

A conceptual analysis of deep sleep

BhAshya and VArtika have described sushupti in different fashions in different places. At some places, sushupti is stated to be another name of avidyA whereas at other places, it is described as being devoid of avidyA. The instances are enumerated as under: -

Statements positing presence of avidyA in sushupti

As per **Annexure -I**

Statements describing sushupti to be devoid of avidyA

As per **Annexure -II**

Reasons for positing presence of avidyA in sushupti

1. There is direct vArtika-vachana. In Naiskarmya Siddhi 4.53, AchArya says -
सुषुप्त्याख्यं तमोऽज्ञानं बीजं स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः। स्वात्मबोधप्रदग्धं स्याद्वीजं दग्धं यथाऽभवम्॥
2. It is seen that a man after waking up recalls, “I did not know anything”. If there was no avidyA in sushupti, it is not possible for a man to recall the experience of avidyA in deep sleep.
3. If there were no avidyA in sushupti, there would be immediate liberation. This would result in the futility of jnAna which is supposed to remove ajnAna. By merely going to deep sleep, one would attain Moksha. Further, since the seed of ignorance were to be equally absent in liberation and sushupti, there would be the occasion of birth/waking up of even liberated persons. (MK 1.2)
4. The merger of jIva in sushupti is spoken not in pure Brahman but in kAraNa Brahman. That is why the words such as prANa or Sat are used wherein the causality of Brahman is retained. BSB 1.1.9 clearly says so - तदेव सच्छब्दवाच्यं कारणं प्रकृत्य श्रूयते — ‘यत्रैतत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम, सता सोम्य तदा सम्पन्नो भवति; स्वमपीतो भवति; तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते; स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति’ (छा. उ. ६ । ८ । १) इति । **The merger is spoken in the vAchyA-artha of Sat, which is kAraNa Brahman.** Same thing is explained in MK 1.2 wherein Sat is stated to retain causality. BBV 1.4.371 clearly says that

causality of Brahman is only after superimposing avidyA therein which is the material cause of magical duality.

In view of the above, it is clear that merger of jIva in sushupti is in kAraNa Brahman, which is Sat and which is avidyA-vishishTa-Brahman.

5. There would remain no difference between PrAjna and TurIya or between sushupti and Moksha.
6. In NS 4.58, AchArya rejects the argument of pUrvapakshI that if ajnAna were to be there in sushupti, then it should have been perceptible to us like that in waking state in the cases of rAga, dvesha or pot-ignorance. AchArya refutes that by saying that ajnAna is very much there in sushupti and it is not clearly perceptible on account of absence of manifestor which is antah-karaNa.
7. A man wakes up as a man, a mosquito as mosquito etc only on account of merger in kAraNa-Brahman during sushupti while retaining their individuality.

Reasons for positing absence of avidyA in sushupti

1. There are bhAshya-vAkyAs clearly stating that there is absence of avidyA in sushupti as mentioned in Annexure-II.
2. If sushupti were not to be the pure Brahman, there would remain no means to directly show the Self and it would remain a concept.
3. The statements mentioning presence of avidyA in sushupti are from the point of view of waker whereas absence of avidyA in sushupti is the correct description of sushupti and is made from the standpoint of the direct intuition of deep sleep.

Harmony of the two prima facie distinct sets of statements in bhAshya and vArtika

First and foremost, we need to understand the concept of sAkshI, pramAtA and ajnAna. VArtika says in 1.4.372 that pure Brahman with the upAdhi of **only** ajnAna is termed as sAkshI. In BBV 4.3.91, चिदाभाविद्ययैवाऽऽत्मा कूटस्थोऽत्येति साक्षिताम्। आगमापायि रूपेषु स्थितो नैकेषु चैकलः।, it is stated that kUTastha attains sAkshI-hood owing to the avidyA illuminated by the effulgence of chaitanya.

pramAtA on the other hand is pure Brahman with the upAdhi of mind.

ajnAna is the material cause of the magical duality. (1.4.371)

अस्य द्वैतेन्द्रजालस्य यदुपादानकारणम्। अज्ञानं तदुपाश्रित्य ब्रह्मकारणमुच्यते॥

It is the shakti through which Brahman creates everything (BBV 4.3.1784) When this ajnAna is superimposed in pure Brahman, then we get kAraNa-Brahman. (BBV 1.4.371)

