

Adhyatma Granthavali

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

by
SRI SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

Serial No. 176

Publishers
Adhyātma Prakāsha Kāryālaya
Holenarasipur - 573211
© : 08175-573820
2004

First Print 1978 - 1000 copies
Second Print 2004 - 1000 copies

Pages vi + 102

Price : Rs.25

All rights Reserved by
Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipur

Copies can be had from :
Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya
68, II Block, Thyagaraja Nagar
Bangalore - 560 028
☎ : 080 - 26765548

DTP by
Prashanth Enterprises
45, T. R. Nagar Po.
Nagasandra
Bangalore - 560 028
☎ : 080 - 26764650

Printed at :
Standard Printers
Shankar Mutt Road
Bangalore-560 004
☎ : 080 - 26521527

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

(First Edition)

H. H. Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji who attained Mahanirvana on 5th August 1975 had delivered a series of lectures in Kannada at Chickmagalur on the occasion of **Sankara Saptaha during the year 1970**. He was kind enough, at the request of his earnest admirers, to put it down in writing in English for the benefit of the English knowing public. This work was completed early in 1970 itself, but its publication was held up due to unavoidable circumstances.

The present work deals with the **sixth chapter of the Chandogya Upanishad** and presents in a nutshell the true nature of **the Science of Being**. It is hoped that it will be a source of enlightenment to all seekers of Truth.

Our thanks are due to the donor who has made it possible to publish posthumously this valuable work of the Swamiji ; and to Sri D. S. Krishnachar, M.Sc., of the Prabha Printing House, Bangalore - 4, for having printed it so well. We are grateful to Sri H.N. Narayana Rao, M.A., B.T. Subject Inspector (Retd.), Sri D.B. Gangolli and Pandits K.G. Subrayasharma and H.S. Lakshminarasimha Murthy of the Editorial committee for carefully reading through the proofs but for whose efforts the work could not have seen the light of the day.

As in the case of all his works, the copyright of this work has been handed over to the Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipur.

10-01-1978
Holenarasipur

Arkalgud Thandaveswara
Chairman, Executive Committee

Second Print

This book published in 1978 is brought out again for the benefit of **Seekers of Truth**.

11-04-2004
Holenarasipur

Publishers
A.P.Karyalaya

ENGLISH BOOKS

SHRI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATHI SWAMIJI (1880-1975), the founder of Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, a public charitable trust, Holenarsipur, Hassan District, Karnataka - 573211 wrote and published about 200 books in Kannada, English and Sanskrit with a view to propagating pristine pure Advaita Vedanta as expounded by Shri Gaudapada, Shri Sankara Bhagavatpada and Shri Sureswara in their famous extant works based on the three canonical Vedantic texts viz. Ten principal Upanishads, Bhagavadgita and Vedanta Sstras (popularly known as Brahma Sstras). The revered Swamiji carried out research for over six decades with a profound sense of dedication and missionary zeal so as to cleanse Advaita Vedanta of the dross and distortions that it had acquired in the post-Sankara era. Although the Swamiji had authored nearly 20 odd books in English and over 25 books in Sanskrit, many of his masterpieces were written in Kannada. In order to provide the benefit of these gems, the Karyalaya has brought out several books in English which are faithful translations of the original texts in Kannada. For the guidance and benefit of ardent students of Advaita Vedanta, the list of books, including Swamiji's original works, is arranged in a thematic order and listed in pages 100, 101 and 102, to help imbibe the genuine teachings and their subtle imports.

CONTENTS

	Page No.
I The Introductory Narrative 1
II Being and Non-Being 8
III The Cause As Consciousness 14
IV The Individual Self and The Doctrine of Mayic Existence of the Effect 21
V Becoming one with Being 35
VI Being, The Most Subtle Entity 55
VII The Knower of Brahman and The Ignorant Person 61
VIII Conclusion 71
Appendix	
The Central Teaching 77

ABBREVIATIONS

The name of each Upanishad or any other work has been contracted into the initial letter or letters and the Bhāshya thereon has been indicated by the Symbol 'Bh'. (भा.), i.e. G - Gītā ; G.Bh. = Gītā Bhāshya.

अ.भा.	Intro.	Introduction to Sūtra-Bhāshya
क.	Ka.	Kāthakōpanishad
के.	Ke.	Kenōpanishad
कौ.	Kau.	Kaushīthaki Upanishad
गी.	G.	The Bhagavadgītā
गी.का.	G.K.	Gaudapāda's Kārikas on the Māndūkya Upanishad
छं.	Ch.	Chāndōgyōpanishad
नै.सि.	Nai.Si.	Naishkarmya Siddhi of Sureśwarāchārya
पं.पा.	Pan.	Pañchapādikā, a sub-commentary by Sri Padmapādāchārya on the Sūtra-Bhāshya
पं.वि.	P.V.	Pañchapādikā-Vivarana, a sub-commentary by Prakāśāmayaṇi on the Pañchapādikā.
पा.	P.	Page ; Pp. pages.
बृ.	Br.	Bṛahadāranyakōpanishad
भा	Bha.	Bhāmati, a sub-commentary by Āchārya Vāchaspati Miśra on the Sūtra-Bhāshya
मुं.	Mun.	Mundakōpanishad
वे.सू.	V.S.	Vedānta Sūtras of Bādarāyana
सू.भा.	S.Bh.	Śaṅkara's Bhāshya on the Vedānta Sūtras. (Pages of the book published by the Nirṇayasagar Press, Bombay)
श्वे.	Sve.	Śvetāśvatarōpanishad

THE SCIENCE OF BEING

SECTION I

THE INTRODUCTORY NARRATIVE

ॐ । श्वेतकेतुर्हिरण्येय आस तं ह पितोवाच श्वेतकेतो वस ब्रह्मचर्यं
न वै सोम्यास्मत्कुलीनोऽननूच्य ब्रह्मबन्धुरिव भवतीति ॥ (छां.६-१-१)

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

The controversy about Vedantic anecdotes :

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

Badarayana's dictum :

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

परिप्लवायां इति चेन्न विशेषितत्वात् । (वे. सू. ३-४-२३)

This cannot be so, for they have been particularized.

(V. S. 3-4-23)

(To explain) The injunction which begins with **परिप्लवम् आचक्षीत** (He shall recite the *Pāriplava*) enumerates some particular narrative only such as that beginning with **मनुर्वैवस्वतो राजा** (The King *Manu Vaivasvata* etc.). This particularization would serve no purpose if it were intended to cover all Vedic narratives. **तथा चैकवाक्यतोऽप्यन्यात् (वे. सू. ३-४-२४)** (Accordingly we find there is unity of thought in context in the teaching that follows;) for instance, the narrative of *Yajñavalkya* and *Maitreyi* serves the purpose of showing the importance of the science of the Vision of *Atman* by creating interest in the knowledge and eulogizing it.

3. Consistently with this argument, we find that Uddālaka the son of Aruna is expostulating with his son Śvetaketu about the necessity of approaching a guru and getting initiated in the Vedic learning. Being learned in the Vedic lore he could have undertaken the task of initiation himself, but instead, he asks his son to serve as a Brahmacharin under somebody else probably because he was about to go travelling elsewhere.

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

The verity of secular knowledge as compared with spiritual wisdom :

स ह द्वादशवर्षः उपेत्य चतुर्विंशतिवर्षः सर्वान् वेदान् अधीत्य
महामना अनूचानमानी स्तब्ध एषाद्य तं ह पितोवाच ॥ (छां. ६-१-२)

"He studied under his Guru for twelve years and having acquired proficiency in all the Vedas returned when he was twenty four years of age. He was most conceited and impolite and thought he was highly learned".
(Ch. 6-1-2)

His father said to him :

षेतकेतो यक्षु सोम्येदं महामना अनूचानमानी स्तब्धोऽस्युत
तमादेशमप्राप्यः येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातमिति कथं नु
भगवः स आदेशो भवतीति ॥ (छां. ६-१-३)

"Svetaketu, my dear boy, now that you are arrogant and impolite thinking yourself very learned, have you enquired about that entity needing special instruction by means of which even that which is not heard about becomes heard, even that which is not reflected upon becomes reflected upon, and even that which is unknown becomes known ?" "How, revered Sir, would that special instruction be ?"

(Ch. 6-1-3).

यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृत्तम्वं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं
विकारो नामधेयं मृत्पिण्डित्येव सत्यम् ॥ (छां. ६-१-४)

यथा सोम्यैकेन लोहमणिना सर्वं लोहमवं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं
विकारो नामधेयं लोहमित्येव सत्यम् ॥ (छां. ६-१-५)

यथा सोम्यैकेन नखमिकृन्तनेन सर्वं कृष्णावसं विज्ञातं
स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं कृष्णावसमित्येव सत्यमेवं सोम्य स
वादेशो वक्षतीति ॥ (छां. ६-१-६)

"In the same way, my dear boy, that by knowing a single lump of clay everything made of clay would have become known and the effect is merely a name being only a play of words; in the same way, my dear boy, that by knowing a nugget of gold, all that is made of gold would have become known and the effect is merely a name being only a play of words; in the same way, by knowing a single pair of nail scissors all that is made of steel would have become known and the effect is merely a name, being only a play of words, even so, my boy, is this Entity of special instruction." (Ch. 6-1-4, 5, 6).

5. Svetaketu's study at the feet of his guru may be compared with that of a modern student's school and college career at a modern university where he has specialized in many subjects and come off with flying colours. Such a student would naturally think very high of himself when he goes back to his home flushed

with his success in having taken so many academic degrees. Śvetaketu is naturally proud that he has mastered all branches of Vedic learning in twelve years. The object of describing this attitude of the boy is to lay bare his secular knowledge in its true colours and to show that it dwindles into nothing beside the all-embracing wisdom of one who possesses the knowledge of Reality.

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

The principle of Causal Relation :

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

8. Herein lies the bearing of the introductory narrative on the subject matter of the Sixth Chapter. The Vedantic theory of

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

No injunction about the means of knowledge :

Introductory:

9. There is one point more in Uddālaka's teaching that we have to notice here. It will be seen that he says: येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातम् । "which being heard about, everything else will have been heard about, which being reflected upon everything else becomes reflected upon, and which being known everything else becomes known." These means of knowing Atman are also enumerated in the Maitreyi Brahmana.

आत्मनि सत्त्वे ह्ये श्रुते मते विज्ञाते इदं सर्वं निश्चितम् (बृ. ४-५-६)

Atman being seen, heard about, reflected upon and known, my dear, all this becomes known. (Br. 4-5-6)

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

न वै नूनं भगवन्तस्त एतद्वेदिषुर्यथेतद्वेदिष्यन् कथं मे
नावस्यन्निति भगवांस्त्वेव मे तद्वीत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच
(छां.६-१-७)

"Surely that revered teacher did not know this ; for if he did, how could he fail to teach That to me ? So your revered self may personally be pleased to tell me about it." "All right, my dear boy, I shall do so."
(Ch.6-1-7)

SECTION II

BEING AND NON-BEING

सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् । तत्रैक आहुरसदेवेदमग्र
आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयं तस्मादसतः सञ्जायत ॥ (छां. ६-२-१)

कुतस्तु सन्तु सोम्यैवं स्यादिति होवाच कथमसतः सञ्जायेतेति ।
सत्त्वेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् । (छां. ६-२-२)

"This was Being alone in the beginning, ONE with-out a second. Here some say this was non-being alone in the beginning, ONE without a second and from it being was born; But my dear boy, how could it possibly be so ? he said. How could being be born from non-being ? On the contrary, this was Being alone in the beginning, ONE without a second." (Ch. 6-2-1, 2)

The Style of the Upanishads :

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

and concepts at the risk of the latter being misunderstood by the unwary.

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

What is the meaning of the 'is'ness of Being ?

11. One who is usually given to think of objective phenomena only, would be perplexed to know what this proposition could possibly mean. What is the meaning of the statement "Being alone" was in the beginning of things ? Being, as it is commonly known, is only an attribute of things; Everything conceivable 'is'; We cannot conceive of anything whatsoever which has no being ; But to say that being 'is', sounds sheer tautology. Has it any more significance than,—for instance,—a statement like 'a horse is a horse' ? Moreover how could mere

being exist of its own accord, any more than redness can exist independently of a rose ? On the face of it, this proposition almost amounts to saying that before the beginning of things nothing existed.

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

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

‘कार्यनिवर्त्तुर्वृत्ति कारणम्’.

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

But a little reflection will reveal the hollowness of this argument. For, in the first place we are talking of the state of the principal cause of all the Universe as the effect of that cause.

How could there be any time before the Universe shows itself, that is to say, how could there be any time before time itself makes its appearance, for time is a concomitant of the universe and cannot be torn from the latter by any feat of the intellect. Therefore Being or Reality cannot be supposed to be a cause in the sense that it is immediately antecedent to the universe. The word 'cause' therefore as applied to Being can only mean the *prims* to the idea of the universe. In the second place it will be seen that Uddālaka means Atman or the essence of everything by the word Sat or Being only, for, his repeated reference in the discourse is 'तत्सत्यं स आत्मा'. 'It is Reality, it is the Atman'. It is clear that Atman or the Self cannot be the cause of the universe in the sense that the antecedent clay is the cause of a clay jar or a pitcher.

