

Bhāshya Vākyas (भाष्यवाक्यानि) of
Dakṣiṇabhārata Śāṅkara Vedānta Vidvadgoṣṭhi
by Swāmiji Shri Swami Prakashanandendra Saraswati et. al.
with additional comments by
Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Mahaswami

Compiled and edited by Brahmachari Sutejas (Hishiryo)

January 2023, v.1.0

info@adishankaracharya.net

Dedicated to Adi Shankaracharya Bhagavatpada

Preface

Like the "*Supplement to the English translation of The Essential Adi Shankara*" ¹, this selection of भाष्यवाक्यानि appearing in the Appendix of *Dakṣiṇa Bhārata Śāṅkara Vedānta Vidvadgoṣṭhi* ² should serve as a suitable reference for more in-depth studies. To emphasize specific issues, clear statements by **Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Mahaswami** have been included.

1. Available for download at

https://adishankaracharya.net/Supplement_to_the_Essential_Adi_Shankara_Final.pdf

2. Available for download at <https://adhyatmaprakasha.org>

TOPICS

Adhyāropāpavādaprakriyā	4
Paramārthadṛṣṭivavahāradṛṣṭi Bhedaḥ	7
Vidyāvidyayoḥ	9
Prātibhāsikavastuvicāraḥ	13
Māyāsvarūpam	14
Śāstraprāmāṇyam	18
Anubhavasvarūpavicāraḥ	22
Anvayavyatirekalakṣaṇam – Tarkasvarūpam	23
Suṣuptātmavicāraḥ	28
Avasthātrayaparakriyā (adhyāropāpavādakrameṇa)	33
Kāryakāraṇaparakriyā (adhyāropāpavādakrameṇa)	37
Pañcakośaparakriyā (adhyāropāpavādakrameṇa)	41
Draṣṭṛdṛśyavicāraḥ	43
Śravaṇamanananididhyāsana	45
Mokṣasvarūpam	49

Abbreviations

Adhy. Bh.	Brahma-Sūtra Adhyāsa Bhāṣya
Ait.Up.	Aitareya Upaniṣad
BG.	Bhagavad Gītā
Bh.	Bhāṣyam
BGh.	Bhagavad Gītā Bhāṣyam
BSBh. Adhyasa Bhashya	Adhyāsa Bhāṣya
BSBh.	Brahma-Sūtra Bhāṣyam
BrS.	Brahma-Sūtra
Br.Up.	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad
Br.Up.SSSS	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Comm. and Transl. by Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Mahaswami
Ch.Up.	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
Gītā	Bhagavad Gītā
Isa. (Is.Up.)	Īsopaniṣad
Kath.Up.	Kaṭhcopaniṣad
Kena.Up.	Kenopaniṣad
Kaus.Up.	Kauṣītakopaniṣad
Manu. Smṛ.	Manusmṛti
Ma.Up.	Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad
Ma.Up.Ka.	Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad Kārikā
Mund.Up.	Muṇḍakopaniṣad
M.V.	The Method of the Vedanta by A.J. Alston
Pra.Up.	Praśnopaniṣad
SSSS	Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Mahaswami
Sve.Up.	Śvetāśvataropaniṣad
Tai.Up.	Taittirīya Upaniṣad
Up.	Upaniṣad
Upod.	Upōdghāta (Introduction)

Adhyāropāpavādaprakriyā

यदेतद् द्वैतस्य मिथ्यात्वं बोध्यते ज्ञानबाध्यत्वं च, तदपि द्वैतस्य न ब्रह्मव्यतिरेकेण वस्त्वन्तरत्वमङ्गीकृत्य, किं तु वस्तुतः परमार्थानन्यत्वमभिप्रेत्यैव ।
अतः सत्यानृतमिथुनीकरणमध्यासः, तन्निमित्तश्च सर्वो व्यवहारः इति वाचोयुक्त्या तथ्यत एवाध्यासः कृतोऽस्तीति, ज्ञानेन वस्तुत एवापबाध्याभवेदिति वा न भ्रमितव्यम् ।
अध्यारोपापवादयोरप्यध्यासभूमावेव लब्धप्राणत्वात् । तस्मात्, परमार्थदृष्ट्या नाद्वैतिनो जगन्मिथ्यात्ववादित्वेन व्यवहार्याः, किं त्वात्मैकत्ववादित्वेनेत्यवधेयं ।
न हि जातु मिथ्याविकल्पस्य प्रतीतिकाले सत्त्वं बाधकाले तु निवृत्तिरिति युज्यते । अतो यथा रज्ज्वादिकं स्वरूपेण स्थितमेव सर्पादिबुद्ध्या विकल्प्यते,
एवं एकरूपेण स्वरूपेणावस्थितमेव ब्रह्म जगज्जीवादिरूपेण विकल्प्यत इत्येव सिद्धान्तः ।
(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 116 and Vedāntaparakriyāpratyabhijñā, p. 234)

It is that duality is false and subject to cancellation through knowledge (jñānabādhyatvaṃ). But it should be clearly understood that duality is not accepted as any second real thing standing over against the Absolute, but rather as something ultimately non-different from it. From a phrase like 'Superimposition is a synthesis of the real with the false, and all practical experience is based on it' one should not draw the wrong conclusion that superimposition is ever really performed or that it really exists and has to be cancelled by knowledge. **For false attribution and subsequent negation, themselves have significance only within the realm of Ignorance** (adhyāropāpavādayorapyadhyāsabhūmāveva). For this reason, from the standpoint of the highest truth, Advaitins should not be considered and spoken of as people who proclaim the falsity of the world (paramārthadr̥ṣṭyā nādvaitino jaganmithyātvaavaditvena vyavahāryāḥ). They should be considered, rather, as people who proclaim the sole existence and (undifferentiated) reality of the Self. A false notion cannot be real while it lasts and then undergo obliteration at the time of correction. We find in the world that a rope, for example, will remain exactly what it is, even if it be falsely imagined as a snake or the like. And in the same way, the Absolute remains what it is, even when it is falsely imagined as the world and the soul and so forth. This is the finally accepted truth.

दर्शयति च श्रुतिः पररूपप्रतिषेधेनैव ब्रह्म – निर्विशेषत्वात् – 'अथात आदेशो नेति नेतिऽ (बृ. उ. २ । ३ । ६) 'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधिऽ (के. उ. १ । ४) 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सहऽ (तै. उ. २ । ४ । १) इत्येवमाद्या । बाष्कलिना च बाध्वः पृष्टः सन् अवचनेनैव ब्रह्म प्रोवाचेति श्रूयते – 'स होवाचाधीहि भो इति स तूष्णीं बभूव तं ह द्वितीये तृतीये वा वचन उवाच ब्रूमः खलु त्वं तु न विजानासि । उपशान्तोऽयमात्माऽ इति । तथा स्मृतिष्वपि परप्रतिषेधेनैवोपदिश्यते – 'जेयं

यत्तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि यज्जात्वामृतमश्नुते । अनादिमत्परं ब्रह्म न सत्तन्नासदुच्यतेऽ (भ. गी. १३ । १२)
इत्येवमाद्यासु । तथा विश्वरूपधरो नारायणो नारदमुवाचेति स्मर्यते – ‘माया ह्येषा मया सृष्टा यन्मां
पश्यसि नारद ।s (म. भा. १२ । ३२६ । ४३) ‘सर्वभूतगुणैर्युक्तं नैवं मां ज्ञातुमर्हसिs (म. भा. १२ । ३२६
। ४३) इति । [BSBh. 3.2.17]

That Brahman is without any difference is proved by those scriptural passages also which expressly deny that it possesses any other characteristics; so, e.g. 'Next follows the teaching by not this, not this' (Br.Up. 2.3.6); 'It is different from the known, it is also above the unknown' (Kena. Up. 1.4); 'From whence all speech, with the mind, turns away unable to reach it' (Tai.Up. 2.9). Of a similar purport is that scriptural passage which relates how Bāhva, being questioned about Brahman by Vaṣkalin, explained it to him by silence, 'He said to him, "Learn Brahman, O friend," and became silent. Then, on a second and third question, he replied, "I am teaching you indeed, but you do not understand. Silent is that Self."' The same teaching is conveyed by those Smṛtitexts which deny of Brahman all other characteristics; so, e.g. 'I will proclaim that which is the object of knowledge, knowing which one reaches immortality; the highest Brahman without either beginning or end, which cannot be said either to be or not to be' (Gītā 13.12). Smṛti also says, how, Nārāyaṇa assuming the cosmic form of the universe, spoke to Nārada – “Oh Nārada, when you see me as one endowed with the attributes of all beings, it is only an illusion of my own creation. But you should not understand me to be really so”.

अथवा ‘नेति नेतिs (बृ. उ. २ । ३ । ६) इति वीप्सा इयम् – ‘इतिs इति यावत्किञ्चित् उत्प्रेक्ष्यते, तत्सर्वं न भवतीत्यर्थः – परिगणितप्रतिषेधे हि क्रियमाणे, यदि नैतद्ब्रह्म, किमन्यद्ब्रह्म भवेदिति जिज्ञासा स्यात् ; वीप्सायां तु सत्यां समस्तस्य विषयजातस्य प्रतिषेधात् अविषयः प्रत्यगात्मा ब्रह्मेति, जिज्ञासा निवर्तते । तस्मात् प्रपञ्चमेव ब्रह्मणि कल्पितं प्रतिषेधति, परिशिनिष्टि ब्रह्म – इति निर्णयः [BSBh. 3.2.22]

Or again the meaning is, that in as much as “not this, not that”, is tautologous [a repetition], everything whatsoever that is thought of (as existent), does not exist in the real sense. Were the repudiation to be limited to a definite number of phenomenal entities [just corporeal and incorporeal], one would be curious to know, as to what other phenomenal entity, possibly, could be Brahman, if these phenomenal entities are not Brahman. The tautologous statement being there, and as all objects as such, are repudiated by it, it becomes established that Brahman is not of the nature of a phenomenal object, but that it is the Universal Self, and thus in this manner curiosity is satisfied. The conclusion therefore is that the passage “not this, not that” denies the truth of all phenomenal entities superimposed on Brahman (brahmaṇi kalpitam), and Brahman alone is left over (remains).

वेदा अवेदाः (ब्र.उप्. ४.३.२२) इति वचनात् इष्यत एव अस्माभिः श्रुतेरप्यभावः प्रबोधे [BSBh. 4.1.3] Go on to say in the end, that “The Vedas cease to be the Vedas” (Br.Up. 4.3.22), and thus after the realization (of Brahman) we do welcome, even the Vedas ceasing to be the Vedas.

उपाधिकृतं मिथ्यारूपमपि अस्तित्वाधिगमाय ज्ञेयधर्मवत् परिकल्प्य उच्यते ‘सर्वतःपाणिपादम्s इत्यादि . तथा हि सम्प्रदायविदां वचनम् – ‘अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यतेs (?) इति [BGh. 13.13]

Although the unreal form is caused by the limiting adjuncts, still, for the comprehension of its existence it is said, ‘(It) has hands and feet everywhere’, etc., by assuming this as a quality of the Knowable. Thus, as is well known, there is a saying of the people versed in tradition, ‘The Transcendental is described with the help of superimposition (adhyāropa) and its refutation (apavāda)’ [1].

SSSS note: [1] It is not known where this quote is from. Since it is a quote of those who know the tradition [sampradAya], it might be a statement of Dravidācārya. Acharya has quoted it here without giving its source (name).

अपवादो नाम – यत्र कस्मिंश्चिद्वस्तुनि पूर्वनिविष्टायां मिथ्याबुद्धौ निश्चितायाम् , पश्चादुपजायमाना यथार्था बुद्धिः पूर्वनिविष्टाया मिथ्याबुद्धेः निवर्तिका भवति – यथा देहेन्द्रियसङ्घाते आत्मबुद्धिः, आत्मन्येव आत्मबुद्ध्या पश्चाद्भाविन्या ‘तत्त्वमसिs (छा. उ. ६ । ८ । ७) इत्यनया यथार्थबुद्ध्या निवर्त्यते . यथा वा दिग्भ्रान्तिबुद्धिः दिग्गयाथात्म्यबुद्ध्या निवर्त्यते – [BSBh. 3.3.9]

Apavāda, (apavādo nāma) occurs, where, regarding an entity, a false notion (of its being some other entity) having already been definitely and successfully superimposed on it, a correct knowledge of it (that it is the self-same entity), which arises later on, negatives (i.e., ablates) the earlier false notion superimposed on it. For instance, the idea of Selfhood persisting with regard to the assemblage of body and senses is driven away by the subsequent true idea (i.e., knowledge) of Selfhood with regard to the Self (Atman) Itself springing up from the (instruction), "That thou art" (Ch.Up. 6.8.7); or a confusion about directions is removed by the true idea (i.e., knowledge) of directions.

अध्यारोपितनामरूपकर्मद्वारेण ब्रह्म निर्दिश्यते ‘विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्मs (बृ. उ. ३ । ९ । २८) ‘विज्ञानघन एव ब्रह्मात्माs (बृ. उ. २ । ४ । १२) इत्येवमादिशब्दैः | [Br.Up 2.3.6 Bh.]

Brahman is described by means of name, form and action superimposed on It, in such terms as, ‘Knowledge, Bliss, Brahman’ (Br.Up. 3.9.28), and ‘Pure Intelligence’ (Br.Up. 2.4.12), ‘Brahman,’ and ‘Atman.’

Paramārthadr̥ṣṭivavyavahāradr̥ṣṭi Bhedaḥ

शास्त्रदृष्टिः आर्षदर्शनम्, पारमार्थिकदृष्टिश्चेति पर्यायाः . लौकिकदृष्टिः, स्वाभाविकदृष्टिः, व्यावहारिकदृष्टिः इति च | शास्त्रदृष्टिश्चेयं परमार्थतत्त्वदर्शनलक्षणा सती तत्त्वदर्शिन आचार्यस्यापि भवतीति आचार्यदृष्टिः इत्यपि व्यपदेशमर्हति |

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 120 and Vedāntapraṅkriyāpratyabhijñā, p. 237)

The terms 'Vedic standpoint' (śāstradr̥ṣṭi), 'standpoint of the Rsis' (ārṣadarśanam) and 'standpoint of the final truth' (pāramārthikadr̥ṣṭi) are used as synonyms, as also are 'worldly standpoint' (laukikadr̥ṣṭi), 'natural standpoint' (svābhāvikadr̥ṣṭi) and 'standpoint of empirical experience (vyāvahārikadr̥ṣṭi). And the Vedic standpoint, in which the final truth is seen, is that of the Acarya (i.e., Adi Shankara) who has seen that truth, and may also be called the 'Acarya's standpoint' (ācāryadr̥ṣṭi).

अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते; पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते | [BSBh. 2.1.27]

Brahman appears to become susceptible of (i.e. appears to be the basis of) all empirical behaviour by way of modifications etc. By reason of the distinctions of aspects or forms characterized by names and forms imagined through ignorance, which are at once both evolved and unevolved, and about whom it is not possible to predicate that they either are or are not Brahman, while in its truest nature Brahman subsists only in its unmodified aspect and is beyond all empirical behaviour.

सर्ववादिभिरविद्याकृतव्यवहाराभ्युपगमात् परमार्थानभ्युपगमाच्च [Ma.Up.Ka. 3.5. Bh.]

For all the disputants admit the relative experience to be caused by Avidya and deny its existence from the standpoint of the Supreme Reality.

तदर्थं सुखदुःखादिविक्रियावति सत्त्वे भोक्तृत्वमध्यारोपयति । इदं हि कर्तृत्वं भोक्तृत्वं च सत्त्वक्षेत्रजयोरितरेतरस्वभावविवेककृतं कल्प्यते । परमार्थतस्तु नान्यतरस्यापि सम्भवति, अचेतनत्वात्सत्त्वस्य, अविक्रियत्वाच्च क्षेत्रजस्य । अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितस्वभावत्वाच्च सत्त्वस्य सुतरां न सम्भवति । तथा च श्रुतिः – 'यत्र वा अन्यदिव स्यात्तत्रान्योऽन्यत्पश्येत्' (बृ. उ. ४ । ५ । १५) इत्यादिना स्वप्नदृष्टहस्त्यादिव्यवहारवदविद्याविषय एव कर्तृत्वादिव्यवहारं दर्शयति [BSBh. 1.2.12]

And it is with that purpose that the attribute of being an experiencer is superimposed on 'Sattva' which is affected with such notions, as that of pleasure etc. It is thought that the attributes of being an experiencer and an agent, are the

result of the failure to discriminate properly between the respective natures of 'Sattva' and 'Kṣetrajña', while in the ultimate true sense, it is not at all possible in the case of either, inasmuch as the 'Sattva' is non-sentient and the 'Kṣetrajña' (cognizer in the body) is not liable to modifications. It is even less possible in the case of 'Sattva' whose nature is brought about by ignorance. Even so, says the Scriptural passage – "Where things, as it were, appear to be different, there, it is possible for one to see another" –

Which shows that all this behaviour as an agent etc., is quite as much the result of ignorance as is the behaviour of an elephant as seen in a dream.

तस्मात्प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताप्रतिबोधादुपपन्नः सर्वो लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः [BSBh. 2.1.14]

Therefore, prior to the realization of Brahman as the Self of all, all worldly and religious (vedic) dealings based on the Scriptures, are reasonably sustainable valid.

स च स्वात्मभूतानेव घटाकाशस्थानीयान् अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपकृतकार्यकरणसङ्घातानुरोधिना जीवाख्यान् विज्ञानात्मनः प्रतीष्टे व्यवहारविषये . तदेवमविद्यात्मकोपाधिपरिच्छेदापेक्षमेवेश्वरस्येश्वरत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वशक्तित्वं च, न परमार्थतो विद्यया अपास्तसर्वोपाधिस्वरूपे आत्मनि ईशित्रीशितव्यसर्वज्ञत्वादिव्यवहार उपपद्यते [BSBh. 2.1.14]

And within the domain of empirical existence, He (i.e., the Lord) rules it over the selves which identify themselves with the (individual) intellects and are called creatures, and which though identical with Himself, conform, like the spaces in pots etc., to the assemblages of bodies and senses created by name and form that are called up by ignorance. Thus Lord's rulership, omniscience, and omnipotence are contingent on the limiting adjuncts conjured up by ignorance, but not so in reality can such terms

as "the ruler", "the ruled", "omniscience", etc., be used with regard to the Self shining in Its own nature after the removal of all limiting adjuncts through illumination.

यदा तु परमार्थदृष्ट्या परमात्मतत्त्वात् श्रुत्यनुसारिभिः अन्यत्वेन निरूप्यमाणे नामरूपे मृदादिविकारवत् वस्त्वन्तरे तत्त्वतो न स्तः – सलिलफेनघटादिविकारवदेव . तदा तत् अपेक्ष्य 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छा. उ. ६ । २ । १) 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' (बृ. उ. ४ । ४ । १९) इत्यादिपरमार्थदर्शनगोचरत्वं प्रतिपद्यते . यदा तु स्वाभाविक्याविद्यया ब्रह्मस्वरूपं रज्जुशुक्तिकागगनस्वरूपवदेव स्वेन रूपेण वर्तमानं केनचिदस्पृष्टस्वभावमपि सत् नामरूपकृतकार्यकरणोपाधिभ्यो विवेकेन नावधार्यते, नामरूपोपाधिदृष्टिरेव च भवति स्वाभाविकी, तदा सर्वोऽयं वस्त्वन्तरास्तित्वव्यवहारः [Br.Up. 3.5.1 Bh.]