Thus,

pramAtA = jIva = mind-vishishTa-Brahman.

kAraNa-Brahman = Sat = avidyA-vishishTa-Brahman = ajnAta-Brahman (BBV 4.3.1787)

sAkshI = ajnAna-upahita-Brahman. (BBV 1.4.372)

अज्ञानमात्रोपाधित्वादविद्यामुषितात्मभिः। कौटस्थ्यान्निर्द्वयोऽप्यात्मा साक्षीत्यध्यस्यते जडैः॥

By the reasons adduced in support of presence of ajnAna in sushupti, it is clear that ajnAna has to be present in sushupti. However, this ajnAna is not manifest, vyakta, like in the case of waking and dream. There is no abhivyanjana (expression) of this ajnAna in sushupti. When we have pot-ignorance, it is avyavahita-pratyaksha i.e. it is clearly manifest to us without any obstacles. Such avyavahit-pratyaksha pot-ignorance is clearly manifest on account of the presence of buddhi. ajnAna is always avyavahita-pratyaksha i.e. sAkshi-bhAsya. Its clear perception depends on simultaneous presence of buddhi. In case of sushupti, there is no vyaktA-avidyA (manifested ignorance). And hence, even though ajnAna is avyavahita-pratyaksha then, there is no expression thereof.

It is the vyaktA-avidyA which is the cause of manifestation of 'other'. **Since it is peaceful (shAntA) in sushupti, the bhAshya and vArtika at many places state the absence of avidyA in deep sleep.** The usage of the word 'shAntA' is also insightful as it refers to the states of avidyA as shAntA and ashAntA.

This is important because the cause of kartritva, bhoktritva, kAma, karma etc is this vyaktA-avidyA only. Its absence leads to Ananda-prAya and not Ananda. MU 1.5 states clearly मनसो विषयविषय्याकारस्पन्दनायासदुःखाभावात् आनन्दमयः आनन्दप्रायः ; नानन्द एव, अनात्यन्तिकत्वात्

| यथा लोके निरायासः स्थितः सुख्यानन्दभुगुच्यते | अत्यन्तानायासरूपा हीयं स्थितिरनेनात्मनानुभूयत इत्यानन्दभुक् ,
'एषोऽस्य परम आनन्दः' (बृ. उ. ४ | ३ | ३२) इति श्रुतेः | Anandagiri SwamI says in BrihadAraNyak
BhAshya - यद्यपि सुषुप्तेऽविद्या विद्यते तथाऽपि न साऽभिव्यक्ताऽस्तीत्यनर्थपरिहारोपपत्तिरित्यर्थः | Similarly he
explains in VArtika-tIkA.

Thus, we see that there is really no contradiction between the two sets of statements
because the absence of avidyA in sushupti is stated only with respect to absence of
vyaktA-avidyA and not with respect to avidyA in its bIja-rUpa.

How exactly is this description useful

The idea of using sushupti as an example is to point to Self. Pure Brahman is
prakAsha-swarUpa like Sun. There is no action of illumination in it. When an object
comes near it, it becomes illumined. However, whether the object is illuminated by being
in the presence of the Sun or unillumined because it is away, there is not an iota of
change in the Sun. Thus, prior to illumination and post-illumination, there is no change
in Sun. However, on account of the fact of illumination, the Sun is called an illuminator.

Similarly, Pure Self is jnAna-swarUpa. There is no jnAna-kriyA in it. However, it is said to
be sAkshI on account of illuminating ajnAna and its effect.