One without a Second :

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

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

Absolute Being :

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

Mayic origination:

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

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

सतो हि मायया जन्म युज्यते न तु तत्त्वतः ।

तत्त्वतो जायते यस्य जातं तस्य हि जायते ॥

असतो मायया जन्म तत्त्वतो नैव युज्यते ।

बन्ध्यापुत्रो न तत्त्वेन मायया वापि जायते ॥

(गौ.का.३-२७, २८)

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

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

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

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

SECTION III

THE CAUSE AS CONSCIOUSNESS

The Three elements as the effect of Sat :

तदेकत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति तत्तेजोऽसृजत तत्तेज ऐकत बहु स्यां
प्रजायेयेति तदपोऽसृजत । तस्माद्यत्र क च शोचति स्वेदते वा पुरुषस्तेजस
एव तदध्यापो जायन्ते ॥ (छां. ६-२-३)

ता आप ऐकन्त बहुव्यः स्याम प्रजायेमहीति ता अन्नमसृजन्त
तस्माद्यत्र क च वर्षति तदेव भूमिष्ठमन्नं भवत्यन्न एव तदध्यन्नाद्यं
जायते ॥ (छां. ६-२-४)

three elements in consonance with Taittiriya, only these three are mentioned here just to illustrate how the grosser objects in the world are all composed of the primordial elements.

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

The controversy about Consciousness :

16. The followers of the Sāṅkhya system claimed that the expression सदेव ('Being alone') used at the commencement of this section could only mean Prakṛti or the balanced state of the three guṇas in the beginning of things, and argued that Sat as Brahman cannot possibly be meant here inasmuch as Being which is of the nature of Consciousness, is a perfectly changeless entity without body or senses ; It cannot be supposed to be an agent of the action of knowing which occurred at a particular point of time in the past. Therefore it stands to reason to assume that the Primordial Pradhānam though insentient in itself, may yet be spoken of as omniscient in a secondary sense since it comprehends the satva guṇa (the basic pre-supposition of knowledge) also along with Rajas and Tamas and since it is well known that Yogins owing to the attribute of Consciousness of Satva endowed with body and senses actually become omniscient. Even the Vedantin who holds that Brahman is omniscient should grant that its omniscience is due to its potency of knowing all. For if the knowledge of Brahman be eternal the latter would cease to be an agent of the action of knowing; On the other hand if that action be impermanent, Brahman would cease sometimes to know and consequently should be granted to

be omniscient only by virtue of His possessing the potency of omniscience. Moreover, Brahman is granted to be devoid of the factors requisite to produce knowledge before the origin of the universe and it is inconsistent to presume that, anyone devoid of body and senses can be credited with knowledge directly. Therefore the conclusion of the Sankhya philosophers is that Being, mentioned in the first verse of the section, is the Pradhāna alone which is composed of many elements and can be allowed to evolve into an effect, like clay which being composed of parts can transform itself into effects like pots, Jars etc.

The witness alone can be omniscient:

17. Sankara rebuts this charge on the ground that a mere function of *satva* cannot be denoted by the verb 'to know' without someone witnessing it and hence it must be granted that Brahman which alone can be a witness of all is omniscient. As for the contention that if the act of knowing be eternal, Brahman cannot be held consistently to be the agent of that act, the opponent should be asked to explain how eternal Consciousness would contradict omniscience. It is self-contradictory to say that one who possesses eternal Consciousness capable of throwing light upon all objects is not omniscient. If it be objected that to speak of it as an agent of knowledge which is eternal is not reasonable, we say 'No', for we see the sun being spoken of in such terms as 'he burns, he shines upon things'. But it will be objected, that it might be consistent in the case of the sun in those terms, inasmuch as there are objects to be burnt or shone upon; whereas in the case of Brahman there is no contact of the knowledge with any object whatever and hence this comparison is not on all fours with this illustration. But we see usage allows us to say- 'the sun

shine' even when there is no object to be shone upon. So even if there be no object of knowledge, the usage 'it saw' (thought) is quite justified and hence there is no disparity whatever. Further, if it be supposed that an object is needed, Sruti texts speaking of Brahman as knowing all are more consistent. And what is this object at the time of creation? The reply is undifferentiated name and form intended to be differentiated, these (name and form) being undefinable as either identical with or other than Brahman.

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

As for the argument that it is not reasonable to think that the Ruler is able to know anything since He has no body or senses before creation, that objection is not valid here at all; since it is quite consistent and reasonable to think that there is no need for the means of knowledge since Brahman is eternally of the essential nature of knowledge itself just as the brightness of the sun is eternal. Moreover in the case of the transmigratory self, inflicted by ignorance and other defects, birth of knowledge may depend upon the body and other factors, but not in the case of the Lord who has no cause of obstruction to His knowledge. The following two *mantras* point out that the Lord is in no need of body and other factors but possesses unveiled knowledge throughout; For to Him there is neither body nor any instrument of knowledge and no one is seen equal to or greater than He.

न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते
न तत्समश्चाम्यधिकश्च दृश्यते । (इवे. ६-८)

अपाणिपादो जवनो ग्रहीता
पश्यत्यचक्षुः स शृणोत्यकर्णः ।
स वेत्ति वेद्यं न च तस्यास्ति वेत्ता
तमादुरग्रं पुरुषं महान्तम् ॥ (इवे. ३-१९)

"We hear of His great power of various kinds and of inherent knowledge, power and activity (Sve.6-8) having neither hands nor feet, He is swift and grasps everything, sees without eyes and hears without ears. He knows everything knowable but there is none that can know Him. He is said to be foremost supreme Purusha."

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

The Consciousness of the Elements :

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

मृद्धोद्विस्तुल्लिङ्गायैः सृष्टिर्वा चोदितान्यथा ।
उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ॥ (गौ.का. ३-१५)

Creation which has been described in a variety of ways with the

help of illustrations such as those of clay, metal and sparks of fire is only a device to introduce the enquirer to the truth of the unity of Atman. There is no difference of things however we may look at it.

(G K. 3-15)

Pure Being and pure Consciousness in one :

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

As Śankara remarks:

न च सङ्ख्यणमेव ब्रह्म, न बोधलक्षणमिति शक्यं वक्तुम् ;
'विज्ञानघन एव' इत्यादिभूतिवैयर्थ्यप्रसङ्गात् । कथं वा निरस्तचैतन्यं ब्रह्म
चैतनस्य जीवस्यात्मत्वेनोपदिश्येत ? नापि बोधलक्षणमेव ब्रह्म न
सङ्ख्यणमिति शक्यं वक्तुम् ; 'अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धव्यः' (का. २-३-१३)
इत्यादिभूतिवैयर्थ्यप्रसङ्गात् । कथं वा निरस्तसत्ताको बोधोऽभ्युपगम्येत ?

(सू. भा. ३-२-२१. पा. ३६०)

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

and how could Consciousness bereft of Being be postulated?"

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

Brahman as the material as well as the Efficient cause:

20. Since the Sruti declares that Sat or Brahman wished to be born as many and then created light, it is clear as Badarayana says अभियोपदेशाच्च । (वे.मू. १-४-२४).

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

SECTION IV

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

Significance of thought attributed to the elements :

21. We have now to see how Uddalaka is going to make good his initial statement वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयम् । (छां. ६-१-४) 'The effect is only a play of words, a mere name'.

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

The triple constituents of things:

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

सेयं देवतैश्चत इन्ताहमिमास्तिन्नो देवता अनेन
जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि इति ॥

तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणीति सेयं देवतेमास्तिन्नो देवता
अनेनैव जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरोत् ॥

तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकामकरोयथा तु खलु सोम्येमास्तिन्नो
देवतास्त्रिवृत्त्रिवृदेकैका भवति तन्मे विजानीहीति ॥

(छां. ६-३-२, ३, ४.)

"This Devata (Goddess) thought, 'Well, I shall enter these three *devatas* in my jiva-self and differentiate name and form. Each of them I shall make triple severally.' This Devata entered these three *devatas* in this its Jiva self and differentiated name and form. Each of them made triple severally. How each of these is triple I shall tell you, my boy, so that you may learn it." (Ch. 6-3-2, 3, 4)

Brahman the original Devata :

23. Here Brahman, the primary cause, Being and Consciousness, in one has been styled *Devata*. In the Vedas especially in their ritualistic portion, Gods as the presiding deities of external and internal phenomena are usually designated by the word '*devatas*' (shining ones) chiefly because of their unimpeded knowledge and powers. The Upanishads, therefore, sometimes depict the Supreme Cause or Brahman as *Isvara*

(Ruler) and dominating Devata (shining) as it outrivals them all in its glory and is unexcelled by any one else in any respect. Witness the mantra —

तमीशराणां परमं महेश्वरम् ।

तं देवतानां परमं च दैवतम् ॥

(श्वे. ६-७)

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

Brahman's entrance into the elements :

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

It is Brahman alone that enters into the elements and brings them into a differentiated state. Brahman is said to enter these elements in its Jiva form for two reasons. In the first place, Brahman as the Universal Self continues to remain in its Brahmic nature even after entering into the creation as the sage Kāśa Kṛtsna quoted by Badarayana (VS 1-4-22) opines, and in the second place the Jiva form superimposed upon Brahman is a mayic reflection, as it were, of that supreme Self (VS 2-3-50), very much like the reflection of a scene in water depending upon its original for its very existence as a reflection. It is true that even Jiva also differentiates names and forms of things as for Instance when a potter differentiates clay into names and forms such as pitcher or a claylid. But he himself is not involved at all in the

differentiation of names and forms in the maze of phenomena like a hill, a river or a sea. Therefore Sankara while interpreting Badarayana Sutra “संक्षामूर्तिरुत्तिस्तु त्रिवृत्कुर्वत उपदेशात्” (2-4-20) says that the Sruti ‘I shall differentiate name and form’ (Ch. 6-3-2) should be taken literally to mean that it is Supreme Devata, the Sat alone, that is responsible for the differentiation of all names and forms. Even where we know that the Jiva himself makes things and invests them with names and forms, the act should be ultimately traced to Sat, Brahman only, inasmuch as the Jiva is quite distinct from the Supreme Lord like an employed servant of a king and that is why in the Sruti अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य (entering into them in the form of my Jiva Self). It is said the Jivahood of the individual is only due to circumscribing conditions such as the body and the senses.

The three elements in the effects :

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

यद्ये रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्चुक्तं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदभस्यापागाद्योरहितं वाचासम्भवं विकारो नामधेयं त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ॥

यदादित्यस्य रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्चुक्तं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदभस्यापागादादित्यादादित्यत्वं वाचासम्भवं विकारो नामधेयं त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ॥

यद्यन्त्रमसौ रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्चुक्तं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदभस्यापागात्तन्त्रमन्त्रत्वं वाचासम्भवं विकारो नामधेयं त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ॥

यद्विद्युतो रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुद्धं तदपां यत्कृष्णं
तदभस्वापगाद्विद्युतो विद्युत्त्वं वाचात्मनं विकारो नामधेयं त्रीणि
रूपाणीत्येष सत्यम् ॥ (छां. ६-४-१, २, ३, ४.)

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

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

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

The Sankhya and the Vedanta Doctrines contrasted. Vedanta contrasted with Sankhya with regard to the effect :

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

यदि चैतनं शुद्धं शब्दादिहीनं च ब्रह्म तद्विपरीतस्याचेतनस्याशुद्धस्य शब्दादिमतस्य कार्यस्य कारणमिष्येत, असत्तर्हि कार्यं प्रागुत्पत्तेरिति प्रसज्येत । अग्निं चैतत्सत्कार्यवाग्निस्त्ववेति चेत् ? नैष दोषः ; प्रतिषेधमात्रत्वात् । प्रतिषेधमात्रं हीदं नास्य प्रतिषेधस्य प्रतिषेध्यमस्ति । न ह्ययं प्रतिषेधः प्रागुत्पत्तेः सत्त्वं कार्यस्य प्रतिषेधं शक्नोति । कथम् ? यद्येव हीदानीमपीदं कार्यं कारणात्मना सत्, एवं प्रागुत्पत्तेरपीति गम्यते । न हीदानीमपि इदं कार्यं कारणात्मना सत्त्वेन स्वतन्त्रमेवास्ति ; 'सर्वं तं प्रादायोजन्वजात्मनः सर्वं वेद' (वृ. २-४-६) इत्यादिश्रवणात् । कारणात्मना तु सत्त्वं कार्यस्य प्रागुत्पत्तेरिति सिद्धम् । ननु शब्दादिहीनं ब्रह्म ज्ञातः कारणम्, नाज्ज् ; न तु शब्दादिस्तत्कार्यं कारणात्मना हीनं प्रागुत्पत्तेरित्यनी वास्ति । तेन न सक्त्यते वक्तुं प्रागुत्पत्तेस्तत्कार्यमिति ॥

(सु. मा. २-१-७ ; पा. १८९.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

And elsewhere Śankara observes:

तस्माद्यथा घटवत्कायाकाशानां महाकाशानन्यत्वम्, यथा च मृगतुल्लिखोदकादीनामपूरारविम्योजनव्याप्यम्, छन्दस्वरूपत्वात्, स्वरूपेणानुपास्यत्वात्, एनमस्य योग्यमोक्तविप्रपञ्चातस्य ब्रह्मन्तिरेकेणान्व वि ब्रह्मम् ॥ (सू. भा. २-१-१४ ; पा. १९७)

"Therefore just as jar space and a drinking pot space have no independent existence apart from space in general and just as the water of a mirage and the phenomena have no existence independent of a mirage and other things, these being of a nature just appearing and disappearing the next moment and indefinable in their character, so also, one should know that this phenomenal world consisting of distinctions like the experienced objects and experiences has no being other than that of Brahman." (S.Bh. 2-1-14; P. 197)

The Doctrine of Maya :

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

सब एव त्रैलोक्येन अन्यथागृह्यमाणत्वात् नासत्त्वं कस्यचित्कचिदिति
ब्रूमः । यथा सतोऽन्यद्वास्तवन्तरं परिहृत्य दुस्तस्यैव प्रमुत्पत्तेः प्रथ्वंसाद्योर्ध्वं
असत्त्वं ब्रुवते तार्किकाः, न तथास्माभिः कदाचित्कचिदपि
सतोऽन्यदभिधानमभिधेयं वा कदाप्यस्तीकृत्यते । सत्स्येव दुस्तस्यभिधानमभिधीयते
न यदन्यदुच्यते । यथा रज्जुरेव सर्पमुच्यते सर्व इत्यभिधीयते, यथा वा पिण्डवटादि
मृदोऽन्यदुच्यते पिण्डवटादिसाधनेनाभिधीयते लोके ॥ रज्जुविवेकदर्शिनां तु
सर्पोभिधानदुष्टी निवर्तते ॥ (छां.भा. ६-२-३ ; भा. ५१०.)

