

## CHAPTER IV

### SECTION I

In the third chapter, meditation together with its means was discussed. In this chapter, the fruit of meditation, after investigating the nature of meditation, is taken up for consideration.

*Topic 1 : Frequent repetition of meditation*

आवृत्तिः असकृदुपदेशात् ॥ १ ॥

1. Repetition (of meditation is to be practised) again and again, on account of the teaching.

The texts say in this connection : 'He who knows Brahman attains the highest' (*Tai.* II. i. 1) ; 'Having known him thus, one transcends death' (*Śve.* III. 8) ; 'He who knows Brahman becomes like Brahman' (*Mu.* III. ii. 9) ; 'When the seer sees him who is bright like gold...' (*Mu.* III. i. 3).

Here the question is raised whether the act of meditation (i.e. knowledge) prescribed in the Vedānta texts is to be practised only once or to be practised again and again. The opponent holds that it is to be practised once only. For, there is no authority for repeating the meditation again and again, as the texts quoted above indicate.

This *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that acts of meditation (i.e. knowledge) must be repeated ; this is the purport of the scripture. The purport of the scripture is that the term *vedanā* (knowing) is synonymous with the terms

4.1.2. ]

Śrī-Bhāṣya

437

*dhyāna* and *upāsana* (meditation). In the following text, the verbs *vid*, *upās*, and *dhai* give the same meaning (i.e. meditation) with reference to one and the same object. The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* begins, 'One should meditate (*upāsita*) on the mind as Brahman' (III. xviii. 1), and concludes by the word *vid* in the passage, 'He who knows (*veda*) thus shines and glows with fame, greatness and spiritual splendour' (III. xviii. 6). Similarly, the same *Upaniṣad* identifies knowledge of Raikva with meditation : 'Whoever knows anything, that Raikva knows' (IV. i. 4) and concludes by the word *upās* in the passage, 'Now, Revered Sir, teach me that Deity on which you meditate' (IV. ii. 2).

'Now *dhyāna* is meditation ; it is not mere remembrance or representation, but is of the nature of *continued* remembrance. And the term *upās* has also the same meaning, because it denotes the uninterrupted series of thought of the mind that has one pointed concentration. Both these terms are denoted by the term *vedanā* (knowledge) as in the following passages : 'He who knows Brahman attains the highest' (*Tai.* II. i. 1) and 'By knowing the Lord one is released from all fetters' (*Śve.* II. 15).

लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ ॥

2. Because of the indicatory marks.

Here *linga* means *smṛti*. This meaning is made out from the *Smṛti* also, which says that *vedanā* (knowledge), which is the means of Release, has the nature of continued remembrance, as in the following passage of *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* (VI. vii. 91) : 'The meditation of His form is one continued stream without attachment to any other object. Meditation

of Him is thus generated by the six limbs of "yoga". Therefore the purport of the scripture is that meditation has to be repeated again and again.

*Topic 2 : Meditation on Brahman as the  
Âtman of the meditator*

आत्मेति तूपगच्छन्ति ग्राहयन्ति च ॥ ३ ॥

3. Certainly, the meditators worship (Brahman) as their Self ; and the scriptures make us realize (Him as such).

The question is whether Brahman is to be realized by the meditator as other than the meditator or the Self of the meditator. The opponent holds that Brahman is to be realized as other than the meditator, because Brahman is different from the individual self who is the meditator.

This *Sūtra* refutes this view and holds that Brahman is to be realized as the Self of the meditator. Just as, the individual self is the self of his own body, he should meditate on the supreme Brahman as the Self of his own self. Why ? Because the ancient meditators thus realized him : 'O Lord, indeed you are me, I am you.' But it may be asked how the meditators accept that Brahman is their inner self who is in fact a different entity from the meditator. Other scriptural texts also make meditators understand this meaning as free from contradiction : 'He who, dwelling within the self, is within the self, whom the self does not know, whose body is the self, who controls the self from within—He is your inner ruler, the immortal Self' (*Br. Mā.* III. vii. 22). As all notions are based on Brahman and all words ultimately denote Brahman, the texts teach in reciprocal terms thus : 'O Lord, indeed you are me, I am you.' Thus, if we understand the

relation between individual self and Brahman, the contradiction between the texts which teach the difference and non-difference will not arise. In so far as the individual self has Brahman as its own Self, we deny difference ; in so far as the supreme Self is different from the individual self—in the same way as the soul is different from our body—we accept difference. Therefore, the worshipper should meditate on supreme Brahman as his own Self.

*Topic 3 : Symbols*

न प्रतीके, न हि सः ॥ ४ ॥

4. (The Self) should not be (meditated on) in the symbol ; for the symbol is not that.

The meditation on symbols is given in the following text : 'One should meditate on mind as Brahman' etc. (*Chā.* III. xviii. 1). In such meditations, where the mind is taken as a symbol of Brahman, the question is whether the symbols ought to be viewed as being of the nature of the Self or not. The opponent holds the former view. For 'meditation on mind as Brahman' (*Br.* III. xviii. 1) is the same as meditation on Brahman, Brahman being the Self of the meditator ; the conclusion is that the symbol should be meditated on as the Self.

This view is set aside by the *Sūtra*. A symbol should not be meditated on as the Self ; for the Self of the meditator is not a symbol. In the meditation on symbols what is to be meditated on is the symbol only and not Brahman ; indeed, a symbolic meditation is that meditation in which what is not Brahman is viewed as Brahman. As told earlier, the symbol, the object of meditation, is not the Self of the

meditator. Therefore, it should not be meditated upon as the Self.

ब्रह्मदृष्टिः उत्कर्षात् ॥ ५ ॥

5. The symbol is to be viewed as Brahman; on account of the superiority.

The opponent says that the object of meditation is Brahman itself. As such, it is inappropriate to hold that the mind etc. which are non-sentient things of very little power should be the basis of meditation. Therefore, though viewed as mind etc. Brahman itself is the object of meditation.

