

1.1.17

netaronupapatteḥ

Meaning of the words

na- not; itaraḥ – the other; anupapatteḥ – because of impossibility

Summary

Ānandamaya cannot be the other (individual soul) because of impossibility of this view.

Notes

In relation to *Brahman* the individual soul is stated as *itara* (the other). Even the individual soul that is in the state of liberation cannot be the *Brahman* which is denoted by the *mantra* (*mantravarṇa*) referred in the previous Sūtra (Brahman is truth knowledge and infinity, which is also *ānandamaya*). It is impossible for an individual soul (irrespective of the state in which it is in bondage or liberation) to have unconditioned omniscience which is stated in the verse –

“so'kāmayata bahusyāṁ prajāyeya”

“It desired, let me become many, let me be born”

(*Taittirīyopaniṣad Ānandavallī 6-2*)

Unconditioned omniscience means the power to realize all one's purposes. The realized soul may be omniscient. But it cannot be unconditioned, for, in the state of samsāra it is limited in power.

Comments of T Krishnamacharya

If one asks, why should the one denoted by the *mantra* be *Brahman*, why not *jīvātman*? It is replied that it is *Brahman* and not *jīva* because *jīva* does not possess the capacity that *Brahman* has.

The following textual reference supports the above view –

“so'śnute sarvān kāmān saha brahmaṇā vipāściteti”

(*Taittirīyopaniṣad Ānandavallī 1.1*)

This verse means that the *jīva* enjoys various pleasures along with *Brahman*. *Brahman* is the entity which can create, sustain and destroy the universe. The *jīva* does not have this potential and hence, *jīva* can be present with *Brahman* during liberation and enjoy all his desires, but he himself cannot be *Brahman*. It is also clear from this verse that *jīva* and *Brahman* are two different entities. Further, by this, the views of the proponents of the unity of *jīva* and *Brahman* stands rejected. The usage of the term 'saha' in the above reference clearly

rules out the oneness of individual soul with that of the supreme being. According to Pāṇini's Grammatical rule (*Aṣṭādhyāyī** 2.3.79) the usage of the term '*saha*' (along) renders one among the two constituents in the sentence secondary**.

Footnotes:

* *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is a Sanskrit grammatical treatise composed by Sage Pāṇini approximately 5000 years ago

** In the sentence "the prince goes along with the king" the King is the primary goer and the prince just accompanies him and he is subordinate to the king here. Similar is the case in the sentence *jīvātman* enjoys various pleasures along with *Brahman*. Hence *jīvātman* is subordinate to *Brahman* and hence cannot be one with him.