"What we say is that nothing anywhere is unreal, inasmuch as it

is Being alone that is mistaken for the world of duality and difference. Just as it is a rope alone that is called a 'snake' when it is mistaken for a snake or just as a lump of clay or a jar is taken to be other than clay and is called by names like 'lump', 'a pot' etc., but for those who have distinctly recognized the rope or the clay, the names and ideas of a snake or a jar cease to exist, so also for those who have distinctly recognized the Absolute Being (as the only Reality) the name and the idea of an effect cease to exist" (Ch. Bh. 6-2-3 ; P. 510)

Mayic Existence of the Effect in the Cause:

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

एतन्न स्म वै तद्विद्वांस आहुः पूर्वं मद्भासात्म यद्भाषोक्त्या न नोऽव
ब्रह्मनाशुतममतमविद्वात्तमुदाहरिष्यतीति ह्येभ्यो विदाश्चक्रुः ॥

(छां. ६-४-५)

यदु रोहितमिवाग्निदिति तेजसस्तद्रूपमिति तद्विदाश्चक्रुर्नदु
शुक्लमिवाग्निदित्वां रूपमिति तद्विदाश्चक्रुर्नदु कृष्णमिवाग्निदित्वनस्य
रूपमिति ताद्विदाश्चक्रुः ॥

(छां. ६-४-६)

यद्विद्वात्तमिवाग्निदित्येतासामेव देवतानां समास इति
तद्विदाश्चक्रुर्नदु नु खलु सोम्येमास्तिस्रो देवताः पुरुषं प्राण
मिच्छन्निवृत्तैकैका भवति तन्मे विजानीहीति ॥

(छां. ६-४-७)

"Knowing this, the ancient ones who possessed spacious homes and who were highly learned in sacred lore said : 'There is none amongst us who says anything he has not heard about, reflected upon, and known'. They knew everything from these illustrations." (Ch. 6-4-5).

"Whatever appeared as red, they knew to be the colour of fire; that which appeared as white, they knew to be the colour of water; and whatever appeared as black they knew to be the colour of food or the earth. (Ch. 6-4-6)

"And whatever appeared to be unknown, that they knew to be an aggregate of these Devatas alone. How these three Devatas on getting into the body become triplicated severally, you may now learn from me." (Ch. 6-4-7)

अन्नमग्निं त्रेधा विधीयते तस्य यः स्वविद्धो घातुस्तत्पुरीषं भवति
यो मध्यमस्तन्मांसं योजिह्वस्तन्मनः ॥ (छां. ६-५-१)

"Food eaten is divided into three (stages of refinement), of that the grossest part becomes faeces, that part which is of medium refinement becomes flesh and that which is the most refined part becomes the mind." (Ch. 6-5-1)

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

आपः पीताम्नेषा विधीयन्ते तासां यः स्वविद्धो घातुस्तन्मूत्रं भवति
यो मध्यमस्तद्धोर्हितं योजिह्वः स प्राणः ॥

तेजोऽग्निं त्रेधा विधीयते तस्य यः स्वविद्धो घातुस्तदस्थि भवति यो
मध्यमः स मज्जा योजिह्वः सा वाक् ॥ (छां. ६-५-२, ३)

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

"The product of fire taken is divided into three, the grossest part becomes the bone, that which is of medium refinement becomes marrow and the most refined part becomes the organ of speech." (Ch. 6-5-2,3)

29. The details given above of the physical and psychic components of a man need not be literally or critically examined and compared and contrasted with the findings of modern physiology and psychology. The one fact which is stressed is that all not-self, internal or external to man, including his body, is composed and made up of the Primordial elements and the elements themselves are the illusory manifestations of Sat-Pure Being, which is the only Reality. The following text summarizes the conclusion to be remembered about this ego-complex of which the mind (presumably including the senses), the vital force and the organ of speech are the chief constituents.

अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः आपोमयः प्राणस्तेजोमयी वायुमिदं भूय एव
मा भगवान् विहास्यत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच ॥ (छां. ६-६-४)

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

The Purport of the Sequel :

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

दध्नाः सोम्य मध्यमानस्य वोऽग्निमा स ऊर्ध्वः समुदीर्यति
तत्सर्विरेयति ॥

एवमेव सत्तु सोम्यान्स्वात्स्वमन्नस्य वोऽग्निमा स ऊर्ध्वः समुदीर्यति
तन्मनो भवति ॥ (छां. ६-६-१, २)

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

food eaten rises up and that becomes the mind.” (Ch. 6-6-1, 2)

अपां सोम्य पीयमानानां योऽग्निमा स ऊर्ध्वः समुदीषति स प्राणो भवति ॥

तेजसस्सोम्याश्चमानस्य योऽग्निमा स ऊर्ध्वः समुदीषति सा वाग्भवति ॥ (छां. ६-६-३, ४)

“Of water drunk, my dear boy, the finer portion rises up and that becomes the vital force (Prana); of the quality of fire eaten, my dear boy, the subtle part rises up and that becomes the organ of speech.” (Ch. 6-6-3, 4)

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

अन्नमप्यं हि सोम्य मनः आपोमयः प्राणस्तेजोमयी वागिति भूय एव मा भगवान् बिज्ञापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच ॥ (छां. ६-६-५)

“Of food, my dear boy, is the mind constituted ; of water is the life force (Prana) constituted and of fire is speech constituted. 'May your revered self be pleased to enlighten me further on this point.' 'All right, my dear boy,' said (Uddalaka) 'I shall do so. (Ch. 6-6-5)

The Mind, a Product of Food :

31. The next instalment is intended to be an experiment to

demonstrate how mind is constituted of food.

षोडशकलः सोम्य पुरुषः पञ्चदशाहानि माशीः काममयः
पिबापोमयः प्राणो न पिबतो विच्छेत्स्यत इति ॥ (छां. ६-७-१)

“The human body, my dear boy, consists of sixteen parts. Do not eat any food for fifteen days; you may drink water as much as you please, for life force (Prana) is constituted of water and if you do not drink, it may depart.” (Ch.6-7-1)

स ह पञ्चदशाहानि नाशाय हैनमुपससाद किं ब्रवीमि भो इत्यृचः
सोम्य यजूंषि सामानीति स होवाच न वै मा प्रतिभान्ति भो इति ॥
(छां. ६-७-२)

“He ate not for fifteen days and then came to him (Uddalaka) asking him 'what shall I recite O father?' 'Rks, Yajus texts and Samas' (replied Uddalaka). He then said, 'O father, they do not flash to my mind.’ (Ch.6-7-2)

तं होवाच यथा सोम्य महतोऽभ्यादितस्यैकोऽङ्गारः स्रष्टोतमात्रः
परिशिष्टः स्यात्तेन ततोऽपि न बहु द्दहेदेवं सोम्य ते षोडशानां कलानामेका
कलातिशिष्टा स्यात्तयैतद्द्विवेदान्नानुभवस्यशानाय मे विज्ञास्यसीति ॥
(छां. ६-७-३)

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

स द्वाशाय हैनमुपससाद तं ह यत्किञ्च पच्यते सर्वं ह प्रतिषेदे ॥

(छां. ६-७-४)

"He then took food and approached his father (Uddalaka) and whatever the latter asked him he was able to know." (Ch. 6-7-4)

तं होवाच यया सोम्य महतोऽभ्यादितस्यैकमङ्गारं खद्योतमात्रं
परिशिष्टं तां तृणैरुपसमाधाय प्राज्वलयेत्तेन ततोऽपि बहु दहेत् ॥

एवं सोम्य ते षोडशानां कलानामेका कलातिशिष्टामूत्
साधेनोपसमादिता प्राज्वाली तथैतर्हि वेदाननुभवस्याभिमयं हि सोम्य मन
आपोमयः प्राणस्तेजोमयी वागिति तद्वास्य विजज्ञाविति विजज्ञाविति ॥

(छां. ६-७-५, ६)

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

SECTION V

BECOMING ONE WITH BEING

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

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

उद्दालको हारुणिः श्वेतकेतुं पुत्रमुवाच स्वप्नान्तं मे सोम्य
विजानीहीति यत्रैतत् पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सोम्य तदा सम्पन्नो भवति

स्वमपीतो भवति तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते स्वंह्यपीतो भवति ॥

(छां. ६-८-१)

"Uddalaka, son of Aruna, said to his son Svetaketu, 'Now, my dear boy, know from me the state of sound sleep. When a man is said to be asleep ('स्वपिति नाम्') then, my dear boy, he becomes one with Sat. He is dissolved unto Himself; therefore they say about him that he sleeps (स्वपिति). It is well known that he is dissolved into his own Self.' (Ch.6-8-1)

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

34. Sankara in his Sutra Bhashya thus explains the significance of the word *Svapiti* (स्वपिति) in this context.

(१) मनश्चक्षरोषाधिविशेषसम्बन्धात् इन्द्रियार्थान् गृह्णन् तद्विशेषाकरो जीवो जागर्ति, तद्व्यसनाविशिष्टं स्वप्नान् पश्यन् मनश्चक्षुष्याभ्यो भवति, स व्यापिद्रव्योऽस्मिन् सुषुप्तावस्थायां व्यापिकृतविशेषाभावात् स्वात्मनि प्रलीन इव इति 'स्वं हि ज्ञाती भवति' इत्युच्यते ॥ (सू. भा. १-१-९; पा. ३२-३३)

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

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

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

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

(२) सुषुप्तिस्थाने च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीव एकतां न चक्षति । परस्मान्

ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायते इति वेदान्तमर्यादा । तस्माद्यत्रास्य जीवस्य निःसम्बोधतास्वच्छतारूपः स्वापः उपाधिजनितविशेषविज्ञानरहितं स्वरूपं यतस्तद्वंशरूपमागमनं सोऽत्र परमात्मा वेदितव्यतया भावित इति गम्यते ॥
(सू.भा. १-४-१८; पा. १६८)

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

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

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

स्वच्छतारूपमिव रूपमस्येति स्वच्छतारूपः, न तु स्वच्छतैव

"For there is the *Laya* (ignorance) and the potentiality of the impression of *Vikshepa* (the projecting power of *Avidya*) the similarity (of Purity) is only because of the absence of the several *Vrittis* functioning, समुदाचरदृत्तिविशेषाभावमात्रेणोपमानम् ॥ (भामती. १-४-१८, पा. ४०९)

Comment is needless.]

(३) अपि च न कदाचिज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सत्संपत्तिर्नास्ति ; स्वरूपस्यानयायित्वात् । स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तूपाधिसंपर्कबशात्पर-रूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात्सुषुप्तेः स्वरूपापत्तिनिर्वक्ष्यते । अतश्च

सुषुप्तावस्थायां कदाचित्सता सम्पद्यते कदाचिन्न संपद्यते इत्युक्तम् ॥

(सु. भा. ३-२-७ ; पा. ३५१)

(3) "Moreover there is no time when there is no unity of Jiva with Brahman, for the essential nature of a thing can never disappear. Only relative to the foreign nature which he puts on, as it were, in dream and waking, he is said to resume his own nature in sleep. For this reason also it is improper to say that he becomes united into one or with Being only on a certain occasion but is not united on other occasions."

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

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

36. This is not mere speculation but reasoning on the basis of facts experienced by all. Accordingly Śankara writes:

यदपि शब्दव्यतिरेकेण मननं विदधच्छब्द एव तर्कमप्यादर्तव्यं
सर्वस्यतीत्युक्तम्, नानेन मिथेन मुष्कतर्कस्यात्रात्मसायःसम्पद्यति ;
सुप्तानुमृष्ट एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवसत्त्वेनाधीयते । स्वस्मान्तबुद्धान्तयो-
ग्ययोरितरेतरव्यभिचारादात्मनोऽनन्वयसत्तात्मम्, सम्प्रसादे च
प्रत्यक्षपरित्यागेन सदात्मना सम्पद्येर्निष्प्रयत्नसदात्मत्वं, प्रत्यक्षस्य
ब्रह्मस्यैकत्वात्कार्यकारणानन्वयत्वन्यायेन ब्रह्मव्यतिरेक

इत्येवञ्जातीयकः ॥

(सू. भा. २-१-६ ; पा. १८८ - १८९)

“And as for the argument that the word itself which enjoins *manana* (reasoning) besides *sravana*, listening to the teaching of the *Sruti*, shows that reasoning also should be adopted, we say dry speculation cannot gain entry here in this place, for the reasoning offered by the *Sruti* itself is adopted here as subservient to intuition. It is of the following type :

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

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

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

37. The intimate relation between *Jiva* and the universal Self is seen here even during the states of their seeming distinction. This is brought home in the next *Śruti* text:

स यथा शकुनिः सूत्रेण प्रबद्धो दिशं
पतित्वान्यत्रायतनमलम्बा बन्धनमेवोपश्रयते एवमेव खलु सोम्य तन्मनो

दिशं दिशं पतित्वान्वावतनमलब्ध्वा प्राणमेवोपश्रयते प्राणवन्धनं हि
सोम्य मन इति ॥ (छां. ६-८-२.)

