

GOD-REALIZATION THROUGH REASON

BY
SWAMI ISWARANANDA



SRI RAMAKRISHNA ASHRAMA
VILANGAN, P.O. PURANATTUKARA
TRICHUR, KERALA

Published by
SWAMI ISWARANANDA
PRESIDENT, SRI RAMAKRISHNA ASHRAMA
VILANGAN, P.O. PURANATTUKARA
DT. TRICHUR, KERALA STATE

FIRST EDITION JULY 1953
REVISED
SECOND EDITION NOV. 1959

Printed by
A. S. KAMATH
AT SHARADA PRESS
MANGALORE

PREFACE

The first edition of this book was published in July 1953 under the title, '*Talks on Jhana Yoga*'. This book has been renamed '*God-Realization Through Reason*' as many a reader on reading the title only of the first edition got the impression that it is only a re-discussion or study of Swami Vivekananda's lectures on *Jñāna Yoga*, whereas it is an entirely independent work. The topics discussed, the approach to, and the technique of *jñānayoga* expounded in this book are different from those of Swamiji's lectures. To remove the misunderstanding, a change in the title of the book has been thought advisable.

It is hoped that the book will also serve as a valuable supplement to Swamiji's lectures for a fuller and more intimate understanding of *jñānayoga*. The Upanisadic traditions were of two kinds: one theological and mystical and the other rational. Of these, Swami Vivekananda followed the rationalist tradition up to a certain point and advocated, as the final step, mysticism or yoga which culminated in intuition and inspiration in the superconscious state. The rationalist tradition, on the other hand, represented by the rsis to whom this book is dedicated, stuck to reason of the conscious state to the very end for the highest realization, and this book follows their tradition.

The path of brahmajñāna advocated in this book does not require any power of reasoning other than that possessed by the ordinary man; no intellectual gymnastic or any involvement in technicalities of logic is demanded of the aspirant. The procedure followed in this book is based on the common experience of all mankind and does not require any 'supra-rational organon' as claimed by

some who are fond of modern high-sounding jargons which serve only to surround the clear path of brahma-vidya with mysteries blocking the vision of the seeker.

Some of the matter of the *Talks* has been re-arranged in this edition. Some topics have also been added. All Sanskrit quotations have been transliterated in Roman characters according to the accepted International scheme, a table of which is given at the beginning of the book, and relegated to the footnotes, translations of which have been given in the body of the book. Quotations left untranslated in the first edition have been translated in this edition.

Before closing this preface let me express my heartfelt appreciation of the selfless services of friends who prepared the manuscripts of the book for the press, supervised the printing and corrected the proofs. I refrain from thanking them for their labour of love, out of respect for their dislike to be thanked. I also desire to give expression to my deep appreciation of the fine printing and get-up of the book by the Sharada Press, Mangalore.

Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama Trichur

26th September 1959

SWAMI ISWARANANDA

Preface to the First Edition

This book seeks to expound the philosophical approach to the realization of Brahman, the absolute Reality, in a very simple and rational way. The technique adopted here may appear novel to many; but, as a matter of fact, the author has only sought to clear the most ancient path trodden by the rsis of the Upanisads of over-growths. Mystical approaches and theological doctrines have been so much mixed up with the purely rational method in course of time as to make the latter path disappear, as it were, beneath the former, leaving only a faint streak on the surface to enable it to remind us of the existence of the path of jñānayoga. An attempt is made here to present the brahma-vidya shorn of the mystical and

theological accretions. Let scientists, rationalists, atheists, agnostics and materialists see if they have not a philosophy here which will not overstrain their power of reason and which will satisfy their intellect, at the same time be supremely beneficial and practical in their everyday life*

The realization of the philosophy taught in these pages is not such as will absorb the whole energy of man to the exclusion of the activities needed for the maintenance of the individual or social life. The struggle for existence is so keen at the present time as to make people complain that they have little time and energy left for the prolonged religious exercises and mystic absorptions. In this age when every ounce of man's energy, especially in India, has to be spent for acquiring the means of livelihood in a keen struggle for existence, on account of scarcity due to over-population and pressure on material resources, he wants a philosophy and a method of realizing it in everyday life which will release his time and energy for acquisition of those means, after attaining the highest peace, freedom, knowledge, bliss, love, fearlessness and the certainty of eternal life. Such a philosophy and the method of realizing it are offered to every man in these pages, which will take him to the *summum bonum* of life with the least expenditure of time and energy. May this book be helpful to all seekers of Truth and Reality in all climes and ages.

The book is divided into two parts. The first part consists of expository talks, and the second part is intended for those who want the authority of the scriptures and the great teachers for the standpoint adopted in these talks; in this second part they may have the authority they seek to their fill.

The author is deeply indebted to the donor, who has made a gift of the amount needed for the publication of this book, whose name he is not free to disclose. The sale proceeds of the book will go towards the service of the

Sadhus as desired by the donor as well as towards a second edition of the book.

20th July 1953 Trichur

THE AUTHOR

**DEDICATED
WITH SALUTATIONS**

TO

UDDÁLAKA ÁRUNI

SANATKUMÁRA

YÁJÑAVALKYA

PRAJÁPATI

AJÁTASATRU

PIPPALÁDA

SAÑKARÁCÁRYA

AND

ALL WHO TAUGHT BRAHMAVIDYÁ

THROUGH SAMPRASÁDAVIDYÁ

Note on Transliteration

In this book Devanagarī characters are transliterated according to the scheme adopted by the International Congress of Orientalists at Athens in 1912 and since then acknowledged to be the only rational and satisfactory one. The scheme of transliteration in full is as follows:

	3ta,	. an a, ? i,	f 1, 3 U, 3!
	r,	q e,	ii q ai, 3ft au, - ni,.
: h,	k,	kh, n g,	u gh, ? ñ,
sch,		jh, st ñ,	it, 3 th, 3 d,
? dh, or n,	at,	«tth,	5 d, n dh, H n,
<T p,	ph,	ab, ?tbh.	H tn, tf y, u,
n 1, W v,	Sts,	as, .	ns, t'h.

Pronunciation of Transliterated Words.

VOWELS

<i>a sounds like</i>	u in <i>sun</i> i	<i>sounds like i in bid</i>
a „	a „ <i>far</i> T	„ ee „ <i>seed</i>
ai „	y „ <i>my</i> o	„ o M <i>no</i>
au „	ow „ <i>now</i> u	„ u „ <i>bull</i>
e „	ay „ <i>say</i> u	„ oo „ <i>cool</i>

CONSONANTS

<i>c sounds like</i>	ch in <i>Church</i> r	<i>sounds like ru in French,</i> (midway between <i>roo</i> and <i>ri</i>)
d „	d in French s	„ sh
d „	d s	„ sh (practically)
g „	g in <i>get</i> t	„ t in French
h half-articulated	h Í	» t
m or ñ	ing	„ th in <i>thing</i>
ñ or n n (practically)		

The rest of the consonants sound as in English.

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface, İÜ
Preface to the first edition, v
Dedication, vii
Note on transliteration, viii

PART ONE

ARGUMENT

1. Introduction	1
2. A study of the Knower and the Known: <i>Analytic and synthetic reasoning..</i>	5
3. Non-duality in dreamless deep	11
4. What is reasoning?	14
5. Realization of Brahman only in terms of thought	16
6. Reason and Logic distinguished	18
7. The content of samadhi and susupti experiences the same	19
8. The difference between susupti and samadhi	21
9. Is sleep a modification of the mind?	24
10. Realization through vicára or samadhi?	25
11. Does suppression of the mind lead to liberation?	32
12. How did the many come out of the One?	33
13. Causality not true	35
14. Are you really bound?	37
15. Turiya the same as samprasáda	39
16. Sádhanas or disciplines	43
17. Is there sádhana after brahmajñána?	48
18. Is knowledge opposed to work?	50

x

PART TWO

ARGUMENT

1. Chandogyopanisad — <i>Sadvidya</i>	59*
--	-----

	„ — <i>Bhümavidyá</i>	63
	„ — <i>Daharavidya</i>	65-
	„ — <i>Samprasadavidyá</i>	..	67
2.	Taittiriya Upanisad	70'
3.	Prasna Upanisad	73
4.	Brhadáranyaka Upanisad	77
5.	Brahma-sütra-bbásya	98'
6.	Mándükyopanisad	108»

PART ONE

ARGUMENT

OM

Know me to be that transcendental Reality, the real Self identified with which an embodied soul (that is fast asleep) experiences by self-intuition the deep sleep and (supreme) felicity in that state.

That consciousness of the embodied soul which while remembering the sleeping and the waking states is aware of itself as the commonground of both, and which could be distinguished from the states, that consciousness is Brahman, the Absolute.

—Bhagavan Ananta to Citraketu
(*Snmad-Bhūgavata*, VI. xvi. 55, 56)

*yena prasuptah pur usa h svāpam veda 'imanas tada
sukham ca nirgunarit brahma lam atmanam avéhi mam
l ubhayam smaratah pumsah praspapratibodhayoh an
veil vyatiricyeta taj jñānam brahma tat param n*

God-Realization Through Reason

1. INTRODUCTION

The Upanisads are the highest authority on Hindu Religion and Philosophy. Their metaphysics has risen to the highest flights of thinking ever achieved by man. The dizzy

heights to which the vision of their thinkers and sages soared, have never been surpassed anywhere else in the world. In the Upanisads are depicted the sublimest reaches of freedom, fearlessness, bliss and enlightenment to which the soul of man has ever risen. To the suffering, sorrowing, struggling, unhappy race of humanity the Upanisads have imparted the knowledge of the secret of peace, bliss and fearlessness, inspired countless generations to strive for the highest and noblest ideals of life, and beckon all humanity to arise, awake and stop not till the goal is reached. These Upanisads have declared in unfaltering tones the realization of the Supreme Being as the highest achievement of great seers and sages. Thus spake one of the rsis: 'I have known that Great Being of the brilliance of the sun, beyond all darkness; knowing him alone one crosses over to immortality; there is no other way to the goal, there is no other way.'¹

The Upanisads have taught therefore, that Brahma-jñana, the realization of the Supreme Being, the One

*1 vedahametam purusa'ih mahantam ddityavarnam
tamasah parastdt tameva viditva 'timrtyumeti
nd 'nyah panthd mdyate, 'yandya (Sve. 8).*

without a second, as the sole means of liberation or moksa for the human soul.

The question is, how to attain this realization? What are the means and methods? The *Bhagavad-g'ita*, the next highest authority of Hinduism has dealt with four yogas: Jñána (philosophical investigation), dhyána or abhyása (practice of mental control and introspection), bhakti (love of Personal God) and karma (way of dedicated works). We shall be dealing here with the yoga or path of philosophical enquiry as taught in the Upanisads. Our object in these talks is to elucidate the fundamentals of the way trodden by the rsis of the Upanisads and present the salient features of this yoga as distinguished from other yogas.

It is a remarkable thing that the Upanisadic rsis imparted Brahmavidya not to pundits but to young men who had to unlearn what they had learnt. Of course, these youths had a preparatory training in the control of the mind and the senses, had renunciation, were earnest seekers after Truth and were devoted to the realization of Brahman. To them the rsis of old imparted the highest Truth in the simplest way possible, which, in course of time, falling into the hands of logicians, intellectuals, theologians, ritualists and mystics, had been covered by accretions, non-essential doctrines, and a forest of commentaries, and commentaries upon commentaries, and philosophical jargons, so much so that the student of Vedanta has to grope all his life before he could catch a gleam of light and very often, even this is denied to him by the over-solicitous anxiety of the wellmeaning but confirmed believers in and champions of mysticism who, in the name of jñanayoga, the path of philosophy, have reduced it to the art of seeing visions, hearing voices and getting realizations by repetition of

formulas and by the suppression of mental functioning in samadhi. Whatever may be the value and utility of such

practices—and we do not mean to deny them— they do not form the essence of jñānāyoga, which is pre-eminently the path of vicāra or reason and which has been blazoned by the knowers of Brahman. Neither does this yoga consist in a knowledge of various systems of philosophies and theologies of which the number is legion. No amount of acquaintance with the inexhaustible details of the panorama of world phenomena, the microcosm and the macrocosm, and organizing them into systems will give us that knowledge of the Reality which will save us from the constant fear of the unknown that ever confronts us. Like the proverbial will-o'-the-wisp, the ultimate ever deludes us until most of us abandon the search for knowledge and betake ourselves to the satisfactions and joys offered by mysticism or social service. But he who treads the path of jñānāyoga must have the determination or the śraddhā to achieve the goal which, after all, is not so very formidable as the pundits and mystics make us believe. Today the very name Vedānta is dreaded by many, so much so that whatever is difficult to understand and requires complicated ways of reasoning and thinking, is in popular language 'Vedānta'. Why should this be so? Why should Truth be so very difficult to get at? One should have thought it is untruth and error that required to be supported by a thousand props and not truth which is characterised by straightforwardness. Jñānāyoga is the path of straightforward thinking, the shortest way to the realization of the ultimate Reality and the easiest of all yogas, and the resultant realization of Advaita, the most comprehensive of all realizations, is the simplest of all philosophical truths which no philosophical system could

ever refute or overthrow. ‘To the introspective,’ says Sankara, ‘with the blessing of a teacher and of one’s own self, there is nothing so easy, so well known and so quickly accessible, and so near as this knowledge of Brahman.’² Therefore, the first thing that the aspirant to the realization of Brahman has to do is to get rid of the fear and prejudice against this yoga embedded in their hearts by the teachings of the devotees and the mystics.

² *báhyükara-nivrta-buddhnam tu labdha-gurvñtma-prasá- dándm na atah parám sukham suprasiddhaih suvijñeyaih sva- çannataram asti {Gita-bháśya, XVIII, 50}.*

2. A STUDY OF THE KNOWER AND THE KNOWN

Analytic and Synthetic Reasoning

The goal of jñānayoga is the realization of the ultimate Reality (Brahman) by knowing which everything becomes known, *yajjhatva sarvam idarh vijnatarii bhavati*. There are two assertions implied in this: First, that there is only one ultimate Reality; second, that everything can be known. Are these assertions true, or are they mere assumptions? Jñānayoga proposes to answer these questions to the entire satisfaction of the questioner.

The starting point in jñānayoga is the question: What is this world and who am I? 'Ahatrī and 'Idam\ 'I' and 'this', the two categories in our experience, are the objects of investigation; and when these have been thoroughly investigated we will have attained the goal of jñānayoga. Nothing more will remain to be known; for, these are the only contents of our experience—I, the knower and this, the known. We first start with self-analysis asking the question, 'Who am I?' The Self is immediately intuited in our experience, is *pratyak*. No one can doubt that one exists.

If anyone doubts the existence of the Self, then the seer of the doubt is the Self. Who then am I? Am I a body and mind as is usually supposed? This conviction is so deep-rooted that I hardly doubt it. But I have to start with this very question of my own nature. Along with the consciousness of 'I', I have the consciousness of 'this' also, something other than I. I know that I am not this paper; I am convinced of this fact. Why? Because it is an object of experience, because it is known to the knower I. For the same reason, I am compelled

to conclude that I am not this body, neither am I the senses, nor the mind, because they are known to me, the knower. They are other than myself. The knower and the known, the seer and the seen, the drk and the drsya cannot be the same. It is on this ground that I am not this paper. It is on the very same ground that I am not the body or the mind. Even the ego-senée of I, being only a modification of the mind, which is experienced as an object, is other than the real I, and is seen as an object along with the body, the mind and the world of senses. The real I then is simply, the Knower, Consciousness itself set against which is the world of insentient nature including my body and mind. The fact that I talk of 'my' body and 'my' mind implies that I have some vague idea of these being other than myself and which I can possess as I possess my umbrella or shoe. In this way, all our world of experience could be analysed into the categories of Self and non-Self following our present cognition of T and 'this' and pushing it to its ultimate logical possibility. This is the first step in Vedantic reasoning and ends in the discovery of the real I, the Self as Pure Consciousness or cit, the essence of knowledge. This, the atman does not require any proof whatever. For, if there is any proof required for its existence, the proof has to be certified by the Self itself. Therefore, the Self, Consciousness, is fundamental in all our experience.

A series of interesting conclusions follow from this. None of the qualities and properties and functions and states of the world of objects belong to me the knower, nor do they affect me. Not being the body, I am not subject to hunger or thirst. I have no disease, no growth or decay, neither birth nor death. I am not white or black, neither ugly nor beautiful. I am neither male nor female, I have no sex. I am no father or mother, I am no son, or daughter, I am no husband or wife, brother or sister, for these relations are derived through the

body of which I am only the knower. Nor am I the doer of any action; I neither drink nor eat, neither walk nor sit, neither weep nor laugh, neither write nor speak; for these are only the functions of the body. Not being the senses, I neither see nor hear, neither do I smell nor taste nor touch. Not being the mind, I am not the thinker or the doubter or the questioner, or the enquirer or the judge, or a philosopher or a poet or a mathematician. I am neither dull nor intelligent, neither a fool nor a genius. I am the Pure Consciousness which simply reveals the activities of the mind. I am, therefore, neither happy nor unhappy, neither proud nor humble, these being only states of the mind. I am neither a Christian nor a Hindu, nor a Muslim nor a Jew nor a Zoroastrian, these being only the mind's ideas of my social or religious affiliations. My body may be born of Indian, Chinese, British or Negro parents, but being only the Seer of the body, I am neither an Indian nor a Chinaman nor a Britisher nor a Negro. I have no country, I am only the Seer of all countries. I therefore, do not belong to any country, nor does any country belong to me. 'Mine' is only a mental modification which comes and goes and relates itself to different objects and persons and places at different times. As the body and mind do riot hold me, as I am only their Seer and so outside them, I am not limited by them. I am outside nature; I am not in space, I am the Seer of space and also of time. I am, therefore, unlimited by time or space. Time and space, their existence being revealed by me, have no support nor locus except in me, the consciousness that knows them. I am infinite and the whole world exists in me. I could not have been born, for if anything comes into existence either from a state of existence or even from non-existence I must have been there to know it; nor can it be supposed that I will die or go into non-existence or into some other state of existence, for I must be there as the unchanging witness to

see the changes. I am unchanging, eternal, unborn and immortal. Birth or death does not belong to me. Being ever unchanging and of the same nature even when everything else may change, I am eternally peaceful and beyond all wants, anxieties, cares, desires, miseries or fear; for these are only states and modifications of the mind. I am unqualified existence, knowledge absolute and bliss unalloyed— so "ham! so 'ham! I am the sole support of the universe; the universe exists because I reveal its existence, I am Pure Consciousness, the Self. 'He shining, everything else shines. All these are revealed by his self-effulgence.'³ Such is my glorious and majestic Self. These are the startling conclusions we come to by the process of drg- drsya-viveka, discrimination between the Self and the non-Self, the seer and the seen.

This process of reasoning ends in dualism, the duality of the Self and the non-Self. This is the point where the Sankhya system climbed up to, but where it stopped. It did not go further than reducing the multiplicity of experience into two ultimate categories of purusa and prakrti, each of which was equally real and mutually exclusive. This process of analytical reasoning is called vyatirekin reasoning and ends in the dualism of spirit and matter.

Vedanta would not stop there. It puts the question: What is this non-Self, the world of drsya, the so-called world of insentient matter and mind? By the first process of reasoning, we have known the Self. It has not told us what the non-Self is, and unless this is answered, we have not known all that is to be known.

And of what use is this knowledge of duality of the Self

3 *tarn eva bhcintam anubhati sarvam*

tasya Lhasa sarvam idam vibhdti (Mund. U., II. ii. 11).

and the body, asks Vedanta.¹ Hence the second process of reasoning known as anvayin, synthetic, by which we come to the knowledge that all this is the Self, *atmai 've "dam sarvam*. That which was first rejected as non-Self, the world of drsya is known at the end of this process as nothing other than the Self. The Self being thus without a second, nothing more will remain to be known. Says Sri Ramakrsna: 'He (Tsvarakoti) follows the process of negation and affirmation. First he negates the world realising that it is not Brahman, but then he affirms the same world as the manifestation of Brahman. To give an illustration, a man wanting to climb to the roof first negates the stairs as not being the roof, but on reaching the roof he finds that the stairs are made of the same materials as the roof—bricks, lime and brickdust. Then he can either move up and down the stairs, or remain on the roof as he pleases' {*Gospel of Érí Ramakrsna, Page 635*}.

