsanās* are the two forms of Brahman is being elaborated.

The space and air may not be visible but their existence is very clearly known. Therefore, in the second

explanation both of them also are included in the category of *mūrta* consisting of earth, water and the fire. But the *vāsanā* can be inferred only from its effect. It can never be known directly. Therefore, in this case the *vāsanās* are categorized as *amūrta*. This standpoint was suggested as an alternative view. Now it is explained in accordance with the *śruti*.

The nature of being full of varieties of *vāsanās* of *liṅga-śarīra* (subtle body) characterized by the inner instrument (*antaḥkaraṇa*) is described by the *śruti* in the following manner. 'The nature of *puruṣa* (*liṅga-śarīra*) is like the cloth dyed with turmeric or the wool of white or grey sheep or deep red insect called *indragopa* or flames of fire or white lotus or like the bright and brilliant flash of lightning spreading light everywhere (to signify the *sūkṣma-śarīra* of *Hiraṇyagarbha*). The *upāsanā* of *Hiraṇyagarbha*, (the deity of macrocosmic subtle bodies) in this way gives plenty of wealth (*śrī*) to the *upāsaka* as a secondary result' (*Br. U.2-3-6*). This is indicated now.

प्रपञ्चो नाम पूर्वोक्तं

मूर्तामूर्तद्वयं भवेत् ।

तद्वासना विचित्राः स्युरनन्ता

लिङ्गमाश्रिताः ॥९१॥

पूर्वोक्तं - the earlier described

entity प्रपञ्चः नाम - called *prapañca* (*jagat*) मूर्तामूर्तद्वयं - the pair of *mūrta* (earth, water, fire) and *amūrta* (air, space) भवेत् - is तद्वसन - the *vāsanās* of *prapañca* विचित्राः - variegated अनन्ताः - endless लिङ्गम् आश्रिताः स्युः - are centred in the *liṅga-śarīra* (subtle body)–(91)

91. The earlier described entity called *prapañca* (*jagat*) is the pair of *mūrta* (earth, water, fire) and *amūrta* (air, space). The variegated endless *vāsanās* of *prapañca* are centred in the *liṅga-śarīra* (subtle body).

अनेकवासनाचित्रं तल्लिङ्गं पटभित्तिवत् ।
मायेन्द्रजालसदृशं व्यामोहास्पदमात्मनः ॥९२॥

तत् लिङ्गम् - that *liṅga-śarīra* पटभित्तिवत् - is like a canvas or a wall on which pictures are painted अनेकवासनाचित्रं - on it innumerable pictures are depicted by *vāsanās* मायेन्द्रजालसदृशं - (that *liṅga-śarīra*) is similar to *māyā* and magic आत्मनः व्यामोहास्पदम् - it is an abode of erroneous notions about *ātmā* (on account of *ātmānātmādhyāsa*)–(92)

92. That *liṅga-śarīra* is like a canvas or a wall on which pictures are painted. On it (*liṅga-śarīra*) innumerable pictures are depicted by *vāsanās*. That (*liṅga-śarīra*) is similar to *māyā* and magic. It is an abode of erroneous notions about *ātmā* (on account of *ātmānātmādhyāsa*).

According to this interpretation, the *mūrta* comprises the entire *prapañca* (denoted by earlier *mūrta* and *amūrta* consisting of five elements) and *amūrta* is described as the *vāsanās* of *prapañca*. Generally, the *vāsanās* are said to abide in the *antaḥkaraṇa* only, but the mind, *buddhi*, *indriyas* also become their abodes. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa also has told that the *indriyas*, *mana* and *buddhi* are the resorts of desires (*B.G.* 3-40). Desires can be present where *vāsanās* abide. *Vāsanās* are unpredictable and variegated. Therefore they are described as ‘*vicitra*’ (diversified). They depict the pictures of desires, anger, greed, etc., on the canvas of *liṅga-śarīra*. Many a times more than one *vāsanā* function together. Their modus operandi cannot be understood. That is why they are compared with *māyā* and magic. *Māyā* corresponds to the causal state of *vāsanās* whereas magic shows its state of *kārya* (effect). The *vyāmohā* (erroneous notions) about *ātmā* is on account of *liṅga-śarīra* which itself is the storehouse of *vāsanās*. That is why in the deep sleep we have no erroneous notions about *ātmā*. Because of such *liṅga-śarīra* which projects wrong notions about oneself, the *jīva* wanders in the cycles of transmigration.

By mistaking the *liṅga-śarīra* to be *ātmā*, different schools of thought

about the nature of *ātmā* have emerged. If *liṅga-śarīra* gets totally centred in *ātmā* to the total exclusion of anything else, it can know non-dual *sat cit ānanda*. This fact is shown now.

एतावन्मात्र आत्मेति तत्र भ्रान्ता निरागमाः ।

बौद्धकाणादसांख्याद्यास्तर्कमात्रोपजीविनः ॥९३॥

बौद्धकाणादसांख्याद्याः - *bauddha*, *vaiśeṣika*, *sāṅkhya*, etc. तर्कमात्रोपजीविनः - who merely rely on *tarka* (reasoning) निरागमाः - ignorant of Vedic teaching तत्र - about the real nature of *ātmā* 'एतावत् मात्रः आत्मा' - '*ātmā* is only this much' इति भ्रान्ताः - thus they are deluded – (93)

93. As for the real nature of *ātmā* the *bauddha*, *vaiśeṣika*, *sāṅkhya*, etc., who merely rely on *tarka* (reasoning) and are ignorant of Vedic teaching are deluded by the erroneous concept that '*ātmā* is only this much' (limited in nature).

The knowledge of *ātmā* can be gained only through the *pramāṇa* of Vedas in the *buddhi* which has essential *sāmagrīs* (pre-requisites). It cannot be the object of independent reasoning. Those who consider it to be so conclude *ātmā* to be *liṅga-śarīra* with different features as thought of by them. *Liṅga-śarīra* is manifold. Therefore, they describe it differently. 'Only this much' refers to their concept of *liṅga-śarīra*.

Bauddhas are atheist because they do not accept the Vedas and *Vaiśeṣika*, *sāṅkhyas* are so because they totally rely on the reasoning. Reasoning in accordance with the *śruti* is acceptable but *ātmajñāna* cannot be gained by mere reasoning independent of *śruti*.

First of all the concept of *bauddhas* is shown.

एकैकां वासनां तत्र

प्रतिक्षणविनश्वरीम् ।

आहुः क्षणिकमात्मानं

बौद्धा विज्ञानवादिनः ॥९४॥

तत्र - among those schools of thought विज्ञानवादिनः बौद्धाः - the *vijñānavādī bauddhas* प्रतिक्षणविनश्वरीम् - every moment destructible एकैकां वासनां - each and every *vāsanā*, (i.e. *buddhi-vṛtti* or *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) क्षणिकं आत्मानं आहुः - say as *kṣaṇika* (momentary) *ātmā* – (94)

94. Among those schools of thought the *vijñānavādī bauddhas* say that each and every *vāsanā*, (i.e. *buddhi-vṛtti* or *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) which is destructible moment by moment is the *kṣaṇika* (momentary) *ātmā*.

Nihilists (*śūnyavādī*) does not attempt to ascertain *ātmā*. *Vijñānavādī* (*yogācāra*) declares that *kṣaṇika vijñāna* (momentary *vṛttis* of *buddhi*) as the meaning of the word *ātmā*. '*Kṣaṇika*'

means that which gets destroyed every moment. *Naiyāyika* (*Vaiśeṣika*) accepts birth in one moment, the sustenance (*sthiti*) in the next moment, and the destruction in the third moment. *Bauddhas* say that the destruction takes place at the very moment of its birth. This is impossible and not given to any reasoning. It is a wonder that they accept such a view.

The gloss by Ānandagiri comments on the phrase ‘*etāvanmātram*’ (‘*ātmā* is only this much’) in the context of *Kṣaṇika Vijñānavādīs* as follows. ‘They call the *buddhi* coupled with the *vṛtti* of *ahaṃkāra* as *ātmā*. *Buddhi* gets destroyed every moment without the need of any cause of destruction. Without waiting for a destructible cause it gets destroyed the moment it is born. The *buddhi* is sullied with *rāga* (attachment), etc. Other than *buddhi*, there is no other entity everlasting or transient which can be *ātmā*. They call the continuous flow of *kṣaṇika vijñāna* endowed with past *saṃskāras* (impressions)/*vāsanās* to be *ātmā*. *Bauddhas* use the phrase ‘*kṣaṇika vijñāna*’ or ‘*kṣaṇika buddhi*’ very often. Therefore, the word ‘*vāsanā*’ used in this verse refers to *kṣaṇikavijñāna*. From the Vedāntic standpoint, the word *vāsanā* as used here can be considered as *buddhi-vṛtti*. The *śruti* here has described the differences in the *liṅga-śarīra* in terms

of *vāsanās* which hints that *bauddhas* mistake the varieties of *vāsanās* experienced as *ātmā*. Under any circumstances, not knowing the real nature of *ātmā* they are deluded by considering the *liṅga-śarīra* as *ātmā*.

Vaiśeṣika (*Kaṇāda*), *Naiyāyika*, etc., called *tārkikas* justify their concept of *ātmā* based on the description of *liṅga-śarīra* as given here in this *śruti*. This is told now.

आत्मनो द्रव्यभूतस्य गुणा बुद्ध्यादयो नव ।
वासनात्वेन वेदोक्ता इति वैशेषिकादयः ॥१५॥

द्रव्यभूतस्य आत्मनः - of *ātmā* in the form of a *dravya* (an entity endowed with *guṇas*/attributes) बुद्ध्यादयः - *buddhi* (*jñāna*), etc. नव गुणाः - nine *guṇas* (attributes) वासनात्वेन - in the form of *vāsanās* वेदोक्ताः - are described in the Upaniṣad (*Br. U. 2-3-6*) इति - thus वैशेषिकादयः - *Vaiśeṣikas*, etc., (*Naiyāyikas*) consider—(95)

95. *Buddhi* (*jñāna*, knowledge), etc., the nine *guṇas* (attributes) of *ātmā* in the form of a *dravya* (an entity endowed with *guṇas*/attributes) are described in the Upaniṣad (*Br. U. 2-3-6*). Thus, *Vaiśeṣikas*, etc., (*Naiyāyikas*) consider.

According to them an entity endowed with *guṇas* is called a *dravya* (thing). They say that in the *dravya*

called *ātmā* the *buddhi* (*jñāna*, knowledge), *sukha* (joy), *duḥkha* (sorrow), *icchā* (desire), *dveṣa* (hatred), *prayatna* (effort), *dharma* (*puṇya*), *adharma* (*pāpa*) and *saṃskāra* (*vāsanās*) are the nine exclusive attributes (*guṇas*). These *guṇas* are not in the other *dravyas*. In addition according to them, the five *guṇas* such as *saṅkhyā*, *parimāṇa*, *prthaktva*, *saṃyoga* and *viyoga* are also there in *ātmā*, but they are not exclusive. These five abide in others also. *Vaiśeṣikas* think that their nine *guṇas* such as *buddhi*, etc., only are told in the *śruti* under discussion. This shows their total reliance on *tarka* (reasoning). It also points out what is referred to as *liṅga-śarīra* by the *śruti* is considered by them to be *ātmā*.

How the followers of *Sāṅkhya* school of thought interpret the said *śruti* is shown in the next verse.

त्रिगुणं यत् प्रधानं तत् पुरुषार्थेन हेतुना ।
प्रवर्तते वासनात्वक्लृप्तिस्तत्रेति कापिलाः ॥१६॥

यत् त्रिगुणं प्रधानं - whatever *pradhāna* (*prakṛti*) constituted of three *guṇas* is there तत् - that पुरुषार्थेन हेतुना - to accomplish the *puruṣārtha* (*bhoga* and *apavarga/mokṣa*) of *puruṣa* (*cetana/ātmā*) प्रवर्तते - engages तत्र - in that *pradhāna* (*prakṛti*) वासनात्वक्लृप्तिः - designs of *vāsanās* are there इति कापिलाः -

so the followers of Kapila (*Sāṅkhyas*) consider—(96)

96. The *pradhāna* (*prakṛti*) constituted of three *guṇas* engages itself to accomplish the *puruṣārtha* (*bhoga* and *apavarga/mokṣa*) of *puruṣa* (*cetana/ātmā*). The designs of *vāsanās* are there in that *pradhāna* (*prakṛti*). The followers of Kapila (*Sāṅkhyas*) consider so.

According to *Sāṅkhya*, the inert *prakṛti* (*pradhāna*) puts efforts for the *bhoga* and *mokṣa* of *ātmā*. Though, they do not consider that *antaḥkaraṇa* itself is *ātmā*, they accept the *prakṛti* that works for the *bhoga* and *mokṣa* (*apavarga*) to be *satya*, independent and *triguṇātmikā*. The description of *puruṣa* (*liṅga-śarīra*) in the *śruti* (*Br. U. 2-3-6*) is mistaken by *sāṅkhya* as that of *prakṛti*.

The wrong notions about the current *śruti* was mentioned in the earlier four verses. The defects of other schools of thought are thoroughly discussed and answered in the second chapter of *Brahmasūtra*. *Bhāṣyakāra* simply mentions here these views and remarks that it is not correct to imagine what is not told in the *śruti* based on mere reasoning. Therefore, without indulging in the discussion about them, the text proceeds to show the purport of this *śruti* statement.

अनन्तकल्पोपचिता अनन्ता एव वासनाः ।
उदाहरणमात्रं तु दृष्टान्तैरिह वर्ण्यते ॥९७॥

अनन्तकल्पोपचिताः - accumulated in endless *kalpas* (a day of *Brahmā* or 1000 *yugas* with four of them put together as one *yuga*) वासनाः - *vāsanās* अनन्ताः एव - are certainly endless तु - but इह - in the Upaniṣad (*Br.U.2-3-6*) दृष्टान्तैः - by illustrations उदाहरणमात्रं वर्ण्यते - only a few samples of *vāsanās* are cited – (97)

97. *Vāsanās* accumulated in the endless *kalpas* (a day of *Brahmā* or 1000 *yugas* with four of them put together as one *yuga*) are certainly endless. But in the Upaniṣad (*Br.U.2-3-6*) only a few samples of *vāsanās* are cited.

हारिद्रं वसनं यद्वत् संसर्गात्
पीततां व्रजेत् ।
तद्वन्नार्यादिसंसर्गात् लिङ्गं
रागादिमद् भवेत् ॥९८॥

यद्वत् - just as हारिद्रं वसनं - white cloth dyed with turmeric संसर्गात् पीततां व्रजेत् - becomes yellow by association तद्वत् - similarly लिङ्गम् - *liṅga-śarīra* नार्यादिसंसर्गात् - because of friendship with women, etc. रागादिमद् भवेत् - becomes full of attachment, etc. – (98)

98. Just as the white cloth dyed with turmeric becomes yellow by association, similarly the *liṅga-śarīra* becomes full of attachment, etc.,

because of friendship with women, etc., (i.e. because of *viṣayabhoga*).

Vāsanās are accumulated by the *jīva* in its endless births. These impressions in the *buddhi* or *antaḥkaraṇa* never get destroyed on their own irrespective of whether they are active or dormant. It is impossible to describe all *vāsanās*. Therefore, Upaniṣad describes only some of them as a sample which can give an idea about the others. *Sāṅkhyas* have attempted to categorize all *vāsanās* into three *guṇas*. But to combine innumerable *vāsanās* into three varieties is unnatural. The Upaniṣad also has not attempted in this way. Therefore it is said here that only a few samples are given. The first illustration is dyeing of cloth by the turmeric. This points out that association with women, wealth, etc., produces attachment to them and that is accompanied by desires, anger, greed, etc. *Bhagavān* Kṛṣṇa also has said that *viṣaya-dhyāna* (repeated thinking of sense-objects) generates love for them (*B.G.2-62*). The second illustration is explained in the next verse.

ईषत्पाण्डुश्च परुषः स्यात् स्वतः श्वेतकम्बलः ।
तथेषच्छ्रद्धया युक्तं स्वतो रागादिभागपि ॥९९॥

स्वतः श्वेतकम्बलः - a woollen blanket white by itself (by the contact with the dust, etc.) ईषत् पाण्डुः - a little pale

yellowish परुषः च - and coarse स्यात् - becomes तथा - similarly स्वतः - by itself रागादिभाक् अपि - (the mind) though has attachment, etc. ईषत् श्रद्धया - by little śraddhā युक्तं - becomes endowed with –(99)

99. A woollen blanket white by itself becomes a little pale yellowish and coarse (by the contact with the dust, etc.). Similarly though (the mind) by itself has attachment, etc., becomes endowed with a little śraddhā in śāstras, etc.

A blanket made from the wool of a white sheep is naturally white in colour. But because of its contact with dust, etc., it appears to be pale yellowish and a little coarse in the course of time. But its natural whiteness is not lost. Similarly our mind though has attachment for sense-object, etc., if it has some śraddhā in śāstras appears as if it has changed for good. And yet the initial attachment and the fascination for the sense-objects continue. There is another reading of ‘roṣādibhāg’ (endowed with anger, etc.), in the place of ‘rāgādibhāg’.

The third illustration is explained now.

इन्द्रगोपोऽतिरक्तः स्यात् स्वतः
एव तथा मनः ।
विविक्तदेशस्थस्यापि विषयप्रवर्णं
क्वचित् ॥१००॥

इन्द्रगोपः - the insect called *indragopa* स्वतः एव - by its nature itself अतिरक्तः स्यात् - happens to be deep red तथा - similarly विविक्तदेशस्थस्यापि मनः - the mind of a person though staying in a solitary place क्वचित् - at times विषयप्रवर्णं स्यात् - becomes attached (or addicted) to the sense-objects –(100)

100. The insect called *indragopa* by its nature itself happens to be deep red. Similarly the mind of a person though staying in a solitary place at times becomes attached (or addicted) to the sense-objects (by its nature itself).

Indragopa is an insect found in the monsoon only. Literally the word means the one who is protected by Indra (deity of rain). It is deep red in colour or white. But here the illustration is that of a red one. In the example of white blanket becoming pale yellowish and coarse was on account of external entities such as dust, etc. But here the redness is the natural colour. In the earlier example the mind gets attracted by external provoking but in this case the mind itself is totally attached to *viṣayas* without any external provocation.

The fourth illustration is explained in the next verse.

अग्नेरर्चिर्यथा भास्वद्दहत्यपि तथा क्वचित् ।
वेदशास्त्रविदप्यन्यान् बाधेतेष्वर्थाद्युपद्रवैः ॥१०१॥

यथा - just as भास्वत् - brilliant अग्नेः
अर्चिः - flame of fire दहति अपि - burns also
तथा - similarly क्वचित् - in some cases
वेदशास्त्रवित् अपि - even a person learned in
the Vedas ईर्ष्या आदि उपद्रवैः - on account of
harmful dispositions such as jealousy,
etc. अन्यान् बाधेत - afflicts others – (101)

101. Just as the brilliant flame of
fire burns also, similarly in some cases
even a person learned in the Vedas
afflicts others on account of harmful
dispositions such as jealousy, etc.

The fire illuminates, but it burns
also. Similarly some persons learned in
the scriptures give troubles to others
because of envy, etc., born on account of
the knowledge itself which they have
acquired. Such persons cannot tolerate
others and so afflict them by misuse of
their knowledge, tricks or fallacious
arguments. Such disposition infested
with wrong attitudes is described by the
illustration of fire.

The fifth example shows the
following fact.

सिताम्भोजं यथा सौम्यं सुगन्धि मृदु च स्वतः ।
जन्मनैव तथा चित्तं युक्तं शमदमादिभिः ॥१०२॥

यथा - just as सिताम्भोजं - white lotus
स्वतः - by its nature सौम्यं - is pleasing
सुगन्धि - fragrant मृदु च - and tender तथा -
similarly जन्मना एव - by birth itself चित्तं -
the mind शमदमादिभिः - by *śama, dama,*

etc. युक्तं - is endowed with – (102)

102. Just as a white lotus by its
nature is pleasing, fragrant and tender,
similarly (in some persons) the mind by
birth itself is endowed with *śama, dama,*
etc.

Differences in the newly born
babies is quite evident. Those who
are quiet, pleasing, etc., by birth
itself are compared to the white lotus.
This example shows quite contrary
disposition that was described in the case
of *indragopa* insect.

The sixth illustration is explained
in the next verse.

तीव्रविद्युद्यथात्यन्तं घनध्वान्तापनोदकृत् ।
तथा हिरण्यगर्भस्य सर्वज्ञा वासना भवेत् ॥१०३॥

यथा - just as तीव्रविद्युत् - intense lightning
अत्यन्तं - completely घनध्वान्तापनोदकृत् -
destroys the pitch darkness तथा -
similarly हिरण्यगर्भस्य - of *Hiranyagarbha*
वासनाः - *vāsanās* सर्वज्ञाः भवेत् - are all
knowing in nature – (103)

103. Just as the intense lightning
destroys the pitch darkness completely,
similarly the *vāsanās* of *Hiranyagarbha*
are all knowing in nature.

A lightning may flash for just a
while, but it dispels darkness all around
completely. Similarly the *vāsanās* of
Hiranyagarbha have omniscience. It
contains the knowledge of everything.

That is how *Hiraṇyagarbha* can create everything.

Contextually an *upāsanā* is enjoined based on the illustration of lightning.

तामुपासीन आप्नोति श्रियमत्यन्तमूर्जिताम् ।
रजःसत्त्वतमोयोगाद् वासनानां विचित्रता ॥१०४॥

ताम् - the *vāsanās* of *Hiraṇyagarbha*
उपासीनः - the one who does the *upāsanā*
अत्यन्तम् ऊर्जिताम् - exceedingly great श्रियम्
- wealth आप्नोति - gains रजःसत्त्वतमोयोगात् -
because of connection with *sattvagūṇa*,
rajogūṇa and *tamogūṇa* वासनानां विचित्रता -
there is variegatedness of *vāsanās*
–(104)

104. The *upāsaka* who does the *upāsanā* of such *vāsanās* of *Hiraṇyagarbha* gains exceedingly great wealth. *Vāsanās* are variegated because of their connection with *sattvagūṇa*, *rajogūṇa* and *tamogūṇa*.

Here the *upāsanā* is actually that of *Hiraṇyagarbha* having the features of such *vāsanās* and not of mere omniscient *vāsanās*. *Bhāṣyakāra* gives the meaning of ‘*śrīḥ*’ as fame (*khyāti*). By fame one can gain wealth also. The word ‘*ūrjā*’ in ‘*ūrjita*’ means the latent energy. Thus the result of *upāsanā* described as ‘*ūrjitā śrī*’ can mean potent wealth or fame highly effective in nature. *Vāsanās* become variegated because of their inherent

sattvagūṇa, *rajogūṇa* and *tamogūṇa* in different permutation and combination.

Having concluded the second explanation (vs. 90 to 104) of *mūrta* and *amūrta* hinted in the verse 82, the third meaning of these two forms of Brahman (vs.82, line 2) is going to be elaborated now.

प्रपञ्चवासने ब्रह्मरूपे इत्येतदीरितम् ।
तथेदमनिदंरूपे इति पक्षोऽधुनोच्यते ॥१०५॥

प्रपञ्चवासने - the *prapañca* (consisting of *mūrta* and *amūrta*) and *vāsanās* ब्रह्मरूपे - are the two forms of Brahman इति एतत् - this standpoint ईरितम् - was told तथा - so also इदम् अनिदंरूपे - two forms of Brahman consisting of ‘*idam*’ (this) and ‘*anidam*’ (*cit*, not this) इति पक्षः - this standpoint अधुना उच्यते - now is described –(105)

105. The standpoint that the *prapañca* (consisting of *mūrta* and *amūrta*) and *vāsanās* are the two forms of Brahman was told. So also the standpoint that the two forms of Brahman consisting of ‘*idam*’ (this) and ‘*anidam*’ (*cit*, not this) is described now.

The second interpretation of the two forms of Brahman to be the *prapañca* (manifest *jagat*) and *vāsanās* (*saṃskāras*, past impressions) was described so far (vs. 90 to 104). Now the third interpretation of the two forms of Brahman to be ‘*idam*’ (this) and *anidam*

(not 'this'; *cit* which is 'I') is being described now.

THE THIRD EXPLANATION OF TWO FORMS (*MŪRTA* AND *AMŪRTA*) OF BRAHMAN

सवासनं जगत्सर्वं

तत्रेदं रूपमीरितम् ।

सच्च त्यच्चेति सत्यं तत् प्रोच्यते

पाञ्चभौतिकम् ॥१०६॥

तत्र - among the two forms of Brahman mentioned now सवासनं - along with *vāsanās* सर्वं जगत् - the entire *jagat* इदं रूपं - the entity 'this' ईरितम् - is said to be तत् - that पाञ्चभौतिकम् - *jagat* made of five elements (which are relatively *satya*) सत् च त्यत् च इति - because it is both 'sat' (easily known) and 'tyat' (known only indirectly) सत्यं प्रोच्यते - is called (relative) *satya* - (106)

106. Among the two forms of Brahman mentioned now the entire *jagat* along with *vāsanās* is said to be the entity 'this' (*idam*). That *jagat* made of five elements (which are relatively *satya*) is called (relative) *satya* because it is both 'sat' (easily known) and 'tyat' (known only indirectly).

सत्यस्य सत्यमनिदं वक्तव्यं शिष्यते ततः ।
आदेशोऽनन्तरं तस्य क्रियतेऽनन्यमानिनः ॥१०७॥

ततः - thereafter अनिदं - (*cit* which is) 'not this' सत्यस्य सत्यं - which is the

satya (truth) of the *satya* (relative truth) वक्तव्यं शिष्यते - remains to be described तस्य - of that (*satya of satya* which is 'anidam') अनन्यमानिनः - which cannot be known by any other *pramāṇas* (means of knowledge) आदेशः - unfoldment (teaching) अनन्तरं - now (hereafter) क्रियते - is narrated - (107)

107. Thereafter (the *cit* which is) 'not this' (*anidam*) which is the *satya* (truth) of the *satya* (relative truth) remains to be described. Now (hereafter) the unfoldment (teaching) of that (*satya* of relative *satya*) which cannot be known by any other *pramāṇas* (means of knowledge) is narrated.

Vāsanās are also *bhautika* (products of five elements) because they abide in the *citta* (*antaḥkaraṇa*) as impressions (*saṃskāras*). The *upādhi* of *Hiraṇyagarbha* being subtle, his *vāsanās* also are *bhautika* only. *Vāsanās* are related to five elements in the sense they objectify the *jagat* made of five elements and elementals. That way also they can be called 'pāñcabhautikam' (vs.106). The five elements are divided into *mūrta* (earth, water, fire) as *sat* and *amūrta* (air, space) as *tyat*. Both of them (*sat* and *tyat*) together are called 'satya' (relative truth). Then the absolute truth (*satya*) was defined as 'satyasya satya' (the absolute truth of the relative truth).

That second truth, (i.e. absolute one) is the second *rūpa* (form) of Brahman referred to in the *śruti* statement ‘*dve vāva brahmaṇah rūpe*’ (*Br.U.2-3-1*). That ‘form’ which actually is the formless real nature of Brahman is called ‘*anidam*’ (not this; vs.107). There being no other *pramāṇa* than the Vedas to reveal it, the same can only be the *ādeśa* (unfoldment) of Upaniṣads.

‘NETI NETI’ (NOT THIS, NOT THIS)

That *ādeśa* (*upadeśa* - teaching, unfoldment) from the *śruti* is: ‘Now Brahman is taught. It is not ‘this’, it is not ‘this’. There is no other teaching than this unfoldment. There is no higher principle than this. In the phrase ‘*neti*’ (*na iti*) by the word ‘*iti*’ whatever that can be pointed out as ‘*idam*’ (‘this’) is included and then Brahman is shown as distinct from all of them describing it by ‘*anidam*’ (none of those that can be indicated by ‘*idam*’/‘this’). This statement of *śruti* is now explained.

आदेशो नेति नेतीति ब्रह्मतत्त्वावबोधकः ।

यथायमुपपद्येत तथा सम्यङ्गिनरूप्यते ॥१०८॥

आदेशः नेति नेति इति - ‘the teaching *neti neti* (not this, not this)’ ब्रह्मतत्त्वावबोधकः - is an indicator of the real nature of Brahman यथा - how अयम् - this उपपद्येत - is possible तथा - so सम्यक् निरूप्यते - it is

described thoroughly – (108)

108. ‘The teaching *neti neti* (not this, not this)’ is an indicator of the real nature of Brahman. How this is possible is described (now) thoroughly.’

इतिशब्देन चिद्भास्यमनूद्य

प्रतिषिध्यते ।

नकारेण द्विरुक्तिस्तु वीप्सा

कृत्स्ननिषिद्धये ॥१०९॥

‘इति’ शब्देन - by the word ‘*iti*’ चिद्भास्यम् - the *anātmā* that is illumined (made known) by *cit* (*caitanya*) अनूद्य - having told नकारेण - by the particle of negation ‘*na*’ (not) प्रतिषिध्यते - (*iti/anātmā*) is negated (as not Brahman) द्विरुक्तिः तु - whereas the repetition of word ‘*na*’ for the second time कृत्स्ननिषिद्धये वीप्सा - is a repetition to negate all that is *anātmā* in entirety (as not Brahman) – (109)

109. Having told by the word ‘*iti*’ the *anātmā* that is illumined (made known) by *cit* (*caitanya*), by the particle of negation ‘*na*’ (not) (*iti/anātmā*) is negated (as not Brahman). The repetition of word ‘*na*’ for the second time is a repetition to negate all that is *anātmā* in entirety (as not Brahman).

मूर्तं वा यदि वामूर्तमज्ञानं वासनाथवा ।

अध्यात्ममधिदैवं वा तत् सर्वं प्रतिषिध्यते ॥११०॥

मूर्तं वा यदि वा अमूर्तम् - whether it is

mūrta or *amūrta* अज्ञानं अथवा वासना - whether it is self-ignorance or *vāsanā* अध्यात्मं अधिदैवं वा - whether it is *adhyātma* or *adhidaiva* तत् सर्वं - all of them प्रतिषिध्यते - are negated (as not Brahman) – (110)

110. Whether it is *mūrta* or *amūrta*, whether it is self-ignorance or *vāsanā*, whether it is *adhyātma* or *adhidaiva*, all of them are negated (as not Brahman).

‘*Neti neti*’ is a very famous Upaniṣadic teaching. It reveals *ātmā*/Brahman totally distinct from all that is *anātmā* up to the level from which there is no trace of *anātmā* at all. Prima facie, it seems to be a negation, but when taken to by a highly eligible *mumukṣu*, it directly reveals non-dual *sat, cit, ānandā ātmā*/Brahman. Because Brahman is attributeless (*nirviśeṣa*) the teaching of its real nature can be complete when all the features attributed to it erroneously are negated. To show clearly that such an entity that remains after the negation of *ātmā* only, the phrase ‘*neti neti iti ātmā*’ is used further in this Upaniṣad (*Br.U.3-9-26; 4-2-4; 4-4-22*).

In the phrase ‘*neti*’ there are two words - ‘*na*’ and ‘*iti*’. The word ‘*iti*’ used here is to do the job of including all that can be pointed out to be *anātmā*. Thus, ‘*iti*’ in this *śruti* refers to all possible categories of *prapañca* such as gross,

subtle, etc., which are not Brahman but are in fact *anātmā*. The word ‘*cidbhāśya*’ (all that is made known by *cit*) clarifies this point. The role of negative particle ‘*na*’ (not) is well-known. ‘*Iti*’ with ‘*na*’ shows that all that is in the category of *anātmā* can never be *ātmā*/Brahman. *Vīpsā* is repetition, twice or more. Repetition is used to include all that are connected with. It gives the sense of ‘whatever’. Thus, by using the word ‘*iti*’ twice, all *anātmā* without any exception is included. Similarly, by using ‘*na*’ twice everything that is *anātmā* is totally negated as not *ātmā*/Brahman. Double negation (*vīpsā*) highlights that there cannot be any exception. Thus the *mumukṣu* should discard whatever known as ‘this’ or ‘*viśaya*’ (object). *Bhāśyakāra* says: ‘Whatever that is experienced as object is invariably negated. (*yat yat prāptam tat tat niṣidhyate*) (*Br.U.Bh.2-3-6*). Sureśvarācārya in his *vārtikas* (2-3-195, etc.), points out that even the ‘negation’ also being something that is in the category of ‘*iti*’ as ‘*idam*’ gets negated. To show the negation of everything without any exception, the verse 110 includes all possible divisions of *prapañca*. What remains thereafter is *cit mātra* Brahman.

This teaching is called *ādeśa* (*upadeśa*, advice) because it imparts

thereby the direct knowledge of Brahman and not just negating. After the negation of everything the knower principle (*sākṣī* totally free from the cognition of *sākṣya* or *idam*) remains which cannot be negated. That is Brahman and that is revealed by this negation. Therefore, ‘*neti*’ does not mean that ‘nothing can be said about Brahman’. On the contrary it shows ‘whatever that is not *anātmā* (*idam*, *dr̥śya*) is *ātmā*/Brahman.

ANOTHER MEANING OF ‘NETI NETI’

The well-known meaning of ‘*neti neti*’ was described so far. Now its another meaning is given.

अथवात्रेति शब्दौ द्वौ जीवेशोपाधिवाचिनौ ।
नकाराभ्यामुपाधी द्वौ निषिध्य ब्रह्म लक्ष्यते ॥१११॥

अथवा - or अत्र - in this *śruti* statement ‘*neti neti*’ द्वौ - two ‘इति’ शब्दौ - words ‘*iti*’ जीवेशोपाधिवाचिनौ - express the *upādhis* of *jīva* and *Īśvara* नकाराभ्याम् - by the two negative particles ‘*na*’ द्वौ उपाधी - both *upādhis* निषिध्य - having negated ब्रह्म लक्ष्यते - Brahman is indicated (by implication through *mahāvākyas*)
–(111)

111. Or in this ‘*śruti*’ statement ‘*neti neti*’, the two words ‘*iti*’ express the *upādhis* of *jīva* and *Īśvara*. Having negated both *upādhis* by the two

negative particles ‘*na*’, Brahman is indicated (by implication through *mahāvākyas*).

‘*Neti neti*’ eliminates the erroneous notions of *jīva* and *Īśvara* falsely superimposed on Brahman because of ignorance. *Antaḥkaraṇa* (*ahaṃkāra*) born of *avidyā* is the *upādhi* of *jīva* whereas *māyā* is that of *Īśvara*. *Īśvara* creates the *jagat* through *māyā* and *jīva* undergoes its *bhoga* in accordance with its *rāga* and *dveṣa* besides *karmas* by the means of *ahaṃkāra*. To make the *jīva* undergo *bhoga* is the task of *Īśvara* whereas the *jīva* is its recipient. The statuses of *jīva* and *Īśvara* are mutually dependent. Therefore they are in the realm of *vyavahāra*. The independent entity only can be *satya* and it is *cit* free from *upādhis* of both *jīva* and *Īśvara*. The two ‘*na*’ in ‘*neti neti*’ having negated both *upādhis* by their direct meaning indicate by implication (*lakṣaṇā*) the furthest limit of negation, namely Brahman, where the job of ‘*iti*’ ends and no further negation becomes possible.

How negation leads to the indication of Brahman by implication is derived now. One may doubt that the word ‘*na*’ as a word indicating Brahman directly as its main meaning, (i.e. *śakti artha* of Brahman) is not correct because Brahman is not the

vācyārtha (वाच्यार्थ, expressed meaning) of the word 'na'. Brahman has no connection with anything. This is answered with the illustration of *tripuṭī* (*pramātā*, *pramāṇa-vṛtti* and *prameya*). We can consider the example of 'aham brahma asmi'. Here the two *vācyārtha* (expressed meaning) are *jīva* for the word *aham* (as *pramātā*) and *Īśvara* for *nirguṇa* Brahman. Both *aham* and *Īśvara* are *cidbhāsyas* (illuminated by *cit*). By the means of those two *vācyā* words (words that express their meaning directly) the *śuddha-caitanya* (*upādhi-less cit*) is indicated by *lakṣaṇā* (implication). Here the connection between the *upādhi* and *cit* is *bhāsyā* (illuminated) and *bhāsaka* (illuminator) respectively. Similarly, the *abhāva* (absence) of *jīveśvara-upādhis* told in the verse 111 which is expressed by the word 'na' (not) is also *sākṣibhāsyā* (is made known by *sākṣī*). Therefore, there is the connection of *bhāsyā* and *bhāsaka* between the absence of *jīveśvara-upādhis* and *sākṣī-cit* whereby 'na' can indicate *śuddha-caitanya* through *lakṣaṇā* (implications).

यथा मात्रादिसत्तेयं प्रत्यक्संवित्तिसाक्षिका ।
प्रमात्रादेरभावोऽपि तथाऽतस्तेन लक्ष्यते ॥११२॥

यथा - just as इयं - this (well-known) मात्रादिसत्ता - existence of *pramātā* (knower), etc., (i.e. *pramāṇa-vṛtti*/

knowledge-*vṛtti* and *prameya*/known called *tripuṭī*) प्रत्यक् संवित्तिसाक्षिका - has *pratyak-saṃvit* (*pratyagātmā*) as their *sākṣī* तथा - similarly प्रमात्रादेः - of *pramātā*, etc. अभावः अपि - absence also (has *pratyak-saṃvit* as its *sākṣī*) अतः - therefore तेन - by 'na' that indicates the absence (of *jīveśvara-upādhi*) लक्ष्यते - (the Brahman) is indicated by implication (*lakṣaṇā*)—(112)

112. Just as this (well-known) existence of *pramātā* (knower), etc., (i.e. *pramāṇa-vṛtti*/knowledge-*vṛtti* and *prameya*/known called *tripuṭī*) has *pratyak-saṃvit* (*pratyagātmā*) as their *sākṣī*, similarly the absence of *pramātā*, etc., also (has *pratyak-saṃvit* as its *sākṣī*). Therefore by 'na' that indicates the absence (of *jīveśvara-upādhi*) (the Brahman) is indicated by implication (*lakṣaṇā*).

Generally, the usage of implied sense is found in the case of *mahāvākyas* such as 'tat tvam asi'. This method is taken as an illustration. The word 'tat' (from 'tat tvam asi') as the main meaning (*śakti-artha*) expresses *Īśvara* whereas *śuddha* (*upādhi-less*) Brahman is the illuminator (*bhāsaka*) of *Īśvara*. Therefore 'tat' *pada* indicates *śuddha* Brahman by implication (*lakṣaṇā*). As for 'tvam' (from 'tat tvam asi') *pada* its main meaning is *pramātā* whereas

śuddha Brahman is the illuminator of *pramātā*. Therefore *tvam pada* indicates *śuddha* Brahman by *lakṣaṇā* (implication). Similarly the negative particle ‘*na*’ (not) can indicate *sākṣī*-Brahman by *lakṣaṇā* (implication). ‘*Na*’ directly expresses the absence of *pramātā*, *pramāṇa* and *prameya* (*tripuṭī*). That ‘absence’ is illumined by *pratyak samvit*. Therefore, ‘absence’ is *bhāśya* (illumined) and *sākṣī* is *bhāsaka* (illuminator). Thus the absence can indicate *sākṣī*-Brahman by implication. If this is not so, then *lakṣaṇā* (implication) will not be possible. In that case there will be no *puruṣārtha* of *Brahmajñāna* since either mere negation or culmination in non-existence will be the outcome of negation in ‘*neti neti*’. This cannot hold good because this topic itself started as ‘*ādeśa*’ (*upadeśa*, advice) which must have fruitful result. *Bhāṣyakāra* clarifies that *abhāva* (absence, non-existence) is also made known by *sākṣī* like the *bhāva* (existence). Otherwise *abhāva* (non-existence of an entity) will not be known. Therefore, Brahman is connected to both *bhāva* (existence of an entity) and *abhāva* the non-existence (of an entity). This connection is only *mithyā* (false) since in Brahman there is neither the existence nor absence of any entity other than itself because Brahman is non-dual.

Even the words such as *sat*, *cit* including the word Brahman indicate Brahman only by implied sense because their direct meaning can be possible only with attributes which cannot be in Brahman. The understanding of things such as ‘pot is’, ‘cloth is’, ‘pot is known’, ‘cloth is known’ are all with attributes. The attributeless ‘is-ness’ and ‘knowledge’ can be known only by implication. Similarly ‘*na*’ may directly express negation but it indicates *sākṣī*-Brahman by *lakṣaṇā* (implication).

A question may be asked: ‘*Ātmā* exists’ is known when the *pramātā* (knower) knows as ‘I am’. Therefore how can it be said that *pramātā* is made known by *sākṣī-ātmā-brahma*? If this is not proved the absence of *pramātā* also cannot be known by *sākṣī-ātmā*. In that case *lakṣaṇā* (implied sense) will not be possible. In addition, it is seen that an entity directly expressed by words, (i.e. *vācya*) becomes the one conveyed through implication (*lakṣya*). If *ātmā* is not a *vācya*, how can it be a *lakṣya*? Both these questions are answered now.

अतिरोहितसंवित्को

दृष्टिमात्रात्मकत्वतः ।

विनैव वाचकं शब्दं बोध्यो

लक्षणयाऽप्यतः ॥११३॥

अतिरोहितसंवित्कः - the entity whose nature of knowledge-principle is never

extinct or covered, (i.e. *svaparakāśa*, self-luminous) दृष्टिमात्रात्मकत्वतः - because of being independent self-existing knowledge-principle alone वाचकं शब्दं विना एव - without the need of a word expressing its direct meaning बोध्यः - can be known अतः लक्षणया अपि - therefore by implication also (बोध्यः - can be known) –(113)

113. (The Brahman) whose nature of knowledge-principle is never extinct or covered, (i.e. *svaparakāśa*, self-luminous) because of being independent self-existing knowledge-principle alone, can be known without the need of a word expressing its direct meaning (*śakti artha*). Therefore, (it can be known) by implication (*lakṣaṇayā*) also.

The statement that the existence of *ātmā* is known through *pramātā* (*ahaṃkāra*) is not correct. The *tripuṭī* consisting of *pramātā* (*ahaṃkāra*) in the form of a *vṛtti*, *pramāṇa-vṛtti* which gives the knowledge by ending ignorance and *prameya* (the object being known) is inert by itself without any power of cognition. It is *ātmā* that gives *cit* (knowledge) and *sat* existence aspect to the trio in the form of *tripuṭī* because of which it (*tripuṭī*) appears sentient. This is how *pramātā* (*ahaṃkāra*) comes to know 'I am'. In *Brahmajñāna*, all *upādhis* including *pramātā* end. As a result *pramāṇa* ceases to be a *pramāṇa* like the dream-*pramāṇa* on waking up.