This *Sūtra* refutes this view. The mind etc. may be appropriately viewed as Brahman, and not *vice versa*; because Brahman is superior to mind etc. while mind etc. are inferior to Brahman. Indeed, to view a king as a servant produces evil; on the contrary, to view a servant as a king produces worldly prosperity.

Topic 4 : The views of Āditya etc.

आदित्यादिमतयश्चांग उपपत्तेः ॥ ६ ॥

6. And the subsidiary (such as, the Udgītha in the sacrificial acts) has to be viewed as Āditya etc. because it is consistent.

'One should meditate upon him who glows (i.e. Āditya) as the Udgītha' (*Chā.* I. iii. 1); here the doubt is whether Āditya should be viewed as Udgītha etc. which are the subsidiaries of sacrificial acts or Udgītha etc. should be viewed as Āditya. The opponent holds the former view. It was already said that what is inferior should be viewed as super-

ior; in this case the Udgītha etc. which are subsidiaries of sacrificial acts, and are the means of attaining the desired fruits, are superior to Āditya etc.

This view is set aside by the *Sūtra*. The Udgītha etc. which are the subsidiaries of sacrificial acts, should be viewed as Āditya. Why? Because it is consistent; for it is established that Āditya etc. are superior. Indeed, through propitiation of the deities such as Āditya etc. even sacrificial acts become the means of bringing about their fruits. Therefore, Udgītha etc. which are the subsidiaries of the sacrificial acts, ought to be viewed as Āditya etc.

Topic 5 : Meditation in a sitting posture

आसीनः सम्भवात् ॥ ७ ॥

7. (One should meditate) in a sitting posture; because (in that way alone) meditation is possible.

It was said before that knowledge (i.e. jñāna), which is set forth by the Vedānta texts as the means of attaining final Release, and denoted by the terms meditation (*dhyāna*), worship (*upāsana*) etc. is to be frequently practised. This meditation, it was said, is of the nature of continued succession of remembrances. The question is how to practise it. As there is no rule, the opponent holds that the meditator may practise it either sitting or sleeping or standing or walking.

This view is not accepted by the *Sūtra*. One should meditate in a sitting posture. Why? Mental concentration is possible in that way alone. Standing or walking requires effort and lying down conduces to sleep. Therefore, one should meditate sitting on some support without any bodily effort.

ध्यानाच्च ॥ ८ ॥

### 8. And on account of meditation.

Since worship (i.e. *upāsanā*) is of the nature of meditation, as prescribed by the following text, 'The Self is to be meditated upon' (*Bṛ. II. iv. 5*), concentration of the mind must be necessarily attained. It has been already stated that meditation is concentration of mind on one object, uninterrupted by the ideas of different things.

अचलत्वं चापेक्ष्य ॥ ९ ॥

### 9. Immovability is necessary (for meditation).

'The Earth meditates as it were, Ether meditates as it were, Heaven meditates as it were, Waters meditate as it were, Mountains meditate as it were' (*Chā. VII. vi. 1*)—in such statements, meditateness is ascribed to Ether etc. having immovability in view. Therefore, immovability is necessary for the meditator in a sitting posture like earth, mountain etc.

स्मरन्ति च ॥ १० ॥

### 10. The Smṛti texts also declare (the same thing).

The Smṛti texts also declare that meditation is possible in a sitting posture—'Having established in a clean spot a firm seat, neither too high nor too low, having covered it with sacred grass, then with a deer skin and then with a cloth, there sitting on that seat, with a mind concentrated upon a single object, holding the mind and senses in check, he should practise yoga for the purification of his own self' (*Gītā, VI. 11-12*).

यत्रैकाग्रता तत्र, अविशेषात् ॥ ११ ॥

### 11. Wherever there is concentration of mind, (there meditation is to be practised), there being no specification.

No mention is made of special places and times for the concentration of mind. The only thing required is that the place and the time should be conducive to meditation. The text, 'Meditation has to be practised in a level and clean place which is pleasing to the mind' (*Śve. II. 10*), only suggests any quiet place fit for concentration of mind.

Topic 6 : Meditation till death

आप्रयाणात्, तत्रापि हि दृष्टम् ॥ १२ ॥

### 12. It (i.e. meditation) has to be performed till death ; for, here also scriptural authority is seen.

The question is whether this meditation, which is the means for final Release, has to be performed only for a day or to be performed every day till death. The opponent holds that it is to be performed only for a day, as it will satisfy the scriptural purpose.

This view is refuted by this *Sūtra*. Meditation has to be performed till death ; for, scripture declares that meditation should be performed from the time of commencement of meditation till death : 'Living, indeed, thus throughout his length of life, he reaches the world of Brahman' (*Chā. VIII. xv. 1*).

Topic 7 : Fruits of meditation

तदधिगम उत्तरपूर्वघोरश्लेष् विनाशौ तद्व्यपदेशात् ॥ १३ ॥

### 13. On attaining that, non-clinging and destruction

of subsequent and previous sins will result respectively, because it is so declared (by the scriptures).

Having thus far investigated the nature of meditation (i.e. knowledge), now, the Sūtra-kāra begins to consider the fruits of meditation.

The scriptures state that, after the attainment of knowledge of Brahman, the destruction of previous sins and the non-clinging of subsequent sins will result with regard to the meditating devotee, as in the following passages : 'As water does not wet the lotus leaf, even so no sins cling to him who knows this' (*Chā. IV. xiv. 3*) and 'Just as cotton growing on reeds is burnt when thrown into fire, even so are burnt the sins of one who knowing this offers Agnihotra' (*Chā. V. xxiv. 3*).

Here the doubt arises whether or not these non-clinging and destruction result as the fruits of meditation. The opponent holds that they will not result, because the scripture declares, 'No work, which is not experienced, will perish even after millions of aeons' (*Brahma-Vaivarta Purāṇa : Prakṛti-khanda, XXVI. 70*). Non-clinging and destruction of sins should be taken as eulogy of knowledge.

