
UNIT 3 CHANDOGYA

Contents

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 The Ways of Knowing *Brahman*
- 3.3 The Philosophical Implications of *Tajjalaniti*
- 3.4 The Potential Nature of the Universe
- 3.5 Return to the Nature of *Brahman*
- 3.6 *Uddaalaka's* Refutation of the *Vedic Suktas*; his Cosmology
- 3.7 The Meaning of *Swapti* and its Relation to Dream State
- 3.8 The Bonds of *Sat*
- 3.9 *Atman* and the Source of the Universe, i.e., *Brahman*
- 3.10 The Supreme Knowledge (*Bhooma Vidya*)
- 3.11 Let Us Sum Up
- 3.12 Key Words
- 3.13 Further Readings and References
- 3.14 Answers to Check Your Progress

3.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit you will get to know in detail:

- the philosophical significance of the *Chandogyopanishad*
- a lot of discussion on liturgical aspects
- the establishing of the identity of *Brahman* and *Atman*
- the *Upanishad* as the earliest work on cosmology and the evolution of life.
- this work as the first ever attempt to introduce quantitative analysis in addition to qualitative analysis
- the nature of *Atman* in several ways as presented by this *Upanishad*.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This *Upanishad* belongs to *Taandya Brahmana* of the *Samaveda*. It consists of eight chapters with each chapter divided into several sections. First five chapters, excluding fourteenth section of the third chapter which includes *Shandilya Vidya* are devoted to the superiority and effects of various forms of '*Upasanas*' and '*Homas*'. *Upasanas* and *Homas* constitute rituals. The prominence enjoyed by these forms of rituals clearly indicate that (sections numbering around one hundred and ten are devoted to the description of these forms) the chapters and sections dealing with this aspect must have been appended to the *Upanishad*. Even though the *Upanishad* denounced all forms of rituals, they did not lose the ground instantaneously. The statement '*ahimsa sarvani bhutani anyatra teerthebhyaha*' means that elsewhere non-violence is a virtue, but during the performance of

Yaga animal sacrifice is mandatory. Even in those sections, which are devoted to glorifying rituals, there is no homogeneity because these sections were appended to the Chandogya at different times. So the *Upanishad* which is available to us in the present form contains extraneous matter in a large quantity. This *Upanishad* not only describes in detail various rituals, it also contains glorification of various aspects of the *Samaveda*. For example, the very beginning of the *Upanishad* is marked by hailing the importance of ‘*Udgeetha*’ (this *Veda* is designed mainly to uphold the importance of *Udgeetha*) which stretches to several sections followed by the descriptions of *Prastava*, *Pratihara*, *Stobha* and so on. Salutations to ‘*Soma*’ occupy nearly the whole of second chapter. While there is diversity in this part of the *Upanishad*, the *Upanishad* proper is restricted to a discussion of *Atman* and *Brahman*. One possible reason for glorifying the non philosophical part is the emphasis upon the concept of *moksha*. In those days people might have thought that ‘*brahma sakshatkara*’ was possible only through rituals in conjunction with knowledge.

Like any other *Upanishad*, the *Chandogya* is also full of anecdotes of several fictitious persons. Even philosophical part of the text is not free from this approach. Hence in our study of the *Upanishad*, we must first segregate philosophy from myth. In order to achieve this, we have to concentrate only on some sections of the last three chapters of the *Upanishad* and as an exception in this case, we shall consider the twelfth section of third chapter of the *Upanishad*.

3.2 THE WAY OF KNOWING BRAHMAN

The particular section with which we are dealing presently is known as *gayatri brahma*. This section regards *vak* or speech as *Gayatri* and it is through *Gayatri* that *Brahman* can be understood. *Brahma* or *Brahman* is what manifests in speech. This may be the reason for regarding speech as the means of knowing *Brahman*. For our purpose, ‘*Gayatri*’ can be taken to mean a form of prayer. According to *Yajnavalkya*’s interpretation, there cannot be any positive description of *Brahman*. Since it is very difficult to understand *Brahman* with only negative interpretation, *Chandogya* chooses an alternative method. There is no need to know what prayer consists of. The *Mantras* numbering seventh, eighth and ninth describe *Brahman* as *Akasha*. In this case *Akasha* can be taken to mean something like ether or space or some eternal substance, and all pervasive. These three mantras first identify *Brahman* with *Akasha* which is external to *purusha* and far superior to prayer. It further says that the very same *Akasha* is also internal to *Purusha*. It points to two possibilities. One is that the very distinction of *Akasha* into external or internal itself is without foundation. The second possibility is that the internal self, which is *Atman*, is the essence of individual whereas the external *Akasha* is the essence of external world. When what is internal is identified with what is external, the individual self is identified with the external world. Hereby the equation of *Brahman* and *Atman* is established. This is the main theme of the *Upanishads*.

