

EIGHT UPANIṢADS

VOLUME TWO

(Aitareya, Muṇḍaka, Māṇḍūkya & Kārikā and Praśna)

With the Commentary of
ŚAṄKARĀCĀRYA

Translated by
SWĀMĪ GAMBHĪRĀNANDA



ADVAITA ASHRAMA
5 DEHI ENTALLY ROAD
CALCUTTA 790-014

तमसो मा अ्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

22.08

G124

V.2

240486

Published by
Swami Budhananda
President, Advaita Ashrama
Mayavati, Pithoragarh, Himalayas

All Rights Reserved
December 1937

Set and Printed by in India
BY THE SHARADA PRESS, CAR STREET
MANGALORE-575-001

CONTENTS

			PAGE
AITAREYA UHANIṢAD	1
MUNḌAKA UPANIṢAD	77
MĀṆḌŪKYA UPANIṢAD AND KĀRIKĀ	173
PRAŚNA UPANIṢAD	405
INDEX TO TEXTS I	507
INDEX TO TEXTS II (KĀRIKĀ)	511
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	515

KEY TO TRANSLITERATION AND PRONUNCIATION

<i>Sounds like</i>	<i>Sounds like</i>
अ a o in son	ड ḍ ḍ
आ ā a in master	ढ ḍh ḍh in <i>godhood</i>
इ i i in <i>if</i>	ण ṇ ṇ in <i>under</i>
ई ī ee in <i>feel</i>	त t French t
उ u u in <i>full</i>	थ th th in <i>thumb</i>
ऊ ū oo in <i>boot</i>	द d th in <i>then</i>
ऋ ṛ somewhat between r and ri	ध dh theh in <i>breathe here</i>
ए e a in <i>evade</i>	न n n
ऐ ai y in <i>my</i>	प p p
ओ o oh	फ ph ph in <i>loop-hole</i>
औ au ow in <i>now</i>	ब b b
क k k	भ bh bh in <i>abhor</i>
ख kh ckh in <i>blockhead</i>	म m m
ग g g (hard)	य y
घ gh gh in <i>log-hut</i>	र r r
ङ ṅ ng	ल l l
च c ch (not k)	व v in <i>avert</i>
छ ch chh in <i>catch him</i>	श ś sh
ज j j	ष ṣ sh in <i>show</i>
झ jh dgeh in <i>hedg hog</i>	स s s
ञ ñ n (somewhat)	ह h h
ट ṭ t	◌ṁ ṅ
ठ ṭh th in <i>ant-hill</i>	: ḥ half h

AITAREYĀ UPANIṢAD

ॐ वाङ् मे मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता मनो मे वाचि
प्रतिष्ठितमाविरावीर्म एधि वेदस्य म आणीस्थः श्रुतं मे
मा प्रहासीरनेनाधीतेनाहोरात्रान् संदधाम्यृतं वदिष्यामि
सत्यं वदिष्यामि तन्मामवतु तद्वक्तारमवत्ववतु मामवतु
वक्तारमवतु वक्तारम् ।

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

May my speech be based on (i.e. accord with) the mind; may my mind be based on speech. O Self-effulgent One, reveal Thyself to me. May you both (speech and mind) be the carriers of the Veda to me. May not all that I have heard depart from me. I shall join together (i.e. obliterate the difference of) day and night through this study. I shall utter what is verbally true; I shall utter what is mentally true. May That (Brahman) protect me; may That protect the speaker (i.e. the teacher). May That protect me; may That protect the speaker—may That protect the speaker.

Om Peace! Peace! Peace!

AITAREYA UPANIṢAD

PART I

CHAPTER I

Introduction: Earlier than this¹ was finished *karma*² along with the knowledge (i.e. meditation on) the inferior Brahman (i.e. Hiraṇyagarbha). The highest result, achievable through *karma*, as associated with meditation, was concluded with the meditation on Uktha.³ It was said, “This Brahman that is Truth is called Prāṇa; this is the only Deity” (Kau. II. 2; Maitrāyaṇī, VII. 7); “All the gods are but manifestations of this Prāṇa”; “Attaining identity with (Consciousness, the Deity, Brahman, Immortality, that is) this Prāṇa, one becomes united with the gods.” Some people believe that the highest human goal consists in this merger in the Deity, that this is emancipation, that this is attainable through a combination of meditation and *karma*, and that there is nothing higher than this. With a view to enjoining the knowledge of

¹ The Aitareya Upaniṣad forms the 4th, 5th, and 6th chapters of the second Āraṇyaka of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. The Upaniṣad is concerned only with knowledge of the Self, whereas the earlier portions deal with *kārma* as associated with meditation.

² Rites, duties, etc.

³ Uktha is Prāṇa (lit. Vital Force, i.e. Hiraṇyagarbha—cosmic power of knowledge and action); and meditation on it consists in thinking, “I am that Uktha, that is Prāṇa,” Such deep concentration ensures identity with Prāṇa.

the absolute Self, whereby this (earlier) view may be refuted, this Upaniṣad says, “In the beginning this was but the absolute Self alone” etc. (I. i. 1).

Objection: How is it, again, known that the subsequent text is meant for enjoining the knowledge of the absolute Self, unconnected with *karma*?

Answer: Since no other meaning can be deduced. Moreover, through such texts as “He subjected Him¹ to hunger and thirst” (Ai. I. ii. 1) etc., it will be shown that the gods such as Fire, mentioned earlier, are included in the phenomenal world because of the defects of their hunger etc. All that is subject to hunger etc. is within the phenomenal world, whereas the supreme Brahman is mentioned in the Vedas as transcendental to hunger and the rest.

Objection: Even if it be thus conceded that the knowledge of the absolute Self is the means for emancipation, it does not follow that a non-performer of *karma* alone is qualified for this, since no such specification is heard of, there being no mention in this Upaniṣad of any non-performer of *karma* (i.e. Sannyāsi) belonging to a distinct order. Again, the knowledge of the Self is begun after introducing the rite called Br̥hatī-sahasra. Therefore it is the performer of *karma* who is in fact entitled to this. Nor is the knowledge of the Self incompatible with *karma*, for the summing up (here) at the end conforms to what went earlier. Just as it was stated by the (earlier) *brāhmaṇa* (portion) that Puruṣa,² identified with the Sun, is the Self of all

¹ Virāṭ who is the gross manifestation of Hiranyagarbha.

² Conscious, all-pervasive Reality that dwells everywhere.

beings, mobile and immobile,¹ and as it was confirmed by the *mantra* (portion) in such texts as “The Sun is the Self (of the universe, moving and motionless)” (Ṛ. I. cxv. 1), similarly (here), too, the start will be made with “This one is the inferior Brahman, this is Indra” (Ai. III. i. 3), and the conclusion will be, “All the creatures that there are, which move or do not move, are impelled by Consciousness” (Ai. III. i. 3). Similarly, too in the Upaniṣad of the *samhitā* (portion) the Self will be spoken of as associated with *karma* in the text, “The followers of the Ṛg-Veda deliberate on this very Entity in the hymn called Br̥hatī-sahasra” etc. (Ai. Ā. III. ii. 3. 12), and the conclusion will be with, “They speak of it alone as the Self in all beings” etc. Similarly, too, the identity of the One that is referred to in “That which the bodiless conscious Self” is spoken of in “One should know That as identical with Him that is in the sun”. Here, again, commencing with, “What is It that we worship as the Self?” (Ai. III. i. 1), identity with Consciousness Itself will be shown in “Consciousness is Brahman” (Ai. III. i. 3). Therefore the knowledge of the Self is not disconnected with *karma*.

Counter objection: (On that supposition) the present text becomes useless because of tautology. How? The Self having been ascertained by the *brāhmaṇa*

¹First His identity with the Sun is shown in, “He indeed illumines this world—the One that shines as the Being (in the sun)”; and then He is shown as all-pervading in, “Therefore they know Him as a hundred-rayed—the One that is that very Puruṣa”, and “The Vital force indeed is all these beings” (Ch. VII. xv. 14, V. i. 15).

(portion) in “O Ṛṣi, I am indeed Prāṇa”, and by the *mantra* (portion) in “The Sun is the Self” (R. I. cxv. 1), it is useless to ascertain It over again by the *brāhmaṇa* (i.e. Upaniṣad portion) by raising the question, “What is It that we worship as the Self?” (Ai. III. i. 1) and then answering that all this is but the Self, and so on.

Opponent's view: Not so, for no tautology is involved, inasmuch as this is meant to determine some special qualities of that very Self. How? Of that very Self, as connected with *karma*, it is sought to determine some special attributes such as (the power of) creation, protection, and dissolution of the world, or to present It as an object of meditation in Its unconditioned state. To explain the second alternative: from the fact that meditation on the Self (as such) was not enjoined in the context of *karma*, it might be inferred that the Self, that is (found) associated with *karma*, is not to be meditated upon apart from *karma*: therefore the purport of the (following) text, beginning with “*Ātmā*” etc., is that the unconditioned Self, too, is to be meditated on. Or since the Self is to be worshipped (both) as different and non-different (from oneself), the same Self that is subject to the idea of difference in a context of *karma* is again to be meditated on as non-different outside (that) *karma*. Thus there is no tautology. Moreover, according to the adherents of the Vājasaneyya Section (of the Yajur-Veda) there are the statements, “He who knows these two, *vidyā* and *avidyā*, together, by crossing over death through *avidyā*, attains immortality through *vidyā*” (Īś. 11) and “By doing *karmas*

indeed should one wish to live here for a hundred years" (Īś 2). Not that mortals can have more than a hundred years as the fullest span of life, so as to be able to meditate on the Self after renouncing *karma* (after a hundred years). And it has been shown in the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, "The span of a man's life comprises as many thousands of days."¹ Now the hundred years of life are packed with *karma*; and the *mantra*, "By doing *karma* indeed" has just been quoted. Similar are the texts, "One should perform the Agnihotra sacrifices as long as one lives", "One should perform the Darśa and Pūrṇamāsa (new moon and full moon) sacrifices as long as one lives", and others, as well as, "Him they burn along with the sacrificial vessels". Besides, there is the Vedic text speaking of the three debts.² As for the scriptural text dealing with monasticism etc., to wit, "Knowing this very Self Brāhmaṇas renounce, . . . and lead a mendicant life" (Br. III. v. 1., IV. iv. 22), it is eulogistic, meant to praise the knowledge of the Self. Or it is meant for the disqualified ones (e.g. the blind, the lame, and others).³

Vedāntist's reply: Not so; for when the supreme knowledge is achieved, there can be no idea of results, and so no action is possible. As for the statements that "the knowledge of the Self comes to the man

¹ The Āraṇyaka first points out that the *śastra* (hymn) called Bṛhatī-sahasra has got 36,000 letters in it, and then states that a man's life consists of as many days, that is, 100 years.

² "The Brāhmaṇa, from his birth, is under three debts" (Tai. S. VI. iii. 10)—to the gods, Manes, and sages.

³ Who cannot undertake Vedic rites.

engaged in *karma*", that "it is associated with *karma*", and so on, they are wrong. Action is inconceivable in one who has the knowledge of Brahman as his Self as comprised in the realisation, "I am the supreme Brahman in which all desires are fulfilled and which is above all the worldly shortcomings", and who has no idea of results because he feels no need for anything to be got for himself from actions done or to be done (by him).

Objection: Though he may not perceive any benefit therefrom, he still acts because of the (scriptural) injunction.

Answer: No, for he has realised the Self that is beyond the range of injunctions. It is a matter of experience that one comes within the scope of injunction so long as one feels the need for acquiring some desirable thing or avoiding some undesirable thing and seeks for a means thereof; but not so the one who is of a contrary disposition and has realised the identity of the Self with Brahman that cannot be subjected to any injunction. If a man who has realised the identity of the Self and Brahman has still to bow down to injunctions, even though he is beyond all mandates, then there will remain none who is outside the pale of scriptural direction; and so all actions will become fit to be undertaken by all and sundry at all times. But that is undesirable. Nor can he be directed by anybody, for even the scriptures emanate from him. Not that anyone can be impelled by any sentence issuing out of his own wisdom. Nor is a well-informed master commanded by an ignorant servant.

Objection: The Vedas, being eternal, are independ-

ent, and hence have the mandatory power over all.

Answer: No, for the defect (of such an argument) has been already pointed out. Even on this assumption, the defect persists unavoidably of every duty becoming fit to be indiscriminately undertaken at all times by all and sundry.

Objection: That, too, is enjoined by the scriptures. (To explain): As performance of duties is prescribed by scriptures, so is the knowledge of the Self prescribed for that man of *karma* by the scriptures themselves.

Answer: No, for it is unthinkable that the scriptures should be prescribing contradictory things. Just as heat and cold cannot both be averred of fire, so it is not possible to instruct association as well as dissociation with virtue and vice for the same person. Nor are the desires to attain the delectable and to avoid the detestable, for oneself, created by the scriptures, for all beings are seen to have them. Had these two been the products of the scriptures, they would not have been found in the cowherds and others, who are ignorant of scriptures. The scriptures have to instruct about those things only that are not self-evident. That being so, if the scriptures have produced the knowledge of the Self, opposed to (ideas of) duties that have been accomplished or are yet to be accomplished, how can they again produce a sense of duty that runs counter to it, like coldness in fire or darkness in the sun ?

Objection: The scriptures do not certainly generate such a knowledge.

Answer: They do; for the conclusion is made thus:

“One should know thus: ‘He is my Self’ ” (Kau. III. 9), “Consciousness is Brahman” (Ai. III. i. 3). And sentences such as, “It knew only Itself as ‘I am Brahman’; therefore It became all” (Bṛ I. iv. 10), “Thou art That” (Ch. VI. viii-xvi), bear on the same idea. And since the knowledge of the identity of the Self and Brahman, once it has emerged, is never sublated, its origination cannot be denied or pronounced erroneous.

Objection: With regard to renunciation, too, there is an equal absence of need, in accordance with the Smṛti, “(He has no object in this world to gain by doing action), nor by non-performance” (G. III. 18). Those who say that after realising Brahman one must resort to renunciation are equally open to the same charge of absence of need.

Answer: No, since renunciation consists in mere cessation from activity. The feeling of want follows from ignorance and is not inherent in any object, for this fact (of feeling of want towards an object) is in evidence in all beings.¹ Moreover, it is noticed that one acts through speech, mind, and body when one is impelled by thirst for desired results; and by the text beginning with, “He desired, ‘Let me have a wife’ ” (Bṛ I. iv. 17), and by the text, “Both these are but desires (for ends and means)” (Bṛ. III. v. 1, IV. iv. 22), of the Vājasaneyā Brāhmaṇa, it has been

¹ Even in people who are ignorant of the nature of a thing. This is according to the reading, “*taddarśanāt*”. Ānanda Giri prefers “*tadadarśanāt*—is not in evidence”. If the feeling inhered in the object, all should have felt it similarly and for ever. The reaction being different, the feeling is subjective.

emphatically asserted that sons, wealth, etc., that constitute the fivefold *karma*¹ are comprised within desire. Since the fivefold activities of speech, mind, and body, arising from such defects as ignorance, desire, etc., cannot belong to a man of realisation because of his freedom from those defects, his renunciation consists in mere absence of activity; and it is not a positive something to be accomplished like sacrifice etc. And that being a natural accomplishment of a man of illumination, no necessity is to be sought for it. Not that any question can be raised as to why a person, who was (once) enveloped in darkness, does not fall into a pit, swamp, or brambles after the dawn of light.

Objection: Then it comes to this that renunciation follows as a matter of course and is not fit to be enjoined. Therefore, if the supreme knowledge of Brahman dawns in domestic life, the passive man may continue in that state, and there need be no moving away from it,

Answer: No, since domestic life is a product of desire; for it has been clearly declared, "This much indeed is desire"² (Br. I. iv. 17), "Both these³ are indeed desires" (Br. III. v. 1, IV. iv. 22). Renunciation is defined as the mere absence of well-established

¹ The metre called Pañkti has five letters in each foot; and in sacrifices the five factors—wife, son, divine wealth (meditation), human wealth, and rites—get conjoined. Hence sacrifices are *pāñkta*, constituted by five factors.

² The first part of the sentence is: "He desired, 'Let me have a wife, so that I may be born (as a child). And let me have wealth, so that I may perform rites'".

³ Hankering for ends and means.

relationship with sons etc. arising from desire and not as the mere moving away from that domestic life. And so the inactive man of realisation cannot continue in the domestic life itself.¹ Hereby it is established that for an illumined soul there can be no acceptance of such duties as the service of the Guru, or (practice of) austerities.

Against this argument, some householders, shy of begging alms and afraid of ridicule, advance the following rejoinder, thereby making a show of their intellectual acumen:

Inasmuch as a mendicant, desirous merely of maintaining his body, is seen to subject himself to regulations about begging, there may be continuance in the domestic life even for a householder who has become freed from both kinds of desires with regard to ends and means, but who has to depend on mere food and raiment for the maintenance of the body.

Answer: Not so; for this has already been refuted by saying that the constant habit of resorting to any particular house of one's own is prompted by desire. When there is no clinging to any particular house of one's own, there follows begging alone, as a matter of course, in the case of one who has no special inclination for turning to his own and who seeks for food and raiment under the impulsion of maintaining the body.

Objection: Just as (for a Sannyāsi) there are

¹He cannot consider himself a householder, nor can he deliberately put on the householder's garb or accept the latter's duties.

regulations with regard to engagement in begging for the sake of maintaining the body, as also with regard to personal cleanliness etc., so in the case of the householder, who has become illumined and free from desire, there may be regular engagement in obligatory duties for the sake of avoiding evil in pursuance of the impulsion implied in the Vedic text enjoining *karma* for the whole life.

Answer: This has already been refuted by pointing out that the illumined soul is outside the range of injunction; besides, he cannot be impelled.

Objection: The injunction about obligatory duties contained in "One should perform the Agnihotra sacrifice for life" becomes meaningless thereby.

Answer: No, because it retains its meaningfulness with regard to the ignorant man. As for the regulation about the activities of the mendicant engaged in the mere support of the body, that regulation does not generate any action. Just as no fresh motive is in evidence in the matter of quenching thirst (*pari passu*) for a man engaged in sipping water from the palm of the hand as a ceremonial act, similarly in the matter of (rules for) begging, no other impulse is in evidence (apart from assuaging hunger).¹ It cannot be argued on similar grounds that in the case

¹ Following the injunction about sipping, a man sips water and the thirst is assuaged *pari passu*; but the latter fact is not the motive for the sipping. Similarly, a man engages naturally in begging for food for life, and consequent on that there occur some rules; but those rules cannot lead to a supposition of some fresh motive for the begging.

of Agnihotra, too, the activities are derived naturally and are regulated accordingly.¹

Objection: Restriction of even spontaneous activity is uncalled for when it serves no purpose.

Answer: No, since that restriction follows naturally out of past tendencies, and an overriding of them involves great effort.² From the fact that a fresh injunction of renunciation, despite its emergence as a matter of course (in the case of a man of illumination), is met with,³ it becomes evident that it is obligatory for the man of illumination. And monasticism is obligatory even for the unilluminated soul that hankers after emancipation. With regard to this matter, the sentence, "Therefore he who knows thus becomes self-controlled, calm" etc., (Bṛ IV. iv. 23) can be cited as authoritative. Besides, such means for the realisation of the Self as physical and mental control etc., are incompatible with other stages of life. And it is known from the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, "To those (monks) who had gone beyond the (four) stages of life he spoke well of that supremely holy Reality that is sought after by seers of Truth" (VI. 21). And in the Kaivalya Upaniṣad (2) we find,

¹ For these activities are not spontaneous, but follow from a desire for heaven etc.

² Life can be maintained by begging for alms, whether according to rules or not. But before the rise of knowledge, the mendicant had followed good rules as a spiritual discipline, and the habit persists even after illumination. The path of least resistance lies in following the habit and not in counteracting it.

³ In Bṛ III. v. I. etc.—"Knowing this very Self, the Brāhmaṇas renounce . . . and lead a mendicant life."

“Some attained immortality not by *karma*, not by progeny, not by wealth, but by renunciation.”¹ And the Smṛti says, “After attaining knowledge, one should have recourse to inactivity”, and “He should continue in that order of life (Sannyāsa) which is conducive to the attainment of Brahman.” Moreover, the practice of such disciplines as continence, in their totality, is possible only for those who have gone beyond the four stages of life, whereas it is impossible in domestic life. Not that any inadequate means can lead to full consummation. As for the kinds of realisation to which the *karmas* pertaining to the householder’s life can lead, their highest result has been summed up as merger in the Deity (Hiraṇyagarbha), and that is within the worldly state itself. If the knowledge of the Self were possible for people engrossed in *karma*, the conclusion there would not have been made with a result, (viz merger in Deity), very much within the worldly state.

Objection: That is only the product of some subsidiary factor (associated with the higher knowledge).²

Answer: No, for the knowledge of the Self relates to the Reality that is the Self and that is entirely opposed to it (viz a subsidiary). The means to the attainment of immortality is the knowledge of the Self which is the supreme Reality beyond all names, forms, and actions. If that knowledge remains asso-

¹The idea is that the few who ever realised, did so through renunciation.

²e.g. the knowledge of Fire associated with the realisation of the Self.

ciated with some secondary result (within the world), it cannot pertain to the Reality that is the Self from which is ruled out all distinctions. And that is undesirable; for in the text of the Vājasaneyā Brāhmaṇa, beginning with "Where everything becomes his Self" (Br. II. iv. 14), all empirical dealings, involving actions, auxiliaries, and fruits, have been denied for the illumined soul; and by saying, "Where there is an appearance of duality" (Br. IV. iv. 14), the worldly state has been shown in the case of the unillumined soul opposed to the former. Similarly, here, too, the text thinks, "I shall speak of that absolute knowledge of the all-pervasive Reality that leads to immortality after I have dealt with the fruit that consists in the identity with the Deity, exists within the worldly state, and is constituted by things subject to hunger etc." For the unenlightened man, again, and not the enlightened one, do the three debts act as impediments in the way to his attaining the worlds of men, Manes, and gods, as it is established by the Vedic text, "That world of men is to be conquered through the son alone"¹ etc. (Br. I. v. 16), which determines the means for the attainment of the three worlds. And for the man of illumination, craving for the world of the Self, the absence of impediment from debts is shown by "What shall we achieve through children" etc. (Br. IV. iv. 22). So also there are the texts of the Kauṣītakī branch, "So the ancient seers, the Kāvāṣeyas, who had realised It, said ('Why should we study the Vedas?')" (Kau. II. 5) and

¹ "... the world of Manes through rites; and the world of the gods through meditation."

“The ancient illumined souls, who knew It, did not perform the Agnihotra sacrifice” (*ibid*).

Objection: For the unillumined soul, then, there can be no monasticism before he clears the (three) debts.

Answer: Not so, because one does not become involved in debts before entering the householder’s life. If one can become indebted irrespective of his obligation thereto, then all may as well become so, which (conclusion) will lead to undesirable consequences. Even for one who has embraced the householder’s life, monasticism is desirable as a disciplinary means for the realisation of the Self in accordance with the text, “From the domestic life he should resort to that of the forest-dweller (recluse), and then embrace monasticism; alternatively one may embrace monasticism from the stage of the celibate, or the house-holder, or the recluse” (Jā. 4). The Vedic texts speaking of performance of rites throughout life find the fullest scope among the unenlightened souls who do not long for freedom. In (some recensions of) the Chāndogya, too, it is found that for some people it is enjoined that the Agnihotra sacrifice can be given up after performing it for twelve nights. As for the view that monasticism is meant for those who are disqualified (from performing *karma*), it is unsound, since with regard to them an independent injunction occurs in “He whose fire has been extinguished or who has not lighted it up (shall renounce the day he becomes desireless)” (Np. III. 77). Moreover, it is a well-known fact that the Smṛtis, in a general way, enjoin option with regard

to, as well as adoption (in succession) of, all the stages of life. As for the argument, "Inasmuch as renunciation ensues spontaneously in the case of the illumined soul, it is beyond the purview of the scriptures, and therefore it makes little difference as to whether he continues in domestic life or repairs to the forest", it is unsound, for absolute renunciation being a spontaneous result, there can be no persistence in any other order. We pointed out that involvement in any other stage of life is a result of desire, and that renunciation consists merely in the absence of this. As for wilfulness in the case of the illumined soul, it is entirely out of place, it being found among the extremely ignorant. Moreover, seeing that even scriptural duties are known to be inapplicable in the case of the knower of the Self, they being too burdensome, can there be for him any (action through) heedlessness that arises from extreme non-discrimination? Not that a thing perceived under lunacy or through eyes affected by Timira disease, continues to be exactly so when the disease is cured, that vision being contingent on the lunacy or Timira. Accordingly, it is proved that for the knower of the Self there can be neither recklessness nor engagement in any other duty apart from renunciation.

As for the text "He who knows these two, *vidyā* and *avidyā*, together" (Īś. 11), it does not convey the idea that ignorance, too, persists along with enlightenment for the man of knowledge. What is the meaning then? It is meant to imply that they cannot cohere in the same person at the same time, as for instance the ideas of silver and nacre cannot cohere in the same

person with regard to the same mother of pearl. For it is said in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad. "That which is known as *vidyā* (knowledge) and that which is known as *avidyā* (ignorance) are widely contradictory, and they follow divergent courses" (I. ii. 4). Hence there is no possibility of continuance of ignorance when knowledge dawns. From such Vedic texts as, "Crave to know Brahman through concentration" (Tai. III. ii.), it follows that concentration etc. that are conducive to the rise of knowledge, as well as activities like service of the teacher, are called *avidyā* (nescience), since they are the products of nescience. Producing *vidyā* (knowledge) through them, one transcends death that is the same as desire. Then the passionless man renounces all desires and achieves immortality through the knowledge of Brahman. In order to reveal this idea the (Īsā) Upaniṣad says, "Crossing over death through *avidyā*, one attains immortality through *vidyā*" (11). As for the view that the entire span of a man's life is stuffed with *karma* according to the text, "By doing *karma* indeed should one wish to live here for a hundred years" (Īs 2), that has been dismissed as relating to the ignorant, for otherwise it would be untenable. And the argument was advanced that what follows (in the present Upaniṣad) is in line with what preceded it, and therefore the knowledge of the Self is not opposed to *karma*. This view was disposed of by relating the two standpoints to the conditioned and the unconditioned Self, and this will be shown by us in the succeeding explanation. Therefore the following text is commenced in order to reveal the know-

ledge of the oneness of the Self and Brahman that is absolute and actionless:

ॐ आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत् । नान्यत्
किञ्चन मिषत् । स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति ॥१॥

1. In the beginning this was but the absolute Self alone. There was nothing else whatsoever that winked. He thought, "Let Me create the worlds."

Ātmā vai, the absolute¹ Self. The word *ātmā*, Self, is derived in the sense of comprehending, engulfing or pervading, and by it is signified one that is the highest, omniscient, omnipotent, and transcendental to all such worldly attributes as hunger; and is by nature eternal, pure, conscious, and free; and is birthless, undecaying, immortal, fearless, and without a second. *Idam*, this—all that has been referred to as this world, diversified through the differences of name, form, and action. This world *agre*, in the beginning, before the creation of this world, *āsīt*, was; *ātmā ekah eva*, but one Self.

Objection: Has It ceased to be the same one entity ?

Answer: No.

Objection: Why is it then said, "It was" ?

Answer: Though even now that very same single entity endures, still there is some distinction. The distinction is this: The universe in which the differ-

¹ *Vai* is used to present the absolute by way of ruling out the conditioned.

ences of name and form were not manifest before creation, which was then one with the Self, and which was denotable by the word and idea "Self", has now become denotable by many words and concepts as well as by the word "Self", because of its diversification through the multiplicity of names and forms. The case is analogous with that of foam and water. Foam is denoted by the single word and concept water before the manifestation of names and forms distinct from water; but when that foam becomes manifested as (an entity) distinct from water, owing to the difference of name and form, then the very same foam becomes denotable by many words and concepts, viz foam and water, as well as by only one word and one concept, viz water. The same is the case here.

Na anyat kiñcana, there was nothing else whatsoever; *miṣat*, winking, that was active. (Nor was there) anything else (that was inactive). Unlike the Pradhāna of the Sāṃkhyas which is an independent entity classed with the non-Selves, and unlike the atoms of the followers of Kaṇāda, there remained here nothing whatsoever apart from the Self. What existed then? The Self alone existed. This is the idea. *Sah*, that Self; being naturally omniscient, *īkṣata*, thought; even though It was but one.

Objection: Since the Self was devoid of body and senses, how could It think before creation?

Answer: This is no fault because of Its nature of omniscience, in support of which fact is the *mantra* text, "Without hands and feet He grasps and goes" etc. (Śv. III. 19). With what motive (did He think)?

The answer is *srjai*, let Me create; *lokān*, the worlds— (viz) *ambhas* etc. which are the places for the enjoyment of the fruits of work by creatures.

Having visualised, i.e. deliberated, thus,

स इमाँल्लोकानसृजत । अम्भो मरीचीर्मरमापोऽदोऽ-
म्भः परेण दिवं द्यौः प्रतिष्ठाञ्ज्तरिक्षं मरीचयः पृथिवी
मरो या अधस्तात्ता आपः ॥२॥

2. He created these worlds, viz *ambhas*, *marīci*, *marā*, *āpah*. That which is beyond heaven is *ambhas*. Heaven is its support. The sky is *marīci*. The earth is *marā*. The worlds that are below are the *āpah*.

Sah, that Self; *asrjata*, created, *imān lokān*, these worlds; just as in the world an intelligent architect, or others, think, "I shall construct a palace etc. according to this plan", and builds up the palace etc. after that deliberation.

Objection: It is logical that architects and others, possessed of materials, should raise up palaces etc. But how can the Self, devoid of materials, create the worlds ?

Answer: This is nothing wrong. Name and form, which remain identified with the Self in their unmanifested state just like the (undiversified) foam with water, and are hence denotable by the word Self, can become the material cause of the universe, as water becomes that of the manifested foam. Therefore there is nothing incongruous in saying that the omniscient

Being creates the universe by virtue of Its oneness with the materials—viz name and form—which are identified with Itself, Or the more reasonable position is this: Just as an intelligent juggler, who has no material, transforms himself, as it were, into a second self ascending into space, similarly the omniscient and omnipotent Deity, who is a supreme magician, creates Himself as another in the form of the universe. On this view, the schools that hold such beliefs as the unreality of both cause and effect have no legs to stand on and are totally demolished.

Which are the worlds that He created? They are being enumerated: *Ambhas*, *marīcīḥ*, *maram*, *āpah*. Starting with space, he created in due order the cosmic egg, and then created the worlds—*ambhas* etc. As for these, the Upaniṣad itself explains the words *ambhas* etc. *Adaḥ*, that one—the world that is there; *pareṇa divam*, beyond heaven; is *ambhas*, is denoted by the word *ambhas*. It is called *ambhas* because it holds *ambhas*, water (cloud). Of that world, viz *ambhas*, *dyauḥ pratiṣṭhā*, heaven is the support. *Antarikṣam*, the sky—that there is below heaven is the (world called) *marīci*. Though this (last) world is one, it is used in the plural number as *marīcīḥ* (or rather *marīcayāḥ*) because of the diversity of the space covered by it. Or it is so used because of its association with the *marīcayāḥ*, rays (of the sun). *Pr̥thivī*, the earth, is *marāḥ*, since beings die (*mriyante*) on it. *Yāḥ adhastāt*, the worlds that are below—below the earth; *tāḥ*, they (are); *āpah*, called *āpah*, (lit. water) the word being derived

(from the root *āp*) in the sense of being *attained*.¹ Though the worlds are constituted by the five elements, still, because of the predominance of water (etc. in them), they are referred to, by the synonyms of water (etc.)² as *ambhas*, *marīcīh*, *maram*, *ūpaḥ*.

स ईक्षतेमे नु लोका लोकपालान्नु सृजा इति ।
सोऽद्भूच एव पुरुषं समुद्धृत्यामूर्च्छयत् ॥३॥

3. He thought, "These then are the worlds. Let Me create the protectors of the worlds." Having gathered up a (lump of the) human form from the water itself, He gave shape to it.

Having created the four worlds that provide support for the fruits of action, as well as the materials for those fruits³, for all creatures, *saḥ*, He, God; *īkṣata*, deliberated; again; *iti*, thus: "*Ime nu lokāh*, these then are the worlds, viz *ambhas* etc., created by Me, which will perish if they are devoid of protectors. Accordingly, for their preservation, *nu sṛjai*, let Me create; *lokapālān*, the protectors of the worlds." Having deliberated thus, *saḥ*, He: *samuddhṛtya*, having gathered up; *puruṣam*, a human form, possessed of head, hands, etc., *adbhyaḥ*, from the water, itself—from the five elements in which water predominated, and from which He had created (the worlds, viz) *ambhas* etc.—just as a potter gathers up a lump of clay from the earth; *amūrchayat*, (He)

¹ Attained by the denizens of the nether worlds.

² The word "water" is suggestive of *marīci* etc.—A.G.

³ And accessories for the achievement of fruits.

gave shape to it—that is to say, fashioned it by endowing it with limbs.¹

तमभ्यतपत्तस्याभितप्तस्य मुखं निरभिद्यत यथाऽण्डम् । मुखाद्वाग्वाचोऽग्निर्नासिके निरभिद्येतां नासिकाभ्यां प्राणः प्राणाद्वायुरक्षिणी निरभिद्येतामक्षिभ्यां चक्षुश्चक्षुष आदित्यः कर्णौ निरभिद्येतां कर्णाभ्यां श्रोत्रं श्रोत्राद्दिशस्त्वङ्निरभिद्यत त्वचो लोमानि लोमभ्य ओषधिवनस्पतयो हृदयं निरभिद्यत हृदयान्मनो मनसश्चन्द्रमा नाभिर्निरभिद्यत नाभ्या अपानोऽपानान्मृत्युः शिश्नं निरभिद्यत शिश्नाद्रेतो रेतस आपः ॥४॥

इत्यैतरेयोपनिषदि प्रथमाध्याये प्रथमः खण्डः ॥

4. He deliberated with regard to Him (i.e. Virāt of the human form). As He (i.e. Virāt) was being deliberated on, His (i.e. Virāt's) mouth parted, just as an egg does. From the mouth emerged speech; from speech came Fire. The nostrils parted; from the nostrils came out the sense of smell; from the sense of smell came Vāyu (Air). The two eyes parted; from the eyes emerged the sense of sight; from the sense of sight came the Sun. The two ears parted; from the ears came the sense of hearing; from the sense of hearing came the Directions. The

¹ He created Virāt.

skin emerged; from the skin came out hair (i.e. the sense of touch associated with hair); from the sense of touch came the Herbs and Trees. The heart took shape; from the heart issued the internal organ (mind); from the internal organ came the Moon. The navel parted; from the navel came out the organ of ejection; from the organ of ejection issued Death. The seat of the procreative organ parted; from that came the procreative organ; from the procreative organ came out Water.¹

Tam, with regard to Him, (Virāt of) that human form; He *abhyatapat*, undertook *tapas* (lit. austerity), i.e. He deliberated over, or resolved about, Him; for a Vedic text says, “Whose *tapas* is constituted by knowledge” (Mu. I. i. 9). *Tasya abhitaptasya*, of that (Virāt) of the lump (that was Virāt’s body), when subjected to the *tapas* or resolution of God; *mukham nirabhidya*, the mouth parted—a hole in the shape of the mouth emerged, just as the bird’s egg bursts. *Mukhāt*, from (that) mouth, that had parted; was brought into existence *vāk*, the organ of speech: *vācaḥ*, from that *vāk*; was produced *agniḥ*, Fire, (the deity) that presides over *vāk* and is a regional protector. Similarly *nāsike nirabhidye-tām*, the nostrils parted; *nāsikābhyām prāṇaḥ*, from the nostrils emerged the sense of smell; *prāṇat vāyuḥ*, from the sense of smell was formed Vāyu, Air. In all cases, the seat of the organs, the organs, and the deity—these

¹ Thus originated the presiding deities of the organs from the limbs of Virāt.

three emerged in succession. *Akṣinī*, the two eyes; *karnāu*, the two orifices of the ears; *tvak*, skin—(all these which are the seats of the organs), (and) *hr̥dayam*, heart (which is the) seat of the internal organ; *manah*, mind, the internal organ, *nābhīh*, the navel (i.e. the root of the anus), which is the focal point of the vital forces. The organ of ejection (seated at the anus) is called *apānāh*, because of its association with *Apāna* (the vital force that moves down). From that originated its presiding deity *mṛtyuh*, Death. As in the other cases, so *śiśnam*, the seat of the organ of generation was formed. Its organ is *retas*, semen—the organ meant for discharging semen being called semen from the fact of its association with semen. From semen (i.e. the procreative organ) emerged (its deity) *āpuh*, Water.

CHAPTER II

ता एता देवताः सृष्टा अस्मिन्महत्यर्णवे प्रापतन् ।
तमशनायापिपासाभ्यामन्ववार्जत् । ता एनमब्रुवन्नाय-
तनं नः प्रजानीहि यस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठिता अन्नमदामेति ॥१॥

1. These deities, that had been created, fell into this vast ocean. He subjected Him (i.e. *Virāt*) to hunger and thirst. They said to Him (i.e. to the Creator), “Provide an abode for us, staying where we can eat food.”

Tāh etāh devatāh, these deities—Fire and others; *sṛṣṭāh*, that had been created as the rulers of the regions,

by God; (fell) *asmin*, into this; *mahati arṇave*, vast ocean—of the world which is like a vast ocean, that is filled with the water of sorrow arising from ignorance, desire, and action; that is infested with huge sea-animals in the form of acute disease, and age, and death; that has no end and limit and provides no resting place; that affords only momentary respite through the little joy arising from the contact of senses and objects; that is full of the high waves in the shape of hundreds of evil, stirred up by the gale of hankering for the objects of the five senses; that resounds with the noise of cries and shrieks of “alas! alas!” etc., issuing from the beings condemned to various hells like *Mahāraurava*; that has the raft of knowledge, furnished with such provisions for the way as truth, simplicity, charity, compassion, non-injury, control of inner and outer organs fortitude, etc., that are the embellishments of the heart; that has good company and renunciation of everything as its track; and that has emancipation as its shore. Into this vast ocean *prāpatan*, (they) fell. This is the construction. Hence the idea sought to be imparted here is that even the attainment of the state of merger in the deities, viz Fire and others, that was explained (earlier), and that is the result of the combined practice of meditation and *karma*—(even this) is not adequate for the removal of the sorrows of the world. Since this is so, therefore, after having grasped this fact, one should, for the eradication of all the worldly miseries, realise the supreme Brahman as the Self of one’s own as also of all beings—the Self which is possessed of the characteristics to be mentioned hereafter, and which has been introduced as the source of the origination,

continuance, and dissolution of the universe. Therefore in accordance with the Vedic text, "There is no other path for reaching there" (Śv. III. 8, VI. 15), it follows that, "This that is the knowledge of the oneness of Brahman and the Self, is the path, this is the *karma*, this is Brahman, this is truth" (Ai. Ā. II. i. 1).

(He, the Creator) *anvavārjat*, suffused, i.e. endowed, *tam*, Him — who was the source of the organs, their seats, and their deities, the Being (i.e. Virāt) who was the first begotten and the Self in the form of a lump; *aśanāyā-pipāsābhyām*, with hunger and thirst. Since He (the first begotten), the source of all, was afflicted with the defects of hunger etc., His products, the deities, are also subject to hunger etc. Then *tāḥ*, those deities; being afflicted with hunger and thirst; *enam*, to Him, to the grandsire, to the Creator (of the body of Virāt); *abruvan*, said; *iti*, this: *Prajānīhi*, provide; *naḥ*, for us; *āyatanam*, an abode; *pratiṣṭhitāḥ yasmin*, staying where— and becoming able; *annam adāma* we can eat food.

ताभ्यो गामानयत्ता अब्रुवन्न वै नोऽयमलमिति ।
ताभ्योऽश्वमानयत्ता अब्रुवन्न वै नोऽयमलमिति ॥२॥

2. For them He (i.e. God) brought a cow. They said, "This one is not certainly adequate for us." For them He brought a horse. They said, "This one is not certainly adequate for us."

God, having been told so, *tābhyah*, for them, for the deities; *ānayat gām*, brought a cow; having gathered up a lump of the size of a cow from that very water, just as before, and having fashioned it, He showed it

to them. *Tāḥ*, they; on their part, having seen the bovine form; *abruvan*, said: *Ayam*, this one—this lump; *na vai*, is not certainly; *alam*, adequate; *naḥ*, for us—fit to serve as a seat while eating food; that is to say, it is not sufficient so far as eating is concerned. The cow having been rejected, He *ānayat*, brought; *aśvam*, a horse; *tābhyaḥ*, for them. *Tāḥ*, they, *abruvan*, said; *iti*, this—just as before: “*Ayam, na vai alam naḥ*, this is not certainly serviceable for us.”

ताभ्यः पुरुषमानयत्ता अब्रुवन् सुकृतं बतेति पुरुषो
वाव सुकृतम् । ता अब्रवीद्यथायतनं प्रविशतेति ॥३॥

3. For them He brought a man. They said, “This one is well formed; man indeed is a creation of God Himself.” To them He said, “Enter into your respective abodes.”

When all else had been rejected, *tābhyaḥ*, for them; *ānayat* (He) brought; *puruṣam*, a man, their progenitor.¹ Having seen that man, that was their source, they became free from misery, and *tāḥ*, they; *abruvan*, said; *iti*, this: “This abode is *sukṛtam bata*, well created, to be sure.” As a result *puruṣaḥ vāva*, man is indeed; *sukṛtam*, virtue itself—he having thereby become the source of all virtuous deeds.² Or he is called *sukṛta*, (lit.) created by oneself, because God created man by Himself, through His own *Māyā*.³

¹ Who conformed in features to Virāṭ, their origin.

² Since they pronounced man as *sukṛta*, therefore man acts virtuously even today.

³ Man was a good product, since God created him independently

God thought that this abode was liked by them, since all beings love the source from which they spring; and so He *abravīt*, said, *tāh*, to them; *iti*, this: “*Praviśata*, enter; *yathāyatanam*, into the respective abode—into the dwelling that suits each for such activities as speaking etc.”

अग्निर्वाग्भूत्वा मुखं प्राविशद्वायुः प्राणो भूत्वा नासिके
प्राविशदादित्यश्चक्षुर्भूत्वाऽक्षिणी प्राविशाद्दिशः श्रोत्रं
भूत्वा कर्णौ प्राविशन्नोषधिवनस्पतयो लोमानि भूत्वा
त्वचं प्राविशंश्चन्द्रमा मनो भूत्वा हृदयं प्राविशन्मृत्यु-
रपानो भूत्वा नाभिं प्राविशदापो रेतो भूत्वा शिशुं
प्राविशन् ॥४॥

4. Fire entered into the mouth taking the form of the organ of speech; Air entered into the nostrils assuming the form of the sense of smell; the Sun entered into the eyes as the sense of sight; the Directions entered into the ears by becoming the sense of hearing; the Herbs and Trees entered into the skin in the form of hair (i.e. the sense of touch); the Moon entered into the heart in the shape of the mind; Death entered into the navel in the form of *Apāna* (i.e. the vital energy that presses down); Water

of servants and accessories, *Sukṛta* is thus explained in three senses—good product, virtue, created by oneself. (*sva*).

entered into the limb of generation in the form of semen (i.e. the organ of procreation).

Just as the commander of armies etc. (enter into a city at the bidding of the king), so having got the permission of God in the words, "Let this be so", *agnih*, Fire, the deity that identifies himself with the organ of speech; *bhūtva*, becoming, *va*, speech itself; *prāviśat*, entered; *mukham*, into the mouth, which was his source. Similarly are the rest to be explained. *Vāyuh*, Air, entered *nāsike*, into the nostrils. *Ādityah*, the Sun; *akṣiṇī*, into the eyes; *diśah*, the Directions; *karṇau*, into the ears; *oṣadhi-vanaspatayah*, the Herbs and Trees; *tvacam*, into the skin; *candramūḥ*, the Moon; *hṛdayam*, into the heart; *mṛtyuh*, Death; *nābhim*, into the navel (i.e. the root of the anus); *āpah*, Water, *śiśnam*, into the generative organ.

तमशनायापिपासे अब्रतामावाभ्यामभिप्रजानीही।
ते अब्रवीदेतास्वेव वां देवतास्वाभजाम्येतामु भागिन्यौ
करोमीति । तस्माद्यस्यै कस्यै च देवतायै हविर्गृह्यते
भागिन्यावेवास्यामशनायापिपासे भवतः ॥५॥

इत्यैतरेयोपनिषदि प्रथमाध्याये द्वितीयः खण्डः ॥

5. To Him Hunger and Thirst said, "Provide for us (some abode)." To them He said, "I provide your livelihood among these very gods; I make you share in their portions." Therefore when oblation is taken up for any deity whichsoever, Hunger and Thirst become verily sharers with that deity.

When the gods had thus found their abodes, *aśanāyā-pipāse*, Hunger and Thirst, being without abodes, *abrūtām*, said, to that God: *Āvābhyām*, for us *abhiprajānīhi*, think of, i.e. provide; some abode." God, having been told thus, *abravīt*, said; *te*, to them two—to Hunger and Thirst: "Since you are but feelings, you cannot possibly enjoy food without being supported by some conscious being. Therefore *etāsu eva*, among these beings themselves; *devatāsu*, among the deities, viz Fire etc. — in the corporeal context, as also in the divine context; *ābhajāmi vām*, I favour you by assigning your livelihood. *Karomi*, I make you; *bhāginyau*, sharers; *etāsu*, among these gods. Whatever allotment, consisting of oblation etc., is assigned to any deity, I make you share in that very portion." Since God ordained thus in the beginning of creation, *tasmāt*, therefore; even today; *yasyai kasyai ca devatāyāi*, for whichever deity; *haviḥ*, oblation — such as porridge, cake, etc.; *grhyate*, is taken up; *asyām*, in that deity; *aśanāyā-pipāse*, Hunger and Thirst; *bhāginyau eva bhavataḥ*, become sharers indeed.

CHAPTER III

स ईक्षतेमे नु लोकाश्च लोकपालाश्चान्नमेभ्यः सृजा
इति ॥१॥

1. He thought, "This, then, are the senses and the deities of the senses. Let Me create food for them."

Saḥ, He, God; *īkṣata*, thought. thus. How? "*Ime nu*, these then are; *lokāḥ ca lokapālāḥ ca*, the senses and

their deities—that have been created by Me and dowered with hunger and thirst; therefore these can not subsist without food. Accordingly, *ṣṛjai* (which is the same as *ṣṛje*), let Me create; *annam*, food; *ebhyaḥ*, for these—the deities of the senses.” Thus is seen in the world the independence of lordly persons with regard to extending favour or disfavour to their own people. Therefore the supreme Lord, too, has independence in the matter of favouring or disfavouring all, since He is the Lord of all.

सोऽपोऽभ्यतपत्ताभ्योऽभितप्ताभ्यो मूर्तिरजायत ।
या वै सा मूर्तिरजायतान्नं वै तत् ॥२॥

2. He deliberated with regard to the water. From the water, thus brooded over, evolved a form. The form that emerged was verily food.

Saḥ, He, God; being desirous of creating food; *abhyatapat*, deliberated with regard to; *apah*, water, already mentioned. *Tābhyaḥ abhitaptābhyaḥ*, from the water that was brooded over, and that formed the material; *ajāyata*, evolved; *mūrtiḥ*, a solid form—that could provide support for others and that comprised the moving and the unmoving. *Yā vai sā mūrtiḥ ajāyatu*, the moulded form that evolved; *ta annam vai*, that (formed thing) is verily food.

तदेनत्सृष्टं पराङ्गत्यजिघांसत्तद्वाचाऽजिघृक्षत् तन्ना-
शकनोद्वाचा ग्रहीतुं । स यद्धैनद्वाचाऽग्रहैष्यदभिव्याहृत्य
हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥३॥

3. This food, that was created, turned back and attempted to run away. He tried to take it up with speech. He did not succeed in taking it up through speech. If He had succeeded in taking it up with speech, then one would have become contented merely by talking of food.

Tat enat annam, this aforesaid food; that was *sṛṣṭam*, created — in the presence of the senses and their deities. As a mouse, for instance, when in the presence of a cat, thinks, “This is an eater of food and is Death to me”, and moves back, similarly this food became *parāk*, turned back; and *atyajighāmsat*, wanted to go beyond the reach of the devourers; — began to run away. When that sum total of the organs and their deities, that formed the lump called the body and senses (of *Virāṭ*), realised that intention of the food, but did not notice other eaters of food, He Himself being the first begotten, He *ajighṛkṣat*, tried to take up; *tat*, that food; *vācā*, through speech, through the act of speaking. *Na aśaknot*, He did not succeed, *grahitum tat*, to take up that, *vācā*, through speech through speaking. *Yat*, if; *saḥ*, He, the First Born, the first embodied Being; *agruhaiṣyat*, had taken up; *enat*, this food; *vācā*, through speech; then everyone, being a product of the First Born; *atrapśyat*, would have become satisfied; *abhi-vyāhṛitya eva annam*, merely by talking of food. But, as a matter of fact, this is not the case. Hence we understand that the First Born, too, did not succeed in grasping food through speech. The remaining portions are to be similarly explained.

तत्प्राणेनाजिघृक्षत् तन्नाशक्नोत्प्राणेन ग्रहीतुं स
यद्वैनत्प्राणेनाग्रहैष्यदभिप्राण्य हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥४॥

4. He tried to grasp that food with the sense of smell. He did not succeed in grasping it by smelling. If He had succeeded in grasping it by smelling, then everyone would have become contented merely by smelling food.

तच्चक्षुषाऽजिघृक्षत् तन्नाशक्नोच्चक्षुषा ग्रहीतुं स
यद्वैनच्चक्षुषाऽग्रहैष्यद्दृष्ट्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥५॥

5. He wanted to take up the food with the eye. He did not succeed in taking it up with the eye. If He had taken it up with the eye, then one would have become satisfied by merely seeing food.

तच्छ्रोत्रेणाजिघृक्षत् तन्नाशक्नोच्छ्रोत्रेण ग्रहीतुं स
यद्वैनच्छ्रोत्रेणाग्रहैष्यच्छ्रुत्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥६॥

6. He wanted to take up the food with the ear. He did not succeed in taking it up with the ear. If he had taken it up with the ear, then one would have become satisfied merely by hearing of food.

