

The Kena Upanishad and Schopenhauer: Revelation of Brahman in Will and Better Consciousness

Sri Lanka Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities
Volume 2 Issue 1, February 2022: 65-72
ISSN: 2773 692X (Online), 2773 6911 (Print)
Copyright: © 2021 The Author(s)
Published by Faculty of Social Sciences and
Languages, Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka
Website: <https://www.sab.ac.lk/sljssh>
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.4038/sljssh.v2i1.57>



Sabindra Raj Bhandari^{1,*}

¹ Department of English, Prithvi Narayan Campus, Tribhuvan University, Pokhara, Nepal.

Received: 14 September, 2021, **Revised:** 26 October, 2021, **Accepted:** 20 November, 2021.

How to Cite this Article: Bhandari, S.R. (2022), The Kena Upanishad and Schopenhauer: Revelation of Brahman in Will and Better Consciousness. *Sri Lanka Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(1), 65-72.

Abstract

This paper explores the speculations of the absolute reality projected in the Kena Upanishad and their reflections in the philosophy of Schopenhauer. His proclamations of Will remain as the metamorphosis of the absolute reality, Brahman, postulated in the Kena Upanishad. For Schopenhauer, every phenomenal manifestation is the objectification of Will. The Kena Upanishad also states similar nature of the absolute reality. Likewise, both the Kena Upanishad and Schopenhauer identify the individual with the entire cosmic Will as a whole. In this way, Schopenhauer's philosophical concepts of Will, ideas and better consciousness find their perfect explanation in the Kena Upanishad. In spite of the differences in time, space and context, it is very interesting to see the great coalescence of Schopenhauer's Will with the ideation of Brahman in the Kena Upanishad. They both bear similar tones and concepts in their essence. This paper applies the paradigm of qualitative approach, interpretive and explorative strategy, and uses the content analysis method to show the relation between the philosophical concepts of Schopenhauer with the enthralling ideas of cosmic speculations expressed in the Kena Upanishad.

Keywords: A priori, Brahman, better consciousness, cosmic Will, maya

INTRODUCTION

The present paper aims to explore and interpret how the esoteric ideas that *the Kena Upanishad* projects find their perfect resemblance with the concepts of will and better consciousness in Schopenhauer's philosophy. The Upanishad identifies the individual with the entire cosmos where the individual becomes the representation of the world as a whole. Similarly, Schopenhauer's philosophy also postulates the idea that the whole world and its manifestation is the expression of the cosmic Will. Therefore, tunes of Schopenhauer's philosophy have their rhythmic beats in *the Kena Upanishad*. In this regard, this new revisit proves to be justifiable.

The Upanishads are the classical heritage of wisdom handed down to humanity by the great seers who are called *rishis* in Sanskrit. There are altogether eleven principal Upanishads in the Hindu philosophical system and *the Kena Upanishad* is one of them. Navlakha (2000) admits that they were compiled and composed between 900 to 600 BC (p. x). The authorship of this Upanishad is not clear. Olivelle (2001) rightly admits that the issue of the authorship is complicated because the earliest Upanishads are anthologies that must have existed as independent texts before their compilations and incorporation into these Upanishads by editors (p. 10). It belongs to *Sama Veda*, one of the four Vedas. The Vedas, which mean the source of knowledge, are the major scriptures of the Hindu religious system.

The Sanskrit word "Upanishad" signifies the elimination of ignorance and dullness with a touch of knowledge. Great Vedic scholar Mascaro (1965) views that etymologically the word "Upanishad" has its root in the verb "sad" which means "to sit", and "ni" signifies "near". The whole meaning is then to sit near the illumined instructor (*Guru*) and gain the light of wisdom (p.7). Scholars like Easwaran (2007) and Mehta (2017) exactly support this definition. Mehta even describes that the philosophy of the Upanishad is objective and always leads the inquirer from this gross and manifested world to the spiritual and the transcendental reality (p. 88). Thus, the Upanishads represent the philosophical part of the Veda known as Vedanta, the summation of philosophical insights of the Vedas. Their main quest is to crystallize the dichotomy between the gross physical and the essential truth. They are probably the most ancient source of wisdom cherished with philosophical insights to guide the humanity with the esoteric knowledge. Thus, Schopenhauer rightly prophesized (2010) that one day the Upanishadic philosophy would flow and cherish on Europe and inwardly transform them with new thoughts and perceptions (as cited in Goldberg, 2010, p. 98). In these aspects too, his ideas of Will and better conscious remain as the leitmotif of the projection of the final cause of the Upanishad. Fundamentally, this Upanishad starts from a great philosophical question that leads to the exploration of the first cause of the creation. The word "Kena" means "by whom?" Its major quest is to speculate the truth "By whom the creation gets its radiation and

* Corresponding author: Tel.: 977-061573370; Email: bhandaisabindra@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3906-4605>



This article is published under the Creative Commons CC-BY-ND License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>). This license permits use, distribution, and reproduction, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the original work is properly cited and is not changed in anyway.

drives?" Written in sonorous Sanskrit language, this Upanishad consists of four sections; the first two are in verse, while the latter two are in prose. The metrical sections deal with the nature of the absolute reality, which the Upanishad describes as *Brahman*. The last two sections consist of an allegorical story that reveals that to rise beyond the phenomenal reality is the only way for the realization of the absolute reality.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Various commentaries have acknowledged the connection between Eastern Philosophy and Schopenhauer. *The Kena Upanishad* also has a great impact on the philosophy of Schopenhauer (2010) because he glorifies the philosophy of the Upanishad. He states:

How the Oupnek'hat [the Persian-Latin translation of the Upanishad] breathes throughout the sacred spirit of Vedas! How every line is full of sure, definite and throughout harmonizing significance! How out of every page confront us deep, original, elevated thoughts, while a higher and highly sacred earnestness vibrates through the whole! Everything here breathes forth the Indian atmosphere and primordial existence akin to nature... . It is the most rewarding and the most elevation book which ... there can be possible in this world! It has become the solace of my life and will be the solace of my death. (as cited in Deussen, 2010, p. vi)

The Upanishad will provide solace in his life and will be ultimate consolation in his death. It shows his great affinity with the philosophy of Upanishad. It demands to detect how his philosophy reverberates the echoes of the philosophy of the Upanishad. Therefore, the attempt of this study to show the relation is justifiable. How Schopenhauer's philosophy relates to the Upanishadic notion of inwardness also becomes, in this sense, a great matter of explanation and interpretation.

The nature of absolute reality becomes a matter of great discussion in the East. Schopenhauer's philosophy about the absolute reality of the East has attracted scholars like Durant (1961). He writes:

The Hindus were deeper than the thinkers of Europe because their interpretation of the world was internal and intuitive. . . .The Hindus saw that the "I" is a delusion; that the individual is merely phenomenal, and that only reality is the Infinite one—"That art thou" ... Schopenhauer does not think that Christianity will ever displace Buddhism in the East Rather Indian philosophy stream into Europe, and will profoundly alter our knowledge and our thought ... "The influence of Sanskrit Literature will penetrate not less deeply than did the revival of Greek letters in the fifteenth century". (p. 339)

Schopenhauer's philosophy also postulates the idea of inwardness. His will is intuition, a totality. In this regard, it remains to explore the nature of absolute reality *Brahman* in *the Kena Upanishad* and Schopenhauer's Will.

Similarly, Janaway (2002) makes a clear cut explanation of the Upanishad's influence on Schopenhauer. She writes that the ideas of *maya* or *illusion* from Hindu philosophy impressed Schopenhauer. The another idea is the identification of the individual reality with the cosmic reality that is embodied in the great saying in Sanskrit from *Chandogya Upanishad* "tat tvam asi", which means you are that eternal reality (p.18). The point of Schopenhauer's philosophy about the identification of illusion with the word as a whole and

the idea of the Upanishadic notion of "you are that" invites a new interpretation and explanation. In this regard, the present study proves to be justifiable. The relationship between the individual with the world consciousness always attracts exploration. The great mystic Aurobindo (2011) views that *the Kena Upanishad* always deals with the affinity between the personal mind consciousness to *Brahman* (the eternal reality) consciousness (p. 15). The relationship between the creator, creation and the world as a whole is important. This is another important factor of Schopenhauer's philosophy. His philosophy of Will and idea also postulates the nature of reality, and *the Kena Upanishad* also brilliantly leads toward that inner essence. Easwaran (2007) in his book *The Upanishads* writes, "Kena the title and opening word of the process Upanishad mean 'by whom?'—that is, impelled by whom do all the notions of life stir?" (p. 210). In this way, both—Schopenhauer's philosophy and *the Kena Upanishad*—have a great search for the essential reality. The philosophical tenets of the Upanishad and Schopenhauer identify the individual with the world as a whole. The concepts that *the Kena Upanishad* describes the ruler and the prime mover exactly resemble Schopenhauer's concept of Will, representation and better consciousness. Besides, there have been several tones of the Upanishadic connections with Schopenhauer's philosophy. In this way, the present study fulfills the gaps, showing the relation between *Brahman* with Will and the notion of rising beyond the phenomenal with better consciousness.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The main exploration of the Upanishad is to expose the nature of the mover of this creation. It identifies the individual as the outer manifestation of absolute reality. Schopenhauer's philosophy of Will, idea and better consciousness postulate how the ordinary consciousness should be delimited to realize the consciousness of the world. Therefore, both of them have similarities in concepts and ideas. Therefore, following questions demand an in-depth exploration and investigation: a) What is the nature of absolute reality? b) How do Schopenhauer's idea of Will and better consciousness resemble the concept of *Brahman* as the absolute reality that *the Kena Upanishad* projects?

OBJECTIVES

The present study aims to show the similarities of the concepts, ideas, and philosophical overtones expressed in *the Kena Upanishad* and the prominent philosopher Schopenhauer. It also aims to bridge how in the deep level the philosophy of Schopenhauer and the philosophy of the Upanishad produce the same vibrations of knowledge.

METHODOLOGY

This study has implemented the qualitative approach, and strategy of interpretivism. This strategy of research "believes in qualitative insights into social phenomena. . . . This is because the social reality is viewed by different people in different ways" (Pant, 2018, p.22). It co-relates the concept and ideas expressed in *the Kena Upanishad* with the philosophy postulated by Schopenhauer. In this regard, Schopenhauer's philosophy of will, representation and better consciousness become the philosophical lenses to interpret, explore and enlarge the concepts and ideas exposed in *the Kena Upanishad*. The study implements the content analysis

method. *The Kena Upanishad* and Schopenhauer's philosophy becomes the source of primary ideas. Related books, their criticisms, online resources have been considered as the secondary sources to justify the concepts while showing the relations.