The Sūtra refutes this view and says that, on attaining meditation, non-clinging and destruction of subsequent and previous sins will result respectively through the greatness of knowledge as stated in the above texts. There is no contradiction between the texts above quoted (*Chāndogya*) and text quoted by the opponent. According to the opponent, works produce results through their power ; but the passages quoted above establish that meditation possesses the capacity to destroy the power of works done before and also the capacity to obstruct the power of works done subsequently. The power of works (sinful actions) to produce results is

nothing but the displeasure of the Lord. So the meditation on the supreme Person destroys that displeasure, which has been produced by sins, committed before by the meditator.

*Topic 8 : Good deeds and meditation*

इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः पाते तु ॥ १४ ॥

14. Of the other (i.e. good deeds) also there is thus non-clinging and destruction ; but in regard to some deeds, non-clinging occurs only after death.

It has been stated that, on account of meditation, previous and subsequent sins do not cling and are destroyed. Similarly, owing to the power of meditation good deeds also do not cling and are destroyed. Thus the texts say : 'All sins turn back from him' (*Chā. VIII. iv. 1*) and 'He shakes off good and evil deeds' (*Kau. I. 4*). For one who is desiring final Release, even good deeds are designated by the term 'sin'. Since good deeds are enjoined by the scriptures and their fruits are desired by some, a doubt arises that they may not be antagonistic to meditation ; to remove this doubt the same reasoning of the previous aphorism is applied here.

But even to a man of knowledge, rains, food etc. are desirable for the purpose of achieving meditation etc. ; how, it may be questioned, is their destruction brought about ? The Sūtra disposes of this doubt by means of the clause, 'only after death'. After the death of the body, good deeds which are helpful to meditation are destroyed.

*Topic 9 : Deeds which have not begun to yield fruits*

अनारब्धकार्ये एव तु पूर्वं तदवधेः ॥ १५ ॥

15. But only those previous deeds (i.e. good and evil), the effects of which are not yet begun, (perish) ; since they

(i.e. deeds which have begun to yield fruits) last till that (i.e. death).

It has been stated that all good and evil deeds done before and after the origination of knowledge of Brahman are destroyed. Now, past deeds are of two kinds : Those which have not yet begun to yield fruits (accumulated), and those which have begun to yield fruits (commenced). The doubt here is that whether all works, good and evil, are destroyed fully by knowledge or only those, the effects of which have not yet begun to bear fruits. The opponent holds that all are destroyed, because the text says : 'All sins are burnt' (*Chā. V. xxiv. 3*); and the existence of the body subsequent to the rise of knowledge may be accounted for by the force of impetus as in the case of revolutions of the potter's wheel.

The *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that only those previous deeds are destroyed, the effects of which have not yet begun to bear fruits ; for the text declares, 'For him there is delay as long as he is not liberated from the body' (*Chā. VI. xiv. 2*). Further, apart from the Lord's pleasure and displeasure caused by good and evil deeds, there is no proof for the existence of impetus that causes the existence of the body.

*Topic 10 : Agnihotra and the rest*

अग्निहोत्रादि तु तत्कार्यायैव तद्दर्शनात् ॥ १६ ॥

16. But Agnihotra etc. have to be performed for generating that effect (i.e. producing knowledge), because that is seen from the scriptures.

Under the aphorism IV. i. 14, it was stated that there is non-clinging of even good deeds on account of the power

of knowledge. Since Agnihotra and all the other daily and occasional works incumbent on one's own stage of life do not have their fruits clinging to the doer, one who does not like them need not perform them. The *Sūtra* sets aside this view.

Agnihotra and other works must be performed since their fruits are necessary. The wise man has to perform Agnihotra etc. for the production of the effect known as knowledge. This is declared in the scriptures : 'The Brāhmaṇas desire to know him by repetition of the Vedas, by sacrifices, by offering gifts, by penance, by fasting' (*Bṛ. IV. iv. 22*). Since knowledge becomes excellent through practice day after day until death, obligatory duties of the stages of life have to be performed for producing that knowledge. Otherwise, if there is omission in performing these duties, his mind would lose its clarity and there will be no generation of knowledge.

अतोऽन्यापि ह्येकेषामुभयोः ॥ १७ ॥

17. Other than these (i.e. Agnihotra and the rest), (there are many good deeds) among the two (i.e. good deeds done before and after the generation of knowledge) ; such is the view of some.

But, if Agnihotra and other good deeds are intended for generating knowledge and if other good deeds prior to the generation of knowledge are destroyed, according to the texts (*Chā. V. x. 5* ; *Bṛ. IV. iv. 6*), what is the purport of the following passage : 'His friends inherit his good deeds' (*Śātyāyana-Brāhmaṇa*) ?

Besides Agnihotra and other good deeds, which are meant to generate knowledge, there are manifold good deeds,

prior or subsequent to the production of knowledge, the fruits of which are obstructed by more powerful works. Some *Śākhās* (schools) refer to those good deeds as in the following texts: 'His sons get his inheritance, his friends his good deeds, and his enemies his evil deeds' (*ibid.*), and the text which declares non-clinging and destruction of works through knowledge refers to those deeds. The following *Sūtra* recalls to mind the possibility of obstruction to the fruits of works actually performed.

यदेव विद्ययेति हि ॥ १८ ॥

18. Because of the text 'that alone (i.e. the sacrificial act) which is performed with knowledge... becomes more vigorous'.

The text declares: 'That alone (i.e. the sacrificial act) which is performed with knowledge... becomes more vigorous' (*Chā. I. i. 10*). This text referring to the knowledge of Udgītha, says that knowledge has for its fruits, the non-obstruction of the fruit of sacrificial act. From this we understand that there is obstruction even to work which are actually performed. Therefore, this text of *Śāṭyāyana* (*op. cit.*) refers to those good deeds performed by a man of knowledge, the fruits of which have been somehow obstructed.