तत्त्वचाऽजिघृक्षत् तन्नाशक्नोत्त्वचा ग्रहीतुं स यद्वै-
नत्त्वचाऽग्रहैष्यत् स्पृष्ट्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥७॥

7. He wanted to take it up with the sense of touch. He did not succeed in taking it up with the sense of touch. If He had taken it up with touch, then one would have been satisfied merely by touching food.

तन्मनसाऽजिघृक्षत् तन्नाशक्नोन्मनसा ग्रहीतुं स
यद्वैनन्मनसाऽग्रहैष्यद् ध्यात्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥८॥

8. He wanted to take it up with the mind. He did not succeed in taking it up with the mind. If He had taken it up with the mind, then one would have become satisfied by merely thinking of food.

तच्छिश्नेनाजिघृक्षत् तन्नाशक्नोच्छिश्नेन ग्रहीतुं स
यद्वैनच्छिश्नेनाग्रहैष्यद्विसृज्य हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥९॥

9. He wanted to take it up with the procreative organ. He did not succeed in taking it up with the procreative organ. If He had taken it up with the procreative organ, then one would have become satisfied by merely ejecting food.

तदपानेनाजिघृक्षत् तदावयत् सैषोऽन्नस्य ग्रहो
यद्वायुरन्नायुर्वा एष यद्वायुः ॥१०॥

10. He wanted to take it up with Apāna. He caught it. This is the devourer of food. That vital energy which is well known as

dependent on food for its subsistence is this vital energy (called Apāna).

Being unable to take up the food through nose, eye, ear, skin, mind and the generative apparatus, that is to say, through the activity of the respective organs, at last He *ajighrkṣat*, wanted to take up the food; *apānena*, by Apāna (the indrawing energy of) air — through the cavity of the mouth, *Tat āvayat*, (He) took up that— that food thus; He ate it. Therefore *saḥ eṣaḥ*, this Apāna air; *annasya grahaḥ*, (is) the devourer of food. *Yat vāyuh* (should be rather *yaḥ vāyuh*), the vital energy that; is *annāyuh vai*, well known as dependent on food, for its subsistence; is *eṣaḥ*, this one; *Yat vāyuh*, that is the vital energy, called Apāna.¹

स ईक्षत कथं न्विदं मदृते स्यादिति स ईक्षत कतरेण प्रपद्या इति । स ईक्षत यदि वाचाऽभिव्याहृतं यदि प्राणेनाभिप्राणितं यदि चक्षुषा दृष्टं यदि श्रोत्रेण श्रुतं यदि त्वचा स्पृष्टं यदि मनसा ध्यातं यद्यपानेनाभ्यपानितं यदि शिश्नेन विसृष्टमथ कोऽहमिति ॥११॥

11. He thought, “How indeed can it be there without Me?” He thought, “Through which of the two ways should I enter?” He thought, “If utterance is done by the organ of speech, smelling by the sense of smell, seeing by the eye, hearing by the ear, feeling by the sense of

¹ The eater of food is not the Self, but the vital energy that manifests itself as inhaling etc.

touch, thinking by the mind, the act of drawing in (or pressing down) by Apāna, ejecting by the procreative organ, then who (or what) am I?"

Having thus made the existence of the congress of senses and their deities dependent on food, like the existence of a city, its citizens, and its rulers, *saḥ*, He; *īkṣata*, thought—like the ruler of the city, while cogitating thus: "*Katham nu*, how indeed; *mat-ṛte*, without Me, the master of the city; *syāt*, can there be; *idam*, this thing—this activity belonging to the body and senses that will be spoken of; since it is meant for somebody else? *Yadi vācā abhivyāhṛtam*, if speaking is encompassed by the organ of speech. The mere use of speech etc. will become useless, will not take place in any way, just as offerings and praise that are made and sung by citizens and bards in honour of their lord become useless when their lord is not there. Therefore just as the king is with regard to the city, so I should be there as the supreme lord, the ruler, the witness of virtue and vice, and the enjoyer. It is a logical necessity that the combination of the effects (i.e. body and the organs) should be meant for somebody else. If this necessity can be fulfilled even without Myself who am a conscious being and by whom enjoyment through them is sought for, just as much as the activities of a city and its citizens can be sought to be explained without their lord, *atha*, then; *kaḥ aham*, who or what, and whose lord am I? If, after entering into the combination of body and senses, I do not witness the fruits of utterances etc. made by speech

etc., just as a king, after entering a city, observes the omissions and commissions of the officers, then nobody will understand or think of Me as, "This one is a reality and is of this kind." Contrariwise, I shall become cognisable as the conscious reality who knows as His objects such activities as utterance etc. of the organs of speech etc., and for whose sake exist these utterances etc. of such composite things as speech and so on, just as the pillars, walls, etc., that enter into the construction of a palace etc., exist for the sake of somebody else who is sentient and does not form a part of that structure. Having reasoned thus, *saḥ*, He; *īkṣata*, thought, *iti*, thus: "*Katareṇa prapadyai* through which shall I enter? There are two ways of entrance into this composite thing—the fore part of the foot and the crown of the head. *Katareṇa*, by which of these two, paths; *prapadyai* (or rather, *prapadyeya*), should I enter; into this city of the aggregate of body and senses?"

Having considered thus and having deliberated, "That being so, I should not enter through the lower way—viz the two tips of the feet—that is the path of entry for My servant *Prāṇa* (the Vital Force), that is commissioned to act in every way on My behalf. What then (should I do)? As a last resort, let me enter by splitting up the crown of its head"—having thought so, just like a human being who performs what he thinks.

स एतमेव सीमानं विदार्येतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत् । सैषा
विद्वृतिर्नाम द्वास्तदेतन्नान्दनम् । तस्य त्रय आवसथास्त्रयः
स्वप्ना अयमावसथोऽयमावसथोऽयमावसथ इति ॥१२॥

12. Having split up this very end, He entered through this door. This entrance is known as *vidṛti* (the cleft entrance). Hence it is delightful. Of Him there are three abodes—three (states of) dream. This one is an abode, this one is an abode, this one is an abode.

Salḥ, He, the Creator God; *etam eva sīmānam vidārya*, having cleft this very end, having made a hole into, the farthest point where the parting of the hair occurs; *etayā, dvārā*, through this gate, this entrance; *prāpadyata*, entered; into this world, i.e. into this conglomeration of body and senses. This one is that entrance that becomes well known from the fact of the perception inside (the mouth) of the taste etc. of oil and other things when these are applied on the crown of the head for a long time. *Sā eṣā dvāḥ*, this door; *vidṛtiḥ nāma*, is well known as *vidṛti* (the cleft one), because of its having been cleft. As for the other entrances—viz the ear etc.—they are neither perfect nor the sources of joy, since they are common passages meant for those occupying the places of servants etc. But this passage is only for the supreme Lord; *tat*, hence; *etat nāndanam*, this one is productive of joy. *Nāndana* is the same as *nandana*, the lengthening being a Vedic licence. It is so called because one revels (*nandati*) by reaching the supreme Brahman through this door. *Tasya*, of Him, who, after having created thus, entered (the body) as an individual soul, like a king entering a city; there are *trayaḥ āvasathāḥ*, three abodes—viz the right eye—the eye-ball, the seat of the sense (of vision)—during the waking state; the mind

inside, during the dream state; and the space within the heart, during the state of deep sleep. Or the three abodes may be the ones that will be enumerated, viz the body of the father, the womb of the mother, and one's own body. (He has) *trayaḥ svapnāḥ*, three dreams, that are known as waking, dream, and deep sleep.

Objection: The waking state is not a dream, it being a state of consciousness.

Answer: Not so, it is verily a dream.

Objection: How?

Answer: Since there is no consciousness of one's own supreme Self, and since in it are perceived unreal things as in a dream.

Ayam, this one—the right eye; is the first *ūvasathāḥ*, abode, the second is the mind inside; and the space within the heart is the third. "*Ayam ūvasathāḥ*, this is an abode" is only a recounting of what is already enumerated. Residing alternately as identified with those abodes, this individual soul sleeps deeply for long through natural ignorance, and does not wake up, though experiencing the blows of sorrow that arise from the concurrence of many hundreds of thousands of calamities and fall like the thumps of a heavy club.

स जातो भूतान्यभिव्यैख्यत् किमिहान्यं वावदिष-
दिति । स एतमेव पुरुषं ब्रह्म ततममपश्यत् । इदमदर्श-
मिती ३॥१३॥

13. Being born, He manifested all the beings;¹ for did He speak of (or know) any-

¹He knew and spoke distinctly of them as identified with Himself thus: "I am a man", "I am blind", "I am happy", etc.

thing else ?¹ He realised this very Puruṣa as Brahman, the most pervasive, thus: "I have realised this."

Sah jātaḥ, He being born, having entered into the body as the individual soul; *abhivyaikhyat*, manifested; *bhūtāni*, the beings. When, by good luck, a teacher of supreme compassion beat near his ears the drum of the great sayings of the Upaniṣads whose notes were calculated to wake up the knowledge of the Self, then the individual *apaśyat*, realised; *etam eva*, this very; *puruṣam*, Puruṣa (as Brahman)—the Puruṣa that is being discussed as the Lord of creation etc., who is called Puruṣa because of residence (*śayana*, i.e. existence) in the city (*puri*) (of the heart). (He realised Him) as *brahma*, Brahman, the Great; that is *tatamam* (by adding the missing *ta*, and taking the form *tatatamam*, the word means) the most pervasive, the fullest, like space. How (did he realise)? "I *adarśam*, have seen; *idam*, this one—this Brahman, that is the real nature of my Self." The elongation (of *i* in *itī*) is in accordance with the rule that in the case of a word suggesting *deliberation*, the vowel gets lengthened.²

तस्मादिन्द्रो नामेन्द्रो ह वै नाम । तमिन्द्रं
सन्तमिन्द्र इत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण । परोक्षप्रिया इव हि
देवाः परोक्षप्रिया इव हि देवाः ॥१४॥

¹That is to say, He neither perceived, nor spoke of anyone besides Himself. As He did not perceive any difference, He identified Himself with the individual soul.

²The elongation suggests that he first considered whether Brahman had been fully realised or not and then got the conviction, "It is fully realised". This conviction led to full satisfaction.

इत्यैतरेयोपनिषदि प्रथमाध्याये तृतीयः खण्डः ॥

14. Therefore His name is Idandra. He is verily known as Idandra. Although He is Idandra, they call Him indirectly Indra; for the gods are verily fond of indirect names, the gods are verily fond of indirect names.

Since He realised Brahman as "this" (i.e. directly) -- "the Brahman that is immediate and direct, the Self that is within all" (Br. III. iv. 1)—therefore from the fact of seeing as "*idam*, this", the supreme Self is *idandraḥ nāma*, called Idandra. God is *idandraḥ ha vai nāma*, verily known as Idandra, in the world. *Tam idandram santam*, Him who is Idandra; they, the knowers of Brahman; *ācakṣate*, call; *parokṣeṇa*, indirectly by a word denoting a remote thing; *indraḥ itī*, as Indra. (They call Him thus) for the sake of conventional dealings, they being afraid of referring by a direct name, since He is the most adorable. So it follows that, *hi*, inasmuch as; *devūḥ*, the gods; are *parokṣapriyāḥ iva*, verily fond of indirect names; it needs no mention that the great Lord, the God of all the gods, must be much more so. The repetition (in *parokṣapriyāḥ* etc.) is to indicate the end of the Part (I) that is being dealt with.

PART II

CHAPTER I

Introduction: The purport of the Fourth¹ (i.e. First) Part (just finished) is this: The Reality, that is the creator, preserver, and destroyer of the universe, and is transcendental, omniscient, omnipotent, and all-knowing, created in due order, this entire universe beginning with space, without the help of any substance other than Himself. Then He entered by Himself into all living creatures for the sake of self-realisation. And having entered there, He realised directly His own Self in its reality as "I am this Brahman." Therefore He is the only one Self in all bodies and there is none besides. And so everybody else, too, should realise thus: "He is my Self" (Kau. III. I. 8), "I am Brahman" (Br. I. iv. 10).² Moreover, it has been said here, "In the beginning this was but the absolute Self alone" (Ai. I. i. 1), and "Brahman that is the most pervasive" (Ai. I. iii. 13), and so also in other Upaniṣads.

Objection: For the One that is all-pervasive and that is the Self of all, there is not so much as the point of a hair unoccupied. Therefore how could He enter by splitting the end like an ant entering into a hole?

¹Fourth, counting from the First Part of the Āraṇyaka in which this Upaniṣad is included.

²In the commentary the two texts seem to have become combined.

Answer: This is but an insignificant question to be posed when there are so many others that can be asked here. That without organs He thinks; that without the help of anything He created this universe; that gathering up (a lump of) the human size from water, He gave it shape; that from His brooding parted the mouth etc., from which emerged Fire etc., the presiding deities of the organs; that the deities became associated with hunger and thirst; that they prayed for abodes; that cows etc. were shown to them; that they entered into their respective abodes; that the created food ran away; that there was an attempt at taking it up with the organ of speech etc.—all these are on a par with the (problem of) splitting the end and entering.

Objection: Then reject all this as incoherent.

Answer: No, there is no fault, since all this is but eulogistic,¹ the only thing sought to be taught being the knowledge of the Self. Or a better explanation is that the Deity, who is omniscient and omnipotent and is a great conjurer, created all this like a magician; but the parable etc. are elaborated here for the sake of easy instruction and comprehension just as it is done in ordinary life. For the mere acquaintance with anecdotes regarding creation etc. leads to no useful result, whereas it is well known in all the Upaniṣads that from the knowledge of the unity of the Self follows immortality as a result; and the same fact is in evidence in the Smṛtis like the Gītā in such sentences as “(He

¹ *Arthavāda*, meant for emphasising something other than the idea conveyed literally.

sees, who sees) the Lord Supreme, existing in all beings, (deathless in the dying)” (XIII. 27). .

Objection: There are three souls: One is well known in the world and in all the scriptures as the transmigrating soul that enjoys and acts. The second soul is God, the creator of the universe, the intelligent one. And He is inferable from the logical ground shown in the scriptures, viz the creation of bodies and worlds fitted with many localities that are suitable for the enjoyment of the fruits of actions of innumerable beings, just as an architect etc. possessed of the requisite skill and knowledge can be inferred from the fact of the construction of a town, a palace. etc. The third is the all-pervading Consciousness (Puruṣa) presented by the Upaniṣads alone and well known from such texts as: “From where speech turns back” (Tai. II. iv. 1), “Not this, not this” (Br. III. ix. 26). Thus there are three selves distinct from one another. That being so, how can it be known that the Self is one without a second and transcendental?

Vedāntist: As to that, how is the individual soul even known?

Opponent: Is he not known as the hearer, thinker, seer, teacher, maker of (inarticulate) sound, perceiver, and knower?

Vedāntist: Is it not contradictory to say of him, who is known through the act of hearing etc., that “He thinks without being thought of, he knows without being known” (Br. III. viii. 11, Ke. I. i. 6), and that “You cannot think that which is the thinker of thought; you cannot know that which is the knower of knowledge” (Br. III. iv. 2) etc.?

Opponent: True, it will involve a contradiction if the individual soul is known directly like happiness etc. But as a fact, direct perception is denied by "You cannot think that which is the thinker of thought" etc. But he is known through such inferential ground as hearing. Hence how can there be a contradiction?

Vedāntist: How is he known even through such ground of inference as hearing? For when the Self is engaged in hearing an audible sound, it cannot have the actions of thinking and knowing with regard to itself or anything else, since it is engrossed in the mere act of hearing. So also with regard to other acts like thinking. And the acts of hearing etc. pertain to their own objects only (and not to their subjects); not that the act of thinking by the thinker can occur with regard to anything outside the thinkable.¹

Opponent: Is not the mind able to think of everything?

Vedāntist: Truly this is so; still no thinkable can be thought of without the thinker.²

Opponent: Granted this is so, what follows?

Answer: This will be accruing result here. He who is the thinker of all will simply be the thinker, and he will not be an object of thought. And there is not a second thinker who can think of that thinker. Should he be thinkable by the Self, then there will be two Selves—the one being the Self by which the (thinking) Self is thought of and the other Self which is thought of. Or the same Self will be split

¹The Self is not a thinkable object.

²Mind being only an instrument for the Self, an agent has to be posited to make the act of thinking possible. *

into two halves, like a bamboo, to become the thinker and the thinkable. But it is illogical either way. This is analogous to the case of two lamps which, because of their similarity, cannot be (mutually) the illuminator and the illumined. Besides, the thinker, while engaged in thinking the thinkable object, has no time left out from the process of thinking during which to think of himself.¹ Even on the supposition that the thinker thinks of the Self through the grounds of inference, there will spring up two Selves—the one that is inferred through logical grounds, and the other that infers. Or the same Self will be split up. And so there will be the defect already mentioned.

Objection: If the Self be not known either through perception or inference, why is it said, "One should realise thus: 'He is my Self?'" (Kau. III. 9)? Or why is the Self called the thinker and the hearer?

Answer: Is it not a fact that the Self is possessed of such qualities as the capacity of hearing;² and is it not well known (in the Upaniṣads) that It is free from such qualities as the capacity of hearing? What inconsistency do you find here?

Opponent: Though it may not strike you as incongruous, to me it is so.

Vedāntist: How?

Opponent: When the Self is a hearer, It is not a thinker; and when It is a thinker, It is not a hearer. That being so, It becomes a hearer and a thinker

¹The mind engages not in the Self but in things external to It.

²The Self is the eternal hearer, seer, etc.

from one point of view, while from another It is neither a hearer nor a thinker. So with regard to other situations. That being so, how can you avoid the feeling of an irreconcilability in the face of the doubt that crops up as to whether the Self possessed of the capacity to hear etc., or possessed of the opposite quality of not being able to hear etc.? At the time when Devadatta moves he is not stationary, but is moving to be sure; and when he is motionless, he is not moving, but staying on. During such a period he can be either moving or staying as an only exclusive alternative; but he cannot be both moving and staying continuously. The same is the case here. Similar (also) is the view, in this matter, of the followers of Kaṇāda and others, according to whom the Self is called a hearer, a thinker, and so on because of Its being occasionally possessed of hearing etc. For they say that the knowledge is a product of contact (between the mind and the senses), and that this contact is not simultaneous. And (as a proof) they adduce such an argument as: "My mind was occupied with some other object, so I did not see this." And (they argue that) it is proper to accept the non-simultaneity of knowledge as a logical ground for inferring the existence of mind.¹ Let this be so. What do you lose if it be so?

Vedāntist: Let it be so if it be logical and if it

¹If the mind did not exist, then all the senses, when simultaneously in contact with their objects, would perceive all the objects. But this is not a fact. So the Vaiśeṣikas believe in an atomic mind that gets connected with the senses in succession.

pleases you. But it cannot be the meaning of the Upaniṣads.

Opponent: Is it not implied by the Upaniṣads that the Self is the hearer, thinker, etc.?

Vedāntist: No, since there is the statement that It is not the hearer, thinker, etc.¹

Opponent: Was not that position denied by you by saying that It is occasionally so?

Vedāntist: No, for by me the Self is accepted as the eternal hearer etc., according to the Vedic text, "For the listener's function of hearing can never be lost" etc. (Br. IV. iii. 27).

Objection: If on that view eternal hearing is admitted, there will be the simultaneous origin of (all kinds of) knowledge that will contradict experience; besides, this will lead to the assumption of absence of ignorance in the Self. And that is unacceptable.

Answer: Neither of the defects arises, since according to the Upaniṣads, the Self can become the hearer etc. through Its (inherent) power of hearing etc.² (Br. III. iv. 2). The seeing etc., by the impermanent and gross eyes etc. that are subject to conjunction and disjunction (with their objects), are impermanent indeed, just as is the burning of fire because of its production from contact with hay etc. Not that the eternal and formless Self, which is free from the attributes of conjunction and disjunction, can have transitory qualities like seeing etc. that are caused by contact. In support of this is the Vedic text: "The

¹Seems to be a reference to Br. IV. iv. 2.

²By virtue of Its being the witness of all mental changes involved in the acts of hearing etc.

vision of the witness can never be lost" etc. (Br. IV. iii. 23). From this it follows that there are two kinds of vision—the transitory vision of the eye and the eternal vision of the Self. Similarly, there are two kinds of hearing—the transitory hearing of the ear and the eternal hearing of the Self. So also are there two kinds of thinking and two sorts of knowing—the external and the internal. For on this view alone, and in the way it has been shown, does the Vedic text "The seer of seeing and the hearer of hearing" (Br. III. iv. 2) become justifiable. It is a matter of experience, too, that the vision of the eye is non-eternal, inasmuch as it is lost or regained in accordance as the disease, called *Timira*, sets in or is cured. Similar is the case with hearing and thinking. And the eternity of the vision of the Self is well known in the world, for a man whose eyes have been plucked out says, "My brother has been seen by me, in dream today." Similarly, a man who is known to be deaf may say, "A *mantra* has been heard by me today in dream", etc. Should the eternal vision of the Self be produced merely through the contact of the eye, it should be destroyed on the destruction of the latter: and then a man whose eyes are plucked out should not perceive blue, yellow, etc. in dream. Moreover, such Vedic texts as, "The vision of the witness can never be lost" etc. (Br. IV. iii. 23), would be illogical; and the same will be the fate of such Vedic texts as, "That is the eye in a man through which one sees in a dream." The logical position is this: The eternal vision of the Self witnesses the ephemeral external vision; but since the external vision has such changing

attributes as growth and decay, the vision of the Self that witnesses it, appears accordingly and seems to be ephemeral owing to the error of men. The case is similar to that of the vision fixed in a whirling fire-brand or such other things, where the vision seems to be revolving (as the latter does). And in confirmation of this is the Vedic text, "It thinks as it were, and shakes as it were" (Br. IV. iii. 7). Hence the vision of the Self being eternal, it can have neither simultaneity, nor the opposite of it. But for the ordinary people, owing to their preoccupation with the external limiting adjuncts, and for the logicians, owing to their remaining outside scriptural tradition, it is quite possible to have the erroneous idea that the vision of the Self is impermanent.

The imagination of difference among God, the individual soul, and the supreme Self can also be traced to this error; and equally erroneous it is to fancy such ideas as "it is", "it is not" with regard to the eternal and unconditioned vision of that Entity in which all the variations of speech and mind (i.e. name and form) get unified. He who entertains, with regard to that Reality beyond all speech and mind, any idea of fancying that It exists, or It does not exist; that It is one, or that It is many; that It has attributes, or that It has not; that It knows, or that It does not; that It is active, or that It is not; that It is fruitful, or that It is fruitless; that It has a seed, or that It is seedless; that It is happiness, or that It is misery; that It is inside, or that It is outside; that It is void, or that It is not; or that It is different from me, or that It is I;—(that man) may as well wish to roll up the sky

like leather, to ascend there with his feet, or to trace the footprints of the fish and birds in water and sky; for the Vedic texts declare: "Not this, not this" (Br. III. ix. 26), "From which words turn back" (Tai. II.iv.1), and so on. And there is the *mantra* text, "Who indeed knows?" etc. (R.I.xxx.6).

Objection: How does he, then, get the realisation. "He is my Self"? Tell me, how can I realise Him as, "He is my Self."

Answer: Apropos of this, they relate a story: An idiot, who committed some guilt was told, "Fie on you! You are no man!" Because of his stupidity he approached somebody to get the conviction that he was a man and told him, "Tell me who I am." The latter understood his silliness and said, "I shall make you understand by degrees." And then after proving that he was not a motionless thing, and so on, he (the teacher) concluded with, "You are none other than a man." That dullard then told him, "You who started to enlighten me have become silent. Why do you not instruct me?" That sentence of yours is just like this. How can he, who does not understand himself to be a man when told, "You are none other than a man," understand himself to be a man even when told, "You are a man"? Therefore the process to be followed in enlightening about the Self is as it is set forth in the scriptures and nothing else; for hay etc. that can be consumed by fire are not burnt by anything else. It is because of this that the scripture, which started to impart knowledge about the nature of the Self, stopped after declaring "Not this, not this" (Br. III. ix. 26), just as it was done in the story after denying all that was

other than man. And similar are the texts, "Without interior or exterior" (Br. II. v. 19, III. viii. 8), "This Self, the perceiver of everything, is Brahman. This is the teaching" (Br. II. v. 19), "Thou art That" (Ch. VI. viii-xvi), "But when to the knower of Brahman, everything has become the Self, what should one see and through what?" (Br. II. iv. 14, IV. v. 15); and there are still others.

As long as one does not realise thus this Self that has been described, so long does one accept the limiting adjunct,¹ possessed of the external and impermanent vision, as one's Self; and considering through ignorance the attributes of the limiting adjuncts as one's own, one transmigrates under the influence of ignorance, desire, and action, by rotating again and again through the regions of the gods, animals, and men, that range from Brahma to a clump of grass. While transmigrating thus, one rejects the body assumed earlier, and giving it up, accepts another. In the course of showing what states one experiences as one continues thus without a break in the current of birth and death, as though in a river, the Upaniṣad says with a view to generating detachment:

ॐ पुरुषे ह वा अयमादितो गर्भो भवति यदेतद्व्रतः ।
 तदेतत्सर्वेभ्योऽङ्गेभ्यस्तेजः संभूतमात्मन्येवाऽऽत्मानं
 विभर्ति तद्यदा स्त्रियां सिञ्चत्यथैनज्जनयति तदस्य
 प्रथमं जन्म ॥१॥

¹The mind whose vision is identical with itself and is external to the Self.

1. In man indeed is the soul first conceived. That which is the semen is extracted from all the limbs as their vigour. He holds that self of his in his own self. When he sheds it into his wife, then he procreates it. That is its first birth.

This very man performs such *karmas* as sacrifice etc. owing to his self-identification with ignorance, desire, and action; then he reaches the lunar region after passing from this world through smoke and the rest in succession; and then, when the fruits of his action become exhausted, he reaches this world to become food after passing in succession through rain etc.; then he is poured as a libation in the fire that is man. *Puruṣe ha vai*, in that man indeed; *ayam*, that, transmigrating soul; *āditalḥ garbhalḥ bhavati*, is first conceived, in the form of semen after passing through the juice of food etc. This is being stated by saying that he takes birth in that form in the text: “*Yat etat retalḥ.*” *Yat etat retalḥ*, that which is this semen; *sambhūtam*, is accomplished, (extracted); as *tejas*, vigour, essence, of the body; *sarvebhyalḥ aṅgebhyalḥ*, from all the limbs, from all the component parts, such as the juice of the body that is the product of food. Being identified with the man himself, this (semen) is called his self. He *bibharti*, bears; that *ātmānam*, self that has been conceived in the form of semen; *ātmani eva*, in his own self:—(in other words) he holds his own self (the semen) in his own body. *Yadā*, when—when his wife is in the proper state; he *siñcati*, sheds, while in union; *tat*, that semen; *striyām*, in the wife—in the fire of the woman; *atha*, then; the father; *jana-*

yati, procreates; *enat*, this one—that was conceived by him as identified with himself. *Asya*, of that transmigrating soul; *tat*, that, that issuing out of its own place, in the form of semen, when it is being poured out; is the *prathamam janma*, the first birth—the first manifested state. This fact was stated earlier by the text, “This self (that is the man), (offers) this self of his (that is the semen), to that self of his (that is the wife).”

तत्स्त्रिया आत्मभूयं गच्छति यथा स्वमङ्गं तथा ।
तस्मादेनां न हिनस्ति । साऽस्यैतमात्मानमत्र गतं
भावयति ॥२॥

2. That becomes non-different from the wife, just as much as her own limb is. Therefore (the foetus) does not hurt her. She nourishes this self of his that has entered here (in her womb).

Tat, that, the semen; *gacchati*, becomes; *ātma-bhūyam*, non-different—from the wife into whom it is shed; *yathā svam aṅgam tathā*, just like her own limb—her breast etc.—as it was in the case of the father. *Tasmāt*, because of this fact; the foetus *na hinasti*, does not hurt—like a boil; *enām*, this one—the mother. Since it has become a part of herself just like her breast etc., therefore it does not hurt her; this is the idea. *Sā*, she, that pregnant woman; understanding *etam ātmānam*, this self, of her husband *atra gatam*, as having entered here—into her womb;

bhāvayati, nourishes, protects it—by avoiding the food etc. that are injurious to the foetus and by accepting such food etc. as are favourable to it.

सा भावयित्री भावयितव्या भवति । तं स्त्री गर्भ
बिर्भति । सोऽग्र एव कुमारं जन्मनोऽग्रेऽधिभावयति ।
स यत्कुमारं जन्मनोऽग्रेऽधिभावयत्यात्मानमेव तद्भावय-
त्येषां लोकानां सन्तत्या । एवं सन्तता हीमे लोकास्त-
दस्य द्वितीयं जन्म ॥३॥

3- She, the nourisher, becomes fit to be nourished. The wife bears that embryo (before the birth). He (the father) protects the son at the very start, soon after his birth. That he protects the son at the very beginning, just after birth, thereby he protects his own self for the sake of the continuance of these worlds. For thus is the continuance of these worlds ensured. That is his second birth.

Sā, she; the *bhāvayitrī*, nourisher, of the self of her husband, conceived in her womb; *bhāvayitavyā bhavati*, becomes fit to be nourished, to be protected, by the husband; for no one can have any relation with another unless it be through reciprocity of benefit. *Strī*, the wife; *bibharti*, bears; *tam garbham*, that foetus, by following the method of protecting the foetus mentioned earlier; *agre*, before its birth. *Sal*, he, the father; *bhāvayati*, protects; *kumāram*, the son; *agre eva*, at the very start, as soon as he is born;

janmanah adhi, after the birth; through natal rites etc. *Yat*, that; *salḥ*, he, the father; *bhāvayati*, protects; the *kumāram*, son; *agre janmanah adhi*, at the very start, just after the birth; through natal rites etc.; *tat*, thereby; he *bhāvayati ātmānam eva*, protects his own self. For it is the father's self that takes birth as the son. And so it has been said, "The husband enters into the wife" (Hari. III. lxxiii. 31). Now is being stated why the father protects himself after being born as the son: *eṣām lokānām santatyai*, for the continuance of these worlds, i.e. for their non-stoppage. For these worlds will cease to continue if everyone should stop procreating sons etc. The idea is this: Since these worlds thus continue to flow like a current through the continuity of such acts as the begetting of sons, therefore these acts should be undertaken for the non-stoppage of the worlds, but not so for the sake of emancipation. *Tat*, that fact, the issuing out; *asya*, of him, of the transmigrating soul; as a son from the mother's womb; is the *dvitīyam janma*, second birth, the manifestation of the second state, relatively to his form as semen.

सोऽस्यायमात्मा पुण्येभ्यः कर्मभ्यः प्रतिधीयते ।
अथास्यायमितर आत्मा कृतकृत्यो वयोगतः प्रैति । स
इतः प्रयत्नेव पुनर्जायते तदस्य तृतीयं जन्म ॥४॥

4. This self of his (viz the son) is substituted (by the father) for the performance of virtuous deeds. Then this other self of his (that is the father of the son), having got his duties ended

and having advanced in age, departs. As soon as he departs, he takes birth again. That is his (i.e. the son's) third birth.

Salḥ ayam ātmā, that self that is the son; *asya*, of his, of the father; *puṇyebhyaḥ karmabhyaḥ*, for the performance of virtuous deeds, as prescribed by the scriptures; *pratidhīyate*, is substituted, by the father, in his own place, for the accomplishment of all that was the father's duty. Similarly, it is seen in the Vājasaneyaka, in the portion dealing with the substitution (of the son), that on being instructed by the father, the son admits thus: "I am Brahman (i.e. the Vedas), I am the sacrifice"¹ (Br. I.v. 17). *Atha*, after that, after the father's responsibility has been entrusted to the son, *ayam itarāḥ ātmā*, this other self, that is the father; *asya*, of this one, of the son; *kṛtakṛtyaḥ*, becoming freed from duties, from the three debts (to gods, to seers, and to Manes) having all his duties fulfilled; *vayogataḥ*, having advanced in age being afflicted with decrepitude; *praiti*, dies. *Salḥ itaḥ prayan eva* as soon as he departs from here, no sooner does he leave the body than; he *punaḥ jīyate*, takes birth again; by adopting another body according to the results of his actions (by moving from one body to the other) just like a leech. *Tat*, that, the birth that he gets after death; is *asya*, his *ṛtīyam janma*, third birth.

¹The father's idea is this: "Let the study of the Vedas (Brahman) which so long was my duty, devolve on you, for you are Brahman. Similarly, whatever sacrifices there are, that were to be performed by me, be henceforth performed by you, for you are the sacrifices." All this the son accepts (See Śaṅkara's commentary on the passage).

Objection: Is it not a fact that for the transmigrating soul the first birth is in the form of semen from the father? And his second birth has been stated to be as a son from the mother. The turn now being for stating the third birth of that very soul (which became the son), why is the birth of the dead father enumerated as the third?

Answer: That is not wrong: for the intention is to speak of the identity of the father and the son. That son, too, just like his father, entrusts his responsibility to his son (in his own turn) and then departing from here takes birth immediately after. The Upaniṣad thinks that this fact which is stated with regard to another (viz the father) is implied here (with regard to the son) also; for the father and the son have the same self.

तदुक्तमृषिणा

गर्भे नु सन्नन्वेषामवेद-

महं देवानां जनिमानि विश्वा

शतं मा पुर आयसीररक्ष-

न्नधः श्येनो जवसा निरदीयमिति ।

गर्भ एवैतच्छयानो वामदेव एवमुवाच ॥५॥

5. This fact was stated by the seer (i.e. *mantra*): “Even while lying in the womb, I came to know of the birth of all the gods. A hundred iron citadels held me down. Then, like a hawk, I forced my way through by dint of knowledge of the Self.” Vāmadeva said this while still lying in the mother’s womb.

Transmigrating in this way, ever involved in the chain of birth and death through the manifestation of the three states, everyone remains merged in the ocean of this world. If he ever succeeds somehow, in any of the states, to realise the Self as revealed in the Vedas, he becomes freed then and there from all worldly bondages and gets all his duties fulfilled. The Upaniṣad says that *tat*, this fact; *uktam*, was declared; *ṛṣiṇā*, by the seer, by the (following) *mantra*; also: “*Garbhe nu san*, while still in the womb, of my mother. The (indeclinable) word *nu* implies deliberation. By virtue of the fruition of my meditations in many previous births, *aham*, I; *anvavedam*, knew; had the knowledge of; *viśvā janimāni*, all the births; *eṣām devānām*, of these gods—of Speech, Fire, etc. What a good luck! *Śatam*, a hundred, many; *āyasīḥ* (or rather *āyasyaḥ*) *purāḥ*, citadels made of iron, that is to say impenetrable bodies as though made of iron; *arākṣan mā*, kept me guarded; *adhaḥ*, in the lower worlds; guarded me from getting freed from the meshes of the world. (Or *adhaḥ*, later on);¹ *śyenaḥ*, like a hawk; *javasū*, forcefully, through the power generated by the knowledge of the Self; *nirādīyam*, I came out, by tearing through the net. O the wonder!” *Vāmadevaḥ*, Vāmadeva, the seer; *garbhe eva śayānaḥ*, while still lying in the womb; *uvāca*, said; *etat*, this; *evam*, in this way.

स एवं विद्वानस्माच्छरीरभेदादूर्ध्वं उत्क्रम्यामुष्मिन्

¹Ānanda Giri gives these two alternative explanations of the word *adhaḥ* occurring in the commentary. There are two readings, *adho'dhaḥ* and *Adho'tha*.

स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान् कामानाप्त्वाऽमृतः समभवत्
समभवत् ॥६॥

इत्यंतरेयोपनिषदि द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥

6. He who had known thus (had) become identified with the Supreme, and attained all desirable things (even here); and having (then) ascended higher up after the destruction of the body, he became immortal, in the world of the Self. He became immortal.

Sah, he, the seer Vāmadeva; *evam vidyān*, having known thus, known the Self as spoken of earlier; became *ūrdhvalḥ*, uplifted, identified with the supreme Self; and *asmāt śarīrabhedāt*, after the destruction of this body—of this body that is conjured up by ignorance, that is impenetrable like iron; on the dissolution of the succession of bodies—subject to many evils consisting in birth, death, etc.—through the power generated by the tasting of the knowledge of the supreme Self; that is to say, on the destruction of the body following the destruction of such causes as ignorance that are the seeds of the creation of the body; he *ūrdhvalḥ* (*san*), having already become identified with the supreme Self; (then) *utkramya*, having ascended higher up as compared with the lowly worldly state, becoming established in the state of the pure, all-pervasive Self, shining with knowledge; *amuṣmin*, in that Reality, which was described as ageless, deathless, immortal, fearless, and omniscient, which has no cause or effect; inside or outside, which is of the

nature of the unalloyed nectar of consciousness; he became merged like the blowing out of a lamp. He *samabhavat*, became; *amṛtaḥ*, immortal; *svarge loke*, in his own Self, in his own reality; *sarvān kāmān āptvā*, after the attainment of all desires; that is to say, after having got all the desirable things, even earlier (when still living), by virtue of his becoming desireless through the knowledge of the Self. The repetition in "he became" is to show the end of the knowledge of the Self together with its fruit and its illustration.

PART III
CHAPTER I

There are Brāhmaṇas of modern times who crave for emancipation, hanker after the knowledge of Brahman, and realise that the achievement of identity with the Self of all follows from its (own) means, viz the knowledge of Brahman, as revealed by the Vedas through the succession of teachers like Vāmadeva and well known in the councils of the knowers of Brahman. These Brāhmaṇas of modern times become desirous of desisting from the impermanent world of ends and means, inclusive of being born as limited souls; and with a view to this they ask each other thus, while engaged in deliberation: “*Kaḥ ayam ātmā* etc.—what is It that we worship as this Self?” How do they ask?

ॐ कोऽयमात्मेति वयमुपास्महे कतरः स आत्मा ।
येन वा पश्यति येन वा शृणोति येन वा गन्धानाजिघ्रति
येन वा वाचं व्याकरोति येन वा स्वादु चास्वादु च
विजानाति ॥१॥

1. What is It that we worship as this Self? Which of the two is the Self? Is It that by which one sees, or that by which one hears, or that by which one smells odour, or that by which one utters speech, or that by which one tastes the sweet or the sour?

The Self which *vayam upāsmāhe*, we worship; directly *ayam ātmā iti*, as this Self; *kaḥ*, what, is It? And we worship that very Self, by meditating on which directly as "This is the Self", Vāmadeva became immortal. What indeed is that Self? When they were thus questioning each other with such eagerness to know, then from the Vedic texts, "Brahman¹ entered into this person through the two ends of the feet", and "Having split up this end, He entered through this door" (Ai. II. i. 12), called up by the mental impression created (in the past) as a result of hearing (the Vedas), there flashed in their minds the fact, "Two Brahman entered from opposite sides. And these two are the souls in this body. One of these selves is fit to be worshipped." While still engaged in discussion, they again asked each other with a view to determining clearly the Self that was to be worshipped out of the two. As they were discussing, there arose in them another thought regarding the one that should be the object of close enquiry. How? Two entities are perceived in this body: One is the instrument, diversified into many forms, through which one perceives; and the other is the perceiver, inferable from the fact of the occurrence of recognition through memory of what was perceived with a different sense.² Of these two, the one through which one perceives cannot be the Self. Through what,

¹Prāṇa, the inferior Brahman.

²A man, with eyes plucked out, remembers the colour he had perceived before with his eyes. So also he thinks, "I who saw before am hearing now." This is impossible unless the perceiver is one in the different situations.

again, does one perceive? That is being stated: *Yena vā paśyati*, that by which, transformed as eye, one sees colour; *Yena vā*, that by which, transformed as ear, *śṛṇoti*, one hears sound; *yena vā*, that by which, transformed as the sense of smell, *ājighrati gandhān*, one smells the odours; *yena vā*, that by which, transformed as the organ of speech, one *vyākaroti vācam*, utters speech, consisting of names, such as cow, horse, etc., and good, bad, etc.; *yena vā*, that by which, transformed as the sense of taste, *vijānāti*, one perceives *svādu ca asvādu ca*, the sweet and the sour (tastes).

Which, again, is that one organ that has become diversely differentiated? That is being answered:

यदेतद्दृढदयं मनश्चैतत् । संज्ञानमाज्ञानं विज्ञानं प्रज्ञानं
मेधा दृष्टिर्धृतिर्मतिर्मनीषा जूतिः स्मृतिः संकल्पः क्रतुरसुः
कामो वश इति । सर्वाण्येवैतानि प्रज्ञानस्य नामधेयानि
भवन्ति ॥२॥

2. It is this heart (intellect) and this mind that were stated earlier. It is sentience, rulership, secular knowledge, presence of mind, retentiveness, sense-perception, fortitude, thinking, genius, mental suffering, memory, ascertainment, resolution, life-activities, hankering, passion, and such others. All these verily are the names of Consciousness.

Etat, it is; *hṛdayam manah ca*, the heart and mind;¹ *yat*, that were spoken of earlier, in "The essence (i.e. the product) of all beings is the heart; the essence of the heart is the mind; by the mind was created water and Varuṇa; from the heart came the mind; and from the mind Moon". That very thing, that is but one, has become multiformed. Through this single internal organ, as transformed into the eye, one sees colour; through this, transformed into ear, one hears; through this, transformed into the sense of smell, one smells; through this, transformed into the sense of taste, one tastes; through this very one, in its aspect as the organ of deliberation, one deliberates; and in its aspect as the heart (i.e. the intellect), one decides. Therefore this is the one single organ which acts with regard to all objects of the senses, so that the perceiver may perceive everything. Similar is the text of the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad: "Becoming identified with the organ of speech through the intellect (as reflecting the consciousness of the Self), the Self reaches (i.e. becomes identified with) the names² etc." (III. 6). And in the Vājasaneyaka occur these: "It is through the mind that one hears" (Br. I. v. 3), "for one knows colours through the heart" (Br. III. ix. 19), etc.

¹The entity you asked about is the same as was referred to earlier as the heart (i.e. intellect), or the mind. This entity is the vital force that assumes various aspects. It entered through the tip of the feet, whereas Brahman entered through the crown of the head.

²The intellect becomes transformed into the organ of speech, and speech into words. The Self, too, through superimposed self-identification, seems to assume those forms, though it still remains as their illuminator.

Accordingly, the entity that is called the heart and the mind is well known as the agent producing perception. And the vital force (Prāṇa) consists of these two, for there occurs the *brāhmaṇa* text: "That which is the vital force is the intellect; that which is the intellect is the vital force" (Kau. III. 3). And we said in the texts dealing with the conversations with the vital force and so on (Bṛ. I. iii, VI. i. 7-14; Pr. II.) that the vital force is in essence a combination of the organs. Therefore the entity, (in the form of which) Brahman entered through the feet, cannot be the Self to be worshipped, since it is a subsidiary thing, being an instrument of perception for the perceiver. As a last resort, they arrived at this certitude: "That witnessing Self is worthy of worship by us, for whose perception the functions of this instrument, in its aspects as the heart and the mind, are being stated."

The functions of that inner organ—with regard to internal and external objects—that take place for bearing witness to the witnessing Brahman¹ that is consciousness by nature and that exists in the midst of Its limiting adjunct, viz the internal organ, are (these that are) being enumerated: *Samjñānam*, sentience, the state of consciousness; *ājñānam*, rulership, the state of lordliness; *vijñānam*, (secular) knowledge of arts etc.; *prajñānam*, presence of mind; *medhā*, ability to understand and retain the purport of books; *dṛṣṭiḥ*, perception, of all objects through the senses; *dhṛtiḥ*, fortitude, by which the drooping body and

¹Brahman cannot be perceived since It is not an object of cognition, and It is attributeless. Still, without being objectified, It is perceivable as the witness of mental states.—A.G.

senses are buoyed up—for they say, “By fortitude they buoyed up the body”; *matih*, thinking; *manīṣā*, independent thinking (genius); *jūtiḥ*, mental suffering, owing to disease etc.; *smṛtiḥ*, memory; *saṃkalpaḥ*, ascertaining, of colours etc. as white, black etc.; *kratuḥ*, resolution; *asuḥ*, any function calculated to sustain life’s activity, such as breathing etc.; *kāmaḥ*, desire for a remote object, hankering; *vaśāḥ*, passion for the company of women; *iti*, etc., and other functions of the inner organ. Since these are the means for the perception of the witness who is mere Consciousness, they are the limiting adjuncts of Brahman that is pure Consciousness, and therefore *saṃjñāna* etc. become the names of Brahman. *Sarvāṇi eva etāni*, all these verily; *bhavanti*, become; *nāmadheyāni*, the indirect names; *prajñānasya*, of Consciousness, but not so naturally and directly. And so it has been said, “When It does the function of living, It is called the vital force” (Br. I. iv. 7) etc.

एष ब्रह्मैष इन्द्र एष प्रजापतिरेते सर्वे देवा इमानि
 च पञ्च महाभूतानि पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो
 ज्योतीषीत्येतानीमानि च क्षुद्रमिश्राणीव । बीजानीतराणि
 चेताराणि चाण्डजानि च जारुजानि च स्वेदजानि
 चोद्भिज्जानि चाश्वा गावः पुरुषा हस्तिनो यत्किंचेदं
 प्राणि जङ्गमं च पतत्रि च यच्च स्थावरं सर्वं तत्प्रज्ञा-
 नेत्रम् प्रज्ञाने प्रतिष्ठितं प्रज्ञानेत्रो लोकः प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठा
 प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म ॥३॥

3. This One is (the inferior) Brahman; this is Indra, this is Prajāpati; this is all these gods; and this is these five elements, viz earth, air, space, water, fire; and this is all these (big creatures), together with the small ones, that are the procreators of others and referable in pairs—to wit, those that are born of eggs, of wombs, of moisture, of the earth, viz horses, cattle, men, elephants, and all the creatures that there are which move or fly and those which do not move. All these have Consciousness as the giver of their reality; all these are impelled by Consciousness; the universe has Consciousness as its eye, and Consciousness is its end. Consciousness is Brahman.

Eṣah, this One, the Self which is essentially Consciousness; is *brahma*, Brahman, the inferior one (who is Hiranyagarbha and) who as the vital force (possessed of the power of action) and the conscious soul (possessed of the power of knowledge) exists in (the sum total of) all the bodies (i.e. in the cosmic gross body) after having entered into all the limiting adjuncts of the internal organs (i.e. into the cosmic subtle body) like the reflection of the sun on diverse waters. He is the power of action and knowledge (in the individual). *Eṣah*, this One; is verily *indraḥ*, Indra, who is called so because He possesses the qualities (mentioned earlier in Ai. I. iii. 13–14); or “Indra” means the lord of the gods. *Eṣah*, this One; is

prajāpatiḥ, Prajāpati (Virāt) who is the first embodied Being¹. That Prājapati, from whom the presiding deities of the organs, viz Fire and others, were born after the formation of the cavity of the mouth etc., is verily this One. And *ete sarve devāḥ*, all these gods, viz Fire and others, that there are, are but this One; *ca*, and; *imāni pañca mahābhūtāni*, these five great elements; viz *etāni*, these—starting with earth—that are the materials of all the bodies and that constitute the foods and the eaters; *ca imāni*, moreover these also, e.g. snakes etc. that are *kṣudramiśrāṇi iva*, mixed with small creatures, the word *iva* being meaningless; and that are *bījāni*, the seeds, causes (of others); *ca itarāṇi itarāṇi* as well as those others and others, that are mentionable in pairs (e.g. the moving and the stationary). Which are they? They are being enumerated: *Aṇḍajāni*, born of eggs—birds and others; *jārujāni*, born of wombs—men and others; *svedajāni*, born of moisture—lice etc.; *udbhijjāni*, born of earth—e.g. trees etc.; *aśvāḥ*, horses; *gāvah*, cattle; *puruṣāḥ*, human beings; *hastinaḥ*, elephants; and *yat kim ca idam*, and whatever living creature there may be. Which are they? Whichever is *jaṅgamam*, moving on feet; and whichever is *patatri*, flying in the sky; and whatever is *sthāvaram*, motionless. All that is but this One. *Tat sarvam*, all that, without exception, is *prajāñetram*, made to exist by Consciousness, (the phrase being derived thus): *Prajñū* is Consciousness that is the same as Brahman: *netra* is that by which one is dowered with substance, or that by

¹Hiranyagarbha identifies Himself with the cosmic subtle body, but Virāt with the cosmic gross body.

which one is impelled (to one's natural activity); therefore that which has Consciousness as the giver of its substance or as its impeller is *prajñānetra*. *Prajñāne pratiṣṭhitam*, on Consciousness it is established, that is to say, it is supported by Brahman during creation, existence, and dissolution. The sentence "*prajñānetraḥ lokah*, the universe has Consciousness as its impeller", is to be understood as before; or the meaning is that all the universe has got Consciousness as its *netra*, eye (i.e. the source of revelation). *Prajñā*, Consciousness; is *pratiṣṭhā* the support, of the whole universe.¹ Therefore *prajñānam brahma*, Consciousness is Brahman.

That Entity, thus dealt with, when freed from all distinctions created by the limiting adjuncts, is without stain, without taint, without action, quiescent, one without a second, "Not this, not this" (Br. III. ix. 26), to be known by the elimination of all attributes, and beyond all words and thoughts. That very Entity that is God, the omniscient, and the ordainer of the common seed of all the unmanifested universe - assumes the name of *antaryāmi* (the Inner Controller) by virtue of guiding. That Entity Itself assumes the name of Hiranyagarbha, identifying Himself with (cosmic) intelligence that is the seed of the unmanifested world. That Entity Itself gets the name of Virāṭ, that is Prajāpati, by assuming as His limiting

¹Consciousness is self-revealing and is not dependent on any other factor for the revelation of Itself or of others. Or the sentence may mean that Consciousness is the one reality in which all phenomenal things end, just as the superimposed snake etc. end in their bases, the rope etc., after the dawn of knowledge.

adjunct the (gross, cosmic) body that is born first within the cosmic egg; and It becomes known by the names of the (cosmic) deities such as Fire and others, who originate from that egg. Similarly, Brahman gets the respective names and forms as conditioned by the divergent bodies, ranging from that of Brahmā to that of a clump of grass. It is the same entity that has become diversified under all the conditions and is known in every way and is thought of multifariously by all creatures as well as the logicians. "Some call this very Entity Fire, some call It Manu, and some Prajāpati. Some call It Indra, while others call It Prāṇa (vital force) and still others the eternal Brahman" etc. (Manu XII. 123).