But when name and form are tested from the standpoint of the highest truth in the light of the above Śruti texts, as to whether they are different from the Supreme Self or not, they cease to be separate entities, like the foam of water, or like the

modifications (of clay) such as a jar. It is then that such passages as, 'One only without a second,' and 'There is no difference whatsoever in It,' have scope from the standpoint of the Supreme Self as referring to the highest realisation.

But, when, owing to natural ignorance, the nature of Brahman, although existing in Its own form, not being contacted by anything whatsoever, like a real rope, a mother-of-pearl, and the sky, is not vividly thought of as different from the limiting adjuncts such as the body and senses, which are but the creation of name and form, and when one's natural conception of these as name and form remains, then all this becomes operative around existence of things different from Brahman.

विज्ञानं चेतनम् ; अविज्ञानं तद्रहितमचेतनं पाषाणादि . सत्यं च व्यवहारविषयम् , अधिकारात् ; न परमार्थसत्यम् ; एकमेव हि परमार्थसत्यं ब्रह्म . इह पुनः व्यवहारविषयमापेक्षिकं सत्यम् , मृगतृष्णिकाद्यनृतापेक्षया उदकादि सत्यमुच्यते [Tai.Up. 2.6 Bh.]

Vijñanam is sentient, and avijñanam is devoid of that (sentience), insentient stone etc. It follows from the context that satyam is truth falling within the range of the empirical, and not absolute truth (na paramārthasatyam). For the absolute truth is only one, which is Brahman. But here the relative truth, as found in the empirical world, is referred to; as for instance, water is said to be true in comparison with the water in a mirage which is false.

Vidyāvidyayoh

अस्ति कश्चिदध्यारोपो यः सर्वेषामध्यारोपाणां मूलहेतुः । यस्मिन् सत्येवेतरा भ्रान्तयो आत्मानं लभ्यन्ते, अनर्थहेतवश्च भवन्ति स्वस्वजीवितकाले । अत एव तम् अविद्याशब्देन विशिषन्ति वेदान्ताः तद्वाधनेन तत्त्वस्वरूपनिर्धारणं ज्ञानं च विद्याशब्देन ।

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 45 and

Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā, p. 183)

There is one false attribution (asti kaścid-adhyāropaḥ) that is the root cause of all others (sarveṣām-adhyāropāṇām). It is due to its presence that the other erroneous ideas come into being and work mischief during the time or their existence. So, the Upanishads (vedāntāḥ) single out this error and call it metaphysical Ignorance (avidyā). And the knowledge whereby one establishes the true nature at metaphysical reality through negating that error is called enlightenment (vidyā).

अत एव चास्य मूलाध्यारोपस्य न सति काले आदिरन्तो वा शक्यकल्पनः ,

कालस्याप्यध्यारोपपुरःसरमेवात्मलाभादिति, अनादिरनन्तश्चायमित्यभियुक्ताः संव्यवहरन्ति । सर्वोऽपि विद्याविद्याव्यवहारोऽयमविद्याभूमावेवेति प्रागावेदितम्, तन्न प्रस्मर्तव्यम् ।

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 112 and Vedāntaparakriyāpratyabhijñā, p. 232)

One cannot conceive this root-superimposition (mūlādhyāropasya) of the not-self onto the Self as having either a beginning or an end in time. For time itself only comes into existence with this superimposition. And the authorities speak of it as beginningless and endless (M.V.46,12). And it must not be forgotten that we have already shown that the whole notion of Ignorance and enlightenment itself belongs to the realm of Ignorance (sarvaḥ-api vidyā-avidyā-vyavahāraḥ-ayam-avidyā-bhūmau).

तामसो हि प्रत्ययः, आवरणात्मकत्वात् अविद्या विपरीतग्राहकः, संशयोपस्थापको वा, अग्रहणात्मको वा ; विवेकप्रकाशभावे तदभावात् , तामसे च आवरणात्मके तिमिरादिदोषे सति अग्रहणादेः अविद्यात्रयस्य उपलब्धेः [BGh. 13.2]

As partaking of the nature of a obstruction, avidya whether causing perception of what is quite the contrary of truth, or causing doubt, or causing non-perception of a truth is a Tamasic notion, i e., a notion born of Tamas; for, on the dawn of the light of discrimination, it disappears; and (for instance) we find the same three modes of avidya such as non-perception, etc., arising also from timira, which is Tamasic, as partaking of the nature of a obstruction.

तथाप्यन्योन्यस्मिन्नन्योन्यात्मकतामन्योन्यधर्माश्चाध्यस्येतराविवेकेन अत्यन्तविविक्तयोर्धर्मधर्मिणोः मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य 'अहमिदम्' 'ममेदम्' इति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः [Adhy. Bh.]

Still, on account of the superimposition upon each the inherent nature and attributes of the other, owing to wrong knowledge (i.e., ignorance) about the entities and their attributes which are ever absolutely distinct, by mixing the Real and the Unreal, man naturally assumes the attitude, 'This am I', 'This is mine', in his dealings.

तमेतमेवलक्षणम् अध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते. तद्विवेकेन च वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्यामाहुः [Adhy. Bh.]

Learned (wise) men regard this superimposition as avidya (ignorance), and the ascertainment through discrimination of the true nature of a thing, they say, is vidya (knowledge).

तमेतमविद्याख्यम् आत्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्ष पराणि [Adhy. Bh.]

This mutual superimposition of the not-Self and the Self that is called avidya is the basis on which rest all the practical (empirical) distinctions between means of knowledge and objects of knowledge, all conventional and scriptural activities, and

all the scriptures consisting of injunctions and prohibitions, showing the path to liberation.

एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः [Adhy. Bh.]

Such is this superimposition which is without beginning and end, natural, delusive and productive of the notion of agency and enjoyership (in the individual self) and which is experienced by all.

विद्योत्पत्तौ तदाश्रयेऽविद्यानुपपत्तेः . न हि अग्निरुष्णः प्रकाशश्च इति विज्ञानोत्पत्तौ यस्मिन्नाश्रये तदुत्पन्नम् , तस्मिन्नेवाश्रये शीतोऽग्निरप्रकाशो वा इत्यविद्याया उत्पत्तिः . नापि संशयः अज्ञानं वा [Isha. 18. Bh.]

For when vidya (knowledge) arises, avidya (karma) vanishes, since in the person in whom there is knowledge, avidya (karma) cannot remain. When the knowledge that the fire is hot and bright dawns in a person, never indeed will exist in that very person the misapprehension, doubt, or ignorance that the fire is cold and nonilluminating.

यदि ज्ञानाभावः, यदि संशयज्ञानम् , यदि विपरीतज्ञानं वा उच्यते अज्ञानमिति, सर्वं हि तत् ज्ञानेनैव निवर्त्यते ; न तु कर्मणा अन्यतमेनापि विरोधाभावात् [Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.]

If the absence (or lack) of knowledge, or knowledge not free from doubt or false notion, is spoken of by the term ignorance, all this is indeed removed by knowledge, but not by action, for the latter is not opposed to ignorance.

क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोः विषयविषयिणोः भिन्नस्वभावयोः इतरेतरतद्धर्माध्यासलक्षणः संयोगः
क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञस्वरूपविवेकाभावनिबन्धनः, रज्जुशुक्तिकादीनां तद्विवेकज्ञानाभावात्
अध्यारोपितसर्परजतादिसंयोगवत् [BGh. 13.26]

The union between the kshetra, the object, and the Kshetrajna, the subject, which are of different nature, is one of mutual adhyasa (superimposition) between the attributes of one and the other. Due to absence of discrimination between the nature of the kshetra and the Kshetrajna, both these are confused, even as a snake and silver are superimposed on a rope and a pearl-oyster respectively in the absence (lack) of discriminative knowledge about these two.

सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्यात्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य मायाशक्तिः प्रकृतिरिति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलष्येते [BSBh. 2.1.14]

It is declared by both the Scriptures and the Smṛtis, that names and forms which are imagined through ignorance and which are as it were the Self of the

Omniscient Lord, and about which it is impossible to say, either that they are one with Brahman or that they are different from it, and which are the seeds of this entire expanse of transmigratory existence, are called as the power, called Maya of Omniscient Lord, or as prakrti.

प्रतिषिद्धसर्वविशेषस्यापि ब्रह्मणः सर्वशक्तियोगः सम्भवतीति
एतदप्यविद्याकल्पितरूपभेदोपन्यासेनोक्तमेव [BSBh. 2.1.31]

That it is possible, that Brahman, with regard to which all special attributes are denied, may yet possibly possess all powers when it is borne in mind that it has already been stated that even though all specific attributes are denied in the case of Brahman, still when it is assumed that it has different forms or natures imagined through ignorance (avidyā), it becomes possible that it can have a connection with all powers.

विद्याविद्ययोः तद्धर्मत्वमिति चेत् न ; प्रत्यक्षत्वात् . विवेकाविवेकौ रूपादिवत् प्रत्यक्षावुपलभ्येते
अन्तःकरणस्थौ . न हि रूपस्य प्रत्यक्षस्य सतो द्रष्टृधर्मत्वम् .
अविद्या च स्वानुभवेन रूप्यते मूढोऽहम् अविविक्तं मम विज्ञानम् इति . तथा विद्याविवेको अनुभूयते .
उपदिशन्ति च अन्येभ्य आत्मनो विद्यां बुधाः . तथा च अन्ये अवधारयन्ति . तस्मात् नामरूपपक्षस्यैव
विद्याविद्ये नामरूपे च ; न आत्मधर्मो, 'नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्म' (छा. उ. ८ . १४ . १)
इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् . ते च पुनर्नामरूपे सवितर्यहोरात्रे इव कल्पिते ; न परमार्थतो विद्यमाने [Tai.Up.
2.8.5 Bh.]

Objection: Knowledge and ignorance are qualities of the Self.

Answer: No so, for they are perceived. Discrimination (i.e., knowledge) and nondiscrimination (i.e. ignorance) are directly perceived, like colour etc., as existing in the mind. Not that colour, perceived as an object, can be an attribute of the perceiver. And ignorance is ascertained by such forms of its perception as, 'I am ignorant', 'My knowledge is indistinct'. Similarly, the distinction of knowledge (from the Self) is perceived, and the enlightened people communicate the knowledge of the Self to others; and so, too, do others grasp it. Accordingly, knowledge and ignorance are to be ranked with name and form; and name and form are not attributes of the Self, in accordance with another Vedic text, '(That which is indeed called Space) is the manifester of name and form. That in which they two exist is Brahman' (Ch.Up. 8.14.1). And those name and form are imagined existing in Brahman like night and day in the sun, though in reality they are not there.

यथा लोके द्रष्टुश्चक्षुष आलोकेन संयोगो यत्कालः, तत्काल एव रूपाभिव्यक्तिः, एवमात्मविषयं विज्ञानं
यत्कालम्, तत्काल एव तद्विषयाज्ञानतिरोभावः स्यात् [Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.]

Just as in common parlance, when the eye of the on-looker comes in contact with light the form becomes manifested, so also, when the knowledge of the Self is acquired, at that very time, there will be the disappearance of the ignorance about It.

अत इदम् अविद्यायाः सतत्त्वमुक्तं भवति – सर्वात्मानं सन्तम् असर्वात्मत्वेन ग्राहयति, आत्मनः अन्यत् वस्त्वन्तरम् अविद्यमानं प्रत्युपस्थापयति, आत्मानम् असर्वमापादयति [Br.Up. 4.3.20 Bh.]

Hence the nature of ignorance is shown to be this, that the Purusha inspite of being one with all, regards itself as not being one with all, owing to ignorance which presents objects, other than the Self, that are non-existent, and makes the Self something that does not identify itself with all.

तस्मात् आद्यः अन्त्यः सन्ततः असन्ततश्चेत्यचोद्यमेतत्, अविद्यादिदोषनिवृत्तिफलावसानत्वाद्विद्यायाः - य एव अविद्यादिदोषनिवृत्तिफलकृत्प्रत्ययः आद्यः अन्त्यः सन्ततः असन्ततो वा, स एव विद्येत्यभ्युपगमात् न चोद्यस्यावतारगन्धोऽप्यस्ति [Br.Up. 1.4.10]

Therefore, the question does not arise whether it is the first or the last, continuous or interrupted, for knowledge, as its result, finds culmination in the cessation of the evils such as ignorance. That itself is knowledge which the consciousness brings about as the result viz. the cessation of evils such as ignorance, whether first or last, continuous or interrupted. Hence there is no scope whatsoever for any objection.

विद्यायां हि सत्याम् उदिते सवितरि शार्वरमिव तमः प्रणाशमुपगच्छति अविद्या [BGh. 2.69]
for at the dawn of knowledge, ignorance, like darkness of the night at daybreak, disappears.

न हि क्वचित्साक्षाद्वस्तुधर्मस्यापोद्गी दृष्टा कर्त्री वा ब्रह्मविद्या, अविद्यायास्तु सर्वत्रैव निवर्तिका दृश्यते; तथा इहाप्यब्रह्मत्वमसर्वत्वं चाविद्याकृतमेव निवर्त्यतां ब्रह्मविद्यया; न तु पारमार्थिकं वस्तु कर्तुं निवर्तयितुं वा अर्हति ब्रह्मविद्या [Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.]

This knowledge has never been observed either directly to remove some characteristic of a thing or to create one. But everywhere it is seen to remove ignorance. Similarly here also let the idea of not being Brahman and not being all that is due to ignorance, be removed by the knowledge of Brahman, but it cannot either create or remove a real thing.

Prātibhāsikavastuvicārah

प्रत्येत्येव हि केवलं रजतमिति, न तु तत्र रजतमस्ति - [BSBh. 4.1.5]

A man merely perceives it as silver, when actually no silver is there.

आह – कोऽयमध्यासो नामेति. उच्यते – स्मृतिरूपः परत्र पूर्वदृष्टावभासः. तं केचिद्,
'अन्यत्रान्यधर्माध्यासः' इति वदन्ति. केचित्तु, 'यत्र यदध्यासः, तद्विवेकाग्रहनिबन्धनो भ्रमः' इति. अन्ये
तु. 'यत्र यदध्यासः, तस्यैव विपरीतधर्मत्वकल्पनाम् आचक्षते'. सर्वथापि तु अन्यस्यान्यधर्मावभासतां न
व्यभिचरति. तथा च लोकेऽनुभवः – शुकितका हि रजतवद् अवभासते, एकश्चन्द्रः सद्वितीयवदिति
[Adhy. Bh.]

What indeed then, is this superimposition any way?

Reply: Like memory it is just a reflection elsewhere of something seen earlier.

Some say that is the superimposition of the attribute of one thing on another. But some others say that it is the delusion (bhramah) arising from the lack of understanding of the difference between that on which the superimposition takes place and that which is superimposed. Yet some others hold that it is the ascription to a thing of attributes which by nature are contrary to that thing. All these statements make no departure from the assumption that there can be the semblance of one thing in something else (sarvathāpi tu anyasyānyadharmāvabhāsatām na vyabhicarati). In agreement with this we observe in common parlance that the mother-of-pearl appears as silver, and one moon appears as double.

Māyāsvarūpam

अविद्यात्मिका हि सा बीजशक्तिरव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासुषुप्तिः, यस्यां
स्वरूपप्रतिबोधरहिताः शेरते संसारिणो जीवाः । तदेतदव्यक्तं क्वचिदाकाशशब्दनिर्दिष्टम् – 'एतस्मिन्नु
खल्वक्षरे गार्ग्याकाश ओतश्च प्रोतश्च' (बृ. उ. ३ । ८ । ११) इति श्रुतेः ; क्वचिदक्षरशब्दोदितम् –
'अक्षरात्परतः परः' (मु. उ. २ । १ । २) इति श्रुतेः ; क्वचिन्मायेति सूचितम् – 'मायां तु प्रकृतिं
विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्' (श्वे. उ. ४ । १०) इति मन्त्रवर्णात् ; अव्यक्ता हि सा माया,
तत्त्वान्यत्वनिरूपणस्याशक्यत्वात् [BSBh. 1.4.3]

This potential power of the seed is of the nature of ignorance, and it is indicated by the word 'undeveloped' (Avyakta), and has the Highest Lord as its basis, and is of the nature of an illusion (Māyā) and is the great sleep. In which the transmigratory Jīva-Selfs unaware of their own true nature (Rūpa) continue to slumber on. This same 'undeveloped' (Avyakta) is occasionally indicated by the word Ākāśa, as in the Scriptural passage – "Verily, Oh Gārgi, in this, the imperishable one, is the Ākāśa woven weft-and-warp-wise" (Br.Up. 3.8.11). Occasionally it is expressed by the word 'Akṣara', as in the Scriptural passage "Higher than the high Imperishable" (Mund.Up.

2.1.2), and occasionally it is suggested to be the Māyā (shakti) thus – “You should know the Prakṛti to be but Māyā, and the Highest Lord as the master-illusionist” (Sve.Up. 4.10). It is this Māyā that is this ‘undeveloped’ (Avyakta), because it is not possible to predicate about it, that it either is different from it (i.e. Brahman) or not different from it.

अविद्यात्मकनामरूपबीजव्याकरणापेक्षत्वात्सर्वज्ञत्वस्य. तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः सम्भूतः (तै. उ. २ । १ । १) इत्यादिवाक्येभ्यः
 नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वरूपात्सर्वज्ञात्सर्वशक्तेरीश्वराज्जगज्जनिस्थितिप्रलयाः, चेतनात्प्रधानादन्यस्माद्वा – इत्येषोऽर्थः प्रतिज्ञातः – ‘ जन्माद्यस्य यतः (ब्र. सू. १ । १ । २) इति ; सा प्रतिज्ञा तदवस्थैव, न तद्विरुद्धोऽर्थः पुनरिहोच्यते . कथं नोच्यते, अत्यन्तमात्मन एकत्वमद्वितीयत्वं च ब्रुवता ? शृणु यथा नोच्यते – सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्यात्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य मायाशक्तिः प्रकृतिरिति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलप्येते . ताभ्यामन्यः सर्वज्ञ ईश्वरः, ‘आकाशो वै नाम नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्म (छा. उ. ८ । १४ । १) इति श्रुतेः, ‘नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि (छा. उ. ६ । ३ । २) ‘सर्वाणि रूपाणि विचित्य धीरो नामानि कृत्वाभिवदन्यदास्ते (तै. आ. ३ । १२ । ७) ‘ एकं बीजं बहुधा यः करोति (श्वे. उ. ६ । १२) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यश्च

[BSBh. 2.1.14]

The omniscience (of Brahma as the Lord) depends upon the evolving of the seed of the nature of names and forms which are the result of ignorance, and on the scriptural passage "The Akasha was born of this very Self" (Tai.Up. 2.1), and that the origin, preservation and resorption of the world proceed from the Lord who is of an eternally pure, wise, and free nature, and neither from the nonsentient Pradhana nor from any other things, is what is declared (by the Sutrakara) by the Sutra "From whom is the origin etc. of this world" (BrS. 1. 1. 2). That declaration still holds the ground as before, and nothing contrary to that is here suggested.

Opponent: How can you say that you do not say so (i.e. you do not contradict the declaration) when you talk of the Self's eternal oneness and nonduality?