In *Akasha*, which is internal to man there are actually two divisions, *Akasha* inside the body and *Akasha* inside the heart. It means that there are three strata of *Akasha*. According to one interpretation, these three strata of *Akasha* correspond to the first three states of mind, *jagrut* (waking state), *swapna* (dream state) and *sushupti* (deep sleep). While the first two states cause misery, the last one does

not. *Akasha* is associated with these states and also the experience. This particular interpretation poses some difficulties. Waking state does not bring only miserable experience. It also brings other experiences. There is no reason why they should be omitted. Secondly, if *Akasha* has three '*prakaras*' or three kinds, then, we have to discern qualitative difference in which case it is difficult to accept that there is one *Akasha* only.

The seventh *Mantra* of the thirteenth section in the same chapter identifies *Brahma* with light. Again, light is both external and internal to *Purusha* just as *Akasha* is. The most unusual aspect of this mantra is that this light has to be experienced to know. It involves three sense organs, eyes, ears and skin. Obviously, the *Upanishad* must have meant that these three organs are not physical but some sort of metaphysical counterparts.

3.3 THE PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF *TAJJALANJTI*

In the previous unit (5.1.7), a detailed description of *tajjalan*, a part of *Shandilya Vidya*, was given. This section deals with a particular concept of *Brahman* known as *saguna brahma* which forms a part of *Tajjalan*. It means that there are attributes of *Brahman* and only through these attributes is it possible to explain *Brahman*. *Tajjalan* states that the world emerged from and much later it is re-absorbed by *Brahman*. So the physical world has both beginning and end. But *Brahman*, which is the source of the universe, has neither beginning nor end. If, for the time being, we ignore the idealistic theory which pervades the *Upanishads*, the description of *Brahman* correlates to the indestructibility of matter. Matter is not only indestructible, it cannot be created either. Physics speaks about the origin of universe but not matter. Suppose we hypothesize the origin of matter. It results in posing, say, pre-matter. If matter has its origin in pre-matter, then we can further hypothesize the origin of pre-matter in pre-pre-matter. Obviously, it results in infinite regress. So we have to stop at some stage while we are doing science. The position of philosophy is no different from that of science. The selection of point from which we start may or may not be random. While the *Nasadiya Sukta* was skeptical of the origin of the universe, the *Upanishads* were definite. While going back in time, the *Upanishads* stopped at *Brahman*. The termination of search for the primitive source is not a random termination because the *Upanishads* maintain, not just believe that it is the source. The manner in which '*Brahman*' is analyzed testifies to this comment.

The next *Mantra* mentions the attributes of *Brahman*. It is '*manomaya*' (spiritual), *prana sharira* (consciousness), *bhaarupa* (*bhaa* = light), *satyasankalpa* (positive purpose), *aakashatma* (form of *akasha*), *sarvakarma* (maker of all), *sarvakama* (flawless desire), *sarvagandha* (substratum of all pleasant odour), *sarvam idam abhyatta* (enveloping all), *avaakya* (silent), *anaadara* (unenthusiastic). It must be noted that all attributes in one way or another have human touch. *Brahman* is *manomaya* because it is through *Brahman* that *manana* or reflection of what one has listened is possible. By considering *Brahman* as conscious, the *Upanishad* could bring in other attributes. In addition to consciousness, *Brahman* is regarded as light. Hence *Brahman* stands for knowledge and it is *para*, the highest. Since *Brahman* is characterized by positive purpose the results also are positive. Since it is maker of all the positive results are the results of its actions. In spite of so