Topic 11 : Destruction of good and evil deeds

भोगेन त्वितरे क्षययित्वाऽथ संपद्यते ॥ १९ ॥

19. But having destroyed by experience of the other two (i.e. good and evil deeds that have begun to yield fruits), then he attains (Brahman).

*Sūtra* 15 referred to the destruction of the good and evil deeds which have not begun to yield fruits through experience. But there are other good and evil deeds which have begun to yield fruits. Now the doubt is raised whether these latter are destroyed at the end of that bodily existence which originates knowledge, or whether there is no rule regarding their destruction at the end of that bodily existence or at the end of other bodily existence. The opponent says that according to the text: 'And for him the delay is only as long as he is not freed from the body' (*Chā. VI. xiv. 2*), they are destroyed at the end of the bodily existence.

This *Sūtra* sets aside this view and says that only after destroying good and evil deeds that have begun to yield fruits, he attains Brahman. And, if the fruits of good and evil deeds are experienced in one bodily existence, then at the death of that body, Brahman is attained; if the fruits of the deeds require many bodies, then at the death of those bodies, Brahman is attained; for, the deeds which have begun to yield fruits have to be destroyed solely through experience. This is the purport of the text (*Chā. VI. xiv. 2*) quoted by the opponent. The meaning is: There is no fixing of any limit for the bodily existences, as long as all karmas which have begun to yield fruits have not been exhausted.

However, all those works which have not begun to yield fruits are at once destroyed on the rise of true knowledge. And the deeds performed subsequent to the rise of knowledge, do not cling to the performer. As such, the friends of the knower receive his good deeds on his death, and his enemies his evil deeds.



## CHAPTER IV

### SECTION II

#### Topic 1 : Speech

वाङ्मनसि दर्शनाच्छब्दाच्च ॥ १ ॥

1. Speech (combines) with mind, because it is so seen, and because also there are scriptural statements (to that effect).

Now, the Sūtra-kāra begins an inquiry into the modes of reaching Brahman on the part of one who knows. At first, the departure of the individual self is taken up for consideration. In this connection the texts say: 'When a person departs from here, his speech reaches the mind, the mind reaches the Prāṇa, the Prāṇa reaches the Fire, and Fire reaches the supreme Deity' (Chā. VI. viii. 6). Now the question is whether only the function of speech as such reaches the mind or the organ of speech itself? The opponent holds that the function of speech reaches the mind. Why? For the mind is not the material cause of speech, and therefore, here the essential nature of speech cannot reach the mind. As the functions of speech and other organs are controlled by the mind, the text which speaks of the reaching of the functions of speech is not inappropriate.

The Sūtra-kāra refutes this view and says that the essential nature of speech combines with the mind; for even when the organ of speech loses its function, the activity of the mind is seen. According to the scripture, 'speech reaches the mind' (Chā. VI. viii. 6), and it is not absorbed

4.2.3.]

Śrī-Bhāṣya

451

in the mind, but only it is combined or associated with the mind.

अत एव सर्वान्यनु ॥ २ ॥

2. And for the same reason all (the sense-organs) follow (speech).

'Speech is combined or associated with the mind'. This means only conjunction or association of speech and not its absorption in the mind; for that same reason, the text appropriately speaks that the remaining organs, following speech, reach the mind; 'Therefore, with the bodily heat extinguished, he goes for rebirth, with his senses resting in mind' (Pra. III. 9).

#### Topic 2 : Mind

तन्मनः प्राण उत्तरात् ॥ ३ ॥

3. That mind (reaches) Prāṇa, because of the subsequent passage.

The mind, which is joined with all the senses, reaches Prāṇa; not merely the function of mind. Why? Because of the subsequent text: 'Mind reaches Prāṇa.' (Chā. VI. viii. 6).

Here however, a further doubt is raised. The scriptural statement, 'Mind consists of earth (or *anna*)' (Chā. VI. vi. 5), says that the mind has *anna* for its causal substance. And the statement, 'They (i.e. waters) created *anna*' (Chā. VI. vi. 4), declares that *anna* consists of water. Again, the statement 'the Prāṇa consists of water' (Chā. VI. vi. 5), declares that Prāṇa has water for its causal substance. From the above passages, we have to understand that the mind is absorbed in its own causal substance.



The reply to the above objection is as follows : The text, 'Mind consists of *anna*, *Prāṇa* consists of water' (*Chā.* VI. vi. 5), means, that the nourishment of mind and *Prāṇa* takes place through *anna* and water respectively, and not that they are the causal substances of mind and *Prāṇa* ; for mind consists of the principle of *ahaṅkāra* (the principle of egoism) and *Prāṇa* is a modification of ether. The term '*Prāṇa*' indicates 'water' in a secondary sense.

*Topic 3 : Lord of the senses*

सोऽध्यक्षे तदुपगमादिभ्यः ॥ ४ ॥

4. It (i.e. *Prāṇa*) (reaches) the lord (of the senses), on account of approaching it etc.

In the text cited in the first *Sūtra*, we have '*Prāṇa* reaches the fire' (*Chā.* VI. viii. 6). The opponent, following the same reason given in the previous *Sūtras*, says that the *Prāṇa* reaches only fire.

The answer to this view is as follows. *Prāṇa* reaches the lord of the senses, i.e. individual self. Why ? For '*Prāṇa* approaches the lord' and so on. That *Prāṇa* approaches the departing individual self at the time of death is declared in the following scriptural text : 'At the time of death, all the *Prāṇas* go to the individual self' (*Br.* IV. iii. 38). Again, the departure of *Prāṇa* together with the individual self from the body is declared in the following text 'When he departs, *Prāṇa* follows' (*Chā.* IV. iv. 2). Again, its co-existence with the individual self is mentioned in the following text : 'In whose departure shall I be departing ? In whose staying shall I be staying ?' (*Pra.* VI. 3). We, therefore, conclude that *Prāṇa* conjoined with the individual

self, reaches the fire ; that is the meaning of the passage '*Prāṇa* reaches the fire'.