This sAkshI always shines. Till the removal of ajnAna, sAkshI shines. In waking, in dream
and in deep sleep. Just as we know in waking and dream that "I know" due to sAkshI,
similarly in deep sleep, we know on account of sAkshI that "I don't know". Here BBV says
in 4.3.1474 - पश्यामीति यथाऽद्राक्षीरात्मदृष्ट्यैव जागरे। न पश्यामीत्यपि तथा नित्यदृष्ट्यैव वीक्षसे॥ Just as
you see in the waking "I see" by Atma-drishTi, similarly in sushupti, you know by that
very drishTi "I don't see". Here also is rejected the argument that one knows "I don't
know" on account of inference. In BBV 4.3.192 and 193 also, it is stated that the one
(sAkshI) who sees the seer, seen and seeing in the dream, that alone sees their absence in
sushupti. Anandagiri says that by dream, one has to infer waking also. द्रष्टृदर्शनदृश्यांश्च यः
स्वप्ने प्रसमीक्षते। तदभावं सुषुप्ते च स आत्मेत्यभ्युपेयताम्॥ (4.3.192)

This sAkshI is obscure in waking and dream due to functioning of mind and indriya.
However, in sushupti, it is clearly visualized. Had this sAkshI not been there illumining

ajnAna in sushupti, there would have been no way to state in waking “I did not know”. AnumAna does not work on account of absence of hetu. sAkshI knows the presence as well as absence of buddhi. It illumines the avidyA in sushupti. BBV says तदात्मज्योतिषेद्धं सन्नित्यमेवावतिष्ठते। उत्पत्तिस्थितिभङ्गानां न वेद्मीति च साक्षितः॥ (4.3.351) and निःसाक्षिके न वेद्मीति न कथंचित्प्रसिध्यति। तथा कूटस्थसंवित्के नितरां नैतदिष्यते॥(4.3.353)

The ajnAna is always illuminated by sAkshI. आत्माज्ञानमतः प्रत्यक्चैतन्याभासवत्सदा। आत्मनः कारणत्वादेः प्रयोजकमिहेष्यते॥(4.3.355)

Pure Self is NOT sushupti

Pure Self is not sushupti. It cannot be sushupti. That would render Moksha infructuous. Pure Self is the seer of sushupti (through the upAdhi of ajnAna). Like the sun, pure Self always shines. It is stated to be sAkshI on account of ajnAna which is always present in all three states. In waking/dream, mind is present whereas the mind is merged in ajnAna in sushupti. Pure Self, as sAkshI, shines in all the three.

Focusing on the seer is easy in case of sushupti when the mind is merged and there is **only** avidyA. Like the seer of blackness in dark pitch black night, we can identify with the sAkshI.

With this purpose in mind, that is to point to pure Self, Shruti uses sushupti as an example. Also, there is evident similarity in so far as there is absence of all effects of avidyA in both Moksha and sushupti. Hence, the analogy is workable.

The very fact that sushupti is mere drishTanta and not dArshTantika, it is clear that sushupti and Moksha are not same.

The scheme of avasthA-traya

AtmA is jnAna-swarUpa. There is no jnAna-kriyA in it. However, with the upAdhi of ajnAna, it is stated to be sAkshI. As long as ajnAna lasts, so long lasts the sAkshi-tva of Atman. There is no drishTi in Atman. However, there is drishTi in sAkshI. This drishTi of sAkshI is nitya-drishTi. Through this nitya-drishTi, sAkshI always sees. In waking and in dream, he sees ajnAna as well as its kArya. In sushupti, it sees **only** ajnAna as the effects

of ajnAna are absent in sushupti. That is to say, avidyA is avyaktA then, whereas in waking and dream, the avidyA is vyaktA. This vyaktA-avidyA is the cause of shoka-moha. On account of its absence in sushupti, there is samprasAda.

pramAtA is adhyasta in sAkshI as mind is an effect of avidyA. Due to the tAdAtmya-adhyAsa of pramAtA and sAkshI, the nitya-drishTi of sAkshI in sushupti is utilised by pramAtA in waking and the statement “I did not know” is made.

In 4.3.21 to 4.3.34 of BrihadAraNyak Upanishad, where it is said “seeing then, it did not see”, the BBV explains that “it did not see” is known to everyone. And hence Shruti did mere anuvAda of that. The statements of unity of jIva and Brahman are made on account of merger of buddhi. Just as the image merges with the object in case the mirror is taken away, similarly there is merger of jIva. As explained earlier, the merger is in the cause of mind, which is kAraNa-Brahman i.e. avidyA-vishishTa-Brahman.