many attributes with human touch *Brahman* remained *niraakara* (formless) because it is *Aakashatma*. This one attribute is enough to accept the view that *Brahman* is impersonal. To say that *Brahman* is speechless is to admit that silence is supreme. It is not possible to discern the basis for regarding silence as supreme. But one *Upanishad*, which is now extinct says, '*upashantoyam atma*' (for this statement, the available source is *Shankara's* commentary on *Vedanta Sutra*. It is remarkable that there is an equivalent Austrian adage which proclaims 'speech is silver; silence is golden.' Equally, it is paradoxical that *Brahman* should be characterized by silence while one of the supposed root meanings of *Brahman* itself is 'prayer that manifests itself in audible speech.' But, then, paradox is a paradox because there is no solution to it. '*Unenthusiastic*' should be taken to mean, again, calm and composed. What is important is 'enveloping all'. It ought to be, if this particular attribute is quantified. In terms of quality cause and effect should remain the same. Similarly, in the case of quantity, cause should at least equal the effect because from 'less' it is impossible to derive 'more'. Second law of thermodynamics states that heat flows from higher end to lower end but not the other way round. If this law is extended to this particular attribute, then *Brahman* ought to be more than the universe. This attribute derives support from the *Purusha sukta* also. It states, '*sabhoomim vishwatovrittva ashtatishtasya dasaangulam*' which means 'after enveloping the universe the *Purusha* outstripped it by ten inches. This *Upanishad* replaced *Purusha* by *Brahman* and the result remains the same.

If we consider the etymological meaning of *Brahman*, which is equivalent to 'burst forth', then *Brahman* can be regarded as energy. The universe is pervaded by two types of energy; stellar energy and nuclear energy. While stellar energy is external, in one sense, in the same sense nuclear energy is internal. But the nature of energy remained the same. Now *Brahman* can be understood as equivalent to nuclear energy when it is regarded as subatomic and equivalent to stellar energy when it is regarded as transcending deep space. In the former state *Brahman* has to be understood as *Atman*. If *Brahman* is regarded as packet of energy, then the universe, before it was evolved, can be said to be latent in *Brahman*; a position very much similar to the Sankhya. It is potential and when it evolves it becomes actual. If the third *Mantra* is understood in this spirit, then it becomes much simpler.

Check Your Progress I

Note: a) Use the space provided for your answer

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit

1) What do you mean by *Akasha*?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) Could you mention some of the attributes of Brahman found in this Upanishad?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.4 THE POTENTIAL NATURE OF THE UNIVERSE

The nineteenth section of third chapter begins with the *Mantra* according to which, *Aditya is Brahman*. These two are equated because the sun is the principal means of knowing the external world. This *Mantra* says that in the beginning there was *asat* (nonbeing); and then it became *sat*. Later we will come to know that the *Upanishad* refutes this particular possibility. Evidently, the *Upanishad* could not have made a statement earlier only to deny it later. Therefore the first statement of the *Mantra* stands in need of clarification. One possible interpretation is that *Asat* is interpreted as *avyakrit* (not expressed), i.e., potential. When the universe is in unexpressed state, it is in its potential form. At that stage, *naama roopa bheda* (name and form distinction) does not exist. In this restricted sense only it can be regarded as *asat*. Then it became '*sat*', i.e., name and form distinction appeared. The *Upanishad* is very clear about the origin of *Sat*. On this crucial point the *Upanishad* says so; '*asat eva idam agra aseet tat sat aseet tat samabhavat tat aandam*' (this was earlier *asat*; that was *Sat*, it was born, it was egg). Evidently, the interpretation given above is not much helpful. The interpretation assumes that '*Asat*' means the absence of name and form differentiation whereas '*Sat*' means the presence of the same. However, what we can understand from the text is altogether different. Accordingly, the existence of *Sat* preceded differentiation in terms of name and form. The first and second *Mantras* very clearly state that after the *Sat* came into existence it became egg. Its gestation period was one year. Later, it hatched from which *Prithivi* (silver), *Dyu* (gold), etc. originated. The third *Mantra* suggests that *Aditya* originated from the egg. The formation of these bodies designates the differentiation in terms of name and form as far as the interpretation is concerned. Thus, this particular interpretation puts the cart in front of the horse.

Apart from *Asat-Sat* controversy, the origin of *Aditya* also poses a problem. If we suppose that *Aditya is Brahman*, how can it evolve from egg when egg is a successor to *Asat*? If, in accordance with, *Brahma-Parinama Vada*, cause and effect are treated as real, and effect is only a manifestation of cause, then, it means that *Brahman* came out of itself. This is not a comfortable position. Evidently, it has to be treated as *Asat* only because there was no differentiation. But it is doubtful whether any *Upanishad* would ever concede this suggestion.