Says Saiikara: 'By analytic reasoning one reaches the ultimate cause of the universe and by synthetic reasoning that very same cause is seen always in the effect.'⁴⁵

The sastras have taught that the first stage of realization is the knowledge of the difference between the Self and the non-Self. This is accompanied by the ideas of reality and unreality *i.e.*, the Self as real and the non-Self as unreal. In the second stage the knowledge of Brahman is of two forms in accordance with experience and reason. The first is due to the previous identification of the Self with the body and is of the nature, 'I am Brahman', that is to say, not the body, and

4 *ity átmadehabhagena prapañcasyai "va satyatá yatho 'ktá tarkasástrena tatah kim purusárthatá.*

(*Aparoksánubhñti, 41*)

5 *káranam vyatirekena puntan ádau vilokayet anvayena punastad hi kdrye nityam prapasyati.*

(*Aparúksánubhñti, 138*)

the other is when I know the Self is all this and is of the nature 'All this is Brahman'.⁶

6 *dtmandtmapratitih prathamam abhihita satyamithyatvayo- gát d/vedhá brahmapratitir nigamanigaditá svdnuhbhütyopapatyá. ádyá dehánubandhád bhavati tadapará sá ca sarvatmakatvdt ddau brahma 'ham asml 'ty anubhava udite khalvidam brahma pascát (Sataslokl, 3).*

3. NON-DUALITY IN DREAMLESS SLEEP

How then do I know that 'all this is the Self'? Here, again, we start with experience, anubhava, a significant experience. It is nothing but our everyday experience of dreamless sleep, susupti. We hardly give a thought to the nature of this experience except to say, 'I had a very profound or pleasant sleep'. We dismiss it then and there, and take no more thought of it; but the rsis of old, the seers of the Upanisads, considered this experience as a treasure of gold over which we pass up and down everyday of our life without ever suspecting the existence of an invaluable treasure under our feet {*Chánd. U., VIII. 3*). This unique experience is being neglected by us as something of no consequence except for the rest of the body and mind it affords. But to the rsis this experience was of great philosophical significance, and on this has been grounded the saving Truth of Advaita and the reality of the non-dual Brahman.

What then is this experience? What happens to this world and my personality as Mr so-&-so in deep sleep? We say, 'I did not know anything in sleep'. I am now sure that the world of objects including my personality with body, mind and ego was not experienced. Nothing of the drsyaprapañca, the world of objects of the waking or dream states, was present in my consciousness. Why? Was it that consciousness itself was non-existent in deep sleep? That could not be; for if consciousness were absent, there could not have been now the memory that, 'all this' of the waking state was not experienced then. This is not an inference. If I did not see a lion this morning, but was reminded of this fact when I saw one in the evening, I do not say that I 'inferred' that I had not seen the lion in the morning. It was a fact of experience. But then,

I existed in the morning and I know it from memory, so that I can now vouch for the fact that I did not then see the lion, though I had not the idea then that I was not seeing the lion; (for to have such an experience, no idea is necessary). Thus then, my existence as consciousness in deep sleep could not be doubted, *na hi vijhatur vijhater viparilopo vidyate (Br. U.)*. It is that consciousness that is now bearing witness to the fact that this world was not experienced. What could be the reason for it? Shall we suppose that a screen of ignorance, avidya invaded my consciousness and so the world of non-Self was hidden from my consciousness? That cannot be; for, if the screen of ignorance were present, it should have been known to consciousness as present before it as a second entity other than itself. (If I do not see an object before me on account of a screen, I cannot avoid seeing the screen itself.) But this is contradicted by our experience, of which we say, 'T did not see anything'. If ignorance were present as an object, our verdict would be, 'T knew ignorance in deep sleep'; but this nobody says. And if I knew a second entity, then I must have been waking or dreaming. In these states we experience ignorance, but certainly not in deep sleep in which no object, gross or subtle, dark or white, is experienced, as different from the Self.

Where then was this world? Was it remaining in some subtle state, say, like a tree in a seed? If it were, then, it could have been witnessed by the ever-present consciousness. Whoever hath seen the world-seed in dreamless sleep? We say, 'T knew nothing in deep sleep'. Therefore, the fact that nothing other than the Self existed in *susupti* is an incontrovertible conclusion. 'There the seer alone existed, one without a second, like one mass of water.'⁷ Where then was this world? The seers of the Upanisads say that the world

7 sálila eko drastá advaito bhavaii (Br. U., IV. Hi. 32).

existed then as non-different from the Self. To see another, to know another, there must be that second entity. Without a second entity beside itself, how can the Self know it? If then the world was not seen by the Self, that was because the world remained as the Self. The reasoning is clear and simple. This second process is known as anvayin or the synthetic process.

Was not the world then the Self in the previous waking state? And is not the world even now, in this waking state, the Self? Is not the world always theatman? Yes, it is so. All this is always atman: *atmaCve'dam sarvam*. All this is Brahman: *sarvarh khalvidam brahma*. There are not many here: *ne'ha nana'sti kiricana*. There is only one without a second: *ekam evadvitlyam brahma*. The whole universe, therefore, is nothing but pure consciousness, cit, the Self that 'I am'. We have answered the second question: What is this world? This realization known as sarvatmabhava is the supreme goal of Vedantic investigation and attainment, the highest state of freedom, fearlessness, desirelessness and bliss. This is the realization of Brahman, brahmajñana.

4. WHAT IS REASONING?

Now let us turn back and examine our steps. We started with the anubhava or experience of the waking state, in which the T is pitted against the 'non-I'. Consciousness of duality is the essential feature of the waking experience. What is implied in this consciousness is the axiom that the experiencer and the experienced are not the same. The experienced must be different from and other than the experiencer in order to be experienced. We apply this axiom to our cognition of our body and mind and realize the truth that these are not the real T', the experiencer. What we have done is simply to make explicit what has been implicit in our ordinary experience of objects. The anubhava was there, but the jñāna, the knowledge, that we are not the body or the mind, that we are the drk, the pure consciousness, was not there. Why were we ignorant of this truth? Because we never thought of the implications of our experience; we have not reasoned. That which has made us conscious of the truth in terms of ideas such as T am the pure consciousness other than the body and the mind and the ego' is the process of reasoning. *And by reason is meant the process by which that which is implicit in experience is made explicit in terms of thought.* For millions of generations men saw apples falling, but only a Newton reasoned and brought out the implications of that experience in terms of thought, and thus realized the truth of gravitation. That the earth is round is not patent to us until we have put together a number of our experiences and made explicit what is implied in these experiences. The judge comes to the conclusion that so-&-so is a criminal by putting together various pieces of evidence and educing, as it were, what is already implied in the facts of evidence before him which

is the sum total of his experience. The logician argues: All men are mortal; Socrates is a man; therefore Socrates is mortal. The conclusion is nothing but an explicit statement of what is implied in the premises. Yet the association of mortality with Socrates is the new piece of knowledge gained by this reasoning. Anubhava is, therefore, not tantamount to jñána. Jñána is the result of vicara or reasoning on experience, *vicárad anyasádha- nair bodho (tattvabodho) na jayate (Atmabodhd)*. All jñána or knowledge is experience; but all anubhava or experience is not knowledge.

5. REALIZATION OF BRAHMAN ONLY IN TERMS OF THOUGHT

The same technique is now applied to answer the question, what is the world of non-Self, the world of *drsyaprapañca*? Of the many experiences we have, *susupti* is the one experience which will answer this question and is therefore of special significance. We simply make explicit what is already implied in that experience. That experience is non-dual, where the non-self of the waking state was not experienced as other than the Self, or as having an independent existence. It was the Self alone that remained, the Self that reveals the existence, if any, of a second entity, as its very nature is never-failing consciousness. The world of the waking state is, therefore, a mirage, as it were, on the desert of the *atman*; which mirage disappeared for a time and this gap in our experience of the waking and dream states is *susupti*. But the implications of this experience, the truth of the non-dual existence, could not be realized in that state by the very nature of that experience; for in the absence of the thinking instrument, the mind, as a separate entity from the Self, no thought in the form, 'All this is the Self' is possible. The realization of this truth is possible only on reflection in the waking state when the mind is present, or in the dream state also, if you please, which is not fundamentally different from the waking. 'All this is the Self', 'All this is Brahman', 'There are not many here', &c. are forms of thought, they are *vrtti-jñana*. *Vrtti* is possible only in the waking and therefore, *brahmajñāna* is possible only in the waking, whereas *brahmanubhava* is what obtains in deep sleep. When the implications of *brahmanubhava* are made explicit in terms of thought by *vicara* or reasoning, we get *brahmajñana*. There is no such thing

as realization of Brahman other than, brahmanubhava or brahmajñana. 'The srutis themselves declare that this dualistic universe is but a delusion, and that in reality it is non-dual. This is directly experienced in dreamless sleep.'⁸

⁸ *máyamat/ram idañt dvaitam advaitam paramarthatah iti brüte srutih saksdt susuptávanubhñyate (Vivekacüdamani, 405).*

6. REASON AND LOGIC DISTINGUISHED

Reason is not logic. Logic is concerned with formal truth, not material truth. For example, if you once admit that all men are fools and Socrates is a man, then you are bound to conclude that Socrates is a fool. Logic does not enquire into the truth or otherwise of the premise, 'All men are fools', nor into the conclusion, 'Socrates is a fool'. And yet the conclusion is perfectly logical. Logic can build anything upon assumptions, unverified premises; and whole philosophical structures have been built upon assumptions without any foundations in facts of experience, and which could not therefore be verified. These systems have remained as mere theoretical structures, playthings for the imagination of university intellectuals and pundits. The truth of Advaita is not built upon gymnastics of logic or upon the fancies of imagination,. It is based upon experience and its interpretation. The jñānayogin must be a thorough rationalist and should not be trapped into the treacherous pits of dry logic, suskatarka or kevalatarka unsupported by anubhava. The tarka or reasoning which the jñānayogin adopts is in the words of Sankara, 'reasoning based on experience' (*anubhavaḥgatvena tarkaḥ*) which alone will take him to Truth.

THE CONTENT OF SAMADHI AND SUSUPTI EXPERIENCES THE SAME

What is really wanting is not the experience of Brahman or atman; for the Self is immediately intuited by all—in the waking state as conditioned by the limiting adjuncts of the body, mind and various kinds of relationships and ideas superimposed on the atman and in deep sleep completely free from all these. The intuition of deep sleep is timeless, spaceless and mindless; in fact it is pure sentiency, jñapti. It

is objectless intuition or awareness without any object to be aware of, or Pure Consciousness. However much one may meditate or withdraw oneself, one cannot go beyond the Self. Therefore the real work to be done is the removal of the superimpositions through discrimination and by understanding the implications of the non-dual experience of deep sleep. But there are many who on account of its being a free gift of Nature do not consider it of any value higher than that of physical and mental relaxation and rest. Sleep comes to us unsought; we are so familiar with it; and that is why we do not give a thought to it. There is the English proverb, 'Familiarity breeds contempt' and the Indian proverb, 'The jasmine in your courtyard has no smell'. Such people are not satisfied with the Ganges water which flows by the side of their own house, but want to dig a well of their own on the bank with great effort. They too will surely get water after which alone their thirst will be satisfied. For such people the dhyána- yogins or rajayogins have prescribed the astáñga-yoga leading to the suppression of all mental modifications and withdrawal of consciousness from the physical body (jada-samadhi or nirvikalpa-samadhi). But the man in samadhi of this kind gets no more realization of the

Absolute than the one in deep sleep, just as the man who digs the well gets nothing but water.

The attainment of the Absolute in samadhi is valuable to the yogin on account of the trouble taken, pains undergone and effort put forth to attain it whereas the same got in susupti having come to him without any effort is of little or no value. It is one of the accepted principles of economics that value is determined by the amount of labour spent on the commodity; that seems to be applicable here also.

8. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SUSUPTI AND SAMADHI

Is there then no difference between susupti and samadhi? If by samadhi is meant in this context, the non-dual experience, then there is absolutely no difference between the two from the standpoint of the experiencing consciousness. The sruti says with reference to the experience of susupti: 'The seer remains alone, one without a second like a mass of water.'⁹ Does the man in samadhi get an experience different from this? But from the standpoint of an onlooker and from the standpoint of the persons who have come out of these states and have fallen into the waking state, a difference could be made out, or is made out between the mental conditions of the two on the supposition that minds existed in samadhi and susupti. I say, 'on the supposition', for, no mind is experienced as such in samadhi or susupti. The existence of the mind in these states is a mere inference in the waking state, but contradicted by experience. For, both of them coming out of their experiences report that they knew nothing in these states. It is, therefore, on the supposition that there is mind in these states that a difference could be made out between susupti and samadhi.

Well, then, the difference may be stated to be like the difference between the body-postures and conditions of two men in deep sleep—one standing and the other lying. The one lying on a bed is completely relaxed; the one standing has all his muscles and nerves thoroughly under control and therefore is in a tense state. Now, neither of them knows anything about his body in sleep. Their experiences do not differ; but when they come out of sleep,.

⁹ *salila eko drastá advaito bhavati (Br. U., IV. Hi. 32).*

one finds his body standing as it was before he went to sleep; the other finds his body lying in bed as it was before sleep. The former infers that his body continued to be standing and the latter that his body continued to be lying in bed; but neither of them had any knowledge of his body in the sleep-state itself. As such the experience of the one could not be distinguished from that of the other. The difference, therefore, is only from the standpoint of the body. But we are not concerned with the state of the body when we enquire into the actual experience of the two. It is of no consequence in this context. Similarly, the state of mind, manah-pracara, of the one who has undergone yogic discipline and has attained cittavrtti- nirodha or complete suppression of the mind-modification, may be different from the relaxed state of the undisciplined mind of a person in ordinary sleep. It is this state of discipline and control which is valuable in the practice of yoga and not the state of complete forgetfulness which follows the suppression and which could not be distinguished from the complete forgetfulness, sarvavismrti, or complete non-cognition, sarva-agrahana, of the susupti state; because this we get in the latter state, Sankara has defined samadhi as 'Complete forgetfulness of all vrttis'.¹⁰ When the man comes out of samadhi, he gets back again the pre-samadhi controlled state of mind. He, therefore, infers that his mind continued to be niruddha or controlled in samadhi also; whereas the man coming out of susupti infers that his mind continued to exist submerged or lina even as it was before he lost sight of it. But of what consequence is this to me except to know that if my mind is controlled in the waking state, I may get it back in the

10 *vrttl-vismaranam samyak samádirjñánasaihjñakalj.*
(*Aparoksánubhñti* 9 124)

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SUSUPTI AND SAMADHI 23 same way in the next waking state, and if uncontrolled, I may get it back uncontrolled—the forgetfulness of sleep or samadhi making no difference in the content of one's experience in those states. If, then, the samadhi under discussion is a case of non-dual experience, the difference in the poise of the supposed minds does not bring about additional knowledge or realization any more than what obtains in susupti. But with the knowledge of non-duality gained in a previous waking state, the man coming out of samadhi experiences this knowledge again in the waking when he experiences his mind. If he was ignorant, he continues to be ignorant even after samadhi, even though his mind is thoroughly disciplined, controlled and concentrated, for no knowledge of Truth or Reality is gained where there is no mind. This is true of deep sleep as well; a fool comes out of sleep as a fool and a knower of Brahman as a knower of Brahman.

9. IS SLEEP A MODIFICATION OF THE MIND?

Indirectly this is a rejection of the yogic definition of *susupti*: *abh civ a prat yaya lamban ci vrttir nidra*. That sleep is a mental modification resting on the idea of non-existence is unacceptable to Vedanta. The Vedántin asks: who bath seen this mental modification or idea of absence of things of the waking state? If there is the presence of such a *vrtti* it would have been immediately known as an object to the witness which is always consciousness itself. When an idea such as 'I am not seeing an elephant' occurs to me, that idea is immediately known and could be remembered. But if I am asked, 'Did you see an elephant this morning?' and I reply, 'No', it does not imply that I had any such idea of the absence of the elephant in my mind before the question was put to me. Therefore, the inference that such a *vrtti* existed all along is wrong. In fact, absence or presence of any elephant was not at all thought of by me. Similarly the absence of any thought about the universe of the waking state is a matter of experience, which is called deep sleep and this is remembered in the waking state by contrast. Deep sleep is, therefore, total forgetfulness (*sarvavismrti*) of all objects including the mind and its *vrttis*. Therefore the conclusion of the Vedanta that 'The Self alone exists, One without a second' is a bare statement of experience and it is pointing to this witness which is present even now in the waking state that the *sruti* teaches *lat tvam asi*.

10. REALIZATION THROUGH VICARA OR SAMADHI?

Some students of the scriptures make a distinction between knowing and realizing. They believe that that which is arrived at through reason has to be realized later on by meditation. They are right if they mean by reason only second-hand knowledge got at through inference or the

experience of other people, paroksajñána. They have to resort to imagination in order to harmonise their present experience in the waking state with the second-hand knowledge heard from those who have realized the Truth. Their knowledge is only theoretical or indirect, only intellectual, but the knowledge obtained by the application of reason to one's own experience can never be theoretical. The knowledge of Advaita when obtained as a result of the right interpretation of the advaya experience of deep sleep can never be theoretical or indirect; being based on one's own experience it is direct or aparoksa; for, as Sankara says: 'We on the other hand do want to prove that the 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 unconnected with the worlds that appear in the waking and dreaming states. Hence the Self alone is the place of deep sleep.'¹¹ And by reasoning on this experience, one attains átmalábha or the realization of the Self. 'By reasoning of

the latter type (reasoning leading to realization) we may, for instance, arrive at the following conclusions: that because the state of dream and the waking state exclude each other, the Self is not connected with those states; that, as the soul in the state of deep sleep leaves the phenomenal world behind and becomes one with that whose Self is Pure Being, it has for its self Pure Being apart from the phenomenal world; that as the world springs from Brahman it cannot be separated from

11 *brahma tn anapdyi suptisthanam Uy etad pratipádayámah, tena tu vijñánena prayojanam asti. jivasya brahmátmatváva- dháranahi svapnajágarita-vyavahara- vimuktatvavadluirana'm co* ;asmad Citmaiva suptisthanam.*

(Sankara's *Sñtra-bhdsya*, III, ii. 7)

Brahman according to the principle of the non-difference of cause 3Bd effect',¹² Sankara in the commentary on *Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad* has insisted that deep sleep is an experience of mokṣa itself. *tasmad samprasādashānari mokṣa-drstāntabhūtam* (IV. iii. ,34). That is why reasoning on this experience in the waking state leads to direct realization of mokṣa and sarvātmabhāva. On the otherhand Sankara has condemned (the wisdom or pānditya of those who believe thus: “Kṣetrajña is Tsvara himself; but kṣetra is different from the kṣetrajña and is the object of experience for the kṣetrajña. But I am a bound soul with happiness and unhappiness as my lot. I am to get rid of my bondage by discriminating between the Self and the non-Self and then I shall get a direct vision of the Lord by becoming kṣetrajña by meditation^ He who knows thus and he who teaches thus, neither of them is the Self. Whoever thinks thus is /the meanest of pundits, deluding himself with the thought

12 *srutyānugrahita eva hi atra tarkah anubhavadṅgatvena āsriyate. svapndnta-buddhantayor ubhayor itaretara-vyabhi- cdrdd ātrnano ananvdgatatvam, samprasāde ca prapañca- paritydgena saddtmand sampatter nisprapañca-saddtmatvaQh^ prapañcasya brahmaprabhavatvdt kdryakarandnanyatva-nydyena brahmavyatireka ity eva?ri jatiyakah.*

(Sankara's *Sūtra-bhāṣya*, II. i. 6)

that he has found out the meaning of sarhsara, moksa, and the sastras dealing with them. Such a man is the murderer of the Self; himself blind, he deludes others also by his ignorance of the traditional knowledge of the scriptures. He murders the scriptures and imposes his own imagination in the place of what is taught in them. Such a man, even though he may be learned in all the scriptures, on account of his ignorance of the traditional technique is to be rejected as an ignorant person.’¹³ Practising the repetition of a formula such as, ‘I am Brahman’, ‘All this is Brahman’ is of as much use as repeating ‘I am abracadabra’, ‘All this is abracadabra’ in the case of one who has not understood the meaning of Brahman from one’s own experience. One who has never experienced tooth-ache cannot form an idea of it, nor can one who never had an experience of non-duality ever formulate the idea ‘All this is Brahman’.

That the meaning of the mahávákya (Upanisadic grand text) *tat tvam asi* (Thou art That) can be realized only by referring to the experience of deep sleep is emphasised by Saiikara in the *Sarvaveddntasiddhantasara- sañgraha*. After

13 *idam, ca anyat pándit/yanv kesairicit astu—ksetrajña isvara eva. ksetram, ca anyat ksetrajñasyai ’va visayah. aham tu samsarl sukhi dukhi ca. sariisaroparamas ca mama kartavyah ksdra- ksetrajñavijñanena, dhydnena ca isvaram ksetrajnam saksat- krtva tat svarupavasthanena iti. yas ca evam buddhyate, yas ca bodhayati, na asau ksetrajña iti.*

evam manvanah yah sah panditCipasadah, samsara-moksa- yoh sastrasya ca arthavattvam karomi ’ti; atmaha ca; svayam mudhahi anyarhsca vydmohayati, sastrarthasampraddyarahitatvdt- srutahánim, asrutakalpanam ca kurvan. tasmát asampradayavit sarvasastravid api murkhavad eva upeksamyah.