न पश्यतीति प्राप्तत्वान्नापूर्वोऽर्थोऽवबोध्यते। न पश्यतीत्यतोऽनूद्य पश्यन्निति विधीयते॥

पश्यन्नित्यस्य वा व्याख्या कारकत्व निवृत्तये। न पश्यतीति वचनं न त्वर्थान्तरमुच्यते॥

Brahman is jnAna-swarUpa. It has no drishTi. With upAdhi of ajnAna, it is called sAkshI. The sAkshI has nitya-drishTi. The sAkshI always sees. In waking, in dream and in sushupti. In waking and in dream, sAkshI sees drashTA, drishTi and drishya through its nitya-drishTi. In sushupti, it sees ajnAna by the very same nitya-drishTi.

Due to tAdAtmya-adhyAsa of mind in avidyA, there is tAdAtmya-adhyAsa of pramAtA in sAkshI and thus the experience of sAkshI in sushupti is utilised by pramAtA and it is averred - I did not know in sushupti.

There is no standpoint of “direct intuition of sushupti” as held by some. There is no mention of such a line of argument anywhere in bhAshya, vArtika, tIkA or any text. Thus, it is a figment of imagination and outside of sAmpradAyika teaching.

There can be only two viewpoints. From the point of view of self, and from the point of view of non-self. The point of view of non-self is always from avidyA.

From the point of view of avidyA, the absence of avidyA is never posited. Hence, waking, dream and sushupti all have avidyA when seen from the point of view of non-self.

From the point of view of self, there is no avidyA. Hence, there are no states such as waking, dream and sushupti.

“There is no avidyA” is an apavAda-drishTi which at once obliterates all states. Hence, making the statement selectively for sushupti “there is no avidyA in sushupti” is meaningless unless only absence of vyaktA-avidyA is meant.

The mithyAtva of ajnAna and hence its utter non-existence is proved by anumAna on account of it being seen. विमतं मिथ्या, दृश्यत्वात्, शुक्तिरुप्यवत्। The argument that one must see it to be absent at some time in order to posit its mithyAtva is meaningless as its mithyAtva is proved by anumAna.

Thus, all references mentioning absence of avidyA in deep sleep have to be understood as being referring to absence of vyaktA-avidyA. ajnAna is always sAkshi-bhAsya from the point of view of avidyA, in waking, in dream and in deep sleep. ajnAna is never existent from the point of view of pure self. We have to turn away from the anitya-drishTi of Atman which is the pramAtri-drishTi and situate in nitya-drishTi of sAKshI and ultimately by doing the apavAda of ajnAna, be the pure Self.