स एतेन प्राज्ञेनाऽऽत्मनाऽस्माल्लोकादुत्क्रम्यामुष्मि-
न्स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान् कामानाप्त्वाऽमृतः समभवत्
समभवत् ॥४॥

इत्यैतरेयोपनिषदि तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥

4. Through this Self that is Consciousness, he ascended higher up from this world, and getting all desires fulfilled in that heavenly world, he became immortal, he became immortal.

Sah, he Vāmadeva or somebody else; knew thus the Brahman as described; through the Self that is Consciousness—through that very conscious Self by which the seers of old became immortal. Similarly,

this one, too, *etena prājñena ātmanā*, through (i.e. in identification with) this (very) Self that is Consciousness; *asmāt lokāt utkrāmya*, ascending higher up from this world. The portion starting from here was explained before (Ai. II. i. 6). Ascending higher up from this world and *sarvān kāmān āptvā*, attaining all the desires; *amuṣmin svarge loke*, in that heavenly world; (he) *samabhavat*, became; *amṛtaḥ*, immortal; *samabhavat*, (he) became (immortal). *Om*.

ॐ वाङ् मे मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता मनो मे वाचि प्रतिष्ठितमाविरावीर्म एधि वेदस्य म आणीस्थः श्रुतं मे मा प्रहासीरनेनाधीतेनाहोरात्रान् संदधाम्यृतं वदिष्यामि सत्यं वदिष्यामि तन्मामवतु तद्वक्तारमवत्ववतु मामवतु वक्तारमवतु वक्तारम् ॥

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

MUNDAKA UPANISAD

ॐ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवा
 भद्रं पश्येमाक्षभिर्यजत्राः ।
 स्थिरैरङ्गैस्तुष्टुवाग्‌सस्तनूभि-
 व्यंशेम देवहितं यदायुः ॥
 स्वस्ति न इन्द्रो वृद्धश्रवाः
 स्वस्ति नः पूषा विश्ववेदाः ।
 स्वस्ति नस्ताक्षर्यो अरिष्टनेमिः
 स्वस्ति नो बृहस्पतिर्दधातु ॥
 ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

Om! O gods, may we hear auspicious words with the ears; while engaged in sacrifices, may we see auspicious things with the eyes; while praising the gods with steady limbs, may we enjoy a life that is beneficial to the gods.

May Indra of ancient fame be auspicious to us; may the supremely rich (or all-knowing) Pūṣā (god of the earth) be propitious to us; may Garuḍa, the destroyer of evil, be well disposed towards us; may Bṛhaspati ensure our welfare.

Om! Peace! Peace! Peace!

MUNḌAKA UPANIṢAD

FIRST MUNḌAKA

CANTO I

Introduction: The Upaniṣad, commencing with “*Om brahmā devānām*” etc. belongs to the Atharva-Veda, (and it is being explained). By way of eulogy, the Upaniṣad itself reveals at the very beginning the connection, forged by a succession of teachers of the knowledge, that this Upaniṣad has (with the knowledge of Brahman). Thus with a view to arousing the interest of the hearers, the knowledge itself is being extolled by showing that this knowledge, that is a means for the highest human goal, was acquired with strenuous effort by great people. For, when this knowledge is made attractive by praise, they will engage in it. As to how this knowledge is related to its purpose (or goal), like a means to its end, will be spoken later on in “the knot of the heart gets untied” etc.¹ (Mu. II. ii. 8). And here, too, the Upaniṣad itself first distinguishes between the superior and inferior knowledge and then, through the text beginning with “remaining within the fold of ignorance” etc. (Mu. I. ii. 8), declares that the knowledge, called the inferior one, comprising the Ṛg-Veda etc. and devoted merely to injunction and prohibition, does not possess the power of removing the defects of ignorance etc. that

¹The purpose of the knowledge being shown thus, the purpose of the Upaniṣad is shown *pari passu*.

are the causes of the worldly state; and then in the text beginning with "After examining the worlds" etc. (Mu. I. ii. 12), it speaks of the knowledge of Brahman that is the means for the highest goal and is achievable through the grace of the teacher after renouncing everything, whether it be an end or means. And of the purpose (i.e. the goal aimed at) it speaks more than once thus: "Anyone who knows Brahman becomes Brahman" (Mu. III. ii. 9), and "Having become identified with the supreme immortality, they become freed on every side" (Mu. III. ii. 6). And by mentioning "while begging for alms" (Mu. I. ii. 11), and "with the Yoga of monasticism" (Mu. III. ii. 6), the Upaniṣad shows that though people in all stages of life have a right to knowledge as such,¹ still the knowledge of Brahman, founded on monasticism only and not as associated with *karma*, is the means for emancipation. And this follows from the opposition between knowledge and *karma*; not even in dream can *karma* proceed side by side with the vision of the identity of the Self and Brahman. Knowledge brooks no temporal limitation, as it has no association with any time and is not dependent on definite causes.

As for the indirect indications (suggesting that knowledge and *karma* can co-exist), to wit, the fact that among the householders are found some with whom started the traditional lines of the knowers of

¹According to the injunction, "The Vedas are to be studied," the three higher castes have a right to read the Upaniṣads and grasp their meaning.—A.G.

Brahman,² that cannot override the established rule. For when the co-existence of light and darkness cannot be brought about even by a hundred injunctions, much less can it be done so by mere indications.

Of the Upaniṣad, whose connection and goal have thus been shown, a brief explanation is begun. This is called Upaniṣad, because it mitigates (*niśātayati*) such numerous evils as birth, old age, disease, etc., for those who approach this knowledge of Brahman with loving eagerness; or it is called so, since it leads to the supreme Brahman, and completely weakens or destroys (*avasādayati*) the ignorance etc., that are the causes of the world; for traditionally, the meaning of the root *sad*, preceded by *upa* and *ni*, is shown to be so.

ॐ ब्रह्मा देवानां प्रथमः संबभूव
विश्वस्य कर्ता भुवनस्य गोप्ता ।
स ब्रह्मविद्यां सर्वविद्याप्रतिष्ठा-
मथर्वाय ज्येष्ठपुत्राय प्राह ॥१॥

1. *Om!* Brahmā, the creator of the universe and the protector of the world, was the first among the gods to manifest Himself. To His eldest son Atharvā He imparted that knowledge of Brahman that is the basis of all knowledge.

The word *brahmā* means One who is all-surpassing, great, i.e. excels all others in virtue, knowledge, detachment, and splendour; (He) *prathamah* (*san*), as the foremost in quality, or the first in precedence: *devānām*, among the shining ones, such as Indra and

²See Muṇḍaka, I. i. 1-3

others; *sambabhūva*, became perfectly manifest, that is to say, He was born independently, unlike other worldly creatures who take birth under the impulsion of virtue and vice. This agrees with the *Smṛti*, "He that is super-sensuous, and cannot be grasped, (subtle, unmanifested, eternal, existing in all beings, and beyond thought—is this One who was born independently)" (Manu, 1.7). *Kartā*, the creator; *viśvasya*, of the whole universe; *goptā*, the protector; *bhuvanasya*, of the world, after it is created. This description of Brahma is meant as a eulogy of the knowledge (in this way): *Saḥ*, He, Brahmā, whose fame is so well known; (*prāha*, imparted); the *brahmavidyām*: the *vidyā* or knowledge of Brahman, the supreme Self, is the *brahmavidyā*, for it relates to the supreme Self, inasmuch as it is described as "that by which one realises the true and immutable Puruṣa" (Mu. I. ii. 13); or it is called *brahmavidyā*, because the knowledge was imparted by Brahmā, the First Born. (He imparted) that knowledge that is *sarva-vidyā-pratiṣṭhām*, the support of all kinds of knowledge, since it is the source of them all, or since through it alone is known all that all kinds of knowledge aim at, in accordance with the Vedic text, "That by which all that cannot be heard becomes heard, all that is unthinkable becomes thought of, all that is unknowable becomes known" (Ch. VI. i. 3). By the phrase "basis of all kinds of knowledge" the knowledge is again being praised. (He) *prāha*, imparted, that knowledge; *atharvāya jyeṣṭhaputrāya*, to Atharvā, His eldest son. He is the eldest and he is also one among the sons of Brahmā. Atharvā is the eldest in the sense

that he was born at the beginning of one of the many cycles of Brahmā's creation. To that eldest son He said:

अथर्वणे यां प्रवदेत ब्रह्माऽ-

थर्वा तां पुरोवाचाङ्गिरे ब्रह्मविद्याम् ।

स भारद्वाजाय सत्यवहाय प्राह

भारद्वाजोऽङ्गिरसे परावराम् ॥२॥

2. The knowledge of Brahman that Brahmā imparted to Atharvā, Atharvā transmitted to Ṇgir in days of yore. Ṇgir passed it on to Satyavaha of the line of Bharadvāja. He of the line of Bharadvāja handed down to Ṇgiras this knowledge that had been received in succession from the higher by the lower ones.

Yām Brahmavidyām, that knowledge of Brahman, which; *brahmā*, Brahmā; *pravadeta*, said; *atharvaṇe*, to Atharvā; *tām*, that very knowledge, received from Brahmā; *atharvā*, Atharvā; *purā*, in days of yore; *uvāca*, said; *ṅgire*, to one named Ṇgir. And *saḥ*, he, Ṇgir; *prāha*, said; *satyavahāya bhāradvājāya*, to one named Satyavaha of the line of Bharadvāja. *Bhāradvājāḥ*, he of the line of Bharadvāja; (imparted) *ṅgirase*, to Ṇgiras, who was either his son or disciple; *parāvarām*, (the knowledge) that had been received from the higher (*para*) by the lower (*avara*), in succession;¹ or it is so called because it permeates all things that come within the scope of the higher (*para*) or lower (*avara*) knowledge.

¹i.e. it ran through a line of masters and disciples.

He imparted to Aṅgiras this knowledge that had been received from the higher by the lower in succession, the verb "imparted" being understood.

शौनको ह वै महाशालोऽङ्गिरसं विधिवदुपसन्नः
पप्रच्छ । कस्मिन्नु भगवो विज्ञाते सर्वमिदं विज्ञातं
भवतीति ॥३॥

3. Śaunaka, well known as a great householder, having approached Aṅgiras duly, asked, "O adorable sir, (which is that thing) which having been known, all this becomes known?"

Śaunakah, the son of Śunaka; mahāśālah, a great householder; upasannah (san), having approached; vidhivat, duly, that is to say, in accordance with the scriptures; the teacher aṅgirasam, Aṅgiras, disciple of Bharadvāja; paprachha, asked. From the use of the adverb "duly" from the time of contact between Śaunaka and Aṅgiras, it is understood that for their predecessors there was no established rule about the method of approach. The adverb is used by way of delimitation, or it is used on the analogy of a lamp placed in a house,¹ for the rule regarding the manner of approach is intended for us as well. What (did he ask)? That is being stated: "Bhagavaḥ, kasmin nu vijñāte, O adorable sir, (which is that thing) which having been known indeed; sarvam idam, all that there is, that is to be known; bhavati, becomes; vijñā-

¹The lamp placed in the threshold of a house illuminates the inside as well as the outside. The rule may thus relate both to those who preceded and succeeded Aṅgiras and Śaunaka.

tam, well known?" The particle *nu* is used to express reflection. Śaunaka had heard the traditional utterance of the good people that there is something by knowing which one becomes omniscient. Being desirous of knowing that thing specifically, he asks thoughtfully, "which indeed?" Or by following the common-sense view, he puts this question knowingly: "There are in the world varieties of pieces of gold etc. which are known by ordinary people from the recognised fact of the substantial oneness of gold etc. Similarly, does there exist a single (substance that is the) cause of the whole universe of diversity, by knowing which all things become known?"

Objection: The question with the word "which" is improper with regard to an unknown thing. In that case the reasonable form of the question is: "Does such a thing exist?" "Which" can occur only when the existence is already established, as in, "Into which is it to be deposited?"

Answer: No, for the question, "Which is that thing which having been known, one becomes all knowing?" is admissible from the standpoint of avoiding trouble arising from verbosity.

तस्मै स होवाच । द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये इति ह स्म
यद्ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति परा चैवापरा च ॥४॥

4. To him he said, "There are two kinds of knowledge to be acquired — the higher and the lower', this is what, as tradition runs, the knowers of the import of the Vedas say."

Tasmai, to him, to Śaunaka; *saḥ* he, Aṅgiras; *uvāca* *ha*, did say. What did he say? That is being stated: “ ‘*Dve vidye veditavye*, two kinds of knowledge are to be acquired’—*iti*, this, is; *ha sma*, as the tradition goes; *yat*, what; *brahmavidah*, the knowers of the import of the Vedas, those who have realised the supreme Truth; *vadanti*, say.” Which are the two? That is being said: “*Parā ca*, the higher, the knowledge of the supreme Self; *aparā ca*, and the lower, the knowledge of virtue and vice and their means and ends.”

Objection: The question put by Śaunaka was, “Which is it which having been known one becomes all-knowing?” The answer should have related to that, whereas Aṅgiras says in his answer, “There are two kinds of knowledge” etc.—something beside the question.

Answer: That is nothing wrong, for the answer requires an order of procedure. For the lower knowledge is ignorance which has to be eradicated, inasmuch as nothing in reality is known by knowing the objects of ignorance; and the rule is that the conclusion should be stated after refuting the faulty standpoints.

Which of these two is the lower knowledge? The answer is:

तत्रापरा ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्ववेदः शिक्षा
कल्पो व्याकरणं निरुक्तं छन्दो ज्योतिषमिति । अथ परा
यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते ॥५॥

5. Of these, the lowers comprises the R̥g-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sāma-Veda, Atharva-Veda, the science of pronunciation etc., the code of

rituals, grammar, etymology, metre, and astrology. Then there is the higher (knowledge) by which is realised that Immutable.

Ṛg-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sāma-Veda, Atharva-Veda—these are the four Vedas. *Śikṣā*, the science of pronunciation etc.; *kalpah*, the code of rituals; *vyākaraṇam*, grammar; *niruktam*, etymology; *chandaḥ*, metre; *jyotiṣam*, astrology;—these are the six auxiliary parts (of the Vedas). These constitute the *aparā* (lower) knowledge. *Atha*, now is being stated; the *parā*, higher knowledge: *yayū*, by which *tat*, that; *akṣaram*, the Immutable, whose attributes will be stated hereafter; *adhigamyate*, is attained; for (the root) *gam*, preceded by (the prefix) *adhi*, generally means attainment. Besides, the sense of realisation does not differ from that of attainment in the case of the Highest; for the attainment of the Highest consists merely in removing ignorance, and nothing more.

Objection: From this point of view, then, the knowledge (of Brahman) is outside the Ṛg-Veda etc.; and so how can it be the higher knowledge, and how can it be the means for emancipation? The view accepted traditionally is this: “The Smṛtis that are outside the Vedic pale, and those that propound perverted views, are all useless in the next world; and they are counted as occupied with dark things” (Manu, XII. 9); therefore it will be unacceptable as its outlook is perverted and it is useless. Moreover, the Upaniṣads will become excluded from the Ṛg-Veda etc. Again, if they are included in the Ṛg-Veda etc.

it is illogical to distinguish them by saying, "Then the higher" and so on.¹

Answer: No, since (by the word *vidyā*) is implied the realisation of the thing to be known. What is primarily meant in this context by the term, "higher knowledge," is that knowledge of the Immutable that is imparted only by the Upaniṣads (considered as revealed knowledge), and not merely the assemblage of words found in the (books called) Upaniṣads. But by the word Veda the meaning implied everywhere is the assemblage of words. The knowledge of Brahman is distinctively mentioned and it is called the higher knowledge since, even after the mastery of the assemblage of words, the realisation of the Immutable is not possible without some other effort consisting in approaching the teacher and so on, as well as detachment.

In connection with the subject-matter of injunctions are to be found certain acts which are like the Agnihotra (sacrifice) to be performed subsequent to the understanding of the text, through a combination of numerous accessories, to wit, the agent etc. Unlike this, nothing remains to be performed here within the domain of the higher knowledge; but all actions cease simultaneously with the comprehension of the meaning of the sentences, inasmuch as nothing remains to be done apart from continuance in the mere knowledge revealed by the words. Therefore the higher knowledge is being specified here by referring to the Immutable, possessed of attributes stated in "(The

¹There is another reading, "*Atha katham pareti*, how then is, it called the higher?"

wise realise ...) that which cannot be perceived" etc.

यत्तदद्रेश्यमग्राह्यमगोत्रमवर्ण-

मचक्षुःश्रोत्रं तदपाणिपादं ।

नित्यं विभुं सर्वगतं सुसूक्ष्मं

तदव्ययं यद्भूतयोनिं परिपश्यन्ति धीराः ॥६॥

6. (By the higher knowledge) the wise realise everywhere that which cannot be perceived and grasped; which is without source, features, eyes, and ears; which has neither hands nor feet; which is eternal, multiformed, all-pervasive, extremely subtle, and undiminishing; and which is the source of all.

By the expression, "yat tat—that which", is called up to memory something as a realised entity that is still to be explained. (They realise that which is) *adreṣyam* (should rather be *adrēyam*), not visible (or not perceptible), i.e. beyond the range of all the organs of knowledge, for the power of perception, as directed outward, has the five senses as its gates. *Agrūhyam*, beyond one's grasp, i.e. beyond the range of the organs of action. *Agotram*: *gotra* is synonymous with connection or root; so *agotram* means unconnected, for It has no root with which It can get connected. *Varṇāḥ*, (features), are those that can be described; they are qualities of a thing, such as grossness etc. or whiteness etc. That Immutable which is devoid of *varṇāḥ* is the *avarṇam*, featureless. *Acakṣuḥśrotram*; the *cakṣuḥ*, eye, and *śrotram*, ear, are the organs in all

beings for perceiving forms and names; that in which these two do not exist is *ackṣuḥśrotram*, without eye and ear. From the ascription of sentience in the text: "He who is omniscient in general and all-knowing in detail" (Mu. I. i. 9), it may follow that, just like ordinary beings, the Immutable, too, achieves Its purposes with the help of such organs as eyes, ears, etc. That supposition is refuted here by "without ear and eyes"; for this accords with what is found (elsewhere): "He sees without eyes, and He hears without ears" (Śv. III. 11). Moreover, that Immutable is *apāṇipādam*, without hands and feet, that is to say, devoid of the organs of action. Since It cannot thus be seized, nor does It seize, therefore, It is *nityam* (eternal), indestructible. It is *vibhum*, multi-formed because of assuming diverse forms in all the different creatures from Brahmā to a motionless thing. *Sarvagatam*, all-pervasive, like space. *Susūkṣmam*, extremely subtle, being devoid of such causes of grossness as sound etc. Sound etc. are verily the causes of the progressive grossness of space, air, etc. Being free from these, It is extremely subtle. Furthermore, *tat*, that; is *avyayam*, undiminishing, one that does not decrease, because of those very virtues. For a partless thing cannot have any diminution by way of loss of Its parts as in the case of a body; nor can It sustain any loss by way of decrease of treasure as in the case of a king; nor can there be any shrinkage through loss of qualities, since It is attributeless and all-pervasive. *Yat*, that, which is possessed of such characteristics; *bhūtayonim*, the source of all creation, just as the earth is of all moving and unmoving things;

—that Immutable, *dhīrāḥ*, the intelligent, the discriminating ones; *paripaśyanti*, see everywhere, as the Self of all. The purport of the whole verse is this: “That is the higher knowledge by which the Immutable of this kind is realised.”

It has been said that the Immutable is the source of all creation. Now is being shown with the help of familiar illustrations how It can be so:

यथोर्णनाभिः सृजते गृह्णते च
 यथा पृथिव्यामोषधयः संभवन्ति ।
 यथा सतः पुरुषात् केशलोमानि
 तथाऽक्षरात् संभवतीह विश्वम् ॥७॥

7. As a spider spreads out and withdraws (its thread), as on the earth grow the herbs (and trees), and as from the living man issues out hair on the head and body, so out of the Immutable does the universe emerge here (in this phenomenal creation).

Yathā, as it is a familiar fact, in the world, that the *ūrṇanābhiḥ*, spider, by itself and independently of any other auxiliary; *sṛjate*, spreads out, the threads that are non-different from its own body; *ca*, and, again; *gṛhṇate* (should rather be *gṛhṇāti*), withdraws, those very threads—makes them one with itself; *ca*, and; *yathā*, as; *pṛthivyām*, on the earth; (grow) *oṣadhayaḥ*, the herbs, that is to say, plants ranging from corn to trees—as they grow inseparably from the earth; and *yathā*, as; *sataḥ puruṣāt*, from the exist-

ing. living. man; *sambhavanti*, grow; *keśa-lomāni*, hair on the head and other parts of the body, that is dissimilar (to the body) in nature;—just as it is in these cases, so *akṣarāt*, from the Immutable, of the foregoing characteristics, that does not depend on any other auxiliary; *sambhavati*, originates; *iha*, here, in this phenomenal creation; *viśvam*, the entire universe—both similar and dissimilar. As for the citing of many illustrations, it is meant for easy comprehension.

The next verse is begun in order to show a fixed order of creation, viz that the universe, while emerging out of Brahman, does so in this order of succession and not simultaneously like a handful of jujubes thrown down:

तपसा चीयते ब्रह्म ततोऽन्नमभिजायते ।

अन्नात्प्राणो मनः सत्यं लोकाः कर्ममु चामृतम् ॥८॥

8. Through knowledge Brahman increases in size. From that is born (the unmanifested) food. From food evolves Prāṇa (Hiraṇyagarbha); (thence the cosmic) mind, (thence) the five elements; (thence) the worlds; (thence) the immortality that is in *karmas*.

Tapasū, through knowledge, by virtue of possessing the knowledge of the process of creation; *brahma*, Brahman, the Immutable, the source of creation—when desirous of creating this world, like a seed sending out its sprout; *cīyate*, increases in size, as a father procreating a son does out of elation. From that Brahman, thus become inflated because of Its possession, through Its omniscience, of the power and know-

ledge of creation, preservation, and dissolution; *abhi-jāyate*, originates (grows) *annam*, food; the word being derived from the root *ad* in the sense of that which is eaten, i.e. enjoyed, means the Unmanifested (Māyā) that is common to all creatures. (That food originates or) gets evolved into the states of imminent manifestation.¹ From that Unmanifested, i.e. from that food in a state of imminent manifestation, (was born) *prāṇah*, Hiranyagarbha, who is common² to all the beings in the universe that are endued with (a part of His) power of knowledge and action, who sprouts from that seed of all beings, constituted by ignorance, desire, and action, and who identifies Himself with the universe; “was born” this is to be supplied. From that Hiranyagarbha evolved *manah*, that which is called the (cosmic) mind, comprising volition, deliberation, doubt, determination, etc. From that mind, again, as characterised by volition etc., evolved *satyam*, the five elements, such as space etc., which are called *satya* (i.e. the gross, *sat*, and the subtle, *tyat*). From those five elements, called *satya*, evolved the *lokāḥ*, the seven worlds, such as the earth etc., in succession, after the creation of the cosmic egg. Following the order of the evolution of creatures—beginning with men—there evolved on these (worlds) *karmas*,³ castes, and stages of life. And *karmasu*, in the *karmas*,

¹The beginningless Māyā is the unmanifested food; the Upaniṣad speaks of its origin in the sense of its becoming ready for evolution. Otherwise Māyā has no beginning.

²He is the sum total of all the individuals. Being common to all, He is called Sūtra, the thread (running through all).

³Rituals etc.

that acted as the cause, (there evolved) *amṛtam*, immortality, the fruit of *karmas*. It is called immortality, since it is not destroyed as long as *karma* is not eliminated in billions of *kalpas* (cycles).

With a view to concluding the subject-matter, dealt with above, the verse states as follows:

यः सर्वज्ञः सर्वविद्यस्य ज्ञानमयं तपः ।

तस्मादेतद्ब्रह्म नाम रूपमन्नं च जायते ॥९॥

इति मुण्डकोपनिषदि प्रथममुण्डके प्रथमः खण्डः ॥

9. From Him, who is omniscient in general and all-knowing in detail and whose austerity is constituted by knowledge, evolve this (derivative) Brahman, name, colour, and food.

Yah, He, the one called the Immutable, and answering to the foregoing definition; that is *sarvajñah*, a knower of all things in general; (and) *sarvavit*, a knower of all things in detail; *yasya*, whose; the *tapah*, austerity; is *jñānamayam*, made up of knowledge—consists in omniscience, and not in effort; *tasmāt*, from that, from that omniscient Entity, as aforesaid; *jāyate*, is born; *etat brahma*, this, the derivative, Brahman, as said before, who is called Hiranyagarbha. Besides, (from It) evolve *nāma*, name, such as “That one is Devadatta or Yajñadatta” etc.; *rūpam*, colour, such as “This is white or blue” etc.; *ca annam*, and food, such as paddy, barley, etc. They evolve in the order shown in the preceding verse; and hence it is to be understood that there is no contradiction.

FIRST MUNDAKA

CANTO II

By the text starting with "R̥g-Veda, Yajur-Veda" (Mu. I. i. 5) it has been said that the Vedas, with their appendages, constitute the lower knowledge. And the higher knowledge, with its attributes, has been defined as that knowledge through which is realised the Immutable whose characteristics have been set forth in the text beginning with, "(The wise realise ...) that which cannot be perceived" etc. (I. i. 6) and ending with, "are evolved name, colour, and food" (I. i. 9). The following text starts by setting before it the task of distinguishing hereafter the subject matters of these two kinds of knowledge which relate to the states of bondage and freedom. Of these, the sphere of the lower knowledge is the state of bondage which involves a distinction of accessories like agent etc., and actions and results. This state has no beginning and no end; it has to be eradicated wholly¹ and individually by each embodied being, because it consists of sorrow; and it flows unbroken like the current of a river. And the subject-matter of the higher knowledge is freedom—which consists in the elimination of that bondage and is beginningless, endless, ageless, deathless, immortal, fearless, pure, and placid; and it is supreme bliss that is without a second and

¹The world of diversity is not eradicated wholly in deep sleep; but on the rise of realisation, when nescience is destroyed, its effect, the world, also is eliminated entirely and for ever.

is nothing but remaining established in one's own Self. That being so, the text commences first to show the content of the lower knowledge; for detachment from it follows only as a consequence of recognising its nature. It will be said accordingly in, "After examining the worlds acquired through *karma*" etc. (I. ii. 12). And inasmuch as examination is not possible unless something is in view, the text says by way of presenting it:

तदेतत् सत्यं

मन्त्रेषु कर्माणि कवयो यान्यपश्यं-

स्तानि त्रेतायां बहुधा सन्ततानि ।

तान्याचरथ नियतं सत्यकामा

एष वः पन्थाः सुकृतस्य लोके ॥१॥

1. That thing that is such is true.

The *karmas* that the wise discovered in the *mantras* are accomplished variously (in the context of the sacrifice) where the three Vedic duties get united. You perform them for ever with desire for the true results. This is your path leading to the fruits of *karma* acquired by yourselves.

Tat etat, that thing that is such; is *satyam*, true. Which is that? The *karmāṇi*, *karmas*, Agnihotra etc., *yāni*, which; *kavayaḥ*, the wise—Vasiṣṭha and others; *apaśyan*, saw; *mantraṣu*, in the *mantras*, known as the Rg-Veda etc.—these *karmas* having been revealed by the *mantras* only. Those that were seen thus are *satyam*, true, they being unfailing in ensuring human

goals. And *tāni*, these, the *karmas* enjoined by the Vedas and visualised by the seers; *santatāni*, are in vogue, are accomplished; *bahudhā*, in various ways; by the people steeped in *karma*; *tretāyām*, where the three get united, in the context of the sacrifice consisting of three kinds of duties prescribed by the Ṛg-Veda, Yajur-Veda, and Sāma-Veda; or the meaning is that the *karmas* are very much in vogue *tretāyām*, in the Tretā Age. Therefore you *ācaratha tāni*, accomplish them; *nityam*, for ever; *satyakāmāḥ*, with a desire for the true results of *karma*. *Eṣaḥ*, this is *vaḥ*, your; *panthāḥ*, path; *sukṛtasya loke*, for the result (of *karma*) accomplished by yourselves. The result of *karma* is called *loka*, the word being derived from the root *luk* in the sense of that which is looked at or enjoyed (*lokyaṭe*) as a result. This is the path leading to it, or ensuring its achievement - this is the idea. These *karmas*, viz. Agnihotra etc., that are enjoined in the Vedas, constitute this path that is meant for the achievement of inevitable results.

The next verse proceeds now to present Agnihotra first, out of all these *karmas*, since it precedes all others. How is that presented?

यदा लेलायते ह्यर्चिः समिद्धे हव्यवाहने ।

तदाऽऽज्यभागावन्तरेणाऽऽहुतीः प्रतिपादयेत् ॥२॥

2. When, on the fire being set ablaze, the flame shoots up, one should offer the oblations into that part that is in between the right and the left.

Yadā, at the (very) time when; *samidhḥe havya-vāhane*, on the fire being set ablaze, by a good supply

of fuel; *arcih*, the flame; *lelāyate*, shoots up; *tadā*, then; into the blazing, dancing flame; *ājyabhūgau* (should be rather *ājyabhūgayoh*) *antareṇa*, in the midst of the two places where oblations are poured, and which is called the *āvāpa-sthāna*; one *pratipādayet*, should offer;¹ *āhutīh*, oblations; in honour of the gods. The word *āhutīh* occurs in the plural number, since the offerings have to be made for many days.²

This path of *karma*, that consists in the adequate offering of oblations etc., is the road to the attainment of the results of *karma*. But it is difficult to follow it properly, and impediments crop up in galore. How?

यस्याग्निहोत्रमदर्शमपौर्णमास-

मचानुर्मास्यमनाग्रयणमतिथिवर्जितं च ।

अहुतमवैश्वदेवमविधिना हुत-

मासप्तमांस्तस्य लोकान् हिनस्ति ॥३॥

3. It (i.e. the Agnihotra) destroys the seven worlds of that man whose Agnihotra (sacrifice) is without Darśa and Paurṇamāsa (rites), devoid of Cāturmāsya, bereft of Āgrayaṇa,

¹In the Darśapūrṇamāsa sacrifice two oblations are offered in the right and left sides of the fire in honour of Fire and Soma respectively, the other oblations are offered in the middle portion called the *āvāpa-sthāna*.

²The Agnihotra sacrifice is performed twice a day—in the morning and the evening. But this is a daily duty to be followed throughout a man's whole life. And hence the plural, instead of the dual, number.

unblest with guests, goes unperformed, is unaccompanied by Vaiśvadeva (rite), and is performed, perfunctorily.

Yasya, of him, of that performer of the Agnihotra (sacrifice), whose; *agnihotram*, Agnihotra; is *adarśam*, devoid of the sacrifice called Darśa. The performance of the Darśa (sacrifice) being a necessary duty for the undertaker of Agnihotra, it becomes a qualifying word for Agnihotra, owing to its concomitance with the latter. The sense is that, it is an Agnihotra in which the Darśa is not accomplished. Similarly are to be understood the adjectival use in the words, *apaurṇamāsam* etc. with relation to Agnihotra, for they equally form parts of the Agnihotra. *Apaurṇamāsam*, without the Pūrṇamāsa sacrifice. *Acāturmāsyam*, devoid of the Cāturmāsyā¹ ritual. Āgrayaṇa rituals² are to be undertaken in autumn etc.; that Agnihotra in which these are not accomplished is *anāgrayaṇam*. So also *atithivarjitam*, that in which guests are not served, day in and day out. *Ahutam*, in which the Agnihotra itself remains unperformed at the proper time. Just like *adarśa* etc., *avaiśvadevam* means that in which the Vaiśvadeva rite remains unaccomplished. And although the Agnihotra is performed, it is *avidhinā hutam*, performed unduly, that is to say, not performed in the proper way. What

¹The three sacrifices performed at the beginning of each season of four months, viz Vaiśvadevam, Varuṇa-praghāsaḥ, Śākamedhaḥ.

²The Āgrayaṇa rituals are performed in autumn and spring with newly harvested corn.

these rites, viz Agnihotra and the rest, lead to, when they are thus accomplished perfunctorily or left undone, is being stated: (That rite) *hinasti*, destroys, *āsaptamān lokān*, the worlds up to and inclusive of the seventh; *taṣya*, of him, of the performer. It destroys, as it were, for the only fruit is the trouble undergone. Inasmuch as the worlds counting from the earth to Satya,¹ accrue as a result, only when the rites are duly performed, and inasmuch as those worlds are not achievable through Agnihotra etc. of the above description, they are, so to say, destroyed. Since the mere trouble is a constant factor, it is said that such a rite is destructive. Or the meaning is this: The seven generations—viz father, grandfather, great-grandfather, son, grandson, great-grandson, (and the sacrificer), who become connected through the favourable influence of such services as the offering of lumps of food etc.² do not confer any benefit on oneself as a result of this kind of Agnihotra etc.; and this is affirmed by saying that they are destroyed.

काली कराली च मनोजवा च
 मुलोहिता या च सुधूम्रवर्णा ।
 स्फुलिङ्गिनी विश्वरुची च देवी
 लेलायमाना इति सप्तजिह्वाः ॥४॥

4. Kālī, Karālī, Manojavā, and Sulohitā and that which is Sudhūmravarṇā, as also Sphul-

¹Bhūr, Bhuvar, Svar, Maha, Jana, Tapas, Satya.

²The sacrificer serves the three past generations by offering *piṇḍa*, water etc., and the three living generations by feeding them. Thus the six generations get connected with himself as the seventh.

ingini, and the shining Viśvaruci—these are the seven flaming tongues.¹

These, beginning from Kālī and ending with Viśvaruci are the *lelāyamānāḥ*, flaming; *sapta jihvāḥ*, seven tongues, of fire, meant for devouring the clarified butter offered as oblation.

एतेषु यश्चरते भ्राजमानेषु
 यथाकालं चाहृतयो ह्याददायन् ।
 तं नयन्त्येताः सूर्यस्य रश्मयो
 यत्र देवानां पतिरेकोऽधिवासः ॥५॥

5. These oblations turn into the rays of the sun and taking him up they lead him, who performs the rites in these shining flames at the proper time, to where the single lord of the gods presides over all.

These *āhutayaḥ*, offerings of oblation, undertaken by the sacrificer, these libations that had been poured by him; *ādadāyan*, having taken him up; (carry him) by having become *sūryasya raśmayah*, the rays of the sun, that is to say, along the course of the sun's rays; (and) they *tam nayanti*, lead him—that performer of Agnihotra; *yah*, who; *carate*, performs the rites, e.g., Agnihotra etc.; *eteṣu bhrājamāneṣu*, in these different shining tongues; *yathākālam*, at the proper time, at the time fit for each rite;—(they carry him) to heaven *yatra*, where; *patiḥ*, the lord, Indra; *devā-*

¹Literally the names mean: Black, terrible, speedy as mind, very red, coloured like thick smoke, emitting sparks, having innumerable rays.

nām, of the gods; *ekaḥ*, alone; *adhivāsaḥ*, dwells (presides), above all.

Now is being stated how they carry him along the rays of the sun:

एह्येहीति तमाहुतयः सुवर्चसः

सूर्यस्य रश्मिभिर्यजमानं वहन्ति ।

प्रियां वाचमभिवदन्त्योऽर्चयन्त्य

एष वः पुण्यः सुकृतो ब्रह्मलोकः ॥६॥

6. Saying, “Come, come”, uttering pleasing words such as, “This is your well-earned, virtuous path which leads to heaven”, and offering him adoration, the scintillating oblations carry the sacrificer along the rays of the sun.

The *suvarcasah*, scintillating (oblations); *ehi ehi iti*, welcoming (him) with the words “Come, come”; moreover, *abhivadantyaḥ*, uttering; *priyām vācam*, pleasant words, i.e. praise etc.; and *arcayantyaḥ* adoring—the idea being that they carry him while uttering such pleasant words as —“*Eṣaḥ*, this one, is; *vaḥ*, your; *puṇyaḥ*, virtuous; *sukṛtaḥ*, well-earned, road to; *brahmalokaḥ*, heaven, which is your result.” From the context it follows that *brahmaloka* (lit. the world of Brahṁā) means heaven.

This *karma*, unassociated with knowledge, is being decried by showing that it has only this limited result; that it is the product of ignorance, desire, and action; and that it is for this reason unsubstantial and the source of misery:

प्लवा ह्येते अदृढा यज्ञरूपा
 अष्टादशोक्तमवरं येषु कर्म ।
 एतच्छ्रेयो येऽभिनन्दन्ति मढा
 जरामृत्युं ते पुनरेवापि यन्ति ॥७॥

7. Since these eighteen constituents of a sacrifice, on whom the inferior *karma* has been said to rest, are perishable because of their fragility, therefore those ignorant people who get elated with the idea, "This is (the cause of) bliss", undergo old age and death over again.

Plavāḥ means perishable. *Hi*, since; *ete*, these; *yajñarūpāḥ*, the constituents of the sacrifice, the accomplishers of the sacrifice; (who are) *aṣṭādaśa*, eighteen in number, viz the sixteen priests, the sacrificer, and his wife; *yeṣu uktam*, on whom, on which eighteen of these, it has been said, by scripture, as resting: the *avaram karma*, the inferior *karma*, mere *karma*, without knowledge;—(these are perishable, because they are) *adr̥ḍhāḥ*, fragile, impermanent; therefore, the inferior *karma* accomplished by those eighteen factors. gets destroyed, along with its result, owing to the fragility of the eighteen factors on which it rests, just as milk or curd held in a vessel is destroyed on the destruction of the latter. This being so, *ye*, those, the non-discerning, ignorant people, who *abhinandanti*, delight with regard to this (*karma*); thinking, "*Etat sreyas*, this is good—the cause of bliss"; *te*, they; after staying in heaven for some time; *punar eva api*, over again; *yanti*, undergo; *jarāmṛtyum*, old age and death.

अविद्यायामन्तरे वर्तमानाः

स्वयं धीराः पण्डितं मन्यमानाः ।

जङ्घन्यमानाः परियन्ति मढा

अन्धेनैव नीयमाना यथाऽन्धाः ॥८॥

8. Remaining within the fold of ignorance, and thinking, "We are ourselves wise and learned", the fools, while being buffeted very much, ramble about like the blind led by the blind alone.

Furthermore, *vartamānāḥ*, existing; *avidyāyām antare*, within the fold of ignorance; being steeped in non-discrimination; (and) *manyamānāḥ*, thinking; "Svayam dhīrāḥ, we ourselves are intelligent; and *paṇḍitāḥ*, learned, conversant with all that is to be learned"—flattering themselves in this way; those *mūḍhāḥ*, fools; *jaṅghanyamānāḥ*, while being buffeted, hurt very much, by hosts of evils like old age, disease, etc.; *pariyanti*, ramble about, because of their loss of vision; just as in the world *andhāḥ*, the blind, deprived of eyes; fall into pits or brambles; *nīyamānāḥ*, while being led, being shown their way; *andhena eva*, by the blind alone, by one who is himself without eyes.

Moreover,

अविद्यायां बहुधा वर्तमाना

वयं कृतार्था इत्यभिमन्यन्ति बालाः ।

यत्कर्मिणो न प्रवेदयन्ति रागात्

तेनाऽऽतुराः क्षीणलोकाश्च्यवन्ते ॥९॥

9. Continuing diversely in the midst of ignorance, the unenlightened take airs by thinking, "We have attained the fullest achievement." Since the men, engaged in *karma*, do not understand (the truth) under the influence of attachment, thereby they become afflicted with sorrow and are deprived of heaven on the exhaustion of the results of *karma*.

Vartamānāḥ, continuing; *avidyāyām*, in the midst of ignorance; *bahudhā*, in diverse ways; *bālāḥ*, the unenlightened; *abhimanyanti*, take airs by thinking, "*Vayam kṛtār-thāḥ*, we alone have attained the fullest achievement." *Yat*, since; in this manner; *karmināḥ*, the men engaged in *karma*; *na pravedayanti*, do not understand the truth; *rāgāt*, under the influence of attachment—to the results of *karma*; *tena*, thereby; *āturāḥ* (*santāḥ*), (becoming) afflicted with sorrow; they *cyavante*, get deprived, of heaven; *kṣīṇalokāḥ*, on the exhaustion of their results of *karma*.

इष्टापूर्तं मन्यमाना वरिष्ठं

नान्यच्छ्रेयो वेदयन्ते प्रमदाः ।

नाकस्य पृष्ठे ते सुकृतेऽनुभूत्वे-

मं लोकं हीनतरं वा विशन्ति ॥१०॥

10. The deluded fools, believing the rites inculcated by the Vedas and the Smṛtis to be the highest, do not understand the other thing that leads to liberation. They, having enjoyed (the fruits of actions) on the heights of heaven

that are the abodes of pleasure, enter this world or an inferior one.

Manyamānāḥ, thinking; *iṣṭam*, sacrifice and other rites, enjoined by the Vedas; *pūrtam*, (digging of) pools, wells, tanks, etc. inculcated by the Smṛtis;— thinking these to be the *variṣṭham*, best means, for the achievement of human objectives, the chief thing;— thinking thus, the *pramūḍhāḥ*, deluded fools, who are so because of their infatuation for sons, cattle, friends, etc.; *na vedayante*, do not understand; *anyat*, the other thing, called the knowledge of the Self—to be the means for the achievement of *śreyas*, the highest goal (liberation). And *te*, they; *anubhūtvā* (should rather be *anubhūya*), having enjoyed, the fruits of their *karma*; *sukṛte*, in the abode of enjoyment; *nākasya pṛṣṭhe*, on the heights of heaven; again; *viśanti*, enter; into *imam lokam*, this, human, world; *vā hīnataram*, or a world inferior to it, e.g. that of the beasts, or hell, etc., in accordance with the residual results of *karma*.

तपःश्रद्धे ये ह्यपवसन्त्यरण्ये

शान्ता विद्वांसो भैक्ष्यचर्या चरन्तः ।

सूर्यद्वारेण ते विरजाः प्रयान्ति

यत्रामृतः स पुरुषो ह्यव्ययात्मा ॥११॥

11. Those who live in the forest, while begging for alms—viz those (forest-dwellers and hermits¹) who resort to the duties of their

¹The householders who repair to the forest in the third stage of their lives, or become monks in the fourth stage.

respective stages of life as well as to meditation, — and the learned (householders) who have their senses under control — (they) after becoming freed from virtue and vice, go by the path of the sun to where lives that Puruṣa, immortal and undecaying by nature.

On the other hand, as opposed to the former, *ye*, those, who—the forest-dwellers and the hermits, possessed of knowledge; while staying *araṇye*, in the forest; *upavasanti*, resort to; *tapahśraddhe*—*tapas*, the duties pertaining to that stage of life, and *śraddhā*, meditation on Hiranyagarbha and others; and the *śāntāḥ*, self-controlled, who have their senses under control; *vidvāṃsaḥ*, the learned, that is to say, the householders, too, who are devoted chiefly to meditation; (go). (*Upavasanti araṇye*) *bhaikṣyācaryām carantaḥ*, (live in the forest) while begging for alms, since they do not accept the customary gifts; they live in the forest while begging for alms—this is how the sentence is to be construed. *Te*, they; *virajāḥ*, becoming freed from *rajas*, that is to say, having got their virtue and vice attenuated; *prayānti*, move superbly; *sūryadvāreṇa*, along the path of the sun, along the Northern Path, indicated by the word sun, to the worlds called Satya etc.; *yatra* where (lives); *saḥ amṛtaḥ puruṣaḥ*, that immortal Puruṣa, the first-born Hiranyagarbha; *hi avyayātmā*, who is by nature undecaying, who lives as long as the world endures. The goals of this world, that are attainable through the lower knowledge, terminate here alone.

Objection: Is not this state considered to be liberation by some?

Answer: Theirs is not a correct view in accordance with such Vedic texts as: "All the desires vanish even here" (Mu. III. ii. 2). "Those discriminating people, ever merged in contemplation, attain the all-pervasive (Brahman) everywhere, and enter into the all" (Mu. III. ii. 5), etc.¹ Besides, that is not the topic here. Since the topic under discussion is that of the lower knowledge, the consideration of liberation cannot crop up all of a sudden. As for freedom from virtue and vice, it is only relatively so. All the results of the lower knowledge, comprising the ends and means, and diversified into varieties of action, accessories, and fruits, and consisting in duality, extend up to this only, or in other words, terminate with the realisation of Hiranyagarbha. So also it has been said by Manu, while recounting successively the courses of the world, starting with that of the motionless things, "The wise men say that this is the highest goal of holiness that consists in the attainment of (the state of) Hiranyagarbha, the Prajāpatis (lords of creatures, such as Marici), Dharma (Death), (the principle called) Mahat, and the Unmanifested" (XII. 50).

Now this verse is being said in order to show that one who becomes detached from this whole world of ends and means has competence for the higher knowledge:

परीक्ष्य लोकान् कर्मचितान् ब्राह्मणो
 निर्वेदमायान्नास्त्यकृतः कृतेन ।
 तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत्
 समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठम् ॥१२॥

¹These texts deny any course to be followed by the liberated soul after the death of the body.

12. A Brāhmaṇa should resort to renunciation after examining the worlds, acquired through *karma*, with the help of this maxim: "There is nothing (here) that is not the result of *karma*; so what is the need of (performing) *karma* ?". For knowing that Reality he should go, with sacrificial faggots in hand, to a teacher, versed in the Vedas and absorbed in Brāhman.

Parīkṣya, examining—all these (rites) that are included within the scope of the lower knowledge constituted by the Ṛg-Veda etc., that are to be undertaken by persons subject to natural ignorance, desire, and action, they having been inculcated for the man swayed by the defects of ignorance etc.; and (examining) the worlds that are their results and are indicated by the Northern and Southern Paths, and the worlds of the beasts and ghouls that follow as the result of omission of obligatory duties and commission of prohibited ones—having examined all these, with the help of direct perception, inference, analogy, and scriptures, i.e. having ascertained: *lokān*, the worlds—in their essence from every point of view, the worlds that exist as the goals of transmigration ranging from the Unmanifested to a motionless thing, whether evolved or involved; that are productive of one another like the seed and the sprout; that are assailed with multifarious troubles in their hundreds and thousands; that are devoid of substance like the interior of a plantain tree; that appear like magic, water in a mirage, or a city in space; and that are

comparable to dream, water-bubbles, and foam, that get destroyed at every turn;—that is to say, turning one's back to virtue and vice acquired through *karma*, instigated by the defects of ignorance and desire, (a Brāhmaṇa should renounce). The Brāhmaṇa is mentioned because he alone is specially qualified for the acquisition of knowledge by renouncing everything. What should one do after examining the worlds? This is being said: *Nirvedam āyāt*, one should arrive at detachment, that is to say, should renounce—the root *vid* with the prefix *niḥ* being used here in the sense of renunciation. The process of renunciation is being shown: “In the universe there is nothing that is *akṛta*, a non-product; for all the worlds are effects of *karma*; and being products of action, they are impermanent. The idea is that there is nothing that is eternal. All actions are productive of transitory things, since all effects of actions are only of four kinds—they can be produced, acquired, purified, or modified; over and above these, action has no other distinctive result. But I am desirous of the eternal, immortal, fearless, unchanging, unmoving, absolute Entity, and not of its opposite. Therefore *kṛtena* (*kim*), what is the need of (accomplishing) any task, that involves great trouble and leads to evil?”¹ Having become detached in this way, *saḥ*, he, the dispassionate Brāhmaṇa; *abhiḡacchet*, should go; *gurum eva*, to a teacher alone, who is blessed with mental and physical self-control, mercy, etc.;

¹Some annotators explain this portion thus: That (which is) *akṛtaḥ*, not a product, *na asti*, does not come to exist, is not produced, *kṛtena*, as a result of action. Liberation is not a product of *karma*.

tad-vijñānārtham, for the sake of understanding that fully. The emphasis in “the teacher alone” implies that he should not seek for the knowledge of Brahman independently, even though he is versed in the scriptures. (He will go) *samit-pūñih*, with a load of (sacrificial) faggots in hand; (to) *śrotriyam brahmaniṣṭham*, (a teacher) who is versed in the meaning of the Vedas that he recites and hears, and who is absorbed in Brahman. One who renounces all activities and remains absorbed in the non-dual Brahman only is *brahmaniṣṭhaḥ* just as it is in the case of the words *japaniṣṭhaḥ* absorbed in self-repetition, *tapaniṣṭhaḥ*, absorbed in austerity. For one, engrossed in *karma*, cannot have absorption in Brahman, *karma* and the knowledge of the Self being contradictory. Having approached that teacher in the proper way, and having pleased him, he should ask about the true and immutable Puruṣa (all-pervasive Reality).

तस्मै स विद्वानुपसन्नाय सम्यक्
प्रशान्तचित्ताय शमान्विताय ।

येनाक्षरं पुरुषं वेद सत्यं

प्रोवाच तां तत्त्वतो ब्रह्मविद्याम् ॥१३॥

इति मुण्डकोपनिषदि प्रथममुण्डके द्वितीयः खण्डः ॥

13. To him who approaches duly, whose heart is calm and whose outer organs are under control, that man of enlightenment should adequately impart that knowledge of Brahman by which one realises the true and immutable Puruṣa.

Saḥ vidvān, that enlightened one, the teacher who has realised Brahman; (should say) *tasmāi*, to him; *upasammāya*, to the one who has approached; *samyak*, duly, that is to say, in accordance with the scriptures; *praśāntacittāya*, to one whose heart is calm, who has become free from such faults as pride; and *śamānvitāya*, to one who is endued with control over the outer organs, i.e. who has become detached from everything; (to such a one) he *provāca*, said, or rather, should say: *tām brahmanavidyām*, that knowledge of Brahman; *tattvataḥ*, adequately; *yeṇa*, by which, by which higher knowledge; *veda*, one realises; *akṣaram*, the Immutable, that is possessed of such attributes as being imperceptible etc. (Mu.I.3). That very Immutable is referred to by the word *Puruṣa*, because of all-pervasiveness or existence in all the hearts; and that again is *satyam*, true, because of being essentially the supreme Reality; and It is *akṣaram* (immutable) because of the absence of mutation, injury, and decay. For the teacher, too, this is imperative that he should save from the ocean of ignorance any good disciple that approaches him duly.

SECOND MUNDAKA

CANTO 1

All the effects of the lower knowledge have been stated. And that Immutable is true that is called Puruṣa (the all-pervasive Reality), and that is the essence of this phenomenal existence, the source from which it springs, and the place where it gets dissolved. The Reality, after knowing which all this becomes known, is the subject-matter of the higher knowledge of Brahman. That has to be stated. Hence commences the subsequent text:

तदेतत् सत्यं

यथा मुदीप्तात्पावकाद्विस्फुलिङ्गाः

सहस्रशः प्रभवन्ते सरूपाः ।

तथाऽक्षराद्विविधाः सोम्य भावाः

प्रजायन्ते तत्र चैवापि यन्ति ॥१॥

1. That thing, that is such, is true:

As from a fire, fully ablaze, fly off sparks, in their thousands, that are akin to the fire, similarly O good-looking one, from the Immutable originate different kinds of creatures and into It again they merge.