(Gita-bhasya, XIII. 2)>

showing that the individual soul (jiva) with his limiting adjuncts, upádhis, cannot be the same as the personal God, Isvara, with his unlimited adjuncts and therefore the mantra cannot be accepted at its face-value on account of obvious contradictions, the acarya says:

‘In the sense of the One Undivided Existence, the meaning is acceptable to the sruti. In order to establish the non-duality of Brahman, the sruti declares the identity of the self and Brahman in the passage.¹⁴ “All this has the self as its substratum” *after having shown that self alone exists in deep sleep and that it is non-different from Brahman*, and that, therefore, this extended universe is in essence Pure Existence only. Where is non-duality in Brahman, when the soul and the universe are seen? Therefore, their *infinity* and *identity* are acceptable to the sruti. The obvious contradictions in the apparent meaning of the mantra are thereby removed, and it does not also contradict the sruti’ {*Vide* verses 728 to 753}. Earlier in verses 703, 704 and 705 Sankara points out that right knowledge results from ascertaining the meaning of the sruti text: ‘So long as the meaning of “That” and “Thou” are not reflected upon, one will remain in bondage and misery. But liberation, of the nature of Existence-Knowledge-Bliss Absolute, will be attained *by understanding the meaning of the mantra from one’s own experience directly*”.

Some yogins believe that brahmajñana takes place in the state of nirvikalpa-samadhi. We have seen that there is self-contradiction in this belief, for vrtti and absence of vrtti cannot be experienced at the same moment. Hence, the belief demands an explanation. We think that the yogin fails to remember that he has reasoned out his knowledge immediately after samadhi. After all, there is only a single

14 *sa ya eso animaitadatmyam idam sarvarii tat satyam sa dtrna tat tvam asi svetaketo* (Chánd. U., VI. viii. 7).

step of reasoning from brahmanubhava to brahmajñana. The yogin's mind may so rapidly pass over this reasoning that he may take the knowledge arrived at as having happened in the nirvikalpa itself. The nirvikalpa experience being also the basis for the knowledge, his legitimate claim that brahmajñana is the *result* of nirvikalpa is modified into the statement that the jñána takes place *in* samadhi. The statement also is not far from truth as the knowledge takes place, as it were, on the very brink of experience. When we say that London is on the Thames, it does not mean that the city is on the waters of the river. We mean only that it is on the banks of the river. In the same way we have to understand that it is only an approximate statement of the mystics that they have their brahmajñana in nirvikalpa-samadhi.

The curd when left undisturbed does not yield its butter, but requires to be churned before the butter can come to the surface. So also the experience of nirvikalpa has to be churned by the rod of reason before it can yield the truth that remains implicit in it. The yogin may overlook and slur over this process and lay all emphasis on the experience itself. The difference between brahmanu- bhava and brahmajñana is too subtle to be easily observed and distinguished. Hence the belief that the samadhi in itself is a state of enlightenment which is not the view of vedántins like Sankara.

If cittavrttinirodha were a state of knowledge, it would be a contradiction in terms, for vrttinirodha cannot co-exist with knowledge. The mind does not function, and no knowledge in the form, 'T am Brahman' or 'All this is Brahman', is possible. Such knowledge is the result of reasoning on the experience of samadhi or susupti, both of which require to be supplemented by vicara in order to gain the realization of the truth of Advaita in the waking state. The fundamental reason why advaita-samadhi could not be distinguished from susupti is that in neither of these "s there

particularised knowledge or visesavijñana. Two states of visesavijñana or particularised knowledge can be compared or distinguished from each other; but two states of nirvisesavijñana, non-particularised consciousness or awareness can never be distinguished from each other.

The practice of concentration can be and should be a preparatory sādhana or spiritual discipline in so far as it fashions the instrument with which the jñānin has to reason. Yoga, therefore, should be practised, though the forgetfulness which follows the complete suppression of mental modification is of no greater worth to the jñāna-yogin than his susupti. But without vicara there can be no knowledge of the Truth, no enlightenment.

The definition of yoga is cittavrttinirodha, the suppression of all modifications of the mind. When all modifications are suppressed, no trace of any modification or vrtti can be supposed to exist. If any is seen to exist, then the nirodha or suppression is not complete. When it is completed, how could it differ from complete forgetfulness of all vrttis as in susupti? The difference is only in the conditions which led to either and the definitions also are based on such conditions, the contents of the two experiences remaining identical.

Again advaita-samadhi also may be of two kinds—these also based on the previous conditions, processes and states of mind:

1. It may be the result of mechanical cittavrtti-nirodha or deliberate suppression of mind; the yogin may not have attained through reasoning to enlightenment or knowledge of the Truth, 'All this is the Self', and therefore may come out of it without that knowledge.

2. It may be the result of absorption in the idea, 'All this is the Self' which knowledge one has attained through reasoning on the experience of avasthatraya. The tendency of

this knowledge is to negate 'all this' and get absorbed in the Self. When the absorption is complete, the Self alone remains, and 'all this' is forgotten. Vrttivismarana takes place. As this samadhi is brought about by absorption in the knowledge 'All this is atman' or 'I am Brahman' it is known as jñānasamadhi. Says Sankara in *Aparoksanubhūti*: 'Remaining identified with pure Existence, with the idea "I am Brahman" which gives us supreme bliss is known as dhyana. Following this takes place what is called jñānasamadhi in which there is no vrtti, or which is the same as the form (or nature) of Brahman which is brought about by the complete forgetfulness of the vrtti "I am Brahman". Vrttivismarana is the essential condition of nirvikalpa; for this is not brought about without forgetting all vrttis. And when all vrttis are forgotten, it is the same as susupti; as susupti is total forgetfulness (sarvavismṛti), total non-cognition (sarva-agrahana). If no knowledge can arise in susupti, no knowledge can arise in nirvikalpa-samadhi also. Therefore, for jñānasamadhi knowledge of the form 'I am Brahman' should have risen earlier by reasoning on the experience of cittavrtti-nirodha or susupti. Ther[^]vrttinirodha in itself is not productive of jñāna any more than vrttivismarana of susupti as both are identical in their content.

11. DOES SUPPRESSION OF MIND LEAD TO LIBERATION?

For the above reason, that is to say, as it is not in itself productive of jñána, suppression of the modifications of the mind or vrttinirodha does not lead to liberation. Even if it is said that jñána will give rise to a continuous flow of mind-modification reflecting the nature of the self and excluding other vrttis, finally leading to vrttinirodha or samadhi, there can be no objection to that. Let it be so. It only proves that jñána is not the result of vrttinirodha. On the other hand, it only proves that vrttinirodha might be the result of jñána. Regarding this, says Sankara: Tf it is contended that nirodha might have some other purpose, and therefore might be the subject of an injunction, over and above the knowledge of the Self gained through an understanding of the meaning of Vedic texts, even then, it is not known to be a means for the attainment of moksa, because in the Upanisads no other means than the knowledge of the self as Brahman is declared to be the means for the attainment of the *summum bonum* of life. Then again, there is this fact that for nirodha there is no other means than átmavijñána, for there is no other means for nirodha than the continuous flow of thought *arising from self-knowledge*. But, this is only a concession. In fact, there is no other means for moksa than brahmajñána.¹⁵

15 *nirodhas tarhi arthantaram iti cet: athápi syat cittavrtti- nirodhasya vedavdkyajanitdtmavijñndnt arthantaravat. tantr- antaresu ca kartavyataya avagatatvdt vidheyatvam iti cet na, moksasadhanatvena anavagamat. na hi vedantesu brahmatma- vijñndnt anyat paramapuruserthasadhanatvena avagamyate.... ananyasadhanatvat ca nirodhasya. na hi atmavijñánadatsmrti- santanavyatirekena cittavrttinirodhasya sadhanam asti. abhy- upagamyá idam uktam na tu brahmavijñánavyatirekena anyat*

12. HOW DID THE MANY COME OUT OF THE ONE?

Here is a pertinent question in this connection. If the world had remained non-different from the Self in deep sleep as knowers of Brahman assert, how did it come out again as an object of experience? The same may be put in another way: How did the many or the multiplicity of the waking experience come out of the unitary experience of deep sleep? Again, it is the same question as: How did the world come out of Brahman, or how did creation take place, or what caused creation? The answer is: This world was and is Pure Consciousness. If you do not see it thus it is due to avidya, nescience. This avidya is usually present in the waking and dream states. Its nature is indefinable, anirvacamya; but its function is to present before the Self and as other than the Self something which is really not present there as a second entity. It is avidya which presents the dualistic universe of the waking and dream states in the non-dual Brahman which was experienced in susupti or samadhi. And this avidya is agantuka, that which comes and goes. The world of creation disappears entirely in susupti along with avidya. The world then remains entirely non-different from the Self and that was why it was not seen as a second entity. Is not this world then non-different from the Self even now, in this waking state? Yes, it is so. It is our idea that the world is other than the Self that constitutes our ignorance and this is bound to disappear if we fully understand the implications of the unitary experience of samadhi or susupti with the aid of reason, resulting in the realization or vidyá: 'All this is Brahman', 'All this is Atman'. Both vidyá and avidya are absent in the state of susupti and nirvikalpa-samadhi. The vidyá of the jñánin and

mokśasadhanam avagamyate (Brhadaranyaka-bhāṣya, I. iv. 7).

the avidya of the ajñānin

both disappear in those states where all is Brahman and Brahman alone. The knowledge of this non-duality alone removes the avidyá of the waking state and the world is .seen then as nothing other than the Self. No creation or projection has really taken place. All this was Brahman; all this is Brahman; all this will continue to be Brahman. The question how the world came out of the Brahman will become meaningless when the Truth of the unborn Brahman is realized.

13. CAUSALITY NOT TRUE

This affords us an occasion to discuss the affirmation of potential avidya during sleep in the *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya* of Sankara (II. iii. 31). It is clear that the argument there is based on causality. 'This explanation is appropriate, because nothing can be assumed to spring up unless it be from something else; otherwise we would have to suppose that effects spring up without causes.' Now, that causality itself is an assumption from the standpoint of practical common-sense without which the activities of everyday life will be impossible, but not true when enquired into, that is to say, not philosophically true, has been shown by Gaudapada in the *Mandūkyakārika* and accepted by Sankara in the commentary to it. The assumption is only pragmatic (vyāvaharika), but not existent in truth, (paramarthika). It is not even as true as the objects which are supposed to exist as cause and effect; for while we can see the seed and the tree with our eyes the relation between them is based on supposition or imagination. In other words, causality is a concept, not a precept, full of selfcontradictions. Hence it has to be rejected as a true statement of the relation between the two. In truth, there is no relation between them. It is Brahman that appears as the seed and then as the tree; this is the Vedantic view. There may be invariable regularity in the precedence and succession of the seed and the tree. But we can never prove it is the seed (cause) that has become the tree (effect); for either the cause has changed or not changed to become the effect. If it has not changed, it has not become the effect; it would have remained as it was. If it has changed, some new factor not found in the cause has come into existence, or some factor has disappeared, otherwise we would not call it effect. That a new word is required to

denote the effect shows that something new has come in, or something has been lost. We have, therefore, to admit that phenomena do spring up without causes. Only we should not call them effects; for if we do, we assume causes. In fact, every change, every fresh phenomenon is a challenge to the concept of causality. Therefore, akasmika utpatti or spontaneous origination is possible. It is taking place all around us every moment. This is in accordance with our everyday experience and twentieth century science. The doctrine of causality is a pragmatic assumption which does not stand the search of . reason. This is the position taken in the *Karika* which refutes the assumption allowed in the *Sūtra-bhasya*. The result is this: this world-appearance is spontaneous and does not require any cause. It is no doubt false appearance, mithyājñāna in Brahman; no one can say why it should retract in deep sleep, samadhi and pralaya (cosmic dissolution), nor why it should reappear. Its appearance and dis-appearance are inexplicable; its true nature is incomprehensible; it is anirvacamya; that is why it is said to be *maya*. But the knowledge ‘All this is Brahman—Ātman’, (samyak-jñāna) leaves behind no second entity to be explained. All phenomena are the false appearance of Brahman and no explanation is necessary. Therefore, the view of causality taken up in the *Sūtra-bhasya* as a concession to the commonsense view is not final; it is abandoned later on when enquiry has matured.

This question will be further discussed in connection with the prajña and turiya of the *Manliikya Upanisad* {Vide Part II}.

14. ARE YOU REALLY BOUND?

The question how the world came out, on waking, as an object of experience after having been non-different from the Self in deep sleep, is again put in a slightly different form thus: Having been free from all bondage in susupti, how is it that I am a bound soul again in this waking state? The reply is that the idea that I am a bound soul or I am a freed soul are superimpositions on the Atman and these were absent in sleep. There is nothing except jñána to prevent superimpositions of any kind and to any number, on the Reality which does not undergo any change on account of these superimpositions. They leave the Atman entirely unaffected. The rope is not affected by our superimposing the ideas of snake, garland or a streak of water on it. These wrong ideas simply vanish when the right knowledge of the rope arises. The nature of the Self is not opposed to our superimpositions. Therefore, these superimpositions are not destroyed by the Self. A superimposition can be destroyed only by another superimposition which is opposed to the former. Therefore, it is the knowledge of the Self, the idea that I am free, that is opposed to the wrong idea that I am bound which will destroy bondage. These two could not, therefore, co-exist in the same mind; one drives out the other. A baddha-jiva, bound soul, therefore, cannot be a jivanmukta, freed soul, at the same time; but neither the jiva nor its sense of bondage exists in deep sleep. Our individuality with all its limiting adjuncts entirely disappears in susupti. Nor can one have the idea, 'I am a freed soul', in that state. The freedom, therefore, that is experienced in susupti is not jivanmukti (freedom of the soul during its apparent existence in the waking), but the freedom of videhamukti (freedom when there is no experi

ence of the body) or ajatamukti (freedom of the unborn or unprojected state), the Self's own nature; for jivan- mukti has meaning only when there is the appearance of jiva, that is to say in the waking state. The superimpositions, the ideas of bondage or freedom of the waking state are not opposed to the real nature of the Self which is experienced in deep sleep. The question, therefore, 'How I became bound again' is inadmissible. You are not really bound. You are eternally free. You have only to give up the wrong idea of your bondage and remember what you are in susupti: *tat tvam asi svetaketo*: 'svetaketo, thou art that which thou art in deep sleep.'

15. TURIYA THE SAME AS SAMPRASÁDA

So far we have not mentioned the much-talked about turiya. If by turiya is meant the state of advaitajñána, then, we have seen that it comes within the waking state. There is no need for a separate concept other than the state of jñána in the waking. If, on the other hand, turiya means the Atman other than the waking, dream and sleep states, the self that is the witness of all the three, sarvadrk sadá, then alone can it be counted as a fourth one. This is possible if sleep also is thought of as a state. But, is sleep really a state? Before answering this question, let us apply the foregoing logic to the turiya also. If turiya- anubhava is a state other than waking, dream and sleep and the state of jñána in the waking, then the Átman which witnesses these four states becomes turiyátita, a fifth one beyond the four states. There are theologies which claim that turiyátita is the Reality and not turiya (*Vide Turiya- tita Upanisad and Saiva-siddhantd*). If again turiyátita is a state, we have to go in for a turiyátita-atita as the witness of turiyátita and so on and so forth endlessly without ever reaching the Ultimate Reality. If we want to avoid this *regres sus ad infinitum*, we should avoid committing the initial error of supposing that susupti also is a state, even though adopting the language of common parlance, we ourselves have talked about it as a state. A state is temporary. It appears and disappears; it comes and goes. The jágrat and svapna are states as they appear and disappear. What appears and disappears is the drsya (objective) side of our experience including the ego. The drk, the Witness, the Self, never disappears. It is there in the so-called state of sleep also. It is here and now in the waking and does not undergo any modification. It did not undergo any modification in sleep, and It alone existed,

One without a second: *salda eko drasta advaito bhavati*. Therefore, sleep is not a state. It is that which fills the gap between two states. We called it by the name sleep to make a contrast with the waking and dream to note their absence. But the only thing, which remains in our experience when the two states disappear, does not undergo any change whatever, and therefore, is not really a state, is Brahman Itself. 'The susupti is Atman itself, Brahman Itself.'¹ 'It is the true, because it is not anything other than Brahman; it is the absolute Reality.'¹⁶
¹⁷ 'The knowers of Brahman do not see or desire attainment of Self in any state other than dreamless sleep.'¹⁸ In this state the "Being All" is the natural state of this Atman; in this way Yājñavalkya taught Janaka that in susupti the nature of the Atman which is free from and transcends all relations of samsara such as nescience, desire and effort is experienced directly.'¹⁹ 'Therefore, the point of deep sleep is a demonstration of moksa or liberation.'²⁰

The word *prājña* is used for the Atman (Self) in deep sleep when thought of as the potential state of the future waking and dream states. It is therefore supposed to be the causal state of the projected universe. Sankara says that it is this very same Atman of the deep sleep state when not thought of as a causal state which is spoken of as *turiya*. 'That

16 *atmd eva susuptisthanam, brahmaiva tvekam susuptisthanam (Brahma-sūtra-bhdsya, II. i. 6).*

17 *satyam hi avitatham brahma.*

(*Chánd. U. Bhasya, VIII, Hi. 4*)

18 *na hi susuptisthndd anyatra svam apltim icchantā brahmavidah (Chand. U. Bhdsya, VI. viii. 1).*

19 *tatra ca sarvatmabhavah svabhavo asya, evam avidyā-kamakarmādi sarvasamsdra-dharmasambandhatitam rūpam asya saksdt susuptau grhyate] iti etat vijñdipitam.*

(*Br. U. Bhdsya, IV. Hi. 34*)

20 *tasmat samprasddasthanam mokṣadrstntabhūtam.*

(*Br. U. Bhdsya, IV. Hi. 34*)

which is the cause of the phenomenal world, designated as prajña, will be described as turiya separately when it is not viewed as the cause and when it is free from all phenomenal relationships (such as that of the body etc.) *Le.* in its absolutely real aspect.²¹ This, as we have seen, is experienced in deep sleep. Therefore, we have to stop with this maximum of unlimited experience once we have found it and should not confuse our understanding by introducing unnecessary concepts.^{21 22} The concept of turiya is, philosophically considered, superfluous and the concept of prajña as Isvara is a theological supposition which is not verified in experience, as we do not see ourselves governing the universe or as knowing the past, present and future of anything whatsoever in susupti. Nor do we see the world merging into or coming out of the Atman in deep sleep. Such an experience may be true of mystic states but not of susupti. If by prajña is meant only the pure experience, prajñaptimátra, then it does not differ from the concept of samprasada which is unrelated to the universe and free from nescience and which alone is true to the experience of dreamless sleep. Therefore, the Atman is not a fourth one in our experience. It is only the third, if jagrat and svapna are counted as separate states and the Atman as its witness. But even these states can be reduced and brought under a common category— visesavijñana state. For, both these are states of particularised knowledge. So, we have only two kinds of experience: one with visesavijñana comprising waking, dream and multifarious forms of mystic experiences;

21 *tarn abhjavastham tasyaiva prdjñdsabdavdcyasya tuñyat-
vena dehádisambandharahitam páramárthikvm prthag
vaksyati.*

{*Mandvkya. U. Bhásya, I. vi, 2*}

22 *Occam*^{3S} *Razor*: The Principle that the unnecessary supposition that things of a peculiar kind exist, when the observed facts may be equally well explained on the supposition that no such things exist,

and the other, nirvisesa-anubhava, free from any kind of particularisation of consciousness. This latter is called susupti or samadhi according to the undisciplined or disciplined states of a non-experienced mind supposed to be there. Of these, the visesavijñana or the state of particularised knowledge is only an apparent modification of the nirvisesa-anubhava of the deep sleep state. For the visesas, particulars, disappear in susupti leaving behind only the nirvisesa-brahman, the One without a second. The state of brahma-jñana, therefore, falls within the visesavijñana state where there are the ideas such as, 'All this is Brahman', 'All this is Átman', 'I am Brahman', 'There is no duality here', etc. If tunya is the position attained by the jñanin free from non-perception (agrahana) and wrong perception (anyathagrahana) of the Reality, then it falls within the waking state. If the tunya is the witness of that state, that witness is no other than the witness in deep sleep. 'That is the last point, that is the Supreme.'²³ 'There is no seer other than him.'²⁴ 'He knows all and is the Eternal Knower.'²⁵

The message of the Vedanta may be summed up thus: Arise, awake, and know the serene self of dreamless sleep.²⁶ Thou art That.²⁷ The philosophy of deep sleep is the key to the realization of Brahman.²⁸

23 *sá kásthá sa para gatih.*

24 *nányo "to 'sti drasta.*

25 *tat sarvadrk soda.*

26 *uttisthata, j cig rata, samprasadam nibodhata.*

27 *tat ivam asi.*

28 *samprasddavidyai 'va brahmavidya.*

16. SADHANAS OR DISCIPLINES

What are the disciplines or sādhanas for the realization of Brahman?