Reply: Listen, how we do not say so. It is declared by both the Scriptures and the Smṛtis, that names and forms [1] which are imagined through ignorance, and which are as it were the Self of the Omniscient Lord, and about which it is impossible to say, either that they are one with Brahman or that they are different from it [2] (see also BSBh. 1.1.5), and which are the seeds of this entire expanse of transmigratory existence, are called as the power, called Maya of Omniscient Lord, or as prakṛti.

That the omniscient Lord is different from them is indicated by the Scriptural passage "The Akasha is the revealer of the names and forms, and that in which they are contained, is Brahma" (Ch.Up. 8.14.1), and also according to the Scriptural

passages "May I evolve names and forms" (Chan.Up. 6.3.2); "Having created all beings and given them names, the Lord keeps on voicing them" (Sve.Up. 6.12).

Notes:

1. avyākṛte nāmarūpe as seed, vyākṛte nāmarūpe as apparent (manifested) world.
2. Regarding 'tattvānyatvābhām anirvacanīya'

अत्र नामरूपयोस्तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयत्वमुक्तं व्यवहारे यथाप्रतिभासमानमायिकशरीरमपेक्ष्य ।
परमार्थतस्तु तयोरात्मत्वमेवेति प्रागुक्तम् (३५), तन्न प्रस्मर्तव्यम् ।

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 108 and
Vedāntapraṅkriyāpratyabhijñā, p. 229)

It is from the empirical standpoint that name and form are spoken of as indeterminate either as the real principle or as anything different (nāmarūpayostattvānyatvābhāmanirvacanīyatvamuktaṃ vyavahāre), relative to their illusory form as it appears. But it should not be forgotten that it has already been shown at M. V. 35 that from the standpoint of the highest truth they are the Self.

अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन
ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते; पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण
सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते [BSBh. 2.1.27]

Brahman appears to become susceptible of (i.e. appears to be the basis of) all empirical behaviour by way of modifications etc. By reason of the distinctions of aspects or forms characterized by names and forms imagined through ignorance which are at once both evolved and unevolved, and about whom it is not possible to predicate that they either are or are not Brahman. While in its truest nature Brahman subsists only in its unmodified aspect and is beyond all empirical behaviour.

‘इन्द्रो मायाभिः (बृ. उ. २ . ५ . १९) इत्यभूतार्थप्रतिपादकेन मायाशब्देन व्यपदेशात् . ननु प्रजावचनो
मायाशब्दः . सत्यम् , इन्द्रियप्रजाया अविद्यामयत्वेन मायात्वाभ्युपगमाददोषः . मायाभिः
इन्द्रियप्रजाभिरविद्यारूपाभिरित्यर्थः . ‘अजायमानो बहुधा विजायते (तै. आ. ३ . १३) इति श्रुतेः
[Ma.Up.Ka. 3.24 Bh.]

This is further evidenced by the usage of the word Maya in the sense of unreality in the sruti-passage, “The Lord, owing to Maya, (is seen diversely) (Br. Up. 2.5.19).
Objection: The word Maya indicates knowledge.

Reply: True. Yet it is free from evil, since sensory knowledge is regarded as Maya (i.e. illusory), as is the outcome of ignorance. Mayabhih: through various kinds of sensory knowledge of the nature of ignorance, as declared by the sruti, “Though unborn, It appears as though born in many ways”.

इन्द्रः परमेश्वरः मायाभिः प्रजाभिः नामरूपभूतकृतमिथ्याभिमानैर्वा न तु परमार्थतः, पुरुरूपः बहुरूपः, ईयते गम्यते – एकरूप एव प्रजानघनः सन् अविद्याप्रजाभिः [Br.Up. 2.5.19 Bh.]

The supreme Lord owing to Maya or miscellaneous knowledge or through a false identification created by name, form and elements, is perceived as manifold, on account of the notions superimposed by ignorance, although although He is ever the same Pure Intelligence (Consciousness).

एक एव परमेश्वरः कूटस्थनित्यो विज्ञानधातुरविद्यया, मायया मायाविवत्, अनेकधा विभाव्यते, नान्यो विज्ञानधातुरस्तीति [BSBh. 1.3.19]

The objective is to show that the supreme Lord is but one-immutable, eternal, pure consciousness, but like a juggler He manifests Himself variously through nescience called Maya. Besides this there is no other consciousness.

अस्ति चायमपरो दृष्टान्तः - यथा स्वयं प्रसारितया मायया मायावी त्रिष्वपि कालेषु न संस्पृश्यते, अवस्तुत्वात्, एवं परमात्मापि संसारमायया न संस्पृश्यत इति; यथा च स्वप्नदृगेकः स्वप्नदर्शनमायया न संस्पृश्यते [BSBh. 2.1.9]

There is this other illustration also. Just as an illusionist is never affected during all the three times, by the illusion projected by himself, in as much as it (i.e. the illusion) is insubstantial, even so, the Highest Self is never affected by the illusion of transmigratory existence. Also, just as a person who experiences a dream is never affected by the illusory nature of the dream vision.

माया नाम वस्तु तर्हि . नैवम् , सा च माया न विद्यते . मायेत्यविद्यमानस्याख्येत्यभिप्रायः [Ma.Up.Ka. 4.58 Bh.]

Opponent: Then, is there a thing called Maya?

Reply: Not so. That Maya is non-existent.

The drift is that it (i.e., Maya) is the name of something that does not [really] exist (māyā iti avidyamānasya ākhyā).

मया अध्यक्षेण सर्वतो दृशिमात्रस्वरूपेण अविक्रियात्मना अध्यक्षेण मया, मम माया त्रिगुणात्मिका अविद्यालक्षणा प्रकृतिः सूयते उत्पादयति सचराचरं जगत् [BGh. 9.10]

Maya, under Me as the supervisor, remaining changeless as a mere witness under all circumstances; the Prakrti, My Maya consisting of the three gunas and characterized [1] as ignorance produces the world of the moving (living) and the non-moving (inert) things.

Note:

1. ಅವಿದ್ಯಾಲಕ್ಷಣ - ಭ.ಗೀ. ತಪ್ಪುತಿಳವಳಿಕೆಯಿಂದ, ತೋರುವ ಪ್ರಕೃತಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಾಯೆ: avidyālakṣaṇa: In the Bhagavad Gita, because of misunderstanding it appears as prakṛti or māyā (Pāribhāṣika śabdakośa of SSSS).

Śāstraprāmāṇyam

उक्तमेतद् यथा अविद्यापरपर्यायात्मानात्मेतराध्यास एवात्मनि सकलेतराध्यारोपमूलम् यथा च स एव सर्वप्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारप्रवृत्तिहेतुः, सर्वशास्त्रवृत्तिहेतुश्चेति ।

उक्तं च यथा वेदान्ता अपि प्रमाणव्यवहारगोचरत्वात्, आत्मैकत्वावगतेरूर्ध्वमप्रमाणीभवन्ति । इत्थं च विद्याविद्याव्यवहारोऽप्यविद्याभूमावेव, अविद्याया आत्मनि बन्धकारित्वं विद्यायाश्च तदपहारेण मोक्षकारित्वमित्यप्याविद्यकमेवैत्यप्युक्तमेव भवति ।

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. P. 64 and Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā, p. 197)

It has already been stated (M.V.22) that the mutual superimposition of the not-self onto the Self and the Self onto the not-self, called Ignorance, is the root and origin of all other superimpositions onto the Self. And it has also been explained how the Upanishads, since they fall within the sphere of the play of the empirical means of knowledge, cease to be a means of knowledge after direct insight into the unity and sole reality of the Self has been attained. It has also been explained how the notions of knowledge and Ignorance themselves pertain to the sphere of Ignorance only (vidyāvidyāvyaḥāro'pyavidyābhūmāveva). And it has been explained how the notion that Ignorance causes the Self to undergo bondage and that knowledge removes that bondage and accords release (i.e., liberation), are also notions pertaining solely to the sphere of Ignorance.

अविषयत्वे ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रयोनित्वानुपपत्तिरिति चेत् . न; अविद्याकल्पितभेदनिवृत्तिपरत्वाच्छास्त्रस्य. न हि शास्त्रमिदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपादयिषति . किं तर्हि? प्रत्यगात्मत्वेनाविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदम् अपनयति [BSBh. 1.1.4]

If there is an objection (by the opponent) that in case Brahman is not an object (of sense), the Śāstra could not possibly be its source (as is said in Sūtra 2)

Reply: No, because the Śāstra has concern merely for the removal of difference imagined through ignorance. And it does not purport to propound Brahman as being an object objectively, thus – This is Brahman. What then does it propound? It propounds Brahman as not being an object (of sense), but as being the Universal Self. And thereby removes the distinction between objects to be known, the knower, and the act of knowing etc., as imagined through ignorance.

अपि चान्त्यमिदं प्रमाणमात्मैकत्वस्य प्रतिपादकम् - नातःपरं किञ्चिदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति; यथा हि लोके यजेतेत्युक्ते, किं केन कथम् इत्याकाङ्क्ष्यते; नैवं 'तत्त्वमसि' 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' इत्युक्ते, किञ्चिदन्यदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति - सर्वात्मैकत्वविषयत्वावगतेः; सति ह्यन्यस्मिन्नवशिष्यमाणोऽर्थे आकाङ्क्षा स्यात्; न त्वात्मैकत्वव्यतिरेकेणावशिष्यमाणोऽन्योऽर्थोऽस्ति, य आकाङ्क्ष्येत [BSBh. 2.1.14]

Now what is more is, that this is the final means-of-proof which declares the oneness of Self, and there is nothing further which is desired to be known. Just as in the ordinary world, when an injunction to perform a sacrifice is given, it is necessary to know with what (material) and how one should perform the sacrifice, But when it is said "That thou art" or "I am Brahman" and one understands how the Ātmā i.e. Brahman is the Self of all, there is nothing which need be known beyond that. For it is only when there still remains something which ought to be known, that there can be any further desire to know. And as apart from one's unity with the Self nothing still remains which one would further want to know.

न चेयमवगतिर्नोत्पद्यत इति शक्यं वक्तुम्, 'तद्धास्य विजज्ञौ' (छ.उप्. ६.१६.३) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः [BSBh. 2.1.14]

It is not possible to say that such realization cannot arise, for sruti says – "He (i.e., Śvetaketu) understood that (viz. the oneness of Self) from him (i.e. his father)" (Ch.Up. 6.16.3).

कर्मफले हि स्वर्गादौ अनुभवानारूढे स्याद् आशङ्का भवेद्वा न वेति; अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम् - 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म' (ब्र.उप्. ३.४.१) इति श्रुतेः . 'तत्त्वमसि' (छ.उप्. ६.८.७) इति सिद्धवदुपदेशात् [BSBh. 3.3.32]

The fruits of actions, however, viz. the heaven etc., not being based on experience, a doubt, as to whether they are or are not possible, would be justified. But the fruit of perfect knowledge is based on experience (anubhavārūḍhaṃ tu jñānaphalam). Because the Scriptures declare "That Brahman, which is immediate and is directly experienced" (Br.Up. 3.4.1), and give instruction about it, as being an entity firmly established, thus – "That thou art" (Ch.Up. 6.8.7).

तथाप्यात्मविज्ञानस्य फलपर्यन्तत्वान्न तद्विषयस्य शास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यं शक्यं प्रत्याख्यातुम्. न चानुमानगम्यं शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम् [BSBh. 1.1.4]

Still as the knowledge of the Self results in its own fruit, it would not be possible to question the validity or authoritativeness of the Śāstra dealing with the subject of the Self. It is not that the validity or authoritativeness of this Śāstra is inferable.

प्रमातृत्वं हि आत्मनः निवर्तयति अन्त्यं प्रमाणम् ; निवर्तयदेव च अप्रमाणीभवति, स्वप्नकालप्रमाणमिव प्रबोधे [BGh. 2.69]

The final authority (antyam pramāṇam) denies percipiency (of a "knower", pramāṭṛtvam) to the Atman. With the denial it ceases to be an authority even as the dream ceases to govern (the mind of) the one who is awake.

वेदस्य हि निरपेक्षं स्वार्थं प्रामाण्यम्, रवेरिव रूपविषये [BSBh. 2.1.1]

The authority of the Vedas is direct and independent, with respect to matters which come in their own province, just as that of the Sun in the province of form.

न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम् . किन्तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणम्, अनुभवावसानत्वाद् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य [BSBh. 1.1.2]

It is not that the Scriptures alone are the means of the right knowledge of Brahman, as is the case about the right knowledge of religious duty, but the Scriptures, as also intuitional experience (śrutyādayo'nubhavādayaśca), so far as is possible, constitute the authoritative or valid means of right knowledge. Because the knowledge of Brahman culminates in the realization (Anubhava) of Brahman and has an already existing entity as its object.

रूपाद्यभावाद्धि नायमर्थः प्रत्यक्षस्य गोचरः . लिङ्गाद्यभावाच्च नानुमानादीनाम् [BSBh. 2.1.6]

This entity (Brahman) devoid of any form as it is, is neither perceptible by any direct (ocular) means-of-proof, nor is it perceptible by inference etc., as there is absence of any indicatory mark about it (i.e., Brahman).

तस्मात् 'पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः' (कथ.उप्. १.३.११) 'तं त्वोपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि' (ब्र.उप्. ३.९.२६) इति चौपनिषदत्वविशेषणं पुरुषस्योपनिषत्सु प्राधान्येन प्रकाशयमानत्वे उपपद्यते [BSBh. 1.1.4]

Therefore, the particularization of the Puruṣa as the one belonging to the Upaniṣads, in the passages "There is nothing beyond the Puruṣa, he is the final goal and the transcendental condition" (Kath.Up. 1.3.11). And "I ask you about the Puruṣa mentioned in the Upaniṣads" (Br.Up. 3.9.26) can be proper, only if the Puruṣa is principally the subject illustrated in the Upaniṣads.

न हि आत्मा नाम कस्यचित् अप्रसिद्धो भवति . शास्त्रं तु अन्त्यं प्रमाणम्

अतद्धर्माध्यारोपणमात्रनिवर्तकत्वेन प्रमाणत्वम् आत्मनः प्रतिपद्यते, न तु अज्ञातार्थज्ञापकत्वेन . तथा च श्रुतिः – 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः' (बृ. उ. ३ . ४ . १) इति [BGh. 2.18]

To none at all is the Self altogether unknown (na hi ātmā nāma kasyacid aprasiddhaḥ bhavati). The final means of right cognition, the sastra or scripture, acquires validity as regards the Self by setting aside the non-attributes of the Self superimposed on It, and not by revealing what was altogether unknown. Thus the

sruti declares: "That which is immediately present is Brahman, the Self in all" (Br.Up. 3.4.1).

तस्मात् वेदप्रामाण्यस्याव्यभिचारात् तादर्थ्ये सति वाक्यस्य तथात्वं स्यात् , न तु पुरुषमतिकौशलम् ; न हि पुरुषमतिकौशलात् सविता रूपं न प्रकाशयति ; तथा वेदवाक्यान्यपि न अन्यार्थानि भवन्ति [Br.Up. 3.3.1 Bh.]

Therefore, the authority of the Vedas being inviolable, a Vedic passage must be taken exactly in the sense that it is tested to bear, and not according to the ingenuity of the human mind. The sun does not cease to reveal objects because of the ingenuity of the human mind; similarly, the Vedic passages cannot be made to give up their meaning.

न तथैह परविद्याविषये वाक्यार्थज्ञानसमकाल एव तु पर्यवसितो भवति, केवलशब्दप्रकाशितार्थज्ञानमात्रनिष्ठाव्यतिरिक्ताभावात् [Mund.Up. 1.1.6 Bh.]

Unlike this, nothing remains to be performed here within the domain of the higher knowledge; but all actions cease simultaneously with the comprehension of the meaning of the sentences, inasmuch as nothing remains to be done apart from steadfastness only in the knowledge revealed by the words.

न हि विधिशतेनापि तमःप्रकाशयोरेकत्र सद्भावः शक्यते कर्तुम् . किमुत लिङ्गैः केवलैरिति [Mund.Up. Upod. Bh.]

For not even by a hundred injunctions is it possible to make darkness and light co-exist. What could then be done by mere indications?

न च वचनं वस्तुनः सामर्थ्यजनकम्. ज्ञापकं हि शास्त्रं न कारकमिति स्थितिः [Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.]
A scriptural statement cannot generate any power in a thing. The scripture is informative, not creative. That is the position.

अथवा यथोक्तम् ऋग्वेदादिशास्त्रं योनिः कारणं प्रमाणमस्य ब्रह्मणो यथावत्स्वरूपाधिगमे. शास्त्रादेव प्रमाणात् जगतो जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्माधिगम्यत इत्यभिप्रायः [BSBh. 1.1.3]

Or the Śāstra, R̥g-Veda etc. described above, is the source, the cause, and the authoritative means of the understanding of the right knowledge of Brahman as it is. What is meant to be conveyed is that Brahman which is the cause and origin etc. of this transitory world, is understood from the Śāstra (such as the Scriptures) which is the only means of right knowledge.

न हीदमतिगम्भीरं भावयाथात्म्यं मुक्तिनिबन्धनमागममन्तरेणोत्प्रेक्षितुमपि शक्यम् [BSBh. 2.1.11]

Barring traditional instruction of the Vedas, it is not possible even to indulge in any conjecture about the very deep nature and positive existence of an entity (Brahman) as such, on which final release (i.e., liberation) depends.

तथा प्रतिपुरुषं परिसमाप्तं शास्त्रम् इति न शास्त्रविरोधगन्धोऽपि अस्ति [Br.Up. 5.1.1 Bh.]
Hence, the scriptures having similarly fulfilled their mission with regard to every person, there is not the least chance of a conflict with them.

शब्दमूलं च ब्रह्म शब्दप्रमाणकम्, नेन्द्रियादिप्रमाणकम् [BSBh. 2.1.27]

As Brahman has the scriptures as its basis, and scriptures alone and not the sense-organs are authoritative about it.

Anubhavasvarūpavicārah

न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम् . किन्तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणम्, अनुभवावसानत्वाद् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य .
कर्तव्ये हि विषये नानुभवापेक्षास्तीति श्रुत्यादीनामेव प्रामाण्यं स्यात्, पुरुषाधीनात्मलाभत्वाच्च कर्तव्यस्य [BSBh. 1.1.2]

It is not that the scriptures alone are the means of the right knowledge of Brahman, as is the case about the right knowledge of religious duty. But the Scriptures, as also intuitional experience, so far as is possible, constitute the authoritative or valid means of right knowledge. Because the knowledge of Brahman culminates in the realization (Anubhava) of Brahman and has an already existing entity as its object. In the case of religious action there is no expectation of intuitional experience (Anubhava, i.e., direct experience) and the Scriptures alone are the authoritative means of its right knowledge, and action is dependent upon man for its origination.

अनुभवावसानं च ब्रह्मविज्ञानमविद्याया निवर्तकं मोक्षसाधनं च दृष्टफलतयेष्यते [BSBh. 2.1.4]
Knowledge of Brahman however culminates in experience, and by removing ignorance becomes the means of liberation, and only if it is so understood, can it be said to have a fruit which is visible or tangible.

एष व्यावृत्तसर्वसंसारधर्मकोऽनुभवात्मको ब्रह्मसंज्ञकस्तत्पदार्थो वेदान्ताभियुक्तानां प्रसिद्धः [BSBh. 4.1.2]

The entity 'That' (Tat) called Brahman, which is devoid of all the attributes of a transitory mundane existence, and which is capable of being realized, is well-known to those who are well-versed in Vedānta.