“In the same way as a bird with a string flies in this direction and that, and finding no abode of rest, it would seek refuge in the very post to which it is tied up, so also, indeed, my dear boy, it is that this ‘mind’ flies in this direction and that, but finding no abode of rest, seeks refuge in the Prāṇa alone at last, for the mind is tied up to Prāṇa.”
(Ch. 6-8-2)

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

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

अज्ञानापिपासे मे सोम्य विजानीहीति यत्रैतत्पुरुषोऽशिशिषति
नामाऽऽय एव तद्व्यतिथं नयन्ते तद्यथा मोनायोऽश्ननायः पुरुषनाय इत्येवं
तद्यथा जायन्तेऽश्ननायेति तत्रैतच्छुभ्रमुत्पत्तितं सोम्य विजानीहि नेदममूलं
यन्निष्पत्तीति ॥ छां. ६-८-३.

“Know the truth about hunger and thirst, my boy, from me. When a person is spoken of as अशिशिष्यति (he feels hungry), then water alone leads on that which is eaten. Just as they speak of गोनाय (leader of cattle), अश्वनाय (leader of horses), पुरुषनाय (leader of men), so also they call water by the name अशननाय (leader of food eaten). You should know, my dear son, that it is thence this offshoot has sprouted. This can never be without a cause.” (Ch. 6-8-3)

तस्य क मूलं स्वादन्वत्राद्यादेवमेव सत्तु सोम्यात्वेन शुद्धेनाथो
मूलमन्विच्छातिः सोम्य शुद्धेन तेजो मूलमन्विच्छ तेजसा सोम्य शुद्धेन
सन्मूलमन्विच्छ सन्मूलः सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजा सदायतनाः सत्प्रतिष्ठः ॥
(छां. ६-८-४)

“Where else could its cause be if not food? In like manner too, my dear boy, from the offshoot food trace the cause, water; from the offshoot water, my dear boy, trace the cause, fire ; from the, offshoot fire, my dear boy, trace the cause, Being. All these beings, my dear boy, have their cause in Being and Being alone have they for their residing abode and in Being alone they ultimately merge themselves”. (Ch. 6-8-4)

अथ यत्रैतत्पुरुषः पिपासति नाम तेज एव तत्पीतं नयते तस्या
गोनाथोऽश्वनाथः पुरुषनाथ इत्येवं तत्तेज आत्तह उदयेति तत्रैतदेव
शुद्धमुत्पत्तिं सोम्य विजावीहि नेदममूलं भविष्यतीति ॥ (छां. ६-८-५)

“And when a person is spoken of as पिपासति (feels thirsty) then it is heat that leads on what is drunk. Just as they speak of a गोनाय (leader of cattle), अश्वनाय (leader of horses), पुरुषनाय (leader of men), so also one calls ‘fire’ by the name उदन्य (leader of water), thirst. And know that, my dear boy, it is thence that this offshoot has sprouted.

This can never be without a cause."

(Ch. 6-8-5)

तस्य क मूलं स्यादन्यत्राग्नौऽग्निः सोम्य शुक्लेन तेजोमूलमन्विच्छ
तेजसा सोम्य शुक्लेन सन्मूलमन्विच्छ सन्मूलाः सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः
सदायतनाः सत्प्रतिष्ठा यथा नु खलु सोम्येमास्तिन्नोदेवताः पुरुषं प्राप्य
त्रिवृत्त्रिवृदेकैका भवति तदुक्तं पुरस्तादेव भवत्यस्य सोम्य पुरुषस्य प्रयतो
बाह्वनसि सम्पद्यते मनः प्राणे प्राणस्तेजसि तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम् ॥

(छां. ६-८-६)

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

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

"Of this person who is departing, speech merges in the mind and the mind in the प्राण (Life-Force), प्राण in fire and fire in the Supreme Devata." (Ch.6-8-6)

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

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

The following text states this at length :

स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि
चेतकेतो इति श्रूय एव मा भगवान् विज्ञापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति
होवाच ॥ (छां. ६-८-७)

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. The Jiva or the individual self has only a seeming existence of its own. As Śankara says elsewhere, it is only a semblance (आभास एव), neither one with nor different from the Real Atman. Each one of us really is eternally and essentially one with this really real Atman.

42. Svetaketu asked his father to enlighten him further on the doctrine of oneness, because he had one great misgiving about it. How is it that no Jiva ever recognizes himself during sleep as having become one with Atman of whom Uddālaka is speaking? If one has arrived at a particular village, surely, he ought to be able to recognize his having done so. The father's reply to this objection is here:

यथा सोम्य मधु मधुकृतो निस्तिष्ठन्ति नानात्वयानां वृक्षाणां रसान्
समबहारमेकतां रसं गमयन्ति ॥

ते यथा तत्र न विवेकं लभन्तेऽमुष्याहं वृक्षस्य रसोऽस्म्यमुष्याहं
वृक्षस्य रसोऽस्मीत्येवमेव खलु सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सति सम्पद्य न विदुः
सति सम्पद्यामह इति ॥ (छां. ६-९-१, २)

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

(Ch. 6-9-1, 2)

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

from that stand-point only one Jiva enters into sleep and becomes one with Being and the same Jiva awakes from Being. As Śankara remarks :

सदेव तूपाधिसंपर्काज्जीव इत्युपचर्यत इत्यसकृत्प्रपञ्चितम् । एवं सति
यावदेकोपाधिगता बन्धानुवृत्तिस्तावदेकजीवव्यवहारः । उपाधन्तरगतायां
तु बन्धानुवृत्तौ जीवान्तरव्यवहारः । स एवायमुपाधिः
स्वाप्नबोधयोर्बीजादुरन्यायेनेत्यतः स एव जीवः प्रतिबुध्यत इति युक्तम् ॥
(सू. भा. ३-२-९ ; पा. ३५३)

"It is Being itself that is spoken of, as has been shown in detail, as Jiva figuratively owing to the contact with the conditioning associate. This being so, we speak of the Jiva so long as bondage continues in connection with the same conditioning associate but when there is continuance of bondage with reference to another conditioning associate we speak of another Jiva". (S.Bh. 3-2-9 ; P. 353)

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

विशेषविज्ञानोपशमलक्षणं तावत्सुषुप्तं न कचिद्विशिष्यते । तत्र सति
सम्पन्नस्तावदेकत्वात् विजानातीति युक्तम्; 'तत्केन कं विजानीयात्'
(बृ. २-४-१४) इति श्रुतेः ॥ (सू. भा. ३-२-७ ; पा. ३५१)

"In the first place the absence of particular cognition as characteristic of deep sleep is the same throughout. Now it is reasonable to hold that when Jiva is one with Being, he does not know anything in particular because there is only Atman, for the Sruti says 'there (in the state of one Atman) what should one know and with what?' (Br. 2-4-14)

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

A More Comprehensive View of Deep Sleep :

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

स ययोर्णनाभिस्तन्तुनोच्चरेययाग्रेः धुव्रा विस्फुलिङ्ग
व्युच्चरन्त्येवमेवास्मादात्मनः सर्वे प्राणाः सर्वे लोकाः सर्वे देवाः सर्वाणि
भूतानि व्युच्चरन्ति ॥ (बृ. २-१-२०)

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

(Br. 2-1-20)

यत्रैतत्पुरुषः सुप्तः स्वप्नं न कञ्चन पश्यत्ययास्मिन्प्राण एवैकधा
भवति तदैवं वाक्सर्वैर्नामभिः सहाप्येति चक्षुः सर्वैः रूपैः सहाप्येति श्रोत्रं
सर्वैः शब्दैः सहाप्येति मनः सर्वैर्ध्यानैः सहाप्येति स यदा प्रतिबुध्यते
यथाग्नेर्ज्वलतो विस्फुलिङ्गा विप्रतिष्ठेरन्नेवमेवैतस्मादात्मनः प्राणा
यथायतनं विप्रतिष्ठन्ते प्राणेभ्यो देवा देवेभ्यो लोकाः ॥ (कौ. ३-३)

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

(Kau.3-3)

The above two passages describe in detail how from the higher standpoint of the Upanishads the whole of the universe

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

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

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

एवमेव सन्तु सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजा जहन्त्यहनि सति संषष्टुषुसिकाते मरणप्रत्यक्षेण न विदुर्न विजानीयुः सति सम्प्रयाप्ताह इति सम्पन्न इति वा ॥
(छां. भा. ६-१-२ ; पा. ५२८)

"In the same manner, my dear boy, all these beings becoming one with Sat during sleep daily, during death, and general dissolution, are not aware that they are becoming one with Being or that they have become one with Being". (Ch. Bh. 6-9-2 ; P. 528)

And this will be in consonance with the next passage.

त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृक्षो वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा

इंशो वा मशको वा यद्यत्रवन्ति तदामवन्ति ॥

(छां. ६-२-३)

“And whatever they are (now) whether a tiger or a lion or a wolf or a boar or a worm or a firefly or a gnat or a mosquito - that they become again”. (Ch. 6-9-3)

47. The fact that all creatures become one with Being during sleep, death or dissolution in no way interferes with their retaining their individual form due to their '*Karma*' so long as they do not realize their metaphysical oneness with Reality. Accordingly, Sankara remarks with reference to the oneness at the time of death :

कीदृशी पुनरियं सम्पत्तिः स्यादिति चिन्त्यते । तत्रात्यन्तिक एव तावत्स्वरूपप्रविलय इति प्राप्तम् ; तत्प्रकृतित्वोपपत्तेः । सर्वस्य हि जनिमतो वस्तुजातस्य प्रकृतिः परा देवतेति प्रतिष्ठापितम् । तस्मादात्यन्तिकीय-मविभागापत्तिरिति । एवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः - तत्तेज - आदि भूतसूक्ष्मं भोत्रादिकरणाभयभूतमा अपीतेरा संसारमोक्षात् सम्यग्ज्ञाननिमित्तादवतिष्ठते ।

योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते शरीरत्वाय देहिनः ।

स्याणुमन्येऽनुसंयन्ति यथाकर्म यथामृतम् ॥ (का. २-२-७)

इत्यादिसंसारव्यपदेशात् । अन्यथा हि सर्वः प्रायणसमय एवोपाधिप्रत्यस्तमयादत्यन्तं ब्रह्म सम्पद्येत । तत्र विधिशास्त्रमनर्थकं स्याद्विधाशास्त्रं च । मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तञ्च बन्धो न सम्यग्ज्ञानादते विभ्रंसितुमर्हति । तस्मात् तत्प्रकृतित्वेऽपि सुषुप्तप्रलयवत् बीजभावावशेषैवैषा सत्सम्पत्तिरिति ॥ (सू. भा. ४-२-८ ; पा. ४८३)

“We have to discuss as to what sort of oneness would this be. Here the *prima facie* view would be that this merging of the

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

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

48. This doctrine of the conditioning association due to ignorance of the true nature of Brahman (now and then referred to by Śankara) has been developed by post-Śankara sub-commentators into a theory of residue of Positive Avidya in sleep and into the suicidal corollary of the continuance of the distinction of the individual self and the Supreme Self even in sound sleep. It passes one's understanding how these Vedantins reconciled themselves to a conclusion that forces them to believe that there

is no state whatever where non-duality of Atman is intuited. Sankara, on the other hand, states in so many words that the inference of distinction in sleep is based on misconception due to Avidya in waking.

यथा ह्यविभागोऽपि परमात्मनि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धो
विभागव्यवहारः स्वप्नवदव्याहतः स्थितौ दृश्यते, एवमपीतावपि
मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धैव विभागशक्तिरनुमास्यते ॥

(सू. भा. २-१-९ ; पा. १९१, १९२)

“Just as in the Supreme Atman, devoid of all distinctions, there are conventional dealings of distinctions due to wrong knowledge in the state of sustentation unimpeded as in a dream, so in the state of dissolution also latency of distinctions due to wrong knowledge alone can be inferred”.
(S.Bh. 2-1-9; Pp. 191-192)

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

स य एषोऽणिमैतदाम्त्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि
चेतकेतो इति भूय एव मा भगवान् विज्ञापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति
होवाच ॥
(छां. ६-९-४)

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

"Your reverence may please enlighten me further."

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

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

इमाः सोम्य नद्यः पुरस्तात्प्राच्यः स्यन्दन्ते पश्चात्पृथीच्यस्ताः
समुद्रात्समुद्रमेवापियन्ति स समुद्र एव भवति ता यथा तत्र न

एवमेव खलु सोम्येमाः सर्वाः ज्ञवाः सत आगम्य न विदुः सत आगच्छाम्यह
ह्नी त इह ज्ञातो वा सिंहो वा वृक्षो वा बराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा
मक्षिको वा यथाभवन्ति तदाभवन्ति ॥ (छां. ६-१०-१, २)

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

50. Just as in the case of honey, the different juices lose their identity and become all honey, so in the case of the sea also the rivers which originate in the clouds and become rivers, flowing in different directions, lose themselves in the sea. In the sea all rivers become part and parcel (undifferentiated) of the sea and can never be distinguished individually ; so also with

the Jivas who merge themselves in Being and emerge from It but yet they can never be said to have lost their identity in Being or having again come out of It. The conclusion is the same as before.

**स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो
इति भूय एव मा भगवान् विद्वापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच ॥ (छां. ६-१०-३)**

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

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

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

**अस्य सोम्य महतो वृक्षस्य यो मूलेऽभ्याह्न्याज्जीवन्न्त्रवेद्यो
मध्येऽभ्याह्न्याज्जीवन्न्त्रवेद्योऽग्रेऽभ्याह्न्याज्जीवन्न्त्रवेत्स एष
जीवेनात्मनानुप्रभूतः पेयीयमानो मोदमानस्तिष्ठति ॥ (छां. ६-११-१)**

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

(Ch.6-11-1)

**अस्य यदेकां शाखां जीवो जहात्यय सा शुष्यति द्वितीयां जहात्यय सा
शुष्यति तृतीयां जहात्यय सा शुष्यति सर्वं जहाति सर्वः शुष्यति ॥**

(छां. ६-११-२)

“Should the Jiva leave one of the branches, then it withers: should he (Jiva) leave off a second branch, then that would wither up: should he leave off another one, then that would also wither up. If he should leave off the whole tree the whole tree would wither up”. (Ch. 6-11-2).