3.5 RETURN TO THE NATURE OF *BRAHMAN*

In the seventh chapter, fresh attempts are made to describe *Brahman*. After having said that *Brahman* is *avak* (silent), now the *Upanishad* designates it as *vag brahma* (*vak* + *brahma* = *vagbrahma*). Before doing so, *Brahman* was called *naama brahma*. Not only *Brahman* is *Naama*, all *Vedas* are names. However, it is so only at inferior level. In a phased manner, the *Upanishad* provides the supposed perfect description. *Vak* is said to be superior to name. The question is how can *Vak* be a better description of *Brahman* when, earlier, it was said that *Brahman* is silent. It is true that the description ‘*Upashantoyam Atma*’ applies to self. But there is no difference between *Brahman* and *Atman*. So, whatever predicates are applicable to *Atman*, are at the same time applicable to *Brahman* and vice versa. So, it shows that in its attempt to describe *Saguna Brahman*, the *Upanishad* is contradicting itself. Failure of affirmative description, perhaps, is not inherent in the concept. But it may be due to contributions from several thinkers at different times.

Mano Brahma is said to be superior to *Vagbrahma*. But it is not clear why the *Upanishad* has identified *Manas* with *Brahman* twice. Only difference is that earlier the function of *Manas* was restricted to reflection only. But in the seventh chapter there is shift in its function. Desire becomes the function of *Manas*. From *Manas* it passes on to will or determination (*Samkalpa*). In this manner, the *Upanishad* considers in all twelve predicates, the highest being ‘*prana*’. It may be noted that *Akasha* is a repetition. Here, the status is decided based on the supposition of dependence, the principle on most of the occasions is dependence. First let us list various predicates in the order of their position. Determination is followed by *chitta* (to know), *dhyana* (meditation), *vijnana* (higher knowledge), *bala* (force or might), *anna* (food), *ap* (water), *tejas* (heat), *smara* (memory), *asha* (desire) and *prana* (life). However, it is not necessary to consider this chain in detail. It is sufficient to consider the end point of the chain. It is more than obvious that *Prana* is the substratum of whatever was earlier mentioned. Accordingly, *Brahman* is life just as *Atman* is. Life pervades the whole universe and it outstretches the same. This argument is close to the ancient Greek thought which considered the whole world as animated. By considering the world as animated by the Greek thought that they could solve the problem of change. And the *Upanishads* knowingly or unknowingly solved the problem of origin of life.

Finally, by regarding *Brahman* as *Prana*, the *Upanishad* established the identity of *Brahman* and *Atman* more effectively.

3.6 *UDDAALAKA*’S REFUTATION OF *VEDIC SUKTAS*: HIS COSMOLOGY

If we understand cosmology in modern sense, then we can claim that *Uddaalaka*’s theory is the first ever attempt to grapple with the problem of the origin and the structure of the Universe. It is interesting to note that all preliminary approaches ended up in monism. In the western tradition also, philosophy began on monistic note only. The only difference is that ancient Greek philosophers, who are called pre-Socratic philosophers are mainly materialists, whereas in India, they are mainly idealists. Opposition to these creeds is only a later development.

If the physical world emerged from *Brahman* only to be reabsorbed later, then can we not conclude that the physical world is real? If so, how can *Uddaalaka* be regarded as an idealist? It is very important to address this objection.

There are two distinct ways of analyzing the origin of external world and life. They are quantitative and qualitative analyses. In any speculative science only the latter is possible. However, in this respect *Uddaalaka* is an exception.

Uddaalaka's arguments begin with his refutation of a *sukta* from the *Rigveda*. The *sukta* says: '*devaanam purve uge asataha sat ajaayata*' (before the (birth of) gods only *Asat*, i.e., nonexistence was from which *Sat*, i.e., existence emerged). In addition to this *Sukta*, the uncertainty of *Nasadiya Sukta* further strengthened *Uddaalaka*'s argument. The *Sukta* says that '*na asat aseeno sat aseeta daneem*' (Neither *Sat* nor *Asat* was). *Uddaalaka* counters both these statements from the *Rig Veda*. He asks '*katham asataha sat jayeta*' (how can '*Sat*' come out of '*Asat*'?). The absence '*Sat*' does not mean (according to the *Rigveda*) the presence of '*Asat*'. To that extent the *Sukta* is correct. When neither of them is present how can '*Tat Ekam*' breathe? To wriggle out of this maze *Uddaalaka* refutes both the *Suktas*. Before the formation of objects only '*Sat*' was and nothing else. This is the meaning of '*ekamevaadvitiya*' (second to none). *Brahman* is this '*Sat*'. How did the formation of objects or the birth of objects become possible? If we can assume that where there is spirit there is activity, then we can conclude that *Brahman* is the seat of activity because *Brahman* is spiritual. This activity manifests in *Brahman* in the form of production of this world. For the manifestation of activity no cause may be required. *Uddaalaka* traces the path of production which is bound by sort of reasonableness, the '*one*' became many, i.e., *Brahman* became many. First to be produced is *Tejas*, and from *Tejas*, *Ap* and from *Ap*, *Anna* (food or solid). *Uddaalaka* explains this scheme in this manner. Water (sweat) is generated when there is heat (*Tejas*). So it means that water is born from *Tejas*. *Uddaalaka*'s explanation can be supplemented easily. Rainfall (water) is always preceded by heat (*Tejas*). If *Uddaalaka*'s theory can be regarded as scientific, it is not because of what he said but because why he said so. He provided 'evidences' to justify his theory. Surely, evidences need not be accepted. They can be shown to be inadequate or irrelevant. This possibility is sufficient to classify his theory as a scientific theory.