तस्मात् सर्वदुःखविनिर्मुक्तैकचैतन्यात्मकोऽहमित्येष आत्मानुभवः [BSBh. 4.1.2]

Therefore, the realization of the Self, is the realization that 'I am the Self', characterized only by sentiency and freedom from all pain as such.

अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम् - 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्मस (ब्र.उप्. ३.४.१) इति श्रुतेः [BSBh. 3.3.32]

But the fruit of perfect knowledge is based on experience because the scriptures declare "That Brahman, which is immediate and is directly experienced" (Br.Up. 3.4.1).

पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेष्वकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्व स्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वा अहमासम्, नेदानीम्, नापि भविष्यत्काले - इति ब्रह्मविद् अवगच्छति [BSBh. 4.1.13]

The person who has realized Brahman understands, that he himself is Brahman, which has the nature of never being an agent or an experiencer during all the three divisions of time (viz. the past, present or future), contrary to the preconceived (wrong) notion of being such an agent or experiencer. And a person who has realized Brahman knows that he never was such agent or experiencer before, nor is he so at present, nor will he ever be so at some future time.

तस्मात् यदपाये देहे दर्शनं न भवति, यद्भावे च भवति, तत् दर्शनादिक्रियाकर्तृ, न देह इत्यवगम्यते [Br.Up. 4.3.6 Bh.]

Therefore, it is clear that the real agent of seeing (knowing) etc. is not the body, but that whose absence deprives the body of the power of vision, and whose presence gives it that power.

Anvayavyatirekalakṣaṇam – Tarkasvarūpam

स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोरुभयोरितरेतरव्यभिचारादात्मनोऽनन्वागतत्वम् . सम्प्रसादे च प्रपञ्चपरित्यागेन सदात्मना सम्पत्तेर्निष्प्रपञ्चसदात्मत्वम् . प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रभवत्वात्कार्यकारणानन्यत्वन्यायेन ब्रह्माव्यतिरेकः - इत्येवंजातीयकः [BSBh. 2.1.6]

For instance, that as the conditions of dreams and wakefulness mutually differ from each other, the Self is not connected with either of these conditions. And in as much as in the condition of deep sleep, the Jīva-Self gives up its phenomenal existence and becomes one with the Highest Self, its nature is purely that of 'Sat' Self (i.e., Being) and has no phenomenal existence, and as all phenomenal existence originates from Brahman, in accordance with the maxim of the cause and effect not being different from each other, it is not different from Brahman.

यदपि श्रवणव्यतिरेकेण मननं विदधच्छब्द एव तर्कमप्यादत्तव्यं दर्शयतीत्युक्तम् नानेन मिषेण शुष्कतर्कस्यात्रात्मलाभः सम्भवति . श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयते [BSBh. 2.1.6] With regard to the objection, viz. that it has been said that as the sruti enjoin cogitation in addition to the hearing of it, it shows that they welcome reasoning also with due respect,

(Our reply is): Mere empty reasoning cannot justify its own help (to the understanding of Brahman) on some such pretext. It is only such reasoning as is in consonance with the sruti (śrutyānugr̥hīta tarka) [1] that can be resorted to as a subordinate auxiliary to experience (anubhavāṅga).

Note:

[1] In Salient Features of Śaṅkara's Vedānta, SSSS states: 'That's why the reason proposed by śruti, claims superiority over any other ordinary speculative reason. It is based upon universal experience (anubhava) while the other speculations are barren since they have no such support'.

आगममात्रसमधिगम्य एव त्वयमर्थो धर्मवत् [BSBh. 2.1.6]

Like religious duty, it (i.e., Brahman) is understandable from the sruti alone.

सत्सु तु वेदान्तवाक्येषु जगतो जन्मादिकारणवादिषु, तदर्थग्रहणदार्ढ्याय अनुमानमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि प्रमाणं भवत्, न निवार्यते, श्रुत्यैव च सहायत्वेन तर्कस्याभ्युपेतत्वात्. तथा हि – 'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यः (ब्र.उप्. २.४.५) इति श्रुतिः . 'पण्डितो मेधावी गन्धारानेवोपसम्पद्येतैवम् एवेहाचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेदः (छ.उप्. ६.१४.२) इति च पुरुषबुद्धिसाहाय्यम् आत्मनो दर्शयति [BSBh. 1.1.2]

Such Vedānta passages dealing with the cause of the creation etc. of the transitory world being there (for that purpose), Inference also, which is not antagonistic (to such passages) and furnishes a means of right knowledge, for the strengthening of the understanding of the meaning of these passages, is not rejected, because the sruti themselves accept the aid of logic as an auxiliary. For sruti passages such as "The Self is to be heard and cogitated upon" (Br.Up. 2.4.5), and "A learned, and intelligent person does of course reach Gāndhāra, and similarly, a man who has a teacher acquires knowledge (of Brahman)" (Ch.Up. 6.14.2), show that a man's intelligence is helpful to the scriptures.

यस्मान्निरागमाः पुरुषोत्प्रेक्षामात्रनिबन्धनास्तर्का अप्रतिष्ठिता भवन्ति, उत्प्रेक्षाया निरङ्कुशत्वात् ; तथा हि – कैश्चिदभियुक्तैर्यत्नेनोत्प्रेक्षितास्तर्का अभियुक्ततरैरन्यैराभास्यमाना दृश्यन्ते ; तैरप्युत्प्रेक्षिताः सन्तस्ततोऽन्यैराभास्यन्त इति न प्रतिष्ठितत्वं तर्काणां शक्यमाश्रयितुम् , पुरुषमतिवैरूप्यात् । अथ कस्यचित्प्रसिद्धमाहात्म्यस्य कपिलस्य अन्यस्य वा सम्मतस्तर्कः प्रतिष्ठित इत्याश्रीयेत –

एवमप्यप्रतिष्ठितत्वमेव, प्रसिद्धमाहात्म्याभिमतानामपि तीर्थकराणां कपिलकणभुक्प्रभृतीनां परस्परविप्रतिपत्तिदर्शनात् । अथोच्येत – अन्यथा वयमनुमास्यामहे, यथा नाप्रतिष्ठादोषो भविष्यति ; न हि प्रतिष्ठितस्तर्क एव नास्तीति शक्यते वक्तुम् ; एतदपि हि तर्काणामप्रतिष्ठितत्वं तर्केणैव प्रतिष्ठाप्यते, केषाञ्चित्तर्काणामप्रतिष्ठितत्वदर्शनेनान्येषामपि तज्जातीयकानां तर्काणामप्रतिष्ठितत्वकल्पनात् ; सर्वतर्काप्रतिष्ठायां च लोकव्यवहारोच्छेदप्रसङ्गः ; अतीतवर्तमानाध्वसाम्येन ह्यनागतेऽप्यध्वनि सुखदुःखप्राप्तिपरिहाराय प्रवर्तमानो लोको दृश्यते ; श्रुत्यर्थविप्रतिपत्तौ चार्थाभासनिराकरणेन सम्यगर्थनिर्धारणं तर्केणैव वाक्यवृत्तिनिरूपणरूपेण क्रियते ; मनुरपि चैवं मन्यते – ‘ प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च शास्त्रं च विविधागमम् । त्रयं सुविदितं कार्यं धर्मशुद्धिमभीप्सताऽ इति ‘ आर्षं धर्मोपदेशं च वेदशास्त्राविरोधिना । यस्तर्केणानुसन्धते स धर्मं वेदनेतरःऽ (मनु. स्मृ. १२ । १०५,१०६) इति च ब्रुवन् । अयमेव च तर्कस्यालङ्कारः – यदप्रतिष्ठितत्वं नाम ; एवं हि सावद्यतर्कपरित्यागेन निरवद्यस्तर्कः प्रतिपत्तव्यो भवति ; न हि पूर्वजो मूढ आसीदित्यात्मनापि मूढेन भवितव्यमिति किञ्चिदस्ति प्रमाणम् । तस्मान्न तर्काप्रतिष्ठानं दोष इति चेत् – एवमप्यविमोक्षप्रसङ्गः ; यद्यपि क्वचिद्विषये तर्कस्य प्रतिष्ठितत्वमुपलक्ष्यते, तथापि प्रकृते तावद्विषये प्रसज्यत एवाप्रतिष्ठितत्वदोषादनिर्माक्षस्तर्कस्य ; न हीदमतिगम्भीरं भावयाथात्म्यं मुक्तिनिबन्धनमागममन्तरेणोत्प्रेक्षितुमपि शक्यम् [BSBh. 2.1.11]

Because, reasonings, which are not derived from Scriptural traditions and which depend solely on the conjectures of man, happen to be inconclusive, in as much as such conjectures are unfettered. Reasonings or deductions made by some highly competent persons with great effort, are seen to be demonstrated as fallacious by more competent persons, and those made by these latter ones, are also in their turn demonstrated to be equally fallacious by some other persons And hence as men's understanding differs, it is not possible to accept that reasonings have sure basis and that they are conclusive. Even if one were to rely on reasoning, acceptable to men of well-known intellectual eminence such as Kapila and others, as having a sure basis and as being conclusive, even so, inconclusiveness would be there all the same, because it is seen that Tīrtha-karas such as Kapila and Kaṇāda whose intellectual eminence is well-known are seen mutually to differ from each other.

Objection: We would infer in such other way as would not cause the fault of inconclusiveness, because it cannot possibly be said that there never can be any reasoning which is conclusive,

Reply: We say that you cannot say so because even this inconclusiveness of reasoning is itself established by reasoning alone, viz. by conjecturing, that because some reasonings are seen to be inconclusive, other reasonings of a similar nature also are inconclusive. Besides, if all reasoning were to be inconclusive, there would result the predicament of the destruction of all worldly transactions. It is seen that people in general are impelled towards activity in their future course, either for acquiring happiness or avoiding pain, by its similarity to the past or the present

course. When there is contradiction in scriptural passages, it is only by means of reasoning, which explains the general force or import of sentences, and by refuting their wrong and apparent meaning, that the correct ascertainment of their meaning is accomplished (śrutyarthavipratipattau cārthābhāsanirākaraṇena samyagarthanirdhāraṇaṃ tarkeṇaiva vākyavṛttinirūpaṇarūpeṇa kriyate). Manu also thinks similarly when he says thus:

“Those who desire the purity of Dharma, have to know well the triad of direct perception, inference and Śāstra based on different traditional knowledges of various sorts” (Manu. Smṛ. 12. 105),

and “He alone and none other really knows Dharma, who combines the instructions about religious duties by sages, with reasoning which is not opposed to the Vedic Śāstra” (Manu. Smṛ. 12. 106).

That reasoning is by nature inconclusive, is indeed in itself something which constitutes its glory or ornament (alaṅkāra).

It is exactly because it is so, that faulty reasoning is rejected, and faultless reasoning has to be arrived at. There is no justification for a person to be an ignoramus because his ancestor happened to be so.

Objection: Hence, if it be said that, that reasoning is without a firm basis and is inconclusive, is no fault

Reply: That way also in the case of reasoning there would still be the predicament of the absence of escape from fault just the same. Even though with regard to some particular subject, reasoning is seen to have a firm basis i.e. it is conclusive, still so far as the present subject is concerned, the objection that reasoning cannot escape the fault of having no firm basis and being inconclusive, does apply all the same. Barring traditional instruction of the Vedas, it is not possible even to indulge in any conjecture about the very deep nature and positive existence of an entity (Brahman) as such, on which liberation depends.

श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयते [BSBh. 2.1.6]

It is only such reasoning as is in consonance with the Scriptures that can be resorted to as a subordinate auxiliary to experience.

अपि च सम्यग्ज्ञानान्मोक्ष इति सर्वेषां मोक्षवादिनामभ्युपगमः ; तच्च सम्यग्ज्ञानमेकरूपम् , वस्तुतन्त्रत्वात् ; एकरूपेण ह्यवस्थितो योऽर्थः स परमार्थः ; लोके तद्विषयं ज्ञानं सम्यग्ज्ञानमित्युच्यते – यथाग्निरुष्ण इति ; तत्रैवं सति सम्यग्ज्ञाने पुरुषाणां विप्रतिपत्तिरनुपपन्ना ; तर्कज्ञानानां त्वन्योन्यविरोधात्प्रसिद्धा विप्रतिपत्तिः ; यद्धि केनचित्तार्किकेणोदमेव सम्यग्ज्ञानमिति प्रतिष्ठापितम् , तदपरेण व्युत्थाप्यते ; तेनापि प्रतिष्ठापितं ततोऽपरेण व्युत्थाप्यत इति च प्रसिद्धं लोके ; कथमेकरूपानवस्थितविषयं तर्कप्रभवं सम्यग्ज्ञानं भवेत् ; न च प्रधानवादी तर्कविदामुत्तम इति

सर्वैस्तार्किकैः परिगृहीतः, येन तदीयं मतं सम्यग्ज्ञानमिति प्रतिपद्येमहि ; न च शक्यन्तेऽतीतानागतवर्तमानास्तार्किका एकस्मिन्देशे काले च समाहर्तुम् , येन तन्मतिरेकरूपैकार्थविषया सम्यग्मतिरिति स्यात् ; वेदस्य तु नित्यत्वे विज्ञानोत्पत्तिहेतुत्वे च सति व्यवस्थितार्थविषयत्वोपपत्तेः, तज्जनितस्य ज्ञानस्य सम्यक्त्वमतीतानागतवर्तमानैः सर्वैरपि तार्किकैरपहनोतुमशक्यम् [BSBh.

2.1.11]

Besides all those who believe in liberation, understand, that perfect knowledge (of Brahman) results in liberation. That perfect knowledge, which is dependent on the thing-in-itself (for its validity), is of a uniform nature. That entity which exists uniformly is the highest entity. In the ordinary world, knowledge about it is understood to be perfect knowledge, as for instance the knowledge that 'fire is hot'. It being so, it would not be reasonably sustainable to understand that men can have differences about perfect knowledge. Mutual differences amongst men, about knowledges as a result of reasoning, are notorious. That, whatever is expounded by one logician as perfect knowledge, is upset by another, and that established by him, is upset by yet a third, is well-known in the ordinary world. How ever, then, can knowledge arrived at by reasoning, which is not of one settled aspect, be correct knowledge? It is not as if a follower of the doctrine of the Pradhāna is accepted by all logicians as the best amongst the professors of logic. So that we can understand that, that which is understood by him to be correct knowledge, is in fact so. It is not possible to get together all the past, present and future logicians at one time and in one place, so that the uniform nature of their knowledge about an entity, could be correct knowledge. The Scriptures (sruti) on the other hand being eternal (vedasya tu nityatve) and being the cause of the attainment of knowledge, it would be reasonably sustainable to understand them to have the ability to possess well-established knowledge of an entity, so that, it is not possible for the whole lot of past and future logicians to deny the correctness of the knowledge arising from them (i.e., sruti).

एतेन सर्वाणि तर्कस्मरणानि प्रतिवक्तव्यानि; तान्यपि तर्कोपपत्तिभ्यां तत्त्वज्ञानायोपकुर्वन्तीति चेत्, उपकुर्वन्तु नाम; तत्त्वज्ञानं तु वेदान्तवाक्येभ्य एव भवति [BSBh. 2.1.3]

By this (refutation), all smṛtis based on reasoning should be refuted. If it be said that they also are helpful for the attainment of knowledge, by means of inferences by reasoning, well may they indeed be so helpful, but the knowledge of truth can only be attained by scriptural passages (tattvajñānaṃ tu vedānta-vākyaebhyaḥ eva bhavati).

अतोऽनन्यप्रोक्त आत्मन्युत्पन्ना येयमागमप्रभवा मतिः, नैषा तर्केण स्वबुद्ध्यभ्यूहमात्रेण आपनेया नापनीया न प्रापणीयेत्यर्थः ; नापनेतव्या वा ; नोपहन्तव्या . तार्किको ह्यनागमज्ञः स्वबुद्धिपरिकल्पितं

यत्किञ्चिदेव कल्पयति . अत एव च येयमागमप्रभूता मतिः अन्येनैव आगमाभिज्ञेनाचार्येणैव तार्किकात् , प्रोक्ता सती सुज्ञानाय भवति हे प्रेष्ठ प्रियतम [Kath.Up. 1.2.9 Bh.]

The knowledge of the Self described by the scriptures and imparted by a teacher who has identified himself with the Self cannot be attained through argumentation, i.e. through mere conjecture of one's own intellect. Or (if the word aapaneya is read as apaneya, it would mean) -- cannot be destroyed by argumentation for a logician who is not versed in the scriptures will speak only what is contrived by his own intellect. Therefore, O dearest one, this wisdom arising from the scriptures, only if taught by a person other than a logician, i.e., by a teacher who is conversant with the scriptures, constitutes the right knowledge.

न हि मनोविकल्पनाया रज्जुसर्पादिलक्षणाया रज्ज्वां प्रलय उत्पत्तिर्वा ; न च मनसि रज्जुसर्पस्योत्पत्तिः प्रलयो वा, न चोभयतो वा . तथा मानसत्वाविशेषाद्द्वैतस्य . न हि नियते मनसि सुषुप्ते वा द्वैतं गृह्यते [Ma.Up.Ka. 2.32 Bh.]

For such a mental illusion as the fancying of a rope for a snake does not either originate from or merge in the rope. Nor does the rope-snake originate in the mind and merge there, nor does it do so from both (the rope and the mind). Thus duality being nondifferent from mental (subjective) imagination (cannot have a beginning or an end). For, duality is not perceived when one's mental activities are controlled or in deep sleep.

Suṣuptātmavicārah

सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीव एकतां गच्छति; परस्माच्च ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायत इति वेदान्तमर्यादा [BSBh. 1.4.18]

During the period of deep-sleep, moreover, the Jīva-Self becomes one with the Highest Brahman. All Vedāntas (i.e. sruti) culminate in inculcating that all this transitory world of Prāṇa etc. originates from the Highest Brahman.

यथा हि सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादावपि सत्यां स्वाभाविक्यामविभागप्राप्तौ . मिथ्याज्ञानस्यानपोदितत्वात्पूर्ववत्पुनः प्रबोधे विभागो भवति [BSBh. 2.1.9]

Just as during deep-sleep and samadhi, even though there naturally is a complete oneness (of the Jīva-Self and the Highest Self), wrong knowledge (ignorance) not yet having been eradicated, differentiation (as it was before deep-sleep or samadhi) is re-established on the waking up (of the Jīva).

मनःप्रचारोपाधिविशेषसम्बन्धादिन्द्रियार्थान्गृहणंस्तद्विशेषापन्नो जीवो जागर्ति . तद्वासनाविशिष्टः स्वप्नान्पश्यन्मनःशब्दवाच्यो भवति . स उपाधिद्वयोपरमे सुषुप्तावस्थायामुपाधिकृतविशेषाभावात् स्वात्मनि प्रलीन इवेति 'स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति' (छ.उप्. ६.८.१) इत्युच्यते [BSBh. 1.1.9]

When the Jīva-Self, on account of contact with the peculiar adjuncts of the nature of the operation of the mind or intelligence, perceives sense-objects, as one who has (for the time being) attained that particular condition, he is said to be awake. When he (the Self) coloured with the impression sees dreams, he is then indicated by the word mind or intelligence. And when limiting adjuncts of both these sorts have ceased to operate, then in the condition of deep sleep, because of the absence of any special condition caused by the limiting adjuncts, He is as it were absorbed into himself, and it is then said of him – “He is absorbed in his own self” (Ch.Up. 6.8.1).

