

THE
Sreegopal Basu Mallick
Fellowship Lectures
FOR 1930-31.

(A Realistic Interpretation of Sankara-Vedanta.)

BY


Kokileswar Sastri Vidyaratna, M. A.

Lecturer in Sanskrit and Philosophy, Calcutta University, and author of The Introduction to Advaita Philosophy, The Upanishader Upadesh in three big volumes, The Advaita-Vāda, The Outlines of Vedānta Philosophy, The Bhagavad Gitā &c. &c.

AND

• *Savā-Pandit of the "Cooch-Bihar Durbar."*

—:0::0:—



PUBLISHED BY
THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

1931.

PRINTED BY
Rajendralal Sircar,
AT THE
KATYAYANI MACHINE PRESS.
39/1, Shibnarayan Dass Lane, Calcutta.

STOCKTAKING-2011

ST - VERF

9697

3 APR 1965

CONTENTS.

Lect.	Page.
I. Introductory 	1
The Absolute Reality and God 	8
II. What is Māyā and why is it Anirvachaniya 	30
III & IV. One End works in Nature and in Finite Self 	50
V. The Vedantic Prāna : —Its character 	70
VI. The Vedantic Prāna : —Its two-fold manifestations 	83
VII. The Vedantic Prāna : —Its Objectivity 	93
VIII. Why is Māyā called so 	105
IX. Sankara-Vedānta is not Pantheism...	123
X. The Subject and its true character...	143
XI. Jiva's State of Samsāra or False Predication and How to get rid of it	167
XII. The Source of Adwaita-Vāda : 	191
6 Conclusion 	

AUTHORITIES QUOTED.

ABBREVIATIONS :

ऋग्वेद—Rg. Veda.

वे० भा०, ब्र० सू० भा०, ब्र० भा०, ब्र०—Brahma-Sutra-bhāsyā.

गी० भा०, गी०—Gitā-bhāsyā.

बृ० भा०, बृ०—Bṛihadāranyaka-bhāsyā.

मु० भा०, मु०—Mundaka-bhāsyā.

तै० भा०, तै०—Taittirīya-bhāsyā.

कठ० भा०—Katha-bhāsyā.

आत्म-बोध—Atma-bodha—a poem by Sankara.

श्वे० भा०, श्वे०—Swetāśwatara-bhāsyā.

शतश्लोकी—Sata-Sloki—a poem by Sankara.

छा० भा०, छा०—Chhāndogya-bhāsyā.

रा० ती०, रामतीर्थ—Rāma-tirtha's Gloss on Vedānta-Sāra.

उप० सा०—Upadesha-Sāhasri of Sankara.

प्र० भा०, प्र० उ०—Prasna-bhāsyā.

शिशुपालवध—Sisupālabadha of Poet Māgha.

मा० गौड का० भाष्य, मा० का० भा०—Sankara's bhāsyā on
Goudapāda-Kārikā and Māndukya-upanishad.

अनुभूतिप्रकाश—Vidyāranya's Anubhuti-Prakāsha.

वे० सा०—Vedānta-Sāra.

केन० वा० भा०—Kena-bākya-bhāsyā of Sankara.

रत्न० प्र०—Ratna-Pravā—Gloss on Ved. bhā.

वि० भि०—Vijnāna-bhikshu.

आ० गि०—Ananda-Giri.

ईशा० भा०—Isa-bhāsyā.

स्वात्मनिरूपण—A Poem by Sankara.

PREFACE.

Most of the writers on Sankara-Vedānta have dwelt almost exclusively upon the traditional illusory aspect and have tended to relegate its realistic aspect to the back-ground. I have found it necessary to refuse to accept the traditional ascetic interpretation *alone* to the entire neglect and inexcusable exclusion of the realistic ; because it seems to me that the realistic side was very prominent in Sankara's own mind and I have conceived it to be my duty to try and present a concise account of his philosophy in its realistic and objective truthfulness with constant reference to the original sources. Even if this side is at a discount in the general esteem at the present moment, yet the realistic interpretation cannot be ignored nor evaded, and it is one of great and growing urgency. This neglect increases my gratitude to the great founder of this Fellowship whose impartial and enlightened generosity has rendered possible the publication of my studies on the realistic and practical aspect of the Vedānta and I trust that nothing of first-class importance has escaped my attention in re-emphasising this most neglected side of Sankara.

I cannot conclude without mentioning with deep gratitude the names of Brahmachāri Jnāna chaitanya (who has now become Paramahansa) and Brahma-

chāri Furna chaitanya—two most learned editors of that excellent Monthly Magazine—the *Vedānta-Keshari*—the renowned organ of the Rama-Krishna Matha at Mylapore in Madras, who, by their sympathy and encouragement, almost from the very beginning, helped me a great deal, by opening out the columns of their great Journal for some of these Lectures they so kindly published therein. The present learned editor Brahmachāri Furna chaitanya has placed me under a deep obligation by his kind appreciation of the merits of my Lectures and furnishing me with his valuable opinion on my interpretation which I reproduce below :—

“It is perhaps superfluous on our part to express our admiration for the scholarship and originality you have displayed so abundantly in your interpretation of Adwaita Vedānta. In India, especially, (perhaps it may be due to the adverse condition of our social and political life) men have ceased to think originally. To move even a bit from the old groove of thought is considered the climax of heterodoxy, and men have seldom shown that courage of conviction and intellectual vitality so essentially needed to set at naught such conservative forces at work and chalk out new paths of thought. We have profound regard for the strength of your intellectual conviction and originality of mind that have enabled you to give this new interpretation of Sankara’s System. Some of our readers, who have taken interest in Vedānta all through their life, also told us that they are gathering many new ideas from your lectures.

We feel that of your lectures, those dealing with Māyā and Prāna are the best. You have clearly brought out that Māyā does not simply mean a magical power causing some sort of illusion, but that it is the Lord’s creative power, which is always there either in a manifested or unmanifested condition,

and that it is unreal or illusory only to the ignorant man who views it as separate from and unconnected with its substratum Brahman, while to the vision of the knowing one it appears in its proper relation to Brahman and therefore ceases to be unreal. Mâyāvāda thus interpreted can form a philosophy of life providing an intellectual basis and a kind of sustaining power to man in his daily avocations of life. Your interpretation has shown that Adwaita is not simply a philosophy of asceticism but a gospel of life that can form the basis of dynamic activism. This of course is not stated in your lectures in so many words, but is what seems to us to be clearly implied in them. We do not know whether we have grasped you correctly, but we feel certain that if the implication that we have pointed out is correct, Adwaita, as interpreted by you, can again become a living force in our national life, and form not only a matter for the intellectual satisfaction of the Pandits ; but a gospel of life that can inspire and sustain the youth of the land in the various fields of life that are open to them. In many respects this is also the trend of the interpretation given to the Adwaita Vedānta by the late Swāmi Vivekānanda.

Your lecture on 'Prāna' gives some clear and definite ideas about a much misunderstood subject. Many regard Prāna as some sort of air and others as some sort of energy that is neither spiritual nor material. Your interpretation of it has shown the absurdity of all such ideas that view the Prāna apart from its metaphysical significance that you have so ably expounded. In the light of the wide and comprehensive view you have taken of Prāna, it is possible to understand in a clear and correct perspective the whole world of meaning underlying this difficult concept in Indian philosophy.

• While expressing our appreciation of the view you have taken of Adwaita, we would however like to say that the traditional interpretation of it also has a substantial basis to stand upon. But the point is that Adwaita has in the past been interpreted in an one-sided manner. Since most of the thinkers

of this school in the past have been ascetics, whose one object in life was to transcend all consciousness of relative existence, it is no wonder that this school of thought conceived the Absolute as free from any kind of change either of condition or of entity, and insisted on regarding the world as a totally non-existent phantasm. That such an experience is however possible is evident from the lives of some of our saints and such scriptural passages as the following Mantra from the Māndukya Upanishad :—

“नात्तःप्रज्ञं न वहिःप्रज्ञं नीमयतःप्रज्ञं न प्रज्ञानघनं न प्रज्ञं नाप्रज्ञं ।
अदृष्टमव्यवहृत्यमयाज्ञमलक्ष्यमचिन्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं
शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः ॥”

But this does not mean that the ascetic's view alone is the correct one. The stand-point you have adopted is equally tenable, being supported both by reason and authority as you have proved by your elaborate arguments and quotations. The difference is that the traditional interpretation is that of the ascetic who tries to identify himself with the Absolute by obliterating the consciousness of relative existence, whereas yours is the view of the practical man of the world who tries to transcend the limitation of the world by regarding it as non-different from Brahman, its stuff and substratum'. &c. &c.

I wish also to thank Prof. Narendra Chandra Vedāntatīrtha, M. A., for the great pains he has taken in seeing the book through the press.

SENATE HOUSE.
Calcutta University. } KOKILESWAR BHATTACHARYA.
August, 1931.

Sreegopal Basu Mallick

Fellowship Lectures

FOR 1930—1931.

(*On Sankara-Vedānta.*)

I.

(a) Introductory.

Among the Six main Schools of Vedānta, the School represented by Sankarāchāryya holds a very unique position. It is not only very popular in India, but in the Western world also it has found a number of brilliant and lucid exponents, some of whom have thrown enthusiastic labour into the study of his System and succeeded to correctly seize his main principles. But critics are not wanting both in India and in Europe who have adversely criticised him and are unable, they assure us, to accept his method. But the objections raised by them seems, however, to have been founded on misapprehension of his ideas. These critics have understood Sankara's—
“सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म”—as an all-inclusive whole embracing within it, and entirely immanent in, the in-

dividual selves (विषयौ) and the objects (विषय), and that these, they have thought, are mere reproductions of, or parts constituting, the whole. This, in fact, is an identification of the Absolute with the process of the Actual. In a different way, Brahma of Sankara has been taken by some in the sense of an abstract empty unity in which, "like a lion's den" to use Hegel's phrase,—everything is lost and from which nothing can come out; and Sankara has been credited with the impossible task of deducing the differences of *nāma-rupa* from such a blank, barren, empty unity. Another consequence naturally follows. As there is nothing but Brahma, the world must be an illusion, a kind of hallucination, a creation of the mind of man. It is simply the mental ideas with which the finite man—the knowing subject—conceives the true Reality—Brahma. The apparent world exists in the mind of man and when the mind of man is abolished, the world ceases to exist. In this way, Sankara's doctrine has been reduced by some of these scholars to a sort of Subjective Idealism.

In the all-comprehensive view noticed above the finite souls which are mere phases of one inclusive unity, appear and vanish with no aim or purpose and are drifted along as the countless waves or bubbles on the bosom of the ocean. The individuals, these authors maintain, have no freedom of action, no responsibility,—and the sole responsibility, if any, is attributed only to the whole which is the only individuality. The personality of the *Jīvas* has no place, they say, in this System.

It is forgotten that the finite soul also participates in the Absolute Self—the Infinite—which is eternally present in him and which is his true self, without which his *finititude itself* vanishes. The fact is not noted that the finite self, in Sankara-Vedānta, is both the same (अनन्य) and not the same (अन्य) with God. The cultivation of moral virtues, they would assure us, has been denied by Sankara and a sort of inertia preached. The union with Brahma which is sought for in Sankara System is, according to these critics, only an absorption in which all contents and differences are entirely lost and, contrary to the assurance given in the Gītā—
 “तस्माद्दं न प्रणश्यामि, स च मे न प्रणश्यति” (i. e. ‘I—the Supreme Self—will not be lost to him, nor he—the finite self—will be lost to me’),—the emancipated *Jīva*, these critics tell us, becomes a total void and an empty abstraction. Even Paul Deussen, the most learned and sympathetic interpreter of Sankara’s System has explained the great *āchāryya*’s theory from the point of view of Subjective Idealism, following the theory of Kant and Schopenhauer as understood by him.

It has also been held by some that the *Māyāvāda* as is found in the Sankara System was the creation of his own fertile brain and it has no sanction and support in the most ancient Upanishads and in the *Brahma-Sutras*.

We all of us remember the notorious Sanskrit couplet, particularly its last line—“मायावादमसच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं वीक्षमेव तत्”—and you know how Sankara was

held to ridicule by some of our own countrymen who represented his great Māyā-vādā as an असच्छास्त्र (Asat-Sāstra) and stigmatised him as a प्रच्छन्न बौद्ध—a crypto Buddhist. Evidently, the composer of the lines had in his mind *Sunya-vāda* of a certain sect of the Buddhists. But the man was counting without his host. He knew not what he was about. He not only misunderstood and misinterpreted Sankara, but also signally failed to grasp the true sense of the *Sunya-vāda* too, which he was led to ascribe to Sankara. The great Pali authority gives the following correct idea of the Sūnya-Vāda—

“सिद्ध भिक्षु इमं नावं, सिद्धा ते लह मेच्छति

हेसा रागश्च देवश्च, ततो 'निव्वाण'मेहिस्सि” ।

The text shows that the *Nirvāna* is not an empty vacuum ; it is a state where love and hatred, passion and aversion by which all of us are swayed will never distract our mind ; where all strife and quarrel will cease to exist and perfect tranquillity will come to our possession. Sankara himself has used the term *Nirvāna*, but he understood it in quite a different sense than what the versifier tells us—“अभितो ब्रह्म-निर्व्वाणमत्यन्तं सुखमश्नुते” (Vide. Sankara-bhāṣya on it). When the *Nirvāna* is attained, we would not, he assures us, reach a vacuum but —अत्यन्तं सुखम्—complete bliss and happiness. No suffering will meet us anymore.—“तत्र को मोहः, कः शोकः एकत्वमनुपश्यतः” (quoted in ब्र० सू० भा०, 3. 4. 22.) —But we shall see more elaborately if Sankara really deserves such stigma at all.

Thick accretions of such misapprehension and hasty opinions have gathered round and have almost choked the spirit of this great philosophy, this glorious Metaphysical System of India.

But if any honest and earnest seeker of truth, purging off from his mind preconceived ideas, tries to find out the true meaning of this philosophy, his success is sure to come. Let him carefully collect the materials from the *original sources* which he will find scattered broad-cast in the writings of Sankara himself and he will experience no difficulty to establish the correct position set forth there-in.

In the course of these Lectures, it will be my earnest endeavour to present before my learned audience the correct views of Sankara-Vedānta as appear from his *own writings* and to show the untenability of the opinions formed by some of the Western as well as Indian critics of this great and celebrated Māyā-vāda. An attempt will be made to discover the source of this Ādwaitavāda which I have tried to trace to the R̥g-veda itself. An attempt will also be made in the following course of Lectures to show, here and there, the merits of Vedānta as compared with the Western Schools of thought which would, I hope, also throw some light on the place this School of philosophy occupies in the philosophical world, but our success would, I feel sure, only be partial, if we fail to disperse even to a partial extent, the mist which threatens to throw its brilliancy into the shade. I have, therefore, thrown my main labour in this

direction with a view to draw your special attention to it. It is needless to add that the task is very difficult, but I crave your kind indulgence and sympathetic appreciation.

In bringing these preliminary observations to a close, it is my pleasant duty to invite your kind attention to a most essential fact which I cannot too earnestly impress upon you. To present before you the main features of the Doctrine of Sankara in its various aspects my reliance would, as I have hinted above, be placed mainly upon the Sanskrit texts. To arrive at the correct conclusion, especially in the face of adverse views entertained in *some* quarters, much attentive and single-minded study of Sankara's own writings is needed. Unlike the great Buddha, Sankara did not make use of the current language of the country. Whatever he wrote, he wrote, as you know, in Sanskrit, and that again in a diffuse and dispersed manner. His doctrine may be collected from the various commentaries written by him on the ten Upanishads, on the Brahma-Sūtra and the Gitā, as also from the metrical works of his own composition which have never been excelled in the exquisite beauty and charm of the beautiful verses and the perspicuity of the ideas embodied there-in. Many of you with the exception of very few, who are so kind as to take the trouble to attend here—which shows how great an interest you take in, and the love you cherish for, the Vedānta, are not, I venture to presume, very well acquainted with the first-hand Sanskrit*texts. This imperfect and superficial know-

ledge of the original texts—I mean the commentaries of Sankara as also his Prakarana books, is, to my view, responsible for the inaccurate modern interpretation, both in Europe and in India, of the great Māyā-vāda. To correctly understand Sankara and to reach his inner heart, it is absolutely necessary that we must all of us acquire the first-hand original knowledge of Sankara's own writings. But I see around me some of your faces which are naturally so bright with the illumination of intelligence and learning, growing somewhat darkened at the mention of Sanskrit texts. But, believe me, you have no reason to feel disheartened. Whenever quoting texts from Sankara's writings, it would be my pleasant duty to put before you a faithful and literal English translation. To keep close to the original is what mainly concerns us and I shall try my best to represent the texts as faithfully as in me lies. If you follow this procedure, you will *yourself* have no difficulty in finding out the true view of this great Indian philosopher.

Another point I should like to impress upon your kind attention is this. Too many abstruse things given at a time may prove confusing and you may grow impatient. I have thought it advisable to distribute the whole theory, specially its metaphysical portion, into some broad heads, and to deal with each of the topics under those heads successively one after the other, but not at the same time losing the thread of connection running through them.

(b)—The Absolute Reality (निर्गुण-ब्रह्म)

And God (ईश्वर).

(1) Brahma is absolute and perfect in its nature. Brahma does not undergo any mutation in time, hence it is made up of absolute Being or Reality. There were critics of the Hegelian type who thought Brahma to be a sort of “negative Infinite”,—“a not-finite”—an empty, contentless abstraction. There were others who took it as a “void—without consciousness, without activity, a characterless vacuum”. But Nirguna Brahma in Vedānta is not nothing—

“प्रतिषेधानुपपत्तेः.....अस्तीत्यवोपलभ्यते” (ब्र० सू० भा०, 3. 2. 22.)

[Its negation is not possible.....it is felt as an existence.]

The word Nirguna is a technical term. The term गुण is employed to denote what is *phenomenal*

and hence Nirguna means that anything phenomenal does not *constitutively* belong to Brahma—

“सत्त्वरजस्तमांसि गुणाः, तैर्वेत्तितं निगुणम्” (गी० भा०, 13. 14.)

Brahma is all-illuminating, all-pervading Reality without change, process or progress. It is the essence of all conscious souls (विषयी) and unconscious appearances (विषय) and it abides independently of, and transcends, the relation of subject and object—

“चेतचेतज्ञौ येन ज्ञानेन विषयीक्रियेते, तत् ज्ञानं सम्यक् ज्ञानम्”

(गी० भा०, 13. 2.)

“परस्परौपकार्योपकारकत्वात् एकस्य.....आत्मनः संस्थानविशेषी”

(ब० भा०, 5. 5. 2.)

[That knowledge by which the subject and the object are known i.e. which transcends their cor-relativity—is considered by me to be the true knowledge.]

[They are correlative ; and there is thus a higher Principle which makes their correlativity possible.]

Brahma is one Reality consisting of being, thought and bliss (सच्चिदानन्द). Eternal being, consciousness and bliss are not *attributes* of Brahma, but Vedānta regards them, in their inseparable identity, as Brahma itself. They are so inseparably united that we cannot think of the one without thinking of the other. There can be no separation of these in Brahma, no parting off ; for, if there were, they would fall *outside* of the Divine Essence. The Being cannot be denied. We may think away anything, but we cannot think away Being or Existence. It is—सत्यस्य सत्यम्—Reality of all

realities,—Being of all beings. It is presupposed in all forms or existence ; as Plato argues in his Dialogue, “the existence of one means the existence of others which share in its being.” We ourselves * are immediately conscious not merely of our own existence, but as an existence that is conscious. Being is thus identical with consciousness. If one is different from the other, a dualism would arise—two absolute existences would co-exist, which is absurd.—

“नहि सल्लक्षणमेव ब्रह्म, न बोधलक्षणमिति शक्यं वक्तुम् ।...

कथं वा नित्यचैतन्यं ब्रह्म चेतनस्य जीवस्य आत्मत्वे न उपदिश्येत ?

नापि बोधलक्षणमेव ब्रह्म, न सल्लक्षणमिति शक्यं वक्तुम्—

‘अस्मीत्येवोपलब्धव्यः’ इत्यादिश्रुतिवैयर्थ्यप्रसङ्गात् ।

कथं वा निरस्तसत्ताकं बोधोऽभ्युपगन्तव्यः ?”

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 3. 2१ 21).

The sense of the above is clear : “Brahma can not be defined merely as being, but not as consciousness. How otherwise Brahma could have been instructed as the ‘self’ of the finite souls ? Nor can its definition be as consciousness alone, but not being ; for, such *Srutis* as ‘it is to be felt as existence’—would then become useless. Consciousness which has no existence cannot be admitted.”

While we distinguish these three, we must also see that the *whole* unity is present and active in each

* We can know the nature of Brahma from the nature of our *own* self—“आत्मविदः तद् विदुः, ‘आत्मप्रत्ययानुसारिणः’—

(सू० भा०, 2. 2. 10.)

of them. These, therefore, do not destroy the unity of the one Divine Essence. These constitute the nature of Brahma ; they are its—आत्मभूत and cannot be parted off.

These three are not separable from one another but together constitute the nature of Brahma—

“नहि स्वाभाविकस्य लक्ष्मिः कदाचिदुप-पद्यते, सवितुरिव
शौण्ड-प्रकाशयोः”— (ब० भा०, 4. 3. 20.)

[“A thing cannot be deprived of its own nature, as the heat and light of the sun.”]

We have seen that consciousness or knowledge is not separable from Being. Bliss (आनन्द) is also not separable from knowledge. For, Sankara says, —“As Bliss constitutes the nature of Brahma, it must be eternally present ; it cannot be absent or separate from knowledge. If it be separated or absent from knowledge, it would become non-eternal or अनित्य ; for, knowledge does not illumine it, being separate or absent from it. And what is non-eternal (अनित्य) cannot constitute the nature of the Eternal Self and would be dependent on some stimulating cause for its production.”—

“तस्य आत्मभूतमेव तदिति, उपलब्धिव्यवधानानुपपत्तेः, नित्याभिव्यक्तत्वात् ।

• अथ कदाचिदभिव्यज्यते ?—उपलब्धिव्यवधानात् अनात्मभूतं तदिति,
अन्यतोऽभिव्यक्तिप्रसङ्गः” । (ब० भा०, 4. 4. 6.)

Then, again, says Sankara—“when both have the same identical substratum, one cannot remain

separated or absent from the other ; either *both* must be present or both must be absent.”—

“उपलब्धि-समानाश्रये तु, व्यवधानकाल्यनानुपपत्तेः ; सर्व्वदाऽभिव्यक्तिः,
अनभिव्यक्तिर्वा” ।

Again he says—

“न च ‘समानाश्रयाणा’मेकस्यात्मभूतानां धर्म्याणामितरतर-विषय-
विषयित्वं सम्भवति”—

“There cannot be a subject-object relation among the essential properties which constitute a thing.” Hence, knowledge and Bliss can be *immediately* felt, without one of them being the *object* of the other. For, an *object* (विषय) cannot constitute the essential property (धर्म or स्वरूप) of the subject. *

In this manner Sankara has proved that knowledge (चित्), Being (सत्) and Bliss (आनन्द)—are eternally present and inseparable from one another, and they *together* constitute the nature or स्वभाव of the Absolute (‘आत्मभूतानाम्’).

Thus, it will be seen that the Absolute Brahma, as pointed out by Sankara has a nature, a स्वभाव of its own and it is not a vacuum—

“न स्वभावमिन्द्रियम्” (ब्र० सू० भा०, 3. 2. 22).

* For, the *object* being a *partial* expression of its *subject*, there is subordination i. e. dependence, not co-ordination or समानाश्रयित्वं.

And this nature—सत्-चित्-आनन्द—we find continuously present (अनुगत) behind the differences of names and forms (नाम-रूपस) in the world —

“ब्रह्मणोऽपि ‘सत्तालक्ष्यः’ स्वभावः आकाशादिषु अनुवर्त्तमानो दृश्यते” ।

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 6).

[“The ether and the like are accompanied by the *being* of Brahma which is its characteristic nature.”]

“ ‘चिन्मात्रा’नुगमात् सर्वत्र चित्स्वरूपता गम्यते”

(इ० भा०, 2. 4. 7).

[“As *knowledge* is an accompaniment of all objects everywhere, everything has knowledge as its *Svarupa* (nature).]

“ ‘आनन्देन’ व्यावृत्तविषयवृद्धिगम्य आनन्दः अनुगन्तुं शक्यते”

(तै० भा०, 2. 7).

[“The *Bliss* Divine is present behind all the joys connected with the mutually exclusive objects of the world.”]

(2) Brahma is the *cause*—

Far from reducing Brahma to a negation or non-entity, Vedānta makes Brahma—*Sacchidānanda* in essence—the first *cause*. To strengthen the idea I would quote Rāmātirtha.

“जगदुत्पत्तिस्थितिलयकारणं सच्चिदानन्दानानेकरसं ब्रह्म” ।

(Gloss on *Ved. Sara*).

[“Therefore, it is stated that Brahma—truth, knowledge, infinite, bliss,—one in essence—is the *cause* of production of the world.”]

About the causality of Brahma—सच्चिदानन्द in essence, the Vedantic idea may be stated as follows:—

The differences of names and forms (नाम-रूप) prior to their actualisation existed in Brahma in an undeveloped and undifferentiated state (अव्यक्तावस्थायाम्, अनभिव्यक्ते नाम-रूपे) *indistinguishably* blended in its nature (“चिदेकात्मना निखीनत्वात्”—उप० सा०). It exists as a whole (सर्व्व) in which the differences are merged, but *not obliterated*.*

Sankara himself describes this as—

“अपरित्यक्तान्यतमविशेषवदेव तदव्याकृतं” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 4. 7).

In सा० का०, 5 also “स्वकीय-सर्व्वविस्तारसहितं कारणापन्नं युक्तं (सुषुप्तिप्रलययोः)”.

As in our own consciousness, our ideas, before being expressed in words, exist in *avyakta* form—undifferentiated, unmanifested, submerged,—which has been beautifully expressed by the late Upādhyāya Gouragovinda in his *Gītā-Samanvaya-bhāṣya*, P. 232.—

“ज्ञानात् ज्ञेयान्तरे स्वीकृते सर्व्वकारणस्य ज्ञानस्य अन्यापेक्षित्वप्रसंगः,
अतो न सिध्यति ज्ञानस्वरूपत्वं ब्रह्मण इति विप्रतिपत्तिः—आत्मज्ञाने
सर्वेषां ज्ञेयानाम् अन्तर्भावित्वात् निर्मूला । अव्यक्तानां ज्ञेयानां तस्मिन्
ज्ञाने अभिन्नभावेन स्थितिर्नानुभूतिविरुद्धा”—इत्यादि—

• “आकाशादयः उपरमन्ते ऽस्मिन् इति ‘सर्व्वोपरमः’ तादृशभावात् महासुषुप्तिः प्रलयः
इति अस्य ‘सर्व्वत्वम्’—(रामतीर्थ) .

—[“Without object there can be no knowledge. Knowledge of Brahma will have then to *depend* on an object. But as it is independent of all, how can there be consciousness of Brahma ? The reply is—“In the knowledge of our Self all objects remain included. We are ourselves conscious of the presence of our own objects in our own consciousness before their manifestation, *identically blended with it.*”]

Here I would call your pointed attention to a misunderstanding of Sankara's position. You must carefully note his idea about Nirguna Brahma. His idea is found very explicitly recorded in the Katha-bhāṣya. There are many by whom Sankara has been supposed to deduce the world of differences from an abstract, empty, barren unity and they have compared his System, in this respect, to that of Parmenides. From the Eleatic abstract one, there can be no passage to the actual world of many. Sankara is credited with the performance of an impossible feat ! He does not *deduce* the world from the unity. His object is not to deduce ; he takes the world *as it is*, he only shows that it is the manifestation of Brahma and it has no reality *apart* from Brahma. Brahma is its presupposition, Brahma is its end—

“ब्रह्मादिषु...भूतानामन्त एव च”—

(गी० ७.२०.)

• Take the passage.—

“ ‘यथाप्राप्तस्यैव’ अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितस्य क्रियाकारकफलभेदस्य
(स' सारस्य सत्यतामसत्यतां नाचष्टे ... ‘यथाप्राप्तमीवादाय प्रवर्तते’)—

(ङ० भा० २-१-२०).

9697

2 APR 1965

—[“The Sruti takes the world *as it is* (यथाप्रत)—the world presented by Avidyá and consisting of agent, action and result. Sruti begins with the world.”]

Sankara thus begins with the objective world as he has found it; he only shows its unity with Brahma.—

“उत्पत्तिस्त्रिस्तिलयवाक्यानि ‘परमेष्ठरैकलप्रत्यय’—द्रदिन्ने, न सावयवांशांशिलकल्पना परमार्थतः।” —

[“The statement given in the Sruti about the creation, etc. of the world is not with a view to show Brahma as assuming parts or as an aggregate of नाम-रूप but to strengthen the unity of the world with Brahma.”]

But how does Sankara show this unity? Take this illustration.—

“विष्णु लिंगस्य प्रागये ध्वं सान् अग्रेकलदर्शनात्...अग्रेर्हि विष्णु लिंगः अग्निरैकलप्रत्ययार्हः।” —

[“The scintillation (spark) *before* it came out of fire, was nothing but fire; *after* it comes out of fire it is the same with the fire, and so is the world.”]

Thus we find, as Brahma is the source of the world and Brahma is the end, so the world is one with Brahma, not separate from Brahma, it cannot be taken apart from Brahma.

We see, then, he does not deduce the world of many from the unity. He begins with the world, as he finds it. And then he arrived at the idea of Brahma *through* the कार्य-जगत्, then through the कारण (cause) which is intimately connected with the कार्य (effect), he reached the idea of Brahma which is

beyond कार्य-कारण (effect and cause). We would quote him here—

“पूर्वम्, अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धस्य आत्मनः सत्कार्योपाधिकतासित्वप्रत्ययेन उपलब्धस्य इत्यर्थः । पश्चात्, प्रत्यक्षमित्यसर्वोपाधिकरूप आत्मनस्तत्त्वभावः...नेति नेति श्रुति-निर्दिष्टः प्रसौदति...पूर्वमस्तीति उपलब्धवतः”— (कठ० भा० ६-३).

—[“Atma should be known as *existing*, as producing *effects*then the true nature of the ‘Atma’ unconditioned, devoid of indicative marks,.....and indicated by Srutis ‘not this’ ‘not this’ faces him who had previously realised it as *existent*.”]

“सर्वोपाधिविशेषरहितोऽपि जगतो मूलमित्यवगतत्वात् अस्यैव, कार्यप्रविक्षापनस्य अस्तित्व-निष्ठत्वात्.....कार्यं सूक्ष्मतारतम्यपारम्येण अनुगत्यमानं सददुद्धिनिष्ठामिव अवगमयति । बुद्धिर्हि नः प्रमाणं सदसतीर्याधार्म्यावगमे”—(कठ). “कार्य-कारणसत्यत्वावधारणद्वारेण सत्यं सत्यं ब्रह्म अवधार्यते”— (इ० भा० २-२-१).

—[“Though devoid of attributes, he certainly *exists* ; for that into which effects are absorbed must certainly exist. For, the effects traced back in ascending series of subtlety leads only to the conviction of something as *existent*. Intellect even in the ultimate analysis...is still pregnant with a belief in the *existence* of something”—(कठ). “After ascertaining the truth of effect and its cause, we ascertain Brahma which is truth of all truths.”]

Sankara, it should be noted carefully, never *separated* the world from Brahma, both after and before its manifestation ; he never *separated* many from the unity. He repeatedly observed that the world of नाम-रूप (name and form) had no existence *apart* from Brahma. He never made the infinite a mere correlative of the finite. The true Infinite is such which finds expression in the finite.

The theory of सत्कारणवाद is a well-known tenet of Vedānta. There must be a positive substratum

(अधिष्ठान) of the emergent effects, in which the latter existed in potential form (कारणात्मना)—

“सत्त्वोक्त्यैव सत्यत्वमुच्यते । यस्माच्च जायते किञ्चित् तदस्तीति दृष्टं लोके,
तस्मादाकाशादिकारणत्वात्सि ब्रह्म ।.....यत् सर्वविकल्पास्यद् सर्वप्रवृत्तिबीजं, सर्व-
विशेषप्रत्यक्षमितमपि 'अस्ति' तद् ब्रह्म”— (तै० भा० १-६).

—[It cannot be said that Brahma does not exist ; for, ether, etc., of which the *cause* is Brahma is perceived by the senses. That from which something proceeds exists...He knows Brahma as existing, that Brahma who is the source of all energy and in whom all determinations cease to exist ; *i.e.*, which excludes all determinations which would only make it finite].

In his *Atma-Bodha*, Sankara observes that it is Brahma which must be regarded as the cause of the world, otherwise the absurd hypothesis, *viz.*, from pure negation (असत्) comes something positive (सत्) would have to be admitted. For, says he, an energy to produce something must have a positive *substratum* for its operation. Energy *apart* from the *substratum* is a figment of imagination.—

“कारणमसदिति केचित्, कथयन्त्यसतो भवेन्न कारणता ।
अद्भु रजननी शक्तिः, सति खलु बीजे समीच्यते सकलैः ।
कारणमसदिति कथयन्, वक्ष्यापुत्रे ण निर्वहेत् कार्यम् ॥”

—[Some say that the cause is a non-entity. But the non-existence cannot be a cause. The *power* to generate a sprout is visible to all only if the *seed* exists. He who declares the cause to be a non-entity, can manage affairs with the son of a barren woman].

Prior to their manifestation, *Nāma-Rūpas* existed in Brahma in *Avyakta* form, undeveloped form “जगत् ...प्रागवस्थायां 'बीजशक्त्यवस्थम्' (ब्र० सू० भा०, 1.4.2)”; it has,

therefore, been called in several places as Atma, since it existed indistinguishable from Brahma.—“आत्मभूते इति ज्ञत्वा, ‘आत्मा’ ते कथ्ये ते”—(तै०भा०)

Nāma-rupa could not be separated from Brahma in that stage and hence it was that Brahma's unity was not destroyed.—

“नहि आत्मनोऽनात्मभूतं तत्-प्रविभक्तदेशकालं सूक्ष्मं व्यवहितं भूतं भविष्यद्वा वस्तु विद्यते ; अतो, नामरूपे सर्वावस्थे ब्रह्मणैव आत्मवती”— (तै० भा० २-६).

—[“There is nothing which is divided from it, either in space or in time, which is subtle, distant, different, that was past, that is to be. Therefore, name and form, under all circumstances, are possessed of Atma only, by Brahma.”]

“As the spider produces its thread from its *own stores*, so Brahma produces the world from its *own stores*.” When the नाम-रूपसु (names and forms) came out, there is some differentiation; they could be distinguished, but can never be *separated* from Brahma.

“यदा आत्मस्थेऽनभिव्यक्ते नामरूपे व्याक्रियेते, तदा नामरूपे आत्मस्वरूपापरित्यागे-
नैव ब्रह्मणा अप्रविभक्तदेशकाले सर्वावस्थासु व्याक्रियेते”— (तै० भा० २-६).

—[“Because they were in the Atma with their names and forms unmanifested, and are unfolded by the Atma, and when so unfolded became the object of the designation ‘Shaped’ and ‘Shapeless’ and still they are *inseparable* from the Atma, both in space and time.”]

• Sankara never made Brahma a logical abstraction, a homogeneous unity. It transcends all, but is not utterly *unrelated* to the world. Nature presupposes unity of which it is the manifestation; differences have no meaning *apart* from the unity. The differ-

ences of नाम-रूप are not to be taken in Vedānta as *separate* from Brahma, existing outside of Brahma, as mere correlative. In that case, Brahma would be limited by them, would be finite itself.—

“न ब्रह्मणः परं बल्ललरमक्षीति गम्यते ।.....अन्यप्रतिषेधेऽसति वस्तु बल्ललररात्
व्यावर्तते इति परिच्छेद एव आत्मनः प्रसज्येत”— (ब्र० सू० भा० ३-२-३७).

Brahma includes नाम-रूप, does not exclude them.—

“यस्य च यस्मादात्मलाभः स तेन अप्रविभक्तो दृष्टः यथा घटादीनां मृदा ।
.....न तस एव निर्भेद्य यद्गीतुं शक्यते”— (ब्र० भा०)

—[“What is produced from something, remains undivided from it. It cannot be separated from it.”]

The नाम-रूप (names and forms), though they cannot be separated from Brahma, do exist in Him, not as His elements or धर्म or essential properties. For, in that case, Brahma would be qualified by them and He would become composite (सप्रपञ्च) or with parts, *i.e.*, sum-total of these would be Brahma in that case; His transcendence would be violated. The differences of नाम-रूप, as soon as they were produced, were produced as the *objects* of His consciousness, and His consciousness thus stands distinguished from them. How can they be then the essential properties or धर्म of Brahma ?

“आत्मनः स्वरूपं ज्ञप्तिः.....अतो नित्यं च ।.....तथापि.....ये शब्दाद्याकाराव-
भासाः ते आत्मविज्ञानस्य ‘विषयभूता’ उत्पद्यमाना एव आत्मविज्ञानेन व्याप्ता
उत्पद्यन्ते ।...आत्मन एव ‘धर्माः’ विक्रियाख्या इत्यविवेकिभिः परिकल्प्यन्ते”—
(तै० भा० २-१).

—[The essence of Atma is intelligence ; it cannot exist in separation from it, therefore, it is permanent...The sense-impressions of sound and form though presented as knowable *objects*,

are already comprehended and included in the intelligence. Some ignorant people construe them as the modifications of the Atma, as the essential qualities of the Atma].

They cannot be His धर्म or विकार. Why? Because—

“न हि क्षीरस्य सर्वोपमहेन दधिभावापत्तिवत्, विराट् सर्वोपमहेन एतावान् भास । किं तर्हि ? आत्मना व्यवस्थितस्यैव हि.....आत्मव्यतिरिक्तं.....शरीरान्तरं वभूव”— (ब० भा० १-४-४).

—[As the milk becomes entirely transformed into the curd when it takes the latter form, so the Virat did not. Atma remaining *unaffected* in its own nature changed into a different form.]

We thus see that the immanence of God must not be taken in the sense of Divine *identification* with the process of the world, and the transcendency also ought not to be taken in the sense of *absolutely separating* Brahma from the world.

It is the immanence of transcendence. Sankara's remarks must be carefully noted.—

“यद्यपि ब्रह्म प्रपंचासंख्यं स्वतन्त्रं च, तथापि प्रपंचो न स्वतन्त्रः, अपितु तृन्निम्नेव ब्रह्मणि त्रयं प्रतिष्ठितम्—भोक्ता, भोग्यं, प्रेरितारमिति वक्ष्यमाणं...विकारा-शयल्लेऽपि अविनाशि एव कूटस्थं ब्रह्म अवलिष्ठते ।”

[Although Brahma is untouched by and separate from the world, the world is not separate from Brahma ; in Him as a substratum the three—the enjoyer (finite self), the nature and God (the controller)—exist. All through, the sustaining ground, Brahma, exists as unchangeable and imperishable as ever].

If Brahma is absolutely separated from the world, if He is not admitted to be the ground (अङ्गिष्ठान) of

it, the world would be utterly unreal ; for, Sankara himself has laid down the proposition that—

“अथ महदा यदस्ति किञ्चित्, तत् आत्मना विनिसृज्यते सम्यग्यते”—

(कठ० भा०)

--[Whatever object exists in the world, the infinitely minute or infinitely great, would become *unreal* as soon as it is removed from its connection with Atma.]

Hence, Brahma cannot be absolutely separated from the world. In that case, Sankara's repeated instructions that the differences of changing नामरूप, the world, ought lead us to the knowledge of Brahma (विकार-द्वारेण ब्रह्माधिगमः कर्तव्यः) would be quite contradictory and purposeless. Though Brahma is नियुक्त, it is not unrelated to the world.—

“न पृथगनुभवः, किन्तु तत्-सादृश्यत्वात् ।”

(शतश्लोकी)

—[The world of नाम-रूप is to be looked upon in connection with Brahma, and not cut off from Him].

For these reasons, Brahma in Vedānta is declared to be both the efficient and material cause of the world. For, if He is not the material cause, some other independent material cause would have to be admitted ; but in that case, the world would be quite independent of, and separate from, Brahma and his repeated observation—सदात्मना विकाराणां सत्यत्वं, स्वतस्तु अनृतत्वं—would be quite inconsistent.

We find from all these discussions that Sankara's idea was that there are indeed statements in the Sruti about the *creation* no doubt, but its object is not to describe creation or deduction of the world from unity so much as to show that Brahma is

present (अनुगत) in the world which is its revelation, and to show its unity with Brahma and its non-separability from Brahma.

(a) How can the world be absolutely *separate* (अन्य) from Brahma ? For, if it be absolutely separated, Brahma's knowledge of Himself would be a complete knowledge, and the knowledge of the world would fall beyond it. That is to say, the knowledge of the world would be something beyond the sum-total of Reality, which adds nothing to that knowledge—being complete in itself. Thus a world would be a superfluity and inexplicable, and acosmism would be the result. In that case, the world is not the *expression* of the nature of Brahma. But Sankara everywhere insists on the fact that the world of नाम-रूप is to be taken as the *revelation* of Brahma.

(b) If, again, Brahma be entirely separated from the world, He would be like a human artist fashioning independent and self-existing matter. But Brahma being regarded in Vedānta as also the material cause (उपादानकारण), He is not like an *external* cause, but He *expresses* His nature as it is in the world.

(c) We find in the Upanishads that the नाम-रूप is—

(i) *in* Brahma or *with* Brahma—“ते (नामरूपे) यदन्तरा तद् ब्रह्म” and “आत्मज्योतिः...प्रायेषु” ।

Also the नामरूप is—

(ii) *identified* with Brahma.—“आत्मभूते इव नामरूपे” and “अनन्याः.....कामाः ।”

Thus, we find the नाम-रूप *i. e.* the world is distinguished from (अन्य) and yet identified with (अन्य) Brahma. It means His nature is expressed in नामरूप. • It does not mean that the नामरूप is the product of any *external* energy—as the scientific *antecedent*. It means—the नामरूप is the expression—the counterpart of His nature, *i. e.* He became His *own object*, not something *separate*. (This is material cause, the objective *Māyā*).

(d) The world, according to Vedānta, is declared as neither सत्, nor असत्. It means, if it is absolutely असत्, *i. e.* negative—privation of Reality—less being,—then the world would be a mere illusion; for, all reality belongs to Brahma and not to the world. To avoid this, the world has some sort of reality (सत्ता) given to it which is dependent on Him. Hence Brahma is called in Vedānta as सत्ता-प्रद. But, nor can the world be absolutely सत्; for, in that case, it would be independent of, separate from, Brahma, which would destroy His unity.

(e) We see, therefore, that Brahma has invested the content of His Will (सङ्कल्प) with a *being* (सत्ता): He is the unconditioned source and back-ground of the world *conditioned* by Him. He is for this reason called the सत्ताप्रद of the world. As Brahma is transcendent, His being does not swallow up the being of the world. As He is the unconditioned source of the world conditioned by Him, and as it is constantly sustained by His activity, He is also called the सृष्टि-प्रद of the world.

We quote here what Nilakantha, that faithful

follower of Sankara has stated in his gloss on the section of the *Gītā*—

“अवृत्तस्यास्य (विकारस्य) सत्ता-स्फुरणे एव 'नदीये' प्रयच्छामि ; न तु अवृत्तात्मको भवामि” ।

“There are two portions in the world : the visible changes (विकारस्य) of Nāma-rūpa belong to the world ; and the being and energy—सत्ता-स्फुरणे—(lying hidden behind the *Vikāras*) belong to Brahma which He has given to them, upon which the *Vikāras* stand. For this reason Brahma is called “सत्ता-स्फूर्तिप्रद.” If you disconnect the changing Nāma-rūpas i. e. the *Vikāras* from the Being and Energy lying behind them, they would immediately become *unreal* ; for there would be nothing upon which those changes could stand. Hence we find it stated—“अणु महद्वा यदस्ति किञ्चित्, तत् आत्मना विनिर्मुक्त-‘मसत्’ सम्पद्यते” (कठ० भा०) ; i. e. “If the underlying ātmā be removed from the things of the world, however minute or great they may be, they would at once be unreal.” Also for this reason it is said everywhere—“If there is no intelligent principle as controller, behind this unintelligent world of Differences, there would be no action at all”—“अचेतनप्रवृत्तिः चेतनाधिष्ठान-निवन्धना, अचेतनत्वात् रथादिवत् ।”

So, Brahma is described in Vedānta as सत्ता-स्फूर्तिप्रद.