That truth that is constituted by the results of *karma*, the subject-matter of the lower knowledge, is only relatively so. But this truth is the subject-matter of

the higher knowledge, since it is possessed of the characteristics of the supreme Reality.¹ *Tat etat*, that thing, that is this (subject-matter of higher knowledge); is *satyam*, true; whereas the other is unreal, being within the domain of ignorance. Since the True and Immutable is altogether beyond direct cognition, an illustration is being cited with a view to making people somehow directly realise It: *Yathā*, as; *sudīptāt pāvakāt*, from a fire well lighted up; *visphulingāḥ*, sparks; *sarūpāḥ*, that are akin to the fire; *prabhavante*, fly off; *sahasraśaḥ*, in their thousands, innumera- bly; *tathā*, similarly; *soṃya*, O good-looking (or amiable) one! *akṣarāt*, from the Immutable, of the foregoing characteristics; (originate) *vividhāḥ*, *bhāvāḥ*, different kinds of creatures—different because of conformity with the various bodies that form the limiting adjuncts. The different small empty spaces, circumscribed pots etc., are seen to spring from space in conformity with the differences in the limiting adjuncts viz the pots etc.; just in this way the creatures *prajāyante*, originate, in accordance with the creation, under various names and forms, of the bodies that are their limiting adjuncts; *tatra ca eva*, and into that again, into that very Immutable; they *apiyanti*, merge, following the dissolution of the bodies that are their limiting adjuncts, just as the different openings do on the disintegration of the pots etc. As in the origin and dissolution of the different cavities, space appears as a cause owing to the presence of the limiting adjuncts, viz pots etc., so also in the matter of the birth and death of the individuals, the Immutable appears

¹Since it can never be sublated.

as a cause owing to the presence of the limiting adjuncts, viz the bodies created by name and form.

The text now proceeds to speak of the Immutable that is higher than the (other) immutable which is the seed of name and form, which is called the Unmanifested (Māyā), and which is itself higher than its own modifications; this (absolute) Immutable that is devoid of all limiting adjuncts, which is the very essence of the (other) immutable, is comparable to space, free from all forms, and is describable by such expressions as "Not this, not this":

दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः सवाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः ।

अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्रो ह्यक्षरात्परतः परः ॥२॥

2. Puruṣa is transcendental, since He is formless. And since He is coextensive with all that is external and internal and since He is birthless, therefore He is without vital force and without mind; He is pure and superior to the (other) superior immutable (Māyā).

Puruṣaḥ, Puruṣa, who is so called because of (the derivative meaning of) all-pervasiveness or residence in all hearts; is *divyaḥ*, resplendent—because of self-effulgence or residence in His own resplendent Self—or transcendental; *hi*, because; *amūrtaḥ*, devoid of all forms. That self-effulgent Puruṣa, being formless and all-pervasive is *sabāhyābhyantaraḥ*, coextensive with all that is external or internal; *ajāḥ*, birthless, is not born of anything, since there is nothing else but Himself which can be His cause of birth, in the sense

that air is the cause of water-bubbles etc., or pots etc. are the causes of the different kinds of cavities of space. As all modifications of positive entities are preceded by their births, the denial of birth is tantamount to the denial of all modifications. *Hi*, as; as that Being is coeval with all that is external or internal, therefore It is unborn, and hence It is ageless, deathless and immutable, constant and fearless. This is the idea. Although like the sky, appearing as possessed of surface and taints, It appears in the context of the different bodies to be possessed of vital force, mind, senses, and objects, in the eyes of those people whose vision, owing to their ignorance, is fixed on the multiplicity of the limiting adjuncts, e.g. the bodies etc; yet from Its own point of view It is *aprāṇah*, without the vital force, to those whose eyes are fixed on the supreme Reality. That is called *aprāṇah* in which air, the principle of motion, does not exist in its diversity of the power of action. Similarly, *amanāh*, without mind, that in which mind, consisting of thinking etc., does not exist in its diversity of the power of knowledge. By the expressions "without vital force" and "without mind" it is to be understood that all the different vital forces, viz Prāṇa. (Apāna, etc.), the organs of action, and the objects of those organs, as also the intellect and the mind, the senses of perception, and their objects, are denied. In support of this, there occurs this passage in another Upaniṣad, "It thinks as it were, and shakes as it were" (Bṛ. IV. iii. 7). As the two limiting adjuncts are denied for It, so It is *śubhrah*, pure. And hence (It is higher) *paratah akṣarūt*, as compared with the (other) higher immutable, called the Unmanifested

(i.e. Māyā). And the nature of this Māyā is inferred from the fact of its being the limiting adjunct of Brahman that appears to be the seed of name and form.¹ And that (other) immutable, called the Unmanifested, that is inferred as the limiting adjunct of that (higher) Immutable, is itself higher than all the modifications, because it is considered to be the seed of all the effects and accessories.² The unconditioned, all-pervasive entity is *paraḥ*, higher; *akṣarāt parataḥ*, than that immutable (Māyā) that is superior (in relation to its effects). This is the idea.

It is being shown how the entity that permeates through and through the (other) immutable, called *ākāśa*, and enters as an object into all empirical dealings, can be without the vital force etc. If, like Puruṣa (the all-pervasive Entity), the vital force etc. exist as such before creation, then the all-pervasive Entity will be possessed of the vital force etc. by virtue of their co-existence with It. But as a fact, unlike the all-pervasive Entity, the vital forces etc. do not exist as such before creation; therefore the supremely all-pervasive Entity is without vital forces, just as Devadatta is said to be without a son so long as a son is

¹In such manifestations of consciousness as memory, doubt etc., the power of Brahman remains ingrained, and thus Brahman appears to be the cause of name and form; but in reality the transcendental Brahman cannot be so; and accordingly Māyā has to be assumed to be the limiting adjunct of Brahman, causing this appearance of causality in Brahman.

²Effects are known to be inferior to the causes; so the principle of Māyā, which is known as the cause, must be superior to its effects.

not born. As to how those vital forces etc. do not exist is being stated.

एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च ।

खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः पृथिवी विश्वस्य धारिणी ॥३॥

3. From Him originates the vital force as well as the mind, all the senses, space, air, fire, water, and earth that supports everything.

Etasmāt, from this, this very Puruṣa that is supposed to be the seed of name and form; *jāyate*, originates; *prāṇah*, the vital force, that is an object and a modification of nescience, exists only in name, and is essentially unreal in accordance with another Vedic text, "All modification has speech only as its support: it is unreal" (Ch. VI. i. 4). For just as a man, who has no son, does not become possessed of one by seeing him in dream, similarly, the supreme Reality cannot become possessed of the vital force by being endued with a vital force that is included in ignorance and is unreal. In this way, the mind and all the senses, as well as the objects, originate from this One. Therefore it is proved that Puruṣa is devoid of the vital force etc. in the real sense of the term. And it is to be understood that just as these did not exist in reality before origination, so also they become non-existent after dissolution. And as is the case with the organs, senses, and mind, so also is the case with the elements that are the causes of the bodies and the objects—the elements that are *kham*, space; *vāyuh*, the air inside and outside, differentiated as *āvaha* (moving towards), *pravaha* (moving away from), etc.; *jyotiḥ*, fire; *āpah*, water;

pṛthivī, earth, that is *viśvasya dhāriṇī*, the support of all. All these elements that possess seriatim the qualities of sound, touch, colour taste, and smell, together with all the qualities that belong to the predecessors of each, (all these) originate from this very Puruṣa.

After the brief presentation in the verse "Puruṣa is transcendental, since He is formless" etc., of the Immutable, the unqualified Puruṣa, that is true and forms the subject-matter of the higher knowledge. He has again to be presented in detail in His conditioned state; and hence the following text. For when a subject-matter is stated in brief and *in extenso* like an aphorism and its commentary, it becomes easy of comprehension. As for that Virāṭ within the cosmic egg who takes His birth from the first-born Prāṇa, who is Hiranyagarbha, He (Virāṭ), too, though apparently separated from Puruṣa by another intervening principle (viz Hiranyagarbha), is born of this Puruṣa and is a modification of Him. This fact is being stated, and He (Virāṭ) is being described:

अग्निर्मूर्धा चक्षुषी चन्द्रसूर्यौ

दिशः श्रोत्रे वाग्विवृताश्च वेदाः ।

वायुः प्राणो हृदयं विश्वमस्य

पद्भ्यां पृथिवी ह्येष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा ॥४॥

4. The indwelling Self of all is surely He of whom heaven is the head, the moon and sun are the two eyes, the directions are the two ears, the revealed Vedas are the speech, air is

the heart, and (It is He) from whose two feet emerged the earth.

Of whom *mūrdhā*, head, the best limb; is *agnih*, (lit. fire, means here) heaven, in accordance with the Vedic text, "O Gautama, that world is surely fire" (Ch. V. iv. 1). Of whom *cakṣuṣī*, the two eyes: are *candrasūryau*, the moon and the sun. The words "of whom" are to be supplied everywhere, by transforming the word "*asya*, of Him", that follows (in the third line), to "*yaśya*, of whom". Of whom *diśaḥ śrotre*, the directions are the two ears; of whom *vivṛtāḥ vedāḥ*, the revealed, well-known, Vedas; are the *vāk*, speech; of whom *vāyuh prāṇah*, air is the vital force; *asya*, i.e. *yaśya*, of whom; *viśvam*, the whole universe; is *hrdayam*, the heart; for the entire world is a modification of the mind, inasmuch as it is seen to merge in the mind during deep sleep, and as even during the waking state it emerges out of it to exist divergently, like sparks out of fire. And of whom *padbhyām*, from the two feet; *pṛthivī*, the earth, is born. *Eṣah*, this one—the deity who is Viṣṇu (the all-pervading), or Ananta (the infinite), the first embodied Being who has the three worlds as His physical limiting adjunct—is *sarvabhūtāntarātmā*, the indwelling Self of all.

He is in fact the seer, hearer, thinker, knower, and the reality of all the senses in all beings. And the creatures, too, that transmigrate through the five fires,¹ are born from that very Puruṣa. This is being said:

¹Heaven, cloud, earth, father, and mother (Ch. V. iv-viii).

तस्मादग्निः समिधो यस्य सूर्यः
 सोमात्पर्जन्य ओषधयः पृथिव्याम् ।
 पुमान् रेतः सिञ्चति योषितायां
 बह्वीः प्रजाः पुरुषात्संप्रसूताः ॥५॥

5. From Him emerges the fire (i.e. heaven) of which the fuel is the sun. From the moon emerges cloud, and (from cloud) the herbs and corns on the earth. A man sheds the semen into a woman. From Puruṣa have originated many creatures.

Tasmāt, from that supreme Puruṣa; (originates) *agnih*, fire that is a particular abode (or state) of creatures. That (fire) is being specified; *yasya*, of which; *sūryaḥ*, the sun; is *samidhaḥ*, the fuel, as it were; for heaven is lighted up by the sun. *Somāt*, from the moon, that evolves out of heaven; originates *parjanyaḥ*, cloud, which is the second fire. From that cloud originate *oṣadhayaḥ*, the herbs and corns; *pṛthivyām*, on the earth (the third fire). *Pumān*, man that is (also) a (fourth) fire; *siñcati*, sheds; the *retas*, semen, that originates from the herbs and corns when poured as an oblation into the fire that is man; *yoṣitāyām* (should rather be *yoṣiti*), into the woman that is (the fifth) fire. In this order *bahvīḥ* (rather *bahvyaḥ*), many; *prajāḥ*, creatures; *samprasūtāḥ*, have originated; *puruṣāt*, from the supreme Puruṣa.

Moreover, it is being said that the auxiliaries of *karmas*, as well as their fruits, emerge verily from Him. How?

तस्माद्दृचः साम यजूषि दीक्षा
 यज्ञाश्च सर्वे क्रतवो दक्षिणाश्च ।
 संवत्सरश्च यजमानश्च लोकाः
 सोमो यत्र पवते यत्र सूर्यः ॥६॥

6. From Him (emerges) the *Ṛk*, *Sāma*, and *Yajur mantras*, initiation, all the sacrifices, whether with or without the sacrificial stake, offerings to Brāhmaṇas, the year, the sacrificer, and the worlds where the moon sanctifies (all) and where the sun (shines).

Tasmāt, from Him, from Puruṣa; (emerged) *ṛcaḥ*, the (metrical) *mantras* that have their letters, feet, and lines well regulated and have such metres as the *Gāyatrī* and so on. *Sāma* is that which is divided into five parts or seven parts and is embellished with *stobha* etc. and tune.¹ *Yajūmṣi* are the *mantras* whose letters, feet, and lines are not fixed, and which merely take the form of sentences. These are the three kinds of *mantras*. *Dikṣāi*, initiation, consisting in wearing a girdle etc., made of Muñja grass—that is to say, the different observances to be followed by the sacrificer (preparatory to the actual rite). *Ca sarve yajñāḥ*, and all the sacrifices—Agnihotra etc.—(in which animals are not sacrificed). *Kratavaḥ*, the sacrifices involving the use of a sacrificial stake. *Ca dakṣiṇāḥ*, and the

¹Consisting of five parts—*hnikāra*, *prastāva*, *udgītha*, *pratihāra*, and *nidhana*; of the seven parts—the foregoing five and *upadrava* and *ādi*. *Stobhas* are chanted interjections in a *Sāma* song, such as *hum*, *ho* (Vide Ch. I. xiii—II. xxi).

offerings to priests and Brāhmaṇas, ranging from the giving of a cow to all one possesses. *Ca saṁvat-sarah*, and year, which, as time, forms a factor in a rite. *Ca yajamānah*, and the sacrificer, the master (of the sacrifice). *Lokāḥ*, the worlds, that are the results of that sacrifice. Those results are being specified: *Yatra*, where, in which worlds; *somaḥ pavate*, the moon sanctifies, the creatures; and *yatra*, where; *sūryaḥ tapati*, the sun shines. These (worlds) are attainable through the two paths, called the Southern Course and the Northern Course, and are the results of the rites performed by the ignorant and the knowing people.

तस्माच्च देवा बहुधा संप्रसूताः
 साध्या मनुष्याः पशवो वयांसि ।
 प्राणापानौ व्रीहियवौ तपश्च
 श्रद्धा सत्यं ब्रह्मचर्यं विधिश्च ॥७॥

7. And from Him duly emerged the gods in various groups, the Sādhyas gods, human beings, beasts, birds, life, rice and barley, as well as austerity, faith, truth, continence, and dutifulness.

Ca, and; *tasmāt*, from that Puruṣa; *samprasūtāḥ*, duly issued out; *devāḥ*, the gods, that are ancillary to rites; *bahudhā*, variously in different groups of Vasus etc.¹ *sādhyāḥ*, Sādhyas, a particular class of gods; *manuṣyāḥ*, human beings who are entitled to undertake rites; *paśavaḥ*, beasts—both domestic and wild;

¹Eight Vasus, twelve Ādityas, eleven Rudras, etc.

vayāmsi, birds; and *prāṇa-apānau*, breathing in and out, constituting life; *vīhi-yavau*, rice and barley—meant for sacrificial offering; *ca tapas*, and austerity, either as a part of a rite meant for personal sanctification, or as an independent act leading to some result; *śraddhā*, faith—mental tranquillity and belief in the truth of things (taught by the scriptures and the teacher)—which is a precondition for all application of auxiliaries that are productive of human objectives; so also *satyam*, truth—avoidance of falsehood as well as speaking of facts as they occur, without causing injury; *brahmacaryam*, avoidance of sexual relation; *ca vidhiḥ*, and dutifulness.

सप्त प्राणाः प्रभवन्ति तस्मात्
 सप्तार्चिषः समिधः सप्त होमाः ।
 सप्त इमे लोका येषु चरन्ति प्राणा
 गुहाशया निहिताः सप्त सप्त ॥८॥

8. From Him emerge the seven sense-organs, the seven flames, the seven kinds of fuel, the seven oblations, and these seven seats where move the sense-organs that sleep in the cavity, having been deposited (by God) in groups of seven.

Moreover, *tasmāt*, from that very Puruṣa; *prabhavanti*, originate; *sapta prāṇāḥ*, the seven sense-organs, that are in the head;¹ and (so do) their *sapta arciṣaḥ*, seven flames—the illumination of their objects; simi-

¹Two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, and tongue.

larly the *sapta samidhah*, seven kinds of fuel—seven sense-objects, for the sense-organs are kindled by their objects; *sapta homih*, seven oblations—the perception of those sense-objects, for another Vedic text says, “That which is his sense-perception is what he offers as an oblation” (Mn. LXXX. 1). Besides, *ime sapta lokāh*, these seven seats of the senses; *yesu*, in which *caranti*, move about; *prāṇāh*, the sense-organs. The expression, “where move the sense-organs (*prāṇāh*)” is an attribute of the *prāṇas*, so as to exclude Prāṇa and Apāna (the functions of exhaling and inhaling). (They are) *guhāsayāh*; derived from the word *guhā* (cavity) and the root *si* (to sleep), *guhāsayāh*, means the sleepers in (the cavity of) the body or the heart, during sleep. *Nihitāh*, (having been) deposited—by the Ordainer; *sapta sapta*, in groups of seven, in each living being. The purport of the topic is that from the supreme, omniscient Puruṣa Himself emerge all that are the *karmas* or the fruits of *karmas* of those men of knowledge who sacrifice to the Self,¹ as well as all that are the *karmas* and the auxiliaries and results of *karmas* of the ignorant people.

अतः समुद्रा गिरयश्च सऽर्वे-

स्मात्स्यन्दन्ते सिन्धवः सर्वरूपाः ।

अतश्च सर्वा ओषधयो रसश्च

येनैष भूतैस्तिष्ठते ह्यन्तरात्मा ॥९॥

¹Those who perform sacrifices as a worship of the supreme Lord with this idea: “All this, as well as myself, is but the supreme Self.”—A.G.

9. From Him emerge all the oceans and all the mountains. From Him flow out the rivers of various forms. And from Him issue all the corns, as well as the juice, by virtue of which does the internal self exist in the midst of the elements.

Ataḥ, from this, Puruṣa, issue; *sarve*, all; *samudrāḥ*, the oceans, of Salt etc.; *ca girayaḥ*, and the mountains—Himalayas etc.; all these emerge from this Puruṣa Himself. *Asmāt*, from this Puruṣa; *syandante*, flow out; *sindhavaḥ*, the rivers—Gaṅgā etc.; *sarvarūpāḥ*, of various forms. *Ca ataḥ*, and from Him; *sarvaḥ ośadhayaḥ*, all corns—rice, barley, etc.; *ca rasaḥ*, and the juice—that is of six kinds;¹ *yena*, by virtue of which; *hi*, verily; *tiṣṭhate* (rather *tiṣṭhati*) exists; *bhūtaiḥ*, surrounded by the elements, that^r are gross and five in number; *eṣaḥ antarātmā*, this internal self, the subtle body, so called because of its existence in between the (gross) body and the Self.

Thus from Puruṣa emerged all this. Therefore “all that is a modification is supported by speech and exists only in name” (Ch. VI. i. 5-6), and it is false; but that which is Puruṣa is true. Hence:

पुरुष एवेदं विश्वं कर्म तपो ब्रह्म परामृतम् ।

एतद्यो वेद निहितं गुहायां सोऽविद्याग्रन्थिं

विकिरतीह सोम्य ॥१०॥

इति मुण्डकोपनिषदि द्वितीयमुण्डके प्रथमः खण्डः ॥

¹Has six kinds of taste—sweet, sour, bitter, pungent, astringent, saline.

10. Puruṣa alone is all this—(comprising, the *karma* and knowledge. He who knows this supremely immortal Brahman, as existing in the heart, destroys here the knot of ignorance, O good-looking one!

Puruṣaḥ eva, Puruṣa alone, is; *viśvam idam*, all this. There is no such thing as the universe apart from Puruṣa. Therefore the very thing that was asked in the question, “O adorable sir, (which is that thing) which having been known, all this becomes known?” (Mu. I. i. 3), has been stated here. For on knowing this Puruṣa, the supreme Self, the source of everything, there arises the realisation: “Puruṣa alone is all this—there is nothing besides.” It is being explained as to what this “all” means; *Karma*, such as Agnihotra; *tapas*, knowledge and the separate fruit accruing from it; all these constitute this “all”. And all that is but the product of Brahman. Therefore, *yaḥ*, he who; *veda*, knows, the *brahma parāmṛtam*, Brahman the supremely immortal—knows, (Brahman) thus —“I indeed am all this”, (knows) as *nihitam guhāyām*, existing in the heart of every being; *saḥ*, he; by virtue of such realisation; *vikirati*, throws away, destroys; *avidyāgranthim*, the knot of ignorance, the tendencies and impressions created by ignorance that are hard to untie like knots; *iha*, here, even while living, and not after death; *somya*, O good-looking (amiable) one!

SECOND MUNDAKA

CANTO II

It is being stated how the Immutable can be known, though It is formless:

आविः संनिहितं गुहाचरं नाम
महत्पदमत्रैतत् समर्पितम् ।

एजत्प्राणन्निमिषच्च यदेत-

ज्जानथ सदसद्वरेण्यं परं

विज्ञानाद्यद्वरिष्ठं प्रजानाम् ॥१॥

1. (It is) self-effulgent, well seated, and well known as moving in the heart, and (It is) the great goal. On It are fixed all these—that move, breathe, and wink or do not wink. Know this One that comprises the gross and the subtle, to be beyond the ordinary knowledge of creatures, and (It is) the eligible and the highest of all.

Āvih, self-effulgent, (and) *sannihitam*, well seated; appearing as though perceiving words etc. through the limiting adjuncts, viz the organs of speech etc., in accordance with another Vedic text, “It shines, It blazes up”, It is cognised in the hearts of all beings as revealing Itself through such functions of the conditioning factors as seeing, hearing, thinking, knowing. That Brahman that is *āvih*, effulgent and *sannihitam*, well seated, in the heart; is *guhācaram nāma*, well

known as moving in the cavity of the heart, through such modes as seeing and hearing. (It is) *mahat*, great, because It is the greatest of all; (It is) *padam*, the goal, since It is the resort of all beings, the word being derived from the root *pad* in the sense of that which is reached by all. Now is being shown how It is the great goal. Since *atra*, on this Brahman; *samarpitam*, is fixed—like the spokes to the nave of a chariot wheel; *ejat*, the moving, birds etc.; *prāṇat*, all that breathes—men and others who inhale and exhale; *yat nimīṣat*, all that has such activities as winking; *ca*, and—which word suggests all that does not wink; --*etat*, all this, is fixed on this very Brahman. *Etat*, this One, on which all things rest; *jānatha*, you know, O disciples! That which comprises the *sat* and the *asat* is what has become your Self; for the *sat*, formed, gross, and the *asat*, formless, subtle, do not exist apart from It. (Know) that very Entity alone that is surely the *vareṇyam*, eligible, covetable to all—because of Its eternity; (and that is) *param*, distinct; *vijñānāt*, from the knowledge; *prajānām*, of beings—this is how *vijñānāt* is connected with the remote *prajānām*; that is to say, It is beyond the range of ordinary knowledge. (Know) *yat variṣṭham*, that which is the highest; for that Brahman alone is the highest of all high things, by virtue of Its freedom from all defects.

यदर्चिमद्यदणभ्योऽण च

यस्मिँल्लोका निहिता लोकिनश्च ।

तदेतदक्षरं ब्रह्म स प्राणस्तदु वाङ्मनः

तदेतत्सत्यं तदमृतं तद्वेद्व्यं सोम्य विद्धि ॥२॥

2. That which is bright and is subtler than the subtle, and that on which are fixed all the worlds as well as the dwellers of the worlds, is this immutable Brahman; It is this vital force; It, again, is speech and mind. This Entity, that is such, is true, It is immortal. It is to be penetrated. O good-looking one, shoot at it.

Moreover, *yat*, that which is; *arcimat*, bright. Brahman is bright, because by Its light the sun etc. shine. Furthermore, *yat*, that which; is *aṇu*, subtle; *aṇubhyaḥ*, as compared with the minute things, e.g. the grain called *śyāmāka*. From the use of the word *ca* (and), it is implied that it is much bigger than the big earth etc. *Yasmin*, on which; *nihitāḥ*, are fixed; *lokāḥ*, worlds—earth etc.; *ca lokināḥ*, and the dwellers of the worlds—men and others; for all are known as dependent on Consciousness. *Tat etat akṣaram brahma*, It is this immutable Brahman, that is the support of all: that is *saḥ prāṇaḥ*, the familiar vital force; *tat u*, that, again, is the *vāñ-manāḥ*, speech and mind— as well as all the senses (of perception) and organs (of action). That Entity, again, is the inner Consciousness, for the assemblage of life and senses is dependent on Consciousness, as is shown in another Vedic text: “The Vital Force of the vital force” (Br. IV. iv. 18; Ke. I. 2). *Tat etat*, that Entity, the Immutable, that is thus the inner Consciousness within life etc.; is *satyam*, true; and therefore *tat amṛtam*, It is immortal, indestructible. *Tat veddhavyam*, that is to be penetrated, to be shot at, by the mind; the idea is that the mind is to be concentrated on It. Since this

is so, therefore *somya*, O good-looking one; *viddhi*, shoot—fix your mind on the Immutable.

It is being shown how It is to be shot at:

धनुर्गृहीत्वौपनिषदं महास्त्रं
 शरं ह्युपासानिशितं संधयीत ।
 आयम्य तद्भ्रावगतेन चेतसा
 लक्ष्यं तदेवाक्षरं सोम्य विद्धि ॥३॥

3. Taking hold of the bow, that is the great weapon familiar in the Upaniṣads, one should fix on it an arrow, sharpened with meditation. Drawing the string with a mind absorbed in Its thought, hit, O good-looking one, that very target that is the Immutable.

Gṛhītvā, taking up; the *dhanuḥ*, bow; consisting in the *mahāstram aupaniṣadam*, the great weapon that occurs, i.e. is well known in the Upaniṣads; on that bow *sandhayīta*, one should fix; a *śaram*, arrow. What kind of arrow? That is being stated: *Upāsānīṣitam*, sharpened, that is to say purified by constant meditation. And after fixing the arrow, and *āyamyā*, having drawn the string, that is to say, having withdrawn the inner organ together with the senses from the objects, and concentrating them on the target alone; for the literal meaning of drawing the string with the hand is not admissible here; *cetasā tadbhāvagatena*, with the mind absorbed in the *bhāva* or *bhāvanā*, thought of that Brahman; *viddhi*, hit; *somya*, O good looking one; *tat eva lakṣyam akṣaram*, that very target that is the Immutable, described earlier.

The bow etc. that have been mentioned are being specified:

प्रणवो धनुः शरो ह्यात्मा ब्रह्म तल्लक्ष्यमुच्यते ।

अप्रमत्तेन वेद्धव्यं शरवत्तन्मयो भवेत् ॥४॥

4. *Om* is the bow; the soul is the arrow; and Brahman is called its target. It is to be hit by an unerring man. One should become one with It just like an arrow.

Pranavaḥ, the syllable *Om*; is *dhanuḥ*, bow. Just as the bow is the cause of the arrow's hitting the target, so *Om* is the bow that brings about the soul's entry into the Immutable: For the soul when purified by the repetition of *Om*, gets fixed in Brahman with the help of *Om* without any hindrance, just as an arrow shot from a bow gets transfixed in the target. Therefore *Om* is a bow, being comparable to a bow. *Ātmā hi śarah*, the soul is surely the arrow—the soul that is but the supreme Self in Its conditioned state, that has entered here into the body as the witness of the modes of the intellect, like the sun etc. into water. That soul, like an arrow, is shot at the Self Itself that is the Immutable. Therefore *brahma*, Brahman, *ucyate*, is said to be, *tallakṣyam*, the target of the soul. It is called the target since, just as in the case of a mark, It is aimed at with self-absorption by those who want to concentrate their minds. That being so, the target that is Brahman, *veddhavyam*, should be shot at: *apramattena*, by one who is unerring, who is free from the error of desiring to enjoy external objects,

who is detached from everything, who has control over his senses and has concentration of mind. After that, after hitting the mark, *tanmayah bhavet*, one should remain identified with Brahman, *śaravat*, like an arrow. The idea is this: Just as the success of the arrow consists in its becoming one with the target, similarly one should bring about the result, consisting in becoming one with the Immutable, by eliminating ideas of self-identification with the body etc.

As the Immutable is hard to grasp, It is being presented over and over again so as to make It easily comprehensible:

यस्मिन्द्यौः पृथिवी चान्तरिक्ष-
मोतं मनः सह प्राणैश्च सर्वैः ।

तमेवैकं जानथ आत्मानमन्या
वाचो विमुञ्चथामृतस्यैष सेतुः ॥५॥

5. Know that Self alone that is one without a second, on which are strung heaven, the earth, and the inter-space, the mind and the vital forces together with all the other organs; and give up all other talks. This is the bridge leading to immortality.

Yasmin, that, the immutable Puruṣa, on whom; *dyauh*, heaven; *pṛithivī*, the earth; *ca antarikṣam*, and intermediate space; *otam*, are strung; *ca*, as also; *manas*, the mind; *saha sarvaih prāṇaiḥ*, together with all the other organs; *tam eva*, Him alone—the support of all; the *ekam*, one without a second; *jānatha* (is the

same as *jānītha*), (you) know, O disciples; and having known, *ātmānam*, the Self, the inmost reality of yourselves and all beings; *vimuñcatha* (is the same as *vimuñcata*), discard; *anyāḥ vācaḥ*, other talks, that constitute the lower knowledge; and give up also all *karmas* together with their fruits that are presented by the lower knowledge; because *eṣaḥ*, this, this knowledge of the Self; is the *setuḥ*, bridge, the means of achievement; *amṛtasya*, of immortality, of liberation. It is comparable to a bridge, since it is a means for getting across the great sea of the world. In support of this here is another Vedic text: "Knowing Him alone, one goes beyond death; there is no other path to proceed by"¹ (Śv. III. 8, VI. 15).

अरा इव रथनाभौ संहता यत्र नाड्यः

स एषोऽन्तश्चरते बहुधा जायमानः ।

ओमित्येवं ध्यायथ आत्मानं

स्वस्ति वः पराय तमसः परस्तात् ॥६॥

6. Within that (heart) in which are fixed the nerves like the spokes on the hub of a chariot wheel, moves this aforesaid Self by becoming multiformed. Meditate on the Self thus with the help of *Om*. May you be free from hindrances in going to the other shore beyond darkness.

Moreover, *yatra*, where, in the heart in which; *arāḥ iva*, like the spokes; *rathanābhau*, fixed on the

¹Or—"there is no other path for reaching (the goal)".

hub of a chariot wheel; *saṁhatāḥ*, are pinned; *nāḍyaḥ*, the nerves, that spread over the whole body; in that heart, *saḥ eṣaḥ*, that aforesaid One, the Self under discussion that is the witness of all the ideas occurring to the intellect; *antaḥ carate*, moves, exists, within, *carate* being the same as *carati*. (It exists) as though seeing, hearing, thinking, and knowing, and as though *bahudhā jāyamānaḥ*, becoming multiformed, in accordance with the mental states of anger, joy, etc., on account of Its conformity with the limiting adjunct, mind. Common people, accordingly say, "He has become joyous", "He has become angry". *Evam*, thus, resorting to the imagination stated above; you *dhyāyatha*, think; of that *ātmānam*, Self; *om iti*, with the help of *Om*. This is said, and has to be said, to the disciples by a teacher possessed of this knowledge. And the disciples have stepped on to the path of liberation after discarding all *karṁas*, for they hanker after the knowledge of Brahman. The teacher utters his benediction so that they may realise Brahman without any obstacle: *Svasti (astu)*, let there be no hindrance; *vaḥ*, for you; *parāya*,¹ for (reaching) the other shore; *parastāt*, beyond. Beyond what? *Tama-saḥ*, of the darkness, of ignorance; that is to say, for the realisation of the true nature of the Self as Brahman that is free from ignorance.

It is being shown as to where He exists who forms the subject-matter of the superior knowledge, who is beyond darkness, and who has to be reached after crossing the ocean of the world:

¹Another reading is "pārāya, for crossing over (to the shore)".

यः सर्वज्ञः सर्वविद्यस्यैष महिमा भुवि ।
 दिव्ये ब्रह्मपुरे ह्येष व्योमन्यात्मा प्रतिष्ठितः ॥
 मनोमयः प्राणशरीरनेता
 प्रतिष्ठितोऽन्ने हृदयं सन्निधाय ।
 तद्विज्ञानेन परिपश्यन्ति धीरा
 आनन्दरूपममृतं यद्विभाति ॥७॥

7. That Self which is omniscient in general and all-knowing in detail and who has such glory in this world—that Self, which is of this kind—is seated in the space within the luminous city of Brahman.

It is conditioned by the mind, It is the carrier of the vital forces and the body, It is seated in food by placing the intellect (in the cavity of the heart). The discriminating people realise, through their knowledge, the Self as existing in Its fullness on all sides—the Self that shines surpassingly as blissfulness and immortality.

The portion *yaḥ sarvajñāḥ sarvavit* was explained earlier (I.i.9). He being distinguished again: *Yasya eṣaḥ mahimā bhuvī*, He who has this well-known splendour in the world. What is that splendour? He under whose sway these heaven and earth are held in position; under whose rule the sun and moon rotate interminably like fire-brands; under whose command the rivers and seas do not overflow their boundaries; similarly under whose authority are directed the moving

and the unmoving: in the same way, whose command the seasons, half years, and years do not transgress; and so also under whose rule the agents, *karmas*, and fruits do not violate their appointed hours; *yasya*, He whose; *mahimā*, glory; is *eṣaḥ*, such; *bhuvī*, in the world; *eṣaḥ*, that One;—the *sarvajñāḥ*, omniscient (in general); the effulgent One of such glory;—is *pratiṣṭhitaḥ*, seated; in the *divye*, luminous—illuminated by all the states of the intellect; *brahmapure*, in the city of Brahma—this being the place where Brahman is ever manifest in Its nature of Consciousness; so “the city of Brahman” means the lotus of the heart. *Vyomni*, in the space, that is within that heart; Brahman is perceived as though seated there in that space within the lotus of the heart; for any going, coming, or staying, in any other sense, is impossible for One who is all-pervasive like space.

Saḥ, He, the Self, as seated there, is revealed variously through the mental states: and hence He is *manomayaḥ*, associated with the mind, being conditioned by it; *prāṇa-sarīra-netā*, the carrier of the vital forces and the body, in the matter of transferring them from the gross body to the other (gross or finer¹) body; *pratiṣṭhitaḥ anne*, existing in the food, that takes the shape of a body that is a modification of the food eaten and is subject to growth and decay day by day; *sannidhūya*, by depositing; the *hṛdayam*, intellect; in the cavity of the lotus (of the heart). The presence of the Self in the heart is what is meant by Its being seated in food (i.e. in the body), for the Self is not really seated in food. *Vijñānena*, through special knowledge, emerging from the instruction of

¹According to one reading, the finer body is meant.

scriptures and the teacher, and arising from the control of the inner and outer organs, renunciation of everything, and detachment; *dhūrāḥ*, the discriminating people; *paripaśyanti*, realise as existing in Its fullness everywhere; *tat*, that, that reality of the Self; *yat*, which; *vibhāti*, shines surpassingly, for ever in one's own Self; as *ānandarūpam*, blissfulness; as *amṛtam*, immortality, freed from all evil, miseries, and troubles.

The result of this knowledge of this supreme Self is being stated:

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः ।

क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे ॥८॥

8. When that Self, which is both high and low, is realised, the knot of the heart gets untied, all doubts become solved, and all one's actions become dissipated.

(When that which is both high and low is realised, then) *bhidyate*, is untied, is destroyed; *hṛdaya-granthiḥ*, the knot of the heart—the host of tendencies and impressions of ignorance, in the form of desires that hang on to the intellect, as is declared in another Vedic text: “the desires that subsist in one's heart” (Ka. II. iii. 14; Br. IV. iv. 7). They are based on one's heart and not on the Self. *Sarvasamśayāḥ*, all doubts, with regard to all objects of cognition, that persist in ordinary men continuously till death, like the current of the Gaṅgā; *chidyante*, are dispelled. *Ca*, and; *asya*, one's, of the man whose doubts have been solved, whose ignorance has been removed; *ksīyante*, get

dissipated; *karmāṇi*, the actions, that preceded the rise of illumination but had not yielded results in earlier lives, as also those actions that accompany the rise of illumination, but not so the actions that produced the present life, since they have already begun to bear their fruits. All this happens *tasmin dr̥ṣṭe parāvare*, when that One, the omniscient and transcendent—who is both *para*, high, as the cause, and *avara*, low, as the effect—is seen directly as “I am this”. The idea is that one becomes free on the eradication of the causes of the worldly state.

The following three verses sum up briefly all that has been stated earlier:

हिरण्मये परे कोशे विरजं ब्रह्म निष्कलम् ।

तच्छुभ्रं ज्योतिषां ज्योतिस्तद्यदात्मविदो विदुः ॥९॥

9. In the supreme, bright sheath is Brahman, free from taints and without parts. It is pure, and is the Light of lights. It is that which the knowers of the Self realise.

Para hiraṇmaye koṣe, in the supreme, bright sheath; it is called a sheath because of its being the place for the realisation of the nature of the Self, just as a scabbard is in the case of a sword; it is *para*, supreme, being the inmost of all; and *hiraṇmaya*, shining, being illumined with the intellectual perceptions. There exists *brahma*, Brahman, so called because of being the greatest as well as the Self of all; (Brahman that is) *virajam*, free from taints, from all taints of *rajas*, defects, such as ignorance; (that is) *niṣkalam*, without

any connection with parts, that is to say, partless. Since It is taintless and partless, therefore *tat*, It; is *śubhram*, pure; *tat*, that; is *jyotiḥ*, the illuminator; *jyotiṣūm*, of all lights, of even fire etc. that are inherently bright. The purport is this: The brightness of even fire etc. is caused by the internal light of their Self that is identical with Brahman. That light of the Self is the highest light that is not ignited by anything else. It is *tat*, that; *yat*, which; they *viduḥ*, know, who are *ātmaviduḥ*, knowers of the Self—the discriminating people who know their own Self as the witness of all intellectual modifications with regard to such objects as sound etc. People, engaged in the pursuit of the experiences of the Self, *tat viduḥ*, know It. Since It is the highest light, therefore they alone know It, and not the others who are steeped in the pursuit of external experiences.

It is being shown how It is the Light of lights:

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं
 नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः ।
 तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं
 तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति ॥१०॥

10. There the sun does not shine, nor the moon or the stars; nor do these flashes of lightning shine there. How can this fire do so? Everything shines according as He does so; by His light all this shines diversely.

Tatra, there, in Brahman that is the Self of the sun

itself; *sūryaḥ*, the sun, that illuminates everything; *na bhāti*, does not shine. The purport is that the sun does not illuminate that Brahman, for it is by the light of Brahman that the sun lights up all that is not the Self. Not that the sun is intrinsically possessed of the power of illuminating. Similarly, *na candratāra-kam*, neither the moon nor the stars; *na imāḥ vidyutaḥ*, nor these lightning flashes; *bhānti*, shine; *kutaḥ ayam agniḥ*, how can this fire, that is known to us? To cut short, this universe *anubhāti*, shines in accordance *tam eva bhāntam*, as He, the supreme Lord, shines; because of the fact that He is naturally effulgent. Just as water, firebrand, etc., burn according as the fire does so, owing to their contact with fire, but not by themselves, similarly, only *tasya bhāsā*, by His light, *sarvam idam*, all this—the universe constituted by the sun etc., *ibhāti*, shines diversely. Since, in this way, it is that very Brahman that illuminates and shines through the different manifested lights, therefore it is inferred that Brahman has Its light by Its own right; for anything that is not possessed of natural luminosity cannot enkindle others, for pots etc. are not seen to illuminate others whereas luminous things, like the sun etc., are seen to do so.

It has been established elaborately with the help of reasoning that Brahman, which is the Light of lights, is alone true, and that everything else is Its modification—a modification that exists only in name, having speech alone as its support. That fact is being restated at the end by this *mantra* which is a sort of concluding reaffirmation of the foregoing:

ब्रह्मैवेदममृतं पुरस्ताद्ब्रह्म पश्चाद्ब्रह्म दक्षिणतश्चोत्तरेण।
अधश्चोर्ध्वं च प्रसृतं ब्रह्मैवेदं विश्वमिदं वरिष्ठम् ॥११॥
इति मुण्डकोपनिषदि द्वितीयमुण्डके द्वितीयः खण्डः ॥

11. All this that is in front is but Brahman, the immortal. Brahman is on the right, as well as on the left; above and below, too, is extended Brahman alone. This world is nothing but Brahman, the highest.

Idam brahma eva, this is but Brahman, as defined earlier; that is *purastāt*, in front; that which appears (as an object) in front of people, whose vision is affected by ignorance, is Brahman alone. Similarly, *brahma paścāt*, Brahman is at the back; so also *dakṣiṇataḥ*, on the right; *ca uttareṇa*, and on the left; similarly *adhaḥ*, below; *ca ūrdhvam*, and above, all that is *prasṛtam*, extended everywhere, in the shape of products, appears as different from Brahman, and is possessed of name and form. To be brief, *idam*, this; *viśvam*, universe; is *varīṣṭham*, the most high; *brahma eva*, Brahman alone. All ideas of non-Brahman are but ignorance like the idea of the snake superimposed on a rope.¹ Brahman alone is the supreme truth. This is the declaration of the Vedas.

¹The identity of Brahman and the universe, implied by the sentence, is by way of elimination of the latter. We say, "That (supposed) ghost is but a stump", meaning thereby that the stump alone exists, the idea of ghost being false. So when we say, "The world is but Brahman", we mean that Brahman alone exists, and nothing else.

THIRD MUNDAKA

CANTO I

That higher knowledge has been presented, by which is attained that immutable Truth, called Puruṣa, from whose realisation follows the total eradication of such causes of the worldly state as the knots of the heart. And Yoga, as the means for this realisation, has also been stated with the help of such imagery as the taking up of a bow. Now have to be presented truth and the rest that are helpful auxiliaries to that Yoga; therefore the subsequent text is begun. And though Reality was determined earlier, It, too, is being primarily ascertained in a different way; for It is very inscrutable. While on this subject, a *mantra*, which takes the place of a brief enunciation, is being introduced as a help to the comprehension of the supreme Reality:

द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया
समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते ।
तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्य-
नश्नन्नन्यो अभिचाकशीति ॥१॥

1. Two birds that are ever associated and have similar names, cling to the same tree. Of these, the one eats the fruit of divergent tastes, and the other looks on without eating.

Dvī (or rather *dvau*, means) two; *suparṇū* (being the same as *suparṇau*, means) entities who are well related,¹ or they are so called because of their analogy with birds:² (which are) *sayujū* (that is to say, *sayujau*), ever associated together; *sakhāyā* (or rather *sakhāyau*), bear the same names, and have the same cause of manifestation. Being of such characteristics, these two *pariśasyajāte*, hug (cling to), like two birds; *samānam vṛkṣam*, the same single tree, for enjoying the fruits. It is the "same" in the sense of the identity of the place of their perception; and "tree" means the body because of being demolished like the tree. This is the banyan tree³ that has its roots upward and branches downward (G. XV. 1; Ka. II. iii. 1), that sprouts up from its material cause, the Unmanifested (*Māyā*), called the field (G. XIII. 1-3), and that provides a support for all the results of *karmas* of all beings. God and the soul—as conditioned by the subtle body which holds in itself the tendencies and impressions created by ignorance, desire, and action, —cling to it like two birds. *Tayoh*, of these two; who hug this tree; *anyah*, the one (the individual soul), the knower of the field who clings to the tree of the subtle body that is its limiting adjunct; *atti*, eats, enjoys, owing to non-discrimination; *pippalam*, the fruit, consisting of happiness and misery brought about by action; which is *svādu*, full of tastes, consist-

¹The individual soul, with its limited knowledge, is under the control of God who is omniscient. Through this commendable dependence the former is related with the latter.

²Since clinging to the tree etc. are found in both the cases.

³*Aśvattha*, means a banyan; but derivatively it means transitory—whose existence tomorrow (*śvabh*) is unpredictable.

ing in the experience of multifarious mental reactions. *Anāśnan*, without tasting; *anyaḥ*, the other, God, who is by nature eternal, pure, wise, and free, who is omniscient and has the totality of Māyā as His limiting adjunct—that God does not taste: for merely by His presence as the eternal witness, He is the director of both the enjoyer and the enjoyed. He is the other one who merely *abhicākaśīti*, looks on, without enjoying; for His directorship consists in mere observation, as in the case of a king.

समाने वृक्षे पुरुषो निमग्नोऽ-

नीशया शोचति मुह्यमानः ।

जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीश-

मस्य महिमानमिति वीतशोकः ॥२॥

2. On the same tree, the individual soul remains drowned (i.e. stuck); as it were; and so it moans, being worried by its impotence. When it sees thus the other, the adored Lord, and His glory, then it becomes liberated from sorrow.

Facts being as they are, *samāne vṛkṣe*, in the same tree, in the body mentioned earlier; (there moans) *puruṣaḥ*, the enjoying individual soul; being *nimagnaḥ*, sunken. Drowned in the water of the sea (of the world) like a bottle gourd, under the heavy weight of ignorance, desire, and attachment to the fruits of action, owing to complete identification with the body, this very being has such ideas as, "I am the son of such a one and the grandson of that

one; I am lean, I am stout; I have qualities, I am devoid of qualities; I am happy, I am miserable"; and he thinks that apart from that personality of his there is no other; and so he takes birth and dies, and gets united with or separated from friends and relatives. And therefore *anīśa-yā*, through impotence, consisting in such moods of despondency as, "I am good for nothing", "My son is lost, and my wife is dead; what avails my life?"—with such moods he *śocati*, grieves, is smitten; *muhyamānaḥ*, being worried, by various kinds of troubles because of his ignorance. That soul, while constantly undergoing the degradation of being born among ghosts, beasts, men, and others, is, in the course of multifarious births, perchance shown the path of Yoga, as a result of his accumulation of good deeds, by some very compassionate person; and then becoming endowed with non-injury, truth, continence, renunciation of everything, control of internal and external organs, and concentration of mind, *yadū*, when, while engaged in meditation; (it) *paśyati*, sees; through diverse paths of Yoga and through *karmas*, *juṣṭam*, the adored One; *anyam*, the One who is other—other than that conditioned by the limiting adjunct of the tree of the world; (sees) *īśam*, the Lord—who is supramundane, beyond hunger, thirst, sorrow, delusion, and death, the Lord of the whole universe—(sees thus): "I am this God who is the Self of all and is the same in every being; and I am not the other illusory Self delimited by conditions conjured up by ignorance"; and when he sees *asya mahimānam*, His glory, constituted by the universe; *iti*, in this way; "This is my glory who am the supreme Lord"—when he sees thus, *tadū*, then; he becomes *vītaśokaḥ*, lib-

erated from grief, becomes saved from all the sea of sorrow, that is to say, he reaches the end of all desires.

Another verse also presents this very idea elaborately:

यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं
 कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम् ।
 तदा विद्वान्पुण्यपापे विधूय
 निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति ॥३॥

3. When the seer sees the Puruṣa—the golden-hued, creator, lord, and the source of the inferior Brahman—then the illumined one completely shakes off both virtue and vice, becomes taintless, and attains absolute equality.

Yadā, when; the *paśyah*, seer—the word, derived in the sense of one who sees, means the illumined aspirant; *paśyate* (is the same as *paśyati*), sees, in the manner described earlier; *rukma-varṇam*, the naturally self-effulgent One, or the (golden-hued) One whose light is indestructible like that of gold; *kartāram*, the creator; *īśam*, the lord, of the whole universe; *puruṣam*, Puruṣa; *brahmayonim*, the Brahman that is the source, or (the phrase means) the source of the inferior Brahman;—when he sees thus, *tadā*, then; that *vidvān*, illumined one, the seer; *vidhūya*, having completely shaken off, burnt away, together with their roots, both *puṇyapāpe*, virtue and vice—the two kinds of action that constitute bondage; and having become *nirañjanah*, free from taint, free from

suffering; *upaiti*, achieves; *paramam sām̐yam*, absolute equality, consisting in non-duality. The equality within the range of duality is indeed inferior to it. As compared with this, he attains the highest equipoise that is the same as non-duality.

प्राणो ह्येष यः सर्वभूतैर्विभाति
 विजानन्विद्वान्भवते नातिवादी ।
 आत्मक्रीड आत्मरतिः क्रियावा-
 नेष ब्रह्मविदां वरिष्ठः ॥४॥

4. This one is verily the Vital Force which shines divergently through all beings. Knowing this, the illumined man has no (further) occasion to go beyond anything in his talk. He disports in the Self, delights in the Self, and is engrossed in (spiritual) effort. This one is the chief among the knowers of Brahman.