We have dealt with the main and immediate sadhana viz- vicara or Reason. By reason, it has already been pointed out, we do not mean mere logic, but reasoning on experience or upapatti so as to be in harmony with it. This is nothing but scientific method. The student of jñānāyoga, therefore, will do well to be disciplined in the scientific method of reasoning on observed data. While the sruti may impart the necessary faith and authority so as to lead him to the quest for Truth, it is his own experience that will finally count and be the final authority in the matter of realization. He must at every turn put the question to himself: How do I know? And if he cannot answer the question, he must know that what he has believed to be true is only second-hand knowledge, mere hearsay, and not his own realization. If I know, I also know how I know; and if I do not know how I know, mine is only mere belief and not realization. Logic being the discipline of correct thinking, of drawing conclusions from given data, forms part of rationalistic discipline; but it must always be subordinate to or based upon observed and verified data (*anubhavahgatvena tarkati*).

Concentration and a peaceful state of mind are necessary for the philosopher. The instrument of thinking must be made sharp and fine enough to deal with abstract ideas and subtle problems. If the intellect is dull, it cannot reflect the truth and distinguish it from falsehood and fallacy. Hence a sattvic and bright mind is the fittest instrument for the realization of Brahman.

Although it is not necessary that one must have attained moral perfection before one can take to philo

sophical enquiry, there is no gainsaying the fact that an immoral man can never realize the truth.

'This Atman cannot be realized by one who has not refrained from wickedness or from sense-pleasures, nor can he be attained in self-intuition by one whose mind is not at peace nor concentrated.'²⁹

The seeker after truth must ever be truthful in thought, word and deed and should not practise deception either on himself or on others. Intellectual honesty and integrity are as much required as integrity of conduct and character. The man who is addicted to sense gratifications, who is given to strong attachments and aversions, hatred and love, who is dishonest or treacherous, jealous, spiteful and selfish and greedy for lucre etc., will not have the necessary disposition and determination for the search after truth. One whose mind is always agitated and full of ambitions and plans and who is tossed about by lust, anger, grief or excessive joy cannot have the equanimity of temper for philosophical search. Although the motive power of the jñānin is the desire to know the truth, as in the man of pure science, but as the field of enquiry does not exclude his own self unlike in the natural sciences, the knowledge itself brings about changes in one's outlook on life and deeply influences one's character and modifies it in the light of the truth realized. It transforms the sinner into the saint, although it may not bring about changes in one's vocation or occupation. The more one comes to know the truth about oneself, the less does he find it necessary to lead an uncontrolled and immoral life. In proportion to the bliss he discovers and enjoys as natural to the Self, the less does he find pleasure in the objects of the external world. Control of

29 nd "virato duscaritat nd "santo nd "samahitah nd 'çanta- manaso vd "pi prajñdenai "warn dpnuyat (Katha U.₉ II. 24).

the mind and of the senses becomes natural to him; detachment or vairágya in his case is nothing but the reflection in conduct and will of the natural detachment—nissangatva of the Atman. Hatred and jealousy will give place to universal love and regard for all beings, as he finds mṣre and more that 'the Self is all This'. Selfishness and greed give way to charity, generosity and sacrifice, meanness to nobility and dignity, and vanity and pride to humility and respect and regard for others. Monasticism may not be a necessary step in all cases, but it cannot be disputed that monasticism offers the most congenial atmosphere and conditions for a strenuous, whole-hearted and single-minded struggle for realization free from the distractions and temptations of householders' life. Discrimination, detachment and continence are anyway the necessary conditions of realization. The perfected sage may not be punctilious about external observances, but the sádhaika cannot afford to relax and lose grip of his senses and mind; he has to be ever alert and watchful. To control the mind and senses, the jñána-yogin simply resorts to the remembrance of the truth he has discovered about himself. The perfection of the Self, the mere remembrance of it, acts as a resistant to temptations. To be untrue to oneself, to violate one's nature, to suppress one's conscience is very painful on account of its contradiction to the true nature of the Self; and this produces a natural check upon conduct. The jñánayogin does not depend upon mere abhyása or practice for selfcontrol. He knows that reliance on practice of self-control is like sitting on a spring to keep it down. As soon as the pressure on the spring is relaxed the spring jumps up. In the same way the mind controlled by practice alone might give way at any moment to temptations, because it has been held down by mere will-power. That is the method of the rajayogin. The jñánin on the other hand relies on his knowledge of the truth: 'All this is the Self.' He does not find

a second other than the Self. Desires die, therefore, a natural death. So does fear, for fear is due to something or someone other than the Self—*dvitiyad vai bhayam bhavati*. We may also say that desire arises because of something other than the Self—*dvitiyad vai kámo bhavati*. Desires form the spring for all kinds of selfish, greedy, dishonest, treacherous, spiteful, lascivious and all other kinds of immoral conduct on the part of man. When the roots of wrong conduct are destroyed, wholesome conduct and integrity of character follow as a natural consequence. While Vedic religions and sacrificial cult might have encouraged other-worldliness, the Vedanta has discouraged the desire for heavens and has preached instead unworldliness.

From a practical stand-point, the Vedanta has offered *mukti* as the motive power for knowledge. In the case of those whose quest is not pure knowledge for its own sake, there must be another motive; and there can be no other greater motive than freedom from misery and bondage. Though the Atman is eternally free, *jivanmukti* is the result of knowing it thus. *Moksa* is the result of *jñána*, is its by-product, and the persistent pursuit of knowledge is maintained by some for the sake of the ultimate practical benefit it confers on them. *Mumuksutva*, though not a *sádhana* to be practised, is thus a precedent condition for unremitting struggle. The practical benefit conferred by *jñána* is *jivanmukti*—freedom while living. The mind and body of the *jñánin* is as much subject to the laws of nature as those of the *ajñánin*. Freedom, therefore, in this context means only the freedom of the spirit, the Self, from the laws of nature by knowing itself to be eternally different from nature. No man can say of another, of a certainty, whether he is a *jivanmukta* or not; only one can know for oneself whether the thorn is pricking him or not. Bondage or freedom can be felt only by oneself as the Truth is realized by oneself. Freedom from

physical suffering is not the *sine-qua-non* of jñana. This can be had by hatha-yoga and other exercises, good food, climate, etc. Good health may be a useful asset for the jñanin as for the worldly man, but such a mean result cannot be his ultimate aim. His freedom is through knowledge, so that it produces no change in the physical constitution. The jñanin does not identify himself with it and therein lies freedom. But in his own judgement the suffering of a jñanin is only an apparent phenomenon just as his enjoyment. To him both are unreal. Or, seen from another angle, everything is Brahman, real or unreal, suffering as well as enjoyment, death as well as life. Whether one wishes or not, jñana brings about moksa by the removal of avidya and the manifestation of the freedom of the Self. As bondage is due to wrong knowledge, right knowledge alone is enough to enable us to realize the freedom of the Self which is its nature. We thus come to know that the Self was never in bondage, but was ever free and will be ever free.

17. IS THERE SÁDHANA AFTER BRAHMAJÑÁNA?

Is there any sádhana after the attainment of jñána? We have already shown that the idea of the mystics or dhyana-yogins that after the attainment of self-knowledge through reasoning, one should try by dhyána, samadhi or intuition to identify oneself with Brahman, is due to the ignorance of the traditional technique taught by Vedanta. For, by the knowledge 'I am Brahman' one becomes Brahman—*brahmavid brahmai 'va bhavati*. Therefore, there is no need for further effort to attain what has been attained. It is not that he wills himself to be Brahman; for, if he is not already Brahman, how can he become what he is not? The real nature of a thing never undergoes change. If anything about a thing changes, that changing factor cannot be its real nature. If my Brahmanhood is to be brought about, then that Brahmanhood could not have been my real nature. Whatever is affected by karma or volition will wear out in course of time when the force of karma wears out. Liberation or Brahmanhood is not something which can be wrought by dhyána or even by jñána. Samyakjñána or ripe knowledge is vastutantra, that is to say, controlled by or determined by the nature of the thing itself. The real nature of a thing is not something which can be manipulated by a person's will (purusatantra) nor by knowledge (buddhi-tantra).⁴ The function of reason in the field of brahma-vidyá is simply the removal of mithyájñána or wrong knowledge, the Self or Brahman, which is of the very nature of knowledge or awareness, remaining as it is. Therefore, the only thing the jñánin has to do, if at all he is to do anything by way of sádhana, is just to remember what he has already realized through avastbátraya-vicára. This remembrance of the truth of one's own nature and of

the nature of the universe is automatic in those who have already undergone the preparatory disciplines, and have controlled the senses and the passions and have tranquillised the mind. But in the case of those who have not undergone the sádhanas, their remembrance is obstructed by the habits of thinking, feeling and willing formed previous to enlightenment. In such cases there might be a little conflict between the truth realized and the accumulated habits or vasanás. Our old ways of thinking, feeling and willing have to be changed in order to fit in with the new realization. Our conduct and character must harmonise with our realization. This process of readjustment produces a struggle between the new thought-flow of Selfrealization and the older tendencies. By continuing the sádhanas of sama and dama, renunciation of desires etc. the jñánin simply tries to remove the obstructions to the manifestation of the effects of the knowledge through his conduct and character, without allowing himself to be overpowered by the old vasanás. Everytime an opposite idea from the store-house of memory invades his consciousness, he has only to remember the truth that he has realized. This remembrance will drive away the wrong ideas. Gradually his psycho-physical being will adjust itself to be in harmony with his realization. He has only to surrender himself to the realized truth and allow it to soak into his being; that is all what he has to do. When the readjustment is complete, the jñánin is said to be a jivanmukta or one liberated in life.

18. IS KNOWLEDGE OPPOSED TO WORK?

The idea that the mayavada of Vedanta has been at the root of India's degradation, listlessness, inactivity, conservatism, unprogressiveness, poverty and many other evils for the last few centuries, is still a current criticism among many political leaders and the ignorant public. That this kind of criticism is baseless will be evident from the very fact that the great Vedánta-ácáryas like Bhagavan Krsna, Sankara and Vivekananda and the Buddha too, who have been some of the towering personalities and heroes of action as well as of thought and who made India's history,, have also been preachers of mayavada. Their mayavada made them the most selfless beings on earth, because to them their own bodies and comforts, wealth and relations and possessions were only shadows of a dream-world which they could easily renounce, and they could devote themselves to the amelioration of the society around them, out of deep compassion, seeing only their own Self in all embodied beings. The greatest yogin, according to the *Gita* is he who feels the happiness and unhappiness of others as his own, just as he feels them in himself, because of his realization of the same Self in all creatures. The result was: Out of them issued an all-embracing love for all suffering and ignorant humanity and even for subhuman species, bearing its fruit in intense activity and creative enthusiasm for centuries after they passed away- Vedanta may not consider material progress as all in all, as the *summum bonum* of life. But it does not preach renunciation of worldly interest, for those who are not adhikarins, for those who are not duly qualified by vairágya or dispassion for the world; for them are preserved by the sastras the other three purusárthas or ends of life—dharma, artha and karna—ethical idealism,

wealth and power and enjoyment of pleasures. As the *Gita* says, no confusion of thought is to be produced in the minds of the ignorant, attached to karma. The jñānin, instead, devotes himself to intense activity to set an example to the ignorant, all the while holding the world to be an illusion, his own personality and activity included. If the world is maya, so is his psychological being and all its functionings; the jñānin's ego as well as the world he serves are equally illusory in his understanding. Mâyā-vada is not thereby contradicted, disproved or discredited,

There is another way in which the jñānin may look upon all his activities: here the illusory aspect of the universe is replaced by the aspect of the unity of all existence, the unity of the Absolute. Everything in this vision of the jñānin is Brahman—the Real as well as the unreal.³⁰ The *Gita* clearly refers to this in the passage, 'The sacrificial act is Brahman, the offering is Brahman, the fire is Brahman, the sacrificer is Brahman, the goal is Brahman and the sacrificer is established in brahma-karma-samadhi', where all karma with its means and ends and agents are looked upon as the same Brahman. No karma of his, therefore, contradicts his realization of the unity of the Self.

There is still another way in which the jñānin, while doing all karma, remains the mere on-looker of his activities and of the whole world. This is from the standpoint of the discrimination between the seer and the seen—drgdrsyaviveka. Here the dualism of the Self and the nonself, the difference between purusa and prakṛti is retained, prakṛti remaining as real as the purusa. This is the standpoint of Sāñkhya. In this vision, the agent with his ego, intellect, mind, sense-organs and body, with all their activities form part of Nature, of which the Self is the inactive witness and

30 *tat satyam cá 'nrtam cá 'bhavat (Taittiñya UII. 6).*

non-doer and non-enjoyer. It is the cosmos that goes on whirling like a huge machine of which the psychological being of the jñānin is a part, a spoke in the wheel, the witnessing Self merely revealing the modifications, evolutions and changes in the cosmos. The Self has no part in the drama. It enjoys perfect peace and calm in the midst of intense activity; the idea that 'I am the doer and enjoyer' is not entertained. Of them, it is said in the *Gita* 'All karma is being done by prakṛti. He who sees thus and looks upon himself as the non-doer sees the truth.'³¹ Or, there is another way of looking at the same truth by a devotee when he sees himself as a mere instrument in the hands of the Lord of the cosmos. The *Gita* refers to this in the verse: 'The Lord is seated in the hearts of all beings moving them all to activity like puppets mounted on machines by the power of his maya.'^{31 32} All his activities are, therefore, a part of the Illa or sport of the Lord.

The inactivity that is generally associated with the mystic outlook is not the outcome of jñāna or enlightenment, but is the prelude to such enlightenment. There is a period of retirement and seclusion in which alone single-minded search for the highest truth can be undertaken, undisturbed by distractions and unhampered by responsibilities and worldly duties. This is the period of monasticism (*yividisa-samnyasa*) for the sake of getting instruction in the scriptures (*sravana*), discrimination (*manana*) and contemplation (*nididhyāsana*). No one

criticises an astronomer, a physicist or a chemist if he retires into his observatory or laboratory for research work; similarly

31 *prakṛtyai 'va ca karmani kriyamandni sarvasah
yah pasyati tathatmdnam akartaram sa pasyati.*

32 *isvarah sarvabhūdnariī hrddese 'rjuna tistfyati
bhṛdmayan sarvabhūtni yantrārūdhni may aya.*

the seeker after the highest truth has also a worthy place of his own which has been recognised by all cultured societies. The period of retirement may be short or long; that depends upon the qualifications of the seeker. But when he has become a vidvat, a sthitaprajña, one established in the highest truth, retirement is no more prescribed for him. In whatever way he remains, he is ever in sahaja-samádhi or natural superconsciousness.

It is also to be understood that it is dhyána rather than jñána which makes a man externally inactive, for *dhyana* and karma are the inward and outward expressions of the same faculty of the mind, namely, *willing* and which, therefore, cannot co-exist. The mind cannot will in two directions at the same time. The modifications of the mind in the continuous thought of the Atman cannot co-exist with the modifications required for activities such as writing, speaking, digging, walking etc. One will put a stop to the other. That is why dhyana is opposed to karma. But the case is different with jñána, as the mind here is not necessarily absorbed in the thought of the atman; it is now released from the absorption of dhyana. Dhyana leads to samadhi, making the yogin unconscious of even his body and the outer world. Jñána,- on the other hand, does not involve the absorption of the mind. The yogin feels peace, freedom and bliss when his mind is settled in the Self to the exclusion of all other thoughts; but when the mind comes away from it, he feels restless, identifies himself with his body, mind and senses, and feels the misery of finite consciousness born of such re-identification with his upádhis or limiting adjuncts. He feels he has fallen away from his true nature in which he remained in samádhi; and his longing is to go back into the solitude and absorption of samadhi, so that, external activities, responsibilities and duties are heavy weights which pull his mind away from the throne of the Self in which it wants

always to be seated. Hence the *Gita* says: 'Cessation from external activities is the necessary condition for remaining established in yoga'³³. The jñānin too may be found on occasions to remain unconscious of his body and the external world; but then it is not the result of jñāna or illumination, it is the result of absorption. But such absorption is not a necessary condition or concomitant of jñāna and is independent of jñāna. Jñāna, on the other hand, is not opposed to karma. When a morsel of food is eaten by me, the knowledge that it is rice does not stand in the way of my raising it to my mouth and of chewing and swallowing it, but if in the midst of raising it, I get too much absorbed in some thought or other, I may let the morsel drop and my hand may remain fixed up half way to the mouth. In the same way, when the mind of the jñānin is not absorbed in dhyāna, which is optional to him, he may be working in the world without his knowledge of Brahman getting impaired in the least. He has realized that he is the same saccidananda under all conditions and this knowledge once realized is never sublated or destroyed, such illumination being the very nature of the Self: 'sakrdvibhata' as the *sruti* says. The jñānin's mind may, therefore, get absorbed in any so-called worldly activity and not think of the atman unless any particular necessity arises, and thus when he is called upon to think of the Self, the knowledge of it is ever there in the mind which has been illumined once for all. In the same way, while dealing with the external things and persons unless he is called upon by any circumstance to get absorbed in the contemplation of their ultimate Brahman nature, his external activities may continue undisturbed. His mind can fully merge itself in such activities, as there is nothing else in the world to be cared for than the immediate work in hand. He

33 *yogārudhasya tasyai 'va śamah kdranam ucyate.*

has no personal problem to solve; nothing remains unattained by him, he has no anxieties, worries, hopes» expectations or disappointments to distract him. Therefore, he works in perfect peace, freedom and joy and with perfect concentration and abandon.

PART TWO

ARGUMENT

Now it is the general Vedanta doctrine that at the time of deep sleep the soul becomes one with the highest Brahman, and that from the highest Brahman the whole world proceeds, inclusive of prana and so on. When scripture, therefore, represents as the object of knowledge that in which there takes place the deep sleep of the soul characterised by absence of empirical consciousness and utter tranquillity, that is, a state devoid of all those specific cognitions which are produced by the limiting adjuncts of the soul, and from which the soul returns when the sleep is broken, we understand that the highest Self is meant (*Br. Su. Bhásya, I. iv 18*).

*susuptikále ca parena brahmana jwa ekatam gacchati, parasmdt ca brahmanah pranddikam jagaj-jdyata iti veddnta-
maryada. tasmad yatra 'sya jivasya nihsambodhatdsvacchata-
rúpah svcipa upddhijanitavisesavijndnarahitam svarúpam,
yatas tadbhraiksarupam agamanaih, so" tra paramdtma
veditavyataya srávita iti gamy ate.*

In order that the student of the foregoing talks may feel

assured that the position taken up herein though a bit out of the beaten track is the orthodox position as propounded by the Upanisads and Sankara's commentaries thereon, the following references are appended with short observations thereon.

1. CHÁNDOGYOPANISAD

SADVIDYÁ

VI. viii. 1. In this section is given the famous mahavakya, 'tat tvam asi'. The context proves that the meaning of it is, 'Thou art that which thou art in deep sleep'. The text says that the word 'sleeps' (*svapiti*) implies the attainment of pure existence; and therein one attains one's own Self.¹ In discussing the meaning of *svapnantam* and determining it as dreamless sleep, Sankara says that in no other state than deep sleep do the knowers of Brahman find the attainment of one's own Self.^{34 35} Because therein the self gives up its reflector mind and *jlvatva* (embodiedness) and attains its own form as the Supreme Deity.³⁶

34 *yatrai 'tat purusah svapiti ñama sata somya tadd sampanno bhavati svam apito bhavati tasmd enam svapiti 'ty dcaksate, svam hi apito bhavati.*

35 *na hy anyatra susuptat svam apitim jivasya icchanti brahmavidah (Cha. U. Bhdsya, VI. viii. 1).*

36 *tatra mana-ddy uparame caitanyapratibimbarupena jivena 'tmand manasi pravistd ndmarüpavydkarandya para devatd sd svam evd 'tmdnam pratipadye jivarüpatdm mana dkhyam hitva (Ibid).*

The state is compared to the state in which one's reflection has been withdrawn to one's own self when the mirror is removed. That the reference is not to the dreamstate is insisted upon, because therein mergence in one's own self does not take place on account of avidyá (nescience), kama (desire) and karma (activity) which are the causes of samsara (sojourn in this world). Further, Sankara strengthens the position by a quotation from the *Brhadaranyaka* referring to deep sleep which is said to be free from merit and demerit and free from sorrows and desires, and which is said to be supreme bliss. Again, Sankara says that Uddalaka tells his son that in deep sleep itself he would show his divinity which is free from individuality, *jivatva*.¹

In deep sleep one is said to have become one with Absolute Existence.^{37 38}

A third time in this context Sankara says that *jivatva* (embodiedness) is given up in deep sleep and the self is said to attain the Absolute Reality.³⁹

The expression *yat paramarthasatyam* should be particularly noted, meaning thereby that it is not a mere semblance of the Absolute Reality, but the Reality itself.