*Topic 4 : The elements*

भूतेषु तच्छ्रुतेः ॥ ५ ॥

5. (*Prāṇa* reaches) the elements, as it is declared in the scripture.

In the text '*Prāṇa* reaches the fire' (*Chā.* VI. viii. 6), the conjunction of *Prāṇa* with the individual self was mentioned. Here the question is whether this conjunction is with the fire only or with all the elements ? If it is said that it is with the fire only, as declared by the scripture, our reply is no. Why ? Because *Prāṇa* with the individual self reaches all the elements. Another text declares that the individual self, when departing, consists of all the elements : 'It consists of earth, water, fire' (*Br.* IV. iv. 5).

नैकस्मिन् दर्शयतो हि ॥ ६ ॥

6. Not with one element (is there any joining of *Prāṇa*) ; for, both (Śruti and Smṛti) declare so.

From the text quoted in the previous *Sūtra* (*Br.* IV. iv. 5) one may conclude that *Prāṇa* and the self get united with each element in succession, one at a time. This *Sūtra* rejects this view. As each element is incapable of generating any effect, the *Sūtra* says, 'not with one element'. Both Śruti and Smṛti show such incapability. The following Śruti says that tripartite combination is taught for rendering such capability to evolve names and forms : 'Having entered into these three divinities (i.e. fire, water, earth) with this individual self, which is Myself, let me evolve names and

forms—let me make each of them tripartite' (*Chā.* VI. iii. 2); Smṛti also says so : 'Then the elements, being separate, were not able to produce beings without combination. Having secured mutual combination, they produced the cosmic sphere beginning with Mahat down to individual selves' (*Vi.* I. ii. 52-54). Therefore in the text, 'Prāṇa reaches the fire' (*Chā.* VI. viii. 6), 'fire' means combination of other elements with fire. Thus the conclusion is that the Prāṇa reaches other elements.

*Topic 5 : Attainment of the Supreme*

समाना चासृत्युपक्रमात् अमृतत्वं चानुपोष्य ॥ ७ ॥

**7. (Departure of the individual self from the body is common (for knower and ignorant) up to the beginning of the path ; and the immortality (of the knower is obtained) without having burned.**

Is this departure of the individual self from the body at the time of death common to the knower and the ignorant or whether it belongs to the ignorant only ? The opponent holds that it relates only to the ignorant. Why ? Because, for, the knower there is no departure at all as is declared in the following text : 'When all desires of the heart subside, then he becomes immortal and experiences Brahman here' (*Br.* IV. iv. 7).

This view is set aside by the *Sūtra*. The departure of the individual self from the body is common to the man of knowledge as well as the ignorant up to the beginning of the path ; that is, before the entering of the individual self into the veins. The text says that the meditator passes out through a particular vein (*suṣumnā*) : 'There are a hundred and one arteries of the heart ; of these, one passes up to

the crown of the head ; going up through that, one attains immortality ; the others are for departing in various directions' (*Chā.* VIII. vi. 6). Since the text declares the self's entry through a particular vein, we have to accept the departure. There is no difference in their entrance into the vein. After the entrance, a difference is declared by the scripture : 'The individual self departs by that light, either through the eye, or through the head, or through other bodily parts' (*Br.* IV. iv. 2). As the text (*Br.* IV. iv. 2) must be interpreted in consonance with the text (*Chā.* VIII. vi. 6) to impart the unity of meaning, we have to understand that the departure of the self through the head relates to the man of knowledge, while other ways of departure belong to the ignorant.

As regards the text that the individual self attains immortality here, the reply is as follows : 'The immortality of the knower is obtained without having burned' means without burning connection of the soul with the body and senses etc. The immortality (i.e. non-clinging and destruction of later and earlier sins) attained is referred to in the text : 'When all desires of the heart subside' (*Br.* IV. iv. 7); and the text, 'he enjoys Brahman here' (*Br.* IV. iv. 7). The meaning is that at the time of meditation the knower has the experience of Brahman.

तदापितेः संसारव्यपदेशात् ॥ ८ ॥

**8. That (i.e. immortality is as stated above) ; because, up to the attainment of Brahman, the scripture declares the state of Saṁsāra.**

The immortality referred to must not be understood as implying the dissolution of the connection of the individual self with the body that has not been burnt up. Why ? Because,

upto the attainment of Brahman, the scripture declares the state of Saṁsāra. 'Apīti' means 'the attainment of Brahman'. The Sūtra-kāra shows later on that this attainment takes place after the individual self travelling to a particular place through the path beginning with light etc. 'Saṁsāra' means 'connection with the body'; the scripture says that this connection continues up to the attainment of Brahman: 'And for him the delay is only as long as he is not freed from the body' (Chā. VI. xiv. 2); 'Shaking off evil, just as a horse shakes off hairs, and as the moon releases himself from the mouth of Rāhu, I, a perfected self, having shaken off the body, attain the uncreated world of Brahman' (Chā. VIII. xiii. 1).

सूक्ष्मं प्रमाणतश्च तथोपलब्धेः ॥ ६ ॥

9. And the subtle body persists, for it is so observed through means of knowledge.

For this reason also the bondage of him who knows is not burnt; i.e. because the subtle body continues to persist. This is known in the scripture, an authoritative means of knowledge. For, the scripture says that the knowing individual self, travelling on the path of gods, speaks with the presiding deity of the moon and others: 'He is to reply' (Kau. I. 3). Therefore, subtle body continues to persist till he attains Brahman.

नोपमर्देनातः ॥ १० ॥

10. Hence, not in the way of destruction of the body (does he attain immortality).

Attaining immortality does not mean the destruction of the body as is seen in the text: 'When all desires of the

heart subside, then he becomes immortal and experiences Brahman here' (Br. IV. iv. 7).