It is the nature of *ātmā* that it is the ever-existent self-knowing and self-experiencing principle simultaneously. This self-luminous *dr̥ṣṭi* (knowledge-principle) is never extinct. It cannot be described by any word through its main meaning (*vācyārtha*, *śakti artha*). At no time the Brahman is hidden. All types of existence and non-existence are known because of it. It illumines (makes known) the existence of everything in the waking and dream states. The total non-existence in the sleep is known because of it only. *Pramātā* (*ahaṃkāra*) is extinct in the sleep. If the existence of *ātmā* were because of *pramātā*, the experience of sleep itself will be impossible in the absence of *pramātā* and thereby the absence of *ātmā*. Therefore, to consider that *ātmā* is known because of *pramātā* is wrong. This also refutes the concept of *tārkikas* that *ātmā* is *prameya* (an object of knowledge). The *śruti* and also *smṛti* declare that *ātmā*, Brahman is 'aprameya' (*Bṛ.U.4-4-20*; *B.G.2-18*). Therefore Brahman can be indicated through implication by the relation of illuminator and the illumined only. By using this relation, the negative particle 'na' (not) also can indicate it through implication (*lakṣaṇā*).

Naiyāyikas think that everything in the world is *vācya* (वाच्य, expressed entity by words) and whatever is not *vācya* does not exist at all. This is a wrong notion born of an over exaggerated belief that words can describe anything and everything. That is not true. Words can describe to an extent those entities which have features (*viśeṣas*) such as *nāma*, *rūpa*, *karma* (*kriyā*), *bheda* (*saṃbandha*), *jāti* (species) and *guṇa* (attributes) (*Br.U.Bh.2-3-6*). Conventionally (by *rūḍhi*) we describe a thing having such and such name and form. But this is possible only for perceptible entities. Brahman is imperceptible (*atīndriya*) because of being *upādhiless*. Therefore, conventional description by words is not possible. *Sambandha* (relation) is possible between two distinct entities having the same degree of reality. Brahman is non-dual and ever-existent reality. There is no duality in it. Real entity Brahman cannot have any relation with *mithyā jagat* which is not real. Species (*jāti*) are not there in Brahman because it has no *sāmānya* attribute (such as cowness) and *viśeṣa* (individual member of a generalized attribute). Being *avikriya* (changeless) no *kriyā* (*karma*, action) is possible in it. It is *nirguṇa* and so *guṇas* are not there in it. Thus Brahman cannot be the *vācya* of words.

The statement that everything in the world is *vācya* also is not correct. There are many things which have no precise *vācya* except a generalized name. For example, the fragrance of different flowers cannot be described precisely even by Goddess Saraswati as such and such nature except saying the fragrance of such and such flower. The experience of its smell alone can make us know what exactly it is. The very fact that Brahman is not a *vācya* justifies the necessity of using *lakṣaṇā-vṛtti* (implied method). That is the role of *lakṣaṇā* where the main meaning of the word (*śakti-artha*) is not possible. Otherwise, it cannot be taught.

The self-luminous (*svapṛakāśa*) nature of *ātmā* is explained now. Or if *ātmā* is changeless self-luminous principle how can it be the *sākṣī* of the presence (*bhāva*) and absence (*abhāva*) of *viśayas* because only the entity that illuminates (does the function of illumination which involves change) can be *sākṣī*? Here is the answer.

अनन्यानुभवेनैव

भावाभावात्मभूमिषु ।

प्रत्यक्कूटस्थमात्मानं पश्यन्नास्ते

फलात्मनः ॥११४॥

भावाभावात्मभूमिषु - in the states wherein the existent entities are available to experience as in the waking and dream states or where they are not

available as in sleep अनन्यानुभवेन एव - in the form of (its) self-experiencing nature alone without any alien experiences प्रत्यक् कूटस्थमात्मानं - the *pratyagātmā* that happens to be *kūṭastha* (changeless) फलात्मनः - in the form of *cit* and *cit* alone पश्यन् आस्ते - (*ātmā*) seeing (itself) remains – (114)

114. In the states of waking and dream wherein the existent entities are

available for experiencing and in sleep when they are not, *ātmā*, in the form of (its) self-experiencing nature only without any alien experiences, remains seeing (itself the *kūṭastha*-changeless) *pratyagātmā* in the form of *cit* and *cit* alone.

The reading in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika* is, ‘*pratyakkūṭasthaḥ ātmānam*’ instead of ‘*pratyakkūṭastham*’. It gets connected to ‘*paśyan āste*’ properly.

‘*Bhāvābhāvātmabhūmiṣu*’ can be taken as when objects and beings are available and when they are not there. But on account of the word ‘*ātmā*’, naturally it has to be taken as waking and dream state wherein entities are available for experiencing and the deep sleep wherein they are not available.

Ātmā is called ‘*ananyānubhavaḥ*’ because it is the entity whose real nature is of being the ‘self-experiencing principle’ without alien experiences of *pramātā*, *prameya*, *pramāṇa* therein. When the mind is the *draṣṭā* (seer) of some *drśya* (perceptible entity), the *drśya* being distinct from it, the mind becomes the main *draṣṭā* (seer). But the *ātmā* remaining the changeless *anubhava-svarūpa* all along even when the object (*viśaya*) is experienced (*anubhūta*), it cannot be the main *draṣṭā*, but at best it can be only secondarily because its *anubhava-svarūpa* is never given up to become *viśayānubhava*, etc. The *viśayānubhava*, etc., are the features of *antaḥkaraṇa* erroneously superimposed on *ātmā*. Even in ‘*phala*’ (the reflection of *ātmā* in a specific *viśayākāra antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*) *ātmā* remains *kūṭastha* (changeless) in its real nature of *anubhava-svarūpa cit* and *cit* alone. The *viśayas* get illumined in the presence of ‘*phala*’ without any action on the part of *ātmā*. It is like the sun in whose presence the world gets illumined without any doing on its part though in *vyavahāra* we say that the sun illumines the world. So is the status of ‘*phala*’ as *sākṣī*, the illuminator of *sākṣya* (illumined entities).

In self-luminous *ātmā*, there being no *pramātā*, etc., it is described as ‘(by itself) seeing (*paśyan*) in the form of *cidekarasa* (*phalātmanā* - *cit* and *cit* alone). The mind does gain knowledge or experiences. But its knowledge or experience

aspect is distinct from itself which is inert. But *ātmā* itself is knowledge-principle. The mirror has light, but it is different from the mirror, but the light of the sun is not different from it. The experience in the mind is different from it but *ātmā* is nothing but *anubhava* (experience) principle. Here ‘*ananyānubhava*’ is described as ‘*phala*’ also. Śrī Madhusūdana Saraswati in his commentary *Siddhāntabindu* (vs.1) describes the manifest *ātmā* itself as the *phala*: ‘The *Brahma-caitanya* that is obtained in the *viśaya* but not known is *prameya*. That itself when known is called *phalam*’ (*prameyam tu viśayagatam Brahmacaityameva ajñātam, tadeva jñātam sat phalam*). *Pañcapādikā* defines *phala*: ‘The *aparokṣa-ekarasa cit* and *cit* alone called the experience of a *viśaya* is *phala*’ (*viśayānubhava-saṃśabditaḥ viśayasthāparokṣaikarasaḥ phalam*). *Bhāṣyakāra* says: ‘*Jñeyam* (Brahma) itself when known (*jñātam sat*) called the *phala* of *jñāna* (*jñāna-phalam*) is described as *jñānagamyā* (obtainable by *jñāna*). It (Brahman) is called *jñeya*, when still to be known’ (*B.G.Bh.13-17*).

Though *ātmā* is self-luminous all along in all states, its self-luminous nature becomes evident only when *ātmā* and *ātmā* alone is totally free from all the entities that are *adhyasta*.

अतो मात्रादिसंभेदो

यत्र यत्र निवर्तते ।

तत्र तत्रैकलः प्रत्यक्

स्वमहिम्नैव सिध्यति ॥११५॥

अतः - therefore यत्र यत्र - wherever
मात्रादिसंभेदः - the division of *pramātā*
(knower), etc. निवर्तते - cease तत्र तत्र - in all
such cases एकलः - solitary, (i.e. non-
dual) प्रत्यक्- *pratyagātmā* स्वमहिम्ना एव - in
its natural power (or greatness) सिध्यति -
is proved – (115)

115. Therefore, wherever the
division of *pramātā* (knower), etc.,

ceases, in all such cases the solitary
(non-dual) *pratyagātmā* in its natural
power (or greatness) is proved.

The word ‘*ādi*’, (etc.), in *pramātr*
refers to *pramāṇa*. So long as these two
are there, it appears as though that *ātmā*
is known on account of them. But in
sleep or *samādhi*, the *pramātā*, etc., are
not present. Even then the existence of
ātmā in its self-experiencing nature
continues. This proves that *ātmā* is
known on its own without the
dependence on anything else. It is self-
luminous, self-knowing principle. We
do not know this because of our
ignorance and not because Brahman is
not *sva-prakāśa* (self-luminous). It is
from this standpoint, *ācāryas* emphasize
that ‘efforts should be put in to get rid of
avidyā and not to gain *vidyā*’.

The topic that *ātmā* is *svaparakāśa* is concluded.

एतद् वस्तु स्वतः

सिद्धं प्रमात्राद्यनपेक्षतः ।

सर्वस्यैव ततः सिद्धे कथं

सिध्येत् तदन्यतः ॥११६॥

प्रमात्राद्यनपेक्षतः - independent of *pramātā*, etc. एतद् वस्तु - this entity *ātmā* स्वतः सिद्धं - is self-evident/self-luminous सर्वस्य एव - the entire *jagat* itself ततः - on account of *ātmā* सिद्धेः - because it is known or experienced तत् - that entity *ātmā* अन्यतः - by the means of *anātmā* कथं सिध्येत् - how can it be known or experienced? (certainly not) – (116)

116. Independent of *pramātā*, etc., this entity *ātmā* is self-evident/self-luminous. Because the entire *jagat* itself is known or experienced on account of *ātmā*, how can that *ātmā* be known or experienced by the means of *anātmā*? (Certainly not).

Ātmā itself is self-evident knowledge-principle, self-experiencing principle. All *drśyarūpa anātmā* called *jagat* is known or experienced because of *ātmā*. *Ātmā* cannot be known or experienced by inert *anātmā*. *Śvetāśvatara* (6-14) (*A.Pr.*12-107, 108) and *Kaṭhapaniṣad* (2-2-15) have described this fact.

THE CONCLUSION OF NETI NETI ĀDEŚA

The explanation of ‘*neti neti*’ - teaching begun from verse 111 is now being concluded.

तदित्थं नेति नेतीति

वाक्यं ब्रह्मात्मबोधकम् ।

जीवेशोपाधिनिहुत्या

लक्ष्याखण्डावसानतः ॥११७॥

तदित्थं - thus ‘नेति नेति’ इति वाक्यं - the statement ‘*neti neti*’ जीवेशोपाधिनिहुत्या - by negating the *upādhis* of *jīva* and *Īśvara* लक्ष्याखण्डावसानतः - because of its culmination in the *pūrṇa* (whole and complete) entity that is to be known ब्रह्मात्मबोधकम् (भवति) - gives the knowledge of *pratyagātmā* identical with Brahman – (117)

117. Thus, the statement ‘*neti neti*’ by negating the *upādhis* of *jīva* and *Īśvara*, because of its culmination in the *pūrṇa* (whole and complete) entity that is to be known gives the knowledge of *pratyagātmā* identical with Brahman.

The two ‘*iti*’ words refer to *upādhis* whereas ‘*na*’ the particle of negation negates them. But this is a *ādeśa* (*upadeśa*, advice) for gaining a fruitful result. Therefore, the teaching does not stop with mere negation of *upādhi*, but indicates by implication the ‘*svaparakāśa*’ *ātmā* identical with

Brahman. This is the mode of teaching employed in the ‘*neti neti*’ statement.

The *śruti* (*Br.U.2-3*) concludes by saying: ‘Now the name of Brahman is told. *Satya* (truth) of *satya* (truth) is its name. The *prāṇas* themselves are (the relative, *vyāvahārika*) *satya*, this (Brahman) is their *satya*’ (*Br.U.2-3-6*). This portion is summarized in the next two verses.

इत्येवमनिदं रूपं

ब्रह्मणः प्रतिपादितम् ।

निर्नाम्नस्तस्य नामैतत्

सत्यसत्यमिति श्रुतम् ॥११८॥

इति एवं - thus ब्रह्मणः - of Brahman अनिदं रूपं - the form that is ‘*anidam*’ (other than ‘*idam*’/‘this’, i.e. *pratyak* the innermost) प्रतिपादितं - was expounded तस्य निर्नाम्नः - of that nameless Brahman एतत् सत्यसत्यम् इति नाम - the name ‘*satyasatyam*’ श्रुतम् - is propounded by the *śruti*—(118)

118. Thus, the form of Brahman which is ‘*anidam*’ (other than ‘*idam*’/‘this’, i.e. *pratyak* the innermost) was expounded. The name ‘*satyasatyam*’ is propounded by the *śruti* for that nameless Brahman.

सच्च त्यच्चेति सत्याख्याः प्राणास्ते ब्रह्मणात्मना।
आत्मवन्तस्ततो ब्रह्म सत्यसत्यमितीरितम् ॥११९॥

सत् च त्यत् च इति - because of

being the combined form of *sat* (*mūrta*) and *tyat* (*amūrta*) प्राणाः - the *prāṇas* (vital airs and senses indicating the *jagat*) सत्याख्याः - are called *satya* ते - those *prāṇas* ब्रह्मणात्मना - with Brahman as their *adhiṣṭhāna* आत्मवन्तः - appear to have existence ततः - therefore ब्रह्म - Brahman सत्यसत्यम् - ‘*satyasatyam*’ (the final reality of the relatively real) इति ईरितम् - so it is described by the *śruti*—(119)

119. The *prāṇas* (vital airs and the senses indicating the *jagat*) are called *satya* because of being the combined form of *sat* (*mūrta*) and *tyat* (*amūrta*). Those *prāṇas* appear to have existence with Brahman as their *adhiṣṭhāna*. Therefore, the *śruti* has described Brahman as ‘*satyasatyam*’ (the final reality of the relatively real).

The two forms of Brahman as *mūrta* and *amūrta* were seen in three different ways. The derivation of relative *satya* by combining *sat* and *tyat* also was seen. In the verse 107 considering all that fits in the category of *idam* (this) as *mūrta* in contrast to *pratyakātmā* and *anidam* (not this) as *amūrta*, the *ādeśa* (teaching) of ‘*neti neti*’ employed by the *śruti* to reveal Brahman by the name ‘*satyasatyam*’ was introduced. In reality, Brahman is not connected to any name. No word can

describe it by *śakti-artha* (direct meaning). It is *atīndriya* (imperceptible) and *avyavahārya* (cannot be dealt with). Even then, to give its knowledge, the *śruti* somehow presents its name ‘*satyasatyam*’ through the compound ‘*satyasya satya*’. It is called a name because by inquiring into it, one can gain the knowledge of Brahman. The mode of inquiry is suggested by the *śruti* itself. The first word *satya* should be known as *prāṇas* indicating the entire *idam prapañca* which is a combined form of *prāṇas* (vital airs and *indriyas*), *sat* (earth, water and fire) and *tyat* (air and space). The real nature of those *prāṇas* is their *adhiṣṭhāna* Brahman from whom they borrow their existence and knowledge aspects. As a result of this, they appear to be there and are known. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (6-8-7, etc.), repeatedly asserts nine times that this entire *jagat* has this *sat* (Brahman) as its *ātmā*, the real nature (*aitadātmyam idam sarvam*). Brahman lends the *satyatā* (reality) to the *prāṇas* considered to be relatively *satya*. Though Brahman is named ‘*satya-satya*’ or ‘*satyasya satyam*’, it is so by *lakṣaṇā* (implication) and not as *vācya* (directly expressed meaning). Sureśvarācārya concludes his *Vārtika* on this *Bṛhadāranyaka* with the following dictum: ‘Brahman has to be indicated by *lakṣaṇā* (implication). By

no means whatsoever can the words describe Brahman through their direct meaning (*śakti artha*) because none of the features (such as *jāti*, *guṇa*, *kriyā*, etc.), which enable the word to function is available in *nirupādhika* Brahman (*Br.U.Vā.2-3-254*).

The fourteenth chapter is concluded.

अजातशत्रुर्यां विद्यां

ब्राह्मणैस्त्रिभिरुक्तवान् ।

तद् व्याख्यानेन संतुष्याद्

विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः ॥१२०॥

अजातशत्रुः - the king Ajātaśatru
त्रिभिः ब्राह्मणैः - by three *brāhmaṇas* यां
विद्यां - whatever knowledge उक्तवान् -
taught तद् व्याख्यानेन - by its explanation
विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः - the *guru* Vidyātīrtha
Maheśvara in the form of Śiva सन्तुष्यात् -
may (he) be pleased – (120)

120. By the explanation of whatever knowledge the king Ajātaśatru taught (to Bālāki) contained in the three *brāhmaṇas*, may the *guru* Vidyātīrtha in the form of Śiva be pleased.

The *Brahmavidyā* contained in the first three *brāhmaṇas* of *Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad* chapter two was explained in this chapter. *Ācārya* offers this work to the *guru* in the form of Śiva because a devotee considers that

to please Śiva is the purpose of his life. We find in the *Śivānandalahari* (66) of Ādi Śaṅkarācārya: Oh, Paśupate (Śiva), whatever *karma* that I do is certainly meant to please you only’.

इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिविरचिते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
अजातशत्रुविद्याप्रकाशो नाम चतुर्दशोध्यायः ।

॥ ॐ ॥



CHAPTER - XV

MAITREYĪVIDYĀPRAKĀŚĀ (BRHADĀRAṆYAKOPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[*Maitreyī vidyāprakāśa* is the teaching of Sage Yājñavalkya to his wife Maitreyī. This teaching features twice in two separate chapters (*Adhyāyas*) with marginal difference only in the words in *Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣat* (Chapter 2 - *brāhmaṇa*/section 4 and chapter 4 - *brāhmaṇa*/section 5). This teaching is imparted at the time when Yājñavalkya made the decision to take to *vidvat-sannyāsa* to gain *jīvanmukti*. It essentially highlights that *mokṣa* cannot be gained by wealth and other worldly things. *Eṣaṇātrayatyaḡa* (renunciation of desires) is the stepping stone to gain *ātmajñāna*. Intense *nididhyāsana* is indispensable to get the mind absorbed in *ātmā*. This is possible provided the mind becomes totally introvert. Thereby the mind develops total love for *ātmā* and gets completely disinterested in *anātmā viṣayas*.

One loves an entity because it is the source of *ānanda*. The teaching begins by pointing out that the love for oneself is the primary – the most important - for every individual. One's love for anything else, however dear it may be, is only secondary to the love for oneself. This proves that *ātmā* is limitless *ānanda*. The central theme of the teaching is a thorough elaboration of the famous statement from *Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣat*: ‘आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः, श्रोतव्यः, मन्तव्यः, निदिध्यासितव्यः। आत्मनः वा अरे दर्शनेन श्रवणेन मत्या विज्ञानेन इदं सर्वं विदितम् ॥’ (*Br.U.2-4-5*). The final goal of human life is the *darśana* (*sākṣātkāra*) of *ātmā*. The means for the same are concurrent practice of *śravaṇa*, *manana*, and *nididhyāsana*. As for *manana* it is highlighted that the *jagat* is not distinct from *ātmā*, all along during its *utpatti*, *sṭhiti* and *laya*. It is explained by citing illustrations of *dundubhi* (large kettle drum), conch, *vīṇā*, fire, ocean and the lump of salt. Everything of the *jagat* is only *ātmā*. *Nididhyāsana* as a practice is the constant and consistent meditation of allowing only

a continuous flow of *ātma-pratyaya*, and the *anātma-pratyayas* such as the thoughts pertaining to the body, etc., comprising the *drśya jagat* are completely discarded. The remaining portion of the same *śruti*-statement, states that when the *nididhyāsana* fructifies, it is *vijñāna* itself.

Vijñāna is the *darśana* or *sākṣātkāra* of Brahman. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika* explains *darśana* of *ātmā* called *vijñāna* to be ‘*aparāyattabodha*’, (i.e. *aparādhīna-bodha*) (*Bṛ.U.Vā.* 2-4-217 to 221). It is a totally independent knowledge. It is not dependent on even the *ātmākāra-Brahmākāra-vṛtti* which is necessary initially to end the *avidyā* covering the *ātmā*. Such *bodha* (knowledge) can only be *Brahmasākṣātkāra* wherein *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* disappears after ending the *avidyā*. Only on gaining this knowledge, the *jīva* merges in *Paramātmā* losing its *jīvahood* like a lump of salt gets dissolved in the ocean. Then only *ātyantika pralaya* is possible after which the liberated *jīva* has no birth and death. It should be noted that *jñāna* (knowledge) and *anubhava* (experience) can be twofold. One category is *vṛtti-jñāna* or *vṛtṭyanubhava* and the other one is *jñāna* or *anubhava* without *drśya-vṛtti*. The *jñāna* or *anubhava* without *vṛtti* corresponds to *nirupādhika svarūpajñāna* identical with the *svarūpānubhava* of *ātmā*. The *jñāna* or *anubhava* without *vṛtti* is *svaparakāśa* (self-evident) which is self-evident *paramānanda*, and that is the real nature of *ātmā*. I have gained *ātmajñāna*, and yet *paramānanda* is not experienced means the person is under the delusion that he has got *jñāna*. Experiencing *paramānanda* and the total cessation of sorrows is thr *sine qua non* of *aparokṣajñāna* (*B.G.* 6-20 to 22). The self-evident *paramānanda-ātmā* is necessarily self-experiencing in nature. Therefore to say that self-experiencing *paramānanda-ātmā* without *drśya-vṛtti* is not experienced is as absurd as the statement that the ever-shining self-luminous sun cannot be seen in a cloudless sky by healthy eyes.

The chapter is concluded by showing that Yājñavalkya's teaching is the blessing for Maitreyī. This is true for all the disciples even today since *ācārya's* teaching is blessing for them. At the end Vidyāraṇya Muni identifies himself as a *mumukṣu* and seeks the blessing of *Parameśvara* for all.]

SAGE YĀJÑAVALKYA

Sage Yājñavalkya has an unparalleled status in the Vedic literature. By the dint of his *tapas*, he learnt the entire *Śukla Yajurveda* from *Bhagavān Sūryanārāyaṇa*. He wanted to get absorbed in Brahman and become a *Brahmaniṣṭhā* after his learning.

But he was advised by Sūrya (the deity sun) to propagate *karma*, *upāsanā* and *Brahmajñāna*. Accordingly he took to the life of a *gr̥hastha* and established a *gurukula*. He trained innumerable disciples and propagated the *vidyā* received by him from Sūrya. The entire north India follows *śukla-yajurveda*. After a very long period, he decided to enter in the order of (*vidvat*) *sannyāsa* to get totally absorbed in Brahman. Though *karmas* and *upāsanās* have a role of serving as the indirect means to *Brahmajñāna* by conferring the prerequisites of *śuddha antaḥkaraṇa* and *cittanaiścālyā*, they are not the direct means of gaining *jñāna*. On the contrary to a highly eligible *mumukṣu*, they are a big obstacles in gaining *jñāna* because of being opposed to *jñāna* in nature. Therefore *sannyāsa* is taken to as a means to gain *Brahmajñāna*. *Bhāṣyakāra* emphasizes and elaborates this point while introducing this Maitreyī *brāhmaṇa*.

CONTEXT

As a prelude to the acceptance of *sannyāsa*, Yājñavalkya desires to distribute his enormous wealth between his two wives. While Kātyāyanī accepts the proposal, Maitreyī being a staunch *mumukṣu* asks Yājñavalkya if she will get liberated even if she gets the entire earth full of prosperity. The sage replies, by no such means it is possible. At best, one may live a luxurious life like rich people, but liberation is next to impossible by wealth and the *karmas* accomplished through it. Hearing this, Maitreyī refuses to accept her share of property and requests to impart only *Brahmajñāna* which Yājñavalkya himself has got. Pleased with her right decision and request, the sage consents to teach her *Brahmavidyā*. This teaching is going to be explained in this fifteenth chapter. The subject matter of this chapter is told now.

मैत्रेय्यै याज्ञवल्क्यो यां चतुर्थब्राह्मणेऽब्रवीत् ।
ससाधनां ब्रह्मविद्यां विस्पष्टं व्याकरोमि ताम् ॥१॥

चतुर्थब्राह्मणे - in the fourth *brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* chapter two
मैत्रेय्यै - to Maitreyī यां - whatever ससाधनां ब्रह्मविद्यां - *Brahmavidyā* with its means
याज्ञवल्क्यः - Yājñavalkya अब्रवीत् - taught
ताम् - that teaching विस्पष्टम् - very clearly
व्याकरोमि - I am going to expound—(1)

1. I am going to expound very clearly the *Brahmavidyā* with its means taught by Yājñavalkya to (his wife) Maitreyī which is found in the fourth *brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* chapter two.

The author specifies the subject-matter of this chapter. The teaching is the dialogue between Yājñavalkya and Maitreyī. This teaching appears in the

fourth *brāhmaṇa* of the chapter two. Once more it forms the content of the fifth *brāhmaṇa* of chapter four of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. The teaching of both *brāhmaṇas* is same with minor difference in terms of use of different words. This teaching appeared first in the fourth *brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* chapter two. Therefore the author refers to in this verse that *brāhmaṇa* instead of the fifth one of chapter four. But this exposition (Ch.15) does cover the teachings of both *brāhmaṇas*. The purpose of the connected story is shown in the next verse.

वित्तस्य कर्महेतुत्वात् तत्त्यागो ज्ञानसाधनम् ।
इति दर्शयितुं प्राह श्रुतिराख्यायिकां शुभाम् ॥२॥

वित्तस्य कर्महेतुत्वात् - wealth being the means of *karmas* तत्त्यागः - the giving up of wealth ज्ञानसाधनम् - is the means to gain *Brahmajñāna* इति दर्शयितुं - to show this श्रुति - the Upaniṣad शुभाम् आख्यायिकां - a virtuous story प्राह - narrated – (2)

2. Wealth being the means of *karmas*, giving it up is the means to gain *Brahmajñāna*. To show this fact, the Upaniṣad narrated a virtuous story.

The story of property distribution wherein Maitreyī shows her disinterest is described as *śubha* (virtuous) because it leads to *vairāgya* which is indispensable

to gain *Brahmajñāna*. Renouncing wealth signifies *karmatyāga*. It also indicates giving up of all desires contained in the three categories that will be told in the next verse. The Vedas never speak anything that is futile. Even the stories have some lessons to be taught. This story tells that the wealth is the means to *karmas* resulting in gains here and hereafter. Giving up of wealth is the means to gain *Brahmajñāna* which gives liberation. By wealth, the *karmas* are to be performed to gain *citta-śuddhi*. On gaining *citta-śuddhi*, wealth needs to be given up to pursue the means that lead to *Brahmajñāna*. ‘*Tattyaāga*’ (giving it up) includes the giving up of both wealth and *karma* because to give up *karma* renouncing the wealth is necessary. Here the word ‘*dhana*’ (wealth) includes both ‘*daivī*’ (divine, includes *upāsanās*) and ‘*mānuṣa*’ (human) wealth. Just as *upāsanā* - *vidyās* are wealth because they confer heavenly gains, the worldly knowledge is also wealth since it gives here various gains and fame, etc. Even the wife is the means of *karma*. It also fits in the category of ‘*dhana*’ (wealth). She also needs to be given up for *jñāna-niṣṭhā*. The same case applies to the son. The wealth indicates *karma* and *karma* indicates wealth. The means to get out of this mutually dependant cycle is giving up of wealth. That is why Maitreyī asks whether she can gain liberation by

wealth? Yājñavalkya replies in the negative emphatically. Since all these points get highlighted by this story, it is called *śubha* (virtuous).

The final purpose of *dhanatyāga* (giving up of wealth) is told now.

एषणान्नयसंन्यासो

वित्तत्यागेन लक्ष्यते ।

ज्ञानस्य हेतुः संन्यास इति

शास्त्रेषु डिण्डिमः ॥३॥

वित्तत्यागेन - by giving up the wealth एषणान्नयसंन्यासः - renunciation of three types of desires लक्ष्यते - is indicated by implication संन्यासः - *sannyāsa* ज्ञानस्य हेतुः - is the means of gaining *Brahmajñāna* इति - so शास्त्रेषु डिण्डिमः - so is the proclamation in the *Vedānta-śāstra* – (3)

3. By giving up the wealth, the renunciation of three types of desires is indicated by implication. *Sannyāsa* is the means of gaining *Brahmajñāna*. So is the proclamation in the *Vedānta-śāstra*.

The main three desires are: (i) The desire for son (progeny) (*putraīṣaṇā*) (ii) The desire for wealth (*vittaiṣaṇā*) (iii) The desire for *lokas* (heavenly abodes) (*lokaiṣaṇā*) (*Br. U.3-5-1*). All other desires get included in this. Desires in general to be fulfilled are indicated by ‘*putra*’ (son). Desires for *loka* stands for gaining

heavens. Gaining the wealth is to have the means to fulfill the other two types of desires. The *dhanatyāga* mentioned here indicates all these three desires. Without getting freedom from these desires it is not possible to gain steady *mumuṣṣā* (intense yearning for liberation). Though *jñāna* is gained through *pramāṇa*, *sannyāsa* being included in the *sādhana-catuṣṭaya*, it serves as the necessary means to gain *jñāna* as a specific eligibility. It is an indispensable means to gain *Brahmaniṣṭhā*. *Ādhyātmika* scriptures are replete with the statements highlighting the necessity of *tyāga* or *sannyāsa* in gaining *Brahmajñāna*. ‘By *tyāga* alone the immortality (*mokṣa*) can be gained’ (*Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* 10-5; *Kai.U. 3*).

Yājñavalkya was an undisputed *jñānī*. Is not the *sannyāsa* redundant in his case? Or if *sannyāsa* is the means of *jñāna*, how can *gr̥hastha* Yājñavalkya can be considered *jñānī*? How can his teaching to Maitreyī imparted before taking to *sannyāsa* be effective? These questions are answered by pointing out two types of *sannyāsa*. It justifies the taking of *sannyāsa* by Yājñavalkya in spite of being a *jñānī* and great *śrotriya* (well-versed in the Vedas).

द्विविधः कर्मसंन्यासः फलसाधनभेदतः ।

फलाय ज्ञानिनस्त्यागो जिज्ञासोर्ज्ञानसिद्धये ॥४॥

कर्मसंन्यासः - the renunciation

(*sannyāsa*) फलसाधनभेदतः - because of being the means to gain either the result (*jīvanmukti*) or *Brahmajñāna* द्विविधः - is of two kinds ज्ञानिनः - of a *jñānī* त्यागः - *karmatyāga* or *sannyāsa* फलाय - is to gain the result (*jīvanmukti*) जिज्ञासोः - (*sannyāsa*) of the *mumukṣu* desirous of knowing Brahman ज्ञानसिद्धये - is meant for gaining the *Brahmajñāna* (the means of *mukti*)—(4)

4. The renunciation (*sannyāsa*) is of two kinds because of being the means to gain either the result (*jīvanmukti*) or *Brahmajñāna*. The *karmatyāga* (*sannyāsa*) of a *jñānī* is to gain *jīvanmukti* (called the result) whereas that of a *mumukṣu* is for gaining *Brahmajñāna* (the means of *mukti*).

The result (*phala*) of *Brahmajñāna* while living on account of *prārabdha* is to gain *jīvanmukti* to enjoy one's *paramānanda-svarūpa* right here unaffected by sorrows. This is not possible for a mind engrossed in the *karma* because *karmas* draw one's attention whereby it cannot be made to get absorbed in *ātmā* with single-pointed attention. Therefore a *jñānī* takes to renunciation called *vidvat-sannyāsa* to gain *jīvanmukti*. An ignorant *mumukṣu* who wants to gain *Brahmajñāna* is required to be free from the duties of

karma which is obligatory for him. A mind preoccupied in *karmas* in spite of having *jijñāsā* has no leisure to take to the indispensable means such as *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* required to gain *jñāna*. Therefore the *śāstra* gives a sanction to give up *karmas* to such an eligible *mumukṣu* who has intense *vairāgya* and *śuddha citta* with other prerequisites. Such *karmatyāga* is called *vividīśā sannyāsa*. Thus the *tyāga* of *karma* which creates agitations in the mind is necessary for an eligible *mumukṣu* also. Otherwise the *karma* becomes opposed to the pursuit of gaining knowledge. Though Yājñavalkya was an eminent *jñānī* he opts for *vidvat-sannyāsa* to gain *jīvanmukti* the pursuit of which was not possible for him so long as he continued to be a *grhastha* with duties and responsibilities. This is told now.

ज्ञानित्वाद् याज्ञवल्क्योऽयं जीवन्मुक्तिफलेच्छया ।
चित्तविक्षेपबाहुल्यं गार्हस्थ्यं त्यक्तुमिच्छति ॥५॥

अयं याज्ञवल्क्यः - this Yājñavalkya ज्ञानित्वात् - because of being a *jñānī* जीवन्मुक्तिफलेच्छया - desirous of gaining the result of *jīvanmukti* चित्तविक्षेपबाहुल्यं गार्हस्थ्यं - the stage of life of a householder which is full of mental agitations and preoccupations त्यक्तुम् इच्छति - wants to give up—(5)

5. Yājñavalkya because of being

a *jñānī*, desirous of gaining the result of *jīvanmukti* wants to give up the stage of life of a householder which is full of mental agitations and preoccupations.

The mind of a householder (*gr̥hastha*) is always preoccupied in discharging the duties and responsibilities, scriptural or worldly. It is not possible for such a person in spite of being a *jñānī* to devote the mind entirely to the pursuit of making it *Brahmaniṣṭha*. As a *sannyāsī* he has no obligations whatsoever. He is fully aware that his minimum bodily needs are taken care of by his *prārabdha*. Thus the *vidvat-sannyāsa* enables him to practice the means required to accomplish *jīvanmukti*. The king Janak, etc., are exceptional *jīvanmuktas* who continued to be *gr̥hasthas*. But as a general rule the *vidvat-sannyāsa* is recommended to a *jñānī* to accomplish *jīvanmukti*. It is also possible that Yājñavalkya chose to take *vidvat-sannyāsa* to set an ideal conduct for those who are eligible for it though he was not in its need.

At the beginning of the teaching, Yājñavalkya exhorts Maitreyī to take to *nididhyāsana* or *nirantara cintana* (constant rumination on or paying attention) of whatever he expounds (*Br. U.2-4-2*). That word '*nididhyāsana*' suggests the need of *vidvat-sannyāsa* even after gaining knowledge. This is

told now with 'why' of it.

निदिध्यासस्वेति शब्दात् सर्वत्यागफलं जगौ ।
न ह्यन्यचिन्तामत्यक्त्वा निदिध्यासितुमर्हति ॥६॥

'निदिध्यासस्व' इति शब्दात् - by (using) the word '*nididhyāsasva*' (pay attention or ruminate constantly) सर्वत्यागफलं - the result of renouncing everything जगौ - (Yājñavalkya) told हि - because अन्यचिन्ताम् अत्यक्त्वा - without renouncing all other thinking निदिध्यासितुम् न अर्हति - one cannot take to *nididhyāsana* (cannot pay attention) – (6)

6. (Yājñavalkya) told the result of renouncing everything by (using) the word '*nididhyāsasva*' (pay attention or ruminate constantly) because without renouncing all other thinking, one cannot take to *nididhyāsana* (cannot pay attention).

It is necessary that the mind should not focus or think about anything else and pay full attention to the subject-matter under consideration or to listen attentively. If there is any distraction from some external activity or internal brooding, it is not possible to pay the single-pointed attention to a subject matter under consideration. A *sannyāsī* by virtue of his renunciation of everything, is able to concentrate on a given *dhyeya* to the exclusion of all other dissimilar thoughts because he has no

other preoccupations. *Sannyāsa* is a means that provides an opportunity to take to *dhyāna*, but it does not produce *jñāna* by itself. It is conducive to turn the mind introvert having relieved itself from its natural extrovertedness. Such introvertedness is indispensable either to gain knowledge or *niṣṭhā* in it. This suggests that the *sannyāsī* who remains extrovert, preoccupied in activities, gets deprived of the highest *puruṣārtha*, the *mokṣa*. There is an occasion in *Bhāgavata purāṇa* (*Skanda-11*, Ch.13-vs.18 called *Haṃsagītā*) wherein Brahmā (not Brahman), though a *jñānī* could not find an answer to a question regarding a subtle aspect in meditation asked by Sanaka, etc., because of being *karmadhī* (totally engrossed in the act of Creation as a presiding deity). Total single-pointedness (*ekāgratā*) of mind is the result of *sannyāsa*. Therefore, the statement ‘*nididhyāsasva*’ (do *nididhyāsana*) by Yājñavalkya at the beginning of his teaching to Maitreyī implies a sacred precept that *sannyāsa* is necessary.

The word ‘*nididhyāsana*’ derived from the verb ‘*dhyai*’ (ध्थे) (to think of, to ponder over) also means ‘meditation’ in the beginning of teaching. It is an advice to reflect on what is taught by single-pointedness of the mind to ascertain the *ātmata* that is going to be taught. This is explained now.

निरन्तरं विचारो यः श्रुतार्थस्य गुरोर्मुखात् ।
तन्निदिध्यासनं प्रोक्तं तच्चैकाग्र्येण लभ्यते ॥७॥

गुरोः मुखात् - from *guru's* teaching
श्रुतार्थस्य - of the purport of Vedānta
listened to यः निरन्तरं विचारः - the
continuous reflection तत् - that process
निदिध्यासनं प्रोक्तं - is called *nididhyāsana*
तत् च - that *nididhyāsana* in the form of
constant rumination ऐकाग्र्येण - by the
means of single-pointedness of the mind
लभ्यते - is accomplished – (7)

7. The process of continuous reflection of the purport of Vedānta listened to from *guru's* teaching is called *nididhyāsana*. That *nididhyāsana* in the form of constant rumination is accomplished by the means of single-pointedness of the mind.

Śravaṇa is exposing to the teaching of *guru* in terms of inquiry into the nature of *ātmā* until it is ascertained to the finale of *ātmāsākṣātkāra*. This involves reflection to clear the doubts and contrary notions by reasoning and finally the direct verification of *ātmāsvarūpa* in its real nature by one's *ātmānubhava* (experience of *anubhava-svarūpa ātmā* without *tripuṭī* and any other *upādhis*). This requires finally the contemplation of *ātmā* to the exclusion of all thoughts of *anātmā* which is called *nididhyāsana*. A mind which is extrovert and so preoccupied in many things can never

hope to take to this means without single-pointedness of the mind (called *ekāgratā*). 'Eka' (one) refers to non-dual Brahman. 'Agra' (in the forefront) suggests the keeping it (*ātmā*/Brahman) in the forefront, by a close attention to be aware of its real nature to the exclusion of other *anātmā* entities. Thus, *ekāgratā* (concentration of mind) is necessary for *nididhyāsana* for which the renunciation of everything is essential.

The means to gain *ekāgratā* is being described.

अनात्मन्यरुचिश्चित्ते रुचिश्चात्मनि चेद् भवेत् ।
पुण्यपुञ्जेन शुद्धं तच्चित्तमैकाग्रमर्हति ॥८॥

पुण्यपुञ्जेन - by the virtue of *punya* accumulated in many lives चित्ते - in the mind अनात्मनि अरुचिः - aversion (or disgust) towards *anātmā* आत्मनि रुचिः च - and love for *ātmā* चेत् भवेत् - if it takes place (तदा चित्तं - then the mind) शुद्धं - (becomes) pure तच्चित्तम् - that (type of) mind एकाग्रम् अर्हति - becomes fit to have concentration—(8)

8. By the virtue of *punya* accumulated in many lives when the mind develops aversion (or disgust) towards *anātmā* and love for *ātmā* (then that mind) (becomes) pure. Such a mind becomes fit to have concentration.

The degree of *cittaśuddhi* (purity of mind) is directly proportional to the

intensity of *vairāgya*. The mind is considered to be pure when there is no fascination for *anātmā* or *dṛśya jagat* together with an intense love for *ātmā*. Such mind only can have the power of concentration. This is not a state of hopelessness or despair. It is born of intense yearning for *mokṣa* the highest *puruṣārtha*. This can only be the result of accumulated *puṇya* in the past lives. *Viveka* also dawns on such persons because of *durita-kṣaya* (destruction of past sins) on account of *varṇāśrama karmānuṣṭhāna* in many past lives.

PRIMARY LOVE AND SECONDARY LOVE

After impressing upon Maitreyī to be very attentive, Yājñavalkya does not teach *ātmajñāna* or the identity of *jīva* and *Īśvara*. But he elaborates for whose sake everything becomes dear to show that *ātmā* is nothing but limitless *ānanda*.

शुद्ध्यङ्कुरितमैकाग्रं विवेकेनाभिवर्धयेत् ।
प्रियाप्रियविवेकोऽतो मैत्रेय्या उपदिश्यते ॥९॥

शुद्ध्यङ्कुरितम् एकाग्रं - the concentration (single-pointedness) of the mind resulted from *cittaśuddhi* (purity of mind) विवेकेन - by the discrimination (of pleasing and non-pleasing) अभिवर्धयेत् - should be developed अतः - therefore प्रियाप्रियविवेकः -

the discrimination between the pleasing and non-pleasing मैत्रेय्यै - to Maitreyī उपदिश्यते - is taught – (9)

9. The concentration (single-pointedness) of the mind resulted from *cittaśuddhi* (purity of mind) should be developed by the discrimination (of pleasing and non-pleasing). Therefore, the discrimination between the pleasing and non-pleasing is taught to Maitreyī.

Figuratively *cittaśuddhi* is the seed and *ekāgratā* (concentration of mind) is its sprout, (i.e. result). This sprout is understood as *vividiṣā* (desire to gain *ātmajñāna*), *mumukṣā* (desire to get liberated), etc. No doubt desires are not desirable because of their binding nature being the product of self-ignorance. They keep the *jīva* continued in *saṃsāra*. They are born incessantly without any deliberate effort on one's part as a result of past *saṃskāras*. But *vividiṣā* and *mumukṣā* are benign necessary desires. They need to be nurtured with deliberate efforts, similar to the desire to eat called hunger is to be welcomed for living. If one does not have hunger, it is better to consult a doctor and treat it. Similarly, if the desire to know *ātmā*, Brahman, *Parameśvara* is not there it is harmful since the transmigration continues. Self-ignorance and the extrovertedness of the mind do not allow the desire for *ātmā* or

the pursuit of gaining *ātmajñāna*. That is why the *śāstras* say that *puṇya* needs to be earned to gain *ekāgratā* of *citta*. *Vedādhyayana*, *yajña*, *tapas*, service of the needy, etc., also are described by the *śāstras* as the means to gain *vividiṣā* (*Br.U.4-4-22*). The mind will have *ekāgratā* for *śravaṇa*, *manana*, etc., provided it is interested in gaining *jñāna*. Otherwise, it will get distracted in *śravaṇa*, etc. The mind becoming *ekāgra* on account of *puṇya* is the state of sprout (*aṅkurāvasthā*). But the sprout can grow into a tree only if it gets sufficient water, air, sun, etc. Otherwise it will dry up. Similarly, *ekāgratā* or *mumukṣā* need to be fostered by *viveka* that is going to be told. Then only they can blossom in *ātmajñāna*. Otherwise, the achievement of *ekāgratā* of the mind will be lost.