Annexure -I

1. सुषुप्त्याख्यं तमोऽज्ञानं बीजं स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः। स्वात्मबोधप्रदग्धं स्याद्बीजं दग्धं यथाऽभवम्॥ (NS 4.43)
2. ननु, तत्र 'सदेव सोम्य' (छा. उ. ६ | २ | १) इति प्रकृतं सद्ब्रह्म प्राणशब्दवाच्यम् ; नैष दोषः, बीजात्मकत्वाभ्युपगमात्सतः । यद्यपि सद्ब्रह्म प्राणशब्दवाच्यं तत्र, तथापि जीवप्रसवबीजात्मकत्वमपरित्यज्यैव प्राणशब्दत्वं सतः सच्छब्दवाच्यता च । यदि हि निर्बीजरूपं विवक्षितं ब्रह्माभविष्यत्, 'नेति नेति' (बृ. उ. ४ | ५ | ३) 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते' (तै. उ. २ | ९ | १) 'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि' (के. उ. १ | ४) इत्यवकष्यत्; 'न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते' (भ. गी. १३ | १२) इति स्मृतेः । निर्बीजतयैव चेत्, सति प्रलीनानां सम्पन्नानां सुषुप्तिप्रलययोः पुनरुत्थानानुपपत्तिः स्यात् ; मुक्तानां च पुनरुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गः, बीजाभावाविशेषात्, ज्ञानदाह्यबीजाभावे च ज्ञानानर्थक्यप्रसङ्गः ; तस्मात्सबीजत्वाभ्युपगमेनैव सतः प्राणत्वव्यपदेशः, सर्वश्रुतिषु च कारणत्वव्यपदेशः ।
(MK 1.2)
3. विश्वादीनां सामान्यविशेषभावो निरूप्यते तुर्ययाथात्म्यावधारणार्थम् — कार्यं क्रियत इति फलभावः, कारणं करोतीति बीजभावः । तत्त्वाग्रहणान्यथाग्रहणाभ्यां बीजफलभावाभ्यां तौ यथोक्तौ विश्वतैजसौ बद्धौ सङ्गृहीतौ इष्येते । प्राज्ञस्तु बीजभावेनैव बद्धः । तत्त्वाप्रतिबोधमात्रमेव हि बीजं प्राज्ञत्वे निमित्तम् । ततः द्वौ तौ बीजफलभावौ तत्त्वाग्रहणान्यथाग्रहणे तुरीये न सिध्यतः न विद्येते, न सम्भवत इत्यर्थः ॥ (MK 1.11)
4. यस्मात् — आत्मानम्, विलक्षणम्, अविद्याबीजप्रसूतं वेद्यं बाह्यं द्वैतम् — प्राज्ञो न किञ्चन संवेत्ति, यथा विश्वतैजसौ ; ततश्चासौ तत्त्वाग्रहणेन तमसा अन्यथाग्रहणबीजभूतेन बद्धो भवति । यस्मात् तुर्यं तत्सर्वदृक्सदा तुरीयादन्यस्याभावात् सर्वदा सदैव भवति, सर्वं च तद्वृत्त्येति सर्वदृक् ; तस्मान्न तत्त्वाग्रहणलक्षणं बीजम् ।
(MK 1.12)
5. यथा हि सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादावपि सत्यां स्वाभाविक्यामविभागप्राप्तौ मिथ्याज्ञानस्यानपोदितत्वात्पूर्ववत्पुनः प्रबोधे विभागो भवति, एवमिहापि भविष्यति । श्रुतिश्चात्र भवति — 'इमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सति सम्पद्य न विदुः सति सम्पद्यामह इति,' (छा. उ. ६ | ९ | २) 'त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दशो वा मशको वा यद्यद्भवन्ति तदा भवन्ति' (छा. उ. ६ | ९ | ३) इति । यथा ह्यविभागेऽपि परमात्मनि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धो विभागव्यवहारः स्वप्नवदव्याहृतः स्थितौ दृश्यते, एवमपीतावपि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धैव विभागशक्तिरनुमास्यते । एतेन मुक्तानां पुनरुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गः प्रत्युक्तः, सम्यग्ज्ञानेन मिथ्याज्ञानस्यापोदितत्वात् ।
(BSB 2.1.9)
6. ननु यदि तत्राज्ञानमभविष्यत्, रागद्वेषघटाज्ञानादिवत् प्रत्यक्षमभविष्यत्। यथेह लोके 'घटं न जानामि' इत्यज्ञानमव्यवहितं प्रत्यक्षम्। अत्रोच्यते। न, अभिव्यञ्जकाभावात्। कथमभिव्यञ्जकाभाव इति चेच्छृणु -
बाह्यां वृत्तिमनुत्पाद्य व्यक्तिं स्यान्नाहमो यथा। नर्ते न्तःकरणं तद्गद् ध्वान्तस्य व्यक्ति राञ्जसी॥ (NS 4.58)