In his commentary on VI.viii.3, Sankara says: 'Having thus shown the real nature of the *jīva* (embodied soul) and the substratum of the universe through the well-known experience of sleep, he next traced the root of the universe through the series of causes and effects etc.'¹

Having shown that we attain to pure existence in deep

37 *susuptau eva svam devatárūpam jivatvavinirmuktam dar-sayisydmi ly aha (Cha. U. Bhasya, VI. viii. 1).*

38 *sata sampanno bhavati—ekibhuto bhavati.*

39 *manasi pravistam mana-adi-samsarga-krtam jivarupam parity aj ya svam sadrupam yat paramarthasatyam apito apigato bhavati (Ibid).*

sleep, mantra four and five say that the whole universe has its origin and stay in that Absolute Existence.^{40 41 42} And after showing that just as in deep sleep, in death also we attain to that Supreme Deity, *parádevata*, the Upanisad teaches that this subtle essence which is the Self of all this, is the Reality and that is the Self, your Self, *tat tvam asi. svetaketo.*'s

VI-9 and 10 through the examples of the honey and the rivers, teach that there is neither *vidya* nor *avidya* in deep sleep. There the individual does not know himself as a separate entity as in the waking state. It is the consciousness of individuality that constitutes *avidya*, nescience. Nor is one conscious of one's identity with Brahman in that state. Even the *jñánin* in deep sleep is not aware that he is Brahman. On account of this want of *vidya* in deep sleep, the union with Brahman is of no consequence in the waking state. That is why a lion or a tiger or a bird wakes up from deep sleep with the same old lion-consciousness, or tiger-consciousness or bird-consciousness with which it went into sleep. Sankara in the commentary on VI. x. 1 says that even though every day the *jivas* attain to the causal state in deep sleep, as in death and in cosmic dissolution (*pralaya*) they are not destroyed, unlike waves and bubbles on their attaining their causal state, *viz.*, water.¹ It is, therefore, clear that that which was experienced in deep sleep was not anything other than the real nature of the *jiva* and the substratum of the universe.

This point is brought out by Sankara in the *Upadesasahasri* also, Vide Part I, 93—Disciple: 'But, Sir, I

40 *evam svapiti-namaprasiddhidvarena yaj jivasya satya-svarupam jagato mulam, tat putrasya darsayitvd cilia annadikaryakdranaparamparayd 'pi jagato mulam sad didarsayisuh.*

41 *sanmuldh someye 'mah sarvah prajah sadayatandh sat-pratisthah.*

42 *sa ya eso animai 'tadatmyam idam sarvam tat satyam sa atmd tat tvam asi svetaketo (Chand. U., VI. viii. 7).*

was never conscious of consciousness or anything else in deep sleep. Teacher: You were then conscious in deep sleep, because you deny the existence of objects of knowledge (in that state), but not that of knowledge. I have told that what is your consciousness is nothing but absolute knowledge. The consciousness owing to whose presence you deny (the existence of things in deep sleep) by saying “I was conscious of nothing” is the knowledge, the consciousness which is your Self.[^] This witness does not require any proof, for, as it never ceases to exist, its eternal existence is self-evident, and does not depend on any evidence; for only an object of knowledge different from the self-evident Knower depends on an evidence in order to be known^{A 43 44}

43 *dr st am lake jale vicitarangaphenabudbudadaya utthitah punas tadbhdvam gata vinastd Hi. jwas tu tatkaranabhdvam pratyaham gacchanto "pi susupte maranapralayayos 'ca na vinyanti.*

44 *sisyah: na hi kaddcid bhagavan, susupte maya caitanyam any ad va kiñcid drstam.*

guruh: pasyan tarhi susupte tvam. yasmad drstam eva pratisedhasi, na drstim. yd tava drstih tat caitanyam iti mayo 'ktam, yaya tvam vidyamdnaya na kiñcid drstam iti pratisedhasi sa drstih tvaccaitanyam. tarhi sarvatra avyabhicarat kútasthanityatvam siddham svata eva, na pramanapeksam. svatahsiddhasya hi pramatuh anyasya prameyasya paricchittim prati pramanapeksa (Üpdesasdhasri).

BHÜMAVIDYA

VILxxii. 1, xxiii. 1 and xxiv.1: Bhüman, the Infinite, is defined in xxiv. 1 as that in which or where one does not see another, does not know another.¹

That this bhüman is Brahman has been established by Sankara in the *sütrabhäsyä*, I.iii. 9.^{45 46} That this bhüman is the serene Self of deep sleep is asserted by Sankara in the *Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad* commentary on IV. iii.33: 'Thus that in which the other joys, increasing step by step in multiples of hundred merge and which is experienced by one versed in the Vedas, is indeed the supreme bliss called samprasada, for in it one sees nothing else and so on—and hence is the bhüman, the Infinite and hence immortal; the other joys are the opposite of that.'⁴⁷

Bra. Sü. Bhümadhikarana: Bra. Su. Bhäsyä I. Hi. 8 amply proves that bhüman and samprasada in the Upanisads mean the paramatman. 'It is the paramatman that is to be known by bhüman, not prana, because it has reference to samprasada. Samprasada is the Self of dreamless sleep, because in this state is attained the greatest serenity'.⁴⁸

Commentary to *Sutra* I.iii.9 particularly sums up the

45 *yatra nd 'nyat pasyati nd 'nyac chrnoti nd 'nyad vijanati sa bhümd.*

46 *api ca ye bhümani srüyante dharmas te paramdtmany upapadyante. 'yatra nd 'nyat pasyati nd 'nyac chrnoti nd 'nyad vijanati sa bhümd' iti darsanddivyavahardbhdvarii bhümani avaga- mayati. param,atmani cd'yarii darsanddivyavaharabhdvo'vagatah.*

47 *evam satagunottarottara-vrddhy upeta ananddh yatrai 'katdrii yd,nti, yas ca srotriyapratyakso 'thai 'sa eva sampra-sddalaksanah parama dnandah. tatra hi nd 'nyat pasyati nd 'nyac chrnoti ato bhümd. bhumatvdd amrtah. Hare tad viparitdh atra ca srotriyatva 'vrjinatve tulye.*

48 *paramatmai 've 'ha bhümd bhavitum arhati, na pranah — kasmatt samprasaddad adhyupadesat-samprasada iti susuptam sthanam ucyate; samyak prasidati asmin iti nirvacandt.*

argument thus: 'Then again the properties of bhurnan are appropriate in the paramatman. The absence of all activities such as seeing etc., is shown in the words, "Where no other thing is seen, is heard, no other thing is known, that is bhurnan". In the paramatman also the absence of all activities such as seeing etc., is seen.' In the *Bṛhadaranyaka*, IV.v.15, there is the passage, 'when everything has become the Self, who can see whom?' Then again, whatever absence of activities such as seeing etc., has been thus mentioned, that also has been said with a view to show the unattached nature of atman and not to explain the nature of prana, because the section deals with paramatman. Also the reference to the happiness of that state is made with a view to exhibit the blissful nature of the atman. Hence it is said: 'This is its highest bliss, and other beings live only on an atom of this bliss' (Br. U., IV. iii. 32). In the words, 'that which is bhurnan is bliss', 'there is no happiness in that which is finite, the Infinite alone is happiness', by denying all kinds of happiness mixed with unhappiness, the Brahman alone which is of the nature of happiness itself, viz., the bhurnan is shown. The statement, 'that which is bhurnan is immortal', also leads to the supreme cause, viz., the paramatman because all modifications are dependent on something which is immortal. Sruti also says: 'All that is other than this is mortal'. In the same way the properties mentioned by sruti such as, 'being real', 'being established in its own glory', 'all-pervasiveness', 'being the self of all' are appropriate only with regard to the paramatman and not to anything else. Therefore, it is proved that bhurnan is paramatman.'

DAHARAVIDYÁ

Chap. VIII. iii. 2¹ says that every day all beings go to brahmaloka, but on account of our ignorance of it we are drawn away from it just as one who does not know the golden treasure hidden underground does not possess it even though he may pass over it up and down every day. Sankara in the

commentary adds 'during sleep' to 'every day' and says brahmaloka means Brahman itself.^{49 50}

In the commentary on the next mantra Sankara explains the significance of the text *evamvid svargalokam etc.*, one who knows thus attains to svargaloka. Even though all beings attain to Brahman during sleep, the one who knows this fact even during the waking state can alone be said to have attained to It.⁵¹

Mantra 4 says that this serene self of deep sleep (samprasada) having transcended this body attains to the supreme Effulgence, and remains in his own nature. This is the Atman which is immortal and fearless. This is Brahman and the name of this Brahman is truth.¹ In the commentary to this, Sankara explains the meaning of the word samprasada as the self free from the impurities and worries of the waking and dream-states, which is attained in deep sleep when all beings

49 *atha ye cd 'sye "ha jwd ye ca pretil yac cd 'nyad icchan na labhate sarvaih tad atra gatva vindate 'tra hy asyai 'te satydh kdma anrtapidhdnds tad yathd 'pi hiranyanidhim nihitam aksetrajñd uparyapart samcaranto na vindeyur evam eva imdh sarvah praja aharahar gacchanta etam brahmalokam na vindati anrtena hi pratyudhah.*

50 *evam eve 'md avidydvatyah sarvd imdh praja yathoktam hridaykdsdkltyam brahmalokam brahmai 'va loko brahmalokas tarn aharahah pratyaham gacchanty'o 'pi susuptakdle na vin- danti, na labhante, eso 'ham brahmalokabhavam dpanno 'smy adye 'ti. anrtena hi yathoktena hi yasmat pratyudhd hrtdh svardpdd avid/yadidosair bahir apakrstd ity arthah.*

51 *yathd jdnan ajdnams ca sarvo jantuh sadbrahmaiva tatha 'pi tat tvam asi 'ti pratibodhito vidvdn sadeva nd 'nyo 'smi 'ti janan sadeva bhavati. evam eva vidvdn avidvdms ca susupte yady api sat sampadyate tathd api evamvideva svargam lokam etl 'ty ucyate.*

attain to Pure Existence.^{52 53}

. The paramjyoti to which samprasada attains in deep sleep is said to be the Pure Consciousness which is the nature of the supreme Self.⁵⁴ This is said to be the True because it is not anything other than Brahman, adds Sankara, *satyarii hi avitatharii brahma*.

The idea that it is only a semblance of Brahman that is experienced in deep sleep and not Brahman itself is thereby purposely disallowed by Sankara as well as the Upanisads.

VIII. vi. 3 teaches that when asleep, the Atman, having become completely serene, does not see any dream. In that state no sin touches it, because in that state it has become one with its own effulgence.⁵⁵ In the commentary

the reason for not being touched by sin is said to be that the Atman remains in its own nature.¹ Why should not one who has attained to his own nature be affected by sin? Because of unity with all Existence and there is no second thing which can

52 *atha ya esa samprasaddo smdc charirdt samutthdya param jyotir upasampadya svena rūpena 'bhinispadyata esa atme 'ti ho 'vacai 'tad amrtam abhayam etad brahme 'ti tasya ha va etasya brahmano ndma satyam iti.*

53 *susuptakale svend 'tmand sata sampannah san samyak prasidati 'ti jdgratsvapnayor visayendriyasamyogajatam kalu-syam jahati 'ti samprasadasabdo yady api sarvajantundm sadhdranas tathd 'pye 'varnvit svargam lokam eti 'ti.*

54 *param dtmalaksanam vijñaptisvabhavam jyotir upasampadya svasthyam upagamye 'ly etat.*

55 *tad yatrai 'tat suptah samastah samprasannah svapnam na vijdnáty asu tadd nddisu srpto bhavati tarn na kascana pdpma sprsati tejasa hi tadd sampanno bhavati.*

affect it; this is the explanation given in the commentary.^{56 57} It is in the waking and dream that the self falls away from its own nature and becomes aware of external object; because the germ of nescience, desire and activity has not been burnt to ashes by brahmavidya. This we have shown in section 6.⁵⁸

SAMPRASÁ DAVID YA

Chap. VIII. xi. 1. In this section Prajapati imparts his final teaching to Indra in the following words: 'Here where the soul goes into deep sleep, completely serene all round, and where no dream is seen, that is the Atman, that is the immortal, that is the fearless, that is Brahman'.⁵⁹

It is interesting to note that Indra, as is the case with all who are told for the first time that in susupti one attains to the absolute Reality, lodges his protest in the following words: 'Revered Sir, I did not know myself as "I am This" in that state, as I do now. Nor did I know these beings; therein everything seemed to have been destroyed; I do not see any good in knowing about this.'¹ But Prajapati replied: 'It is so; I am going to explain to you this very being.' *evam tveva bhüyo 'nuvyakhyásyámi.* In the commentary on VIII. xii. 1, says Saiikara: 'Those who like Indra believe the absolutely real

56 *tam sata sampannam na kascana na klñcid api dharmd-dharmarupah pdpmd sprsati disvarúpdvasthitatvdt tadd dtmanah.*

57 *avisayatvat. anyo hi anyasya visayo bhavati, nadu anya-tvarn, kenacit kutascid api satsampannasya.*

58 *svarüpa-pracyavanam ttí dtmano jdgratsvapnavastham prati gamanam bdhyavisayapratibodho avidyakdmakarmabijasya brahmavidyahutsdddhanimittam ityavocdma sastha eva.*

59 *tad yatrai "tat suptah samastah samprdsannah svapnaih, na vijndnty esa dime di ho 'vacai dad amrtam abhayam etad brdhme di.*

unity of the Self to be nothing but non-existence go round in the world of sarhsara engrossed in the objects of the senses even though they accept the Vedas as their authority. Then what to say of those who are naturally inclined to sense objects ? Therefore, this path chalked out by Prajápati should be understood by those worshipful souls who have renounced all attachments and who have entered the order of paramaharhsa-parivrajakas and who are engaged in the study of the Vedanta.^{60 61}

VIII. xii. 2 and 3 also refer to samprasada and emphasise its disembodiedness, attainment of its supreme Effulgence and remaining in its own nature, and it is said to be uttamapurusa. In the same way this self of deep sleep having arisen from the body and attaining to the supreme Effulgence remains in its own nature. He is the uttamapurusa, the highest Being.⁶² The samprasada in the commentary is equated with the liberated soul. Like the rope from which the superimposition of the snake has been removed in the presence of light, the Atman in

60 *nd "ha khalu ayam bhagava evam sampratyatmanam jánáty ayam aJiam as mi 'ti no eve 'máni bhütáni vinásam evá "pito bhavati na "ham atra bhogya?h pasyámi 'ti.*

61 *tatha 'nye karmino báhyavisayápahrtaceiaso vedapramáná api paramárthasatyam átmaikatvam vinásam iva indra van many amana ghatyantravad árohávarohaprakaraiJi anisam bam- bhramanti. kim anye ksudra jantavo vivekahináh svabhávata eva baliirvisayápahrtacelasali. tasmád idam tyaktasarvabahyai 'sanair ananyasaranaih paramahamsaparivrájakaih atyásramibhir vedántavigñanaparair eva mdaniyam püjyatamaili prájá- patyam ce "mam sampradáyam anusaradbhir upanibaddham pr alear anacatustayena.*

62 *evam evai 'sa samprasado 'smac charirat samutthaya param jyotir upasampadya svena rupend 'bhinispadyate; sa uttamapurusah.*

the light of discrimination is said to have realized its own nature. The samprasada in this state is said to have transcended the ksara and the aksara (the Impermanent and the Permanent) or the vyákṛta and the avyákṛta (the Manifest and the non-manifest) and is differentiated accordingly. The commentary also says that the samprasada remaining in its own state becomes the self of all: *sa samprasada svena rūpena tatra svdtmani svasthataya sarv- átmabhūtah paryeti*. Thus the Upanisad uses the same term for the serene self of deep sleep as well as for the liberated soul.

Later on in the same context, the absence of a second entity by the side of the Atman in sleep is said to be equally applicable to the liberated soul as well, *yadyapi susupte tad uktarii muktasyapi sarvaikatvat samano dvitlyabhavah*. Thus, throughout the *Chandogya Upanisad*, brahmavidya has been taught by pointing to the experience of deep sleep. Samprasadavidya is verily brahmavidya.

2. TAITTIRÍYA UPANISAD

Commentary on II, viii, 5

In this Sankara has pointed out that 'the non-perception in deep sleep is not due to concentration and absorption of the mind in one thing to the exclusion of other things as takes place in the waking state. For, in this state, there is total non-perception. The perception of other things in the waking and dream-states is due to nescience and disappears when knowledge arises. If it is said that in deep sleep also non-perception is due to nescience, we say no; because non-perception of a second thing is natural to the Atman';⁶³ (because the Atman is one without a second and is the 'all' of the waking and dream-states). Later on in the same context, the commentary says that vidya and avidya are not the attributes of the Atman, because they could be cognized as objects by the mind. The passage referred to above says: If it is said that vidya and avidya are the attributes of the Atman, we say no; because they are objects. Discrimination and non-discrimination like shapes and colours etc. are experienced directly in the mind. The directly perceived form is not the attribute of the witness. In the same way, avidya also manifests itself in our experience in the form, 'I am ignorant', 'My knowledge is not clear' etc. In the same way, knowledge and discrimination are also directly experienced. Then again, the knower of Atman imparts self-knowledge to others. Similarly, others grasp the same.

63 *susupte "grahanam anyasaktavad iti cet na sarvagrahandt jdgratsvapnayor anyasya grahanat sattvam eve 'ti cet, na avidya- krtatvaj jagratsvapnayoh. yad anyagrahanam jagratsvapnayos tad avidyakrtarii vidyabliave 'bhavat. susupte "grahanam api avidyákrta iti cet, na svabhavikatvat.*

Therefore, vidya and avidya belong to the category of name and form. These names and forms are superimposed like day and night in the sun, but do not, in reality exist in it.⁶⁴ The conclusion that the Atman is free from these when it is in its natural state as in deep sleep is legitimate; the mind also disappears in that state.

Here an objection may be raised: Even though the particular forms of avidya (tūlavidyá) such as jiva, jagat and Isvara might disappear, the basic nescience (mūla-vidya) might remain in deep sleep; the gross and subtle bodies (sthūla and sūksma sanras) of the jiva might have merged or subsided, but the causal body (kárana sarira) might continue to remain; the viksepa (projection) such as names and forms might disappear, but the screen (ávarana) may continue to exist; that is why we know nothing in deep sleep.

The answer to this objection is as follows: The bare fact of non-perception or non-cognition, called agrahana or ajñána in deep sleep is confounded with avidya whose function is to set up a second thing in the self which is the distinguishing feature of the waking and dream. The rationalistic Vedanta does not deny this non-perception; only it says that the non-perception is due to non-duality; there is not a second thing to perceive. If there were a second thing called mūlávidyá or karana-sarira or avarana, why should we not know it in deep

64 vidya 'vidyayos taddharmatvam iti cen pratyaksatvat. vivekavivekau rupadivat praiyaksau upalabh/yate antahkaran-asthau. na hi rūpasya pratyaksasya sato drastrdharma-
tvam. avidya ca svdnubhavana rūpyate mudho "ham aviviktam mama vijñánam iti, tathd vidyaviveko 'nubhuyate upadisanti cd "nyebhya dtmano vidydm budhah tathd cd 'nye 'vadhdrayanti. tasman namarupapaksasyai >va vidyavidye ndmarūpe ca, nd 'tmadharmau. ndmarūpayor nirvahita te yad antara tad brahma' iti srutyantararat. te ca punar ndmarūpe savitary ahoratre iva kalpите na paramarthato vidy amane.

sleep also, where the consciousness of the self is not lost? That the self does not lose its nature as consciousness has been already shown; otherwise we could not remember that we did not know anything in deep sleep. If it is said that what is not seen is the modification into names and forms of avidyá which have subsided, but not the basic material, mülávidya, or karana-sarTra, the question may be asked why we should not perceive it? Can it be that a cow when standing may be seen, but not when it lies down? Can it be that the waves may be seen, but not the ocean when the waves subside? Can it be that objects may be seen, but not the screen which hides the objects from our view? If avidyá, nescience, even in potential seed form had existed, it should have been perceived, but experience says, we did not know anything. Therefore, the existence of a mülávidya or kárana-sarTra or ávarana in deep sleep is only inferred in the waking state; it is contradicted by direct experience and therefore not acceptable to reason. The fact of agra-hana is confounded with avidyá; hence the above misunderstanding.