अस्यैव चोपपत्तेरुच्यते ॥ ११ ॥

11. And the warmth belongs to the subtle body; because it is appropriate.

On account of the subtle body existing in some place in the body of the dying man who is a knower, warmth is seen in some parts of the gross body. This warmth cannot really belong to the gross body, for it is not perceived in all parts of the body. Thus the observation of warmth in some part of the gross body is due to the subtle body of the knower which is about to depart.

प्रतिषेधादिति चेन्न शरीरात् स्पष्टो ह्येकेषाम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. If it be said that the departure is denied (in the scriptures); we say 'no'; because (non-separation of the Prāṇa) from the individual self (is alone said); this is clear according to some.

In the text, 'But he who does not desire, who is without desire, free from desire, who has satisfied his desire, who desires the Self only—of him (*tasya*) the *prāṇas* do not depart; being Brahman he attains Brahman' (Br. IV. iv. 6), the departure of the self from the body at the time of death is denied in the case of a knower. This view of the opponent is set aside by the Sūtra-kāra.

Here the departure of the *prāṇas* from the individual self is denied, but not from the body. The term '*tasya*' (of him) refers to the individual self who is the subject-matter in the text, 'but he who does not desire', and not to the body. The genitive case '*tasya*' denotes the individual self as being connected with the *prāṇas*. Here, there is no cause for any

dispute. Indeed, this is clear according to Mādhyandinas, who in their text refer to the individual self as the starting-point of the *prāṇas* : 'But he who does not desire, who is without desire, free from desire, who has satisfied his desire—from him (*tasmāt*) the *prāṇas* do not depart' (*Br. Mādhyandina*, IV. iv. 6). Here in the text '*tasmāt*' denotes the knower, who is without desires. The *prāṇas* will not desert the individual self through the path of gods, until he attains Brahman.

स्मर्यते च ॥ १३ ॥

13. And the Smṛti also says so.

The Smṛti also declares that the self of the knower departs through the artery in the head, as in the text : 'Of the arteries, one stands above ; (by it the knower goes) piercing the orb of the Sun and passing beyond the world of Brahman, reaches the supreme goal' (*Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, III. 167).

Topic 6 : Subtle elements are merged in the Supreme

तानि परे तथा ह्याह ॥ १४ ॥

14. Those (elements are merged) in the supreme Deity ; for thus the scripture says.

It has been shown above that the individual self, at the time of death, along with the group of senses and the *prāṇas*, becomes merged with the subtle elements, fire and the rest. The doubt here is whether those subtle elements, which are merged with the individual self, produce their appropriate effects according to the works or meditation ; or whether they merge themselves in the supreme Deity. The opponent holds that at the intermediate stage of attaining

the supreme Self, no effects, i.e. : experience of pleasure and pain, are seen ; and therefore, they proceed further to get their effects according to the works and meditation.

The *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that they merge themselves in the supreme Deity. Why ? For the scripture declares : 'The *tejas* (i.e. subtle elements along with the individual self) merge in the supreme Deity' (*Chā. VI. viii. 6*). The meaning is that, the effects have to be viewed in accordance with the scripture. Just as in the states of deep sleep and universal dissolution, there is, on account of merging in the supreme Deity, rest for the individual self from the experience of pain and pleasure, so it is in this case also.

Topic 7 : Non-differentiation of the individual self

अविभागो वचनात् ॥ १५ ॥

15. Non-differentiation (of the individual self with the supreme Self) ; because the scripture says so.

What is the nature of 'merging' (*samāpatti*) ? Is this merging of the individual self with the supreme Self of the character of dissolution into its cause, as is the case with the dissolution of the world at the time of universal absorption ? Or whether it has the character of non-differentiation as quoted in the text : 'Speech reaches the mind' (*Chā. VI. viii. 6*).

The answer is thus given : There is non-differentiation or non-division. The meaning is that the individual self along with the subtle elements is incapable of empirical distinctions from the supreme Self. The scriptural statements support this view : As the text 'The *tejas* merges in the supreme Deity' (*Chā. VI. viii. 6*) is connected with the

previous clause 'speech reaches the mind', the verb 'merges' denotes a special kind of association, and because, when a word is transferred from one place to another, there is no authority to indicate any change in its meaning ; and further, no purpose is served, at the time of death, by the elements resolving into their causal condition ; and finally, there is no statement as regards new evolution from the causal condition.

*Topic 8 : The heart which is the abode of the individual self*

तदोकोग्रज्वलनं तत्प्रकाशितद्वारो विद्यासामर्थ्यात्  
तच्छेषगत्यनुस्मृतियोगाच्च हार्दानुगृहीतशशताधिकया ॥ १६ ॥

16. Owing to the power of meditation and owing to the meditation on the path, which is its subsidiary, the individual self is blessed by the Lord who abides within the heart ; his abode (i.e. heart) becomes lighted from above ; and having its passage illumined by the Lord, he goes out through the hundred and first artery.

It has already been stated that up to the self's entry on the path, the mode of departure of the knower and the ignorant is the same. Now, the speciality of the man of meditation is stated. The texts declare on this point : 'There are a hundred and one arteries of the heart ; of these, one passes up to the crown of the head ; going up through that, one attains immortality ; the others are for departing in various directions' (Chā. VIII. vi. 6). The doubt now is whether this departure for the knower is through this hundred and first artery in the crown of the head, or through other arteries as in the case of the ignorant. The opponent says that there

is no such rule on this point. Why ? Because the arteries being many and minute, they are difficult to distinguish and, therefore, the individual self is unable to follow any particular artery. The text merely refers to what is already established i.e. the departure from the body through any artery.

The *Sūtra* rejects this view and says that the self of the knower departs from the body through the hundred and first artery in the crown of the head ; the knower can easily distinguish this particular artery through the power of meditation (i.e. knowledge), which is dear to the supreme Person and through the repeated remembrance of the path, which is its subsidiary, the supreme Person, who abides within the heart, is pleased ; and by Him the knower is favoured ; and then the heart, the residence of the individual self, is lighted up from above ; and in this way, through the grace of the supreme Person, the individual self, having its passage illumined, distinguishes that artery.