7. यथा अयं दृष्टान्तः, इत्येवमेव खलु सोम्य इमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः अहन्यहनि सति सम्पद्य सुषुप्तिकाले मरणप्रलययोश्च न विदुः न विजानीयुः — सति सम्पद्यामहे इति सम्पन्ना इति वा ॥ (ChhAndogya 6.9.2)
8. यस्माच्च एवमात्मनः सद्रूपतामज्ञात्वैव सत्सम्पद्यन्ते, अतः ते इह लोके यत्कर्मनिमित्तां यां यां जातिं प्रतिपन्ना आसुः व्याघ्रादीनाम् — व्याघ्रोऽहं सिंहोहऽमित्येवम् , ते तत्कर्मज्ञानवासनाङ्किताः सन्तः सत्प्रविष्टा अपि तद्भावेनैव पुनराभवन्ति पुनः सत आगत्य व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा मशको वा यद्यत्पूर्वमिह लोके भवन्ति बभूवुरित्यर्थः, तदेव पुनरागत्य भवन्ति । युगसहस्रकोट्यन्तरितापि संसारिणः जन्तोः या पुरा भाविता वासना, सा न नश्यतीत्यर्थः । ‘यथाप्रज्ञं हि सम्भवाः’ (ऐ. आ. २ । ३ । २) इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् ॥ (ChhAndogya 6.9.3)
9. स्थानद्वयप्रविभक्तं मनःस्पन्दितं द्वैतजातं तथा रूपापरित्यागेनाविवेकापन्नं नैशतमोग्रस्तमिवाहः सप्रपञ्चमेकीभूतमित्युच्यते । अत एव स्वप्नजाग्रन्मनःस्पन्दनानि प्रज्ञानानि घनीभूतानीव ; सेयमवस्था अविवेकरूपत्वात्प्रज्ञानघन उच्यते । यथा रात्रौ नैशेन तमसा अविभज्यमानं सर्वं घनमिव, तद्वत्प्रज्ञानघन एव । एवशब्दान्न जात्यन्तरं प्रज्ञानव्यतिरेकेणास्तीत्यर्थः । मनसो विषयविषय्याकारस्पन्दनायासदुःखाभावात् आनन्दमयः आनन्दप्रायः ; नानन्द एव, अनात्यन्तिकत्वात् । यथा लोके निरायासः स्थितः सुख्यानन्दभुगुच्यते । अत्यन्तानायासरूपा हीयं स्थितिरनेनात्मनानुभूयत इत्यानन्दभुक् , ‘एषोऽस्य परम आनन्दः’ (बृ. उ. ४ । ३ । ३२) इति श्रुतेः । (MU 1.5)

Annexure -II

1. अपि च न कदाचिज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सम्पत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात् । स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तूपाधिसम्पर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात्सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्विवक्ष्यते — 'स्वमपीतो भवति' इति । (BSB 3.2.7)
2. स उपाधिद्वयोपरमे सुषुप्तावस्थायामुपाधिकृतविशेषाभावात्स्वात्मनि प्रलीन इवेति 'स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति' (छा. उ. ६।८।१) इत्युच्यते । (BSB 1.1.9)
3. यो हि सुषुप्तावस्थमिव निर्विशेषमद्वैतम् अलुप्तचिद्रूपज्योतिःस्वभावम् आत्मानं पश्यति, तस्यैव अकामयमानस्य कर्माभावे गमनकारणाभावात् प्राणा वागादयो नोत्क्रामन्ति । किन्तु विद्वान् सः इहैव ब्रह्म, यद्यपि देहवानिव लक्ष्यते ; स ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्म अप्येति । यस्मात् न हि तस्य अब्रह्मत्वपरिच्छेदहेतवः कामाः सन्ति, तस्मात् इहैव ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्म अप्येति न शरीरपातोत्तरकालम् । न हि विदुषो मृतस्य भावान्तरापत्तिः जीवतोऽन्यः भावः, देहान्तरप्रतिसन्धानाभावमात्रेणैव तु ब्रह्माप्येतीत्युच्यते । (BU 4.4.6)
4. ब्रह्म तु अनपायि सुप्तिस्थानम् — इत्येतत्प्रतिपादयामः । तेन तु विज्ञानेन प्रयोजनमस्ति जीवस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वावधारणं स्वप्नजागरितव्यवहारविमुक्तत्वावधारणं च । तस्मादात्मैव सुप्तिस्थानम् ॥ (BSB 3.2.7)
5. तत्राप्यर्थात्सुषुप्तमेव भवति, 'स्वमपीतो भवति' इति वचनात् ; न हि अन्यत्र सुषुप्तात् स्वमपीतिं जीवस्य इच्छन्ति ब्रह्मविदः । (ChhAndogya 6.8.1)
6. एतस्मिन्काले अविद्याकामकर्मनिबन्धनानि कार्यकरणानि शान्तानि भवन्ति । (Prashna 4.7)
7. सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीव एकतां गच्छति; परस्माच्च ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायत इति वेदान्तमर्यादा । तस्माद्यत्रास्य जीवस्य निःसम्बोधतास्वच्छतारूपः स्वापः — उपाधिजनितविशेषविज्ञानरहितं स्वरूपम् , यतस्तद्भ्रंशरूपमागमनम् , सोऽत्र परमात्मा वेदितव्यतया श्रावित इति गम्यते । (BSB 1.4.18)
8. इदानीं योऽसौ सर्वात्मभावो मोक्षः विद्याफलं क्रियाकारकफलशून्यम् , स प्रत्यक्षतो निर्दिश्यते, यत्र अविद्याकामकर्माणि न सन्ति । (BU 4.3.21)
9. यत्र पुनः सा अविद्या सुषुप्ते वस्त्वन्तरप्रत्युपस्थापिका शान्ता, तेन अन्यत्वेन अविद्याप्रविभक्तस्य वस्तुनः अभावात् , तत् केन कं पश्येत् जिघ्रेत् विजानीयाद्वा । (BU 4.3.32)