SCHOPENHAUER AND HIS PHILOSOPHY: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860 AD) is a German renowned philosopher. His philosophy owes much to Plato and Kant. Similarly, Hinduism and Buddhism influenced him. His main philosophical work *The World as Will and Idea* (1818 AD) opens with a philosophical discussion about the reality of the world. In this work, Schopenhauer says, "We can never at the real neither of things from without" (as cited in Durant, 1961, p. 311), rather we must enter within the real essence of nature. Then only the realization of the external world comes out. His philosophy, at this point, differentiates the thing-in-itself from the manifested world that we see, perceive or things for us (things for me). The phenomenal existence is the product of the subject's idea or the intellect. Then, if this perceiver "I" were organized differently, the world and appearance would be different. The reality, according to Weber and Perry (1997), finds its existence only when it is independent of the subject. If so is the cause, the gross manifested worldly realities are relative things "created by the ego, and the *a priori* conditions of thought" (p. 447). It is only the consciousness that digs beneath the appeared reality.

Schopenhauer talks about the differences of the reality that he found in Kant, a great philosopher. The distinction is between the outer manifestation (Phenomenal existence/things for me) and things in themselves or the essence of the things. The reality of outer manifestation is what we accumulate from our sense perception. Then the question arises what is the reality of the things in themselves? Kant's proposition in philosophy is to show that the acquired empirical knowledge is limited because "we could never know how the world was in itself, only how it could appear to us, as scientists or ordinary perceivers" (Janaway, 2002, p. 14). For Kant, this phenomenal world occupies space and time; time and space determine knowledge about everything. At what time you perceive it and in what space remain as the determining factors. Therefore, the knowledge that one acquires is relative. However, the rules of space and time as determinant factors are suspended in the world of itself or things in themselves. The moment we remove space, time and the subject (experiencer), then the scenario of the structure of the world would be different. The knowledge about this empirical world is confined, yet beyond the appearance and mask the subject as a perceiver is closely a rational agent. This is the point where Schopenhauer agrees with Kant. The reality of this world is constructed, accumulated and gathered by time and space along with the rules of causality. On the other hand, the reality of the things in themselves attracted Schopenhauer. And this remains the most debated philosophical issue even up to now. While presenting the solution to this great speculation, he "claimed that thing in itself both in the world in the microcosm of human being, was will" (Janaway, 2002, p. 16). The Will, in this way, becomes the base for everything.

While solving the problem of knowledge about thing-in-itself, Schopenhauer also borrows the concepts of Plato. For Plato, ideas are the archetypal patterns of things, and so are the things in themselves. All manifestations simply remain

as derivation. Tarnas (2000) clarifies that Platonic "archetypes form the world and also stand beyond it" (p. 6). They are timeless. Ordinary persons are not directly aware of these basic ideas and archetypes; only the philosophers and seers can have the relation of this real archetypal pattern. The greatest achievement of our human life is to attain a real perception of these forms and ideas. It is the human soul which has the faculty to realize those ideas. Janaway (2002) clarifies the philosophy:

As a crucial phase in his development, Schopenhauer succumbed to this vision. Even though the Kantian thing in itself was supposed to be beyond the limits of human knowledge, while in Plato's Ideas were the objects of knowledge *par excellence*, Schopenhauer conflated what the two were saying, and formed a Platonic view about what an insight into the thing in itself beyond appearance would be like. For many years, he thought he had made an important discovery: "*Plato's Ideas and Kant's things-in-itself ... that these two are one and the same is as unheard of as it is sure and certain.*" (p.17)

This fusion got a new concept in his mind. He realized the individual consciousness is inferior when it is confined within the dimensions of time, space and causality. To realize the reality, one should see beyond the curtain the worldly reality.

Better Consciousness

Schopenhauer (2002) propagates the idea of better consciousness. The moment when the framework of subjectivity is crossed, then a level of consciousness arises. He says, "As soon as we objectively consider, i.e. contemplate the things of the world, then for the moment subjectivity and thus the source of all misery has vanished This liberation from temporal consciousness leaves the better eternal consciousness behind" (as cited in Janaway, 2002, pp. 17-18). The ordinary consciousness results out of our attachment to the things of appearance, and when we break free from it, we enter into the domain in the realm where the better consciousness carries us into the stage of timelessness. For Schopenhauer, art, great works, and the attitudes of great minds and saints can give us the view of better consciousness because empirical understanding is eliminated at this point. This idea of better consciousness makes "Schopenhauer's own assessment that Kant and Plato were united in his philosophy is near to the mark" (Janaway, 2002, p. 18). The idea of better consciousness brings the notion that we cannot simply rely on senses about the experience of material world. The world is full of differentiation. The moment one suspends it; one gets the real vision of reality. This idea of better consciousness has its proposition. Nothing in the phenomenal world exists on its own ground. "Everything is in relation to something else which is the reason for its being, or the explanation of it" (Janaway, 2002, p. 19). This is the law of reality or cause and effect relationship. If the effect exists, then surely there might be the existence of cause. Effect always precedes its cause. Our mind and sense can primarily grasp only the effects or let's say the existence of things in time and space. Things that occupy time and space are matter, and so are tangible. That's why, they have empirical reality.