• (f) The *object* of His will is not *outside* Himself and He is not limited by anything *outside* Himself. As He is beyond the spatial and temporal order of the world, it cannot enter into the essence

of His being. He is not, therefore, *identical* with the totality of things,—His immanent activity directing and controlling the process of the world. And this view does not lend support to the idea of an *external* designer isolated and standing outside, who arranges things according to his plan. The principle of unity is present in the whole system of the series of 'many' and is immanent in each part—

“समस्तं विकारजातं अघिदैवतादिभेदभिन्नम् अन्तस्तिष्ठन् यमयति।”—

(ब्र० सू० भा० १-२-१८).

But this system of parts has its source *above and beyond* the system itself.—

—“नहि नामरूपायाम् ‘अर्थात्तरं’ ब्रह्मणोऽन्यत्” (ब्र० सू० भा० १-२-४१).

[“It is Brahma which is always to be distinguished from the Nāma-rūpa”.]

All the elements of the world are *related* to a single source and sustained by it, also are directed to a *single end*.—

“अद्वैतज्ञानावसानत्वात्...द्वैतभेदस्य”—

(वृ० भा० ५-१-१).

If you ignore this Supreme Principle of the world, the evolution of the world will be a dream.—

‘खप्र-माश-मरीच्युदकवत् असारम्’ ।

(3) There are critics of Sankara-Vedānta, who suppose the Vedantic Iswara (God) as an unreality, because Sankara has sometimes used such terms as *Avidyātmaka* (अविद्यात्मक), *Avidyā-kalpita* (अविद्याकल्पित)—in connection with Iswara. But this seems to me to be a hasty conclusion drawn from imperfect data. That this is clearly a mis-

conception will appear from the following considerations :—

What Sankara has really done is that he has used the term *Avidyā* in connection with *Nāma-rūpa*—

“अविद्याकल्पित-नामरूपोपाध्यनुरोधी ईश्वरो भवति ।”

We have seen above that Brahma, of its own motion, has manifested its nature in the form of the universe of *Nāma-rūpas*. This is its immanent aspect. Ordinarily, people take this aspect of Brahma as *Iswara*. In our practical concerns of life, in our everyday *Vyavahāra*, we are quite satisfied with taking the world as a manifested form of God ; as it is the *cause* itself which transforms itself into various forms—

“सर्वकारणत्वात् तु विकारधर्मो रपि ‘विशिष्टः’ परमेश्वरः”—

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 1. 20.)

[“As God is the cause of all modifications (विकारस्य), he takes upon himself the modifications and becomes thereby modified, and thus he appears in specific-form”.]

So, God is taken by ordinary people as an all-inclusive whole—*सर्वगत्यः सर्वरसः* &c. &c. But to take *Iswara* (God) in this way is but the effect of *avidyā*. For, it is our *avidyā* which imagines the *Nāma-rūpas* in the self as its essential property or *धर्मः*. That is to say, the ordinary people, as soon as the *Nāma-rūpas* appear, imagine them to be the *essential property of the Self (Brahma)*—

“आत्मन एव ‘धर्मो’ विज्ञियारूपा इत्यविधेकिभिः परिकल्प्यान्ते” (तै० भा०).

It is assumed that because the world of *Nāma-*

rūpas is manifested from Brahma, Brahma actually becomes the world—

“विविक्तस्वरूपानभिव्यक्त्या, तदुपरकस्वरूपत्वं, स्त्रीमयी जात्य इतिवत्” ।

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 3. 17.)

[“That the Self is really *distinct* from, and not affected by, the Nāma-rūpa is forgotten, and it is taken as deeply tinged with Nāma-rūpas, as we say ‘this fellow is deeply affected by the woman’].

In this way, Iswara is looked upon as something *other* (अन्य) than Brahma ; as if Brahma, as soon as Nāma-rūpas appear, becomes restricted to them, and thus in their connection is made something *quite different* (अन्य) (from Brahma itself). But this is a wrong view. He is indeed the world, but yet He is something *more* ;—this fact is quite forgotten by people under the influence of *avidyā*—

“एतावानिव आत्मा परमेश्वरो वा, नातःपरमस्त्विति, ईदृशं ज्ञानं (तामसानामिव भवति)”.—

(गौ० भा०, 18. 22.)

[“i. e. The finite Self or God (Iswara) is *this much* i. e. restricted to particular effects,—and there is nothing *beyond* it, higher than it ;—such a view is fit for the ignorant people.”]

The fact is, although, we admit, this view of *Iswara* is sufficient for ordinary purposes of life, still the *other side* of the question ought not to be forgotten or ignored. As Brahma is *transcendent* and *perfect*, no one of its determinations or forms can exhaust it ; no one of its actualisations can fix it in a final or rigid form. The true view of the thing is that Iswara, though the cause of the world of Nāma-rūpa, does not thereby become *restricted* or *entirely*

reduced to the effects created ;—but as it has also a *transcendental* nature which remains *unaffected* by these, it is no other than Brahma itself—

‘सर्व्वीकृतत्वात्...‘तद्दान्’ भवति । किञ्च ततोऽपि ‘अधिकतरम्’ एतद्भवति’

(तै० भा०, 1. 6.)

[“As he has become all.....He is *composed* of the Nāma-rūpas of all. But *still* He is *more* than these Nāma-rūpas.”]

If, then, we restrict Iswara to the Nāma-rūpas, and thereby take *Iswara* as something quite different—*अन्य*—from Brahma itself, such a view of *Iswara* must be declared as *unreal*. That is to say, the immanence of God should not be taken in the sense of Divine *identification* with the world.

We thus see now that Iswara is not really something different (*अन्य*) from Brahma itself. Though He has assumed the form of the world, He is the *same Brahma* in reality (*परमार्थतः*). This is the correct view, according to Sankara-Vedānta.

WHAT IS MĀYĀ

AND

Why is it Anirvachaniya—अनिर्वचनीय ?

—o—

(1) Māyā is the 'Seed'* of the world of differences—

The universe, prior to its modifications or differentiations into names and forms (नाम-रूप) was in an undeveloped, undifferentiated (अविकृत) condition. This Avyakta state of the world is called Māyā (माया) by Sankara who defines it as—

“अव्यक्ता हि सा 'माया', तत्त्वान्यत्वस्य निरुपपाशकत्वान्.....जगतः प्रामथस्या परमेश्वराधीना” । (ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 4. 3.)

[“This undeveloped prior state of the world which is inexplicable because it is the same and also not the same, is called Māyā, and it is dependent on God (Iswara).”]

The *Panchadashi* repeats the same idea in its own way thus—

“अपित्यशक्तिर्मायैषा, ब्रह्मस्यव्याकृताभिधा ।
अविक्रियब्रह्मनिष्ठा” ॥ (13. 63. 65.)

* In calling it to be 'seed', it is not to be understood that the original entity is completely *exhausted* when it assumes the form of the world. It is not like an organic development, but a *manifestation* of the Reality without affecting its integrity.

["The 'unmanifested' refers to the indescribable force of Māyā inherent in Brahma which transcends all modifications."]

This Māyā has been identified in the Vedānta with Prāna and Prāna being a sort of energy, it cannot exist and operate independently ; it must have Brahma for its substratum. An energy apart from its substratum (आश्रय) is a figment of imagination. Sankara has not made the mistake of our Scientific teachers who have, like Herbert spencer, reduced things and qualities and every object to particles with perpetual motion. Sankara makes it—परमेश्वराधीना, dependent on Brahma. This prior undifferentiated state of changing नामरूप we now perceive, is sometimes called in *Sruti* non-being or असत्. But non-being does not imply anything unreal, but it really means the *undifferentiated* prior state of this world. An earlier world had been withdrawn into that condition out of which it sprang and the latter world was not yet proceeding into being—

“न हि अत्यन्तासत्त्वाभिप्रायेण प्रायुत्पत्तेः कार्यस्य असद्व्यपदेशः । किं तर्हि ?

व्याकृत-नामरूपत्वात् चर्मात् अव्याकृतनामरूपत्वं 'चर्मात्तरम्' (ब्र० सू० भा० 2.1.17.)

“असदिति व्याकृतनामरूपविशेष-‘विपरीत’मविकृतं ब्रह्म उच्यते.....न हि असतः

सैज्जन्म अस्ति” ।

(तै० भा०, 2. 7.)

["The employment of the term *Asat* does not signify that there was absolute non-existence—negation—of the effects previous to their production. What then ? The difference lies only in *two conditions*. In the prior state the नामरूप was non-developed (सूक्ष्मकारणरूप), whereas in the present state it is developed."]

["The term *Asat* means Brahma as non-differentiated which is opposite to—different from—the particular differentiated (सूक्ष्मरूप) condition of Nāma-rūpa. From pure negative something positive cannot be born."]

The commentary on the Chhândogya is more explicit in its description of this condition—

“तदसच्छब्दवाच्यं प्रागुत्पत्तेः क्षिप्रतमनिस्यन्दनसदिव,—सत्-कार्याभिसुखं
ईषदुपजात-प्रवृत्ति (“एतेन बीजस्य उच्छ्रान्तावत् कारणस्य ‘सिसृक्षावस्थां’ दर्शयति”
—आ० गि०) सदासीत् । ततोऽपि लम्बपरिस्यन्दं तत् समभवत्...अहु रीभूत-
मिव बीजं ; ततोऽपि क्रमेण सूक्ष्मीभवत्” । (छा० भा०, 3. 19. 1.)

[“That which, prior to its appearance, was called ‘non-existence’—being dormant and inert—as if non-existent, became turned towards an existent effect, having its activity (प्रवृत्ति) aroused a little, and thus became ‘existent’ i. e. mobile. It grew by means of a slight manifestation of name and form just like a sprouting seed. It then became further materialised &c. &c.”]

(a) Brahma is behind this seed (बीज), not affected (निर्विकार) by it, and it has no reality *apart* from Brahma.—

This prior undeveloped state is the seed (बीज) of the world-tree. This undifferentiated condition is the sum-total of the powers of organs and organisms—an aggregate of the possibilities or potentialities of all material existences.—

“जगती बीजभूतमव्याज्जतनामरूपं सर्वकार्यकारणशक्तिसमाहाररूपमव्यक्तं परमात्मनि
चोत्प्रीतभावेन समाश्रितं बटकषिकायामिव वटवृक्षशक्तिः” । (कठ० भा०, 3. 11.)

[“The *Avyakta* is the seed of all the universe, the unmodified state of name and form, the aggregate of the potentialities of all powers of organs and organisms, entering or woven into the Self, as warf and woof,—as the potentiality of a fig-tree in a fig-seed.”]

It is, in fact, the undifferentiated seed of the world. This is Mâyā. And in this state, the Mâyā is not a non-entity ; for, the world cannot emanate from a sheer non-existence—असत् or अभाव. At the time of

the dissolution of the world, the modifications of the Nāma-rūpas (Vikāras) became undifferentiated, submerged in it.—

“अव्याकृताख्यं.....तद्धि परमं व्योम.....गुहा, तत्र निमग्नाः सर्वे पदार्थाः त्रिषु कालेषु, कारणत्वात्” । (तै० भा०, 2. 1.)

“प्रागवस्थायां परित्यक्तव्याकृतनामरूपं बीजशक्तवस्थम् अव्यक्तशब्दयोग्यं दर्शयति” (त्र० सू० भा०, 1. 4. 2.)

[“This is the highest *Akasa* and it must be *Avyākṛita*—because the highest *Akasa* has been used elsewhere in connection with *Akshara*. We may take *Guha*—the Cavity—in apposition to *Akasa* and construe “the cavity of the *Avyākṛita Akasa*”. In this cavity are hidden—exist submerged—all the substances in all time, because it is the Cause and it is exceedingly subtle.”]

[“The prior state is known as ‘*Avyakta*’. The modifications of नामरूप disappeared and they took the form of ‘Seed’ (बीज) or Potency or seminal form.”]

This undifferentiated seed has Brahma for its substratum (परमेश्वराश्रया). Brahma is, therefore, called through this *seed* of the world, itself a *seed*—

“बीजं मां सर्वभूतानां.....सनातनम्” (गौ० भा०, 7. 10.)

and Śankara explains the term सनातन as—‘बीजान्तरा-दनुत्पन्नम्’—as an ultimate Cause. Both the Nirguna Brahma and Māyā, being undifferentiated (निर्विशेष), are *indistinguishably blended* (‘चिदेकात्मना विलीनत्वात्’—उप० सा०); and we find the illustration of “honey and its flavour inseparably mixed, the butter and its sweetness, the Ganges falling into, and remaining inseparably mixed with, the ocean, with its name and form dropped.”—

“मधुनि रसवत्, घृते माधुर्यवत्, समुद्रप्रविष्ट-नद्यादिवत् (भिद्ये ते तासां नाम-
रूपे, तास्मानसंगतानां.....‘तदमेदेन’ समुद्रइत्येवं प्रोच्यते—प्र० 6. 5) विवेका-
नर्हाः सङ्गताः संप्रतिष्ठिताः भवन्ति.....एकौभवन्ति.....अविशेषतां गच्छन्ति”

(प्र० भा०, 4. 1-2.)

This *Māyā*, Sankara points out, is not negative (असत् or “अभावग्रस्त”) but is positive (स्वरूपवत्)—
ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 2. 26. But as there is, between the *Māyā* and Brahma, a *Svarupa* or *Tādātmya* relation (“ब्रह्मवादिनः कथमिति चेत् ? तस्य ‘तादात्म्य’-लक्षणसम्बन्धोप-
पत्तेः—ब्र० सू० भा०, 2.2.38”), the *Māyā* has no reality or *Svarupa* apart from Brahma. Although inseparably blended, Brahma still remains untouched, unaffected by *Māyā*.

“अव्याकृतात् तु यत् परं परमात्माख्यंअनामरूपकर्मोत्पत्तं ‘नेति’ ‘नेति’

(ब्र० भा०, 1. 3. 2.)

“नामरूपविलक्षणं नामरूपाभ्यामसृष्टं, तथापि तयोर्निर्बोद्धुं एवंलक्षणं ब्रह्म”

(छा० भा०, 8. 14. 1.)

[“What stands beyond this ‘Avyākṛita’—this undifferentiated seed, is the highest Self.....distinguished from *nama*, *rūpa* and *karma* and stated in Sruti as ‘not so’ ‘not so’ &c.”]

[“It is different from name and form, is not touched by the name and form, yet it unfolds both ; such is the character of Brahma.”]

This *seed* of the differentiated *Namā-rūpa* is itself changeless, as it is the cause of all changes. The substratum of this causal seed of the world—this *Avyakta*, is Brahma who is the Cause of all causes, the Ultimate Cause ; and being the Ultimate Cause, He must be devoid of modification—changeless.— .

“तस्मादव्यक्तात् परः.....सर्वकारण-कारणत्वात्” । (कठ० भा०, 3. 11.)

“न च ब्रह्मणोऽपि विकारलं भवितुमर्हति,.....सूक्ष्मप्रकृत्यनभ्युपगमे अनवस्था-
प्रसङ्गात्” । (ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 3. 9.)

[“Brahma is beyond this *Avyakta* (seed).....as Brahma is the Cause of all other causes.”]

[“Brahma must be devoid of change, is not subject to modification ; for, in this unbroken line of causal series, your reason cannot find satisfaction until and unless you hit upon a Cause which is Itself an uncaused Cause and hence not modifiable by any antecedent. To avoid this regress, Brahma must be held to be the changeless ultimate ground of the *Avyakta seed* of the नामरूप.”]

“अक्षरमव्याकृतं नाम-रूप-बीजशक्तिरूपं.....ईश्वराश्रयं । सर्वस्मात् विकारात् परः
योऽविकारः, तस्मात् पर इति भेदेन व्यपदेशात् परमात्मानं (अक्षरशब्देन)
दर्शयति” । (ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 2. 21-22.)

[“This *power* or *energy* of the seed of names and forms is itself changeless, as it is the cause of all (phenomenal) changes. Its substratum is God. As the cause of the differences of नाम-रूप, it is itself undifferentiated and hence it is known as *Akshara*. But the Ultimate Reality behind it is also called *Akshara*. This is the true Cause, not subject to change, and it lies beyond the *Akshara*—the causal seed or *Māyā*.”]

As the *Māyā* has no *Swarūpa* or reality of its own *apart* from Brahma, it is not an *independent* principle like the *Pradhāna* of the Sāṅkhyas. It is not really *different* from Brahma. For, it is Brahma as सत्कार्याभिमुख (छा, 3. 19. 1), as सर्गोन्मुख (र० प्र०, 1. 1. 5.), that is to say, it is Brahma about to manifest itself. It is Brahma as व्याचिकीर्षितावस्थ (सु, 1. 1. 8) i. e. as desiring to differentiate itself. It is Brahma as ‘जायमानप्रकृतित्वेन निर्देशः’ (ब्र, 1. 2. 21),

as “प्रकृतिस्वरूपमात्मानं” (छा० 8. 14. 1); i. e. it is Brahma only looked upon as the material cause of the world.* It is Brahma as उपचीयते, as उच्छूनतां गच्छति (सु० 1. 1. 8); that is to say, it is no other than Brahma about to show itself as growing or somewhat inflated—as a seed appears inflated when about to produce its sprout. It is Brahma inclining to act or with its impulse aroused (ईषदुपजात-प्रवृत्ति—छा०, 3. 19. 1).

This state is very beautifully described in the Mundaka Upanishad * thus—

“ब्रह्म उपचीयते उत्पिपादयिषदिदं जगत् अङ्गुरमिव वीजमुच्छूनतां गच्छति.....
व्याचिकीर्षितावस्थारूपेण जायते” । (सु० भा०, 1. 1. 8.)

This is Māyā. It is Brahma itself under a particular state. Hence how can it be different from Brahma ? Because a *slight distinction* arose, a separate name—*Māyā*—was given. But a change of state cannot effect a real change to the nature of the Absolute. For, it was not a *complete* expression of the Absolute. The Absolute Brahma distinguished itself as its *object* from itself as a Subject. This *object* is known by the designation of Māyā in the Vedānta. †

Sankara asks—

“किं पुनस्तत् ‘कर्म’, यत् प्रागुत्पत्तेरीश्वर-ज्ञानस्य विषयो भवतीति” ?

* cf. also श्रीताश्वतर Text—“यतः प्रवृत्तिः प्रसृता पुराणी” ।—“The innate and ancient Spiritual fervour energizing a little,”

† It is to be noted as Brahma appeared in subject-object relation, it stood at the same time *beyond* this cor-related subject-object form.

He thus replies—

“तत्त्वाव्यक्ताभ्यामनिर्व्वचनीये नाम-रूपे अव्याकृते व्याचिकीर्षिते इति ब्रूमः” ।

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 1. 5.)

That is to say,—The undifferentiated causal seed of the world of differences was what constituted the ‘object’ of Divine knowledge. How can it, then, be something absolutely different from Brahma? It is Brahma finding expression gradually in the differences of नाम-रूप in the world.

At the present moment also, when that undeveloped seed has actually differentiated into the modifications of nāma-rūpas, they still remain *in* Brahma—

“न हि इदानीमपीदं कार्यं कारणात्मानमन्तरिण ‘स्वतन्त्र’मेवास्ति । कारणात्मना

तु सत्त्वं प्रागुत्पत्तेरविशिष्टम्” ।

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 7.)

[“Even now, the effects—the नाम-रूप—do not exist severed from their cause. Both before and after, the effects always stand related to the Self.”]

“आत्मस्वरूपापरिव्यागिनैव सर्व्वावस्थासु (नामरूपे) व्याक्रियन्ते” ।

“आत्म-तादात्म्येनैव.....आत्मनोऽद्वितीयत्वं न विरुध्यते” ।

[“They unfold, in all their conditions and stages, without being separated from Brahma.”]

↓ “As they have no reality *apart* from Atma,.....the unity of the Atma is not affected.”]

Anandagiri remarks that “a thing which has an independent being of its own, must be independent in its activity. But as Māyā has no reality of its own *apart* from Brahma, it is not an independent principle but entirely dependent on Him. It has no reality of its own” (“स्वतःसत्तावत्त्वे स्वव्यापारे स्वातन्त्र्य-मेव स्यात्.....अतः ‘आत्मैवेति’ स्वतन्त्रता-निषेधः । स्वतः-सत्तानिषेधात् सृषात्वमपि.)”

(b) Brahma desired or willed (संकल्प) to be many, and then प्रवृत्ति (action) arose in Him. Sankara describes it as “working of Divine knowledge (“यस्य ज्ञानविकारमेव तपः” —

We quote him fully :—

“विज्ञानं ब्रह्म.....प्रथमजत्वात्, सर्वप्रवृत्तीनां वा तत्-पूर्वकत्वात् प्रथमजं विज्ञानं ।.....सर्वविज्ञानानां महत्तत्त्वकारणम्” । (तै० भा०, 2, 4-5.)

[“All impulse, all activity is preceded by knowledge : Divine knowledge first arose ; it is the source of all knowledge.”]

This fact can also be proved from what Sankara has remarked in the Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya, 2. 2. 28—

“अभावात् भावोत्पत्तौ अनौद्दमानानामपि अभिप्रेतसिद्धिः स्यात्” ।

Sankara's idea is—

[“Unless you desire something and exert yourself, you can not obtain a desired result or object. Hence, a non-entity can not produce an entity.”]

Here, to support this idea, we may quote what Ananda-giri said in his gloss on the Māndukya-Kārikā-bhāṣya—

[“The potter, when he wants to produce an earthen pot, must first have the *idea* of the pot in his mind, then he puts that idea into practice, and when the pot is produced, it is the mental *idea* (संविन्) which is converted into *action* (कर्मांतया जनयति). It is the ordinary people to whom only the action appears as real and as separate from the idea of the potter.” (4. 54)]

This involves the idea that it is Brahma which sets in motion— सत्ता-स्फूर्ति-प्रद—this existent but not yet differentiated germ of the world, though *unaffected* by it.

“नामरूपयोरपि निर्व्यहृषं न ब्रह्मणोऽन्वय सम्भवति” । (ब्र० सू० भा०, 2.3. 41)

“न निरव्यवस्य जगतो व्याकरणं कथ्यते, जगत् साध्यत्वात् व्याक्रियते” ।

“अविकारश्च ब्रह्म.....सर्वविकारहेतुत्वात्” । (तै० भा०, 2. 7.)

["None but Brahma can cause the unfolding of the Nāma-rūpa—the seed of the world."]

["Unless there is an intelligent principle to control, how can there be brought about the unfolding of the world in Nāma-rūpas ? And this intelligent principle which sets the world in motion, being the cause of all modifications, is itself beyond modification."]

Thus, the underlying inner Self which contains within it the undifferentiated seed of names and forms, unfolded it by its own Power. The Māyā is, therefore, the creative Power of Brahma. For this reason, Sankara in Taittiriya remarks—

“आत्मस्थे अव्याकृतनामरूपे, अन्तर्गतेन आत्मना व्याप्त्रियेते” (2. 6.)

["The Nāma-rūpa which is contained in the Atma in undeveloped state (implicit), the Atmā which is behind it makes it differentiated (explicit)."]

(2) The Māyā, considered from two view-points—Pāramārthic and Vyāvahāric.—

It is the universal (सामान्य) which assumes a particular (विशेष) form. The universal is the cause and its particular transformed state is its effect.—

“अपास्तविशेषं सामान्यात्मकं कारणमेव विशेषवद्वस्थान्तरमापद्यमानं कार्यसंज्ञां लभते” । (ब्र० भा०, 2. 2. 5.)

and

“सर्वस्य विकारजातस्य नाम-रूपाभ्यामेव व्याकृतत्वात्” । (ब्र० सू० 1.3. 41)

The universal remains identical with itself in and through its transformed states and all changes or modifications involve differentiations into names and forms. In this way, what is the true cause underlies its effects which may be regarded as its expressions.

The Māyā is two-fold. In its undifferentiated causal condition, it exists undivided (अविभक्त) in, and indistinguishable from, Brahma. It is real—सत्—in this state; for it is not then looked upon as separated (अन्य) from Brahma. This is its सामान्यावस्था, its universal aspect. But when it appears differentiated in the form of effect or विकार, it is unreal—असत्—in this state; for, it is now viewed by us as different or separated (अन्य) from the Universal or Brahma. This is its—विशेषावस्था, its particular aspect; and this is the ordinary Vyāvahāric view of the world of नाम-रूपस. In its सामान्यावस्था, the world is identical with Brahma and indistinguishable from it. But when the modifications of nāma-rūpas (विकारस) appeared, it is its विशेषावस्था; —the world of Nāma-rūpas is now taken as something—*Separate* (अन्योऽयं भिन्न इति—ब्र० 2. 1. 19) from the underlying, hidden universal, i. e. from Brahma, and is regarded as a self-sufficient entity. After the manifestation of the changes or the unfolding of the differences of nāma-rūpas, some distinction or वैलक्षण्य or विशेषावस्था, i. e. some particular *modification* (Vikāra) appeared which was not present prior to its manifestation. With this fact in view the Mūndaka-bhāsyā observes—

“विलक्षणं सलक्षणञ्च.....अक्षरात् सञ्भवति जगत्” । (1.1.7.)

The Brahma-sūtra also speaks of this वैलक्षण्य in the Aphorism 2.1.4—

“न विलक्षणत्वादस्य, तथात्वञ्च शब्दात्” ।

For, all finites are divided (विभक्त) like a water-pot, piece of cloth, pillar and the like. Modification

(विकार) is the characteristic (स्वभाव) of the divided (or finite) things, and it is this characteristic which separates one finite thing from another. This characteristic was absent prior to manifestation.* Brahma, as well as the world-seed, was devoid of modification (विकार) in that stage, and therefore it (the world) is called as its सामान्यावस्था. As soon as there is manifestation, the changes or विकारs involving nāma-rūpas appear : But prior to manifestation, they were in सामान्य or unmodified, universal form.

“सर्वस्य विकारजातस्य नाम-रूपाभ्यामेव व्याकृतत्वात्”

(ब्र० भा०, 1.3.41),

i.e. “All modifications are differentiations into names and forms.”

In the Taittiriya, we find it stated that before its differentiations (विकार) appeared, the unmanifested or undeveloped world of nāma-rūpa may be designated as Atmā ; for, it was indistinguishable from, and identical with, Atmā in that condition. But as soon as it was differentiated, as soon as it manifested in visible form and modifications of nāma-rūpas appeared, it was now called as—मूर्त्तमूर्त्त, shaped and shapeless. That is to say, previously the nāma-rūpa in seed-form was identical with (अनन्य) Brahma and therefore it was Sat (सत्), because unseparated, indistinguishable, from Brahma. But as soon as it came out of Brahma in the shape of modifications (विकार), as there was some distinction—some वैलक्षण्य, we began to look upon it as something quite

* This fact is brought out in ब्र० सू०, 2.1.7. “यावद्विभागस्य विकारः”.

Anyā (अन्य) and unrelated to Brahma,—as if self-sufficient and independent.* The modification or विकार is *distinguished* from its cause or प्रकृति, but it cannot be *separated* from it; for, *Prakṛiti* lies hidden behind the *Vikāras* always—

“प्रकृति-विकारयोर्भेदेन व्यपदेशात्” । “असति अतिशये प्रकृति-विकारोच्छेद-प्रसङ्गः” ।

[“There must be distinction between Prakṛiti and its Vikāra; between the cause, and its effect; otherwise both would become synonymous.”]

There must, no doubt, be some difference between the cause, and its modification in the form of its effects. But there cannot be absolute difference between them. Yet, we, in our *Avidyā-vasthā*—अविद्यावस्था, under the influence of Avidyā in whose grip we always are, look upon the particulars of nāma-rūpa, the विशेषs,—as *absolutely separate* from the underlying universal or the सामान्य. This is our vyāvahāric view of the world.—

“अविद्यया.....अन्यदिव.....वस्तुनरनिव प्रत्युपस्थापितं भवति” ।

(ब० भा०, 4. 3. 31)

[“It is our Avidya which (falsely) presents the world as something quite different, as a separate thing, an independent entity.”]

But even in our Vyāvahāric view, the changes really stand *connected* with their Sāmānya—the underlying hidden Reality—

* येनैव ‘विशेषेण’ (characteristic of modifications) प्रथिव्यादिभ्यो व्यतिरिच्यमानं (Divided) नमः स्वरूपवत्, स एव विशेषः प्रागुत्पत्तेर्नासीत् । एवम् आकाशादिरूपभावेन न स्वरूपवत् ब्रह्म” (Sankara).

“सामान्यमात्मस्वरूपप्रदानेन विशेषान् विभक्तिं.....सर्वे विशेषाः सामान्ये उभवाः”

(ब्र० भा०, 1. 6. 1.)

[“It is the Universal which sustains the particulars by giving them its own nature or reality.....All Particulars are woven into or comprehended in the Universal.”]

It is not possible, therefore, to separate the nāma-rūpas from Brahma which is their sustaining ground, without which they cannot stand even for a minute. This is Sankara's Pāramārthic view. By this, vikāras as such, do not become unreal; only they are not to be conceived as something separated (अन्य) from the Reality, as self-existing and independent—

“न हि स्थितावपि कार्यं कारणात्मानन्तरिण खतन्वसति” ।

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 7.)

[“The effects do not even now exist severed from the essence of the cause, independently.”]

Sankara's remarks in the concluding portion of his elaborate discussion about the relation between the cause and its effects thus—

“सूत्रकारोऽपि ‘परमार्थाभिप्रायेण’ ‘तदनन्यत्व’माह” (ब्र० भा०, 2. 1. 14.)

[“The author of the Sutras declared the effects as non-separate, non-different from their cause, from the Pāramārthic stand-point.”]

To declare the world of नामरूप as *unreal* is to make it *separated* from Brahma, to make it अन्य or different, or to put it *outside* of Brahma. In this view, the Infinite would become simply as not-finite. But such an Infinite is a false infinite. For, in this case the opposition between the world in time and space and the Eternal Brahma would be absolute and the Infinite would itself become finite (ब्र० सू०

भा०, 3.2.37). To guard against this difficulty, Sankara has established the position that Brahma does not *exclude* but *include* within Him the world of nāma-rūpa—

“ते (नाम-रूपे) यदन्तरा तद् ब्रह्म” (छा०)

i.e. Brahma has within Him the nāma-rūpa i.e. the principle of multiplicity, limitation—माया.

Again—

“वस्तुमात्रस्वरूपेण हि.....विशेषक्रियाजनितानि विशेषणानि व्याप्नोति” ।

(इ० भा०, 1. 4. 1.)

[“It is the nature of the thing which permeates and comprehends within it all its adjectival differences i. e. predicates.”]

(3) The Māyā is अनिर्वचनीय (Anirvachaniya)—

Now, in this connection, I should like to invite your attention to a very important observation made by Sankara in connection with the Māyā. He has everywhere called the Māyā or nāma-rūpa as अनिर्वचनीय (inexplicable)—

‘तस्मान्नान्यत्वात्प्रामाणिक्येनैव नामरूपे...मायाशक्तिः प्रकृतिरिति...कथ्यते’

(त्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 14 and 2. 1. 27.)

This Māyā which is manifested into the differences of nāma-rūpa is known in Sankara-Vedānta as परिणामि-नित्य, because it is liable to change. And Brahma is described as कूटस्थ-नित्य, because it transcends all, it is subject to no change or transformation.

Parināmi-Nitya (परिणामि-नित्य) has been thus described—

“विक्रियमाणमपि तत्-प्रत्ययानिवृत्तेर्नित्यं । द्रव्यस्य अवयवान्यथाव्यतिरेकेण विक्रियमाणमपत्तेः” । (इ० भा०, 1. 4. 7.) [Also, Vide—इ० सू० भा०, 1.1.4.]

[i. e. "Unless one part or state of a thing becomes another, the *change* of the thing cannot be conceived and that is called *Pariñami-Nitya* which through its changes of states or parts retains its identity."]

Sankara describes *Kutastha-Nitya* (कूटस्थ-नित्य) thus—

“इदं तु (ब्रह्म) पारमार्थिकं कूटस्थनित्यंसर्वविक्रियारहितं...निरवयवम्” ।

(ब्र० भा०, 1. 1. 4.)

["Brahma is *Kutastha-Nitya*, the highest reality, free from all changes.....having no parts &c." *

Keeping these two kinds of *Nitya* in view, *Vedānta* makes *Māyā* as the direct material cause (उपादान) of the world, and *Brahma* is indirectly the substratum of the world. There is the transcendent *Brahma* behind the *Māyā* which constitutes the material cause of this changing world of *nāma-rūpa*.

When the *Māyā* came out of *Brahma*, when the *Avyakta* stage grew into *Vyakta* stage, it came out as universally pervading *Prāna-spandana*—“परिस्पन्दात्मकत्वं प्राणस्य”—which gradually developed into three forms of energy—

“कार्य-करणवतीनां प्राणैकदेवताभिदानाम् अध्यात्माधिभूताधिदेवतभिदेवकीटिविकल्पानाम् अध्यक्षतामात्रेण नियन्त्रीश्वरः” । (ब्र०, 5. 1. 15.)

[i. e. "All the causes and effects, the external and internal organs, &c.—are only different manifestations of the single deity of *Prana* differentiating into the cosmic (अधिदेव), physical (अधिभूत) and *Psychic* (अध्यात्म) energies, and God supervises over these".]

In *Vedantic* nomenclature, the first manifestation of *Māyā* as प्राण-स्पन्दन is known as *Hiranyā-*

* We shall treat these points more elaborately subsequently.

garbha (हिरण्यगर्भ). In कठ-भाष्य, it is described as—
 “हिरण्यगर्भतृप्तं बोधाबोधाम्कं (i. e. विज्ञान-क्रियाशक्तिप्रत्)
 महानात्मा” (3. 10). For, it contains all the subse-
 quently evolved external and internal senses and
 five elements. The finite selves derive all their
 elements of comprehension and action from this
 universal Prāna or the world—

“सदात्मनः प्राण-सम्बन्धमात्रमेव.....जीवत्वभेदकारणं.....न च प्राणैर्वियुक्तस्य
 जीवत्वमुपपद्यते” । (का० भा०, 5. 10. 2.)

This Māyā or Prāna is not simply material or
 physical, but something *more*. It is with a view to
 present this important fact before our view that
 Sankara has described it to be—

“तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये”—

That is to say, “the Māyā is neither तत् nor
 अ-तत्;” or in other words,—it is itself (तत्) and
 also not-itself (अ-तत्).

The true significance of this has been very beauti-
 fully brought out by the great poet Māgha in his
 immortal work “Sishupāla-badha”, by an illustration.
 We quote here the last two lines—

“तिरोहितात्मा शिशुपाल-संज्ञया,
 प्रतीयते सम्प्रति—“सोऽप्यसः परैः” ।

Take the words—“सोऽपि, अ-सः”—

“He is *the same* man, yet he is *not the same*”.

The story of Sishupāla is well known to you all.
 The same man took three successive forms and names
 in three successive births. The poet is describing
 Sishupāla in his last birth, who in his immediately

preceding birth appeared as Rāvana, and this Rāvana was no other than Hiranya-Kashipu of his former birth. The poet says that this *Sishupāla is *the same* Rāvana, although to the ordinary people, he, in his *present guise* of Sishupāla under which form and name he has now appeared, seems to be *not the same*. Sishupāla is *the same man* known as Rāvana, but he seems *not the same man* because he has now *concealed* himself (तिरोहितात्मा) under his present form of Sishupāla.

This is exactly the Vedantic idea as propounded by Sankara. Poet Māgha seems to have been very well acquainted with the Doctrine of Māya-Vāda. *

The world of nāma-rūpa is always changing, always developing, from one stage to another—

“ज्ञानैश्वर्याद्यभिव्यक्तिरपि.....परिण परिण मूयसी भवति.....ऐश्वर्यशक्तिविशेषः”

(ऋ० भा०, 1, 1, 11.)

[“In successively higher and higher forms, the wealth of wisdom, power &c. is manifesting itself...by God's ऐश्वर्यशक्ति.” This ऐश्वर्यशक्ति is God's Māya, as Sankara himself states elsewhere in his sentence—“परमेश्वराश्रया तदेश्वर्यं मूता” .]

Now, the world of nāma-rūpa is constantly changing ; but what does the ‘change’ signify ? The world of nāma-rūpa is finite, i.e. incomplete ; hence it is always changing to complete itself ; it is moving towards something beyond it which would make it complete,—to make it what it really is. The world

* The poet even uses the term कलना in his Stanza, which represents नाया. The poet also employs the illustration of शैलूष इव—as an actor, just as Sankara himself uses the term नटवत् in “मूलकारणमेव, आ—अन्यात् कार्यात्, तेन तेन कार्याकारिण, नटवत्, &c. &c. (ऋ० 2. 1. 18.)

of *nāma-rūpa* is, therefore, not merely physical but something *more* ; it is itself, no doubt, but it is also not itself : not itself i. e. it is self-transcendent—going out of itself towards self-completion. It is because behind the world, a transcendent element is present. Hence, self-transcendence is the characteristic of every change, every stage, through which the world is passing. Therefore, every stage is *what it is* and also something *other than what it is*. Apart from this co-existent transcendent factor, the world is nothing. This self-transcendence implies the presence of a transcendental element. Behind *Prāna*, there is the inexhaustible (अव्यय) *Nirguna Brahma*.—

“प्राणशब्दितं बीजमज्ञातं ब्रह्म सलक्षणं तदात्मनेति यावत् । तदेवमचेतनं सव्यं
जगत् प्रागुत्पत्तेः बीजात्मना स्थितं, प्राणो बीजात्मा जनयतीति वाक्यशेषः”—

(मा० का० भाष्य,—गिरि's gloss.)

[“The term *Prāna* is the world-seed, and the unknown *Brahma* is defined as ‘Sad-Brahma’ (सद्-ब्रह्म) in relation to, in identification with, this *Prāna*. This non-intelligent world of differences existed in the form of this seed (बीजात्मना) out of which it is produced. It is this seed of *Prāna* which developed or became manifested as this non-intelligent world.”]

“मया अप्रकृतं परित्यक्तं निरात्मकं शून्यं (असत्) तत् स्यात्...सर्वभूतानां
‘बीजं’ तदहमज्जुन” ।

(गौ० भा०, 10. 39.)

[“Anything into which ‘I’ have not entered would be without self (could not exist) and would be void (शून्य). Therefore, everything is of My nature i. e. ‘I’ am the ‘Seed’ (Essence) of everything”.]

The appearance of life and consciousness at the *last* stage of the development would indicate the *source* of the whole process of development. The

lower cannot create the higher out of its *own* जडोय resources ; in that case, the Naiyāyika Asat-vāda (असत्-कार्यवाद) would arise. Hence, the life and finally consciousness must have been *present* from the very beginning. For this reason, the Vedānta has placed Nirguna Brahma-chaitanya *behind* Māyā or Prāna-seed.

We see, therefore, that the Prāna controlled by चिदात्मा (Chidātmá) *contained* within it life and consciousness which subsequently appeared. The world, in its continuous transformations, remains *as it is* ; for, its *content* is always the same (i. e. the प्राण-बीज). “विक्रियमाणमपि तत्-प्रत्ययानिवृत्तिः” * . For this reason, it is called as परिणामि-नित्य . But as there is a transcendent element behind it, it is also *other than what it is* ; for, it contains within itself the condition of all else which *is to be* in every succeeding stage ; and this transcendent element is—कूटस्थ-नित्य (Vide. ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 1. 4)—

“तत्र किञ्चित् परिणामि-नित्यं...तदेवेति बुद्धिर्न विहन्यते ।...इदञ्च कूटस्थ-नित्यं
.....सर्वविक्रियारहितम् &c. &c.

—And this element is moving the world continuously to newer and *newer* stage—

“बहु खां.....प्रजायेयं...‘प्रकर्षो नाम—पूर्वस्मादाधिक्यम्’ ”—विद्यारण्य in
the *Anubhūti-Prakash.* †

Ultimately, this Prāna is, therefore, nothing but Brahma itself at the source and is nothing but Brahma in the end.

—O—

* विक्रियमाणमपि &c. &c.—It means, in and through its changing states it preserves its identity of *content*.

† बहु खां &c. &c.—It means, the particle ‘प्र’ in प्रजायेयं is significant. It brings out the fact of inexhaustible ‘new additions’, i. e. novelty and creation not present in the earlier stage.

III & IV.

One End works in Nature

AND

in Finite Self.

—•—

Sankara has drawn out distinction between the respective characteristics of the Intelligent Self (चेतन) and the non-intelligent elements of Nature (अचेतन). you are particularly requested to bear in mind this point that Sankara has characterised the Intelligent Principle (चेतन) as *Swārtha* (स्वार्थ) ; that is to say, it exists *for itself* and it has the *reason* or *purpose* of its existence in itself. *Chetana* is described as स्वतःसिद्ध, i. e. it is self-sufficient and does not depend for its existence on any other thing. In contrast with this characteristic marks of *chetana*, the *achetana* (अचेतन) material elements are described everywhere as *Parārtha* (परार्थ), i. e. existing and working *for something else* which is other than their own nature, or in other words—which exist and work for the 'purpose' (End) of something *other than* these elements. Sankara points out the fact that *achetana* (अचेतन) has no purpose of its own—

“अचेतने स्वार्थानुपपत्तेः &c.” (ब्र० भा० 4. 3. 7).

“इदं तर्हि स्वार्थस्त्व षितिसत्त्वात्...न परेष प्रयुज्यसे” (उप० सा० गद्यांश)

["The non-intelligent (matter) can serve no purpose of its own &c."]

["You, being intelligent, constitute an *end* or *purpose* in yourself...you are not impelled by others".]

(1) Sankara has thus described the nature of 'Purpose' inherent in Brahma—

'स्वात्मनोऽनन्याः कामाः...नहि कामयित्वा अचेतनमस्मि' (तै० भा०.) *

["The Atmā is identical with its Purpose or काम ; i. e. its purpose is non-separate from its own nature. Non-intelligent things cannot desire, cannot have any purpose in themselves".]

Divine desires (कामाः) are prompted by no *extraneous* stimulating causes or motives, nor is Brahma influenced by them. For, its purposes are not separable and different (अनन्याः) from it.

Sankara thus observes in the Brahma-Sutra (1.4.14) :—

"All the passages setting forth *creation and so on* subserve the purpose of teaching Brahma..... Creation is described, merely for the purpose of teaching us.....*as a means* for the cognition of the Absolute Brahma but does not bring about an independent result."

The manifested nāma-rūpas are to be taken as a means for the realisation of the Purposes (संकल्पs) of God. God is best known by our mind through His

* "सोऽकामयत' इत्यादिश्रुतिभिः ब्रह्मणि जगत्कारणे कामयित्वादि 'रज्ञान'कार्यस्य श्रूयमाणत्वात्...विना तस्य 'अज्ञानाश्रयत्वं कूटस्थस्य न कामयित्वादि" (ब्रह्मणि जगत्कारणत्वादिनिर्व्वाहकमज्ञानं 'मायाशब्दवाच्य'...अज्ञीकर्त्तव्य' । न च चिन्मात्रस्य प्रकाशत्वात् अज्ञानाश्रयत्वविरोधः, अन्तःकरणपरिणामोपहितस्यैव चेतनस्य अज्ञानविरोधित्वात् ।" (राम-तीर्थ),

self-manifestations—through the manifestation and expression of His will (संकल्प) in the created world. These Samkalpas (संकल्पs) are but Divine Ideas existing as potential powers in Brahma—but they realise themselves in the particular individual objects which they evolve and sustain. The phenomenal objects are the expressions in time of the Ideas which are not in time and the Ideas can express themselves *freely* in time—

“नामप्रकाशवशा हि रूपाणां विक्रियव्यवस्था” (ब्र० भा० 2. 4. 10).

“सति च रूप-व्याकरणे, विषय-प्रतिलभात्, नाम व्याक्रियते”

(ब्र० भा०, 2. 4. 20).

[“When general ‘Names’ or Ideas express themselves, the changing particular ‘forms’ follow.”]

[“As the particular forms are manifested, the general names or Ideas also finding them as their dwelling place, express themselves.”]

And again—

“व्यक्तिषु उत्पद्यमानासु अपि आकृतौर्ना नित्यत्वात्” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 3. 28).

[“On the production of the particulars, the universal *Akrities* or Ideas are constantly present.”]

These creative Ideas are a plurality of causes and they are the constituent elements of one Supreme Reality, and these are behind phenomena. All particular changes are but the modes of action by *means* of which the causes realise themselves and thus the particulars cannot serve any independent purpose of their own.

Similarly, all the particular elements of *human organism* work together for the realisation of the purposes (अर्थ) of the Self which controls and directs them.—

“सर्व्वी हि कार्य्य-करणविक्रिया * नित्यचैतन्यात्म-स्वरूपे.....सत्यं च
भवति । तच्च ‘एकार्थवृत्तित्वेन’ संहननम् अन्तरेण चैतनमसंहतं न
भवति ।” (तै०, 2.7).

[“The functions of the senses and the organism are seen when there is a combination of physical and psychical elements together. Such co-operation or combination for the purpose of a *common object* (एकार्थवृत्ति) is not possible without an independent intelligent principle not so combined.”]