एवमेव सलु सोम्य विद्धीति होवाच जीवापेतं वाच किलेदं म्रियते न जीवो म्रियत इति स ऋ एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो इति भूय एव मा भगवान्विज्ञापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच ॥ (छां. ६-११-३)

“Just like this, you have to understand” said (Uddālaka). ‘Bereft of Jiva, indeed, this (body etc.) dies, but the Jiva never dies’.

“Now it is this subtle Entity that all the universe has for its essence. It (alone) is real. That is the Atman. That Thou Art, O! Svetaketu”. “May your reverence be pleased to enlighten me further”. “So be it, my dear boy ; I shall do so.” (Ch. 6-11-3)

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

SECTION VI

BEING, THE MOST SUBTLE ENTITY

How the Subtle Being Can Give Rise to the World :

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

न्यग्रोधफलमत आहरेति इदं भगव इति भिन्धीति भिन्नं भगव इति
किमत्र पश्यसीत्यण्व इवेमा घाना भगव इत्यासामङ्गैकां भिन्धीति भिन्ना
भगव इति किमत्र पश्यसीति न किञ्चन भगव इति ॥ (छां. ६-१२-१)

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

तं होवाच यं वै सोम्यैतमणिमानं न निगालयस एतस्य वै सोम्येषोऽणिम
एष महान् न्यग्रोधस्तिष्ठति भद्वत्स्व सोम्येति ॥ (छां. ६-१२-२)

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

54. It is not blind faith that is demanded here. We know that big trees like the banyan grow out of the extremely small seeds and similarly out of the imperishable Self, which alone persists in sound sleep or during dissolution, all the universe of manifoldness and variety comes out, though our intellect cannot conceive exactly how it comes out.

स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्म तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो
इति श्रूय एव मा भगवान्विज्ञापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच ॥

(छां. ६-१२-३)

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

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

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

लवणमेतदुदकेऽवधायाय मा प्रातरूपसीदथा इति स ह तथा चकार
तं होवाच यदोषा लवणमुदकेऽवधा अहं तदाहरेति तद्वावमृश्य न
विवेद ॥ (छां. ६-१३-१)

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

यथा विलीनमेवाहस्यान्तादाचामेति कथमिति लवणमिति
मध्यादाचामेति कथमिति लवणमिति अन्तादाचामेति कथमिति
लवणमित्यभिप्रास्यैतदथ मोषसीदथा इति तत्र तथा चकार तच्छब्दसं
तं होवाचात्र वाव किल सत्सोम्य न निभालयसेऽत्रैव किलेति ॥

(छां. ६-१३-२)

"Well, my boy, melted as it is, sip some of it from the surface. How do you find it ?" ('It is) salt' 'Sip some from the middle. How do you find it ? 'Salt.' 'Sip some from the other end (bottom). How do

you find it?' 'Salt.' 'Throw this away and then come to me.' He did so (saying) 'it is there always'. He (Uddālaka) then said to him, 'Thou dose not see what is just here, my dear boy, (but) it is here indeed'."

(Ch.6-13-2)

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

स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्त्वं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि
चेतकेतो इति भूय एव मा भगवान्विद्वापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच ॥

(छां. ६-१३-३)

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

(Ch. 6-13-3)

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

यथा सोम्य पुरुषं गन्धारेभ्योऽभिनद्वाक्षमानीय तं ततोऽतिजने
विसृजेत्स यथा तत्र प्राङ्बोदङ्वाधराङ्वा प्रत्यङ्वा प्रध्मायीताभिनद्वाक्ष
मानीतोऽभिनद्वाक्षो विसृष्टः ॥

(छां. ६-१४-१)

तस्य यथाभिनहनं प्रमुच्य प्रब्रूयादेतां दिशं गन्धारा एतां दिशं ब्रजेति स
ग्रामाद्ग्रामं पृच्छन्पण्डितो मेधावी गन्धारानेवोपसम्पद्येतैवमेवेहाचार्यवान्पुरुषो
वेद तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ सम्पत्स्य इति ॥ (छां. ६-१४-२)

"Just as, my dear boy (when) some one should bring a person blind folded from the country of Gandhara, and then leave him in an uninhabited region and when that person shouted out towards the East or towards the North or towards the South or towards the West crying 'I have been brought blind-folded and left blindfolded!' and then some one should loosen his bonds and say 'this way lies the country of Gandhara, so you had better go in this direction' and he, enquiring his way from village to village and becoming well informed and also clever, would at last reach the country of the Gandhara ; even so, a person who has a good teacher, would know the Reality. And for him the delay would be so long as he is not freed and then he would immediately become one with Being". (Ch. 6-14-1, 2)

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

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

वेदान्तवाक्यानि हि सूत्रैरुदाहृत्य निचार्यन्ते ;
वाक्यार्थविचारणान्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिः,
नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता । सत्सु तु वेदान्तवाक्येषु जगतो
जन्मादिकारणवारिषु तदर्थग्रहणक्षम्यायामुपयुक्तमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि
प्रमाणं भवन्न निवार्यते । श्रुत्यैव च सहायत्वेन तर्कस्याप्युपेतत्वात् । तथा

हि 'भोतव्यो मन्तव्यः' (वृ. २-४-६) इति श्रुतिः, 'पण्डितो मेधावी गन्धार्तानेवोपसम्पद्येतैवमेवेष्टाचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद' (छां. ६-१४-२) इति च दुरुपबुद्धिसाक्ष्यमात्मनो दर्शयति । न धर्मविज्ञासाध्यामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मविज्ञासाध्याम्, किं तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुववादस्य वक्तव्यमवमिह प्रमाणम् ; अनुववादसाध्यान्मृत्युस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य ॥
(सू. भा. १-१-२, पा. ७, ८)

"It is the Vedanta texts that are adduced and discussed, for the intuition of Brahman is to result from the enquiry and determination of the meaning of the texts and not from the application of syllogistic inference and other such means of right knowledge. While there are Vedantic texts teaching the cause of the origination etc. of the world, inference also unopposed to Vedantic texts may become a means, in order to place on a firm ground the comprehension of the exact meaning of the texts and is not to be ruled out, for the Sruti itself accepts reason as an aid. To explain : the Sruti quotations, 'Atman is to be heard about, reflected upon and again just as the well-informed and clever person would at last reach the country of the Gandharas; even so, here a person, who has a capable teacher, knows the Reality', permit the aid of man's intelligence."

"Sruti, etc., alone are not here the means of knowledge in the enquiry into the nature of Brahman as in the case of the enquiry into the nature of Dharma; but Sruti and intuition, etc., also are the means here, as the case may be, because the knowledge of Brahman has to culminate in the intuition of Brahman and it has for its object an existent entity."
(S.Bh. 1-1-2, Pp. 7, 8)

60. So far we have considered the various doubts and difficulties with regard to the question of *sat sampatthi* in sleep and other kindred states. Uddalaka, having cleared all possible

doubts, concludes with a reiteration of the general truth that he has been propounding so far :

स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो
इति श्रूय एव मा भगवान् विज्ञापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच ॥

(छां. ६-१४-३)

“Now it is this subtle Entity that all this universe has for its essence. It (alone) is real. That is the Atman, That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu.” (Ch. 6-14-3)

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

SECTION VII

THE KNOWER OF BRAHMAN AND THE IGNORANT PERSON

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

पुरुषं सोम्योतोपतापिनं ज्ञातयः पर्युपासते जानासि मां जानासि
मामिति तस्य यावन्न वाङ्मनसि संपद्यते मनः प्राणे प्राणस्तेजसि तेजः
परस्यां देवतायां तावज्जानाति ॥

अथ यदास्य वाङ्मनसि संपद्यते मनः प्राणे प्राणस्तेजसि तेजः परस्यां
देवतायामथ न जानाति ॥ (छां. ६-१५-१, २)

“Of the person who is ailing, relatives gather around him and ask ‘Can you recognise me ? Can you recognise me ?’ So long as speech does not become one with the mind, the mind with life force, the life force with fire, and the fire with the Supreme Devata, he knows; and when his speech becomes one with mind, the mind with life-force and the life force with fire and fire with the Supreme Devata, he does not know”. (Ch. 6-15-1, 2)

62. The above process is common to the ignorant man who dies and the meditating devotee of Brahman as well as the one who has known the Truth. Śankara in the Sutra Bhashya explains thus: (1) the function of speech dissolves itself in the mind (S.Bh. 4-2-1). By this we have to understand that all the senses cease to work while the mind goes on working; (2) that mind dissolves itself in the life force, (Prana), that is, it ceases to work while life

force continues to work on and then the life force becomes one with the individual soul. The Śruti says that the life force dissolves in fire; and the fire in Sat. And for the meditating devotee the speciality is that he goes to the Sushumna Nadi and passes on through the Devayāna path to Brahma Loka. (S.Bh. 4-2-7)

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

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

अविद्वांस्तु सत उत्थाय प्राग्भावितं व्याघ्रादिभावं देवमनुष्यादिभावं वा विक्षति । विद्वांस्तु शास्त्राचार्योपदेशजनित ज्ञानदीपप्रकाशितं सद्ब्रह्मात्मानं प्रविश्य नावर्तत इत्येष सत्सम्पत्तिक्रमः ॥

(छां. भा. ६-१५-२ ; पा. ५३७)

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

In his Bhashya he writes :

तस्यास्यैवमाचार्यवतो मुक्तविद्याभिन्नस्य तावदेव तावानेव कालधिरं क्षेपः सदात्मस्वरूपसम्पत्तेरिति वाक्यशेषः कियान् कालधिरमित्युच्यते, यावच्च विमोक्ष्ये न विमोक्ष्यत इत्येतत्पुरुषव्यत्ययेन, सामर्थ्यात् । येन कर्मणा शरीरमात्मनं तस्योपभोगेन क्षयादेहपातो यावदित्यर्थः ॥ (छां. भा. ६-१४-२ ; पा. ५३५)

"To such a one who has a competent teacher there is only so much delay 'for being merged in his real nature as *Śat*' must be supplied. How much delay in time? The answer is 'so long as thou art not released'. This must be interpreted to mean, 'so long as he is not released' by altering the first person of the verb to suit the context. The meaning is : till the body falls off after experiencing the Karma which has produced the present body." (Ch.Bh.6-14-2; P. 535.)

63. This is evidently in the nature of a concession to the popular view that the wise man also has a body due to his Prarabdha Karma that has fructified in the birth as this body. The truth from the highest standpoint, however, is that the knower of Truth who understands the meaning of the text, 'That Thou Art, is ever free even while he appears to have a body.' That is why Sankara writes in his Sutra Bhashya :

अनुम्बारुद्धं तु ज्ञानफलम् ; 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षज्ञात्' (बृ. ३-४-१) इति श्रुतेः, 'तत्त्वमसि' (छां. ६-८-७) इति च सिद्धवदुच्येमात् । न हि 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यस्य वाक्यस्यार्थस्तत्त्वं मृतो ऋषिष्यसीत्येवं परिणेतुं शक्यः । 'तद्वैतत् पश्यन् ऋषिर्वाग्देवः प्रतिषेदेऽहं मनुष्यं सूर्यम्' (बृ. ३-४-१०) इति च सम्यग्दर्शनदर्शनकालमेव तत्फलं सर्वात्मत्वं स्वीयति ॥ (सू. भा. ३-३-३२, पा. ४०७)

"But the result of knowledge is immediately intuited. For the Śruti says 'That which is direct, and immediate is Brahman'. And the teaching 'That Thou Art' is as of something that is already existent. Surely the meaning of the sentence 'That Thou Art' cannot be twisted to mean 'That thou wilt become after death'. The Śruti, seeing this indeed Rishi Vamadeva realized, 'I have become Manu and Surya' points to the result of right knowledge as accruing simultaneously with it." (S.Bh. 3-3-32. P. 407)

Elsewhere Sankara writes :

पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेषु
अकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता
वाऽहमासं नेदानीं नापि भविष्यत्काल इति ब्रह्मविद्वगच्छति ॥

(सू. भा. ४-१-१३, पा. ४०३)

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

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

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

स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो इति
यूय एव सा ब्रह्मणो विद्यापयत्विति ब्रह्म सोम्येति श्वेतकेत ॥ (छां. ६-१५-३)

"Now it is this subtle Entity that all this universe has for its essence. It alone is real. That is the Atman, That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu." 'May your reverence be pleased to enlighten me further'. 'So be it, my dear boy, I shall do so.' (Ch. 6-15-3)

65. What remains now about which Svetaketu wants to be enlightened ? It is only to know whether this merging in the

Being is the same both for the common man shuffling off his mortal coil and the wise man who realizes his oneness with Being. How is it the ordinary man returns to mundane life again even after being merged in Brahman ? Why should he alone be subjected to the evils of samsara, while the wise one is left scot-free ? The answer is as follows:

पुरुषं सोम्योत हस्तगृहीतमानयन्त्यपहारीत् स्तेयमकरीत्
परशुमस्मै तपतेति स यदि तस्य कर्ता भवति तत एवानृतमात्मानं कुरुते
सोऽनृताभिसन्धोऽनृतेनात्मानमन्तर्धाय परशुं तप्तं प्रतिगृह्णाति स
दह्यतेऽथ हन्यते ॥ (छां. ६-१६-१)

अथ यदि तस्याकर्ता भवति तत एव सत्यमात्मानं कुरुते स
सत्याभिसन्धः सत्येनात्मानमन्तर्धाय परशुं तप्तं प्रतिगृह्णाति स न दह्यतेऽथ
मुच्यते ॥ (छां. ६-१६-२)

स यथा तत्र नादाह्यैतैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि
चेतकेतो इति तद्भास्य विजज्ञाविति विजज्ञाविति ॥ (छां. ६-१६-३)