Furthermore, *hi eṣaḥ*, verily this One, the One under discussion; viz. *prāṇaḥ*, the Vital Force of the vital forces, who is the supreme Lord; *vibhāti*, shines divergently; *sarvabhūtaih*, through all beings, ranging from *Brahmā* to a clump of grass; the third (instrumental) case is used here to indicate the state of the thing; and so the phrase means, "as existing among all beings as the Self of all". He who becomes *vidvān*, an illumined soul; *vijānan*, after having known, this all-pervasive One as his own Self, directly through the experience, "I am this"; (he) *na bhavate*, does not become (*bhavate* being the same as *bhavati*), what

one does by virtue of mere scriptural knowledge. What does he not become? *Ativādī*, a tall talker, is one who is apt to go beyond all things in his talk. But the one who has become enlightened by realising directly the Self that is the Vital Force of the vital forces has no occasion to surpass others in his talk. This is the purport. For when the realisation comes that everything is the Self and there is nothing besides, then what will he excel in his speech? But the man for whom there is the vision of something different (from the Self) can talk by going beyond it. This enlightened man, however, does not see anything, does not hear anything, does not cognise anything apart from the Self; therefore he does not go beyond anything in his talk. Moreover, (he becomes) *ātma-kṛīḍāḥ*, disporter in the Self alone, and in nothing else, e.g. in sons, wife, and others. Similarly, (he is) *ātma-ratīḥ*, he has his enjoyment, pleasure, in the Self alone. The distinction between the two is that *kṛīḍā* (disport) is dependent on external accessories, whereas *ratīḥ* (pleasure) is independent of auxiliaries, and consists in a mere pleasurable feeling towards external objects. So also *kriyāvān*, is one who is possessed of, i.e. devoted to, (spiritual) practices like knowledge, meditation, detachment, and so on. If there is (i.e. if *ātmaratī* and *kriyāvān* appear as) a compound, then the meaning will be "whose activity consists in his pleasure in the Self", in which case either the implication of the *bahuvrīhi* compound or the meaning of the suffix *matup* (i.e. *vān* in *kriyāvān*), (both indicating possession), becomes redundant.¹

¹The *bahuvrīhi* form should be simply *ātmaratikriyāḥ*, which conveys the same meaning, so that the suffix *vān* becomes

(From this single compound) some, however, aim at deriving a meaning¹ conducive to the combination of *karma*, like Agnihotra etc., with the knowledge of Brahman. But this runs counter to the statement of the primary idea in “*eṣaḥ brahmavidām varīṣṭhaḥ*, this one is the highest of those who know Brahman”. For none who is steeped in external actions can disport in the Self and delight in the Self, inasmuch as one can disport in the Self only on ceasing from external activity, external activity, and disport in the Self being opposed to each other. For light and darkness cannot possibly exist simultaneously at the same place. Therefore the assertion that by this (compound) is established the combination of knowledge and *karma* is a vain rignarole. And this is borne out by the Vedic texts: “Give up all other talks” (Mu. II. ii. 5), “Through the Yoga of renunciation” (Mu. III. ii. 6), and so on. Therefore he alone is here the “man of action” (*kriyāvān*) who is engaged in the practice of knowledge, meditation, and so on, and who is a monk who does not transgress the limits of moral propriety. He who conforms to this description, who has nothing to transcend in his talk, who disports in his Self and delights in his Self, who is given to spiritual practices, and who is fixed in Brahman, is *brahmavidām varīṣṭhaḥ*, the chief among all the knowers of Brahman.

Now are being enjoined for the monk such disciplines as truth and the rest that are predominately

useless. Or if the suffix is retained, the *bahuvrīhi* loses its import-

¹Viz “disporting in the Self and performing *karma*”.

characterised by detachment and that are helpful to the fullest knowledge.

सत्येन लभ्यस्तपसा ह्येष आत्मा
 सम्यग्ज्ञानेन ब्रह्मचर्येण नित्यम् ।
 अन्तःशरीरे ज्योतिर्मयो हि शुभ्रो
 यं पश्यन्ति यतयः क्षीणदोषाः ॥५॥

5. The bright and pure Self within the body, that the monks with (habitual effort and) attenuated blemishes see, is attainable through truth, concentration, complete knowledge, and continence, practised constantly.

(The Self is) *labhyaḥ*, attainable; *satyena*, through truth, through the rejection of untruth; moreover, *tapasū hi*, verily through the concentration, of the mind and senses, which meaning (of *tapas*) follows from the Smṛiti, "The highest *tapas* (lit. austerity) consists in the concentration of the mind and senses" (Mbh. Śa. 250. 4). That kind of *tapas* is indeed the greatest favourable discipline because of its natural tendency towards a vision of the Self, but not so the other kind of *tapas* (austerity) e.g. *cāndrāyaṇa* and the rest. The expression, "*eṣaḥ ātmā labhyaḥ*—this Self is attainable", is understood everywhere. (This self is attainable) *samyag-jñānena*, by complete knowledge, by the vision of the Self in Its reality;¹ *brahma-*

¹By *samyak jñāna*, here, is to be understood such immature but adequate knowledge of the meaning of the text that matures into the knowledge of the thing itself. The mature knowledge, productive of direct perception, does not depend on other factors

caryeṇa, (by continence), through avoidance of sexual relationship. By following the analogy of the lamp placed in the middle (which lights up everything on all sides), the word, “*nityam*—(practised for) ever,” should be supplied everywhere thus: by truth practised for ever: by concentration (practised for) ever; by complete knowledge (practised for) ever. And it will be said later on, “those in whom there is no crookedness, no falsehood, and no dissimulation” (Pr. I. 16). Which is this Self that is to be attained through these disciplines? The answer is being given. (That Self is) *antahśarīre*, inside the body, in the space within the lotus of the heart; (which Self is) *īyotirmayaḥ*, golden-hued (III. i. 3); and *śubhraḥ*, holy; *yam*, which, which Self; *yatayaḥ*, the monks who habitually strive for It; *kṣīṇadoṣāḥ*, whose mental defects—anger etc.—have become attenuated; *paśyanti*, see, realise. That Self is attained by the monks through the disciplines of truth etc. constantly practised, but not through inconstant truth etc. This is eulogistic for commending the disciplines of truth and the rest.

सत्यमेव जयते नानृतं

सत्येन पन्था विततो देवयानः ।

येनाऽऽक्रमन्त्यृषयो ह्याप्तकामा

यत्र तत्सत्यस्य परमं निधानम् ॥६॥

for bringing about its results, viz the cessation of ignorance. So it is immature knowledge that alone can be combined with such disciplines as truth etc. for the acquisition of mature knowledge.

6. Truth alone wins, and not untruth. By truth is maintained for ever the path called *Devayāna*, by which the desireless seers ascend to where exists the supreme treasure attainable through truth.

Satyam eva, truth indeed, the truthful man; *jayate*,¹ wins; *na anṛtam*, not untruthfulness, not the untruthful man; for truth or untruth, by itself, without being practised by men, can have neither victory nor defeat. It is a familiar fact in the world that an untruthful man is defeated by a truthful one, but not contrariwise. Therefore truth is proved to be a powerful auxiliary. Besides, from scripture it is known that truth is a superior discipline. How? *Satyena*, by truth, through the prescription of speaking of things as they are; the *panthāḥ*, path: called *devayānaḥ*, *Devayāna*, the Path of gods; is *vitataḥ*, spread, maintained for ever; *yena*, by which (path); *ākramanti*, ascend; the *ṛṣayaḥ*, seers, who are free from deceit, diplomacy, want of charity, pride, and falsehood; who are *āpta-kūmāḥ*, free from desires for everything. (They ascend there) *yatra*, where: exists *tat*, that; *paramam*, best; *nidhānam*, treasure, that is deposited as a human goal; *satyasya*, as related—by way of being its result—with truth, which is the highest discipline. The path, too, by which they ascend there, is laid with truth—this is how this portion is to be construed with the earlier.

It is being said what that thing is and what Its attributes are:

¹Another reading is *jayati*.

बृहच्च तद्विव्यमचिन्त्यरूपं
 सूक्ष्माच्च तत्सूक्ष्मतरं विभाति ।
 दूरात्सुदूरे तदिहान्तिके च
 पश्यत्स्वहैव निहितं गुहायाम् ॥७॥

7. It is great and self-effulgent; and Its form is unthinkable. It is subtler than the subtle. It shines diversely. It is further away than the far-off, and It is near at hand in this body. Among sentient beings It is (perceived as) seated in this very body, in the cavity of the heart.

Tat, that the Brahman under consideration, which is attainable through the disciplines of truth and the rest; is *br̥hat*, great, because of Its all-pervasiveness; *divyam*, self-effulgent, super-sensuous; and (It is) therefore *acintya-rūpam*, such as Its features cannot be thought of; It is *sukṣmataram*, subtler, than the subtle things like space, for Its subtleness is unsurpassing, It being the cause of all; It *vibhāti*, shines variously as sun, moon, and the rest. Besides, *tat*, that, that Brahman; exists *sudūre*, still further away; *dūrāt*, than the far-off place; for it is extremely unattainable to the ignorant; *ca*, and; (It is) *iha*, here, in the body; *antike*, near, close at hand, to the enlightened, because It is the Self and It permeates all; for the Veda declares that it is inside even space. As engaged in such activities as seeing etc., It is perceived by the Yogis as *nihitam*, seated; *iha*, in this body; *paśyatsu*, amongst those who have eyes, i.e. among sentient beings. Where is It perceived? *Guhāyām*, in the cavity (of the heart), called the intellect; for by the

enlightened It is perceived as hidden there; and yet, though existing there, It is not perceived by the ignorant because of Its being covered by ignorance.

A unique means for Its realisation is being stated again :

न चक्षुषा गृह्यते नापि वाचा
नान्यैर्देवैस्तपसा कर्मणा वा ।

ज्ञानप्रसादेन विशुद्धसत्त्व-
स्ततस्तु तं पश्यते निष्कलं ध्यायमानः ॥८॥

8. It is not comprehended through the eye, nor through speech, nor through the other senses; nor is It attained through austerity or *karma*. Since one becomes purified in mind through the favourableness of the intellect, therefore can one see that indivisible Self through meditation.

As *na grhyate*, (It is) not comprehended, *cakṣuṣā*, by the eye, by anybody, because of Its formlessness; *na api*, nor even is It encompassed *vācā*, by speech, because of Its unutterability; *na anyaiḥ devaiḥ*, nor by the other senses; *na tapasā*, nor by austerity, is It grasped, though *tapas* is the means for the achievement of everything; similarly *na*, nor, is It attained; *karmanā* by Vedic *karma*, to wit, Agnihotra etc., which are celebrated for their great efficacy. What then is the means for Its attainment? That is being said: *Jñānaprasādena*, through the favourableness of knowledge (i.e. the intellect).¹ Though the intellect in all

¹The word *jñāna*, here is derived in the sense of that by which one knows. It means the intellect, the instrument of knowledge—A.G.

beings is intrinsically able to make the Self known, still, being polluted by such blemishes as attachment to external objects etc., it becomes agitated and impure, and does not, like a stained mirror or ruffled water, make the reality of the Self known, though It is ever at hand. The favourableness of the intellect comes about when it continues to be transparent and tranquil on having been made clean like a mirror, water, etc., by the removal of the pollution caused by the dirt of attachment, springing from the contact of the senses and sense-objects. Since *viśuddhasattvaḥ*, one who has become pure in mind, through that favourableness of the intellect, becomes fit for seeing Brahman; *tataḥ tu*, therefore; *paśyate* (is the same as *paśyati*), one sees, realises, *tam*, that Self; (that is) *niṣkalam*, indivisible, devoid of all differentiation of limbs; *dhyāyamānaḥ* while (one is) engaged in meditation, when (It is) thought of by one with a concentrated mind, after having such spiritual disciplines as truth etc. and having the senses withdrawn (from objects).¹

एषोऽणुरात्मा चेतसा वेदितव्यो
 यस्मिन्प्राणः पञ्चधा संविवेश ।
 प्राणैश्चित्तं सर्वमोतं प्रजानां
 यस्मिन्विशुद्धे विभवत्येष आत्मा ॥९॥

9. Within (the heart in) the body, where the vital force has entered in five forms, is

¹Through meditation is attained the favourableness of the intellect, which leads to the seeing of the Self. It is the Upanisadic knowledge, freed from doubt etc., that leads to the realisation of truth; mere meditation has no such ability.— A.G.

this subtle Self to be realised through that intelligence by which is pervaded the entire mind as well as the motor and sensory organs of all creatures. And It is to be known in the mind, which having become purified, this Self reveals Itself distinctly.

The Self, which one sees thus: *eṣaḥ*, this; *aṇuḥ*, subtle; *ātmā*, Self; *veditavyaḥ*, is to be known through the pure *cetasū*, intelligence, only. Where is It to be realised? *Yasmin*, where, in the body in which; *prāṇaḥ*, the vital force; *saṁviveśa*, has entered well; *pañcadhā*, in five different forms, viz *Prāṇa*, *Apāna*, etc.; in that very body, i.e. in the heart, It is to be known through intelligence. This is the idea. Through what kind of intelligence is it to be known? That is being said: Through that intelligence by which *sarvam cittam*, the whole mind, internal organ; *prajānām*, of creatures; *prāṇaiḥ saha*, together with their motor and sensory organs; is *otam*, pervaded, as milk is with butter or wood with fire; for the entire internal organ of every creature in this world is familiarly known to be possessed of sentience. Moreover, It is to be known in that internal organ, *yasmin viśuddhe*, which having become pure, freed from the dirt of grief etc.; *eṣaḥ ātmā*, the foregoing Self; *vibhavati*, reveals Itself distinctly, in Its own reality.

For one, who attains as his own Self that which is the Self of all and is possessed of the above characteristics, is being stated the result, consisting in the attainment of all, which follows from the very fact of his becoming one with all:

यं यं लोकं मनसा संविभाति
 विशुद्धसत्त्वः कामयते यांश्च कामान् ।
 तं तं लोकं जयते तांश्च कामां-
 स्तस्मादात्मज्ञं ह्यर्चयेद्भूतिकामः ॥१०॥

इति मुण्डकोपनिषदि तृतीयमुण्डके प्रथमः खण्डः ॥

10. The man of pure mind wins that world which he mentally wishes for and those enjoyable things which he covets. Therefore one, desirous of prosperity, should adore the knower of the Self.

Yam yam lokam, any world whichsoever, such as the world of the Manes etc., that; *viśuddhasattvaḥ*, the man of pure mind, the man freed from the mental afflictions (*kleśa*),¹ the knower of the Self; *saṁvibhāti*, wishes for; *manasā*, with the mind, while thinking "Let this be mine or for somebody else"; *ca*, and; *yān kāmān*, those enjoyable things that; *kāmayate*, (he) covets; *jayate*, he wins, gets; *tam tam lokam* those very worlds; *ca tān kāmān*, and those enjoyable things that are wished for. Since the wishes of the enlightened man are infallible, *tasmāt*, therefore; *bhūtikāmaḥ*, one who hankers after prosperity; *arcayet*, should worship, through washing of feet, service, salutation, etc.; *ātmajñam*, the knower of the Self, purified in mind by virtue of his knowledge of the Self. Therefore such a knower is certainly adorable.

¹*Kleśa*—ignorance, egotism, desire, aversion, and tenacity for mundane existence (*Yoga-sūtra*, II. 3).

THIRD MUNDAKA

CANTO II

स वेदैत्परमं ब्रह्म धाम
यत्र विश्वं निहितं भाति शुभ्रम् ।
उपासते पुरुषं ये ह्यकामा-
स्ते शुक्रमेतदतिवर्तन्ति धीराः ॥१॥

1. He knows this supreme abode, this Brahman, in which is placed the universe and which shines holy. Those wise ones indeed, who having become desireless, worship this (enlightened) person, transcend this human seed.

Since *saḥ*, he; *veda*, knows; the *paramam dhāma*, best abode, the resort of all desires; (that is) *etat brahma*, this Brahman, as defined before; *yatra*, where in which Brahman, as the abode; *viśvān nihitam*, the whole universe is placed; and which *bhāti*, shines in Its own lustre; *śubhram*, purely, (holy); (therefore) *ye*, those people *akāmāḥ*, who having become free from desire, free from the passion for prosperity; *upāsate*, serve—with aspiration for liberation; even that *puruṣam*, person, who is such a knower of the Self—just as they would worship the supreme Reality; *te*, those; *dhīrāḥ*, wise ones; *atīvartanti*, transcend; *etat śukram*, this human seed—that is well known as the material source of the body; they never again approach any womb (for rebirth), as declared in the Vedic text:

“He has no liking for any abode any more.” Therefore one should adore him. This is the purport.

It is being shown that the eschewing of desires is the chief discipline for an aspirant of liberation:

कामान्यः कामयते मन्यमानः

स कामभिर्जायते तत्र तत्र ।

पर्याप्तकामस्य कृतात्मनस्तु

इद्वैव सर्वे प्रविलीयन्ति कामाः ॥२॥

2. He who covets the desirable things, while brooding (on their virtues), is born amidst those very surroundings along with the desires. But for one who has got his wishes fulfilled and whose Self is self-established, all the longings vanish even here.

Yah, he who; *kāmayate*, covets; *kāmān*, desirable things—seen or unseen; *manyamānaḥ*, while brooding, on them, on their good qualities; *saḥ*, he; *jāyate*, is born; *kāmabhiḥ*, along with those desires, the longing for objects that lead to involvement in virtues and vices; *tatra tatra*, amidst those surroundings, into which the desires tempt the man for the sake of acquiring the objects. He is born amidst those very objects, surrounded by those very desires. *Tu*, but; for him who has got his wishes fulfilled on the realization of the supreme Reality—*paryāptakāmasya*, for the man of fully satisfied desires, for him who has achieved all covetable things from everywhere by virtue of his craving for the Self; *kṛtātmanah*, for the self-poised Self, for the man whose Self, having been

weaned away from Its inferior aspect constituted by ignorance, has become established in Its own superior aspect through knowledge; *sarve kāmāḥ*, all longings, that induce virtuous or vicious activity; *pravṛṇiyanti*, vanish, that is to say, get dissipated; *iha eva*, even here, even while the body lasts. The purport is that desires do not crop up (in his mind) owing to the destruction of their causes.

Some may be led to think that if the attainment of the Self be the highest of all achievements, then for Its realisation one should practise extensively such processes as the study of the Vedas. This notion being there, the text says:

नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो
 न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन ।
 यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्य-
 स्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनुं स्वाम् ॥३॥

3. This Self is not attained through study, nor through the intellect, nor through much hearing. By the very fact that he (i.e. the aspirant) seeks for It, does It become attainable; of him this Self reveals Its own nature.

Ayam ātmā, this Self, that has been explained, and whose attainment is the highest human goal; *na labhyaḥ*, is not attained; *pravacanena*, through study, of Vedas and scriptures extensively. Similarly, *na medhayā*, nor through intelligence, the power of retention of the purport of texts; *na bahunā śrutena*, nor through many things heard, that is to say, through much

hearing (of scriptures). By what then can It be reached? That is being explained. *Yam eva*, that very entity, the supreme Self, which; *eṣaḥ*, this one, the man of knowledge; *vṛṇute*, seeks to reach; *tena*, by that fact of hankering;¹ (*eṣaḥ*, this, the supreme Self); *labhyaḥ*, is attainable; but not through any other spiritual effort, for It is by Its very nature ever attained. Now is being explained how this attainment of the Self by the man of knowledge comes about. *Tasya*, of him: *eṣaḥ ātmā*, this Self; *vivṛṇute*, reveals; *svām tanum*, Its own supreme stature, Its reality that was enveloped in ignorance; the idea is that when knowledge dawns, the Self becomes revealed just like pots etc. on the coming of light. Hence the purport is that the means for the attainment of the Self consists in praying for this consummation to the exclusion of everything else.

These spiritual disciplines, too—viz strength, absence of delusion, and knowledge—as associated with their signs, that is to say, coupled with monasticism, are helpful to the prayer for the attainment of the Self. For:

नायमात्मा बलहीनेन लभ्यो
 न च प्रमादात्तपसो वाऽप्यलिङ्गात् ।
 एतैरुपायैर्यतते यस्तु विद्वां-
 स्तस्यैष आत्मा विशते ब्रह्मधाम ॥४॥

4. This Self is not attained by one devoid of strength, nor through delusion, nor through knowledge unassociated with monasticism. But the Self of that knower, who strives

¹Consisting in pursuing the idea, "I am Brahman."

through these means, enters into the abode that is Brahman.

Since this Self *na labhyaḥ*, is not attainable; *balahīnena*, by one devoid of strength, bereft of the vigour generated by constant adherence to the Self; *na ca pramādāt*, nor again through the delusion, caused by attachment to mundane things—son, cattle, etc.; similarly nor even *tapasaḥ*, from *tapas*; *aliṅgāt*, unassociated with *liṅga* (i.e. the sign of a monk).¹ *Tapas* here means knowledge, and *liṅga* means monasticism. The purport is that It is not gained through knowledge unassociated with monasticism. *Tu*, but; *yaḥ vidvān*, the man of knowledge, the discerning man, the knower of the Self, who; *yataḥ*, strives, with diligence; *etaiḥ upāyaiḥ*, through such means—strength, absence of delusion, monasticism, and knowledge; *taṣya*, of him, of that enlightened man; *eṣaḥ ātmā*, this Self; *viśate*, enters into; the *brahmadhāma*, abode that is Brahman.

How one enters into Brahman is being stated:

संप्राप्यैनमृषयो ज्ञानतृप्ताः

कृतात्मानो वीतरागाः प्रशान्ताः ।

ते सर्वगं सर्वतः प्राप्य धीरा

युक्तात्मानः सर्वमेवाविशन्ति ॥५॥

¹Śaṅkara is very emphatic that external renunciation is necessary (see introductions to this and Aitareya Upaniṣads). But Ānanda Giri seems to differ. Says he, "Why should this be so, since the Vedas mention the attainment of the Self by Indra, Janaka, Gārgī, and others? That is a valid objection. Sannyāsa consists in renunciation of everything; and since they had no

5. Having attained this, the seers become contented with their knowledge, established in the Self, freed from attachment, and composed. Having realised the all-pervasive One everywhere, these discriminating people, ever merged in contemplation, enter into the All.

Samprāpya, having attained, having fully realised; *enam*, this, the Self; the *ṛṣayaḥ*, seers; become *jñānatṛptāḥ*, satisfied with that very knowledge, and not with any external object that gratifies and leads to physical nourishment; *kṛtātmanāḥ*, established in identity with the supreme Self; *vītarāgāḥ*, free from such drawbacks as attachment; *praśāntāḥ*, composed, with the senses withdrawn. *Te*, those people, who become so; *prāpya*, having realised; *sarvagam*, the all-pervasive (Brahman), comparable to space; *sarvataḥ*, everywhere—and not partially, as circumscribed by the limiting adjuncts. What follows then? Having realised as their own Self that very Brahman that is without a second: *dhīrāḥ*, the absolutely discriminating people; who are by nature *yuktātmanāḥ*, ever merged in deep contemplation; *āviśanti*, enter; *sarvam eva*, into the All, even at the time of the falling of the body. They give up the limitations of the adjuncts created by ignorance, like space confined within a pot on the breaking of the pot. Thus the knowers of Brahman enter into the abode that is Brahman.

idea of possession, they had internal renunciation as a matter of fact. The external sign is not the idea intended; for in the Smṛti we have, 'An outer mark is no source of virtue.' "

वेदान्तविज्ञानसुनिश्चितार्थाः

संन्यासयोगाद्यतयः शुद्धसत्त्वाः ।

ते ब्रह्मलोकेषु परान्तकाले

परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे ॥६॥

6. Those to whom the entity presented by the Vedāntic knowledge has become fully ascertained, and who endeavour assiduously with the help of the Yoga of monasticism, become pure in mind. At the supreme moment of final departure all of them become identified with the supreme Immortality in the worlds that are Brahman, and they become freed on every side.

Moreover, *vedānta-vijñāna-suniścītārthāḥ*, those to whom the entity to be known, i.e. the supreme Self presented by the Vedāntic knowledge, has become fully ascertained. Those very people are, again, *yata-yah*, assiduous. (They) *śuddhasattvāḥ*, have become purified in mind; *samyāsa-yogāt*, by dint of the Yoga of manasticism, through the Yoga consisting in the giving up of all activities, which is the same as the Yoga of remaining steadfast in Brahman alone. *Te sarve*, all those people, *parāntakāle*, at the time of final death—the times of death of the worldly people being but times of secondary departure; as compared with these the time of the falling of the body of an aspirant for salvation, at the end of his worldly state, is the supreme moment of departure; at that supreme

moment of departure, (they become freed) *brahma-lokeṣu*, in the worlds that are Brahman, the worlds and Brahman being identical; the plural (in worlds) is used from the standpoint of the aspirants who are many and consequently the same Brahmaloka appears many or is attained divergently. So the word *brahma-lokeṣu* means in Brahman. *Parāṃṛtāḥ*, (they are) those to whom the supreme Immortality, the deathless Brahman, has become their very Self, those who have become Brahman while still living. Having (thus) attained identity with the supreme Immortality, they *parimucyanti*, discard individuality, like a lamp blown out or like the space in a pot (when broken); they become freed on every side—they need not have to wait for going elsewhere. And this is in accord with such Vedic and Smṛti texts as: “Just as the footprints of birds cannot be traced in space and of aquatics in water, similar is the movement of the men of knowledge” (Mbh. Śā. 239.24), “Those who want to go beyond the courses of the world, do not tread on any path” (*Itihāsa Upaniṣad*, 18). The courses (to be followed after death), that are dependent on spatial limitation, are indeed within phenomenal existence, since they are accomplished by limited means. But Brahman, being the All, is not to be approached through spatial limitations. Should Brahman be circumscribed by space like any concrete object, It will also have a beginning and an end, It will be supported by something else, It will have parts, and It will be impermanent and a product. But Brahman cannot be so; therefore Its attainment, too, cannot be determined in terms of limitation of space. Besides, the knowers of Brahman accept only that liberation

which consists in the removal of ignorance etc., and not that which is a product.

Furthermore, at the time of liberation:

गताः कलाः पञ्चदश प्रतिष्ठा
 देवाश्च सर्वे प्रतिदेवतासु ।
 कर्माणि विज्ञानमयश्च आत्मा
 परेऽव्यये सर्वे एकीभवन्ति ॥७॥

7. To their sources repair the fifteen constituents (of the body) and to their respective gods go all the gods (of the senses). And the *karmas*, and the soul that simulates the intellect, all become unified with the supreme Undecaying.

The *kalāḥ*, constituents, that there are—the vital force and the others that build up the body; *gatāḥ*, have repaired. At the time of liberation each constituent goes to its own basis, that is to say, it merges in its cause. The word “*pratiṣṭhāḥ*, to the sources” is used in the plural number accusative case. (The constituents that are) *pañcadaśa*, fifteen in number, that are mentioned in the last Question (of the *Praśna Upaniṣad*); *ca*, and, the well-known *sarve devāḥ*, all the gods, living in the body and seated in the organs of vision etc.; (get merged) *pratidevatāsu*, into the respective gods, viz the Sun and others; “get merged”—this much is understood. And the *karmāṇi*, the *karmas*, performed by the seeker after liberation that have not begun to bear fruit—not the active *karmas* that have begun to bear fruit, since the latter get exhausted merely by being enjoyed; *ca vijñānamayaḥ*

ātmanā, and the soul simulating the intellect. The soul that has entered into multifarious bodies, like the reflections of the sun etc. in water etc., simulates the intellect as a result of considering itself identical with the limiting adjuncts, viz the intellect and the rest, that are created by ignorance. As *karmas* are meant for producing results for this (apparent) soul, therefore the *karmas*, together with this soul resembling the intellect, (become unified in the supreme Undecaying). Therefore *vijñānamaya* means resembling the intellect. When the limiting adjunct is removed these *karmas* and the soul, resembling the intellect, *sarve*, all; *ekībhavanti*, become indistinguishable, become unified; *pare avyaye*, in the supreme Undecaying—in the infinite, imperishable Brahman that is comparable to space, and is birthless, ageless, immortal, fearless without cause and effect, without interior and exterior, auspicious, and calm; just as the reflections of the sun etc. return to the sun on the withdrawal of the vessels of water etc., or the spaces circumscribed by pots etc. to space itself on the displacement of the pots etc.

यथा नद्यः स्यन्दमानाः समुद्रेऽ-

स्तं गच्छन्ति नामरूपे विहाय ।

तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्तः

परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम् ॥८॥

8. As rivers, flowing down, become indistinguishable on reaching the sea by giving up their names and forms, so also the illumined soul, having become freed from name and form,

reaches the self-effulgent Puruṣa that is higher than the higher (Māyā).

Moreover, *yathā*, as; *nadyah*, rivers—Gaṅgā and the rest; *syundamānāḥ*, flowing down; *gacchanti*, attain; *astam*, invisibility, indistinguishable identity; *samudre*, in the sea, on reaching the sea; *nama-rupe vihūya*, by giving up (their) names and forms; *tathā*, similarly; *vidvān*, the illumined soul; *nāma-rūpāt vimuktaḥ*, having become freed from name and form—the creations of ignorance; *upaiti*, arrives at; the *divyam puruṣam*, self-effulgent Puruṣa, as described earlier; who is *param*, higher, *parāt*, than the higher (Māyā), as already explained (Mu. II. i. 2).

Objection: Is it not well known that many obstacles beset the path to liberation? So even a knower of Brahman, when dead, may be deflected from his course and may not reach Brahman Itself, being hindered by one of the mental-diseases or one of the gods or some such being.

Answer: Not so, for by knowledge itself are removed all the hindrances. The only obstacle to emancipation is ignorance, and there is no other hindrance; for emancipation is eternal and identical with the Self. Therefore:

स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद
 ब्रह्मैव भवति नास्याब्रह्मवित्कुले भवति ।
 तरति शोकं तरति पाप्मानं
 गुहाग्रन्थिभ्यो विमुक्तोऽमृतो भवति ॥९॥

9. Anyone who knows that supreme Brahman become Brahman indeed. In his line is not born anyone who does not know Brahman. He over comes grief, and rises above aberrations.

tions; and becoming freed from the knots of the heart, he attains immortality.

Saḥ yaḥ ha vai, anyone who, in this world; *veda*, knows, *tat*, that, *paramam brahma*, supreme Brahman, directly as "I am verily Brahman"; does not follow any other course. In the matter of his attaining Brahman, the gods even cannot raise any obstacle: for he becomes their Self. Hence one who knows Brahman, *bhavati*, becomes, *brahma eva*, Brahman indeed. Furthermore, *asya kule*, in his line, in the line of the knower of Brahman: *na bhavati*, is not born, *abrahmavit*, anyone who does not know Brahman. Besides, even while he is alive, he *tarati śokam*, overcomes mental grief, caused by the loss of many desirable things. He *tarati pāpmanam*, goes beyond aberrations, known as virtue and vice. *Guhāgranthibhyah vimuktah*, having become freed from the knots of the heart, from the knots created by ignorance in the heart (Mu. II. i. 10): he *bhavati*, becomes, *amṛtah*, immortal. It has already been said, "the knot of the heart gets untied" etc. (Mu. II. ii. 8).

Now the conclusion is being made by presenting the rule of transmission of the knowledge of Brahman:

तदेतदृचाऽभ्युक्तम् --

क्रियावन्तः श्रोत्रिया ब्रह्मनिष्ठाः

स्वयं जुह्वत एकर्षिं श्रद्धयन्तः ।

तेषामेवैतां ब्रह्मविद्यां वदेत

शिरोव्रतं विधिवद्यैस्तु चीर्णम् ॥१०॥

10. This (rule) has been revealed by the *mantra* (which runs thus): “To them alone should one expound this knowledge of Brahman who are engaged in the practice of disciplines, versed in the Vedas, and devoted to Brahman, who personally sacrifice to the fire called Ekarsī with faith, and by whom has been duly accomplished the vow of holding fire on the head.”

Tat etat, this rule regarding the transmission of knowledge; *abhyuktam*, is revealed; *rcā*, by a *mantra*: Those who are *kriyāvantaḥ*, engaged in the practice of disciplines, as mentioned earlier; *śrotriyūḥ*, versed in Vedic studies and observances; *brahmaniṣṭhṛḥ*, devoted to the inferior Brahman and seekers of the knowledge of the supreme Brahman: who *svayam*, by themselves: *juhvate* (is the same as *juhvati*), sacrifice; *ekarsim*, to the fire named Ekarsī; *śraddhayantaḥ*, with faith; *teṣām eva*, to them alone, who have become purified and fit recipients; *vadeta*, one should expound; *etām brahmavidyām*, this knowledge of Brahman. And to those alone one should expound *yaiḥ tu*, by whom moreover; *cīrṇam* has been accomplished; *vidhivat*, duly, in accordance with rules; the *śirovratam*, vow of holding fire on the head, a Vedic vow familiar amongst the followers of the Atharva-Veda.

तदेतत्सत्यमृषिरङ्गिरा पुरोवाच नैतदचीर्णव्रतोऽधीते ।

नमः परमऋषिभ्यो नमः परमऋषिभ्यः ॥११॥

इति मुण्डकोपनिषदि तृतीयमुण्डके द्वितीयः खण्डः ॥

11. The seer Aṅgiras spoke of this truth in days of yore. One that has not fulfilled the vow does not read this. Salutation to the great seers. Salutation to the great seers.

Ṛṣiḥ, the seer; named *aṅgirāḥ*, Aṅgiras; *purā*, in days of yore; *uvāca*, spoke of; *tat etat*, that entity that is this; *satyam*, Truth, the immutable Puruṣa; to Śaunaka who had approached duly and asked him. The idea implied is that, anyone, else, too, should similarly speak to one who seeks for the highest good, or hankers after salvation, and approaches dutifully. *Acīrṇavrataḥ*, one who has not fulfilled the vow; *na adhīte*, does not (i.e. should not) read; *etat*, this, this (knowledge) in the form of the text. For knowledge becomes sufficiently clear for bearing fruit to one who has fulfilled the vow.

The knowledge of Brahman is ended. *Namah*, salutation, *parama-ṛṣibhyaḥ*, to those great seers, starting with Brahmā, through whom that knowledge was successively handed down, the great seers being those, beginning with Brahmā, who directly saw and realised Brahman. *Namah*, salutation to those, again. The repetition is used as an indication of great solicitousness, and as a conclusion of the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*.

ॐ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवा

भद्रं पश्येमाक्षभिर्यजत्राः ।

स्थिरैरङ्गैस्तुष्टुवाꣳसस्तनभि-

र्व्यशेम देवहितं यदायुः ॥

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

MĀṆḌŪKYA UPANIṢAD
AND KĀRIKĀ

ॐ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवा
भद्रं पश्येमाक्षभिर्यजत्राः ।
स्थिरैरङ्गैस्तुष्टुवाꣳसस्तनूभि-
र्व्यशेम देवहितं यदायुः ॥

स्वस्ति न इन्द्रो वृद्धश्रवाः
स्वस्ति नः पूषा विश्ववेदाः ।
स्वस्ति नस्तार्क्ष्यो अरिष्टनेमिः
स्वस्ति नो बृहस्पतिर्दधातु ॥

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

(For translation see p. 78)

MĀNDŪKYA UPANIṢAD

CHAPTER I

ĀGAMA-PRAKARAṆA (ON THE VEDIC TEXT)

Commentator's invocation: (1) I bow to that Brahman which after having enjoyed¹ (during the waking state) the gross objects by pervading all the human objectives through a diffusion of Its rays² of unchanging Consciousness that embraces all that moves or does not move; which again after having drunk³ (during the dream state) all the variety of objects, produced by desire (as well as action and ignorance) and lighted up by the intellect,⁴ sleeps while enjoying bliss and making us enjoy through Māyā; and which is counted as the Fourth⁵ from the point of view of Māyā, and is supreme, immortal, and birthless.

(2) May that Fourth One protect us which, after having identified Itself with the universe,⁶ enjoys (during the cosmic waking state) the gross objects

¹Enjoyment consisting in witnessing the various mental moods of happiness, sorrow, etc.

²The individual souls that are but reflections of Brahman on the intellect.

³i.e. having merged all in the unrealised Self.

⁴Existing only subjectively in the form of mental moods or impressions of past experience.

⁵Not possessed of the three states of waking, dream, and sleep.

⁶The cosmic gross body of Virāṭ.

created by virtue (and vice); which again (during the cosmic dream state¹) experiences through Its own light the objects of enjoyment that are called up by Its own intellect; which, further (in sound sleep or cosmic dissolution), withdraws promptly all these into Itself; and which lastly becomes free from all attributes by discarding every distinction and difference.

Introduction: "The letter *Om* is all this. Of this a clear exposition (follows)" (Mā. I. i. 1). These four Chapters (of the *Kārikā*) that sum up the quintessence of the Vedāntic ideas are commenced with the text, "The letter *Om* is all this" etc. Accordingly, the connection, subject-matter, and utility (of this treatise) need not be separately dealt with. The connection, subject-matter, and utility that pertain to Vedānta itself should fit in here also.² Still they ought to be briefly stated by one who wants to explain a treatise. In this connection it is to be noted that by the very fact that a scripture, (whether it be Vedānta or a treatise on it), reveals the spiritual disciplines conducive to the goal; it becomes endowed with a subject-matter;

¹As identified with the cosmic subtle body of Hiraṇyagarbha.

²The present book comprising the Upaniṣadic text and the *Kārikā* of Gauḍapāda forms a sort of a treatise on the Vedānta; and hence the four *anubandhas* or interconnecting elements—viz *adhikāri*, the person competent for study, *sambandha*, connection, e.g. that between the book and the subject-matter, *viśaya*, subject-matter of the book, viz unity of the Self and Brahman, and *prayojana*, utility, viz liberation—are the same in both cases.

and from this fact it becomes indirectly possessed of a distinct relationship, a subject-matter, and utility.¹ What again is the objective in view? That is being explained: Just as the normal state of a man, afflicted by disease, consists in his getting cured of the disease, similarly the normalcy of the Self, stricken with identification with misery, is regained through the cessation of the phenomenal universe of duality. The end in view is the realisation of non-duality. Since the phenomenal world of duality is a creation of ignorance, it can be eradicated through knowledge; and hence this book is begun in order to reveal the knowledge of Brahman. This fact is established by such Vedic texts as: "Because when there is duality, as it were, (then one smells something, one sees something," and so on) (Bṛ. II. iv. 14); "When there is something else, as it were, then one can see something, one can know something" (Bṛ. IV. iii. 31); "But when to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self, then what should one see and through what, then what should one know and through what? (Bṛ. II. iv. 14.)

That being so, the first chapter, devoted to a determination of the meaning of *Om*, is based on (Vedic) traditional knowledge and is an aid to the ascertain-

¹We are concerned primarily with knowledge and its result and not with books. The result aimed at is liberation which follows from the realisation of the non-difference of the Self and Brahman, and not from mere scriptures. Still the scriptures express that non-difference, and knowledge does not dawn without the help of scriptural deliberation. Thus as indirect means to knowledge, the scriptures become connected with the subject-matter.

ment of the reality of the Self. The second chapter is concerned with rationally proving the unreality of that phenomenal world of duality, on the cessation of which is attained non-duality, just as the reality of the rope is attained on the elimination of the illusion of a snake etc. imagined on it. The third chapter is there to establish rationally the truth of non-duality, lest it too should be negated by a similar process of argument. The fourth chapter seeks to refute through their own arguments all the un-Vedic points of view that are antagonistic to the truth of non-duality established by non-dualism, and that remain involved in this unreal duality by the very fact of their mutual antagonism.

How again does the ascertainment of the meaning of *Om* become an aid to the realisation of the reality of the Self? The answer is: From such Vedic texts as, (That goal which all the Vedas with one voice propound, which all the austerities speak of, and wishing for which people practise Brahmacharya)—it is this, viz *Om*” (Ka. I. ii. 15), “This medium is the best” (Ka. I. ii. 17), “O Satyakāma, this (*Om*) is verily Brahman, (superior and inferior)” (Pr. V. 2), “Meditate on the Self as *Om*” (Maitrī. VI. 3), “*Om* is Brahman” (Tai. I. viii. 1), “*Om* indeed is all this” (Ch. II. xxiii. 3), it follows that just as the non-dual Self, notwithstanding the fact that It is the supreme Reality, can still be the substratum of all such illusions as the vital force, like the rope etc. becoming the substrata of the snake etc., similarly it is but *Om* that appears as all the ramifications of speech that have for their contents such illusory manifestations of the Self as

the vital force etc. And *Om* is essentially the same as the Self, since it denotes the latter. And all the illusory manifestations of the Self, such as the vital force etc., that are denoted by the modifications of *Om*, do not exist apart from their names, in accordance with the Vedic texts: "All that is modification exists only in name, having speech as its support" (Ch. VI. i. 4), "All this phenomenal creation of that Brahman is strung together by the thread of speech and by the strands of names", "All these are but dependent on names"¹, and so on. Hence the Upaniṣad says, "*Om iti etat akṣaram idam sarvam*—the letter *Om* is all this."

ओमित्येतदक्षरमिदं सर्वं तस्योपव्याख्यानं भूतं
भवद्भ्रविष्यदिति सर्वमोङ्कार एव । यच्चान्यत्
त्रिकालातीतं तदप्योङ्कार एव ॥१॥

1. The letter *Om* is all this. Of this a clear exposition (is started with): All that is past, present, or future is verily *Om*. And whatever is beyond the three periods of time is also verily *Om*.

As all these objects that are indicated by names are non-different from the names, and as names are non-different from *Om*, so *Om* is verily all this. And as the supreme Brahman is known through the relationship subsisting, between name and its object. It, too, is but *Om*. *Tasya*, of that, of this letter, viz *Om*,

¹Names make empirical dealings possible for objects.

that is the same as the supreme as well as the inferior Brahman; *upavyākhyānam*, a clear exposition, as showing its proximity to Brahman by virtue of its being a means for the attainment of Brahman; the expression, "is to be understood as started with", has to be supplied after "clear exposition" to complete the sentence. *Bhūtam*, the past; *bhavat*, the present; *bhaviṣyat*, the future; *iti*, these, that is to say, whatever is circumscribed by the three conceptions of time; *sarvam oṁkūrah eva*, all this is but *Om*, in accordance with the reasons already advanced. *Ca yat trikālātītam*, and whatever else there is that is beyond the three periods of time, that is inferable from its effects but is not circumscribed by time, e.g. the Unmanifested and the rest; *tat api*, that, too, is *oṁkūrah eva*, verily *Om*.

Though a word and the thing signified are the same, still the presentation in the text, "The letter *Om* is all this" etc., was made by giving greater prominence to the word. The very same thing that was presented through an emphasis on the word is being indicated over again with a stress on the thing signified, so that the unity of the name and the nameable may be comprehended. For otherwise, the nameable having been grasped as dependent on the name, the doubt may crop up that the identity of the nameable with the name is to be taken in a secondary sense. And the necessity of understanding their identity arises from the fact that once this identity is established, one can by a single effort eliminate both the name and the nameable to realise Brahman that is different from both. And this is what the Upaniṣad will say in, "The quarters are the letters of *Om*, and the letters

are the quarters" (Mā. 8). The Upaniṣad adverts to the topic in, "All this is surely Brahman" etc.

सर्वं ह्येतद् ब्रह्मायमात्मा ब्रह्म सोऽयमात्मा

चतुष्पात् ॥२॥

2. All this is surely Brahman. The Self is Brahman. The Self, such as It is, is possessed of four quarters.

Sarvam etat, all this, all this that was spoken of as but *Om*: is *brahma*, Brahman. That Brahman that was indirectly spoken of is being directly and specifically pointed out as, "*Ayam ātmā brahma*, this Self is Brahman." In the text, "This Self is Brahman", the very Self that will be presented as divided into four parts, is being pointed out as one's innermost Self by the word "*ayam*, this", (accompanied) with a gesture of hand.¹ *Saḥ ayam ātmā*, that Self that is such, that is signified by *Om* and exists as the higher and lower Brahman: is *catuspāt*, possessed of four quarters, like a (*kāṣṭhāpaṇa*) coin, but not like a cow.² As the Fourth (Turiya) is realised by successively merging the earlier three, starting from Viśva, the word *pāda* (in the text) is derived in the instrumental sense of that by which

¹By placing the hand on the heart.

²The word *pāda* may mean either foot or quarter. The second meaning applies here. A *kāṣṭhāpaṇa* is divisible into sixteen smaller units. Four of these form a quarter, and eight form a half *kāṣṭhāpaṇa*. The smaller coins lose their individuality in the bigger ones as it were. So Viśva merges in Taijasa, Taijasa in Prājña, and Prājña in Turiya. The word "quarter" is not used in any physical sense.

something is attained, whereas in the case of the Turīya the word *pāda* is derived in the objective sense of that which is achieved.

The Upaniṣad shows how the Self can be possessed of four quarters:

जागरितस्थानो बहिष्प्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशति-
मुखः स्थूलभुग्वैश्वानरः प्रथमः पादः ॥३॥

3. The first quarter is Vaiśvānara whose sphere (of action) is the waking state, whose consciousness relates to things external, who is possessed of seven limbs and nineteen mouths, and who enjoys gross things.

He (Vaiśvānara) who has the *jūgarita*, waking state, as His *sthāna*, sphere of activity, is *jūgaritasthānaḥ*. He who has His *prajñā*, awareness, *bahih*, outside, directed to things other than Himself, is *bahiṣprajñah*. The idea is that Consciousness appears as though related to outer objects, owing to ignorance. Similarly, He has seven limbs. For completing the imagery of Agnihotra sacrifice contained in, "Heaven is verily the head of that Vaiśvānara Self, the sun is His eye, air is His vital force, space is the middle part, water is His bladder, and the earth is His two feet" (Ch. V. xviii. 2), the Āhavanīya fire has been imagined as His mouth (Ch. V. xviii. 2). He that is possessed of these seven limbs is *saptāṅgaḥ*. Similarly, He is *ekonaviṃśatimukhaḥ*, possessed of nineteen mouths—the (five) senses of perception and the (five) organs of action make up ten, the vital forces—Prāṇa and the

rest—make up five, and (there are) mind (thinking faculty), intellect, ego, and mind-stuff. These are mouths, since they are comparable to mouths; that is to say, they are the gates of perception. Since through these entrances, Vaiśvānara, thus constituted, enjoys gross objects,—viz sound and the rest, therefore He is *sthūlabhuk*, an enjoyer of the gross. He is called *vaiśvānaraḥ*, because He leads in diverse ways all (*viśva*) beings (*nara*) (to their enjoyment). Or Vaiśvānara is the same as Viśvānara; He is called Vaiśvānara (all beings) since He encompasses all beings by virtue of His being non-different (in reality) from the Self (i.e. Virāṭ) comprising all the gross bodies. He is the *prathamah pādah*, the first quarter.¹ He gets this precedence, because the knowledge of the succeeding quarters is contingent on His knowledge.

Objection: The topic under discussion being the possession of four quarters by the Self as referred to in the text, "This Self is Brahman" etc., how is it that heaven and the rest are presented as the head etc.?

Answer: That is nothing incongruous, inasmuch as the intention is to show that the entire phenomenal universe and the world of gods, together with this (gross cosmic) Self, contribute to the constitution of the four parts.² If the presentation is made in this way,

¹The first step to the knowledge of Brahman.

²The gross cosmic world, as constituting Virāṭ, is the first quarter. The subtle cosmic world, as constituting Hiraṇyagarbha, is the second quarter. The cosmic world in its causal state (of ignorance) as constituting the Unmanifested, is the third quarter. That, again, when it is freed from all states of cause and effect and exists merely as the substratum of all, as Existence-Knowledge-Bliss, is the fourth quarter.

non-duality stands established on the removal of the entire phenomenal world, and the Self existing in all beings is realised as one, and all beings are seen as existing in the Self.¹ And thus alone will stand affirmed the meaning of the Vedic text: "He who sees all beings in the very Self and the Self in all beings etc." (Iś. 6). Otherwise, the indwelling Self, as circumscribed by one's own body, will alone be perceived, as It is by the Sāṅkhyas and others; and in that case the specific statement, made by the Upaniṣads, that It is non-dual (Mā. I. 7; Ch. VI. ii. 1), will have no distinctiveness, for there will be no difference from the philosophy of the Sāṅkhyas and others. But as a matter of fact, it is desirable to find all the Upaniṣads in accord in propounding the unity of all the selves. Therefore it is but reasonable that, having in view the identity of the Self (as Viśva) in the individual physical context with the Self as Virāṭ (i. e. Vaiśvānara) in the divine context, the former should be mentioned as possessed of seven limbs comprising such physical constituents as heaven etc. And this is confirmed by the logical grounds (for inferring unity) that is implied in "your head would have dropped off if you had not come to me"² (Ch. V. xii. 2).

¹Cf. सर्वभूतस्थमात्मानं सर्वभूतानि चात्मनि ।

संपश्यन्नात्मयाजी वै स्वाराज्यमधिगच्छति ॥ — Manu

²Six Brāhmaṇas, who approached Asvapati, used to worship particular limbs of Vaiśvānara as Vaiśvānara Himself. Aśvapati pointed out their mistakes and said that unless they had come to him for rectification, their head, eye, life, etc. would

This identity (of Viśva) with Virāṭ is suggestive of the unity (of Taijasa and Prājña) with Hiranyagarbha and the Unmanifested (respectively) as well. And this has been stated in the *Madhu-brāhmaṇa* (of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad): "(The same with) the shining immortal being who is in this earth, and the (shining immortal) corporeal being (in the body). (These four are but this Self)" etc. (II. v. 1). As for the unity of the Self in sleep (Prājña) and the Unmanifested, it is a patent fact because of the absence of distinctions.¹ Such being the case, it will become proved that non-duality follows on the dissipation of all duality.

स्वप्नस्थानोऽन्तःप्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः
प्रविविक्तभक्तैजसो द्वितीयः पादः ॥४॥

4. Taijasa is the second quarter, whose sphere (of activity) is the dream state, whose consciousness is internal, who is possessed of seven limbs and nineteen mouths, and who enjoys subtle objects.

have been destroyed. But if the individual and Virāṭ are not the same, it is unreasonable to say, for instance, that from the mistaken worship of heaven (that is only the head of Virāṭ) as Virāṭ Himself, one's own head should drop off. The statement becomes reasonable only if the individual and Virāṭ are the same, so that the head of the one can be the head of the other.

¹The individual sleeps by withdrawing all distinctions into himself, and in dissolution the Unmanifested, too, withdraws everything into itself. The "Unmanifested" means here the "inner Director" (Mā. 6), ruling from inside all.

Taijasa that has the dream state as his sphere of activity is *svapnasthānaḥ*. The consciousness of the waking state, though it is a state of mental vibration, is associated with many means, and it appears to be engrossed in external objects, and thus it leaves in the mind the corresponding impressions. Under the impulsion of ignorance, desire, and (past) action, the mind, thus possessed of the impressions like a piece of painted canvas, makes its appearance (in the dream state) just as in the waking state, but without any external means. In line with this is the statement, “(When he dreams), he takes away a little of (the impressions of) this all-embracing world (the waking state)” (Br. IV. iii. 9). Similarly, in the Upaniṣad of the Atharva-Veda, after introducing (the subject) with “All senses become one in the highest deity, the mind”, it is said, “here in this dream state, the deity (the mind) experiences greatness” (Pr. IV. 5). The mind is *antaḥ*, internal, in relation to the senses. He whose *prajñā*, awareness, in dream, takes the forms of the impressions in that (*antaḥ*, internal) mind, is *antaḥ-prajñāḥ*, aware of internal objects. He is called Taijasa (luminous), since he becomes the witness of the (modes of) cognition that is bereft of objects and appears only as a luminous thing. As Viśva is dependent on objects, he experiences the (modes of) gross cognition, whereas the awareness that is experienced here consists of mere impressions; and hence the enjoyment is subtle. The rest is common (with the earlier paragraph). Taijasa is the second quarter.