Space and time have an empirical reality because they are intangible. This is the way rules of causality became active. Every change and move of the material things possesses a cause. Schopenhauer (2002) says, "Every state that appears must have existed or resulted from a change than preceded

it" (as cited in Janaway, 2002, p. 20). Cause changes itself and transforms into effect too. This is a necessity. And material things exist because of their interactions among themselves. The human intellect creates a world from this phenomenal existence. It is possible only by the implementation of the chain of cause and effect to a sensation that the senses of our body receive. The rule of causality always searches for the final cause nor the first cause. For Schopenhauer, the capacity of concept building differs humans from animals. Animals also gain perception, but lack the concept of material existence. This is the reason they are devoid of judgment, reason, and communicable language.

Schopenhauer's philosophical book *The World as the Will and Idea* possesses a striking question "What am I?" The world is simply a representation as it comes to our sense perception. In other words, material things find their existence when the subject perceives, realizes and acknowledges them. Again this concept of empirical reality relies on the theory of his doctoral thesis "The Four-Fold Root." Janaway (2002) writes, "Empirical things consist of matter, which fills distinct portions of space and time, and which is in casual interaction with other such portions. But his idealism says that without the subject of experience all such subjects would not exist" (p. 29). The thing in the world would have not existed had not there been the experiencing subject because the subject as an experiencer gives different shapes to the things experienced.

Will

Will is another important idea propagated by Schopenhauer. The second part of his philosophical book *The World as Will and Idea* puts the philosophical question: "If the world is representation then what am I?" In the world, material phenomena exist because they remain in time and space with the law of causality. Janaway (2002) clarifies that "but I myself am just the subject which is distinct from every object that it experiences, including that object which I call my body. Something is missing. I seem to be 'a winged cherub without a body'" (p. 33). The world that we face becomes so unknown, unfamiliar and alien to us that we do not belong to it. It clarifies the idea that when "I" asks a person to act, my body makes the movement. "I" as a person remains aware of that movement, and that state is different from the other worldly affairs that my body perceives. The other objects remain outside "me", and I am out of them. However, my own body has an intimate relationship with my real "me" in a unique way. Therefore, other events find meanings when they are perceived empirically by our bodies. And the movement of my body is the enlargement and expression of my own Will. The movement and bodily actions and the works of Will are, in the same way, expressions of the same thing in two different ways. The whole process is the manifestation of will. The Will thus remains as a unifying force of the creation. It is inner nature and essence. So, Schopenhauer (2002) says, "Account of nature is that all natural processes are a manifestation of will" (as cited in Janaway, 2002, p. 35). In this way, Schopenhauer at this point proves to be an anti-dualist. Every event fundamentally is the expression of Will. For him, the action and movement of the body combine both the physical and mental aspects. Will, in this way, is the totality, and a combination of both the inner awareness that is also a part of the external empirical world. It is the Will that is a totality that makes the world homogeneous. "My will, therefore, is one and timeless. Nay, more, it is to be identified with the will of the whole universe, my separateness is an illusion, resulting from my subjective apparatus of Spatio-temporal perception" (Russell, 2013, p.

683). The Will is a totality and combination both of inner awareness that is also a part of the external empirical world. These words from Schopenhauer (2002) summarize the whole concept of Will:

Only the will is thing in itself...It is that of which all representation, all object, is the phenomenon, the visibility, the objectivity. It is the innermost essence, the kernel, of every particular thing and also of the whole. It appears in every blindly acting force of nature and also in the deliberate conduct of man, and the great difference between the two concerns only the degree of the manifestation not the inner nature of what is manifested. (as cited in Janaway, 2002, p. 37)

In one way, the Will does not occupy space and time. It is to perceive in the context of totality—the whole. The world that we see is the expression and manifestation of the empirical reality of Will. The whole world and its display should be understood as the representation and another aspect of the Will. In this regard, "what is real is one vast will appearing in the whole course of nature, animate and inanimate alike" (Russell, 2013, p. 683). If so is the definition, then surely for Schopenhauer cosmic Will is the identification of God.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The subsequent sections apply the theoretical dimension of Schopenhauer's philosophy notably the idea of Will and better consciousness in *the Kena Upanishad*. The revelation of the Will and better consciousness in the Upanishad bring the perfect blending between the philosophy of Schopenhauer and this Upanishad.

Brahman as the Will: A Unifying Force in the Kena Upanishad

The Kena Upanishad from the very beginning leads to the demarcation between the essential reality as the thing in itself and the worldly manifestation as the things for "ME" or simply appearance. Manifested reality is relative, just the accumulated knowledge of the subject as Schopenhauer postulated that whatever the object perceives is just the extension of the Universal Will. The first invocation, in the Upanishad, shows the essential nature of the reality and the subject—the perceiver. The Upanishad invokes:

May all my limbs (organs)- speech (five organs of action), the vital airs (five vital airs in the body), eye, ear (five sense organs)- achieve their fullness, along with the mental strength to restrain them. All that is seen is Brahman. May I not neglect Brahman. May not Brahman reject me. May I have non-rejection, may I have the non-rejection. May all the virtues postulated in the Upanishads dwell in me, dwell in me, who am dedicated to know atman. May the three fold obstacles-relating to self relating to elements and relating to gods-subside and may peace prevail. (Rao trans, 2014, p. 5)

The beautiful verses (*mantra*) from Upanishad postulate *Brahman* as the eternal and the absolute reality. It becomes a form of cosmic will from where everything radiates in its entirety. The above verses clarify that "I" the perceiver is simply the representation of the thing-in-itself—the *Brahman*. So, "I" as the subject gets sustenance when it unifies itself with the absolute Will. These worldly existence and bodily manifestations are the external and empirical reflection of the will. All is the reflection of the will—the *Brahman*. If all bodily processes just like five vital airs, five sense organs

underlie their essence in *Brahman*, surely then it is the cosmic Will that is the thing-in-itself. Schopenhauer's proclamation about the idea of the thing-in-itself and things in appearance make a clear cut explanation here in the above lines. The speaker of the invocation prays for an eternal unity with the *Brahman*—another form of cosmic Will that Schopenhauer projects.