Viveka (discrimination) is knowing an entity in its right perspective. The *śāstra* speaks of *viveka* between *kārya-akārya* (things to be done and not to be done), *jñeya-ajñeya* (to be known and not to be known), *satya-asatya* (true and false), *jñāna-ajñāna* (knowledge and ignorance), etc. Here Yājñavalkya is going to elaborate the *viveka* between *priya* and *apriya* (pleasing and non-pleasing) so as to distinguish between *ānanda* and *anānanda* (source of happiness and that which is not so). This

helps to ascertain the real nature of *ātmā* as limitless *ānanda* sought by all.

Maitreyī had served her husband discharging her duties for a long period and had pleased him. That is why Yājñavalkya tells her: ‘You were dear to me even earlier, but now you are more dear because you have expressed your desire to gain *ātmajñāna*’. This shows that by discharging her duties as the wife she got *cittaśuddhi* and so she was not fascinated by the wealth. But this *cittaśuddhi* or *ekāgratā* needs to be developed by *viveka*. We love anything that is the source of *ānanda*. It is true that *ātmā* is *ānanda* and so we love ourselves. But there are many other entities and beings which also we love. Here we have to see that anything other than *ātmā*, (i.e. *anātmā*) is not pleasing to us by itself. And yet if we love them as the source of *ānanda*, that love is for our purpose (or need). Our inquiry will now reveal that *ātmā* alone is the locus of limitless *ānanda* because it is the locus of limitless love.

It is true that there are different entities that we love. But whatever love for entities other than oneself, (i.e. *anyatra*, *anātmā*) such as towards wife, husband, children, wealth, fame, etc., is for the purpose (need) of oneself (*ātmārtham-ātmaprayojanāya*).

This is the fact, whether one likes

it or not. The sooner we discover this, the better it is for us, so that our life can be more purposeful. We hesitate to accept this fact lest we should be branded as selfish. However, we cannot fool ourselves. One loves anything and everything for the sake of oneself alone.

Yājñavalkya has explained this basic fact to Maitreyī in unequivocal terms. He says: ‘O, dear Maitreyī, verily the husband is dear to the wife not for the sake of husband, but it is for her own sake that he is dear. The wife is dear to the husband not for the sake of the wife, but it is for his own sake that she is dear. Children are dear to parents not for the sake of children, but it is for the sake of parents that they are dear. The wealth is dear not for the sake of wealth, but it is for one's own sake that it is dear. The animals are dear not for the sake of animals, but it is for one's own sake that they are dear. The Brahmin is dear not for the sake of Brahmin, but it is for one's own sake that he is dear. The *kṣatriya* is dear not for the sake of *kṣatriya*, but it is for one's own sake he is dear. The heavenly abodes are dear not for their sake, but it is for one's own sake that they are dear. The Vedas are dear not for the sake of Vedas, but it is for one's own sake that they are dear. The five elements (earth, water, fire, air and space) are dear not for their sake, but it is for one's own

sake that they are dear. Verily all is dear not for the sake of all, but for one's own sake that all is dear (*ātmanastu kāmāya/prayojanāya sarvam priyam bhavati*)' (*Br.U.2-4-5* and *4-5-6*). The word *priyam* used in the above topic is to be taken as dear, pleasing, agreeable or liked. Anything and everything that is *priyam* is not for the sake of those entities themselves but for the sake of oneself. The import of this topic is explained in the next four verses. Based on one's experience and reasoning it is shown that the love for *ātmā* is primary whereas it is secondary for others.

पतिजायादिभोग्येषु

भोक्तार्यात्मनि चेक्ष्यते ।

प्रीतिस्तत्र क्व मुख्येयं

कुत्रामुख्येति चिन्त्यताम् ॥१०॥

प्रीतिः - love पतिजायादिभोग्येषु - in the objects of enjoyment such as husband, wife, etc., (*bhogyā*) भोक्तरि आत्मनि च - and in the *bhoktā ātmā* ईक्ष्यते - is seen तत्र - among the *bhoktā* and *bhogyā* इयं - this love क्व मुख्या - where (it is) primary (natural) कुत्र अमुख्या - where (it is) secondary (dependant) इति चिन्त्यताम् - should be considered – (10)

10. Love is seen in both the objects of enjoyment such as husband, wife, etc., (called *bhogyā*) and also in the *bhoktā ātmā*. Among the *bhoktā* and

bhogyā where the love is primary (natural, independent) and where it is secondary (dependant) should be considered.

It is a matter of universal experience that love is seen for the sentient and inert objects of enjoyments (*bhogyā*) as well as the *bhoktā jīva*. Now it has to be investigated as to which of these two is primary (natural) love and which is the secondary (dependant one).

The main or the primary love is for *ātmā* only is proved with the help of evidence.

सदा भूयासमेवाहं मा न

भूवं कदाचन ।

इत्यनौपाधिकी प्रीतिः

प्राणिनामात्मनीक्ष्यते ॥११॥

अहं - I सदा - always भूयासम् एव - should be there without fail न कदाचन - never मा भूवं - I should cease to be there, (i.e. never I should die) इति - so प्राणिनाम् - in the case of all living beings अनौपाधिकी - natural (without a cause) प्रीतिः - love आत्मनि - for *ātmā* (oneself) ईक्ष्यते - is seen – (11)

11. 'I should be there always without fail', 'Never I should cease to be there, (i.e. never I should die). Thus, natural (without a cause) love for *ātmā* (oneself) is seen in the case of all living beings.

‘*Anaupādhikī*’ means without any specific cause. Love for *ātmā* (I) is not because of any specific cause, but it is only because that is *ātmā* (I). The nature of that love also is described in terms of universal desire in all living beings which is expressed as ‘I should live forever; I should not die at all’. This is the main or primary love. It does not depend on time, place or anything. Not only humans but also all other living beings have love for oneself. The love for the mind, senses and the body is so long as they please us. Love for them ceases the moment they become the source of sorrow.

The secondary love for *bhogyā* or entities other than *ātmā* is deduced now.

स्वसंबन्धोपाधिनेव भोग्ये

प्रीतिर्न तु स्वतः ।

अन्यथा वैरिभोग्येऽपि

भोग्यत्वात् प्रीतिरापतेत् ॥१२॥

भोग्ये - in the *bhogyā* (such as husband, wife, etc.) स्वसंबन्धोपाधिना एव - by the *upādhi* (cause) in the form of ‘mineness’ alone प्रीतिः - love (happens to be there) तु - but स्वतः न - not on its own (without the *upādhi* of such ‘mineness’) अन्यथा - otherwise वैरिभोग्ये अपि - in the *bhogyā* (objects of enjoyment) of one's enemy also भोग्यत्वात् - because of their nature of being the objects of enjoyment

प्रीतिः आपतेत् - love should occur – (12)

12. Love for the *bhogyā* (such as husband, wife, etc.), (happens to be there) by the *upādhi* (cause) in the form of ‘mineness’ alone, but not on its own (without the *upādhi* of such ‘mineness’). Otherwise love should occur for the *bhogyā* (objects of enjoyment) of one's enemy also because of their nature of being the objects of enjoyment.

Here, the word *upādhi* means a special cause for a general effect. *Bhogyā* or the *viśayas* (objects) of *bhoga* (enjoyment) whether they are inert or sentient are necessarily distinct from the *bhoktā* (enjoyer). Therefore they are *anātmā*. They become *priya* or they invoke our *prīti* (love) provided they are related to us with ‘mineness’ coupled with conducive or favourable disposition. That is why we have no love towards the *bhogyā* of our enemies because of having no ‘mineness’ towards them even though we may love similar *bhogyā* not belonging to the enemy provided they are available to us. It is also true that the *bhogyas* that are unfavourable are not *priya* even if related to us. Therefore, the secondary love is experienced towards *anātmā* because of specific relation of ‘mineness’ in connection with the primarily *priya* (pleasing) *ātmā* only. Further, who exactly is the ‘I’ that is the

locus of main or primary love will have to be investigated. Is it the assemblage of body, etc.? Or can it be *sākṣī*? The inquiry will reveal that the *sākṣī ātmā* which itself is Brahman is in fact the most dear (*priya*).

It is deduced now that the result of ascertaining the locus of primary love is to develop the *ekāgratā* (the power of concentration) of *citta* (mind).

अविचारेण पुत्रादौ या प्रीतिस्तां विचारतः ।
आत्मन्येवोपसंहृत्य चित्तैकाग्रं विवर्धयेत् ॥१३॥

अविचारेण - because of indiscretion
पुत्रादौ - for the son (progeny), etc. या प्रीतिः
- whatever love is there तां - that love
विचारतः - by investigation आत्मनि एव - in
ātmā only उपसंहृत्य - having taken back
चित्तैकाग्रं - the concentration of the mind
विवर्धयेत् - should be developed—(13)

13. Whatever love is there for the son (progeny), etc., is because of indiscretion, having taken it back in *ātmā* only by investigation, the concentration of the mind should be developed.

The love for all worldly *bhogyā* is because of indiscretion alone. On proper inquiry, it gets reduced to a barter deal only. There is no real love. There is some seeming semblance of love so long as an entity is useful. That also is for the sake of ‘oneself’ who is the dearest in the entire Creation. Here the word ‘oneself’

should not be mistaken for body, etc., but it refers to *sākṣī ātmā* identical with Brahman whose nature is nothing but limitless *ānanda* totally free from sorrows.

ĀTMĀ DRAṢṬAVYAḤ (SĀKṢĀTKĀRA OF ĀTMĀ SHOULD BE GAINED)

Thus having told the primary *priya* (pleasing entity) to be *ātmā*, Yājñavalkya exhorts that *ātmā* should be known in its real nature (*ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ*) for which its means *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* (*śrotavyaḥ*, *mantavyaḥ*, *nididhyāsitavyaḥ*) should be taken to (*Br.U.2-4-5; 4-5-6*). Thus, the means and the necessity of *cittaikāgratā* were established so far. This is necessary to take to the constant contemplation of *ātmā* called *nirantara-vicāra* or *nididhyāsana*. With this preparation now the *sūtra* (aphorism) ‘*ātmā vā are (अरे) draṣṭavyaḥ*’ etc., (*Br.U.2-4-5* and *4-5-6*) is being commented upon which corresponds to the *vidyāsūtra*, ‘*ātmā vā iti eva upāsīta*’ (*Br.U.1-4-7; A.Pr.13-155 to 249*). First the topic is introduced and then the *śruti* statement in the form of *sūtra* will be explained word by word.

एकाग्रमचलं कृत्वा

निदिध्यासनकारणम् ।

आत्मा द्रष्टव्य इत्येतत् सूत्रं

व्याख्यातुमाददे ॥१४॥

निदिध्यासनकारणम् - the means of *nididhyāsana* ऐकाग्रम् - (namely) the concentration of the mind अचलं कृत्वा - having established beyond any trace of doubt 'आत्मा द्रष्टव्यः' - 'ātmā should be known directly (*aparokṣatayā*)' इति एतत् सूत्रं - this aphorism (*sūtra*) व्याख्यातुम् आददे - (Yājñavalkya) takes to comment upon - (14)

14. Having established beyond any trace of doubt the means of *nididhyāsana* (namely) the concentration of the mind (to be indispensable) (Yājñavalkya) takes to comment upon the *sūtra* (aphorism), 'ātmā should be known directly (*aparokṣatayā*)' (viz., *ātmā vā are draṣṭavyah*).

Yājñavalkya had told to Maitreyī to take to *nididhyāsana* which is possible by the means of *citta-ekāgratā*. Such concentration of the mind can be fostered by withdrawing our love for *anātmā* and directing it towards *ātmā* who is the locus of primary love. Only with well-developed *ekāgratā* of the mind the seeker can take to *nididhyāsana* of the teaching received from *guru*. 'Acalam Kṛtvā' (अचलं कृत्वा) means 'having established beyond any trace of doubt the fact that *citta-ekāgratā* is the means of *nididhyāsana*'. Unless the mind is withdrawn from the extrovertedness resorting to the *priya-*

apriya viveka, it is not possible to take to effective *śravaṇa*, etc. Though the role of *nididhyāsana* is after the *śravaṇa* and *manana* to gain the *ātmasākṣātkāra* by the combined practice of these three, it (*nididhyāsana*) is also necessary to an extent to gain the clarity of *parokṣa jñāna*. This statement is considered as *sūtra* which is going to be elaborated now.

The word 'ātmā' from the *sūtra*, 'ātmā vā are draṣṭavyah', etc., is now commented upon.

आहात्मशब्दः प्रत्यञ्चं तथा

लोकेऽनुभूतितः ।

अनेनाऽत्राऽऽत्मशब्देन प्रमेयं

निर्दिदिक्षितम् ॥१५॥

आत्मशब्दः - (here) the word 'ātmā' प्रत्यञ्चं - the innermost entity (*pratyagātmā*) आह - speaks of तथा - accordingly लोके - in the world अनुभूतितः - because this is experienced, (i.e. having heard the word 'ātmā' we understand it as 'I') अत्र - in this 'ātmā vā are', etc., *śruti* अनेन आत्मशब्देन - by this word 'ātmā' प्रमेयं - the entity to be known निर्दिदिक्षितम् - is desired to be indicated - (15)

15. (Here) the word 'ātmā' speaks of the innermost entity (*pratyagātmā*) because this is experienced (by all) in the world, (i.e. having heard the word 'ātmā' we understand it as 'I'). By this word

ātmā, in this *śruti*-statement ‘*ātmā vā are*’, etc., the entity to be known is desired to be indicated.

The entity which can never be a *drśya* or an object which can never be known as distinct from self-evident ‘I’ is called the innermost or *pratyak*. That alone is called *ātmā* and itself is *Paramātmā* or Brahman. Now the meaning of ‘*draṣṭavyaḥ*’ is being told.

द्रष्टव्य इति निर्दिष्टा प्रमितिर्दृशिधातुना ।

अज्ञातज्ञापनं तव्यप्रत्ययेनाऽभिधीयते ॥१६॥

द्रष्टव्यः इति - in (the word) ‘*draṣṭavyaḥ*’ (should be directly known) दृशिधातुना - by the verb *drś* (to see) प्रमितिः - valid knowledge निर्दिष्टा - is indicated ‘तव्य’ प्रत्ययेन - by the suffix or particle of potential mood ‘*tavya*’ (should be) अज्ञातज्ञापनं - ‘making known the entity not known’ अभिधीयते - is conveyed—(16)

16. In (the word) ‘*draṣṭavyaḥ*’ (should be directly known) by the verb *drś* (to see), the valid knowledge is indicated (whereas) by the suffix or particle of potential mood ‘*tavya*’ (should see) ‘making known the entity not known’ is conveyed.

The word ‘*draṣṭavya*’ means that which is ‘fit to be seen/known’ or ‘should be seen/known’. It has two components. One is the verb ‘*drś*’ (to see) and the suffix or particle of potential

mood, ‘*tavya*’ (should be). It indicates, ‘making known the entity not known’. ‘To see’ is in the sense to know exactly in accordance with the entity to be known. The word ‘knowledge’ in general like the word ‘experience’ may or may not be true to the entity to be known. It can be erroneous, (i.e. *bhrama*) and with doubt. To eliminate such possibility, the word ‘*pramiti*’ or ‘*pramā*’ which means the correct knowledge born of valid *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) is added. Such knowledge cannot be invalidated. Thus ‘*draṣṭavya*’ exhorts that *ātmā* should be directly known in its real nature in contrast to its erroneous knowledge that we have till now. *Ātmā* is not *kartā*, *bhoktā*, *jīva* but *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* totally free from *samsāra*.

Having told the meaning of two words from ‘*ātmā draṣṭavyaḥ*’ what that phrase as a sentence means is explained in the next verse.

अज्ञात आत्मा वेदान्तजन्यज्ञानेन मीयते ।

इत्येष एव वाक्यार्थो नाऽप्रवृत्तप्रवर्तनम् ॥१७॥

वेदान्तजन्यज्ञानेन - by the knowledge produced by Vedānta अज्ञातः आत्मा - *ātmā* that is not known मीयते - is known in its real nature इति - so एषः एव - this only वाक्यार्थः - is the meaning of the sentence ‘*ātmā vā are*, etc.’ अप्रवृत्तप्रवर्तनम् - prompting to do something that is not begun, (i.e. not a *vidhi*/scriptural

injunction to do a *karma* or *upāsana*) न - not – (17)

17. The *ātmā* that is not known (hitherto) is known in its real nature by the knowledge produced by Vedānta. This only is the meaning of the sentence ‘*ātmā vā are*, etc.’ It is not prompting to do something that is not begun, (i.e. it is not a *vidhi*/scriptural injunction to do a *karma* or *upāsana*).

The ‘*tavya*’ (should be) as the particle of potential mood is generally used in the *karmakāṇḍa* and *upāsana-kāṇḍa* as a *vidhi* (scriptural command) asking to do something. This verse makes it clear that such meaning is not applicable here, only because the suffix ‘*tavya*’ is used. It does not prompt to do something. The particle ‘*tavya*’ only exhorts the *mumukṣu* to gain the *aparokṣajñāna* of *ātmā* in its real nature.

Here the meaning of ‘*draṣṭavya*’ was given taking for granted that *ātmā* is not known (*ātmā ajñātaḥ* vs.17). But one can object that everyone knows *ātmā* as ‘I am’. Then how the occasion of knowing *ātmā* arises at all? This question is first raised and then answered.

नन्वहंप्रत्ययेनात्मा

वेदान्तश्रवणात् पुरा ।

विज्ञात इति चेन्मैवं

सार्वत्म्याऽनवबोधनात् ॥१८॥

ननु - here is a contrary proposition वेदान्तश्रवणात् पुरा - before Vedāntic *śravaṇa* अहंप्रत्ययेन - by the experience as ‘I’ आत्मा - *ātmā* विज्ञातः - is well-known इति चेत् - if it is said so मा एवं - this statement is not correct सार्वत्म्याऽनवबोधनात् - because the entity *ātmā* is the *ātmā* of all is not known directly (*aparokṣatayā*) – (18)

18. Here is a contrary proposition: ‘Before Vedāntic *śravaṇa* *ātmā* is well-known by the experience as ‘I’. If it is said so, this statement is not correct because “the entity ‘*ātmā*’ is the *ātmā* of all” is not known directly (*aparokṣatayā*).

लिङ्गदेहपरिच्छिन्नरूपग्राहिण्यहंमतिः ।

सार्वत्म्यमात्मनस्तत्त्वं तदज्ञातमहंधिया ॥१९॥

‘अहं’ मतिः - the ‘I’- notion लिङ्गदेहपरिच्छिन्नरूपग्राहिणी - experiences *ātmā* in the form limited by the subtle (and also the gross) body आत्मनः - of *ātmā* तद् - that सार्वत्म्यम् तत्त्वं - real nature as the *ātmā* of all free from *upādhis* अहंधिया - by the ‘I’-notion अज्ञातं - is not known – (19)

19. The ‘I’- notion experiences *ātmā* in the form limited by the subtle (and also gross) body. The real nature of *ātmā* as the *ātmā* of all free from *upādhis* is not known by the ‘I’

notion (*ahaṃkāra*).

The experience of 'I' as experienced by the *ahaṃkāra* is *sopādhika*. It is limited by gross and the subtle bodies. This is an erroneous experience of *ātmā* confined and identified with the body. It does not reveal the all pervasive nature of *ātmā* free from *upādhis* as the basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) and the real nature of everything called *sārvātmya* or *ātmā* in all. This itself is the state of ignorance of *ātmā*. The common person takes the body as *ātmā*. Those who have some *viveka* and believe in other *lokas* take the subtle body as *ātmā*. In sleep we experience *ātmā* free from both gross and subtle bodies. But that experience is along with ignorance. It cannot be the experience of *ātmā*. Therefore the real nature of *ātmā* can be known only through the knowledge born from Vedānta by a *mumukṣu* who has the eligible mind. Therefore, *ātmā* is considered as not known and Yājñavalkya exhorts by the word '*draṣṭavyaḥ*' that its direct knowledge be gained.

The Vedānta *śāstra* becomes *pramāṇa* because *ātmā* is not known. This is told now with the result of gaining *ātmajñāna*.

सर्वासूपनिषत्स्वेतत्

सर्वात्म्यं प्रतिपद्यते ।

कार्यज्ञेयसमाप्तिः स्यात्

सर्वात्म्यस्याऽवबोधतः ॥२०॥

एतत् - this सर्वात्म्यं - nature of *ātmā* being *sarvātmā* (*ātmā* of all) सर्वासु उपनिषत्सु - in all Upaniṣads प्रतिपद्यते - is unfolded सर्वात्म्यस्य अवबोधतः - by gaining the *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *sarvātmā* nature of *ātmā* कार्यज्ञेयसमाप्तिः स्यात्- the things to be done and known end – (20)

20. This nature of *ātmā* being *sarvātmā* (*ātmā* of all) is unfolded in all Upaniṣads. The things to be done and known end by gaining the *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *sarvātmā* nature of *ātmā*.

The object of a *pramāṇa* is an entity that is not known earlier, (i.e. *apūrva*). That is why Upaniṣads as *pramāṇa* reveal the real nature of not known *ātmā* along with the means to gain its knowledge. If *ātmā* were known by other means, at best there can be its passing references somewhere. But all Upaniṣads without exception establish the real nature of *ātmā* with criteria such as the '*upakrama-upasamhāra*' (uniformity between the beginning and the conclusion), *abhyāsa* (repetition), etc.

Ātmajñāna is never futile. Its result is the highest *puruṣārtha*

(accomplishment in life). In the wake of this knowledge, all pursuits of doing or knowing something come to a final end. The person is *kṛta-kṛtya*, the one who has done what needs to be done in life. Again he is *jñāta-jñeya*, the one who has known what needs to be known. On gaining the *sākṣātkāra* of oneself to be *nitya-mukta-upādhirahita-paramānanda-svarūpa* Brahman, one discovers oneself to be nothing but self-evident Brahman and that there is nothing other than oneself. Thus, the Vedānta *śāstra* becomes *pramāṇa* to gain *ātmajñāna* because it fulfills both the conditions required to be a *pramāṇa*. They are: ‘Revealing the *ātmā* not known to the seeker earlier by any other *pramāṇa* and the knowledge gained thus is fruitful because it confers *mokṣa* by ending the calamitous *samsāra*.’

Having given the meaning of the *sūtra* ‘*ātmā draṣṭavyaḥ*’ the meaning of ‘*śrotavyaḥ*’ is being told.

आत्मा द्रष्टव्य इत्युक्त्या तत्त्वधीरुपदर्शिता ।
श्रोतव्य इत्यादिना तु विचार उपदर्श्यते ॥२१॥

‘आत्मा द्रष्टव्यः’ इति उक्त्या - by the statement ‘*ātmā draṣṭavyaḥ*’ तत्त्वधीः - the knowledge of ultimate truth उपदर्शिता - was indicated श्रोतव्यः इत्यादिना - by the statement ‘*śrotavyaḥ*’ (should be listened to), etc. तु - but विचार - the inquiry into the nature of *ātmā* उपदर्श्यते - is being

shown – (21)

21. By the statement ‘*ātmā draṣṭavyaḥ*’ the knowledge of ultimate truth was indicated. But by the statement ‘*śrotavyaḥ*’ (should be listened to), etc., the inquiry (*vicāra*) into the nature of *ātmā* is being shown.

It was told that ‘*draṣṭavyaḥ*’ is not a *vidhi* (scriptural injunction to do something) because the knowledge of an entity depends on the entity itself and not on human will to do or not to do something. But ‘*śrotavyaḥ*’, etc., are *vidhis*. They do not signify the actual *ātmajñāna* whereas they point out the *vicāra* (self-inquiry) which is the means to gain *jñāna*. It is clearly known that the nature of *śravaṇa* and *manana* is inquiry. Its nature is mental activity (*manovyāpāra*) dependant on the entity to be known (*vastutantra*) wherein human will has no role. *Śravaṇa* and *manana* involve *tarka* (reasoning) which is a mental *karma*. It depends on human will. Therefore the potential particle ‘*tavya*’ used in the case of *śravaṇa* and *manana* is in the primary (*mukhya*) sense as an injunction (to take to self-inquiry) and not secondary. *Śravaṇa* and *manana* lead to *nididhyāsana* which also requires human efforts. Thus the potential particle ‘*tavya*’ is in the primary sense in case of ‘*nididhyasitavyaḥ*’ (*Siddhānta-bindu*, vs.8).

Samkṣepa-sārīraka has clarified the above point (1-479 to 481). When the potential, imperative, etc., particles are used in the context of gaining knowledge, they are in the secondary sense because the knowledge is not something that can be accomplished by doing some *karma*, (i.e. not *kṛti-sādhya*). But these particles are used in the primary sense in the case of sacrifices, etc., which are the means of some desirable end and can be accomplished only through *karmas*. The knowledge as the means to accomplish a desirable result is not known earlier which the potential, imperative, etc., particles make them known. But the knowledge being dependant on the entity to be known and not a *kṛti-sādhya*, these particles become secondary in their potential, etc., moods. In the case of desirable ends such as sacrifices, etc., which are *kṛti-sādhya* involving things to be done they become primary and not secondary. Just as the potential, etc., moods engaged in the context of sacrifice, etc., are primary, similarly they are primary (in terms of human efforts) in the case of direct means (*antaraṅga sādhanā*) of *Brahmajñāna* namely *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana*. These means also are *kṛti-sādhya* (accomplished by human

efforts). Therefore the potential particle ‘*tavya*’ in *śrotavyaḥ*, *mantavya* and *nididhyāsitavya* is in the primary sense.

Literally, ‘*śrotavya*’ means ‘should be listened to’. But that is not meant here. It signifies self-inquiry in this context. This is explained now.

श्रुत्यर्थाविष्कृतेर्हेतुः

शब्दशक्तिविवेककृत् ।

श्रुतलिङ्गादिको न्यायः प्रोक्तः

श्रोतव्य इत्यतः ॥२२॥

श्रोतव्यः इति अतः - by the word ‘*śrotavya*’ श्रुत्यर्थाविष्कृतेः हेतुः - the means of revealing the purport (*tātparya*) of *śruti* (the Vedas) न्यायः - the method of inquiry शब्दशक्तिविवेककृत् - which gives the correct import of the words used in Vedānta श्रुतलिङ्गादिकः - and which employs the six criteria such as *śruti*, *liṅga*, etc. प्रोक्तः - is told – (22)

22. The word ‘*śrotavya*’ tells the method of inquiry that serves as the means of revealing the purport (*tātparya*) of *śruti* (the Vedas) by giving the correct import of the words used in Vedānta and which employs the six criteria such as *śruti* (the passage of *śruti* which speaks of *aṅga*/limb of a main *karma*) *liṅga*, etc., (to ascertain the purport).

The *śravaṇa* (listening to) in *śrotavyaḥ* does not mean just the understanding of etymological meaning contained therein. Such a knowledge can be gained by an

avivekī also. It cannot give *ātmasākṣātkāra*. Therefore, *śravaṇa* stands for the means which reveals the final purport (*tātparya*) of the Vedas culminating in *jīva-brahma-aiḱya* (identity of *jīva* and Brahman). This is arrived at by ascertaining the exact import of the words used in Vedānta for which the criteria of *śruti*, *liṅga*, etc., are employed. This can be accomplished by a *vivekī* only.

In *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika* (2-4-84) the '*śravaṇa*' is defined as '*śruti-liṅgādikaḥ nyāyaḥ śabdaśaktirvivekakṛt*' (*śravaṇa* is the method of inquiry which employs the six criteria such as *śruti*, *liṅga*, etc., to reveal the expressive power or significance of word). *Ānandagiri* in his gloss explains this phrase as: 'By the methods of inquiry employing the criterion such as *śruti*, etc., the ascertainment of the Vedāntic purport in the identity of *jīva* and Brahman is *śravaṇa*'. To know the exact import of a sentence, the full significance of the words contained therein including implied meaning (*lakṣaṇa*) needs to be known. For this purpose Jaimini in his *sūtra* (3-3-14) has indicated six criteria to ascertain what a statement from the Vedas has to say. Though those norms are useful in ascertaining the *aṅga* (auxiliary) of a main *karma* in the *karmakāṇḍa* portion of the Vedas, they are also useful in ascertaining the purport (*tātparya*) of other Vedic statements.

These criteria are:

- i) *Śruti* (a specific direct statement of *śruti*). Here the word *śruti* refers to the statements in the Vedas which describe a specific topic. For example, consider the *mahāvākya*, '*tat tvam asi*'. Here the words *tat* (Brahman) and '*tvam*' (*jīva*) are both in the nominative case. This indicates the identity between them.
- ii) *Liṅga* refers to *sāmarthya* or the power of a word which gives a clue. The words such as *ajara* (without old age) or *amara* (immortal) indicate that the body cannot be *ātmā*.
- iii) *Vākya* (syntactical connection). Consider the statement, '*buddhvā buddhimān syāt kṛtakṛtyaḥ*' (having got the *ātmajñāna* the *jñānī* becomes totally accomplished person). This shows that *ātmajñāna* is the means of *kṛtakṛtyatā*.
- iv) *Prakaraṇa* refers to the context. The teaching of Yamarāja in the *Kaṭhopanīṣad* is regarding *Virāḍagni*, *jīva* and *Paramātmā* is determined by the context of the question by *Nacīketā* (*Br.Sū. 1-4-6*).
- v) *Sthāna* is the criterion of position or the order of a specific statement or entity. A *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* statement is: '*śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitya.... śravaṇena matyā* (by *manana*) *vijñānena*' (*Br.U.2-4-5*). The question is 'what is the meaning of *vijñāna*' in this statement? It is ascertained by taking into

consideration the position or the order of the word ‘vijñāna’. Since ‘vijñānena’ corresponds to ‘nididhyāsitavyaḥ’ the word ‘vijñāna’ means ‘nididhyāsana’ (in its finale).

vi) *Samākhya* means name. The name ‘*Aupaniṣadam puruṣam*’ (*Bṛ.U.3-9-26*) shows that *Paramātmā* (Brahman) is not an object of any other *pramāṇas*. Only the Upaniṣads can reveal it.

The word ‘*śruti*’ in ‘*śrutiyarthāviṣkrteḥ*’ (vs.22) means the entire Vedas where the same word in ‘*śrutilingādikaḥ*’ (vs.22) refers to a specific statement of Vedas describing a certain topic such as *aṅga* (auxiliary) of a *karma*, etc.

Or the phrase ‘*śrutilingādikaḥ*’ can be taken as another set of criteria such as ‘*upakrama-upasaṃhāra*’, etc. They are: *Upakramopasaṃhāra* (harmony between the beginning and the end), *abhyāsa* (repetition of the topic), *phala* (desired result), *apūrva* (unknown by any other *pramāṇa*), *arthavāda* (praise or censure to highlight a point), *upapatti* (reasoning in accordance with the *śruti*). An inquiry conducted with the means of these criteria to ascertain the purport (*tātparyā*) of *śruti* is called *śravaṇa* (*P.7-101*). Pañcapādikā (*varṇaka* 9) defines *śravaṇa* as the inquiry into the *Vedānta-vākya*s and *Brahmasūtras* to gain *ātmajñāna*.

The nature of *manana* (reflection) is explained.

अर्थाऽसंभावनोच्छेदी तर्को मननमीरितम् ।
वेदशास्त्राऽविरोध्यत्र तर्को ग्राह्यो न चेतः ॥२३॥

अर्थाऽसंभावनोच्छेदी तर्कः - the reasoning that destroys the notion that the things taught by Vedānta (Upaniṣads) is impossible मननम् ईरितम् - is called *manana* अत्र - in the context of *manana* वेदशास्त्राऽविरोधी तर्कः - the reasoning unopposed to the Vedas ग्राह्यः - has to be accepted न च इतरः - and not the one opposed to the Vedas—(23)

23. The reasoning that destroys the notion that the things taught by

Vedānta (Upaniṣads) is impossible is called *manana*. In the context of *manana* the reasoning unopposed to the Vedas has to be accepted and not the one opposed to the Vedas.

As an *anādi jīva*, our *buddhi* is firmly oriented towards duality in this pluralistic world of objects and beings. The non-duality and one *ātmā* being present in all pointed out by Vedas does not tally with our intimate experiences. Therefore, reasoning needs to be employed to find out how, what is told by the Vedas is possible. The contrariety that we come across is at the *upādhi*-level and not about *ātmā*. This can be ascertained by the inquiry with the

means of reasoning in accordance with the *śruti*. A reasoning opposed to what is told by the Vedas also can be imagined. Therefore, the advice is to follow the reasoning that establishes the truth conveyed by the Vedas.

The word ‘*nididhyāsana*’ is defined (*Br.U.Vā.2-4-217* to *221*).

अपरायत्तबोधोऽत्र

निदिध्यासनमुच्यते ।

ध्यानाशङ्कानिवृत्त्यर्थं

विज्ञानेनेत्युदीरणात् ॥२४॥

अत्र - in this *śruti* statement ‘*ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ*’, etc. अपरायत्तबोधः - the knowledge of *ātmā* not dependant on anything whatsoever निदिध्यासनम् उच्यते - is said to be *nididhyāsana* ध्यानाशङ्कानिवृत्त्यर्थं - to dispel the doubt that *nididhyāsana* must be *dhyāna* (meditation) विज्ञानेन - by ‘*vijñāna*’ (*Br.U. 4-5*) इति उदीरणात् - thus the *śruti* has commented upon – (24)

24. In this *śruti* statement ‘*ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ*’, etc. (*Br.U.2-4-5*), the knowledge of *ātmā* not dependant on anything whatever (*aparāyattabodha*), is said to be *nididhyāsana*. To dispel the doubt that *nididhyāsana* must be *dhyāna* (meditation), the *śruti* has commented upon (the word *nididhyāsana*) as ‘*vijñāna*’ (by which everything becomes known) (*Br.U. 2-4-5*).

‘*Parāyatta*’ means that which is dependant on something else. ‘*Na parāyattaḥ bodhaḥ*’ (the knowledge that is not dependant on anything else) is ‘*aparāyattabodha*’. Having proper means such as *śama*, *dama*, etc., when the *śravaṇa*, *manana* are taken to, the *mahāvākyas* such as ‘*tat tvam asi*’ because of ending of all obstructions give rise to the knowledge totally independent of everything including *mahāvākyas*, *śravaṇa*, *manana* and repeated meditation to maintain a flow of *ātmā-pratyaya* to the exclusion of *anātmā-pratyaya*. This is the knowledge wherein even *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* having done its job of ending the self-ignorance has dropped itself in the *jñāna-niṣṭhā*. This *aparāyattabodha* corresponds to *Brahmasākṣātkāra* wherein the self-evident knowledge principle or self-experiencing principle *cit* and *cit* alone is.

It is true that the word ‘*nididhyāsana*’ means constant and consistent meditation by maintaining *ātmā-pratyayas* and excluding the *anātmā-pratyayas*. That is a means recommended earlier to get rid of obstructions that hinder the spontaneous knowledge called ‘*aparāyattabodha*’. Truly speaking, meditation (*dhyāna*) on attributeless (*nirviśeṣa*) entity is not possible because *dhyāna* is a *mānasa karma* (mental activity). Therefore,

one can meditate only on entities that can be objectified by the meditator. It is well-known that non-dual *ātmā* is beyond the reach of mind and words. Thus, when there is a doubt whether the *nididhyāsana* word means meditation or ‘independent knowledge’, we will have to be guided by the rule ‘*sandigdhe vākyaśeṣāt*’ (when there is a doubt about a *śruti* statement, be guided by the remaining portion of that *śruti-vākya*). Accordingly the meaning of ‘*nididhyāsana*’ has to be taken as specified by its corresponding explanatory word by the *śruti* namely ‘*vijñānena*’ that follows therein. Thus, it has to be *vijñāna* in the sense ‘*aparāyatabodha*’. Here also *vijñāna* word cannot be taken to as meditation by its etymological derivation ‘*vijñāyate anena*’ because we have already seen that *nirviśeṣa ātmā/Brahman* cannot be an object of the meditator. This is how a *vṛtti* conforming to *nirviśeṣa ātmā/Brahman* called *ātmākāra/ brahmākāra* or *akhaṇḍākāra* becomes inevitable to end the ignorance. There has to be *vṛttivyāpti* though *phalavyāpti* is not possible. Thereafter *ātmā/Brahman* being self-evident appears spontaneously in its own glory without the dependence on anything including *akhaṇḍākāra vṛtti*. That is *aparāyatabodha* aimed at by

nididhyāsana. Thus, *nididhyāsana* word in the referred *śruti* finally means *vijñāna* or independent knowledge of *nirviśeṣa Brahman* wherein *ajñāna* and its *kārya* (effect) are totally absent.

Here is the possibility of another doubt. Yājñavalkya first told that ‘*ātmā draṣṭavya*’ and thereafter *śrotavya*, etc. But the *darśana* (direct knowledge) in *draṣṭavya* itself is ‘*vijñāna*’. Then what is that *vijñāna* separately told by *nididhyāsana*? If it is the same, is it not a repetition? This is answered now.

द्रष्टव्य इति विज्ञानमुद्दिश्य श्रवणं तथा ।
मननं च विधायाऽथ विज्ञानमवधिं जगौ ॥२५॥

द्रष्टव्यः इति - by the word *draṣṭavya*
विज्ञानम् - direct knowledge उद्दिश्य - having
meant (or referred to) श्रवणं तथा मननं च -
so also *śravaṇa* and *manana* (which are
its means) विधाय - having enjoined अथ -
thereafter विज्ञानं अवधिं - *vijñāna* as the
furthest limit until the fulfilment of
which *śravaṇa* and *manana* have to be
practiced जगौ - told—(25)

25. Having meant (or referred to) *vijñāna* (direct knowledge) by the word ‘*draṣṭavya*’, so also having enjoined ‘*śravaṇa*’ and ‘*manana*’ (by *śrotavya* and *mantavya*) (which are its means) thereafter told the ‘*vijñāna*’ as the furthest limit until the fulfilment of which *śravaṇa* and *manana* have to be practiced.

When a *jijñāsu* is asked to practice *śravaṇa* and *manana*, it is natural that one would like to know how long those means have to be taken to. Or question is when the *jijñāsā* (desire to know *ātmā*) will end? The *śruti* answers this by commenting upon the word *nididhyāsītavyaḥ* by '*vijñāna*' in the remaining portion of the statement, (i.e. in *vākyaśeṣa*). Therefore, there is no repetition. As the means to the *darśana* (direct knowledge) contained in '*draṣṭavyaḥ*', the *śravaṇa* and *manana* are recommended. By '*nididhyāsītavyaḥ*' the fructified *darśana* of *ātmā* as *vijñāna* is specified though it can mean meditation initially. Just as *dhyāna* (meditation) is to be taken to until the *dhyeya* (meditated entity) is gained or *upāsana*s to gain heavens have to be practiced whole life-time, so also *śravaṇa*, etc., have to be taken to until *vijñāna* is gained.

BY ĀTMAJÑĀNA EVERYTHING BECOMES KNOWN

Yājñavalkya tells further that by the *darśana*, *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *vijñāna* everything else in entirety becomes known (*Br.U.2-4-5*). In short by the *vijñāna* of *ātmā* entire *jagat* in the form of *anātmā* becomes known. This is being explained in the form of question and answer. The *śruti* had told that by '*ātmā-vijñāna* everything is known'

(*Br.U.2-4-5*). Such a result of *ātmajñāna* is now doubted.

नन्वनात्मा न विज्ञात आत्मदर्शनमात्रतः ।
ततोऽकृत्स्नत्वदोषश्चेन्मैवं सर्वस्यवेदनात् ॥२६॥

ननु - here is a doubt आत्मदर्शनमात्रतः - by mere gaining *aparokṣa ātmajñāna* अनात्मा - whatever that is not *ātmā* न विज्ञातः - is not known ततः - therefore अकृत्स्नत्वदोषः - there is a defect of partial knowledge (since it cannot be the knowledge of everything) (इति) चेत् - if you argue so मा एवं - please do not say so सर्वस्य वेदनात् - because everything is (certainly) known – (26)

26. Here is a doubt. Some argue that by mere gaining *aparokṣa ātmajñāna* whatever that is not *ātmā* is not known and therefore, there is a defect of partial knowledge (since it cannot be the knowledge of everything). This argument is not correct because everything is (certainly) known.

The general concept of common people is that knowing each and everything in the world is omniscience (*sarvajñatā*). They expect the *Brahmajñānī* to know anything and everything. This is not so. Then what is *sarvajñatā*? Here is the answer. A superimposed (*adhyasta*) entity is not different from its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*). Brahman is the basis of entire Creation.

Therefore, knowing the one non-dual real entity Brahman which is the basis of entire superimposed Creation is itself the omniscience. All Upaniṣads speak of such knowledge alone as *sarvajñatā*. The next verse explains this fact.

आत्मनो दर्शनेनेदं दृष्टं

स्यादखिलं जगत् ।

प्रत्यङ्मात्रैकयाथात्म्यात्

कार्यकारणवस्तुनः ॥२७॥

आत्मनः दर्शनेन - by the *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *ātmā* इदं - this अखिलं जगत् - entire *jagat* दृष्टं स्यात् - is (as good as) known कार्यकारणवस्तुनः - of the entities which are in the form of manifest *jagat* (as the *kārya* - effect) and its unmanifest (cause) प्रत्यङ्मात्रैकयाथात्म्यात् - because their real nature is *pratyagātmā* alone –(27)

27. This entire *jagat* is (as good as) known by the *aparokṣajñāna* of *ātmā* because the real nature of the entities which are in the form of manifest *jagat* (as the *kārya*-effect) and its unmanifest form of (cause) is *pratyagātmā* alone.

In fact, knowing the real nature of everything which exists forever alone is the right type of knowledge. On knowing that ultimate reality, everything in the form of *nāmarūpātmaka jagat* gets reduced to *bhrama* (an erroneous notion). Then the occasion of knowing

falsely projected entities does not arise at all except the knowledge that they are false. Knowing all entities that a rope appears to be erroneously can never be the knowledge of such a rope. Nothing in the world exists independent of *ātmā*. Therefore, knowing *ātmā* only in its real nature is the final knowledge that cannot be invalidated.

The phrase ‘*kāryakāraṇa-vastu*’ is explained now.