Take the following also—

“दृष्टेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धीनां संहतानां, चैतन्यात्म-‘पारार्थ्येन’ निमित्तमूत्तेन,
...यत् स्वरूपधारणं तत् चैतन्यात्मकतमेव” (गौ० भा०, 13. 22).

[“The body, the senses, the mind, the intellect which are combined or organised together to serve the *purpose* of an intelligent Self, and which are what they are, only as *made* by that intelligent Self.”]

You are to note here that it is not a *passive* adaptation of inert matter which submits to the influence of its environment merely.

Sankara elsewhere remarks—

“The Director is inferred by a logical necessity from the *activity* manifested by the ear and others combined, inured *for the benefit* of something distinct from them all (i.e. the Self). As things combined or organised for a common end (एकार्थवृत्तित्वेन) exist *for the use of* another thing not so combined, we argue, therefore, there is a *director* of the ear &c, and for whose use the whole lot exists and has been combined.”

* About the कार्य्य and करण,—they would form the subject-matter of our next day’s Lecture.

Each of these fulfils a *purpose*, a function, in fulfilling it, each contributes to the realisation of the *purpose* (अर्थ) of the cause within.

In the *Madhu-vidyā* (मधुविद्या, वृ०, 2.5.1—19), the great truth is emphasised, viz., there is a reciprocal *relation* among all the elements of the world. Sankara shows here that the world is a whole of interconnected parts and their reciprocal मधुत्व consists in the fact that there is not only an intimate relation amongst phenomenal things themselves but they mutually *determine* each other—

“भूतानां शरीरारम्भकत्वे न उपकारात् मधुत्वं, तदन्तर्गतानां तेजोमया-
दीनां कारणत्वे न उपकारात् मधुत्वम् &c. &c. &c.”

There is mutual determination between the external elements (भूतगण) and the body, and between the physical and the psychical elements. The activities characteristic of a particular species (जाति) are, Sankara suggests, what determine and dispose (प्रयुक्ताः) the particular way of working of the elements of the animal organisms—

“धर्मः चरित्रादीनां नियन्ता । धर्म-सत्यायां ‘प्रयुक्तः’ कार्य-करण-
संघातः, ...स येन जातिविशेषेण (Species) संयुक्तो भवति...
शरीरिभिः संबध्यमानः...मधुत्वं न उपकरोति” &c. &c.

We find from the above remarks that the elements are mutually determined in the interest of Species (जाति); that is to say, the whole working has a reference to the *racial ends*. We may conclude, therefore, that the development of organic forms in a body is *purposive* to the interest of the *typical* result (जाति).

This is the truth we find everywhere inculcated. In the *Katha-bhāṣya*, the following important sentence occurs—

‘न ह्येषां ‘पराधीनां’ संहत्यकारित्वात् जीवनहेतुत्वमुपपद्यते । ‘स्वाद्ये’न’ असंहतेन परेण केनचित् अप्रयुक्तं संहतानामवस्थानं न दृष्टं, यथा गृहादीनां लोके । तथा प्राणादीनामपि संहतत्वात् भवितुमर्हति । अतः इतरेष्वेव संहत-प्राणादिविलक्षणेन तु सर्व्वे संहताः सन्तो जीवन्ति प्राणान् धारयन्ति ।... यस्मिन् आत्मनि सति, एतौ प्राणापानौ चक्षुरादिभिः संहतौ उपाश्रितौ ; यस्यासंहतस्य ‘अर्थे’ प्राणापानादिः सर्व्वं व्यापारं कुर्व्वन् वर्धते संहतः सन्, स ततोऽन्यः स्मृतः इत्यभिप्रायः” (कठ० भा०, 5. 2).

[“It may be urged that ‘the body becomes destroyed only by the exit of Prāna, apāna &c. and not by the exit of the *Atma* distinct from these.’ This is not so. These acting jointly *for the benefit* of some other cannot be the source of life. The existence of houses &c. *composite* in their nature, has not been seen to be undirected by some other not connected with them, for whose benefit they exist ; so also it should be in the case of the combination of Prāna and the rest. Therefore, it is by some other alone dissimilar to the combination of Prāna and the rest, all these combined maintain their life. On which ‘*Atma*’, dissimilar to those combined, these two Prāna and apāna combined with the eyes and the rest depend and *for the benefit* of whom (not so combined), prāna, apāna and the rest perform their functions in combination, he is established to be *other* than they.”]

We find, therefore, that there is an End or purpose present in nature and within the organism, which works.

(2) Non-intelligent blind Energy is incapable of producing order and adaptation (रचनानुपपत्तेश्च नानुमानम्, ब्र० सू०, 2.2.1). It is supposed, for this very reason, that the natural world is adapted to the *ends* of the

Spirit. The forces, if unarranged, uncombined, unutilised by a presiding consciousness or mind can not give rise to a single orderly system (रचना) of the universe. In the adaptation of the organism (देह) to the external circumstances, animal *life* makes the best use of the external environments, throws off disadvantages and *utilises* the conveniences and thus builds up the organisms. There is, therefore, present in nature the End which nature has to reach. It is operative through the whole field of nature forcing it to particular forms—a self-realising idea. Such an end, such an idea,—must be at the *beginning*. We are obliged to refer this 'idea' to an infinite *mind* which as its *subject* must be distinguished from the *object* in which it works. "An idea busy in the world, but present to no subject is a contradiction", as Martineau observes.

The Sāṅkhya idea of Prakriti is different. According to Sāṅkhya, Prakriti is the "condition of equilibrium consisting in a uniform diffusion of three tendencies—power of doing work counter-balanced by resistance (of mass)." The world in this view is something *given* in its *complete* form and is *self-existent* and *independent*. It is a complete whole *given in its totality*; it is eternally complete—unchangeable. Development within it discloses no *new* property which is not to be found in the pre-existing elements. The manifestation of effect is, therefore, only its passage from potentiality to actuality. Evolution is the development of the differentiated *within* the undifferentiated—"liberation of energy stored up in a *collocation*, by overthrowing the arrest

which goes on to a fresh collocation." Hence, only the collocations change.

But the Vedantic conception is quite otherwise. Satwa, Rajas, Tamas—सत्त्व-रजः-तमः—owe their mutual *relations* of equilibrium together to some controlling influence of a whole which brings about connection and combination of interacting elements, so that each and all co-ordinate to *realise* a final end or *purpose*. Such interaction and reciprocal adaptability and sympathy of objects and of different parts (परस्पररोपकारार्थोपकारकत्व*) cannot be the result of *mechanical* working of blind energy, but it proves the presence and working of an immanent purpose which has brought about and connected the elements, so that a purpose (पुरुषार्थ) may be realised.*—

“यदर्था यत्-प्रयुक्ताश्च...चेष्टाः सः अन्यः सिद्धः।”

“स’द्वतानां परार्थत्वं दृष्टम्”। (तै०, 2. 7.)

[“For whose purpose and by whom urged or moved.....these activities work, he must be other than these.”]

[“It is seen that those which are combined together serve the purpose of some other for whose sake they are combined.”]

Prakriti, from the Vedantic position, is not, therefore, an irrational power independently working out effects (परिणाम—बिकारs), but it is a rational creative power of Brahma—“जगतः उत्पत्तिप्राक्काले ब्रह्मातिरिक्तं वस्तु नास्तीति दर्शितं ; अविद्यायाश्च (मायायाः) ब्रह्मशक्तित्वेन ततः पार्थगर्थ्यायोगात्”—रामतीर्थ in वे० सार०. [“Since माया is a *power* of the Spirit, it cannot be an entity

* नहि अचेतनं चेतनानधिष्ठितं किञ्चित् कुर्वन्नुपपद्यते” (वे० सा०—रामतीर्थ) ।
cf. “तदभिध्यानदेव तन्नित्वात् सः” (ब० सू०) ।

distinct therefrom.”] We can, therefore, never understand the universe “as *becoming* merely, but as *being* that is becoming.” *Vikāras* (विकारस) are not mere changes, but movements to a definite End or goal, a progress.—

“एकरूपस्यापि.....उत्तरोत्तरमाविष्कृतस्य तारतम्यम् ऐश्वर्यशक्तिविशेषैः

अयुते”

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 1. 11).

[“Although *identical* in its nature.....there are degrees of its progressively higher and higher manifestations—by the splendour of His glorious power.” [This ‘glorious power’—ऐश्वर्यशक्ति—is *Maya*, as Sankara himself explains in another place “तदाग्रथा तदैश्वर्यमृता.”]

“आदित्यादिषु हि सत्त्वमय्यन्तप्रकाशं...अतस्तत्रैव आविस्तरं ज्योतिः

...न तु तत्रैव तदधिकमिति । यथा तुल्येऽपि मुखसंस्थानि.....

आदर्शादौ तु स्वच्छे स्वच्छतरे च ‘तारतम्येन’ आविर्भवति तद्वत्”

(गी० भा०, 15. 12).

[“The better manifestation of consciousness in the sun &c. is due to a higher proportion of *Satwa*.....To illustrate, the same face of man is reflected in a mirror in a *greater or less degree* of clearness, according as the mirror is more or less transparent.”]

“उत्तरोत्तरविशिष्टतरानिव ब्रह्माकाशान्तान् लोकान्...परं परं वरीयो

विशिष्टतरं जीवनं हास्य विदुषो भवति” (छा० भा०, 1. 9. 1).

[“He wins gradually higher and higher worlds up to *Brahmakasa* (ब्रह्माकाश) in order of merit—which is the highest and best supreme....he gains gradually higher and higher forms of life progressively.”]

“इदमस्मात् परम् इदमस्मात् परं—इति पुरुष एवैभ्यः सत्त्वेभ्यः परः प्रतिपद्यते

इति युक्तं ।...पुरुष-प्रतिपत्त्यर्थैव ‘पूर्व-पर-प्रवाहोक्तिः’—

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 3. 3. 14).

In this quotation the phrase ‘पूर्व-पर-प्रवाह’ is significant :—

[“It is higher and better than this’, ‘it is higher and better than the former’—in this way, the Supreme Self is the Highest of all, the best. In this unbroken series of the degrees of higher and higher orders, the Highest Self is to be gradually realised in the higher and higher forms of objects’.]

(3) Our idea of the conditioned is composed of—(1) some kinds of being(सामान्य)and (2) the limits or conditions (विशेष or विकार) under which they are known. All the definite beings are qualitatively distinct in our consciousness and are all relative realities. These relative realities can be conceived only in connection with an Absolute Reality—‘कारण-व्यतिरेकेण अनुपलब्धेरसत्’—(गी० भा० 2. 16). Successive changes are determinations of a single substance ; it follows therefore, that there is a plurality of substances producing series of changes which are the outer expression of those active essences which must be *many*, though ultimately constituting the nature of One Reality, and the changes cannot be conceived *apart* from those essences or causes.—

“दधि-घट-रूपकारणार्थिभिः ‘प्रतिनियतानि कारणानि’ (Essential causal substances) उपादीयमानानि लोके दृश्यन्ते ।...नहि दध्निभिः सत्तिका उपादीयते, न घटाधिभिः क्षीरम्’

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 18.)

“सर्वस्य वस्तुनः ‘स्वे न स्वे न रूपेण’ भावात्मनैव उपलभ्यमानत्वात्”

(2. 2. 26).

[“Those who want to produce certain effects such as curd, jars &c. employ for the purpose certain determined (i. e. corresponding) causal realities such as milk, clay &c. He would not employ clay for the production of curd ; neither would he employ milk, if he wants to produce a jar”.]

["Every object has a positive determined 'nature' of its own". "Each causal substance", Sankara says, "has a certain *capacity* for some particular effects only and not for other effects'; this capacity is a certain power of the cause".]

Sankara, it will be seen, never separated the effects or the manifestations from their causes which contain them within themselves. "The cause", he remarks, "is always found to be larger in extent than the effects, and what is smaller in extent is *included within the larger*"——

‘कारणं हि लोके कार्यात् भूयो दृष्टं, यथा घटादिभ्यो ऋत् ।...यत् यस्य
अलम्बं हि तदस्य, भूय इतरत्’ (छा० भा०, 7. 12. 1).

He brings out this non-separability, this essential fact, in various ways :—

(i) In distinguishing between unreality and reality, he observes in his commentary on the *Gītā*, that the effects cannot be known *apart* from their causes ; as soon as you separate them from their causes, they would at once be unreal.

‘‘कार्यस्य घटादेः ऋदुदिकारणस्य च, तत्-कारणव्यतिरेकेण अनुप-
लब्धेः, ...कारण-व्यतिरेकेण अनुपलब्धेरसत्’’ (गौ० भा०, 2. 16).

“The pot is a *particular* thing ; it is one form of clay which is *universal*, is regarded as a reality. The pot is a mere form or guise under which the universal clay (*ऋत्*), is hidden”. But clay is sensuous universal ; it is again dependent on, and a manifestation of, pure universal behind it. The same universal appears in many different shapes and remains *identical* with itself in all its forms. The clay is not confined to one particular form—pot (*घट*)—but goes beyond it to others and hence *transcends* these.

Thus, each distinguishable object has a nature—a universal—of which it is the expression and which is present in it hidden behind.

(ii) Commenting on a passage in the Chhāndogya-Upanishad, he thus concludes—

“जायद्विषया अपि मानस-प्रत्ययाभिर्निर्वा एव ; सदीक्षाभिर्निर्वात्-
तेजोऽवन्नमयत्वात्...संकल्पमूला हि लोकाः” (छा० भा०, 8. 5. 4).

This is an observation the importance of which cannot be too prominently emphasised.

[“All sensible objects (जायद्विषयाः) are determinations of intelligible principles (of Divine Mind)—मानस-प्रत्ययाः—which contain them. As we find in the Sruti that they are embodiments of Fire, Water, Food—तेजः—अप्—अन्न—the universal constituents—which are again determined by Divine Purposes (संकल्पस) i. e. the Universals of Thought.” We thus find that behind the plurality of phenomenal objects, Divine Purposes (संकल्पस) are present on which the former are grounded”].

The same truth is more pointedly stated elsewhere—

“अग्न्यादीन् (Phenomenal objects) परमार्थ-सद्रूपान् वदति,
योऽविजानन् वदति । न तु ते रूपव्यव्यतिरेकेण परमार्थतः सन्ति ।
तथा तावपि रूपाणि सदपेक्षया नैव सन्ति” (छा० भा०, 7. 17. 1).

[“One who speaks without understanding, takes the phenomenal objects, fire &c. as real truths ; while as a matter of fact, these objects have no real existence *apart* from the three universal constituents or forms, viz : Fire, Water, Food—तेजः—अप्—अन्न. Even these universal forms have no real existence *apart* from Sat (सत्) i. e. they are included in Divine Purpose or Thought.”]

Brahma is the Supreme form related to all other forms.

(iii) Again elsewhere—

“सामान्य-विशेषवानर्थो नामव्याकरणवाक्ये विवक्षितः ।.....अनेके हि
विलक्षणाः...सामान्य-विशेषाः.....तेषां पारम्पर्यं गत्या एकस्मिन् महा-
सामान्ये अन्तर्भावः प्रज्ञानघने” (ब० भा०, 2. 4. 9.)

[“In the Sruti describing how the process of the evolution of the differences of nama-rūpa took place, objects are described as consisting of universals and particulars. There is a plurality of distinguishable universals with the particulars contained in them. All the plurality of the Universals (with their particulars which they include), in their progressive order (पारम्पर्य-गत्या) is included within the Supreme Universal Intelligence.”*]

We find from this description of the Evolution that behind the plurality of phenomenal particular objects, there is a plurality of universals (सामान्य) on which they are grounded and of which they are the expressions. All objects have thus a *double* character—the universal and particular—and they are *inseparable*.

Elsewhere we find Sankara remarking—

“सामान्यनामस्वरूपप्रदानेन विशेषान् विभक्तिं,.....विशेषाः सामान्ये उभाः, न
तत एव निर्भिद्य गृहीतुं शक्यन्ते” (ब० भा०, 1. 6. 1).

* cf. “विशेषाः सामान्ये कल्पिताः । तथा च द्रव्यत्वादीनां सामान्यविशेषाणां सामान्य-
मात्ररूपायां सत्तायामन्तर्भावः । सत्ताया अपि स्फुरणविरहितायाः कापि अनुपलम्भात्
स्फुरणमात्रत्वं युक्तं । स्फुरणञ्च ब्रह्मैव । (सामान्यस्य विचार्यमाणे ब्रह्मस्वरूपानतिरेकात्
अचेतनत्वहेतोस्तत्र अप्रवृत्तिः)”—रामतीर्थ in वे० सा०. [“All particulars
(or individual things) are surmised in the universal. The various universals must be included under *existence* which contains all universality. As existence is never cognised without ‘Sphurana’, it is rightly regarded as consisting only of such ‘Sphurana’. (Universality is not different from Brahma and therefore the argument is: unconsciousness does not apply to universality.)” *Gough's Trans.*]

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL
LIBRARY

["The Universals are the sustaining principles which contain the particulars...the particulars are interwoven into the universal and they cannot be severed from them,"] •

The Universals *include* the particulars in their own being ("विशेषाणां सामान्ये अन्तर्भावात्" 1. 6. 1.) and it is the universals (निर्विशेष) which give reality to the particulars (विशेष). There is no *essential* difference of kind between them ; the one is the expression of the other. Yet they are arbitrarily separated. Kant separated Thing-in-itself (सामान्य) from the phenomena (विशेष). Rámánuja stated, we had no knowledge of the *Nirvishesha* (निर्विशेष).

These Sámānyas or universal causes may be looked upon as *Secondary causes*, ("अवान्तर-प्रकृतिः" —रामतौर्था in वे० सा०) and Brahma is the Prime Cause including them. This we find from the following passage— •

“एवं क्रमेण सूक्ष्मं सूक्ष्मतरं, अनन्तरमनन्तरतरं, कारणमपीत्य, सर्व्वं कार्यजातं
—परमकारणं परमसूक्ष्मं ब्रह्माप्येति । न हि स्वकारणव्यतिरेकेण, कारण-कारणे
कार्याप्ययो न्यायः” . (ब्र० भा०, 2. 3. 14.)

["The phenomenal objects or the effects cannot *at once directly* merge in the *Final Cause*—Brahma. They must merge successively in their own preceding causes, in reverse order. In their ascending series in the reverse order, the earlier is more and more subtle than the latter into which each successively disappears. Observing this order, the objects will merge in their *own* subtler and subtler causes, in succession, until at last the most subtle, the most inward *Final Cause*—Brahma—is reached".]

The universals, according to Sankara, are ultimately Divine Purposes (स'कल्प)—"जाग्रद्विषया अपि मानसप्रत्ययाभिर्निर्वृता एव, सदीक्षाभिर्निर्वृत्ततेजोऽवन्नमयत्वात्

&c. &c.” (छा०, 8. 5. 4), * which find expression in phenomenal individual differences upon which the latter are grounded. The Supreme Self includes within itself all the intelligent universal purposes which are behind the phenomena. Being Divine Purposes, they are included in the Divine Thought. They are the constituent elements of one Supreme Being ; they constitute the nature of Brahma. Sankara calls them—“कामाः—ब्रह्मणोऽनन्याः” —not different from Brahma. For this reason the *Chhândogya* describes—

“तानि एतानि संकल्पात्मकानि.....संकल्पं कृतवत्याविव द्यावा-पृथिव्यौ, समकल्पितां वायुश्च आकाशश्च.....तथा आपश्च तेजश्च...स्वेन रूपेण निश्चलानि लक्ष्यन्ते.....सर्व्वं जगत् संकल्पमूलं...संकल्पप्रतिष्ठितानि...स्थितौ, एवमुत्पत्तौ,...प्रलये च” ।

[“All these abide in the Divine Will : Heaven and Earth willed, the air and ākāsha willed.....the whole universe willed in its immovable form, abides in the Will during origination, during continuance &c. &c.” (7. 4. 1.)]

As the external world is the expression of the Purposes of the Absolute Self, it conforms to, and serves the purpose (परार्थ) of the Finite Selves—its opposition is only apparent.—

(4) In Lecture II, it was pointed out that the characteristic of the world is Self-transcendence. As the world is grounded on a transcendental Supreme Purpose which is present behind it, it reveals higher and higher purposes i.e. the realisation of more and more, higher and higher, forms implied in it, from the very beginning. It has evolved the five elements, and the higher contains the properties

* Quoted and translated at P. 61.

of the lower. Akāsha comes first and has the property of sound, but the last—the earth—contains the five properties of each preceding series (Vide. प्र० भा०, 6. 4). The same reality is seen more fully in man than in beasts and insects. Four gradually higher and higher forms or types—उड्डिञ्ज, खेदज, अण्डज and जरायुज—have come out. When the evolution reached the species man whom it has supplied with organs of knowledge and action (Vide वृ० भा०, 2. 4, 11) *, it seems as if its further business is to perfect the man. For this reason, man is not satisfied with the mundane objects merely ; he is *ever and ever striving to realise higher and higher goods—purposes—which the world is gradually revealing.—*

‘पूर्व-पूर्व-प्रवृत्तिनिरोधेन उत्तरोत्तरापूर्व-प्रवृत्तिजननस्य प्रत्यगात्माभिमुख्येन प्रवृत्त्यात्पादनार्थत्वात्” (गौ० भा०, 18, 66).

“भगवत्-कथितकारिणो ये वृत्ततमाः.....ते उत्तरोत्तरहीनफल-व्यागावसान-साधनाः” (18, 66).

[“By restraining the first *natural activities* one by one and thereby *gradually* inducing fresh and *higher activities* it (Sruti) serves to create an aspiration to *reach the innermost Self*” .]

[“Who are most devout, rendering services to the Lord,—they will resort to the last path, gradually abandoning the successive lower and lower paths in their descending order.”]

But as no stage of *mūndane* development is intrinsically perfect and not vitiated by evil, the human desire or purpose is not being fulfilled or completed in any of these stages under *earthly* conditions. The goal must, therefore, be *supramun-*

* “विषयस्यैव स्वात्मग्राहकत्वेन संस्थानान्तरं करणं नाम” &c. &c. Vide : Lect.—“Why is Māyā called so ?”

dane transcending the earthly order. For, a principle of goodness (साध्वर्थ) is the presupposition and condition of the manifestation of a good developing in the world.—

“साधु-शब्द-वाच्योऽर्थः ब्रह्म वा सर्वथापि लोकादिकार्ये अनुगतं ; यथा घटादि-
दृष्टि र्दृष्टादिदृष्ट्यनुगतैव सा.....‘साध्वर्थस्य’ लोकादिकार्येषु कारणस्य अनुगतत्वात्,
वृदादिवत् घटादिविकारिषु” (ङा० भा०, 2. 2. 1).

[“The word “good” signifying the *cause*, extends to the effects in the shape of the *world* ; just as clay does to its modifications—jar and the rest. Just as wherever we have a notion of the jar, it is always accompanied by the notion of clay, so, in the same manner, the notion of the *world* is always accompanied by a notion of the “Good”].

Man must participate in that Good Purpose (“साध्वर्थ of Sankara”)* which is fulfilling itself in the Universe. As God is acting behind the process of the world, the world is moving perpetually to realise the Divine Purpose. The *Gītā* calls the working, in the world, of this Divine Purpose as—“मत्-कर्म्म” (“जन्म कर्म्म च मे दिव्य”) †. The *Gītā* wants us to participate in this Divine Action or Purpose, so that in our lives we may not be led captive by sensuous desires and forget the Transcendental Purpose or Goal—“मत्कर्म्म-परमो भव”—“Participate in my Divine action” (गी० भा० 12. 10). We must embrace the Divine Good as our own good and see that it is fulfilled. The *Gītā* looks

* cf. “सर्वकल्याणानामतिशयेन कल्याणं” (ङा० भा०, 5. 15. 1)—“The Highest Good of all other Goods”. Also, सर्वपदार्थेषु वरेषु अतिशयेन वरं” (सु० भा०, 2. 2. 1)—“Among all other Goods of the world, it is the Supreme Good”.

† Vide : *Gītā*, 4, 9.

upon the Divine Purpose or action as—“धर्मसंस्थापन” —the establishment of Righteousness in the world. But, there is the other side of the shield. The good cannot be attained unless you overcome evil, oppression and suffering—“विनाशाय च दुष्कृतां ।” This is the “establishment of the Righteousness.” This is the Message of Vedānta.—

“परिचाषाय साधूनां, विनाशाय च दुष्कृतां ।

धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय सम्भवामि युगे युगे” ॥ (गौ, 4. 8.)

[“For the protection of the virtuous and the good, for the destruction or overcoming of evil, for the firm establishment of Righteousness or Good, I am born in every age”].

We are all parts of the system of nature, members of the universe. The parts belong to the whole and the whole is in the parts undivided. We do not exist *apart* from the world and we cannot, therefore, have any good which is separate and isolate from the good revealed in the world, which is not the good of the whole. We are not independent of, separate from, the world or the whole. For, the whole is present in each part (“समीऽहं सर्वभूतेषु”) and we must see the fulfilment of every part in the whole. The false view of *Anyatwa* (अन्यत्वं)—Separateness—must be supplanted by the idea of *Ananyatwa*—non-separateness. Each of us, we must remember, is the *same* (अन्यत्वं) and yet is not the same (अन्यत्वं) with God or the whole. Our non-separateness is the true idea—the solidarity—the ‘लोक-संग्रह’ of the Gitā. We must all *identify* ourselves with the good purpose operating within the world as well as in us.

From what has been stated above, it is clear that

in Vedānta there cannot arise the question of *dualism* between matter and mind, between particulars and universals, between parts and the whole. They are not two different entities, as in the System of Aristotle and in Kartesians. Nor can our self be an addition, from outside, to matter. The Self is rather the goal which nature had to reach by continuous transformations,—which Bosanque calls “the soul-making business of the world”. It has brought about what it had in itself—

“सत्त्वाच्चावरस्य” (ब्र० सू० 2. 1. 6).

“कारणात्मनैव कारणे सत्त्वमवरकालीनस्य कार्यस्य भूयते” (शङ्कर-भाष्य) ।

[“What is to be produced subsequently must be present implicitly in the cause”.]

The phrase ‘अवरकालीनस्य’ is to be particularly noted here. The sense of the Aphorism is that the higher is *contained implicitly* in the lower. Nature must have contained life and consciousness in it, otherwise they could not have emerged afterwards from it. There is always a continuous transformation of nature or Prāna and for this reason, it is known in Sankara-Vedānta as—परिणामि-नित्य—and the consummation of the human form was the End which nature had in view. It is an important tenet in Vedānta that—

“यच्च यदात्मना यत् न वर्तते, न तत् तत् उत्पद्यते, यथा सिकताभ्यर्त्तलं”

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 16),

[“What does not exist in ‘implicit’ form in the cause, can not become ‘explicit’ in the effect, and what subsequently becomes explicit must have been present in the earlier stages in implicit form (कारणात्मना)”.]


Thus there is no dualism between matter and mind ; both are aspects of a single reality which has taken innumerable forms in the world. This truth has been beautifully brought about in the story of Swetaketu in the Chhândogya Upanishad. What is called as matter in its triplicate forms—(तेजोऽवन्न)—can give rise to the most exquisite manifestations of psychical functions—speech, Prāna and mind—वाक्, प्राण and मनः । The essence of Food (अन्न) &c. taken by us produces thoughts, memory &c. There is no causal relation between the two. There is the one everlasting Principle *hidden* in everything (“नामरूप-विकारैः कृतं”) having names and forms which manifests itself in manifold forms, as breath, speech, thought &c. from the lowest progressively to the highest, as salt is hidden in water. All these are but the functions of a unity which is the fundamental basic principle of all functions—

“परमेश्वर एव तेन तेन आत्मना अवलिष्ठमानो अभिध्यायन् तं तं विकारं सृजति”

(ब्र० भा०, 2. 3. 12.)

[“It is the same Iswara—the Fundamental unity—who assuming innumerable changing forms on Himself has manifested Himself”.]

This beautiful truth the Chhândogya has placed before us.



The Vedantic Prāna :

ITS CHARACTER.

Part I.

—:0:—

(1) What is Prāna in Vedānta? Let us see how Sankara himself speaks of this Prāna. "The term Prāna is the world-seed (वीजात्मना स्थितं) and Brahma is defined as Sad-Brahma (सद्वृत्त) in relation to and in identification with (तदात्मना) the Prāna. It is this Prāna which before its manifestation existed as a seed; it became manifested—as this non-intelligent world" (सा० का० भा० 1. 2). Prior to its manifestation, this world of Nāma-rūpa is called as *Avyakta*. Sankara informs us that the *Prāna-vija* exists in *Pralaya*—dissolution of this world, and also in *Susupta*—deep slumber of finite Self, in undeveloped or *Avyākṛita* condition i. e. not yet differentiated in space and time order—

“अव्याकृतस्य देशकालविशेषाभावात्...अव्याकृत एव प्राणः सुषुप्ते (प्रलये च)
...सर्वभावानामुत्पत्तेः प्राक् प्राण-वीजात्मनैव सत्त्वम्” ।

“समस्तं जगत् कार्यकारणलक्षणं, सह विज्ञानात्मना, परस्मिन्नक्षरे
सुषुप्तिकाले संप्रतिष्ठते, सामर्थ्यात् प्रलयोऽपि...तत एव च उत्पद्यते इति च सिद्धम्”
(प्र० भा०, 6. 1).

“प्राणवस्थायां परित्यक्त-व्याकृत-नामरूपं बीजशक्त्यवस्थाम् अव्यक्तशब्दयोग्यं दर्शयति” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 4. 2).

[“In the dreamless sleep (and in the Pralaya) the Prāna was non-differentiated. Before their birth (i. e. appearance in developed forms of Nāma-rūpa) all objects had their *being* in the form of potential (अव्याकृत) Prāna. It then became gradually developed or manifested in space and time”.]

[“All the universe in the nature of effects and causes, together with the knowing Self, enters into the Supreme, undecaying Self during sleep...and by necessary implication even in *Pralaya*...and that is produced from thence”.]

[“(The world) in its prior condition was fit to be called as *Avyakta* (not manifested), as it was reduced to the state of ‘Power of Seed’ devoid of differentiated nāma-rūpa”.]

This Prāna in *Avyakta* stage is synonymous with *Māyā*. The *Brahma-Sūtra-bhāṣya* says—

“बीजशक्तिरव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या...नायामथौ महासुषुप्तिः” (1. 4. 3.)

[“This seed indicated by the term ‘*Avyakta*’.....is like deep slumber consisting of *Māyā*”.]

The *Māndukya-bhāṣya* states—

“अव्याकृत एव प्राणः सुषुप्ते, प्रलये च...प्राणशब्दत्वमव्याकृतस्य”

(भा० का० भा० 1. 2.)

[“In the deep slumber and in *Pralaya* the Prāna becomes *Avyakta*.....the Prāna is known by the term *Avyākṛita*”].

Behind this Prāna or *Māyā*, there is *Brahma* as its substratum. This *Avyākṛita* (non-manifested) Prāna is not a self-existing entity, but it cannot be explained without referring to the *Being* of *Brahma* whose energy it is.—

“मया अप्रकृतं परित्यक्तं शून्यं तत् स्यात्...सर्वं भूतानां बीजं तदहमस्मिन्”

(जी० भा० 10. 39.)

[“Anything into which ‘I’ have not entered, from which ‘I’

am removed, would be without Self (could not exist) and would be void".]

Again—

“तमोबीजस्य स्वातन्त्र्येण प्रवृत्तिशब्दा स्यात्, तथा सति सांख्यसिद्धान्तापात् इति
‘आशय’ (Substratum) दर्शयति” (रामतीर्थ in उप० सा०, 17. 27).

[“Some one might think that this ‘Seed of Tamas’ i, e. Prāna-vija acts independently and in that case our theory might resemble the Sāṅkhya Prakriti ; to disarm such suspicion the author (Sankara) shows its Substratum (आशय, अधिष्ठान)”].

This seed of Māyā or Prāna existing in Brahma in undifferentiated state, identically blended in it, distributed itself gradually into *three* forms,—the gross (स्थूल), subtle (सूक्ष्म) and the causal (कारण) conditions of the Prāna.—

“तदेवैकं त्रिधा ज्ञेयं मायाबीजं पुनः क्रमात् ।

मायाव्यात्माऽविकारोऽपि बहुधैको जलाकवत्” ॥ (उप० सा०, 17. 27.)

[“One seed (of Māyā) gradually divided itself into three forms. The intelligent ātmā which is changeless, though one, appeared as many in connection with the three-fold Māyā, like the Sun appearing as many when reflected in the rippling surface of a lake”.]

These three forms of the Prāna may be compared with the three states of the finite individual Self in its wakeful, dreaming and slumbering conditions respectively. The differentiations into gross states are the product of their subtler condition. The subtle differentiations are again the product of the causal state which is called as the undifferentiated causal form or seed-form of the Prāna (अव्याकृत-प्राणावस्था). All these states were merged in Brahma in Avyakta form.

(a) But what is the *relation* between Prāna and its Substratum Brahma ?

The Avyakta Prāna is really the *Swarupa* (nature) of Brahma itself.—

“मम परमेश्वरस्य विश्वोः ‘स्वभूता’...माया” (गी० भा०, 7. 14.)

[“This Māyā is inherent in Me, Vishnu, the Lord”.]

“नामरूपबीजभूतात्...खविकारापेक्षया परात् ‘अक्षरात्’, परं सर्वोपाधि-
वर्जितम्, ‘अक्षरस्यैव’ स्वरूपम्” (सु० भा०, 2. 1. 2.)

[“The Māyā or Prāna, the seed of all names and forms, is termed ‘Akshara’, and this being the *source* of all changes does not itself change. The Brahma which is devoid of all determinations and limitations is the real ‘Akshara’. The former Akshara—the Māyā-Seed—is, in reality, the *Swarupa* i. e. the nature of the Akshara Brahma.”]

There is thus a *Swarūpa* or *Tādātmya* relation between the Avyakta Prāna and Brahma in which it is submerged*but not obliterated. What is *Tādātmya* ? Sankara defines this *Tādātmya* (तादात्म्य) in his commentary on the Brihadāranyaka thus—

तत्-स्वरूपव्यतिरेकेण अग्रहणं यस्य, तस्य ‘तदात्मत्व’ दृष्टं लोके” (2. 4. 7).

[“Something which cannot have any being or action *apart* from that of the other is in *Tadatmya* relation with it”.]

Prāna then has no being or activity *apart* from that of Brahma which is its substratum. In all its successive forms, the Prāna works not apart from but in identity with Brahma.

“(नाम-रूपे) ‘आत्म-तादात्म्येनैव’...सर्वव्यवस्थासु व्याक्रियेते”

(वै० भा०, 2. 6).

[“All its differentiations and developments are, in all conditions, in intimate relation with Brahma, not apart from Brahma.”]

“यदात्मकं मयि वर्तते स्थितिकाले” (व० भा०, 2. 1. 20),

“प्रलये च कलानाम् 'आत्मभावागमनम्' (प्र० भा०, 6. 5).

“(जगत्) ब्रह्मणि लीयते—‘तदात्मतया’ श्लिष्यति...तद्व्यतिरेकेण अग्रहणात् ;
तस्मात् ‘सर्वमिदं ब्रह्म’—(छा० भा०, 3. 14. 1.)”

[“The world of Nāma-rūpa exists not apart from Me, but in identity with My Swarupa (स्वरूप)”.]

[“When it disappears, the ten-fold *Kala* (i. e. all the differences) are merged in My nature and thus existed in identical relation with Me”.]

[“In an order—reverse of that of birth, all this dissolves into Brahma—becomes identified with it.....thus at all periods of time this universe remains one with Brahma and is never cognised *apart* from it, consequently this universe is Brahma itself, in reality.”]

We find then that the Prāna or Māyā, when existing unmanifested in Brahma has no being or activity * *apart* from Brahma. “The Prāna had no independent being of its own or activity apart from Brahma and for this reason, the Prāna *though existing* cannot violate or interfere with the unity—non-duality—of its substratum” †. When the differentiations gradually develop under space and time limitations, they do not arise *separated* from or independent of or apart from Brahma, and when these differences go on operating (स्थितिकाले), we cannot say that they have made Brahma something else (अन्य), Brahma remains, unaffected, the same substantial being under the appearance of differences.

* cf. ‘नामत् किञ्चन मिवत्’—‘न किञ्चिदपि व्यापारवत्’ (ए० भा०, 1. 1).

† ‘स्वतः-सचावच्छे स्वव्यापारे स्वातन्त्र्यमेव . स्यात्,... अतः आत्मनोऽद्वितीयस्य न विरोधः—ब्रह्मन्दमिति in ऐतरेय-भाष्ये ।

These differentiations again stand in Tādātmya (तादात्म्य) relation to their cause Prāna, as the latter is related to Brahma—its source, its substratum—in the same Tādātmya relation. They cannot make the causal substances something different (अन्य) ; because, they are, in reality (परमार्थतः) not something different but express the nature of Brahma.

(2) To the Sruti, this Prāna, as soon as manifested, is known as *Sutra* (सूत्र).—

“तदेतत् हिरण्यमस्य स्वात्मनो जन्म ;—यद्व्याकृतस्य जगतो व्याकरणम्”

(इ० भा०, 5. 5. 1).

[“The differentiation of the undifferentiated world is the birth (or first manifestation) of *Hiranya-garbha* which is *Sutra*” .]

It is called *Sutra*, because it weaves into itself all the differences of the world. It is this energy which related together all the beings, all the determinations (विशेषस) in the world. It passes through all, it sustains all, as a piece of thread passes through and contains in it, all the flowers of a garland.

“अन्वथा सक्तुसुष्टिवत् विशीर्येत” (इ० भा०, 3. 6. 1).

[“Otherwise, if it did not sustain,—all the differences of the world of nāma-rūpa would have been torn to fragments, scattered, like a handful of fried ground grain (सक्तु)”].

But we have seen it cannot act independently ; it has Brahma as its Substratum, as its source, as its sustaining ground. With a view to impress this fact upon our mind, the Sruti calls Brahma as—“सूत्रस्य सूत्रं, तस्यैव नियन्तारं” and “प्राणस्य प्राणः”—

["Brahma is the thread of all threads, it is the controller—the guide—of this thread". "It is the Prāna of the Prāna"].

"मयि सर्वमिदं प्रोतं सूत्रे मणि-गणा इव" (गौ०, 7. 7).

Nilakantha thus explains—

"सामान्यरूपे मयि सर्वे विशेषाः प्रोता दृन्दुभ्यादिदृष्टान्तैः ।...रसतन्मात्ररूपे मयि सर्वे अ-विशेषाः प्रोताः—इत्यादि,.....सुखवत् सर्वत्र अनुसृते मयि सर्वे परस्परव्यावृत्तं तत् प्रोतं, ...अतः प्रपञ्चातीतोऽहम् ।"

["Strike a musical instrument, the strike will produce a general undifferentiated sound—अनुरक्षण । Then strike it more and more, varieties of sound would now be produced upon it. But all these varieties—these various degrees—high and low—of different sounds would all be heard *accompanied* by the *general* अनुरक्षण *first* produced. As a piece of thread enters and touches all the different flowers in a garland, so 'I', the Self, have entered and kept constantly touching all the mutually exclusive (व्यावृत्त) finite objects of the world. As the continued Identity (अनुगत) remains distinguished from, and unaffected by mutually exclusive objects ;...so, I transcend the world".]

Each of the objects of the world is finite and it arises from its *negative relation* to others * ; as Plato

* Sankara's idea in this respect is identical with Plato's.—

'A finite is that which has a limit. If something is limited, it follows that beyond the limit, there is another something. Hence to be finite means to be limited by something else and so on'.—"अश्वत्थान् गोत्वमिति अन्तवदेव भवति । स च अन्तो (Limit) भिन्नेषु वस्तुषु दृष्टः ।" Thus arises a complex system of many inter-related finite things. But limit, according to Sankara, always involves negation (निवर्तकत्व)—"यतो यस्य बुद्धे 'निवृत्तिः', स तस्य अन्तो भवति, यथा गोत्वबुद्धि-रश्वत्थात् 'विनिवर्तते' (तै० भा० 2. 1). "The idea of the 'cow' *negates* or excludes the idea of the 'horse'. This is what keeps one thing separate from another thing. Each one negates or excludes the other ones from it." Thus one finite object negates another finite object. There are, therefore, series of finite objects—many.

says—"in their *distinction* from each other, things are limited and hence many". But as Brahma is present, as *Sutra*, in each, contains everything, the many are also one—Infinite. We thus find that the phenomenal objects are the expression of the active non-phenomenal essences (सामान्य) behind them, and these latter are all involved in the Ultimate Essence—Brahma.

“कथमवगम्यते अज्ञाने (i. e. अव्याकृते प्राणे) तमः-प्राधान्यम् इति तदाह...
जाड्याधिक्यदर्शनात्, सत्ता-स्फूर्तिं प्रदत्तेन चैतन्यस्यापि ईषदनुवृत्तिं सूचयति”
(रामतीर्थ in वे० सा०).

[“Why there is prevalence of *Tamas* in their cause ?the author implicates from seeing non-intelligence in the effects; there is also in all products some degree of intelligence (चेतन)”.]

Now, then, this *Prána* is the germ, the energy (स्फूर्ति) of the Supreme, from which perishable things take their rise. This is the imperishable (अक्षर), undifferentiated, *seed* (बीज) or germ, with Brahma behind it as its *source*—the *real seed*.—

“बीजं मां सर्वभूतानां विद्धि पार्थ सनातनम्” (गी०, 7. 10).

And

“अक्षरात् परतः, परः (अक्षरः)”—(सु०, 2. 1. 2).

It is that which causes the growth of all things that germinate and this endures as long as *Samsāra* endures. Nothing springs up without a seed, and since growth is constant, the continuity of the seed never fails.—

“नित्यञ्च प्ररोहदर्शनात् बीजसक्तं न व्येति” (गी० भा०, 9. 19).

[“I am the *manifested* which *manifests itself in relation* to the cause ; and I am the reverse, the non-existence i. e, the

unmanifested, the cause—“सत्—यस्य यत्-सम्बन्धितया विद्यमानं तत्, तद्विपरीतं न सच्च' अहमेव”—गौ० भा० १०. १९.]

This causal power (बीज)—is subject to God, subject to His control—

“तदाश्रया तदैश्वर्यभूता”—

—and existing in Brahma, this causal Seed—Prāna—developes into differentiations of Nāma-rūpa, the world.

(b) Brahma is the source and regulator of the Prāna——

We have seen there is *Tādātmya* relation between this Prāna and Brahma, and through this Prāna, Brahma is the cause of all.

The Gitā says—

“When Brahma is said to be not accessible to the thought or word of सत् (existence), one may suppose it to be असत् (non-existence). To prevent this supposition, the Gitā declares its existence as *manifested* in the upādhis, through the senses of all living beings (13. 12—13)”. “There must be some self-conscious principle *behind* the *insentient principles in activity*, such as physical body ; for, we invariably find self-consciousness lying behind all insentient objects *in activity*, such as a carriage in motion.” Brahma the sentient principle is not *actually engaged* (व्यापाराविष्टतया) in the *particular* activities ;—and in that supposition Brahma would be as if reduced to पररूप or assuming the character of that with which it is connected. We should understand, Brahma manifests itself through the Upādhis or limitations

of the senses, through the *functions* of all the senses ; that is to say, the knowable Brahma (ज्ञेय) functions *as it were*, through the functions of all the senses ('As it were'—i. e. not actually engaged, only seems to be so engaged).

Sankara elsewhere observes—

“विक्रियादिविशेषरहितस्य आत्मनः मन-आदि-प्रवृत्तौ निमित्तत्वम्”

(केन० वा० भा०, 1. 2).

[“Atmā is not subject to modification or change, and remaining unaffected in its own nature, it is the *director* of the intellect, senses etc”.]

And again—

“सर्व्वचितनप्रवृत्तीनां चेतनाधिष्ठानपूर्व्वकत्वात्, तस्मिन् चेतने सर्व्वचितन-वर्ग-प्रवृत्तिहेतौ नास्ति नास्तिशङ्का” (गौ०, 13. 13).

“ न हि अचेतनं चेतनानधिष्ठितं स्वतन्त्रं प्रवर्त्तते प्रवर्त्तयति वा”

(ब्र० भा०. 2. 2. 12).

[“The existence of an intelligent principle cannot be doubted *behind* the non-intelligent objects in activity, as their source, inasmuch as, wherever there is activity of any non-intelligent objects in the world, that activity must have an intelligent principle as its controller or regulator.”]

[“A non-intelligent thing cannot act or cause others to act of its own accord and independently, without being presided over by an intelligent principle”.]

Compare what Rāmānirtha says in *Vedānta-Sāra*—

“प्राणाः स्वातिरिक्त-स्वान्तर्गतचेतन्याधिष्ठानपूर्व्वकप्रवृत्तयः अचेतनत्वात् रथादिवत् ।”

[“The vital airs have, as the antecedent of their activities, superintendence of Intelligence other than themselves but residing in themselves, because they are unintelligent like a chariot.”]