Annexure -III

(BrihadAraNyaka BhAshya VArtika References)

1. योऽप्यविद्यादिसम्बन्धः सोऽप्यविद्याप्रकल्पितः। वास्तवसत्त्वभिसम्बन्धो नोपपत्त्याऽऽत्मनो यतः॥ (BBV 4.3.95)

It states that the sambandha of avidyA with Atman is also imagined by avidyA. This is so because there can be no real sambandha with Atman.

2. In 4.3.338, it is stated that AtmA-avidyA is the material cause of buddhi etc.

उपादानं हि बुद्ध्यादेरात्माविद्येति भण्यते। सकृद्विभातं चिन्मात्रं ज्योतिरित्युपदिश्यते॥

3. Between 348 to 356, it is stated that avidyA is the subtlest among all buddhi etc and always situates being illuminated by the effulgence of pure Self <https://sudhanshushekhhar.wordpress.com/2023/10/20/the-apparent-existence-of-ajnana>

4. In BBV4.3.1029, it is stated that Atman enjoys the fruits of actions by the pratibimba of Atman in avidyA.

अविद्यास्रोतसैवास्य क्रियाकारकताऽऽत्मनः। तत्स्थचैतन्यबिम्बेन भुङ्क्तेऽसौ कर्मणः फलम्॥

5. In 4.3.1293, it is stated that ATmA-avidyA is mrishA (false) in jAgrat, swapna and sushupti. However, when it attains transactional status, it is known by sAkshI.

जाग्रत स्वप्न सुषुप्तेषु त्वात्माविद्या मृषा सती। व्यवहारपथं प्राप्ता स्वतःसिद्धात्मसाक्षिका॥

6. In 4.3.1320, it is stated that the AtmA-AbhAsa is there in both ajnAna as well as its kArya (such as buddhi).

आत्माभासोऽपि योऽज्ञाने तत्कार्ये चावभासते। कार्यकारणतारूपस्तमप्येषोऽतिवर्तते॥

In Anandagiri TIkA on 4.3.1357, it is stated that vyaktA-avidyA is the cause of kartritva etc. It is owing to the absence of vyaktA-avidyA that the absence of avidyA in sushupti is spoken.

In Anandagiri TIkA on 4.3.1517, it is stated that on account of following the sthula-laukika-drishTi, which says there is no ajnAna in sushupti because it is not

perceived like pot-ignorance in waking, it is stated that there is no avidyA in sushupti.

In 4.3.1532, it is reemphasized that the absence of vyaktA-avidyA is meant by the statement of abhAva of avidyA in sushupti.

7. In 4.3.1578 and 1579, it is stated that “I don’t see in sushupti” is already known by everyone. Hence, Shruti does only the anuvAda thereof and no new explanation is adduced therefor. However, ‘**It sees** (that it does not see)’ is explained by Shruti to remove kArakatva.

न पश्यतीति प्राप्तत्वान्नापूर्वोऽर्थोऽवबोध्यते। न पश्यतीत्यतोऽनूद्य पश्यन्निति विधीयते॥

पश्यन्नित्यस्य वा व्याख्या कारकत्व निवृत्तये। न पश्यतीति वचनं न त्वर्थान्तरमुच्यते॥