कार्यात्मा कारणात्मा च

द्वावात्मनौ परात्मनः ।

प्रत्यगयाथात्म्यमोहोत्थौ मोहे

नष्टे विनश्यतः ॥२८॥

परात्मनः - of *parātmā*, (i.e. *pratyagātmā*) कार्यात्मा - the entity in the form of effect कारणात्मा च - and the entity in the form of cause (इति) द्वौ आत्मनौ - (thus) there are two natures प्रत्यगयाथात्म्यमोहोत्थौ - born from the ignorance of the real nature of *pratyagātmā* मोहे नष्टे - when the ignorance ends विनश्यतः - both of them get destroyed –(28)

28. There are two natures of *parātmā*, (i.e. *pratyagātmā*). The one is the entity in the form of effect (*kārya*) and the other is in the form of cause (*kāraṇa*). They are born from the ignorance of the real nature of *pratyagātmā*. Both of them get

destroyed when the ignorance ends.

The *jagat* has two facets. One is its manifest condition and the other is the unmanifest one. Both of them are the products of *avidyā*, the ignorance of *ātmā*. They no longer continue once the *avidyā* ends. The real nature of *jagat* (or *samsāra*) is Brahman only. It is referred to here as *pratyagātmā*. Its knowledge alone is omniscience. By citing this result, the topic of becoming omniscient on knowing *pratyagātmā* is being concluded.

मोहतत्कार्ययोर्बाधे प्रत्यक् सर्वमितीर्यते ।
अतः प्रतीचि विज्ञाते सुलभं सर्ववेदनम् ॥२९॥

मोहतत्कार्ययोः बाधे - when the ignorance of *ātmā* and its effect the manifest world are ended प्रत्यक् - *pratyagātmā* सर्वम् इति ईर्यते - is said to be everything अतः - therefore प्रतीचि विज्ञाते - when the *pratyagātmā* is known directly सर्ववेदनम् - the knowledge of everything सुलभं - becomes easy – (29)

29. The *pratyagātmā* is said to be everything when the ignorance of *ātmā* and its effect the manifest world are ended. Therefore, the knowledge of everything becomes easy when the *pratyagātmā* is known directly.

The basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of *jagat* is *Paramātmā* (Brahman). It is called *pratyagātmā* here. That itself appears as

the cause and effect so long as its ignorance continues. The *pratyagātmā* with the causal *upādhi* can be considered as *Īśvara* whereas the same with *kārya* (effect) - *upādhi* as *jīva* (including the *jagat*). When *pratyagātmā* is known in its real nature, the *jīva* and *jagat* called ‘everything’ remains as Brahman only. Therefore, such knowledge alone is called knowing ‘everything’.

Yājñavalkya declares further that ‘the *varṇas* (castes) such as *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, etc., the *lokas*, deities and five elements (including all beings) deprive the person of *mokṣa* who considers *brāhmaṇa*, etc., to be different from *ātmā* because in reality the *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *lokas*, etc., all are *ātmā* only’ (*Br.U.2-4-6*). This is explained now.

तत्रैवं सति यो मूढः समस्तव्यस्तरूपताम् ।
ज्ञातव्यां मनुते तां तु वेद एव निषेधति ॥३०॥

तत्र एवं सति - this being so, (i.e. when the non-dual *ātmā* alone is the basis of everything) यः मूढः - the ignorant person who समस्तव्यस्तरूपताम् - the nature of *ātmā* (Brahman) as having all (*samasta*) and distinct individual (*vyasta*) forms ज्ञातव्यां मनुते - considers to be known तां तु - that notion of manifold nature of *ātmā* वेदः एव - the Vedic passage such as ‘*brahma tam parādāt*’, etc., (*brāhmaṇa varṇa* will deprive him of

liberation itself) निषेधति - refutes – (30)

30. This being so, (i.e. when the non-dual *ātmā* alone is the basis of everything) (if any) ignorant person who considers the nature of *ātmā* (Brahman) as having all (*samasta*) and distinct individual (*vyasta*) forms to be known, the Vedic passage such as ‘*brahma tam parādāt*’, etc., (*brāhmaṇa varṇa* will deprive him of liberation itself) refutes the notion of manifold nature of *ātmā*.

The word ‘*samasta*’ means both the *samaṣṭi* (macrocosm) and the cause whereas *vyasta* refers to *vyasṭi* (microcosm) and its effect. At *vyavahāra-level*, knowing either of them cannot be the knowledge of everything. But in the *pāramārthika* entity in the absence of *saṃsāra* or Creation, such meaning of knowing individually or totally does not arise at all. And yet, if anyone ascribes any features to *ātmā* (Brahman), he will cast duality and thereby will get deprived of *mokṣa*. The presence of any entity distinct from the non-dual Brahman is bound to limit it.

The purport of statements such as ‘*brahma tam parādāt*’, etc., (*Br.U.* 2-4-6) is being told now.

यो विप्रजातिश्चैतन्यादन्यद्

वस्त्विति मन्यते ।

कैवल्यात् तं पराकुर्यात् विप्रजातिः

पराङ्मुखम् ॥३१॥

विप्रजातिः - the *varṇa* (caste) *brāhmaṇa* चैतन्यात् अन्यत् वस्तु इति - is different from *caitanya ātmā* इति - thus यः - the one who मन्यते - considers तं - to him पराङ्मुखम् - who is extrovert, (i.e. is engrossed in *anātmā*) विप्रजातिः - the *varṇa* of *brāhmaṇa*, (i.e. Brahman the basis of *brāhmaṇa-varṇa*) कैवल्यात् - from *mokṣa* पराकुर्यात् - distances from – (31)

31. The one who considers the *varṇa* (caste) *brāhmaṇa* is different from *caitanya ātmā* (and therefore) who is extrovert, (i.e. is engrossed in *anātmā*), is distanced from *mokṣa* by the *varṇa* of *brāhmaṇa*, (i.e. Brahman the basis of *brāhmaṇa-varṇa*).

If the *brāhmaṇa-varṇa* is considered to be different or independent of *caitanya (ātmā)*, the person becomes preoccupied in such notions of *anātmā* and thereby becomes extrovert. As a result, he gets deprived of *mokṣa*. This *śruti* statement is presented here figuratively. The *varṇa* of *vipra (brāhmaṇa)* gets insulted as it were by the wrong notions of such person that it is not originated from Brahman as its basis. Therefore out of anger it distances the person having such wrong notions from *mokṣa*. In short instead of knowing oneself to be Brahman, such a person considers himself to be a *brāhmaṇa*.

What is actually that act of distancing is described in the next verse by explaining the meaning of 'parākuryāt' (vs.31).

ब्राह्मणोऽहमिति भ्रान्त्या बृहस्पतिसवादिषु ।
प्रवृत्तो लभते जन्मेत्येषैवास्य पराक्रिया ॥३२॥

अहं ब्राह्मणः - 'I am a *brāhmaṇa* (distinct from Brahman)' इति भ्रान्त्या - by such erroneous notion बृहस्पतिसवादिषु प्रवृत्तः - having got engaged in the performance of *bṛhaspatisava* (a sacrifice), etc. जन्म लभते - (to enjoy its result) the person takes further births इति एष एव - this itself अस्य पराक्रिया - is the distancing of this person (from *mokṣa*)—(32)

32. By the erroneous notion such as 'I am a *brāhmaṇa* (distinct from Brahman)' having got engaged in the performance of *bṛhaspatisava* (a sacrifice), etc., (to enjoy its result) such a person takes further births. This itself is the distancing of this person (from *mokṣa*).

The notion of duality is the sign of ignorance of one's real nature. Such a person is bound to have desires. Naturally the *karmas* will be performed by him. As a result, the continuance of transmigration becomes inevitable. This itself is the indefinite postponement of *mokṣa* in the case of such a person.

What was told in the context of

considering the *brāhmaṇa varṇa*, etc., to be distinct from *ātmā* having the form of *caitanya* is generalized now.

विप्रत्ववत् क्षत्रलोकदेवभूतादिकं
जगत् ।

स्वस्मात् भेदेन पश्यन्तं
क्लेशयेदपराधिनम् ॥३३॥

क्षत्रलोकदेवभूतादिकं - the *jagat* consisting of *kṣatriya*, *loka*, deities, five elements (including beings), etc. स्वस्मात् - from oneself (*ātmā*) भेदेन पश्यन्तम् - to the one sees (them) as distinct अपराधिनम् - the criminal जगत् - the *jagat* विप्रत्ववत् - like the *brāhmaṇa-varṇa* (or brahminhood) क्लेशयेत् - punishes—(33)

33. Like the *brāhmaṇa-varṇa* (or brahminhood), the *jagat* punishes the criminal who sees the *jagat* consisting of *kṣatriya*, *loka*, deities, five elements (including beings) distinct from oneself (*ātmā*).

The notion that 'I am a *kṣatriya*' induces that individual to perform *kṣātra-karmas* (*karmas* performed by *kṣatriyas*) such as *rajasūya yāga*, etc. This will keep the transmigration continued. Similarly the notion that the *lokas* (worlds) here and hereafter are real will prompt them to do *karmas* to gain them. This is also binding in nature. The invocation of *anātmā* - deities will give *sāṃsārika* results only. If the elements

and beings are taken to be real, something will have to be done for their sake also which becomes binding. Even the *āsakti* (love, attachment) for beings, etc., is because of the notion that they are real. *Āsakti* is certainly binding. Thus, the notion of duality becomes the cause of sorrows and distances the *jīvas* from *mokṣa*.

What is the crime perpetrated by taking the *jagat* to be real? How such a notion is wrong is being explained.

यदस्ति तन्न जानाति यन्नेहास्ति तदीक्षते ।
इत्येवमपराधोऽस्य विद्यते भेददर्शिनः ॥३४॥

यत् अस्ति - whatever that really exists (as *sat cit ānanda* - *ātmā*) तत् - that one न जानाति - (he who sees duality) does not know यत् - whatever (doership, etc.) इह न अस्ति - is not there in *ātmā* तद् - that ईक्षते - he sees इति एवम् - of such nature अस्य भेददर्शिनः - of this person who sees duality अपराधः - crime विद्यते - is there—(34)

34. (The person who sees duality) does not know whatever that really exists (as *sat cit ānanda* in *ātmā* as its nature). He sees doership (*karṭṛtva*), etc., that is not there in *ātmā*. This itself is the crime of the person who sees duality (in the place of non-dual *ātmā*).

All schools of thought and the modern science except Vedānta accept

the duality. All have wrong notions about the nature of *ātmā* and consider it to be *kartā* (doer), *bhoktā* (enjoyer or sufferer), etc. They also consider the *jagat* with deities, etc., to be real. They know not the *sat, cit, ānanda* nature of *ātmā*. This is the crime on their part. It is precisely described in the Mahābhārata (1-68-26). The same verse is quoted here now (vs.35) with their lines interchanged.

योऽन्यथा सन्तमात्मानमन्यथा प्रतिपद्यते ।
किं तेन न कृतं पापं चोरेणात्मापहारिणा ॥३५॥

यः - the one who अन्यथा सन्तम् आत्मानम् - *ātmā* having one nature अन्यथा प्रतिपद्यते - considers it to be of quite contrary nature तेन चोरेण आत्मापहारिणा - by that robber of *ātmā* किं पापं - what sin न कृतं - not committed?—(35)

35. What sin is not committed by that robber of *ātmā* who considers the *ātmā* having one nature to be quite contrary to it? (Mahābhārata, 1-68-26)

Ātmā is *sat, cit, ānanda*, free from *saṃsāra, akartā, abhoktā*, immortal. But the ignorant person considers it to be sorrowful *saṃsārī, kartā, bhoktā*, subject to birth and death, etc. Such wrong notion itself is called the robbery of *ātmā* because of which the person gets imprisoned in the *saṃsāra*. Considering oneself to be *kartā, bhoktā* is the cause of all sins as a result of which he appears as

if the one who has perpetrated all sins. A person with such contrary notion about *ātmā* is also described as *ātmahā* (the one who kills *ātmā*) (*Īśāvāsyopaniṣat*-3).

To comment upon the remaining portion, ‘*Idam brahma..... idam sarvam yat ayam ātmā*’ (all these *brāhmaṇa*, etc., is this *ātmā* only) (*Br.U.2-4-6*) a question is asked and the conclusion of *śruti* is given as its answer.

अपोदितत्वाज्जात्यादिदर्शनस्येह किं पुनः ।
द्रष्टव्यमित्यतो वक्ति सर्वाखण्डत्वदर्शनम् ॥३६॥

जात्यादिदर्शनस्य अपोदितत्वात् - because the understanding of *varṇa*, *lokas*, deities, etc., to be real (*satya*) is refuted इह - in this world पुनः - on the other hand किं द्रष्टव्यम् - what real entity remains worthy to be known to gain the highest *puruṣārtha*? इति - thus it can be asked अतः - therefore (in answer) सर्वाखण्डत्वदर्शनम् वक्ति - the *śruti* tells that the real nature of everything as non-dual *ātmā* should be known – (36)

36. Because the understanding of *varṇa*, *lokas*, deities, etc., to be real (*satya*) is refuted in this world, on the other hand, what real entity remains worthy to be known to gain the highest *puruṣārtha*? Thus, it can be asked. Therefore (in answer) the *śruti* tells that the real nature of everything as non-dual

ātmā should be known.

प्रत्यक्त्वेन य आभाति

प्रत्यक्बुद्धिप्रमाणकः ।

तावन्मात्रैकयाथात्म्यमुक्तजात्यादि

दृश्यताम् ॥३७॥

यः - the entity प्रत्यक्त्वेन आभाति - who appears as *pratyagātmā* ‘I’ प्रत्यक्बुद्धिप्रमाणकः - who is ascertained by the *antaḥkaraṇa* (*buddhi*) conforming to *pratyagātmā* or simply known as I उक्तजात्यादि तावन्मात्रैकयाथात्म्यम् - the real nature (*yāthātmyam*) of *varṇa*, *lokas*, etc., told earlier is only that much, (i.e. *pratyagātmā*) दृश्यताम् - this should be known by *sākṣātkāra* – (37)

37. The real nature (*yāthātmyam*) of *varṇa*, *lokas*, etc., told earlier is only that much as the entity who appears as *pratyagātmā* ‘I’, who is ascertained by the *antaḥkaraṇa* (*buddhi*) conforming to *pratyagātmā* or simply known as I. This (real nature of *varṇa*, etc.), should be known by *sākṣātkāra*.

‘*Akhaṇḍatva-darśana*’ (vs.36) means *ātmā* alone is the non-dual entity and there is nothing else distinct from it. This is the explanation of *śruti* statement, ‘all this is *ātmā*’ (*idam sarvam yad ayam ātmā*) (*Br.U.2-4-6*).

First of all the notion that *varṇa*, *loka*, deities, etc., are distinct from *caitanya ātmā* was prohibited. Thereafter,

it was exhorted that everything be seen as *ātmā*/Brahman only. Thereby, the *śruti* did the *bādhā* (annulling) of entire *jagat* in the sense it does not exist in reality in the three periods of time. This was done only to point out that Brahman alone is *satyam* (the ever-existing entity without duality). That is why it was told that the *darśana* (*sākṣātkāra*) of *ātmā* as *akhaṇḍa* (non-dual) be gained. In our ignorance when we were taking *ātmā* as *kartā*, *bhoktā*, *brāhmaṇa*, etc., the *śruti* refuted it as wrong. Then the question cropped as to what is the real nature of *varṇa* (*jāti*), *loka*, etc.? It was pointed out that the entire *jagat* in reality is the *akhaṇḍa* (non-dual) *ātmā*, which suggests that *jagat* is *adhyasta* on *ātmā*. The *satya* (*ātmā*) is *akhaṇḍa* (non-dual) and the *khaṇḍa* (duality) is superimposed on it. The phrase ‘*draṣṭavyaḥ*’ points out that *sākṣātkāra* of *pratyakātmā* be gained. *Pratyak* is that which invariably appears to exist but never is known as an object. The *buddhi* cognizes it by the experience as ‘I’. Therefore it is described as the entity who has *buddhi* as its *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge). Though the *buddhi* referred to as *pramāṇa* is illumined by *pratyagātmā* and the *buddhi* cannot objectify it, and yet, *pratyak* is described as having *buddhi* as its *pramāṇa* from the standpoint of common people. The entire *jagat* has its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) in *pratyagātmā* only and the *jagat* has no existence at all apart from

pratyagātmā. This vision of non-duality is the gist of Yājñavalkya's teaching.

The elaboration of ‘*śrotavyaḥ*’ is concluded and the topic of ‘*mantavyaḥ*’ (*manana* [vs.23] should be done) is introduced.

एवं श्रोतव्य आत्मायं समाप्तः श्रवणे विधिः ।
कथं मन्तव्य इत्यत्र दुन्दुभ्यादि निदर्शनम् ॥३८॥

एवं - thus आत्मा - *ātmā* श्रोतव्यः - should be listened to, (i.e. should be inquired into) अयं श्रवणे विधिः - this Vedic injunction to inquire into *pratyak ātmā* समाप्तः - is concluded कथं - how मन्तव्यः - (*ātmā*) is to be reflected upon? इति अत्र - about this दुन्दुभ्यादि निदर्शनम् - (the *śruti* gives) the illustration of a large kettle drum, etc. – (38)

38. Thus, the Vedic injunction that the *pratyak ātmā* should be listened to, (i.e. should be inquired into) is concluded. How (*ātmā*) is to be reflected upon? About this (the *śruti* gives) the illustration of a large kettle drum, etc.

The word ‘*evam*’ (thus) means *akhaṇḍa* which dispels the duality whereas ‘*ayam*’ (this) points out *ātmā* whose nature is *pratyak*. The word ‘*śrotavyaḥ*’ stands for Vedāntic inquiry into the nature of *ātmā*. The next injunction is about the *manana* (reflection) on the nature of *ātmā* with the help of reasoning in accordance

with the *śruti*. Yājñavalkya gives the illustrations of *dundubhi* (large kettle drum), conch, *vīṇā* (Indian lute), fire, ocean and lump of salt to highlight the status of *ātmā* from the standpoint of *utpatti* (birth), *sthiti* (sustenance) and *laya* (dissolution) of Creation. They show that the *jagat* is not distinct from *ātmā* during its birth, sustenance and dissolution.

The main topic described by all illustrations is told now in nutshell.

स्थितौ जनौ लयेऽप्येतत्
जगदात्मातिरेकतः ।
नास्तीत्येतत् क्रमेणाऽत्र दृष्टान्तैः
प्रतिपाद्यते ॥३९॥

एतत् जगत् - this *jagat* स्थितौ - during the period of sustenance जनौ - at the time of birth लये अपि - and at the time of dissolution आत्मातिरेकतः - distinct from *pratyagātmā* न अस्ति - is not इति एतत् - this fact अत्र - in this chapter क्रमेण - in the order (of sustenance, birth and dissolution) दृष्टान्तैः - by the means of illustrations प्रतिपाद्यते - is explained – (39)

39. This *jagat* is not distinct from *pratyagātmā* during its period of sustenance besides at the time of its birth and dissolution. This fact is explained in this chapter in the order (of sustenance, birth and dissolution) by the means of illustrations.

The mistaken entities such as snake, etc., in the place of rope, etc., can never be distinct from their basis (*adhiṣṭhānas*). The superimposed entities such as the mistaken snake, etc., are born from their basis, exist in them and merge back in them only. Similarly, when it is known that the *jagat* has its basis in *ātmā* in all the three states of birth, sustenance and dissolution, it becomes clear that the *jagat* can never be distinct from *ātmā*. The verses 40 to 49 explain that the *jagat* is not distinct from *caitanya ātmā* by the illustration of large kettle drum, conch and *vīṇā* (Indian lute). As for the identity between *jagat* and *ātmā* at the time of birth, the fire is the example (vs.50 to 55). The illustrations of ocean and a lump of salt (vs.56-61) speak of their identity at the time of dissolution.

JAGAT IS NOT DISTINCT FROM ĀTMĀ DURING ITS STHITI

The illustration of दुन्दुभि (large kettle drum) is being explained.

यथा दुन्दुभिः शब्दत्वसामान्यादुत्थितान्
पृथक् ।
नादातुं शक्नुयात्
कश्चिद्विशेषानसिकोशवत् ॥४०॥
तद्वदात्मातिरेकेण नात्मीयोऽर्थो
मनागपि ।
यतः समीक्षितुं शक्यस्तेनासौ
रज्जुसर्पवत् ॥४१॥

यथा असिकोशवत् - like knowing the sword and its sheath distinct from each other दुन्दुभिशब्दत्वसामान्यात् - from the general sound of a drum that is being beaten उत्थितान् विशेषान् - specific beats and moods arise from its general sound पृथक् आदातुं - to grasp separately न कश्चित् - no one शक्नुयात् - is capable तद्वत् - similarly आत्मातिरेकेण - without *ātmā* (or independent of *ātmā*) आत्मीयः अर्थः - specific names and forms superimposed on *ātmā*, (i.e. *upādhis*) यतः - because मनाक् अपि - even a little समीक्षितुं - to consider (to take into account) न शक्यः - is not possible तेन - therefore असौ - the specific names and forms (attributed to *ātmā*) रज्जुसर्पवत् - (are false) like the snake, (etc.), imagined in the place of a rope – (40, 41)

40, 41. Like knowing the sword and its sheath distinct from each other, no one is capable to grasp separately the specific beats and sentiments (*rasas*) arising from the general sound of a drum that is being beaten. Similarly, without *ātmā* (or independent of *ātmā*) because to consider even a little of specific names and forms (attributed to *ātmā*) is not (at all) possible, therefore the specific names and forms attributed to *ātmā* (are false) like the snake, (etc.), imagined in the place of a rope.

‘*Dundubhi-sabdatva-sāmānya*’ means the general sound emerging from a drum when being beaten by a stick. But it gets modulated by different modes of beating such as high pitch, low pitch or different patterns to communicate different sentiments (*rasa*) in a fort or to the army. Without hearing the general sound, the specific beats and sentiments cannot be grasped. They cannot be grasped independent of general sound like seeing a sword distinct from the sheath. The illustration can be viewed differently also. Just as the sword kept in the sheath cannot be seen without seeing the sheath, so also the specific sound of the drum cannot be heard without hearing its general one. In the case of *ātmā*, it is clear that all superimposed entities on *ātmā* such as *varṇa* (caste), *loka*, deities, etc., whether internally or externally cannot be grasped without the cognition of sentience principle *ātmā*. Therefore, *ātmā* is the real nature of *nāmarūpātmaka jagat*. *Bhāṣyakāra* specifies the general rule seen in the world. He says: ‘Anything that cannot be grasped as distinct from an entity has that entity as its real nature (*Br. U. Bh. 2-4-7*). Therefore, the names and forms called ‘*artha*’ in the sense all *upādhis* have no existence apart from *ātmā*. It is just like ‘the mistaken snake is not different from its basis the rope’.

In the illustration of *dundubhi*, the *śruti* uses three words namely ‘*dundubhi*’, ‘*dundubhyāghāta*’ and ‘*śabda*’. By implication they stand for the general sound of the drum, the specific form of the general drum-sound and its further specific form of the earlier specific sound respectively. This is explained in the next three verses.

सामान्यं तद्विशेषश्च

तद्विशेषा इति त्रयः ।

दुन्दुभिस्तस्य चाघातः

शब्दश्चेत्येभिरीरिताः ॥४२॥

दुन्दुभिः - drum ‘तस्य च आघातः’ - its beating ‘शब्दः च’ - and the ‘sound’ इति एभिः - by these ‘सामान्यं’ - the drum-sound in its general nature ‘तद्विशेषः च’ - its specific feature तद्विशेषाः - further specific feature of the earlier one इति त्रयः - these three ईरिताः - are told (in the same order) - (42)

42. By the *śruti-words* ‘drum’, ‘its beating’ and the ‘sound’, ‘the drum-sound in its general nature when it is beaten’, ‘its specific feature’ and ‘the further specific feature of the earlier one’ are told (in the same order).

सामान्यं दौन्दुभः शब्दो वीरादिरससंयुतः ।
विशेषस्तद्विशेषास्तु नीचोच्चादिविभेदिनः ॥४३॥

सामान्यं - the general दौन्दुभः शब्दः - is the drum-sound (when the drum is

beaten) विशेषः - specific feature of general drum-sound वीरादिरससंयुतः - is endowed with the sentiments such as valour, etc. तद्विशेषाः तु - its further specific features are नीचोच्चादिविभेदिनः - of different types such as low pitch, high pitch, etc. - (43)

43. ‘The general’ is the drum-sound (when the drum is beaten). The specific feature of general drum-sound is endowed with sentiments such as valour, etc. Its further specific features are of different types such as low pitch, high pitch, etc.

नीचादिभेदिनः शब्दाः

वीरादिरससंयुते ।

अन्तर्भवन्ति सोऽप्यन्तर्भूतः

स्याद्दौन्दुभध्वनौ ॥४४॥

नीचादिभेदिनः - the secondary specific features such as low pitch, high pitch, etc. शब्दाः - called ‘sounds’ वीरादिरससंयुते - in the sounds having the sentiments such as valour, etc. अन्तर्भवन्ति - are contained सः अपि - that (sound of sentiment) also दौन्दुभध्वनौ - in general drum-sound अन्तर्भूतः स्यात् - is contained - (44)

44. The secondary specific features such as low pitch, high pitch, etc., called ‘sounds’ are contained in the sounds having the sentiments (*rasas*)

such as valours, etc. That sound of sentiment also is contained in the general drum-sound (when beaten).

When a drum that is being beaten is heard the first perception is that of general sound that is emerging from such drum. Then, from the order of beats, it is learnt that the sound has sentiments of valour (*vīra*) or an attitude of joy during *holī-festival*, etc. This is the first specific feature of the general drum-sound. Then, the secondary feature of high or low pitch, etc., comes to notice. The secondary feature is contained in the first specific feature such as the sentiment of valour, etc., because without it, the varying pitch cannot be heard. The first specific feature of sentiment, etc., is contained in the general drum-sound without which it cannot have existence. Thus the specific features are inseparable from the basic sound.

The illustrations of conch and *vīṇā* (Indian lute) also have to be considered like that of *dundubhi*. What is the purpose of three examples of sound? These two topics are told in the next two verses.

एवं शङ्खेऽपि वीणायां

योजयित्वा ततः पुनः ।

शङ्खदुन्दुभिर्वीणाख्यध्वनीनन्यत्र

योजयेत् ॥४५॥

एवं - like the illustration of *dundubhi* (drum) शङ्खे वीणायां अपि - in the case of conch and *vīṇā* (lute) also योजयित्वा - having applied the main principle (of specific and secondary features being included in their main sounds) ततः - thereafter पुनः - again शङ्खदुन्दुभिर्वीणाख्यध्वनीन् - the sounds of drum, conch and *vīṇā* अन्यत्र योजयेत् - should be understood as contained in the universal sound in general (called *mahāśabda* in the next verse)–(45)

45. Like the illustration of *dundubhi* (drum), having applied the main principle (of specific and secondary features being included in their main sounds), thereafter again the sounds of conch and *vīṇā* (lute) should be understood as contained in the universal sound in general (called *mahāśabda* in the next verse).

ध्वनित्रयं महाशब्दसामान्येऽन्तर्भवेदिति ।

विवक्षया शङ्खभेरीवीणास्तिस्र उदीरिताः ॥४६॥

ध्वनित्रयं - the three types of sounds, (i.e. of drum, conch and *vīṇā*) महाशब्दसामान्ये - in the universal sound in general अन्तर्भवेत् - are contained इति विवक्षया - with the purpose of telling this शङ्खभेरीवीणाः - conch, drum and *vīṇā* तिस्रः - these three उदीरिताः - are cited as illustrations–(46)

46. The three types of sounds, (i.e. of drum, conch, *vīṇā* [lute]) are contained in the universal sound in general. With the purpose of telling this, the three illustrations of conch, drum and lute are cited as illustrations.

Like the sounds of drum, the conch and lute also have basic sounds, specific features and further distinct of tone, etc. The each of the subsequent feature is contained in its earlier specific feature. These three indicate all musical instruments. In an orchestra there are many musical instruments but the sound in general is one and the same. It has different specific features and further secondary ones. We can detect, this is the sound of such and such instrument. Further, we can also know that such and such tone or melody is excellent or out of tune, etc. And yet all of them are included in one main sound of orchestra. Similarly, all distinct and different sounds available in the universe are contained in general universal sound called *mahāśabda*. Without hearing the general sound, no specific sound can be heard. Thus, with the help of three illustrations, it is established that all specific features of sound of each instrument are falsely superimposed on the basis of main sound.

Now the application of these illustrations is shown in the case of

illustrated entity *ātmā* in relation to the specific feature called *nāmarūpātma* *jagat*. It is shown that the entire *jagat* exists in *cit ātmā* and the same fact is derived with the example of a pot.

यथा

विशेषसामान्यतत्सामान्यपरंपरा ।

शब्दे स्थिता तथा

सर्वमुपलब्धिस्थमीक्ष्यते ॥४७॥

यथा - just as (any sound with its) विशेष-सामान्य-तत्सामान्य-परम्परा - the series of specific secondary features (such as high pitch, low pitch, etc.), its common specific feature (such as the sound of valour-sentiment, etc.), and the main common feature (such as drum-sound) (in the case of drum, conch, lute and other varieties of sounds) शब्दे स्थिता - abides in the universal sound in general तथा - similarly सर्वम् - the entire *jagat* उपलब्धिस्थम् - exists in pure awareness *cit* which is self-experiencing (*anubhava-svarūpa*), self-knowing (*jñapti-svarūpa*) principle ईक्ष्यते - is known – (47)

47. Just as (any sound with its) series of specific secondary features (such as high pitch, low pitch, etc.), its common specific feature (such as the sound of valour-sentiment, etc.), and the main common feature (such as drum-sound) (in the case of drum, conch, lute and other varieties of sounds) abides in

the universal sound in general, similarly it is known that the entire *jagat* exists in pure awareness *cit* which is self-experiencing (*anubhava-svarūpa*), self-knowing (*jñāpti-svarūpa*) principle.

उपलब्धोऽस्ति सन् कुम्भो लम्बोष्ठो देशकालवान्।
पूर्वाऽपूर्वाऽतिरेकेण नोत्तरोऽर्थोऽनुभूयते ॥४८॥

उपलब्धः अस्ति - is known सन् कुम्भः - existent pot लम्बोष्ठः - has a long neck (or protruding brim) देशकालवान् - is in a particular place at a particular time पूर्वाऽपूर्वाऽतिरेकेण - (in these) without the sequence of preceding and the following उत्तरः अर्थः - the subsequent entity न अनुभूयते - cannot be experienced – (48)

48. (Consider the case of a ‘pot’ having following observations). ‘Is known’, ‘existent pot’, ‘has a long neck (or protruding brim)’, ‘is in a particular place’, ‘is at a particular time’. (In these) without the sequence of preceding and the following, the subsequent entity cannot be experienced.

By the illustration of ‘sound’, it has to be understood that all names, forms and *karmas* or in short the entire *jagat* is contained in *caitanya* (called *upalabdhi*). Just as all specific features of sound are based in the general sound, so is the entire duality centred in *upalabdhi* (*caitanya*). This is told in the verse 48 by ‘*upalabdhaḥ*’ (is known), etc. The foremost entity among these is

the ‘*upalabdhi*’, the *caitanya* or knowledge-principle. But our attention is totally focused on ‘what is known’ (*upalabdha*). Instead of that it should be directed to the knowledge-principle (*caitanya*). Then comes the turn of ‘is’ (existence). On considering ‘what is there?’ it comes to our notice that ‘the pot is’. Thereafter comes the role of specific features of the pot. The circular broad brim at the mouth of a pot (like our lips) is called ‘*lamboṣṭha*’. Literally a camel which has bigger lips is called ‘*lamboṣṭha*’. When the pot is considered thus, we find that its brim has no existence apart from pot. It is identical with the pot. Similarly the pot is identical with existence (*sat*) and *sat* (is-ness) is identical with *upalabdhi* (*cit*, *caitanya*). Like the brim the place, time including the utility of the pot are the features superimposed on the pot. So they cannot be considered independent of pot. Similarly to show that the *nāmarūpātmaka jagat* cannot be known independent of *cit ātmā*, the earlier three illustrations were given.

The topic that during the period of sustenance of *jagat*, (i.e. *sthiti*) everything is *ātmā* alone is concluded.

एवं चिदन्वयात् सर्वं चिदध्यस्तं

तथा सति ।

चिदात्मैवास्य सर्वस्य तात्त्विकं

रूपमीक्ष्यताम् ॥४९॥

एवं - thus चिदन्वयात् - because of the continuance of *cit* (in and through everything) सर्व - the entire *jagat* चिदध्यस्तं - is superimposed on *cit* तथा सति - when it is ascertained so अस्य सर्वस्य - of this entire *jagat* तात्त्विकं रूपं - the real nature चिदात्मा एव - is *ātmā* having the nature of *caitanya* alone ईक्ष्यताम् - thus it should be known—(49)

49. Thus, because of the continuance of *cit* (in and through everything) the entire *jagat* happens to be superimposed on *cit* (*ātmā*). When it is ascertained so, it should be known that *ātmā* having the nature of *caitanya* alone is the real nature of this entire *jagat*.

During the period of sustenance of *jagat*, how the dualistic world is centered in or superimposed on *cit* *ātmā* was made clear. Anything whose existence (*sattā*) and knowledge (*sphūrṭi* or experience) depend on whatever entity, that is the basis on which the dependant thing is superimposed (*adhyasta*). This can be very clearly understood by the examples of rope and the mistaken snake, etc. On *cit* *ātmā* alone, the existence and experience of *jagat* depends. Therefore, the *jagat* is falsely superimposed on (or attributed to) *ātmā*. Though the illustrations such as the threads and the cloth, etc., can show the same truth that the *jagat* is superimposed on *ātmā*, the *śruti* does not

employ them because in appearance the cloth seems to be slightly different from threads though it is not really so. But such drawback is not found in the illustration of sound because the specific sound never appears to be different from the general one.

JAGAT IS NOT DIFFERENT FROM ĀTMĀ DURING ITS UTPATTI

The *Śruti* highlights that the *jagat* is centred in *cidātmā* at the time of its birth also by stating ‘Just as the clouds of smoke, etc., emerge from the fire having wet fuel, so do the *Ṛgveda*, etc., (indicating the *jagat*) comes out from *Paramātmā* (effortlessly) like exhaling (*Br.U.2-4-10*). This statement contains aspects of both illustration (*dr̥ṣṭānta*) and the illustrated (*dār̥ṣṭānta*). The smoke, etc., emerging from fire is non-separate from the fire is the illustration (vs. 50-51). The *Ṛgveda*, etc., (indicating the *jagat*) born from *Paramātmā* is identical with him is the illustrated (vs. 52 to 55).

स्थितिकाले यथैकात्म्यं शक्यते ज्ञातुमञ्जसा ।
यथोक्तन्यायतस्तद्दुत्पत्तावपि शक्यते ॥५०॥

यथोक्तन्यायतः - in the manner that was told earlier यथा - just as स्थितिकाले - during the period of sustenance of *jagat* ऐकात्म्यं - real nature of everything as *cit* only अञ्जसा - correctly ज्ञातुं शक्यते - is

possible to know तद्वत् - like that उत्पत्तौ अपि - at the time of Creation (birth of *jagat*) also शक्यते - is possible (to know) – (50)

50. Just as during the period of sustenance of *jagat* the real nature of everything as *cit* only is possible to know correctly in the manner that was told earlier, like that it is possible (to know) at the time of Creation (birth of *jagat*) also.

धूमार्चिर्विस्फुलिङ्गादि विभागजननात् पुरा ।
अग्निरेव न धूमाद्यास्तथैकात्म्यं जनेः पुरा ॥५१॥

धूम-अर्चि-विस्फुलिङ्गादि - smoke, flame, sparks, etc. विभागजननात् पुरा - before the birth of distinct features such as अग्निः एव - there is fire only धूमाद्याः न - smoke, etc., are not there तथा - similarly जनेः पुरा - before the birth of *jagat* एकात्म्यं - their real nature *cit* alone is there – (51)

51. Before the birth of distinct features such as smoke, flame, sparks, etc., there is fire only and not the smoke etc., similarly before the birth of (vivid) *jagat*, there is its real nature *cit* only.

The smoke, flame, etc., are there in the fire before it starts burning. Similarly, the manifold *jagat* before its birth is *ātmā* alone. In that *ātmā* only, the *samsāra* manifests. Earlier, it was shown that entire *jagat* abides in one *cit* during its *sthiti* (sustenance). Here, in the illustration at first it is told that from one non-dual *cit* alone the *jagat* is born.

Though for smoke, etc., the cause is not the mere fire but wet fuel, etc., also contribute, the combined form of all these features including the inherent unmanifest fire is called the fuel. In the case of *ātmā* also for abidance of manifoldness of *jagat* therein the *avyakta-upādhi* (unmanifest condition of *jagat*) is taken for granted. *Muṇḍakopaniṣat* (2-1-1) also gives the illustration of fire while describing the Creation. In the verse 50, ‘*utpattau*’ (at the time of birth) is said whereas in the verse 51 it is described as ‘*janeḥ purā*’ (prior to birth). This points out that when there is *cit* alone before the birth of *jagat*, it is but proper that at its birth when duality is about to start, there is *cit* alone. As for during the period of sustenance, it was already shown that what is there at that time in reality is *cit* only.

The *śruti* (*Br.U.2-4-10*) in its next illustration of smoke, etc., emerging from fire intends to tell the birth of *jagat*. Even then the names mentioned to indicate the *jagat* are the four Vedas and certain topics from the *Brāhmaṇa* portion of the Vedas such as *itihāsa* (certain history from *brāhmaṇa*), *purāṇa* (certain narrations describing what was there before the Creation), *vidyā* (teaching of dance and music), *Upaniṣad* (*upāsanās*), *ślokas* (*mantras* contained in the *brāhmaṇa* portion), *sūtras* (brief Vedic statements),

anuvyākhyā (explanation of *mantras*) and *vyākhyāna* (*arthavāda* portion of the Vedas containing praise and censure to highlight certain points). This portion is summarized now.

स्वार्थसाधनयत्नादीननपेक्ष्य यथा सृजेत् ।
धूमादीन् हुतभुक् तद्वद्गदादीन् प्रत्यगीश्वरः ॥५२॥

यथा - just as हुतभुक् - the fire स्वार्थ-साधन-यत्नादीननपेक्ष्य - independent of utility for oneself, any means and efforts धूमादीन् - smoke, etc. सृजेत् - produces तद्वत् - similarly प्रत्यगीश्वरः - *pratyagātmā* in the form of *Īśvara* ऋगादीन् - Creates *Rgveda*, etc., (without utility for oneself, etc.)—(52)

52. Just as the fire produces the smoke, etc., independent of utility for oneself, any means and efforts, similarly *pratyagātmā* in the form of *Īśvara* Creates (*jagat* in the form of) *Rgveda*, etc., (without utility for oneself, etc.).

The fire has no purpose of its own in producing the smoke, etc. It does not use any means and does not exert any efforts to produce them. It is its natural produce when the fuel is wet. So is the case with *Īśvara*. He has no purpose of his own in giving birth to Creation. He neither needs any means nor exerts any effort. Creation comes into existence effortlessly like breathing. *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā* (1-9) describes it as '*devasya*

eṣaḥ svabhāvaḥ (this is the nature of *Īśvara*). There, the word *svabhāva* (nature) means beginningless *māyā* or *avidyā*. The *śruti* (*Br.U.2-4-10*) uses the phrase '*asya mahato bhūtasya*'. '*Asya*' (of this) suggests the nature of being innermost as *pratyagātmā* which is the most proximate and never available for objectification. '*Mahān*' (the greatest) adjective signifies the status of *Īśvara*. '*Bhūta*' (the existent one) implies its nature as '*sat*' (ever-existent principle). Though, as the cause of *jagat*, the nature of being *pratyak* is not that important, and yet by pointing out the fact that *jagatkāraṇa* (cause of *jagat*) is identical with *pratyagātmā*, the possibility of *jīva* being different from the *jagatkāraṇa* is ruled out.

The purport of the statement, '*Paramātmā* has produced the *jagat* effortlessly like breathing' is explained now.

नार्थं बुध्वा वेदसृष्टिः

कालिदासादिवाक्यवत् ।

किं तु श्वास इवायत्नात्

स्यादतोऽपौरुषेयता ॥५३॥

कालिदासादिवाक्यवत् - unlike the sentences constructed by (great poets and authors such as) Kālīdāsa, etc., (which are written after considering their meaning thoroughly) वेदसृष्टिः - producing of the Vedas अर्थं बुध्वा न - is not

after knowing their meaning किं तु - but श्वासः इव - like the (effortless) breath अयनात् स्यात् - it takes place effortlessly अतः - therefore अपौरुषेयता - the Vedas are *apauruṣeya* (not conjectured by human intellect) in nature—(53)

53. Unlike the sentences constructed by (great poets and authors such as) Kālīdāsa, etc., (which are written after considering their meaning thoroughly), the Vedas are not produced after knowing their meaning, but like the (effortless) breath it takes place. Therefore, the Vedas are *apauruṣeya* (not conjectured by human intellect) in nature.

That which is independent of efforts by *puruṣa* (individual *jīva*) is *apauruṣeya*. The poets, etc., construct sentences after thoroughly considering the meaning of words and other nuances. It is an expression of their mind. But *Īśvara* does not reveal Vedas by depending on any knowledge independent of the Vedas. The Vedas themselves are his knowledge. Therefore, the Vedas constitute the perennial body of knowledge independent of everyone. Our *sanātana dharma* is based on such infallible body of knowledge. It is not centred on any individual however great he may be. Though *Īśvara* is considered to be the author of the Vedas, it is not totally correct because he is not authoring

them based on his knowledge independent of the Vedas. In this sense, the Vedas are accepted as *nitya* the ever-existing body of knowledge which is not an outcome of any *jīva*.

The meanings of the words *Ṛgveda*, etc., mentioned in the *Śruti* to indicate the *jagat* are given now.

मन्त्राश्चतुर्विधा ज्ञेया ऋग्वेदादिगिरोदिताः ।
ब्राह्मणं चेतिहासादिरूपमष्टविधं भवेत् ॥५४॥

चतुर्विधाः - four types of ज्ञेयाः - to be learnt मन्त्राः - *mantras* ऋग्वेदादिगिर उदिताः - are revealed by the words of *Ṛgveda*, etc. इतिहासादिरूपं अष्टविधं च - and the eight types of topics in the form of *itihāsa* (history), etc. ब्राह्मणं भवेत् - is the portion of the Vedas called *brāhmaṇa*—(54)

54. The four types of *mantras* to be learnt are revealed by the words of *Ṛgveda*, etc. The eight types of topics in the form of *itihāsa* (history), etc., is the portion of Vedas called *brāhmaṇa*.