According to *Uddaalaka* '*Tejas*, *Ap* and *Anna*' are the elements. To this group the *Taittiriya* adds *Vayu* and *Aakasa*. Once these elements are born the classification of name (*nama*) and form (*roopa*) takes place. When '*one*' becomes many, each one becomes finite. What is finite has definite form. Name is necessary to distinguish one from the other. In this way, name and form determine this world. In the same part, the fourth *Mantra* states that all these three elements undergo the process of further division. So we have nine divisions together. These divisions apply to matter in gross state. *Tejas* does have other elements. But the proportion of other elements in *Tejas* is much less. The same explanation ought to hold good for other elements. It also means that these elements are not really elements. However, that apart the reference to proportion of elements at any given level, evidently, marks a revolutionary idea. Quantitative aspect which distinguishes one element from another essentially belongs to science. *Uddaalaka* also correlates colour to *Tejas*, white of *Ap* and black that of *Prithivi*. This correlation later gave rise to substance-attribute relation.

The next stage of triple division is very significant. It contains discussion of *manas* or mind. One *Mantra* asserts that mind emerged from the subtle part of *Anna*, i.e., solid. It means that mind is not qualitatively different from solid or matter. Mind is, perhaps, microscopic or subatomic part of matter. There are two ways of interpreting the relation; any aspect of mind can be explained through matter. This method of explanation is accepted by epiphenomenalism; a theory in modern western philosophy. Not only mind even *Prana* has its origin in matter. ‘*Apam... peeya maanaanaam ya animaa sa urdhvaha samudeeshati sa pranobhavati*, (When water is consumed, the subtle part of it rises upwards and becomes *Prana*). So, not only *Manas* even *Prana* has its origin in the so-called matter. If this is the conclusion, then it runs counter to the general spirit of Indian Philosophy. To circumvent this situation, *Uddaalaka*, perhaps, regards not only *Brahman* but also the off-shoot, viz., *Tejas*, *Ap* and *Anna* as gods, and gods in the *Upanishads* do not mean the same as gods in the *Vedas*. Here gods can be taken to mean ‘Spiritual’ as distinct from matter. If so, then whatever exists must be spiritual. *Uddaalaka* chose this path. This is how ‘*sarvam khalvidam Brahma*’ can be understood.

Uddaalaka demonstrates the ‘composition of *Manas* and *Prana* in an extraordinary way. Given the tenor of the *Upanishads* and also the age to which the *Upanishads* belonged what *Uddaalaka* did is, surely, extraordinary. Warder goes to the extent of calling it an experiment. According to the *Brihadaranyaka*, *Prajapati* is made up of sixteen aspects. Of them fifteen aspects constitute *Manas* and the remaining aspect *Prana*. *Manas* has too many aspects because it is too complex. To drive home this point, *Uddaalaka* asks his son to go on fast for fifteen days. As a result he goes into *Amnesia*. It shows that mind (after all, memory is a function of mind) depends upon matter. This is what Warder calls quantitative analysis only because there is obvious reference to ratio and composition, which cannot be understood without numbers.

Is there any difficulty in accepting that whatever exists is spiritual? If *Manas* and *Prana* together have sixteen aspects then ‘spirit’ or *Chaitanya* also must have sixteen aspects. How can what is not physical, possess different aspects? Secondly, if *Manas*, *Prana*, etc. are spiritual, are bone, flesh, etc., which have originated from *Brahman* also spiritual? This may or may not be the case. But *Uddaalaka* is silent on this issue.