Brahman encompasses everything. It is eternal consciousness from which everything finds its essence in the universe. Hill (1928) describes the nature of the *Brahman* as the ultimate dwelling place and the goal of all. It is the final destination of action and knowledge. It equally dwells in those who know it and are unaware of it. Being the fundamental essence of all transitory things, it is the imperishable truth that drives the perishable. Above all, it is transcendent, but at the same time immanent in this phenomenal reality being the prime mover (p. 24). *Brahman* is the essence in which everything gets its unification. Once the unity is identified, then the whole illusion is eliminated. The above verse also invokes the universal reality *Brahman* to nourish and sustain every phenomenal existence. In this regard, *Brahman* is Schopenhauer's Will because "it is the will which gives unity to consciousness and holds together all in ideas and thoughts, accompanying them like a continuous harmony" (Durant, 1961, p. 313). If Will is the force to give unity that harmonizes the entire cosmic manifestation, so also exactly is *Brahman* or even more than that. It is transcendent and immanent. Therefore, Schopenhauer's notion of cosmic will find its perfect projection in the above lines from the *Kena Upanishad*.

The Upanishad, after its grand invocation, asks a wonderful question in the first verse "By whom willed and directed does the mind light on its object? By whom commanded does the life the first, move? At whose will do (people) utter this speech?" (Radhakrishnan trans, 2016, p. 581). These questions lay the fundamental ground for a guiding force, a universal drive, a cosmic will. The questions surely presuppose that the experiences of the perceiver are not the ultimate reality. Something must be there that makes all these activities happen. And even the third question provides a role of an action by the use of the pronoun "whose." These "questions assume that there is a relation between the reality and these phenomena" (Radhakrishnan, 2016, p. 581). Thus, reality, being the universal rule, governs the world of representation. This is also the exact proclamation of Schopenhauer's philosophy.

The above questions are asked by a pupil. Then the teacher logically and perhaps brilliantly answers the questions that establish the ideas that only in the superficial level there is multiplicity, but this multiplicity is the reflection of representation of same unifying and a driving force that resembles Schopenhauer's cosmic Will. The answers by the teacher are reflected in these sonorous lines:

It is the ear of the ear, the mind of the mind, the speech of the speech, the breath of the breath, and the eye of the eye. Detached [from the sense] the wise, on departing from this world, become immortal.

The eye does not go thither, nor speech, nor mind. We do not know it, we do not understand it, how anyone can teach it.

It is other than the known; it is also above the unknown. Thus we have heard from those who taught us this. (Muller trans, 2000, p. 20)

It is the Will that makes the eye to see, ear to hear. Only the Will no doubt remains as the thing-in-itself. All objects are

simply visibility. Schopenhauer exactly claims, as cited in the above section, that Will is fundamental essence of every particular thing. The Will as the essence becomes *a priori*, so it is real. Except it, all knowledge and experience depend on space and time. In this way, they become relative. Only the hearing quality of the ear and breathiness of the breath precede the space and time as intangible and do not occupy the space. It has permanency and all other appearances and their representations become the transitory ones.

The degree of manifestation differs, but the innermost reality is the same. The cosmic Will is distributed in animate and in inanimate as well. The above verse "Detached from the sense, the wise on departing from this world, becomes immortal" exactly reflects Schopenhauer's projection of Will and representation. The essential wisdom is to delimit one from the phenomenal Will, relating that the cosmic Will is greater and thing-in-itself. Senses are merely for empirical reality. They do not determine the rationality—*a priori*. The personal subjective ego simply accumulates the knowledge relatively. When given the different conditions, space and time, it would understand the world in different way. So, does this empirical reality posse the essence of knowledge reality? Of course not because it is subjective, and "My Will" is only the identification of the whole Will of nature. Only the Will, the real one, in which everything unites, as Schopenhauer postulates, becomes the source of Will and the innermost reality. In the same way, the above verses express Schopenhauer's voice because the thing-in-itself precedes the reality about the thing for me.

Another fundamental side of Schopenhauer's philosophy is the rule of causality. If the effect remains, it is sure there must be the existence of a cause. Every state that existed must have been preceded from a cause. If this phenomenal worldly existence appears, surely there must be another greater reality that precedes it. Then it must be nothing than the Will because Schopenhauer postulates the idea that natural processes are manifestations of Will. In this regard too, its name is uncertain it is not this, and not that in human-made demarcation. Then it is a mixing of this and that, a unique blending that remains the beyond level of human cognition. Schopenhauer was right to recall Plato's voice that only the philosopher perceives it. And Schopenhauer himself explicates that it is the artistic perception and vision of the saint who can realize it.

For Schopenhauer, the cycle of space, time and causality determine our perception of worldly phenomena. The thing for me is not real because the perception about the thing differs according to time, space, person and cause and effect. But the Will, being the governing factor, has the qualitative growth and so transcends the determining factor of the worldly phenomena. The perception is an illusion resulting from the Spatio-temporal dimension of reality. The Will is only timeless, all movements, activities and manifestations are enlargements of the Will. It is a whole, a totality, an integrating force. That's why, it is in the immanent thing, but at the same time transcend them. The Upanishad beautifully expresses the essence of Schopenhauer's philosophy:

That which is not expressed by speech, but that by which speech is expressed, that alone known as brahman, not that which people here adore.