The *mantras* that are useful to *hotā* (*Ṛgvedīya ṛtvik/priest*), *adhvaryu* (*Yajurvedīya ṛtvik*), *udgātā* (*Sāmavedīya ṛtvik*), and *brahmā* (the chief officiating *ṛtvik* who has learnt *Atharvaveda* and the rest) are contained in the four Vedas beginning from *Ṛgveda*. The word *itihāsa* refers to the eight divisions of *brāhmaṇa* called *itihāsa* (history), *purāṇa*, *upaniṣat*, *vidyā*, *śloka*, *sūtra*,

anuvyākhyāna and *vyākhyāna*. Their meanings were given while introducing the verse 52.

The words *itihāsa*, (etc.), can be taken as the other famous histories, etc., besides the portions from the Vedas. Those words indicate the entire *jagat*.

प्रसिद्धाश्चेतिहासाद्याः

ऋग्वेदाद्युपबृंहकाः ।

निखिलापि जगत्सृष्टिः

शब्दसृष्ट्यापलक्ष्यते ॥५५॥

शब्दसृष्ट्या - by the birth of words (in the form of *Rgveda*, etc.)
 ऋग्वेदाद्युपबृंहकाः - those who supplement the *Rgveda*, etc. प्रसिद्धाः - well-known
 इतिहासाद्याः च - histories and others निखिला - the entire जगत्सृष्टिः - creation of *jagat*
 अपि - also उपलक्ष्यते - is indicated – (55)

55. By the birth of words (in the form of *Rgveda*, etc.), those, well-known histories and others which supplement the *Rgveda*, etc., and the entire creation of *jagat* also is indicated.

Though, the *śruti-statement* directly means the birth of the Vedas and portions of its *brāhmaṇas*, even then by indication it comprises the creation of entire *jagat* from *Paramātmā*. The words such as *itihāsa* (history), etc., in the world are well-known to mean *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, etc. Though sages such as *Vyāsa*, *Vālmīki*, etc.,

have composed them, it is *Parameśvara* only who has produced them with the sages as his instruments. Generally it is asked: ‘Other than *Bhagavān* *Puṇḍarikākṣa* (*Viṣṇu*) who else can write *Mahābhārata*?’ The Vedas are directly produced by *Parameśvara* whereas *Mahābhārata*, etc., are through other sages. It is just like *Parameśvara* produces the space whereas the pot is made by him through a pot-maker, etc. *Īśvara* is both efficient and material causes of the entire universe. Not only the words but also their meanings are from him only.

IN PRALAYA THE JAGAT DISAPPEARS IN NON-DUAL ĀTMĀ

It was shown so far that the *jagat* has no existence apart from *cit ātmā* at the time of *sthiti* and *utpatti* and therefore the real nature of *jagat* is Brahman only. Now the *Śruti* points out that during the period of *pralaya* (dissolution) also the *jagat* gets reduced to Brahman only. Just as bubbles, foam of water are identical with water, similarly is the *jagat* in the form of *nāma*, *rūpa* and *karma* identical with Brahman, though it appears to be distinct from *cit ātmā*. But like the water-bubbles, etc., merging in water losing their distinct features, the *jagat* also loses its *nāma*, *rūpa*, *karma* in Brahman

during the *pralaya*. The *śruti* explains this with a series of examples. It begins from the example of waters from different sources such as rivers, wells, lakes, etc., directly or indirectly have the ocean alone as their resort losing the earlier individuality of names and forms (*Br.U.Bh.2-4-11*). This is being explained now.

प्रज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण यथैव स्थितिसर्गयोः ।

वस्त्वन्तरं न संभाव्यं प्रलयेऽपि तथोच्यते ॥५६॥

यथा - just as स्थितिसर्गयोः - during the sustenance and the birth of *jagat* प्रज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण - distinct from *cit ātmā* (called *prajñāna*) वस्त्वन्तरं - any other entity संभाव्यं न - is not possible to exist तथा एव - in the very same manner प्रलये अपि - in the *pralaya* also उच्यते - is told (by the *śruti*)—(56)

56. Just as during the sustenance and the birth of *jagat*, it is not possible for any other entity to exist distinct from *cit ātmā* (called *prajñāna*), in the same manner in the *pralaya* also it is told (by the *śruti*) (that nothing else can exist).

The same principle which was described earlier as ‘*ātmā*’, ‘*mahān bhūta*’ is called *prajñāna (cit)*. In spite of appearance of distinct entities what is there in reality is only one principle called *prajñāna, upalabdhi, cit, ātmā*. *Prajñāna* is non-dual in nature not only during *sthiti* and *utpatti* but also in

pralaya. Because *prajñāna* or *cit* and *cit* alone permeates everywhere as the basis, the *cit* alone is the real nature of everything. The *śruti* explains with the illustrations of ocean and the lump of salt that in *pralaya* all that is there is only non-dual *cit* Brahman.

स्वाभाविकाऽऽत्यन्तिकौ द्वौ

प्रलयौ जगतस्तयोः ।

स्वाभाविकः स्यात् कल्पान्ते

बोधादात्यन्तिको मतः ॥५७॥

जगतः - of *jagat* स्वाभाविकाऽऽत्यन्तिकौ - natural and total द्वौ प्रलयौ - two dissolutions are there तयोः - among the two कल्पान्ते - at the end of an aeon (432 million human years; the day period of *Hiranyagarbha*) स्वाभाविकः स्यात् - is the natural dissolution आत्यन्तिकः - the total dissolution बोधात् मतः- is considered to take place by *ātmasākṣātkāra*—(57)

57. The natural and total are the two types of dissolutions. Among the two the dissolution at the end of an aeon called *kalpa* (432 million human years; the day period of *Hiranyagarbha*) is the natural one. The total dissolution is considered to take place by *ātmasākṣātkāra* only.

The *māyā* is also considered as *svabhāva* (nature with respect to Brahman). Therefore, the dissolution in *Īśvara* wielding *māyā* is *svābhāvika*

pralaya. The *jagat* is dormant in it. Therefore again, at the appropriate time, the *jagat* is reborn. *Ati-anta* (*atyanta*) means the final. On gaining *ātmasākṣātkāra*, the *jñānī* has no rebirth and therefore no Creation.

समुद्रखिल्यौ दृष्टान्तौ

क्रमात् प्रलययोर्मतौ ।

लीयतेऽब्धौ जलं यद्वत् तथा

ब्रह्मणि तज्जगत् ॥५८॥

प्रलययोः - with respect to the two types of *pralayas* क्रमात् - in the order (of natural and final) समुद्रखिल्यौ दृष्टान्तौ - the two illustrations of ocean and a lump of salt मतौ - are considered यद्वत् - just as अब्धौ - in the ocean जलं लीयते - the water merges तथा - in the same manner तत् जगत् - the *jagat* ब्रह्मणि - merges in Brahman – (58)

58. The two illustrations of ocean and a lump of salt are considered with respect to the two types of *pralayas* in the order of (natural and the final *pralayas*). Like the merging of water in the ocean the *jagat* merges in Brahman.

The illustration of waters merging in the ocean is with reference to the natural dissolution. Like the water from the ocean can be taken back, the *jagat* also returns from the natural dissolution. But once the lump of salt merges in the ocean, it cannot be retrieved. The *śruti*

(*Br.U.2-4-12*) explains this illustration with its application. ‘The lump of salt thrown in the water gets dissolved in it and thereafter it cannot be retrieved even though it tastes saline all over that water. Similarly this (called *Paramātmā*) limitless (*mahat*), changeless (*kūṭastha*), causeless, free from effects is nothing but self-evident knowledge (*viññānaghana*) principle. It appears as if having the *upādhis* as its features. But on gaining *aparokṣajñāna* and thereby getting totally freed from bodily identification at all levels, its appearance as something other than *viññānaghana* (*upādhiless* knowledge-principle) totally ends. Thereafter, there is no more any *nāma* and *rūpa* corresponding to the hitherto superimposed *jagat*. This shows that the *jñānī* (the liberated person) can no longer get subjected to bondage like the lump of salt dissolved in water cannot be retrieved’.

The illustration of ocean is explained further.

साक्षाद् वाऽथ प्रणाड्या वा

जलमब्धौ प्रलीयते ।

साक्षाद्गङ्गादिका नद्यस्तत्प्रणाड्या

जलान्तरम् ॥५९॥

जलम् - the water साक्षात् - directly वा अथ - or प्रणाड्या वा - in succession (or indirectly) अब्धौ - in the ocean प्रलीयते - merges गङ्गादिका नद्यः - the rivers such

as Ganges साक्षात् - directly (merge in the ocean) जलान्तरम् - other waters (of tributaries) तत्प्रणाड्या - indirectly (merge) –(59)

59. Directly or indirectly water merges in the ocean. The rivers such as Ganges (merge in the ocean) directly (whereas) other waters (of tributaries) (merge) indirectly.

How the *jagat* in the form of cause and itself the effect merge in Brahman is being told.

तथैव कारणं वस्तु साक्षाद् ब्रह्मणि लीयते ।
कार्यं तु कारणद्वारेत्येतदत्र विवक्षितम् ॥६०॥

तथा एव - similarly कारणं वस्तु - the entity called the cause ब्रह्मणि - in Brahman साक्षात् - directly लीयते - merges अत्र तु - whereas कार्यं - the effect कारणद्वारा इति - (merges) through the cause एतत् - this विवक्षितं - is the meaning –(60)

60. Similarly the entity called cause directly merges in Brahman whereas the effect (merges in Brahman) through the cause. This is the meaning (of the *śruti-statement*).

Here the word ‘*kāraṇa*’ (cause) means ‘*jñāna-śakti, kriyā-śakti*’ (powers of knowledge and action, i.e. *Hiraṇyagarbha*). It merges in *māyopādhika* Brahman, (i.e. *Īśvara*) directly. This is suggested in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad Vārtika* (2-4-

383 to 389) but in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtikasāra* (by Vidyāraṇya Muni) (2-4-136) it is very clearly mentioned that the dissolution of *jñānaśakti* and *kriyāśakti*, (i.e. *Hiraṇyagarbha*) is in Brahman with *māyā* as *upādhi*, (i.e. *Īśvara*). Here, the word ‘*kāraṇa*’ (cause) cannot be considered as ignorance of *ātmā* because it gets destroyed only by *ātmajñāna* and not in natural dissolution.

While describing the dissolution (*pralaya*), the *śruti* speaks of *pralaya* of *viśayas* only but does not mention separately about the *laya* of *indriyas* in Brahman. The reason is given here and the topic of *pralaya* is concluded.

विषयप्रलयेनाक्ष-

प्रलयस्योदितत्वतः ।

लयः सर्वस्य जगतो

ब्रह्मणीत्यत्र सुस्थितम् ॥६१॥

विषयप्रलयेन - by mentioning the dissolution of *viśayas* (sense-objects) अक्षप्रलयस्य - of the dissolution of *indriyas* उदितत्वतः - because it is as good as told सर्वस्य जगतः - of entire *jagat* लयः ब्रह्मणि (भवति) - dissolution in Brahman takes place इति - so अत्र - in the context of non-dual Brahman सुस्थितम् - is quite appropriate –(61)

61. Because by mentioning the dissolution of *viśayas* (sense-objects) the dissolution of *indriyas* (senses) is as

good as told, the dissolution of entire *jagat* takes place in Brahman. This is quite appropriate in the context of non-dual Brahman.

The *śruti* considers the *indriyas* as the entities that belong to the same category as that of *viśayas* and not a different category. *Indriyas* are devices in another form to reveal (make known) the *viśayas*. It is just like the light is another form of all forms as a means to illumine them. Therefore, separate mention of *indriya-pralaya* is not necessary to describe the *pralaya* of *jagat* in Brahman (*Br.U.Bh.2-4-11*). Thus, the natural dissolution of manifest *jagat* is very well illustrated by the illustration of the ocean.

Till now (from vs.38) the topic of *manana* (reflection) was elaborated. It is concluded.

एवं मन्तव्य आत्माऽयम् अर्थाऽसंभवनुत्तये ।
दुन्दुभ्याद्युक्तदृष्टान्तन्यायमार्गेण यत्नतः ॥६२॥

अर्थाऽसंभवनुत्तये - to dispel the doubt that the identity of *jīva* and Brahman unfolded by the Vedas is impossible दुन्दुभ्याद्युक्तदृष्टान्तन्यायमार्गेण - by following the guidelines shown by the illustrations such as drum (*dundubhi*), etc. यत्नतः - with conscious efforts अयं आत्मा - this *ātmā* एवं - thus मन्तव्यः- should be reflected upon – (62)

62. This *ātmā* should be reflected upon by following the guidelines shown by the illustrations such as drum (*dundubhi*), etc., with conscious efforts.

With the help of illustrations given so far the mind has to be convinced repeatedly that in all the three periods of *sthiti* (sustenance of *jagat*), *utpatti* (birth of *jagat*) and *pralaya* (dissolution of *jagat*), all that is there is mere *cit*, *caitanya ātmā*. Thereby, the doubt that ‘what *śāstras* says is not possible’ gets ended. These are not the only illustrations. There are many more modes of verification given in the scriptures. We can also invent some arguments to justify what the *śāstra* says. But the final result is the verification of what the *śāstras* says is true.

NIDIDHYĀSANA

The illustration of a lump of salt (*Br.U.2-4-12*) is for explaining *nididhyāsana*. This is being told.

अपरायत्तबोधाख्यनिदिध्यासनसिद्धये ।
आत्यन्तिकलयं वक्तुं खिल्यदृष्टान्त उच्यते ॥६३॥

अपरायत्तबोधाख्यनिदिध्यासनसिद्धये - for accomplishing the ‘independent knowledge’ (*aparāyattabodha*) called *nididhyāsana* आत्यन्तिकलयं वक्तुं - to describe the total *pralaya* (dissolution) खिल्यदृष्टान्तः - the illustration of a lump of salt उच्यते - is told – (63)

63. For accomplishing the ‘independent knowledge’ (*aparāyattabodha*) called *nididhyāsana* the illustration of a lump of salt is told to describe the total *pralaya* (dissolution).

The ‘independent knowledge’ (*aparāyattabodha*) was described earlier (vs.24) (*Br.U.Vā.2-4-217* to 221). Effortless abidance in Brahman even without the need of *Brahmākāra-vṛtti*, leave alone *śravaṇa*, etc., is *aparāyattabodha*. It was already ascertained that such knowledge which was equated to *vijñāna* (the *nirupādhika* knowledge principle, *Br.U.2-4-5*) is the true nature of *nididhyāsana* and not the meditation of maintaining *ātmā-pratyaya-pravāha* to the exclusion of *anātmā-pratyayas* pertaining to the body, etc., though it is necessary to end the obstructions in gaining ‘*vijñāna*’. The *sādhanās* are necessary until the ‘I’-notion in body, mind, *prāṇa*, *ahaṃkāra* does not crop up at all. Till then *ātma-vicāra* is indispensable everyday until one sleeps and further the whole life, upto the point of death or the ‘independent knowledge’ is gained. When a lump of salt is dissolved in the water, the same lump can never be retrieved. So also the bodily notion should never arise on discovering oneself to be Brahman. That is ‘independent knowledge’. It does not depend on anything.

The illustration is elaborated now. First what is ‘*saindhava khilya*’ (lump of salt) (*Br.U.2-4-12*) is described.

सामुद्रमम्भो लवणक्षेत्रे

भानुविपाकतः ।

लवणोपलतां प्राप्य सैन्धवः

खिल्य उच्यते ॥६४॥

सामुद्राम्भः - the oceanic water
लवणक्षेत्रे - in the salt-fields (salt pans)
भानुविपाकतः - because of being heated by the sun
लवणोपलतां प्राप्य - having become a lump (or grain) of salt
सैन्धवः - born from ocean
खिल्यः - a piece (of salt)
उच्यते - is said (described) – (64)

64. The oceanic water in the salt-fields (salt-pans) having become a lump (or grain) of salt is described as a piece (of salt) born from ocean.

स खिल्य उदधौ क्षिप्तस्तापशान्तौ विलीयते ।
अशक्यः पुनरुद्धर्तुं खिल्यरूपेण पूर्ववत् ॥६५॥

सः खिल्यः - that lump (or grain) (of salt)
उदधौ क्षिप्तः - when thrown in the ocean
तापशान्तौ - when the effect of solar heat (that gave the shape of lump) ends
विलीयते - gets dissolved
पुनः - once again
पूर्ववत् खिल्यरूपेण - in the form of same lump of salt
उद्धर्तुं - to bring out
अशक्यः - is impossible – (65)

65. On throwing that lump (or grain) (of salt) in the ocean gets

dissolved when the effect of solar heat (that gave the shape of lump) ends. (Thereafter) it is impossible to retrieve it in the form of same lump of salt.

खिल्योद्धृत्यै नीरमब्धावाददीत

यतो यतः ।

तत्र तत्र रसो लभ्यः खिल्यस्त्वेष

न कुत्रचित् ॥६६॥

खिल्योद्धृत्यै - to retrieve the (dissolved) lump of salt अब्धौ - in the ocean यतः यतः - from wherever नीरम् - water आददीत - is collected तत्र तत्र - at all those place रसः - saline taste लभ्यः - is available तु - whereas एषः खिल्यः - this (dissolved) lump of salt (in its earlier form) कुत्रचित् न - is not available anywhere—(66)

66. To retrieve the (dissolved) lump of salt from wherever in the ocean, the water is collected, at all those places the saline taste is available, whereas this (dissolved) lump of salt (in its earlier form) is not available anywhere.

The solar heat has a role in solidifying the salt. So long as this effect continues the crystalline form of the salt is retained. But when the water which is opposed to heat comes in contact with the salt, it melts because the heat that gave the concrete form is subdued by the water. Though the form is lost, the salt does not lose its saline real nature.

Everywhere the water is saline but the earlier lump of salt is nowhere available. Another lump of salt may be had but never the earlier. This particular instance is possible only in the case of illustration. It is not at all applicable in the *dārṣṭānta* referring to the *jīva* who is in the place of lump of salt. When a *jīva* loses its individuality in Brahman on gaining *Brahmasākṣātkāra*, there is no more return of that *jīva* to *saṃsāra* even in the form of another *jīva*.

JĪVAHOOD

The illustration is applied to the *jīva* who is the illustrated entity. The *śruti* (*Br.U.2-4-12*) points out the similarity in the case of *jīva* when it merges in Brahman on gaining the *jñāna* by giving up its erroneous identification with the body, etc., and loses its *jīvahood* when the body, etc., which are instrumental to produce the notion as *jīva* themselves get *bādhita* (sublated). The *Paramātmā* (Brahman) wherein the *jīva* merges and loses its identity is described as *mahān*, *bhūtam*, *anantam*, *apāram* and *viññānaghanah*. The author is going to explain all these words.

सामुद्रस्याऽम्भसस्तापात् खिल्यतैवं परात्मनः ।
आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तं जीवता स्यादविद्यया ॥६७॥

सामुद्रस्य अम्भसः - of the oceanic water तापात् - by heat खिल्यता - appearance

of lump (of salt) (comes into existence) एवं - similarly अविद्यया - on account of ignorance of oneself परात्मनः - of *Paramātmā* (Brahman) आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तं - beginning from *Brahmā* upto a bush जीवता - *jīvahood* स्यात्- appears to gain –(67)

67. The oceanic water becomes a lump of salt by the heat. Similarly *Paramātmā* (Brahman) appears to gain the *jīvahood* ranging from that of *Brahmā* upto a bush on account of self-ignorance.

महद्भूतमनन्तं स्यादपारं

चिद् घनं स्वतः ।

देहेन्द्रियाख्यभूतेभ्यो जीवत्वेन

समुत्थितिः ॥६८॥

स्वतः - the *jīva* by its nature चिद् घनं - *cit* (*caitanya*) and *cit* alone महद्भूतम् - (which) is all pervasive ever-existence principle अनन्तं - limitless अपारं - inexhaustible स्यात् - is देहेन्द्रियाख्यभूतेभ्यः - on account of (identification with) body and senses called *bhūtas* (in the *śruti*) जीवत्वेन समुत्थितिः - it appears as *jīva* –(68)

68. The *jīva* by its nature is *cit* (*caitanya*) and *cit* alone which is all pervasive ever-existence principle, limitless and inexhaustible. It appears as *jīva* on account of (identification with) body and senses called *bhūtas* (in the *śruti*).

Even though the root cause of *jīva* is *avidyā*, its concrete manifest form as *jīva* is when it is identified with the body, senses, mind and *prāṇa*. Irrespective of exaltedness of *upādhis* or otherwise, the *jīvahood* has necessarily connection with the *upādhi* because of *avidyā*. In the case of *avatāras* such as *Bhagavān* Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, etc., there is no connection with *avidyā*. *Avatāras* have *Īśvarahood*, but not *jīvahood*. *Hiraṇyagarbha* or *Virāṭ* are born as *jīva* to begin with but they get *Brahmajñāna* immediately. Therefore, they are considered to be *Īśvara*. The *Paramātmā* who appears as *jīva* and in whom the *jīva* merges back on gaining *Brahmajñāna* is described by the *śruti* as ‘*mahān*’, etc. The author is describing the meaning of *mahān*, etc., one by one.

महत्त्वं सर्वगत्वं स्याद्

भूतत्वं नित्यसिद्धता ।

अनन्तापारशब्दाभ्यां

व्याप्तिनित्यत्वसाधनम् ॥६९॥

महत्त्वं - the nature of ‘*mahān*’ सर्वगत्वं स्यात् - is all pervasiveness भूतत्वं - the nature of *bhūta* नित्यसिद्धता - is self-evident ever-existence principle अनन्तापारशब्दाभ्यां - by the words ‘*ananta*’ and ‘*apāra*’ व्याप्तिनित्यत्वसाधनम् - the means to prove all pervasiveness and ever-existence (*nityatva*) (are shown) –(69)

69. The nature of 'mahān' is all pervasiveness. The nature of 'bhūta' is the self-evident ever-existence principle. By the words 'ananta' and 'apāra' the means to prove all pervasiveness and ever-existence (nityatva) (are shown).

कार्यकारणरहित्यं यदि वेहोपलक्ष्यताम् ।
अनन्तत्वमकार्यत्वमपारत्वमहेतुता ॥७०॥

यदि वा - or perhaps (and if necessary) इह - in the case of the words 'ananta' and 'apāra' कार्यकारणरहित्यं - the absence of effect and the cause (as) अनन्तत्वं अकार्यत्वम् - 'ananta' means 'it is not an effect of any entity, (i.e. causeless)' अपारत्वम् अहेतुता - (and) 'apāra' means 'it is not a cause of anything, (i.e. effectless)' (इति) उपलक्ष्यताम् - so it should be known in addition by implication - (70)

70. Or perhaps (and if necessary) in the case of words 'ananta' and 'apāra', the absence of effect and the cause should be known in addition by implication. (Thereby) 'ananta' means 'it (Paramātmā) is not an effect of any entity, (i.e. causeless)' and 'apāra' means 'it is not a cause of anything, (i.e. effectless)'. (In short Paramātmā is all pervasive and ever-existent in nature).

विज्ञानघन एवेति

जात्यन्तरनिषेधनम् ।

तदिदं वस्तुनस्तत्त्वं मायिकी

सा समुत्थितिः ॥७१॥

विज्ञानघनः एव इति - the phrase (from śruti) 'caitanya alone' जात्यन्तरनिषेधनम् - refutes the existence of anything other than vijñāna (caitanya) तदिदं - this itself, (i.e. vijñānaghana) वस्तुनः - of ātmā/ Brahman तत्त्वं - is the real nature सा समुत्थितिः - that appearance as jīva (having the upādhi ranging from Brahmā upto a bush) मायिकी - is unreal - (71)

71. The phrase (from śruti) 'vijñānaghana eva' (caitanya alone) refutes the existence of anything other than vijñāna (caitanya). This itself, (i.e. vijñānaghana) is the real nature of ātmā/Brahman (whereas) that appearance as jīva (having the upādhis ranging from Brahmā upto a bush) is unreal.

The entity (Paramātmā) wherein the jīvahood becomes manifest because of avidyā (ignorance of oneself) and wherein the jīva also gets merged on gaining Brahmajñāna is described by the Upaniṣad as mahān bhūta, etc.

The word bhūta signifies the sat nature. 'Mahān' which is synonymous to bhūmā stands for ānanda nature. 'Vijñānaghana' is cit svarūpa. That Paramātmā is neither the effect of anything nor the cause of anything. It is changeless. Being limitless it is all pervasive, indestructible, ever-existent principle and independent of everything.

It is free from the limitations of time, space and objects.

The observations found in the illustration of a lump of salt dissolved in the ocean is now being applied to the illustrated, (i.e. *jīva* losing its individuality in *Paramātmā* by *jñāna*).

अब्धिस्थानीयमैकात्म्यं जलस्थानं तु साक्षिचित्।
क्षेत्रस्थानं शरीरादि तापस्थानं तु विभ्रमः ॥७२॥

अब्धिस्थानीयम् - in the place of ocean ऐकात्म्यं - is the non-dual *ātmā* जलस्थानं तु - whereas in the place of oceanic water diverted in the salt-field साक्षिचित् - is the *sākṣī-caitanya* शरीरादि क्षेत्रस्थानं - salt-field corresponds to the *upādhis* such as body, etc. तापस्थानं तु - whereas the solar heat corresponds to विभ्रमः - the *avidyā* (vs.67) in the sense its first modification the 'I'-notion (*ahaṃkāra*)—(72)

72. The non-dual *ātmā* is in the place of ocean whereas the *sākṣī-caitanya* is in the place of oceanic water diverted in the salt-field. The salt-field corresponds to the *upādhis* such as body, etc., whereas the solar heat corresponds to the *avidyā* in the sense its first modification, the 'I'-notion' (*ahaṃkāra*).

खिल्यस्थानं चिदाभासयोगात्
कर्तृत्वभोक्ते ।

द्रष्टा श्रोता द्विजो गौरो धनी

गोमान् भवेत् ततः ॥७३॥

खिल्यस्थानं - in the place of lump of salt ततः चिदाभासयोगात् - because of connection with *cidābhāsa* कर्तृत्वभोक्ते - doership besides the status of enjoyer or sufferer and thereafter द्रष्टा - seer श्रोता - hearer द्विजः - brahmin गौरः - a person with white complexion धनी - rich गोमान् - owner of cows, etc. भवेत् - happens to be there—(73)

73. In the place of lump of salt, because of connection with *cidābhāsa* there happens to be the doership besides the status of enjoyer or sufferer and thereafter the seer, hearer, a brahmin, a person with white complexion, rich, owner of cows, etc.

The ever-existent non-dual *ātmā* is in the place of ocean. *Ātmā* in its real nature is non-dual because of being free from *māyā*. Though it is with *māyā* from the standpoint of Creation, it continues to be non-dual because *śakti* (power) and *śaktimān* (the entity endowed with power) are totally identical. It appears as the *pramātā* (knower) only after gaining the status of *sākṣī*. By association with ignorance about *ātmā* it, (i.e. *ātmā*), gains the status of *sākṣī* whereas it becomes *pramātā* (knower) because of its identification with *antaḥkaraṇa* (*Saṅ.Śā.3-132*). Therefore, only that much water which becomes salt is in the place of *sākṣī*. Just as the oceanic water becomes salt because of solar heat, it is

avidyā that makes Brahman appear to be a *jīva* (vs.67). Therefore *vibhrama* (delusion, vs.72) which is in the place of solar heat stands for *avidyā* in the form of its first effect as *ahaṃkāra*. The *jīva* manifests itself clearly as *kartā* (doer), *bhoktā* (enjoyer or sufferer). Therefore *kartā*, *bhoktā* with their manifestation as seer, hearer, Brahmin, etc., the ‘I’ notion at different levels are in the place of the lump of salt. The ‘*vibhrama*’ (vs.72) itself is described as *cidābhāsa* (vs.73).

The state when Brahman itself appears as *jīva* is being described now.

प्रत्यगात्मैव सद् ब्रह्म परोक्षमभवत् तदा ।
ब्रह्मैव सन्नयं चात्मा संसारित्वमवाप्तवान् ॥७४॥

तदा - then, (i.e. when Brahman itself appeared as *jīva* on account of *avidyā*) ब्रह्म - Brahman प्रत्यगात्मा एव सत् - though remaining itself as *pratyagātmā* (*sākṣāt/upādhiless aparokṣa caitanya*) परोक्षम् अभवत् - became an unknown entity distinct from oneself (I-*ātmā*) अयं च आत्मा - this *ātmā* also ब्रह्म एव सन् - remaining itself Brahman only संसारित्वम् - transmigratory existence अवाप्तवान् - got - (74)

74. Then, (i.e. when Brahman itself appeared as *jīva* on account of *avidyā*) Brahman though remaining itself as *pratyagātmā* (*sākṣāt/upādhiless aparokṣa caitanya*) became an unknown

entity distinct from oneself (I-*ātmā*). This *ātmā* also got transmigratory existence remaining itself Brahman only.

When Brahman appears as *jīva*, we consider that Brahman is an entity unknown and distinct from us. We forget that it is our real nature. Perpetual thinking of oneself other than what one is in reality, makes the individual forget one's real identity. *Ātmā* can never be *parokṣa*, a distinct unknown entity. And yet it makes us think so because the *jīvahood* is so deeply rooted in our mind that it does not allow us to think what the reality is. The notion that ‘I am born’, ‘I will die’ is an error. In reality, we are *anādi*, *ananta* Brahman.

The *śruti*-phrase (*Br.U.* 2-4-12) ‘*etebhyaḥ bhūtebhyaḥsamutthāya*’ (having projected oneself as *jīva* by identification with body, etc., made up of five elements) seems to be the cause for Brahman to appear as *jīva*. But this is not correct because the five elements have a beginning being born, but the *jīva* is *anādi* (beginningless). Therefore here the *bhūtas* (elements) stand for their cause *anādi māyā*. This point is brought to our notice.

इत्येवं परवस्त्वेव पञ्चभूताख्यमायया ।
जीवत्वेन समुत्थाय ततः शास्त्रेण बुध्यते ॥७५॥

पञ्चभूताख्यमायया - on account of

māyā called five elements परवस्तु एव - *Paramātmā* itself इति एवं - in the manner told earlier जीवत्वेन - as a *jīva* समुत्थाय - having cropped up ततः - thereafter शास्त्रेण - by the means of *śāstra* बुध्यते - knows one's real nature—(75)

75. *Paramātmā* itself on account of *māyā* called five elements having cropped up as a *jīva* in the manner told earlier, knows one's real nature thereafter by the means of *śāstra*.

The *ātmajñāna* which ends the *jīvahood* can be gained only through the scriptures as the means of knowledge. *Ātmā* being imperceptible (*atīndriya*), no other *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge) can give this knowledge. On ending the *avidyā* the *jñānī* discovers that ‘I am the illuminator of *kartṛtva* and *bhokṛtva* but not a *kartā* or *bhoktā*’.

ĀTMAJÑĀNA

The statement ‘knows one's real nature by the means of *śāstra*’ (vs.75) is further explained.

सर्वमात्मेति सम्यग्

धीजन्मनैवाऽखिले भ्रमे ।

नष्टे नश्यति जीवत्वं

जले प्रक्षिप्तखिल्यवत् ॥७६॥

सर्वं आत्मा - everything is *ātmā* इति - such सम्यग्धीजन्मना एव - by the birth of right knowledge itself अखिले भ्रमे नष्टे - when the entire erroneous notion is

destroyed जीवत्वं नश्यति - the experience of *jīvahood* ends जले प्रक्षिप्तखिल्यवत् - it is just like the impossibility of retrieving a lump of salt thrown, (i.e. melted) in the water—(76)

76. When the entire erroneous notion is destroyed, by the very birth of right knowledge that ‘everything is *ātmā*’, the experience of *jīvahood* ends. It is just like the impossibility of retrieving a lump of salt thrown, (i.e. melted) in the water.

क्षेत्रज्ञेश्वरभेदेन पुनः संज्ञा

न विद्यते ।

तद्धेतोस्तमसो ध्वंसात् खिल्याऽनुद्धरणं

यथा ॥७७॥

पुनः - further क्षेत्रज्ञेश्वरभेदेन संज्ञा - the differential knowledge such as *kṣetrajñā* (*jīva*) and *Īśvara* न विद्यते - is not there तद् हेतोः - of the cause of such distinct knowledge तमसः - of the ignorance of oneself ध्वंसात् - because of (its) destruction यथा - just as खिल्याऽनुद्धरणम् - the dissolved lump of salt that cannot be retrieved—(77)

77. Further the differential knowledge such as *kṣetrajñā* (*jīva*) and *Īśvara*, (etc.), is not there because the ignorance, the cause of such differential knowledge is (already) destroyed. It is just as the dissolved lump of salt that cannot be retrieved.

‘*Samyak-dhī*’ (right knowledge) means the *aparokṣa jñāna* free from doubts and contrary notions. By such knowledge the ignorance ends along with all erroneous notions such as ‘I am the body, etc.’, ‘this is mine’, ‘I am a *saṃsārī*, *kartā* and *bhoktā*’, ‘the *jagat* is real’, ‘I am distinct from *Īśvara*’, etc. All these are because of identification with *upādhis* on account of ignorance. Even the distinction between the *jīva* and *Īśvara* is because of their different *upādhis*. In *Brahmajñāna*, there being no such *upādhis* all that is there is *cit* and *cit ātmā* alone. There is no more the erroneous notions of *jīva* and *Īśvara* also. This is what Yājñavalkya says, ‘*na pretya saṃjñā asti*’ (on getting rid of identification with the embodiment there is no differential knowledge such as ‘I am *saṃsārī jīva*, etc.) (*Bṛ.U.2-4-12*). Just as the dissolved lump of salt cannot come back similarly there is no return of the differential knowledge.

There can be the possibility of a rope mistaken for a snake, being mistaken once again as a snake in dull darkness at some other place or time in spite of seeing the basis rope in the earlier instance. But on gaining *ātmajñāna* there is no such possibility of mistaking *ātmā* again as *saṃsārī jīva*.

This is told now.

दृष्टिमात्रात्मयाथात्म्यात्

कार्यकारणवस्तुनः ।

नाऽज्ञातं किञ्चिदप्यस्ति नानपास्तं

तथा तमः ॥७८॥

कार्यकारणवस्तुनः - of entities that are cause and effect दृष्टिमात्रात्मयाथात्म्यात् - because their real nature is *ātmā* having the nature of knowledge-principle *caitanya* alone (तस्मिन् विज्ञाते - when that *ātmā* is known in *aparokṣa*) अज्ञातं - not known किञ्चिद् अपि - anything whatever न अस्ति - is not there तथा - so also अनपास्तं तमः - the ignorance that is not ended न (अस्ति) - is not there—(78)

78. Because the real nature of entities that are cause and effect is the *jñapti-svarūpa-cit* (*caitanya* which is nothing but knowledge-principle) (on knowing that *ātmā* is *aparokṣa*) there remains nothing whatever that is not known and also no ignorance that is not ended.

Dṛṣṭi according to *advaita* Vedānta finally means *Cinmātra ātmā*. In the knowledge of non-dual *ātmā*, the entire *jagat* in the form of cause and effect (*kārya-kāraṇa*) gets ended. From the *Taittirīya śruti*, it is well-known that everything such as space (*ākāśa*), etc., are born from *ātmā* identical with Brahman. Thus, all *anātmā* have their basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*) in *ātmā*. It is true that

it is not possible to know all *anātmā* in their unique forms. By the knowledge of pot only the ignorance of pot will end but the cloth will not be known. This is true and experienced by all. And yet according to Vedānta *pramāṇa* the basis of entire *jagat* being *ātmā*/Brahman alone, the knowledge of *ātmā* is the knowledge of everything and thereby there remains no ignorance that is not ended. The reason is, in reality there is no entity other than *ātmā*.

The *ātyantika pralaya* (total dissolution) mentioned in the verse 57 and already described (vs. 63-78) is now concluded.

आत्यन्तिकोऽयं प्रलयः पुनर्जन्मविवर्जनात् ।
स्वाभाविकलये शक्तिशेषादस्ति पुनर्जनिः॥७९॥

अयं - this आत्यन्तिकः प्रलयः - is the total dissolution पुनर्जन्मविवर्जनात् - because there is no rebirth thereafter स्वाभाविकलये - in the natural dissolution (which takes place at the end of *kalpa*) पुनर्जनिः अस्ति - rebirth is there शक्तिशेषात् - because *māyāśakti* or *ajñāna* continues to be there - (79)

79. This (described in vs. 63-78) is the total dissolution because there is no rebirth thereafter. There is rebirth in the natural dissolution (which takes place at the end of *kalpa*) because the *māyāśakti* or *ajñāna* continues to be there.

The dissolution with *avidyā* (ignorance of *ātmā*) still intact is the natural one. Therein rebirth or new Creation is inevitable. When the *avidyā* ends there is no occasion for rebirth or Creation. Therefore it is the finale of dissolution.

On listening to this teaching, Maitreyī complains that she is confused. In the beginning it was pointed out that the principle of *Paramātmā* is *vijñānaghana* (non-dual knowledge-principle-*caitanya*). Now it is said that when the *jīva* merges in *Paramātmā* there is no *saṃjñā*. The word *saṃjñā* means both consciousness or knowledge-principle and also differential knowledge (*viśeṣa-jñāna*) as experienced in the state of ignorance in terms of the world of plurality. Maitreyī understood the ‘*saṃjñā*’ as having the former meaning whereas Yājñavalkya meant the latter meaning. The sage replies: ‘I am not, confusing you. What I taught is sufficient to gain *ātmajñāna*’ (*Bṛ.U.2-4-12*).

विज्ञानैकघनस्याऽस्य संज्ञा नास्तीति यद्वचः ।
तद् व्याहतिर्न शक्याऽत्र तयोर्विषयभेदतः ॥८०॥

अस्य विज्ञानैकघनस्य - of this *ātmā* having *vijñānaghana* (non-dual knowledge-principle alone) as its nature संज्ञा - differential knowledge (*viśeṣa-jñāna*) न अस्ति - is not there (after merging of *jīva*

in *Paramātmā*) इति यद् वचः - such statement अत्र - in that (statement) तयोः - of those two words (*viññānaikaghana* and *saṃjñā*) विषयभेदतः - because of purpose (or subject) being different तद् व्याहतिः - contradiction between them न शक्या - is not possible – (80)

80. A contradiction between the two phrases ('*viññānaikaghana*' and '*saṃjñā na asti*') (appearing) in the statement, 'differential knowledge (*saṃjñā*) is not there (after the merging of *jīva*) in *ātmā* having *viññānaghana* as its nature', is not possible because the purpose (or subject) of those two phrases is different.

विज्ञानैकघनोक्त्याऽस्य

कृत्स्नैकात्म्यं पुरोदितम् ।

संज्ञा नास्तीति चाऽविद्याजन्या

बुद्धिर्निषिध्यते ॥८१॥

अस्य विज्ञानैकघनोक्त्या - by the phrase 'the *ātmā* is solidified *viññāna* (knowledge-principle-*caitanya*) alone कृत्स्नैकात्म्यं - the real nature of entire *jagat* is *ātmā* only पुरा उदितम् - was told earlier च - and 'संज्ञा न अस्ति' इति - by the phrase differential knowledge (such as 'I am a *saṃsārī jīva*', etc.), is not there अविद्याजन्या बुद्धिः - notions born of *avidyā* निषिध्यते - are shown to be absent (after the *ātyantika pralaya*) – (81)

81. By the phrase 'the *ātmā* is solidified *viññāna* (knowledge-principle-*caitanya*) alone the fact that 'the real nature of entire *jagat* is *ātmā*' was told earlier and by the phrase, 'differential knowledge (such as 'I am a *saṃsārī jīva*', etc.), is not there' the notions born of *avidyā* are shown to be absent (after the *ātyantika pralaya*).

By the phrase '*saṃjñā* is not there', Maitreyī thought that there is no experience or cognition of anything in spite of earlier statement that all that is there is homogeneous knowledge-principle (*viññāna*) alone. Yājñavalkya had asserted the existence of '*viññāna*' and simultaneously negated the existence of '*saṃjñā*'. By using two different words he has suggested that the entity that exists is different from the one that does not exist. He meant '*svarūpa-jñāna*' (*nirupādhika* knowledge-principle wherein *vṛttis* are not at all there) is the one that always exists whereas *vṛtījñāna* is totally absent in *Paramātmā* in *ātyantika pralaya* when the *jīva* loses its identity in *viññānaghana Paramātmā*. *Svarūpa-jñāna* is the real nature of *saṃsāra* or *jagat*. This is repeatedly told in *Chāndogyopaniṣad*: '*Aitadātmyam idam sarvam*' (this *sat* is the *ātmā*/real nature of everything) (*Ch.U.6-8-7*, etc., nine times with '*tat tvam asi*'). Independent of this knowledge-principle, nothing can be

experienced nor can be available in the *jagat*. Therefore Yājñavalkya asserts the existence of *adhiṣṭhāna* of *jagat* by the statement of ‘*viññānaghana*’. *Vṛtti-jñāna* is born of *avidyā*. It is being negated. *Vṛtti-jñāna* can exist only in the realm of *adhyasta jagat*. When along with the cause *avidyā*, the effect of *adhyasta jagat* ends there is no occasion for any *vṛtti-jñāna* to exist. This is what is told by the phrase ‘there is no *saṃjñā* in *ātyantika pralaya*’. What remains is only *svarūpa-viññānaghana*.

NON-DUAL ĀTMĀ

On hearing Maitreyī's doubt, Yājñavalkya while denying that he has confused her, he concludes that his teaching is sufficient to gain *ātmajñāna* (‘*Alam vā are idam viññānāya*) (*Br.U.* 2-4-13). If the question is, ‘in case the *jīva*, etc., the entire *drśya-rūpa jagat* ends, how can the *viññānaghana ātmā* be known because there is no means to know it. The reply follows: ‘The *viññānaghana* is self-luminous (*svaprakāśa*, *svayamjyoti*), self-experiencing (*anubhava-svarūpa*), self-knowing (*jñapti-svarūpa*) *cit*. It does not need any means to know it’.

कार्यकारणनाशेऽपि स्वतःसिद्धम् अनन्यमम् ।
यद्वस्तु तदलं स्वात्मसंवित्त्यै निरपेक्षतः ॥८२॥

कार्यकारणनाशे अपि - even if the *kārya* (*drśya-jagat* including the *jīva*)

and its *kāraṇa* (the cause *avidyā*) have ended स्वतःसिद्धम् - that (*ātmā*) which itself is *svaprakāśa* (self-evident) अनन्यमम् - not illumined (known) by any other entity यत् वस्तु - whatever entity, (i.e. *ātmā*) (remains) तत् - that one स्वात्मसंवित्त्यै - to know itself अलं - is self-sufficient निरपेक्षतः - because it exists independent of everything – (82)

82. Even if the *kārya* (*drśya-jagat* including the *jīva*) and its *kāraṇa* (the cause *avidyā*) have ended, the entity (*ātmā*) which itself is *svaprakāśa* (self-evident) (and) not illumined (known) by any other entities is self-sufficient to know itself because it exists independent of everything.