*Topic 9 : The knower follows the rays of the Sun*

रश्म्यनुसारो ॥ १७ ॥

17. He follows the rays (of the Sun).

In the *Chāndogya Upanisad* we have, 'Now, when he departs from this body, he goes up through these rays only (VIII. vi. 5). Now the point to be considered is whether there is any rule that the knower of Brahman should follow the rays of the Sun after his departure from the body ; since if the knower dies during the night, it is not possible to follow the rays of the Sun. The conclusion is that there is no rule or restriction. The statement of the text refers to a few cases only.

The *Sūtra* repudiates this view and says that he moves upwards following the rays of the Sun. Why? The word in the text, 'eva' (only), leaves no other alternative; even during night also, the knower can follow the rays of the Sun. The heat is felt during the summer nights, and is present in winter also though it is not felt in winter, being overpowered by snow. According to the scriptural texts, there is mutual connection between arteries and the rays of the Sun. 'Just as a great highway goes to two villages, this one and that one, so also, these rays of the Sun go to the two worlds, this one and that one. They stretch themselves forth from the Sun and enter into his arteries; they are spread out from these arteries and connected with the yonder Sun' (*Chā. VIII. vi. 2*). Therefore, the conclusion is that as the rays of the Sun are present during nights also, the knower of Vidyā attains Brahman through the rays of the Sun only.

*Topic 10 : The attainment is possible even during night*

निशि नेति चेन्न संबन्धस्य यावद्देहभावित्वात्,  
दर्शयति च ॥ १८ ॥

18. If it be said that it cannot be in the night, we say 'no'; because the connection continues as long as the body lasts; the scripture also declares this.

The existence of the rays of the Sun may be admitted at night also; the knower may move upwards at night also following the rays of the Sun. But the scriptures speak of death during the nights as highly objectionable, as in the passage, 'Day-time, the bright fortnight, and the northern course of the Sun, these are favourable for those about to die; the contrary times are unfavourable'. So, dying at night

may lead the knower to an inferior state and not to the attainment of Brahman.

The *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that in the case of a man of knowledge, the connection with works (*karma*) continues as long as the body lasts. The meaning is because the works, which are the cause of future inferior births, are destroyed by the contact with knowledge, because there is non-clinging of later works, and because these works, which have begun to yield their fruits, come to an end with the final body, there is no cause for bondage to last further. Thus, in the case of a man who knows, the attainment of Brahman is established, though he may die at night. And the scripture also declares to that effect: 'And for him the delay is only as long as he is not freed from the body; then he will be united' (*Chā. VI. xiv. 2*). The text beginning with 'day-time, bright fortnight...' refers to a man without knowledge.

*Topic 11 : Southern course of the Sun*

अतश्चायनेऽपि दक्षिणे ॥ १९ ॥

19. And for the very reason even during southern course of the Sun (the knower attains Brahman).

On account of the very reason stated above, the attainment of Brahman is possible, even for one who may happen to die, during the southern course of the Sun. But a further doubt arises here; because of the text, 'he who dies during the southern course of the Sun, reaches the glory of the manes and experiences union with the presiding deity of the Moon' (*Ma. XXV. 1*), one who dies during the southern course of the Sun reaches the Moon; and because also of the texts, 'When *karma* gets exhausted' (*Bṛ. VI. ii. 16*).

and the *Chāndogya* passage 'they return again' (*Chā.* V. x. 2); and because Bhīṣma and others, who were devoted to Brahma-Vidyā, awaited the return of the northern course of the Sun, the attainment of Brahman is not possible for one who dies during the southern course of the Sun.

The answer to the above objection is as follows. Those who are without knowledge attain the presiding deity of the Moon through the path of manes ; only they return to the world. On the contrary, he who has knowledge, even after he has gone to the Moon, does not come back to the world ; for, the supplementary text in the *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad*, 'From there he attains the glory of Brahman' (XXV. 1), says that the place in the Moon is a stage for rest for him who dies during the southern course of the Sun. Bhīṣma and others, who could choose the time of their death through the power of Yoga, postponed it in order to demonstrate the excellence of the northern course of the Sun for the purpose of promoting *Dharma* and *ācāra*.

योगिनः प्रति स्मर्येते स्मार्ते चैते ॥ २० ॥

20. And these two paths are mentioned in the *Smṛtis*, with reference to yogins, as things to be meditated.

In the *Gītā* (VIII. 23-26), we have an authoritative statement, which declares that persons who die during day, etc. do not return any more to this world and that persons who die during night, etc. do return to this mortal world.

Here, special time of death for those about to die is not taught in the *Smṛti*, but it rather teaches two things to be remembered—the path of the gods and the path of the manes—for persons practising Yoga daily. In the passage of the *Gītā* mentioned above, the words time, etc. should be taken to denote the deities presiding over time, etc.

## CHAPTER IV

### SECTION III

Topic 1 : The path beginning with light

अचिरादिना तत्प्रथितेः ॥ १ ॥

1. Through the path beginning with light (the self of the knower reaches Brahman) ; because it is well known (from the scriptures).

In the last section, the departure of the individual self from the body through a particular artery with the help of the blessing of the supreme Self who is seated in the heart, was described. Now the *Sūtras* go on to determine the path, which the individual self follows. The scriptures give different versions of the path. In the *Chāndogya*, there is a detailed version where it is declared, 'Whether the sons of the dead perform funeral ceremonies or not' etc. (IV. xv.). In the eighth section of the same *Upaniṣad*, there is a different account : 'Then, he goes up through these very rays' (*Chā.* VIII. vi. 5).