That which does not think by mind, but that by which, they say, the mind thinks, that alone know as brahman, not that which people here adore.

That which does not breathe by life, but that by which life breathes, that alone known as brahman, not that which people here adore. (Muller trans, 2000, p. 19)

Brahman, as the thing-in-itself, is not guided and confined into the framework of time, space dimension, but it is the guiding force for everything, and "Brahman is the equivalent of an impersonal absolute that might also be called oneness or Being" (Hamilton, 2007, p. 19). So also exactly is the Will of Schopenhauer's philosophy. If *Brahman* is thing-in-itself, certainly it is identified with Will because Schopenhauer exactly says that "the world and all its phenomena are only the objectification of will" (as cited in Russell, 2013, p. 684). In this way, the Will is primary, and exactly resembles the proclamation of *Brahman* in the above verses from the Upanishad.

Since there is not *Brahman* there is not the world. Hence, the world and creation along with their multiple dimensions are merely the plays of *Brahman*. Schopenhauer exactly says, "No will, no idea, no world" (as cited in Russell, 2013, p. 685). Both the projection of *Brahman* in the *Kena Upanishad* and the Will as the unifying force of the nature and creation of nature in Schopenhauer's philosophy have their same over tunes in concepts, explanations and projection.

The concept of *Brahman* unifies all the dualities. It consolidates the fact that all roads lead to the same destination of truth. If so is the argument, it focuses on the unification of multiculturalism. S. Zizek (2010) in his book *Living in the End Times* believes that multiculturalism always leads to the hegemonic ideology (p.44). It creates fragmentation, tutelage and clash in society. To make the course of society and humanity justifiable, a unifying concept is a must. In this regard too, *Brahman* as a unifying force provides a better standpoint to neutralize the voice of racism, inequality, hegemony, and so on. Ahmed is (2010) right to view that multiculturalism protects different variations of racial conflicts, inequality and violence (as cited in Zizek 2010, p. 44). Thus, from the socio-cultural perspective of our own time, the concept of *Brahman* as a cosmic Will to unify all the dualities and antagonism proves to be factual and justifiable.

From Outer to Inner: The Way to Better Consciousness

Schopenhauer's distinction of ordinary consciousness and eternal consciousness finds its clear source and explanation in the *Kena Upanishad*. The ordinary consciousness is the result of our attachment with the gross matters. The moment we break free from the entanglement of this apparent reality, we then enter into the domain of better consciousness. It is a stage of perfect sublimity that ultimately leads to timelessness. To attain this stage, one should negate the empirical reality. The more one negates the subjective perception determined by time and space; one is much nearer to the better consciousness. This is possible after the suspension of knowledge of this material world. We have to search the reality from within, not from outside. Only the enlargement of consciousness leads to the zenith. From the plane of suspension arises the germination of the reality because the first proposition of the better consciousness, as discussed by Schopenhauer, is the realization of that nothingness in the phenomenal world. Things are not in themselves here. They find their meaning according to the perception of the perceiver. This idea of better consciousness leads one to the reality or the heart of the matter and crystallizes the real knowledge of the creation. The first proposition is to negate this subjective perception, realizing that reality is somewhere else. The nature of reality is wonderfully expressed in

these paradoxical, but genuine lines from the *Kena Upanishad*:

The teacher said; 'If thou thinkest I know it well, then thou knowest surely little; what is in that is thou, what is it that is of the divines? Reflect upon it seriously.' 'I think it is known,' replied the pupil.

The teacher said: 'I do not think I know it well, nor do I know that I do not know it. He among us who knows it, knows it, but he does not know that he does not know it. (Muller trans, 2000, p. 20)

The accumulated knowledge within the framework of space and time is illusory and not verified in every context objectively. The teacher refers to this aspect. Too much reliance on the empirical knowledge gained by the sense perceptions certainly leads to ignorance. The moment one empties the constructed perceptions, one arises to the plenum of the nothingness. It is the nothingness that becomes the lens of empirical reality. When one creates an aloofness from the junk of the unnecessary reality, one always opens the suitable path for real knowledge. It is just like a process to attain Nirvana better expressed in the Buddhist philosophy. The whole process is summarized by Easwaran (2015) explaining Nirvana in his book *The Dhammapada*: "When the mind is stilled, the appearance of change and separateness vanishes and nirvana remains. It is *shunyata*, emptiness, only in that there is literally nothing there--"no-thing." But emptiness of process means fullness of being" (p. 97). Thus, better consciousness is the elimination of this accumulated consciousness, and the moment it eliminates, "nothing" remains there, which is the rising of eternal consciousness.

The teacher in the Upanishad is right to say, "If thou thinkest I know it well, then thou knowest surely little" (Muller trans, 2000, p. 20). To think confined by the dimension of space and time is surely a way of putting aside reality. Getting rid of these mock shows of the phenomenal reality is the way to enter into the nature of thing-in-itself. Schopenhauer thinks that the attitude of the great saints, artists and great works can give the view of better consciousness. This is the perfect point where the *Kena Upanishad* influences the philosophy of Schopenhauer. Only the knowledge attained by the philosophical process with deep insight can give this vision. Thus, the first hallmark in this process is to be ignorant. A paradoxical statement finds values here "to be ignorant is the better way of illumination." The more one remains ignorant of the phenomenal reality, one rises nearer to the cosmic consciousness. These lines by Dionysius (2016) better clarify the provocation made by the Upanishad and Schopenhauer:

There is that most divine knowledge of God which takes place through ignorance, in the union which is above intelligence, when the intellect quitting all things that are, and then leaving itself also, is united to the superluculent rays, being illuminated thence and therein by the unsearchable depth of wisdom (as cited in Radhakrishnan, 2016, p. 585).