During the dissolution of the world, the Prāna merges with all the varieties of its actions, in Brahma. And this Prāna is, in Vedānta, not an independent

principle, and as it is non-intelligent and always acts in combination with senses and others, it cannot be held to be independent in its activity and must be held to be acting for some Sentient Principle, as is stated in the Brahma-Sutra, thus—

“संहतत्वाचेतनत्वादीन् प्राणस्य स्वातन्त्र्यनिराकरणहेतून् दर्शयति”

(2. 4. 10).

Prāna may, therefore, be called to be the creative energy of Brahma, and Brahma for this very reason, called in Vedānta as—“प्राणस्य प्राणः”. It is not anything which can exist and work separated or divided from Brahma. It has not any *independent Swarupa* or nature of its own like the Pradhāna of the Sānkhyas, but is in constant and living relation with Brahma.

“यदि हि प्राणादयः प्रागुत्पत्तेः ‘स्वेन आत्मना’ (i. e. as an independent principle) सन्ति, तदा...पुरुषस्य प्राणादिमत्त्वं भवेत् । न तु ते...स्वेन आत्मना सन्ति ; अतः अप्राणवान् पुरुषः” (सु० भा०, 2. 1. 2.)

In this quotation, ‘स्वेन आत्मना’ can be explained in the light of what Sankara stated in ब्र० सू०, 2.3.7. He states there—all finite things are divided (विभक्त), like a water-pot, piece of cloth, pillar and the like. Each of these is characterised by particular modifications or *vikāras* and such characteristic modifications of each can be said to be the ‘स्वरूप’ or the characteristic nature of that object and this swarupa separates one finite thing from another finite thing: “नहि ‘अविभक्तं’ किञ्चित् कुतश्चित् विभक्तमुपलभ्यते ।येन ‘विशेषण’

व्यतिरिच्यमानं (i. e. विभक्तं) अन्येभ्यः, तेन “स्वरूपवत्” सविशेषः प्रागुत्पत्तेर्नास्ति” (ब्र० 2. 3. 7).

In the light of this hint, the words ‘स्वेन आत्मना’ occurring in सु० भा० quoted above would mean that such particular *modification*, by which Prāna is characterised as Prāna and is distinguished from other particular modifications characteristic of other objects, was not present in Brahma, prior to its manifestation. Hence, in that stage the Self (पुरुष) can be called as अप्राणादिमान् पुरुषः । Similarly in ब्र० सू० 2. 3. 7. Sankara’s conclusion is—“आकाशादि-स्वभावेन न स्वभाववत् ब्रह्म ।” Hence, we can conclude that prior to manifestation, Prāna existed in Brahma not in the form of *modification* but *in identity with* Brahma, as non-modified seed or power. We thus find that in Vedānta, Prāna is looked upon as a Universal, all-pervasive, quasi-material energy. It is a Self-constructive Divine Energy working from the Centre and gradually evolving differentiations. All the cosmic (आधिदैविक), physical (आधिभौतिक) and psychical (आध्यात्मिक) forces and activities are to be traced to this Energy which first appeared as Universal *Pari-Spanda* (Vibration)—

“प्राणस्य परिस्पन्दात्मकत्वं—वागादिषु अन्येदिषु च अनुगतं (ब्र० भा०, 1.5.23).”

And

“नहि प्राणादन्यत्र चलनात्मकलोपपत्तिः” ।

[“It is the vibration of Prāna which is *contained* in the Cosmic Fire &c. and in the Psychic Speech &c.”]

And

[“There can be no vibratory motion anywhere apart from Prāna”.]

“एतावद्भि इदं सर्वं व्याकृताव्याकृतञ्च यदुत नाम-रूपं कश्चित्...अध्यात्माधि-
देवताधिभूत-मादेन व्यवस्थितमेतदेव” (इ० भा०, 1. 6. 3).

[“It is this Prāna which, without forfeiting its own nature, divided itself into those three main forms of activities everywhere in the world, *and* it works as varieties of names, forms and acts”.]

And—

“स प्राणमसृजत...तदुपाधिद्वारा आत्मनि सर्वं विक्रियालक्षणः संव्यवहारः” ।

“अहं प्राणः...सर्वं परिस्पन्दकृत्” ।

[“He created Prāna.....By this Prāna all practical concerns of life consisting of all changes are done by Atmā.”]

[“I am Prāna.....the active source of all vibrations”.]



The Vedantic Prāna :

ITS TWO-FOLD MANIFESTATION.

Part II.

—:0:—

The Prāna-vīja existing in Brahma in unmanifested *avyakta* form exhibits from the moment of its *manifestation* two phases, one concomitant of the other—

(3) Every *manifested* form of Prāna shows two inseparable sides—करणश (Energy or motion) and कार्याश (Matter). The Sruti declares—

“उभयात्मको हि प्रजापतिः ; उपकार्योपकारकदर्शनात् अन्ना, अद्यच्च । नहि कार्य-करणप्रत्याख्यानं सारोऽवगम्यते ।...कार्यकरणानामात्मा—प्राणः ; प्राण-स्थितिकरं सत्—अन्नं, न स्वातन्त्र्येण अन्नसम्बन्धः * (इ० भा०, 1. 3. 18).

[“As there is always interaction and inter-relation between the two—motion (or energy) करणश and matter कार्याश, the Prajāpati (the Universal Prāna) is two-fold in his nature—composed of these two concomitant and inseparable † factors.

* “अन्नं प्रतिभावमापद्यते ऋते प्राणात् । प्राणः अन्ने न विना न शक्नोति आत्मानं चारयितुं (इ० भा०. 1. 5. 20).

† We find two other terms for *Anna*, as रवि and सोम ; for *Annada*, two other terms, as अग्नि and प्राण (Vide. प्र० उ०, 1. 4—5). The manifestation of the Prāna from the Supreme Self (अक्षरात् पुरुषात्) is considered as an अतिप्रसन्न ; for, it lies beyond the province of logical argument and rational demonstration ; it is hard to know (Vide ; प्र० उ०, 3. 2-3).

The Prāna is the essence of both, अन्न (Matter) is the basis or support of प्राण (Energy or motion) ; and thus there is concomitance of the two. If you leave off these two factors there is no *Samsara*—

“अग्नि-धोमात्मकं जगत्—प्रजापतिः (प्राणः)”— ब्र० भा०, 1.4. 6.]

Again—

“नामरूपे सत्यं—कार्यात्मके शरीरावस्थे । क्रियात्मकस्तु—प्राणस्योरुपपत्तयः
वाद्याभ्यां शरीरात्मकाभ्यां क्वत्रः अप्रकाशीकृतः” (ब्र० भा०, 6. 6. 3).

“वाद्यस्य कार्यलक्षणः उपजनापायधर्मकः * त्वण-कुश-वृत्तिकासमः” (2. 1. 1).

[“The nāma-rūpas are true ;—these nāma-rūpas are कार्यांश or *material* portion ; it becomes gradually developed into the form of organism and it is liable to growth and decay. The Prāna-portion appears as motion (क्रिया) which nourishes or supports the former. It is by कार्यांश or matter that the करणांश—motion or energy lies concealed’.]

[“The कार्यांश is its exterior and करणांश interior.”]

The change from a diffused, imperceptible state to a concentrated, perceptible state is dissipation of motion and concomitant integration of matter †. The loss of energy or *motion* is accompanied by a gain in the volume of *matter*. . When the loss of insensible motion—we call heat, light, sound—proceeds, the particles of diffused matter becoming more and more concentrated will be followed by liquefaction—fluidity—तारल्य, (अणु—जल), and eventually by solidification—hardness—(काठिन्य—पृथिवी).

As there is radiation of heat and light (तेजः) into space, there is dissipation of motion (वायु) therein. And it is followed by concentration of its

* cf. “उत्पत्तिप्रलयात्मके हि नामरूपे” (ब्र० भा० 2. 1. 20).

† Herbert Spencer's *First Principles*.

concomitant matter in the form of liquefaction (जल);
—for the Veda instructs—

“वातस्य सर्गः अभवत् सरौमणि (अग्नेः)”—ऋग्वेद, 7. 1. 34. 11.

“चलनस्य वायुपूर्वकत्वात्” (ऋ० भा०, 4. 3. 1).

[“When the Fire speeds on, the वायु is implicated therein”.]

[“All movement is preceded by वायु or vibration.”]

Then—

“अग्नेरापः” and—

“अपां यः शरः स समहन्यत, सा पृथिवी समभवत्” (ऋ० भा०,)

[i. e. “The radiation of heat and light is followed by liquefaction (अप_ or तारल्य)”]

and—

[“What constitutes the essential substance of water became integrated and the result was solidification—(पृथिवी, काठिन्य)” .]

We thus find the manifestation of sound (शब्द) and heat and light (तेजः)—on the part of *motion*; and consequent appearance of liquefaction (जल) and eventual solidification (पृथिवी) on the part of its concomitant *matter*. About आकाश or space, the *Aitareya-Aranyaka* says—

“आवपनमाकाशः, प्राणः लघ्वतेऽस्मिन्” .

[i. e. “It is the space into which the Prāna-vibration is interwoven”.]

The Upanishad also similarly describes the space by saying it as—

“वायुर‘खम्’* .

[i. e. “the space containing वायु (vibration) can be said to be qualified by it”.]

It is in this way that from the करणांश and the कार्यांश respectively, of the Prāna-vija,—the *five*

* “वायुदेरेव शब्दवत्त्वसम्भवात् किम् आकाशेन ?—इति अतिप्रसङ्गात्, यतः श्रुतत्वात् वायादिकारणत्वेन आकाशवत् आगन्तुकत्वेन &c. &c.”—रत्न० प्र०, 1. 1. 5.

elements have come out; i.e. from the कर्णांश (Energy or motion), the sound (नाद, स्पर्श), heat and light (तेजः) come out; from the कार्यांश (Matter), the liquefaction (अप्) and solidification (पृथिवी) come out. Space (आकाश) is the container of all these.

This also holds good in the case of animal organisms. It is the Prāna which builds up the body in the mother's womb and distributes the sense-organs and its other parts. In the Protoplasmic cell, the fertilised ovum does not petrify (ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 4. 8.) as the Prāna manifested first within it and exerts its activity. It is this energy which acted on by the cosmic and physical environment gradually unfolds the sense-organs and the entire apparatus.—

“प्रथमो वृत्तिलाभः प्राणस्य चक्षुरादिभ्यः...गर्भं पृथ्वति प्राणः”

(ब्र० भा०, 6. 1. 1).

“कार्ये-करणानामात्मा प्राणः.....अङ्गानां रसः”

(ब्र० भा०, 1. 3. 19 & 8).

[“It is Prāna which first manifests itself in the ovum in the womb of mother and it gradually builds up the sense-organs and owing to its presence and activity the ovum does not petrify”.]

[“Prāna is the essence of both the कर्णांश and कार्यांश.....it is the essence of the limbs of the child's body in the mother's womb.”]

The phenomena of growth, circulation of sap and blood, nutrition, arrangement of cells, unfolding of the structure of the foetus—are due to the agency of Prāna. Even the power to heal injured organs by the growth of flesh (“देहं प्राणः शस्त्रादिहिंसितं पुनर्मांसेन आपूरयति” —ब्र० भा० 5. 13. 4.) is due to the activity of this Prāna. It maintains (देहेन्द्रिय-रक्षा) and nourishes (देहेन्द्रिय-पुष्टि—ब्र० भा० 2. 4. 11.) the animal life

—“यावदस्मिन् देहे प्राणो वसति, तावदायुः—ब्र० भा० 1. 1. 29. As from this Prāna, both cognitive and active powers within the organism are produced—this energy is termed in the Sruti as cognitive and active—‘ज्ञानक्रियाशक्तिमत् or बोधाबोधायकं’ (ऋ० भा०). It is called the collective प्राण, because it possesses power of action ; and हिरण्यगर्भ, because it possesses power of cognition ;—or it may be described as—

“अथवा ज्ञानक्रियाशक्तिमत्-समष्टिप्राणेन्द्रिय-
समुदायात्मकं समष्टिलिङ्गशरीरं” (रामतीर्थ).

[i. e. “The *collective* subtle body consisting of the aggregate of all the vital airs and organs, possessing all cognitive and active powers in the form of Buddhi, Manas and Prāna.”]

The Prāna within the body is the modification of the *Sūtra* (सूत्र)—“मुख्यप्राणोऽपि वायोर्वाह्यस्य सूत्रात्करूपस्य विकारः” (रा० ती० in Ved. Sāra). It is called *Antah-karana* when emphasis is laid on the cognitive powers, and the same is called Prāna when emphasis is laid on the active powers. In this way—Buddhi (बुद्धि) stands for cognitive power, Manas (मनः) for desire or feeling and Prāna for active power or willing ;—and all these are but the वृत्तिस or modifications of this same Prāna or Sūtra. *

* Here it will be instructive to bear in mind what विज्ञान-भिन्नु has explained about this Prāna—“महत्तत्त्वं हि एकमेव प्रकृतेः—(i. e. अव्याकृतात्) उत्पद्यमानं, ज्ञान-क्रियाशक्त्यां बुद्धि-प्राणशब्दाभ्यामभिलष्यते इति स्मृतिषु अवधारितं” । “यो वै प्राणः स प्रज्ञा, या प्रज्ञा सा प्राणः इत्यादि स्मृतिषु च । अतएव महत्तत्त्वस्यैः पृथक् प्राणसृष्टिः स्मृतिस्मृतिषु प्रायशो न श्रूयते.....यद्यपि प्राणान्तः-कारणयोरप्येकव्यक्तित्वमेव, तथापि क्रियाशक्तेरवान्तरभेदाः पञ्च, ज्ञानशक्तेरवान्तरभेदास्तु चत्वारः” (वि० भि० in ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 4, 11—12). It was the Prakriti (or the Māyā or Avyakta Prāna) which appeared first as महत्तत्त्व (or *Sūtra*) and this is called as बुद्धि (अन्तःकरण) or प्राण— with reference to its cognitive and active powers exhibited

In the Samvarga-vidyā (संवर्गविद्या) it is stated that the activities of the external objects—the sun, the moon, the light, the heat &c. derive their respective functions from the Prāna, and that when their respective activities cease, they merge and disappear undivided (अविभक्तरूपेण) in the Prāna. The different functions of several internal sense-organs also merge during sleep in this Prāna within us and when we awake it is this Prāna which sends forth these organic activities again to their respective objects. It is not a resultant of the operations of all the forces in the organism, as the Sāṅkhyas hold, but a separate Energy which is at the root of all kinds of activities going on in the creation. It is this Prāna which has brought the finite selves and all finite existences into relation; it is the common medium in which they interact, and out of which their organisms differentiate—

“परस्परौपकारार्थोपकारकभूतं जगत् सर्वं पृथिव्यादि । यच्च लोके परस्परौपकारार्थो-
पकारकभूतं, तत् एककारणपूर्वकं ‘एकसामान्यात्मकं’ (Common
medium), एकप्रलयच्च दृष्टम्” (ब्र० भा०, 2. 5. 2).

“भूतानां शरीरारम्भकालेन उपकारात् ‘मधुल’ । तदन्तर्गतानां तेजोमयादीनां
करणत्वेन उपकारात् ‘मधुल’ (2. 5. 5)”.

“[There is reciprocal sympathetic interaction among the elements of the world. And this reciprocal action of the elements presupposes *unity* of some kind; they belong to a whole—a *common medium*—in which the elements interact, from which source they come and in which they disappear.”]

by it. Both the बुद्धि and प्राण—constitute *one* principle. Though *one* in substance, it is modified into 4 *cognitive* acts and 5 *active or vital* powers.

“The external elements help in building up the organism ; and the organs—the result of *Tejas* &c.—act upon the elements ;—”

i. e. “Between the inorganic and organic world, a constant interaction goes on, and elements from the external world are absorbed and are made to function as constituents in the life of living beings. This presupposes adaptation and sympathy”.

But this whole or the principle of unity continuously present in and differentiating and determining all the elements of the world has its source or *final ground* in a transcendent Reality. We have pointed out previously that the characteristic of the world (or the common medium of *Prāna*) is self-transcendence. This is, as stated above, due to the transcendent element behind the world which is its ultimate ground. That the transcendent Supreme Self is the Director (प्रेरक) of the activities of the *Prāna* has been beautifully described in Sankara's *Sata-Sloki* (शत-श्लोकी) thus—

“व्यापारं देहसंस्थः...प्राणः सर्वेन्द्रियाणामधिपतिरनिशं,...यस्य चिद्घनस्य सचया कुरुते,...प्राणस्य प्राण एवः” (89)

[“The *Prāna*, residing in each body.....master of all the senses, incessantly carries on all the activities.....by a *Power* which belongs undoubtedly to the Self that is pure consciousness ;—it is the life *behind* all life (प्राणस्य प्राणः)”].

Again—

“ब्रह्मच्छेदे कुठारः प्रभवति यदपि, प्राणि-नोद्यस्तथापि ।

स्वात्मना नश्वरेऽस्मिन् न हि खलु घटते, प्रेरकोऽस्मान्तरात्मा” ॥ (84)

[“Although the axe is able to fell a tree, it is nevertheless wielded by a *living* being ;.....Yet the axe cannot do it *independently* ; it is *impelled thereto* by the inner Self.”]

Sankara in his commentary on the following Stanza of the *Gītā*—

‘मयाध्यक्षेण * प्रकृतिः सृयते सचराचरं ।

हेतुनानेन कौन्तेय जगद्विपरिवर्त्तते” ॥ (गी०, 9. 10).

thus explains—

“दृशिमात्रस्वरूपेण अविक्रियत्मानः ‘अध्यक्षेण’ जगत्...व्यक्ताव्यक्तात्मकं... विपरिवर्त्तते सर्व्वासु अवस्थासु” ।—

[“Because ‘I’ am the witness, I preside ; this Universe comprising the manifested and the unmanifested *moves on* in all stages”.]

Here Anandagiri—“कार्यवत् कारणस्यापि साक्ष्यधीना प्रवृत्तिरिति ‘अव्यक्तात्व’माह”—

[i. e. “The term ‘Avyakta’ has been employed to show that not only the modifications of *nāma-rūpas* at present perceived, but also the *Causal seed* of this world were impelled or *moved to action* because ‘I’ presided”.]

Then Sankara adds—

‘सर्व्वासु अवस्थासु ‘दृशि-कार्यत्वापत्ति’निमित्ता हि जगतः प्रवृत्तिः,— ‘अहमिदं भोक्त्ये’, ‘एतदर्थमहमिदं करिष्यामि’...इत्याद्या अवगतिनिष्ठा ‘अवगत्य-वसाना’ एव” ।—

That is to say—

[“All activities of the world arise by way of *forming an object* of consciousness”, i. e. all activities have their value only in the fact that they may be *used* by the *Drisi* (दृशि)—the rational ‘I’ for his own purpose, that they may be *utilised* for his own end ; that they may prove *useful* to him (कार्यत्वापत्ति or उपकार). Otherwise, all these movements and actions (प्रवृत्ति) will lose their value, and thus the realisation of *Drisi* (दृशि) is its *final end*—its अवसान, its पथ्यन्त’.]

Elsewhere he has brought this important fact in a slightly different way, thus—

* cf. “प्रे रयिता हि असी भोग्य-भोक्तोः”—म० भा०, 1. 1. 1.

“अप्रसिद्धे हि आत्मनि, स्वार्थाः सर्व्वाः प्रवृत्तयः व्यर्थाः प्रसजेरन्...दुःखं दुःखार्थमेव सुखं सुखार्थं”—

[“If no *Atma* is present behind these activities and movements, they would prove useless ; for, in that case the activities would be for their own sake ;—as pain exists for pain, pleasure exists for the sake of pleasure ; but this is quite absurd”].

“नहि चन्दनकण्टककृते दुःखे चन्दनकण्टकाद्ये.....अतः तद्विज्ञातुर्मम चन्दनादिकृतोऽर्थः, अहं हि ततोऽन्यः” (उप० सा० गद्यांश) ।

[“The pain produced by a thorn cannot be for the sake of the *thorn itself* ; which is non-sense. It must be *for me* who feels the pain, and ‘I’ am distinct from the thorn as well as from the pain.”]

These remarks are important. They show that the intelligent Self (चेतन) has his own *purpose* of being in himself and his purpose is realised in these activities, and it is he who utilises these *actions* for his own *use* in which lies the value of these actions.

From all these discussions the fact stands out very clear before us that urged on by the Infinite within, the Prāna or the world is constantly moving towards the realisation of an *End* and this *End* is the transcendental Brahma itself. For this, the finite world ever keeps on transcending its finitude until it will reach its own *End*. The world is a sort of self-working system with Prāna—the vital principle, for its maintenance. It is composed of several members among whom functions are distributed, so that each member with the co-operation with other members exercises its own function in the place allotted to each, and the unity of the whole system is maintained by the vital principle—Prāna. We would quote the whole passage here—

“तस्मिन् आत्मतत्त्वे सति नित्यचैतन्यस्वभावे...मातरिश्वा वायुः (प्राणः)
सर्वप्राणशक्तक्रियात्मको, यदाश्रयाणि कार्य-करणजातानि यस्मिन् श्रोतानि
प्रोतानि च, यत् स्वसंज्ञकं, सर्वस्य जगतो विधारयित्, स मातरिश्वा...प्राणिनां
चैष्टालक्षणाणि अग्न्यादित्यपञ्ज्यादीनां ज्वलन-दहनाभि-वर्षणादिलक्षणाणि दधाति
‘विभजति’ । “सर्वो हि कार्य-करण-विक्रिया नित्यचैतन्यप्रात्मस्वरूपे सर्वस्यदभूते
सत्ये व भवति” ।—ईशा० भा०, 4.

[“It is because the *Atmā* whose nature is eternal intelligence is constantly present (behind), it has become possible for the *Mātariswā* *—the *Prāna* which is the essence of all activities of those who possess life and in which, as the substratum, all the material and psychical elements are woven as warf and woof, and which under the designation ‘*Sutra*’ † sustains the whole world,—to allot and to distribute various functions of burning, lighting and raining to the respective objects viz, the fire, the sun and the clouds and to allot various functions to the living beings also”. “All the physical and psychical activities (of the world) are maintained, because there exists behind them the *Atmā* whose nature is eternal intelligence and which is the ultimate ground of all”.]

It is for this reason that the *Prāna* is called as an instrument of the Self for the accomplishment of all purposes or ends in—

“प्राणो राजमन्त्रिवत् सर्वार्थकरणभूतः, न स्वतन्त्रः” (ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 4. 10).

[“The *Prāna* is not an independent principle, it is an instrument which the Self employs for the realisation of all its Purposes or Ends (अर्थ) as a minister is employed by a king.”]



* मातरि अन्तरीक्षे शसिति—इति ।

† It is “*Sutra*”—because like a piece of thread it passes through all the elements of the universe and binds them all.

The Vedantic Prāna :

ITS OBJECTIVITY.

Part III.

—:0:—

The Prāna is identified with the Ajnāna (अज्ञान) or Avidyā, and hence Ajnāna in Vedānta is not a mere *Subjective* notion.—

(4) We have found that the term Māyā is used in Vedānta with regard to the world, both in its undeveloped and developed conditions. But there is another term Avidyā or Ajnāna (false knowledge) which is often employed in this connection. But this has, unfortunately, led to a serious misconception. There are people who regard the world to be due to our Ajnāna—a subjective idea of the individual Soul.

A distinction is to be made between the Individual sense of Avidyā and the cosmic sense of Avidyā. The individual Avidyā or Ajnāna is what Sankara has called as fundamental *Adhyāsa* (अध्यास), under whose influence we superimpose the world of nāma-rūpa on Brahma, and Brahma becoming thus *concealed* from our view, we look upon the world of nāma-rūpa as a Self-sufficient, separate (अन्य, स्वतन्त्र) and independent entity. As Sankara has observed—
 “नाम-रूपोपाधिदृष्टिरेव भवति स्वाभाविकी” (Vide : वृ० भा०,

3.5.1). But Avidyā has got another sense in Vedānta. It is used in the sense of आवरण i. e. self-concealment or self-limitation of Brahma. The Supreme Self has partially concealed Himself by creating or manifesting the world of nāma-rūpa, as the Upanishad declares—“देवः एकः स्वमावृणोत् तन्तुभिः प्रधानजैः)”, —and Sankara explains—“नाम-रूप-कर्माभिः आत्मानमावृतवान्” (Vide. खे०, 6. 10); i. e. “by names and forms and actions the Self covered Himself.”. It is the ‘cosmic Avidyā’ and it is equivalent to Māyā (माया) or the Frāna (प्राण) described in Lecture V.

Now, take the following passages—

- (1) “ईश्वरस्य आत्मभूते इव ‘अविद्या-कल्पिते’ नामरूपे स’सार-प्रपञ्चबीज-भूते...मायाशक्तिः प्रकृतिरिति...अभिलष्ये ते, ताभ्या’मन्यः’ * सर्वज्ञ ईश्वरः।”
(इ० भा० 2. 1. 14).

[“The names and forms are constructed or produced (कल्पित, कृत) by Avidyā. They are, as it were, the self or nature of Iswara...are called Māyā-sakti or Prakṛiti...Iswara is *distinct* from these names and forms.”]

- (2) “...‘अविद्यात्मिका’ हि सा बीजशक्तिरव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या परमेश्वरा-श्रया मायामयी” (ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 2. 8.).

[“The seed-potency (vija-sakti) of the world whose self or essence is Avidyā, is indicated by the term Avyakta (unevolved) and its substratum is the Supreme Iswara.”]

In the two passages quoted above, *Avidyā* cannot be taken as the ‘Individual Avidyā’; for, the Avidyā inherent in an individual Soul cannot be held to produce nāma-rūpa, cannot be the cause of the whole material world including our body, sense-organs etc. Here, *avidyā* must denote the ‘cosmic’

* Also cf. “नामरूपाभ्यामात्मनीऽन्यलाभ्युपगमत्”...“उत्पत्तिप्रलयात्मके हि नामरूपे, तद्विलक्षणञ्च ब्रह्म” (इ० भा०, 2. 1. 20).

avidyā or Māyā which is the cause of the material world.

The term avidyā has, thus, two different uses in the Sankara-bhāṣya. The 'individual avidyā' is what Sankara has called as 'fundamental Adhyāsa' under whose influence we superimpose the differences of the world of nāma-rūpa on Brahma. But avidyā has also been used in the sense of what may be called 'cosmic' avidyā or Māyā or Prakṛiti, as we have stated above. The former is false and may be destroyed by Vidyā (true knowledge); but the latter is not so. The Vidyā or true knowledge annihilates the avidyā or the ignorance of an individual and sublates for him the world imposed on, or identified with, Brahma—

“अविद्याधस्तः ब्रह्मणि एकस्मिन्नयं प्रपञ्चः विद्यया प्रविलाप्यते”
(ब्र० भा०, 3. 2. 21.)

But this Vidyā is quite powerless with regard to the 'cosmic avidyā' which is the causal seed of the world of nāma-rūpa, which latter *continues to subsist* after the Mukti of the Jiva or the individual Soul. *

This distinction in use between the 'individual avidyā' and the 'cosmic avidyā' or Māyā shows conclusively that the world born of the latter is not a mere *Subjective appearance*. The world does

* In a letter addressed to the author, Dr. H. Jacobi of the university of Bonn, Germany has rightly pointed out this distinction of cosmic and individual Avidya, but he has drawn from it a conclusion entirely different from the conclusion reached here.

not vanish into nothingness the moment the individual Soul attains Mukti. All that is involved in the attainment of Mukti is the displacement of the *false outlook* (अविद्याधस्तं) by the true one, and not the annihilation of the world. The final realisation of Bāmadeva who declared his inner conviction by saying—“अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च” &c. &c. does not show that *Manu*, *Suryya* &c. disappeared from the world. But since the world is not due to *our individual avidyā*, its only *locus* is Brahma ;—the false error of ‘independent being’ of the world—what may be called the ‘fundamental Adhyāsa’—this alone disappears in the *Mukti* and not the world itself.

Here, in the quotation of the passage marked (1), the world of नामरूप is described as आत्मभूत of Iswara ; but Iswara is described different from, distinguished from, and independent of, the world of nāma-rūpas—“ताभ्यामन्यः सर्वत्र ईश्वरः ।” This part of the commentary clearly shows that the world of names and forms cannot be our subjective construction. What does our mental construction really signify ? It means that *in the place of the Supreme Self* our mind and our senses have constructed a world of nāma-rūpa, that there does not appear to us the Supreme Self at all, that it is completely concealed by the distorted view which has taken possession of us, that the Supreme Self is *entirely reduced* to the world of names and forms. Such is the influence of our ‘individual avidyā’ or false knowledge. Everywhere, before us and behind us, only the differences of nāma-rūpas

appear and Brahma becomes concealed from our view. The world of nāma-rūpa is thus viewed by us as something separate (स्वतन्त्र), self-existent, self-sufficient, independent entirely (“नामरूपोपाधिदृष्टिरेव भवति स्वाभाविकी”) । But it is not a real view. The world is not really the construction of our mind. There is the Supreme Brahma who *underlies* the differences of nāma-rūpa, without being affected by them. * The differences of nāma-rūpa cannot really conceal Brahma. These are to be taken as the manifestation or expression of His nature and they cannot, therefore, be taken as something different (अन्य), as some self-existent, self-sufficient entity †. Brahma is distinct from them, since they cannot be taken as a *complete* expression of His nature. He stands beyond the world of nāma-rūpa ; He transcends it, yet he is immanent in it. This is the significance of the sentence— “ताभ्यामन्यः सर्वज्ञ ईश्वरः” । If the world of nāma-rūpa were simply the *mental construction* of the finite Self, no *distinction* in that case could be made between Brahma and the world. The fact is, while it is neces-

* *Maya* in Vedānta is to be looked upon as ābarana (Individual sense) and *Vikshepa* (cosmic sense) ; i. e. both as concealment and projection. In Mukti of jiva, the former only disappears, while the latter remains.

“आवरण-विक्षेपशक्तिद्वयविशिष्टमज्ञानं—कूटस्थस्य जगत्कारणलोपाधिः”—रा० तीर्थ
in वे० सा० ।

† “उत्पत्त्यादिश्रुतीनामेकात्म्यायामपरत्वात्...न तासां निराकाङ्क्षार्थप्रतिपादनसामर्थ्यमस्ति” (ब्र० भा० 4. 3. 14).

cf. रामतीर्थ in the *Vedānta-Sara*—“आत्मशक्तिले न सतः पार्थगर्थप्राप्तेर्गतात्...दृथक्सत्तायोगात्” ।

sary to *distinguish* the world from God, it is equally necessary to distinguish it from illusion or *Subjective phantasm*.

(a) Rāmatirtha's view on *Ajnāna* (ignorance)—

In commenting on the celebrated Vedānta-Sāra, Rama-tirtha, that most learned interpreter of Sankara has established the important position that *Ajnāna* (अज्ञान) must not be understood in the sense of subjective notion—of an individual Soul. What he says, I shall quote here—

“मिथ्याज्ञानव्यसंस्कारः अज्ञानं, असत्प्रकाशनशक्तित्वेन असिद्धा—इति मतद्वयं निरसति” ।

[“Two doctrines about the *Ajnāna* are to be rejected ; viz. that *Ajnāna* or ignorance is an *impression derived from false cognition*, and that it is non-existent (i. e. something merely negative)”.]

[“The author”, says Ramatirtha, “now rejects the alternative that ignorance (अज्ञान) is an *erroneous cognition and a quality of the Soul*”].

His argument is stated below—

“सत्त्व-रज-समीलनघणास्तुयी गुणाः, कारणमव्याकृतात्मकम् ‘अज्ञानं’ विरूपेण निगुणात्मकं । तथाच, गुणस्य गुणवत्त्वानुपपत्तेर्न मिथ्याज्ञानम्—‘अज्ञान’मित्यर्थः ।”

[“By reason of the three constituent elements—*Satwa*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*—in the products, the cause—*Ajnāna*—also is composed of these three constituents. Since, therefore, a quality cannot possess qualities, the erroneous cognition which is a *quality of the Soul* cannot be ignorance (i. e. *Ajnana*) ; for, it possesses the three constituent elements (i. e. *objective* and not a *quality of the Soul*.)”]

Thus, refuting the opinion that *Ajnāna* is a subjective quality of the mind, he now goes on to show that it is positive (भावरूप) and not mere negation ; thus—

“ज्ञानाभावोऽज्ञानमिति मतं निरस्यति” ।

[i. e. “He refuses the view that ignorance is mere *absence of knowledge*”].

Then giving reasons in favour of the *positive* character of Ajnāna, he establishes the fact that it is a sort of relative entity and thus *concludes*—

“देवस्य स्वयंप्रकाशस्य आत्मनः शक्तिमत्-परतन्तां स्वगुणेः सत्त्वादिभिः निगूढा-
भाविज्ञितां...अपश्यन्...ब्रह्मणो स्वप्रकाशत्वे न ‘अस्ति’ ‘प्रकाशते’ इति, तद्विपरीत-
व्यवहारस्य आत्मनि ‘आवरण’मन्तरेण अनुपपत्तिः”

That is to say—

[“They beheld the *power* (शक्ति) of *Atma* self-illuminant, subject to its possessor, embraced by three constituent—*satwa*—*rajas*—*tamas*unless the Soul were enveloped (आवृत), there could not exist the practical assurance—‘It is not’, ‘It shines not’—contradictory to another assurance—‘It is’, ‘It shines’—in the constant self-illumination of the Supreme Spirit” (Gough’s translation)].

This ‘आवरण’ or अज्ञान is explained as तमः with a slight admixture of रजः and सत्त्व.

(b) Sankara’s own view on *Ajnāna*—

Now, I shall show that Sankara himself identified *Ajnāna* with the *Prāna-Sakti* in his *Māndukya-bhāṣya*. And this, I think, would be a conclusive proof about the *objectivity* of Ajnāna. In describing the condition of *Pralaya* (and the dreamless *susupta* state of the finite Self), we find the following observation in Sankara’s *Brahma-Sutra-bhāṣya* :—

“निश्चाज्ञानप्रतिबद्धा विभावाशक्तिरनुमास्यते—अपीतावपि ; एतेन सुप्तानां
पुनरुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गः प्रतुल्यः, सत्यगुणैर्निर्निश्चाज्ञानस्य अपोदितत्वात्” (ब्र० सू०
भा०, 2. 1. 9).

[“So in *Pralaya* (at the dissolution of the world) the presence of a *causal potency* of differences— with which the Ajnāna

or false notion is bound up—must be inferred. By this, the possibility for the re-appearance of those, who have already been released is precluded, since their 'false notion' or *Ajnana* (which binds to *samsāra* and causes difference) has been destroyed by true knowledge"].

But let us see how Sankara expresses himself in describing a *similar condition* in his *Māndukya-bhāṣya* :—

“बीजात्मकत्वाद्भ्रुगपगमात् सतः। जीवप्रसव—(सर्व्वपदार्थज्ञातस्य उपलक्षणं—आ० गि०)—बीजात्मकत्वमपरित्यज्यैव प्राणशब्दत्वं सतः।...निर्वीजतयैव चैत, सति प्रलीनानां सुषुप्ति-प्रलययोः पुनरुत्थानानुपपत्तिः सुप्तानाञ्च पुनरुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गः, बीजाभावाविशेषात्” (मा० गौड़-का० भाष्य, 1. 2 Karika).

[“We are to understand the term *Sat* (सत्) as containing the *causal seed*. The term 'sat' denotes *prana*, without leaving out the sense of its causal potentiality which is productive of all objects.....If we abandon the idea of this *causal seed*, then the possibility for the re-appearance of even those who have already been emancipated will arise, along with those not emancipated ; since no productive *causal seed* exists.”]

In comparing the two passages quoted above it would be seen, what Sankara described by the term *Ajnāna-Sakti* in the *Brahma-Sutra-bhāṣya*, is the same as what he called by the term *प्राण-बीज*—*Prāna-vija* (the causal seed of 'Prāna) in the *Māndukya-bhāṣya*. The *Ajnāna* or ignorance being bound up with the causal seed of *Prāna*, it is clearly an *objective matter* and not merely a *Subjective* notion. This *बीज* is the cosmic seed or the *Prāna-energy* of the *Sat*. Thus we find that according to Sankara the world cannot be a subjective notion of the mind of man. It is called *Ajnāna*, because it is the *other* i. e. opposite (*विपरीत*) of *ज्ञान* or the absolute Knowledge.

In this connection it would be instructive to mention what रामतीर्थ has said about this *Ajnāna*, in his gloss on the वेदान्तसार—“समष्ट्यज्ञानमव्याकृतं, तदुपहितः ईश्वरः ; तदुभयाश्रयम् अनुपहितमक्षरशब्दवाच्यं चिन्मात्रं... अव्याकृतात् विलक्षणः तत्साक्षी चिद्धातुः” । We give here Gough’s translation of this passage—

[“The *avyākṛita* (the undifferentiated world) is the collective aggregate of *Ajnāna* ; what accompanies this *Avyākṛita* (or the collective *Ajnāna*) is (called) *Iswara*. And the substratum of both (i. e. of the *Ajnāna* and God), viz, Pure Intelligence designated by the term *Akshara* is the witness of that which is undifferentiated (*Avyākṛita*)”].

Here, I should like to call your attention to the concluding remarks of Sankara—

“सवीजत्वाद्युपगमेनैव सतः प्राणत्वव्यपदेशः, सर्वश्रुतिषु च कारणत्वव्यपदेशः ।

...नेति नेति च बीजवत्त्वापनयनेन च व्यपदेशः” ।

[“In all *Srutis* wherever the word ‘*Sat*’ has been used, we are to take the existence of causal seed—*Prana* with it... But where such terms as ‘*neti*’ ‘*neti*’ occur in *Sruti*, *Brahma* devoid of this causal seed is to be understood. That is to say, *Brahma* with the causal *Prāna* existing *potentially* in it is to be called as सद्वत्तम्. It is this undifferentiated seed (बीज) which differentiated into the modifications of names and forms.”]

Sankara also adds further down there that—

“इतरान् सर्वं भावान् प्राणो बीजात्मा जनयति” (6 Karika).

“च तौऽश्वो ये तान् पुरुषः पृथक् सृजति विषय-भावविलक्षणान्” ।

[“It is this *causal seed of Prana* which is the productive cause of all objects of the world”].

[“But the *finite Souls* have come out from the Absolute Spirit directly”.]

We see from all these that the *Ajnāna* is not a *Subjective* idea, but an *objective* seed or matter

which is described by Rāmatirtha as "coloured by the potentiality of all effects" ("समस्तकार्यसंस्कारोपरञ्जितम्") ।

(c) Ānanda-giri's view—

Anandagiri first of all raises the following very clear objection—

“ननु अनाद्यनिर्व्वाच्यमज्ञानं स'सारस्य 'बीजभूतं' नास्तीति, सिध्याज्ञान-
तत्संस्काराणामज्ञानशब्दवाच्यत्वात्” ?

[“If some one urges the objection that since the word *Ajnana* means *false mental conception* and its impression, there does not exist *Ajnāna* as the beginningless *causal seed* of the world”].

Anticipating this objection, Anandagiri gives his own conclusion on the subject thus—

“अतः 'सपादानत्वेन' अज्ञान-सिद्धिः—

[“Thus our conclusion is that—the beginningless *Ajnāna* is established as the *material cause* of the world and it is not a *subjective mental idea*”—*Gloss on Mandukya bhāṣya 1. 6.*]

That there is a *matter* which is *transformed* into the differences of the *nāma-rūpa* of the world is thus stated by Anandagiri in *another* place on another occasion—

“परिणामित्वात् तस्य 'परिणाम्युपादानं' वक्तव्यं । तत्र विद्यदादौः परिणामित-
मङ्गीकृत्य अव्याकृतं 'परिणाम्युपादानमस्ति' ।—

[“As the world is always modified, it must have a *modifiable* material cause. Taking into consideration the fact that the Ether and others are always transformed from one state to another, we hold that there exists a transformable material cause of the world in the state of *Avyakta* (prior to its differentiations or transformations.”]

Another argument in favour of *Ajnāna* being the *matter* of the world is—

“ज्ञानदास्य 'बीजा'भावे ज्ञानानर्थक्यप्रसङ्गः”

[i. e. "If the existence of a 'causal' seed which can be burnt by (the fire of) perfect knowledge is not admitted, all instructions about the perfect knowledge (विद्या) would become useless".]

In bringing this discussion about the Prāna to a close it may not be out of place to mention here an important fact in this connection. In some places in the commentaries of Sankara, we come across two kinds of *Nitya* (नित्य)—the one is called परिणामि-नित्य and the other कूटस्थ-नित्य । The *Parināmi-Nitya* is defined as that which while changing incessantly in its states retains a kind of continuous identity of being, as in the following passage—

“विक्रियमाणमपि तत्-प्रत्ययानिदृष्टेर्नित्य” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 4. 7).

[“That is called नित्य which can be recognised as identical with itself through the successive changes of its states”.]

But the *Kutastha-Nitya* is what stands beyond change, eternally existing without changing its nature. This is the Supreme Self—

“इदञ्च कूटस्थनित्यं सर्वविक्रियारहितं निरवयवम्” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 1. 4).

[“It is devoid of any change, without parts”.]

In Sankara's commentary on the Chhāndogya Upanishad the remarks made by him about the Prāna leaves no doubt in our mind that he considered it as a *Parināmi Nitya*, and the Supreme Reality which constitutes the truth of the Prāna and stands beyond it as its ultimate Principle is the *Kutastha Nitya*.

Thus he describes the Prāna here—

“सर्वे क्रिया-कारक-फलभेदजातं प्राण एव ; न प्राणाद् वद्विभूतमस्ति”

(ब्र० भा०, 7. 15).

["It is Prāna consisting of all varieties of differences bound up in the relation of cause and effect which may be described as विकारादृतन्न, and outside of this Prāna nothing exists".]

The Prāna is not the ultimate reality, since all phenomenal changes take place within this Prāna, and to this Prāna "are fastened all differences, as the spokes are fastened to the nave (of a wheel)". But "there is a Spirit greater and higher than this Prāna", and "he who realises this Spirit is the true Ati-vādi (अतिवादी), not he who knows merely the nature of the Prāna".



Why is Māyā Called So ?

—:0:—

According to the Vedantic theory, no cause exhausts its nature in its effects or the changes which the former successively produces or undergoes. No effects can, either collectively or individually (समष्टि or व्यष्टिरूपेण) entirely manifest or express the nature of the cause ; or in other words, the cause cannot be resolved into its effects or the sum-total of the effects does not constitute the nature of the cause. The cause evolves the changes, it lives in each of its effects, it supports them, but cannot be identified with any of them. The cause, because it is universal, cannot be confined to any particular effect, but passes beyond it to other effects—

“न कारणस्य कार्यात्मत्व” (ब्र० भा०—2. 1. 9.)

In its explanation, the author of the *Samkshepa-Sāriraka* points out that, as the universal cause is present in *other* particular effects also, any of the particular effects cannot restrict it to itself only—

“कार्यस्य परिच्छिन्नस्य, कार्यान्तरेष्वपि वर्तमानेन कारणधर्मैण सम्बन्धाभावात् ।”

The effects are, in fact, its modes of activity which but imperfectly and incompletely reveal or represent the nature of the cause.—

“अथ मनसि सुवेदिति दधमेवापि नूनं त्वं वेद्य ब्रह्मणो रूपं, यदस्य त्वं यदस्य देवेषु”। (केन० 2. 1).

“न केवलमध्यात्मोपाधिपरिच्छिन्नस्य अस्य ब्रह्मणो रूपं त्वमस्य वेद, यदस्य अधिदैवतोपाधिपरिच्छिन्नस्य रूपं देवेषु वेद्य त्वं तदपि नूनं दधमेव वेद्य” (भाष्य) ।

[“Whether in cosmic or psychic objects, the manifestations of Brahma are all limited. These objects, therefore, represent the nature of Brahma very inadequately. Brahma cannot be known in its *full form* in any of these particular manifestations”.]

The cause, therefore, cannot be the sum-total of its effects, but something *more*.

When the changes appear *in* the cause ; they are sustained by it, and they ultimately merge in it.

The causal Reality is thus the bond of unity of its effects and is distinguished (अन्व) from them—

“अविभक्तं विभक्तेषु, विभक्तमिव च स्थितं” (गी०, 13. 16).

“यदा भूतप्रपञ्चभावमेकस्य मनुपश्यति” (13. 30).

[“It is *undivided* in different bodies, still it appears to be different in different bodies”.]

[“All the various classes of beings abide or are centred in the One—in the Self”.]

In fact, the effects or the changes are but its reactions produced in the causal Reality in consequence of its relation (संसर्ग) with the external environment.—

“भूतमात्रासंसर्गस्तु अस्य भवति”

“संसर्गाभावे च तत्-कृतस्य विशेषविज्ञानस्य अभावात्”

(ब्र० सू० भा० 1. 4. 22).

“उपाधि-सम्पर्क-जनित-प्रबुध्यमान- (Aroused). विशेषात्मानः”

(इ० भा०, 2. 1. 20).