3. PRASNA UPANISAD

In this Upanisad the portion dealing with brahma- vidyá begins with the fourth chapter (the fourth prasna or question). Sankara introduces this topic with the remark that having dealt with the subject of lower knowledge (aparavidya) in the previous three chapters the Upanisad now wishes to propound the absolute Reality which is different from means and ends divested of the pranas and mind and unknown to the senses, auspicious, serene, unmodified, indestructible, unprojected either inwardly or outwardly, known as the purusa and which is to be realized by higher knowledge (parávidyá). The question is: *kasmin sarve sampratisthitáh?* What is that in which all these are established? The teacher Pippaláda answers Gárgya's question thus: 'All these (the whole of this objective universe) gets unified in the supreme Being called Mind. It is on account of that that in that state called deep sleep (susupti) the person hears not, sees not, smells not, tastes not, enjoys not, evacuates not, moves not about.'⁶⁵ The third mantra says that only the pranas or the physical forces are said to function in the body in that state. In the fourth mantra, the udána is said to bring the yajamana of this state to Brahman as in a sacrifice. The sacrificer is taken to svarga by the priest. The fifth mantra says that the dream world consists of things experienced as well as unexperienced in the waking state and the purusa's self-effulgence is manifest as the witness of that state. The sixth mantra describes the state of susupti: 'When the soul is overwhelmed by effulgence of the self there this bright being does not see any dream. There is only one uniform all-pervading light, so that one object could not be distinguished from another. Then here in this body

65 *tat sarvam pare deve manasy ekl bhavati tena tarhy esa puruso na srnoti, napasyati, na jighrati, na rasayate, na sprsate, nd 'bhivadate, nd 'datte nd 'nandayate, na visrjate, ne "ydyate svapitl 'ty acaksate.*

arises this bliss.’¹ The commentary explains when the tendencies of the mind are rejected or obstructed by the fluid called pitta, then the rays of the mind get withdrawn into the heart. When the mind thus spreads over the whole of the body without any particularised form of cognition, then takes place what is known as deep sleep. This deva known as mind does not see any dream, because the effulgence has blocked the doors of perception. When the consciousness thus pervades the whole body, then it becomes serene; then it is that this bliss of deep sleep takes places. Further, it is said in this state the senses and the mind which are conditioned by avidya, karna, and karma completely subside. When they thus subside, the self which was imagined differently from its own nature on account of the limiting adjuncts (the body and the senses) becomes one without a second, all-auspicious and perfectly calm.^{66 67} The seventh mantra

66 *sa yada tejasa ’bhibhuto bhavati atrai ’sa devah svapnan na pasyati athai ’tasmin sarlra etat sukham bhavati.*

67 *sa yada manorüpo devo yasmin kale saurena pittakhyena tejasa nadlsayena sarvato ’bhibhuto bhavati tiraskrtavdsanddvaro bhavati. tadd saha karanair manaso rasmayo hrady upasamhrtd bhavanti, yada mano ddrvagnivad avisesavijñdnarñpeña krtsnam sariram vyapyd ’vatisthate tadd susupto bhavati. atrai ’tasmin kdla esa mana-dkhyo devah svapnan na pasyati darsanadvdra- sya niruddhatvat tejasa. atha tadai ’tasmin sarlra etat sukham bhavati yad vijñdnam nirdbddham avisesena sarlravyapakam prasannam bhavati ’ty arthah. etasmin kale ’vidydkdmakarmani- bandhanani karyakdranani santani bhavanti. tesu santesv dtma-*

says that all the universe enters into the supreme Self in that state just as birds return to their nests at the end of the day.¹ In the eighth mantra, the whole universe consisting of senses and sense-objects are said to enter into the supreme Self. The ninth mantra says that this soul, the seer who sees, touches, hears, smells, tastes, thinks, knows, does, is the embodied consciousness called purusa, the person. He gets established in the supreme Self.^{68 69 70} In the commentary this entrance into the self is compared to the re-entrance of the image of the sun into itself when the water in which it is reflected is dried up.⁷¹ The tenth mantra emphasises that that which is attained by the knower of the self as free from avidya, as disembodied, as without attributes, as pure and immortal and real is the supreme Being Itself. Such an one becomes all-knowing; he becomes all. The next mantra also emphasises the fruit of this knowledge of the self in which the jiva along with the senses and pranas with their embodied specific consciousness called devas are re-absorbed in the state of susupti as all-knowingness and all-pervadingness. This is the sarvatmabhava, the supreme goal of parávidya announced at the beginning of the chapter.

That the reference was to susupti and not to any other state has been emphasised by Sankara in the introduction to the sixth prasna thus: 'It has been already said that this whole universe of causes and effects along with the jivatman is re-

68svarüpam upadhibhir anyatha vibhavyamdnam advayam ekam sivam santam bhavati.

69 sa yathd somya vayamsi vasovrksam sampratisthante, evam ha vai tat sarvam para dtmani sampratisthate.

70 esa hi drastd sprasta srota ghratd rasayitd manta boddha kartá vijñdndtmd purusah. sa pare "ksara dtmani sampratisthate.

71 sa ca jalasüryakddipratibimbasya suryadipravesavaj jagaddharasose pare 'ksara dtmani sampratisthate.

absorbed into the supreme paramatman during the state of deep sleep.⁷¹ It is also pointed out that this compels us to conclude that the same truth, that the universe enters into and comes back from the supreme Being at dissolution, pralaya, and re-emergence, srsti, holds good.^{72 73}

72 *samastam jagat káryaküranalaksanaih saha vijñánátmanü parasminn aksare susuptikale sampratisthata ify uktam.*

73 *sámarthyát pralaye ³pi tasminn eva ³ksare sampratisthate*

4. BRHADÁRANYAKA UPANISAD

This Upanisad and Sankara's commentary on it give a very elaborate analysis of the experience of deep sleep. To start with, (II.i.16) Ajatasatru asks Gárgya about the nature of deep sleep in order to provoke him to enquire into it. In the commentary Sankara remarks: The Atman has to be pointed out when free from the aggregate of action, agent and the result of action before waking up. Before awaking, (in profound sleep) the purusa perceives nothing whatsoever like pleasure and so forth, which are the effects of past work. Therefore, not being affected by past work, we understand that that is the very nature of the Self. In order to teach that the Self was in its own nature and that only when one deviates from it, it becomes contrary to its nature, subject to transmigration, Ajatasatru asks Gárgya who was abashed with a view to enlighten him on the point.⁷⁴

In mantra II.i. 16, Ajatasatru says that this vijñánamaya-purusa (being with limited consciousness, jiva) lies in the hrdayákása (space in the heart) wherein the pranas (vital forces), the speech, the senses and the mind are all absorbed. The purusa is then said to have gone into sleep: *etat purusa svapiti nama*. The commentary says that ákása here means the Supreme Self which is identical with the jiva's own life. It lies in that supreme Self which

⁷⁴ *prak pratibodhát kriydkdrakaphalaviparitasvabhdva atme 'ti kdryabhavena didarsayisitam. na hi prak pratibodhat karmadikaryaih sukhdli kiñcana grhyate. tasmad akarmaprayuktatvat tathá svábhávyam era dtmano "vagamyate, yasmin svabhavye 'bhüt yatas ca svabhavyat pracyutah samsárl svabhdva- vilaksana ity etadvivaksaya prcchati gargyam pratibhanarahitam buddhivyutpadanaya.*

is its own nature and transcends birth and death, not in the ordinary ether, for there is another sruti in its support, 'With existence, my dear, it is then united' (*Chand.VI.viii.1*). The idea is that it gives up its individualised form which is created by its connection with the limiting adjuncts—the subtle body—and remains in its undifferentiated natural absolute Self.¹ A few lines further on, the commentary says that the organs being absorbed, the self rests in its own Self, for, then, it is no more changed into action, its factors, and its results.^{75 76}

In II.i.19, the jiva is said to attain the acme of bliss. 'Now when he goes into deep sleep, then he knows nothing verily as a youth or a great king or a great brahmin might rest when he has reached the summit of bliss.'⁷⁷ The commentary says later on 'when in deep sleep the soul attains to its natural serenity, it gives up, like water, the impurity due to contact with other things'. The Self is again said to have no connection with the body as having transcended all desires and as being free from sorrows.⁷⁸

75 *ákásasabdena para eva sva at mo 'ey ate, tasmin sve átmany ákase sete svábháviké 'sámsárike. na kevale ákása eva srutyán- tarasámarthyát said somya tadá sampanno bhavati iti. lingo- pádhisambandhakrtam visesátmasvarñpam utsrjya avísese svábháviké átmany eva kevale vartata ity abhipráyah.*

76 *tasmád upasamhrtesu vágádisu kriyákárákaphalátmatá- bhávát svátmastha eva átmá bhavati 'ty avagamyate.*

77 *atha yadá susupto bhavati, yadá na kasyaeana veda.... sa yathá kuniáro vá mahárájo vá mahábráhmáno vá 'tighnvm-ánandasya gatvá sayitai 'vam evai 'sa etac chete.*

78 *yadá yasmin kále susuptah samprasádam svábhávyam gato bhavati, salilam iva anyasambandhakálusyam hitvá svá- bhávyena prasidati. na hi susuptikále sarirasambandho 'sti..*

The import of this section is explained in the commentary thus: (In *susupti*) the self was not in any place different from itself nor did it come from any place different from itself; nor is there in the self any means different from itself. What then is the import? That the self was in its own Self. This is borne out by the *sruti* passages—‘It merges in itself’ {*Chánd.* VI. viii. 1), ‘With existence, my dear, it is then united’ {*Ibid*), ‘Fully embraced by the Supreme Self’ {*Br.* IV. iii. 21), ‘Rests on the Supreme Self’ {*Prasna*, IV. 7) etc. For the same reason it does not come from any place different from itself. This is shown by the text itself. ‘From this Self etc., for there is no other entity besides the Self.’^{79 80}

The Upanisad in II.i.20 also repeats that it is from this *Atman* of deep sleep that all energies, worlds, gods and beings arise and that it has the secret name of the Real of the real, *satyasya satyam*, that is to say: the Personal God, the source of all vital energies from whom the whole universe comes into existence has got his reality in the

79 *turno hi tadd sarvañ chokan hrdayasya iti hi vaksyati. sarva- samsdraduhkhaviyuktd iyam avasthe ’ty atra drstdntah ayam svabhavike sve atmani sarvasamsdradharmatlo variáte svapakdla iti.*

80 *nd ’yam atma anyo ’nyatra ’bhud anyo vd any asmad dgatah sadhandntaraih vd dtmany asti. kim tarhi svdtmany evd ’bhut; svam dlmanam apito bhavati (Chand. VI. viii. 7), sata somya tadd sampanno bhavati (Chand. VI. viii. 7), prdjñend ’tmand samparisvaktah (Br. IV .Hi. 21), para atmani samprastithate, (Prasna, IV. 7) ity adi srutibhyah. ata eva nd ’nyo ’nyasmdd agacchati — tat srutyai ’va pradarsyate asmad dtmanah (in the next Bráhmana) iti. dtmavyatirekena vastvan tar a bhvdvt.*

Impersonal Self (revealed in dreamless sleep) the absolutely Real.⁸¹

We next come to IV.iii.18. In the introduction to this, the explanation for dealing with the three states, waking, dream and sleep is said to be that they reveal that the self is unattached. 'How do we know that the self is unattached? Because it moves as it were by turn from the waking to the dream-state, from this to the state of profound sleep, and from that again to the dream-state, then to the waking and again to the dream-state and so on which proves that it is distinct from the three states.' In the preceding paragraphs, the self-luminous Atman which is different from the body and organs has been stated to be distinct from desire and work, for it moves alternately to the three states. These relative attributes do not belong to it *per se*; its relative existence is only due to its limiting adjuncts and is superimposed by ignorance. This has been stated to be the gist of the whole passage. There, however, the three states of waking, dream and profound sleep have been described separately, not shown together as a group. For instance, it has been shown that in the waking state the self appears through ignorance as connected with attachment, death, (work) and the body and organs; in the dream-state, it is perceived as connected with desire, but free from the forms of death; in the state of profound sleep, it is perfectly serene and unattached, this non-attachment being the additional feature. If we consider all these passages together, the result is that the self is by nature eternal, free, enlightened and pure. This comprehensive view has not yet been shown. Hence, the next paragraph. It will be stated later on that the Self becomes such

81 *sa yatho 'rnanabhis tantuno 'ccared yathd 'gneh ksudra visphulingd vyuccaranty evam eva 'smad dtmanah sarve pranah sarve lokah sarvani bhutdni vyuccaranti tasyo 'panisat satyasya satyam iti prana vai satyam tesam esa satyam.*

only in the state of profound sleep. 'That form of his is beyond desire, free from evils and fearless.' As it is such, *i.e.*, unique, the Self desires to enter this state¹.

Mantra 19 says that the Self in the state of *susupti* is free from desires, and free from all kinds of particularised forms of perception, *Z.e.*, *svapna* which includes according to Sankara the waking state also.^{82 83} In the commentary, the Atman in this State is said to be distinct from all relative attributes and devoid of all exertion caused by action with its factors and results.⁸⁴

The introduction to the next mantra (20) is very significant. If *avidya* were attached to the Self, in all the three states, it would follow that the atman is never free from it, and liberation would be impossible. It is, therefore, necessary to show that there is at least one experience in our life which demonstrates to us that the Self is free from *avidya*. Therein alone the Atman stands revealed in its own nature. If this freedom from the attributes of *samsara* is Its (Atman's) own nature, then it follows that the attributes of *samsara* are due to limiting adjuncts other than itself. Is this *avidya* natural to the Self, or is it only adventitious, like desires, activities, etc? If it is only adventitious, then liberation is possible. Well, is there any data for proving that it is adventitious? Or, how is *avidya*

82 *susupte punah samprasanno asaṅgo bhavati 'ty asangata 'pi dr̥ṣyate. ekavākyatayā tū 'pasamliriyamanam phalam nitya- muktabuddhasuddhasvabhavata 'sya nai 'katra puñjīkrtya pradarsite 'ti tatpradarsanaya kandika 'rabhyate. susupte, hy evāriirupatd 'sya vaksyamana tad va asyai 'tad aticchanda apahatapdpma 'bhayam rūpam iti. y asmad evamrūpam vilaksa- nam susuptam praviviksati.*

83 *yatra supto na kañcana kamam kamayate na kañcana svapnam pasyati.*

84 *sarvasamsaradharmavilaksanam sarvakriyakarakaphala- yāsaéūnyam svam ātmānam pravisati.*

not natural to the Self? The next section is begun to ascertain the real nature of avidya which is the cause of all miseries.⁸⁵

Here avidya is said to be *agantuka*, that which comes and goes. Whenever it is to be *anádi*, beginningless, it means that we cannot trace its beginning; for beginning implies time, and time is experienced only in the waking when there is avidya. Time-sense is within avidya, and in this sense alone can avidya be said to be beginningless. The refutation of the doctrine of *basic nescience* (*mūlāvīdyá*) is implied in this above passage. If avidya comes (as in the waking and dream-states) and goes (as in *susupti*), then only is liberation possible.

Mantra 20 indicates the nature of *vidya* and *avidya* and also the highest plane to which the human consciousness could rise. 'Now when one feels in a dream, he is being killed, overpowered or driven by an elephant and falls into a pit and when he sees any other object of fear which he saw in the waking state, all that is considered as happening on account of *avidya*. Then when he thinks he

85 *yadi* *asya* 'yam *svabhavaḥ*
sarvasamsciradharmasunyatd, paropddhinimittam cd "sya
samsdradharmitvam, yannimittam cd 'sya paropadhikrtam,
samsaradharmitvaTh, sd cd 'vidyd, tasyd avidydyah kim
svdbhavikatvam ahosvit kdmakarmddivad dgantu- katvam?
yadi cd 'gantukatvañi, tato vimoksa upapadyatc. tasyas cd
'gantukatve, ko 'papattih, katham va nd "tmadharmo "vidya,
iti sarvdnarthabijabhutdyd avidydyah
satattvdvadhdranarthaTh pard kandika arabhyate.

is a god or a king, or when he thinks, "I am all this" that is his highest world or plane of existence.'⁸⁶ Says the commentary: 'Where ignorance is eliminated, and knowledge reaches its perfection, the state of identity with all, which is another name for liberation, is attained. That is to say, just as the self-effulgence of the Atman is directly perceived, so is the result of knowledge. Similarly, when ignorance increases and knowledge vanishes, the results of ignorance also are directly perceived in dreams. "Now, when he feels as if he were overpowered or killed etc." Thus the results of knowledge and ignorance are identity with all and identity with finite things respectively. Through pure knowledge, a man is identified with all, sarvatmabhava, and through ignorance he is identified with finite things or separated from something else. He is in conflict with that from which he is separated and because of this conflict, he is killed, overpowered or pursued. All this takes place, because the results of ignorance, being finite things, are separated from him. But if he is All, what is there from which he may be separated so as to be in conflict, by whom would he be killed, overpowered or pursued? Hence the nature of ignorance proves to be this: that it represents that which is infinite as finite, presents other things that are non-existent, and makes the Self appear as limited. Hence arises the desire for that from which he is separated; desire prompts him to action which produces results. This is the gist of the whole passage.'

This sarvatmabhava of the vidyá state is only a reflection of the sarvatmabháva of the deep sleep state. The difference between the two is the difference between experience and knowledge, between anubhava and jñána. That which is

86 *atha yatrai "nam ghnanti 'va jinanti 'va hasti 'va viccha-
yayati gartam iva patati yad eva jdgadbhaya-
pasyati tad atra 'vidyayd manyate 'tha yatra deva iva raje 'vd
'ham eve 'dam sarvo 'smi 'ti many ate so 'sya paramo lokah.*

implicit in experience is made explicit by vicára in terms of thought or vrttijñána.

Mantra 1 V.iii.21 teaches that the Self in this state goes beyond all desires, beyond all imperfections, beyond dharma and adharma and all fear, that it knows neither inside nor outside, that in this state of susupti it has attained to all its desire, that the Self alone has become its own object of desire and is beyond all miseries.¹

In the commentary the following points may be noted:

1. That susupti is the attainment of totality of existence by the Self, sarvatmabháva.
2. That it is the state of liberation, moksa.
3. That it is the same as the result of knowledge, vidyaphalam.
4. That it is free from action, agency and results, kriyákarakaphalasünya.
5. That therein there is neither avidyá, káma nor karma.
6. That this state is represented as a direct verification, in our experience, of the Self.^{87 88}
7. That by the denial of fear, its cause, vzz., nescience, is also denied.¹ /
8. That as mantra 21 says, the ignorance of deep sleep is

87 *tad vd asyai 'tad aticchandd apahatapdpma 'bhayaih rūpam ayarii purusah prdjñend 'trnana samparisvaktō na bahyam kiñcana veda nd 'ntararii tad vd asyai 'tad dptakamam dtmakdmam akdmam rupaiii sokantaram.*

88 *iddivnh yo 'sau sarvdtmabhdvo rnokso vidyaphalarit kriyd- kdrakaphalasñnyañt, sa pratyaksato nirdisyate yatra 'vidyd- kdmakarmdni na santi. tad etat prastutam—yatra supto na kañcana kamam kdmayate, na kañcana svapnarit pasyati iti.*

not due to avidya, but due to unity. In sleep the jivatman is said to have been completely in the embrace of the paramatman. 'As the Atman is thus not lost in susupti it remains in its own form. If it is asked why one does not know the Self then as "I am this", nor these external things, as in waking or dream, the sruti replies thus: Hear the reason for the ajñana (non-cognition). Unity is the only reason for this non-cognition.....just as in the parallel instance, so this purusa or ksetrajña free from all contact with objects.....having been fully embraced by this his own absolutely real nature, by the effulgent supreme Being, having become one with him, the All-Self without a break, does not know another object outside, nor himself as "I am happy", "I am unhappy".'^{89 90}

9. That the perception of multiplicity is due to particularised forms of knowledge brought about by nescience. That is absent in deep sleep. Hence the experience of unity. 'There by implication it was shown that multiplicity is caused by particularised forms of cognition and this multiplicity is due to avidya which sets up objects other than the Self, where the

89 *bhayam hi namd 'vidyakaryam. avidyaya bhayam many ate iti hy uktam. tatkdryadvdrena kdranapratisedho 'yam. abhayam rupam ity avidyavarjitam ity etat.*

90 *sa yady dtmd atrd 'vinastah svenai 'va rñpena variate kasmd ay am aham asmi 'ty ditmdnam va bahir ve 'mani bhutanl 'ti jdgratsvapnayor iva na jdndli 'ty atro 'cyate. srnv atrd 'jñdnahetum. ekatvam eva 'jñdnaheluh. tat katham ity ucyate. drstdntena hi pratyaksibhavati. vivaksito 'rtha ity aha evam eva yathd drstanto 'yam purusah ksetrajño bhutamatra-samsargatah.....so 'yam purusah prdjñena param,drthena svdbhdvikenā svend 'tmand parena jyotisd samparisvaktah ekibhūto nirantarāh sarvdtmd, na bdhyam kiñcana vastvantaram nd 'py dntaram dtmani ayam aham asmi sukhi dukkhi ve 'ti veda.*

Self is completely free from avidya, then it becomes one with all. Therefore* when there is no division of knower, knowtHtfid object, where is the scope for desire on account of the absence of particularised knowledge in this self-sufficient natural form of the Self?'¹ This point is important to remember, as this is the very core of the argument for Advaita. Of the two other possible explanations for non-cognition in deep sleep, avidya and non-existence of the Self, neither of them is accepted by Sankara and the same point will be expanded by the Upanisad. The difference between ajñana and avidya may also be noted. Not knowing anything whatsoever—Self or non-Self—is ajñana; knowing something as other than the Self is avidya; it consists of adhyása or superimposition; ajñana here is the same as agrahana.