यत्र सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं कामयते न कञ्चन स्वप्नं पश्यति तत् सुषुप्तम् । सुषुप्तस्थान एकीभूतः प्रज्ञानघन एवानन्दमयो ह्यानन्दभुक् चेतोमुखः प्राज्ञ-स्तृतीयः पादः ॥५॥

5. That state is deep sleep where the sleeper does not desire any enjoyable thing and does not see any dream. The third quarter is Prājña who has deep sleep as his sphere, in whom everything becomes undifferentiated, who is a mass of mere consciousness, who abounds in bliss, who is surely an enjoyer of bliss, and who is the doorway to the experience (of the dream and waking states).

Since sleep, consisting in the unawareness of Reality, is a common feature of the two states (of waking and dream) where there are the presence and absence (respectively) of perceptible gross objects, therefore the adverbial clause, "Where the sleeper" etc.,¹ is used in order to keep in view the state of deep sleep. Or since sleep, consisting in the unawareness of Reality, is equally present in all the three states, deep sleep is being distinguished (by that clause) from the earlier

¹That is to say, the portion "does not desire any enjoyable thing" etc. occurring in the clause "Where the sleeper" etc.; for the portion "does not" etc. distinguishes deep sleep from other two states which have the common feature of unawareness.

two states.¹ *Yatra*, in which place or at which time; *suptaḥ*, the sleeping man; *na paśyati*, does not see; *kam cana svapnam*, any dream; *na kāmāyate*, does not desire; *kam cana kāmam*, any enjoyable thing—for in deep sleep there does not exist, as in the two earlier states, either dream, consisting in the perception of things otherwise than what they are, or any desire²—this is *tat susuptam*, that state of deep sleep. He who has got this state of deep sleep as his sphere is *susuptasthānaḥ*. He is said to be *ekībhūtaḥ*, undifferentiated, since the whole host of duality, that are diversified as the two states (of waking and dream) and are but modifications of the mind, become non-discernible (in that state) without losing their aforesaid characteristics, just as the day together with the phenomenal world becomes non-discernible under the cover of nocturnal darkness. As such, conscious experiences, that are but vibrations of the mind in the waking and dream states, become solidified as it were. This state is called *prajñānaghaṇaḥ*, a mass of consciousness, since it is characterised by the absence of discrimination. It is a mass of consciousness like everything

¹Since by the use of the portion "does not see any dream" that is to say "does not have any false perception of Reality", the other two states of dream and waking can be eliminated the addition of the portion "does not desire any enjoyable thing" may seem to be redundant if we follow the first interpretation. To obviate this difficulty the second explanation is introduced. Non-perception being a common factor of the three states, sleep can be distinguished by the absence of desire.

²Thus either of the adverbial portions—viz absence of false perception and freedom from desire—can be used for eliminating the earlier two states.

appearing as a mass by becoming indistinguishable under nocturnal darkness. From the use of the word *eva*, merely, it follows that there is nothing of a separate class other than consciousness. And he is *ānanda-mayah*, full of joy, his abundance of joy being caused by the absence of the misery involved in the effort of the mind vibrating as the objects and their experiencer; but he is not Bliss itself, since the joy is not absolute. Just as in common parlance, one remaining free from effort is said to be happy or *ānanda-bhuk*, an experiencer of joy, so this one, too, is called *ānandabhuk*, for by him is enjoyed this state that consists in extreme freedom from effort, in accordance with the Vedic text, "this is its supreme bliss" (Br. IV. iii. 32). He is *cetomukhal*, since he is the doorway to the consciousness of the experiences in the dream and waking states. Or he is called *cetomukhal* because consciousness, appearing as empirical experience, is his doorway or entrance leading to the states of dream and waking. He is called *prājñah*, Prājña, conscious *par excellence*, since in him alone is there the knowledge of the past and the future and of all things. Even though lying in deep sleep he is called Prājña (conscious) because of his having been so earlier (in the two former states of dream and waking); or he is called conscious, since he alone is possessed of the peculiar characteristics of mere (undiversified) consciousness, whereas the other two have diversified knowledge as well. Prājña, as described, is the third quarter.

एष सर्वेश्वर एष सर्वज्ञ एषोऽन्तर्याम्येष योनिः
सर्वस्य प्रभवाप्ययौ हि भतानाम् ॥६॥

6. This one is the Lord of all; this one is Omniscient; this one is the inner Director of all; this one is the Source of all; this one is verily the place of origin and dissolution of all beings.

Eṣaḥ, this one (this Prājña), when in his natural state; is surely *sarveśvaraḥ*, the Lord of all, of all diversity inclusive of the heavenly world; and contrary to what others believe in, He (the Lord of all) is not something intrinsically different from this one (that is Prājña), as is borne out by the Vedic text, "O good-looking one, (the individual soul conditioned by) the mind is tethered to (that is to say, has for its goal) the Vital Force (which is Brahman)" (Ch. VI. viii. 2). This one, again, in his (state of) immanence in all diversity, is the knower of all; hence *eṣaḥ sarvajñaḥ*, this one is Omniscient. *Eṣaḥ*, this one, is; *antaryāmī*, the inner Controller; this one becomes the Director of all beings by entering inside (*antar*). For the same reason¹ he gives birth to the universe together with its diversities, as described before; and hence *eṣaḥ yoniḥ*, this one is the Source; *sarvasya*, of all. And since this is so, therefore this very one, is *hi*, certainly; *prabhava-apyayau*, the place of origin and dissolution; *bhūtānam*, of all beings.

GAUḌAPĀDA'S KĀRIKĀ

अत्रैते श्लोका भवन्ति —

¹Since Prājña is Lord, Omniscient, and inner Director (in his identity with Brahman).

Pertaining to this, here are these verses:

Atra, with regard to the subject-matter dealt with: *ete ślokāḥ bhavanti*, here occur these verses:

बहिःप्रज्ञो विभुर्विश्वो ह्यन्तःप्रज्ञस्तु तैजसः ।

घनप्रज्ञस्तथा प्राज्ञ एक एव त्रिधा स्मृतः ॥१॥

1. *Viśva* experiences the external things and is all-pervading; but *Taijasa* experiences the internal things; similarly, *Prājña* is a mass of consciousness. It is but the same entity that is thought of in three ways.

The purport of the verse is this: The transcendence of the three states by the Self, Its unity, purity, and unrelatedness (to anything) are proved by the fact of Its existence in the three states in succession and of Its being interlinked by memory as "I". This is borne out by the illustration of the great fish and others in the Vedic texts.¹

दक्षिणाक्षिमुखे विश्वो मनयन्तस्स्तु तैजसः ।

आकाशे च हृदि प्राज्ञस्त्रिधा देहे व्यवस्थितः ॥२॥

2. *Viśva* is met with in the right eye which

¹"As a great fish swims alternately to both the banks (of a river), eastern and western, so does this infinite being move to both these states—the dream and waking states" (Bṛ. IV. iii. 18). "As a hawk or a falcon flying in the sky becomes tired, and stretching its wings, is bound for its nest, so does this infinite being run for this state, where falling asleep he craves no desires and sees no dreams" (Bṛ. VI. iii. 19).

is his place of experience. But Taijasa is inside the mind. Prājña is in the space within the heart. In three ways he exists in the body.

This verse aims at discovering how all the three, starting with Viśva, are experienced in the waking state itself. Viśva, the witness of gross objects is primarily experienced¹ in the *dakṣiṇa akṣi*, right eye, that is his *mukha*, mouth (or place of experience); and this is in accordance with the Vedic text, "This being who is in the right eye is named Indha" (Br. IV. ii. 2). He who is Indha or Vaiśvānara, possessed of effulgence—the Virāṭ Self (identifying Itself with the cosmic gross body) that is within the sun—and he who is the (individual) Self (i.e. Viśva) in the (right) eye are identical.

Objection: Hiraṇyagarbha is different, and different also (is the soul that) is the knower of the body and senses, that exists in the right eye as the controller of the eyes, that is the cogniser, and that is the master of the body.

Answer: Not so, for in reality no difference is admitted, in accordance with the Vedic text, "One effulgent being hidden in all creatures" (Śv. VI. 11), and the Smṛti texts, "O scion of the Bharata dynasty, know me, again, as the knower of the bodies and senses in all the bodies" (G. XIII. 2), "Indivisible, and yet existing in all beings, as though divided" (G. XIII. 16).²

¹By the adepts in meditation.

²Virāṭ is essentially identical with Hiraṇyagarbha and, so is the "knower" with them both.

Though Viśva exists equally in all the organs, he is specially referred to as existing in the right eye, for in the right eye is noticed the faculty of perception at its best. The soul, with its abode in the right eye, perceives some form; and then closing the eyes and recollecting that very form sees it manifested, *manasi antah*, inside the mind, in the form of impressions as in a dream.¹ As it is the case here, so is it in dream. Therefore, though Taijasa is within the mind, he is really the same as Viśva. On the cessation of the activity called memory, Prājña, sitting *ākāśe ca hr̥di*, in the space within the heart, becomes free from the diversity (of objects and their perceiving subject) and continues to be a mere mass of consciousness, for then there is no functioning of the mind.² Perception and recollection are merely vibrations of the mind; in the absence of these, there is mere existence in an unmanifested state, in the heart, in identification with the vital force, as is said in the Vedic text, "It is the vital force indeed that engulfs all these" (Ch. IV. iii. 3). Taijasa is the same as Hiranyagarbha because of existing in the mind,³ as is declared by the Vedic texts: "(Being attached, he, together with the work, attains

¹This is how Taijasa is met with in the waking state. And Viśva and Taijasa are the same; for the same entity that sees as Viśva, recollects as Taijasa.

²This is how Prājña is met with in the waking state. When the mind ceases to act, the same entity assumes the characteristics of Prājña.

³Taijasa is conditioned by the individual mind, and Hiranyagarbha by the cosmic mind. But the individual and cosmic minds are the same; and so Taijasa and Hiranyagarbha, conditioned by them, must be the same.

that result to which his) subtle body or mind (is attached)"¹ (Br. IV. iv. 6), "This Puruṣa, identified with the mind,² (and resplendent, is realised within the heart)" (Br. V. vi. 1), and so on.

Objection: The vital force is a manifested (i.e. perceptible) reality in a sleeping man; and the organs merge into it.³ How can the vital force be unmanifested?

Answer: That is no defect; for an undifferentiated thing is characterised by absence of any distinction of time and space. Although the vital force appears to be differentiated so long as (individual) identification with Prāṇa persists (among those who think themselves to be intimately connected with the different portions of the vital force⁴), still, since the self-identification with any special feature, as conditioned by the body, is absent in the vital force during deep sleep, the vital force is then surely undifferen-

¹Hiraṇyagarbha, as possessed of the power to act, is the soul within the subtle body (*liṅga*); and *liṅga* is equated with mind in the Vedic text. Therefore Taijasa and Hiraṇyagarbha are the same.

²Hiraṇyagarbha is but a special manifestation of Puruṣa identified with the mind. And Taijasa's chief adjunct is mind. Therefore they are the same.

³People sitting by a sleeping man clearly perceive the activities of the vital force (Prāṇa). And an additional argument proving that Prāṇa is a manifested entity is provided by the fact that the organs become identified with it in sleep. "Unmanifested" means "devoid of the limitations of time, space, and things". Prāṇa is not so in deep sleep.

⁴They may think, "This is my Prāṇa", "That is his", and so on.

tiated.¹ Just as in the case of people identifying themselves with individualised vital force, the vital force becomes unmanifested after death, similar, too, is the unmanifestedness in the state of absence of distinctions (in deep sleep) in the case of those who identify themselves with the vital force, and similar also is its potentiality to produce effects. And the witness in the state of unmanifestedness and deep sleep is the same (Consciousness).² Moreover, since the individuals who identify themselves with limitations, or witness those states, appear as identical with the Unmanifested, the foregoing attributes, “in whom everything becomes undifferentiated”, “who is a mass of consciousness”, etc., become appropriate with regard to him³ (i.e. Prāñña in deep sleep, identifying himself with Prāṇa). And there is also the reason adduced earlier.⁴

Objection: Why should the Unmanifested be called Prāṇa (Vital Force)?

Answer: Because of the Vedic text, “O good-looking one, (the individual soul, conditioned by) the mind is surely tethered to (that is to say, has for its goal) Prāṇa” (Ch. VI. viii. 2).

¹Though to others it may appear to be manifested, to the sleeping man it is unmanifested, because for him Prāṇa is then unassociated with any particular time or space.

²Consciousness underlines the two entities conditioned by the unmanifested states on the divine and human planes.

³Not only are the sleeper and the Unmanifested one from the standpoint of absence of distinction, but they are also one even when conditioned by limiting adjuncts.

⁴The unity of the entity manifested on the divine and human planes.

Objection: In that text the word Prāṇa means Brahman that was introduced as Existence in the sentence, "O good-looking one, all this was but Existence (Brahman) in the beginning" (Ch. VI. ii. 1).

Answer: That is no valid objection, for Existence was assumed there in a state of latency. Though in that sentence the Existence-Brahman is called Prāṇa, still that Existence (-Brahman) is called Prāṇa as well as Existence without ruling out the state of Its being the source of the emergence of individual beings. Had the seedless (non-causal) state of Brahman been meant, the text would have declared, "Not this, not this" (Bṛ. IV. iv. 22, IV. v. 15), "From which speech turns back" (Tai. II. 9), "That (Brahman) is surely different from the known, and, again, It is above the unknown" (Kc. I. 4), and so on, as it is also stated by the Smṛti, "It is called neither existence nor non-existence" (G. XIII. 12). If Brahman in Its seedless (non-causal) state be meant there, then the individuals that merge in It in deep sleep and dissolution cannot reasonably re-emerge, and¹ there will be the possibility of the freed souls returning to take birth again, for in either case, the absence of cause is a common factor. Besides, in the absence of any seed (of worldly state) to be burnt by the knowledge (of Brahman), knowledge itself becomes useless. Hence Existence is referred to as Prāṇa (in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad) and It is spoken of as the cause in all the Upaniṣads by assuming It (for the time being) to be the seed of others.

¹If anybody can re-emerge from sleep or dissolution, conceived of as nothing but identity with the pure Brahman, then.

And it is because of this that It is referred to by eliminating Its causal state in such Vedic texts as: "Superior to the superior Unmanifested" (Mu. II. i. 2), "From which speech turns back" (Tai. II. 9), "Not this, not this" (Br. IV. iv 22), etc. The supremely real state, free from causality, relation with body etc., and modes of waking etc., of that very entity that is called Prājña, will be spoken separately in its aspect as the Turiya (Fourth). The causal state, too, is verily experienced in the body, inasmuch as an awakened man is seen to have such a recollection as, "I did not know anything (in my deep sleep)." Hence it is said, "*Tridhā dehe vyavasthitaḥ*—existing in three ways in the body".

विश्वो हि स्थूलभुङ्गित्यं तैजसः प्रविविक्तभुक् ।
आनन्दभुक्तथा प्राज्ञस्त्रिधा भोगं निबोधत ॥३॥

3. Viśva ever enjoys the gross; Taijasa enjoys the subtle; and similarly Prājña enjoys bliss. Know enjoyment to be threefold.

स्थूलं तर्पयते विश्वं प्रविविक्तं तु तैजसम् ।
आनन्दश्च तथा प्राज्ञं त्रिधा तृप्तिं निबोधत ॥४॥

4. The gross satisfies Viśva, and the subtle satisfies Taijasa. And so also joy satisfies Prājña. Know enjoyment to be threefold.

The two verses need no explanation.

त्रिषु धामसु यद्भोज्यं भोक्ता यश्च प्रकीर्तितः ।
वेदैतदुभयं यस्तु स भुञ्जानो न लिप्यते ॥५॥

5. He who knows both these—viz the enjoyment that there is in the three states, and that which is declared to be the enjoyer there—does not become affected even while enjoying.

Triṣu dhāmasu, in the three states, of waking and the rest; there is but one *bhojyam*, object of enjoyment, that appears in triple form, known as gross, subtle, and bliss. And the entity, known by the names of Viśva, Taijasa, and Prājña, is *prakārtitaḥ*, declared to be the one *bhoktā*, enjoyer, because of his recognition (i.e. persistence of memory in all states) through the single concept of “I am that”, and because of his common feature of being the perceiver. He who *veda*, knows; *etat ubhayam*, both these, as diversified multifariously into enjoyers and the things of enjoyment; *saḥ*, he; *na lipyate*, does not become affected; *bhūñ-jānaḥ*, even while enjoying, because all that is enjoyable belongs to a single enjoyer. For nothing is added to or deducted from one’s nature by one’s own objects (of enjoyment or awareness) as in the case of fire; for fire does not lose or gain (in its essential nature) by consuming its own fuel.

प्रभवः सर्वभावनां सतामिति विनिश्चयः ।

सर्वं जनयति प्राणश्चेतोऽंशं पुरुषः पृथक् ॥६॥

6. It is a well-established fact that origination belongs to all entities that have existence. Prāṇa creates all (objects); Puruṣa creates separately the rays of Consciousness (that are the living creatures).

Prabhavaḥ, origination, in their respective apparent appearances consisting of names and forms created by ignorance; *sarvabhūtānām*, belongs to all entities, to the different modes of Viśva, Taijasa, and Prājña:—*satām*, to all those that exist.¹ It will be said later on, “A barren woman’s son does not take birth either in reality or through *Māyā* (*Kārikā*, III. 28). For if birth really belongs to nonentities themselves, then Brahman, which is beyond all empirical relations, will be left without any ground of cognition,² and may be equated with nonentity. But as a matter of fact, it is seen that the snake and such other things, created by ignorance, and sprouting from the seed of *Māyā*, and appearing as a rope etc., have their existence as the rope etc. (which are their substrata). For nobody perceives anywhere a rope-snake or a mirage if there is no substratum. Just as the snake surely had its existence as the rope before its illusory appearance as the snake, so also all positive entities, before their mani-

¹Exist in their own substratum on which they are superimposed. In the sixth paragraph of the Upaniṣad, in “this one is verily the place of origin”, it was said that Prājña is the source of the phenomenal world. The question now is: “Is he a producer of entities or nonentities?” The answer is that he produces entities which are a sort of reflection of Reality and are true so long as their substratum is kept in view.

²Logical ground of inference. If the effect is true, the cause can be inferred to be so; but if the effect is non-existing, the cause will be equally so. The inference with regard to Brahman will be like this: “This world is produced from Existence (Brahman), for it is a superimposed thing like the snake on a rope.”

festation, had certainly existence in the form of their cause. Prāṇa.¹ And it is therefore that the Upaniṣad, too, says, "All this (that is in front) is but Brahman" (Mu. II. ii. 11), "In the beginning this universe was but the Self" (Bṛ. I. iv. 1). *Prāṇah janayati*, Prāṇa creates, *sarvam*, all. *Puruṣah janayati*, Puruṣa creates: *pṛthak*, separately; *cetomśūn*, the rays of Consciousness, that issue out (from Puruṣa) like rays from the sun, that are the modes of the intelligence of Puruṣa who is by nature Consciousness, that are comparable to the reflections of the sun on water, and that appear divergently as Viśva, Taijasa, and Prājña in the different bodies of gods, animals, and others;—(Puruṣa creates) all these rays of Consciousness that possess the characteristics of living creatures, that differ from what has assumed the appearance of objects, and that are similar (to Puruṣa) just as the sparks of fire (are to fire), or the reflections of the sun on water (are to the sun). But Prāṇa, or the Self in the causal state, creates all other entities² as shown in the Vedic texts: "as a spider (spreads and withdraws its thread)" (Mu. I. i. 7), and "as from fire tiny sparks fly in all directions" (Bṛ. II. i. 20).

विभूतिं प्रसवं त्वन्ये मन्यन्ते सृष्टिचिन्तकाः ।

स्वप्नमायासरूपेति सृष्टिरन्यैविकल्पिता ॥७॥

7. Others steeped in cogitation about creation

¹Prāṇa is Brahman considered as an unknown entity but identified with Existence and serving as the source of all.

²Existing in the form of objects.

consider origination as an exuberance (of God), while by others it is imagined that creation is comparable to dream or magic.

Sṛṣṭicintakāḥ, people steeped in the thought (or theories) of creation; *manyante*, consider; that creation is a *vibhūti*, exuberance, (a demonstration of the superhuman power), of God. The idea implied is that for people who think of the supreme Reality there is no interest in questions regarding creation, (which is illusory) as is declared in the Vedic text, "Indra (the Lord), on account of Māyā, is perceived as manifold" (Br. II. v. 19). For those who observe a magician throw up a rope into the sky, ascend it with arms and vanish out of sight, and engage in a fight in which he is cut to pieces and falls to rise up again, do not evince any interest in deliberating on the reality of the magic and its effect conjured up by him. Similarly, analogous to the spreading out of the rope by the magician, is this manifestation of deep sleep, dream, and so on: comparable to the magician, up the rope, are the Prājña, Taijasa, and the rest in those states; and different from the rope and the man who has climbed up it is the real magician. Just as that very magician stands on the ground, invisible because of his magical cover, similar is the supreme Reality called Turiya. Therefore the noble people, aspiring to liberation, evince interest in the contemplation of that Turiya alone, but not so in that of creation that serves no purpose. Hence these theories are advanced only by those who cogitate about creation. This fact is stated

in *svapnamāyāsarūpā*, of the same nature as dream and magic.¹

इच्छामात्रं प्रभोः सृष्टिरिति सृष्टौ विनिश्चिताः ।
कालात्प्रसूर्ति भूतानां मन्यन्ते कालचिन्तकाः ॥८॥

8. With regard to creation some have the firm conviction that creation is a mere will of the Lord. People engrossed in the thought of time (to wit, astrologers) consider that birth of beings is from time.

Sṛṣṭih, creation, is *icchāmātram*, a mere will; *prabhoh*, of the Lord, because His will is unfailing. A pot, for instance, is a mere thought, and it is nothing beyond thought. Some think that creation is from time alone.

भोगार्थं सृष्टिरित्यन्ये क्रीडार्थमिति चापरे ।
देवस्यैष स्वभावोऽयमाप्तकामस्य का स्पृहा ॥९॥

9. Some others say that creation is for the enjoyment (of God), while still others say that it is for (His) disport. But it is the very nature of the Effulgent Being, (for) what desire can One have whose desire is ever fulfilled?

Others think that, *sṛṣṭih*, creation, is *bhogārtham*,

¹This differs from the Vedāntic position in believing that dream is true so far as it reflects the phenomenal realities of the waking state, and that the incantations etc., conjuring up magical illusions, are themselves empirically true, though the magic is false.

for the sake of enjoyment; (and) *krīḍārtham*, for the sake of disport. These two views are refuted by “*devasya eṣaḥ svabhāvaḥ ayam*, of the Effulgent Being this is the nature”¹ etc., where reliance is placed on the argument from the nature (of God). Or all the points of view² are refuted by asserting, “*Āptakūmasya kṛṣṇā*, what desire can One have whose desire is ever fulfilled?” For apart from the fact that the rope etc. are constituted by natural ignorance,³ no cause can be ascertained for their appearing as snake etc.

UPANIṢAD

The fourth quarter which follows in order has to be stated; hence this is presented (by the Upaniṣad) in “*nāntaḥ-prajñam*, not conscious of internal object” etc. Since It (i.e. Turiya) is devoid of every characteristic that can make the use of words possible, It is not describable through words; and hence the (Upaniṣad) seeks to indicate Turiya merely through the negation of attributes.

Objection: In that case It is a mere void.

Answer: No, for an unreal illusion cannot exist without a substratum; for the illusion of silver, snake, human being, mirage, etc., cannot be imagined to exist

¹Nature, otherwise known as Māyā, is without any beginning though it is directly perceived. This being so, no motive should be searched for.

²Presented in the verses 7 and 8, and the first line of verse 9.

³Ignorance about the rope etc. that are the substrata of the illusory things like snake etc.

apart from the (corresponding) substrata of the mother of pearl, rope, stump of a tree, desert, etc.¹

Objection: In that case, just as a pot etc. that hold water etc. are denoted by works, so also Turīya should be specified by (positive) words, and not by negations, for It is the substratum of all such illusion as Prāṇa etc.

Answer: Not so, because the illusion of Prāṇa and the rest is unreal just as silver and the rest are on the mother of pearl etc. For a relation between the real and the unreal does not lend itself to verbal representation, since the relation itself is unsubstantial. Unlike a cow, for instance, the Self, in Its own reality, is not an object of any other means of knowledge; for the Self is free from all adventitious attributes. Nor like a cow etc. does It belong to any class; because, by virtue of Its being one without a second, It is free from generic and specific attributes. Nor is It possessed of activity like a cook for instance, since It is devoid of all action. Nor is It possessed of qualities like blueness etc., It being free from qualities. Therefore It baffles all verbal description.

Objection: It will, in that case, serve no useful purpose like the horn of a hare and such other things.

Answer: Not so; for when Turīya is realised as the Self, it leads to the cessation of craving for the non-Self, just as the hankering for silver ceases on recognising the nacre. For there can be no possibility of such defects as ignorance, desire, and the like, after

¹Since an illusion is perceived as soaked in the idea of existence, it cannot have non-existence as its basis.

the realisation of Turiya as one's Self. Nor is there any reason why Turiya should not be realised as identical with one's Self, inasmuch as all the Upaniṣads aim at this conclusion, as is evidenced by the texts, "Thou art That" (Ch. VI. viii-xvi), "This Self is Brahman" (Br. II. v. 19), "That which is the Self is Truth" (Ch. VI. viii. 16), "That which is directly and immediately Brahman" (Br. III. iv. 1), "That which is inside and outside and is without birth" (Mu. II. i. 2), "All this is but the Self" (Ch. VII. xxv. 2), and so on. This very Self, that is the supreme Reality but has false appearances, has been spoken of as possessed of four quarters. Its unreal form has been dealt with, which is a creation of ignorance and which is analogous to a snake superimposed on a rope, and consists of the three quarters that are related (mutually) like the seed and its sprout.¹ Now, in the text beginning with, "*nāntah-prajñam*, not conscious of the internal world", the Upaniṣad speaks of the non-causal, supremely real state, comparable to a rope, etc., by way of eliminating the three states, comparable to the snake etc. (superimposed on the rope etc..

नान्तःप्रज्ञं न बहिष्प्रज्ञं नोभयतःप्रज्ञं न प्रज्ञानघनं न
प्रज्ञं नाप्रज्ञम् । अदृष्टमव्यवहार्यमग्राह्यमलक्षणमचि-
न्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं
शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः ॥७॥

7. They consider the Fourth to be that which is not conscious of the internal world,

¹By way of cause and effect.

nor conscious of the external world, nor conscious of both the worlds, nor a mass of consciousness, nor simple consciousness, nor unconsciousness; which is unseen, beyond empirical dealings, beyond the grasp (of the organs of action), uninferable, unthinkable, indescribable; whose valid proof consists in the single belief in the Self; in which all phenomena cease; and which is unchanging, auspicious, and non-dual. That is the Self, and that is to be known.

Objection: The start was made with the premise that the Self is possessed of four quarters. Then, after the presentation of the three quarters, it has become evident that the fourth is different from those three that are conscious of the internal world, and so on; and hence the negation through "not conscious of the internal world" etc. becomes futile.

Answer: Not so; for as the true nature of the rope is realised through the negation of the illusions of a snake etc., so the very Self, subsisting usually in the three states, is sought to be established as Turiya in the same way as is done in the case of the text "That thou art"¹ (Ch. VI. viii). For if Turiya, whose characteristics are dissimilar to those of the Self in the three states, be really different (from the Self), then owing to the absence of any means for realising Turiya

¹This positive statement is interpreted not literally, but figuratively to mean that "thou", which is the individual soul, is identical with "that", which is God, when both are bereft of conditioning factors.

the scriptural instruction would be useless or Turīya will be reduced to a nonentity. On the view, however, that like the rope, imagined variously as a snake etc., the Self, too, though one, is imagined in the three states to be possessed of such attributes as consciousness of the internal world etc., there follows the cessation of the phenomenal world of misery simultaneously with the valid knowledge, arising from the negation of such attributes as being conscious of the internal world; and therefore there remains no need to search for any other means of knowledge or any other discipline (like constant thinking) for the realisation of Turīya. This is similar to what happens in the case of the knowledge of the rope where the elimination of the snake from the rope occurs simultaneously with the discrimination between the rope and the snake.¹ On the contrary, by those who hold the view that in the act of knowing a pot, for instance, an instrument of knowledge engages in some other activity in addition to the removal of darkness (from the pot etc.), it may as well be held that in the matter of splitting wood, the act of splitting engages in doing something to one of the two parts in addition to removing the adhesion of the two members.² On the other

¹Since along with the discriminating knowledge of the form, "This is a rope and not a snake", the cessation of the snake comes simultaneously, one need not search for a separate result to issue out of the direct perception of the rope, or for any other means of its knowledge, or any other aid to it.

²The *objection* was: "The result of applying an instrument of knowledge to any object is the revelation of the object and not the mere removal of any illusion created by darkness or

hand, if it is true that the instrument of knowledge, engaged in separating a jar from the darkness (covering it), fulfils its goal by merely removing the unwanted darkness, just as the act of cutting, aiming at liquidating the sticking together of the parts of the wood to be split, fully serves its purpose by separating the two limbs, then the knowledge of the jar emerges immediately; and it is not achieved by any instrument of knowledge. Just as it is here, so in the case of Turīya the instrument of the knowledge, that is nothing but a valid knowledge arising from negation and intended to separate such ideas as "conscious of the internal world" that are superimposed on the Self, has no other action on Turīya, apart from eliminating the unwanted attributes like "conscious of the internal world";¹ for simultaneously with the cessation of such attributes as "conscious of the internal world", there comes about the eradication of the difference of the knower, (the known, and the knowledge). So also it will be said, "duality does not persist after knowledge" (*Kārikā*, I. 18), for knowledge (as a mental state) does not continue for a second moment following that of the cessation of duality. Should it, ignorance." The answer is: "An instrument of knowledge fulfils its purpose by removing the darkness of ignorance from its object. The revelation comes *pari passu*, as a matter of course. If the instrument of knowledge is supposed to serve the additional purpose of adding a fresh feature, like revelation, to its object, then one may as well argue that the cutting of wood aims not only at removing the adhesion of the two parts, but also at adding something to either of the two parts."

¹Turīya is self-effulgent and does not require to be illumined by any instrument of knowledge.

however, continue, it will lead to infinite regress resulting in non-cessation of duality.¹ Therefore the conclusion arrived at is that all evils, such as "consciousness of the internal world", superimposed on the Self, cease simultaneously with the application (that is to say, birth) of the instrument (of illumination) that is nothing but a valid knowledge arising from negation (of duality).

By the phrase, "*nāntaḥ-prajñam*, not conscious of the internal world", is eliminated *Taijasa*. By "*na-bahiḥ-prajñam*, not conscious of the outside world", is eliminated *Viśva*. By "*na ubhayataḥ-prajñam*, not conscious of either" is ruled out the intermediate state between dream and waking. By "*na prajñānaghanam* not a mass of consciousness" is denied the state of deep sleep, for this consists in a state of latency where everything becomes indistinguishable. By "*na prajñam*, not simple consciousness" is denied the awareness of everything simultaneously (by a single act of consciousness). By "*na aprajñam*, not unconsciousness" is negated insentience.

Objection: Since attributes like "conscious of the internal world" are perceived as inhering in the Self, how can they be understood to become non-existent by a mere negation, like the snake disappearing from the rope?

¹If the knowledge, calculated to eliminate duality, persists after serving its purpose, some other knowledge will be needed to eliminate it. That other knowledge will again require a third for a similar purpose, and so on. To avoid this contingency, the final knowledge must be assumed to be self-immolating.

The *answer is*: Since like the imaginary diversities—such as a snake, a line of water, etc., superimposed on the rope—the above states (appearing on the Self) mutually rule out each other, though they are in essence one with the witnessing Consciousness, and since the witnessing Consciousness in Its essence is unchanging in all the states, it follows that the witness is true.

Objection: It changes (i.e. disappears) in deep sleep.

Answer: Not so, for one in deep sleep is cognised (as soaked in Consciousness);¹ and this is borne out by the Vedic text, “for the knower’s function of knowing can never be lost” (Br. IV. iii. 30).

And just because It is so, It is *adṛṣtam*, unseen.² Since It is unseen (i.e. unperceived), therefore It is *avyavahūryam*, beyond empirical dealings; *agrāhyam*, beyond the grasp, of the organs of action; *alakṣaṇam*, without any logical ground of inference, that is to say, uninferable. Therefore It is *acintyam*, unthinkable. Hence It is *avyapadeśyam*, indescribable, by words. It is *eka-ātma-pratyaya-sāram*, to be spotted by the unchanging belief that It is the same Self that subsists in the states of waking and so on. Or the Turiya that has for Its *sāra*, valid proof, *eka-ātmapratyaya*, the single belief in the Self, is the *eka-ātmapratyaya-sāra*. And this is in accord with

¹ One rising from deep sleep says, “I slept soundly, and I was not aware of anything.” This memory would not be possible unless the state was witnessed with the help of Consciousness so as to produce the necessary impressions.

² Not the object of any sense of knowledge.

the Vedic text: "It is to be meditated upon as the Self" (Bṛ. I. iv. 7).

The attributes, such as "conscious of the internal world", belonging to the possessors of the states (viz Viśva, Taijasa, and Prājña), have been negated. In "prapañcopaśamam, the one in whom all phenomena have ceased" etc. are being denied the attributes of the states. Hence It is *sāntam*, unchanging;¹ *śivam*, auspicious.² Since It is *advaitam*, non-dual, free from illusory ideas of difference; therefore *manyante*, (they) consider, It to be; *caturtham*, the Fourth, being distinct from the three quarters that are mere appearances. "Saḥ ātmā, that is the Self; saḥ vijñeyaḥ, that is to be known" this is said to imply that just as the rope is known to be different from the snake, the chink on the ground, or the stick, superimposed on it, similarly, that Self is to be known (as different from the superimposed states)—the Self that is presented in the sentence "That thou art" (Ch. VI. viii-xvi), and that has been spoken of by such texts as "He is never seen, but is the witness" (Bṛ. III. vii. 23), "for the vision of the witness can never be lost" (Bṛ. IV. iii. 23), etc., This (knowledge of the Self) is spoken of from the standpoint of the previous state of ignorance,³ for on the dawn of knowledge, no duality is left.

¹ Free from love, hatred, etc.

² Absolutely pure; supreme Bliss and Consciousness in essence.

³ The Self, defying all description, cannot be known objectively. But since in the state of ignorance, one understands knowledge as having an objective reference, the text follows that trend of thought here as well. ♪

GAUḌAPĀDA'S KĀRIKĀ

Here occur these verses (of Gauḍapāda):

निवृत्तेः सर्वदुःखानामीशानः प्रभुरव्ययः ।

अद्वैतः सर्वभावानां देवस्तुर्यो विभुः स्मृतः ॥१०॥

10. The inexhaustible non-dual One is the ordainer — the Lord — in the matter of eradicating all sorrows. This effulgent Turīya is held to be the all-pervasive source of all entities.

Nivṛtteḥ, in the matter of the eradication; *sarvaduhkhānām*, of all sorrows, represented by Viśva, Taijasa, and Prājña; the Self that is Turīya is *īśānah*, the ordainer. The word *prabhuḥ*, Lord, is an explanation of *īśānah*. The idea is that He is the Lord capable of ordaining the cessation of sorrow; for sorrow ceases as a result of His knowledge. (He is) *avyayah*, inexhaustible, that is to say, does not deviate from His nature. Why is this so? Because He is *advaitah*, non-dual. He who is this *devaḥ*, effulgent One, who is so called because of His self-effulgence; who is *turyah*, the Fourth; is *smṛtah*, held to be; *vibhuḥ*, all-pervasive (source);¹ *sarvabhāvānām*, of all entities.

For determining the true nature of Turīya, the generic and specific characteristics of Viśva and the rest are being ascertained:

कार्यकारणबद्धौ ताविष्येते विश्वतैजसौ ।

प्राज्ञः कारणबद्धस्तु द्वौ तौ तुर्ये न सिध्यतः ॥११॥

¹Turīya is *vibhu*, because the different (*vividha*) states issue (*bhavantī*) from Him—A.G.

11. Those two, viz Viśva and Taijasa, are held to be conditioned by cause and effect. Prājña is conditioned by cause. But both these do not exist in Turiya.

Kārya, derived in the sense of anything produced, means the state of being the effect. *Kāraṇa*, derived in the sense of anything that acts, means the causal state. Those two, viz *viśva-taijasau*, Viśva and Taijasa, as described earlier; *iṣyete*, are held to be; *kārya-kāraṇa-baddhau*, bound by, comprised within, the seed and fruit states, consisting in the non-apprehension and misapprehension of Reality. But Prājña is bound by the causal state alone. The non-apprehension of Reality alone is the cause of bringing about the state of Prājña. Therefore *tau dvau*, both these two—the causal and the resultant conditions, the non-apprehension and misapprehension of Reality;—*na sidhyataḥ turye*, do not exist, that is to say, are not possible, in Turiya.

नात्मानं न परांश्चैव न सत्यं नापि चानृतम् ।

प्राज्ञः किञ्चन संवेत्ति तुर्यं तत् सर्वदृक् सदा ॥१२॥

12. Prājña comprehends neither himself nor others, neither truth nor falsehood. But that Turiya is for ever everything and the witness.

How, again, is Prājña conditioned by the causal state, and how are the bondages of non-apprehension and mis-apprehension impossible in the case of Turiya? Since unlike Viśva and Taijasa, Prājña *na samveitti*, does not apprehend; *kim cana*, anything, any external duality that is different from the Self and is born of

the seed of ignorance; therefore he is conditioned by the darkness of non-perception of Reality that is the seed of false perception. Since *tat*, that; Turiya is *sadā*, for ever; *sarva-dṛk*, all (*sarva*) that there is as well as a witness (*dṛk*), there being nothing beside Turiya; therefore Turiya has not the seed consisting in non-perception of Reality. And just because of this there is absence in Turiya of false perception resulting from non-perception; for in the sun, that is ever resplendent, there cannot be any possibility of the opposite darkness or shining in any way other than that of the sun, in conformity with the Vedic text, "for the vision of the witness can never be lost" (Br. IV. iii. 23). Or Turiya is said to be the "*sarva-dṛk*, seer of everything" for ever, because it is but Turiya who, by existing in all beings during the dream and the waking states, seems to be the seer of everything. For the Upaniṣad says, "There is no other witness but this" (Br. III. viii. 11).

द्वैतस्याग्रहणं तुल्यमुभयोः प्राज्ञतुर्ययोः ।

बीजनिद्रायुतः प्राज्ञः सा च तुर्ये न विद्यते ॥१३॥

13. Non-perception of duality is common to both Prājña and Turiya. Prājña is endowed with sleep that is a causal state. But in Turiya that sleep does not exist.

This verse is meant to remove the doubt arising from another source. "The non-perception of duality being similar, why should Prājña alone be conditioned by causality and not Turiya?"—this doubt that may arise

is being refuted. The reason is that Prājña is *bīja-nidrā-yutah*: *nidrā*, sleep, consists in the non-perception of Reality, and that itself is the *bīja*, seed of the birth of the cognition of varieties; and Prājña is *yutah*, endued by this *bījanidrā*, sleep that is a causal state. That sleep, consisting in the non-perception of Reality, *na vidyate*, does not exist; *turye*, in Turiya, because of his being by nature a constant witness. Therefore in Him there is no bondage of the causal state. This is the purport.

स्वप्ननिद्रायुतावाद्यौ प्राज्ञस्त्वस्वप्ननिद्रया ।

न निद्रां नैव च स्वप्नं तुर्ये पश्यन्ति निश्चिताः ॥१४॥

14. The earlier two are endued with dream and sleep, but Prājña is endued with dreamless sleep. People of firm conviction do not see either sleep or dream in Turiya.

Svapna, dream, consists in false perception, like that of a snake on a rope. *Nidrā*, sleep, has been spoken of as darkness, consisting in non-perception of Reality. By these two—dream and sleep—are endued Viśva and Taijasa; and this is why they have been referred to as conditioned by the states of cause and effect (*Kārikā*, I. 11); whereas Prājña is conditioned by sleep alone, unassociated with dream; and hence he has been referred to as conditioned by the causal state. *Niścītāḥ*, those with firm conviction, the knowers of Brahman; *na paśyanti*, do not see, both these in Turiya, these being of an opposite nature, like darkness with regard to the sun. Therefore it has been said that Turiya is not conditioned by the states of cause and effect.

It is being shown when one becomes firmly rooted in Turīya:

अन्यथा गृह्णतः स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजानतः ।
विपर्यासि तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्नुते ॥१५॥

15. Dream belongs to one who sees falsely, and sleep to one who does not know Reality. When the two errors of these two¹ are removed, one attains the state that is Turīya.

Svapnaḥ, dream; comes to one *gr̥hṇataḥ*, cognising; *anyathā*, falsely; like the cognition of a snake on a rope, in the states of dream and waking. *Nidrā*, sleep;—belonging to one *ajānataḥ tattvam*, not cognising Reality;—is equally present in all the three states. Dream and sleep being the common features of both Viśva and Taijasa, are treated as one. Since in these two states sleep is of secondary importance owing to the predominance of false perception, the error (in these states) is equated with dream. But in the third state the error takes the form of sleep alone, consisting in non-perception of Reality. Therefore when *tayoh*, of these two (Viśva-Taijasa and Prājña), existing in the states of effect and cause; *viparyāse*, the two errors, consisting in false perception and non-perception, and constituting the two bondages in the states of effect and cause; *kṣīṇe*, are eradicated on the cognition of the supreme Reality; then one *aśnute*, attains; *turīyam padam*, the state of Turīya. The idea is that, as he

¹ Viśva and Taijasa constitute one factor and Prājña the other. This is why “*tayoh*, of these two” is used in the dual number.

does not perceive both kinds of bondage, he becomes firmly rooted in Turīya.

अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते ।

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥१६॥

16. When the individual, sleeping under the influence of beginningless Māyā, is awakened, then he realises the birthless, sleepless, dreamless, non-dual (Turīya).

This one, the *jīvaḥ*, the transmigrating individual soul, that is *suptaḥ*, asleep; while seeing in both the (waking and dream) states such dreams as "This is my father", "This my son", "This is my grandson", "This is my field", "These are my animals", "I am their master", "I am happy, miserable", "I am despoiled by this one, and I have gained through this one", and so on, under the influence of sleep that is but Māyā whose activity had no beginning and which has the two facets of non-perception of Reality or the causal state, and false perception of Reality. *Yadū*, when; by a most gracious teacher, who has realised the truth that forms the purport of the Upaniṣads, he (the individual) is awakened through the teaching. "Thou art not a bundle of causes and effects, but 'Thou art That' ", then that individual understands thus. How? (Thus): (He knows the) *ajam*, birthless, which is called so since in It there is no external or internal mutation, starting with birth, that positive objects are heir to; the idea is that It is externally and internally devoid of all mutations that phenomenal objects are subject to. (He knows the) *anidram*, sleepless (Turīya), since in

It there is no sleep or the causal state, consisting in the darkness of ignorance that is the cause of birth and so on. Since that Turiya is sleepless, therefore (he realises) It as *asvapnam*, dreamless, false perception (*svapna*) being based on non-perception (*nidrā*). Since It is sleepless and dreamless, therefore the individual, *tadā*, then; *budhyate*, realises the birthless, non-dual Turiya as his Self.

प्रपञ्चो यदि विद्येत निवर्तेत न संशयः ।

मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः ॥१७॥

17. It is beyond question that the phenomenal world would cease to be if it had any existence. All this duality that is nothing but *Māyā*, is but non-duality in reality.

If one is to be awakened by negating the phenomenal world, how can there be non-duality so long as the phenomenal world persists? The answer is: Such indeed will be the case *yadi prapañcaḥ vidyeta*, if the world had existence. But being superimposed like a snake on a rope, it does not exist. *Na saṁśayaḥ*, there is no doubt; that if it had existed, *nivarteta*, it would cease to be. Not that the snake, fancied on the rope through an error of observation, exists there in reality and is then removed by correct observation. Not that the magic conjured up by a magician exists in reality and is then removed on the removal of the optical illusion of its witness. Similarly, *māyāmātram idam dvaitam*, this duality that is nothing but *Māyā*, and is called the phenomenal world; is *paramārthataḥ*, in supreme truth; *advaitam*, non-dual, just like the rope

and the magician. Therefore the purport is that there is no such thing as the world which appears or disappears.

विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत कल्पितो यदि केनचित् ।

उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥१८॥

18. Diversity would disappear if it had been imagined by anyone. This kind of talk is for the sake of (making) instruction (possible). Duality ceases to exist after realisation.

How can such fancies as instruction, instructor, and the instructed disappear? To this the answer is: *Vikalpaḥ*, diversity; *vinivarteta*, would discontinue; *yadi*, if; it had been *kalpitaḥ*, imagined; *kena cit*, by anybody. Just as this phenomenal world is analogous to magic or a snake superimposed on a rope, so also such fancies as the differences of the instructed and so on are there *upadeśāt*, for the sake of instruction; hence *ayam vādaḥ*, this talk—of instructor, instruction, and instructed—is for the sake of instruction. When the effect of instruction is accomplished, *jñāte*, on the realisation, of the supreme Reality; *dvaitam na vidyate*, duality ceases to exist.

UPANIṢAD

सोऽयमात्माऽध्यक्षरमोङ्कारोऽधिमात्रं पादा मात्रा
मात्राश्च पादा अकार उकारो मकार इति ॥८॥

8. That very Self, considered from the standpoint of the syllable (denoting It) is *Om*. Considered from the standpoint of the letters

(constituting *Om*), the quarters (of the Self) are the letters (of *Om*), and the letters are the quarters. (The letters are): *a*, *u*, and *m*.

Saḥ ayam ātmā, that very Self, that was equated with *Om* in "This Self is possessed of four quarters" (Mā. 2), by giving predominance to the object denoted (by *Om*),—that very Self; *adhyakṣaram*, from the standpoint of the syllable, (is *Om*) when explained with emphasis on the syllable. Which again is that syllable? That is being stated: *Oṅkārah*, it is the syllable *Om*. That syllable *Om*, while being divided into quarters, is *adhimūtram*, exists on letters as its basis. How? Those which constitute the quarters of the Self are the letters of *Om*. Which are they? They are the letters *a*, *u*, and *m*.

जागरितस्थानो वैश्वानरोऽकारः प्रथमा मात्राऽऽ-
प्तेरादिमत्त्वाद्वाऽऽप्नोति ह वै सर्वान् कामानादिश्च
भवति य एवं वेद ॥९॥

9. Vaiśvānara, having the waking state as His sphere, is the first letter *a*, because of (the similarity of) pervasiveness or being the first. He who knows thus, does verily attain all desirable things, and becomes the foremost.

With regard to these, specific relations are being established. He who is *vaiśvānarah*, Vaiśvānara (Virāt); *jūgaritasthānah*, with His sphere (of activity) as the waking state;¹ is *akārah*, *a*;—*prathamā mātrā*, the

¹The Self in the gross individual context (viz *Viśva*) is identical with the Self in the gross cosmic context (viz *Vaiśvānara* or *Virāt*). Similarly, it is to be understood that *Taijasa* is identical with

first letter, of *Om*. Because of what similarity? That is being said: *Āpteḥ*, because of pervasiveness. *Āpti* means pervasiveness. By the sound *a* is pervaded all speech, according to the Vedic text, "The sound *a* is indeed all speech" (Ai. Ā. II. iii. 7. 13). Similarly, by Vaiśvānara is pervaded the whole universe, according to the Vedic text, "The head indeed of this Self, that is Vaiśvānara, is heaven" etc. (Ch. V. xviii. 2). And we said that the word and the thing denoted by the word are the same. That which has *ādi*, precedence, is said to be *ādimat*, first. As the letter called *a* is the first, so also is Vaiśvānara. Because of this similarity Vaiśvānara is identified with *a*. The fruit attained by a knower of this identity is stated: *Āpnoti ha vai sarvān kāmān*, he surely attains all desirable things; *ca bhavati ādīḥ* and he becomes the foremost, among the great; *yaḥ evam veda*, who knows thus, knows the identity as stated.

स्वप्नस्थानस्तैजस उकारो द्वितीया मात्रोत्कर्षाद्भय-
त्वाद्द्वोत्कर्षति ह वै ज्ञानसन्ततिं समानश्च भवति
नारयाब्रह्मवित् कुले भवति य एवं वेद ॥१०॥

10. He who is Taijasa with the state of dream as his sphere (of activity) is the second letter *u* (of *Om*); because of the similarity of excellence and intermediateness. He who knows thus increases the current of knowledge

Hiranyagarbha, and Prājña with the Unmanifested, the difference lying only in the sphere of manifestation. This identity is suggested by the indiscriminate use of these terms in the present and following texts.

and becomes equal to all. None is born in his line who is not a knower of Brahman.

He who is *taijasaḥ*, Taijasa; *svapnasthānaḥ*, with the state of dream as his sphere; is the *dvitīyā mātṛā*, second letter; *ukāraḥ*, *u*, of *Om*. Because of what similarity? That is being said: *Utkarṣāt*, because of excellence. The letter *u* is, as it were, better than the letter *a*; so also is Taijasa better than Viśva. *Ubhaya-tvāt vā* or (this is so) because of intermediate position. The letter *u* occurs between the letters *a* and *m*; and so also is Taijasa intermediate between Viśva and Prājña. (Taijasa is *u*) because of this similarity of being related to both. The result attained by the knower is being stated: *Utkarṣati ha vai jñānasantatim*, he heightens, that is to say, increases, the current of his knowledge; *ca bhavati samānaḥ*, and he becomes equal—he does not become an object of envy to his enemies, as he is not to his friends. *Asya kule*, in his line; *yaḥ evam veda*, who knows thus; *na bhavati abrahmavit*, none is born who is not a knower of Brahman.

सुषुप्तस्थानः प्राज्ञो मकारस्तृतीया मात्रा मितेर-
पीतेर्वा मिनोति ह वा इदं सर्वमपीतिश्च भवति य
एवं वेद ॥११॥

11. Prājña with his sphere of activity in the sleep state is *m*, the third letter of *Om*, because of measuring or because of absorption. Anyone who knows thus measures all this, and he becomes the place of absorption.