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

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

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

(Ch. 6-16-1, 2, 3)

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

The Śruti text says truly :

योऽन्यथा सन्तमात्मानमन्यथा प्रतिपद्यते ।

किं तेन न कृतं पापं चोरेणात्मापहारिणा ॥

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

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

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

66. The concluding sentence ‘he understood what the father had told him’ should not be interpreted to mean a mental assent on the part of the son. Svetaketu had now no cause for any doubt whatever, because there was no occasion for it. This is what is known as अन्त्यप्रमाण (final means of right knowledge) among Vedantins. An extract from Śankara Bhashya on the subject is presented here :

अपि चान्त्यमिदं प्रमाणमात्मैकत्वस्य प्रतिपादकं नातः परं
 किञ्चिदाकाङ्क्षमस्ति । यथा हि लोके यजेतेत्युक्ते किं केन
 कथमित्याकाङ्क्ष्यते, नैवं 'तत्त्वमसि', 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' इत्युक्ते किञ्चित्
 अन्यदाकाङ्क्षमस्ति; सर्वात्मैकत्वविषयत्वावगतेः । सति
 ह्यन्वस्मिन्नवशिष्यमाणेऽर्थे आकाङ्क्षा स्यात् ।
 नत्वात्मैकत्वव्यतिरेकेणावशिष्यमाणो अन्योऽर्थोऽस्ति य आकाङ्क्ष्येत । न
 चेयमवगतिर्नोत्पद्यते इति सक्त्यं वक्तुम् ; 'तद्वास्य विजयी' (छां. ६-
 १६-३) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः । अवगतिसाधनानां च अवगादीनां
 वेदानुबचनादीनां च विधानात् । न चेयमवगतिरनर्षिका भ्रान्तिर्वेति सक्त्यं
 वक्तुम् । अविद्यानिवृत्तिफलदर्शनात्, बाधकज्ञानान्तराभावाच्च ।
 प्राक्चात्मैकत्वावगतेरव्याहतः सर्वः सत्यानृतत्ववहारो लौकिको
 वैदिकश्चेत्यवोचाम् ॥ (सू. मा. २-१-१४ ; पा. १९९-२००)

"Moreover, this means teaching the oneness of Atman is ultimate and nothing more to be questioned remains beyond this. Unlike the meaning of the injunction 'one should sacrifice' in ordinary life which gives rise to questions 'what', 'with what means' and 'how ?' the hearing of the statement, 'That Thou Art or 'I am Brahman' does not give rise to anything more to be enquired into, for the intuitive knowledge is about the unity of the Self of all. It is only when something else remains (to be known) an enquiry would arise ; but there remains nothing to be enquired into beyond the unity of Atman nor can it be said that this intuition is not born at all, for there are texts like 'this teaching of the father he understood' and as the means of understanding It, such listening to the Śrutis and the study of the Vedas etc., has been enjoined. Further it cannot be said that this knowledge is useless or delusive, for we see the result of it in the eradication of ignorance and there is nothing else which sublates it. We have already said all ideas of true and false, secular and Vedic, goes on intermittently only before

the dawn of the knowledge of the oneness of Atman."

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

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

The Śruti says :

यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत्केन कं पश्येत्..... तत्केन कं
विजानीयात् येनेदं सर्वं विजानाति तं केन विजानीयात्
विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात् ॥ (बृ. ४-५-१५)

"Where, however, everything becomes Atman alone, there what could one see and with what?..... there what could one know and with what ? With what could one know that Atman by means of whom one knows all this ? With what, my dear, could one know the knower Himself?" (Br. 4-5-15)

68. And Śankara thus justifies how the Śruti is called a means of valid knowledge with regard to Brahman which is everyone's Atman.

न हि शास्त्रमिदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति, किं तर्हि ?
प्रत्यगात्मत्वेनाविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितुवेदना-
दिभेदमपनयति ॥ (सू. भा. १-१-४ ; पा. १६)

"The Vedānta Śāstra does not objectify Brahman and try to teach it as such and such, but it teaches that it is no object because of its being the inner Atman ; it removes all differences such as the knower, the knowledge and knowledge predications projected by Avidya".

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

Elsewhere Śankara teaches that the idea of perception and other means of knowledge, including the Vedas themselves obtain only in the region of ignorance which prevails before the dawn of knowledge of the oneness of Atman :

यदप्युक्तं- अधिकार्यभावः प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधश्चेति, तदप्यसत् ; प्राक् प्रबोधात् संसारित्वाभ्युपगमात्, तद्विषयत्वाच्च प्रत्यक्षादिव्यवहारस्य । 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत्केन कं पश्येत्' (बृ. २-४-१४, ४-५-१५) इत्यादिना हि प्रबोधे प्रत्यक्षाद्यभावं दर्शयति । प्रत्यक्षाद्यभावे भुतेरप्यभावप्रसङ्गः इति चेत्, न ; इष्टत्वात् । 'अत्र पिताऽपिता भवति' (बृ. ४-३-२२) इति वचनात् इष्यते 'एवास्माभिः भुतेरप्यभावः प्रबोधे ॥

(सू. भा. ४-१-३, पा. ४६५)

"And as for the objection that there would be no aspirant at all, and it would be opposed to the evidence of perception and other valid means of knowledge (If even the transmigratory soul, be deemed to be one with Iswara), we reply that even that is not right, for we grant that one is a transmigratory soul before enlightenment; and perception and other mental processes relate to that state only. (The Śruti) points out that there is no perception or any other process during the state of enlightenment (when it says), 'where for this (enlightened) one, all

has become Atman only, there, whom could one see and with what?' (Br. 4-5-15). (objection) : But in the absence of perception, etc., it would lead us to the repugnant conclusion that even the Śruti is not there! (Reply) : Not so, for the consequence is admitted. (To explain) : The Śruti beginning with, 'In this state the father becomes no father', and concludes 'The Vedas, become no Vedas, and so we do admit even the non-existence of the Śruti in the state of enlightenment'.

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

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

कस्य पुनरयमप्रबोध इति चेत्, - यस्त्वं पृच्छसि तस्य ते इति वदामः ।
नन्वाहमीश्वर एव उक्तः भूत्वा, यद्येवं प्रतिबुद्धोऽसि नास्ति कस्यचिदप्रबोधः ।
योऽपि दोषमोचते कैश्चित् अविद्यया किलात्मनः सद्वितीयत्वात्
अद्वैतानुपपत्तिरिति, सोऽप्येतेन प्रत्युक्तः ॥ (सू. भा. ४-१-३, पा. ४६५)

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION VIII

CONCLUSION

The Intuition of Atman :

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

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

न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिः न बद्धो न च साधकः ।

न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्तः इत्येषा परमार्थता ॥ (गौ. का. २-३२)

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

(G.K. 2-32)

This should not be understood to mean that there is no view of Reality which can be rightly held, nor that all things are

without an essence of their own, which is the doctrine of the Buddhist Nāgārjuna and his followers.

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

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

This difficulty is, no doubt, inevitable with regard to phenomenal things. But the Reality that the Upanishads and the Rshis attempt to teach is nothing phenomenal or objective. They have, therefore, openly admitted that it cannot be taught through words or caught through concepts. (यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह) - That from which words turn back unable to reach there together with the mind (Tai. 2-9). But yet there is the advantage in teaching Reality, for it is the Essence, -Self (Atman) of all and everything ऐतदत्यमिदं सर्वं स आत्मा) and is the only Reality worth

the name (तत्सत्यम्). Therefore, the teachers and the Upanishads appeal to the seeker to turn towards his own Self which is devoid of all attributes. Whenever there may happen to be something which the listener is liable to mistake for the Self, the residual Self, which can never be desired is easily intuited by the enquirer.

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

स एष नेति नेतीति व्याख्यातं निहुते यतः ।

सर्वमग्रहभावेन हेतुनाऽजं प्रकाशते ॥ (गी. का. ३-२६)

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

The Unique Method of Superimposition and Rescission

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

अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते ॥

(गी. भा. १३-१३, पा. २०४)

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

The method itself consists in imputing certain characteristics to Atman by means of which some other attribute

is easily discarded and becomes obvious as not pertaining to the Self.

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

Reasoning Based Upon Intuition

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

The word 'intuition' as used throughout in these pages bears a signification. While the dictionary meaning of this word would be immediate apprehension by the mind or the senses without reasoning, it has been deliberately extended to mean not only direct knowing by the mind, the senses and the sense data in

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

Intuition of the Self :

74. The expression 'intuition of the Self' used here as a synonym for the Sanskrit words विज्ञान, अवगति or अनुभव should be carefully examined and the principle for which it stands must be exactly determined. It does not mean exactly the same thing that we mean when we speak of sense intuition or mental

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

APPENDIX

THE CENTRAL TEACHING

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

स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यामिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि
चेतकेतो ।

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

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

3. There is no reason to restrict the expression “all this” to any one aspect or portion of the universe. In Sanskrit philosophical works it is usual to divide the universe into Ādhyātmic (interior or physiological or psychical or ethical etc.) Ādhibhautic (external or physical) and Ādhidaivic (relating to the heavens or the regions of the gods). Since there is no restrictive attribute here, the statement ऐतदात्म्यामिदं सर्वं (all this has for its essence This Entity) requires that all without exception has this **Subtle Entity** alone for its essence and there is nothing which has any existence independent of this Entity.

4. We have now to consider the meaning of the word (अणिमा) Subtle (Entity). Does it mean something very tenuous like rarefied air or very minute like the scientist's chemical atom? This cannot be, for Uddālaka is here talking of Pure Being which is One without a second, which is 'the essence of all this'. Besides It is the cause which created and transformed Itself into all the universe and then It cannot in Itself be any one of the categories (such as substance, quantity, quality, relation etc.) or even the Psychic entities which Its seeming effects superimposed upon it. That is why Uddālaka says that it is Reality (सत्यम्) as distinguished from all superimposed Objects. Therefore (अणिमा) Subtle Entity is only another name for something neither perceivable nor conceivable, but is the substrate of all that is born. In fact, all that is born thrives and finally merges in being in it. Reality is subtle in the sense that it is Pure Consciousness through which everything shines and there is nothing which can objectify and throw light on It nor is there any need for it.

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

THE TEXT TEACHING

The Identity of the Jiva and Iswara

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

7. Strictly speaking, 'तत् त्वम् असि' (literally 'That Thou

Art') is neither a grammatical sentence nor a logical proposition about Brahman, for neither words nor thoughts can objectify Brahman. As the the Śruti says :

यद्वाचाऽनभ्युदितं येन वागभ्युच्यते ।

तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ (केन. १-५)

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

(Ke 1-5)

यन्मनसा न मनुते येनाहुर्मनो मतम् ।

तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ (केन. १-६)

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

(Ke. 1-6)

'That Thou Art' is called वाक्य (sentence or proposition) because when uttered by a competent teacher it suggests Brahman, which is One without a second, as the Self of the seeker of Truth.

Sureswara, the author of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, therefore calls Brahman in accordance with the Taittiriya Bhashya in 2-1 अवाक्यार्य, (नै.सि. ३-९) i.e., that which is realized neither through the knowledge of the relation (संसर्ग) of things expressed by the words in a sentence, nor through the knowledge of distinction of things (भेद) denoted by the words in a sentence.

Knowledge of Atman, no Meditation

8. It goes without saying that this sentence तत् त्वम् असि does not enjoin or imply any sort of meditation, as for instance, in 'अनन्तं वै मनः' (Infinite, indeed, is the mind - Br. 3-1-9), 'मनो ब्रह्मोत्पुपासीत' (One should meditate on the mind as Brahman - Ch. 3-18-1), 'आदित्यो ब्रह्मोत्पादेशः' (The sun is Brahman, such is the instruction - Ch. 3-19-1), 'प्राणो वाच संवर्ग' (Prana is indeed sovereign, all inclusive - Ch. 4-3-3). In all such sentences two different things are enjoined to be meditated upon as though they were one. But in the present case 'That' and 'Thou' do not refer to two different things, but actually to one and the same entity. Swetaketu is really the same as the Pure Being proposed to be taught. We have already quoted the Upanishadic text which expressly negates that Brahman in its true nature can be meditated upon - so says Śaṅkara :

सम्पदविरूपे हि ब्रह्मात्मैकत्वविज्ञाने अभ्युपगम्यमाने 'वत्त्वमसि', 'अं ब्रह्मास्मि', 'अवमात्मा ब्रह्म' - इत्येवमादीनां वाक्यानां ब्रह्मात्मैकत्व-
वस्तुप्रतिपादनपरं न ह्यवगम्यतः पीडयेत् ॥ (सू. भा. १-१-४, पा. १६)

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

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

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

The Function of the Text

10. There is only one Reality without a second, from the standpoint of Vedānta Sāstra and from that point of view, there is neither teaching nor learning. In accordance with this, Śaṅkara quotes a text in Sūtra Bhaṣya :

स होवाचाधीहि भो इति स तूष्णीं बभूव तं ह द्वितीये वा तृतीये वा-
वचन उवाच ब्रूमः खलु त्वं तु न विजानासि । उपशान्तोऽयमात्मा ॥

(सू. भा. ३-२-१७, पा. ३५८)

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

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

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

विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत कल्पितो यदि केनचित् ।

उपदेशाद्यं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥

गौ. का. १-१७

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

(G.K. 1-18)

From this thought position, therefore the function of the text 'That Thou Art' is to reveal that there is no teaching necessary and that there is nothing to be actually achieved by knowing the

Truth. 'That Thou Art, O, Svetaketu' means you have no need to become That, you have no need to be taught the truth about It; you are already That. In fact, the conventional distinctions of teaching, teacher and taught are only to facilitate knowing. You are the one Reality without a second ; neither a teacher nor one to be taught.