["It (Self) comes into relation with the external elements".]

["In the absence of its *relation* with the external objects, it cannot have its particular state stimulated by them in it".]

["Its particular states or activities are excited or stimulated in it in consequence of its connection with the things which set a limit to it".]

We find thus that no actions can be produced in an object in the absence of an operative cause (कारक); for, it is the operative cause which stimulates particular activities in an object.

Now, Sankara informs us that what is produced by an operative or stimulating cause (कारक) cannot be the *real nature* or the essence of a thing; these are its modifications or predicates (विशेषण); and these predicates are the effects of the thing, and these are change-able.—

“न हि कारकान्पेचं वस्तुनस्तत्त्वम् । सतो विशेषः कारकापेचः, विशेषस्तु विक्रिया” ; (तै० 2. 9.)

And—

“विषयादिसाधन-सम्बन्धवशात्... अनवस्थितः सम्पद्यते” (तै० भा०, 2. 8).

The relation between the cause or the nature of a thing and its effects is this :—The effects produced are all व्यावृत्त or mutually exclusive of one another, but the cause remains identical with itself—अनुगत—behind each of these effects which it permeates or includes within itself.

“सर्वान्स्वैव अवस्थानु प्रत्यभिज्ञावलीन अन्वयविच्छेददर्शनात्”

(ब्र० भा०, 2. 2. 22.)

["In and through its changing series of states, the real cause without break, runs on connected with each state, whose identity is easily recognised".]

It is the cause or the real nature of the thing which pervades its states or qualities which are its predicates ; and these predicates which we call effects fall far short of, and are incomplete expressions of, the real Swarūpa of the thing. Take the following passage—

“कृत्स्नो हि असौ खेन वस्त्ररूपेण गृह्यमाणः ।
अस्मिन् हि प्राणाद्युपाधिकृताः ‘विशेषाः’ प्राणादिकर्मज-
नामाभिधेयाः...एतानि कर्मनामानि न कृत्स्नात्मवस्तु-
वद्योतकानि” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 4. 7.)—

“In its essential nature, the Self or the Cause is complete. But certain particular activities are produced in it in consequence of its relation with the conditions or limitations (उपाधि) of Prāna and others. But these particular activities by which we generally designate it cannot express the *full* nature of the Self”. Those who restrict the infinite Atmā to any of its activities or predicates—which are its incomplete expressions—and think them to be the real and complete nature of the Self do not know what the Atmā really is. But we usually, in this way, take the world of nāma-rūpas as the complete manifestation of God’s nature. But this is wrong. It is done by us under the influence of Māyā.

We shall now proceed to collect the passages where and how Sankara has found occasion for declaring the unreality (मायामयत्व) of the world of Nāma-rūpas—

(1) “दृष्ट-नष्ट-स्वरूपत्वात्...स्वरूपेण अनुपाख्यत्वात्”

(ब्र० सू०, भा० 2. 1. 14).

We have seen generally that the effects or the Nāma-rūpas cannot be independent entities ; for, they cannot appear separated or divided from their cause. The names and forms are the modifications or transformations of the causal reality. These modifications we call as effects. The modifications or changes are the characteristics (स्वभाव or स्वरूप) of all Nāma-rūpas (Vide : ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 3. 7). But these modifications are perpetually changing. They have no independent and self-sufficient Swarūpa—स्वरूपेण अनुपाख्यत्वात्। The names and forms are seen one moment and vanish in the next ; they are, therefore, perishable, not constant (अनित्य)*. Sankara declares these characteristics of the changing Nāma-rūpas as—दृष्ट-नष्ट-स्वरूप। Elsewhere he characterises them as—“कदलीस्तम्भवदसारं।” What persists in these *Vikāras*, what is constant behind these modifications is the *being* of the causal reality, which finds its expression in them ; and these forms are not to be perceived *apart* from the being of the causal reality—“व्यतिरेकेण अभवः”। But as the being of the causal reality lies *hidden* from our view, we take these modifications of Nāma-rūpas, these *vikāras*, as self-sufficient entities. We forget that the *vikāras* cannot be self-sufficient ‘things’—“न हि ‘वस्तुवृत्तेन’ विकारो नाम कश्चिदस्ति” (ब्र० भा० 2.1.14). Looked in this way, separated from the underlying, hidden, causal reality,—the modifications of changing Nāma-rūpas must be unreal, false.

* “प्रतिक्षणप्रथ्वंसान्...कदलीगर्भवदसारान्”—सु० भा०, 1. 2. 12.

(2) “मायामात्रमेतत्...यत् परमात्मनः...अवस्थात्रयात्मना

• अवभासनम्, रज्जा इव सर्पादिभावेन”

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 9).

Under the influence of Avidyā, we reduce the underlying Reality into its three states—*सृष्टि-स्थिति-लय*—in which it appears. Or, we entirely reduce the underlying individual Self into its three successive states, namely—waking, dreaming and dreamless slumbering states—which it undergoes daily. We forget the independent existence of the underlying Self which, without being affected by them accompanies these states. By ignoring or forgetting the Reality of the ever-present, underlying, hidden Brahma of which the process of the world of *nāma-rūpas* is a gradual manifestation or appearance, and by severing the connection of the world with the underlying Brahma, we always come to exclusively occupy ourselves with the continuous process (*परिणामि-नित्य*) merely, imagining a kind of causal relation among the changing antecedents and consequents (*क्रिया-फलात्मकः*) among them ; or a relation of means and ends (*साध्य-साधनलक्षणः*). But it is a law of phenomenal or scientific causality—here the cause is *external* to the effect. In this way, forgetting the real cause which lies deeper down, we fix our look upon these changing *nāma-rūpas* alone and call some *nāma-rūpas* as the cause and some others following the former as its effect. But the modifications or *Vikāras* when thus *severed* from their connection with the underlying Self and looked upon as something having independ-

ent reality, cannot be real in themselves ; we erroneously call that to be real which is unreal.

“आत्मस्वरूपात् ‘अन्यत्’... ‘वस्तु नरं’... स्वप्न-माया-मरीच्युदकवदसारम्”

(इ० भा०, 3. 5. 1),

“सतोऽन्यत्वे’ अवृतत्वम्” (का० भा०, 6. 3. 2).

[“The nāma-rūpas, when *separated* from the Atmā and regarded as something self-sufficient and as an independent entity (वस्तु नरं), as something quite another (अन्य) from the Atmā,—become as unessential as a dream, as an illusion, as the appearance of water on the shining surface of a desert”.]

[“When looked upon as something quite *other* than the *Sat* (i. e. the underlying Reality), the Vikāras become false”.]

Thus, under the influence of our Avidyā, we take the effects separated from, outside of, the causal reality underlying them and working among them,—as something *other* (अन्य). Sankara would call it a wrong view. This view arises either by separating Brahma altogether from the world of Nāma-rūpas as an unknowable and unknown something (as has been done by Herbert Spencer), or by entirely reducing the nature of the cause (Brahma) to the nāma-rūpas, taking the latter as all in all and ignoring the separate life of the underlying Brahma, altogether (as the Pantheists of the types of the Vrittikāra do);—this is reducing the cause to the effects, against which Sankara has raised his warning voice ; thus—

“न कारणस्य कार्यात्मत्वं (अनन्यत्वे ऽपि कार्य-कारणयोः)”—ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 9.

(3) “ज्ञस्वरूपाविशेषेऽपि, इतरेतरव्यभिचारात् असत्यत्वं...

सर्वत्र अव्यभिचारात् ज्ञस्वरूपस्य सत्यत्वं ।”

(मा० भा० 7).

["The changing states (of consciousness) are always variable, liable to perpetual transformations—one state continuously supplanting the other state—but what invariably runs through them all is constant. The variability is the mark of their unreality and persistence is the mark of reality."]

Consciousness is present in *each state* (of our consciousness), because consciousness is common to all its states. One state excludes the other, but none of the states can exclude consciousness which is present in each of these states. Thus the states being variable are unreal ; but consciousness is constant and is therefore real.

Compare in this connection the remark—"अन्यथा-भवत्यपि ज्ञातव्ये, न ज्ञातुरन्यथाभावोऽपि, वक्तुमानस्वभावत्वात्" (ब्र० भा०, 2. 3. 7).

We find the following observation elsewhere—

"सर्वत्र हे बुद्धी सर्वैरुपलभ्येते समानाधिकरणे ;—सन् घटः, सन् पट इत्यादि । तयोर्घटादिबुद्धिवैभिरचरति, न तु सद्बुद्धिः" (गौ० भा०, 2. 16').

["Every fact of experience involves two-fold consciousness (बुद्धि)—the consciousness of the real (सन्—Universal) and the consciousness of the unreal (असत्—particulars). Now, that is said to be real of which our consciousness never fails ; and that to be unreal of which our consciousness fails".]

Hence, what is fleeting must be unreal, and what is constant must be real.

In this connection, I would draw your attention to the following definition of unreality—

"यद्विषया बुद्धिव्यभिचरति तत्—'असत्' (गौ० भा० 2. 16).

Also—

"यद्द्रुपेण यन्निरुद्धं तद्द्रुपं व्यभिचरत्—'अस्त'मित्युच्यते" (तै० भा० 2. 1).

"अतः विकारोऽस्तम्" ।

["That is 'unreal' of which our consciousness fails i. e. which is fleeting, not constant".]

["That is 'false' of which the character, determined as it is, fails i. e. which changes in its pre-determined character ; therefore, change-ability is falsehood".]

We find, therefore, that change-ability is the mark of unreality.

(4) There is another way in which Sankara has declared the world as an unreality. Brahma is the sustaining ground—अधिष्ठान—of the world of Nāma-rūpa. If the world of nāma-rūpa is taken as a mask *concealing* the sustaining ground Brahma, if our view is fixed only upon the Nāma-rūpas, such a world Sankara would call to be unreal.—

“नाहं प्रकाशः सर्वस्य योगमाया-समाहतः ।

सूक्ष्मं नानिजानाति” ॥

(गौ० भा०, 7. 25).

[“I am not manifest to all, *veiled* as I am, by Māyā. ; the deluded people know not my real nature (Swarūpa)”.]

The causal reality always lies hidden from view and it is the changing nāma-rūpas (Vikāras) which are always perceptible to us—“प्राकृतविषयविकारविज्ञानैः प्रच्छन्नम्” (कठ० 2. 12).—It is for this reason that Sankara in several places has defined the changing differences of the world as visible and Brahma which is beyond modifications as invisible—

“दृश्यं नाम विकारो, दर्शनार्थत्वात् विकारस्य । न

दृश्यम् अदृश्यं—अविकारः । अविकारश्च ब्रह्म”—

(तै० भा०, 2. 7).

Thus when our view is fixed exclusively upon the changing names and forms which conceal Brahma, and when in this way they are looked upon as something *other* (अन्य) than Brahma, they become unreal, false. But if we can take these nāma-rūpas as ब्रह्म-लिङ्ग—as *expressing* the characteristics of Brahma, then such a world of nāma-rūpas cannot be charac-

terised as unreal, because such a world would help us to realise the Absolute Reality—Brahma—
 ‘ब्रह्मदर्शनोपायत्वे नैव विनियुज्यते..... न स्वतन्त्रफलाय’ ।
 “स्रष्टृत्वादि.....नामरूपनिर्वहणाभिधानादेव.....‘ब्रह्मलिङ्ग’-
 मभिहितं भवति” (ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 3. 41.)

How does the world of Nāma-rūpa conceal the Absolute Reality? Sankara explains it in his commentary on the *Brahma-Sutra* (1. 3. 1.); thus—

Brahma is the ground (आयतन) of the differences of Nāma-rūpa. When we reduce the ground entirely to the world of names and forms, the ground to our view loses its independent existence and takes the form of the world, and is present now in the form of Nāma-rūpas. In this way, Brahma becomes—“स-प्रपञ्च”—i. e. something composite—“द्रव्यं विक्रियात्मकं सावयवञ्च स्यात्” (कठ० भा०). That is to say, Brahma would now appear as an aggregate or sum-total of the differences of nāma-rūpa merely. This is His विशिष्टरूप । When this happens, only the *names and forms* are present before us and not anything else. This erroneous view Sankara explains thus in his commentary on the *Bṛihadāranyaka-Upanishad*—

“केनचिदस्युष्टस्वभावमपि सत्, नामरूपकृतकार्यकरणोपाधिभ्यो विवेकेन नावधार्यते, नामरूपोपाधिदृष्टिरेव भवति स्वाभाविकौ, तदा सर्वोऽयं ‘वस्तुन्तरास्तिल-व्यवहारः’;—अस्ति चार्थं भेदकतो मिथ्याव्यवहारः” (3. 5. 1). “सप्रपञ्चत्वं ब्रह्मणः प्रसज्यते” (ब्र० सू० भा०, 3. 2. 21).

[“When the Absolute Reality which is always unaffected by anything cannot be discriminated by us from the adjuncts of the finite material and psychical elements produced by the Nāma-rūpas, then it is that our view becomes naturally fixed exclusively upon these finite names and forms and all these

differences of names and forms appear to us as so many independent entities. Thus arises our erroneous view of the differences of the things of our practical life"; "and in this manner the underlying Reality is taken as a *composite* whole."]

But if, instead of such a view, we can feel and recognise the presence of Brahma everywhere in the world, if the objects are not looked upon as something *other* than Brahma but as manifestations—expressions—of the nature of the highest reality, this, according to Sankara, is the real view of the world. The idea of *Anyatwa* (अन्यत्वं) would be supplanted by the idea of the presence of Brahma in all things—as the expression of Brahma everywhere. This is the correct view of the world—

‘यदा तु परमार्थदृष्ट्या, परमतत्त्वात् ‘अन्यत्वेन’ विरुध्यमाणे नाम-रूपे
...‘वस्तु न्तरे’ तत्त्वतो न सः,...तदा परमार्थदर्शनगोचरत्वं प्रतिपद्यते’’
(*Ibid*, 3. 5. 1.)

Also— .

‘सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चस्य वृत्तप्रतिपत्त्यर्थतां दर्शयति’’ (ब्र० सू०, भा० 1. 4. 14).

‘परिणामश्रुतिः...वृत्तात्मभावप्रतिपादनार्था’’ (ब्र० भा०, 2. 1. 27.)

[“All the Srutis describing the creation of the world of names and forms, all the Srutis describing the changes or modifications are to be taken only for the purpose of the knowledge, through them, of the nature of the Absolute Reality.”]

(5) The differences of *nāma-rūpas* are called *Māyā*, since these are all described as *आगन्तुक* (accidental), in as much as they are produced by some stimulating cause (कारक), in the absence of which they do not appear—“आगन्तुकेन नामरूपेण” (ब्र० भा०, 4. 4. 5).

As the differences of names, and forms are *आगन्तुक* (*āgantuka*) or accidental, they appear for a time, work for some time and then disappear and are

supplanted by others, in connection with their external causes. But the real nature of a thing is not of such a character ;—it is constant, abiding in its own *Swarupa* or nature which is uniformly the same, as Sankara declares—

“आगन्तुकं हि वस्तु निराक्रियते, न स्वरूपं ।

न हि आत्मा आगन्तुकः कस्यचित्, स्वयं सिद्धत्वात्”—

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 3. 7.)

[“What is due to some external cause which stimulates it or brings it into being, can be easily repudiated ; but not so with the real nature of a thing. The Self is eternally abiding in its own nature and as such, it cannot be got rid of”.]

I can put aside the notion of reality of all other things, but I can never be relieved of the sense of *my own* reality. The differences of *nāma-rūpa* are the result of the activity of something beyond them ; they change their forms with the change of their stimulating cause (कारक-व्यापार). This change-able character of their forms marks them, according to Sankara, as *unreal*.

In this connection, we must note an important fact. These particular differences which are produced by the action of some accidental (आगन्तुक) cause, must have a ‘*nature*’ underlying these particular differences. For, Sankara tells us in another connection, the production being a sort of activity, it implies the *agent* of this activity—

“उत्पत्तिश्च नाम क्रिया, सा सकर्तृ कौव भवितुमर्हति ।

क्रिया च नाम स्यात्, अकर्तृ का चेति—विप्रतिषिध्येत”

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 18).

[“An activity is there, but there is no one who acts,—is contradictory”.]

We cannot, therefore, conceive of activity without thinking of something which is active; and activities are referred to definite centres to which they belong and do not fly to and fro. If you resolve the centre entirely into its activity, it would have no nature or character of its own, in virtue of which it maintains a continuity between its past and present. A reference to that which is other than itself (i. e. its कारक) implies a reference to its own Self or its own nature (स्वरूप). Thus this two-fold relation, to Self and to other-than-Self i. e. स्वरूप and बाह्यरूप is essential to all objects (Vide. ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 2. 17.)

(6) The world of nāma-rūpa—विषय—we represent to us in terms of our own mind and the senses (अन्तःकरण). The one involves the other; for, both are of the same nature. Sankara tells us—

“विषय-समानजातीयं करणं मन्यते श्रुतिः, न तु जात्यन्तरं। विषयस्वैव स्वात्मयादृक्कलेन संस्थानान्तरं करणं नाम।...सर्वविषयविशेषाणामिव स्वात्मविशेष-प्रकाशकलेन संस्थानान्तराणि करणानि” (इ० भा०, 2. 4. 11).

[“The *Sruti* regards our subjective senses as of the same nature with our experienced objects, and not of different essence. The senses are but another form or phase (संस्थान) which the experienced objects have assumed with a view to come to a comprehension of their own nature as the objects of senses. For the manifestation of, or with a view to give expression to, what infinite wealth the objects contain in their own nature,—the objects have taken the forms of the subjective senses”.]

The *Mundaka* also states the same thing in a different way—

“दर्शनश्रवणमननविज्ञानाद्युपाधिधर्मैराविभूतं सत् लक्ष्यते हृदि गुहायां
—अन्तःकरणे कोषे—सर्वप्रमाणानां” (2. 2. 1 & 9.)—

[“In the inner and exterior senses of the finite

Selves its nature is expressed through the cognitions of sight, hearing, reflections and intellect—“आत्मस्वरूपोपलब्धिस्थानत्वात्”—which are the places of its expression.”]

We thus find that there is no difference in kind between the physical and the organic world. The same reality is present in two different aspects, which are distinguishable from each other, but *essentially* identical. It appears then that whenever our outer senses and our inner sense (अन्तःकरण) are more and more developed, the aspect of the world (विषय) will change its feature. The world, therefore, as it appears to us at the present moment cannot be taken as rigidly fixed and final in its form. The appearances of the world, as we take it, must therefore be unreal. Our knowledge works with the subject-object relation—“अयमहमिति विषयेण विषयिणः सामानाधिकरण्योपचारात्” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 4. 7), or in other words, we are concerned always with *Adhyāsa* as Sankara would say. Our thought cannot go beyond this *relation*. It attributes ‘what’ to ‘that’. But that is not the true nature of the Reality. In this way, in Sankara-Vedānta, such *relative* view of the Empirical world may be called unreal.

Now, all these arguments can be brought to a focus and the conclusion arrived at as the result of this discussion points to the fact that there is an Immutable and Eternal Principle behind the process of the world. The changes going on in the world are not mere capricious variations—“नापि अप्रवृत्तिः, उन्नतप्रवृत्तिर्वा”—(ब्र० सू० 2. 1. 33), nor the dances of mad energies, but an advancement, a methodically gradual

progress—“उत्तरोत्तरमाविस्तरत्वमात्मनः (ऐ० आ० भा०) which the mundane process involves. This regularity (रचना—ब्र० भा०) proves the presence and working, throughout the process, of such a principle and it is deeper than any such process ; for, the process is always changing in its elements. It is that transcendent Principle behind it which is finding its *expression* in the process. It is wrong therefore to *separate* the latter from the underlying Principle taking the process of nāma-rūpa itself to be all-in-all. Such a view is an unreal view, according to Sankara. Sankara thus summarises his final opinion—

“As a *player* (नट) taking on successive characters upon himself, enacts on the stage the parts of each of these characters in succession but yet retains his *own distinct* character ; so the underlying Causal Unity (मूलकारणमेव), retaining its own distinct identity, realises itself successively in each of the changing effects produced” (ब्र० सू० भा० 2. 1. 18. and 1. 3. 19.)

Compare also—

“परमेश्वर एव तेन तेनात्मना अवतिष्ठमानो तं तं
विकारं सृजति”।

It is He who assumes all these forms, but He does not become changed by these assumed forms under which He appears. For, Sankara quotes here the lines—“यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्...पृथिवीमन्तरो यमयति..... &c. &c- इति ‘साध्यक्षाणां’ भूतानां प्रवृत्तिं दर्शयति” (ब्र० भा० 2. 3. 13). It is His immanent activity directing and controlling (यमयति) the process of the world and guiding it in its upward progressive path.

This is the true significance of the term *Māyā* as applied to Nāma-rūpas in the Sankara-Vedānta, and of the term *Māyāvi* applied to the Supreme Reality, who in connection with the Nāma-rūpas appears in various forms.

Herbert Spencer's conclusion that 'we know only the manifestations, but what is manifested is unknown and unknowable to us'—is entirely opposed to Sankara's idea. In Māndukya-bhāṣya Sankara tells us that it is the manifestations which enable us to realise the nature of what is manifested, to a certain extent. Were there no manifestations, the underlying Reality would remain quite shut out from our knowledge and would itself be unreal.—

“कार्येण हि लिङ्गेन कारण-ब्रह्मज्ञानार्थं सृष्टिश्रुतीनां
...तच्चेदसद्भवेत्, न तेन सम्बन्धधीरिति कारणमपि
असदेव स्यात् ।”—

It is the manifestations that throw light upon what is manifested ; they do not serve any independent purpose or use—“स्वतन्त्रम् अफलं” ।

The names and forms, to the ordinary people appear, no doubt, as *concealing* Brahma and therefore to be something quite *other* (अन्य) existing on their own account, but the truly initiated know all the while that Brahma itself expresses itself in them.—

“ब्रह्मरूपवशात् च आकाशाद्यन्नमयान् कार्यं प्रदर्शितम्” (तै० 2. 6.)

[“The effects beginning from the ether and ending in the sheath composed of *Anna* are to lead to the apprehension of the nature of Brahma. Only for this end, the evolution of the effects is described”.]

(7) I should like to point out another important fact in connection with what has just been stated. In section (6) above, we have shown that the object (विषय) and the subjective senses (इन्द्रिय & अन्तःकरण) are essentially of the same nature. Matter and mind are not antithetical and independent substances having nothing in common. If they were absolutely opposed to each other, how could the subject be aware of the object? Consciousness which is a unity involves the knower and the known and must therefore transcend them and at the same time express itself in the two.

“अध्यात्माधिदैवतयोः परस्परौपकार्योपकारकत्वात्...

...एकस्य सत्यस्य ब्रह्मणः संस्थानविशेषौ”

(इ० भा०, 5. 5. 2).

“मामेव उभय-रूपेण—क्षेत्र-क्षेत्रज्ञरूपेण—स्थितं विद्धि”

(गी०, 13. 2. नीलकण्ठ).

It is thus that the subject is capable of knowing the object, and the object also is capable of coming into relation with the subject. As the same Spirit works in both the subject and the object, the object does not, in reality resist or oppose, but conforms itself to the subject and there is adaptability between the two. As the object or the system of things expresses the Self behind it, it has been possible for our mind to know it, and that nature can respond to the forms of our knowledge, and that nature serves the purpose (परार्थ) of the Spirit. Thus we find that the elements from the inorganic world are absorbed by the organic beings

which become constituents in their life—“भूतानां शरीरारम्भकत्वेन उपकारात्” (मधुविद्या in वृ० भा०). If we take the object not as परार्थ i. e. not serving the purpose of the Spirit, and not mutually benefitting each other (परस्पररोपकार्योपकारकत्वात् ‘मधुत्व’—वृ० भा०) but as *opposed* and *independent* entities, Sankara would declare it to be *unreal* and *false*.



Sankara-Vedānta is not Pantheism.

—:0:—

From a perusal of Sankara's commentaries, it appears that a kind of Pantheism was current in his time and it went by the name of one Vrittikāra who held it. He reduced unity to multiplicity—Brahma or the Self to the changing nāma-rūpas. In this view, Brahma was looked upon as the whole and the differentiations of names and forms including the finite Spirits, as parts of that whole—as modes of its self-expression—as mere reproduction of the whole. Thus the Vrittikāra made Brahma as composed of parts—अनेकात्मक । But yet, most inconsistently, he looked upon *both* the unity and the multiplicity to be equally *real*. * He failed to develop the logical consequences of his own premises.

Sankara, in several parts of his commentaries on some of the most important Upanishads and on the *Brahma-Sutra* and on the *Gītā* has criticised this theory. He put the theory to severe test and exposing its inconsistency and inaccuracy, exploded it. It cannot, in the face of such criticism, be held that Sankara's own theory is no more than Pantheism, as

* *Vrittikāra's* view has been thus stated by Sankara in ३० भा०, 5. 1. 1.—“एवञ्च द्वैताद्वैतात्मकमेकं ब्रह्म । यथा किल समुद्रो जल-तरङ्ग-फेन-बुद्बुदात्मक एव; यथा च जलं सत्यं, तदुद्बवाद्य तरङ्ग-फेन-बुद्बुदादयः समुद्रात्मभूता एव.....पर-मार्थसत्य एव” &c. &c. So also in other places.

stated by some of his critics. We would quote here the opinions of one or two of such critics :—

The writer of the "*Indian Theism*" thus observes—

"India has always been recognised as so determinedly *Pantheistic* in its religious thoughts that 'Indian Theism' will seem to many an unnatural collocation of words. There are some who will maintain that whatever can be so described is really foreign to the Indian spirit."

Yet another——

"The later doctrine of Sankara may be named *Pantheism*—strange as its pantheism is—for it says that Brahma is all, because all but Brahma is false."

Dr. Flint in his "*Ante-Theistic Theories*" says——

"In the *Pantheism* of the Vedānta doctrine the finite is lost in the Infinite. Along with the affirmation of an impersonal God, there is the negation of the reality of the worlds—both of sense and consciousness. In other words, the issue of this kind of Pantheism is a-cosmism. But Pantheism is just as likely to issue in atheism."

Dr. Galloway writes——

"Even the distinction of worshipper and worshipped dwindles and fades, till the Hindu thinker recognised that he was one with All, with Brahma. The very appearance of difference is explained away, it is the product of illusion. The Vedānta is a strict *Pantheism*".

To show the injustice made by these and other writers of their train, I should like to give here the tenour of Sankara's criticism of this Pantheism from which it will be seen that Sankara can never be held

to be a Pantheist and it was something very different from Pantheism which he preached and wrote.

I have said that the Vrittikāra reduced the unity (Brahma) into the differences of nāma-rūpa. Sankara in his criticism of this theory of the Vrittikāra argues that when the differences emerge, the underlying unity does not and cannot become entirely reduced to them. It retains its unity, its own character, its separate substantial life, behind these differences. As the plurality of the nāma-rūpa arises, the unity does not become something else, losing its own nature in them.—

“यद्वर्त्मकी यः पदार्थः प्रमाणोनावगतो भवति, स देश-कालावस्थान्तरिष्वपि तद्वर्त्मक एव भवति, स चेत् तद्वर्त्मकत्वं व्यभिचरति, सर्व्वः प्रमाणव्यवहारो लुपेत”

(ब्र०, भा०, 2. 1. 20).

[“When by all manner of proofs a thing is known to be of such and such essential nature, it cannot lose that essential nature, through the change or alteration of its place, time and states. If its essential nature changes, all proofs will lose their validity.”]

And also—

“न हि विशेषदर्शनमात्रेण वस्तु न्यत्वं भवति...स एवेति प्रत्यभिज्ञानात्”

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 18.)

[“The appearance of a thing in a particular form does not make it something *other* than it.....it is recognisable as the same identical thing—in this changed form.”]

The reason is, says Sankara, that the unity, when it is reduced in its entirety into the multiplicity cannot retain its distinct character, a separate life of its own ; for, it is now present in the form of many, it is now present as—अनिकात्मक, something composite, something composed of parts, as सावयव !

It is forgotten that what is composite, what is सावयव cannot be eternal ; for, being composed of parts, it must be perishable—*Vikāri*—“सावयवस्य अनेकात्मकस्य क्रियावतो नित्यत्वानुपपत्तेः” (ब्र० भा०, 5. 1. 1). The unity of which the Vrittikāra still speaks of is an abstract unity, a mere empty logical abstraction—a mere unity of aggregate. For, the so-called unity has now no existence except in the form of multiplicity ; because it has no nature by which it is recognisable *apart* from the many. It is a contentless *abstract* idea in general. Hence, argues Sankara, it cannot be held to be real. It is a mere unity of collection, aggregate of parts. And the parts,—the differences—(of which the whole is a mechanical aggregate of disconnected parts) with no organising principle behind to connect them would be an unreality. For, mere differences, haphazard changes, with no purpose—no plan—no end—to govern them and to connect them are unreal, according to Sankara. He says—

“न हि 'निरात्मक' किञ्चित् व्यवहाराय अवकल्पते” —

[“What has no self or nature *behind* it cannot be put to any use in practical life”.] .

The finite selves also, being, according to Vrittikāra's view, mere phases or reproductions of an indeterminate whole have no real life, no character, of *their own*. Mere parts unrelated to, and separated from, any organising unity behind them are, in Sankara's opinion, unreal.

In this way, Sankara has shown that *both* the unity and multiplicity cannot be held to be *equally* real, as the Vrittikāra supposes in his own theory.

Sankara shows in the following extracts that “it is a self-contradiction to speak of Brahma as possessed of all specific attributes (Multiplicity) and at the same time as devoid of all specific attributes (Unity)”—

“नहि एकस्य ब्रह्मणः परिणामधर्मवत्त्वं तद्रहितत्वञ्च
शक्यं प्रतिपत्तुं...नहि कूटस्थस्य ब्रह्मणः...अनेकधर्मा-
श्रयत्वं सम्भवति (ब्र०, 2. 1. 14).

“विशिष्टशक्तिमत्त्वप्रदर्शनं विशेषप्रतिषेधश्च इति
विप्रतिषिद्ध” (गी० भा०, 13. 12).

“कथम् एकस्य आत्मनः अशनायायतीतत्वं, तद्वत्त्वञ्च
—इति विरुद्धधर्मसमवायित्वमिति” (ब्र० भा०, 3. 5. 1.)

“न हि एकं वस्तु परमार्थतः कर्त्तादिविशेषवत्,
तच्छून्यञ्च—इतुप्रभवथा द्रष्टुं शक्यते” (तै० 1. 12).

But in Sankara's *Advaita-Vāda* no such absurdity as noticed above may arise. In his own theory, the 'One' is the Reality which has a 'nature' of its own, which is self-sufficient and independent (स्वतःसिद्ध), and which is permanent, eternal and which for ever retains its own uniform character, and it is not subject to any change, any transformation. It is Brahma who has taken upon Himself the various forms of नाम-रूप, who has assumed the form of this world with a view to reveal, to a certain extent, the infinite and inexhaustible treasure which His nature contains. And the world of nāma-rūpas—although distinguishable from Him, being a partial expression of Himself,—cannot be taken as a separate and independent whole.—

“यदात्मके नामरूपे...यश्च ताभ्यां नामरूपाभ्यां विलक्षणः, स्वतो नित्यशुद्ध-
बुद्धसुखमायः” (इ०, भा०, 1. 4. 7).

“न हि दृष्टं दृष्टं ‘रयान्तरं’ ; तस्यैव तेन तेन रूपेण मायाविवत् प्रवस्थानात्”

(इ० भा०—आ० गिरि, 1. 4. 5).

[“Names and forms have their essence in Brahma and are therefore non-different from it.....But Brahma is different from these names and forms.”]

[“The created (world) is not something different and not a separate entity from the Creator ; for, it is the Creator Himself who stands in the forms of such and such objects, like a juggler (मायावी) who shows himself under different assumed forms,—without being affected or altered by these objects or forms”.]

With a view to impress upon us this fact, the Sruti declares—“रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपी—‘वह्निश्च’—(वह्निश्च—i.e. स्वेन अविज्ञतेन रूपेण आकाशवत्’)—कठ० भा०, 5. 10.

“He has Himself assumed the forms of the innumerable Nāma-rupas, but yet He stands *beyond* them ; that is to say—this world is to be regarded as only a very partial and inadequate expression of the infinite and unfathomable depth of His resources, and thus the world is *distinguishable* from Him, though it is not a separate or a different (अन्य) entity”—

“यथैव हि ब्रह्मणो जगदुत्पत्तिः श्रूयते, एवं विकारव्यतिरेकेणापि ब्रह्मणोऽ-
वस्थानं * श्रूयते” (ब्र० सू० भा०, 2. 1. 27).

[“As the world has come out of Brahma, so also Brahma stands beyond the world distinguished from it”.]

* cf. “यस्य आत्मनोऽपगमे क्षणमात्रात् कार्य-करणकक्षापरूपं सर्वमिदं हतवत्त्वं विध्वस्तं भवति विनष्टं भवति, ‘सोऽन्यः’ सिद्ध आत्मा” (कठ० भा०, 5. 4). Brahma is thus the sustaining ground of the modifications of नाम-रूपस, which, if removed from behind them,—will leave all these immediately annihilated.

Sankara asks—"why has Brāhma taken upon Himself the various forms of names and forms" ?—

“किमर्थं पुनः प्रतिरूपागमनं तस्य इतुच्यते” ?

He thus answers—

“अदि हि नाम-रूपे न व्याक्रियेते, तदा अस्यात्मनो निरुपाधिकं रूपं प्रज्ञान-
घनाख्यं न प्रतिख्यायित।.....यदा पुनः नामरूपे...व्याकृते भवतः, तदा अस्य रूपं
प्रतिख्यायित” (ब्र० भा०, 2. 5. 11).

[“If there were no unfolding of the names and forms in the world, there would be no manifestation of the Absolute which is eternal consciousness in its nature...Through the unfolding of the names and forms, His nature became manifested, His consciousness found its expression.”]

The नामरूपाः which are the multiple expressions of the nature of Brahma cannot, therefore, be independently real ; but they are real only in connection with the unity of Brahma of which they are the expressions. It follows, therefore, that the ‘unity’ is the true reality. A thing cannot be both ‘one’ and ‘multiple’ in its true nature. If it be one, it cannot be manifold. If it be manifold, it cannot be one. The relation between the unity and the multiplicity—is not like the temporal relation of succession which obtains between the antecedent and its consequent phenomena. The unity stands unaffected amidst the multiplicity. It is a relation, says Sankara, like the relation of a piece of rope and the serpent appearing upon it.—

“रज्ज्वादेहरगाद्यैः सम्बन्धवदस्य दृश्यसम्बन्धः”

(Sankara's *Swātma-Nirupana*, 72).

Also—

“रज्ज्वामिव सर्पः” (खे० भा०, 1. 6).

That is to say, Sankara's idea is that there is an intimate relation between the two, yet the unity stands behind the multiplicity of names and forms unaffected by it. The unity cannot be reduced to the multiplicity. The Vrittikāra, Sankara thinks, was possessed by a feeling of Divine immanence, rather than Divine transcendence. The world, to him, was the *direct* representation of the Divine. He was satisfied with looking upon सामानाधिकरण्य (relation of identity or co-ordination) between God and the world.

(1) Sankara in numerous places has employed certain illustrations to bring out the relation between the Absolute Reality Brahma and its appearances of नामरूप । Some of the illustrations are—the sea-water and the forms of waves, billows, ripples, bubbles &c., the clay and its successive transformations, viz : the (powders) fragments (चूर्ण), the lump (पिण्ड), the pot (घट) &c. ; the tree and its successive developments in the forms of sprouts, branches, flowers, leaves etc. We are not to understand by these illustrations the ordinary phenomenal relations which subsist between the antecedent and consequent states of things.

“न हि जननमरणाद्यनर्थाशतसहस्रभेदसमाकुलं समुद्रवनादिवत् सावयवं अनेक-
रसं ब्रह्म—ध्येयत्वे न ज्ञेयत्वे न वा श्रुत्या उपदिश्यते” (वृ० 5. 1. 1.).

[‘Nowhere the Sruti holds the nature of ब्रह्म as composite, as consisting of thousands of differences and distinctions, such as the ocean composed of billows, foams, waves, or as the forest consisting of trees, bushes &c. &c. Such (composite) ब्रह्म is neither to be known nor to be worshipped.’]

The main purpose of these illustrations is to show that as the real causal substance stands unaffected behind, untouched by the changes ; so Brahma as the true causal power remains unaffected as the sustaining ground (अधिष्ठान) of the perpetually changing world of नामरूपः. * This is the relation between the two.

(2) Every true cause is a centre of power ; it is a source of power which is liberated on the occasion of its stimulation by something else. As a *cause* it is a source of power, but this power is *manifested* gradually in its activities in successive stages. These activities are its effects which are the result of relation between the Subject and the Object—“विषयेषु विषयिणः सामानाधिकरन्धोपचारात्” —ब्र० 1. 4. 7.—“विषय-विषयिलक्षणम् अनेकात्मभावगमनम्” —प्र० 4. 5. Both are *more* than these activities which cannot exhaust them. The Subject or the Object is *present* in all its *manifestations* which cannot be resolved into mere changes and which is *more* than the sum of the changes. Phenomena by themselves are not true causes. Every phenomenon arises out of something which is not a phenomenon. It is wrong to regard phenomena as causes of phenomena and ignore the non-phenomenal power underlying them. Sankara has pointed our attention to this transcendental cause as the true cause. He is not willing to regard the invariable *antecedent phenomena* as the true causes of the consequent phenomena. He remarks—

* “अनेकधादर्शनापवादाच्च ‘सृष्ट्योः स स्रुतामाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति’ इति... निन्दितत्वात् न द्रष्टव्य” (ब्र० 5. 1.)

“नासावुपसृद्यमाना पूर्वावस्था उत्तरावस्थायाः कारण-
मभ्युपगम्यते, अनुपसृद्यमानानामेव अनुयायिनां (conti-
nued identity) वीजाद्यवयवानां अङ्कुरादिकारणभावा-
भ्युपगमात् (ब्र० सू०, 2. 2. 26).

“After the disappearance of the antecedent state, the consequent state is produced ; but we do not wish to regard the former as the cause of the latter. The true cause rather is that which cannot disappear or change its character, which remains identical with itself, and is constantly present in all the stages.”

The phenomenal cause is no true cause ; for, what we call as cause is really the effect and not a cause at all. It is rather the *expression* in time of the true cause which transcends time-order, which is beyond time. It can originate effects in nature by itself, not as a result of, or determined by, any antecedent in time-series. In empirical effect, its ground must always be a past phenomenon, but the true transcendental cause does not follow the order in time. It is outside the time-series.

(3) The relation of the underlying principle to the objects is not the same as the relation of one of the objects to others. The principle of unity through which the objects are related to one another is not one of them and is not itself subject to the relations of which it is the source. The phenomenal causal determination is determination from *without* ; but Brahma is not *external* to the world and cannot, therefore, be the cause or effect of it. Brahma and the world are not *external* to each other ; but the world is the aspect of the nature of Brahma ; neither

of these has the nature of its own apart from the other—"असति आत्मनः प्रविभक्ते वस्तुन्तरे, असति च आत्मनि ततः प्रविभक्ते"—बृ• 4.3.31. The world is a self-expression of Brahma and is, therefore, non-different (अनन्य) from it, has no real existence *apart* from Brahma—"सतोऽन्यत्वे अनृतत्वम्" ।

(4) Here in this connection I would invite your attention to the story found in the Brihadāranyaka Upanishad of king Ajāta-satru and Vālāki. King Ajāta-satru of Benares was a real ब्रह्मज्ञ; he corrected the misconception of a Brahmin youth named Vālāki who like a Pantheist seems to have resolved all individuals into a mere tissue of relations and qualities within a whole. He divided the objects of the world into three main classes—आधिदैविक (cosmic), आधिभौतिक (physical or material) and आध्यात्मिक (psychical); and he seems to have thought that a general mind (प्राण) is entirely immanent in all objects and minds, and so, it means that apart from its presence in the minds of the individuals, it would have no existence, nor can individuals have any being in themselves apart from the general mind. You cannot say that "I" have an individuality of my own or a definite purpose of my own; for, "I" am nothing else than a particular modification of Prāna—the whole, and "I" represent Prāna in some definite aspects. The individuality of myself as well as of others is only apparent—the result of reciprocal relation and connection which give a meaning and place within the whole. All those objects—the sun, the moon, the cow, the man &c. which, in this view, are mere phases of the प्राण-ब्रह्म, are but the manifestations of one Prāna in

some determined phase. For, it is the Prāna which is *entirely* immanent in each of us. In this way, Vālāki took all the objects as mere phases of Brahma or Prāna. Ajāta-satru corrected this view. In our opinion, Sankarāchāryya did not appear to have abolished the individuals. Sankara in his criticism of the Nyāya theory of causality, has incidentally shown that all objects have a स्वरूप and a वाच्य-रूप or सम्बन्धिरूप ;—that is to say, the objects must be something *for themselves* ere they can be something to *one another*. The connection of individuals shows that they all depend on a *common ground* and this makes possible that interaction among themselves—“परस्पररोपकारार्थोपकारकत्व’ तदेकसामान्यात्मकं एककारणात्मकत्व’ दृष्टम्”। If you assume, like the Pantheists, that the individual is simply its *relations*, then it may be deprived of any being for itself (स्वरूप) in one Identity—in the whole—which comprehends all, where all the elements are determined in *relation* to one another and to the whole. But, if in one sense, the qualities or universal relations belong to the Reality as a whole, these are grounded in the various activities of *individual* objects. In this immanent view, the distinctive differences which separate the experiences of one Self from another would be unintelligible. But the Transcendental Principle does not reduce these individual centres to mere appearances, but connects and correlates them so that each may serve the purpose of the whole ; yet it allows to each its own functions and activities, as it *distinguishes* itself

from them and is not *lost* in the elements it unifies and connects.

(5) Now, we shall invite your notice to some of the places where, and the manner in which, the theory of Pantheism is described and criticised and refuted by Sankara—

(a) Brahma-Sutra, II. 1. 14—

“ननु अनेकात्मकं ब्रह्म । यथा वृक्षोऽनेकशाखः, एवमनेकशक्तिप्रवृत्तियुक्तं ब्रह्म । अतः एकत्वं नानात्मस्य उभयमपि सत्यमेव । यथा वृक्ष इत्येकत्वं, शाखा इति च नानात्वं । यथा समुद्रात्मना एकत्वं, फेनबुद्बुदात्मना नानात्वं । यथा सृदात्मना एकत्वं, घटशरावाद्यात्मना नानात्वं ।...नैवं स्यात्, प्रकृतिमात्रस्य दृष्टान्ते सत्त्वावधारणात् । (१) न हि एकस्य ब्रह्मणः परिणामधर्मत्वं तद्रहितत्वञ्च शक्यं प्रतिपत्तुं । न हि कूटस्थस्य ब्रह्मणः...अनेकधर्मोत्पत्त्यत्वं सम्भवति । (२) न च यथा ब्रह्मणः आत्मैकत्वदर्शनं मीक्षसाधनं, एवं जगदाकारपरिणामित्वदर्शनमपि स्वतन्त्रमेव कश्चिच्चिन्त फलाय श्रवकल्पते । न हि परिणामिवत्त्वविज्ञानात् परिणामवत्त्वमात्मनः फलं स्यात्” ।

We give the sense of the above—

It is the cause which transforms itself into effects. It is the cause which is ‘one’, but has divided itself into ‘many’ forms and appeared as the world of नामरूपः । The sea is one, but it has taken the forms of wave, bubble, ripple &c. The clay is one, but it is many in the form of plates, pots &c. The tree as tree is one, but it has manifested itself as twig, branch, flower &c. The Absolute Reality (Brahma) has appeared as the world of many qualities, forms, activities &c. That is to say, this world is His nature ; there is no other nature than this world which may be said to be separate from the world. For, Brahma has entirely

manifested Himself—His nature—in the changing forms.

Describing in this way his opponent's view, Sankara criticises thus—

A thing cannot be one and also many *at the same time*. If the 'one' be real, the 'many' must be unreal. Again, if 'many' be real,—if you regard the various changing states to be real, in that case, the 'one' cannot be real. When an object is changed into various forms and qualities, it loses its one-ness, it is now composed of many forms &c. Since it was one, which is now present in the shape of many forms ; its unity has now disappeared ; Brahma is thus something composite, manifold (अनेकात्मक) in its nature. This is the view of Divine immanence ; there is thus a सामानाधिकरण्य between ब्रह्म and the world. This is वृत्तिकार's idea.

Sankara then goes on to state his own theory, thus—

These manifested changes, no doubt, constitute the world ; but Brahma transcends them all, and hence it is separate, and distinct and distinguished from them. Brahma has got a nature of its own different from the changing objects—names and forms. It has appeared as the world, has assumed the forms of नाम-रूप, remaining unaffected by these, in its own nature. No finite form can adequately manifest Him. The world cannot reveal the depth of the Divine nature. It exists beyond all changes, all transformations. It is not its entire nature that has appeared in the form of the world. In and through all changes, the identity of its essence can

be recognised. You cannot, therefore, look upon the nature of Brahma as *composed of these changes*.