अपि च न कदाचिज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सम्पत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात् . स्वप्नजागरितयोः तूपाधिसम्पर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य . तदुपशमात्सुषुप्तेः स्वरूपापत्तिर्विवक्ष्यते - 'स्वमपीतो भवति' इति [BSBh. 3.2.7]

Besides, it is not, that the Jīva-Self is ever not one with Brahman, because its own real nature is imperishable. It is with reference to the Self's having, as it were, acquired a foreign nature as a result of its contact with limiting adjuncts during the conditions of dreams and wakefulness that it is said, that, when during deep sleep, these limiting adjuncts are relaxed, it acquires its own true nature.

इदानीं योऽसौ सर्वात्मभावो मोक्षः विद्याफलं क्रियाकारकफलशून्यम् , स प्रत्यक्षतो निर्दिश्यते, यत्र अविद्याकामकर्माणि न सन्ति [Br.Up. 4.3.21 Bh.]

Now liberation in the form of identity with all, which is the result, devoid of action with its factors and results, of knowledge, and in which there is no ignorance, desire, or work, is being directly pointed out.

तत्र च सर्वात्मभावः स्वभावोऽस्य, एवम् अविद्याकामकर्मादिसर्वसंसारधर्मसम्बन्धातीतं रूपमस्य, साक्षात् सुषुप्ते गृह्यते – इत्येतद्विज्ञापितम् [Br.Up. 4.3.34 Bh.]

It has also been stated that identity with all, which is its nature— its transcendent form, in which it is free from all such relative attributes as ignorance, desire and work— is directly experienced in the state of deep-sleep.

सुषुप्ते पुनः सम्प्रसन्नः असङ्गो भवतीति असङ्गतापि दृश्यते [Br.Up. 4.3.19 Bh.]

and in the state of deep-sleep it is perfectly serene and unattached, this nonattachment being the additional feature [is seen].

तत्र चैतन्यज्योतिःस्वभावत्वे कस्मादिह न जानातीति यदप्राक्षीः, तत्र अयं हेतुः मयोक्तः एकत्वम् , यथा स्त्रीपुंसयोः सम्परिष्वक्तयोः । तत्र अर्थात् नानात्वं विशेषविज्ञानहेतुरित्युक्तं भवति ; नानात्वे च कारणम् – आत्मनो वस्त्वन्तरस्य प्रत्युपस्थापिका अविद्येत्युक्तम् [Br.Up. 4.3.21 Bh.]

You asked me why, in spite of its being the light that is Pure Intelligence, the self fails to know in the state of deep sleep. I have told you the reason– it is unity, as of a couple fully embracing each other. Incidentally it is implied that variety is the cause of particular consciousness; and the cause of that variety is, as we have said, ignorance, which brings forward something other than the self.

सः यद्यात्मा अत्र अविनष्टः स्वेनैव रूपेण वर्तते, कस्मात् अयम् – अहमस्मीत्यात्मानं वा, बहिर्वा – इमानि भूतानीति, जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोरिव, न जानाति – इत्यत्र उच्यते . शृणु अत्र अज्ञानहेतुम् ; एकत्वमेव अज्ञानहेतुः [Br.Up. 4.3.21 Bh.]

(Now an objection is being raised:) If the self remains intact in its own form in the state of deep sleep, why does it not know itself as ‘I am this,’ or know all those things that are outside, as it does in the waking and dream states? The answer is being given: Listen why it does not know. Unity is the reason.

तत्रापि द्वारमात्रं नाड्यः पुरीतच्च, ब्रह्मैव तु एकम् अनपायि सुषुप्तिस्थानम् [BSBh. 3.2.7]
Wherein the Nāḍīs and the Purītat are but merely the entrances, and Brahman alone is the place of deep sleep.

Supplement on “Waking up”:

सदेव तु उपाधिसम्पर्काज्जीव इत्युपचर्यते इत्यसकृत्प्रपञ्चितम् ; एवं सति यावदेकोपाधिगता बन्धानुवृत्तिः, तावदेकजीवव्यवहारः ; उपाध्यन्तरगतायां तु बन्धानुवृत्तौ जीवान्तरव्यवहारः ; स एवायमुपाधिः स्वापप्रबोधयोः बीजाङ्कुरन्यायेन – इत्यतः स एव जीवः प्रतिबुध्यत इति युक्तम् [BSBh. 3.2.9]

Brahman (i.e. Sat) itself is on account of its connection with limiting adjuncts metaphorically called individual soul. Hence the phenomenal existence of one soul lasts as long as it continues to be bound by one set of adjuncts, and the phenomenal existence of another soul again lasts as long as it continues to be bound by another set of adjuncts. Each set of adjuncts continues through the states of (deep) sleep (and dream) as well as of waking (svāpa-prabodhayoḥ); in the former it is like a seed, in the latter like the fully developed plant. Hence the proper inference is that the same soul awakes from (deep) sleep.

धर्माधर्मयोरपि हि कारयितृत्वेन ईश्वरो हेतुः व्यपदिश्यते, फलस्य च दातृत्वेन – ‘एष ह्येव साधु कर्म कारयति तं यमेभ्यो लोकेभ्य उन्निनीषते । एष उ एवासाधु कर्म कारयति तं यमधो निनीषतेऽ इति ;

स्मर्यते च अयमर्थो भगवद्गीतासु – ‘यो यो यां यां तनुं भक्तः श्रद्धयार्चितुमिच्छति । तस्य तस्याचलां श्रद्धां तामेव विदधाम्यहम् ॥९ (भ. गी. ७ । २१) ‘स तथा श्रद्धया युक्तस्तस्याराधनमीहते । लभते च ततः कामान् मयैव विहितान्हितान् (भ. गी. ७ । २२) इति । सर्ववेदान्तेषु च ईश्वरहेतुका एव सृष्टयो व्यपदिश्यन्ते ; तदेव च ईश्वरस्य फलहेतुत्वम् , यत् स्वकर्मानुरूपाः प्रजाः सृजति ।

विचित्रकार्यानुपपत्त्यादयोऽपि दोषाः कृतप्रयत्नापेक्षत्वादीश्वरस्य न प्रसज्यन्ते [BSBh. 3.2.41]

For the Lord is presented as the cause both by way of making others act virtuously or viciously and of bestowing the results (phalasya ca dātṛtvena), in the text, "It is He Himself who makes him do a good deed whom He wishes to raise up from these worlds; and it is He Himself who makes him do a bad deed whom He wishes to throw down" (KausUp. III. 8). This fact is mentioned in the Gita as well, "Whichever divine form a devotee wants to worship with faith, I ordain for him unswerving faith in that very form. Endowed with that faith, he continues in the worship of that form, and obtains from it the results he desires, as ordained by Me" (Gita. VII. 21-22) Besides all Vedānta texts declare, that all this creation is brought about by the Lord. That the Lord is the giver of the fruits of action. And the Lord's bestowing of results consists (precisely) in His creating the creatures according to individual merits (svakarmānurūpāḥ, own's actions). The defects of the impossibility of the emergence of variegated results from the very same cause, and so on, do not arise since the Lord acts (as if) by taking into account the efforts made by the creatures.

यस्मात् च एवम् आत्मनः सद्रूपताम् अज्ञात्वा एव सत् संपद्यन्ते, अतः - ते इह लोके यत्कर्मनिमित्तां यां यां जातिं प्रतिपन्नाः आसुः व्याघ्रादीनाम् - ‘व्याघ्रः अहं’ ‘सिंहः अहम्’ इत्येवम्, ते तत्कर्मज्ञानवासनाअङ्किताः सन्तः सत्प्रविष्टाः अपि तद्भावेन एव पुनः आभवन्ति, पुनः सतः आगत्य व्याघ्रः वा सिंहः वा वृकः वा वराहः वा कीटः वा पतङ्गः वा दंशः वा मशकः वा यद्यत् पूर्वम् इह लोके भवन्ति, बभूवुः इत्यर्थः, तद् एव पुनः आगत्य भवन्ति. युगसहस्रकोट्यन्तरिता अपि संसारिणः जन्तोः या पुरा भाविता वासना, सा न नश्यति इत्यर्थः. "यथाप्रज्ञं हि सम्भवाः" (ऐत्.अर्.२.३.२) इति

श्रुत्यन्तरात्

[Ch.Up. 6.9.3 Bh.]

Inasmuch as, without knowing (ajñātvā) the nature as Sat, one becomes absorbed into Sat. Therefore, in the world on account of the karma (karmanimittāṃ) they are born as any of the species like tiger and the rest. Furthermore, they are stamped by the impressions that "I am a tiger", "I am a lion" resulting from (corresponding) karma and knowledge (karmajñāna vāsana). Even though they enter into Sat (everyday), they remain the same (as before). The meaning is, having returned from Sat they become what they were before in this world - a tiger, lion, wolf, boar, worm, moth, fly or mosquito. The tendencies developed by the creatures [that are in the transmigratory process, do not perish even after a lapse of millions of years, as

evidenced by another sruti-text,'They take birth in conformity with their mental impressions.'

‘योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते शरीरत्वाय देहिनः । स्थाणुमन्येऽनुसंयन्ति यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम्ऽ (क. उ. २ । २ । ७) इत्यादिसंसारव्यपदेशात् ; अन्यथा हि सर्वः प्रायणसमय एव उपाधिप्रत्यस्तमयादत्यन्तं ब्रह्म सम्पद्येत, तत्र विधिशास्त्रमनर्थकं स्यात् , विद्याशास्त्रं च ; मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तश्च बन्धो न सम्यग्ज्ञानादृते विसंसितुमर्हति ; तस्मात् तत्प्रकृतित्वेऽपि सुषुप्तिप्रलयवत् बीजभावावशेषैव एषा सत्सम्पत्तिरिति [BSBh. 4.2.8]

Because, the following Scriptural passage, viz. “Some enter into the species (Yoni) of beings which have a body, for the purpose of acquiring such a body, and others acquire existence as inanimate (‘stationary’) things, according to what their actions are, and what they know” (Kath.Up. 2.2.7), indicates such transmigratory existence (in the case of the ignorant), because otherwise, every one would attain absolute Brahman by the mere extinction of all limiting adjuncts, just at the moment of death. In that case both the Śāstra which gives injunctions, as also the Śāstra of correct i.e. perfect knowledge, would be rendered meaningless. Bondage, of which wrong knowledge (i.e. ignorance) is the cause, does not deserve to be dissolved, except through correct i.e. perfect knowledge. Therefore, even though it (i.e. Brahman) is the cause (of everything), this merging into Sat (i.e. Brahman) is – as in the case of deep sleep and the great absorption (Pralaya) only in such a way that they (i.e. the Jīva etc.) still continue to exist in a seed form.

धर्माधर्मावपेक्षत इति वदामः ; अतः सृज्यमानप्राणिधर्माधर्मापेक्षा विषमा सृष्टिरिति नायमीश्वरस्यापराधः ; ईश्वरस्तु पर्जन्यवद्वृष्टव्यः – यथा हि पर्जन्यो व्रीहियवादिसृष्टौ साधारणं कारणं भवति, व्रीहियवादिवैषम्ये तु तत्तद्बीजगतान्येवासाधारणानि सामर्थ्यानि कारणानि भवन्ति, एवमीश्वरो देवमनुष्यादिसृष्टौ साधारणं कारणं भवति, देवमनुष्यादिवैषम्ये तु तत्तज्जीवगतान्येवासाधारणानि कर्माणि कारणानि भवन्ति ; एवमीश्वरः सापेक्षत्वान्न वैषम्यनैर्घृण्याभ्यां दुष्यति . कथं पुनरवगम्यते सापेक्ष ईश्वरो नीचमध्यमोत्तमं संसारं निर्मिमीत इति ? तथा हि दर्शयति श्रुतिः – ‘ एष ह्येव साधु कर्म कारयति तं यमेभ्यो लोकेभ्य उन्निनीषत एष उ एवासाधु कर्म कारयति तं यमधो निनीषतेऽ (कौ. ब्रा. ३ । ८) इति, ‘ पुण्यो वै पुण्येन कर्मणा भवति पापः पापेनऽ (बृ. उ. ३ । २ । १३) इति च ; स्मृतिरपि प्राणिकर्मविशेषापेक्षमेवेश्वरस्यानुग्रहीतृत्वं निग्रहीतृत्वं च दर्शयति – ‘ ये यथा मां प्रपद्यन्ते तांस्तथैव भजाम्यहम्ऽ (भ. गी. ४ । ११) इत्येवंजातीयका

[BSBh. 2.1.34]

We say that these are merit and demerit. No fault attaches to the Lord, since this unequal creation is brought about in conformity with the virtues and vices of the creatures that are about to be born. Rather, the Lord is to be compared to rain. Just as rainfall is a common cause for the growth of paddy, barley, etc., the special reasons for the differences of paddy, barley, etc., being the individual potentiality of

the respective seeds, similarly the Lord is the common cause for the birth of gods, men, and others, while the individual fruits of works associated with the individual creatures are the uncommon causes for the creation of the differences among the gods, men, and others. And in this way, the Lord, because of this regard (for men's merits and demerits) is not vitiated by (such faults as of) discrimination and cruelty. And if we are asked how we come to know that the Lord, in creating this world with its various conditions, is bound by regards, we reply that Scripture declares that; compare, for instance, the two following passages, 'For he (the Lord) makes him, whom he wishes to lead up from these worlds, do a good deed; and the same makes him, whom he wishes to lead down from these worlds, do a bad deed' (Kaus. Up. III, 8); and, 'A man becomes good by good work, bad by bad work' (Br.Up. 3.2.13). Smṛti passages also declare the favour of the Lord and its opposite to depend on the different quality of the works of living beings; so, for instance, 'I serve men in the way in which they approach me' (Gīta. 4.11).

Avasthātrayaparakriyā (adhyāropāpavādakrameṇa)

ज्ञाने च लौकिकादिविषये ज्ञेये च लौकिकादौ त्रिविधे, पूर्वं लौकिकं स्थूलम् ; तदभावेन पश्चाच्छुद्धं लौकिकम् , तदभावेन लोकोत्तरमित्येवं क्रमेण स्थानत्रयाभावेन परमार्थसत्ये तुर्ये अद्वये अजे अभये विदिते, स्वयमेव आत्मस्वरूपमेव सर्वज्ञता सर्वशचासौ जश्च सर्वज्ञः, तदभावः सर्वज्ञता इह अस्मिन् लोके भवति महाधियः महाबुद्धेः [Ma.Up.Ka. 4.89 Bh.]

On acquiring knowledge of the ordinary etc. and on knowing the three kinds of objects in succession – i.e. at first the gross ordinary, then, in their absence, the ordinary without object, and when that too is absent, the extraordinary – and then, when the three states become absent, and the supreme Truth viz the state of Turiya that is non-dual, unborn and fearless, becomes known, there follows consequently for the man of great intellect, in this world, the state of being omniscient for ever which is the very nature of the Self. Sarvajnah (omniscient): sarva + jnah. Sarva: the state of being all. Jnah: the knower.

त्रयाणां विश्वादीनां पूर्वपूर्वप्रविलापनेन तुरीयस्य प्रतिपत्तिरिति करणसाधनः पादशब्दः ; तुरीयस्य तु पद्यत इति कर्मसाधनः पादशब्दः [Ma.Up. 2 Bh.]

As the Fourth (Turīya) is realized by successively merging the earlier three, starting from Viśva, the word pāda (in the cases of Viśva, Taijasa and Prājña) is derived in the instrumental sense of that by which something is attained, whereas in the case of the Turīya the word pāda is derived in the objective sense of that which is achieved.

प्रसिद्धेनैव भेदानां ग्राह्यत्वेन हेतुना समत्वेन स्वप्नजागरितस्थानयोरेकत्वमाहुर्विवेकिन इति
[Ma.Up.Ka. 2.5 Bh.]

Men of discrimination speak of the similarity of the waking and dream states, in view of the well-known ground of inference, i.e. the objects (in both the states) are associated with the perceiver-perceived relationship.

सर्वस्य प्रपञ्चस्य साधिदैविकस्य अनेनात्मना चतुष्पात्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात् . एवं च सति
सर्वप्रपञ्चोपशमे अद्वैतसिद्धिः . सर्वभूतस्थश्च आत्मा एको दृष्टः स्यात् ; सर्वभूतानि चात्मनि
[Ma.Up. 3 Bh.]

[The intention] is to describe the entire phenomena, including those of gods (Adhidaiva) as having four quarters from the standpoint of this Atman (known as the Virāt). If the presentation is made in this way, non-duality stands established on the removal of the entire phenomenal world, and the Self existing in all beings is realized as one, and all beings are seen as existing in the Self. And in this way alone is nonduality established by the removal of (this wrong view of) the entire phenomena. Further, the one Atman is realized as existing in all beings and all beings are seen as existing in Atman.

सम्प्रसादशब्दोदितो जीवो जागरितव्यवहारे देहेन्द्रियपञ्जराध्यक्षो भूत्वा, तद्वासनानिर्मितांश्च
स्वप्नान्नाडीचरोऽनुभूय . श्रान्तः शरणं प्रेप्सुरुभयरूपादपि शरीराभिमानात्समुत्थाय . सुषुप्तावस्थायां परं
ज्योतिराकाशशब्दितं परं ब्रह्मोपसम्पद्य . विशेषविज्ञानवत्त्वं च परित्यज्य, स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते
[BSBh. 1.3.20]

(It is to show that) the Jīva-Self indicated by the word 'the serene being', becoming first, the presiding authority over the cage of the body and sense-organs during the wakeful condition, and next, becoming one as moving in the Nāḍīs and experiencing dreams caused by desires, and being exhausted and desirous of obtaining some sanctuary, and rising above the false pride i.e. vanity of identifying itself with both the kinds of (the gross and subtle) bodies, and attaining, during deep sleep, the Highest Light i.e. the Highest Brahman which here is expressed by the word Ākāśa, and also in that condition giving up its ability for special cognition becomes manifest in its own true nature.

तथापि जीवप्रसवबीजात्मकत्वमपरित्यज्यैव प्राणशब्दत्वं सतः सच्छब्दवाच्यता च यदि हि निर्बीजरूपं
विवक्षितं ब्रह्माभविष्यत् , 'नेति नेतिऽ (बृ. उ. ४ . ५ . ३) 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्तेऽ (तै. उ. २ . ९ . १)
'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधिऽ (के. उ. १ . ४) इत्यवक्ष्यत् ; 'न सत्तन्नासदुच्यतेऽ (भ. गी. १३ .
१२) इति स्मृतेः [Ma.Up.Ka. 1.2 Bh.]

Though Sat, i.e., Brahman, is indicated in that passage by the word 'Prana', yet the Brahman that is indicated by the words Sat and Prana (in that connection) is not the one who is free from its attribute of being the seed or cause that creates all beings. For if in that Śruti passage, Brahman, devoid of the causal relation (i.e., the Absolute) were sought to be described, then the Śruti would have used such expressions as "Not this, Not this," "Wherefrom speech turns back", "That is something other than both the known and the unknown", etc. The Smṛti also declares, "It is neither Sat (as an object) nor Asat" (Gitā 13.12).