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

अविद्या अविद्या न निवर्तते तावद् अविद्यामोक्षत्वं जीवस्य जीवत्वं च न निवर्तते । तन्निवृत्तौ तु प्राज्ञ एव 'तत्त्वमसि' इति श्रुत्या प्रस्थाप्यते । न चाविद्याकत्वे तदपगमे च वस्तुनः कश्चित् विशेषोऽस्ति । यथा कश्चित् संतमसे पतितान् काञ्चिद्वज्रम् यदि मन्यमानः शीतो वेषमानः पलायते तं चापरो ब्रूयात् मा शैवीः नायमहि स्त्रुवेवेति । स च तदुपश्रुत्यादिकृतं त्रयमुत्सृजेदेषु पलायनं च । न त्वद्विमुक्तिर्वाते तदपगमकाले च वस्तुनः कश्चिद्विशेषः स्यात् ॥

(सू. भा. १-४-६, पा. १५४)

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

(S.Bh. 1-4-6, P. 154)

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

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

न चाविद्यावत्त्वे तदपगमे च वस्तुनः कश्चिद्विशेषोऽस्ति ॥

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

तत्त्वमसीति ब्रह्मात्मभावस्य शास्त्रमन्तरेणानवगम्यमानत्वात् ॥

(सू. भा. १-१-४, पा. ११)

"One's identity with Brahman can never be known except through the Vedānta Sāstra" (S. Bh. 1-1-4, P. 11)

12. The Vedanta text 'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि' ("All this universe has this subtle Entity for its essence. It alone is real, that is the only Atman. '-That Thou Art') is **the only valid means of right knowledge** concerning Brahman. For perception and inference are valid only in the case of knowable objects and they can never objectify Atman who is always the knower and never the knowable.

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

पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे

प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः, सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि
विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्षपराणि ॥ (अथासमाख्यम्)

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

Negation of Jivahdod

13. The proposition, 'That Thou Art', therefore, aims at negating the erroneous assumption of one's being a transmigratory soul and reaffirming his true nature as Brahman. There is actually no Jiva at all distinct and apart from the only Reality free from all blemishes. The following excerpts from Sankara are worth remembering in this connection :

१) न हि जीवो नामात्यन्तभिन्नः ब्रह्मणः ; 'तत्त्वमसि', 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' - इत्यादिभुतिभ्यः । बुभ्याद्युपाधिकृतं तु विशेषमाश्रित्य ब्रह्मैव सन् जीवः कर्ता भोक्ता चेत्युच्यते ॥ (सू. भा. १-१-३१, पा. ११)

1) "The Jiva so-called is not altogether different from Brahman, for there are Sruti texts like 'That Thou Art', 'I am Brahman'. But in consideration of the apparently particular form due to the intellect and other conditioning associates the Jiva, though really Brahman itself, is said to be an agent and experiencer (of fruits of actions)."

(S. Bh. 1-1-31, P. 61)

२) यत्तत्परं ज्योतिरुपसम्यक्तव्यं श्रुतं तत्परं ब्रह्म । तदायद्वत्पापमत्वादिवर्मकम्, तदेव च जीवस्य वार्षाधिकं स्वरूपम् 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यादिशास्त्रेभ्यः, नेतदुपाधिकल्पिकम् । यमदेव हि स्थाणाविव पुरुषबुद्धिं द्वैतलक्षणाविविधां निवर्तयन् कूटस्थनित्यहवस्वरूपमात्मानमहं ब्रह्मास्मीति न प्रतिपद्यते तावज्जीवस्य जीवत्वम् । यदा तु देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिसङ्घाताद्युत्पाप्य श्रुत्या प्रतिबोध्यते, नासि त्वं देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिसङ्घातः नासि संसारी, किं तर्हि ? तद्यत्तत्त्वं स आत्मा चैतन्यमात्रस्वरूपः तत्त्वमसि' इति - तदा कूटस्थनित्यहवस्वरूपमात्मानं प्रतिबुध्यमानाच्छरीराद्यभिमानात्तदुक्तिन् स एव कूटस्थनित्यहवस्वरूपः आत्मा भवति ॥ (सू. भा. १-३-१९, पा. ११९)

2) "That Supreme Light which has got to be attained, that is the highest Brahman, and that has properties like the nature which has done away with sin etc. That alone is indeed the real nature of Jiva, vide texts like 'That Thou Art', and not the other one conjured up by the conditioning associates. When, by the Śruti, one is taken beyond the aggregates - the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect, and is taught thus: 'Thou art not the aggregate of the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect, thou art not the transmigratory soul, but that

Reality, that Atman of the nature of Pure Consciousness,' 'That Thou Art', then one realizes oneself as of the nature of changeless, eternal Witness; and transcending this samsāra of identifying oneself with the body etc., one becomes that very Atman of the nature of changeless eternal Witness." (S.Bh. 1-3-19, P. 112)

३) पर एवात्मा देहेन्द्रियमनोबुधुषाधिभिः परिच्छिद्यमानो बालैः शरीर इत्युपपद्यते । यथा घटकरकाद्युपाधिबिनादपरिच्छिन्नमपि नमः परिच्छिन्नवदवशासदे, तद्वत् । तद्वेष्या च कर्मकर्तृत्वादिवेदव्यवहारो न विरूप्यते प्राक् 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यात्मैकत्वोपदेशग्रहणात् ॥ (सू. भा. १-२-६, पा. ६७)

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

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

४) न ईशस्त्व संसारान्तरात्मत्वं प्रतिपाद्यत इत्यभ्युपगच्छामः, किं तर्हि ? संसारिणः संसारित्वापोहेनैकप्रात्मत्वं प्रतिनिपादयिषितमिति । एवं च सति गद्वैतेश्वरत्वाच्छ्रुतमप्यत्वाद्विगुणता, विपरितगुणता त्विदस्य सिध्येति प्यवतिष्ठते ॥ (सू. भा. ४-१-३, पा. ४६४, ४६५)

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

(S.Bh. 4-1-3, Pp. 464, 465)

५) पारमेश्वरमेव हि शारीरस्य पारमार्थिकं स्वरूपम्, उपाधिकृतं तु शारीरत्वम् ; 'तत्त्वमसि' (छां. ६-८-७), 'नान्यदतोस्ति ब्रह्म' (बृ. ३-८-११) - इत्यादिभूतिभ्यः ॥ (सू. भा. ३-४-८, पा. ४३६)

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

६) शास्त्रं च 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यपहृतपाप्मत्वात् । एष ब्रह्म शारीरस्यात्मत्वेनोपदिशत् शारीरस्यैव तावत् उपभोक्तृत्वं वारयति । कुतस्तदुपभोगेन ब्रह्मणः उपभोगप्रसङ्गः ? (सू. भा. १-२-८, पा. ६९)

6) "And the Śāstra, teaching as it does the Brahman, possessing the property of being free from sin etc., is the Self of the self of the embodied soul, wards off all experience of the fruits of action in the case of the embodied soul itself. Where then is there any repugnancy of Brahman becoming an experiencer on account of it (Jiva) being an experiencer ? " (S.Bh. 1-2-8, P. 69)

७) न ह्यत्र शारीरः क्षेत्रज्ञः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वादिना संसारधर्मेणोपेतो विवक्ष्यते । कथं तर्हि ? सर्वसंसारधर्मातीतो ब्रह्मस्वभावश्चैतन्यमात्र-स्वरूपः ; 'अनन्नन्नन्योकूटमिचाकशीति' (मुं. ३-१-१), 'अनन्न-न्नन्योकूटमिषदयति ज्ञः' इति वचनात् । 'तत्त्वमसि' (छां. ६-८-७), 'क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि' (गी. १३-२) इत्यादिभूतिस्मृतिभ्यश्च ॥

(सू. भा. १-२-१२, पा. ७४)

7) "Indeed, here (in the *Paingi Brāhmaṇa*) the embodied Kshetrajna is not proposed to be taught as possessing the properties of samsāra such as being an agent and experiencer of fruits of actions, but only as being of the nature of Brahman, essentially as Pure Consciousness, free from all properties of a transmigratory soul; for the text runs 'not eating, the other only sees', that is to say, the knowing Self only witnesses without experiencing anything (Mun.3-1-1) and also

because there are the Śruti texts like 'That Thou Art', and 'know the Kṣhetrajña to be Myself' (Gita 13-2) (S.Bh. 1-2-12, P. 74)

८) काशाकृत्स्नस्याचार्यस्यानिकृतः परमेश्वरो जीवो नान्य इति मतम् ।
.... तत्र काशाकृत्स्नीयं मतं श्रुत्यनुसारीति गम्यते ; प्रतिपादयिषितार्थानुसारत्वं
'तत्त्वमसि' (छं. १-८-७) इत्यादिश्रुतिम् ॥ (सू. भा. १-४-२२, पा. १८१)

8) "The opinion of teacher Kāśakṛtsna is that the Supreme Lord, unchanged, is Himself the Jiva, and none other; now we may conclude that Kāśakṛtsna's opinion follows the Śruti, for it is in accordance with what is proposed to be taught and there are Śruti texts like 'That Thou Art'." (S.Bh. 1-4-22, P.171)

९) जीवस्यापितु दुःखप्राप्तिरविद्यानिमित्तैवेत्युक्तम् । तथा
चाविद्यानिमित्तजीवमावप्युदासेन ब्रह्ममावमेव जीवस्य प्रतिपादयन्ति
वेदान्ताः - 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्येवमादयः ॥ (सू. भा. २-३-४६, पा. ३००)

9) "Even for Jiva, we have already said that suffering is due to ignorance only. Accordingly Vedānta texts like 'That Thou Art' negate the Jiva-hood of Jiva and teach that he is Brahman Itself."

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

१०) अपवादो नाम - यत्र कस्मिंश्चित्श्रुतिं पूर्वनिविष्टायां मिथ्यानुद्धौ
निविष्टायां पश्चादुपस्थापयमाना यत्तर्था बुद्धिः पूर्वनिविष्टया मिथ्यानुद्धेर्निर्विक्रमा
भवति । यथा वेदेन्द्रियसङ्घाते आत्मबुद्धिरात्मन्येवात्मबुद्ध्या पश्चाज्जायन्त्या
'तत्त्वमसि' - इत्यनन्ता यथार्थबुद्ध्या निवर्तते ॥ (सू. भा. ३-३-९, पा. ३८२)

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

(S.Bh. 3-3-9, P. 382)

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

अपि च 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्येतद्वाक्यं त्वंपदार्थस्य तत्पदार्थभावमाचष्टे ॥

(सू. भा. ४-१-२, पा. ४६२)

"Moreover, the text 'That Thou Art' affirms the identity of what is connoted by the word 'Thou' with what is connoted by the word 'That'."

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

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

आत्मेत्येव परमेश्वरः प्रतिपत्तव्यः । तथा हि - परमेश्वरप्रक्रियायां जाबाला आत्मत्वेनैवैतमुपगच्छन्ति- 'त्वं वा अहमस्मि भगवो देवतेऽहं वै त्वमसि भगवो देवते' इति । तथान्येऽपि 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' इत्येवमादयः आत्मत्वोपगमा द्रष्टव्याः ॥

(सू. भा. ४-१-३, पा. ४६४)

"The Supreme Lord should be cognized as verily one's own Self ; that is why the Jābālās, in context where the Supreme Lord is the topic discussed, approved Him in these words, 'O Revered Deity - I am verily Thyself; Thou art verily myself, O Revered Deity.' Similar recognitions of Brahman as the Self such as 'I am Brahman' should also be included here." (S.Bh. 4-1-3, P. 464)

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

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

Immediate Intuition of Brahmanhood

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

१) प्रत्यक्षावगमं चेदं फलम् । 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यसंसार्यात्म-
त्वप्रतिपत्तौ सत्यां संसार्यात्मत्वव्यावृत्तेः ॥ (सू. भा. १-४-१४, पा. १६४)

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

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

२) गृहीते त्वात्मैकत्वे बन्धमोक्षदिसर्वव्यवहारपरिसमाप्तिरेव
स्यात् ॥ (सू. भा. १-२-६, पा. ६७)

2) "As soon as the unity of Atman is realized, all conventions of differences such as bondage and release would cease." (S.Bh. 1-2-6, P. 67)

३) बाधिते च शारीरात्मत्वे तदाश्रयः समस्तः स्वाभाविको व्यवहारो बाधितो भवति ॥ (सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९७)

3) "When embodiedness is sublated all conventions would come to an end." (S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 197)

४) न चायं व्यवहाराभावोऽवस्थाविशेषनिबद्धोऽभिधीयते इति युक्तं वक्तुम् ; 'तत्त्वमसी'ति ब्रह्मात्मभावस्यानवस्थाविशेषनिबन्धनत्वात् ॥ (सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९८)

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

५) न हि 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यस्य वाक्यस्यार्थः 'तत्त्वं मृतो भविष्यसि' - इत्येवं परिणेतुं शक्यः ॥ (सू. भा. ३-३-३२, पा. ४०७)

5) "For one cannot twist the text 'तत्त्वमसि' (That Thou Art) so as to mean 'That Thou shalt become after death.'" (S.Bh. 3-3-32, P. 407)

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

स्वयंप्रसिद्धं होतृच्छारीरस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वमुपदिश्यते, न यत्तान्तरप्रसाध्यम् । अतथेदं शास्त्रीयं ब्रह्मात्मत्वमवगम्यमानं स्वाभाविकस्य शारीरात्मत्वस्य बाधकं सम्पद्यते, रज्ज्वादिवृद्धय इव सर्पादिवृद्धीनाम् । बाधिते च शारीरात्मत्वे तदाश्रयः समस्तः स्वाभाविको व्यवहारो बाधितो भवति ॥

(सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९७)