10. Why the Self alone is the object of desire? It is said to be desiring its own Self; because there is no avidya producing a second thing to desire. Therefore this form of the Self is free from desire, because of the absence of any object.^{91 92}

11. In this form the Self is said to attain to the fulfilment of all its desires (áptakáma), because it has attained to all objects of desire in this state.¹

The* absence of avidyá in susupti is emphasised thrice in the course of the commentary to this mantra.

91 *tatra 'rthad ndnñtvam visesavijñdnahetur ity uktam bhavati. ndnatve ca kd'anam—dimano vastvantarasya pratyupasthapika 'vidyc 'ty uktam. tatra cd 'vidyadya yadd pravivikto bhavati tada sarvenai 'katvam eva 'sya bhavati. tatas ca jñdnajñeyddi- kdrakavibhdge, 'sati kuto viscsavijñdnaprddurbhdvah kdmo va sambhavati svabhdvike svarūpastha atmajyotisi.*

92 *anyatvapratyupasthapakahctor avidyaya abhavad dtmakd- mam. ata evd 'kdmam etad rūpam kdmyavisaydbhavdt.*

IV. iii. 22 says that the Self in this state (susupti) is free from all adjuncts and attributes of varna, asrarna and samskara and all kinds of relationships. Thus a father ceases to be a father, a sramana ceases to be a sramana, a candála ceases to be a candala, a hermit ceases to be a hermit etc. The Self is untouched by good work as well as evil work and is free from all woes.^{93 94} The commentary on this repeats that the Atman which is self-effulgent, is free from avidyá, káma and karma and that its nonperception in deep sleep even while retaining its selfeffulgence is not adventitious but is due to attainment of unity, and this again is said to be directly experienced by us. Further, this form of the Atman is said to be beyond all relations which is but a statement of fact.⁹⁵

IV. iii. 23 to 32 is a piece of bold reasoning on the part of the sruti itself as to why a second thing is not experienced in deep sleep which has been already indicated by Sankara in the commentary. Explaining the object of this section (23 to 32),

93 *y asmad evam sarvaikatvam evd 'sya rūpam atas tad va asya 'tmanah svayamjyotihsvabhavasyai 'tad rupam aptakamam; yasmāt samastam etat tasmdd aptah kdmd asmin rūpe tad idam aptakamam.*

94 *atra pitá 'pitá bhavati mata 'mata loká alokd devá adevd veda avedah. atra steno 'steno bhavati bhrūnahd ' bhrūnahd canddlo 'canddlah paulkaso 'paulkasah sramano 'sramanas tapaso 'tapaso 'nanvagatam punyena 'nanvagatam papena tirno hi tadá sarvdn chokan hridayasya bhavati.*

95 *prakrtah svayamjyotir dtma 'vidyakamakarmavinirmukta ity uktam vidyamdnasyai 'va svayamjyotistvasya susupte 'grahanam ekibhdvadd hetoh na tu kdmakarmddivad agantukam atra cai 'tat prakrtam avidyakamakarmavinirmuktam eva tad rupam yat susupte atmano grhyate pratyaksata iti. tad etat yathdbhutam evd 'bhihitam sarvasambandhatitam etat rupam iti.*

the commentary says: ‘Selfeffulgence is being pure intelligence by nature. Now, the question is: If this intelligence is the very nature of the Self, like the heat of fire, how should it, in spite of the unity, give up its nature and fail to know, and if it does not give up its nature, how is it that it does not see in profound sleep? It is self-contradictory to say that intelligence is the nature of the Self and again that it does not know. The answer is that it is not Self-contradictory. Both these are possible. How?*

Says the Upanisad: ‘That it does not see in that state is because although seeing there, it does not see; for the vision of the witness can never be lost, because it is immortal. But there is not a second thing separate from it which it can see/¹ The very same argument is repeated with regard to smelling, tasting, speaking, hearing, thinking, touching and knowing. ‘When there is something else, as it were, then one can see something, one can smell something, one can taste something, one can speak something, one can think something, one can touch something, one can know something.’^{96 97}

The reasoning is quite straight. The following thoughts occur in the commentary by way of explanation:

‘Those things that cause the particular visions (of the waking and dream-states) viz-, the mind, the eyes and forms were all presented by nescience (avidya) as something different from the Self. They are now unified in the state of profound sleep as the individual self has been embraced by the supreme Self.’

Hence, the organs and objects do not stand as different

96 yad vai tan na pasyati pasyan vai tan na pasyati na hi drastur drster viparilopo vidyate ’vinásitvát, na tu taddvitiyam asti tato ’nyad vibliaktañi yat pasyed.

97 yatra va anyad iva syaf, tatra ’nyo ’nyat pasyed anyo ’nyaj jighred anyo "nyad rasayed anyo "nyad vaded anyo ’nyac chrnuydd anyo ’nyan manvitd ’nyo ’nyat sprsed anyo ’nyad vijaniyat.

entities, and since they are absent, there is no particularised experience, for it is the product of the organs etc., not of the Self, and only appears as the product of the Self. Therefore, this mistake is committed, viz., the vision of the Self is lost.⁹⁸

Another point to be noted is the import of the word 'iva' in *yatra va anyad iva syat* (*Br. U. IV.iii.31*). The seeing of a second thing is qualified by 'as it were' meaning thereby that the division in the non-dual Self into 'I' and 'This' is unreal. The world of the senses and the mind is conjured up by avidya which is, therefore, a delusion, not real. This takes place only in the waking and dream, and therefore it is that Sankara always speaks of avidya only in connection with jagrat and svapna and insists that the susupti-state. is free from this avidya, where there is only one non-dual existence. The following quotation from the commentary will make this point clear: 'It has been said that in this state of profound sleep there is not as in the waking and dream-states that second thing differentiated from the Self which it can know. Hence, it knows no particulars in profound sleep; here it is objected: If this is its nature, why does it give up that nature and have particularised knowledge? If, on the other hand, it is its nature to have this kind of knowledge, why does it not know particulars in the state of profound sleep? The answer is this: When in the waking or dream-state, there is something else besides the Self, as it were, presented by nescience, then one, thinking of oneself as different from that something—although there is nothing different from the Self, nor is there any Self

98 *yadd hi tad visesadarsanakaranam antahkaranam caksu rupam ca tadavidyayd 'nyatvena pratyupasthapitam asit. tad etasmin kale ekibhutam. atmanah parena parisvangdt tena na prthaktvena vyavasthitani karanani visayas ca. tada-bhdvad visesadarsanam nd 'sti. karanadikrtam hi tan nd 'tmakrtam. dtmakrtam iva pratyavabhasate. tasmdt tatkrtte 'yam bhrdntih dimano drstih parilupyata iti.*

different from it—can see something. This has been shown by a reference to one's experience in the dream state in the passage, "As if he were killed or overpowered". Similarly one can smell, taste, speak, hear, think, touch and know something where there is something else as it were.'⁹⁹ This position of the sruti is further confirmed by Sankara in the *Vivekacuddmani*, verses 170 and 171. In dreams, when there is no actual contact with the external world, the mind alone creates the whole universe consisting of the enjoyer, etc. And similarly in the waking state also; there is no difference.

99 *jdgratsvapnayor iva yad vijaniydt tat dvittyam pravi-
bhaktam anyatvena nd 'stl 'ty uktam. atah susupte na vijanati
visesam. nanu yady asya 'yam eva svabhavah kinnimittam
asya visesavijñnam svabhdvaparityagena? atha
visesavijñnam evd 'sya svabhavah, kasmad esa visesam na
vijandtl 'ti? ucyate srnu. yatra yasmiñ jagarite svapne vd any
ad iva atmano vast- vantaram iva avidyayd pratyupasthdpitam
bhavati, tatra tasmd dvidypratyupasthdpitdd anyah anyam
iva dtmdnam manyama- nah asati dtmanah pravibhakte
vastvantare 'sati cd 'tmani tatah pravibhakte anyo 'nyat
pasyeduzpalabheta. tat ca darsitam svapne pratyaksato
ghnanti 'va jinanti 'va iti. tatha 'nyo 'nyaj jighred rasayed
vadee chrunydn manvita sprsed vijdniydd iti.*

Therefore, all this (phenomenal universe) is the projection of the mind. In dreamless sleep when the mind is merged in the Atman there exists nothing (for the person asleep) as is evident from universal experience. Hence man's relative existence is simply the creation of the mind and has no objective reality.¹⁰⁰ Again, in sloka 405, Sankara says: 'This duality is maya. The Reality is non-dual. The sruti declares that this is directly experienced in deep sleep.'² Again, slokas 107, 403 and 404 say: 'That in profound sleep we experience the bliss of Atman independent of sense-objects is clearly attested by sruti, direct intuition, tradition and inference.'³ 'How can the talk of diversity apply to the supreme Reality which is one and homogeneous? Who has ever noticed any diversity in the unmixed bliss of the state of profound sleep.'⁴ 'Even before the realization of the highest Truth the universe does not exist in the absolute Brahman, the Essence of Existence. In none of the three states of time the snake is ever observed in the rope, nor a drop of water in the mirage.'¹ It may be noted that Saiikara makes no difference here between the content of nirvikalpa-samadhi and susupti.

The function of avidya and its absence in deep sleep is again brought out in the following passage in the commentary on *Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad*, IV. iii. 32: 'Then again where that avidya which sets up a second thing other than the Self has quietened down, and where a second thing separated by avidya is absent, who can see whom, who can smell whom, who can know whom. Having been fully embraced by its own

samsara etasya na vastuto 'sti. (171)

—² *máyámátram idam dvaitam advaitam paramarthatah iti*
 100 *svapne 'rthasikse susuptav anubhūyate.* (405)

manu eva sarvam tathai 'va jagrati api na visesas
ya susuptau nirvīṣya vimānādo mubhūyate
srutiprayaksam antīyām anūmānam ca jagrati. (1079)

⁴ *sukūṭīkale manasi pralīnā*
svapnāi 'va sūktīkīṅṅit sakalaprāsiddheh atamanahkalorā
susuptau sukūṭīkīṅṅit sakalaprāsiddheh atamanahkalorā
eva pumsdh (403)

nature, the self-effulgent Self having become completely serene, the Self having fulfilled all its desires, having no other object to desire, the seer remains one without a second like a mass of pure water; because a second thing is separated by avidya and that is absent; therefore, it is one only.^{101 102} The sruti here proclaims in emphatic tones that that which is experienced in this state is Brahman itself. 'It becomes like one mass of water, the one witness, and one without a second. This is the world of Brahman, O Emperor!' Thus did Yájñavalkya instruct Janaka. 'This is its supreme attainment, this is its supreme glory, this is its highest world, this is its supreme bliss. On a particle of this bliss other beings live.'¹

The world of Brahman is Brahman Itself and is the supreme: *brahmai 'va loko brahmalokah*. Further, in profound sleep, the Self, bereft of its limiting adjuncts, the body and the organs, remains in its own supreme light of the Atman free from all relations.^{103 104} This is said to be the supreme attainment of the individual self, because the other attainments, characterised by the taking of a body, from the state of hiranyagarbha down to that of a clump of grass are created by ignorance and, therefore, inferior to this, being

101 *na hy asti visvam paratattvabodhdt sadatmani
brahmani nirvikalpe kalatraye nd³py ahir iksito gune
na hy ambubindur mrgatrsnikdydm. (404)*

102 *yatra punah sd³ vidyd susupte vastvantarapratyupasthd-
pika sdntd, tend 'nyatvena avidypravibhaktasya vastuno
'bhavdt*

103 *salila eko drastd 'dvaito bhavaty esa brahmalokah
samrdd iti hai 'num anusasása yájñavalkya esa 'sya parama
gatr esa 'sya parama sampad eso "sya paramo loka eso 'sya
parama ananda etasyai 'vá 'nandasyá 'nyáni bhñtáni mátrám
upajivanti.*

104 *para evá 'yam asmin kale
vyávrttakáryakaranopádhibhedah sve dtmajyotisi
sántasarvasambandho varíate he samrdd.*

within the sphere of ignorance.¹⁰⁵ But this identification with all, in which one sees nothing else, is the highest of all attainments such as identity with the gods that are achieved through meditation and rites.¹⁰⁶ This is said to be the jiva's supreme glory, the highest of all its splendours, being natural to it; other glories are artificial.¹⁰⁷

Likewise, this is its highest world as the other worlds which are the result of its past work, are inferior to it; this, however, is not attainable by any action, being natural. Hence, this is the highest world.¹ Similarly, this is its supreme bliss in comparison with other joys that are due to the contact of the organs with their objects, since this is eternal. For, another sruti says that that which is infinite is Bliss. 'That in which one sees something,.....knows something, is puny, mortal, secondary joy.' But this is the opposite of that, this is its supreme bliss.^{108 109} Other being including even Brahma, the Creator, is said to live only on a particle of this very bliss, put forward by ignorance, and

105 *esa 'sya vijñānamayasya parama gatih. yās tu a'fyah dehagrahanalaksanāh brahmadistambaparyantd avidydkalpitds tā gatayo 'to 'parama avidyāvisayatvāt.*

106 *iyam tu devatvādigatinām karmavidyāsādhyānām para- mottamā yah samastātmabhāvo, yatra nd 'nyat pasyati nd 'nyac chrnoti nd 'nyat vijānāti 'ti.*

107 *esai 'va ca parama sampat; sarvasdm sampaddm vibhuti- nām iyam parama svābhāvikatvāt asyāh. krtakā hy anyāh sampadāh.*

108 *tathai 'so 'sya paramo lokah. ye 'nye karmaphalasraya lokds te 'srnad aparamdh ay am tu na kenacana karmana miyate svabhdvikatvat.*

109 *tathai 'so 'sya parama dnandah. yani anyani visayendri- yasambandhajanitany ānandajātani tdeny apeksya eso 'sya parama anando, nityatvdt. yo vai bhūmā tat sukham iti sruty antarat. yatra 'nyat pasyati any ad vijanati tad alpam martyam amukhyam sukham. idam tu tadviparitam. ata evai 'so 'sya parama anandah.*

perceived only during the contact of the organs with their objects. They are separated from that bliss by ignorance and are considered, therefore, different from Brahman. Being thus different, they subsist on a fraction of that Bliss which is perceived through the contact of the organs with their objects.¹¹⁰

The importance of the enquiry into and study of the three states—waking, dream and sleep—in determining the metaphysical nature of the reality behind this ego and the universe and the supreme value of the study of the experience of deep sleep in helping us towards the realization of moksa are well brought out by Sankara in his summing up of the preceding passages in the commentary to IV.iii.34. *'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 such as ignorance, desire and work—is directly experienced in the state of profound sleep.* The Atman is self-luminous and is the supreme Bliss. This is the subject-matter of knowledge; this is the perfectly serene state, and the culmination of happiness. All this has been explained by the foregoing passages.'¹¹¹

110 *etasyai 'va 'nandasya matrarn kalam
avidyapratyupa- sthdpitdm
visayendriyasambandhakalavibhavyam anyani bhutdny
upajivanti. kani tdnī? tata eva 'nandad avidyaya pravibhajya-
mdnasvarūpdny anyatvena tani bramhanah pr^ikalpyamanany
anyani santy upajivanti bhūtdni visayendriyasamparkadvarena
vibhavyamdnam.*

111 *tatra ca sarvdtmabhavah svabhdvo 'sya, evam
avidyakdma- karmddisarvasamsdradharmasambandhtltarii
rupam asya saksdt susupte grhyate ity etad vijñdpitam.
svayariijyotir atmai 'sa parama anandah. esa vidydyd visayah.
sa esa paramah sam- prasadah sukhasya ca para kdstha. ity
etad evam antena granthena vydkhydtam.*

Next, is this experience of deep sleep an experience of moksa? If deep sleep is an experience of Brahman, as is repeatedly insisted on by sruti, and by Sankara, then it follows that in deep sleep we experience moksa. We have already seen that it is not a semblance, but the Reality itself. Sankara, therefore, says in the para next to the one quoted above, *tasmāt samprasadaṣṭhanam mokṣadrstanta- bhūtam*. And we actually find it is so; for in deep sleep, no kind of bondage is felt by anyone; where there is no individuality or personality or ego there can be no room for bondage. That is the significance of the passage, 'There the father ceases to be a father, the mother ceases to be a mother, the brahmana ceases to be a brahmana' etc. There no father or mother is aware of his or her relations as a father or mother. The candāla is not aware of his status as a candāla. The sramana is not conscious of his order of life and so he is then free from the rules of discipline imposed on him by virtue of his belonging to that order. In sleep no one thinks of his merit or demerit and he is free from the fruits of his good or bad deeds etc. One in sleep not being aware of his mind or body is completely free from all laws of nature. All of which show that we actually experience moksa in deep sleep. It is a direct demonstration that there is such a thing as moksa. If there were no susupti there would be no way of ascertaining that moksa is possible; in other words, susupti is the proof of moksa. What remains for us to do is to get a reflection or expression of this experience in the waking also which is known as jivanmukti. This freedom of the Self is not experienced in the waking until we have reflected on the experience of deep sleep and made explicit in terms of ideas, the implications of that experience, *prcīpie sukham samanubhūya samutthitah san sarvāpmkaravisayapratipattisūnye supto 'ham atra sukham ity anusandadhnaḥ sarvo 'pi jantur avagacchati tasya saukhyam (Safiksepascirīftka, 23)*.

To quote Sankara again: If you say that unhappiness etc. is so strong that no one ever sees oneself free from them, it is

not so, because it is seen that identification with unhappiness etc. is delusive just as the identification with the body etc.; for we see that delusive is the identification that 'T am wounded,' 'T am burnt', when the body is wounded or burnt. So also we see that the idea, 'T am miserable', when one's sons or relatives are miserable is a superimposition. In the same way is it with the identification with the sorrows etc. of life; for these are seen to be outside consciousness (other than consciousness), *because they do not accompany us in susupti*. On the other hand, the continued existence of consciousness is affirmed in the mantra, *yad vai tan na pasyati pasyan val tan na pasyati*: 'That it does not see even while it sees etc., therefore, there is the experience of the nature of pure consciousness completely free from unhappiness etc. And in the case of one who *knows thus* there remains nought else to be done.'

That the sruti itself has admitted reason as the means to realization is evident in the section where Yájñavalkya reasons out advaita from the experience of susupti. More than that, the sruti seems to expressly enjoin re-examination of the experience as the necessary and only means for the attainment of jivanmukti. In *Br. U.*, IV. iv. 13, 14 & 15, 19 & 20 the following words of the mantras indicate re-examination or vicara of experience: (7) *yasyá 'nucittah pratibuddha atnia*(2) *ihai 'va santo "tha vidmas tad vayam*.....(3) *yadai 'tam anupasyati átmánam devam añjasá*... (4) *manasai 'va 'nudrastavyam*.. (5) *ekadhai 'va 'nudrastavyam*. The use of the prefix 'anu*' which means afterwards or 'again' will have little or no significance if it does not refer to an experience one already had. Therefore, the expressions indicate the mind moving over an experience (here, susupti already pointed out) which implies nisrapañca-sadatma-tattva, the state of freedom from relative experience, the very nature of the Atman. The word *pratibuddha* can be interpreted to mean 'having come back to the waking state', *ihai 'va* may be interpreted to mean 'even here in this waking

state'.

5. BRAHMA-SUTRA-BHASYA

That it is by reasoning on the experience of *susupti* as blessed by the *sruti* that we realize the Self as devoid of all relations is also mentioned by Sankara in the commentary to *Brahma-sutra* 6 in the first pada of the second chapter, *drsyate tu*, beginning with *sravanavyatirekena mancinam vidadhat, sabda eva tarkam apy ádartavyam*.

‘The reasoning (*manana*) apart from hearing, (*sravana*) enjoined by the *sruti* has been already shown to be that which has been accepted by *sruti*. The realization of the Self does not happen by dry fruitless logic. (Because, as we have shown in Part I of this book, logic is formal, based on assumptions and does not insist on observed and verified data as in science.) But here it is reasoning, *tarka*, blessed by *sruti* with experience (*anubhava*) forming its part, that is relied upon. (This is followed by citing, the particular experience on which reasoning is based.) The waking and dream-states by mutual exclusion do not accompany the Atman. In sleep by complete renunciation of the universe and by remaining as absolute existence, the Atman is experienced as free from this world-projection; as the world has come out of Brahman (in the waking and dream) by the logic of the non-difference of cause and effect, it is non-different from Brahman. The reasoning sanctioned by the *sruti* is of this kind. The unreliability of mere logic (*kevala-tarka*) will be shown in the commentary on the *Sūtra*, *tarka ’pratishánát* etc.