(b) Sankara thus observes in वृ० 2. 1. 20.—“यदि च ब्रह्मणश्चित्रपटवत् वृक्षसमुद्रादिवच्च उत्पत्त्याद्यनेकधर्मविचित्रता विजिग्राहयिषिता, एकरसं अनन्तरमवाह्यं इति नोपसंहरिष्यत्... ‘य इह नानैव पश्यति’ इति निन्दावचनञ्च न प्रायोच्छ्यत्” । “His *unity* does not become *composite* by the productions of नामरूप, like a tree composed of its branches, flowers ; and a cloth dyed with variegated colours. Then ब्रह्म would not have been described as of uniform nature (एकरस)”.

Pantheism, as we have stated above, reduces the finite Self also to certain states and activities ; certain relations. The sum-total of these qualities, relations, senses etc. constituted the nature of the individual Self. But Sankara has shown that the real essence (स्वरूप) of the finite, empirical Self is what underlies these relations and qualities, unaffected by them—

“शरीरस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वमुपदिश्यते । ब्रह्मात्मत्वमभुपगम्यमानं, स्वाभाविकस्य शरीरात्मत्वस्य वाचकं सम्पद्यते” ।.....न अनेकात्मकब्रह्मकल्पनावकाशोऽस्ति ।”

(c) Brihadāranyaka, II. 1. 20—

“अनेकद्रव्यसमाहारस्य सावयवस्य परमात्मनः पूर्वसंस्थानावस्थस्य वा परस्य एकदेशो विक्रियते ; सर्व्व एव वा परः परिणमेत् । अथ नित्यायुतसिद्धावयवानुगतः अवयवो पर आत्मा, तस्य तदवस्थस्य एकदेशो विज्ञानात्मा—तदापि सर्व्वावयवानुगतत्वात् अवयविन एव अवयवगतो दोषो गुणो वा इति विज्ञानात्मनः स सारिन्द्रदोषेण पर एवात्मा संवध्यते—इयमपि अनिष्टकल्पना ।”

“Some hold the view that Brahma is the *whole*, and what constitutes that whole must be its *parts*. What we find in the form of manifestations, must necessarily be the parts of Brahma—the

whole. He has divided Himself into several parts and the manifested names and forms constitute those parts. For, the sum-total of the parts gives us the whole. How can the parts then exist apart from the whole? The faults and merits belonging to the parts must necessarily affect the whole. For, how can the whole exist apart from the parts constituting it? The finite Selves also being the constituent parts of Brahma—the whole, must affect Brahma when they are affected by pleasure or pain. But the pain which I feel cannot, at one and the same time, be my pain and a part of God's perfect experience."

Sankara also remarks here that it is the essence of the conscious Self to be for Self, to distinguish itself from all other things. How can the finite minds as consciousness, interpenetrate or merge into one another? But in the Pantheistic view, the finite Self would lose his own स्वरूप; for, it would merge in God's consciousness.—

'एकदेशैकदेशिकल्पना च ब्रह्मणि अनुपपन्ना।.....एतेषु पक्षेषु अनिर्वाच-
प्रसङ्गः, स'सायात्मत्वानिर्वाचिः, निर्वचनी वा स्वरूपनाशप्रसङ्गः।'

(d) Brihadāranyaka, IV. 3. 30—

'अत्र केचित् व्याचक्षते—आत्मवस्तुनः स्त एव एकलं नानात्वञ्च। यथा
गोद्रव्यतया एकलं साक्षाद्दीनां धर्मोणां परस्परतो भेदः। तथा निरवयवेषु अमूर्त्त-
वस्तुषु एकलं नानात्वञ्च अनुमेयम्।...न, अन्यपरत्वात्।.....न च निरवयवेषु
अनेकात्मकता शक्यते कल्पयितुं। सा च क्रिया नैव अविशेषे सम्भवति, तथा
धर्मभेदाः।' (Also vide—इ० भा० 5. 1. 1.)

"Atmā", the Pantheists say, "is one and many in its nature; as a cow in its character as a cow is one, and also in its various qualities (such as having

dewlap, colour &c.) is many. But this, says Sankara, cannot hold good in Atmā which has no parts (निरवयव). Atmā cannot be 'many'—composite—i. e. manifold in its qualities or actions which really belong to नामरूपस, —not to the underlying nature of the Atmā”.

When my Self comes in contact with certain objects beyond it, it stimulates in myself certain reactions (through my senses and mind). All these reactions in the form of my states, feelings &c. cannot really affect or change the Self. My अन्तःकरण is transformed and as such I falsely identify my consciousness with those mental transformations. But it is not परमार्थ, cf. “सर्वो हि लोकव्यवहारः ब्रह्मण्येव कल्पितः, न परमार्थः” (बृ० 1. 4. 10). My consciousness seems to be changed. But really my consciousness remains unaffected by these.—“न ब्रूमः.....ब्रह्मणि अतदन्माधारोपया नास्तीति” (बृ० 1. 4. 10.) *

The idea is that through the changes of the states, activities &c. the real substratum of these changes, the real essence of the Soul does not at all change. Sankara humourously illustrates the fact thus—

“न हि लोके गौस्त्रिष्टन् वा गौर्भवति ; शयानस्तु
अश्वादिजात्यन्तरमिति । यदन्मैको यः पदार्थः...स देश-
कालावस्थान्तरेष्वपि तदन्मैक एव भवति ।”

“The essential nature of a thing is not subject to change or alteration, under the changes of its states, actions, place and time. You call a cow a cow,

* i. e. The Reality is Reality ; but we refer this or that predicate to it.

when she is sleeping ; but when she gets up and begins to walk, can you call her a horse ?”

Thus it is that what constitutes the essential nature of Brahma remains the same, is not changed and affected, under the appearance of the changes of नाम-रूप । As soon as the modifications of नाम-रूप appear, our Avidyā imagines the underlying unity of Brahma as entirely reduced to these नाम-रूप, as if Brahma has become सावयव i. e. composed of parts.—

“न हि अविद्याकल्पितेन रूपभेदेन सावयवं वस्तु सम्यद्यते” (ब्र० सू०, 2. 1. 27). But in reality Brahma retains its own unity. It is our बुद्धि, says Sankara, which imagines Brahma to be सावयव (composite) through changing नाम-रूप imposed on it—“बुद्धिकल्पितेभ्यः सावयवेभ्यः विकार-संस्थानोपपत्तेः” (छा० भा० 6. 2. 2.).

(6) Other arguments used by Sankara in disproof of Pantheism may be noticed here.

(a) The qualities or relations are accidental—भागन्तुक—are produced by stimulating causes (“अभिव्यक्तिसाधनापेक्षता”—ब्र०.भा०) and therefore, they are not permanent. How can these constitute the *nature* of the Self which is eternal and permanent (“नित्याभिव्यक्त”) ? They are manifestations of its nature ; they represent that nature very inadequately and partially ; they always change their character.

(b) For this reason Sankara has remarked more than once that no co-ordination (सामानाधिकरण्य) * is possible between “तत्” and “सर्वम्”—Brahma and

* सामानाधिकरण्य—occupying the same level (सामानात्रय) । नाम-रूपस really occupy a lower level (than ब्रह्म's level). For, they are incomplete manifestation and विषय (not विषयी). Vide—Lec. I, P. 12.

the world (Vide. ब्र० सू० भा० 1. 3. 1). How can then 'one' and 'many' *both* constitute the nature of the Self, as the Pantheists want us to believe? If there be सामानाधिकरण्य between one and many, the theory would be like that held by the Stoics—spiritual would be material—no distinction.

(c) Then again Sankara asks—what is the final emancipation (मुक्ति) ? To get rid of 'many'—pleasure, pain and other changes—is to be free from their power. But if they constitute the nature of the Self, how can they be got rid of? For, you cannot rob a thing of its essential nature—

“न हि स्वाभाविकेन धर्मे ष कस्यचिद्वियोगो दृष्टः”

(ब्र० 4. 3. 8).

and—

“एकस्य अनेकस्वभावानुपपत्तेः (ब्र० सू०, 3. 2. 21).

(d) It is proved, therefore, that the real nature of a thing is what lies behind the changing states &c. unaffected by them, and the latter very inadequately express that nature. A thing cannot have more than one nature. All these changing states, far from constituting the nature of the Self, are rather the 'object' (ज्ञेय or विषय) and being 'object', * the Subject or the Self must be different from it. It is only the ignorant who look upon them as constituting the nature (धर्म) of the Self.—

* “कथं कर्मभूतं सत्, कर्तृस्वरूपदृशिविशेषणम् (धर्मः) स्यात् ? कर्म हि कर्तृ-
क्रियया व्याप्यमानं भवति ; अन्यत्र व्याप्यं, अन्यत् व्यापकं ; न तेनैव तत् व्याप्यते ।”
(ब्र० भा०, 4, 4. 6.)

“शब्दाद्याकारावभासाः...तस्यैव ‘विषयभूता’ उत्पद्य-
मानाः...आत्मन एव ‘धर्मा’ विक्रियारूपा इत्यविवेकिभिः
परिकल्प्यन्ते” (तै०, 2. 1).

“अनात्मानं देहेन्द्रियादिसंघातं आत्मनो दृश्यमानमपि
(i. e. “object—ज्ञेय”) घटादिवत्, आत्मत्वेन...गृह्णाति
...मायया मोमुञ्चमानः” (कठ० 3. 12).

i. e. They are presented as ‘knowable objects’.
Only the ignorant people construe them as ‘essential
qualities’ of Atmā.

(e) Another point noticeable is—they being
परार्थ (we have already dealt with it), they work in
the interest of the Self which must be *other than*
these. They cannot, therefore, be held as constitut-
ing the nature of the Self. The ‘object’ cannot
affect the real nature of the Subject—“न हि यस्य यो
विषयः, स तेन ज्ञीयते वर्द्धते वा ।” (मा० का० 5 on 6 मन्त्र).

We cannot understand how, in the face of these
arguments advanced by him, the charge of Pantheism
could have been found possible to be levelled at
Sankara’s poor shoulders by some of his modern
critics and interpreters !

The Subject and Its true Character.



The Subject (क्षेत्रज्ञ) and the object (क्षेत्र) are but two different aspects (संस्थानविशेषौ) of one Reality—

“अध्यात्माधिदैवतयोः अन्वोन्योपकार्योपकारकत्वात्,...एकस्य सत्यस्य ब्रह्मणः संस्थान-विशेषौ”—(ब० भा०, 5. 5. 2.)

[“Both the Subject (अध्यात्म) and the object (अधिदैवत including अधिभूत) are aspects of one Truth—one Reality (एकस्य सत्यस्य ब्रह्मणः)”]

The separation between thought and thing is a separation *within* the unity of thought ; the object is not something *outside* thought, unknowable. The Commentary on the Gitā states—

“क्षेत्र-क्षेत्रज्ञौ येन ज्ञानेन विषयीक्रियेते तत् ज्ञानं सम्यक् ज्ञानं”

(गौ० भा०, 13. 2).

[“That knowledge is the real and perfect knowledge which comprehends *within itself* both the Subject and the object.”]

It is the unity of the Absolute which expresses itself in the finite subject and the object—

“भामिव उभयरूपेण स्थितं विद्धि, उभयात्मा अहमेव”

(गौ० भा०, नीलकण्ठ's gloss, 3. 2).

The finite Self,* as pointed out before, is rooted in the Infinite, and it is the Infinite which is bifurcated into, and expressed in, both the Subject and the object. Each of the Selves, in their negative *relation* to the others, is finite ; but in virtue of the presence, in every one of these Selves, of the unity of the Universal Self, complete and undivided *, in which each of them shares, is also Infinite. Every Subject and object are, therefore, at once finite and infinite, one and many, universal and particular. The subject and the object are thus correlated elements *within* the unity of the ultimate Principle which, as their sustaining ground, brings them into relation, yet transcends them.

The unity of the Universal Spiritual Principle which is present in each of us is the true Subject (ज्ञाता or ब्रह्मरूप) in which we share, and which, as Universal, cannot be restricted to a particular object but goes out to other objects.

Thus, there is *correlation* among the finite objects and subjects of the world—"विषय-विषयि-लक्षणं 'अनेकाल-भाव'-गमनं"—(प्र० 4. 5), but yet both the Subject and the object are *more* than these relations, as each of them, as we have pointed out above, shares in the unity of the Infinite which is completely present in each—

“यद्यपि कार्यात्मना उद्दिश्यते.....तथापि यत् पूर्णं स्वरूपं तत्र जहाति.....
पूर्वमेव उद्दिश्यते” (इ० भा०, 5. 1. 1.)

* “सर्वोऽहं सर्वभूतेषु” and “अविभक्तं विभक्तेषु”—गी० । “अवि सर्वाणि भूतानि ।”

[i. e. The mind, senses &c. &c. are all modifications of Prakriti. All these set a sort of limit to the Subject and are therefore called in Vedānta as its *Upadhīs* or adjuncts. These are all its *objects* of cognition or experiences and cannot therefore form the essential properties of the cogniser.]

“धावत् किञ्चित् चेतन्नस्य दुःखितलादिदोषजातं अवियमानं (i. e. not inherent to it) आसन्नयति, तस्य च यत्नोपपत्तेः, चेत्यधर्मात्त्वमेव, न चेतन्न-धर्मत्वं । न च तेन चेतनो दूष्यति ; चेतनेन ज्ञातुः संसर्गात्तुपपत्तेः”

(गौ० भा०, 13. 2).

[“What is *perceived* (कर्म) is an attribute of *Kshetra* (matter) ; and *Kshetrajna*, the cogniser cannot be vitiated by the blemish due to it. Whatever blemish—not inhering in *Kshetrajna*—you ascribe to Him, it comes under the cognised and therefore forms a property of *Kshetra*, not a property of *Kshetrajna*. Nor is *Kshetrajna* really affected by it, since association (संसर्ग) of the cogniser and the cognised is impossible.”]

(a) *The Empirical Self described—*

In one of our previous Lectures, we saw there is mention of Prāna-continuum which Sankara stated as Parināmi-Nitya. This is Māyā or Prakriti under the control of Brahma, out of which the five elements (पञ्चभूत) and the four successive types of beings gradually arose ; and this Prāna-continuum is the connecting link of all these—(एकसामान्यात्मकं). This may be called generally as Non-Ego or विषय which constitutes the environment of the Ego or the Subject or विषयी. There is interaction between the Subject and the object, and all the *experiences* (विशेष-विज्ञान) of the Subject are the result of this interaction. The empirical Self is described in Vedānta as “भूतमात्रासंसर्गात् लब्धविशेषविज्ञान” (ब्र० भा०, 4. 5. 13) ;

because it is a part of nature or विषय which has equipped it with its organs of senses and the nervous system, and in connection with which it receives all its experiences or विशेषविज्ञान ।

“अस्मिन् शरीरे प्राणः पञ्चतन्त्रिः इन्द्रियमनोबुद्धियुक्तः प्रज्ञात्मा विज्ञानक्रिया-
शक्तिव्यसंस्पर्शितात्मा युक्तः” (छा० भा०, 8. 12. 3).

[i. e. “In this body, *Prana*, together with mind and *Buddhi* which mean “Conscious Ego” covered by the two faculties of cognition and action is attached.”].

“सदात्मनः प्राण-सम्बन्धमात्रमेव...जीवत्वभेदकारणं.....न प्राणैर्वियुक्तस्य
जीवत्वमुपपद्यते” (छा० 5. 10. 2).

[“It is its connection or relation with the *Prāna* which constitutes the empirical Subjects and their differences from one another”.]

This Empirical Self is composed of five Koshas or spheres—the अन्नमय, प्राणमय, मनोमय, विज्ञानमय and आनन्दमय । In each of these spheres, the Self identifies itself with the particular sheath and looks upon it as the true Self. The lowest function discharged by the Soul or this physical Ego (अन्नमय) is the nutritive function—the desire felt by the Soul is hunger and thirst (अग्ना-पिपासे). The next form is the sensory Ego which is called as —प्राणमय with its ‘sense-perception and motor actions, such as locomotion, excretion &’. The functions which stand higher are classed under the mind and heart and it is the mental Ego or मनोमय । Higher than these are विज्ञानमय—intellectual activities. At the top stands—आनन्दमय—which is contemplation of Divine bliss and it is the sphere of feeling or enjoyment. The Soul composed of these five sheaths

with these five varieties of functions is the Empirical Self. It is merely a bundle of passive states and feelings and possesses a fund of impulses and passions. This Self, according to Sankara, is *आत्मा अपरमार्थः*, i. e. it is not the real Self at all. All its experiences (*कर्तृत्व-भोक्तृत्व*) produced by these functions in relation with its environment or *विषय* or not-Self may be regarded as effects ; for, all its *experiences* (*कर्तृत्व-भोक्तृत्वादिविशेषविज्ञान*) are changes or *Vikāras* caused by its relation with its object (*विषय*) —“अयं (object) अहं (Subject)—इति सामानाधिकरण्योपचारात्” (*ब्र० 1. 4. 7*). Sankara's idea is, because the Self erroneously identifies or confounds itself with the body, the senses, the states, feelings &c., it *experiences* the qualities born of the *Prakriti*, manifesting themselves as pleasure, pain &c ; it thinks—“I am happy, I am miserable” &c. Its identification with what it *experiences* (*विशेषविज्ञान*), forgetting that the true Self lies beneath these five sheaths and is distinct from these experiences, forms its *Samsāra*-state and is the main cause of its birth. The Psychologists discover only the laws of these states or its experiences (*विशेषविज्ञान*), —how they are connected with the antecedents and consequents. The antecedent condition undergoes destruction in being replaced by subsequent condition—

“सर्वं हि कारणं कार्यमुत्पादयत्, पूर्वोत्पन्नस्य आत्मकार्यस्य तिरोधानं कुर्वन् कार्यान्तरमुत्पादयति” (*ब्र० भा० 1. 2. 1.*).

This is merely the description of the changing

states—phenomena—merely the process of change. The antecedent phenomena are held to be the productive cause of the consequent phenomena. Hence the *whole* of the Soul changes from its antecedent condition to its subsequent condition in time ; and the Soul is nothing more than the sum-total of its phenomena or experiences. This is equivalent to saying that *becoming* is everything and that there is no *being* which is becoming or manifesting. But the *real* Self is *more* than its experiences. The *real* Self cognises, feels, wills with the help of these five vehicles. It is this Self which has manifested itself in these successive spheres and identifies itself with each of these sheaths and is limited by these.

The true Self is *conscious* of its three states—जाग्रत्, स्वप्न and सुषुप्ति—in all of which its true character can be detected. During our *wakeful* hour, our sense-organs are exposed to the influence of the external objects (विषयेन्द्रियसन्निकर्ष), and they become affected by the latter. Thus acted on, we wake up and actively compare the similar with dissimilar impressions and thus form concepts and make the sensations our objects of knowledge—

“निष्कृष्य समानासमानजातीयैश्चो इदन्तदिति विवेचनम्” (है० भा० 2. 6.)

During our *dreaming* moments, when the environment no longer acts on, and produces relations from, our sense-organs and the mind, it is our inner sense (बुद्धि), which remains engaged with the reminiscences of the impressions left upon it during the wakeful hour and these the mind recollects.

“The intellect is kept engaged, during dream, with the relics (वासना) of waking presentations, and these become the *objects* of the Self. The Subject being always distinct from its object, its luminosity is not destroyed.—”

“ननसि कामकर्मनिमित्तोद्भूतवासनावति...वासनाः...अन्यदिव पश्यतः...

द्रष्टुः वासनाभ्योऽन्यत्वेन स्वयंज्योतिर्द्रष्टु...न वारयितुं शक्यते” (प्र० 4. 5.)

During *deep slumber*, all these activities not being aroused by external or internal stimulus cease, and they merge undifferentiated in Prāna.—

‘स’हृतानि करणानि ‘स्वास्थ्यार्थानि’ परतन्त्राणि च जायद्विषये। स्वापेऽपि

स’हृतानां ‘पारतन्त्रेणैव’ कस्मिंश्चित् सङ्गतित्वात्। जायन्-स्वप्नव्यापारादुपरताः

सन्तः प्राये सत्येकौभूताः...विवेकानर्हा भवन्ति”

[“All the senses combined together *work for* the Lord—the Soul—dependent on him during our waking states and hence the coalition of all the senses etc. *in One* is reasonable *even in Sleep*, because of their dependence on, and acting in co-operation *on behalf of*,—some Lord. Waking and dreaming activities having ceased they blend indistinguishably in the Prāna .]”

This undifferentiated Prāna in which all activities of the mind have merged in deep sleep is the seed—root-cause—of both the dreaming and waking states. For, when we wake up, from this seed the different activities (of the mind) become aroused by the action of the environment. This undifferentiated Prāna is not an *independent* entity *apart* from the Self ; it cannot be explained without referring to the *Subject* whose energy it is. Under no conditions Prāna exists *separated* from the Subject.

“सुषुप्तावस्थायां विशेषविज्ञानाभावमेव दर्शयति, न ‘विज्ञातारं’ प्रतिषेधति”

(त्र० सू० भा०, 1, 3. 19.)

["During dreamless slumber, the experiences merge in *Atmā* but we do not deny the existence of the *Cogniser*]."

We thus find from the brief description given above, that the Self in its three states is an active Subject and not merely an abstract indeterminate principle. —

"अवस्थात्रयसाक्षी.....अवस्थात्रयेण व्यभिचारिणा न संस्पृशति" (i. e. cognizer of 3 states)—ब्र० सू० 2. 1. 9.

(b) *The true Idealistic Self described—*

That the passive empirical Self (which is merely the aggregate of states, feelings &c. &c.) described above is not the true Self is very clearly brought out by Sankara in several places. We shall collect together some of his arguments about the nature and the distinction of the true Subject from the empirical Self.

"Men and others are called as endowed with *Atmā* not only because they possess the five sheaths (पञ्च-कोष given above), but they are known as endowed with *Atmā* because they possess that self-existing, eternal, changeless *Atmā*...who is beyond these five Sheaths". Here are the lines——

"एवं मनोमयादिभिः पूर्व-पूर्वव्यापिभिः आनन्दमयान्तैः आकाशादिभूतारब्दैः...
'आत्मवन्तः' सर्वे प्राणिनः । तथा स्वाभाविकेनापि आकाशादिकारणेन नित्ये नावि-
कृतेन...पञ्चकोषातिगेन 'आत्मवन्तः'...(तै० भा०, 2. 3)."

Thus we find the empirical ordinary knower and doer is subject to change (विकृत), but the true character of the knower and doer—which is the real essence of the former—is not subject to change. Sankara emphasises this truth in another passage i

another way. He says there that the "I" (अहं) is two-fold. The empirical "I" is subject to change (विकारि), but the real "I" is what underlies the former which is its essential nature, since the empirical "I" is the result of the confounding of the Self with its body, the senses, states, actions &c. &c. I quote the passage here—

(i) "अहंकारेण देहादिसंघातोऽपि आदिश्यते अविवेकिभिः ।...

(ii) द्रष्टुरनन्यत्वदर्शनार्थं भूमैव निर्दिश्यते अहंकारेण, 'अहमेवावस्थात्'

इत्यादिना" (कृ० भा०, 7. 25. 1.)

["The indiscriminate people describe the body, the senses &c. as "I"...but with a view to point out that the Infinite is non-different from the Seer or the Subject, it is described as "I"—'the I below' &c. &c."]

Here it is to be particularly noted that the real underlying "I" is stated as 'द्रष्टा'—i. e. active Subject or Knower. In the Taittiriya-bhāṣya also Sankara shows that what we call as the knower (वेदिता) is not the true character of the knower. What is true knower lies deeper, it is the Absolute itself—"वेदितुः स्वरूपं ब्रह्म"—तै० 2. 1.

In the Katha-bhāṣya, we find—

"केवलसामान्यविज्ञानवान् सर्व्वतो यातीव । विशेषविज्ञानस्य, खेन रूपेण

स्थित एव सन्" (कठ० भा०, 2. 21.)

Here *two facts* stand clear before us :

Underlying or accompanying our *particular experiences* which we ordinarily know as our Self, there is the true Self ; and this is the true knower and agent.

In the Chhāndogya also the same truth is brought out thus—

“आत्मनेति वचनात् स्वात्मनोऽव्यतिरिक्ते न... ‘अविज्ञप्ते न’ इति दर्शयति” ।

Also

“तेजोऽवन्नसंभवे न ‘लब्धविशेषविज्ञाना’ &c.” (षा० 6. 3. 2).

[“By means of that Self partaking of the character of Intelligence and as such *not differing from the real Self*—is indicated.”]

Also

[“Having obtained *specific consciousness* by contact with fire, water, food, manifest” &c.]

Here also we find that when the true Subject comes in contact with the external objects, special experiences (विशेषविज्ञान) are produced in it, and this is our ordinary Self. We confound the true underlying Subject with these experiences. But the underlying Self is the true Self which *has* these experiences.

The *Brahma-sutra* also gives us the same idea——

“ब्रह्मस्यो जीवात्मना अवस्थानं, ब्रह्मात्मना च” (ब्र० भा०, 2, 3. 17).

[“Behind the empirical *Jiva*, the Infinite Brahma is present”].

Again——

“अस्मिन् निरुपाधिके आत्मनि, प्राणायु पाधिकता ‘विशेषाः’ प्राणादिकर्म-
जनानामभिधेयाः” (इ० भा०, 1. 4. 7).

[“When there is relation with Prāna and others, *in* the real Self certain *particular activities* are produced or manifested.”]

The aggregate of these manifested activities and states is our ordinary empirical Self ; but the real Self lies deeper which we ignore.

(c) *The true Self is the real Cognizer and Doer (i. e. active conscious Subject) :—*

In all these passages, we come to realise the important fact that Sankara everywhere reminds us that although to us the aggregate of the specific conscious states &c. constitutes the empirical knower, the *real knower* is the Intelligent Self underlying the specific states etc.

Similar is the case with the *Doer* (कर्त्ता) which is two-fold in its character. This fact has been brought out by the mention of two kinds of vision—*दृष्टि* ।

“दृष्टिरिति द्विविधा भवति—लौकिकी, पारमार्थिकी च । तत्र, लौकिकी... सा क्रियते इति जायते विनश्यति च । या तु आत्मनो दृष्टिः...सा तु द्रष्टुः स्वरूपत्वात् न जायते विनश्यति च । सा क्रियमाणया...स'दृष्टेव व्यपदिश्यते”

(ब० भा०, 3. 4. 2).

[“The vision is two-fold : one is ordinary vision—it is produced, and it is destroyed and thus it is liable to *change* ; the other is the true character of the Subject (द्रष्टा) and that is eternal, not changeable. We ordinarily confound or identify the latter with the former and describe as द्रष्टा or Doer.”]

Sankara gives the true character of the Doer in the following Bhāṣya—

“अविपरिवृत्तस्वभावया दृष्ट्या नित्यया ‘द्रष्टेति’ उच्यते”

(ब०, 4. 3. 23.)

[“The eternal unchangeable Vision is the real ‘Doer’ (द्रष्टा) ।”]

The *reason* is given below—

“न च द्रष्टुर्नित्येव दृष्टिरित्येवं विज्ञाते द्रष्टृविषयां दृष्टिरन्यामाकाङ्क्षते... तदसम्भवात्...न च स्वरूपविषयाकाङ्क्षा स्वस्यैव” (ब० भा०, 1. 4. 10.)

A similar idea* is given in the *Brahma-Sutra-bhāṣya* also. (2. 2. 28.)

The sense of the above quotation is this. When it is realised that the activity of the Subject is unchangeable and eternal, this eternal activity is itself its own Subject (द्रष्टा). For, if you still ask what is the Subject of this activity, *Anavasthā—regressus ad infinitum* would be the result. Sankara puts the idea more clearly thus—

‘यो दृष्टं ‘द्रष्टा’ स ‘दृष्टि’श्चेद भवति, नित्यमेव पश्यति दृष्टि’.....तत्र दृष्टुं दृष्ट्या नित्यया भवितव्यं” (ब० 1. 4. 10).

[i. e. The eternal activity of the Atmā is itself the *Doer*, that is to say—the real character of the Subject (द्रष्टा) is the eternal *unchangeable* activity (दृष्टि)].

In his *Vākyaṅgī*, Sankara states the fact thus—

“अनापन्नविकारः सन् अयस्मान्मवदेव यः ।

बुद्ध्यादीन् चालयेत् प्रत्यक् सोऽहमित्यवधारय” ॥ (SI. 19.)

[“Let you bear in mind this fact that ‘I’ am the true inner Subject who remaining unaffected and unchangeable in itself moves or impels the intellect, the senses &c. &c. like a load-stone”.]

All these discussions prove the fact that in Sankara-Vedānta the Subject is the true *Knower* and it is not affected by the *object* of knowledge ; and the Subject is also the real *Doer* who remains unaffected by its *object* of action and the *activities*—“न हि यस्य यो विषयः (object), स तेन ह्येयते वहते वा” (मा० का० भा०). It is only the *empirical* knower and doer (कर्तृत्वभीक्ष्णत्वादिविशिष्टः) who is dependent on and is affected by its *object*.—

“न हि केवलात्मनो 'भोक्तृत्व', बुद्ध्यादृशपाधिकृतमेव 'भोक्तृत्व' (कठ० भा०, 3. 4.)”

And also—

“क्वचत्त्वभोक्तृत्वयोः 'विक्रिययोः' विशेषात्तुपपत्तिः” (प्र० भा०, 6. 3.)

[i. e. “There is no difference virtually between क्वचत्त्व and भोक्तृत्व ; for, both are the changing *states* of the *Atmā* and they produce changes in it. These are in reality the modifications of the Intellect (बुद्धि)”.]

It is to be borne in mind in this connection that wherever in his commentaries Sankara has refused to ascribe 'Agentship' * to the Self, it is such agentship as noticed above which is really a sort of changing state of the Self. The real character of the Subject, in Sankara-Vedānta, is that it is the original *source* of activity and of knowledge. There are some critics who have misunderstood Sankara's real position in this respect and they have made Sankara's Self as merely an abstract, indeterminate principle,—“a sort of action-less, consciousness-less void”.

As the topic is very important, we would quote here the explanation given by the famous *Tikā-kāra* Rāmātirtha in his gloss on Sankara's *Upadeshā-sāhasri* which will, I am sure, support my contention. I would give the purport of what he says there—

* cf “क्रिया नामरूपसाध्या प्राणसमवायिनी” (इ० 1. 4. 7).

Also—“प्राग् भोगोत्पत्तेः केवलचिन्मात्रस्य पुरुषस्य 'भोक्तृत्व' नाम 'विशेषो' भोगकाले चिञ्जायते, निवृत्ते च भोगे सविशेषादपेनः...इति 'विशिष्टविक्रिया' कल्प्यते” (प्र० 6. 3.)

“The external objects produce modifications in our inner sensory (अन्तःकरण); and these are the *states* of consciousness produced in the Self, and the conscious Self is *reflected* in these states. Thus the Self becomes *identified* with its states, and the aggregate of these states is looked upon as the real Subject. This is the empirical “knower” or cogniser (ज्ञाता or प्रमाता)”.

Again—

“The Prāna acts in various ways within the body, and its activities are stimulated by the organs of action (coming in contact with the external world). The Self *accompanies* all these activities and we fail to *distinguish* the Self from these activities. In this way, the Subject becomes the Empirical “Agent” (कर्त्ता)”.

But, Rāmatirtha concludes that— .

“But as the real Subject is always *distinct* and distinguished from these states and activities, it is the *witness* of all states and activities, it is the eternal *cogniser* and *Agent*”. *

* “अन्तःकरणहृत्तीनासाविर्भाव-तिरोभावधर्मवत्त्वात् तद्विशिष्टतया स्वरूपमङ्गीकृत्य, विषयस्थचेतन्याभेदेन प्रकाशमानवृत्ति-तत्स्थाभासाग्रयतया भासमान आत्मा—‘प्रमाता’ (ज्ञाता) इत्युच्यते ।”

“कर्मन्द्रियाण्यधिष्ठाय क्रियावत्-प्राणप्रधानान्तःकरणलिङ्गताभासाविवेकात् ‘कर्त्ता’ इति च उच्यते ।”

“एतां सर्वानिव चित्तविलासावस्थां ‘स्वरूपचेतनानुगम’-साक्षेण, साक्षादवभासयन् इव भासमानः अलुप्तप्रकाशः...साक्षी उपलब्धा ‘ज्ञाता’ इति च व्यपदिश्यते... ‘निर्विकार’ एव (‘कर्त्ता’) कूटस्थः ।”

We thus come to the conclusion that the Subject (as well as the object) is the real *Seat* of Power—the active Source—which produces states and activities—its manifestations—in interaction with each other.

The true character of the Subject then is ज्ञाता and कर्ता ।

We may conclude then that everywhere, there is the empirical causality and the noemenal causality simultaneously present in each situation. Thus both the Subject and the object have a double character : an empirical and a noemenal character. The empirical character is the *expression* in time of the noemenal character which is not in time but expresses itself spontaneously and freely.

(d) We now proceed to collect particular instances where the Self is shown to be a true cogniser and active agent, which will bring out the fact that the Subject with Sankara was never a mere *abstract*, indeterminate principle :— .

(I) “No presentation coming to the Self can remain unknown or unperceived. It is absurd to suppose that an object (विषय) is there, but it is not known by the Self (विषयी)”.—

“वस्तुतत्त्वं भवति किञ्चित्, न ज्ञायते—इति च अनुपपन्नं.....रूपञ्च दृश्यते,
न चास्ति चक्षुरिति यथा । व्यभिचरति ज्ञेयं, न ज्ञानं व्यभिचरति कदाचिदपि ज्ञेयं ।
ज्ञेयामावे ज्ञेयान्तरे भावात् ज्ञानस्य” (प्र० भा०, 6. 2.)

[“Whatever be the nature of the object of cognition, there is always the consciousness to cognise it...When one object is

replaced by another, when one object is removed and another is placed in its stead, the consciousness *cognising* them does not cease to exist, but continues unchanged behind it".]

“स्वरूपव्यभिचारिषु पदार्थेषु चैतन्याव्यभिचारात्, यथा यथा यो यो पदार्थः
ज्ञायते, तथा तथा ज्ञायमानत्वादेव, तस्य तस्य चैतन्याव्यभिचारित्” *

[“The objects may change, but the consciousness is constant to *cognise* and hence the cogniser does not change”].

The passages quoted above show that the Self whose nature is consciousness is always a conscious Subject (ज्ञाता or cogniser) in reality.

Consciousness may exist where there is no object to be known, but an object can never exist without being cognised by the consciousness. The reason is—“The consciousness, if it does not exist, how can there exist a knowable? Where there is no consciousness, there can be no knowable”.

(2) In our every-day changes of three states, viz: our waking state and also our dreamless state, and the dreaming state,—the one and the same *identical* Intelligence (चैतन्य) continues to be present, and it is the *cogniser* (ज्ञाता) of all these states. This shows that the Self is a conscious Subject.—

(i) Even when the Self falls asleep in deep slumber (सुषुप्ति), the conclusion of Vedānta seems to be that although there is apparently no *knowable*

* cf “वाच्यादिवपि जायदादिषु तथा सर्वास्ववस्थास्वपि, व्यावृत्तास्वतुवर्त्तमान'मह'-
मिथ्यन्तःस्वरुत् सदा” (दक्षिणामूर्ति ०, 7).

present in that state, the Self must, says Sankara, be regarded as *cognizant*, inasmuch as the absence of the knowable being itself a fact to be known ; but that cannot be known in the absence of a *cognizer* (प्र० भा०, 6. 2). The *Brihadāranyaka* agrees with this view—

“विद्यमानस्यैव स्वयंजीतिष्टस्य (ज्ञातृत्वस्य) सुषुप्तेऽयद्व्ययमेकीभावाद्देतोः...
सम्बन्धत्वातीतमेतद्रूपं” (4. 3. 22).

The expression एकीभाव gets its elucidation from Chhāndogya-bhāṣya thus—“द्रष्टुरन्यत्वेन अभावात्, मुक्तः न पश्यति च” (8. 12. 2-3)—i. e. In the सुषुप्त stage or in the final release (मुक्ति) the *cognizant* Subject is present. Only because the *knowables* do not appear as *different* from or *apart* from the cogniser, he seems to be non-cognizant of anything knowable—“सुषुप्तावस्थायां.....न ‘विज्ञातार’ प्रतिषेधति” (ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 3. 19).

(ii) During our dreaming state, although the sense-organs cease to operate, our mind (अन्तःकरण) is active in that state with the waking reminiscences which are aroused. These reminiscences are to be regarded as its knowable which the Self *cognizes*—

“स्वप्नेऽपि ‘द्रष्टुः’ (cognizer)-रेवोपदेशः ।...यद्यपि स्वप्ने स-धीः भवति (आत्मा).....जाग्रदासनाश्रया ‘दृशैव’ धीर्भवति इति न ‘द्रष्टुः’ स्वयं-ज्योतिष्ट्वाधो भवति” (का० भा०, 3, 12. 1.)

(iii) During our *waking* state, when we *perceive* the objects of the external world, the Self is proved to be an actively *conscious Subject*. This is shown below :—

(3) No *perception* can be had unless the Self *exercises* its power of discrimination and assimilation, and active comparison of the sense-impressions aroused by the action of the external objects in the Self—

“हस्तस्यायं स्पर्शः, जानीरयमिति विवेकेन (Discrimination) प्रति-
पद्यते...लङ्ग मात्रेण कुतो विवेकप्रतिपत्तिः ?”

“सर्वो हि लोको मनसा पश्यति (Attention).....ज्ञानं भवति”
(ङ० 1. 5. 3.)

[“The surface of the body (लङ्ग) itself cannot make or comprehend the *difference between* the two kinds of impressions excited in the body by the hand and the knee respectively, unless the Self *attends* to those impressions (and institutes *comparison* between them). This attention shows the *active* nature of the conscious Subject.”]

(i) The Self as real ज्ञाता (conscious Subject)—

“चक्षुषा रूपं विजानाति, श्रोत्रेण शब्दं विजानाति, रसनेन रसं विजानाति
...इति सर्व्वैव च ‘विज्ञानशब्द’वाच्यतामेव दर्शयति...इति ‘प्रज्ञानस्वभावतैव’
(ङ० भा०, 4. 3. 2-30.)” “यो ‘वेद’ इदं मन्वानीति, ...इदं जिज्ञासोति,
‘वेद’...इति सर्व्वत्र प्रयोगात् ‘वेदन’स्य स्वरूपं (ङा० भा०, 8. 12. 4-5).”

[i.e. “A mental act in which the Self is known implies, like every other mental act, a *perceiving Subject*. In every act of cognition, in each case, I am immediately *conscious of myself* as seeing, hearing thinking &c.” Thus the Self is inferred to be a *conscious Subject*].

(ii) The Self as real कर्त्ता (active Agent)—

“दर्शनादि-क्रिया-(different functions)-निर्हृत्त्वर्थानि तु चक्षुरादि-
करणानि...इदञ्च अस्य ‘सामर्थ्यात्’ (Active power) अवगम्यते ।...आत्मनः
सत्तामात्र एव ‘कर्त्तृत्व’, नतु व्यापृततया” (ङा० 8, 12. 4-5).

["The organs of sight, of smell &c. are for *fulfilling the functions* of seeing, smelling &c. This fact is inferred, because the Self possesses the *capability*, because the Self is an *active Power*. This *agentship* (कर्तृत्व) of the Self is to be understood not as if the Self is *actually occupied* with the *particular functions* of the organs ; i. e. the Self is active without being affected by those activities."]

Thus, the Self is inferred to be an *active Subject*. From these, we find that in the perception of the objects of the external world, the Self is proved to be not *merely* as an abstract intelligence, but as a conscious and *active Subject* (ज्ञाता and कर्ता).

(4) Wherever, in consequence of its relation with the objects of the world, certain states of consciousness are produced in the Self, they are all known by the term 'cognitions' (विज्ञान). The aggregate of these cognitions constitutes the ordinary consciousness. As these states are all permeated by the consciousness, the ordinary indiscriminate people take these cognitive states to be the essential properties of the Self. To such people the Self is what is constituted by the sum-total of these states. But, in reality, these states are felt to be the 'knowables' (ज्ञेयभूताः) or objects of the Subject.—

“चक्षुरादिद्वारैर्विषयाकारिण परिणामिन्या (बुद्धिः) ये शब्दाद्याकारावभासाः
आत्मविज्ञानस्य 'विषयभूता' उत्पद्यमाना एव, आत्मविज्ञानेन व्याप्ता उत्पद्यन्ते ।”

But to the ordinary people these states are regarded as the *धर्म्य*s i. e. the essential properties of the Self.—

“आत्मन एव धर्म्या विक्रियारूपा इत्यविवेकिभिः परिकल्प्यन्ते”

(तै० भा०, 2. 1.)

This is the ordinary empirical Self consisting of these modifiable and changing states, which the ignorant people take as ज्ञाता and भोक्ता. But this Self is merely the "bundle of sensations, appetites, desires, affections which constitute its experience. It is resolvable into the series of its conscious states."

But this is the Psychological account of the Self. There is another account of the transcendental or idealistic Self which is its true nature.

Here, I would draw your notice to certain terms. We have seen that the true character of the transcendental Self which underlies the cognitive states is not subject to modification. Although these states are its manifestations and belong to it, still it is not *affected* by them. With a view to show this Sankara has used the word *Vijnāna* (विज्ञान)—'consciousness'—to indicate its nature—"आत्मविज्ञानिन व्याप्ता उत्पद्यन्ते".

But as these cognitive states are 'pervaded' consciousness and are felt to be its 'object', this or consciousness must be the *conscious Subject*.

We would support our position by quoting Sankara has stated elsewhere.—

"कथं कर्म खातां, दृशिना व्याप्यत ? कर्म हि कर्तृक्रियया व्याप्यमानं भवति । अन्यच्च व्याप्यं, अन्यत् व्यापकं ; न तेनैव तत् व्याप्यते"

(ब्र० भा०, 4. 4. 6).

["The *object* is always pervaded by the activity of the *Subject*. And the pervader is distinguished from, other than, the thing which is pervaded by it. A thing cannot be pervaded by itself."]

We find then that here, as the cognitive states are stated as its *object*, the consciousness mentioned

above to indicate the nature of the Self must be understood to be the *conscious Subject* (ज्ञाता or cogniser).

In connection with this point, the following observations of Sankara must be conclusive—

“दृशि-कर्मलापत्तिनिमित्ता हि जगतः सर्वा प्रवृत्तिः—‘अहमिदं भोक्तुं’
‘पश्यामि’...‘एतदर्थमिदं करिष्ये’—इत्याद्या...अवगतिनिष्ठा”

(गौ० भा०, 9. 10).

[“All the activities of the world have value in so far as they prove *useful* to the Subject, if the Subject can derive benefit from them, if these activities can be *utilised as an object* which might serve the purpose of the दृशि i. e. the Subject”.]

(5) That in the Sankara system, the consciousness is to be taken in the sense of ‘conscious Subject’ (and ‘active agent’) can be gathered also from the following—

(i) The world is divided into two parts—the Self and not-Self.

“यदा हि सर्वं ‘ज्ञेयं’ कस्यचित्, तदा तद्व्यतिरिक्तं ‘ज्ञानं’ ज्ञानमेवेति
द्वितीयो विभागः...इत्यादि” (प्र० भा०, 6. 2.)

“All things can be classified as ‘knowledge’ and ‘knowable’—ज्ञान-ज्ञेययोरन्यत्वम्—and all those who are not Nihilists in their opinion concede only a two-fold classification of ‘knowledge’ and ‘knowable’ and do not admit a third kind.”

Here we find ‘knowledge’ (ज्ञान) has been used for ‘cogniser (ज्ञाता) or the Perceptient Subject.

(ii) “Those who hold that ‘cognition’ (ज्ञान) is formless and is not known by mediate perception must admit that since an *object* of knowledge is

apprehended through 'cognition', the cognition is quite as immediately known"—*Gītā-bhāṣya*, 18. 50.

Again in the following sentences, note why Saṅkara makes no difference between eternal 'cognition' and 'cogniser'.

“अप्रसिद्धं चेत् 'ज्ञानं' ज्ञेयवत् जिज्ञास्येत...न चैतदस्ति । अतीत्यन्तप्रसिद्धं

(Self-sufficient) ज्ञानं, 'ज्ञातापि' अतएव प्रसिद्ध इति”

[“Just as a man seeks to reach by 'cognition' the cognisable *object*, such as pot, so also would he have to seek to reach cognition by means of another cognition. But the fact is otherwise. Wherefore, cognition is self-revealed and therefore also is the *cogniser* self-revealed.”]