The way of quitting all phenomenal things, in this sense, is the best way to get illuminated. The more one says he knows, he does not know in fact. Thus, Schopenhauer's idea of better consciousness, and the Upanishad's proclamation of the elimination of phenomenal thought process proves to be justifiable at this point.

The Upanishad in its crux exploits the literary devices of paradox to express the loftiest ideas, and the profound truth. When one is in the complete process of negating this reality

of “things-for-me”, one sees the first cause, the causes of the effects. In this context, the following verses from *the Kena Upanishad* expose the proclamations projected by Schopenhauer and Upanishad to get the vision of the eternal reality, the cosmic Will or *Brahman*:

'He by whom it is not thought [since it is beyond thought], by him it is thought; he by whom it is known, knows it not [since it is unknowable]. It is not understood by these who understand it, it is understood by those who do not understand it.

'It is thought to be known [as if] by self awakening, and [then] we obtain immortality indeed. By the self we obtain strength, by knowing we obtain immortality. (Muller trans, 2000, p. 20)

These paradoxical lines express the genuine truth. One who claims that he thinks about the eternal reality is not in the right facts. It is only the better consciousness that can apprehend the truth. It is the way of detaching oneself from the lower consciousness derived from the attachment of phenomenal existence, rising beyond the pair of dualities. These lines at the superficial level seem nonsensical, but they bear the very profound truth. The Upanishad exploits the literary device of paradox. A paradox "is a statement or pair of statements whose meaning is made clear by the reconciliation of apparently irreconcilable idea" (Goodman, 2003, p. 16). When the irreconcilable ideas in the superficial level are synthesized, then the underlying message is crystallized. These processes of a thesis, antithesis and synthesis are perpetual in the development of human knowledge. Goodman again clarifies that paradoxes expose the profound truth. Jesus too exposes his in-depth meanings by grandly exploiting the device of paradox in his parables which seem superficial for the ignorant while they expose the jewel of truth in the discussion and reflection (Ibid). The Upanishad with this device explains the truth about eternity. It proves that the antithesis in the phenomenal world merges in the level of better consciousness.

The greatest truth is the realization. It is a stage of realization and illumination when one knows that he knows nothing as Socrates (1996) expresses the essential truth, "one thing only I know, and that is I know nothing" (as cited in Gaarder, 1996, p. 68). Knowing that s/he knows nothing is the greatest awareness. The above lines from the Upanishad, using paradox, give such profundity of the truth. The moment one realizes that this world of appearance and representations, as Schopenhauer has expressed, it is the beginning point to leave the footprints of ordinary consciousness to attain the better consciousness. The Upanishad declares the perfect way in the above quoted first verse. Lao Tzu (1986) also expresses the realization of the truth exactly in the same way when he says, "To know that you do not know is best" (p. 7). When one knows this reality, one is then opened to attain what is real from the unreal. The better consciousness then detaches us from the world of appearance and leads to the realization of the ultimate reality—the cosmic Will.

Schopenhauer's postulation of the horizon of better consciousness is to go beyond the periphery of the world of appearance. Perhaps this stage demands a state of equanimity, equilibrium of consciousness where one remains unaffected by the play of senses. The Upanishad pleads for self-awakening exactly in the same voice that Schopenhauer speaks. The awakening is a process to get immortality, rising beyond the pair of the subjectivity of ordinary consciousness where subject and object merge and become the One. Mehta

(2017) beautifully says, "To have one's consciousness the co-existence of knowing and not-knowing is to bring that consciousness to the highest state of receptivity. The openness of mind consists in the simultaneous existence of knowing and not-knowing" (p. 17). The moment the mind is aware of both polarities, and then everything is realized. This is the highest crux of better consciousness of Schopenhauer that finds its perfect exemplification and explanation in the above verses from the Upanishad. That's why; the Upanishad reveals the genuine reality with the use of paradox where both extreme polarities of the same truth collide. After the collision, when the polarities intersect, possessing some basic qualities from each other, then an eternal process of truth reveals out. The clearest point truth is neither this in its complete way nor is it that. It is neither this nor that. This is the profound reality that the Upanishad reflects at its ultimate point.

The Upanishad before coming to the final section makes a declaration. Schopenhauer's philosophy about better consciousness postulates that every activity is the expression of the same reality just in different ways. Similarly, every aspect exists in the interaction with each other. The Upanishad also proclaims, "In every being, the wise one perceives it and, departing out of this world, becomes immortal" (Deussen trans, 2010, p. 212). The wise one perceives the same will and the expression of better consciousness in everything. Seeing oneself in the other is the ultimate way of going beyond the death and decay. Russell (2013) explains Schopenhauer's ideals which show their better confluence with the Upanishad:

The distinction between one man and another is part of the phenomenal world, and disappears when the world is seen truly. To the good man, the veil of Maya (illusion) has become transparent; he sees that all things are one, and that the distinction between himself and another is only apparent. He reaches this insight by love, which in always sympathy, and has to do with the pain of other. (p. 684)

When one crosses the phenomenal existence, one sees all in one, and one in all. There is the same cosmic Will, the same consciousness guiding over the whole creation. Every duality ceases in that stage of perfection.