"This Brahmanhood of the embodied soul is self-established and not something to be achieved with the help of a distinct effort. And hence this Śāstraic identity with Brahman becomes the sublator of the naive nature of being an embodied soul, like, the correct ideas of the rope and other existent things which sublimate the false ideas of the snake and other appearances. When the nature of one's being a migratory soul is sublated, then all human behaviour depending on it will become sublated." (S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 197)

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

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

१) कवेकत्वैकान्ताभ्युपगमे नास्तत्त्वाभावात् प्रत्यक्षादीनि लौकिकानि प्रमाणानि व्यावहृत्येत्, निर्विपर्ययात्, त्याग्यादिविव पुण्यादिव्यापानि । तथा निष्प्रतियोग्यात्मनि वेदोपेक्षत्वात् तदभावे व्याहृत्येत्, मोक्षज्ञासस्यापि शिष्यासिद्धादिमोक्षोपेक्षत्वात् तदभावे व्याहृत्येत् । कर्माद्यनृतेन मोक्षसाधनेन प्रतिपादितस्यातैकत्वस्य सत्यत्वमुपपद्येतेति ? अत्रोच्यते, - नैषदोषः ;

सर्वव्यवहाराणामेव प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताविज्ञानात् सत्त्वोपपत्तेः, स्वव्यवहारस्येव प्राग्बोधात् । यावन्नि न सत्त्वात्मैकत्वाप्रतिपक्षिस्तावत्प्रमाणप्रमेयफलद्वयेषु विकारेष्वनृतत्वबुद्धिर्न कस्यचिदुत्पद्यते । विकारानेष तु अहं प्रमेयविषयामात्मीयेन भावेन सर्वो जन्तुः प्रतिपद्यते स्वाभाविकीं ब्रह्मात्मतां हित्वा । तस्मात् प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताप्रतिबोधादुपपन्नः सर्वो लौकिको वैश्विकव्यवहारः । यथा सुप्तस्य प्राकृतस्य जनस्य स्वप्ने ज्वावचान् भक्तान् पश्यतो निमित्तमेव प्रत्यक्षाभिमतं विज्ञानं भवति प्राग्बोधात्, न च प्रत्यक्षाभासाभिप्रायस्तत्काले भवति, तद्वत् ॥ (सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९८)

1) "(Objection :-) If unity alone is accepted as real, there would be no plurality and consequently perception and other empirical valid means of knowledge would be nullified, having no objects to make known, just like the ideas of man etc., in a post or the like and the Śāstra, dealing with the injunctions and prohibitions, would lose its vocation depending as it does upon plurality. And the Śāstra dealing with liberation, depending as it does on differences like the teacher and the taught, would find no vocation for propounding Truth. And how could the unreal Śāstra dealing with liberation consistently reveal the real unity of the Atman ?

(Reply :-) This is no defect, for all conventions can consistently be real before the dawn of the knowledge of the identity of Atman with Brahman, just as all procedure in a dream is real before one wakes up. (To explain :-) So long as the knowledge of the unity of the real Atman has not dawned, no one happens to entertain the idea of unreality regarding phenomena presenting themselves as valid means of knowledge, objects of knowledge and the resultant knowledge of those objects. And it is the modifications that every born soul regards as 'me and mine' through अविद्या (ignorance) seeing them as related to one's own self and things owned by one's self, abandoning the idea of his inherent nature of oneness with Brahman. Therefore before the dawn of enlightenment of one's oneness with Brahman every conventional

procedure, whether secular or sacred, is quite consistent. In the same way as for the common man, who has fallen into a dream and there sees things of varying ranks, knowledge of phenomena would be felt to be surely real, a direct perception and not merely an apparent perception, so also appears the knowledge with regard to human procedure here.” (S.Bh. 2-1-14, P. 198)

२) कथं त्वसत्येन वेदान्तवाक्येन सत्यस्य ब्रह्मात्मनस्य प्रतिबिम्बमप्येत ? न हि स्नुसर्पेण दशो म्रियते । नापि मृगतृष्णिकाम्बसा बान्नावगाहनादिप्रयोजनं क्षियत इति । नैष दोषः ; ब्रह्मविषादिनिमित्तमरणादिकार्षोषतन्त्रेः, स्वप्नदर्शनावस्यस्य च सर्पदंशनोदकस्नानादिकार्षदर्शनात् । तत्कार्षमप्यनृतमेवेति चेत्, ब्रूयात्, तत्र ब्रूमः - यद्यपि स्वप्नदर्शनावस्यस्य सर्पदंशनोदकस्नानादिकार्षमनृतम्, तथापि त्वनगतिः सत्यमेव कलम् ; प्रतिबुद्धस्याप्यबाध्यमानत्वात् । न हि स्वप्नदृष्टं सर्पदंशनोदकस्नानादिकार्षं मिथ्येति मन्वमावस्तवगतियमि मिथ्येति मन्यते कश्चित् ॥

(सू. भा. २-१-१४, पा. १९८, १९९)

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

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

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

(Rejoinder :-) To this, we reply that while the snake-bite or bathing in water is unreal, the resultant knowledge of such acts is quite real for it is not sublated even on waking.

(To explain :-) Surely no one who wakes from a dream, even while knowing the act of snake-bite or bathing in the water to be unreal, takes the knowledge thereof to be unreal also." (S.Bh.2-1-4, Pp.198,199)

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

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

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

१) तत्त्वावधारणाभ्यासस्य हि स्वभाव एव स तादृशः, यदनादिमपि निरूढनिबिडवासनमपि मिथ्याप्रत्ययमपनयति ॥ (भामती पा. ४०)

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

२) न ब्रह्मज्ञानमात्रं सांसारिकघर्मनिवृत्तिकारणम्, अपि तु साक्षात्कारपर्यन्तम् । ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारश्चान्तःकरणवृत्तिभेदः भवणमननादि-जनितसंस्कारसचिवमनोजन्मा ॥ (भामती १-१-४, पा. १५०)

2) "Knowledge of Brahman alone is not the cause for removing the properties of being a transmigratory soul, but that knowledge culminating in direct realization: and realization of Brahman is a special modification of the mind, born in the mind, which is accompanied by the impression born out of *Sravaṇa* (theory), *Manana* (reflection)."

(Bhāmati I-1-4, P.150)

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

३) विशिष्टशब्दावधारणं प्रमेयावगमं प्रत्यव्यवधानेन कारणं भवति; प्रमाणस्य प्रमेयावगमं प्रत्यव्यवधानात् । मनननिदिध्यासने तु चित्तस्य प्रत्यगात्मप्रवणतासंस्कारपरिनिष्पन्नतदेकाग्रवृत्तिकार्यद्वारेण ब्रह्मानुभवहेतुतां प्रतिपद्येते - इति फलं प्रत्यव्यवहितस्य करणस्य विशिष्टशब्दावधारणस्य व्यवहिते मनननिदिध्यासने तदङ्गे अङ्गीक्रियेते ॥

(पञ्चपादिकाविवरणम् - पा. ५११)

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

(P.V.; P.511)

It is evident that the Vedantic text alone is enough for leading one to the knowledge of Brahman according to the author of *Vivaraṇa*, only reflection and meditation are used just to turn

the mind inward. In the opinion of *Vāchaspati Miśra*, the author of the *Bhāmati*, the text itself is unable to produce direct realization. Meditation is absolutely necessary to make the mind competent to produce realization. Both of these sub-schools are in direct contradiction to Śankara's dictum; for he wrote :-

४) येषां पुनर्निपुणमतीनां नाङ्गानसंशयविपर्ययलक्षणः
पदार्थविषयः प्रतिबन्धोऽस्ति, ते शक्नुवन्ति सकृदुक्तमेव
तत्त्वमसिवाक्यार्थमनुभवितुमिति तान्प्रत्यावृत्त्यानर्थक्यमिष्टमेव ।
सकृदुक्तमेव ह्यात्मप्रतिपत्तिरविद्यां निवर्तयतीति नात्र कश्चिदपि
क्रमोऽभ्युपगम्यते ॥ (सू. भा. ४-१-२, पा. ४६२)

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

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

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

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

17. But there is a show at least of *manana* (reasoning)

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

The answer is here :-

अस्य तु नैषोऽनुययो द्रग्निव जायते तं प्रत्यनुवर्त्य एवावृत्त्यमुपमदः ।
तत्रापि न तत्त्वमसिवाक्यान्वात्रच्यव्यावृत्तौ प्रवर्तयेत् । न हि कस्यात्मन
कन्यामुद्राहयन्ति । निवृत्तस्य चास्मिन्निवृत्तौऽहं कर्ता मयेदं
कर्तव्यमित्यवश्यं ब्रह्मत्ववाङ्मयीत्युच्यते उत्पद्यते । यस्तु स्वयमेव
मन्दमतिप्रतिबानात्तं वाक्यार्थं जिह्रसेत्तस्यैतस्मिन्नैव वाक्यार्थे स्थिरिकार
जावृत्त्यादिवाचोयुक्त्याऽभ्युपेक्षते ॥ (सू. भा. ४-१-२, पा. ४६३)

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

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

THE CENTRAL TEACHING

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

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

For the present, it will be enough to state that a competent teacher who rests in Brahman (ब्रह्मनिष्ठ) alone could know where to use any of the items of discipline that are proper for disciples and that *nididhyāsana* has a place in *Sravaṇa* or *Manana* also, whether actually expressed by that name or not.

OM TAT SAT

ENGLISH BOOKS

Books Authored by Sri. S.S. Swamiji

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>Name of the Book</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1.	NARADA'S APHORISMS ON BHAKTI (The book will serve as a valuable guide to those who wish to tread the path of Bhakti)	32 P.
2.	MINOR WORKS OF SRI SANKARACHAARYA (Contains 16 most popular minor works of Sankara)	68 P.
3.	SANKAR'S CLARIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN VEDANTIC CONCEPTS (Some more deep seated misconceptions among students and scholars of Vedanta are clarified in this valuable text)	90 P.
4.	HOW TO RECOGNISE METHOD OF VEDANTA (Introduction to Sanskrit Text, "Vedanta Prakriya Pratyabijna of Vedantic thought upto the time of Sarvajnatna Muni)	120 P.
5.	AVASTHATRAYA OR THE UNIQUE METHOD OF VEDANTA (Method of three states of Consciousness, which our real Self transcends. A valuable introduction to the study of Vedanta as a pure philosophy)	16 P.
6.	SALIENT FEATURES OF SANKARA VEDANTA (Presents matter and method of genuine Sankara Vedanta in a small compass)	110 P.
7.	MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT SANKARA VEDANTA (All criticisms on Vedanta are convincingly solved using the genuine traditional methodology of Sankara Vedanta)	120 P.
8.	VISION OF ATMAN (The different aspects of three means of intuitive knowledge, to wit, Savana, Manana and Nididhyasana are explained)	120 P.
9.	INTUITION OF REALITY (The Vedantic Knowledge is not mere subtle intellectualism but is intuition of Reality, arising through Divine Grace)	105 P.
10.	UPANISHADIC APPROACH TO REALITY (The Unique Method of teaching Vedanta adopted by Sri Gaudapada, Sankara & Sureśvara)	50 P.
11.	THE SCIENCE OF BEING (This is in your hand) (Deals with Chapter VI of Chandogya Upanishads. Presents in a nut-shell the true nature of the Science of Being)	108 P.

- 12. ESSAYS ON VEDANTA** **167 P.**
(Contains essential tenets of the Upanishads and the method of approach adopted in them)
- 13. SUDDA-SAANKARAA-PRAKRIYA-BHAASKARA** **200 P.**
(Sheds Light on the Vedantic Method according to Sankara determining the real doctrine of Upanishads)
- 14. SANKARA'S SUTRA BHASHYA** **125 P.**
(Illustrates to an earnest seeker of Truth how Sankara Bhashyas are self-explanatory, and do not require guidance of commentators)
- 15. INTRODUCTION TO VEDANTA TEXTS** **226 P.**
(Compilation of Introductions from English & Sanskrit works of S. S. Swamiji)
- 16. ISAVASYOPANISHAD (Sankara Bhashya)** **66 P.**
- 17. VEDANTA OR THE SCIENCE OF REALITY** **560 P.**
(Book Written by Sri K.A. Krishnaswamy Iyer)
(Deals with the immediate realisation of Brahman by intuitive reflection on the witness of the three states of consciousness)

BOOKS AUTHORED BY SRI D. B. GANGOLLI

(SATCHIDANANDA VAKJYOTHI SERIES 18 to 25)

- 18. THE RELEVANCE OF VEDANTA IN THIS MODERN AGE OF CIVILIZATION** **40 p.**
(Translation of "Vedantavuu Adhunikā Jivanavuu")
- 19. A BROAD OUTLINE OF VEDANTA** **24 P.**
(Translation of "Sankara Mahaa Manana")
- 20. REALITY BEYOND ALL EMPIRICAL DEALINGS** **40 P.**
(Translation of "Sarva Vyavaharateetavada Paramartha")
- 21. DELIBERATION ON THE ULTIMATE REALITY** **84 P.**
(Translation of "Anubhava Paryantavada Atma Vichara")
- 22. BRAHMAVIDYA OR KNOWLEDGE OF THE ULTIMATE REALITY** **52 P.**
(Translation of "Brahama Vidya")
- 23. THE QUINTESENCE OF PRISTINE PURE VEDANTA** **42 P.**
(Translation of "Parishuddha Vedanta Sara")
- 24. THE PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCE OF VEDANTA** **44 P.**
(Translation of Adhyatma Vidye")
- 25. VEDANTA : THE ONLY CONSUMMATE SPIRITUAL SCIENCE** (Translation of "Paripurna Darshana") **44 P.**

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

About Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ABOUT SWAMIJI



Shri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji
(1880 -1975 A.D.) the founder of Adhyatma
Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarsipur, Hassan Dist.,

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

Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya
Holenarsipur - 573 211, India.