We find in these passages, 'cognition' means really the 'cogniser' or the conscious Subject i.e. there is no distinction between the two.

The reason for using the term cognition for cogniser is to guard against the fact that the *empirical* cogniser or ज्ञाता with whom we are familiar is always changeable (विकारि-ज्ञाता). But the *real* conscious Subject is devoid of change when it cognises its object ; that is to say, the *object* of cognition cannot affect him.

(iii) “यदि ज्ञातापि ज्ञेयसम्बन्धो ज्ञायते, अन्यो ज्ञाता कल्याः स्यात्, तस्यापि अन्यः । यदि पुनरविद्या ज्ञेया अन्यदा, ज्ञेयं ज्ञेयमेव ; तथा ज्ञातापि ज्ञातेव, न ज्ञेयं भवति” ।

[“If the *relation* between the cogniser and the cognised could be cognised, another cogniser should be supposed to exist, then another and so on. If *avidya* or anything else is the cognised, then it is always the cognised only (ज्ञेय). So the cogniser is ever the cogniser &c.”—*Gīta-bhā.* 13. 2.]

Here the term 'cogniser' is employed, but this cogniser is not like the changing *empirical cogniser*; this cogniser is free from modifications i. e. not affected when it knows its object.

(iv) "तस्मात् देहादिलक्षणान् च रूपादीन् एतेनैव देहादिव्यतिरिक्तो नैव विज्ञान-समावेन आत्मना विजानाति" (कठ० भा० 4. 3.)

["*Atma*, whose nature is 'consciousness', *cognises* the body, the senses &c. composed of colour, sound &c."]

Here, it is to be noted that to denote the 'cogniser', the term 'consciousness' has been employed.

Take the following also—

"सर्वे प्रत्यया 'विषयीभवन्ति' यद्य, स...सर्वप्रत्ययदर्शी चिच्छक्तिस्वरूप-
मात्रः ।...सर्वप्रत्ययदर्शिले च सपजनापायवर्जितदृक्स्वरूपता, नित्यत्वं, ...
निर्विशेषता, एकत्वञ्च...सिद्धं भवेत्" (केन० भा०, 2. 4).

["All cognitive states (प्रत्ययाः) are *known* by it...the cogniser of all its knowable states is in its nature pure intelligence... That the *cogniser* of all its states is really eternal, free of particular determinations, one and not subject to changes of states in its own nature becomes well established."]

Here also, the eternal, changeless, '*consciousness*' (चित्स्वरूपमात्रः) is the real "*Cogniser* of all his cognitive states."

The reason is stated in the following significant line for the employment of the term 'consciousness' for the 'conscious Subject (द्रष्टा)'—

"द्रष्टुं हि दृश्यं अर्थान्तरभूतं.....इति द्रष्टुः, असङ्गत्वात् 'स्वयंभ्योतिह'
(non-affection) सिद्धं" (वृ० भा०, 4. 3. 22).

[i. e. "The conscious and active Subject is always to be *distinguished* from his objects of cognition; for, it is not attached to and not affected by anything."]

I must conclude by calling your attention to the fact that the conscious Subject being *distinct* from the object, there can be no *identity* between the consciousness and the being. The consciousness does not create or constitute its object (“आत्मसमवायित्वे दृश्यत्वानुपपत्तेः”); but the object is the manifestation of the Being or Power from which it is produced in interaction with the Subject.—

“ज्ञानन्तु प्रमाणजन्यं ; प्रमाणञ्च यथाभूतं वस्तुविषयं । अतो ज्ञानं कर्तुं न कर्तुं मन्यथा कर्तुं न शक्यं ... वस्तुतन्मैव तत्” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 1. 4. & 3. 2. 21).

It is thus seen that the Intelligence is not constituted of its objects of cognition. The object is ‘given’. The object has an existence over and above its *presentation* to consciousness. The *object* possesses an identity which is not made by our mind, but *persists* in its changing modes or activities. This is the fundamental truth in the Subject-object relation. It is thus found that both the Self and not-Self—विषय and विषयौ—are known to us intuitively, according to Sankara, in the same act of *perception*, both being inseparable cor-relatives, although in their essence they are *ultimately identical*.

Jiva's State of Samsāra or False Predication and How to get rid of it ?

—❖—

“नासि त्वं संसारी,—‘अमुष्य पुत्रत्वादि-‘धर्मवान्’ ;
किं तर्हि ? ‘सत्’ यत् त्वमसि” (छा० भा० 6. 14. 2).

i. e. “This spatial and temporal world does not enter into the *substance* of the nature of your Self ; nor does any of the states,—say, the state of your-self being somebody’s son &c. &c. belongs to you as your essential nature (धर्म). What then ? You are really distinct from, and unaffected by, the world or the states ;—You are true Being, that thou art.”

(1) We must learn not to take things as they appear to us but as they are in their true character or nature,—not as they appear to our sense-organs and intellect. To perceive things as they are in themselves has been described as—“यथाभूतार्थदर्शनम्” in Sankara’s *Sarvavedānta-Siddhānta* and as—“स्वात्मयाथात्म्य-ज्ञान”—in *Katha-bhāṣya* (3. 14). But how do the things appear to our intellect and our senses, and how to perceive them in their true character ? “Unless you wake up”, says Sankara, there in his *Katha-bhāṣya*, “from the deep slumber of *Avidyā* into which you are immersed, your look

will not be turned inward into the true knowledge of yourself (आत्मज्ञान)". Why he speaks of Avidyā, we shall see that later on.

When an object (विषय) acts upon the Self by affecting the sense-organs, the impressions produced in the Self it interprets in terms of its own sensations.—

"गन्धादिभिरपि घ्राणादिषु अनुगृहीतेषु, प्रवृत्ति-निवृत्त्यादयो (Motor and sensory activities) भवन्ति, तेन तैरपि अनुगृह्यते भवति कार्य-करण-संघातस्य" (इ० भा०, 4. 3. 5).

Also

"मनु-संकल्पवशानि हि इन्द्रियाणि प्रवृत्तं क्ते—निवृत्तं क्ते" (इ०, 6, 1. 5.) *

[i. e. "There are action and reaction between the sense-organs and their respective sense-objects; and the result is knowledge of external world and stimulation of impulsive action (प्रवृत्ति & निवृत्ति)"]

["The *Manas* is an organ of reflection and volition and will. We have cognition followed by consequent action". (Vide. also छा०, 7. 18-22).]

The true Subject, as we have seen, has a nature (स्वरूप) of its own, it has its own reason of being in itself; it determines its own activities for the realisation of the *end* inherent in it. (छा०, 7. 22-23).

That it is *active* proves its interaction (संसर्ग) with the environment beyond it.

"सतो विशेषः कारकापेक्षः, विशेषस्तु विकारः.....तदभावेऽभावात्"
(तै० भा०, 2. 8).

Thus the Subject is related to its own Self (स्वरूप) as well as to others beyond it (बाह्यरूप or सम्बन्धिरूप,

* "शब्देन (अधिसूत) श्रोत्रेन्द्रिये प्रदीप्ते, मनसि विवेक उपजायते, तेन मनसा वाक्छां चेषां प्रक्षिपयते" (4. 3. 5.)

—ब्र० भा०, 2. 2. 17). This self-reference and reference to others constitute its outward characteristics or relations. The object is therefore known to the Self so far as it comes into *relation* (संसर्ग) with it.

But the Subject and the object do not derive their *whole* meaning from the *relations* into which they come to each other through interaction. Both are something *more* than their relations ; possess a Swarūpa (nature) of their own which come into reciprocal relation.

“उपाधिसम्बन्धकतं विशेषात्मस्वरूपं &c. &c. सर्व्वा भूत-भौतिकमात्रा
अस्य 'संसर्ग'कारणभूता विद्यन्ते” (ब्र०, 4. 3. 9 and 2. 1. 18).

[“When some object in the environment comes into *relation* with the Subject, certain particular states and activities (विशेष-विज्ञान) are produced in it.”]

Thus, neither the Subject nor the object can be wholly *resolved* into these relations.—

“विशेषविज्ञानवत्त्वं परित्यज्य, स्वेन रूपेण अभिव्यज्यते” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 3. 20).

These relations, or in other words, the particular states and activities &c. of the Self are but its *partial* or *inadequate manifestations*.—

“दर्शनश्रवणमननविज्ञानादादापाधिधर्मैः (क्रीडहृषादिप्रत्ययैश्च) ‘आविर्भूतं’
सङ्गच्छते (ब्रह्म)”—सु० भा०, 2. 2. 1. But—

“उपाधिपरिच्छिन्नस्यास्य रूपं त्वमल्पं वेद्य” (केन० भा०, 2. 1).

In these relations, its *nature* finds partial (अङ्गत्स्र and अल्प) * *expressions* ; they cannot represent it fully and adequately, as we have considered fully in our previous discussions.

* Vide : Lect. VIII P. 106 & 108.

But such is the habit of our intellect (बुद्धि) that instead of taking these states &c. as *partial expressions* of the Subject which underlies them, our intellect takes them to be the *component parts*, of which the Subject is composed. Thus reducing the nature of the Subject to these parts, or relations, our intellect makes the Subject as सावयव or composed of parts i. e. the sum-total of these states &c. constitutes the whole nature of the Subject. Here compare what Sankara has stated—

“रज्ज्वाद्यवयवैभ्यः सर्पादिसंस्थानवत्, बुद्धि-परिकल्पितेभ्यः सदवयवैभ्यः
विकारसंस्थानोपपत्तेः” (ङा० भा०, 6. 2. 2.)

[“Just as the parts of the serpent are assumed in the rope as its own parts, so the modifications are assumed by our intellect as parts constituent of the Being (सत्)”.]

Also—

“निर्विशेषे एव आत्मनि सुखित्वादयो ‘विशेषाः’ कल्पिताः (i. e. अविक्रया
अधस्ताः) ;..... अद्वयस्य अव्यभिचारात्, कल्पनावस्थायामपि अद्वयता शिवा”

—मा० भा०, 2. 32.

[i. e. “The determinate states &c. are imagined (by our intellect) in the Self as its qualities or constituent parts (चर्चस). But still, even while they are thus imagined, the Self remains unqualified by these (since the Self is unaffected by these and changeless), as it transcends these”.]

Sankara elsewhere argues that all these states, viz : pleasure, pain &c. &c. are felt by the Subject to be its *objects* ; and being its objects how can they constitute the nature of the Subject ?

“सुखदुःखयोः विषयवर्धत्वं, न आत्मवर्धत्वं । न दुःखेन प्रत्यक्षविषयेषु
आत्मनो विशेषत्वम्” (ङा० भा०, 1. 4. 7).

[“Pleasure and pain (and all nāma-rūpas) are the proper-

ties of the *object*, they cannot, therefore, be the properties of the Subject."]

Another argument advanced by Sankara—

“एकप्रत्ययविषयत्वानुपपत्तेः । न हि सुख-ग्राहकेण प्रत्यक्षविषयेण प्रत्ययेन,
नित्यानुमेयात्मनो विषयीकरणमुपपद्यते” (वृ० भा०, 1. 4. 7.)

[“Both the Subject and the object cannot be comprehended by the same kind of knowledge ; i. e. they cannot stand in co-ordinate relation. For, the pleasure, pain &c. are the objects of *perceptual knowledge*, whereas the Self is an object of *inferential knowledge*.”]

There cannot be सामानाधिकरस्य (Identity) between the knowledge of the Eternal Self and the knowledge of its changing states or qualities.

But of the deeper unity of the Subject, our intellect, as we have stated above, perceives only the outer qualities spread out side by side. It sees one object outside another ; and in the object also, one point of space outside another point of space. It makes the underlying unity of the Subject as *composed* of its multiple states, as *अनेकात्मक* ; as if the sum-total of these states constitutes the Subject. Thus the Subject, to the view of the intellect, becomes altogether a *new thing* (*वस्तुन्तरमिव*), something *other* (*अन्य*) than the real underlying Subject. This is the way in which both the unity of the Subject, and the unity of the object * also, appear to our intellect and our senses. This

* The *object* is not mere ‘manifold,’ as Kant thought. It is already a unity and there is orderly connection among its qualities. For, they are the factors of a Purposive Unity, in connection with one another.

view is known in Sankara-Vedānta as the view of *Avidyā*—

“अविद्यया ‘अन्यत्वे न’ प्रतुपस्थापितमासीत्...‘वस्तुन्तरमिव’ ;...कारणादिकृतं हि तत्, न आत्मकृतं ; आत्मकृतमिव प्रत्यवभासते” (ब्र० भा०, 4. 3. 23).

Take in this connection the following **भाष्य** on the Aphorism (ब्र० सू० 3. 2. 15.)—

“एवं ब्रह्मापि पृथिव्यादुपपत्तिसम्पर्कात् तदाकारतामिव प्रतिपद्यते”

As soon as the names and forms become manifested and the objects appear before us, we think as if Brahma has *become* these forms ; Brahma seems to us to be of such and such forms. That is to say, we *restrict* Brahma to such and such forms, as if Brahma has itself *become* such and such objects ; i. e. in this view, Brahma’s presence in the objects is in reality their presence. No distinction exists between the presence of God and the mere presence of objects. But this, says Sankara, is the view of ignorance. The real view is thus stated—

“निराकारमेव ब्रह्म अवधारयितव्यं” (ब्र०, 2. 3. 14.)

“प्रतुपपत्तिर्देहि हि अनेदमेव ब्रह्मणः शक्यति शास्त्रम्”

(ब्र० 3. 2. 12, 16).

The manifested objects look like Brahma’s forms, but they are not really so. They are not His forms : as if he has been reduced to these forms : as if He has actually *become* these forms : Brahma has no form at all *.

(a) That such erroneous views are due to our intellect (बुद्धि) and to our sense-organs will appear

* i. e. “यत् सर्व्वं, तद् ब्रह्मति...न तु यद् ब्रह्म, तत् सर्व्वमिति” (रत्न० भा०, 1. 3. 1.)

particularly from the commentary on the *Gītā* where *Avidyā* has been said to be an inherent property of our intellect and our senses.—

“It is not right to hold that *Avidyā* is an inherent property (धर्म) of the cogniser. For, we see such diseases as lead to the perception of what is contrary to truth and so on *pertain to the intellect, to the eye, to the organ*. Neither the perception of what is contrary to truth, nor the cause there-of (viz : the disease of *timira*) pertains to the perceiving Subject &c. &c. (गी० भा०, 13. 2.)

I would quote the text here—

“एवं तर्हि ज्ञातधर्मोऽविद्या ? न ; करणे, चक्षुषि, तैमिरिकत्वादिदोषोप-
लब्धे: ।.....यथा करणे, चक्षुषि, विपरीतयाहक्कादिदोषदर्शनात्...सर्व्वेव अग्रहण-
विपरीत-संशयादिप्रत्ययाः तन्निमित्ताः करणस्यैव कस्यचित् भवितुमर्हति, न ज्ञातः
चेवज्ञस्य । संवेद्यत्वाच्च तेषां.....न ज्ञातधर्मोऽल' &c. &c.”

In the commentary on the *Taittiriya-Upanishad*, the same conclusion is given—

“विद्याऽविदायोस्तद्धर्मोऽलमिति चेत् ? न ;.....रूपादिवत् प्रत्यक्षाबुपलभ्येते
अन्तःकरणस्यो” (2-8).

[“Knowledge and ignorance (अविद्या) could be *perceived* ;
colour perceived cannot be an attribute of the perceiver.....
Therefore knowledge and ignorance, like name and colour, are
not attributes of *Atmā* ; they pertain to the *intellect*.”]

“अविद्या न आत्मनः स्वाभाविकी धर्मः.....न स्वाभाविकस्य चञ्चितिः
कदाचिदुपपद्यते” (इ० भा०, 4. 3. 20).

[“*Avidyā* cannot constitute the essential nature of the
ātma ; for, you cannot deprive a thing of its essential nature”.]

It is thus seen that our intellect and our senses take only an outward view of things, and they can not go deeper into the inmost unity.—

“पराञ्चि खानि व्यत्यन्त स्वयम्भुः, तस्मात् पराङ् पश्यति, नान्तरात्मन्”

(कठ०, 4. 1.)

["The self-existent ब्रह्म created the senses out-going. Therefore the perceiver sees the *external* objects, and not the *ātma* within".]

Everything appears to them as composite—अनेकात्मक, नानाधर्मविशिष्टः विचित्र आत्मा (ब्र० भा०, —composed of parts, as divided into units (सावदा), one outside the other. In the place of the underlying unity a new thing composed of multiple parts (अनेकधा) is *created* for the time being—

“एक एव कूटस्थनिष्ठः अविदाया...अनेकधा विभाज्यते”

(ब्र० भा०, 1. 3. 19.)

It is therefore the construction of our intellect due to deep-rooted habit it has inherited. This is due to *avidyā* (मिथ्याज्ञान). This Vedāntic false knowledge is known as अनिर्वचनीय-ख्याति. It superimposes the states of Consciousness upon the *unity* of the Subject, ignoring or forgetting the fact that the Subject is a unity which it maintains in and through its successive states which cannot be its component parts i. e. cannot be identified or confounded with the real nature of the Subject. They are, in reality, the *expressions* of its nature, and the Self is distinct from them—“अपृथगेवेति” * (मा० भा०, 2. 30); “सूतन्त्रो भवति सर्वदा” (कठ० 4. 1.). Similarly, simply because God has taken the forms of *nāma-rūpas* on Him—“न ब्रूमोऽतद्वर्माधारोपणा नास्तीति”—He has not actually *become these*. These forms are to be taken as His *expressions*; His objects; He is to be found partially expressed, manifested in these. These are ब्रह्मलिङ्ग—indicative of His *Svarūpa* to a certain extent, and hence *Ananya* (अनन्य)—non-

* cf. “पशान्तीऽपि प्रपञ्चसंसारं,
पृथगात्मनो न पश्येत्” (स्वात्मनिरूपण, १००)

different from the Self—"इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा"—"Everything, all this, is ātmā". This fact is sometimes described by Sankara as—"सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रतिपत्त्यर्थतां दर्शयति" (ब्र०, भा० 1. 4. 14 & 2. 1. 33.) i. e. the manifestation of the world is for the sole object of leading to the knowledge of *Brahma* and not for any other purpose. Sometimes this fact is described as—"प्रपञ्च-विलय" as in—"अविद्याकृतं कार्य-प्रपञ्चं 'विद्यया' प्रविलापयन्तः तमेवैक-भायतन-भूतमात्मानं जानन् (ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 3. 1.). It means that under the influence of *Avidyā* we used to take the world of *nāma-rūpas* as something separate, as if the underlying (*आयतनभूत*) Self has become *composed* of these *nāma-rūpas* and become something *Anyā*—really *other*, abandoning its real nature (*कार्यप्रपञ्चविशिष्टः विचित्र आत्मा*). But by *Vidyā* (*विद्या*), we are now to take the world (*प्रपञ्च*) as the *expression* of *Brahma* i. e. nothing but *Brahma* *;—that is to say, everything is to be looked upon as revelation of *Brahma's* nature, not as *this* or *that thing* (i. e. 'अन्यदिव कार्याकारिण प्रसृतम्'—सू० 2. 2. 11.). In the *Taittiriya-bhāṣya* Sankara himself shows us the way and gives us the indication as to how we are to take the particular objects of nature as *Brahma*. He says there that—

"उभे पुण्य-पापे.....आत्मरूपेणैव, स्वेन विशेषरूपेण शून्ये कृत्वा..... पश्यति विद्वान्" (2. 9.)

[i. e. "We are to look upon virtue (*पुण्य*) and evil (*पाप*),—not as *पुण्य* and *पाप* in their *special forms*, but as *Paramatma*."]

A similar idea is given in the *Chhāndogya-bhāṣya* also—

दुःखसम्बन्धोऽपि स्यात् इति चेत् ? न ; दुःखस्यापि आत्मलोप-
गमात् अविराधः" (8. 12. 1) *

* cf. "निखिलं दृश्यविशेषं, दृग्-रूपत्वेन पश्यतां विदुषां" (*सात्वानिरूपणम्*, 102).

[i. e. "If you object that if everything is to be taken as *ātma*, there will then be connection with 'Suffering' (दुःख) also ; —we reply that even suffering is not to be taken as suffering, but as *Atma*."]

As there is always an unchangeable sustaining *ground* in which the modifications of names and forms are rooted (ब्र० भा०, 1. 3. 1), we are indeed, liable to confound the ground with the *Vikāras*. But it is a wrong view, view of Avidyā—"न कार्य-प्रपञ्चविशिष्टः, विचित्र आत्मा विज्ञेयः...यथा अनेकात्मको वृक्षः" । *Māndukya-bhāṣya* calls this view as चित्तदोष, विकल्पना (fault of the intellect). And Sankara has pointed out that—

"न हि बुद्धिपरिकल्पितेन अवयवेन परमार्थतः सावयवं वस्तु भवति"

(ब्रा०)

[i. e. "The unity does not really change to multiplicity, simply because our intellect cannot keep the *ground* separate and it imagines parts (अवयव) in it i. e. identifies the two erroneously".]

"Can the water of mirage", Sankara asks, "render the saline soil (उषर-देश) miry with moisture" ? (गौ० भा० 13. 2). Again he says—"न तु अद्विवुद्धिकाले, तदपगमकाले च, वस्तुनः कश्चिद्विशेषः स्यात् (ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 4. 6)." That is to say, "when a piece of rope is imagined under the form of a serpent, can that imagined form really make the rope a serpent ? It really makes no difference in the rope".

We must make earnest effort to change such *intellectual* outlook of ours, and try to look upon the world from the stand-point of the Self.—

"सर्वं जगदेकीकृत्य, षोडशधा प्रविभक्त्य, तस्मिन् ब्रह्मदृष्टिर्दिधातव्या"

(ब्रा० भा०, 4. 4. 1.)

Even when we are *confined to this Samsāra*,

to the world, we are to take it as *Atmā*, not as something *other* than *Atmā*.

Compare—

“स इहेव ब्रह्म, यद्यपि देहवानिव लक्ष्यते.....यस्मात् न हि तस्य 'अब्रह्मत्व-परिच्छेदहेतवः' कामाः सन्ति ।

‘तस्य आत्मैव, ‘नान्यः’ कामवित्तव्यः ‘वस्तुत्तरभूतः’ पदार्थो भवति’

(इ० भा०, 4. 4. 6).

Nothing ought to appear to him as *other than* Brahma; but all the differences of *nāma-rūpa* should now appear as *manifestations* of the underlying unity which is realising itself in them; for, *Atmā* is the *truth* of all differences—“सदात्मना विकाराणां सत्यत्वं, स्वतस्तु अनृतत्वमेव”। The differences would no longer appear *different* (अन्य) from Brahma, as so many self-subsisting things. And all ideas of *Separation* (भेद-बुद्धि, अन्यत्व-बोध) due to *Avidyā* would vanish. This erroneous idea it is which stands between our Self and *Mūkti* (final freedom).—

“अन्यत्वापीहेन संसारोपरमः कर्तव्यः । अविद्याया ‘अन्यत्वे न’ प्रत्युपस्थापित-मासीत्, तत् एतस्मिन् काले एकीभूतं” (इ० भा० 4. 3. 23.)

• “अन्यो हि अविद्यया भेदप्रत्ययः । स ‘अन्यत्’ पश्यन्, शृण्वन्, मन्वानो—इदं ज्ञत्वा इदं प्राप्नुयामिति हि मन्यते । तस्य एवं-कुर्वतो न ब्रह्मसंस्थता”

(छा० भा०, 2. 23. 1.)

[“This *Samsāra* ought to be got rid of, by means of removing the idea of *Anyatva* i. e. separateness. The idea of separateness is due to *Avidyā*, has been brought on by *Avidyā* or ignorance. This separateness is to be supplanted by the idea of Brahma, idea of unity”.]

(N. B. The significance of the word ‘एकीभूत’ is to be found in छा० भा० 8. 12. 3. quoted below.)

“The man with whom the idea of *difference* has not ceased regards (everything as) *Anya* i. e. different or separate from Brahma. He sees things as *different* from Brahma, hears and thinks things as different—he also conceives in this way—‘by means of this thing I will gain that thing’ &c. The man who takes things in this way, cannot be said to be ‘resting in Brahma’.”

“ननु ‘कथमेकः’ सन् नान्यत् पश्यति, नान्यत् शब्दोति ।.....कामांश्च ब्राह्म-
लौकिकान् पश्यन् रमते इति च विरुद्धं ?.....नैष दोषः ; द्रष्टु-‘रन्यत्वे न’
कामानाम्भावात् न पशति” (छा० भा०, 8. 12. 3).

[“How is it that you make two contradictory statements ? When the idea of *unity* will be established, one will see nothing, hear nothing &c. Yet you say that a “Mukta” will see the कामs (ideal forms) in Brahmaloaka. The reply is this—He does not see these ideal forms as अन्य, as separate from ātmā.”]

Here compare what Sankara says elsewhere—

“अविद्यादृष्टीनां.....‘अन्यदिव’ कार्याकारिण्य प्रसृतं । अन्नन्नप्रत्ययः
सर्वोऽविद्यामात्रः, ब्रह्मैवैकं परमार्थसत्यं” (सु० भा०, 2. 2. 11.)

[“Those who are affected by *avidya* view the effects extending on all sides as if they are something *other* (अन्य) than Brahma. All ideas that it is not Brahma are nothing but *avidya* ; Brahma alone is the Reality”].

(b) In this connection, I should like to draw your attention to Sankara’s theory of “*Adhyāropa* and *Apavāda*” (अध्यारोप and अपवाद) which has been resorted to for the purpose of “अन्यत्वापोह” referred to above, i. e. for the removal of the idea of separateness—अन्यत्व—from our mind and to firmly establish the idea of Brahma everywhere. The significance of the Theory is stated here :—When in the Self, through its contact (संसर्ग) with the objects in the environ-

ment, certain particular states and activities are produced, we superimpose (अध्यारोप) these on the Self, and thus confounding the two, we regard as if the sum-total of these particular states &c. constitutes the nature of the Self. This is *Adhyāropa*. Then Sankara describes the theory of *Apavāda*. Instead of confounding the states &c. and the Self, we ought to take these particular states &c. as means—उपाय— for the true knowledge of the underlying Self. Always to look upon the states &c. as a means for self-realisation is the correct view and this Sankara describes as *Apavāda*. *Rāma-tirtha* has thus explained this *Apavāda* theory in his note on the *Vedānta-sāra* which we should always bear in mind. He explains—

“अपवादो नाम—कार्यस्य कारणमात्रसत्तावशिष्यं, कारणस्वरूपव्यतिरेकेण
कार्यस्य असत्तावधारणं वा—‘अपवाद’ इत्युक्तं भवति” ।

The lines have been thus translated by A. E. Gough—

“ [Rescission or repudiation is the attribution, to the effect, of the being of its cause, or the determination of the non-existence of the effect otherwise than as identical with (i. e. nondifferent from) its cause.] ”

You will see then that we are not to look upon the effects i. e. the objects of the world or the states &c. of the finite Self, as so many *self-subsisting* and independent entities, but as having *no separate being* from the underlying cause or the Self. Sankara regards this view as the *means* or उपाय for self-realisation which will remove the idea of separateness or अन्यत्वं । Take his illustration given there—

“संख्यास्वरूपपरिज्ञानाय.....रेखाध्यारोपयं कृत्वा ‘एकेयं रेखा’ ‘दशैयं’
‘शतैयं’ इति याद्वयति, अवगमयति संख्यास्वरूपं केवलं—न तु संख्याया ‘रेखात्मत्व’-
मेव ।...तथा, सत्पत्न्याद्यने ‘कोपाय’मास्थाय एकं ब्रह्मतत्त्वमावेदितं । पुनः
तत्-कल्पितोपायजनित ‘विशेष’परिशोधनार्थं ‘नेति’ ‘नेति’ इति तत्त्वोपसंहारः
कृतः” (व० भा०, 4. 4. 25).

It means—

“अनुबुद्धिः कश्चित् रेखामिव अक्षरं (or संख्या) मेने । पश्चात् उपदेशेन
रेखायां अक्षरबुद्धिं (or संख्याबुद्धिं) तत्याज । तद्वत्...अनात्मानमेव आत्मतया
जानीते...तस्मात् दृष्टिं वारयित्वा...तदुपायमादत्ते इति.....तत्स्वरूपं बोधयति”

(आ० मि०) ।

[i. e. “We employ lines, dots &c. to represent the numbers and we call certain line as ‘one’, another line as ‘two’ and so on. But simply because the lines are used for numbers, the numbers do not become lines ; the lines are to be viewed only as a means for the comprehension of the nature of the numbers. In the same way, the manifested differences of nāma-rūpa and states &c. do not reduce the Self to these differences ; but these are to be taken simply as a means of, for the purpose of, the real knowledge of the Self. These differences are not to be mistaken for the Self, simply because they appear in the Self”.]

Compare also—

“अनात्मानं देहेन्द्रियादिसंघातं आत्मनो दृश्यमानमपि (i. e. object)
घटादिवत्, ‘आत्मत्वे न’ गृह्णाति...अज्ञो दुरवगाह्या विचित्रं यं माया”

(कठ० भा०, 3. 12).

[“People mistake for the *atma* the body, the intellect, the senses &c. &c. which are not the *atma*, but as its knowable objects, like the pot &c. This is due to the influence of the mysterious and marvellous *Maya*.”]

“The true nature of the Self is not tainted by the blemishes of the senses &c. ; because the *atma* is external to the false notion so superposed”—5. 11.]

(2) The *Sādhanas*, means, for the realisation of Brahma—

By the cultivation of moral virtues and other *Sādhanas* we must purify our mind and the senses—“*ātmā* is seen by the purified intellect” (कठ० भा० 3. 12). The infinite wealth (ज्ञानैश्वर्य—आनन्द) of the inexhaustible (अव्यय) nature of the *Atmā* is present in our Self. The realisation by the Ego of the Reality of the *Atmā* in us is beautifully described in the *Bṛihadāranyaka-Upanishad* by the help of the impressive illustration of the union of husband and wife* in deep love and affection. The husband in the embrace of his most affectionate wife forgets altogether the presence of objects near him and loses his *separate* consciousness and being in the pure and perfect and selfless happiness born of such union.—

“यथा लोके प्रियया इष्टया स्त्रिया सम्यक् परिषक्तः, कान्यन्त्या कामुकः,
न वाञ्छति किञ्चन वेद ‘मत्तोऽन्यद्भस्तु इति’, न च आननं ‘अहमस्मि सुखी दुःखी
वेति’ ; अपरिषक्तस्तु तथा विभक्तः जानाति सर्वमेव वाञ्छति’ &c.”

(इ० भा०, 4. 3. 21.)

It is thus seen that when the true knowledge arises, the *avidyā* under whose influence the objects of the world appeared as *different* from the Supreme Unity will vanish and with it the idea of separateness (अन्यत्व-बोध) will disappear, and this is जीवन्मुक्ति—Emancipation.—

* We believe the *Vaisnava* philosophers borrowed their ideas of मधुर-भाव from this text.

“अन्यत्वभावनिरहती... आत्मभावो भवति ।... सर्व्वात्मभावो मुक्तिः”

(इ० भा० 4. 4. 6.)

“संसारिणः संसारित्वापीडेन ईश्वरात्मत्व प्रतिपादयित्”

(त्र० सू० भा०, 4. 1. 3).

[“When the idea of (our) *separateness* (from God) is removed, the idea of (our essential identity with) God will arise. This is *Mukti*. That we are *essentially* connected with the world is to be removed, and that we are *essentially* related with God is to be realised”.]

Unless we are able to annihilate this *avidyā* which has concealed Brahma and created or projected the idea of *Anyatwa*—separateness—in its place, how can we gain the true character of the Supreme Reality—याथात्म्य-दर्शन ? Nīla-kantha, the reputed commentator of the Mahābhārata and a faithful follower of Sankarāchāryya states that Nirguna Brahma whose nature is Bliss (आनन्द) contains within it infinite wealth of ज्ञानैश्वर्य and शक्तिशैश्वर्य, and it is this wealth which is finding expression in the world. “आनन्दस्य नित्यैश्वर्यं मायया अभिव्यज्यते” *. Sankara himself calls Nirguna Brahma as *Sivam* (शिवम्) in—

“परमार्थतोऽनुपाधिकृतं एकमेवाद्वितीयं... अत्रमभयं ‘शिव’मिष्यते”

(प्र० भा०, 6. 3).

And also—

“अद्वयता शिवा” (मा० का० भा० 2. 33.)

“यच्च अत्रममृतमभयं ‘शिव’मद्वितीयं तत् सत्यं स आत्मा तव”

(छा० भा० 6. 16. 3).

As the Infinite is within the finite Self, the Infinite ज्ञानैश्वर्य—wealth of Wisdom and Power

* Vide : महाभारत—वनपर्व, chap. 213.

and Beauty—lies concealed under *avidyā* within us.—

“जीवः परमात्मांश्च एव सन्, तिरस्कृतज्ञानैश्वर्यो भवति...जीवस्य ज्ञानैश्वर्य-
तिरोभावः...देहेन्द्रियबुद्धि-विषयवेदनादियोगात् भवति”

(ब्र० सू० भा०, 3. 2. 6).

“परमानन्दस्यैव विषय-विषय्याकारिण मात्रा प्रकृता” (ब्र० भा०, 4. 3. 33.)

[“The finite Self—being like a part of *Paramatma*,—like a Divine Spark, Infinite ज्ञानैश्वर्य—exists concealed within him..The infinite wealth of Wisdom and Power is covered up on account of the connection of the finite Self with his body, sense-organs, the intellect and sense-perceptions and the like.”]

[“Limited measures of the Supreme Bliss work in the world through the Subject-object relation.”]

At present, we do not even suspect its presence in us, so completely has *avidyā* concealed, screened it. Our eye is fixed at present upon the names and forms—“नामरूपोपाधिदृष्टिरेव भवति स्वाभाविकी” (ब्र० 3. 5. 1). But as that screen is gradually removed by our cultivation of moral virtues and other *Sādhanas*, the Infinite ज्ञानैश्वर्य will gradually stand revealed before us. —

“ज्ञानैश्वर्याद्यभिव्यक्तिरपि परेण परेण भूयस्ती भवति” (ब्र० भा०, 1. 3. 30).

To the extent you are able to remove the Screen of *Avidyā* (Vide, ब्र० सू० भा०, 1. 1. 12 and 3. 2. 5), to that extent the Infinite Divine Wealth—*भगवदैश्वर्य*—will stand revealed and realised by you. But it requires great effort and *Sādhana* on your part.—

“महाप्रयासेन स्वभावप्रवृत्तिनिरोधं कृत्वा” (कठ० भा०, 4. 1),

(प्र० भा० 6. 1).

[“Our inherent natural impulses must be curbed with intense effort.”]

And our success in this direction is also dependent on the Grace of God.

“परमेश्वरमभिधायतो यतमानस्य... 'ईश्वर-प्रसादात्'... कश्चिदिवादिर्भवति...
न स्वभावतः सर्वेषां” (ब्र० सू० 3. 2. 5).

[“It reveals to only a few of those earnest Spirits who meditate on God, through the Divine Grace.”]

These ऐश्वर्य's are inexhaustible and perfect, they cannot, therefore, be completely revealed here in this temporal and imperfect mundane world, since what is revealed here is but a partial expression of the Divine. To a world beyond this, yet connected with it, we would carry our Soul there with its *Sādhana* (पूर्वप्रज्ञा—वृ० 4. 4. 2), and be enabled there to *further* develop our capacities—

“यतते च ततो भूयः संसिद्धौ कुहनन्दन” (गी०, 6. 43).

and thus to perfect our character. We are not merely finite and creature of time, but we are also something *more*—we are also infinite, which raises us beyond time-limitations and makes us one with the Supreme Infinite (परमात्मैकत्व) Principle—Brahma, where all strife and defect will end and we would be perfect with the Perfect.—

“सर्वदुःखविनिर्मुक्तचेतन्यात्मकोऽहमित्येव आत्मानुभवः (ब्र०, 4. 1. 2).

“पुरुषे तु... सर्वानर्थभ्रातातीते प्रतिपन्ने दृश्यते प्रयोजनं मोक्षसिद्धिः”

(ब्र० भा०, 3. 3. 14).

[“The immediate realisation of the *atma* is “I” which is free from all suffering and evil.” “The Supreme End of existence is the realisation of freedom in the Supreme *Purusha* who is found to be lying beyond all evils and sufferings”.]

The Infinite is within us, God's purpose is revealing in the world, and it is our duty to choose that

Good as our Ideal. We may fail to realise it, and in that case there is no advancement. But we are *free* to a certain extent and there is possibility to adopt it as our End. As God is working in the world and He is the ultimate Agent, He will see that His good purpose is not frustrated and that the world is, as a whole, advancing to the good Purpose. God is within us in possibility and we have actualised that possibility so far in our character. Infinite possibility lies open in our character and it is not something stereotyped. Determinists say that it is our character—*प्रकृति*—which finds expression in our conduct (*आचरण*)—“*प्रकृति स्तुं नियोज्यति... करिष्यस्यवशोऽपि सन्*” (गी०, 18. 59); and it is our character that determines our actions. But our character has been *formed* by us; it is liable to transformations. The Determinists *identify* the Self with the character which it owns. But the real solution lies in the *relation* of the Self to the character. The Self is to be *distinguished* from its content; it *has* its character, but it is not identical with it. *Apart* from Self, character is mere abstraction. Hence, that our character determines our action really means—it is *our Self* (which *has* the character for its content) that determines; and the basal Self being Infinite, infinite possibilities are always open to it. My past and present life cannot be exhaustive expression of my possibilities; I am always *more* than my past and present life. Hence, nobody can tell beforehand how our Self will actually express its hidden possibilities. Sometimes the Self surprises all by its action which is quite unexpected, which

leads to quite a different course of action. Take the case of *Jagāi* of Nadia who broke away from his past, yet he was the *same* man. But the man sometimes falls when he is expected to stand.

Other Sādhanas for self-realisation——

(a) So long as we are driven helpless to action by the energies of our impulses born of our empirical nature (प्रकृति), we desire objects which are calculated to satisfy these impulses ; we are bent on selfish ends and are deluded by 'Egoism'. We must rise above the sway of affection and aversion and restrain these impulses under the law of rational reflection, by "abandoning attachment and the fruits thereof"——

“राग-द्वेषवियुक्तैस्तु विषयानिन्द्रियैश्चरन् ।

आत्मवशैर्विधेयात्मा प्रसादमधिगच्छति” ॥—

Worldly desires and interests are useless to a man of wisdom. The commentary on the *Gītā* says—
“By restraining the *first natural* activities one by one and thereby gradually inducing fresh and *higher* activities, the *Sruti* teaching works (कर्मकाण्ड) serves to create an aspiration to reach the inmost Soul” (I8, 66).

(b) “I reward the *unselfish* who do their *prescribed duties* and seek for *Moksha*, by granting them knowledge” (Chap. 4). Free from egoism and without attachment for fruits of action, one must meditate on *Iswara*, *dedicating* all actions to Him. Devotion to one's *duty* leads to perfection. “Self-knowledge is the aim of all endeavour.”

(c) Knowledge of the true nature of the Self aided by all favourable conditions of its rise and de-

velopment, viz : purity of mind, humility, inner purity of mind, "Self-control which consists in directing exclusively to the right path the body and the mind which are by nature attracted to all directions", perception of evil in birth, death and old age, in sickness and pain ; steady unflinching meditation on the One as our sole refuge &c. &c.—these virtues are to be cultivated (Chap. 13. 7-11.). ज्ञान-निष्ठा consists in an "intent effort to establish a continuous current of the idea of the inner Self (प्रत्यगात्मा)—chap. 18, 55.

(d) The *Gītā* remarks—"The end of knowledge is freedom (मुक्ति). The end should be kept in view ; for, it is only when one perceives the end that one will endeavour to cultivate attributes which are the means of attaining that knowledge. The attributes or virtues to be cultivated have been specified in Chap. 13, 7-10.—

(i) Humility, patience, uprightness, purity, social service, absence of Egoism, society of the disciplined &c. &c.

"अमानित्वमदमित्वमहिंसा चान्तिराज्जैव । दया भूतेष्वलोलुपः" &c. &c.

(ii) Cultivation of piety, chastity, right intuition &c. &c. (Chap. 16, 1.)

"अभयं अक्षयं बुद्धिः ज्ञानयोगव्यवस्थितिः । अहिंसा सत्यमक्रोधः, अपैशुनः" &c. &c.

(iii) मैत्री, करुणा, मुदिता, उपेक्षा &c. as mentioned by Madhusudana in his Gloss on the *Gītā*.

(e) Contemplation of the Beautiful—in "रसोऽहमस्मि, कौन्तेय," "प्रभास्मि शशि-सूर्ययोः," "शब्दः खे," "पीरुषं तृषु" etc. etc. (Chap. 6, and 11) ;

Chap. 5, 25—"सर्वभूतहिते रताः" etc.

(f) Sankara's remarks are very useful in the formation of our *ethical* character.—

“The good (श्रेयः) and the pleasurable (प्रेयः) are confusedly presented to the man. The intelligent compare the two ; and on mature reflection discern their relative value—their difference—and having thus reflected, they embrace the good as worthier than the pleasurable. Then they adopt means to the attainment of the End chosen” (कठ० भा०). We thus compare, estimate our impulses—they are thus our objects of contemplation. A sum-total of feelings, impulses etc. etc. cannot deliberate, cannot control anymore than each feeling and impulse separately. Only a free Self can do so which has them. In every voluntary action, the Self which is not in time, does and can introduce a new element in time.

(g) कर्म—Work done under impulsive forces and with self-seeking end in view is to be replaced by work done with higher and inner ends in view. Reflection—विचार—guides man in this stage for selecting higher ends. Then lastly, the realisation of the unity of the Self is the highest end and it is the highest activity in life. The meditation of Brahma in and through the manifested objects—“जगतश्च यन्मूलं तत्परिज्ञानात् परं श्रेय इति सर्वोपनिषदां निश्चितोऽर्थः” (प्र० भा०, 6. 1)—in order of increasing value—is regarded as meritorious, and it leads man gradually to the highest Goal. The doing of all prescribed duties and leading a life of virtue (“पूर्वं पुण्यकृत् भूत्वा”—वृ० भा० 4.4.9.)—are regarded as necessary aids to the knowledge of Brahma.

It is wrong to hold the view* that the Vedānta teaches *inertia*—inactivity.—

“पूर्व-पूर्वभूमिषु वैराग्यं, उत्तरोत्तरभूमौ आनन्दप्राप्तिसाधनं ; वैराग्यस्य
‘तर-तम-भाविन’ परमकाष्ठोपपत्तेः, ‘निरतिशयस्य’ तस्य (Transcendent good
—beyond the series of goods in the scale of existence)
‘परमानन्द’प्राप्तिसाधनत्वसम्भवात्”—(आ० गिरि, in व० भा०, 4. 3. 33.)—

i. e. Man cannot find satisfaction of his Self in any earthly and temporal order of things. He seeks in Transcendent God the fulfilment of the Good he is trying to realise in his own life. This Good—**“परमानन्द”**—we find revealed *gradually* in the order of nature.

‘यत्र यत्र विभूत्याद्यतिशयः, तत्र तत्र ईश्वर इति उपाख्यतया योक्तव्ये’ ।

Thus we think of God as a Power in the world—immanent power working in the world and progressively making for Good. The world, as I have tried to show in a previous Lecture, reveals an End or Divine Purpose which is being unfolded stage by stage. The world is striving towards, developing towards, an End and its Goal is out of sight. “Brahma is **“आनन्द”**—**“रस”** ; and this **रस** is what gives pleasure and joy, is well-known in the world as sweet, sour &c. &c. Here, the *worldly bliss* produced by the presence of external helps (stimulating objects), has been instanced for understanding the Divine Bliss ; for, it is by means of this well-known bliss that the Divine Bliss can be understood” (तै० भा०).

Thus the *Ideal Good* (**आनन्द** or **साध्वर्थ**) which is revealing and working in the worldly objects, of which they are but imperfect manifestations—is the *highest*

End of human pursuit. The lower and higher objects are, therefore, only the *proximate* ends and these can be made to be embraced in the Highest Good. The multiplicity of human ends is connected with the Supreme End. But as Brahma *transcends* the temporal order of objects, we ought not to remain satisfied with these lesser ends, but must move through these for a complete and *final* satisfaction.—

“जगत्कारणं उपास्य ब्रह्म उवाच, अनुपाधिन्न ह्यप्रतिपत्तिः कर्त्तव्या ..
उभयविदेव सम्यग् ज्ञानी । न हि अन्यतरस्य तत्त्वे ज्ञाते कृतकाल्यता अस्ति”

(नीलकण्ठ in the *Gītā*).

In the *Gītā*, it has been shown that Brahma is to be first worshipped as the *Cause* of the world—as the *Power* which carries on and sustains the worldly process—परिष्ठासि-नित्य । —“सामान्यात्मके मयि सर्वे^३ विशेषाः प्रोताः” । Then at the same time, Brahma is to be *known* as a Being which transcends this process—कूटस्थ-नित्य. A man who has not realised these *two aspects* of Brahma cannot be said to be able to realise the Highest Good—the Supreme End (गौ०, Chap. 12).