Both *the Kena Upanishad* and Schopenhauer play the music of inner freedom. S. Zizek (2001) in his book *On Belief* categorizes formal and actual aspects of freedom. He opines that a person should prioritize the actual form of freedom to transcend the admixtures of the constructed situation (p.115). Formal freedom is constructed one while the actual freedom is an inner one. If a person desires to merge in the liberated situation, s/he should realize the quality of actual freedom that emerges within. Certainly, the concept of *Brahman* projected in the Upanishad and the ideals of cosmic Will and better consciousness postulated by Schopenhauer validate themselves as the pathfinders to attain the actual freedom.

CONCLUSION

Schopenhauer's philosophy of the Will, representation, and the better consciousness find their perfect haven in the beautiful verses from *the Kena Upanishad*. The Upanishad makes an explanation that the entire manifestation is just the spark from the same absolute reality that it names *Brahman*. The whole creation is just like a string one attached with the other. Only the degree of manifestation is different, but the underlying pattern is the same *Brahman*. The world

is the effect. If effect exists, then surely there must be the cause that precedes it. The fundamental cause is the absolute reality—the thing in itself. Exactly, in similar way, Schopenhauer also postulates his philosophy of Will. The whole world and its creations are the Will and idea. Everything is just the expression of Will, and one thing exists because of its interrelation with the other. Just as the radiance of *Brahman* unites the entire creation, the Will of the Schopenhauer is the unifying force, a totality where the antagonisms of this superficial level become one and united. The real agent is the *Brahman* or the Will. Besides, both Schopenhauer and the Upanishad state a ground project of the negation of the individual subjectivity determined by the dimension of time and space. The more one negates from this phenomenal world, the more the empties the dualities perceived by the mind. "No-thing" remains there. The moment the process of cognition comes to an end; there is the illumination of the reality i. e. the thing-in-itself. The cosmic Will of Schopenhauer remains as the metamorphosis of the absolute *Brahman* that the *Kena Upanishad* idealizes for. In the same way, they both postulate that all the dialectics of the world are the expression of the same absolute. Only the form is different; the real essence is the same. The Real Essence is the thing-in-itself. Schopenhauer and the Upanishad both make similar proclamations of ideas that the real essence lies in the integration, totality and in the wholeness. To perceive the fragment is to neglect the reality because reality and truth only come out of the totality. The moment one suspends the ordinary consciousness of this phenomenal world and seeks a union with better consciousness, one is in the stage of realization of the ultimate knowledge. The moment one realizes this truth, and then the dualities and clash of this phenomenal reality vanish. Thus, this article provides a broader outlook to realize the actual freedom, truth and liberation.

REFERENCES

- Aurobindo, S. (1996). *Kena and other upanishads*. Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press.
- Deussen, P. (Trans). (2010). *Sixty upanishads of the vedas* (V.W. Bedekar and G.B. Palsule, Trans). Motilal Banarsidass,
- Durant, W. (1961). *A story of philosophy: The lives and opinions of the greater philosophers*. Pocket Books.
- Easwaran, E. (Trans). (2015). *The dhammapada*. Jaico Publishing House.
- Easwaran. (Trans). (2007). *The upanishads*. Nilgiri Press.
- Gaarder, J. (1996). *Sophie's World* (P. Moller, Trans). Berkley Books.
- Goldberg, P. (2010). *The American veda*. Three River Press.
- Goodman, W. R. (2002). *Quintessence of literary essays*. Doaba House.
- Hamilton, S. (2007). *Indian philosophy: A very short introduction*. OU Press.
- Hill, W. D. P. (Trans). (1928). *The bhagavadgita*. O U Press.
- Janaway, C. (2002). *Schopenhauer: A very short introduction*. O U Press.
- Mascaro, J. (Trans). (1965). *The Upanishads*. Penguin Books.
- Mehta, R. (2017). *The call of the upanishads*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Muller, M. (Trans). (2000). *The thirteen principal upanishads*. Wordsworth Classics.
- Navlakha. S. (2000). Introduction. In Max Muller (Trans), *The thirteen principal upanishads* (pp. ix- xxxi). Wordsworth classics.
- Olivelle, P. (Ed. & Trans). (2003). *The early upanishad*. Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press.
- Pant, P. (2018). *Social science research and thesis writing*. Buddha Publications.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (Ed. & Trans). (2016). *The principal upanishads*. Harper Collins Publishers.
- Rao, K. A. (Trans). (2014). *Kena upanishad, with explanation on shankaracharya's commentary*. Advaita Academy.
- Russell, B. (2013). *History of western philosophy*. Routledge Classics.
- Schopenhauer, A. (2010). Foreword. In P. Deussen (Trans), *Sixty upanishads of the veda* (p. vi). Motilal Banarsidass.
- Tarnas, R. (2000). *The passion of the western mind: Understanding the ideas that have shaped our world view*. Pimlico.
- Tzu, L. (1986). *The Tao of Power* (R. L. Wing, Trans). Thorson.
- Weber, A, & Berry, R. B. (1997). *History of philosophy* (F. Thilly, Trans). Surjeet Publications.
- Zizek, S. (2010). *Living in the end of times*. Hower Text.
- Zizek, S. (2001). *On belief*. Routledge.