The *Kauṣītakins*, in their text, give a different version : 'He, after reaching this path of the gods, comes to the world of Agni' etc. (I. 3). Again, we read in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* : 'Those who know it thus and those who in the forest meditate on Brahman with faith etc.' (VI. ii. 15). The same *Upaniṣad* gives a different version in another place : 'When a person departs from the world, he goes to Vāyu' etc. (*Bṛ.* V. x.).



The question is whether these texts refer to one and the same path beginning with light or whether they describe different paths, so that either through those paths or through that single path he reaches Brahman, and thus there is no restriction as to this or that path. The opponent holds that these texts refer to different paths ; for the paths are many and independent of one another.

The *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that these texts refer to one and same path beginning with light ; because that path is well known everywhere, i.e. different texts describe it with more or less completeness. The details which are mentioned in one text have to be transferred to another place, as in the case with the combination of the attributes in various meditations. Both in the Upakosala-Vidyā and Pañcāgni-Vidyā of the *Chāndogya*, the path is described to be one and the same. And in the Pañcāgni-Vidyā of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, the same path beginning with light is declared with a slight difference. And we recognize everywhere Agni, the Sun, etc. as the deities at certain stages of the path.

### Topic 2 : The presiding deity of Vāyu

वायुमब्दादविशेषाभ्याम् ॥ २ ॥

#### 2. From the Year to Vāyu, because of general and specific words (to indicate it).

In the last *Sūtra*, it was stated that persons possessing knowledge reach Brahman only through the path beginning with light. In connection with the path beginning with light, the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (V. x. 2) places the Year between the month and the Sun : 'From the months (they go to) the Year ; from the Year to the Sun'. But in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (VI. ii. 15) the world of the

gods is placed between the months and the Sun : 'From the months to the world of gods, from the world of gods to the Sun'. Now, as the path given in both the texts is same, we have to supplement each by the additional item given in the other. Here, in the case of Year and the world of the gods, stated after the months, the order of succession is the same according to the scripture which uses the ablative case. Further, according to the *Chāndogya* (V. x. 1), the progress is throughout from the shorter periods of time to the longer duration ; therefore, the Year—which is longer—has to be placed after the months, which is shorter. Thus it is determined that the world of gods comes after the Year.

The Vājasaneyins state that Vāyu precedes the Sun, as in the following text : 'He goes to Vāyu ; Vāyu makes room for him... He goes upward through that and reaches the Sun' (*Br. V. x. 1*). The Kauśītakins, on the other hand, place Vāyu after light or the world of Agni, as in the following text : 'He having reached the path of the gods, reaches the world of Agni ; then he comes to the world of Vāyu' (*Kau. I. 3*). Here, according to the order of succession, Vāyu is placed after light. As against this in the order of succession according to the Vājasaneyins as expressed in their text (V. x. 1), the term 'upward' has greater force than the order of succession in the text itself. Therefore, we have to place Vāyu before the Sun.

Thus, before the Sun and after the Year, we have to place the world of gods and Vāyu. Here we have to consider whether the world of gods and Vāyu are different things which the knower may attain in any order he likes or, whether, they being one and the same thing, he attains Vāyu, i.e. the world of gods, after the Year. The opponent says that they are different things, as they are well known to be so ;

and also because the word in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* text 'upwards' indicates Vāyu, and ablative usage in the *Chāndogya* indicates the world of gods. Thus, as there is no specification of difference between the two, the knower may attain them in the order which he likes.

The *Sūtra* rejects this view and says that the individual self, having departed from the Year, attains Vāyu ; because of general and specific words. For, the term 'world of the gods' is a general one which includes Vāyu, while, on the other hand, the term 'Vāyu' specifically denotes Vāyu, the deity. Hence, the knower of Vidyā, should attain Vāyu alone after the Year. As regards the 'world of Vāyu' in the text of Kauśītakins, the expression only means 'Vāyu, who is the world'. That Vāyu may be viewed as being the world of the gods, is confirmed in the following passage : 'Vāyu blows in the abodes of the gods' (*Jaimini Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa*, III. 1).

### Topic 3 : Varuṇa

तद्वितोऽधि वरुणस्सम्बन्धात् ॥ ३ ॥

3. After lightning Varuṇa (should come), on account of the connection (between the two).

According to the Kauśītakins, 'The knower comes to the world of Agni, he then goes to the world of Vāyu, to the world of Varuṇa, to the world of Sun, to the world of Indra, to the world of Prajāpati, to the world of Brahman' (*Kau.* I. 3); here 'the world of Agni' is the same as that of 'light'. In the previous two *Sūtras* it was determined that Vāyu comes after the Year and the Sun is placed after Vāyu, the world of gods. Now, we have to consider the

places of Varuṇa, Indra etc. The doubt here is whether Varuṇa and others ought to be placed after Vāyu in accordance with the order of succession in the above text, or to be placed after lightning according to the series given in *Chā.* IV. xv. 5 and V. x. 1. According to the opponent, following the order of series in the *Kauśītakī* text, Varuṇa is to be placed after Vāyu.

The *Sūtra-kāra* says that after lightning, Varuṇa is to be placed. Why? Because of the connection between the two. As Varuṇa, the deity of waters, is naturally connected with lightning, which is within the clouds, connection of it with Varuṇa is well known. With the purpose of rendering the teaching of the Upaniṣad valid, Varuṇa and others have to be placed somewhere. As the order of series according to *meaning* is more powerful than the order of series in the text, Varuṇa is to be placed after lightning, and it also follows that Indra and Prajāpati should come after Varuṇa.

### Topic 4 : Guides

आतिवाहिकाः तल्लिङ्गात् ॥ ४ ॥

4. They are those who guide, because of indicatory marks.

Now the question is whether the enumerations of light etc. are mere signposts or places of enjoyment or the guides who lead men of knowledge to attain Brahman. The opponent says that they are only signposts on the way to Brahman just as a tree, a river etc. are to a village.

The *Sūtra* says that the deities are meant here and not signposts or places of enjoyment. Vāyu etc. are particular deities appointed by the supreme Person to lead the soul to