इति अविद्याकामकर्मभिः संसारहेतुभिः संयुक्तः . एव स्वप्ने इति न स्वम् अपीतः भवति "अनन्वागतं पुण्येन अनन्वागतं पापेन तीर्णः हि तदा सर्वान् शोकान् हृदयस्य भवति" (ब्र.उप्. ४.३.२२) "तद्वा अस्य एतद् अतिच्छन्दा" (ब्र.उप्. ४.३.२१) "एषः परमः आनन्दः" (ब्र.उप्. ४.३.३३) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः. सुषुप्तः एव स्वं देवतारूपं जीवत्वविनिर्मुक्तं दर्शयिष्यामि इति आह - स्वप्नान्तं मे मम निगदतः हे सोम्य विजानीहि विस्पष्टम् अवधारय इत्यर्थः [Ch.Up. 6.8.1 Bh.]

In this way, (dream) is indeed associated with ignorance, desire, and action, which are causes of transmigration. Therefore (in dream) the soul does not merge in its nature. This is established also by such Upanisadic texts as: '(This form of is untouched by good work and untouched by evil work, for he is then beyond all the woes of his heart (intellect)' (Br.Up. 4.3.22); 'That is his form (in which all objects of desire have been attained and are but the Self, and) which is free from desires and devoid of grief' (Br.Up. 4.3.21); 'This indeed is the supreme bliss (Br.Up. 4.3.33). With the intention, 'I shall show the inherent nature of the Deity, freed from individual selfhood, in deep sleep itself', he said; 'Somya, O good looking one learn, fully understand from me about deep sleep.' This is the meaning.

अत्र च एतत् प्रकृतम् – अविद्याकामकर्मविनिर्मुक्तमेव तद्रूपम् , यत् सुषुप्ते आत्मनो गृह्यते प्रत्यक्षत इति [Br.Up. 4.3.22 Bh.]

Having mentioned this incidentally, the text takes up the topic under discussion, viz. that the form of the self that is directly perceived in the state of deep sleep is free from ignorance, desire and work.

ब्रह्म तु अनपायि सुप्तिस्थानम् - इत्येतत्प्रतिपादयामः तेन तु विज्ञानेन प्रयोजनमस्ति . जीवस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वावधारणं . स्वप्नजागरितव्यवहारविमुक्तत्वावधारणं च . तस्मादात्मैव सुप्तिस्थानम् [BSBh. 3.2.7]

We, on the other hand, do want to expound, that Brahman is the lasting abode of the soul in the state of deep sleep; that is a knowledge which has its own uses, viz. the ascertainment of Brahman being the Self of the soul, and the ascertainment of the soul being essentially nonconnected with the worlds that appear in the

waking and in the dreaming state. Hence the Self alone is the place of deep sleep (tasmādātmaiva suptisthānam).

उपपद्यते च अत्र ईदृश एव सम्बन्धः, नान्यादृशः - 'स्वमपीतो भवतिऽ (छ.उप. ६.८.१) इति हि स्वरूपसम्बन्धम् एनमामनन्ति [BSBh. 3.2.35]

And it is only thus and in no other way that a 'relation' becomes reasonably sustainable, because the scriptures (sruti) declare such a relation with its own nature, thus – "He becomes one with his own Self" (Cha.Up. 6.8.1).

सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीव एकतां गच्छति . परस्माच्च ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायत इति वेदान्तमर्यादा [BSBh. 1.4.18]

During the period of deep-sleep, moreover, the Jīva-Self becomes one with the Highest Brahman. All Vedāntas (sruti) culminate in inculcating that all this transitory world of Prāṇa etc. originates from the Highest Brahman.

यत्र यस्मिन्काले एतन्नाम भवति पुरुषस्य स्वप्स्यतः . प्रसिद्धं हि लोके स्वपितीति .

गौणं चेदं नामेत्याह – यदा स्वपितीत्युच्यते पुरुषः, तदा तस्मिन्काले सता सच्छब्दवाच्यया प्रकृतया देवतया सम्पन्नो भवति सङ्गतः एकीभूतो भवति . मनसि प्रविष्टं मनआदिसंसर्गकृतं जीवरूपं परित्यज्य स्वं सद्रूपं यत्परमार्थसत्यम् अपीतः अपिगतः भवति . अतः तस्मात् स्वपितीत्येनमाचक्षते लौकिकाः . स्वमात्मानं हि यस्मादपीतो भवति [Ch.Up. 6.8.1 Bh.]

When, at which time; a person going to sleep comes to get this name, svapiti, 'He sleeps', as is wellknown in the world. This name is a secondary one is being shown by stating: When a person is spoken of as 'He sleeps', then, he becomes identified; sata, with Existence; i.e. he becomes united with, identified with the Deity under discussion, referred to by the word Existence. Having discarded the nature of the individual soul which has entered into the mind and which is produced from the contact with the mind etc., he attains his own self, his nature as Existence which is the ultimate Reality. Therefore, the common people, speak of this one as svaptiti, 'He sleeps' (lit. 'he is in his own self') because he attains his own Self.

अपि च न कदाचिज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सम्पत्तिर्नास्ति . स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात् . स्वप्नजागरितयोः तूपाधिसम्पर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य . तदुपशमात्सुषुप्तेः स्वरूपापत्तिर्विवक्ष्यते - 'स्वमपीतो भवतिऽ इति [BSBh. 3.2.7]

Besides, it is not, that the Jīva-Self is ever not-one-with-Brahman, because its own real nature is imperishable (constant). It is with reference to the Self's having, as it were, acquired a foreign nature as a result of its contact with limiting adjuncts during the conditions of dreams and wakefulness, that it is said, that, when during deep sleep, these limiting adjuncts are relaxed, it acquires its own true nature.

अत्रोच्यते - न स्वप्नादिप्रत्ययवज्जाग्रत्प्रत्यया भवितुमर्हन्ति . कस्मात्? वैधर्म्यात् [BSBh. 2.2.29]

It is said with regard to this – perceptions during waking state do not deserve to be like the perceptions in a dream etc. Why? Because of the dissimilarity in their nature.

स उपाधिद्वयोपरमे सुषुप्तावस्थायामुपाधिकृतविशेषाभावात् स्वात्मनि प्रलीन इवेति 'स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति' (छं.उप्. ६.८.१) इत्युच्यते [BSBh. 1.1.9]

And when limiting adjuncts of both these sorts have ceased to operate, then in the condition of deep sleep, because of the absence of any special condition caused by the limiting adjuncts, He is as it were absorbed into himself, and it is then said of him – “He is absorbed in his own Self” (Ch.Up. 6.8.1).

यथा च स्वप्नदृगेकः स्वप्नदर्शनमायया न संस्पृश्यते . प्रबोधसम्प्रसादयोरनन्वागतत्वात् एवमवस्थात्रयसाक्ष्येकोऽव्यभिचार्यवस्थात्रयेण व्यभिचारिणा न संस्पृश्यते . मायामात्रं ह्येतत् यत्परमात्मनोऽवस्थात्रयात्मनावभासनम्, रज्ज्वा इव सर्पादिभावेनेति [BSBh. 2.1.9]

Also, just as a person who experiences a dream is never affected by the illusory nature of the dream vision, in as much as it does not persist during the conditions of deep sleep and wakefulness, even so, this one unchanging, constant and immediate witness of all the three conditions (viz. the Highest Self i.e. Brahman) is not affected by the three changing transmigratory conditions (of creation, preservation, and resorption). This manifestation of the Highest Self, by its existing as the Self of these three conditions, is – like the appearance of a snake etc. in a rope – but a mere illusion.

अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते [BSBh. 2.1.27]

Brahman appears to become susceptible of (i.e. appears to be the basis of) all phenomenal behaviour by way of modifications etc. By reason of the distinctions of aspects or forms characterized by names and forms imagined through ignorance which are at once both evolved and unevolved, and about whom it is not possible to predicate that they either are or are not Brahman.

Kāryakāraṇaprakriyā (adhyāropāpavādakrameṇa)

तत्सत्यत्वं परं व्यावहारिकमेवाङ्गीक्रियते अविद्याकृतनामरूपमायामनपबाध्य सृष्टेः सर्वस्य मायिकत्वाभ्युपगमात् | यदा पुनर्ब्रह्मणस्तत्त्वमेव निर्दिधारयिषितम् , तदा तु नामरूपयोः प्रतीतिदशायां

ब्रह्मणस्तत्त्वेनान्यत्वेन वा निर्वक्तुमशक्यत्वात्, ब्रह्मदृष्ट्या च निरूप्यमाणयोर्वस्तुतोऽभावाच्च, ब्रह्मण एव तत्तच्छब्दबुद्धिगोचरत्वं व्यवहारे इत्यध्यवसीयते तथा च ब्रह्मणोऽद्वितीयत्वं सर्वव्यवहारातीतं नित्यसिद्धमेवेति सेत्स्यति ।

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 78,

Vedāntaparakriyāpratyabhijñā p. 208)

All creation is admitted to enjoy its illusory existence before the illusory play of name and form set up by Ignorance (avidyā) has been cancelled. But when the aim is to identify the Absolute in its true nature, then it is declared that it is the Absolute alone that is referred to by every word and comprehended in every idea. For even when they are manifest, it is impossible to explain name and form either as identical with or as different from the Absolute (brahmaṇaḥ-tatvena-anya-tvena). And if they are spoken of from the standpoint of vision of the Absolute (brahmadṛṣṭyā), they do not in truth exist (vastutaḥ-abhāva). Thus it stands proved that the Absolute has no second, is beyond all empirical experience and is eternally and constantly self-established (nityasiddhameveti).

अस्य जगतो नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य अनेककर्तृभोक्तृ संयुक्तस्य

प्रतिनियतदेशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाश्रयस्य मनसाप्यचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य जन्मस्थितिभङ्गं यतः

सर्वज्ञात्सर्वशक्तेः कारणादभवति [BSBh. 1.1.2]

The omniscient and all-powerful cause from which, the origin, preservation and dissolution [is understood]. Of this transient world, which is distinguished by names and forms, and which is connected with diverse agents and enjoyers, springs, and which is the basis of the fruit of actions depending upon a particular environment, time, and cause, and in even the mere thinking about which, imagination boggles and is unable to comprehend the arrangement.

कार्यमाकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चं जगत् . कारणं परं ब्रह्म . तस्मात्कारणात्परमार्थतोऽनन्यत्वं

व्यतिरेकेणाभावः कार्यस्यावगम्यते [BSBh. 2.1.14]

The effects comprise of this diverse world, such as the Ākāśa etc. And the cause is the Highest Self i.e. Brahman. It is understood that in a real sense the effect is non-different from the cause i.e. the Highest Self, i.e. it has no existence as apart from its cause, the Highest Self.

न चेयं परिणामश्रुतिः परिणामप्रतिपादनार्था, तत्प्रतिपत्तौ फलानवगमात् ;

सर्वव्यवहारहीनब्रह्मात्मभावप्रतिपादनार्था त्वेषा, तत्प्रतिपत्तौ फलावगमात् ; ‘ स एष नेति नेत्यात्माऽ

इत्युपक्रम्याह ‘ अभयं वै जनक प्राप्तोऽसिऽ (बृ. उ. ४ । २ । ४) इति ; तस्मादस्मत्पक्षे न कश्चिदपि दोषप्रसङ्गोऽस्ति

[BSBh. 2.1.27]

Nor have the scriptural passages which speak of Brahman as undergoing change the purpose of teaching the fact of change; for such instruction would have no fruit. They rather aim at imparting instruction about Brahman's Self as raised above this apparent world; that being an instruction which we know to have a result of its own. For in the scriptural passage beginning 'He can only be described by Not this, not that' (which passage conveys instruction about the absolute Brahman) a result is stated at the end, in the words 'O Janaka, you have indeed reached fearlessness' (Br.Up. 4.2.4). Hence our view does not involve any real difficulties.

पारिशेष्यात् सत् एकमेव वस्तु अविद्यया उत्पत्तिविनाशादिधर्मैः अनेकधा नटवत् विकल्प्यते इति [BGh. 18.48]

As the only other alternative, there remains this theory, that the One Existence, the sole Reality, due to avidya (ignorance), imagined variously, as so many things undergoing production, destruction and the like changes, like an actor on the stage.

तथा मूलकारणमेव आ अन्त्यात्कार्यात् तेन तेन कार्याकारेण नटवत्सर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते [BSBh. 2.1.18]

Similarly, it is only the fundamental cause, which, like an actor, assumes different forms as effects right down to the last effect, and becomes amenable (accessible) to all worldly transactions.

अथवा, सतः विद्यमानस्य वस्तुनो रज्ज्वादेः सर्पादिवत् मायया जन्म युज्यते न तु तत्त्वतो यथा, तथा अग्राह्यस्यापि सत एवात्मनो रज्जुसर्पवज्जगद्रूपेण मायया जन्म युज्यते . न तु तत्त्वत एवाजस्यात्मनो जन्म [Ma.Up. 3.27 Bh.]

Just as a snake etc. can be born from an existing thing like a rope etc, possibly through Maya, but not in reality, so too, the Self that is existent, though incomprehensible, can have birth in the form of the universe through Maya like a snake illusorily seen on a rope. But in reality, the Self that is unborn cannot have any birth.

माया नाम वस्तु तर्हि . नैवम् , सा च माया न विद्यते . मायेत्यविद्यमानस्याख्येत्यभिप्रायः [Ma.Up.Ka. 4.58 Bh.]

Opponent: Then, is there a thing called Maya?

Reply: Not so. That Maya is non-existent. The drift is that it (i.e. Maya) is the name of something that does not exist (māyā iti avidyamānasya ākhyā).

न त्वयं विभागः परमार्थतोऽस्ति, यस्मात्तयोः कार्यकारणयोरनन्यत्वमवगम्यते । कार्यमाकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चं जगत् ; कारणं परं ब्रह्म ; तस्मात्कारणात्परमार्थतोऽनन्यत्वं व्यतिरेकेणाभावः

कार्यस्यावगम्यते . कुतः ? आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः । आरम्भणशब्दस्तावदेकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं प्रतिज्ञाय दृष्टान्तापेक्षायामुच्यते – ‘ यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् (छा. उ. ६ । १ । ४) इति ; एतदुक्तं भवति – एकेन मृत्पिण्डेन परमार्थतो मृदात्मना विज्ञातेन सर्वं मृन्मयं घटशरावोदञ्चनादिकं मृदात्मकत्वाविशेषाद्विज्ञातं भवेत् ; यतो वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयम् – वाचैव केवलमस्तीत्यारभ्यते – विकारः घटः शराव उदञ्चनं चेति . न तु वस्तुवृत्तेन विकारो नाम कश्चिदस्ति [BSBh. 2.1.14]

But in reality, this difference does not exist, since a non-difference between those cause and effect is recognized. The effect is the universe, diversified as space etc. and the cause is the supreme Brahman. In reality it is known that the effect has non-difference from, i.e. non-existence in isolation from, that cause. How so? "On account of the texts about origin etc." (in the Upanisad). As for the word "origin", it occurs by way of citing an illustration, called for by the assertion that the knowledge of all follows from the knowledge of one: "As, O amiable one, all things made of clay are known when a lump of clay is known, since a modification has speech as its origin and exists only in name; as clay alone it is true" (Ch.Up. 6.1.4). The idea implied is this: When a lump of clay is known as nothing but clay in reality, all things made of clay, for instance pot, plate, jar, etc., become known, since they are nondifferent as clay, because of which fact it is said, "A modification has speech as its origin and exists only in name". A modification, e.g. a pot, plate, or jar, etc. originates from speech alone that makes it current by announcing, "It exists". But speaking from the standpoint of the basic substance, no modification exists as such (apart from the clay).

इतश्च कारणादनन्यत्वं कार्यस्य, यत्कारणं भाव एव कारणस्य कार्यमुपलभ्यते, नाभावे . तद्यथा - सत्यां मृदि घट उपलभ्यते, सत्सु च तन्तुषु पटः . न च नियमेनान्यभावेऽन्यस्योपलब्धिर्दृष्टा [BSBh. 2.1.15]

Again, why the effect is non-different from its cause, is, because it is only when the cause exists, that the effect is seen to exist, and not when it does not. For instance, it is in the presence of clay only that a pot is seen to exist, and in the presence of yarns only that cloth is seen to exist. It is not, that when one thing exists, that, as a rule, another thing is to be seen to exist.

प्रकृतिश्चोपादानकारणं च ब्रह्माभ्युपगन्तव्यम्, निमित्तकारणं च. न केवलं निमित्तकारणमेव. कस्मात्? प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् . एवं हि प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तौ श्रौतौ नोपुरुध्येते. प्रतिज्ञा तावत् - ‘उत तमादेशमप्राक्ष्यः येनाश्रुतम् श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातम् (छ.उप्. ६.१.२) इति . तत्र चैकेन विज्ञातेन सर्वमन्यद्विज्ञातमपि विज्ञातं भवतीति प्रतीयते . तच्चोपादानकारणविज्ञाने सर्वविज्ञानं सम्भवति . उपादानकारणाव्यतिरेकात्कार्यस्य .

निमित्तकारणाव्यतिरेकस्तु कार्यस्य नास्ति . लोके तक्षणः प्रासादव्यतिरेकदर्शनात्. दृष्टान्तोऽपि 'यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातम् स्याद् वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्' (छं.उप्. ६.१.४) इत्युपादानकारणगोचर एवाम्नायते [BSBh. 1.4.23]

Brahman should be understood to be both the material cause and the reasonable cause, and not only a reasonable cause. Why? Because (understood that way alone) there is no conflict between the Scriptural solemn statement (Pratijñā, 'the proposition') and the illustration (Dṛṣṭānta). It is in this way that a conflict between the Scriptural solemn statement and the illustration does not take place. The solemn statement for instance is: – "Have you by any chance asked (him) for the instruction of that, by means of which that which is not heard becomes heard, that which is not perceived becomes perceived, and that which is not known becomes known?" (Ch.Up. 6.1.2), and from that it is understood, that by the knowledge of one, all else which is not known, becomes known. That knowledge of everything, is possible, only by knowing the material cause, because a modification is non-different from its material cause, while no such non-difference of the modification from the cause is seen in the case of an accidental cause. Because in the ordinary world an architect (lit., a carpenter) is seen to be different from the palace (he builds). The illustration also on the other hand – "Just as, Oh mild one, by knowing a clod of earth, every other thing made of earth becomes known, modification is but only a name which is made current by speech, and the essential truth is that (the modification) is but merely the earth, in fact" – as given by the sruti is indicative of the material cause.

परमार्थतस्तु न कस्यचित्केनचिदपि प्रकारेण कार्यकारणभाव उपपद्यते [Ma.Up.Ka. 4.40 Bh.]
In Reality (paramārtha), nothing can be said to have any causal relationship in any way whatsoever.

Pañcakośaprakriyā (adhyāropāpavādakrameṇa)

अन्नमयादिभ्य आनन्दमयान्तेभ्य आत्मभ्यः अभ्यन्तरतमं ब्रह्म विद्यया प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन दिदर्शयिषु शास्त्रम् अविद्याकृतपञ्चकोशापनयनेन अनेकतुषकोद्रववितुषीकरणेनेव तण्डुलान् प्रस्तौति तस्माद्वा एतस्मादन्नरसमयादित्यादि [Tai.Up. 2.2.1 Bh.]

Of all the "sheaths" beginning from the physical and ending with the blissful, Brahman is the innermost. With the intent of showing through knowledge that Brahman as the indwelling Self, the scripture begins with the mantra, 'tasmāt va etasmāt annamayarasat' etc., by adopting the process of elimination of the five

sheaths, which are a creation of ignorance, even as rice is separated from the grain known as kodrava that has too much of chaff.