Tat tvam asi (that is you) occurs in *Uddaalaka*’s exposition on seven occasions. It means that you are the very same *Atman*, which being the most subtle and true, is also the primal source of the universe. In other words, I should feel my identity with the universe. How is this achieved? *Uddaalaka* gives two analogies; rivers flowing from different directions to merge in sea and production of honey. In this particular case we should discover the essential characteristic of Indian philosophy. This kind of realisation of being one with *Atman-Brahman*, which transcends all reason and experience, is the essence of the *Chandogya*. This is essentially a state of mind.

A passing reference to the evolution of life is sufficient. *Uddaalaka* considers three classes only; *Andaja* (born from the egg), *Jivaja* (born from the animal) and *Udbhijja* (plants). *Aitareya* adds one more; *Swedaja* (born from sweat). It is sufficient to remark that this kind of classification is the primitive form of taxonomy.

In the beginning of the sixth chapter, *Uddaalaka* introduces an important issue. Effect is only name. But cause is fundamental. For example, chain is the effect. But gold, from of which chain is made is its material cause. *Brahman* is the material causes whereas the world is its effect. Goldsmith makes chains. So he is the efficient cause. *Brahman* is not only the material cause, but also he is the efficient cause because he (or it) has made this universe. This theory of causation, which is called *Brahma Parnama vāda*, is the earliest theory of causation. Last element, which deserves to be mentioned is his reference to generalization. If I can show the properties of any one object made from iron, then I can as well know the properties of all objects made from iron. This is an important topic in logic.

Check Your Progress II

Note: a) Use the space provided for your answer

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit

- 1) How do you interpret the teaching of Chandogya that in the beginning there was *asat* (nonbeing)?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) What is the meaning of *Tatvamsi* in Uddalaka's exposition?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.7 THE MEANING OF *SWAPITI* AND ITS RELATION TO DREAM STATE

At the outset, two aspects should be made clear; one, the meaning of '*Swapiti*' and the other, meaning of dream state. *Uddaalaka* defines '*Swapiti*' as the association of individual with his true nature, i.e., *Sat*. The association of individual with *Sat* becomes possible when *Sat* comes to be associated with *Manas*. Instead of *Sat*, we can also say self or *Atman*. It means that at empirical level, all activities like, seeing, hearing, etc. owe their possibility to this association. Therefore the true nature of *Sat* is obliterated. This is what can be termed as bondage. Freedom from bondage consists in complete dissociation. In other words, *Swapiti* is realised when *Sat* is dissociated from *Manas*. The nature of *Swapiti* is better understood when we understand the nature of '*Sushupti*'! The *Upanishad* does not use this particular word. Instead, it uses another word '*swapanaantam*' (end of dream state). The word *Sushupti* is used by

commentators. To understand the process of dissociation, it is necessary to refer to other states of *Manas*. In waking state not only the nervous system is active, but also the individual is conscious of this activity. Hence waking state is characterized by conscious activity. In this state, the association with *Manas* is complete. In dream state, consciousness is absent, but motor organs function. This is one difference between waking and dream states. Secondly, though motor organs function, there is vast difference in degree. It means that nervous system is active, but less active. Therefore even in dream state, *sat* remains at empirical level. While one end of dream state is marked by waking state characterized by full-blooded association with external world, the other end of the spectrum is characterized by the total withdrawal of *sat* from external world. This is possible only in deep sleep. Deep sleep must have been used as an analogy by *Uddaalaka* because deep sleep is only momentary. But when *Sat* is dissociated from external world it is permanent. In this context *sat* is regarded as *Atman* which in at the same time *Brahman*.

A simpler way of understanding *Swapiti* is to regard it as *Swa-Roopa* (one's own or true nature). When *Sat* regains its *Swa-Roopa*, it goes beyond good and evil because good and evil are associated only with external world. It shows that the bond, which connects *Sat* with *Manas* and through *Manas* the external world is not necessary but contingent. According to the *Upanishads*, the goal is to break this bond. Hence, whatever intellectual exercise that can be discerned in the *Upanishad* is propelled by this goal. Thus, the means is intellectual but the end is not. This, exactly, is the essential nature of the *Upanishads*.

