



मुण्डकोपनिषद् Muṇḍakopaniṣad



Mantra 13

तस्मै स विद्वान् उपसन्नाय सम्यक्
प्रशान्तचित्ताय शमान्विताय ।
येनाक्षरं पुरुषं वेद सत्यम्
प्रोवोच तां तत्वतो ब्रह्मविध्याम् ॥ १।२।१३ ॥
tasmai sa vidvān upasannāya samyak
praśāntacittāya śamānvitāya ।
yenākṣaraṁ puruṣaṁ veda satyam
provoca tāṁ tattvato brahmavidhyām ॥ 1|2|13||

tasmai - to that student; *samyak* - properly; *upasannāya* - who has approached; *praśāntacittāya* - whose mind is resolved; *śamānvitāya* - who has mastery over mind; *sa* - that; *vidvān* - wise person, *provoca* - may he teach; *tām* - that; *brahmavidhyām* - brahmavidhya, *yena* - by which; *veda* - he knows; *akṣaram* - the imperishable; *puruṣam* - truth; *satyam* - limitless; *tattvata* - as it is

To that student who has approached properly, who has a resolved mind, who has mastery over mind, that wise person should teach that brahmavidhyā by which he knows the imperishable, limitless truth as it is.

Guru is not some kind of a generic name. There is no class of *gurus*. Only when a student approaches the person for knowledge, and that person is willing to teach, he becomes one's *guru*. The person wants to know and the one whom he considers as a *guru* does not teach at all, yet he can be a *guru*, like DroG-a was *guru* to Ekalavya.

Sa%-, that *guru* who is a *srotriya* and a *brahma-nicm-ha* is being approached. He has the knowledge of the scriptures. Unless he has that knowledge, there is no way of imparting the knowledge.

Samyak upasannāya tasmai provāca: to that student who has approached properly, may the teacher teach until the person understands. A person may approach a teacher, but wants something else. So, first the teacher has to find out what the person wants, and also find out whether the person has the right kind of mind, whether the heart of this person is set for this knowledge. *Samyak upasannāya* means one who shows his readiness to receive this knowledge. May the teacher teach such a person.

There are some more adjectives for the *śiṣya*. He is *praśāntacitta*, one who has a resolved mind. By *viveka* and *vairāgya* he has freed his mind from other *puruṣārthās*. The different ends in life do not pull his mind. *Samānvitāya* is one who has qualities like *śama-dama*. Vedanta talks about those qualities - *amānitva* and *adambhitva* as mentioned in the *Gītā* -that one must have to gain this knowledge. The *upanic-ads* also mention *śama*, *dama*, *uparati*, *titik-ā*, *æradhā* and *samādhāna*.¹³⁹ The one who has these qualifications in a relative measure, is *samānvitā*. In other words, the *śiṣya* is a *jijṣāsu*. For that person the *guru* taught. It is is(?) how *sampradāya* begins. Here, *guru*, *AE-giras* taught the *śiṣya*. Similarly, the *śiṣya* will go and teach when he himself has understood. So there is a kind of *vidhi*, stipulation, that may the teacher teach that person. Here, in the verb '*provāca*,' '*vac*' *dhātu* is a transitive verb. So, there is a subject matter involved. The subject matter is *brahma-vidyā*. *Brahmavidyām provāca*, he taught the knowledge of Brahman. Really he taught what is Brahman, which is the knowledge of Brahman. There is no such thing as a subject matter called *brahma-vidyā*. There is only Brahman, which one has to know. If what he taught is Brahman, then why it is said *brahma-vidyām provāca*? Here, Brahman is the object to be gained, and it is to be gained in terms of knowledge alone. Therefore, knowledge itself is mentioned here as the object.

¹³⁹ *B[-hadāraG-yakopanic-ad 4.4.23*

He handed over the knowledge of Brahman, *tattvata%*-, as it is, without any personal embellishment. Without any reservation he taught that *brahma-vidyā* for which he was approached.

Yena akc-araC-veda: by which teaching the *śiṣyā* would get *akc-ara*, that which is not subject to decay or decline. *Puruc-a* means that which is *pūrṇa*, the limitless, the whole, and there is nothing outside the *puruc-a*. *Satya* is the cause of everything, which does not undergo any change. It is always the same, which is why it is *abādhita*. Not that once upon a time it was the cause, and afterwards it became an effect. It was always the same; it is the cause of everything but does not undergo any change. It is completely free from any modification. That *vidhyā* alone he taught 'as it is.'

From this we understand that for the *guru* also there is a kind of a rule- may the *guru* teach the person who has properly approached and who is ready for the knowledge. It is not a real *vidhi* for a *guru*. If he is *brahma-nicm-ha*, he does not come under any *vidhi* or *nic-edha*, 'teach' or 'do not teach.' According to one's own *prārabda* and one's own disposition, a *śrotriya* may teach or may not teach. If a *śrotriya* teaches, some may gain knowledge. So there is no reason why a *śrotriya* should not teach.

In the *sampradāya* there is a mention of an unwritten convention that the person should keep teaching in order to make his or her knowledge clear. Teaching itself is like a finer *sādhana*. It is called *brahmābhyāsa*. Teaching is a means to get more clarity about what one already knows, and is always advocated in the *sampradāya*. Even those who write great books would say, "I am writing this book simply for my *anta%-karaG-a-śuddhi*, for my own clarity." Even Sureśvara says, "I am writing this to see whether my understanding is clear or not." Teaching is an extended study. If the teaching is not there, who will study *Brahmasūtra* again? If one studies, then one will study the *sūtra* and *v[-tti*. When one teaches, one has to go line by line and word by word; one will get further clarity. Therefore, for one's own clarity one may teach. This also is involved.

ज ई च यम् उ ॥ ॥ अ इ म् म् ई ए ङ्
iti prathāmamamūG-ake dvitīyakhaG-a%-

Thus ends the second section of the first chapter.