तथा मनुष्याः पशवश्च ये, ते प्राणनकर्मणैव चेष्टावन्तो भवन्ति . अतश्च नान्नमयेनैव परिच्छिन्नात्मना आत्मवन्तः प्राणिनः . किं तर्हि ? तदन्तर्गतप्राणमयेनापि साधारणेनैव सर्वपिण्डव्यापिना आत्मवन्तो मनुष्यादयः . एवं मनोमयादिभिः पूर्वपूर्वव्यापिभिः उत्तरोत्तरेः सूक्ष्मैः आनन्दमयान्तैराकाशादिभूतारब्धैरविद्याकृतैः आत्मवन्तः सर्वे प्राणिनः . तथा, स्वाभाविकेनाप्याकाशादिकारणेन नित्येनाविकृतेन सर्वगतेन सत्यज्ञानानन्तलक्षणेन पञ्चकोशातिगेन सर्वात्मना आत्मवन्तः ; स हि परमार्थत आत्मा सर्वेषामित्येतदप्यर्थादुक्तं भवति [Tai.Up. 2.3.1 Bh.]

Similarly, ye manusyah pasavah ca, those that are human beings and animals, they become active through the function of breathing. Hence, also, it is not simply by possessing the limited self in the form of the body built up by food that creatures become dowered with selves. What then? Human beings and others are endowed with their selves by virtue of possessing a vital body within each physical body, which former is common to, and pervades, each physical body as a whole. Similarly, all creatures are possessed of their selves by virtue of being provided with the bodies beginning with the mental and ending with the blissful, which successively pervade the preceding ones and which are made up of the elements counting from akasa that are the creations of ignorance. So also are they blessed with their selves by the Self that is common to all, self-existent, the source of space etc., everlasting, unchanging, allpervading, defined as 'truth, knowledge, and infinite', and beyond the five sheaths. And by implication it is also said that this is the Self of all in the real sense.

अत्रोच्यते - यद्यप्यन्नमयादिभ्य इवानन्दमयात् 'अन्योऽन्तर आत्माऽ इति न श्रूयते, तथापि नानन्दमयस्य ब्रह्मत्वम् [BSBh. 1.1.19]

With regard to this it is said – even though the Scriptures do not speak of any Self still inner than the Ānandamaya, as they do after Annamaya etc., still Ānandamaya could not be Brahman.

तस्मात् न प्राप्तिः सङ्क्रमणम् ; नापि अन्नमयादीनामन्यतमकर्तृकं [Tai.Up. 2.8.5 Bh.]

Therefore, samkramana does not mean acquisition, nor does it mean 'reaching' by anyone of them beginning with the food body.

अपि चानन्दमयस्य ब्रह्मत्वे प्रियाद्यवयवत्वेन सविशेषं ब्रह्माभ्युपगन्तव्यम् [BSBh. 1.1.19]

Moreover, if by Ānandamaya we understand Brahman, we should understand it as Saḡuṇa (qualified by attributes) Brahman, because it is said to have limbs such as bliss (joy) etc.

Draṣṭṛdrṣyavicārah

ननु अत्र को विशेषो द्रष्टरि ; यदि दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा, यदि वा घटस्य द्रष्टा, सर्वथापि द्रष्टैव ; द्रष्टव्य एव तु भवान्विशेषमाह दृष्टेर्द्रष्टेति ; द्रष्टा तु यदि दृष्टेः, यदि वा घटस्य, द्रष्टा द्रष्टैव । न, विशेषोपपत्तेः – अस्त्यत्र विशेषः ; यो दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा सः दृष्टिश्चेद्भवति नित्यमेव पश्यति दृष्टिम् , न कदाचिदपि दृष्टिर्न दृश्यते द्रष्टा ; तत्र द्रष्टुर्दृष्ट्या नित्यया भवितव्यम् ; अनित्या चेद्द्रष्टुर्दृष्टिः, तत्र दृश्या या दृष्टिः सा कदाचिन्न दृश्येतापि – यथा अनित्यया दृष्ट्या घटादि वस्तु ; न च तद्वत् दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा कदाचिदपि न पश्यति दृष्टिम् । किं द्वे दृष्टी द्रष्टुः – नित्या अदृश्या अन्या अनित्या दृश्येति ? बाढम् ; प्रसिद्धा तावदनित्या दृष्टिः, अन्धानन्धत्वदर्शनात् ; नित्यैव चेत् , सर्वोऽनन्ध एव स्यात् ; द्रष्टुस्तु नित्या दृष्टिः – ‘न हि द्रष्टुर्दृष्टेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यतेऽ (बृ. उ. ४ । ३ । २३) इति श्रुतेः ; अनुमानाच्च – अन्धस्यापि घटाद्याभासविषया स्वप्ने दृष्टिरूपलभ्यते ; सा तर्हि इतरदृष्टिनाशे न नश्यति ; सा द्रष्टुर्दृष्टिः ; तथा अविपरिलुप्तया नित्यया दृष्ट्या स्वरूपभूतया स्वयञ्ज्योतिःसमाख्यया इतरामनित्यां दृष्टिं स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोर्वासनाप्रत्ययरूपां नित्यमेव पश्यन्दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा भवति । एवं च सति दृष्टिरेव स्वरूपमस्य अग्न्यौष्ण्यवत् , न काणादानामिव दृष्टिव्यतिरिक्तः अन्यः चेतनः द्रष्टा [Br.Up. 1.4.10 Bh.]

Objection: But what difference does it make in the seer? Whether it be the seer of sight or of a jar, it is but the seer under all circumstances. By saying ‘The seer of sight’ you are simply stating a difference as regards the object seen. But the seer, whether it be the seer of sight or of a jar, is just the same.

Reply: No, for there is a difference, and it is this: If that seer of sight is non-distinct from the sight, it ever sees the sight and there is never an occasion when the seer does not see it. There, the vision of the seer must be eternal. If the seer's sight is transitory, then sight viz. the object seen, may not at times be seen, even as a jar is not seen by a transitory vision. But such a circumstance as this when the seer of sight does not see the sight, does not occur.

Objection: Has the seer then two kinds of vision, one eternal and invisible, and the other transitory and visible?

Reply: Yes. The transitory vision is familiar to us, for we see some people are blind, and others are not. If the eternal vision were the only one in existence, all people would be possessed of vision.

But the sight of the Seer is eternal (draṣṭustū nityā drṣṭiḥ). for the Sruti says, ‘The vision (sight) of the witness can never be lost’ (IV. iii. 23). This is proved by inference also, for even in the blind, such a sight is seen in dream as will enable

the perception of the semblance of a jar etc. and that sight does not perish when the mortal vision perishes. That is the sight of the Seer.

Since that eternal sight which is never destroyed and which is of one's own nature and called self-effulgent light, sees eternally the other transitory sight which is of the nature of past impressions and notions in the dream and waking states, it becomes the seer of sight. Such being the case, sight itself is the nature of the seer, as heat is of fire and there is no conscious seer apart from the sight as the followers of Kanada hold.

दृष्टिरिति द्विविधा भवति – लौकिकी पारमार्थिकी चेति . तत्र लौकिकी चक्षुःसंयुक्तान्तःकरणवृत्तिः ; सा क्रियत इति जायते विनश्यति च . या तु आत्मनो दृष्टिः अग्न्युष्णप्रकाशादिवत् , सा च द्रष्टुः स्वरूपत्वात् , न जायते न विनश्यति च . सा क्रियमाणया उपाधिभूतया संसृष्टेवेति, व्यपदिश्यते – द्रष्टेति, भेदवच्च – द्रष्टा दृष्टिरिति च [Br.Up. 3.4.2 Bh.]

Vision (seeing, understanding) is of two kinds, ordinary and real. Ordinary vision is a function of the mind as connected with the eye; it is an act, and as such it has a beginning (born) and an end. But the vision that belongs to the Self is like the heat and light of fire; being the very essence of the witness, it has neither beginning (born) nor end (destroyed). Because it appears to be connected with the ordinary vision, which is produced and is but a limiting adjunct of it, it is spoken of as the witness, and also as differentiated into witness and vision.

यत् अस्य जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः चक्षुराद्यनेकोपाधिद्वारं चैतन्यात्मज्योतिःस्वाभाव्यम् उपलक्षितं दृष्ट्याद्यभिधेयव्यवहारापन्नम् , सुषुप्ते उपाधिभेदव्यापारनिवृत्तौ अनुद्भास्यमानत्वात् अनुपलक्ष्यमाणस्वभावमपि उपाधिभेदेन भिन्नमिव – यथाप्राप्तानुवादेनैव विद्यमानत्वमुच्यते , तत्र दृष्ट्यादिधर्मभेदकल्पना विवक्षितार्थानभिज्ञतया . सैन्धवघनवत् प्रज्ञानैकरसघनश्रुतिविरोधाच्च ; 'विज्ञानमानन्दम् (बृ. उ. ३ । ९ । २८) 'सत्यं ज्ञानम् (तै. उ. २ । १ । १) 'प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म (ऐ. उ. ३ । १ । ३) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यश्च [Br.Up. 4.3.30 Bh.]

In the state of waking and dream, through many limiting adjuncts such as the eye, the natural self-luminous intelligence expresses itself and is seen associated with activity named vision etc. And in the state of deep sleep, since the activities of the different limiting adjuncts have stopped, they do not come into prominence and so, the nature of the Self as differentiated by these limiting adjuncts cannot be observed, and; in spite of being of an imperceptible nature for the above reason, the fact of its being present as distinct from the different limiting adjuncts is spoken of by way of reiteration of the difference normally experienced. As such, the notion that the above passage declares the attributes such as vision to be different from the Self, is due to want of knowledge of the meaning intended. Moreover, it would be in conflict with the Śruti text that speaks of the self as homogeneous Pure

Intelligence, like a lump of salt, and also with texts like the following: 'Knowledge, Bliss' (Br.Up. 3.9.28), 'Truth, Knowledge' (Tai. 2.1), and 'Consciousness is Brahman' (Ait. Up. 3.1.3).

'यः वेद सः आत्माऽ इति एवं सर्वत्र प्रयोगात् वेदनम् अस्य स्वरूपम् इति अवगम्यते. यथा 'यः पुरस्तात् प्रकाशयति सः अदित्यः, यः दक्षिणतः यः पश्चात् यः उत्तरतः यः ऊर्ध्वं प्रकाशयति सः अदित्यःऽ इति उक्ते प्रकाशस्वरूपः सः इति गम्यते [Ch.Up. 8.12.5 Bh.]

Since the expression, 'One who has the consciousness is the Self, has been used everywhere, therefore it is understood that consciousness is its own nature. As when somebody says, 'That which lights up the front is the sun; that which lights up the right, the left, the north, and above is the sun', then it is understood that it (the sun) is of the nature of light.

Śravaṇamanānānididhyāsana

संन्यासस्तु महाबाहो दुःखमाप्तुमयोगतः (गी.५.६) इति च कर्मयोगस्यैव परमार्थसंन्यासोपायत्वस्मरणाच्च | श्रवणादीनां तु साक्षाज्ज्ञानसाधनानां त्वधिकारभेदादनुष्ठानविकल्पसमुच्चयौ ज्ञेयौ | तद्यथा तावदुत्तमाधिकारिणः सकृच्छ्रुतवेदान्तवाक्यादेव ब्रह्मात्मत्वमनुभूयितुं शक्नुयुः, तेषां श्रवणमात्रादेव कृतार्थतेति न तदूर्ध्वं किञ्चित् कर्तव्यमवशिष्यते | न ह्युदिते सूर्ये पुनरपि तमोऽपनयनाय प्रयत्नोऽपेक्ष्यत इति | ये तु तथा वाक्यार्थमनुभूयितुं न शक्नुवन्ति तान् प्रति वाक्यश्रवणाभ्यासः, तदर्थग्रहणप्रतिबन्धकशक्कानिवृत्त्यर्थं मननं च कर्तव्यं यावज्ज्ञानोत्पत्ति | अभ्यासेन मन्दप्रज्ञानां प्रतिपत्तिदर्शनान् |

(SSSS, The Method of Vedānta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 143,

Vedāntapraṅkriyāpratyabhijñā p. 253)

The Smṛiti text 'But renunciation, O' mighty armed one, is hard to achieve without the previous practice of Karma Yoga' (Bh.G. V.6) shows that Karma Yoga is the special means to renunciation

in the true sense of the word, namely direct intuition of the supreme reality. As for the immediate means to knowledge (sākṣāt-jñāna-sādhanānām, gen. pl.), such as hearing the upanishadic texts and so on, the decision between choice of one of them, or combination of some or all of them, depends on the qualifications of the person practising them. For example, the highest kind of candidate (uttamādhikāri) is able to acquire immediate intuitive vision that his Self is the Absolute (brahmātmatvamanubhaviṭam) from merely hearing the relevant upanishadic texts once. These people who realize the goal by merely hearing the texts once have nothing further to do (na tadūrdhvaṃ kiñcit kartavyamavaśiṣyate). When once the sun has risen, no further action is needed to remove darkness. But those who are

not able to acquire intuitive knowledge of the meaning of the texts in their own direct experience have to go on hearing the texts and reflecting over them to remove the doubts that prevent their meaning being understood, and they have to continue with this until intuitive knowledge arises. For we see that those of dull understanding acquire knowledge through diligent repetition (abhyāsenā mandaprajñānām pratipattidarśanān).

Notes on Difference between Upasana and vidyā (jñānopāsanayorvailakṣaṇyam):

1) अविद्याविषयत्वेऽप्युपासनानां ज्ञानकाण्डे तेषां विधानं न विरुद्धम् |विद्यात्वाविशेषात्, मनोवृत्तित्वसामान्याच्च |

(SSSS, The Method of Vedānta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 132,

Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā p. 246)

In the realm of Ignorance (avidyāviśayatve), there is no contradiction if meditations on the Absolute as associated with conditioning adjuncts, along with injunctions to perform them, are found in the section of the Veda devoted to metaphysical knowledge. For both meditation and knowledge, as the latter occurs at this preliminary stage, are denoted by the technical term 'Vidyā', and both are modifications of the mind (manovṛttivasāmānyācca).

2) यद्यपि मानसत्वाविशेषादेवाद्वैतज्ञानमुपासनं चेत्युभयमपि समंज्ञानविद्योपासनाशब्दैर्व्यपदिश्यते श्रुतिस्मृत्योः, तथापि तयोः स्वरूपभेदोऽस्ति | यतो ध्यानापराभिधामुपासनं कर्तृव्यापारायतनिष्पत्ति मानसं कर्म, चोदनालक्षणं च कर्मवत् | ज्ञानं तु प्रमाणजन्यं प्रमेयवस्त्वनुसारेण जायमानं मनोवृत्तिलक्षणमिति | अत एव ह्युपासनमध्यारोपितकारकफलापेक्षः कर्मविशेषः, ज्ञानं तु सर्वाध्यारोपापह्वात्मवस्त्ववगतिरित्युच्यत इति |

(SSSS, The Method of Vedānta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 133,

Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā p. 246)

Thus, insofar as they are both mental, knowledge of the non-dual reality and meditation on the Absolute as associated with conditioning adjuncts are both equally referred to in the Veda and Smṛti by such terms as 'jñāna', 'vidyā' and 'upasana'. Yet there is an essential difference between them. Upasana (alternative form of upasana) is a synonym for dhyana (meditation). It is a mental activity, dependent on the efforts of a person acting (kartṛ-vyāpāra), and, like ritualistic action, can only be known about through the injunctive texts of the Veda. But knowledge properly so called is the result of the application of a means of valid cognition. It is sometimes defined as a mental idea that arises in true correspondence with the thing known (prameyavastvanusāreṇa). Thus meditation on the Absolute as associated with conditioning adjuncts is a kind of action, and so depends on the factors and results

of action, all of which are false superimpositions. But knowledge (in the deepest sense of the word) is that intuitive awareness of reality in which all superimposition is abolished.

श्रोतव्यः पूर्वम् आचार्यत आगमतश्च ; पश्चान्मन्तव्यः तर्कतः ; ततो निदिध्यासितव्यः निश्चयेन ध्यातव्यः . एवं ह्यसौ दृष्टो भवति श्रवणमनननिदिध्यासनसाधनैर्निर्वर्तितैः . यदा एकत्वमेतान्युपगतानि, तदा सम्यग्दर्शनं ब्रह्मैकत्वविषयं प्रसीदति [Br.Up. 2.4.5 Bh.]

It should first be heard of from a teacher and from the scriptures, then reflected on through reasoning, and then steadfastly meditated upon.' Thus, only is It realised – when these means, viz. hearing, reflection and meditation, have been gone through.

पूर्वम् आचार्यागमाभ्यां श्रुते, पुनः तर्कणोपपत्त्या मते विचारिते, श्रवणं तु आगममात्रेण, मते उपपत्त्या, पश्चात् विज्ञाते - एवमेतत् नान्यथेति निर्धारिते [Br.Up. 4.5.6 Bh.]

By hearing first from the teacher and the scriptures, and then thinking it out to the logical effect through reasoning – the hearing is only through the scriptures (with the grace of the teacher) and the thinking through reasoning – and meditating thereafter upon it that is to say, knowing or ascertaining it to be definitely such and such and not to be anything else.

यत्पुनरुक्तं श्रवणात् पराचीनयोर्मनननिदिध्यासनयोर्दर्शनाद् विधिशेषत्वं ब्रह्मणः, न स्वरूपपर्यवसायित्वमिति . तन्न; श्रवणवद् (न,) अवगत्यर्थत्वात् मनननिदिध्यासनयोः. यदि ह्यवगतं ब्रह्मान्यत्र विनियुज्येत, भवेत्तदा विधिशेषत्वम् . न तु तदस्ति, मनननिदिध्यासनयोरपि श्रवणवद् अवगत्यर्थत्वात् [BSBh. 1.1.4]

Again with regard to what was said, viz., that because it is observed that further cogitation and meditation should follow the hearing of Brahman, Brahman is merely complementary to an injunction and its knowledge does not culminate in the realization of its own nature, if Brahman after being fully realized were to be employed elsewhere (for some other purpose) then it would very well happen to be complementary to an injunction, but it is not so, because (as said above) cogitation and meditation also, like hearing, are meant ultimately to culminate in the complete realization (of Brahman).

Reply: No, because cogitation and meditation are [like hearing] for the purpose of their ultimate culmination in the realization (of Brahman) (manananididhyāsanayorapi śravaṇavad avagatyarthatvāt).

दर्शनपर्यवसानानि हि श्रवणादीन् यावत्पर्यमानानि दृष्टार्थानि भवन्ति - यथा अवघातादीनि तण्डुलादिनिष्पत्तिपर्यवसानानि, तद्वत् [BSBh. 4.1.1]

It is only when they so culminate in such intuitive realization (of Brahman) by such repeated hearing etc. that they have their tangible fruit. Just as the threshing of rice (which has its husk on it) has its culmination in the dehusking of such rice grains.