He that is *prājñaḥ*, Prājña; *suṣuptasthānaḥ*, with the state of sleep as his sphere, is *makāraḥ*, the letter *m*;

which is *ṛtīyā mātrā*, the third letter; of the syllable *Om*. By what analogy? That is being said: This is the analogy here—*mitēḥ*, because of measuring. *Miti* means to measure. As barley is measured by the vessel called *Prastha*, so are *Viśva* and *Taijasa* measured, as it were, because of their entry into and coming out of *Prājña* during dissolution and origination. Similarly, too, at the end of the pronunciation of the syllable *Om* and at the time of its fresh pronunciation, the letters *a* and *u* seem to enter into the last letter *m* to come out again from it. *Vā apīteḥ*, or because of absorption. *Apīti* means getting merged or united in. At the time of the pronunciation of *Om*, *a* and *u* seem to get merged into the last letter *m*. Similarly, *Viśva* and *Taijasa* merge into *Prājña* at the time of sleep. Because of this analogy also there is the identity of *Prājña* and the letter *m*. The result attained by the man of knowledge is stated: *Minoti ha vai idam sarvam*, he measures all this, universe, that is to say, he knows its reality; *ca bhavati apītiḥ*, and he becomes the place of absorption, of the universe, that is to say, the Self in its causal state. The mention of subsidiary results here is by way of praising the primary means.

GAUDAPĀDA'S KĀRIKĀ

Here occur these verses (of Gaudapāda):

विश्वस्थात्वविवक्षायामादिसामान्यमुक्तम् ।

मात्रासंप्रतिपत्तौ स्यादाप्तिसामान्यमेव च ॥१९॥

19. When the identity of *Viśva* with the letter *a* is intended, (that is to say) when

Viśva's identity with a letter is apprehended, the similarity of being the first, as well as the similarity of all-pervasiveness, emerges in view.

When the identity *viśvasya*, of Viśva; with *a*, with the mere letter *a*, is intended, then, according to the reasoning adduced; *sāmānyam*, the similarity; of being the *ādi*, first; is seen as *utkaṭam*, obvious. This is the idea. The clause "when the identity with *a* is intended" is explained by *mūtrāsampratipattau*, which means "when Viśva's identity with *a* alone is apprehended". After "*āpti-sāmānyam eva ca*, the similarity of all-pervasiveness", the word "*utkaṭam*, (is seen as) obvious" is understood because of the use of "*ca*, and".

तैजसस्योत्वविज्ञान उत्कर्षो दृश्यते स्फुटम् ।

मात्रासंप्रतिपत्तौ स्यादुभयत्वं तथाविधम् ॥२०॥

20. In the matter of comprehending Taijasa as identified with *u*, that is to say, when Taijasa's identity with a letter is apprehended, the similarity of excellence is clearly seen, and intermediacy also is equally clear.

Taijasasya utva-vijñāne, in the matter of knowing Taijasa as the letter *u*, when it is intended to be identified with *u*; *utkarṣaḥ*, excellence; *dṛśyate*, is seen; *sphuṭam*, clearly. This is the meaning. *Ubhayatvam*, intermediacy, is also clear. All this is to be explained as before.

मकारभावे प्राज्ञस्य मानसामान्यमुत्कटम् ।

मात्रासंप्रतिपत्तौ तु लयसामान्यमेव च ॥२१॥

21. In the matter of Prājña's identity with the letter *m*, that is to say, when Prājña's identity with a letter is apprehended, the similarity of being a measure is seen to emerge plainly, and so also does the similarity of absorption.

The idea is that, in the matter of Prājña's identity with the letter *m*, measurement and absorption are excellent points of similarity.

त्रिषु धामसु यस्तुल्यं सामान्यं वेत्ति निश्चितः ।

स पूज्यः सर्वभूतानां वन्द्यश्चैव महामुनिः ॥२२॥

22. He who knows with firm conviction, the common similarities in the three states is a great sage, worthy of adoration and salutation by all beings.

Sal, he; who *niścitaḥ*, having the firm conviction, "This is certainly so"; *vetti*, knows; in the three states, mentioned above; *tulyam sāmānyam*, the common analogies spoken of; becomes in the world a knower of Brahman and is *pūjyaḥ*, adorable; and *vandyah*, worthy of salutation.

अकारो नयते विश्वमुकारश्चापि तैजसम् ।

मकारश्च पुनः प्राज्ञं नामात्रे विद्यते गतिः ॥२३॥

23. The letter *a* leads to Viśva; so also the letter *u* leads to Taijasa; and the letter *m*, again, leads to Prājña. With regard to one freed from letters, there remains no attainment.

Akāraḥ, the letter *a*; *nayate* carries; him who, after resorting to *Om*, meditates on it by identifying the

quarters of the Self with the letters of *Om* through the foregoing common features; *viśvam*, to Viśva; makes him attain Viśva. The idea is that he who meditates on *Om* with the help of *a*, becomes identified with Vaiśvānara (Virāt). Similarly, *ukārah*, the letter *u*; takes him *taijasam*, to Taijasa. And *makārah*, the letter *m*; *punaḥ*, *prājñam*, to Prājña. The verb “leads” is to be understood from the use of the word “*ca*, and”. But when *m*, too, disappears, then owing to the destruction of the causal state, *amātre*, with regard to the one freed from letters (and parts); *na vidyate*, there does not remain; any *gatiḥ*, attainment.¹

UPANIṢAD

अमात्रश्चतुर्थोऽव्यवहार्यः प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवोऽद्वैत
एवमोङ्कार आत्मैव संविशत्यात्मनाऽऽत्मानं य एव
वेद ॥१२॥ इति माण्डूक्योपनिषत् समाप्ता ॥

12. The partless *Om* is Turiya—beyond all conventional dealings, the limit of the negation of the phenomenal world, the auspicious,

¹*A* represents the gross universe, the waking state, and Viśva; *u* represents the subtle universe, dream, and Taijasa; and *m* represents the causal state, sleep, and Prājña. The earlier ones merge into the latter ones. In this way everything is reduced to *Om*. While engaged in this meditation of *Om* as all, there flashes in the aspirant's mind the teacher's instruction that everything is but the absolute Brahman. Then all the phenomenal world, merged in *Om*, disappears in Brahman, and there remains no goal to attain. Though the meditations in the three stages relate to the same *Om*, the results are different in accordance with the emphasis laid on its constituents.

and the non-dual. *Om* is thus the Self to be sure. He who knows thus enters the Self through his Self.

Amūtrah, that which has no *mātrā*, part—the partless *Om*; becomes but the *caturthah*, Fourth, Turiya, merely the absolute Self; which is *avyavahāryah*, beyond empirical relations, because of the disappearance of names and nameables, that are but forms of speech and mind; *prapañcopaśamah*, the culmination of phenomenal existence;¹ *śivah*, the auspicious; *advaitah*, non-dual. *Evam*, thus; *Om*, as possessed of the three letters, and as applied by a man with the above knowledge, is *ātmā eva*, verily identical with the Self, possessed of three quarters. *Yah evam veda*, he who knows thus; *samviśati*, enters; *ātmānam*, into (his own supreme) Self; *ātmanā*, through (his own) Self. The knower of Brahman, who has realised the highest truth, has entered into the Self by burning away the third state of latency; and hence he is not born again, since Turiya has no latency of (creation). For when a snake superimposed on a rope has merged in the rope on the discrimination of the rope and the snake, it does not appear again to those discriminating people, just as before, from the impressions of the past sticking to the intellect. To those men of renunciation who are possessed of dull or average intellect, who still consider themselves aspirants, who tread the virtuous path, and who know the common features of the letters and the quarters (of *Om* and the Self) as presented before, (to them) the syllable *Om*, when meditated on in the proper way, becomes helpful

¹ The ultimate limit of the negation of the world.

for the realization of Brahman. In support of this it will be said, "The three inferior stages of life" etc. (*Kārikā* III. 16).

GAUḌAPĀDA'S KĀRIKĀ

Just as before, here occur these verses:

ओङ्कारं पादशो विद्यात्पादा मात्रा न संशयः ।

ओङ्कारं पादशो ज्ञात्वा न किञ्चिदपि चिन्तयेत् ॥२४॥

24. One should know *Om*, quarter by quarter; (for) there is no doubt that the quarters (of the Self) are the letters (of *Om*). Having known *Om*, quarter by quarter, one should not think of anything whatsoever.

Because of the aforesaid similarity, the quarters are the letters, and the letters are the quarters. Therefore *vidyāt*, one should know; *oṅkāram*, the syllable *Om*; *pādaśaḥ*, quarter by quarter. This is the meaning. When the syllable *Om* is known thus, *na cintayet*, one should not think of; *kim cit api*, anything whatsoever, serving any seen or unseen purpose; for he has got all his desires fulfilled.

युञ्जीत प्रणवे चेतः प्रणवो ब्रह्म निर्भयम् ।

प्रणवे नित्ययुक्तस्य न भयं विद्यते क्वचित् ॥२५॥

25. One should concentrate one's mind on *Om*, (for) *Om* is Brahman beyond fear. For a man, ever fixed in Brahman, there can be no fear anywhere.

Yuñjīta, one should concentrate; *cetaḥ*, the mind; *praṇave*, on *Om*, as explained, which is essentially the supreme Reality; for *praṇavaḥ*, *Om*; is *brahma nirbhayam*, Brahman beyond fear; because for one who is ever fixed in it, *na bhayam vidyate kvacit*, there can be no fear anywhere, in accordance with the Vedic text, "The enlightened man is not afraid of anything" (Tai. II. ix).

प्रणवो ह्यपरं ब्रह्म प्रणवश्च परः स्मृतः ।

अपूर्वोऽनन्तरोऽबाह्योऽनपरः प्रणवोऽव्ययः ॥२६॥

26. *Om* is surely the inferior Brahman; and *Om* is considered to be the superior Brahman. *Om* is without cause, without inside and outside, and without effect; and it is undecaying.

Praṇavaḥ, *Om*; is both the superior and inferior Brahman. When the quarters and letters disappear, from the highest standpoint, *Om* becomes verily the supreme Self that is Brahman. Therefore it is *apūrvah*, without any cause preceding it. There is nothing inside it that is of a different class; therefore it is *anantaraḥ*, without inside. Similarly, there is nothing existing outside; therefore it is *abāhyam*, without outside. There is no *aparaḥ*, effect of it; therefore it is *anaparaḥ*, without effect. The idea implied (as a whole) is that is coextensive with all that is inside or outside; it is birthless; and it is a mass of Consciousness, homogeneous like a lump of salt.

सर्वस्य प्रणवो त्वादिर्मध्यमन्तस्तथैव च ।

एवं हि प्रणवं ज्ञात्वा व्यश्नुते तदनन्तरम् ॥२७॥

27. *Om* is indeed the beginning, middle; and end of everything. Having known *Om* in this way indeed one attains immediately (identity with it).

Just like the magician and others, (*Om* is the) beginning (*ādi*), middle (*madhya*), and end (*anta*)—the origination, continuance, and dissolution; *sarvasya*, of all—of the whole phenomenal universe, consisting of space and the rest which originate like a magic elephant, a snake superimposed in a rope, a mirage, a dream, etc. (from the magician and the rest). *Evam hi*, in this way indeed; *jñātvā praṇavam*, having known *Om*, that is the Self and that is comparable to the magician and the rest; *vyaśnute*, one attains; identity with the Self, at that very moment. This is the idea.

प्रणवं हीश्वरं विद्यात् सर्वस्य हृदि संस्थितम् ।

सर्वव्यापिनमोङ्कारं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥२८॥

28. One should know *Om* to be God seated in the hearts of all. Meditating on the all-pervasive *Om*, the intelligent man grieves no more.

Vidyāt, one should know; *praṇavam*, *Om*; as *īśvaram*, God; existing *hṛdi*, in the heart—the seat of memory and perception; of all living beings. *Matvā*, having meditated on (i.e. realised); the *sarvavyāpinam*, all-pervasive; *oṅkāram*, *Om*, that is the Self beyond

the worldly state; *dhīrah*, the intelligent man; *na śocati*, does not grieve; for no cause of grief can be possible (than), in accordance with such Vedic texts as, "The knower of Self transcends sorrow" (Ch. VII. i. 3).

अमात्रोऽनन्तमात्रश्च द्वैतस्योपशमः शिवः ।

ओङ्कारो विदितो येन स मुनिर्नेतरो जनः ॥२९॥

29. The *Om*, without measures and possessed of infinite dimension, is the auspicious entity where all duality ceases. He by whom *Om* is known, is the real sage, and not so is any other man.

Amātraḥ, (*Om*) beyond measures, is Turiya. *Mātrā*, derived in the sense of that by which anything is measured, signifies dimension; that which has infinite (*ananta*) dimension is *anantamātraḥ*; the idea is that its extension cannot be determined. It is *śivaḥ*, auspicious, holy, because of the negation of all duality. *Saḥ yena*, he by whom; *oṅkārah*, *Om*, as explained; *viditaḥ*, is known; is a *muniḥ*, sage (lit. a mediator), because of his meditating on the supreme Reality; but *na itarah janah*, not any other man, though he may be learned in the scriptures. This is the idea.

CHAPTER II

VAITATHYA-PRAKARAṆA (ON UNREALITY)

In consonance with such Vedic texts as, "One indeed without a second" (Ch. VI. ii. 1), it has been said that duality ceases to exist after realisation (*Kārikā*, I. 18). That is, however, only a scriptural assertion. But this falsity can be confirmed even through reasoning. This is why the second chapter commences:

वैतथ्यं सर्वभावानां स्वप्न आहुर्मनीषिणः ।

अन्तःस्थानात्तु भावानां संवृतत्वेन हेतुना ॥१॥

1. The wise declare the falsity of all objects in a dream because of the location of the objects inside (the body) and because of (their) contraction.

The state of the *vitatha*, unreal, is *vaitathyam*, unreality, or falsity. Of what? *Sarvabhāvānām*, of all objects, both external and internal; that are perceived *svapne*, in dream. (This is what) *manīṣiṇaḥ*, the wise people, adept in the use of means of knowledge; *āhuḥ*, say. The ground of falsity is being stated: *antaḥ-sthānāt*, because of existence inside; because of those (*bhāvāḥ*, things) having their *sthāna*, place *antaḥ*, inside the body; for (*bhāvāḥ*), objects, such as elephants or mountains, are perceived there and not outside the body. Therefore they ought to be false.

Objection: This ground of inference (viz existence within) is invalidated by the perception of (real) jars etc. within a house etc.¹

In *answer* to this objection it is said: *samvṛtatvena hetunā*, by reason of their contraction, that is to say, because they are confined within a small space. For mountains and elephants cannot possibly exist within the limited space inside the nerves in the (dreamer's) body. A mountain does not surely exist within a body.

Objection: It is not tenable that the things seen in a dream have a limited space inside (the body); for one sleeping in the east is seen as though dreaming in the north.

Apprehending such an objection the text *answer*:

अदीर्घत्वाच्च कालस्य गत्वा देशान्न पश्यति ।
प्रतिबुद्धश्च वै सर्वस्तस्मिन्देशे न विद्यते ॥२॥

2. Besides, one does not see places by going there, for the time is not long enough. Moreover, every dreamer, when awakened, does not continue in that place (of dream).

One does not dream by going anywhere outside the body; for as soon as one goes to sleep, one sees as though one is dreaming in a place eight hundred miles away from the body that can be reached in a month only. Not that there is sufficient time to reach there and come back. Hence *adīrghatvāt ca kūlasya*, inas-

¹So "existence within" is no valid ground for inferring that a thing is unreal.

much as the time is not long, the dreamer does not go to a different place. Moreover, *pratibuddhaḥ ca vai sarvaḥ*, every dreamer, when awakened; *na vidyate*, does not stay, in the places dreamt of. Should one go to a different region in dream, one should wake up in the region of one's dream. But this is not a fact. A man sleeping at night, sees things as though in the day time. And when the dreamer comes into contact with many, he should be acknowledged as such by those whom he meets. But he is not apprehended thus; for if they really contacted him, they would say, "We noticed you there today." But this is not so. Therefore he does not go to a different place in dream.

Things seen in a dream are unreal because of this further reason :

अभावश्च रथादीनां श्रूयते न्यायपूर्वकम् ।

वैतथ्यं तेन वै प्राप्तं स्वप्न आहुः प्रकाशितम् ॥३॥

3. Besides, the absence of chariot etc. is heard of in the Upaniṣad from the standpoint of logic. They say that the falsity arrived at thus (by logic) is reiterated by the Upaniṣad in the context of dream.

Ca, besides; *abhāvaḥ*, non-existence; *rathādīnām*, of chariots etc.; *śrūyate*, is heard of in the Upaniṣad, in the text, "There are no chariots, nor animals to be yoked to them" (Br. IV. iii. 10); *nyāyapūrvakam*, from the standpoint of logic. They, the knowers of Brahman, *āhuḥ*, say; that the *vaitathyam*, unreality;

prāptam, arrived at; through such reasons as existence inside the body contraction etc.; is *prakāśitam*, revealed by the Upaniṣad, that reiterates that fact while engaged in establishing (the soul's) self-effulgence; *svapne*, in dream.

अन्तःस्थानात्तु भेदानां तस्माज्जागरिते स्मृतम् ।

यथा तत्र तथा स्वप्ने संवृतत्वेन भिद्यते ॥४॥

4. As the dream objects are unreal in a dream, so also, because of that very reason, the objects in the waking state are unreal. But objects (in the dream state) differ because of existence inside (the body) and because of contraction (in the dream).

The proposition (major premiss) to be established is the unreality of objects seen in the waking state. "Being perceived" is the ground of inference (middle term). And the illustration (in confirmation) is "like an object seen in a dream". And the assertion of the presence of the middle term in the minor term is made thus: *Yathā tatra svapne*, as (objects "perceived") there in a dream, are false; so also are they false *jāgarite*, in the waking state; the fact of "being perceived" being equally present. And the concluding reiteration is: *Tasmāt jāgarite smṛtam*, therefore falsity is admitted of objects in the waking state as well. The dream object *bhidyate*, differs, from the object of the waking state; *antaḥsthānāt*, because the former is confined within; and *samvṛtatvena*, because of being contracted. And the common features in both the states are the facts of being perceived and being false.

स्वप्नजागरितस्थाने ह्येकमाहुर्मनीषिणः ।

भेदानां हि समत्वेन प्रसिद्धेनैव हेतुना ॥५॥

5. Inasmuch as the diverse things are (found to be) similar on the strength of the familiar grounds of inference, the wise say that the dream and the waking states are one.

Samatvena, inasmuch as there is similarity; *bhedā-nām*, of the diverse things; *prasiddhena eva hetunā*, on the strength of the familiar ground of inference, viz that things (in dream and waking states) are equally either the perceiver or the perceived;¹ therefore the discriminating people speak of the sameness of the states of waking and dream. This is only a corollary of what was arrived at on earlier valid grounds.

आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ।

वितथैः सदृशाः सन्तोऽवितथा इव लक्षिताः ॥६॥

6. That which does not exist in the beginning and the end is equally so in the present (i.e. in the middle). Though they are on the same footing with the unreal, yet they are seen as though real.

The different things noticed in the waking state are unreal, for this additional reason that they do not exist in the beginning and at the end. A thing, for instance a mirage, *yat*, which; *na asti*, does not exist; *ādau ante ca*, in the beginning and at the end; *tat*, that;

¹On the logical ground of "being perceived".

does not exist even in the middle. This is the ascertained truth in the world. So also these different things, seen in the waking state, are indeed unreal, they being *vitathāḥ sadṛśāḥ*, similar to, (on the same footing with), unreal things, like the mirage etc., on account of their non-existence in the beginning and at the end. And yet *avitathāḥ iva lakṣitāḥ*, they are perceived as though real, by the ignorant who do not know the Self.

Objection: The assertion that the things seen in the waking state are unreal like those seen in the dream is wrong, since objects of the waking state, for instance food, drink, vehicles, etc., are seen to fulfil some purpose by assuaging hunger and thirst and moving to and fro, whereas dream objects have no such utility. Therefore it is a mere figment of the brain to say that the objects of the waking state are illusory like those of dream.

Answer: That is not so.

Objection: Why?

Answer: Because:

सप्रयोजनता तेषां स्वप्ने विप्रतिपद्यते ।

तस्मादाद्यन्तवत्त्वेन मिथ्यैव खलु ते स्मृताः ॥७॥

7. Their utility is contradicted in dream. Therefore from the fact of their having a beginning and an end they are rightly held to be unreal.

Saprayojanatā, the utility, that is noticed, (in the waking state), of food, drink, etc., *vipratipadyate svapne*, is contradicted in dream. For a man who has got his hunger appeased and thirst quenched by eating and

drinking in the waking state, as soon as he goes to sleep, feels as though he is afflicted by hunger and thirst and is fasting for a whole day and night. This is similar to his case when, after getting full satisfaction in dream from eating and drinking, he wakes up to feel hunger and thirst. Therefore the objects of the waking state are seen to be contradicted in dream. Accordingly, we are of opinion that their unreality like that of dream objects is beyond doubt. Hence from the fact that they possess the common feature of having a beginning and an end, they are rightly held to be unreal.

Objection: From the fact of the similarity of the diverse things in the dream and the waking states, it is wrong to assert that the diversities seen in the waking state are illusory.

Counter-objection: Why?

Opponent: Because the illustration is inapplicable.

Counter-objection: How?

Opponent: For the very same objects seen in the waking state are not experienced in dream.

Counter-objection: What are they then?

Opponent: One sees something novel in a dream. One thinks oneself to be possessed of eight arms and sitting astride an elephant with four tusks. Similarly, too, one sees other grotesque things in a dream. That being dissimilar to any other unreal thing must be true. So the analogy is inapt. Hence it is illogical to say that the waking state is false like dream.

Vedāntist: That is not so. The uniqueness that is supposed by you to be seen in a dream is not so by its own right.

Opponent: How is it then?

अपूर्वं स्थानिधर्मो हि यथा स्वर्गनिवासिनाम् ।
तानयं प्रेक्षते गत्वा यथैवेह सुशिक्षितः ॥८॥

8. The unique attribute is a mere appearance of the experiencer in a particular state, as it is in the case of the dwellers in heaven. This he experiences by going there, just as one, well informed, does in this world.

Apūrvam, the novel attribute; *hi sthānidharmaḥ*, is a mere quality (*dharma*) of (*sthānī*) the man in a certain state, viz the experiencer in the state of dream; *yathā svarganivāsinām*, as it is with the dwellers of heaven, Indra and others. As they have such attributes as the possession of a thousand eyes, and so on,¹ similarly is this a novel attribute of the dreamer; but it is not there by its own right like the real nature of the seer. *Tān*, these, the unique things of this kind that are creations of his mind; *ayam*, this one, the man in that state, the dreamer; *prekṣate* sees; *gatvā*, by going, to the dream state. As *iha*, in this world; *susīkṣitaḥ*, a man well informed about the way leading to another region, goes along that way to that other region and sees those objects, so is the case here. Hence just as the appearances of things in certain states, such as a snake on a rope or a mirage in a desert, are unreal, similarly the novelties experienced in a dream are merely appearances of the dreamer in that state; and therefore they are unreal. Accordingly, the analogy of the dream is not inapplicable.

¹Men, who become gods, get such experiences.

The assumption that in the illustration of dream we are in the presence of some unique entities has been demolished. Now the *Kārikā* again proceeds by way of dilating on the similarity of objects of the waking and dream states:

स्वप्नवृत्तावपि त्वन्तश्चेतसा कल्पितं त्वसत् ।
बहिश्चेतोगृहीतं सदृष्टं वैतथ्यमेतयोः ॥९॥

9. Even in the dream state itself, anything imagined by the inner consciousness is unreal, while anything experienced by the outer consciousness is real. (But) both kinds of things are seen to be false.

Svapnavṛttau api, even in the dream state; anything experienced *antaścetasā*, by the internal consciousness, anything called up by our fancy; is *asat*, unreal; since it ceases to be perceived the moment after being imagined. In that very dream again, whatever, for instance a pot, is *grhītam*, perceived; *bahiścetasā*, by external consciousness, through the eye etc., is *sat*, real. Thus, though it is definitely known that dream experiences are false, still a division of true and false is seen there. Nevertheless, *vaitathyam dr̥ṣṭam*, unreality is perceived, for both kinds of things, be they imagined by inner or outer consciousness.

जाग्रद्वृत्तावपि त्वन्तश्चेतसा कल्पितं त्वसत् ।
बहिश्चेतोगृहीतं सद्युक्तं वैतथ्यमेतयोः ॥१०॥

10. Even in the waking state, whatever is imagined by the inner consciousness is false

and whatever is perceived by the outer consciousness is true. It is reasonable that both these should be unreal.

It is reasonable to say that both the (so-called) true and false are unreal, for they are equally imagined either by the internal or external consciousness. The remaining portion is as already explained.

The *opponent* says:

उभयोरपि वैतथ्यं भेदानां स्थानयोर्यदि ।

क एतान् बुध्यते भेदान् को वै तेषां विकल्पकः ॥११॥

11. If all objects in both the states be unreal, who apprehends these objects and who is indeed their creator?

Yadi, if; there be *vaitathyam*, unreality; *bhedānām*, for the objects; *sthānayoḥ*, in the two—waking and dream—states; then *kaḥ*, who; is it that *budhyate*, cognises; *etān*, these, that are imagined inside and outside the mind; and *kaḥ vai teṣāṃ vikalpakāḥ*, who is indeed their imaginer, creator? The idea implied is this: If you do not want to adopt a theory of the non-existence of the Self, (and want to posit something behind phenomena), then who is the support of memory and knowledge?

(The *answer* is):

कल्पयत्यात्मनाऽऽत्मानमात्मा देवः स्वमायया ।

स एव बुध्यते भेदानिति वेदान्तनिश्चयः ॥१२॥

12. The self-effulgent Self imagines Itself through Itself by the power of Its own Māyā. The Self Itself cognises the objects. Such is the definite conclusion of Vedānta.

Svamāyayā, through Its own Māyā; *devaḥ ātmā*, the self-effulgent Self, Itself; *kalpayati*, imagines; Its own *ātmānam*, self; in the Self; as possessed of different forms to be spoken of later, just as snakes etc. are imagined on rope etc. And in the very same way Itself *budhyate*, cognises; those *bhedān*, objects; *iti*, such; is *vedāntaniścayaḥ*, the definite conclusion of Vedānta. There is nothing else (but the Self) as the support of cognition and memory; nor are cognition and memory without support as is held by the Nihilists. This is the idea.

While imagining, in what way does the Self do so? This is being answered:

विकरोत्यपरान्भावानन्तश्चित्ते व्यवस्थितान् ।

नियतांश्च बहिश्चित्त एव कल्पयते प्रभुः ॥१३॥

13. The Lord diversifies the mundane things existing in the mind. Turning the mind outward, He creates the well-defined things (as well as the un-defined things). Thus does the Lord imagine.

(*Prabhuḥ*, the Lord); *vikaroti*, diversifies; *aparān*, the non-transcendental, mundane; *bhāvān*, objects, such as sound and other unmanifested objects; *vyavasthitān*, existing, *antaścitte*, inside the mind, in the form of impressions and tendencies. And *bahiścittaḥ*

(*san*), having the mind turned outward; (the Lord diversifies) *niyatān*, things well-defined, such as the earth etc., as also *anīyatān*, not well-defined, that exist so long as the imagination lasts; similarly (He diversifies) such things as mental desires by making His mind turn inward. *Evam*, in this way; *prabhuh* the Lord, God, that is to say, the Self; imagines.

The assertion that everything is a subjective creation like dream is being questioned now. For unlike the subjective creations, to wit, desire etc, that are circumscribed by the mind, the external objects are mutually determined.

That doubt is unreasonable, for—

चित्तकाला हि येऽन्तस्तु द्वयकालाश्च ये बहिः ।
कल्पिता एव ते सर्वे विशेषो नान्यहेतुकः ॥१४॥

14. Things that exist internally as long as the thought lasts and things that are externally related to two points of time, are all imaginations. Their distinction is not caused by anything else.

Cittakālāḥ hi ye antaḥ tu, things that exist internally as long as the thought lasts; those that are determined by their thought and those that have no time for determining them apart from the time for which their thought lasts are *cittakālāḥ*, existing as long as the thought lasts. The idea is that they are apprehended only during the time of their imagination. *Dvayakālāḥ*, those that are possessed of two times, i.e. related to different times, that are mutually determined. As for instance, “He stays during the milking”, which means that the cow is

milked as long as he stays, and he stays as long as the cow is milked; "This one (present before us) lasts as long as that one (that is not present)." Thus external factors mutually determine each other. They are thus related to two points of time. But whether they be subjective, lasting for the time of the thought, or objective, related to two points of time, they are all but fancies. The fact that external objects have the distinction of being related to two points of time has no other reason but that of being imagined. Here, too, the illustration of dream fits in.

अव्यक्ता एव येऽन्तस्तु स्फुटा एव च ये बहिः ।

कल्पिता एव ते सर्वे विशेषस्त्विन्द्रियान्तरे ॥१५॥

15. Those objects that appear as obscure inside the mind, and those that appear as vivid outside, are all merely created by imagination. Their distinction is to be traced to the difference in the organs of perception.

The fact that things in the mind, called up by mere mental impressions, have an obscurity, while externally, as objects of the sense of sight etc., they have a vividness, (that fact) is not due to the existence of the objects themselves; for this distinction is noticed even in dream. To what is it due then? This is caused by the difference in the organs of perception. Hence it is proved that the things of the waking state are as much a creation of imagination as the dream objects.

What is the root of imagining that the personal

and external objects are mutually related by way of causation? The answer is:

जीवं कल्पयते पूर्वं ततो भावान् पृथग्विधान् ।

बाह्यानाध्यात्मिकान्श्चैव यथाविद्यस्तथास्मृतिः ॥१६॥

16. First He imagines the individual (soul), and then He imagines the different objects, external and personal. The individual gets his memory in accordance with the kind of thought impressions he has.

Like the fancying of a snake in a rope He *pūrvam kalpayate*, first imagines; on the pure Self that is devoid of such characteristics; *jīvam*, the individual, that is a bundle of causes and effects expressing themselves through such beliefs as "I act; and mine are the (resulting) sorrows and happiness". After that, for his sake, He (the Lord) imagines different objects, such as the vital force and so on; *bāhyān ādhyātmikān ca eva*, both external and personal; dividing them into action, instruments, and results. What is the reason for that imagination? That is being stated. The individual that is imagined by (the Lord) Himself and is himself capable of imagination, gets a memory, *yathāvidyāḥ*, in accordance with the kind of thought impressions that the individual is possessed of; that fact is alluded to by *tathāsmṛtiḥ*, he is possessed of that kind of memory. Hence from the apprehension of some fancy as the cause, there follows the apprehension of the result;¹ from that (awareness of causal relation) follows the memory

¹ If there is eating and drinking, there follows satisfaction;

of the cause and the effect, and from that follows their apprehension, as well as the awareness of the action and accessories that this apprehension of causality leads to and the awareness of the different results following from those actions etc.¹ From their awareness arises their memory; and from that memory again arises their awareness. In this way He imagines diversely the things, both personal and external, that are mutually the causes and effects.

In the previous verse it has been said that the imagining of individuality is the root of all other imaginations. Through an illustration is being shown what that imagining of an individual soul is due to:

अनिश्चिता यथा रज्जुरन्धकारे विकल्पिता ।

सर्पधारादिभिर्भावैस्तद्वदात्मा विकल्पितः ॥१७॥

17. As a rope whose nature has not been well ascertained is imagined in the dark to be various things like a snake, a line of water, etc., so also is Self imagined variously.

As it happens in common experience that a *rajjuh*, rope; that is *aniścitā*, not well ascertained, in its true reality as "This is so indeed"; is *vikalpitā*, imagined

if eating and drinking are absent, satisfaction is wanting; from this the fancy follows that eating etc. are the causes of satisfaction.

¹From the above awareness follows memory on another occasion; from that arises the awareness of the need of action with regard to similar factors that are supposed to lead to satisfaction; from that follows cooking, getting of rice, and producing the result.

variously, in hazy darkness, as a snake, a line of water, or a stick, just because its real nature has not been determined; for if the rope had been ascertained earlier in its own essence, there would not have been such imaginations as of a snake etc., as for instance, there is no such imagination with regard to the fingers in one's own hands. This is the illustration. Similarly, the Self is imagined to be an individual creature or the vital force etc., just because It has not been ascertained in Its true nature as pure intelligence, existence, and non-duality, and as different from such evils as cause and effect that are the characteristics of the world. This is the conclusion of all the Upaniṣads.

निश्चितायां यथा रज्ज्वां विकल्पो विनिवर्तते ।
रज्जुरेवेति चाद्वैतं तद्वदात्मविनिश्चयः ॥१८॥

18. As illusion (on the rope) ceases and the rope alone remains when the rope is ascertained to be nothing but the rope, so also is the ascertainment about the Self.

As on the ascertainment that it is *rajjuḥ eva*, nothing but a rope, all the imaginations disappear and there remains the rope alone without anything else, so also from the scriptural text, "Not this, not this" (Bṛ. IV iv. 22), establishing the Self as devoid of all worldly attributes, there dawns the light of the sun of realisation which leads to this *ātma-viniścayah*, firm conviction about the Self, viz "All this is but the Self" (Ch. VII. xxv. 2), (the Self is) "without anterior or posterior, without interior or exterior" (Bṛ. II. v. 19), "He exists

internally and externally, and hence He is birthless” (Mu. II. i. 2), “Undecaying, immortal, undying, fearless” (Br. IV. iv. 25), “One indeed without a second” (Ch. VI. ii. 1).

If it be a well ascertained truth that the Self is but one, why is It imagined as so many infinite things like the Vital Force etc. that constitute phenomenal existence? To this hear the answer:

प्राणादिभिरनन्तैश्च भावैरेतैर्विकल्पितः ।

मायैषा तस्य देवस्य यया संमोहितः स्वयम् ॥१९॥

19. (This Self) is imagined to be the infinite objects like Prāṇa (the Vital Force) etc. This is the Māyā of that self-effulgent One by which He Himself is deluded.

Eṣū māyā, this is the Māyā *tasya devasya*, of that self-effulgent Self. As the magical spell, created by the magician, makes the very clear sky appear as though filled with leafy trees in bloom, similar is this Māyā of the self-effulgent One, by which He Himself seems to have become influenced like a man under delusion. It has been said, “My Māyā is difficult to get over” (G. VII. 14).

प्राण इति प्राणविदो भूतानीति च तद्विदः ।

गुणा इति गुणविदस्तत्त्वानीति च तद्विदः ॥२०॥

20. Those who know Prāṇa¹ consider Prāṇa

¹Hiraṇyagarbha or immanent God. This is the view of the worshippers of Hiraṇyagarbha and of the Vaiśeṣikas.

(to be the reality that is the cause of the world). The knowers of the elements consider the elements to be so,¹ the knowers of qualities (*guṇas*) cling to the qualities,² and the knowers of the categories swear by them.³

पादा इति पादविदो विषया इति तद्विदः ।

लोका इति लोकविदो देवा इति च तद्विदः ॥२१॥

21. The knowers of the quarters (viz *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, and *Prājña*) consider the quarters to be the cause. The knowers of sense-objects⁴ consider the sense-objects to be so. According to the knowers of the worlds, the worlds constitute reality.⁵ And the worshippers of the gods stand by the gods.

वेदा इति वेदविदो यज्ञा इति च तद्विदः ।

भोक्तेति च भोक्तृविदो भोज्यमिति च तद्विदः ॥२२॥

22. The Vedic scholars ascribe reality to the Vedas, while the sacrificers⁶ ascribe this to the

¹The Lokāyata materialists swear by the four elements-- earth, water, fire, and air.

²The Sāṃkhya hold to *Sattva*, *Rajas*, and *Tamas*, that are the constituents (*guṇas*, lit. qualities) of *Prakṛti*.

³The Śaivas hold to the Self, ignorance, and Śiva as the sources of the world.

⁴The followers of *Vātsyāyana* and others.

⁵The *Paurāṇikas* understand the earth, the intermediate world and heaven to be realities.

⁶Like *Baudhāyana*.

sacrifices. Those acquainted with the enjoyer consider it to be the reality,¹ whereas those conversant with the enjoyable things² consider them to be so.

सूक्ष्म इति सूक्ष्मविदः स्थूल इति च तद्विदः ।

मूर्त इति मूर्तविदोऽमूर्त इति च तद्विदः ॥२३॥

23. People conversant with the subtle consider reality also to be so, while others dealing with the gross consider it to be so. The worshippers of God with forms consider reality as possessed of forms,³ whereas those who swear by formlessness⁴ call it a void.

काल इति कालविदो दिश इति च तद्विदः ।

वादा इति वादविदो भुवनानीति तद्विदः ॥२४॥

24. The calculators of time (the astrologers) call it time. The knowers of the directions consider them real. The dabblers in theories⁵ accept these to be so. And the knowers of the universe consider the (fourteen) worlds to be so.

¹ The Sāṃkhya view is that the Self is an enjoyer but not an agent of work.

² The cooks.

³ e.g. Śiva or Viṣṇu.

⁴ The Nihilists.

⁵ That the metals, *mantras*, etc. hold in them the secret of immortality.

मन इति मनोविदो बुद्धिरिति च तद्विदः ।

चित्तमिति चित्तविदो धर्माधर्मौ च तद्विदः ॥२५॥

25. The knowers of the mind¹ call it the Self, whereas the knowers of intelligence² take it for the reality. The knowers of ideas³ consider them to be the reality. And the knowers of virtue and vice⁴ attribute reality to them.

पञ्चविंशक इत्येके षड्विंश इति चापरे ।

एकत्रिंशक इत्याहुरनन्त इति चापरे ॥२६॥

26. Some say that reality is constituted by twenty-five principles,⁵ while others speak of twenty-six.⁶ Some say that it consists of thirty-one categories,⁷ while according to others they are infinite.

लोकाँल्लोकविदः प्राहुराश्रमा इति तद्विदः ।

स्त्रीपुंनपुंसकं लैङ्गाः परापरमथापरे ॥२७॥

¹ A class of materialists.

² A class of Buddhists.

³ The Buddhists who swear by subjective ideas without corresponding external things.

⁴ The Mimāṃsakas.

⁵ Puruṣa (the conscious individual soul), Pradhāna or Prakṛti (Nature), Mahat (intelligence), Ahaṅkāra (egoism), the five subtle elements, five senses of perception, five organs of action, five sense-objects, and mind. This is the Sāṅkhya view.

⁶ The above 25 and God according to Patañjali.

⁷ The Pāśupatas add *rāga* (attachment), *avidyā* (ignorance), *niyati* (fate), *kālakalā* (divisions of time), and *Māyā* (cosmic illusion) to the above 26.

27. Adepts in human dealings say that the people (that is to say, people's pleasures) are the real things. People conversant with the stages of life hold those to be the reality. The grammarians hold the view that words belonging to the masculine, feminine, and neuter genders are the reality; while others know reality to be constituted by the higher and lower (Brahmans).

सृष्टिरिति सृष्टिविदो लय इति च तद्विदः ।

स्थितिरिति स्थितिविदः सर्वे चेह तु सर्वदा ॥२८॥

28. People conversant with creation call creation to be the reality. The knowers of dissolution call it dissolution. The knowers of subsistence call it subsistence. All these ideas are for ever imagined on the Self.

(20-28). Prāṇa means Prājña, the Self in the state of latency. Everything else, ending with subsistence, is only His product. And similarly all other popular ideas, conceived by every being, like a snake etc. on a rope, are mere imaginations on the Self that is devoid of all of them; and these are caused by ignorance consisting in the non-determination of the nature of the Self. This is the purport (of these verses) as a whole. No attempt is made to explain each of the words in the verses starting with the word Prāṇa, since this is of little practical value and since the meanings of the terms are clear.

यं भावं दर्शयेद्यस्य तं भावं स तु पश्यति ।

तं चावति स भूत्वाऽसौ तद्ग्रहः समपैति तम् ॥२९॥

29. Anyone to whom a teacher may show a particular object (as the reality) sees that alone. And that thing, too, protects him by becoming identified with him. That absorption leads to his self-identity (with the object of attention).

To be brief, *yasya*, anyone to whom; a teacher or any other trustworthy person; *darśayet*, may show; any *bhāvam*, positive object, enumerated or not, from among such things as Prāṇa and the rest, by saying "This is verily the reality"; *sah*, he (that instructed man); *paśyati*, sees; *tam bhāvam*, that object, by identifying it with himself either as "I am this" or "This is mine". *Ca*, and; *sah*, that, that object that was shown; *avati*, protects; *tam*, him, that seer; *asau bhūtvā*, by becoming one with him, with that aspirant; that is to say, that object occupies his attention to the exclusion of all others and keeps him confined within itself. *Tadgrahaḥ*, state of being taken up with that, absorption in it under the idea, "This is the reality". That absorption, *samupaiti tam*, approaches him, viz the acceptor (of the thing); that is to say, it culminates in identification with him.

एतैरेषोऽपृथग्भावंः पृथगेवेति लक्षितः ।

एवं यो वेद तत्त्वेन कल्पयेत् सोऽविशङ्कितः ॥३०॥

30. Through these things that are (really) non-different (from the Self), this One is presented as though really different. He who truly

knows this grasps (the meaning of the Vedas) without any hesitation.

Etaiḥ, through these, viz Prāṇa, etc.; *apṛthagbhāvaiḥ*, through these things that are non-different, from the Self; *eṣaḥ*, this One, the Self; *lakṣitaḥ*, is pointed out, is believed in by the ignorant; *pṛthak eva iti*, as though really different, just as a rope is considered to be diverse imaginary things like snake etc. This is the meaning. The idea is this: Just as to the discriminating people, the snake etc. do not exist apart from the rope, so also Prāṇa etc. have no existence apart from the Self. And this is in accord with the Vedic text, "All these are (but) the Self" (Br. II. iv. 6). *Yañ Veda*, he who knows; *evam*, thus: *tattvena*, truly;—knows from Vedic texts and from reasoning, that all things imagined on the Self are unreal apart from the Self, like the snake imagined in the rope, and knows that the Self is transcendental and untouched by illusion; *saḥ*, he; *kalpayate*, (is the same as *kalpayati*), grasps, the meanings of the Vedas in their respective contexts; *aviśaṅkitaḥ*, without any hesitation; he understands that a certain passage means this and a certain other means that. For a verse of Manu says, "None but a knower of the Self can understand truly the purport of the Vedas; none but a knower of the Self can derive any benefit from the valid means of knowledge"¹ (Manu, VI. 82).

It is being stated that the unreality of duality that

¹This is Ānanda Giri's interpretation of the word *kriyāphala*, where *kriyā* (action) stands for any valid means of knowledge; and its *phala* (result) is the knowledge of Reality; for even *kriyā* in the sense of Vedic rites etc. is meant to serve the purpose of illumination by purifying the aspirant's heart.

is established logically is also derived from the valid evidence of Vedānta:

स्वप्नमाये यथा दृष्टे गन्धर्वनगरं यथा ।

तथा विश्वमिदं दृष्टं वेदान्तेषु विचक्षणैः ॥३१॥

31. Just as dream and magic are seen to be unreal, or as is a city in the sky, so also is this whole universe known to be unreal from the Upaniṣads by the wise.

Svapna-māye, dream and magic, though unreal, being constituted by unreal things, are considered by the non-discriminating people to be constituted by real things. Again, just as *gandharvanagaram*, an illusory city in the sky—appearing to be full of shops replete with vendable articles, houses, palaces, and villages bustling with men and women—is seen to vanish suddenly before one's very eyes; or just as the *svapna-māye*, dream and magic; *dṛṣṭe*, that are visible to the eye; are unreal; *tathā*, similarly; *idam viśvam*, this whole universe, this entire duality; *dṛṣṭam*, is viewed; as unreal. Where? That is being stated. *Vedāntesu*, in the Upaniṣads, as for instance in, "There is no difference whatsoever in It" (Br. IV. iv. 19; Ka. II. i. 2), "The Lord on account of Māyā is perceived as manifold" (Br. II. v. 19), "This was but the Self in the beginning—the only entity" (Br. II. iv. 17), "In the beginning this was indeed Brahman, one only" (Br. I. iv. 11), "It is from a second entity that fear comes" (Br. I. iv.2), "But there is not that second thing" (Br. IV. iii. 23), "But when to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self" (Br. IV. v. 15), and so on. (This is

known) *vicakṣanaiḥ*, by those who are better acquainted with things, by the enlightened. This view is supported by the following Smṛti text of Vyāsa: “(This universe) is viewed (by the wise) as (unreal) like a chink on the ground that a rope appears to be in darkness, or as always (unstable) like a bubble on rain water, devoid of bliss, and ceasing to exist after dissolution.”

न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः ।

न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता ॥३२॥

32. There is no dissolution, no origination, none in bondage, none striving or aspiring for salvation, and none liberated. This is the highest truth.

This verse is meant to sum up the purport of this chapter. If from the standpoint of the highest Reality, all duality is unreal, and the Self alone exists as the only Reality, then it amounts to this that all our dealings, conventional or scriptural, are comprised within the domain of ignorance, and then there is *na nirodhaḥ*, no dissolution, *nirodha* being the same as *nirodhana*, stoppage. *Utpattiḥ*, origination. *Baddhaḥ*, one under bondage, a transmigrating individual soul. *Sādhaka*, one who strives for liberation. *Mamukṣuḥ*, one who hankers after liberation. *Muktaḥ*, one who is free from bondage. In the absence of origination and dissolution, bondage etc. do not exist. *Iti eṣā paramārthatā*, this is the highest truth. How can there be absence of origination and dissolution? The answer is: Because of the absence of duality. The non-existence of duality is established by various Vedic texts such as, “Because

when there is duality, as it were" (Br. II. iv. 14), "(He goes from death to death) who sees difference as it were in It" (Br. IV. iv. 19; Ka. II. i. 10). "All this is but the Self" (Ch. VII. xxv. 2), "All this is but Brahman" (Nṛ. U. 7), "One without a second" (Ch. VI. ii. 1), ("This Brahman, . . .), and this all are the Self" (Br. II. iv. 6, IV. v. 7). Origination or dissolution can belong only to a thing that has existence, and not to one that is non-existent like the horn of a hare. Nor can the non-dual have either birth or death. For it is a contradiction in terms to say that a thing is non-dual and yet has birth and death. And as for our empirical experience of Prāna etc., it has been already stated that it is all a superimposition on the Self like a snake on a rope. For such a mental illusion¹ as the fancying of a rope for a snake does not either originate from or merge in the rope.² Nor does the rope-snake originate in the mind and merge there,³ nor does it do so from both (the rope and the mind).⁴ Similar is the case with duality which is equally a mental illusion, for duality is not perceived in a state of concentration or deep sleep. Therefore it is established that duality is a mere figment of the brain. And therefore it has been well said that since duality does not exist, the highest truth consists in the non-existence of dissolution and the rest.

¹ A creation of the ignorance subsisting in the mind.

² For the birth or death of an illusion is equally illusory. If these be objectively real, the snake should be perceived by all who see the rope.

³ For if birth and death are only subjective, the snake should not be perceived outside.

⁴ For it is not experienced as such.

Objection: If such be the case, then the scriptures have for their objective only the proving of the non-existence of duality, not the proving of the existence of non-duality, the two objectives being contradictory. And as a result, one will be landed into Nihilism, inasmuch as non-duality has no evidence in its support and duality is non-existent.

Answer: Not so, for why should you revive a point already dismissed with the statement that illusions, like that of a snake on a rope, cannot occur without a substratum?

To this the *objection* is raised thus: The rope that is supposed to be the substratum of the illusion of the snake is itself non-existent, and hence the analogy is irrelevant.

Answer: Not so, for even when the illusion disappears, the non-illusory substratum can continue to exist by the very fact of its being non-illusory.

Objection: The non-dual (substratum), too, is unreal like the snake fancied on a rope.

Answer: It cannot be so, for just as the rope constituting a factor in the illusion (of snake) exists as an unimagined entity even before the knowledge of the non-existence of the snake, so also the non-dual (Self) exists, since as a last resort It has to be assumed to be non-illusory. Besides, the being who is the agent of the imagination cannot be non-existent, since his existence has to be admitted antecedent to the rise of the illusion.¹

¹ The Self has to be assumed as the substratum of the illusory appearance of duality; It survives all illusions as the witness of their disappearance; and as a matter of course It precedes the

Objection: But if the scriptures do not deal with the Self as such, how can they lead to a cessation of the awareness of duality?

Answer: That is no defect, for duality is superimposed on the Self through ignorance, just as a snake is on a rope.

Objection: How?

Answer: All such conceptions, as "I am happy, miserable, ignorant, born, dead, worn out, embodied; I see; I am manifest and unmanifest, agent and enjoyer of fruits, related and unrelated, emaciated and old and I am this and these are mine,"—are superimposed on the Self. The Self permeates all these ideas, for It is invariably present in all of them, just as a rope is present in all its different (illusory) appearances as a snake, a line of water, etc. Such being the case, the knowledge of the nature of the substantive (Self) has not to be generated by scriptures, since It is self-established. The scriptures are meant for proving something that is not already known, for should they restate something that is already known they will lose their validity.¹ Since the Self is not established in Its own nature owing to the obstacle of such attributes as happiness that are super-imposed by ignorance, and since the establishment in Its own reality is the highest goal, therefore the scriptures aim at removing from the Self the ideas

illusion. Therefore there can be no question of Nihilism even on the supposition that the Self is not presented positively by the Upaniṣads.

¹ Consisting in presenting something not known otherwise and not sublated later.

of happiness and the rest, by generating with regard to It the ideas of not being happy etc. through such texts as "Not this, not this" (Bṛ. IV. iv. 22), "Not gross" (Bṛ. III. viii. 8) etc. Unlike the real nature of the Self, the attributes of unhappiness etc. are not invariably present in consciousness simultaneously with such attributes as happiness etc.;¹ for if they were persistently present, no alteration could be created by the superimposition of attributes like happiness etc., just as there can be no coldness in fire possessed of the specific characteristic of heat. Therefore it is in the attributeless Self that the distinct characteristics of happiness etc. are imagined. And as for the scriptural texts speaking of the absence of happiness etc. in the Self, it is proved that they are merely meant to remove the specific ideas of happiness etc. from It. And in support of this is this aphorism of those who are versed in the meaning of scriptures: "The validity of the scriptures is derived from their negation of positive qualities from the Self."²

The reason for the preceding verse is being adduced:

¹ If the absence of happiness etc. are natural to the Self, why should they not accompany every perception of the latter? The answer is: The Self may reveal Itself, and yet the opposition between Its absence of happiness etc. and Its empirical modes of happiness etc. may not become patent owing to the influence of human ignorance.