There are two other versions of this verse. But the above one is in accordance with *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika* (2-4-452). Even the gloss on it by Ānandagiri is in conformity with the words in that *vārtika*. ‘*Ananyamam*’ (अनन्यमम्) is the principle whose knowledge is not gained by any entity other than itself (न विद्यते अन्येन मा [प्रमा प्रमितिः] यस्य तत् अनन्यमम्). It is self-known (*svaprakāśa*).

Yājñavalkya further teaches: ‘During the state of ignorance when it appears as if duality is there, then a given individual (*jñātā*-knower) knows some other entity (*jñeya*) distinct from oneself

.... (but) when everything is nothing but the non-dual *ātma* only, then who can know what (distinct from oneself)?... Who can know that principle as an object by which everything is known? (It is just not possible because even in the state of ignorance none of the senses, mind, etc., can know *sākṣī ātmā*, then in the state of knowledge the occasion of knowing *viññāta* (the knowledge-principle) as an object does not arise at all' (*Br.U.2-4-14*). Thus, the self-luminous nature of *ātma* is being explained now.

एकात्म्यं यदविज्ञातं तद् द्वैतमिव विभ्रमात् ।
स्याद्यत्र तत्र पुंसोऽसौ कर्तृकर्मादिभेदधीः ॥८३॥

यद् - when एकात्म्यं - the state of non-duality अविज्ञातं - is not known तद् - then विभ्रमात् - because of erroneous notion born of ignorance यत्र - wherever द्वैतम् इव स्यात् - it appears as though the duality is there तत्र - there पुंसः - in the case of ignorant person असौ - this कर्तृकर्मादि - subject, object, etc. भेदधीः (भवति) - the notion of duality takes place –(83)

83. When the state of non-duality is not known, then because of erroneous notion born of ignorance, there appears as though the duality is present. There in the case of ignorant person, the notion of duality as subject, object, etc., takes place.

Ignorance of *ātma* breeds duality. Thereby, the *jīva* appears as the subject with an object distinct from oneself to be known by the process of knowing. This gives rise to a series of dualities such as seer, seen, eyes and sight; smeller, smelt, sense of smell and smelling, etc. The *śruti* says *dvaitam iva* (as though duality) because in reality there is no duality. It is only an erroneous appearance like the unknown rope appears as snake, stick, garland and crack in the earth, etc.

Having heard the phrase 'as though duality', the person who could not understand the *mithyā* (false or unreal) nature of duality asks a question.

ननु द्वैतमिवेत्येतदुपमानं कथं तव ।
उपमेयद्वैतवस्तुराहित्यादिति चेच्छृणु ॥८४॥

ननु - here is a doubt 'द्वैतम् इव' - 'like the duality' इति एतत् उपमानं - this illustration तव कथं - how is it possible in your case who is a Vedāntist उपमेयद्वैतवस्तुराहित्यात् - because there is no dualistic entity which can be the illustrated thing in the non-dual reality (that you profess) इति चेत् - if this is the question शृणु - please listen to my reply –(84)

84. Here is a doubt. How is the illustration such as 'like the duality' is possible in your case who is a Vedāntist

because there is no dualistic entity which can be the illustrated thing in the non-dual reality (that you profess)? If this is the question, please listen to my reply.

First the answer is given taking recourse to *ananvayālaṅkāra* (a figure of speech in which a thing is compared to itself to show that it is matchless and therefore, there cannot be any other illustration (*upamāna*)).

रामरावणयोर्युद्धं रामरावणयोरिव ।

इत्यादावुपमा दृष्टा स्वस्य स्वेन तथेष्यताम् ॥८५॥

रामरावणयोः युद्धं - the battle of Rāma and Rāvaṇa रामरावणयोः इव - is like the battle of Rāma and Rāvaṇa इत्यादौ - in such cases स्वस्य स्वेन उपमा - by oneself the illustration of oneself दृष्टा - is seen तथा - similarly इष्यताम् - here the illustration be accepted—(85)

85. ‘The battle of Rāma and Rāvaṇa is like the battle of Rāma and Rāvaṇa’. In such case by oneself the illustration of oneself is seen. Similarly, here the illustration be accepted.

Generally, the *upamāna* (illustration) and the *upameya* (the thing illustrated) are distinct from each other. Therefore, a question is asked, ‘what is that other similar entity when the *śruti* says “*dvaitam iva*” (like the duality)? In answer it is pointed out that at times oneself itself is given as the illustration

of oneself. The battle between Rāma and Rāvaṇa is well-known in such instances because it was matchless. In the world also the statement such as ‘you are like yourself’ is made. Similarly ‘duality is like duality’. In fact the *iva* (like) in such cases suggests the *mithyā* (unreal) nature of the entity referred to. There is a statement in *adhyāsa-bhāṣya*: ‘शुक्तिका हि रजतवत् अवभासते’ (A sea-shell appears like a piece of silver). This is explained in *prakaṭārtha-vivarāṇa* (attributed to Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya) as: ‘वत्करणेन च अनिर्वाच्यताम्’ आचक्षे (the *bhāṣya* tells the inexplicability by the use of the suffix ‘*vat*’ [like]). An *anirvācya* (inexplicable) entity cannot be defined as *sat* (an ever-existent one) or as *asat* (non-existent one). *Mithyā* (unreal) entity cannot be *sat* because it ends. It is not *asat* (non-existent one) also because it appears to be there. In *Parimala* gloss on *Bhāmativyakhyā Kalpataru* by Appaya Dīxit, it is clarified as ‘मिथ्यात्वमपि तदर्थः’ (इव-वत्कारयोरर्थः) (the meaning of ‘*iva*’ and ‘*vat*’ is unreality or false nature).

It may be considered that the battle of Rāma and Rāvaṇa is only a matchless incident and so it cannot be considered as an illustration. Therefore to consider oneself as the illustration for oneself is not correct. Taking into account such objection the illustration in the phrase ‘*dvaitam iva*’ (like duality) is

justified in a different manner.

यद्वल्लोके चन्द्रभेदः

कल्पितत्वेन संमतः ।

जगद्धेदोपमा सा स्यान्मिथ्यात्वं

तेन सिद्ध्यति ॥८६॥

यद्वत् लोके - just as in the world
चन्द्रभेदः - many moons कल्पितत्वेन संमतः -
are imaginarily accepted सा - (similarly)
the illustration referred to in the word
'iva' (like) जगद्धेदोपमा स्यात् - can be an
illustration by the imagined manifoldness
(or plurality) of jagat तेन - by both ways
मिथ्यात्वं - unreal nature of jagat सिद्ध्यति - is
established—(86)

86. Just as in the world many
moons are imaginarily accepted,
(similarly) the illustration referred to in
the 'iva' (like) can be an illustration by
the imagined manifoldness (or plurality)
of jagat. (Thus) by both ways the unreal
nature of jagat is established.

The earth has only one moon for
itself. But in mirrors and in different
water-pools many moons are seen on
account of reflection. Even a person
suffering from cataract sees two moons.
Both appear to be similar though one is
real and the other is false. Thus the
imagined duality of jagat can be used as
an illustration. Its *mithyā* nature can be
ascertained because it appears to be there
but ends. If real, it cannot end. Or what is

experienced in dream turns out to be
mithyā in the waking. Everyone knows
what is shown by a magician is *mithyā*.
Instances of dream and magic are cited
in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka vārtika* (2-4-462).
Thus, what appears as *dvaita* is not real
dvaita but just an appearance as if it is
real.

What is the purpose of saying that
'as if there is duality during the period
of ignorance' or why the *mithyā* nature
of duality is mentioned? The *śruti*
describes *ātmā* as *samasta* (everything)
and also mentions as *vyasta* (individual
as seer, hearer, etc.). Therefore the
question arises as to which of these two
is the actual nature of *ātmā* or both? The
answer points out that *dvaita* is *mithyā*
whereas *vijñānaghana* alone is real.

समस्तव्यस्तरूपत्वं यो वक्तीहात्मनः श्रुतेः ।
तत्पक्षस्य निषेधाय द्वैतमिथ्यात्ववर्णनम् ॥८७॥

यः - the person who श्रुतेः - based
on the cursory glance of *śruti* इह - in the
matter of ascertaining the exact nature of
ātmā आत्मनः - (the nature) of *ātmā*
समस्तव्यस्तरूपत्वं - is both the non-dual
in entirety and (also) the individuality
having dualistic features वक्ति - says
तत्पक्षस्य निषेधाय - to refute that stand
द्वैतमिथ्यात्ववर्णनम् - the unreal nature of
duality is described—(87)

87. The person who based on the

cursory glance of *śruti* in the matter of ascertaining the exact nature of *ātmā* says that the (nature of) *ātmā* is both the non-dual in entirety and (also) the individuality having the dualistic features. To refute that stand the unreal nature of duality is described.

The *śruti* has said that in the state of ignorance a given individual smells, sees, hears something other than oneself (*Br.U.2-4-14*). This gives rise to the notion that *ātmā* is smeller (*ghrātā*), seer (*draṣṭā*), hearer (*śrotā*), etc. On the contrary, earlier (*Br.U.2-4-6*) it was told, ‘all that is there is *ātmā* only’. Not being able to reconcile these two statements from the standpoint of ignorance and knowledge some have concluded that *ātmā* is both non-dual and dual in nature. But one and the same entity being both is not possible. Therefore, it was pointed out that the *jagat* is *mithyā*. Non-duality is the real nature of *ātmā* whereas duality is only a *mithyā* appearance. Or some consider *vyāṣṭi* (microcosmic form) by the word ‘*vyasta*’ and ‘*samasta*’ as *samaṣṭi* (macrocosmic form). They claim that these both are the forms of *ātmā*. So it is said that both of them are the unreal (*mithyā*) form of *ātmā*. Some others consider that the entire *jagat* is the body of *Paramātmā* who is distinct from the body. ‘*Dvaitam iva*’ gives answer to them also saying that the so

called body of *Paramātmā* according to them is *mithyā* only and not in reality. This phrase ‘as though duality’ answers the schools of thoughts such as ‘*bhedābheda*’, ‘*viśiṣṭādvaita*’, etc.

Though *ātmā* is non-dual in nature, varieties of *vyavahāra* or activities are possible in it on account of erroneous concepts.

ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयरूपं प्राप्य स्वप्ने यथा मृषा ।
एको व्यवहरत्येवमज्ञो व्यवहरेन्मृषा ॥८८॥

यथा - just as स्वप्ने - in the dream
एकः - one (*ātmā*) ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयरूपंप्राप्य -
having gained the form of knower,
knowledge and known व्यवहरति - does
everything एवं - similarly अज्ञः - ignorant
person मृषा - falsely व्यवहरति - does all
vyavahāra – (88)

88. Just as one (*ātmā*) does everything in the dream having gained the form of knower, knowledge and known, (i.e. *tripuṭī*), similarly the ignorant person does all *vyavahāras* falsely.

During the dream, senses are not functioning and yet perception and actions take place. Therein the actual sense-objects are absent. Even then they are experienced. So also the knower therein in the form of dreamer is different from the knower in the waking state. Therefore the same *ātmā* becomes

threefold and does *vyavahāra* in the dream. Just as the *vyavahāra* in the dream is false, so false is the *vyavahāra* in the waking. This is what Yājñavalkya wants to tell. The dream-*vyavahāra* appears real in the dream, but gets falsified on waking. Similarly the false nature of waking-*vyavahāra* becomes very clear on gaining *ātmajñāna*. The dream itself is false and so is the *vyavahāra* therein. So is the waking false because of being the product of false *avidyā* and therefore the *vyavahāra* there in is also false. The waking does not get affected by the *vyavahāra* in the dream. So the *ātmā* in reality is not affected by the *vyavahāra* in the waking. The *śruti-statement* such as ‘*tad itaraḥ itaram jighrati*’ (then the one [smeller] smells the smell distinct from oneself by the sense of smell), etc., (*Br.U.2-4-14*) points out that in the dream *vyavahāra* is possible in spite of *mithyādvaita*. So also *vyavahāra* is possible in the waking having *mithyā* duality.

In *ātmajñāna*, distinct attributed features of *ātmā* such as seer, seen, sight, etc., are not there. This is what is told by the statement there is no *saṃjñā* when the *jīva* merges in *Paramātmā* on gaining *ātmajñāna* (*Br.U.2-4-12*). To clarify this point, it is told as to when such distinct names are attributed to *ātmā*.

यस्यामविद्याऽवस्थायां भेदभ्रान्तिस्तदा पुमान् ।
घ्रातृघ्रेयघ्राणसंज्ञामाप्नोत्यन्यां तथा त्रिधा ॥८९॥

यस्यां अविद्यावस्थायां - in which state of *avidyā* भेदभ्रान्तिः - the notion of duality is there तदा - then पुमान् - *puruṣa* (*ātmā*) घ्रातृ-घ्रेय-घ्राणसंज्ञाम् - the names such as smeller, smelt and smelling or the sense of smell (nose) आप्नोति - gains तथा - so also त्रिधा - (gains) threefold अन्यां - other (names) (such as seer, seen, seeing or eye, etc.)—(89)

89. In the state of *avidyā* wherein the notion of duality is there, then the *puruṣa* (*ātmā*) gains the names such as smeller, smelt and smelling or the sense of smell (nose). So also (it gains) threefold other (names) (such as seer, seen, seeing or eye, etc.).

All of us are in the state of *avidyā* which is beginningless. So we get different names such as smeller, etc. They are threefold such as the subject (*kartā*), the instrument (*karana*) and the object (*karma*). The *śruti* has begun this series of trio from *jighrati* (he smells). So the author mentions first the smeller (*ghratā*), etc. All names such as seer, walker, etc., are to be considered here in their corresponding groups of trio. From the things perceived or done in the dream state it is ascertained that all known (*jñeya*) and action (*karma*) are names that are attributed to *ātmā*.

The above fact suggests that *ātmā* will not have such names when the state of *avidyā* ends. This is told with the import of the statement that '*ātmā* does not have names (*saṃjñā*)'.

अविद्यायां विनष्टायां

घ्रातृघ्राणादिभेदधीः ।

विनश्यतीत्यभिप्रेत्य संज्ञा नास्तीति

वर्णितम् ॥९०॥

अविद्यायां विनष्टायां - when the *avidyā* is destroyed घ्रातृघ्राणादिभेदधीः - the experience on account of duality such as 'smeller, smelling, etc.' विनश्यति - gets destroyed इति अभिप्रेत्य - having meant so [प्रेत्य - (*jīva*) having merged in *Paramātmā* (on gaining *ātmajñāna*)] संज्ञा न अस्ति - the names attributed to *ātmā* are not there इति वर्णितम् - so it was described—(90)

90. When the *avidyā* is destroyed the experience on account of duality such as 'smeller, smelling, etc.', gets destroyed. After the *jīva* merges in *Paramātmā* (on gaining *ātmajñāna*) the names (*saṃjñā*) attributed to *ātmā* are not there. So it was described.

The meaning of verbal root '*jñā*' (ज्ञा) in *vijñānaghana* and the meaning '*jñā*' in *saṃjñā* are different. Thereby, Maitreyī's doubt was cleared. In '*saṃjñā*' the experience of duality on account of *upādhis* is implied whereas

in '*vijñānaghana*' pure (*upādhi*less) knowledge-principle is meant. '*Vijñānaghana*' has no *tripuṭīs*, but '*saṃjñā*' has *tripuṭīs*. Names are attributed or are useful when in the realm of dualistic experience. When *avidyā* ends there being no *upādhis*, the experience of duality and the consequent names can no longer be there. This is what is meant here. *Jñātā*, *jñāna*, *jñeya* divisions are not possible in *vijñānaghana*. Even then in the state of *jīvanmukti* on account of *prārabdha*, the contact with *upādhis* is experienced and therefore, *vyavahāra* is possible. But that *vyavahāra* appears to *jīvanmukta* as *bādhita* (really non-existent or annulled).

Based on the *vyavahāra* of a *jīvanmukta* it is doubted that *saṃjñā* may not end totally. Perhaps it is verily present in the form of *vyavahāra* and its cessation. This point is clarified based on the *śruti* (*Br.U.2-4-14*) that it is impossible for *saṃjñā* to be in reality.

अभिज्ञोऽप्यज्ञवद्भेदं घ्रातृघ्राणादिलक्षणम् ।
विजानातीति चेन्मैवं विद्यायां तदसंभवात् ॥९१॥

अभिज्ञः अपि - the *ātmajñānī* also घ्रातृघ्राणादिलक्षणम् भेदं - the duality characterized by smeller, smelling, etc. अज्ञवत् - like an ignorant person विजानाति - knows, considers इति चेत् - if it is argued so मा एवं - please do not say so

विद्यायां - (because) on gaining *ātmajñāna* तदसंभवात् - it is impossible to consider the duality or *saṃjñā* to be real – (91)

91. If it is argued that a *jñānī* also considers the duality characterized by smeller, smelling, etc., (to be real) like an ignorant person, it is not correct (because) on gaining *ātmajñāna* it is impossible to consider the duality or *saṃjñā* to be real.

यस्यां तु विद्यावस्थायामात्मैवास्याभवज्जगत् ।
तदा कः केन किं जिघ्रेदद्वैते परवस्तुनि ॥९२॥

यस्यां तु विद्यावस्थायां - in the state of *ātmajñāna* wherein अस्य - in the case of a *jñānī* for whom जगत् - the *jagat* आत्मा एव अभवत् - has got reduced to *ātmā* only तदा अद्वैते परवस्तुनि - then in that non-dual reality (wherein the *pramātā*/knower itself is absent) कः - who (as a knower) केन - by what (*indriyas*) किं - what sense-objects, (i.e. smell) जिघ्रेत् - can smell? (It is just impossible) – (92)

92. In the case of a *jñānī* for whom in the state of *ātmajñāna* when the *jagat* has got reduced to *ātmā*, then in that non-dual reality (wherein the *pramātā*/knower itself is absent) who (as a knower) by what (*indriyas*) (as the means) what sense-object (i.e. smell) can smell? (It is just impossible).

षष्टगोचरवत् सर्वं

कार्यकरणवज्जगत् ।

ध्वस्तात्मान्ध्यस्य विदुषः सम्यग्

ज्ञानोदये भवेत् ॥९३॥

सम्यग् ज्ञानोदये - when the *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is born ध्वस्तात्मान्ध्यस्य विदुषः - for the *jñānī* whose blindness in the form of self-ignorance is destroyed सर्वं कार्यकरणवत् जगत् - the entire *jagat* having the duality comprising cause-effect षष्टगोचरवत् भवेत् - is like the object of the sixth *pramāṇa* (*anupalabdhi* - the means of knowledge to know the absence of an object), (i.e. the *jagat* is totally absent) – (93)

93. When the *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is born, for the *jñānī* whose blindness in the form of self-ignorance is destroyed, the entire *jagat* having the duality comprising cause-effect is like the object of the sixth *pramāṇa* (*anupalabdhi* - the means of knowledge to know the absence of an object), (i.e. the *jagat* is totally absent).

From common man's standpoint, a *jñānī* or *jīvanmukta* does take to *vyavahāra* according to one's *prārabdha*. But the *jñānī* has no longer the notion of reality in it as was in the state of ignorance. With the backdrop of his experience of *Brahmasākṣātkāra* the *mithyā* nature of dualistic *jagat* including

all *vyavahāras* is clear to him like the daylight. It is not any psychological counselling given by him to the mind based on *adhyātma-śāstra* with a constant attempt to live up to it. When the *śruti* has said: ‘When everything has got reduced to *ātmā*, all that is there for a *jñānī* is *ātmā* only and not the *jagat*. This is possible based on the intensity of steadfastness that he has got in *ātmajñāna*. In view of his *aparokṣajñāna* wherein he does not lose sight of his *Paramātma-svarūpa*, the notion that the *tripuṭī* is real is just impossible. The very phrase, “‘*kaḥ*’ (कः) (who or knower) ‘*kena*’ (by what *indriya*) ‘*kim*’ (what object) can perceive?” itself shows that *jñānī’s vyavahāra* cannot be the one that takes the *tripuṭī* to be real. ‘*Samyak-jñāna*’ (vs.93) means the *Brahmasākṣātkāra* gained through the means of *akhaṇḍa Brahmākāra-vṛtti*. When the *avidyā* ends and as its result, the *saṃsāra* also ends. *Saṃsāra* or *jagat* is a flow of cause and effect. Though the *jagat* is made of five elements or constitutes *nāma* and *rūpa*, the *vyavahāra* in it expects us to view the same in terms of cause and effect. For this, not only the *upādhi* of *avidyā* is necessary but also the identification with the gross and subtle body becomes indispensable. When the ignorance of *ātmā* itself ends, its effects such as

identification with the gross body, etc., being not possible, there is no occasion for *saṃsāra* to continue.

The meaning of the word ‘*ṣaṣṭha-gocara*’ is taken as the object of the sixth *pramāṇa* called ‘*anupalabdhi*’. It is the means of knowledge to know the absence of an object. That means *anupalabdhi* has no concrete object that can be perceived. Similarly, the entire *kārya-kāraṇa saṃsāra* is non-existent from the standpoint of a *jñānī*. Another meaning of ‘*ṣaṣṭha-gocara*’ can be the object of the sixth *indriya* (sense-organ) which is non-existent because the sixth sense-organ itself does not exist. We have only five sense-organs. Though, at places the mind is included as the sixth *indriya* (*B.G.15-7*), truly it is not so. Just as the object of the sixth *indriya* does not exist, so also there is no *jagat* on gaining *Brahmasākṣātkāra*.

The reading of verse 93 having the word ‘*ṣaṣṭha-gocaravat*’ is in accordance with the *Bṛhadāranyaka vārtika* (2-4-472) and *Vārtika-sāra* (2-4-174). It is better than the other reading having ‘*dr̥ṣṭa-gocara*’ (दृष्टगोचर) in its place.

VIJÑĀNAGHANA ĀTMĀ

The self-existent and self-evident nature of *sat cit ānanda ātmā* is independent of *tripuṭīs*. It continues in

its nature unhindered even in the absence of *tripuṭī*. Therefore the question how can *ātmā* be known when *tripuṭī* is absent does not arise at all. In fact *tripuṭīs* derive their existence from *ātmā*.

ग्राहकादिविभागोऽत्र नास्ति तद्धेतुत्वसंभवात् ।
चिन्मात्रस्य स्वतः सिद्धेर्विज्ञानघनतेरिता ॥९४॥

अत्र - in the state of liberation or *nirupādhika ātmā* ग्राहकादि विभागः - the division of perceiver (*pramātā*), etc. न अस्ति - is not there तद्धेतुत्वसंभवात् - because their cause the *avidyā* cannot be there चिन्मात्रस्य - (therefore) in the case of *caitanya* स्वतः सिद्धेः - because of being itself the self-existent knowledge-principle विज्ञानघनता ईरिता - its nature as *vijñānaghana* (non-dual knowledge-principle alone) is described – (94)

94. There is no division of perceiver (*pramātā*), etc., in the state of liberation or *nirupādhika ātmā* because their cause the *avidyā* cannot be there. (Therefore) in the case of *caitanya* because of being itself the self-existent knowledge-principle, its nature as *vijñānaghana* (non-dual knowledge-principle alone) is described.

There is no rule that the knowledge or experience necessarily needs *tripuṭī* though all knowledge and experience of a *jīva* (except sleep and *nirvikalpa samādhi*) must have the

tripuṭī. *Ātmā* is ‘*siddha*’ means the existent principle (*sat*). It is known by itself because it is self-evident knowledge-principle (*cit*). *Sat* itself is *cit* and *cit* itself *sat*. *Ātmā* itself is *ānanda* (also). These are not different three qualities of *ātmā* but the self-evident nature which is viewed in three ways from the standpoint of our worldly experiences. Thus, *ātmā* being *vijñāna-svarūpa* does not need *tripuṭīs*. Anything other than *ātmā* needs a means to know it. But the very knowledge-principle *ātmā* does not need any knower (*jñātā*) or means. Therefore, in the state of knowledge (*vidyā*) *ātmā* is *cit-mātra* or *vijñānaghana* without any *tripuṭī*. All that is needed for the *jīva* is to get rid of *avidyā* whereby *ātmā* gets revealed in its glory on its own accord.

The *vyavahāra* of a *jīvanmukta* is possible even when the *tripuṭī* has ended. This is deduced now.

मुक्तस्य व्यवहारस्तु भ्रान्तिवासनया कृतः ।
भ्रान्तिनाशेऽपि संस्कारानुवृत्तिर्दृश्यते खलु ॥९५॥

मुक्तस्य व्यवहारः तु - but the *vyavahāra* (interaction with the world) of a *jīvanmukta* भ्रान्तिवासनया - by the *saṃskāras* (latent impressions of erroneous notions in the *antaḥkaraṇa*) कृतः - is done भ्रान्तिनाशे अपि - even when the error is ended संस्कारानुवृत्तिः - the continuance of its *saṃskāras* खलु दृश्यते -

is certainly seen – (95)

95. But the *vyavahāra* (interaction with the world) of a *jīvanmukta* is done by the *saṃskāras* (latent impressions of erroneous notions in the *antaḥkaraṇa*). Even when the error is ended the continuance of its *saṃskāras* is certainly seen.

The *karṭṛtva* (doership) and *bhokṭṛtva* (status of enjoyer or sufferer) is because of self-ignorance before gaining *ātmajñāna*. In *ātmajñāna*, the *ajñāna* gets destroyed but the *saṃskāras* of earlier erroneous notions continue. Therefore the *jīvanmukta* appears as if a *kartā* (doer), etc., whenever he does *vyavahāra* prompted by *prārabdha*. But in the wake of his *ātmajñāna*, he knows that it is an appearance but never real as he had mistaken it in his state of ignorance. In the same trend, after giving up the *jīvahood* by *ātmajñāna*, though *saṃjñā* ends in reality its appearance continues. The next verse tells us this.

वासनामात्रसंज्ञा तु देहे सति न वार्यते ।
वस्तुत्वभ्रान्तिसंज्ञैव प्रबुद्धस्यात्र वार्यते ॥९६॥

देहे सति तु - but so long as the body of (the liberated person) remains वासनामात्रसंज्ञा - the *saṃjñā* (differential knowledge) in the form of *saṃskāras* न वार्यते - cannot be refuted प्रबुद्धस्य - in the case of a *jñānī* अत्र - in this *saṃsāra*

वस्तुत्वभ्रान्तिसंज्ञा एव - the reality in the differential knowledge (such as I am a knower, seer, etc.) वार्यते - is refuted – (96)

96. But, so long as the body of (the liberated person) remains, the *saṃjñā* (differential knowledge) in the form of *saṃskāras* cannot be refuted. (On the other hand), in the case of a *jñānī*, the concept that the reality in the differential knowledge (such as I am a knower, seer, etc.), pertaining to this *saṃsāra* alone is refuted, (i.e. a *jñānī* does not mistake this *saṃsāra* to be real).

A *jñānī* so long as he is alive and is aware of his body, certainly deals with the dualistic world. But he has no wrong notion that the duality, its experience and *vyavahāra* with it are real. It is just like knowing the earth to be spherical and the sun to be stationery in spite of our actual sight that the earth is flat and the sun is moving.

A *jñānī* has no dualistic notions about *ātmā* also on gaining *Brahmasākṣātkāra* is told now.

ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयरूपा न संज्ञा विषये यथा ।
प्रतीच्यपि तथा संज्ञा प्रबुद्धस्य न विद्यते ॥९७॥

प्रबुद्धस्य - for a *jñānī* विषये - with respect to the perceptible (*drśya*) *jagat* यथा - just as ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयरूपा संज्ञा - *saṃjñā* in the form of knower, knowledge, known न - is not there तथा - similarly

प्रतीचि अपि - with respect to *pratyagātmā* also संज्ञा - differential knowledge न विद्यते - is not there – (97)

97. Just as for a *jñānī* the *saṃjñā* in the form of knower, knowledge and known, etc., is not there with respect to the perceptible (*dṛśya*) *jagat*, similarly he has no such *saṃjñā* (differential knowledge) with respect to *pratyagātmā* also.

Only when the *pratyagātmā* is known with the bodily identification the specific *saṃjñā* and *vyavahāra* is possible. But the dualistic notions such as ‘I am different from others’ and ‘others are different from me’ are not possible on gaining the *aparokṣajñāna* of *upādhisless ātmā*. Here also *bādhita vyavahāra* because of *saṃskāras* is accepted.

There is no real *saṃjñā* in *ātmā* is further explained.

ज्ञानोत्पत्तौ न संज्ञाऽस्तीत्यास्तां

तावदिहात्मनि ।

अपि सत्यामविद्यायां न

संज्ञाऽस्त्यात्मनीदृशी ॥९८॥

इह आत्मनि - in *ātmā* ज्ञानोत्पत्तौ - on gaining knowledge संज्ञा न अस्ति - *saṃjñā* is not there इति तावत् आस्तां - let it be just a little deal, (i.e. is not a great deal) अविद्यायां सत्याम् अपि - even when *avidyā* is present आत्मनि - in *ātmā* ईदृशी संज्ञा - such *saṃjñā*

(in the form of *tripuṭī*) न अस्ति - is not there – (98)

98. On gaining knowledge, there is no *saṃjñā* in the form of *tripuṭī* in *ātmā* is not a big deal. There is no *saṃjñā* in *ātmā* in reality even when the *avidyā* is present (with its effect *saṃsāra*).

During the period of ignorance the *upādhis* breed *tripuṭī*, etc., called *saṃjñā*. Even then in spite of the presence of *tripuṭī*, *ātmā* is totally unconnected to it. It is free from *tripuṭī*. Therefore the occasion of *ātmā* having no *tripuṭī* in the state of knowledge when *upādhis* are absent is not a big deal. In reality, *ātmā* can never have any connection with *upādhis*. Therefore, in reality *saṃjñā* (notion of duality or dualistic *vyavahāra*) can never be in *ātmā*. Acceptance of *tripuṭīs* in *vyavahāra* can never contaminate *ātmā*.

Ātmā which makes everything known can never be the object of knowledge of anyone. This is the gist of *śruti*-statement, ‘By what means can one know that entity by which everything is known?’ (*Br. U.2-4-14*).

ग्राहकादिजगत्सर्वं येन

कूटस्थसाक्षिणा ।

लोकः सर्वो विजानाति जानीयात्

केन तं वद ॥९९॥

येन कूटस्थसाक्षिणा - by which

changeless *sākṣī ātmā* सर्वः लोकः - all people ग्राहकादि सर्वं जगत् - the entire *jagat* consisting of knower, etc., the *tripuṭī* onwards विजानाति - knows तं - that *sākṣī caitanya* केन जानीयात् - by what means can (it) be known (तत्) वद - please tell that –(99)

99. By what means can the changeless *sākṣī caitanya ātmā* be known by which all know the entire *jagat* consisting of knower, etc., (the *tripuṭī* onwards)? Please tell that, (i.e. It cannot be known as an object by any entity).

This shows that there is no entity that can serve as the means to know the *svayam-prakāśa ātmā*. Further the *śruti* asks a question as ‘By what can the knower (*viñātā* or *pramātā*) be known? This is explained.

बोद्धृत्वलोचनेनापि न संज्ञा प्रत्यगात्मनि ।
न बोद्धा गृह्यतेऽन्येन बोधेन विषयेण वा ॥१००॥

बोद्धृत्वलोचनेन अपि - even by considering the nature of knower (*pramātā*) प्रत्यगात्मनि - in *pratyagātmā* संज्ञा न - *sañjñā* cannot be there बोद्धा - (because) the knower (*pramātā*) अन्येन बोधेन - by any knowledge other than itself विषयेण वा - or by a sense-object which is inert in nature न गृह्यते - cannot be known –(100)

100. Even by considering the nature of the knower (*pramātā*) there cannot be any *sañjñā* in *pratyagātmā* (because) the knower (*pramātā*) cannot be known either by any knowledge other than itself or by a sense-object (which is inert in nature).

The *pramātā* (knower) does depend on *caitanya* for its existence but it is not an object illumined by *caitanya*. It is like the reflection of sun or moon in water that cannot be an object that needs to be illumined by the sun or moon as the case be. In this sense the *pramātā* also is self-luminous like the reflection of sun or moon. Therefore in *pramātā* also, *tripuṭī* (*sañjñā*) such as knower of *pramātā*, known *pramātā* and the *karāṇa* (means) to know *pramātā* are not there. If *pramātā* (knower) needs another *pramātā* to know itself, the other entity also being a *pramātā* will need still another *pramātā* and thus it will lead to a never ending situation called *anavasthā doṣa* (*regress ad infinitum*). As for *viṣayas* (sense-objects), they themselves being inert, the occasion of their knowing *pramātā* does not arise at all.

Even in the state of ignorance the knowledge of a knower (*pramātā*) as a known entity is not possible, then what to speak of its impossibility in the state of *ātmajñāna*.

व्यावहारिकसंज्ञाऽसौ संसारिण्यपि दुर्लभा ।
किमु निःशेषविध्वस्तसंसारणवकारणे ॥१०१॥

असौ - this व्यावहारिकसंज्ञा - *saṃjñā* related to the *vyavahāra* संसारिणि अपि - in the case of *saṃsārī pramātā*, (i.e. *jīva*) also दुर्लभा - is not possible to establish किमु - what to speak of निःशेषविध्वस्तसंसारणवकारणे (आत्मनि) - in the case of (*ātmā*) wherein the cause (*avidyā*) of the ocean of *saṃsāra* is totally destroyed?—(101)

101. It is not possible to establish the *saṃjñā* (*tripuṭī*, etc.), related to the (dualistic) *vyavahāra* (even) in the case of *saṃsārī pramātā*, (i.e. *jīva*), (then) what to speak of (that it cannot be possible) in the case of *ātmā* wherein the cause (*avidyā*) of the ocean of *saṃsāra* is totally destroyed?

The word *saṃsārī* means the entity who is subject to birth and death and who parades as *pramātā* (knower), *kartā*, *bhoktā*, etc. When that *jīva* (*pramātā*) itself cannot be perceived as entity, seen or heard, etc., then where is the occasion to see, hear, etc., the *ātmā*, the real nature of *jīva*, from whom the ocean of *saṃsāra* with its cause (*avidyā*) has vanished? The meaning of *saṃjñā* was seen from different standpoints. In short, it is the knowledge of duality or differential knowledge. It is effected by *upādhis*. Even when the *upādhis* are

present, the real dualistic *vyavahāra* in *ātmā* is not possible. Then how can it be ever possible on gaining *ātmajñāna* when *upādhis* are totally absent? It is certainly not possible.

The doubts pertaining to the topic contained in the verses 76 to 79 were resolved. Now that topic is concluded.

इत्येवमपरायत्तबोधेनात्यन्तिको लयः ।
निदिध्यासनरूपोऽत्र फलभूतः प्रकीर्तितः ॥१०२॥

इति एवम् - thus अपरायत्तबोधेन - by the independent (*aparādhīna*) knowledge of *ātmā* आत्यन्तिकः लयः - total dissolution takes place (सः च बोधः - that *ātmajñāna*) निदिध्यासनरूपः - is in the form of *nididhyāsana* at the level of its finale अत्र - here (in this *śruti Br. U.2-4* or in this chapter) फलभूतः - in its, (i.e. of *nididhyāsana*) fructified form, (i.e. *Brahmasākṣātkāra*) प्रकीर्तितः - is described—(102)

102. Thus the total dissolution takes place by the independent (*aparādhīna*) knowledge of *ātmā*. (That *ātmajñāna*) is in the form of *nididhyāsana* at the level of its finale. Here (in this *śruti Br. U.2-4* or in this chapter) (the *nididhyāsana*) in its fructified form, (i.e. *Brahmasākṣātkāra*) is described.

The word ‘*para*’ means something other and the word ‘*āyatta*’ means

dependant. Therefore ‘*aparāyatta*’ means that which is not dependant on anything. Such an independent *ātmajñāna* only can end the *avidyā* totally and total dissolution can take place. To show the steadfast *Brahmasākṣātkāra* alone wherein even the *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* having done its job of ending totally the *avidyā* has dropped off itself, the phrase ‘*aparāyattabodha*’ is used. It is totally *vṛtti-rahita* (free from *vṛttis*) *svarūpa-anubhava* or itself *svarūpa-jñāna*. After gaining this, the *kartrtva*, etc., are not experienced at all. This is the culmination of *śravaṇa-manana* characterized by the finale of *nididhyāsana* which itself is called *nididhyāsana* or *vijñāna* (*Bṛ.U.2-4-5*).

The chapter is being concluded with a prayer seeking the blessings of *guru* and *Īśvara*.

याज्ञवल्क्योऽत्र मैत्रेयीमन्वगृह्णाद्यथा तथा ।
मुमुक्षुमनुगृह्णातु विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः ॥१०३॥

यथा - just as याज्ञवल्क्यः - the sage

Yājñavalkya अत्र - here in this teaching
मैत्रेयीम् अन्वगृह्णाद् - blessed Maitreyī तथा -
similarly विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः - Maheśvara in
the form of Vidyātīrtha मुमुक्षुम् - (me)
who is a *mumukṣu* अनुगृह्णातु - may he bless
-(103)

103. Just as the sage Yājñavalkya blessed Maitreyī by imparting this teaching, similarly may Maheśvara in the form of Vidyātīrtha bless (me) the *mumukṣu*.

The detailed teaching of Yājñavalkya itself was a blessing. Removal of disciple's ignorance itself is the blessing of *ācārya*. Śrī Vidyāraṇya Muni identifies himself with all *mumukṣus* and seeks the blessings of *Īśvara* for them all. Thus, ends the fifteenth chapter.

इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिविरचिते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
बृहदारण्यकोपनिषदि मैत्रेयीविद्याप्रकाशो नाम
पञ्चदशोध्यायः।

॥ ॐ ॥



CHAPTER - XVI MADHUVIDYĀPRAKĀŚĀ (BṚHADĀRAṆYAKOPANIṢAD)

S U M M A R Y

[The *Maitreyī brāhmaṇa* of the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat*, proves that everything is nothing but *ātmā*. The reason given for this is that the *jagat* has its basis in *ātmā* at the time of *utpatti*, it abides in *ātmā* during its *sthiti* and finally merges back into *ātmā* in *pralaya*. Some people doubt the applicability of this reasoning. To dispel such doubt *Madhubrāhmaṇa* begins in the fifth *brāhmaṇa* of the second chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat*.

‘*Madhu*’ literally means sweet, honey, bee-hive, etc. A bee-hive or honey is a product or *kārya* (effect) of co-operative endeavour by many bees. In this sense ‘*madhu*’ means the effect (*kārya*) or a product. It is pointed out that all entities in the world are *madhu* (effect) or product of one another. An example given is that all *jīvas* wanted the earth as their place of *bhoga*, so *Pṛthivī* is the effect of cumulative *karmaphalas* of all *jīvas*. On the other hand, *Pṛthivī* (the presiding deity of earth) desired to have that status whereby all beings have to be there to reap their *bhogas* on earth. All living beings are thus the products of *Pṛthivī's karmaphalas*. Both are mutually helpful to each other. This is shown with respect to all the entities in the *jagat* that they are mutually dependent, helping one another.

This *madhutva* teaches us a lesson that the entities that show mutual helpfulness are born from only one single cause. They abide in that single cause during their continuance, and merge back in the same single cause at the time of dissolution - *laya*. Consider the example of a dream. The dreamer depends on the dream world and the dream world depends on the dreamer. Both the dreamer and dream world are born from one and the same *antaḥkaraṇa*. They abide in it and finally merge back into it. Therefore, all the entities of the *jagat* characterized by the earth, etc., are mutually helpful to one another. They have one single common cause and that

cause is *ātmā*/Brahman.

Prthivī and living beings have their *liṅgātmā* (*liṅga-puruṣa*, *jīva*). They also have mutual *madhutva*. The nature of *liṅga-puruṣa* is shown to be Brahman in the earlier *brāhmaṇa*. The *Madhubrāhmaṇa* gives a narration proclaimed by a *ṛṣi* or the *śruti* itself. It describes how *Aśvinī Kumaras* got this knowledge from *guru Dadhyañ Ātharvaṇa*. They put in unparalleled efforts to get this knowledge. *Guru Dadhyañ* underwent the surgical trauma of multiple head-transplants and kept his promise of teaching this *vidyā* to both the *Aśvinī Kumaras*. Four *mantras* (two each) are dedicated to describe the terrific acts of the *Aśvinī Kumaras* and the summary of the teaching they received.

At the end, the essence of the teaching contained in the *madhukāṇḍa* is given, which is the same as the *tātparyā* of the Vedas. In the next *brāhmaṇa*, the teacher-taught lineage is told for the purpose of *japa* which removes obstacles in the pursuit of gaining *Brahmavidyā*.]

CONTEXT OF MADHU-BRĀHMAṆA

Maitreyī-brāhmaṇa was dedicated to describe *ātmajñāna* which is independent of *karma* and the only means of gaining *mokṣa*. That *ātmajñāna* has total renunciation (*sannyāsa*) as its auxiliary. On knowing *ātmā* everything else becomes known. *Ātmā* is the most dear of all. Therefore the *darśana* (*sākṣātkāra*) of *ātmā* has to be gained. It should be inquired into by *śravaṇa* (the listening to the teaching of *ācārya*) in accordance with the Upaniṣads, reflected upon based on *śruti-sammata-tarka* besides taking to *nididhyāsana* to make the mind get absorbed in *ātmā* to the exclusion of all superimposed *anātmā*. The mode of reflection also was told in the earlier *brāhmaṇa*. First the statement was made: ‘All this is nothing but *ātmā*’. The reason furnished for this was: ‘The entire *jagat* has its basis in *citātmā* at the time of its birth (*utpatti*), it abides in *ātmā* and is non-different from *ātmā* during its *sthiti* (sustenance) and finally merges back in it in *pralaya* (dissolution)’. Some people doubt the applicability of this reason that ‘everything abides in *ātmā* during the *sthiti*, from *ātmā* only *jagat* is born and it merges back in *ātmā* in *laya*’ to prove that everything is *ātmā*. To dispel such doubt this *Madhubrāhmaṇa* is begun.