द्रष्टव्यादिशब्दा अपि परविद्याधिकारपठिताः तत्त्वाभिमुखीकरणप्रधानाः, न तत्त्वावबोधविधिप्रधाना भवन्ति ; लोकेऽपि – इदं पश्य, इदमाकर्णयेति च एवंजातीयकेषु निर्देशेषु प्रणिधानमात्रं कुर्वित्युच्यते, न साक्षाज्ज्ञानमेव कुर्विति ; ज्ञेयाभिमुखस्यापि ज्ञानं कदाचिज्जायते, कदाचिन्न जायते ; तस्मात् तं प्रति ज्ञानविषय एव दर्शयितव्यो ज्ञापयितुकामेन ; तस्मिन्दर्शिते स्वयमेव यथाविषयं यथाप्रमाणं च ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते [BSBh. 3.2.21]

As for expressions like "(The Self) is to be seen" (Br.Up. 2.4.5), which are met with in the context of the supreme knowledge, they are meant mainly for attracting one's mind towards Reality, but do not aim mainly at enjoining any injunction about the knowledge of Reality. In ordinary parlance also, when such directive sentences as, "Look at this", "Lend ear to that", etc. are uttered, all that is meant is, "Be attentive to these", but not, "Acquire this knowledge directly". And a man, who is in the presence of an object to be known, may sometimes know it, and sometimes not. Hence a man who wants to impart the knowledge of the thing has to draw his attention to the object of knowledge itself. When that is done, the knowledge arises naturally in conformity with the object and the means of knowledge.

एवं ह्यसौ दृष्टो भवति श्रवणमनननिदिध्यासनसाधनैर्निर्वर्तितैः यदा एकत्वमेतान्युपगतानि, तदा सम्यग्दर्शनं ब्रह्मैकत्वविषयं प्रसीदति, न अन्यथा श्रवणमात्रेण [Br. Up. 2.4.5 Bh.]

Thus, only is It realised – when these (direct) means, viz. hearing, reflection and meditation, have been gone through. When these three are combined [1] then only true realisation of the union with Brahman is accomplished, not otherwise – by hearing alone.

SSSS Note:

[1] ಶ್ರವಣಮನನನಿಧಿಧ್ಯಾಸನಗಳು ಒಂದಾಗುವುದು- ಎಂದರೆ ಶ್ರುತಿಯುಕ್ತನುಭವಗಳು ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು. ಆಗಲೇ ಆತ್ಮದರ್ಶನವು ಸರಿಯಾಯಿತೆಂದು ನಿಶ್ಚಯಿಸಬಹುದು ಎಂದರ್ಥ. ಬರಿಯ ಶ್ರವಣಮಾತ್ರದಿಂದ ಎಂದರೆ ಮನನನಿಧಿಧ್ಯಾಸನಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದರೆ ಇರುವ

ಶ್ರವಣಮಾತ್ರದಿಂದ ಎಂದರ್ಥ ; ಮನನನಿಧಿಧ್ಯಾಸನಗಳಿಲ್ಲದ ಎಂದೇನೂ ಅರ್ಥವಲ್ಲ; ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಉತ್ತಮಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ವಾಕ್ಯಶ್ರವಣಮಾತ್ರದಿಂದಲೂ ಜ್ಞಾನವುಂಟಾಗಬಹುದು ; ಸೂ. ಭಾ. 4-1-2, (ಭಾ. ಭಾ. 506) - (Br.Up. SSSS Vol. 1)

"When śravaṇamanananididhyāsana are combined", means here śrutiyuktianubhava. By that, the intuitive understanding of the Self (ātmadarśana) can be correctly established. "Not otherwise, by hearing alone" (na anyathā śravaṇamātreṇa) implies manananididhyāsana (occurred in an earlier phase). Because for uttamādhikāris

intuitive understanding can arise by hearing Vedāntavākya (once). See sū. bhā. 4-1-2 (bhā. bhā. 506).

एवमन्वेष्टव्यो विजिज्ञासितव्य इत्यर्थः, दृष्टार्थत्वादन्वेषणविजिज्ञासनयोः [Ch.Up. 8.7.1 Bh.]

The meaning is that It is to be known and enquired into in this way, because the result of knowing It and enquiring into It for realization is a perceptible one.

Mokṣasvarūpam

अविद्यालेशस्य तत्संस्कारस्य वा जीवन्मुक्ते ऽङ्गीकर्तृभिः सर्वैरप्यद्वैतिभिर्व्यवहारदृष्ट्यैव तदभ्युपगम्यत इति स्पष्टम् ।

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta (Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā) p. 731)

In regard to a modicum of Ignorance [avidyāleśa] or an impression of Ignorance in the case of the person liberated in life – where this is admitted anywhere by an Advaitin, it is clear that it is admitted from the standpoint of empirical experience only [vyavahāradṛṣṭyaiva].

मुक्त्यवस्था हि सर्ववेदान्तेष्वेकरूपैव अवधार्यते; ब्रह्मैव हि मुक्त्यवस्था; न च ब्रह्मणोऽनेकाकारयोगोऽस्ति [BSBh. 3.4.52]

All Vedānta scriptures [sruti] understand this condition of liberation to be of one uniform nature. Brahman itself is this condition of liberation (brahmaiva hi muktyavasthā). And there is no possibility of Brahman ever being of many sorts, because according to sruti.

अत्र इहैव प्रदीपनिर्वाणवत्सर्वबन्धनोपशमात् ब्रह्म समश्नुते ब्रह्मैव भवतीत्यर्थः [Kath.Up. 2.3.14 Bh.]

Hence here itself owing to the cessation of all bondage, like the blowing out of a lamp, (he) attains Brahman, i.e. (he) becomes Brahman Itself.

किन्तु विद्वान् सः इहैव ब्रह्म, यद्यपि देहवानिव लक्ष्यते; स ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्म अप्येति . यस्मात् न हि तस्य अब्रह्मत्वपरिच्छेदहेतवः कामाः सन्ति, तस्मात् इहैव ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्म अप्येति न शरीरपातोत्तरकालम् । न हि विदुषो मृतस्य भावान्तरापत्तिः जीवतोऽन्यः भावः, देहान्तरप्रतिसन्धानाभावमात्रेणैव तु ब्रह्माप्येतीत्युच्यते . भावान्तरापत्तौ हि मोक्षस्य सर्वोपनिषद्विवक्षितोऽर्थः आत्मैकत्वाख्यः स बाधितो भवेत् [Br.Up. 4.4.6 Bh.]

Rather this man of realisation is Brahman in this very life, although he seems to have a body. Being but Brahman, he is merged in Brahman. Because he has no desires that cause the limitation of non-Brahmanhood, therefore being verily

Brahman, he is absorbed in Brahman in this life itself, not after the fall of this body (na śarīrapātottarakālam). A knower (man of realisation), when dead, does not undergo any change in condition, i.e. does not become anything different from what he was while living; since he does not have to take another body, he is said to have become absorbed in Brahman, for if liberation was a change of condition, it would contradict the identity of the Self that all the Upaniṣads seek to teach.

न हि 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यस्य वाक्यस्य अर्थः - तत् त्वं मृतो भविष्यतीति - एवं परिणेतुं शक्यः [BSBh. 3.3.32]

It is not possible to construe that the passage "That thou art" means, That one would become so after death.

अतोऽविद्याकल्पितसंसारित्वनिवर्तनेन नित्य मुक्तात्मस्वरूपसमर्पणान् न मोक्षस्यानित्यत्वदोषः [BSBh. 1.1.4]

Therefore, there can be no question of liberation becoming impermanent, for in it is revealed the reality of the eternally free Self (nitya muktātmasvarūpa), after eliminating the idea of the notion of the transitory condition (saṃsāritva), imagined through ignorance.

तस्मान्मिथ्याप्रत्ययनिमित्तत्वात् सशरीरत्वस्य, सिद्धं जीवतोऽपि विदुषोऽशरीरत्वम् [BSBh. 1.1.4]

Thus, since embodiedness is the result of a wrong perception, it is established that the enlightened man has no embodiedness [1] even while living.

Note:

[1] अत्र सशरीरत्वस्य मिथ्यात्वात् सर्वप्रवृत्त्यभावो निवृत्तमिथ्याज्ञानस्य विदुषः इत्युपपादितम् । विद्यमानामपि बाधितानुवृत्तिमकिञ्चित्करीं गृहीत्वा ।

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta (Vedāntapraṅkriyāpratyabhijñā) transl. by A.J Alston. p. 734)

Here the argument is to show that because having a body is illusory there is no engagement in any action (sarvapravṛtṭyabhāvo) on the part of the enlightened person whose erroneous knowledge is terminated. Though it is admitted that he conforms to cognition that he knows to have been cancelled this is taken as 'doing nothing' (bādhitānuvṛtṭimakiñcitkarīṃ).

पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्व विपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेष्वकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्व स्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वा अहमासम्, नेदानीम्, नापि भविष्यत्काले -

इति ब्रह्मविद् अवगच्छति . एवमेव च मोक्ष उपपद्यते [BSBh. 4.1.13]

The knower of Brahman has this realization: "As opposed to the entity known before as possessed of agentship and experiencership by its very nature, I am

Brahman which is by nature devoid of agentship and experiencership in all the three periods of time. Even earlier I was never an agent and experiencer, nor am I so at present, nor shall I be so in future." Liberation is reasonably sustainable only in this way.

अकर्त्रात्मबोधोऽपि हि मिथ्याज्ञानबाधनेन कर्माण्युच्छिनति . बाधितमपि तु मिथ्याज्ञानं द्विचन्द्रज्ञानवत् संस्कारवशात् कंचित्कालम् अनुवर्तत एव. अपि च नैवात्र विवदितव्यम् -
ब्रह्मविदा कञ्चित्कालं शरीरं धियते न वा धियत इति . कथं हि एकस्य स्वहृदयप्रत्ययं ब्रह्मवेदनं देहधारणं च अपरेण प्रतिक्षेप्तुं शक्येत? श्रुतिस्मृतिषु च स्थितप्रज्ञलक्षणनिर्देशेन एतदेव निरुच्यते [BSBh. 4.1.15]

The knowledge that the Self (Ātmā) is not an agent also annihilates actions by removing wrong knowledge (i.e. ignorance). But even though it is so removed it does still persist for a while, as a result of past impressions, just as, for instance, the notion about there being two moons also persists for some time. Besides, it should not be discussed here (i.e. it is not debatable here) as to whether a man who has realized Brahman does continue to possess a body for some time after such realization, or whether he does not, because how can one man ever dispute another man's experience of both the realization of Brahman and of his yet continuing to possess a body, as such experience of the other man, can belong to such other man alone? Sruti and the Smṛtis by way of indicating the characteristics of a man firmly ensconced in the knowledge of Brahman, have explained the same thing.

Additional Notes:

1. अत्र मिथ्याज्ञानं बाधितम् इति वचनात्, न मिथ्याज्ञानशेषः, समर्थक्रियाकारिमिथ्याज्ञानसंस्कारशेषो वा अभ्युपगम्यते तत्रभवता आचार्येण, किं तु तदाभासानुवृत्तिरेव निश्चितशुक्तितत्वस्यापि रजतावभासानुवृत्तिवत् |
बाधितप्रतीत्यनुवृत्त्या हि प्रत्येतुर्न कश्चिदुपकारोऽपकारो वेति | एवं शरीरधारणमपि बाधित एवेति गम्यते |

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. pp. 732-733 and Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā, pp. 676-677)

"Here the words but erroneous knowledge, though cancelled continues on for a certain time show that the revered Commentator did not accept the persistence of a remnant of erroneous cognition (na mithyājñānaśeṣaḥ) or the remnant of an impression of erroneous cognition (mithyājñāna saṃskāra śeṣaḥ), that could have practical effects. He merely maintained that the enlightened person conformed with any illusory appearance of erroneous cognition that might come up (tadābhāsānuvṛttireva) in the full consciousness that it was only an illusory

appearance, as one who has known the shell for what it is accepts any appearance of silver that may come up afterwards in the full knowledge that it is only an illusory appearance. A knowing subject neither gains anything nor loses anything if he conforms with ideas that have been cancelled and which he knows to have been cancelled. From this we see that for the enlightened person, the notion that he has a body is itself cancelled (evam śarīradhāraṇa mapi bādhita eveti gamyate).

2. एतच्चाध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियानुगुणम् | तदाभासानुवृत्तिरेवेति मिथ्याज्ञानानुवृत्तिमध्यारोप्य शरीरधारणादिप्रतीतेः प्रारब्धकर्माभासप्रयुक्तत्वोपपादनात्, तात्त्विकशरीरानुवृत्त्याद्यपवादात् | तस्य बाधितत्वोक्त्या मिथ्याज्ञानानुवृत्तेरप्यपवादाच्च

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. pp. 732-733 and Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā, pp. 676-677)

All this agrees with the technique of false attribution followed by later retraction (adhyāropāpavādaprakriyā). Initial false attribution consists in accepting and conforming to erroneous cognition in the full consciousness that one is accepting and conforming to a mere appearance. It is then perfectly intelligible that the notion that one has a body, sense-organs and mind should be the result of a mere appearance of the unfoldment of the portion of merit and demerit that initiated the current life (prārabdhakarmābhāsa) while conformity with a real body and so on is denied (tātvikaśarīrānuvṛtṭyādyapavādāt). Because erroneous cognition is itself spoken of as cancelled, it is even denied that there is any real conformity with it."

3. तस्मात् जीवन्मुक्तो व्यवहारे द्वैतं पश्यन्नपि न तथ्यतः |

(SSSS Visuddhavedantasarah, p. 102)

Therefore, a Jīvanmukta is seen (understood) in the sphere of the dualistic vyavahārika world (i.e., from avidyā/vyavahārika dṛṣṭi), but not (understood) from Reality (na tathyataḥ i.e., pāramārthika dṛṣṭi).

4. तत्कृतोपदेशेन मुमुक्षुजनानुग्रहेऽपि न तस्मिन्नपि तस्य वास्तविकं कर्तृत्वमस्ति |

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta transl. by A.J Alston. p. 59,

Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā p. 110)

And if he gives spiritual teaching, it is only to help seekers of liberation. Even here, he does not feel that, in the final analysis, he is an individual person performing an action.

दर्शयति च - 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत् (ब्र.उप. ४.५.१५) इत्यादिना .

ब्रह्मात्मत्वदर्शिनं प्रति समस्तस्य क्रियाकारकफललक्षणस्य व्यवहारस्याभावम् [BSBh. 2.1.14]

The Scriptures, by the passage “When all this becomes but the Self to him, by what can he see and whom” (Br.Up. 4.5.15) etc. would discover to a person who understands Brahman as the Self of all, the non-existence of all phenomenal transactions such as actions, agents and the fruit of actions.

नावगतब्रह्मात्मभावस्य यथापूर्वं संसारित्वं शक्यं दर्शयितुम् . वेदप्रमाणजनितब्रह्मात्मभावविरोधात्
[BSBh. 1.1.4]

It is not possible to show that he who has once understood the condition of the Self's identity with Brahman, still continues to be affected by the transmigratory condition. Because it is contradictory to the condition of the identity of the Self with Brahman achieved on scriptural authority.

गुणान् एतान् यथोक्तान् अतीत्य जीवन्नेव अतिक्रम्य मायोपाधिभूतान् त्रीन् देही देहसमुद्भवान्
देहोत्पत्तिबीजभूतान् जन्ममृत्युजरादुःखैः जन्म च मृत्युश्च जरा च दुःखानि च जन्ममृत्युजरादुःखानि तैः
जीवन्नेव विमुक्तः सन् विद्वान् अमृतम् अश्नुते, एवं मद्भावम् अधिगच्छति इत्यर्थः [BGh. 14.20]
The wise man having crossed over while living itself the modes (gunas) aforesaid which are conditioned by Maya and which are the seeds from which the body emerges, is liberated from birth, death, decay and pains while still alive, and enjoys immortality, i.e., he thus attains to My being.

न हि सदयोमुक्तिभाजां सम्यग्दर्शननिष्ठानां गतिः आगतिर्वा क्वचित् अस्ति, 'न तस्य प्राणा
उत्क्रामन्तिऽ (बृ. उ. ४ । ४ । ६) इति श्रुतेः [BGh. 8.24]

There is nothing like 'going' or 'standing still' for those who attain to instant liberation (sadya mukti) and who are established in the right perception (understanding), for there is the sruti, 'His pranas do not go up (or out)'.

न च प्रतिषिद्धसेवाप्राप्तिः, एकत्वप्रत्ययोत्पत्तेः प्रागेव प्रतिषिद्धत्वात् . न हि रात्रौ कूपे कण्टके वा
पतितः उदितेऽपि सवितरि पतति तस्मिन्नेव . तस्मात् सिद्धं निवृत्तकर्मा भिक्षुक एव ब्रह्मसंस्थ इति
[Ch. 2.23.1 Bh.]

Besides, performance of prohibited action cannot take place (in his case) because such action had been prohibited even before the origination of the idea of identity. Just as a man who had fallen into a well or on thorns at night, surely does not do so even after the sun has risen, therefore, it is proved that the monk alone, who has ceased from actions (rites and duties), remains established in Brahman.

विद्वांस्तु पुनः विद्यया अविद्यायां निवृत्तायां शक्नोत्येव अशेषतः कर्म परित्यक्तुम् ,
अविद्याध्यारोपितस्य शेषानुपपत्तेः . न हि तैमिरिकदृष्ट्या अध्यारोपितस्य द्विचन्द्रादेः तिमिरापगमेऽपि
शेषः अवतिष्ठते । एवं च सति इदं वचनम् उपपन्नम् 'सर्वकर्माणि मनसाऽ (भ. गी. ५ । १३) इत्यादि,

‘स्वे स्वे कर्मण्यभिरतः संसिद्धिं लभते नरःs (भ. गी. १८ । ४५) ‘स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवःs (भ. गी. १८ । ४६) इति च [BGh. 18.48]

But the wise man (vidvan) in whose case avidya has been overcome by vidya (true knowledge), is able to give up action entirely, since there is not even the remnant left of what is superimposed by avidya. Never indeed will anything be left of the second moon seen by the eyes affected by Timira when Timira (disease) has vanished. As such the teachings such as "Renouncing all actions mentally" (Gita 5.13), "Devoted each to his own duty, man attains perfection" (Gita 18.45) and "By worshipping Him through performance of his duty, man attains perfection" (Gita 18.46), are quite proper.

Note:

अतोऽविद्यापगमेऽपि या तदनुवृत्तिरिव सा बाधितानुवृत्तिरेवेत्युक्तं भवति ।

(SSSS, The Method of Vedanta (Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā) transl. by A.J Alston. p. 733)

Here (Sri Sankara is saying that), where the enlightened person appears to be conforming to Ignorance that has in fact been removed, he is deliberately conforming to erroneous cognition that he knows to have been canceled.

OM TAT SAT

Bibliography:

A.J Alston. The Method of Vedanta (Vedāntaprakriyāpratyabhijñā)

Apte V.M. Brahma Sutra Shankara Bhashyam

D.B. Gangolli. The Essential Suresvara

Gambhirananda Swami. Brahma Sutra Bhasya

Gambhirananda, Swami. Chandogya Upanisad: With Commentary of Sankaracarya

Gambhirananda, Swami. Eight Upanishads with the Commentary of Sankaracarya, Vol. I (English Edition)

Gambhirananda, Swami. Eight Upanishads with the Commentary of Sankara, Vol. II: Aitareya, Mundaka, Mandukya & Karika and Prashna (English Edition)

Madhavananda Swami. The Brhadaranyaka Upanisad with the commentary of Sankaracarya

Panoli Vidyavachaspati V. Prasthanatraya Vol. 1-6

Sri Srisachidanandendrasaraswati Swami. Brihadaranyakopanishad (Part One) (Kannada)

Sri Srisachidanandendrasaraswati Swami. Srimadbhagavad Gita Part 1 (Kannada)

Sri Srisachidanandendrasaraswati Swami. Vísuddhavēdāntasārah (Sanskrit)