Most people are ready to quote the *Sutra* in support of their belief in the fruitlessness of reasoning; but they fail to distinguish the kind of reasoning which Sankara condemns as fruitless from that which he accepts. The distinction between logic and reason or scientific method has been accepted by western logicians also. It is this

superb rationality of the sruti that really makes it supremely authoritative in the world of metaphysics and in the search for absolute Truth. Even sruti, according to Sankara will not be accepted as authority if it goes against experience, as for example, if it were to say that fire is cold. And whosoever goes against experience cannot be a philosopher.

There is a common point between the scientific method and Vedanta on one side, as against theologies, which makes the former acceptable to all, vzz., the universality of scientific data and scientific method. On account of this, scientific theories and doctrines have gained ground, whereas theological beliefs and dogmas have been progressively losing ground. Vedanta philosophy, as distinguished from Upanisadic theology, is based on universal experience and reason, and that is why any amount of logic cannot overthrow the conclusions of the Vedanta. To this effect says Sankara: 'It is the conclusion of all those who advocate moksa that moksa is to be had by right knowledge (samyag-jñāna) and that (scientific) knowledge is of one form, because, it is governed by the object itself, (vastutantra). That object which remains ever in one form only is absolutely real. In the world, the knowledge with regard to it is said to be scientific knowledge as that "fire is hot". Since that is so, the not knowing this or contrary knowledge is unreasonable. Because Veda is eternal, and is productive of knowledge, because it produces the knowledge of the objects which it seeks to reveal, the validity of the knowledge thus produced is not to be overthrown by all the logicians of the past, present and future put together' (*vide* commentary on *tarka 'pratisthānat* etc. beginning with *api ca samyagjñānāt mokṣah*, II. i. 11).

Sankara's position with regard to reason is further confirmed by the following commentary to *Sutra* I.i.2 *janmad yasya yatah*.

'The realization of Brahman is not to be brought out by inference etc., but only by enquiry into the meaning of the

Upánisadic statements. When there are Vedantic statements regarding the ultimate cause of the universe, inferential argument to confirm the pronouncement of the sruti are not objected to, the help of reason being admitted even by sruti. Thus 'The Atman is to be heard and reasoned upon' (*Br. U. II. iv. 5*). Also in *Chandogya*, 'The man with a teacher knows the truth' (*VI. xiv. 2*) shows that the help of reason also must be taken to realize the Atman, because in the matter of enquiry into Brahman, it is not the sruti alone that forms the authority as in the case of enquiry into duties, dharma. What else, then? Experience as well as scripture is authority here, because the realization of Brahman consummates in experience—*anubhavava- sanatvat*—and also because the object of enquiry is already an existent thing and not to be brought about as in the case of duties. *vdkydrthavicdranddhyavasananirvrtd hi brahmavagatir nd 'numdnddipramdndntaranirvrta* etc.

There is a note on 'anubhavávasána' by Ānandagiri which shows why reason is the more immediate means of realization than hearing and faith in the traditional teaching of the sruti:

'Because it is as a means of liberation that realization of Brahman gains its importance. Of the two, scriptural authority and reason, (*sabda-tarkd*), reason being more immediate and internal than the other which is based on other peoples' realization, and being also of the same nature as one's own experience (that is to say, being only an explicit presentation in the form of ideas or *vrtdijñána* of what was implicit in one's own experience), reason is of greater importance. Tradition, sruti, is external to one's own experience, whereas the other is internal being a part of one's own experience. Hence, reason is superior. A doubt may arise whether brahmajñána also like dharma may not be productive of only unknown results in future; hence, how could reason, destroying wrong knowledge, end in experience? To this the reply is that it does end in the experience of moksa, just as by examining the mother of pearl,

the superimposed idea of silver is destroyed, by reasoning, the inability to conceive the Reality is destroyed, (as it again goes over the experience of reality with a view to examine the contents of the experience, left overlooked till then). Reason is, therefore, the means of moksa, and therefore, does not have the defect of not immediately experiencing its result, as it is the case with dharma'.¹¹²

The utility of knowledge or philosophy of the susupti state is expressly stated by Sankara as the ascertainment of the real nature of the jTva as Brahman and its freedom from the relative existence of the waking and dream-states in the commentary to *Sutra* III. ii. 7. After a lengthy discussion about the whereabouts of the soul in deep sleep, Sankara comes to the following conclusion that the 'Ātman-brahmarí is the sole locus of the soul in that state. 'That sat and prájña are Brahman is well known (from the sruti). In these srutis three loci (of the jiva) in the susupti state are mentioned, the nerves, the heart and Brahman. There the

112 *brahmasdksatkarasya moksopdgatayd prddhdnydt tatra sabddd api paroksagocarad aparoksdrrthasddharmyagocarSs tarko 'ntarangam iti tasyai 'va balavattvam ity arthah. aitihiyamdtrena pravada parampariyamatrena. paroksatfi/yeti yavat. anubhavasya prddhanye, tarkasyo'ktanyayena tasminn antarangatvad agamasya ca bahirangatvdt antarahgabahirangayor antarangam balavat iti nyayad uktam tarkasya balavattvam. anubhavapraddidwyam tu nd 'dya 'pi siddham ity asankya 'ha—anubhave 'ti. nanu brahmajñdnam vaidikatvd dharmavad adrstaphalam estavyam, tat kuto asyd 'nubhavdvasdndvidydnivartakatvam tatra 'ha—mokse 'ti. adhistanasdksdtkdrasya sukyddijndne tadavidyatatkaryanivartakatvadrster brahmagñdnasyd 'pi tarka- - vasad asambhavanddinirdsadvdra sdsdtkdravasdyinas tadavi- dyanivartakatvenai 'va muktihetute 'ti nd 'drstaphalate 'ty arthah..*

(Ānandagiri's gloss on anubhavávasána of áañkarabhásya on *Brahmasñtra*, II. i. 4.)

nerves and the heart are meant as pathways, the only one locus is Brahman.... I have already shown that Brahman is the unchanging locus. There is utility in this knowledge, viz., the ascertainment of the Truth, that jiva is Brahman and that it is free from the vyavahāra (relative experience and activities) of the dream and waking states. Therefore, the point of deep sleep is Brahman itself.¹¹³ The contention that susupti is not an experience of Brahman, but only an analogy is thereby disposed of. In this commentary, two more points may be noted, one of which is that jiva does not rest in the Ātman as a separate entity. From the *Bṛhadaranyaka* expression *prajhena 'tmana samparivaktah* (embraced by the Supreme Self) we may be led to suppose that jiva though immediately close to the *Paramatman* and resting in it, is not yet one with it. To remove the possible wrong impression, Saiikara says: 'Then again the nerves and the heart are only the (resting) abode of the limiting adjuncts of the soul, for apart from its limiting adjuncts it

is impossible for the soul in itself to abide anywhere, because being non-different from Brahman, it rests in its own glory. And if we say that in deep sleep it abides in Brahman we do not mean thereby that there is a difference between the abode and that which abides, but there is absolute identity of the two, for the text says: "With that which is, he becomes united, he is gone to the Self" which means that the sleeping person has entered into his true nature.'¹

113 *satprajñayos ca prasiddham eva brahmatvam. evam etdsu srutisu triny eva susuptisthanani sankirtitdni nddyah puritad brahma ce 'ti. tatrd "pi dvDRAMATRAM nddyah puritac ca, brahmai 'va tv ekam anapayi susuptisthanam. brahma tv anapayi suptisthdnam ity etat pratipadaydmah tena tu vijñd-nena prayojanam asti jivasya brahmdtmatvdvadharam svapna- jagaritavyavahdravimuktatvavadharanam ca. tasmad dtmai "va suptisthdnam.*

Another point to be noted is: it is not that the nva ever attains to something which it had not before, namely brahmatva, because it never falls away from its own nature. It is as a contrast to the seeming loss of its nature in the waking and dream-states, on account of its connection with the limiting adjuncts of body &c. that it is said to attain to its own form in susupti when the adjuncts are merged in the Self. Therefore, it does not happen that sometimes it attains to the Absolute and sometimes does not.^{114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122}

Still another point which may be noted is the definition of susupti accomplished by Sankara as that state in which there is no particularised forrpx of experience. 'Moreover •even if we admit that there are different places for the soul in deep sleep, still there does not result from that difference of place any

114 *api ca nadyah puritad vajivasyo 'pddhyddhra eva bhavati*

115 *tatrd 'sya karanani vartanta iti. na hy upddhisambandham*
 116 *antarena svata eva jivasya 'dharah kascit sambhavati. brahma-*

117 *vyatirekena svamahimapratisthitatvat; brahmddharatvam apy*

118 *asya susupte nai 'va ' dharadheyabhedabhiprayena ucyate, katham*

119 *tarhil tddatmyabhipradyena. yata aha — sata somya tada*

120 *sampanno bhavati svam apito bhavati (Chánd. VI. viii. 1) iti.*

121 *svasabdend 'tmd 'bhilapyate, svarüpan dpannah supto bhavati*

122 *ty arthah.*

.² *api ca na kaddcij jivasya brahmana sampattir nd 'sti svarüpasyd 'napayitvdt. svapnajagaritayos tu updidhisamparkavasdt pararüpapattim iva "peksya tadupasamdt susupteh svarupdpattir vivaksyate. atas ca suptavasthdydm kaddcit sata sampadyate kaddcin na sampadyata ity ayuktam.*

difference in the quality of deep sleep which is in all cases characterised by the *cessation of special cognition*; it is therefore, more appropriate to say that the soul does (in deep sleep) not cognise on account of its oneness, having become united with Brahman; according to the sruti, "How should we know another?" (JBr. U. IV.v.15). If further the sleeping soul does rest in the nadis and the puritat, it would be impossible to assign any reason for its non-cognising, because, in that case, it would continue to have diversity for its object; according to the sruti, 'When there is, as it were, duality, then one sees the other' etc.¹²³

We may also note here that on account of the absence of cognition or visesavijñana it is not possible to distinguish the content of susupti from that of nirvikalpa-samadhi, for the latter also is said to be free from cognition; for only the states with cognition can be distinguished from each other. The state in which there arrives the knowledge in the form of vrttis, 'I am Brahman', 'All this is Brahman,' 'All this is Atman' is savikalpa-samadhi. In the commentary to II.i.9, *Brahmasutrabhasya*, Sankara has bracketed susupti and samadhi together as states in which false knowledge is not necessarily removed, and hence on returning to the waking state, the consciousness of separation and duality comes into existence. 'Then with regard to the objection that if we assume all distinctions to pass (at the time of re-absorption of the universe)- into the state of non-distinction, there would be no special reason for the origination of a new world affected with

123 *api ca sthānavikalpābhyupagame 'pi visesavijñānopā-samalaksanarri tāvat susuptam na kvacid visisyate. tatra sati sampannas tāvat tadekatvān na vijānāti 'ti yuktam; tat kena karri vijāniyāt (Br. U. II. iv. 14) iti sruteh. nādisu puñtati ca sayānasya na kiñcid avijñāne kāranañi sakyam vijñātum. bhedavisayatvāt, yatra vā anyad iva syāt tatrā 'nyo 'nyat pasyēt (Br. U. IV.iii.31) iti sruteh.*

distinctions, we likewise refer to the existence of parallel instances. For the case is parallel to that of deep sleep and trance. In those states also, the soul enters into an essential condition of non-distinction; nevertheless, wrong knowledge being not yet finally overcome, the old state of distinction re-establishes itself as soon as the soul awakens from its sleep or trance... For just as during the subsistence of the world, the phenomena of multifarious distinct existence, based on wrong knowledge, proceed unimpeded like the vision of a dream, although there is only one highest Self devoid of all distinction, so we infer there remains even after absorption the power of distinction (potential distinction) founded on wrong knowledge.¹²⁴ The above passage also explains now, having attained to non-separation from Brahman in *susupti* and *samadhi*, we find ourselves separate from it on waking up again. There is no causality operating there where there is neither time nor space nor any phenomenon. Therefore, the only explanation offered by Vedanta is false knowledge—*mithyájñána*, coming back again in the next waking state through the power of *avidyá*. But this very *avidya* is not to be taken to have really existed in the *susupti* or *samadhi* state itself, because it is adventitious, *ágantuka*. It comes and goes. It comes in the waking and dream and disappears in sleep; if it has not been destroyed in the intellect or *antahkarana* before

124 *yat punar etad uktam samastasya vibhágasyá 'vibhága- prápteh punar vibhágeno "tpattau niyamakaranam no 'papadyata iti. ay am apy adosah. drstántabhdvád eva. yatha hi susupti- samádhyádáv api satyám svábhávikyám avibhgdgaprđptau mithyájñánasya anapoditatvát pürvavat punah prabodhe vibhago bhavaty, evam ihd 'pi bhavisyatiyatha hi avibhage 'pi paramatmani mithyájñánapratibaddho vibhagavyavahárah svapnavad avyáhatah sthito drsyate, evam apilar api mithyá-jñánapratibaddhai "va vibhágasaktir anumásyate.*

susupti, the same comes back with the return of that antahkarana in the next waking state. If the antahkarana was conscious of its separation from Brahman in the previous waking state with the consciousness of being a lion or a snake or a bird or a mosquito, this consciousness returns in the next waking also; the consciousness of separation from Brahman in spite of the unity in susupti reappears. If, on the other hand, the antahkarana which has given up its false idea of separation from Brahman goes to sleep, it comes back again with the consciousness of identity in the form, 'I am Brahman'. Thus in his case there is no rebirth or punar- utpatti; for being Brahman, he is as good as unborn. It is, therefore, quite clear that the destruction of false knowledge should take place not in susupti or samadhi, but only in the waking state, and there is no other way to it except through reason.

Though the above passage is quoted here only to show that samadhi is as much a state of unenlightenment as susupti according to Sankara, an explanation for the statement that mithyájñāna continues to exist in susupti, whereas all along we have been refuting it from the Upanisads and Sankara, seems to be necessary. The explanation is that Sankara only says that it is inferred, there is only anumana in the waking, not anubhava, in those states, of such false knowledge, and when anubhava contradicts anumana the latter must be rejected and anubhava must be accepted as pramana.¹²⁵ Therefore, the statement of Sankara that mithyájñāna in susupti and samadhi is inferred, does not contradict our contention that mithyajñāna does not exist in susupti and samadhi.

125 *na cd 'numanam pratyaksavirodhe prdmanyarii labhate (Br. bhasya, II. i. 20).*

6. MÁNDÜKYOPANISAD

This is the only Upanisad in which a distinction is made between the Atman of deep sleep and the Atman of the state of Truth-realization. The former is called *prájña* and the latter *turiya*. We have already shown in Part I that the concept of *turiya* as other than the Atman of deep sleep is a philosophical superfluity. This will now be borne out by an examination of the definition of *turiya* as given in this Upanisad. The *turiya* is said to be: ‘That which is not. conscious of the internal world nor of the external world, nor that which is conscious of both, nor that which is a mass of sentiency, nor that which is simple consciousness, nor that which is insentient. It is unseen by any senseorgan, nor related to anything, incomprehensible by the mind, uninferable, unthinkable, indestructible, essential of the nature of consciousness, constituting the Self alone, the negation of all phenomena, the peaceful, all-blissful and the non-dual. This is known as the fourth, *turiya*. This is the Atman and it has to be realized’ (*Mandükya*, U. 1.7). Now, is there a single term in this definition of *turiya*, which is not applicable to the Self in deep sleep? We find there is not. Therefore, the so-called *turiya* is none other than *samprasada*. We are confirmed in this view by a key sentence of Sankara in the commentary on the *Gaudapada-karika*, 1.2, where the Self of deep sleep is sought to be identified with the *turiya* which is defined later. ‘That, is designated as *prájña* (when it is viewed as the cause of the phenomenal world) will be described as *turiya* separately when it is not viewed as the cause and when it is free from all phenomenal relationship fsuch as that of the_body_etc._in its absolutely real aspect^.’¹²⁶

The identity of *turiya* with *samprasáda* is, therefore, quite clear. What

126 *tám abijavasthám tasyai ’va prajñasabdavácyaśya turiya- .tvena dehádisambandharahitám par amar thikirii prthag vaksyati.*

remains for us is to explain the introduction of the additional concept, *prájña*. It is necessary to see if the terms applied to *prájña* are verified by experience. That it is desireless does tally with our experience; that it is free from dream is also according to experience. But that it is a mass of sentiency in the sense of the experience of the 'jagrat and the *svapna* all dumped together is not borne out by experience. Therefore, Saiikara is very careful to say, *ata eva svapnajagranmanaspandanáni prajriancini gham- bhñtarií 'va*. The word 'iva' (as if) is very significant as showing that it is wrongly viewed as *prajñánaghana*. And the reason for calling it *prajñánaghana* is given as want of discrimination in that state, *se' yam avastha avivekarüpatvát prajhanaghanam ucyate*. The description of *prájña* as a mass of sentiency is not, therefore, a description of the experience of *susupti* as such, but our view of it before sufficient analysis. This is again supported by other terms applied to the experience of *susupti* such as *sarvesvara*, *sarvajña*, *antaryámin* &c., for who has ever experienced in deep sleep that he is the ruler of the universe, or is the inner controller of the *jivas* and the *jagat*, or is the all-knowing Being, knowing the past, present and future of all created entities in the universe or that he is the origin and dissolution of all beings? It is quite clear, therefore, these attributes are heaped on the innocent *Átman* of deep sleep, rather than experienced. It is a theological attempt to find a place for a personal God of the faithful in a philosophical system, but wrongly placed in *susupti* state. The mystics of all religions have experienced the presence of an allpowerful, all-knowing, creating, destroying sentient Being in their heightened mystic states, in *savikalpa-samádhi*. Such a state would have been the appropriate place for assigning the experience of the personal God. The true

explanation, therefore, for thrusting the experience of Isvara into the metaphysics of avasthātraya is that it is only a theological device to give a philosophical appearance to the concept of the personal God. But experience flatly refuses to certify the identification of the Self of deep sleep with personal God.

With regard to the concept of prajña as the state of bija, or as the potential state of future creation, it is significant to remember that the concept of causality applied to it is only in the sense that there is no realization of Truth in that state, *prájñas tu bijabhavenai 'va baddhah tattvaprabodharh eva hi bījaprájñatve nimittam*.

This we have explained as due to the absence of antahkarana, the instrument with which the Truth has to be realized. There is not, therefore, a second positive entity other than the Atman, which exists potentially as the cause of the bondage. The absence of tattvagrahana (realization of Truth) in susupti, therefore, does not in any way justify our conception of turTya as different from the Self of the state of jñāna where tattvagrahana and anyathagrahana are equally absent. The Atman of deep sleep is, therefore, not more or less related to the world of waking or dream than the turTya. That it is free from avidyā we have already seen. For these reasons, our view that the turTya as the Atman of the state of Truthrealization can be put within the waking state is justified. It may, therefore, be rejected as an entity experienced in any state other than the avasthatrayas. All the other Upanisads through which we have gone do not at all make any reference to this turTya; and their concept of samprasada is the same as the turTya of the *Māndukyopa- nisad*.

OM TAT SAT

REVIEWS

Oriental Institute Magazine, Baroda wrote:

‘The book under review is “an attempt to present the Brahmailidya shorn of the mystical and theological accretions” as the author would have it and the author has ably performed the task he had in view. The book is divided into two parts: In the first part, the author explains the theory of Vedanta in a rational way, without reference to Vedanta texts and in the second part, he quotes Upanisadic texts with his elucidations on them, to show that what he has proved by reasoning is supported by the Sruti texts.

* * * *

‘The author has rightly understood the subtle theory of Vedanta and has put it in so simple a language as to be easily understood even by a layman. We congratulate the author on such a splendid production and strongly recommend it to every seeker of Truth.’

The Hindu, Madras wrote:

⁴.....The book deserves to be carefully studied by the students of Advaita Vedanta in particular.’

The Indian Review, Madras wrote:

⁴.....The book presents in a very simple language the difficult subject of Brahmailidya.’

is unwarranted. In the Middle Ages the monk Occam enunciated a famous axiom to the effect that ‘Entities are not to be multiplied without necessity’.

jagat tata evo 'tpadyata iti ca siddham bhavati.

tat kena karii pasyej jighred vijdnnydd vd. atah svenai ³va hi prdijnend 'tmand svayaihjyotihsvabhdvena samparisvaktah

samastah samprasanna dptakamah dtmakamah salilavat
svacchi- bhñtah sólita iva salila eko dvitiyasya 'bhavdt.
avidyaya hi dvitiyah pravibhajyate. sd ca santa 'tra ata ekah.
drasta drster avipariluptatvad dtmajyotihsvabhdvdyah.
advaito drastavyasya dvitiyasya ³bhavdt. %tad amrtam
abhayam.