‘*Madhu*’ literally means sweet, honey, bee-hive, etc. A bee-hive or the honey is a product or *kārya* (effect) of co-operative endeavour by many bees. In this sense the word *madhu* here means effect (*kārya*) or product. It will be seen now that all entities

in the world are the *madhu* (effect or products) of one another. As a result, this entire *jagat* beginning from earth onwards have a mutual helpfulness among them in the form of ‘favoured’ (*upakārya*) and ‘favourer’ (*upakāraka*). They have mutual helpfulness among them. It is a fact observed in the world that the entities that have mutual helpfulness or enjoy the favourer and the favoured relation are born from one cause, abide in that cause during continuance and merge back in the same cause at *laya*. Consider the example of a dream. The dreamer depends on the dreamt world and the dreamt world depends on the dreamer. Both the dreamer and the dreamt world are born from one and the same *antaḥkaraṇa*. They abide in it during the dream and finally merge back in the *antaḥkaraṇa*. Therefore this *jagat* characterized by earth, etc., having mutual helpfulness or ‘favoured’ and ‘favourer’ relation should necessarily have one and the same cause wherein it abides, is born from it and merges back in the same cause. This is described in the *Madhubrāhmaṇa*.

The relevance of this *brāhmaṇa* can be viewed in another way also. It was stated in the earlier *brāhmaṇa* that *ātmā* is everything. The reason was given by showing the birth of *jagat* from *caitanya*, it continues to remain in *caitanya* and merges back in *caitanya*. Earlier this fact was proved relying on the reasoning with the illustrations of *dundubhi*, conch, *vīṇā*, etc. Now the same fact is deduced again by the Vedic testimony (*āgama-prādhānya*) in the form of *madhuvidyā* of *Madhubrāhmaṇa*.

The author now introduces *madhuvidyā* by mentioning its original teacher and competent disciples who received it.

पञ्चमे ब्राह्मणे दध्यङ्ङाथर्वण उवाच याम् ।
अश्विनोर्मधुविद्यां तामत्र स्पष्टीकरोम्यहम् ॥१॥

पञ्चमे ब्राह्मणे - in the fifth *brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat* second chapter दध्यङ्ङ आथर्वण - a sage by name Dadhyaṅ (दध्यङ्ङ) belonging to *Atharvaṇa-gotra* (lineage) अश्विनोः - to the twins *Aśvinīkumāras* याम् मधुविद्यां - whatever *madhuvidyā* उवाच - taught ताम् - that teaching अत्र - in this chapter अहम्

स्पष्टीकरोमि - I am going to explain – (1)

1. I am going to explain in this chapter that teaching of *Madhuvidyā* (contained) in the fifth *brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat* second chapter taught by a sage by name Dadhyaṅ (दध्यङ्ङ) belonging to *Atharvaṇa-gotra* (lineage) to the twins *Aśvinīkumāras*.

The famous sage Dadhīci (दधीचि) found in the *Purāṇas* himself is called Dadhyaṅ in the *Vedas*. He was adept

in both the *karmakāṇḍa* and the *jñānakāṇḍas* of the Vedas. He was true to his promise (*satyapratijñā*) and *Brahmaniṣṭha*. Heavenly physicians and surgeons the twins Aśvinīkumāras were his disciples. He taught them *madhuvidyā* only after they got the eligibility. To get this knowledge the circumstances demanded that they had to behead their *guru* and re-transplant it with a stop a gap arrangement in between by using a horse's head. This story-part will be told later (vs.29 to 34).

The first statement of the fifth *brāhmaṇa* begins: 'This well-known *Prthivī* (earth) is the *madhu*, (i.e. effect, *kārya*, dear) of all beings. Just as many bees make a bee-hive, similarly all beings by their cumulative *karmaphalas* produce the earth for their *bhoga*. In the same trend the earth, (i.e. presiding deity) to have that position of deity produced by its *karmas*, all beings who need the earth to have their *bhoga*. Thus there is a reciprocal helpfulness between the *Prthivī* and the beings. In addition, in the *Prthivī* there is self-luminous *cit-svarūpa*, immortal *puruṣa*. So also the similar *Puruṣa* is in all beings. Both types of *puruṣas* identified with their respective subtle bodies are also *madhu* in the similar manner. Thus, *Prthivī*, all beings, *Puruṣa* in *Prthivī*, and *Puruṣa* abiding in every individual body are mutually *madhu*. Therefore it is

proved that they have one cause. That cause is *ātmā/Paramātmā/Brahman*. That Brahman is the truth. It is everything (*Br.U.2-5-1*).

Thus there being mutual nature of being *madhu* among *Prthivī*, all beings, *Puruṣa* in *Prthivī* and *Puruṣa* abiding in individual bodies, it is proved that they have one cause. That cause is *ātmā/Paramātmā/Brahman*. That Brahman is the truth. It is everything (*Br.U.2-5-1*).

All the aspects that were told regarding *Prthivī* are told thereafter in the Upaniṣad with reference to *jala* (water), *agni* (fire), *vāyu* (air), *Āditya* (Sun), *dik* (quarters), *Candra* (moon), *Vidyut* (lightning), *stanayitnu* (cloud), *ākāśa* (space), *dharma* (regulating entity), *satya* (*dharma* in practice), *mānuṣa* (all species of embodiments), *ātmā* (*Hiranyagarbha*), *Virāṭ* (deity wielding the macrocosmic bodies). Finally *ātmā* (an *ātmajñānī*) described as the overlord (*adhipati*, *rājā*) the independent entity in whom the entire Creation is centred. What exactly is the nature of *madhu* is going to be elaborated now.

THE NATURE OF MADHU

परस्परोपकारित्वं पृथिव्याः प्राणिनामपि ।
यत्तन्मधुत्वं विज्ञेयमुपकारस्तु सर्जनम् ॥२॥

पृथिव्याः - of *Prthivī* (earth) प्राणिनाम्

अपि - and also of all beings यत् - whatever परस्पररोपकारित्वं - reciprocal helpfulness (is there) तत् - that मधुत्वं - is the nature of *madhu* विज्ञेयम् - (thus) it should be known उपकारः तु - whereas the help or favour is सर्जनम् - the mutual creation of one by the other—(2)

2. The mutual helpfulness between the *Pr̥thivī* (earth) and the beings is called *madhu*. The help rendered by both of them is the creation of one by the other. The *Pr̥thivī* has produced the beings and the beings have produced the *Pr̥thivī*.

The act of mutual production is explained.

जन्तुभिः पृथिवी सृष्टा

स्वकर्मफलभुक्तये ।

पृथिव्याऽप्यात्मभोगार्थं सृष्टाः

सर्वेऽपि जन्तवः ॥३॥

जन्तुभिः - by all beings स्वकर्मफल भुक्तये - to have the *bhoga* (enjoyment and suffering) of their *karmaphalas* पृथिवी सृष्टा - the earth is created पृथिव्या अपि - by *Pr̥thivī* also आत्मभोगार्थं - for one's *bhoga* सर्वे अपि जन्तवः - all beings सृष्टाः - are also created—(3)

3. The earth is created by all beings to have *bhoga* (enjoyment and suffering) of their *karmaphalas*. All beings are also created by *Pr̥thivī* for

one's *bhoga* (as the presiding deity of earth).

Pr̥thivī (deity of earth) is essential for all living beings to undergo the *bhoga* of their *karmaphalas* - *pāpa* or *puṇya*. The *bhoga* of varieties of *karmas* is possible only in *bhūloka* (terrestrial globe). That can be possible only when the earth is there. The *karmaphalas* and the utility are the causes in creating all things. There is nothing redundant in *Īśvara's* Creation. The beings have done such *karmas* that it is essential for them to have the earth for their *bhoga*. Thus the being becomes the cause in producing the earth. *Pr̥thivī* as the cause of all being is very evident because the body, senses, etc., are made of earth. In the *bhūloka* all bodies are predominantly earthen (*pārthiva*) besides *ghrāṇa* (sense of smell) and *upastha* (genital) are made of earth. *Pr̥thivī* is indispensable for *jīvas* to undergo their *bhogas*. Thus because of such help rendered by *Pr̥thivī*, it becomes the *madhu* of all beings. On the other hand as will be told in the next verse, the beings are the *madhu* of *Pr̥thivī* because they are created by *Pr̥thivī* for its *bhoga*. If beings were not there the earth will be redundant and *Pr̥thivī* will have no *bhoga* as the presiding deity of earth. They are not the total cause of each other but both of them have their contribution in producing the

other. This was told by describing the mutual help as 'sarjana' (one creating the other) but not the actual creation. That is why the *śruti* does not mention them directly as cause and effect but as *madhu*.

Though the word *kārya* (effect) is going to be used afterwards (vs.8), it is only to show that everything is the effect of all that is other than itself and everything is the cause of all others. The nature of such cause-effect relation as the reciprocal helpfulness is not confined to any one entity with respect to another specific entity only. The *madhutva* is a universal phenomenon. It was told that the beings are produced by *Prthivī*. Here what is meant by *sr̥ṣṭi* of beings (*jantavaḥ*) is creating the assemblage of their embodiment.

In the earlier verse the Creation (of one by the other) is for one's *bhoga* was told. Now how each becomes the *bhoga-sādhana* (means of *bhoga*) of everything else is shown.

The 4th verse shows the nature of *bhoga-sādhana* between the earth and beings at the physical body level whereas verses 5 and 6 show the same at their subtle body (or *liṅga-puruṣa*) level. It is well-known that without *cidābhāsa*, mere gross and subtle bodies cannot function.

पार्थिवाणि शरीराणि भुज्यन्ते जन्तुभिस्तथा ।
पृथिव्याऽपि धरित्रीत्वं भुज्यते जन्तुधारणात् ॥४॥

जन्तुभिः - by all beings पार्थिवाणि शरीराणि - earthen bodies भुज्यन्ते - are experienced (enjoyed or suffered) तथा - so also जन्तुधारणात् - because of sustaining or protecting the beings पृथिव्या अपि - by the *Prthivī* also धरित्रीत्वं - the status of being the *dharitrī* (one who sustains or protects) भुज्यते - is experienced - (4)

4. Earthen (*pārthiva*) bodies are experienced (enjoyed or suffered) by all beings. So also the *Prthivī* experiences the status of being *dharitrī* (one who sustains or protects) because of sustaining or protecting the beings.

For all beings the earth is an object of *bhoga* in a manifold ways. But the most proximate and indispensable earthen *bhoga* is of their bodies. Though the body is made of five elements in *bhūloka*, it is predominantly earthen (*pārthiva*). *Prthivī* sustains and thus protects all beings. Therefore it is called *dharitrī*. The joy of sustaining them is its *bhoga*. The words *Prthivī*, *jala*, *agni*, *vāyu*, etc., stand for their presiding deities. They are *bhoktās* whereas their inert counterparts such as earth, water, fire, air, etc., are in the category of *bhogyā*. Thus prominently with respect to the bodies, the earth is *bhogyā* of (or the entity experienced by) beings. But

with respect to their sentience in them the *jīvas* are *bhoktā* of *Prthivī*. This division of *bhoktā* and *bhogyā* applies to all based on their sentient or inert aspects under consideration. *Prthivī* is *bhogyā* of all living being becomes clear because the food is mainly *pārthiva*. Thus the relation of mutual helpfulness, (i.e. *madhutva*) between beings and *Prthivī* proves that they are born from one cause.

LIṄGĀTMĀ PURUṢA

Thus the mutual *madhutva* of beings and *Prthivī* was shown from the standpoint of their inert *upādhis*. Now their *madhutva* is being shown with respect to their *liṅgātmā* (*ātmā* endowed with *liṅga-śarīra* - subtle body). The *śruti* has said this by ‘there is self-luminous *cit-svarūpa* immortal *puruṣa* in *Prthivī* (*Br. U.2-5-1*).

अस्यां पृथिव्यां यो

भास्वानामोक्षमविनश्चरः ।

लिङ्गात्मा मध्वसौ सर्वभूतानां

तानि तस्य च ॥५॥

अस्यां पृथिव्यां - in this *Prthivī* यः - the one who भास्वान् - luminous (sentient in nature) आमोक्षम् - until *mokṣa* is gained अविनश्चरः - one who lasts लिङ्गात्मा - sentient entity endowed with the subtle body असौ - that entity सर्वभूतानां - of all beings मधु - *madhu* तानि - those beings तस्य च - are the *madhu* of that *liṅgātmā* - (5)

5. That luminous sentient entity endowed with the subtle body, (i.e. *liṅgātmā*) who lasts until *mokṣa* is gained is the *madhu* (helpful entity) of all beings. Those beings are the *madhu* of that *liṅgātmā*.

‘*Bhāsvān*’ means luminous because of having the power of knowledge. Or it can be a sentient entity. Therefore this entity called *liṅgātmā* is the *jīva* having subtle body with *cidābhāsa* in it. It lasts till *mokṣa* is gained wherein the subtle body disintegrates. As a result there is no more *cidābhāsa* and therefore no *jīva*. Because it (*liṅgātmā*) continues until the *mokṣa* is gained, the *śruti* calls it *amṛtamaya* (immortal) in a relative sense, but not immortal like *ātmā*. The *liṅgātmā* in *Prthivī* is the deity *Prthivī* referred to earlier. Like the *upādhis* are *madhu* of one another, the *liṅgātmās*, (i.e. the entities abiding in them called *jīvas*) also are mutually *madhu*.

The *adhyātma puruṣa* told by *śruti* who abides in *pārthiva* (earthen) bodies, is luminous and relatively immortal also has *madhutva*. This is shown now.

अध्यात्मं यश्च शारीरो लिङ्गात्मा पार्थिवांशगः ।
स चापि मधु सर्वेषां सर्वभूतानि तस्य च ॥६॥

यः च - further the one who is अध्यात्मं - *adhyātma* शारीरः - (i.e.) available

in the physical body पार्थिवांशगः - and is abiding in the earthen portion लिङ्गात्मा - called *liṅga puruṣa* सः च अपि - that entity also सर्वेषां - of all मधु - is *madhu* तस्य च सर्वभूतानि - and all others also are his *madhu* – (6)

6. Further, the one who is *adhyātma*, i.e. available in the physical body and is abiding in the earthen portion called *liṅga puruṣa (jīva)* also is the *madhu* of all and all others also are his *madhu*.

Just as *Pr̥thivī*, etc., are the *madhu* of external *jagat*, every *jīva* is the *madhu* of all other *jīvas*. The word ‘*pārthivāṃśagaḥ*’ (abiding in the earthen portion) is according to *Vārtika-sāra*. Another reading is ‘*pārthivāṃśajaḥ*’ (born of earthen portion). Though *liṅgātmā (jīva)* cannot be born from the elements such as earth, etc., it certainly abides in it like the reflection of sun in the water. That is told figuratively as born from *pārthiva* portion. *Jīvas* have *madhutva* through *Pr̥thivī*, etc., and also directly with other *jīvas*. All beings (*jīvas*) have effected the *Pr̥thivī*. That is how we have got it (*Pr̥thivī*). That makes us obliged to all *jīvas* through *Pr̥thivī*. Even otherwise unmindful of *Pr̥thivī* from different standpoints all *jīvas* are mutually helpful. This shows the direct *madhutva* among all *jīvas*.

THE EFFICACY OF MADHUVIDYĀ

The *madhutva* described so far is concluded.

साध्यात्मं साऽधिदैवं च साऽधिभूतमिदं जगत् ।
एकैकस्यात्मनः कृत्स्नं भोग्यत्वेनाऽवतिष्ठते ॥७॥

इदं कृत्स्नं जगत् - this entire *jagat* साध्यात्मं साधिदैवं साधिभूतं च - together with all individuals, presiding deities (and phenomenal powers) and everything else that is made of five elements (inanimate creation) एकैकस्यात्मनः - of every *jīva* भोग्यत्वेन - as the *bhogyā* अवतिष्ठते - remains – (7)

7. This entire *jagat* together with all individuals, presiding deities (and phenomenal powers) and everything else made of five elements (inanimate creation) remains as the *bhogyā* of every *jīva*.

It is experientially proved that the entire *jagat* is our *bhogyā* in the manner that was told so far. Every *jīva* is the *bhoktā* of *jagat*. The *bhoga* of a few things may be knowingly and that of others can be unknowingly.

The utility of gaining *madhuvidyā* follows.

सर्वं सर्वस्य कार्यं स्यात् सर्वं सर्वस्य भोजकः ।
इत्येषा मधुविद्यात्र वैषम्यक्लेशहारिणी ॥८॥

सर्वं - everything सर्वस्य कार्यं स्यात् -

is the effect (*bhogyā, kārya*) of everyone सर्वः - everyone सर्वस्य भोजकः (स्यात्) - is the cause (*bhoktā, kāraṇa*) of everything इति- because एषा मधुविद्या - this *madhuvidyā* अत्र - (taught) here वैषम्यक्लेशहारिणी - takes away inequality and distress – (8)

8. Because everything is the effect (*bhogyā, kārya*, object of *bhoga*) and everyone is the cause (*bhoktā, kāraṇa*) of everything, this *madhuvidyā* (taught) here takes away the inequality and distress.

The *kāraṇa* (cause) and *bhojaka* (*bhoktā*) are considered to be superior to the *kārya* (effect) and *bhogyā* (object of *bhoga*). Having seen the inequality in *kārya* and *bhogyā* we feel sad that we are not *kāraṇa* and *bhoktā*. But *madhuvidyā* tells us that all are mutually *kāraṇa* and *bhoktā* also. This brings equality in all without any notion of superiority or inferiority. This eliminates the distress on account of inequality. The sentience aspect in the *liṅgātmā* (*jīva*) enables the *bhoga* and becomes *bhoktā* whereas the inert aspect becomes the *bhogyā* (object of *bhoga*). By the ascertainment, ‘I favour or help all’ the individual does not look down on oneself. On the other hand by the findings that ‘I am obliged to all’ eschews anger and hatred towards others besides the individual gives up vanity. Such equality removes all distress.

Further the *śruti* in the case of every entity described as *madhu* says (*Br.U.2-5-1 to 14*) by ‘*ayam eva saḥ yaḥ ayam ātmā, idam amṛtam, idam Brahma, idam sarvam*’ that this *puruṣa* abiding in the *liṅgātmā* of *Prthivī*, etc., and in the *pārthiva aṃśa*, etc., of every *jīva* is the same *ātmā* described earlier as ‘everything is this *ātmā*’ (*Br.U.2-4-6*) to describe the *sārvātmya* of *ātmā*. This was also taught to Maitreyī as the means to gain *mokṣa*. This is immortal; this is Brahman, and this is everything. In addition, this teaching of Brahman was also in Gārgya Bālāki and Ajātaśatru dialogue (*Br.U.2-1*). Its knowledge is called *Brahmavidyā*. That entity itself is this Brahman abiding in all *liṅgātmā* as *ātmā*. By the *sākṣātkāra* of this Brahman the *sārvātmyabhāva* (knowledge that everything is *ātmā*) becomes easy. Thus by *madhutva* of entire *jagat* it was told that non-dual Brahman is its, (i.e. of *jagat*) cause. This is being explained phrase by phrase (of ‘*ayam eva saḥ yaḥ*’, etc.) (*Br.U.2-5-1 to 2-5-14*).

THE REAL NATURE UNDERLYING THE *MADHU*

भूतानि भूमिर्द्वे लिङ्गे इत्युक्तं यच्चतुर्विधम् ।
मध्वविद्याकृतं तस्य वस्तुतत्त्वमथोच्यते ॥९॥

भूतानि - bodies of living beings
भूमिः - *Prthivī* द्वे लिङ्गे - two *liṅgātmās*
in both individual body and *Prthivī*

इति यत् - so whatever चतुर्विधम् - fourfold अविद्याकृतं - the products of *avidyā* मधु - *madhu* (mutually helpful entity) उक्तं - was told अथ - now तस्य - its (of *madhu*) वस्तुतत्त्वम् - real nature उच्यते - is being described—(9)

9. The fourfold *madhu* (mutually helpful entity) which is the product of *avidyā* and which consists of bodies of living beings, *Pr̥thivī*, two *liṅgātmās* in both individual body and *Pr̥thivī* was told (so far). Now its (of *madhu*) real nature is being described.

The real nature of *kārya*, *kāraṇa*, *bhogyā*, *bhoktā* called fourfold *madhu* needs to be ascertained. *Ātmā* in its real nature is indivisible and non-dual. But on account of *ajñāna*, it appears as fourfold *madhu*. Because all of them are the products of *mithyā avidyā*, they also are not real. Therefore it becomes essential that their real nature has to be ascertained.

Now *Paramātmā* is indicated with reference to the *madhu*.

अयमेव स इत्यत्र

मधुरूपश्चतुर्विधः ।

प्रपञ्चोऽयमिति प्रोक्तः स

इत्यात्मोच्यते परः ॥१०॥

‘अयम् एव सः’ इति अत्र - this statement, ‘*ayam*’ (this) ‘*eva*’ (itself) ‘*sah*’ (is he) चतुर्विधः - fourfold मधुरूपः

प्रपञ्चः - the *jagat* in the form of *madhu* ‘अयम्’ इति प्रोक्तः - is called ‘*ayam*’ (this) ‘सः’ इति - by the pronoun ‘*sah*’ (he) परः आत्मा - *Paramātmā* उच्यते - is referred to—(10)

10. In this statement, ‘*ayam*’ (this) ‘*eva*’ (itself) ‘*sah*’ (is he), the *jagat* in the form of fourfold *madhu* is called ‘*ayam*’ (this). By the pronoun ‘*sah*’ the *Paramātmā* is referred to.

The fourfold *madhu* is *Pr̥thivī* and its *liṅgātmā* besides the *bhūta* or the individual body of a being and its *liṅgātmā*. These four types of *madhu* are mutual *kāryas* or mutually helpful. The *sākṣī aparokṣa ātmā* is referred by ‘*sah*’ (he, *Paramātmā*). Among these four, the *madhu* is restated whereas *Paramātmā* is indicated.

By such restatement of *madhu* and indication of *Paramātmā* how *madhu* and *ātmā* are related to each other is being explained.

अयमेव स इत्युक्त्या सामानाधिकरण्यतः ।
प्रत्यङ्मात्रैकयाथात्म्यं प्रपञ्चस्यावबोध्यते ॥११॥

‘अयम् एव सः’ इति उक्त्या - (in the *śruti*) ‘this is he’ सामानाधिकरण्यतः - by the means of the statement having juxtaposition (with negation) प्रपञ्चस्य - of *jagat* प्रत्यङ्मात्रैकयाथात्म्यं - identity with the non-dual *pratyagātmā* अवबोध्यते - is taught—(11)

11. (In the *śruti*) by the means of the statement having juxtaposition (with negation - *bādhita*) namely 'this itself is he' the identity of *jagat* with the non-dual *pratyagātmā* is taught.

Sāmānādhikarānyam is a formation of words with different meanings placed in the same declensional case with mutual relation among them conveying four types of a definite sense. They are: i) One is negated and the other is indicated. 'The snake is a rope' meaning it is not a snake but a rope. ii) *Adhyāsa* (superimposition). '*Sālagrāma* is Viṣṇu. That means the status of *Bhagavān* Viṣṇu is superimposed on the *sālagrāma* stone. iii) An adjective, 'Red cloth' points out to a cloth having redness as its adjective. iv) Identity. 'This is that person'. Here the features of 'this' and 'that' are deleted and the common denominator the 'person' is considered. These meanings are ascertained contextually. In the present *śruti* '*ayam eva saḥ*' the *jagat* referred to by '*ayam*' is negated whereas *pratyagātmā* suggested by '*saḥ*' is indicated. It means the *jagat* having the forms of *bhoktā*, *bhogyā*, *kāryā*, *kāraṇa* called *madhu* in reality is *pratyagātmā/Paramātmā* only. The same *ātmā* was mentioned earlier by the statement '*ātmā eva saḥ yaḥ ayam ātmā*' is told now.

स इत्येनेन

निर्देष्टुमतीतग्रन्थवर्णितः ।

योज्यमित्यादिभिर्वाक्यैश्चतुर्भिः

स्मार्यते परः ॥१२॥

'सः' इति अनेन - by the pronoun *saḥ* (he) निर्देष्टुम् - to indicate (*Paramātmā*) 'यः अयम्' इत्यादिभिः - by '*yaḥ ayam*' (this one), etc. चतुर्भिः वाक्यैः - by four statements अतीतग्रन्थवर्णितः - the one described in the earlier *brāhmaṇas* of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* परः - *Paramātmā* स्मार्यते - is reminded - (12)

12. To indicate *Paramātmā* by the pronoun '*saḥ*' (he), the *Paramātmā* described in the earlier *brāhmaṇas* of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* is reminded by four statements such as '*yaḥ ayam*' (this one), etc. (*Bṛ.U.2-5-1*).

The *ātmā* that was elaborated in the section '*dr̥ṣṭavyaḥ*' (*Bṛ.U.2-4-5*) itself is described here in the form of fourfold *madhu*. That principle of *ātmā* alone is the entity whose knowledge was described by Yājñavalkya as the means of liberation in answer to Maitreyī's question about the same. This is the same Brahman that was taught by Ajātaśatru to Gārgya Bālāki. This is that Brahman by whose knowledge the *jñānī* becomes everything, (i.e. gains *sarvabhāva*) (*Bṛ.U.1-4-9, 10*). Thus the words '*ātmā*' (in '*yaḥ ayam ātmā*'), '*amṛta*' (in '*idam amṛtam*'), *brahma* (in '*idam brahma*')

and ‘sarvam’ (in ‘idam sarvam’) contained in the four statements (quoted in the brackets) (*Br.U.2-5-1* to 14) describe the entity that is *para* (the most exalted, i.e. *Paramātmā/Brahman*) which is referred to as ‘*saḥ*’. It is a common practice to refer to the earlier portion by ‘*yat*’ pronoun and state it by ‘*tat*’ pronoun. Therefore the statements ‘*yaḥ ayam*’, etc., is connected to the earlier portion whereas the pronoun ‘*saḥ*’ gets connected to the subsequent portion.

The *ātmā* that was described in earlier *brāhmaṇas* is pointed out.

आत्मा द्रष्टव्य इत्युक्तममृतं चेति वर्णितम् ।
नेति नेत्युदितं ब्रह्म तत् सर्वमभवत् त्विति ॥१३॥

आत्मा द्रष्टव्यः - ‘*ātmāsākṣātkāra* should be gained’ इति उक्तं - so it was told
अमृतं च इति वर्णितम् - ‘it is immortal’, so it
was described (to Maitreyī) न इति न इति -
by ‘it is not this’, ‘it is not this’ उदितं -
(thus Brahman) was taught in *mūrtā-
mūrta-brāhmaṇa* तत् ब्रह्म तु - that
Brahman सर्वं अभवत् इति - became
everything. (So it was told) – (13)

13. ‘*Ātmāsākṣātkāra* should be gained’. So it was told. It was described (to Maitreyī) that ‘Brahman is immortal’. Brahman was taught in *mūrtā-mūrta-brāhmaṇa* by ‘it is not this’, ‘it is not this’. ‘That Brahman became everything. (So it was told).

The references of Brahman taught earlier are as follows:

- I) ‘*Ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ*’ (*Br.U. 2-4-5*). (*A.Pr.15-14* to 17). It was introduced that the *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *ātmā* should be gained.
- ii) The dialogue between Maitreyī and Yājñavalkya (*Br.U.2-4-2, 3*) shows that Brahman is *amṛta* (immortal). Yājñavalkya says: ‘*Amṛtatvasya tu nāśāsti vittaena* (*mokṣa* cannot be gained by wealth) (*Br.U.2-4-2*).
- iii) *Mūrtā-mūrta-brāhmaṇa* describes *nirviśeṣa* (attributeless) Brahman by (*neti neti*) (*Br.U.2-3-6, A.Pr.14-108* to 117).
- iv) By the knowledge of Brahman everything becomes Brahman (*tasmāt tat sarvam abhavat*) (*Br.U.1-4-10; A.Pr.13-24*, etc.). This shows the Brahman to be *pūrṇa*, non-dual.

How the teaching of *madhu-brāhmaṇa* is connected to the earlier one cited now is clarified.

आत्माऽमृतब्रह्मसर्वशब्दैः प्राक् प्रतिपादितम् ।
वस्त्वस्य मधुनस्तत्त्वमितिवाक्यार्थ ईरितः ॥१४॥

आत्मा-अमृत-ब्रह्म-सर्व-शब्दैः - by the

words *ātmā*, *amṛta*, *brahma*, *sarva* प्राक् प्रतिपादितम् - earlier established वस्तु - entity (Brahman) अस्य मधुनः - of this fourfold *madhu* तत्त्वम् - is the real nature इति - thus वाक्यार्थः - the meaning of the statement, ‘*ayam eva saḥ*’ ईरितः - is said –(14)

14. By the words ‘*ātmā*’, ‘*amṛta*’, ‘*brahma*’, ‘*sarva*’, the entity (Brahman) established in the earlier teaching is the real nature of the fourfold *madhu*. This is pointed out in the statement ‘*ayam eva saḥ*’ (*Br.U.2-5-1 to 14*).

The statement ‘*ayam eva saḥ*’ tells that the same principle, (i.e. Brahman) taught earlier is the real nature of fourfold *madhu*. It is not a new entity.

The fourfold *madhu* and its real nature to be Brahman was shown in the case of *Prthivī*. The same principle applies to the *madhutva* in the case of *jala* (water), *agni*, etc. This is being told now.

उत्तरेष्वपि वाक्येषु मधुरूपमिदं जगत् ।

ब्रह्मापि मधुनस्तत्त्वं योजयेदुक्तवर्त्मना ॥१५॥

उक्तवर्त्मना - in the same manner as explained earlier उत्तरेषु अपि वाक्येषु - in the subsequent statements of *śruti* also इदं जगत् - this *jagat* मधुरूपम् - has the mutual *madhutva* (helpful nature) मधुनः तत्त्वम् अपि - and the real nature of *madhu* also

ब्रह्म - is Brahman (इति) योजयेत् - so it should be applied –(15)

15. In the same manner as explained earlier, in the subsequent statements of *śruti* also this *jagat* has the mutual *madhutva* (helpful nature or *kārya-kāraṇa bhāva*) and the real nature of *madhu* is Brahman. (So) it should be applied.

It is said that the *śruti* (the Veda) is tireless. It knows no laziness. The form of *madhu* and its real nature that was established in the case of *Prthivī* is further applicable in the same manner in the case of *jala*, *agni*, *vāyu*, *āditya*, *dik*, *Candra*, *Vidyut*, cloud, *ākāśa*, *dharma*, *satya*, *mānuṣa*, *ātmā* and *Virāṭ*. In all these fourteen cases the form of *madhu* and its real nature is very clearly established by the *śruti*. Except for the change in the names of the entities considered such as *Prthivī*, *jala*, etc., all these statements are worded in the same way. Therefore the author asks us to apply the principle of *madhutva* established in the case of *Prthivī* to *jagat* comprising *jala*, etc. He does not mention them here separately except adding some explanatory notes in the case of *dharma*, *satya*, *mānuṣa* and *ātmā*.

DHARMA

First the words ‘*dharma*’ and ‘*dhārma*’ (belonging to *dharma*) (*Br.U.2-5-11*) are explained.

साधारणविशेषाभ्यां धर्मो भोगप्रदो द्विधा ।
अधिदैवं तथाध्यात्ममित्यत्राऽसौ विभज्यते ॥१६॥

भोगप्रदः धर्मः - the *dharma* which gives *bhoga* साधारणविशेषाभ्यां - because of being general and special द्विधा - is twofold अत्र असौ - here in this *śruti-statement* (*Br.U.2-5-11*) the word *dharma* अधिदैवं - (*dharma*) pertaining to the presiding deities, (i.e. *sādhāraṇa-dharma*) तथा - so also अध्यात्मम् - (*dharma*) concerning all individuals in general except the presiding deities, (i.e. *viśeṣa-dharma* or called *dhārma*) इति - thus विभज्यते - is divided—(16)

16. The *dharma* which gives *bhoga* is twofold because of being general and special. Here in this *śruti-statement* (*Br.U.2-5-11*) the word ‘*dharma*’ is divided into *adhidaiva* which pertains to the presiding deities, (i.e. *sādhāraṇa-dharma*) and *adhyātma* concerning all individuals in general except the presiding deities, (i.e. *viśeṣa-dharma* or called *dhārma*).

Dharma is ascertained by the Vedas as the regulating principle whereas its performance is under our control. It controls the entire humanity and the *jagat* is centred around *dharma*. Variegatedness seen in the *jagat* is because everything is regulated by *dharma*. The word *dharma* is used here

as its effect *Pr̥thivī*, etc., and the earthen, etc., individual bodies. The *sādhāraṇa* (general) *dharma* produces *Pr̥thivī*, etc., the presiding deities called *adhidaiva*. The *viśeṣa* (special) *dharma* produces the earthen (*pārthiva*), etc., bodies like human bodies, etc. The deities *Pr̥thivī*, etc., and their bodies are meant for all living beings. Therefore their cause is called *sādhāraṇa-dharma*. But our bodies are meant only for individual beings and so their cause is considered to be *viśeṣa*. In terms of one's duties also there is a division called *sāmānya-dharma* (duties in general) and *viśeṣa-dharma* (specific duties under specific circumstances) which may be at times at variance with the general one. But this division is not meant here.

SATYA AND MĀNUŚA

Now the similar division of *sādhāraṇa* and *viśeṣa* is employed to *satya* (*dharma* in practice) and *mānuśa* (all species of embodiments).

सत्यमानुषयोरेवं विभागं योजयेद् द्विधा ।
पृथिव्याद्या मानुषान्ताः विराडंशा उदीरिताः ॥१७॥

सत्यमानुषयोः - in the case of ‘*satya*’ (*Br.U.2-5-12*) and *mānuśa* (*Br.U.2-5-13*) एवं - in the same manner द्विधा विभागं - twofold division of *sādhāraṇa* and *viśeṣa* योजयेत् - should be employed पृथिव्याद्याः - beginning from *Pr̥thivī* (*Br.U.2-5-1*) मानुषान्ताः - ending

with *mānuṣa* (human) (*Bṛ.U.2-5-13*)
 विराडंशाः - the parts of *Virāṭ* उदीरिताः - are
 described – (17)

17. In the case of ‘*satya*’ (*Bṛ.U.2-5-12*) and *mānuṣa* (human) (*Bṛ.U.2-5-13*) the twofold division of *sādhāraṇa* and *viśeṣa* should be employed. The parts of *Virāṭ* are described from *Pr̥thivī* to *mānuṣa*.

In the earlier verse the two divisions of *dharma* were shown. The *sādhāraṇa* (general) pertains to the effect *adhidaiva*, the presiding deities whereas the *viśeṣa* (special) *dharma* called *dhārma* belongs to the effect *adhyātma*, the bodies of beings other than those of presiding deities. Similarly the *sādhāraṇa satya* pertains to the effect *adhidaiva*, the presiding deities whereas the *viśeṣa satya* (called *satya*) belongs to the effect *adhyātma*, the bodies of the beings other than the presiding deities.

Similar division applies to *mānuṣa* (human) which according to *bhāṣya*, etc., is an indicatory word for all species of beings. All embodiments born of *dharma* and *satya* are connected to species. Those species and their individual members have mutual *madhutva* as seen in the case of others.

The sample demonstration of *madhutva* began from *Pr̥thivī* and ended

with *mānuṣa*. All these are different parts of *Virāṭ* the macrocosmic gross body.

After *mānuṣa* ‘this *ātmā*’ (‘*ayam ātmā*’) (not *caitanya ātmā* but *Virāṭ*) (*Bṛ.U.2-4-14*) was shown as the *madhu* of all and vice versa. Explanation is given now about the meaning of ‘*ātmā*’ in that *śruti*-statement and the *liṅga-puruṣa* therein.

VIRĀṬ-HIRAṆYAGARBHA

अयमात्मेति निर्देशो विराजोऽभिमताऽशिनः ।
 हिरण्यगर्भस्तत्रत्यः प्रोक्तस्तेजोमयोक्तितः ॥१८॥

‘अयम् आत्मा’ - ‘this *ātmā*’ (*ayam ātmā*) इति निर्देशः - this specific mention (statement) अंशिनः विराजः - of entire *Virāṭ* अभिमतः - is considered तत्रत्यः - (the *liṅga-puruṣa*) abiding therein, (i.e. in *Virāṭ*) तेजोमयोक्तितः - because of the statement of resplendence, (i.e. the power of knowledge) हिरण्यगर्भः प्रोक्तः - is said to be *Hiranyagarbha* – (18)

18. The statement, ‘this *ātmā*’ (*ayam ātmā*), means the entire *Virāṭ*. The *liṅga-puruṣa* abiding therein, (i.e. in *Virāṭ*) is said to be *Hiranyagarbha* because of the statement of resplendence, (i.e. the power of knowledge).

The whole entity who has *Pr̥thivī*, etc., as its part is *Virāṭ*. The deity or *puruṣa* abiding in *Virāṭ* identified with the macrocosmic subtle bodies is

Hiranyagarbha. Since the constituents of *Virāt* and *Hiranyagarbha* have mutual *madhutva*, their total form as *Virāt* and *Hiranyagarbha* also have reciprocal *madhutva*.

The meaning of the phrase ‘*yaḥ ca ayam ātmā*’ (‘and the one who is this *ātmā*’) in the *śruti-statement* describing *Virāt* as *madhu* is explained now.

विराड् हिरण्यगर्भाख्यस्थूलसूक्ष्मशरीरगः ।
चिदाभासोऽत्र यश्चायमात्मेत्युक्त्याभिधीयते ॥१९॥

विराड् हिरण्यगर्भाख्यस्थूलसूक्ष्मशरीरगः - the one who is available in the macrocosmic gross body called *Virāt* and the macrocosmic subtle body called *Hiranyagarbha* चिदाभासः - the reflected *caitanya* (*cidābhāsa* called *jīva*) अत्र - in this *śruti-statement* ‘यः च अयम् आत्मा’ - ‘and the one who is this *ātmā*’ इति उक्त्या - by this phrase अभिधीयते - is mentioned - (19)

19. In this *śruti-statement*, ‘*yaḥ ca ayam ātmā*’ (‘and the one who is this *ātmā*’), the reflected *caitanya* (*cidābhāsa* called *jīva*) available in the macrocosmic gross body called *Virāt* and the macrocosmic subtle body called *Hiranyagarbha* is mentioned by the phrase ‘*yaḥ ca ayam ātmā*’ (‘and the one who is this *ātmā*’).

In the earlier cases such as *Prthivī*, etc., the phrase ‘*yaḥ ca ayam*

puruṣaḥ’ refers to both the *liṅgātmā* (*liṅgapuruṣa*) abiding in the deity *Prthivī*, etc., and also to *liṅgātmā* in its corresponding part such as *pārthiva aṃśa* (earthen portion) in the individual body of beings. But in the case of *Virāt* body, there being no separately existing individual bodies the phrase ‘*yaḥ ca ayam puruṣaḥ*’ cannot be the *liṅgātmā* in each individual body. Therefore the phrase ‘*yaḥ ca ayam ātmā*’ in this case means the *cidābhāsa* as the *jīva* not specified in earlier cases and who is *vijñānamaya* (who has *buddhi* as the predominant *upādhi*) for whose sake the entire embodiment is available (*Br.U.Bh.2-5-15*).

ĀTMĀ IS ADHIPATI RĀJĀ

After describing all *madhus* the *śruti* proceeds further to unfold the actual *ātmā* who is independent of all of them and also their overlord by ‘स वा अयम् आत्मा सर्वेषां भूतानां अधिपतिः सर्वेषां भूतानां राजा’ ‘The *jñānī* (*ayam ātmā*) is the independent (*adhipati*) overlord (*rājā*) of all beings’ (*Br.U.2-4-15*). This portion is being explained now.

अपूर्वानपरामध्य-

प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यवित्तये ।

स वा इत्यादिको ग्रन्थः

सदृष्टान्तोऽभिधीयते ॥२०॥

अपूर्व-अनपर-अमध्य-प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यवित्तये

- to gain the *sākṣātkāra* of *pratyagātmā* in its real nature which is causeless, effectless and has ‘no middle’ ‘स वा’ इत्यादिकः ग्रन्थः - the statement ‘*sa vā*’, etc., (*Br.U.2-5-15*) सदृष्टान्तः - coupled with an illustration अभिधीयते - is told – (20)

20. To gain the *sākṣātkāra* of *pratyagātmā* in its real nature which is causeless, effectless and has ‘no middle’ the statement ‘*sa vā*’, etc., (*Br.U.2-5-15*) coupled with an illustration is told.

ननुक्तं मधुनस्तत्त्वमयमेव स इत्यतः ।

वचनाद् बहुपर्यायैर्भूयोऽप्येतद्दृढीकृतम् ॥२१॥

ननु - is it not indeed अयम् एव सः - ‘this (*madhu*) is itself that (Brahman)’ इति अतः वचनात् - by this statement (*Br.U.2-5-1*) मधुनः तत्त्वं - the real nature of *madhu* (as Brahman) उक्तं - was told भूयः अपि - repeatedly also बहुपर्यायैः - by many alternatives (*Br.U.2-5-2* to 14) एतत् - this (truth) दृढीकृतम् - was confirmed (Then why this repetition now?) – (21)

21. Is it not indeed by this statement, ‘this (*madhu*) is itself that (Brahman)’ (*Br.U.2-5-1*) the real nature of *madhu* (as Brahman) was told? This (truth) was also confirmed repeatedly by many alternatives (*Br.U.2-5-2* to 14). (Then why this repetition now?).

बाढमेतावता वस्तुसार्वत्त्र्यं स्यात् प्रपञ्चितम् ।
तदेवाऽभिव्यज्यतेऽथ विदुषः फलरूपतः ॥२२॥

बाढम् - true एतावता - so far वस्तुसार्वत्त्र्यं - real nature of all *madhus* is *ātmasvarūpa* प्रपञ्चितम् स्यात् - was elaborated अथ - now तदेव - the same *ātmasvarūpa* of all विदुषः फलरूपतः - in the form of result gained by a *Brahmajñānī* अभिव्यज्यते - is made clear – (22)

22. It is true. So far the real nature of all *madhus* is *ātmasvarūpa* was elaborated. Now the same *ātmasvarūpa* of all is made clear in the form of result gained by a *Brahmajñānī*.

‘*Apūrva*’ is the entity which has no cause (*kāraṇa*) and ‘*anapara*’ is the one which has no effect (*kārya*). *Ātmā* being *vijñānaghana*, it has no middle. The illustration of hub, spokes and the rim of a wheel will be given in the verses 26 and 27. It is true that earlier the real nature of *madhu* was described. But now the same is described as proved by the direct experience (*aparokṣānubhava*) of *Brahmajñānī*. Such descriptions based on *vidvadanubhava* (experience of *jñānīs*) convinces the *mumukṣus* that *ātmajñāna* is not *nitya-parokṣa* or a utopian dream but it can be verified in *Brahmānubhava* which itself is liberation.

This fact is now being explained in accordance with the *śruti*.