3.8 THE BONDS OF SAT

In the previous section a reference was made to bondage and liberation from bondage. Hence it is necessary to know the nature of bondage in detail. *Uddaalaka* recognizes six elements involved in bondage and so calls them '*shadayatana*' (six places). It is easy to trace the link. *Manas* is held captive by *Prana*, *Prana* by *Anna*, *Anna* by *Ap* and *Ap* by *Tejas*. *Sat* is connected through *Manas* in this manner with remaining elements. If *Sat* can break its link with *Manas*, then, naturally, the bondage collapses. *Uddaalaka* clearly states how one element is bound by the other. This is quite illuminating. Food is necessary for life. Hence *Prana* depends upon *Anna*. It is not sufficient if I eat food. It has to be converted to liquid state and then mixes up with juice (*rasa*). Only then it is digested. *Uddaalaka* is merely describing the metabolic process here. Water (*Ap*) is required to convert food into energy. Hence food depends upon water. The process of digestion is known as internal combustion. Directly or indirectly, internal combustion can be equated with *Tejas* or heat.

The bondage can be understood in this way also. *Sat* is the source of *Tejas*; *Tejas* is the source of *Ap* and so on. Everything else depends upon *Sat* but *Sat* itself does not depend upon anything else. This is the nature of bondage. Liberation from bondage does not really mean death. What happens after liberation is different from what happens after death. When *Sat* is liberated from bondage it is not affected by external world because its link with *Manas* has snapped. But this is only in one direction, i.e. *Manas* and *Prana* continue to have relation with *Sat* for their existence. At the time of death one will merge in another; speech in *Manas*, *Manas* in *Prana*, *Prana* in *Tejas* and *Tejas* in *Sat*. And this *Sat* is pure or pure Being.

3.9 ATMAN AND THE SOURCE OF THE UNIVERSE: BRAHMAN

Uddaalaka defines the truth as the equation of atman with subtle essence of the world. To express this equation, Uddaalaka uses what is known as '*mahaa vakya*' (cardinal statement); *tat tvam asi* (that thou art). Put in simple language it only means 'That is you'. He uses analogies, when bees collect juice from different sources (here called trees), they are not preserved separately. The juices collected from different sources lose their identity when they merge in one place. But thereby they do not lose existence. Therefore identity and existence are not one and the same. In case of an individual, this awareness is lost; realisation consists not in maintaining identity but in identifying with *Sat*. Loss in one place is compensated by gain in another place.

Another analogy is 'river-sea' analogy. When rivers enter sea they become parts of sea. It is impossible to differentiate water of one river from water of some other river. Rivers lose their identity only because they become identical with sea. But (assuming that they are conscious), they are not aware of what they have lost and what they have gained.

Uddaalaka uses several analogies in his long discourse. It is not necessary to mention all of them. The essence is that ignorance is the cause of seeing difference when there is none. Acquisition of knowledge is conditioned by three factors, proper guidance, ability and desire to learn. In the absence of any one of them the identity, which is under investigation cannot be realised. Acquisition of knowledge leads to liberation. Truth liberates whereas falsehood curtails freedom. Knowledge is knowing what truth is.

3.10 THE SUPREME KNOWLEDGE (*BHOOMA VIDYA*)

Discussion of knowledge and truth takes us to the nature of supreme knowledge. Seventh chapter of the *Upanishad* begins with the assertion 'one' who knows, speaks the truth' and 'one who does not know, does not speak the truth'. How does one acquire knowledge? Act of knowing demands reflection and truth, reflection demands dedication and commitment. There are in truth, links to happiness. That which provides happiness is supreme knowledge. The *Mantra* says; "*yo vai bhoomaa tat sukham na alpe sukham asti*". It means happiness consists in achieving the highest or supreme. What is inferior does not bring in happiness. When we reach the peak there is nothing else to see, nor to hear, nor to know, where something else can be seen, etc. then, there is *alpa* (inferior). Obviously, this statement is the basis of reflection on *Advaita*. While what is inferior needs the support of something else, the 'Supreme' does not require any support because that itself is the base for all. This 'Supreme' is *Atman*. Hence the knowledge of *Atman* is the 'Supreme' knowledge.

Check Your Progress III

Note: a) Use the space provided for your answer

b) Check your answers with those provided at the end of the unit

1) Explain briefly the meaning of *Swapiti*

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) How does Uddaalaka understands truth?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.11 LET US SUM UP

The *Chandogya* is one of the earliest *Upanishads*. Hence there is lot of discussion on *Vedic* rituals. This *Upanishad* forms a part of *Samaveda* tradition. Hence, the rituals mentioned here derive support mainly from *Samaveda*. *Upanishads* are against rituals because during transition time people still believed that the ritual is one of the means of knowing or realising *Brahman*. *Gayatri* is one *Mantra* through which *Brahman* can be known. There are three strata of *Akash*; each correlated to three states of mind. *Brahman* also is equated with light. *Tajjalan* has very significant Philosophical implications. Cosmology has its roots in this principle. *Uddaalaka*'s Cosmology is not only scientific but also it is in opposition to the *Vedic* account of the origin of universe. *Brahman* is described in various ways, *Prana* being regarded as the best description. *Atman* is not only the source of universe, but also the essence of man. Knowledge of one's own self is the highest knowledge.