The Source of Advaita-vāda.

ADWAITA-VĀDA IN THE RIG-VEDA.

—::—

While discussing the relation which subsists between the cause and its successive effects, Sankarāchāryya in his commentary on the Brahma-Sutra introduced, as we have stated before, the idea of two stand-points from which this relation can be viewed, *viz.*, the Pāramārthika and the Vyāvahārika. He says that from the former stand-point the effects are to be looked upon as Ananya (अनन्य)—not distinct—from their cause, although from the Vyāvahārika view, we take them to be Anya (अन्य)—distinct—from the cause. About the exact significance of these two terms—‘Anya’ and ‘Ananya’—much misunderstanding exists in various quarters and we would try in this Lecture to bring out the bearing of these two terms upon his entire theory in the light of what Sankarāchāryya has himself said about them.

We would here explain the idea with the help of an illustration which Sankara himself has used in several parts of his commentaries. मृच्चूर्ण (fragments of earth), पिंड (lump of earth), घट (pot) are the effects or transformations or manifestations of the cause मृत्तिका (clay). Now, what is the nature of the relation that exists between these

successive changes issuing out of the मृत्तिका—effects produced from the cause? This relation can be explained in two different ways. The ordinary common people of the world regard the successive changes thus produced as self-subsisting entities—existing *separated* or divided from their cause. The clay to their view, has transformed itself as मृच्चूर्ण and the मृच्चूर्ण totally transforms itself into मृत्-पिंड, and the मृत्-पिंड into the घट or the pot. One form is changed into another and that again into another and so on. One dies and another is produced. The preceding forms are looked upon as the causes, successively, of the latter forms. This is the empirical stand-point and our practical life is bound up with this view.

But it is otherwise when these are considered from the Pāramārthika stand-point. This view never regards the effects as separated from or outside of the causal reality. They can never exist separated from their cause, *out of relation to* their cause. मृच्चूर्ण, पिंड, घट etc., are not, to this view, so many self-subsisting entities, but only successive manifestations of the one causal reality—मृत्तिका—lying, hidden behind them. Here, the clay or rather the nature of the clay finds its expression in the successive forms produced out of it. The real essence of the clay is not *lost* in these forms; it is present behind each of these successive changes; the identity of the cause is not lost but present in each successive change or difference.* It does not itself change with these changing forms;

* Vide : the quotation given at P. 132.

it does not, in assuming these forms, become something else or अन्य. It is clear then that these successively changing forms do not entirely lose their value * in the eyes of those who are possessed of the पारमार्थिकदृष्टि. Sankara has told us that there is really no conflict or opposition (विरोध) between these two views.

“तेषां (दैतिनां) दैतदृष्टिः, अस्माकमदैतदृष्टिः ।.....तैः.....असदीयोऽयं
'सर्वानव्यत्वात्' आत्मैकत्वदर्शनपक्षो न 'विरुध्यते' (मा० का० भा०, 3. 17-18)”.

[“They are all Dualists and dualism is their stand-point, but our stand-point is non-dualism. There is no *conflict* between these two views, as everything is non-different (अन्य) from the Self”].

Here compare आनन्दगिरि—

“दैतमदैतकार्थं, न च कारणं तत्कार्यप्रतिभासैर्विरुध्यते,—कार्यस्य
कारणातिरिक्तेण अभावात् । अतः दैतपक्षैरदैतपक्षो विरुद्धो न भवति” ।

[“All dual forms are the effects of non-dual (Brahma); and there is thus no conflict between the effect and the real cause ; for, no effect is really different from the cause.]”

As there is no opposition, the परिणामवाद may be retained even when we emphasise the विवर्त्त-वाद †.

But there are, unfortunately, several modern interpreters of Sankara's System who think otherwise. They regard all nāma-rūpas—the whole universe—as mere illusion, as unreal and false. But, as we have seen above, Sankara has found no necessity for denying the existence of the world altogether. Sankarāchāryya distinctly declares—

* Because they are viewed as the *manifestations* of the underlying cause (not as this thing or that thing.)

† “अप्रत्याख्यानं कार्यप्रपञ्चं परिणाम-प्रक्रियां च आश्रयति सूत्रकारः (वेदा० भा०, 2. 1. 14).

“Nobody has the power to dissolve both the external and internal existences which are presented to our senses and to our consciousness (विद्यमानः).”

Here is how he expresses this idea :—

“कोऽयं प्रपञ्च-विलयो नाम ?.....तत्र यदि तावत् विद्यमानोऽयं प्रपञ्चो देहादिलक्षण आध्यात्मिकः, वास्त्वय प्रथिव्यादिलक्षणः प्रविलापयितव्य इत्याचारत, स पुरुषमात्रे च अशक्यः प्रविलापयितुमिति, तत्रविलयोपदेशोऽशक्यविषय एव स्यात् ।”

(वे० भा०, 3, 2, 21).

[“What”, Sankara enquires of the doubtor, “is your idea about the Dissolution (प्रपञ्च-विलय), pray ?.....The world—both in its subjective and objective condition—actually exists (विद्यमानः) ; nobody is therefore capable of dissolving the *existence* of such a world. You cannot really mean this by your term प्रपञ्च-विलय” &c. &c.]

In a famous passage in the Brihadāranyaka-bhāṣya, he raises a question—

“If you hold all the nāma-rūpas to be real and not false, what would be the fate of your Adwaita-Vāda ? Brahman has been declared in the Sruti as One and without a second. If you hold to this declaration made by the Sruti, you cannot, at the same time, admit the reality of the difference of the nāma-rūpa—the changes going on in the world.”—

“नामरूपोपाध्यस्तित्वे —‘एकमेवाद्वितीयं’ ‘नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन’ इति श्रुतयो विरुद्धे रन् इति,—न ; सलिल-फेनदृष्टान्ते न परिहृतत्वात्”

(ब० भा०, 3. 5. 1).

The reply here suggested by Sankarāchāryya is very important. He says—“No, you need not deny the existence of the changes—the nāma-rūpas. The existence of these does not at all harm, or come into conflict (विरोध), in any way with the theory of Adwaitism. Take the case of the relation between

water and its productions—the waves, bubbles, foams and froth ; the relation between clay and its successive transformations in the shape of मृच्चूर्णं, मृत्पिंड, घट etc.” As it is the *cause* itself which appears as these changed forms, these are, in reality, non-different (अनन्य) from their cause. No necessity arises to *deny* these successive changes, if we conceive them to be (अनन्य) *i. e.*, non-different from their cause. That these are non-different (अनन्य) from their cause does not make them different—अन्य—or independent entities : neither does it *abolish their own respective forms*. Carefully note also what Sankarāchāryya says in this respect in his Vedānta-bhāṣya :—

‘न च समुद्रादुदकात्मनोऽनन्यत्वे ऽपि.....फेन-तरंगादीनां इतरतरभावापत्ति-
भवति ।

न च तेषामितरतरभावानापत्तावपि समुद्रात्मनोऽनन्यत्वं भवति ।”

(वे० भा०, 2. 1. 13).

[“*i. e.* The foams, the waves, the billows &c. are non-different from the sea-water (their cause), but they are different from one another in their own respective forms ; one form does not pass over into another form”.

“Each of these is different from the other, no doubt ; but that does not make them different from the sea-water.”]

The sum and substance of Sankara’s arguments may be thus stated :—

(a) Whenever the effects are produced, they are produced from their cause ; they can never appear divided—separated—from their cause.*—

* “यस्य च यस्यादात्मलाभो भवति, स तेन अप्रविभक्तो दृष्टः, यथा घटादीनां मृदा”
(इ० भा०) ।

“विशेषाः सामान्ये उक्ताः, न तत एव निर्भेद्य ग्रहीतुं शक्नुवन्ते”

(इ० भा०) ।

Can you separate the pot from its cause—the clay ?
Can you separate the waves from their cause—the water ? Can you, placing the waves outside the water, regard them as something self-existent—as something अन्य ?

(b) The effects are, in reality, the manifestations of their cause,—the stages through which the causal reality expresses its nature. It is the cause which without forfeiting its own identity differentiates itself in these forms. It is the cause which holds these forms, sustains them. It is like the identity of the thread which holds the manifold flowers together and forms a piece of garland.* Then how is it possible to *abolish* these successive changes or to *separate* them from their cause which holds them ?

(c) The cause does not, in assuming these forms, lose itself in them. The movements of my hand, the walking, the uttering of words—all these are my states ; they are mine, they belong to me. If you separate these from me, they lose their substance, they die ; for, it is the cause alone which binds its effects. One can, without difficulty, recognise the *identity* of the cause in its different changing states or manifestations. A cow, when lying in repose and ruminating, is called a cow ; but when it gets up and walks, will it now be called a horse, and not the same identical cow † ?

* “मयि सर्वमिदं प्रोक्तं, सर्वे मयिगणा इव” (गौ०) ।

† “न हि लोके गौस्तिष्ठन् गच्छन् वा गौर्भवति शयानस्तु षष्ठादिजात्यन्तरम् इत्यादि”
(इ० भा०, 2. 1. 20).

The cause is thus the same • throughout all its changing differentiations and does not lose its identity and *become* something *different* from its own self.

Throughout all these changes, the cause remained as it was in itself. Thus Brahma exists *apart* from relationships, *as well* as in and through relations. It transcends the universe of Māyā, but in its transcendence it does not throw away Māyā ;—Māyā being but no other than Brahma (itself), revealing and hiding itself. When घट (pot) disappears it hides itself in clay ; for, it was nothing but clay ; when it appears as a pot, it is nothing but clay ; for, it hides its nature as clay in घट (pot) । Sankara thus expresses the idea—

“दन्ति दाद्विकारे,
जगति तथा परमात्मा,

दाद्वि तिरोभवति ; सोऽपि तद्वैव ।
परमात्मन्यपि जगत् तिरोधत्ते” ॥

(स्वात्मनिरूपण, 94.)

[“The wood lies hidden in the form of the elephant, (when it is) made of wood, and the form of the elephant when disappearing also hides itself in the wood. *So the Supreme Self lies hidden in the universe (when manifested) and the universe (when disappearing) lies hidden in the Self”.]

Brahman or the underlying Reality is not thus in any way affected or changed by the changing nāma-rūpas. It is the universe in which the Reality is expressing its nature, so that you need not deny the reality or the existence of the universe. There is, therefore, no opposition (विरोध) between the world and its causal source. * It is in this way that in

* Vide : Ananda-giri quoted at p. 193.

Sankara-Vedānta the परिणाम has been retained, while emphasising the विवर्त^१. It is most erroneous to suppose, as has been done by many, that in order to retain the unity of Brahman, Sankarāchāryya has abolished the world as false.

Sankara's Adwaita Philosophy is founded upon this relation of the cause and its effects. From the discussion given above we arrive at the conclusion that one cause is present behind its different manifestations in the world; that the cause itself is gradually realising itself in the different forms of nāma-rūpa. It will be a mistake to think the effects produced from the cause as something *different* from it.

One Reality manifests itself in the multiplicity of nāma-rūpas, and the true nature of this Reality has not been *reduced* to these successive effects. It is the connecting link of all these differences, and its own nature realises itself in and through these differentiations. There is no need in Sankara's System to declare the unreality* of these differences, or to separate these from the underlying causal reality taking them as self-sufficient entities.

If the Māyā and its products are not Brahma itself, but something else, other than ब्रह्म (अन्य); (if they do not form part of Brahma) then the result would be violation of Adwaita-Vāda—a *dualism* would step in. Sankara avoids this dualism by pointing out non-difference (अनन्यत्व) of effects

* "सदात्मना विकाराणां सत्यत्वं, स्वतस्तु अदृश्यत्वमेव" (का० भा०)

from their cause. He has not *abolished* the objects of the world, he only looked upon them—as Brahma, as the expression of His nature. This was his पारमार्थिक view ; he looked upon the world from this higher stand-point. The following quotations will also support our position—

“अनवगत-काञ्चनानां, भूषण-धीरेव भूषणे हेमि ।
एवमविवेकभाजां, जगति तथा न तात्त्विकी विषया ॥”
(स्वात्म-निरूपण, 83.)

[“Those who have not realised the gold, look upon a golden ornament as an ornament only (but not as gold) ; so too those who have no realisation of truth, do not perceive the world as Brahma, but as world only. ”]

बहुभिः किमेभिरुक्तैः, अहमेवेदं चराचरं विश्वं ।
शोकर-फेन-तरङ्गाः, सिन्धोरपराणि न खलु वस्तूनि ॥ (145)

[“All this universe sentient and non-sentient is Brahma, is “I”. Foam, wave and spray &c. are not, in reality, substances *different* (अन्य, अपर) from the ocean.”]

• “आत्मैवैकं जगत् सर्वं, आत्मनोऽन्यत् न किञ्चन ।
अदो यद्वत् घटादीनि, स्वात्मानं सर्व्वमीक्षते ॥”
(आत्मबोध, 48).

[“As one sees pots &c. as mere clay ; so all this universe (सर्व्वे) is only the Self, there is naught *other* than Self.”]

It is our deliberate opinion—and this opinion has been formed by a careful and scrutinising study of the Rig-Veda itself—that the relation between

the cause and its effect as expounded by Sankarāchāryya, the true import of which we have given above, owes its origin to the Rig-Veda. The popular conception that the hymns of the Rig-Veda are addressed to the grand and remarkable natural forces which captured the imagination of the primitive Aryan settlers of India, in the shape of the Sun, the Moon, the Dawn, the Sky, etc., is altogether erroneous. We have, on the contrary, found ample material in the Rig-Veda which unmistakably proves that the theory of Non-dualism as interpreted by Sankara in his Vedānta System of philosophy runs throughout this stupendous work from the beginning to the end. This may sound strange to many ears, but would it not rather be regarded as remarkably strange that an intelligent race of people like the Hindus should exhibit such a lamentable lack of even common-sense in allowing the hymns and Mantras addressed to inert (जड़) non-intelligent *natural* phenomena to form an essential part of their religion! Even at the present day, their daily devotions and prayers to God are performed by a hymn of the Rig-Veda. If the Rig-Veda contains nothing but certain measured lines meant to be addressed to the fascinating objects of nature calculated to inspire awe and admiration, then its value and importance are considerably diminished. To our view, the importance of the Rig-Veda lies in the fact that it is the original store-house of the Indian Idealism which supplied the materials of Adwaita-Vāda which subsequently gave rise to the admirable System of Vedānta.

We have found above that it is an important feature of the Vedantic causal theory that the effects produced by the cause can never remain *separated* from the cause and be regarded on their own account, to be independent and self-sufficient entities ; and that the causal reality, in assuming these forms, does not become something else (अन्य), losing its own nature. It is only the nature of the causal reality which finds gradual expression in and through these visible forms.* Now, *this is also the position of the Rig-Veda itself*. The Vedic Rishis worshipped this causal Reality which operates behind these visible forms, knowing full well that these visible forms *by themselves* have no value at all. For, they can never be *separated* from the underlying causal reality and considered on their own account, as if they are the only realities.* The Vedic Rishis did not remain satisfied with these visible forms but behind the shifting scenes of nature they always tried to seek for and discovered a constant causal Reality which they worshipped. It is the quest of changeless which is in the midst of changes.

There are quite a number of arguments by which this position has been established in the Rig-Veda. We would, in this Lecture, content ourselves with presenting *only one set* of arguments collected from different places of the Rig-Veda. If, to the Vedic Rishis the gods were no more than so many *visible*

* ".....तया मनुष्यादिष्वेव हिरण्यगर्भं पर्यन्तेषु ज्ञानैश्वर्याद्यभिन्नैरपि परिणमयसी भवति" । (वे० भा० १-३-३०).

Vide : also गी० भा०, १५-१२.

objects as they appeared to the senses, we would not have found mention of the *dual nature* of each of the Vedic gods so clearly and distinctly, as has been done in the Rig-Veda. The Agni, the Suryya, the Aswins, the Soma,—in fact every Vedic god we find described as possessing a dual form, a dual nature of his own. As Brahman has been described in the Upanishads as प्राणस्य प्राणः, मनसो मनः, सूर्यस्य सूर्यः etc., so in the Rig-Veda, under the visible forms of the gods there is, in each case, an *invisible form* which constitutes the *true* nature of these gods. In the Vedic state of society, people were not wanting whose cultured minds were busy discovering the presence of an invisible causal power working behind nature which they contemplated and worshipped, taking the shifting phenomena of nature as mere external expressions of that hidden causal power. The very mention of the dual nature of the Vedic gods unmistakably bears witness to the fact that the actual visible forms of the gods were never recognised in the Rig-Veda as the *only realities*. They are all different facets of one and the same shining light, different types of manifestation of one unity, different names for one Reality.

We would now quote here the hymns from which readers would find how the *dual nature* of the gods has been brought out in the Rig-Veda.

(1) Take the case of the *Agni*—

It is stated about Agni—the fire-god—that the visible, material form of Agni has *within him* another invisible, internal form, and this internal form—**सूक्ष्मरूप**—is the real nature of the material fire.

श्मशानाग्नि, i. e. the fire kindled on cremation ground for burning the dead body is thus addressed :—

‘‘क्रव्यादमग्निं प्रहिणोमि दूरं, यमराज्यं गच्छतु रिप्रवाहः ।
इहैवायमितरो जातवेदा, देवेभ्यो हव्यं वहतु प्रजानम्’’ ॥

[“The material form of the fire, the form which is devouring, consuming the body of the dead, we do not want ; let this form be removed from us. But here, *within* this visible fire, there is *another fire*, and this fire it is which knows everything born in the world. It is this fire which always conveys oblations to the gods.”]

Take again the following Mantra :—

‘‘विधेम ते परमे जन्मन्त्रे, विधेम सोमैरवरे सधस्थे ।
यस्माद् योनेरुदारिषा, यजे तम् ।’’

[“The fire has two-fold birth-places—the place of its manifestation. The one is the superior place, and the other inferior or the gross place. We desire to worship, O Fire ! that place—*that source*—that योनि—from which thou hast sprung” .]

That the invisible form of the fire is nothing but its causal nature has been very well brought out by the term योनि. This invisible causal substance of the visible fire is also referred to in another hymn in this manner :—

• ‘‘विद्वा ते नाम परमं गुह्यं यत् । विद्वा तमुक्तं यत् आजगम्य’’ ॥

[“The fire has got a most *hidden* name, and we have been able to learn of this hidden name of the fire. We know, too, the *source*—उक्त—from which thou hast sprung up, O Fire !”]

In another hymn we find this address :—

“Over and above this material body, the fire has a most *auspicious body* ; carry by that body this dead man to the higher region of heaven (10-16-4).” Exactly similar prayer we find addressed to the Sun in the Isa-Upanishad : “Withdraw, O Sun ! these Thy visible rays. I desire to see that *auspicious form* of thine *which lies concealed within* those rays.”

(2) Suryya—

The Rig-Veda in similarly unmistakable terms refers to the underlying hidden causal substance existing behind the visible form of the Sun.

“द्वे ते चक्रे सूर्ये, ब्रह्माण ऋतुया विदुः ।

अथैकं चक्रं यद् गुहा, तदध्यातय इत् विदुः” ॥

[“To the Sun belong two wheels (चक्र). One is gross, visible to all ; but the other is hidden, invisible- गुहा ।”]

[“Who knows this *invisible hidden* चक्र of the Sun ? Only to those who are of contemplative turn of mind, who meditate inwardly within, this गूढ चक्र reveals its essence ; others cannot know this.”]

This description leaves no doubt in our mind as to the real nature of this invisible wheel of the Sun. It is the causal substance which underlies the *visible* gross form of the Sun. The presence of this causal substance within the visible Sun has been brought out in another form in a hymn which the 50th Sukta contains in the first Mandala.

The Sun is thus described there—

“There are three states or forms of the Sun. The one state is termed as उत् ; the other is उत्+तर, and the last is उत्+तम. That Sun is called as “उत्”, whose beam falls upon this earth. The Sun which spreads its beams upwards in heaven is termed as “उत्तर”. Besides these two, there exists the “उत्तम” Sun who never sets, never rises”. This beautiful description gives us an idea of the visible gross form of the Sun, as well as its invisible causal form, and also the form which lies even beyond the causal state (which in the Upanishadic nomenclature may be called as तुरीय state). Sankara in his commentary on the

Vedānta has explained that the light (ज्योतिः) of the Sun which is sent up to heaven is no other than the being of Brahman—“अथ यदतः परो ज्योतिः दीप्यते”, etc., etc., (वे० भा०, १-१-२४). By the ‘light’ mentioned here in the Sruti we are to understand the Being of Brahman which is to be found underlying all the visible existences as their causal substance. *

The Rig-Veda, too, in describing the invisible subtle state of the Sun clearly refers to that underlying causal substance. In the Chhāndogya-Upanishad, the Solar Disc has been described as a beehive and it is there stated that the real Sun does not rise or does not set—“न निस्त्रोच, नोदियाय ।” This line is exactly similar in its idea to the Sun described in the Rig-Veda as the उत्तम Sun ‘which never rises, never sets’.

These descriptions clearly bring out the fact that the Rig-Vedic Sun and the Fire also are not merely visible gross natural objects.

(3) We shall now consider how the सोम has been described in the Rig-Veda. This is stated about the Soma (सोम)—

“सोमं मन्यते पपिव अन्यत्, संपिषन्ति ओषधिं ।
सोमं यं ब्रह्माणो विदुः, न तस्मान्नाति कश्चन” ॥

[“When the people press the सोम and squeezing from it its juice drink it off, they think they have quaffed the सोम ; but to those whose minds are inwardly turned, the fact stands clearly comprehended that nobody can ever drink of the true, real सोम ।”
“न ते अन्नाति पार्थिवः”—“No mortal man of the earth can drink Thee, Soma !”]

* “विकारि अनुगतं जगत्-कारणं ब्रह्म निर्दिष्टम्” (वे० भा०, 1. 1. 24-25).

You will see that as in the case of the Sun and the Fire, here also we find the two-fold forms of the सोम ;—the one is its gross form which the people ordinarily press and drink ; but “who is to drink the subtle invisible form of सोम, its hidden causal substance which the material form of सोम contains within it ?” It is for this reason that elsewhere it has been stated of the सोम that the “eternally existent *Soma* has got *two kinds of beams* extending both ways :—

“उभयतः पवमानस्य (सोमस्य) रश्मयः, ध्रुवस्य सतः परिवर्ति क्तवः” ।

And also—

“द्विंता व्यूर्थान् अक्षतस्य धाम,
सर्विदे भुवनानि प्रथन्त” ।

[i. e., “सोम which is the source of अक्षत has its *two parts* covered by its rays.”]

It is also stated that the “*Soma* has a *place* within it which lies *hidden and invisible* to the ordinary gaze of the people and it is in this hidden place where exist the thirty-three gods” and that “to this *real* place become centred all the prayers of the devotees”—

“तव त्वि सोम पवमान निव्ये, विश्वे देवास इत्य एकादशासः ।”

“तन्न सत्यं पवमानस्य अस्तु, यत्र विश्वे कारवः सन्नसन्तु” ।

If the सोम were merely the सोम plant, how could it be addressed as the “inexhaustible navel (नाभिः) of the earth,” as “the seed (रेतः) from which all the objects have been produced” ?

As we have seen above in the case of the Sun, the सोम also has been stated to have a “तुरीय” place —“तुरीयं धाम महिषो विवर्त्ति” ।

(4) We now come to *Indra*.—

Indra has got two forms; one of these forms constitutes his gross, visible form and the other is the causal form behind the former into which it is inter-woven, and that is his invisible subtle form. These dual forms of Indra find expression in several ways—

“दूरे तन्नाम (शरीरं) गुह्यं पराचेः ।.....महत् तन्नाम गुह्यं पुरुष्यक्,
येन मूर्तं जनयो येन भव्यं । प्रब्रं जातं ज्योतिर्यदस्य प्रियम्” ।

[“Indra possesses dual bodies. One of these bodies is *most hidden*; and this hidden body is very large and it extends over—touches—large spaces. By this body, Indra has brought into being the past and the future (objects) and created those bright objects he desired to create.”] This body, you are requested to mark, has been called ‘प्रब्रं ज्योतिः’ and ‘पुरुष्यक्’ *i.e.*, it is ‘the most ancient light,’ and ‘exists in touch with all the objects of the world.’ Can it be anything else than the causal substance which interweaves itself into the visible form? The poet of the Mandala V has clearly indicated this causal form when he declares that “he has come to learn the most *hidden place* (पदं) of Indra”—

“अवाचचचं पदमस्य सख, रुयं निघातु रन्वाय मिच्छन् ।
अपृच्छमन्यान्त ते मे आहुः, इन्द्रं नरो बुबुधाना अशेम” ।

[“Among the performers of the sacrifices, only those are able to know this hidden पद of Indra who are बुबुधानाः, *i.e.*, those who could see into the depth of things.”]

Unless we take the invisible causal form of Indra into our consideration, the description that “Indra has created the heaven and the sky (द्यावा-पृथिवी), that “Indra has planted milk into the bosom of the cow”—becomes inconsistent and insignificant. Such descriptions lose their value and become

useless when only the gross, visible, phenomenal form of Indra is taken.

As we have seen while considering the form of the Sun, the Fire and the Soma that each of these Vedic gods possesses a तुरीय form ; in the case of Indra also, a तुरीय पद, besides the two Padas already stated, is mentioned—

“उभे नि पांसि जन्मनी । तुरीयादित्य हवनं त इन्द्रियमातस्यावसृतं दिवि ।”

And this तुरीयपद has been described as असृत पद ।

(5) In the description of Visnu, we find a statement about a परम पद । Visnu has been described to “contain three Padas, viz., the one extending over the earth, the other over the sky and the third the heaven. But nobody, it has been stated, can ever see the *hidden* पद of Visnu—which is असृत—undying, and which is filled up with honey—मधुपूर्ण—

“द्वीषि पदा विचक्रमे विष्णु गीषा अदाभ्यः.....

तद्विद्वांसो विपण्यवो जागृवांसः सन्निवने, विष्णोयंत परमं पदम्” ।

[“Only those who are *wake ful* - ever alive to the real nature of things—who are thoughtful—only such people can see the परम पद of Visnu.”]

(6) Of the वायु—the Wind-god—also, we find a similar description of its two-fold forms. The one is its स्थूल—gross, visible form and the other its deep-laid subtle invisible form which the former contains behind it.—

द्वाविमौ बातौ ;—वात आ सिन्धोरा परावतः ।

दक्षं ते अस्य आवातु, परान्यो वातु यद्रपः” ।

[“The wind is two-fold : one form blows from the sea ; but the other comes from a place very far off (परावतः), i.e., a place

lying beyond (the visible world). The first form gives us strength ; but the other has the *power* to drive out sin.”] What has been described as the killer of sin can never be the gross वायु ; it must be the *causal reality existing behind* all the visible objects. This *subtle form* of the वायु is known as मातरिश्वा in the Rg-Veda. Now, the मातरिश्वा is the source of all sorts of activities. It is from this source that the visible वायु—vibratory motion—has sprung. In the 168th Sukta, in Mandal I, we also find two-fold strength of Maruts—“द्विता शवः ।” “From which region the Marut is coming ?”—it has been asked. The reply given is,—“Is it coming from the inferior (अवर, i. e. खल) region ? Or is it blowing from a region *lying beyond* the visible places ?”—

This enquiry shows us clearly the visible and invisible forms of the Maruts. It is with reference to this invisible underlying वायु, that such statements become consistent as these—“It is *within the lap* of the वायु that all the gods perform their respective functions.” It is clearly the causal reality which is present behind the visible motions or activities which has been referred to by these descriptions. It is of this वायु we find it stated that “it is the Maruts who “have extended the objects of the earth and the shining objects of the sky”—

“आ ये विश्वा पार्थिवानि पप्रथत् रोचना दिवि” ।

The term त्रिषधस्य in connection with the Maruts indicates its three states—the visible, the causal, and the तुरीय state. That all of these Maruts have only *one source* from which they have all sprung has been beautifully described by a metaphor.—“As the spokes are all centred and fixed in the navel of the wheel, so they are all come from one *identical source*”—

“रथानां ये अराः सभाभयः ।”

यद्दो वात ते गृहे अमृतस्य निधिर्हितः”—

This *treasure house* of अमृत must be the causal substance which sustains the gross visible form and which is its source.

(7) Two kinds of Sky (आकाश) we find described in the Rg-Veda. As in the Upanishads the भूताकाश and the परम व्योम—both of these are mentioned, of which the latter is the undifferentiated condition of the Prāna-Sakti. The भूताकाश is the visible differentiated vibrations which fill the आकाश । This परम व्योम *lying behind* the भूताकाश is also known as पुराणं खं in the Upanishads, while the भूताकाश is also known as वायुरं खं । In the Rg-Veda also, similarly two terms have been employed. The one is द्यौः,—it is nothing but the भूताकाश । The other is the परम व्योम । In this परम व्योम the first manifestation of मातरिश्वा or Prāna-Sakti appears.

We need not quote further passages. These would amply show that each and every god mentioned in the Rg-Veda has, in addition to his visible form, an *invisible causal form* which underlies the former. To exhibit this two-fold form in general terms, *all the gods* have been *collectively* also described or defined as द्विजन्मा—

“द्विजन्मानो ये ऋतशापः सत्याः” ।

(8) The same fact irresistibly comes to our mind, when we follow the description of Varuna (वरुण). It is said of him—

“यासां (अपां) राजा वरुणो याति मध्ये,

सत्यादृते अवपश्यन् जनानां” ।

[“There travels, *within* the flowing water, Varuna who watches the truth and untruth—the merit and demerit—of all the beings in the world.”]

This seer of truth and untruth which is present within the water cannot but be the causal सत्ता existing within all. Take again such description as this—

“Varuna knows two kinds of पद—one visible (दर्शनिय) and the other invisible (प्राचीन) Pada.” This प्राचीन पद must be the causal substance lying behind its visible पद or form. And this hidden पद is otherwise referred to when the Vedic Rishi declared that “Varuna has revealed the secret of a *hidden Pada* to a worthy intelligent devotee”—

“विद्वान् पदस्य गुह्यान् अबोचत्, युगाय (योग्याय) विप्र उपराय शिचन्” ।

The following stanza about Varuna becomes consistent only when we take the *causal form* of Varuna ; otherwise it will be meaningless. It is the causal substance alone which works differently in different objects.—

“वनेषु व्यन्तरीचं ततान, वाजसक्वत्सु, पय उच्चियासु ।

दृक्षु क्रतुं वरुणो, असु अग्निं, दिवि सूर्यमदधात् सोमसद्रौ ।”

[“It is Varuna who has placed strength in the horse, milk in the cow, fire in the water, sun in the sky, Soma in the mountain and Varuna has spread the firmament overhead.”]

Sankarāchāryya has shown by arguments that the effects can never be separated from, and taken outside of, their causal substance, and that they must always be considered *in relation with* * their underlying cause which finds its own realisation † through them. In giving a clear idea of the invi-

* “तद्-युक्तमखिलं वस्तु, व्यवहारश्चिदन्वितः, चीरे सर्पिर्विवापितम्” (आत्म-निरूपण) ।

† “...आविर्भूतं सत् ‘लस्यते’ ब्रह्म” (सु० भा०)

sible but ever accompanying causal reality *behind* each of the visible gods, the Rg-Veda wants to show that the visible forms of the gods will always put the people in mind of the *causal* Reality which is *ever present behind* them, and *severed from which* the gods will at once become unessential and कदलौस्तम्भ-वदसारः—to use the expression employed by Sankara. They are always to be taken *in connection with* their causal substance—which is none other than Brahman Itself—of which these gods are so many manifestations. How can the effect be conceived as *different* (अन्य) from the cause? I would again remind you of the illustration given by Sankara to support his position which was quoted in an early part of our Lectures (Vide : Lect. 1, P. 16).—

“अग्नेर्हि विस्फुलिङ्गः अग्निरेव”—

“The spark *after* it comes out of fire is, nothing but fire in reality ; it is not different from, other (अन्य) than, the fire—its cause.”

And also——

“(विस्फुलिङ्गस्य) प्रागग्नेर्भ्रंशात् अग्नेः प्रकत्वदर्शनात्”—

“*Before* the spark came out of fire, separated, itself from the fire—its cause, it was identical with fire, was no other than fire itself.”

The idea of the Rg-Veda is that Brahman is finding its expression through the visible objects—the Vedic gods—mentioned therein. The description of the सूक्ष्मरूप behind the visible स्थूलरूप of these gods serves this great purpose. It would be totally unphilosophical to take the Vedic gods as *separated* from their causal

source and to treat them as so many self-sufficient, independent beings, which some interpreters of the Rg-Veda have sought to do. Sankara has shown such a procedure to be erroneous. The effects cannot, even for a moment, stand *unrelated* to their cause. Neither do they serve any other purpose than the realisation, through them, of the nature of the causal reality. It is in this way that the Rg-Vedic gods must be considered. Sankara has stated that one finite object does indeed negate or exclude another finite object, but none of these objects can negate or exclude the idea of their cause which is the infinite existing behind them—“न हि कार्यं नाम वस्तुतोऽस्ति, यतः कारणवृद्धिर्विनिवर्त्ते”। For, the कार्य is nothing but the transformation (अवस्थान्तर) of the causal reality. How then can a कार्य exclude the idea of its cause? The visible forms or effects have no real value of *their own*. As these are परार्थ, they serve the purpose of the realisation of the nature of the causal reality which exists and operates within them. The causal realities are therefore the ends; but as Brahman is the absolute end, it includes all other lower ends within. * Sankarāchārya has explained this relation between the causal reality and the effects produced out of it. This exactly is the relation which exists between the dual forms of the gods described in the Rg-Veda. Forgetting the *intimate relation* in which the hidden underlying causal reality always stands with the visibly gross

* “अनेके हि विलक्षणाः सामान्य-विशेषाः...तेषामेकस्मिन् महासामान्ये पारंपर्यगत्या अन्तर्भावः” (वृ० भा०)।

forms of natural objects, it is wrong to look upon these as the only *objects* with which we have any concern in the world. This would be व्यावहारिक view as stated by Sankara. But this is not at all the real view; it is the most unphilosophical view which obtains among the ordinary people. We must try to cultivate the real पारमार्थिक view and look upon the gods, *i. e.* the phenomenal objects as manifestations of the causal Reality,—as Brahman Itself sustains them and *works within* them, and without which and cut off from which they would altogether lose their importance,—would become unreal, unessential. This grand truth the Rg-Veda has inculcated upon us, when it describes the subtle invisible form along with the visible gross form of its gods. Otherwise, such description becomes a meaningless jumble. Yet the modern interpreters of the Rg-Veda have not a word to say about the invisible causal form which accompanies those gods, so clearly described in the pages of the Rg-Veda in connection with each of its gods. We have not said anything about the 3 types of Devatās and three kinds of यज्ञs (*yajnas*) which find ample description in the Rg-Veda. Neither have we referred you to the use of the term Māyā exactly in the sense in which Sankara used in his Vedānta. All these are to be found scattered in the Rg-Veda. Sankara seems to have borrowed his main ideas from the Rg-Veda.

Conclusion :—

This is my last day and this day brings me to my labour's end. I am convinced of one fact : that you really love Sankara and that you take a loving interest in this great philosophy of your own ancient land. Your attendance, day after day, in this cold, chilly, wintry evenings gives ample evidence of that fact. But, I do not know if I have been able to please you—if my presentation of India's great philosopher has proved con-vincing to you. But I have laboured honestly. What I have said, I have tried to support and strengthen by ample quotations. For this purpose I have traversed, as you have seen, the whole field—neglecting nothing. Numerous texts from all his commentaries have been put before you to help you to come to your own conclusion. Sankara's theory is not a Pantheism. He has not abolished the things of the world, neither has he declared the finite जीव as so many unrealities. As the world is finite but moving towards the infinite goal, so we—जीव—are also finite as well as infinite. Infinite possibilities lie hidden in us, and Sankara holds out to us the great promise that we shall one day be able to realise our aspirations, and to fulfil all our possibilities, and that all strife and sufferings will cease in ब्रह्म. In Sankara-philosophy there is ample scope for कर्म—duties of man. We are all self-seeking beings : we must try to be unselfish ; and so long as we are not disinterested in our actions and ideas, the ब्रह्मज्ञान, Sankara tells us,

will not dawn—we must treat all as our own—not forgetting the great truth that the same नारायण (Nārāyaṇa) is present in us all. We must make sincere efforts to remove suffering from our fellow जीवs, so far as in us lies, and unless that is done, how can we help them to realise the नारायण within? All these promises Sankara's philosophy holds before us. It is not a philosophy of माया or इन्द्रजाल. He has not woven a net of इन्द्रजाल around us to enmesh us within it beyond hope of extrication. Neither it is a mere Theology. And by the way, our Rg-Veda—that great store-house of Indian wisdom, from which we have derived our all practical religions of every-day life, is not a book of hymns composed by primitive Indian tillers of soil, but it is a store-house of the great Māyā-Vāda too from which Sankara partly borrowed the main ideas of his philosophy. But the time has arrived to take farewell of you however painful it may be, and I do it by offering my good wishes to you all.

I take this opportunity to offer my respectful tribute to the blessed memory of the late Sreegopal Basu Mallick—the great founder of this Fellowship which has given an impetus to the culture and spread of the Vedantic truths.

[*The End.*]

Introduction to Advaita Philosophy.

[Second Edition. Rs 4.

Advaita-Vada.

[Second Edition, Rs 3.

The Outlines of Vedanta Philosophy.

[Second Edition. Re 1.

[These three works have been published by the
Calcutta University.]

The Upanishader Upadesh—

—Volume I (Chhandogya and Brihadaranyaka)

[Third Edition. Rs 2-8.]

—Volume II (Katha and Mundaka)

[Third Edition, Rs 2-8.]

—Volume III (Isha, Kena, Prasna, Aitareya, Taittiriya
and Mandukya)

[Third Edition, Rs 2-8.]

[In each of these Volumes, complete translation with elaborate exposition of the commentaries of Sankara has been given. Each Volume has been translated into Hindi by Pandit Nandakishore Sukla of Oudh].

The Bhagavad-Gita.

(A translation of main Theme).

Extracts from only a few of

OPINIONS

On the author's

"Introduction to Advaita Philosophy."

1. *Professor A. Berrisdale Keith, D. Litt., D.C.L.*
University of Edinburgh :—".....Your book is a remarkably able and highly interesting contribution to the interpretation of Sankara. Its collection of passages alone would be of very high value, for the extent of Sankara's writings is so great as to render easy reference impossible without such aid, and I fully appreciate the labour which has been involved in the selection of the texts cited. Even greater value applies to your powerful exposition of the realistic element in Sankara. Your restatement of his position in terms of modern philosophical conception, shows a very great skill and will demand the most careful consideration from those who seek to apprehend the true force of the teachings of the Acharyya."

2. *Professor Julius Jolly, Ph. D.* University of Wurzburg, Bavaria :—"This work contains an excellent exposition,

I think, of the main principles of the Adwaita system and an equally excellent vindication of this against the reproaches raised by scholars wrongly interpreting its technical terms."

3. *Sir George A. Grierson, K.C.I.E., Ph.D., D.Litt., LL.D.*, late Vice-President, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland :—".....I have read a good deal of it and found it very interesting and instructive.....your book shows evidence of much original research and I hope that you will continue your studies of this and other important Systems of Indian Philosophy."

4. *Dr. L. D. Barnett*, Oriental Studies, London Institution (University of London) :—".....Your book is a work of considerable merit."

5. *Professor J. Wackernagel*, Basil, Switzerland :—".....Introduction to Adwaita Philosophy is a valuable book.....I shall not fail to make it known and accessible to fellow-workers interested in Indian Philosophy, and hope it will be appreciated universally according to its merits."

6. *Professor Hermann Jacobi, Ph.D.*, University of Bonn, Germany :—".....I have read this novel exposition of Sankara's system with interest and profit. Whether one entirely agrees with the author's theory or not, one will admire his ingenuity and be grateful for many valuable suggestions.....It is an admirable book....."

7. *Dr. M. E. Senart* of Paris :—"Your deep justice to the old master—Sankara—and your remarkable command of the difficult literary materials cannot but meet the grateful acknowledgment of all interested in this line of research."

8. *Prof. S. V. Lesney, Ph.D.*, University of Prague :—"...The teaching of your great countryman—Sankara—has been treated by you in a very happy way and to much profit of your readers."

9. *Prof. E. Washburn Hopkins, Ph.D., LL.D.*, Yale University, America :—".....My final judgment is that you have made a most important contribution to our knowledge of Sankara's Philosophy....."

10. *Prof. D. Johannes Hertel, Professor of Sanskrit*, University of Leipzig, Germany :—".....No doubt this work—Introduction to Adwaita Philosophy, 2nd Edition—is extremely useful, lucid in style, and independent, in the representation of Shankara's doctrine. It remarkably marks a decided step in advance....."

11. Prof. Richard Garbe, Ph. D., of the University of Tübingen :—"It is more than its title indicates : not only an able Introduction, but a very important contribution to the history of Indian Philosophy, especially Chapter III seems to me to be of particular importance, as according to it, the current notions about Sankar's conception of the world *have to be corrected*. I wish you all success which your learning and diligence deserve."

12. Prof. James H. Woods, Ph.D., of Harvard University :—".....Your book has given me the greatest pleasure. It is coherently written and the arguments move forward with logical precision and at the same time keep close to the text of the Vedānta. I found the book extremely valuable and I hope it will be the first one of the series. Your work has impressed me so much that I am sending you an invitation....."

13. Dr. Sylvain Lévi, Ph. D., of College De France, Paris :—".....Your book is of a lasting value. You have mastered Sankara's work as a real Pandit and you know to expose his doctrines perfectly as a modern scholar. Never did I realise before so fully the *perfect unity* of Sankara's teachings. Your book is a concordancy, a Cyclopaedia of Sankara's Philosophy. The quotations are well selected, thoroughly clear, conclusive ; a glance over the notes at the foot of the pages shows they are a substantial reading, affording the सार of Sankara's thoughts....."

14. Prof. M. Bloomfield, Esq., of John Hopkins University :—".....Your book is, I am convinced, a most valuable contribution to our knowledge of India's high thought : your exposition of Sankara is that of a loving disciple but at the same time, critical as well as sympathetic. Your chapter on Māyā is especially illuminating, but I remember *every page* of the book as full of clarifying information. No Indologist can possibly read it without being grateful to you for your first-hand, trustworthy help in this difficult field."

15. Prof. Richard Schmidt, Ph. D., of Munster University :—".....Surely your book is an admirably suitable introduction to that most magnificent achievement of Indian thoughtYour book is not only a highly interesting contribution to the interpretation of Sankara's writings, but also in every way a new argument of the justness of the "*ex orienti lux*." I wish you best success."

16. Prof. A. Hillebrandt, Ph. D., of Breslau Univer-

4

sity :—".....Your work marks a great progress by the brilliant exposition which Sankara's views have found therein by your painstaking labour and judicious treatment. I fully appreciate the value of your scholarly work which I think a *perfect success*. Allow me to repeat my opinion that your work represents a high standard of Indian scholarship."

17. *Prof. H. Luders*, of Berlin University :—".....I have read your excellent Introduction with the greatest interest and profit. Your profound knowledge of Sankara has enabled you to carve out new ways to the understanding of India's great philosopher. In my opinion your work is a mark in the exposition of Vedānta Philosophy, and anybody who will take up in future those problems will have to deal with your views. You have solved some of the riddles proposed by apparent contradictions in the text and I am sure we shall have to modify considerably the prevalent opinion on Sankara Philosophy."

18. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, July, 1926 :—"The author is to be congratulated on having produced a very well-written and remarkably clear and able book dealing with a very thorny and difficult subject—the non-dualistic philosophy of the great Vedantist—Sankara. Mr. Sastri has collected a large number of passages of great value and importance from the writings of Sankara and has expounded them with marked ability. His treatment of Sankara's philosophical position is done with great skill....."

19. *The Magazine—Shia-kyo-ken-Vyn (Religious Research)*, Vol. III, Part 6. 1st November, 1926 of Tokyo University, Japan :—"It seems that the author is an authority on the Vedanta system of Philosophy in the Calcutta University of India. He has studied and mastered thoroughly the vast knowledge of the Sankara Philosophy.....The last two chapters are very interesting and give new light on the subject....."(*Original in Japanese*).

20. *The Forward*, October 3, 1926 :—"Prof. Sastri's 'Adwaita Philosophy' no longer requires any advertisement through the press. The book has already made its mark as one of the richest contributions to modern research on the 'Adwaita Philosophy'.....In Prof. Sastri that philosophy has got a very lucid exponent.....as a piece of original research the book has received unqualified admiration from Indian as well as European scholars."

&c. &c. &c.

—0—
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL
LIBRARY