स एव मधुतत्त्वाख्य

आत्माऽयं तत्त्वविन्मतः ।

आधिपत्यं च राजत्वं

विदुष्यविदुषोऽधिकम् ॥२३॥

सः एव आत्मा - the same *ātmā* only
मधुतत्त्वाख्यः - which was called the real
nature of *madhu* अयं - is this (*ātmā* now
described) तत्त्वविन्मतः - as known by a
jñānī विदुषि - in a *jñānī* (in spite of having
the same *ātmā* as that of an
ajñānī) आधिपत्यं - overlordship च राजत्वं -
and kingship अविदुषः - than the *ajñānī*
अधिकम् - are additional – (23)

23. The same *ātmā* only which
was called the real nature of *madhu* is
this (*ātmā* now described) as known by
a *jñānī*. Overlordship (*ādhipatya*) and
kingship (*rājatvam*) are additional in a
jñānī than the *ajñānī* (in spite of same
ātmā in both).

The words *adhipati* and *rājā* are
synonyms. Therefore it appears as if the
same nature is repeated. To remove such
doubt the meaning of these two words as
applicable here is given in the next two
verses.

अत्राधिपतिशब्देन

स्वातन्त्र्यमभिधीयते ।

स्वार्थः प्रत्यक्तदर्थत्वात्

सहेतोर्जगदात्मनः ॥२४॥

अत्र - in the *śruti-statement* (*Br. U.*

2-5-15) अधिपति शब्देन - by the word
adhipati स्वातन्त्र्यम् - independence
अभिधीयते - is told स्वार्थः - the meaning of
the word 'sva' in the sense of 'svātantrya'
प्रत्यक् - is *pratyagātmā* सहेतोः जगदात्मनः - of
the *jagatsvarūpa* with its cause तदर्थत्वात् -
because it is meant for *pratyagrūpa* 'sva'
– (24)

24. The word *adhipati* in the
śruti-statement means *pratyagātmā*.
The meaning of the word 'sva' in the
sense of 'svātantrya' is *pratyagātmā*.
Because the *jagatsvarūpa* with its cause
is meant for *pratyagātmā* (its
independence is justified).

The *bhogyā* is for *bhoktā*. So also
the *jagat* with its cause is for *ātmā*. But
ātmā is not *parārtha* (not for other's
sake). Therefore *ātmā* is independent.

राजत्वं

राजनाद्भास्वदविलुप्तात्मदर्शनात् ।

ब्रह्मास्मीति

परिज्ञानध्वस्तध्वान्तत्वकारणात् ॥२५॥

राजत्वं - the nature of *ātmā* as *rājā*,
(i.e. kingship) राजनात् - is because of (its)
resplendence भास्वत् अविलुप्तात्मदर्शनात् - it is
resplendent because *ātmajñāna* is never
extinct ब्रह्म अस्मि इति परिज्ञानध्वस्तध्वान्तत्व-
कारणात् - (that also is so) because the
avidyā is destroyed by the *pūrṇa*
(complete) knowledge or *sākṣātkāra*
that 'I am Brahman' – (25)

25. The nature of *ātmā* as *rājā*, (i.e. kingship) is because of its effulgence. It is resplendent because *ātmajñāna* is never extinct. (That also is so) because the *avidyā* is destroyed by the *pūrṇa* (complete) knowledge or *sākṣātkāra* that ‘I am Brahman’.

A *jñānī* in the state of *jīvanmukti* also is considered as *rājā*, *adhipati*. This distinguishes the *Brahmaniṣṭha* from an *ajñānī* though the *ātmā* of both is one and the same. Generally the words *rājā* (king), *adhipati* (overlord) are synonyms. Even then by the etymological derivation of *rājā* from the verbal root *rāj* in the sense of resplendence, its meaning is taken as the one who is resplendent. When ignorance of oneself is destroyed by *Brahmasākṣātkāra* a *jñānī* with *niṣṭhā* (steadfastness) in knowledge remains in his own resplendence of self-luminous knowledge-principle. An independent person is called an *adhipati*. *Ātmā* is independent because the entire *jagat* and its cause *māyā* depends on it whereas *ātmā* does not depend on anything.

ĀTMĀ IS THE ĀDHĀRA (BASIS) OF JAGAT

The *śruti* gives an illustration to show that the entire *jagat* is centred in *jñānī* who is nothing but Brahman. The *śruti* says: ‘Just as the spokes of a wheel are centred in its hub and the rim, so are

all beings (from *Hiranyagarbha* to an ordinary creature), all deities, all *lokas*, all *prāṇas* and all *jīvas* centred in *Brahmajñānī*’ (*Br. U.2-4-15*). The gist of this illustration is given in the next two verses.

योऽसावविद्यया देही

संसारीवाप्यभूत् पुरा ।

स एव विद्यया ब्रह्मेत्यतोऽस्मिन्

जगदर्पितम् ॥२६॥

यः असौ - this individual who अविद्यया - on account of *avidyā* देही (इव) - as if endowed with the body संसारी इव अपि - and as if a *samsārī* पुरा - before gaining *ātmajñāna* अभूत् - became सः एव - that individual itself (now) विद्यया - by *ātmajñāna* ब्रह्म - is Brahman इति अतः - therefore अस्मिन् - in this *Brahmajñānī* जगत् अर्पितम् - the *jagat* is centred—(26)

26. This individual who on account of *avidyā* before gaining *ātmajñāna* became as if endowed with the body and as if a *samsārī* that individual itself (now) by *ātmajñāna* is Brahman. Therefore in this *Brahmajñānī* the *jagat* is centred.

चक्रस्यारा यथा सर्वे नाभिनेम्योः समर्पिताः ।
सजीवा निखिला देहा ब्रह्मविद्यर्पितास्तथा ॥२७॥

यथा - just as चक्रस्य - of a wheel सर्वे - all अराः - spokes नाभिनेम्योः - in its hub and the rim समर्पिताः - are centred तथा -

similarly सजीवाः - together with *jīvas* निखिलाः - all देहाः - bodies ब्रह्मविदि - in the *Brahmajñānī* अर्पिताः - are centred – (27)

27. Just as all spokes of a wheel are centred in its hub and the rim, similarly all bodies together with *jīvas* are centred in the *Brahmajñānī*.

Having a body, identifying with it and *saṃsāra*, etc., are on account of *mithyāvidyā*. Therefore it is only an appearance but not in reality. This is indicated by ‘*iva*’ (as if). The defects of *upādhis* such as mirror are attributed to the original entity (*bimba*) through the reflection (*pratibimba*). Similarly because of identity with *avidyā* and its effects such as *antaḥkaraṇa*, etc., *ātmā* appears as if endowed with the body, *saṃsāra*, etc. When the *avidyā* ends by *vidyā* the hitherto seeming *saṃsārī* remains in its real nature of Brahman alone. Brahman is the cause of *jagat*. Therefore the *saṃsāra* is based in it. *Brahmajñānī* also has discovered oneself to be Brahman. In view of this it is appropriate to say that the *jagat* is centred in *Brahmajñānī*. The *śruti* gives the example of spokes of a wheel being centred in its hub and the rim. Though the hub is the middle portion and rim the outer portion of wheel, such division is not there in Brahman. In the state of ignorance the inner and outer distinction can be explained on the basis of *vyasṭi*

and *samaṣṭi*, etc.

The main teaching of *madhuvidyā* is over. Now the related story which describes the context of this teaching is told. It highlights certain commitment that both the *guru* and disciples have to abide by.

NARRATION

समाप्ता ब्रह्मविद्येयं

कैवल्यावाप्तयेऽखिला ।

यथोक्तब्रह्मविद्यायाः

स्तुत्यर्थाख्यायिकोच्यते ॥२८॥

कैवल्यावाप्तये - to gain *mokṣa* इयं - this अखिला - complete ब्रह्मविद्या - *Brahmavidyā* समाप्ता - is over यथोक्त-ब्रह्मविद्यायाः - of *Brahmavidyā* that was taught now स्तुत्यर्था - to praise आख्यायिका - a narration told earlier in *pravargya* section of first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* उच्यते - is being told – (28)

28. This complete *Brahmavidyā* (necessary) to gain *mokṣa* is over. To praise this *Brahmavidyā* that was taught now the narration (told earlier in *pravargya* section of first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*) is being told.

दध्यङ्गथर्वणोऽश्विभ्यामुवाच द्विविधं मधु ।
प्रवर्ग्याङ्गरविध्यानं ब्रह्मज्ञानमिति द्वयम् ॥२९॥

दध्यङ्गथर्वणः - the sage Dadhyañ Ātharvaṇa अश्विभ्याम् - to Aśvinīkumāras द्विविधं मधु - two types of *madhu* उवाच -

taught प्रवर्ग्याङ्गरविध्यानं - (the first one was) the meditation of *Ravi* (sun) an auxiliary of *pravargya* (a ceremony preliminary to the *Soma* sacrifice) (appearing in the first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*). ब्रह्मज्ञानम् इति द्वयम् - second is this *Brahmajñāna* (taught now in the fourth chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, i.e. second chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat*) –(29)

29. The sage Dadhyañ Ātharvaṇa taught to Aśvinīkumāras two types of *madhu*. (The first one was) the meditation of *Ravi* (sun) an auxiliary of *pravargya* (a ceremony preliminary to *Soma* sacrifice) (appearing in the first chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*). The second is this *Brahmajñāna* (fourth chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, i.e. second chapter of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat*).

तं वृत्तान्तमृषिः पश्यन् प्राब्रवीदश्विनौ प्रति ।
वृत्तान्तमब्रवीदृग्भ्यामृग्भ्यां च ब्रह्मवेदनम् ॥३०॥

ऋषिः - a *ṛṣi* (either a Vedic *mantra*, (i.e. the *śruti* itself) or a *mantra-draṣṭā*/seer of *mantra*) अश्विनौ प्रति - about Aśvinīkumāras तं वृत्तान्तं पश्यन् - having known that episode ऋग्भ्याम् - by two *ṛk-mantras* वृत्तान्तम् - the episode प्राब्रवीत् - proclaimed ऋग्भ्याम् च - and by another two *ṛk-mantras* ब्रह्मवेदनम् - *Brahmajñāna* अब्रवीत् - told –(30)

30. A *ṛṣi* (either a *mantra*, i.e. the *śruti* itself) or a *mantra-draṣṭā*/seer of

mantra having known the episode about the Aśvinīkumāras proclaimed the episode by two *ṛk-mantras* (*Br.U.* 2-5-16, 17) and by another two *ṛk-mantras* told the *Brahmajñāna* (*Br.U.* 2-5-18, 19).

Aśvinīkumāras were dear disciples of Dadhyañ Ātharvaṇa. He had taught them the meditation on the deity Sūrya (sun) as an auxiliary of *pravargyakarma*. Since they were not prepared to gain *Brahmavidyā* the performance of certain *sādhanās* were recommended to acquire the required eligibility. But in the meanwhile Indra approached Dadhyañ *Muni* to learn *Brahmavidyā*. As an introduction when the *vairāgya* was elaborated Indra got angry hearing the criticism of his post. He warned the *muni* that he will be beheaded by him if this knowledge is given to any person. When Aśvinīkumāras returned to learn *Brahmavidyā* after gaining the eligibility Dadhyañ Ātharvaṇa told his problem. They offered the solution of doing multiple head-transplants by surgery. On accepting them as disciple for receiving *Brahmavidyā* they will behead the *guru* by surgery and fix in its place a head of a horse and his head will be fixed on the shoulders of the horse. When Indra beheads the horse-head of the *guru* the original one will be restored. On teaching by the head of the horse Indra did behead

Dadhyañ and it was restored by surgery as planned earlier. Thus the *guru* kept his word and taught *Brahmavidyā* even if he had to face hazardous situation. A ṛṣi who knew this incident or the *śruti* itself tells Aśvinīkumāras that he is going to proclaim this terrific action to gain *Brahmavidyā* and also that they were not affected by any adverse effect because of beheading the *guru*. This shows the unparalleled stature of *Brahmavidyā*.

It should be noted that the deity Indra (not Indra as *Paramātmā*) is the name of a functionary or post and not one and the same individual. He has a definite ruling period. Many of them were *jñānīs*. Some others have done wrong deeds also.

The gist of the *mantras* told by the ṛṣi is now given.

अश्विनौ युवयोरुग्रं

लाभाय गुरुमारणम् ।

आविष्करोमि लोकेऽस्मिन् मेघो

वृष्टिं यथा तथा ॥३१॥

अश्विनौ - Oh Aśvinīkumāras लाभाय - to gain (*Brahmavidyā*) युवयोः - of both of you उग्रं - the very cruel act गुरुमारणम् - of beheading the *guru* अस्मिन् लोके - (that one) in this world आविष्करोमि - I shall proclaim यथा मेघः वृष्टिं - just as the clouds display the rains तथा - so - (31)

31. Oh Aśvinīkumāras I shall

proclaim in this world the very cruel act of beheading the *guru* by both of you to gain (*Brahmavidyā*) like the cloud displays the rains to all.

दध्यङ्गथर्वणोऽश्वस्य शिरसा युवयोर्मधु ।
यत् प्रोवाच तदप्यत्र जानन्नाविष्करोम्यहम् ॥३२॥

दध्यङ्गथर्वणः - Dadhyañ Ātharvaṇa अश्वस्य शिरसा - by the means of a horse's head युवयोः - to both of you यत् मधु - whatever *madhuvidyā* प्रोवाच - taught तद् अपि जानन् - knowing that also अहम् अत्र आविष्करोमि - I shall declare it here - (32)

32. Whatever *madhuvidyā* Dadhyañ Ātharvaṇa taught to both of you by the means of a horse's head, having known that also, I shall declare it here.

छित्वा गुरो शिरोऽन्यत्र निक्षिप्याऽश्वस्य यच्छिरः ।
तदाहृत्य गुरो स्कन्धे प्रतिष्ठापयतो युवाम् ॥३३॥

युवाम् - both of you गुरोः शिरः छित्वा - having cut the head of (your) *guru* अन्यत्र - at other place निक्षिप्य - having fixed यत् अश्वस्य शिरः - whatever the head of a horse was there तदाहृत्य - having brought it गुरोः स्कन्धे - on the shoulder of *guru* प्रतिष्ठापयतः - have fixed - (33)

33. Both of you having cut the head of (your) *guru* (and) having fixed it at other place (in turn) having brought the head of a horse have fixed it on the shoulder of *guru*.

सत्यप्रतिज्ञः स गुरुः सोढ्वाप्येदृशीं व्यथाम् ।
मधुद्वयमुवाचेति कथितोऽर्थ ऋचोर्द्वयोः ॥३४॥

सः सत्यप्रतिज्ञः गुरुः - that *guru* who kept his promise ईदृशीं व्यथाम् अपि - even such pain सोढ्वा - having tolerated मधुद्वयम् - two *madhus* उवाच - taught इति - thus द्वयोः ऋचोः - of two *ṛks* (describing the terrific episode) अर्थः कथितः - meaning is told - (34)

34. That *guru* who kept his promise having tolerated even such pain taught two *madhus*. Thus the meaning of two *ṛks* (describing the terrific episode) is told (now).

Though the *guru* was not killed but saved, even then such major multiple surgery is certainly painful besides the

transplanted head can never match the original one. That is why the deed of *Aśvinīkumāras* is called terrific one. Knowing fully well the above trauma of multiple surgeries the sage *Dadhyañ* underwent it only to keep his promise that he will teach the *vidyā*. Here is a lesson to *mumukṣus* also that they should keep their words. This was not the first head-transplant by *Aśvinīkumāras*. They had fixed earlier the head of *Yajña* (deity *Agni*?). Therefore *Dadhyañ Muni* was confident about the capacity of these two surgeons (*Aśvinīkumāras*). The two *madhus* taught are: i) *Tvāṣṭram* - (त्वाष्ट्रम्) meditation of *Tvaṣṭā* (*Āditya*, sun) which is an auxiliary of *pravargya-karma*. ii) *Kakṣyam* (कक्ष्यम्) - secret about *Paramātmā-vijñāna* (*Brahmavidyā*).

BRAHMAN

The summary of two *ṛks* related to the story is over. The summary of two *ṛks* pertaining to *Brahmavidyā* is being given. The two *ṛks* are : ‘...पुरश्चक्रे द्विपदः पुरश्चक्रे चतुष्पदः । पुरः स पक्षी भूत्वा पुरः पुरुषे आविशत् इति । स वा अयं पुरुषः सर्वासु पूर्षु पुरिशयः नैनेन किञ्चन अनावृतम् नैनेन किञ्चन असंवृतम्’ (...*Parameśvara* created biped (human; bird) and quadruped (animal) bodies (*purah*). First (*purah*) he (*Parmeśvara*) having become the subtle body (*pakṣī*) entered the gross bodies (*purah*) in the form of *puruṣa*. *Īśvara* is called *puruṣa* because he abides in all bodies. There is nothing in the *jagat* that is not enveloped (or pervaded) (*anāvṛtam*) by *Paramātmā* or not entered (*asamvṛtam*). (This highlights the all-pervasiveness of *Paramātmā*) (*Br.U.* 2-5-18).

‘... रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव तदस्य रूपं प्रतिचक्षणाय इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूपः ईयते युक्ता ह्यस्य हरयः शता दशेति । अयं वै हरयोऽयं वै दश च सहस्राणि बहूनि चानन्तानि च

तदेतद्ब्रह्मापूर्वमनपरमबाह्यमयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूरित्यनुशासनम्।' (... That *Paramātmā* with respect to the form of every *upādhi* became as it were its replica. Indra (*Paramātmā*) to make everyone know its real nature by *māyā* appears as having manifold forms. His chariot in the form of bodies is yoked with innumerable *indriyas* called horses. That does not mean this *Paramātmā* is different and *indriyas* are different. He himself is innumerable *indriyas* because the embodiments of beings are endless. In reality, this *ātmā/Paramātmā* is Brahman which is causeless (*apūrvam*), effectless (*anaparam*). There is no species of it (*anantaram*) and also it has no distinct entity other than itself (*abāhyam*). This all pervasive Brahman itself is this *ātmā (pratyagātmā)* who appears as seer, hearer, thinker, knower, etc., and also experiences everything in the form of everyone, (i.e. *sarvānubhūh*)' (*Br. U.2-5-19*). These two *ṛks* are explained now.

ईशो मनुष्यपश्चादिदेहांश्चक्रे

पुरा ततः ।

स पक्षी लिङ्गरूपेण भूत्वा

तान् प्राविशत् प्रभुः ॥३५॥

पुरा - in the past at the time of Creation ईशः - *Īśvara* मनुष्यपश्चादि देहान् चक्रे - created the bodies of humans, animals, etc. ततः - then सः - he (*Īśvara*) प्रभुः - the overlord लिङ्गरूपेण - in the form of subtle body पक्षी भूत्वा - having become a bird, (i.e. *jīva* who like a bird flies as it were from one body to the other) तान् - those bodies प्राविशत् - entered—(35)

35. In the past at the time of Creation, *Īśvara* created the bodies of humans, animals, etc. Then *Īśvara* the overlord having become a bird, (i.e. *jīva* who like a bird flies as it were from one body to the other) in the form of subtle

body entered those bodies.

Īśvara is described as a bird in the form of *liṅgaśarīra* (subtle body) because it points out the status of *jīva* who is *cidābhāsa* in the *antaḥkaraṇa* identified with the gross and subtle bodies. The *jīva* like a bird flying from place to place transmigrates abandoning the present gross body to take the next body. Entry of *Īśvara* in the physical body is the availability of sentience or *cidābhāsa* in it. Otherwise the physical body is a dead mass. This entry also is to reveal the real nature of *jīva* donning *cidābhāsa* as nothing but *cit*, *ātmā*, *Paramātmā* only.

The next three verses further explain the *mantra* (*Br. U.2-5-18*).

योऽयं पुरुषशब्दोऽस्मिन् मन्त्रे तस्य निरुक्तितः ।
जीवब्रह्मैक्यतात्पर्यं मन्त्रस्यास्योपवर्ण्यते ॥३६॥

अस्मिन् मन्त्रे - in this *mantra* यः
अयं पुरुषशब्दः - whatever word *puruṣa*
(is employed) तस्य निरुक्तिः - by its
etymological interpretation अस्य मन्त्रस्य -
of this *mantra* जीवब्रह्मैक्यतात्पर्यम् - the
purport regarding the identity of *jīva* and
Brahman उपवर्ण्यते - is described – (36)

36. In this *mantra* (*Br.U.2-5-18*)
whatever word *puruṣa* (is employed)
by its etymological interpretation the
purport regarding the identity of *jīva*
and Brahman is described.

पुरि शेते यतस्तस्मात् पुरुषो जीव उच्यते ।
सर्वं पूरयतीत्येवं पुरुषो ब्रह्म भण्यते ॥३७॥

यतः - because पुरि - in the body
शेते - sleeps, (i.e. abides) तस्मात् -
therefore जीवः - *jīva* पुरुषः उच्यते - is said
to be *puruṣa* सर्वं - everything पूरयति - fills
up or pervades इति एवं - therefore ब्रह्म -
Brahman पुरुषः भण्यते - is called *puruṣa*
– (37)

37. The *jīva* is called *puruṣa*
because it sleeps, (i.e. abides) in the body
(called *pura*). Brahman (also) is called
puruṣa because it fills up or pervades
everything.

Brahman as *puruṣa* is further
deduced.

अनेन ब्रह्मणा किञ्चिद् बहिर्नाऽनावृतं क्वचित् ।
नास्त्यसंवृतमन्तश्च पूरणात् पुरुषस्तथा ॥३८॥

अनेन ब्रह्मणा - by this Brahman

किञ्चित् बहिः - anything outside क्वचित् -
anywhere न अनावृतं - not pervaded or
enveloped न अस्ति - is not there अन्तः च -
and inside असंवृतं - not permeated in and
through (न अस्ति - is not there) तथा - thus
पूरणात् - because of pervading पुरुषः - the
Brahman is called *puruṣa* – (38)

38. There is nothing outside and
anywhere that is not pervaded or
enveloped by Brahman and inside also
there is nothing in and through not
permeated by it. Thus because of
pervading (everything) the Brahman is
called *puruṣa*.

Brahman the cause of everything
itself appears as *jīva*. The imagery of
bird (*pakṣī*) is found in *Taittirīyopaniṣat*
also. The befitting *upādhi* for *Īśvara*
to enter in the body is subtle body
only wherein all pervasive *Paramātmā*
is available as *cidābhāsa*. *Bhāṣya*
interprets the word '*pakṣī*' as *liṅgaśarīra*
made of subtle elements. It is well-
known that this entity is in the form
of *tādātmyādhyāsa*. The word *puruṣa*
indicates both *jīva* and Brahman. It
suggests the identity between both of
them. The *jīva* is called *puruṣa* because
it sleeps in the *pura* (body). Figuratively,
sleeping here means abiding therein
without knowing its real nature. The
ignorance of one's real nature is the
sleep here. On the contrary the Brahman

is called *puruṣa* because it pervades everything and therefore is *pūrṇa* (full and complete). *Īśvara* is *pūrṇa* because of being *sarvotpādaka* (producer of all), *sarva-vilayādhāra* (wherein everything merges) and *sarvaniyantā* (controls everything). Everything inside and outside is pervaded by Brahman. Therefore it is called ‘*asamvṛta*’ and ‘*anāvṛta*’.

The meaning of *śruti* ‘*rūpam rūpam pratirūpāḥ*’, etc., is being given.

रूपं रूपं प्रविष्टः सन् प्रतिबिम्बो भवत्ययम् ।
तदस्य प्रतिबिम्बत्वं प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यवित्तये ॥३९॥

अयं - this *ātmā* रूपं रूपं - every *upādhi* प्रविष्टः सन् - having entered प्रतिबिम्बः भवति - becomes its reflection तद् प्रतिबिम्बत्वं - that appearance of its reflection अस्य - of this *jīva* प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यवित्तये - to ascertain the real nature of *pratyagātmā* – (39)

39. This *ātmā* having entered every *upādhi* becomes its reflection. That appearance of its reflection is meant to ascertain the real nature of *jīva* which is *pratyagātmā* (i.e. free from *upādhi*).

The word *rūpa* (form) used by the *śruti* refers to *upādhis* with which *ātmā* gets identified and mistakes oneself to be *samsārī jīva*. Such phenomenon is called reflection. When you see in the mirror,

actually your face is not there in it. And yet it appears to be there. Similarly *ātmā* without getting limited by the *upādhi* in reality appears to be there in *upādhi*. Such appearance is called *cidābhāsa* because it appears like *cit*. Entry (*praveśa*) and reflection (*pratibimba*) are not different from each other. To end the *ajñāna* of *pratyagātmā* an *akhaṇḍākāra* (*ātmākāra*) *vṛtti* is necessary which is possible only in an *antaḥkaraṇa* with *cidābhāsa*. That is the purpose of *Īśvara*'s entry in the body.

How the *pratibimba* serves as the means to gain the *aparokṣajñāna* of *pratyagātmā* is shown.

चैतन्यात्मादयः शब्दाः व्युत्पन्नाः प्रतिबिम्बके ।
लक्षयन्ति चिदात्मानं तेन याथात्म्यवेदनम् ॥४०॥

चैतन्यात्मादयः शब्दाः - the words such as ‘*caitanya*’, ‘*ātmā*’, etc. प्रतिबिम्बके व्युत्पन्नाः (सन्तः) - being proficient in communicating the reflected *pratyagātmā* (as a *pratibimba*) by their direct meaning (*śaktyartha*) चिदात्मानं - *cidrūpa ātmā* (in its original *bimba* form) लक्षयन्ति - indicate by implication तेन - thereby याथात्म्यवेदनम् - the *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *pratyagātmā* takes place – (40)

40. The words such as ‘*caitanya*’, ‘*ātmā*’, etc., being proficient in communicating the reflected *pratyagātmā* (as a *pratibimba*) by their direct

meaning (*śaktyartha*), indicate by implication the *cidrūpa ātmā* (in its original *bimba* form). Thereby the *aparokṣa-jñāna* of *pratyagātmā* takes place.

The main *ātmā* (*bimba ātmā*) has no *jāti* (species), *guṇa* (attributes) *kriyā* (action), *saṃbandha* (relation) and *rūḍhi* (being known customarily by *pratyakṣa*, etc.). It is not an object of any *pramāṇa* or *vyavahāra* like *pratyakṣa*, etc. Therefore it cannot be described by the direct meaning (*śaktyartha* or *mukhyārtha*) of any words. But its reflection (*pratibimba*) is available for the direct meaning of words such as *caitanya*, *ātmā*. *Pratibimba* of main *ātmā* called *cidābhāsa* though limited by *vṛtti* conforms to the nature of main *ātmā*. It indicates the main *ātmā* by implication (*lakṣaṇāvṛtti*). The reflection of *caitanya*, (i.e. *cidābhāsa*) appears as *caitanya*. It can be directly experienced. Once the *upādhi-features* of *cidābhāsa* are removed, what remains is self-evident self-experiencing *cit* (*caitanya*) alone which itself is main *ātmā*. This is how the *upādhi-less-ātmā* can be known in the human embodiment with the least *upādhi* of *ātmākāra-vṛtti* or *nirvikalpa samādhi*.

How does the one non-dual *ātmā* appears as many is demonstrated.

मिथ्याऽभिमानैः साभासबुध्यादिपरिकल्पितैः ।
द्रष्टा श्रोताऽहमित्यादिबहुरूपो विचेष्टते ॥४१॥

साभासबुध्यादिपरिकल्पितैः - imagined by *buddhi*, etc., endowed with *cidābhāsa*
मिथ्याऽभिमानैः - by false (*mithyā*) identifications अहं - I am द्रष्टा - seer श्रोता - hearer इत्यादि - etc. बहुरूपः - (*ātmā*) appearing in many forms विचेष्टते - does all *vyavahāra* – (41)

41. By false (*mithyā*) identifications such as ‘I am a seer’, ‘I am a hearer’, etc., imagined by *buddhi*, etc., endowed with *cidābhāsa*, *ātmā* appearing in many forms does all *vyavahāra*.

The notions of seer, hearer, etc., are *vṛttis* (thoughts) of *buddhi*. But because of *cidābhāsa* in them they appear sentient and as a result *ātmā* on account of ignorance identifies with them as ‘I myself is this’. Thereby it appears that functions such as seeing, etc., are on the part of *ātmā* only. It is just like superimposing the movement of a speeding boat on the trees situated on the bank. Therefore *ātmā* is not seer, etc., in reality. And yet, it appears so because of ignorance. This is what the *śruti* says that *ātmā* appears as having many forms (*bahurūpaḥ*).

The senses (*indriyas*) called horses (*hari*) by the *mantra* are described.

सन्यस्य हरयोऽक्षाख्या हरणाद् विषयान् प्रति ।
प्राणिभेदादनन्तास्ते तैस्तु संसरतीश्वरः ॥४२॥

अस्य - of this *ātmā* अक्षाख्याः - called *indriyas* हरयः - horses (*haris*) सन्ति - are there विषयान् प्रति हरणात् - (they are called *hari*/horses) because they drive (the bodily chariot) to the sense-objects ते - those *indriyas* प्राणिभेदात् - because of varieties of living beings अनन्ताः - are innumerable तैः तु - so also by means of them ईश्वरः - *Īśvara* संसरति - transmigrates (in the form of *jīvas*) – (42)

42. This *ātmā* has horses (*hari*) called *indriyas* (senses). They are called so because they drive the bodily chariot to the sense-objects. Those *indriyas* are innumerable since there are varieties of living beings. So also *Īśvara* transmigrates (in the form of *jīvas* by means of them).

Kāthopaniṣat describes the *indriyas* as the horses of bodily chariot (*Kṭ.U.1-3-3, 4*). A horse is called ‘*hari*’ because it drives the bodily chariot to sense-objects to indulge in them. Taking into account innumerable living beings, senses are also innumerable. Having got identified with them by mutual *adhyāsa*, the *jīva* gets endowed with all features of *saṃsāra*. *Indriyas* by nature are not real entities. They do not have relation with *ātmā* in reality. It is the *jīva*

who transmigrates. By saying ‘*Īśvara* transmigrates’ the identity of *jīva* with *Īśvara* is hinted.

The quoted *mantras* are over with ‘*asya harayah śatā daśa iti*’. There is a possibility of doubt that *Parameśvara* is different and the *indriyas* are different. To dispel such doubt, the subsequent *brāhmaṇa* portion comments upon it. Its gist is told.

मन्त्रोक्ता हरयोऽध्यस्ताः तत्संख्या च प्रकल्पिता ।
एतेषां तत्त्वमात्मैवेत्याह ब्राह्मणमादरात् ॥४३॥

मन्त्रोक्ताः हरयः - the ‘*haris*’ (*indriyas*) अध्यस्ताः - are superimposed entities तत्संख्या च - their number also प्रकल्पिता - is imagined or falsely *adhyasta* in nature एतेषां - of these *indriyas* तत्त्वम् - real nature आत्मा एव - is *ātmā* only इति - so ब्राह्मणम् - the *brāhmaṇa* आदरात् आह - has described earnestly – (43)

43. The *haris* (*indriyas*) are superimposed entities. Their number also is falsely *adhyasta* in nature. The real nature of these *indriyas* is *ātmā* only. So describes the (subsequent) *brāhmaṇa* (portion) earnestly.

The seeming divisions in *ātmā* on account of *upādhis* are not real because *upādhis* themselves have no existence apart from *ātmā*. They are no better than the things seen in the dream.

THE GIST OF MADHUKĀṆḌA OR ENTIRE VEDĀNTA-ŚĀSTRA

The remaining portion of *brāhmaṇa* summarizes the teaching contained in the entire *madhukāṇḍa* (first two chapters of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* and not just *madhubrāhmaṇa*).

निःशेषमधुकाण्डस्य तदेतदिति

वाक्यतः ।

सारः संक्षिप्यते साक्षात्

करविन्यस्तबिल्ववत् ॥४४॥

‘तदेतद्’ इति वाक्यतः - by the statement ‘*tad etad*’ निःशेषमधुकाण्डस्य - of the entire *madhukāṇḍa* सारः - gist साक्षात् - evidently संक्षिप्यते - is summarized करविन्यस्तबिल्ववत् - like a *bilva* fruit kept on the palm – (44)

44. By the statement beginning from ‘*tad etad*’ (*Bṛ.U.2-5-19*) the gist of the entire *madhukāṇḍa* is evidently summarized like a *bilva* fruit kept on the palm.

While concluding the *madhubrāhmaṇa* the end portion beginning from ‘*tad etad*’ summarizes the real nature of *ātmā* for the sake of utmost clarity. In fact this is not just the summary of only *madhukāṇḍa*, but is that of entire *Vedānta-śāstra* which is the final *tātparya* (purport) of the Vedas. Just as the fruit kept on the palm is very clearly evident so this summary makes the *ātmavarūpa* very clear.

अज्ञातं संशयज्ञातं मिथ्याज्ञातमिदं जगत् ।
तदेतदित्यनूद्यास्य तत्त्वं ब्रह्मेति बोध्यते ॥४५॥

अज्ञातं - (that which is) unknown
संशयज्ञातं - known with doubts मिथ्याज्ञातं -
erroneously known इदं जगत् - (such)
perceptible *jagat* ‘तदेतद्’ - ‘*tad etad*’ (that
this) इति - thus अनूद्य - having referred to
अस्य - of this *jagat* तत्त्वं - real nature ब्रह्म -
is Brahman इति बोध्यते - so it is taught
–(45)

45. Having referred to this perceptible *jagat* which is unknown, known with doubts, and erroneously known by the phrase ‘*tad etad*’ (that this) it is taught that its real nature is Brahman.

The *jagat* is always unknown to the common people who know not the origin, middle and the end of it. For *jijñāsus* who study the *śāstras* the *jagat* appears to be false (*mithyā*) while inquiring into its reality, but it appears very much real during their *vyavahāra*. Thus the *jagat* is a Pandora's box of doubts. Those who insist on their own notions opposed to *śāstras*, the *jagat* with its reality is totally real. So they carry on erroneous notion. Though a common man also considers the *jagat* is real, his concept is only from the standpoint of *vyavahāra*. But those who have definite opinion contrary to

śāstras, insist that *jagat* is absolutely (*pāramārthikatayā*) real. The *śruti* points out the real nature of *jagat* to be Brahman which is ever-existent, changeless knowledge-principle. This shows that Brahman is *satya* and *jagat* is *adhyasta* on it. It is well-known that the reality of anything that is falsely projected (*adhyasta*) is its basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*).

The nature of Brahman is described in the next two verses.

निष्कारणं तन्निष्कार्यं निश्छिद्रं बाह्यवर्जितम् ।
पारोक्षप्रतिषेधार्थमात्मा ब्रह्मेति भण्यते ॥४६॥

तत् - that Brahman निष्कारणं - causeless निष्कार्यं - effectless (*kāryahīnam*) निश्छिद्रं - uninterrupted बाह्य वर्जितम् - without an exterior पारोक्षप्रतिषेधार्थम् - to refute the notion that Brahman is distinct from oneself आत्मा ब्रह्म - *ātmā* is Brahman इति भण्यते - so it is said – (46)

46. That Brahman is causeless, effectless (*kāryahīnam*), uninterrupted and without an exterior. To refute the notion that Brahman is distinct from oneself it is said (by the *śruti*) that *ātmā* is Brahman.

Brahman is the ever-existent non-dual knowledge-principle. Neither it is born from something nor anything is born from it. It has no exterior where

something else other than Brahman can exist. To dispel the doubt that *ātmā* is distinct from oneself or *parokṣa* the *śruti* says that it is *pratyagātmā* which is *sākṣāt aparokṣa*. *Ātmā* is known as *aparokṣa* (self-evident ‘I’) by our experience though we may not know its real nature. Like pot, cot, etc., the ignorance, doubt, and the contrariety about the ‘I’ such as ‘I do not know that I am’, ‘am I there or not?’ and ‘I am not there’ are not found. The words ‘*niśchidram*’ (uninterrupted) and ‘*bāhyavarjitam*’ (without an exterior) correspond to ‘*anantaram*’ and ‘*abāhyam*’ of *śruti*. ‘*Antara*’ can mean ‘*bheda*’ (difference). If differences are there then such members collectively have species (*sāmānya*) such as potness, cowness, etc. Brahman does not have such members on account of differences. Therefore, it is without species (निःसामान्य) (*niḥsāmānya*). Space is uniformly same throughout its expanse. There are no differences in space which can give rise to different space - members having a common feature called spaceness. Something distinct from oneself (called *viśeṣa*) is considered *bāhya* (exterior). Brahman does not have any such distinct entities. So it is *nirviśeṣa* (without any *viśeṣa*). This shows the homogeneous nature of Brahman.

Brahman as ‘*sarvānubhūḥ*’ is commented upon now.

सर्वानुभव एवायं यतः

सर्वानुभूस्ततः ।

कात्स्न्यात् सर्वो भवेदेष चिन्मात्रत्वात्

तथाऽनुभूः ॥४७॥

यतः - because अयं - this *ātmā*/
Brahman सर्वानुभवः एव - is certainly both
everything (*sarva*) and experience
(*anubhava*) by itself ततः - therefore
सर्वानुभूः - it is called ‘*sarvānubhūḥ*’ एषः -
this *ātmā*/Brahman कात्स्न्यात् - because
of its entirety (*pūrṇatva*) सर्वः भवेत् - it
is everything तथा - so also चिन्मात्रत्वात् -
because of being *caitanya* alone अनुभूः -
it is of the nature of experience
(*anubhava*)—(47)

47. This *ātmā*/Brahman is called
‘*sarvānubhūḥ*’ because certainly it is
both everything (*sarva*) and experience
(*anubhava*) by itself. It is everything
because of its entirety (*pūrṇatva*). It is
(also) of the nature of experience
(*anubhava*) because of being *caitanya*
(self-evident pure awareness principle)
alone.

Ātmā is simultaneously self-
evident (*svaparakāśa*) *anubhava-svarūpa*
(self-experiencing principle), *jñapti-
svarūpa* (knowledge-principle) and
ānanda-svarūpa (happiness principle).
These are not three distinct and individual
attributes of *ātmā*. The nature of *ātmā* is
homogeneous one. These three words are

used to describe and appreciate that *ātmā*
is ever self-existing, self-experiencing,
self-knowing and the limitless happiness
principle unlike transience (*anityatva*),
inertness (*jaḍatva*) and sorrows (*duḥkha*)
that we find in the world. The second line
of this verse establishes how *ātmā* is
‘*sarva*’ (everything) and itself ‘*anubhūḥ*’.

Gaining this knowledge is
indispensable to everyone because its
result ‘the liberation’ is the highest
accomplishment that humans can aspire
for. But there is no option. Not knowing
one's real nature is the continuation of
calamitous *saṃsāra*. Therefore the
Vedas exhort:

कर्तव्यमेतद्विज्ञानमिति

वेदानुशासनम् ।

अस्याऽतिलङ्घने दोषः

संसारानर्थसंगतिः ॥४८॥

एतद् विज्ञानम् - this *Brahmasākṣātkāra*
कर्तव्यं - should be gained इति वेदानुशासनम् - so
is the advice (cum command) of the
Vedas अस्य अतिलङ्घने - if this command
is transgressed संसारानर्थसंगतिः दोषः - there
is the danger (*doṣa*) of (perpetual)
association with calamitous *saṃsāra*
—(48)

48. The *Brahmasākṣātkāra*
should be gained. So is the advice (cum
command) of the Vedas. There is the
danger (*doṣa*) of (perpetual) association

with calamitous *samsāra* if this command is transgressed.

कुर्वतस्तु महान् लाभः स्वात्मनः कृतकृत्यता ।
मधुकाण्डार्थसर्वस्वमित्थं श्रुत्योपसंहृतम् ॥४९॥

कुर्वतः तु - the one who has gained this *sākṣātkāra* महान् लाभः - has the greatest accomplishment (of *mokṣa*) स्वात्मनः कृतकृत्यता - (thereby) gains the highest fulfilment of life इत्थं - thus मधुकाण्डार्थसर्वस्वम् - the essence (purport-*tātparya*) of the teaching in the *madhukāṇḍa* श्रुत्या - by the *śruti* उपसंहृतम् - is concluded – (49)

49. The person who has gained this *sākṣātkāra* has the greatest accomplishment (of *mokṣa*). Thereby he gains the highest fulfilment of life. Thus the essence (purport-*tātparya*) of the teaching in the *madhukāṇḍa* is concluded by the *śruti*.

By using the word ‘*anuśāsana*’ (advice or command) the *śruti* highlights the necessity of gaining this knowledge. What is exhorted is to take to *śravaṇa*, etc., with *sādhana-catuṣṭaya*, *antaḥkaraṇa-śuddhi* and *citta-naiścalya*. Not gaining *Brahmajñāna* means the continuation of calamitous transmigratory *samsāra*. *Kenopaniṣad* applauds those who gain the *Brahmajñāna*. ‘*Iha cetavedīt atha satyam asti*’ (If you gain this knowledge in this birth itself, it is highly commendable). It

warns others who have not gained the knowledge. ‘*Na cet iha vedīt mahatī vinaṣṭiḥ*’ (If not known now in this birth, there is a great calamity [of transmigration] awaiting for you) (*Ke.U.* 2-5).

The sixth and the last *brāhmaṇa* of *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (Ch.2) gives the *ācārya-lineage* of *madhukāṇḍa*. Its remembrance and *japa* gives *puṇya*, etc. It is also an expression of gratitude to the past *ācāryas* who kept the teacher-taught lineage unbroken. Such lineage shows that *Brahmavidyā* is not an imagination of someone but it is the ultimate truth verified by the great masters of the past through their direct experience which is also called *Brahmasākṣātkāra* or *vijñāna* or *aparāyatta-bodha*.

विद्यावंशजपाद्विद्याविघ्नः सर्वो निवार्यते ।
मुमुक्षुमनुगृह्णातु विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः ॥५०॥

विद्यावंशजपात् - by the *japa* of *Brahmavidyā-lineage* सर्वः विद्याविघ्नः - all obstacles that hinder the pursuit of gaining the *vidyā* निवार्यते - are warded off विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरः - Vidyātīrtha Maheśvara मुमुक्षुम् - all *mumukṣus* including me अनुगृह्णातु - may (he) bless us – (50)

50. All obstacles that hinder the pursuit of gaining *Brahmavidyā* are warded off by the *japa* of *Brahmavidyā-lineage*. May Vidyātīrtha Maheśvara

bless us all *mumukṣus* including me.

The word ‘*vaṃśa*’ here means the enumeration of those *ācāryas* in a sequential order from whom this *vidyā* has come from the Vedas to the later period. By its remembrance the obstacles on the path of *jñāna* get removed. Though the *śruti* describes this lineage only upto *Pautimāśya*, even then the others upto our *ācārya* from whom we have got the knowledge have to be

remembered to the extent possible. Finally the prayers are offered to Vidyātīrtha Maheśvara to bless us with *Brahmajñāna* without any obstructions and steadfastness in the knowledge so that we get *mokṣa*.

इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिविरचिते अनुभूतिप्रकाशे
मधुविद्याप्रकाशो नाम षोडशोऽध्यायः ।

॥ 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>