3.12 KEY WORDS

- Adage** : An adage is a short but memorable saying that holds some important fact of experience that is considered true by many people, or that has gained some credibility through its long use.
- Attribute** : An attribute is an abstraction of a characteristic of an entity or substance.
- Substance** : The word **substance** originates from Latin '*substantia*,' literally meaning "standing under." The word is a

translation of the Greek philosophical term ‘ousia’. It is the basic principle of an object without which the object would not exist, or what exists only by itself (*causa sui*).

Thermodynamics : Thermodynamics (from the Greek, *therme* = “heat” and *dynamis* = “power”) is the study of the conversion of energy into work and heat and its relation to macroscopic variables such as temperature and pressure.

3.13 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Das Gupta, S.N. *History of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. I. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1988.

M. Hiriyanna. *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1958.

———. *Essentials of Indian Philosophy*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1985.

Sachidananda Saraswati, Swami. *The Chandogya Upanishad*. Bangalore: Adhyaatma Prakashan, 2007.

Sharma, Chandradhara. *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 2000.

S. Radhakrishnan. *History of Philosophy: Eastern and Western*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967.

———. *Indian Philosophy*. Vol. I. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004.

———. *The Principal Upanishads*. London: George Allen and Unwin,

Warder, A.K. *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1971.

3.14 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answers to Check Your Progress I

- 1) In *Akasha*, which is internal to human, there are actually two divisions: *Akasha* inside the body and *Akasha* inside the heart. It means that there are three strata of *Akasha*. According to one interpretation, these three strata of *Akasha* correspond to the first three states of mind, *jagrut* (waking state), *swapna* (dream state) and *sushupti* (deep sleep). While the first two states cause misery, the last one does not. *Akasha* is associated with these states and also the experience.
- 2) It is ‘*manomaya*’ (spiritual), *prana sharira* (consciousness), *bhaarupa* (*bhaa* = light), *satyasankalpa* (positive purpose), *aakashatma* (form of *akasha*), *sarvakarma* (maker of all), *sarvakama* (flawless desire), *sarvagandha* (substratum of all pleasant odour), *sarvam idam abhyatta* (enveloping all), *avaakya* (silent), *anaadara* (unenthusiastic).

- 1) The nineteenth section of third chapter begins with the *Mantra* according to which, *Aditya is Brahman*. This *Mantra* says that in the beginning there was *asat* (nonbeing); and then it became *Sat*. The first statement of the *Mantra* stands in need of clarification. One possible interpretation is that *Asat* is interpreted as *avyakrit* (not expressed), i.e., potential. When the universe is in unexpressed state, it is in its potential form. At that stage, *naama roopa bheda* (name and form distinction) does not exist. In this restricted sense only it can be regarded as *asat*.
- 2) *Tat tvam asi* (that is you) occurs in *Uddaalaka*'s exposition on seven occasions. It means that you are the very same *Atman*, which being the most subtle and true, is also the primal source of the universe. In other words, I should feel my identity with the universe, Brahman.

Answers to Check Your Progress III

- 1) *Uddaalaka* defines '*Swapiti*' as the association of individual with his true nature, i.e., *Sat*. The association of individual with *Sat* becomes possible when *Sat* comes to be associated with *Manas*. In other words, *Swapti* is realised when *Sat* is dissociated from *Manas*. The nature of *Swapiti* is better understood when we understand the nature of '*Sushupti*'! The *Upanishad* does not use this particular word. Instead, it uses another word '*swapanaantam*' (end of dream state).
- 2) *Uddaalaka* defines the truth as the equation of *atman* with subtle essence of the world. To express this equation, *Uddaalaka* uses what is known as '*mahaa vakya*' (cardinal statement); *tat tvam asi* (that thou art). Put in simple language it only means 'That is you'. He uses analogies, when bees collect juice from different sources (here called trees), they are not preserved separately. They lose their identity when they merge in one place. But thereby they do not lose existence. Therefore identity and existence are not one and the same. In case of an individual, this awareness is lost; realisation consists not in maintaining identity but in identifying with *Sat*.