² This is a quotation from Dravidācārya. The idea is this: "Though words may not have any positive meaning with regard to Brahman, the validity of the scripture is well established; for the words, that are associated with negation and are well known as denoting the absence of those qualities, eliminate all duality from the Self."

भावैरसद्भिरेवायमद्वयेन च कल्पितः ।

भावा अप्यद्वयेनैव तस्मादद्वयता शिवा ॥३३॥

33. This Self is imagined to be the unreal things and also to be non-dual; and these perceived things are also imagined on the non-dual Self. Therefore non-duality is auspicious.

In (such illusions as) "This is a snake", "This is a stick", "this is a streak of water", etc. the very thing called rope is imagined to be such unreal things as a snake, a streak of water, etc. and also as the one real thing—the rope; similarly, the Self is imagined to be such multifarious unreal things as Prāṇa etc. which do not exist. But this is not done from the standpoint of reality, for nothing can be perceived by anybody unless the mind is active, nor can the Self have any movement. And things, perceivable to the unsteady mind alone, cannot be imagined to subsist in reality.¹ Therefore though the Self is ever of the same nature, It alone is imagined to be such unreal things as Prāṇa etc., and again as existing in Its own nature of non-duality and absolute Reality. It is supposed to be the substratum of everything, just as a rope is of the snake etc. And those perceived entities, too, viz Prāṇa and the rest, are imagined on the Self alone that is non-dual and absolute Reality, for no illusion can be perceived that is without a substratum. Thus since non-duality is the substratum

¹ "Diversity perceived on the motionless Self cannot be fancied to have real existence" is the interpretation according to Ānanda Giri who takes "motionless" as the synonym of *pracalita*, that in which motion is absent.

of all illusion, and since this non-duality is ever unchanging in its own nature, *advayatā*, non-duality; is *śivā*, auspicious, even in the state of illusion. But the illusions alone are evil, for they generate fear like that from the snake seen on a rope for instance. Non-duality is free from fear; hence that alone is auspicious.

नात्मभावेन नानेदं न स्वेनापि कथंचन ।

न पृथङ् नापृथक् किञ्चिदिति तत्त्वविदो विदुः ॥३४॥

34. This world, when ascertained from the standpoint of the Self does not continue to be different. Nor does it exist in its own right. Nor do phenomenal things exist as different or non-different (from one another or from the Self). This is what the knowers of Truth understand.

Why, again, is non-duality auspicious? Inauspiciousness is to be found where there is diversity or, in other words, where there is difference of one thing from another. For *idam*, this, the manifold phenomenal world, consisting of *Prāṇa*, etc.; when ascertained *ātmarshāvena*, from the standpoint of the supreme Self, the non-dual and absolute Reality; does not continue to be *nānā*, multiple or different in substance, just as an illusory snake has no separate existence when it is found out with the help of a light to be identical with the rope. Besides, this world never exists *svena*, in its own nature, in the form of *Prāṇa* etc., because of its having been imagined like a snake on a rope. Similarly, the objects, called *Prāṇa* etc., are not distinct from each other in the sense that a buffalo exists as

something different from a horse. Accordingly, just because of the unreality (of duality) there is nothing that can exist as non-separate from one another or from the supreme Self. The Brāhmanas, the knowers of the Self; *viduh*, realised, the supreme Reality; *iti*, thus. Hence non-duality is auspicious, for it is free from the causes of evil. This is the purport.

The perfect realisation, as described above, is being extolled:

वीतरागभयक्रोधैर्मुनिभिर्वेदपारगैः ।

निर्विकल्पो ह्ययं दृष्टः प्रपञ्चोपशमोऽद्वयः ॥३५॥

35. This Self that is beyond all imagination, free from the diversity of this phenomenal world, and non-dual, is seen by the contemplative people, versed in the Vedas and unafflicted by desire, fear, and anger.

Munibhiḥ, by the constantly contemplative people, by the discriminating ones; from whom have been removed for ever attachment, fear, envy, anger, and all other faults; *vedapāragaiḥ*, by those who have understood the secrets of the Vedas, by the enlightened souls; by those who are ever devoted to the purport of the Vedas; *dṛṣṭaḥ*, is realised; *ayam*, this Self; which is *nirvikalpaḥ*, devoid of all imaginations; and which is *prapañcopaśamaḥ*: *prapañca* is the vast expanse of the variegated phenomenal world, and the Self in which there is the *upaśama*, total negation, of this, is the *prapañcopaśama*. And therefore It is *advayaḥ*, without a second. The idea is that the supreme Self is realisable

only by the men of renunciation who are free from blemishes, who are learned, and who are devoted to the secrets of the Upaniṣads, but not so by the logicians and others whose hearts are tainted by attachment etc. and whose philosophies are enamoured of their own outlooks.

तस्मादेवं विदित्वैनमद्वैते योजयेत् स्मृतिम् ।

अद्वैतं समनुप्राप्य जडवल्लोकमाचरेत् ॥३६॥

36. Therefore, after knowing it thus, one should fix one's memory on (i.e. continuously think of) non-duality. Having attained the non-dual, one should behave in the world as though one were dull-witted.

Since non-duality is auspicious and free from fear by virtue of its being by nature devoid of all evil, therefore *viditvā enam*, having known it, *evam*, thus; *yojayet smṛtim*, one should fix one's memory, *advaita*, on non-duality; one should resort to one's memory for the realisation of non-duality.¹ And having comprehended that non-duality etc., having realised directly and immediately the Self that is beyond hunger etc., birthless, and above all conventional dealings, after attaining the consciousness, "I am the supreme Brahman," *lokam ācaret*, one should behave in the world; *jaḍavat*, like a dull-witted man, that is to say, without advertising oneself as "I am such and such".

¹Even after knowing the import of the Upaniṣad, there is need of continuously revolving in one's mind those ideas so that they may become firmly rooted.

It is being stated as to what should be the code of conduct according to which he should behave in the world:

निस्तुतिर्निर्मस्कारो निःस्वधाकार एव च ।

चलाचलनिकेतश्च यतिर्यादृच्छिको भवेत् ॥३७॥

37. The mendicant should have no appreciation or greetings (for others), and he should be free from rituals. He should have the body and soul as his support, and he should be dependent on circumstances.

Giving up all such activities as appreciation or greeting; that is to say, having given up all desire for external objects and having embraced the highest kind of formal renunciation, in accordance with the Vedic text, "Knowing this very Self, the Brāhmanas renounce (. . . and lead a mendicant life)" (Br. III. v. 1), and the Smṛti text, "With their consciousness in that (Brahman) their Self identified with That, ever intent on That, with That for their supreme goal" (G. V. 17). *Cala*, changing, is the body, since it gets transformed every moment; and *acala*, unchanging, is the reality of the Self. Whenever, perchance, impelled by the need of eating etc., one thinks of oneself as "I" by forgetting the reality of the Self that is one's *niketa*, support, one's place of abode, and that is by nature unchanging like the sky, then the *cala*, changing body, becomes his *niketa*, support. The man of illumination who thus has the changing and the unchanging as his support, but not the man who has external objects as his support, is the *calācalaniketa*. And he *bhavet*, should be;

yādṛcchikaḥ, dependent on circumstances; that is to say, he should depend entirely on strips of cloth, coverings, and food that come to him by chance for the maintenance of the body.

तत्त्वमाध्यात्मिकं दृष्ट्वा तत्त्वं दृष्ट्वा तु बाह्यतः ।

तत्त्वीभूतस्तदारामस्तत्त्वादप्रच्युतो भवेत् ॥३८॥

38. Examining the Reality in the context of the individual and in the external world, one should become identified with Reality, should have his delight in Reality, and should not deviate from Reality.

The external entities such as the earth, and the personal entities such as the body, are unreal like the snake imagined on a rope or like dream, magic, etc., in accordance with the Vedic text, "All modification exists only in name, having speech for its support" (Ch. VI. iv. 1), and the Self is that which exists within and without, that is birthless, without cause and effect, without any inside or outside, full, all-pervasive like space, subtle, motionless, attributeless, partless, and actionless, as is indicated in the Vedic Text, "That is truth, that is the Self, and That thou art" (Ch. VI. viii-xii)—*dr̥ṣṭvā*, having seen, the Reality in this way; *tattvībhūtaḥ*, (one should) become identified with Reality; *tadārāmaḥ*, (one should) have one's delight only in the Self, and not in anything external like one lacking in realisation, who accepts the mind as the Self, and thinks the Self to be changing in accordance with the changes of the mind, or at times accepts the body etc. to be the Self and thinks, "I am now alienated from Reality, that is the

Self"; and when at times the mind becomes concentrated, who thinks himself to be united with Reality and in peace under the belief, "I am now identified with Reality". The knower of the Self should not be like that, because the nature of the Self is ever the same, and because it is impossible for anything to change its nature; and one should be for ever *apracyutaḥ*, unwavering from Reality, under the conviction, "I am Brahman", that is to say, he should ever have the consciousness of Reality that is the Self, in accordance with such Smṛti texts as "(The enlightened man) views equally a dog or an outcast" (G. V. 18), "(He sees who sees the supreme Lord) existing equally in all beings" (G. XIII. 27).

CHAPTER III

ADVAITA PRAKARAṆA (ON NON-DUALITY)

In the course of determining the nature of *Om* (in Chap. I) it was stated as a mere proposition that the Self is the negation of the phenomenal world, and is auspicious and non-dual. It was further said that "duality ceases to exist after realisation" (*Kārikā*, I. 18). As to that, the non-existence of duality was established by the chapter 'On Unreality' with the help of such analogies as dream, magic, and a city in space, and through logic on the grounds of "being perceived", "having a beginning and an end", and so on. Should non-duality be admitted only on the authority of scripture (and tradition), or should it be accepted on logical grounds too? In answer to this it is said that it can be known on logical grounds as well. The chapter 'On Non-duality' starts to show how this can be possible. It was concluded in the preceding chapter that all diversity, comprising the worshipped, worship, and so on, is unreal and the absolute, non-dual Self, is the highest Reality; for—

उपासनाश्रितो धर्मो जाते ब्रह्मणि वर्तते ।

प्रागुत्पत्तेरजं सर्वं तेनासौ कृपणः स्मृतः ॥१॥

1. The aspirant, betaking himself to the devotional exercises, subsists in the conditioned Brahman. All this was but the birthless Brahman before creation. Hence such a man is considered pitiable (or narrow in his outlook).

Upāsanāśrītaḥ, is a worshipper who resorts to *upāsanā*, devotional exercises (like worship and meditation), as the means of his liberation, under the belief, "I am a worshipper, and Brahman is to be adored by me. Though I now subsist *jāte brahmaṇi*, in the conditioned Brahman, I shall through my devotion to It, attain *ajam brahma*, the unconditioned Brahman, after the fall of my body. *Prāk utpatteḥ ajam sarvam*, before creation all this, including myself, was but the birthless Brahman. Through my devotional exercises I shall regain that which I essentially was *prāk utpatteḥ*, before my birth, though, after being born, I now subsist *jāte brahmaṇi*, in the conditioned Brahman." The *dharmāḥ*, aspirant; *upāsanāśrītaḥ*, who betakes himself to such devotional exercises; since he is cognisant of such a partial Brahman, *tena*, for that very reason; *asau*, that man; *smṛtaḥ*, is considered; *kṛpaṇaḥ*, pitiable, limited (Bṛ. III. viii. 10), by those who have seen the eternal and birthless Brahman; this is the idea. And this is in accord with the following text of the Upaniṣad of the Talavakāra section. "That which is not uttered by speech, that by which speech is revealed, know that alone to be Brahman, and not what people worship as an object" (Ke. I. 5).

अतो वक्ष्याम्यकार्पण्यमजाति समतां गतम् ।

यथा न जायते किञ्चिज्जायमानं समन्ततः ॥२॥

2. Hence I shall speak of that (Brahman) which is free from limitation, has no birth, and is in a state of equipoise; and listen how noth-

ing whatsoever is born in any way, though it seems to be born.

Since on account of one's failure to attain the birthless Self, existing within and without, one becomes limited by thinking oneself through ignorance to be unworthy, and since on that account one comes to believe, "I am born, I subsist in the conditioned Brahman, and having recourse to Its worship I shall attain (the unconditioned) Brahman", *atah*, therefore; *vakṣyāmi*, I shall relate; *akārpaṇyam*, freedom from misery, limitlessness, the birthless Brahman; for that indeed is a source of limitation, "where one sees another, hears another, knows another. That is limited, mortal, and unreal" (Ch. VII. xxiv. 1), as is asserted in such Vedic texts as "All modification exists in name only, having speech for its support" etc. (Ch. VI. iv. 1). Opposed to this is that which has no limitation, which is within and without and is the birthless Brahman, called the Infinite, on realising which there is cessation of all misery caused by ignorance. I shall speak of that freedom from limits. This is the purport. That thing is *ajāti*, birthless; *samatām gatam*, established in a state of equipoise, poised. Why? Since It has no inequality of parts. Anything that is composite is said to evolve when its parts undergo loss of balance. But since this thing is partless, It is established in equilibrium, and hence It does not evolve through any change in any part. Therefore, It is birthless and free from misery. Hear *yathā*, how; *samantatah*, in all respects; *kimcit*, anything, small though it be; *na jāyāte*, is not born; though *jāyamānam*, it may (seem to) be born, like a snake

from a rope, in consequence of perception under ignorance. Hear the secret how It is not born—how Brahman remains unborn in every way. This is the idea.

The promise was, “I shall speak of Brahman which has no birth and which is free from limitation.” Now it is said, “I shall adduce the reason and the analogy for proving this”:

आत्मा ह्याकाशवज्जीवैर्घटाकाशैरिवोदितः ।

घटादिवच्च संघातैर्जातावेतन्निदर्शनम् ॥३॥

3. Since the Self is referred to as existing in the form of individual souls in the same way as space exists in the form of spaces confined within jars, and since the Self exists in the form of the composite things just as space exists as jars etc., therefore in the matter of birth this is the illustration.

Hi, since; *ātmā*, the (supreme) Self; is subtle, partless, and all-pervasive *ākāśavat*, like space;—since that very supreme Self that is comparable to space, *uditah*, is referred to; *jīvaiḥ*, as existing in the form of individual souls, the individual knowers of the bodies etc.; *iva*, in the same way; *ākāśavat ghaṭākāśaiḥ*, as space is referred to as existing in the form of spaces circumscribed by jars. Or the explanation is: As space is (*uditah*) evolved in the form of spaces within the jars, so also has the supreme Self evolved as the individual souls. The idea implied is that the emergence of individual souls from the supreme Self that is heard^o of in

the Upaniṣads is comparable to the emergence of the spaces in the jars from the supreme space; but this is not so in any real sense of the term. Just as from that space evolve composite things like jars etc., so also from the supreme Self, that is comparable to space, emerge the composite things like the earth etc., as well as the bodies and senses that constitute the individual, all of them taking birth through imagination like a snake on a rope. This fact is stated in *ghaṭādivat ca*, and like a jar etc.; It is evolved *saṁghātaili*, in the form of composite things. When with a view to make the fact understood by people of poor intellect, the birth of creatures etc. from the Self is referred to by the Vedas, then *jātau*, with regard to birth, when that is taken for granted; *etat nidarśanam*, this is the illustration, as it has been cited in the analogy of space etc.

घटादिषु प्रलीनेषु घटाकाशादयो यथा ।

आकाशे संप्रलीयन्ते तद्वज्जीवा इहात्मनि ॥४॥

4. Just as the space confined within the jars etc. merge completely on the disintegration of the jars etc., so do the individual souls merge here in this Self.

Just as the spaces within a jar etc. emerge into being with the creation of the jar etc., or just as the spaces within the jar etc. disappear with the disintegration of the jar etc., similarly, the individual souls emerge into being along with the creation of the aggregates of bodies etc., and they merge here in the Self on the

disintegration of those aggregates. But this is not so from their own standpoint.

The next verse is by way of an answer to those dualists who argue, "If there be but one Self in all the bodies, then when one of the souls undergoes birth or death or enjoys happiness etc., all souls should share in these; besides there will be a confusion of the actions and their results."

यथैकस्मिन् घटाकाशे रजोधूमादिभिर्युते ।

न सर्वे संप्रयुज्यन्ते तद्वज्जीवाः सुखादिभिः ॥५॥

5. Just as all the spaces confined within the various jars are not darkened when one of the spaces thus confined becomes contaminated by dust, smoke, etc., so also is the case with all the individuals in the matter of being affected by happiness etc.

Yathā, just as; *ekasmin ghaṭākāśe rajodhūmādibhiḥ yute*, when one of the spaces confined in a jar is polluted by dust, smoke, etc.; *na*, not; *sarve*, all the spaces, confined within the jars etc., are defiled by that dust or smoke etc.; *tadvat*, just like that; *jīvāḥ*, creatures; are not affected by *sukhādibhiḥ*, by happiness etc.

Objection: Is not the Self but one?

Answer: Quite so. Did you not hear that there is but one Self which like space inhabits all the aggregates (of body and senses)?

Objection: If the Self be one, It will experience happiness and sorrow everywhere.

Answer: This objection cannot be raised by the Sāṁkhya. For a follower of the Sāṁkhya philosophy cannot surely posit happiness, sorrow, etc. for the soul, inasmuch as he declares that joy, misery, etc. inhere in the intellect. Moreover, there is no valid ground for imagining that the Self, that is Consciousness by nature, has any multiplicity.

Objection: In the absence of multiplicity, the (Sāṁkhya) theory that Pradhāna (i.e. Primordial Nature) acts for others (viz Puruṣas, the conscious souls) has no leg to stand on.

Answer: No, since whatever is accomplished by Pradhāna cannot get inseparably connected with the Self. If it were a fact that any result in the form of either bondage or freedom inhered in the souls separately, then the supposition of a single Self would run counter to the (Sāṁkhya) theory that Pradhāna acts for others, and therefore it would be logical to assume a multiplicity of souls. But as a matter of fact, it is not admitted by the Sāṁkhyas that any result, be it bondage or freedom, that is accomplished by Pradhāna, can inhere in the soul; on the contrary, they hold that the souls are attributeless and are pure consciousness. Hence the theory, that Pradhāna acts for others, derives its validity from the mere presence of the Self, and not from Its multiplicity. Therefore the fact that Pradhāna acts for others, cannot be a logical ground for inferring the existence of many souls. And the Sāṁkhyas have no other proof to validate their theory that each soul is different from all others. If it be held that Pradhāna by itself undergoes bondage or liberation by virtue of the mere presence of the supreme One (viz God), and that

God becomes an occasion for the activity of Pradhāna by the mere fact of His existence which is the same as pure Consciousness, and not on account of any specific quality, then the assumption of a multiplicity of souls and the rejection of the meaning of the Vedas are the results of mere stupidity.¹

As for the view of the Vaiśeṣikas and others who assert that desire and the rest inhere in the soul, that, too, is untenable; for the impressions (of past experiences) that generate memory cannot remain inseparably located in the Self that has no location. And since (according to them) memory arises from a contact of the soul with the mind, there can be no fixed, tenable rule regarding the rise of memory; or there will be the possibility of the rise of all kinds of memory simultaneously. Moreover, the souls that are devoid of touch etc. and belong to a different category cannot logically come into contact with the mind etc. Furthermore, it is not a fact, though these others believe in it, that qualities like colour or such categories as action, genus, species, or inherence exist independently of the substances. If they were absolutely different from substances, and if desire etc. were so from the soul, those qualities etc. would not have any reasonable relation with substances, (nor would desire etc. have any relation with the soul).

Objection: It involves no contradiction to say that categories that become associated from their very birth can have the relationship of inherence.

¹ This refutes the view of those Sāṃkhyas who believe in one God as well as in a multiplicity of souls.

Answer: Not so; since the eternal Self exists before the ephemeral moods like desire, no theory of congenital inherence can be logically advanced. If on the contrary, desire and the rest are supposed to have an inseparable relation with the soul from their very birth, then there arises the possibility of their becoming as everlasting as the quality of vastness that the soul possesses (even according to the Vaiśeṣikas). And that is not a desirable position, for that will lead to the conclusion that the soul has no freedom from the bondage (of desire etc). Besides, if the relationship of inherence be different from a substance, then one has to posit another relationship for its being connected with the substance, just as much as such a relationship (viz conjunction) is assumed in the case of substance and quality (by Vaiśeṣikas).

Objection: Inherence being an eternal, inseparable connection, there is no need of positing another relationship to connect it (with a substance).

Answer: In that case, since entities that are connected through the relation of inherence remain eternally joined, there can be no possibility of their being separate. Alternatively, if the substances and the rest be absolutely disparate, then just as things possessing and not possessing the attribute of touch cannot come in contact, so also those substances etc. cannot become related (with such categories as relation, qualities, etc.) by way of possession that is implied by the sixth case.¹ Besides, if the Self is possessed of such qualities as desire etc.

¹ We cannot say for instance, "This thing is related to that colour through inherence", which in ordinary parlance is expressed by saying, "This thing has that colour".

that are subject to increase and decrease, It will be open to the charge of being impermanent like the bodies and the fruits of actions. And the other two faults of Its being possessed of parts and being subject to mutation, just like the bodies etc., will be unavoidable. On the other hand, if on the analogy of the sky, appearing to be blackened by dust and smoke attributed to it through ignorance, it is supposed that the Self appears to be possessed of the defects of happiness and sorrow generated by such limiting adjuncts as the intellect that are superimposed on It through ignorance, there remains no illogicality in Its possessing bondage, freedom etc. in an empirical sense. For all schools of thought, while admitting the (relative reality of) empirical modes of behaviour originating from ignorance, deny their absolute reality. Therefore the imagination of the multiplicity of souls that the logician resorts to is quite uncalled for.

It is being shown how, through ignorance, there can be the possibility in the same Self, of that same variety of actions that becomes possible on the assumption of a multiplicity of souls:

रूपकार्यसमाख्याश्च भिद्यन्ते तत्र तत्र वै ।

आकाशस्य न भेदोऽस्ति तद्वज्जीवेषु निर्णयः ॥६॥

6. Though forms, actions, and names differ in respect of the differences (in space created by jars etc.), yet there is no multiplicity in space. So also is the definite conclusion with regard to the individual beings.

As in the same space there is a (supposed) difference of dimensions such as smallness and bigness in respect of the spaces enclosed by a jar, a water bowl, a house, etc., so also there is a difference of functions such as fetching or holding water, sleeping, etc., and of names such as the space in a jar, the space in a water bowl, the space in a house, etc., which are all created by those jar etc.; but all these differences are not surely real that are implied in conventional dealings involving dimensions etc. created in space; in reality *ākāśasya na bhedaḥ asti*, space has no difference nor can there be any empirical dealing based on the multiplicity of space unless there be the instrumentality of the limiting adjuncts. Just as it is the case here, so also *jīveṣu*, with regard to the souls, that are created as individual beings by the conditioning factors of the bodies and are comparable to spaces enclosed by jars; this *nirṇayaḥ*, definite conclusion, has been arrived at by the wise after examination.

नाकाशस्य घटाकाशो विकारावयवौ यथा ।

नैवात्मनः सदा जीवो विकारावयवौ तथा ॥७॥

7. As the space within a jar is neither a transformation nor a part of space (as such), so an individual being is never a transformation nor a part of the supreme Self.

Objection: The experience of difference with regard to those spaces in the jars etc. follows a real pattern.

Answer: This does not accord with fact, since

ghatākāśah, the space within a jar; *na vikārah*, is not a transformation, of the real space, in the sense that a piece of gold ornament is of gold, or foam, bubbles, and ice are of water; nor is it *avayavaḥ*, a part, as for instance the branches etc. are of a tree. *Yathā*, as; the space in a jar is not a transformation of space in that sense; *tathā*, similarly, just as shown in the illustration; *jīvaḥ*, an individual being, that is comparable to the space within a jar; is *na sadā*, never; either a transformation or a part *ātmanah*, of the supreme Self, that is the highest Reality and is comparable to the infinite space. Therefore the dealings, based on the multiplicity of the Self, must certainly be false.

Inasmuch as the experience of birth, death, etc. follows as a consequence of the differentiation among individuals created by the limiting adjuncts constituted by the bodies, just as the experience of the forms, actions etc. are the results of the ideas of difference entertained with regard to the spaces within jars etc., therefore the association of the soul with such impurities as suffering, consequences of actions, etc. is caused by that alone, but not in any real sense. With a view to establishing this fact with the help of an illustration the text goes on:

यथा भवति बालानां गगनं मलिनं मलैः ।

तथा भवत्यबुद्धानामात्माऽपि मलिनो मलैः ॥८॥

8. Just as the sky becomes blackened by dust etc. in the eyes of the ignorant, so also the Self becomes tarnished by impurities in the eyes of the unwise.

Yathā, as, in common experience; *gaganam*, the sky; *bhavati*, becomes; *malinam*, blackened, by cloud, dust, smoke, and such other impurities; *bālānām*, to the non-discriminating people; but to the truly discriminating people, the sky is not blackened; *tathā*, so also *abuddhānām*, to the unwise, to those only who cannot distinguish the indwelling Self, but not to those who can distinguish the Self; *ātmā*, the supreme Self, the knower and the innermost; *bhavati*, becomes; *malinaḥ*, tainted; *malaiḥ*, with impurities—the impurities of mental defects and results of action. For a desert does not become possessed of water, foam, wave, etc. just because a thirsty creature falsely attributes these to it. Similarly, the Self is not blemished by the impurities of suffering etc. attributed to It by the ignorant. This is the idea.

The same idea is being elaborated again:

मरणे संभवे चैव गत्यागमनयोरपि ।

स्थितौ सर्वशरीरेषु आकाशेनाविलक्षणः ॥९॥

9. The Self is not dissimilar to space in the matter of Its death and birth, as well as its going and coming, and existence in all the bodies.

The idea implied is that one should realise that in the matter of birth, death, etc., the Self in all the bodies is quite on a par with space confined in a jar, so far as its origination, destruction, coming, going, and motionlessness are concerned.

संघाताः स्वप्नवत्सर्वे आत्ममायाविसृजिताः ।

अधिक्ये सर्वसाम्ये वा नोपपत्तिर्हि विहाते ॥१०॥

10. The aggregates (of bodies and senses) are all created like dream by the Māyā of the Self. Be it a question of superiority or equality of all, there is no logical ground to prove their existence.

Samghātāḥ, the aggregates, of bodies etc., that are analogous to the jars etc.; are like the bodies etc. seen in a dream and like those conjured up by a magician; and are *ātma-māyā-visarjitāḥ*, produced, conjured up, by the Māyā, ignorance, of the Self; the idea is that they do not exist in reality. Though there may be *ādhyakya*, superiority, of the aggregates of the bodies and senses of the gods and others in comparison with those of the beasts and others, or there may be *sāmya*, equality of all; still *hi*, since; there exists *na upapattiḥ*, no valid ground, no possibility, for them—there is no reason establishing the existence of these things; therefore they are created by ignorance alone—they do not exist in reality. This is the meaning.

(Upaniṣadic) texts that go to establish the fact that the reality of the non-dual Self is proved on the evidence of the Vedas, are now being referred to:

रसादयो हि ये कोशा व्याख्यातास्तैत्तिरीयके ।

तेषामात्मा परो जीवः खं यथा संप्रकाशितः ॥११॥

11. It has been amply elucidated (by us) on the analogy of space, that the individual living being that conforms to the soul of the sheaths, counting from that constituted by the essence of food, which have been fully dealt

with in the Taittirīya Upaniṣads is none other than the supreme Self.

Rasādayaḥ, the essence of food etc., that is to say, the layers of covering constituted by the essence of food, the vital force, etc. which are comparable to the sheaths of swords, as the preceding ones are more and more external in relation to the earlier ones;—these have been *vyākhyātāḥ*, fully dealt with; *taittirīyake*, in a part of the Upaniṣad of the Taittirīyaka branch (Tai. II. i-vi). That which is *ātmā*, the soul, the inmost entity; *teṣām*, of them, of all the sheaths; because of which (sou!) the sheaths come to have existence; is called *jīvaḥ*, the living being, since it is the source of animation. It is being said as to what it is. It is *paraḥ*, the supreme Brahman Itself, that was introduced earlier in the text, “Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinity” (Tai. II. i)—the Brahman from which, it was stated that, through the *Māyā* of the Self, emerged like dream or magic (*Kārikā*, III. 10) (first) space etc. and then the composite things called the sheaths counting from the one composed of the essence of food (Tai. II. i). That very Self *sāmprakāśitaḥ*, has been held forth, by us as analogous to space in the verses beginning with “Since the Self is referred to as existing in the form of individual souls in the same way as space” (*Kārikā*, III. 3). The idea implied is that the Self is not to be established by the mere human intellect just as much as It cannot be by the imagination of the logicians.

द्वयोर्द्वयोर्मधुज्ञाने परं ब्रह्म प्रकाशितम् ।

पथिव्यामदरे चैव यथाऽऽकाशः प्रकाशितः ॥१२॥

12. As it is demonstrated that space in the earth and the stomach is but the same, similarly in the Madhu-Brāhmaṇa the supreme Brahman is revealed as the same with reference to the different dual contexts.

Moreover, *prakāśitam*, it has been revealed; *dvayoh dvayoh*, with reference to the different dual contexts—the superhuman and the corporeal—that the “shining, immortal being” dwelling inside the earth etc. as the knower, is but Brahman, the supreme Self, that is everything (Br. II. v. 1-14). Where (has this been revealed)? That is being stated: The word *madhujñāna* is used in the sense of that from which is known *madhu*, nectar, the cause of immortality, called the knowledge of Brahman which leads to blissfulness; so it means the (chapter called) Madhu-Brāhmaṇa (of the Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad); in that Madhu-Brāhmaṇa. Like what? *Yathā*, as, in the world; the same *ākāśah*, space; is *prakāśitaḥ*, demonstrated to exist, through inference; *prthivyām udare ca eva*, in the earth and the stomach; similar is the case here. This is the purport.

जीवात्मनोरनन्यत्वमभेदेन प्रशस्यते ।

नानात्वं निन्द्यते यच्च तदेवं हि समञ्जसम् ॥१३॥

13. The fact that the non-difference of the individual and the supreme Self is extolled by a statement of their identity, and the fact that diversity is condemned, become easy of comprehension from this point of view alone.

The fact that *ananyatvam jīvātmanah*, the non-difference of the individual soul and the supreme Self, ascertained through reasoning and the Vedas; is *praśasyate*, praised, by the scriptures and Vyāsa and others; *abhedena*, by a reference to (the result consisting in) the identity of the individual and the supreme Self;¹ and the fact that the perception of multiplicity, that is common and natural to all beings and is a view formulated by the sophists standing outside the pale of scriptural import, *nindyate*, is condemned, by the knowers of Brahman as well in such texts as, “But there is not that second” (Br. IV. iii. 23), “It is from a second entity that fear comes” (Br. I. iv. 2), “When he makes a very little difference, then he is subjected to fear” (Tai. II. vii. 1), “. . . and this all are the Self” (Br. II. iv. 6, IV. v. 7), “He who perceives here multiplicity, as it were, goes from death to death” (Ka. II. i. 10), *tat yat*, all that, has been said (thus); *evam hi samāñjasam*, becomes thus easy of comprehension; that is to say, becomes logical from this point of view alone; but the perverted views, cooked up by the logicians, are not easy of comprehension; that is to say, they do not tally with facts when probed into.

जीवात्मनोः पृथक्त्वं यत्प्रागुत्पत्तेः प्रकीर्तितम् ।

भविष्यद्बृत्त्या गौणं तन्मुख्यत्वं हि न युज्यते ॥१४॥

14. The separateness of the individual and the supreme Self that has been declared (in the Vedic texts) earlier than (the talk of)

¹“He who knows the supreme Brahman becomes Brahman” (Mu. III. ii. 9).

creation (in the Upaniṣads), is only in a secondary sense that keeps in view a future result (viz unity); for such separateness is out of place in its primary sense.

Objection: Since *prāk utpatteḥ*, earlier even than the Upaniṣadic texts dealing with creation; *pr̥thaktvam jīvātmanoḥ*, the separateness of the individual and the supreme Self; *prakīrtitam*, has been declared; by the Vedas, in the portion dealing with rites and rituals, in various ways in conformity with the variety of desires (of individuals), in such words as, “desirous of this”, “desirous of that”, and the supreme Self, too, has been declared in such *mantra* texts as, “He held the earth as well as this heaven” (R. X. cxxi. 1), therefore, in case of a contradiction between the sentences of the portions on knowledge (i.e. Upaniṣads) and rites (i.e. Sāmhita and Brāhmaṇa), why should unity alone, standing out as the purport of the portion on knowledge, be upheld as the reasonable one?

To this the *answer* is: *Tat pr̥thaktvam*, that separateness; is not the highest truth; *yat*, which; is *prakīrtitam*, declared; *prāk*, earlier in the portion on rites, before the Upaniṣadic texts dealing with creation occur, to wit, “That from which all these beings take birth” (Tai. III. i), “As from a fire fly tiny sparks” (Bṛ. II. i. 20), “From this Self that is such, space was created” (Tai. II. i. 2), “That (Self) saw (i.e. deliberated)” (Ch. VI. ii. 3), “That (Self) created fire” (Ch. VI. ii. 3), etc. What is it then? It is *gauṇam*, secondary like the separateness of the infinite space and the space within a jar. And this statement is made by keeping in view the

future result, as in the sentence, "He cooks food."¹ For the texts, speaking of difference, can never reasonably uphold it in any literal sense, inasmuch as the texts dealing with the multiplicity of the Self only reiterate the diverse experiences of beings still under natural ignorance. And here in the Upaniṣads, too, in the texts speaking of creation, dissolution, etc., the one thing sought to be established is the unity of the individual and the supreme Self, as is known from such texts as "That thou art" (Ch. VI. viii-xvi), "(While he who worships another god thinking), 'He is one, and I am another' does not know" (Br. I. iv. 10), etc. Therefore the reiteration of the perception of multiplicity is made by the Vedas in this world in a secondary sense only, placing their reliance on the future demonstration of unity that is left over as a task to be accomplished in the Upaniṣads at a later stage. Or the explanation is this: The declaration of unity has been made in "One without a second" (Ch. VI. ii. 2) earlier than that of creation introduced in such texts as "It (the Self) deliberated", "It created fire" (Ch. VI. ii. 2-3). And that, again, will culminate in unity in the text, "That is truth, That is the Self, and That thou art" (Ch. VI. viii-xvi). Therefore the separateness of the individual and the supreme Self that is met with (in the Upaniṣads) anywhere in any sentence must be taken in a secondary sense, as in the sentence, "He cooks food", for the thing kept in view here is the unity that will be established in future.

Objection: Even though everything be birthless and

¹ Where food stands for the ultimate form that the things being cooked will assume.

one without a second before creation, still after creation all these surely have got birth, and individuals, too, are different.

Answer: This is not so, for the Vedic texts dealing with creation have a different object in view. This objection was refuted earlier also by saying that, just like dream, the aggregates are created by the Māyā of the Self, and that the birth, difference, etc. of individuals are analogous to the birth, difference etc. of the spaces within jars (*Kārikās*, III. 9-10). (Since falsity of these have already been dealt with) therefore, taking that very reason for granted, some Vedic texts dealing with creation are being adduced here, from amongst the texts dealing with creation, difference, etc., with a view to showing that they are meant for establishing the oneness of the Self and the individual beings.

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदिताऽन्यथा ।

उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथंचन ॥१५॥

15. The creation that has been multifariously set forth with the help of the examples of earth, gold, sparks, etc., is merely by way of generating the idea (of oneness); but there is no multiplicity in any way.

Sṛṣṭih, the creation; *yā*, which; *coditā*, has been expounded, revealed; *anyathā*, in different ways; *mṛt-loha-visphuliṅga-ādyaiḥ*, with the help of such illustrations as earth, gold, sparks, etc.;¹ *saḥ*, that, all that

¹ Ch. VI. i. 46; Mu. II. i. 1.

future result, as in the sentence, "He cooks food."¹ For the texts, speaking of difference, can never reasonably uphold it in any literal sense, inasmuch as the texts dealing with the multiplicity of the Self only reiterate the diverse experiences of beings still under natural ignorance. And here in the Upaniṣads, too, in the texts speaking of creation, dissolution, etc., the one thing sought to be established is the unity of the individual and the supreme Self, as is known from such texts as "That thou art" (Ch. VI. viii-xvi), "(While he who worships another god thinking), 'He is one, and I am another' does not know" (Br. I. iv. 10), etc. Therefore the reiteration of the perception of multiplicity is made by the Vedas in this world in a secondary sense only, placing their reliance on the future demonstration of unity that is left over as a task to be accomplished in the Upaniṣads at a later stage. Or the explanation is this: The declaration of unity has been made in "One without a second" (Ch. VI. ii. 2) earlier than that of creation introduced in such texts as "It (the Self) deliberated", "It created fire" (Ch. VI. ii. 2-3). And that, again, will culminate in unity in the text, "That is truth, That is the Self, and That thou art" (Ch. VI. viii-xvi). Therefore the separateness of the individual and the supreme Self that is met with (in the Upaniṣads) anywhere in any sentence must be taken in a secondary sense, as in the sentence, "He cooks food", for the thing kept in view here is the unity that will be established in future.

Objection: Even though everything be birthless and

¹ Where food stands for the ultimate form that the things being cooked will assume.

one without a second before creation, still after creation all these surely have got birth, and individuals, too, are different.

Answer: This is not so, for the Vedic texts dealing with creation have a different object in view. This objection was refuted earlier also by saying that, just like dream, the aggregates are created by the Māyā of the Self, and that the birth, difference, etc. of individuals are analogous to the birth, difference etc. of the spaces within jars (*Kārikās*, III. 9-10). (Since falsity of these have already been dealt with) therefore, taking that very reason for granted, some Vedic texts dealing with creation are being adduced here, from amongst the texts dealing with creation, difference, etc., with a view to showing that they are meant for establishing the oneness of the Self and the individual beings.

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदिताऽन्यथा ।

उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथंचन ॥१५॥

15. The creation that has been multifariously set forth with the help of the examples of earth, gold, sparks, etc., is merely by way of generating the idea (of oneness); but there is no multiplicity in any way.

Sṛṣṭih, the creation; *yā*, which; *coditā*, has been expounded, revealed; *anyathā*, in different ways; *mṛt-loha-visphuliṅga-ādyaiḥ*, with the help of such illustrations as earth, gold, sparks, etc.;¹ *saḥ*, that, all that

¹ Ch. VI. i. 46; Mu. II. i. 1.

process of creation; is an *upāyah*, means; *avatārāya*, for engendering, in us the idea of the oneness of the individual and the supreme Self. It is just like the story of the organs of speech etc. becoming smitten with sin by the devils, that is woven round a conversation with Prāṇa, where the intention is to generate the idea of the pre-eminence of Prāṇa (Ch. I. ii; Br. I. iii, VI. i; Pr. 2).

Objection: That, too, is unacceptable.¹

Answer: No, since the conversations of Prāṇa etc. are related divergently in the different branches of the Vedas. If the colloquies were true, we should have met with a uniform pattern in all the branches, and not with heterogeneous contradictory presentations. But, as a matter of fact, divergence is met with. Therefore the Vedic texts setting forth the interlogues are not to be taken literally. So also are to be understood the sentences dealing with creation.

Objection: Since the cycles of creation differ, the Vedic texts dealing with the interlogues, as well as with creation, are divergent with relation to the respective cycles.

Answer: Not so, since they serve no useful purpose apart from generating the ideas already mentioned. Not that any other purpose can be imagined for the Vedic texts speaking of colloquies and creation.

Objection: They are meant for meditation with a view to attaining self-identification.

Answer: Not so, for it cannot be a desirable end to be identified with quarrel, creation, or dissolution.

¹ The anecdotes of Prāṇa are real.

Therefore the texts expressing creation etc. are meant simply for generating the idea of the oneness of the Self, and they cannot be fancied to bear other interpretations. Therefore *na asti*, there is not, any *bhedah*, multiplicity, caused by creation etc.; *kathamcana*, in any way.

Objection: If in accordance with such Vedic texts as "One only without a second" (Ch. VI. ii. 2), the supreme Self, that is by nature ever pure, intelligent, and free, be the only reality in the highest sense and all else be unreal, then why are there such instructions on meditations in the Vedic texts as, "The Self, my dear, should be seen"¹ (Br. II. iv. 5), "The Self that is devoid of sin... (is to be sought for)" (Ch. VIII. vii. 1), "He should resort to self-absorption" (Ch. III. xiv. 1), "The Self alone is to be meditated upon" (Br. I. iv. 7) etc.; and why are the rites like Agnihotra enjoined?

Answer: Hear the reason for this:

आश्रमास्त्रिविधा हीनमध्यमोत्कृष्टदृष्टयः ।

उपासनोपदिष्टेयं तदर्थमनुकम्पया ॥१६॥

16. There are three stages of life—inferior, intermediate, and superior. This meditation is enjoined for them out of compassion.

The word *āśramāḥ*, meaning stages of life, indicates the people belonging to them—the people competent for scriptural duties, as well as the people of different

¹ The remaining portion is: "heard of, deliberated on, and meditated on"

castes following the righteous path—for the word is used in a suggestive sense. They are *trividhāḥ*: of three kinds. How? *Hīna-madhyama-utkr̥ṣṭa-dṛṣṭayah*, people possessing inferior, medium, and superior power of vision; that is to say, they are endued with dull, medium, and fine mental calibre. *Iyam upāsanā*, this meditation, as well as rites; *upadiṣṭā*, has been instructed; *tadartham*, for them, for the sake of people of dull and medium intellect who are affiliated to the stages of life etc., and not for the people of superior intellect having the conviction that the Self is but one without a second. (This is done) by the kind Vedas, *anukampayā*, out of compassionate consideration, as to how people treading the path of righteousness may attain this superior vision of unity, as set forth in such Vedic texts as, “That which is not thought of by the mind, that by which, they say, the mind is thought of, know that to be Brahman, and not this that people worship as an object” (Ke. 1. 6), “That thou art” (Ch. VI. vii-xvi), “The Self alone is all this” (Ch. VII. xxv. 2), etc.

The perfect knowledge consists in the realisation of the non-dual Self, since this is established by scriptures and logic, whereas any other view is false, it being outside the pale of these. A further reason that the theories of the dualists are false is that they are based on such defects as likes and dislikes. How?

स्वसिद्धान्तव्यवस्थासु द्वैतिनो निश्चिता दृढम् ।

परस्परं विरुद्ध्यन्ते तैरयं न विरुद्ध्यते ॥१७॥

17. The dualists, confirmed believers in the methodologies establishing their own

conclusions, are at loggerheads with one another. But this (non-dual) view finds no conflict with them.

Dvaitinalā, the dualists—who follow the views of Kapila, Kaṇāda, Buddha, Arhat,¹ and others; *niścītāḥ*, are firmly rooted; *svasiddhānta-vyavasthāsu*, in the methodologies leading to their own conclusions. Thinking “The supreme Reality is this alone, and not any other”, they remain affiliated to those points of view, and finding anyone opposed to them, they become hateful of him. Thus being swayed by likes and dislikes, consequent on the adherence to their own conclusions, *parasparam virudhyante*, they stand arrayed against one another. As one is not at conflict with one’s own hands and feet, so also, just because of non-difference from all, *ayam*, this, this Vedic view of ours consisting in seeing the same Self in everyone; *na virudhyate*, is not opposed; *tailā*, to them, who are mutually at conflict. Thus the idea sought to be conveyed is that the perfect view consists in realising the Self as one, for this is not subject to the drawbacks of love and hatred.

It is being pointed out why this view does not conflict with theirs:

अद्वैतं परमार्थो हि द्वैतं तद्भेद उच्यते ।
 तेषामुभयथा द्वैतं तेनायं न विरुध्यते ॥१८॥

18. Non-duality is the highest Reality, since duality is said to be a product of it. But for

¹ Viz the Sāṅkhya, Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas, Buddhists, and Jāinas.

them there is duality either way. Therefore this view (of ours) does not clash (with theirs).

Advaitam paramārthaḥ, non-duality is the highest Reality; *hi*, since; *dvaitam*, duality, heterogeneity; *is tad-bhedaḥ*, a differentiation, that is to say, a product of that non-duality, in accordance with the Vedic texts, “(In the beginning there was Existence alone)—One without a second....It created fire” (Ch. VI. ii. 2-3), and in accordance with reason also; for duality ceases to exist in *samādhi* (God-absorption), unconsciousness, and deep sleep, when the mind ceases to act. Therefore duality is called a product of non-duality. But *teṣāṃ*, for those dualists; there is nothing but *dvaitam*, duality; *ubhayathā*, from either point of view, from the standpoints of both Reality and unreality. Though those deluded persons have a dualist outlook and we the undeluded ones have a non-dualist outlook in conformity with the Vedic texts, “The Lord, on account of *Māyā*, is perceived as many” (Br. II. v. 19), “But there is not that second thing (separate from It which It can see)” (Br. IV. iii. 23); yet *tena*, because of this reason (because of the falsity of dualism); *ayam*, this, our point of view; *na virudhyate*, does not clash, with theirs. This point can be illustrated thus: A man sitting astride an elephant in rut does not goad his animal against a madman standing on the ground and challenging him by saying, “I am also seated on an elephant in opposition; drive your animal against me,” just because he has no inimical feelings towards the latter. Thus, since in reality, the knower of Brahman is the very ‘Self’ of the dualists, *tena*, hence, because of this

reason: *ayam*, this, this outlook of ours; *na virudhyate*, does not clash; with theirs.

When it is asserted that duality is derived from non-duality, someone may entertain the doubt that on that ground duality, too, is real in the highest sense. Therefore it is said:

मायया भिद्यते ह्येतन्नान्यथाऽजं कथञ्चन ।

तत्त्वतो भिद्यमाने हि मर्त्यताममृतं व्रजेत् ॥१९॥

19. This birthless (Self) becomes differentiated through **Māyā**, and it does so in no other way than this. For should It become multiple in reality, the immortal will undergo mortality.

Hi, since; that which is the highest Reality; *bhidyate*, differentiates; *māyayā*, through **Māyā**; like the moon seen as many by a man with diseased eyes or like a rope appearing diversely as a snake, a line of water, etc., but not so in reality, for the Self has no parts. A composite thing can get transformed through a change in its components, as earth gets modified into jars etc. Therefore the idea conveyed is that the partless *ajam*, birthless (Self); differentiates, *na kathañcana*, in no way whatsoever; *anyathā*, other than this. *Hi*, for; *tattvataḥ bhidyamāne*, should (It) become multiformed in reality; that which is naturally *amṛtam*, immortal; *ajam*, birthless; and non-dual; *vrajet martyatām*, will undergo mortality, like fire becoming cold. And this reversal of one's own nature is repugnant, since it is opposed to all valid evidence. The birthless, undecaying Reality that is the Self, becomes multiple through **Māyā**

alone and not in reality. Therefore duality is not the highest Truth.

अजातस्यैव भावस्य जातिमिच्छन्ति वादिनः ।

अजातो ह्यमृतो भावो मर्त्यतां कथमेष्यति ॥२०॥

20. The talkers vouch indeed for the birth of that very unborn, positive entity. But how can a positive entity that is unborn and immortal undergo mortality.

But as for those *vādinah*, garrulous people, talking of Brahman; who, while interpreting the Upaniṣads, *icchanti*, vouch for; the *jātim*, birth, in a real sense; *ajātasya eva*, of the very birthless One, of the immortal Reality that is the Self. If the Self be born as they hold, It *eṣyati martyatām*, will undergo mortality, of a certainty. But that Self being by nature a *bhāvaḥ*, positive entity; that is *ajātaḥ*, unborn; *amṛtaḥ* deathless; *katham*, how; can It undergo mortality? The idea is that It will in no way reverse Its nature to embrace mortality (that individuals are subject to).

न भवत्यमृतं मर्त्यं न मर्त्यममृतं तथा ।

प्रकृतेरन्यथाभावो न कथञ्चिद्भविष्यति ॥२१॥

21. The immortal cannot become mortal. Similarly the mortal cannot become immortal. The mutation of one's nature will take place in no way whatsoever.

Because, in this world, the *amṛtam*, immortal; *na bhavati*, does not become; *martyam*, mortal; similarly,

the mortal does not become immortal. Accordingly, *anyathābhāvaḥ prakṛteḥ*, the mutation of one's nature, to become anything other than what one is; *na katham cit bhaviṣyati*, will not take place in any way whatsoever, just as fire cannot change its heat.

स्वभावेनामृतो यस्य भावो गच्छति मर्त्यताम् ।

कृतकेनामृतस्तस्य कथं स्थास्यति निश्चलः ॥२२॥

22. How can the immortal entity continue to be changeless from the standpoint of one according to whom a positive, immortal object can naturally pass into birth, it being a product (according to him)?

As for the disputant, *yasya*, according to whom; *svabhāvena*, naturally; *amṛtaḥ bhāvaḥ*, an immortal positive object; *gacchati martyatām*, attains transmigratoriness, takes birth in reality; *tasya*, for him; it is a meaningless proposition to hold that entity to be naturally immortal before creation. *Katham*, how; can that entity; be *amṛtaḥ*, immortal; *tasya*, for him; *kṛtakena*, inasmuch as it is a product? Being an effect, how will that immortal *sthāsyati*, continue to be; *niścalaḥ*, unchanging, immortal by nature? It cannot remain so by any means. At no time can there exist anything called unborn for one who holds the view that the Self has birth; for him all this is mortal. Hence (from this standpoint) we are faced with the negation of freedom. This is the idea.

Objection: For one who holds the view that the Self does not undergo birth, the Vedic passages speaking of creation can have no validity.

Answer: It is true that there are Vedic texts supporting creation, but such passages have some other point in view; and we said that it “is only by way of generating the idea” of unity (*Kārikā* III. 15). Though the objection was disposed of, the contention and its refutation are adverted to here again merely with a view to allaying the doubts as to whether the passages dealing with creation are favourable or opposed to the subject-matter that is going to be dealt with:

भूततोऽभूततो वाऽपि सृज्यमाने समा श्रुतिः ।

निश्चितं युक्तियुक्तं च यत्तद्भवति नेतरत् ॥२३॥

23. Vedic texts are equally in evidence with regard to creation in reality and through *Māyā*. That which is ascertained (by the Vedas) and is supported by reasoning can be the meaning, and nothing else.

Samā śrutih, (texts speaking of creation) are equally in evidence; *srjyamāne*, with regard to a thing being created; *bhūtataḥ*, in reality; *vā*, or; *abhūtataḥ*, through *Māyā*, as is done by a magician.

Objection: Of the two possible meanings—primary and secondary—it is reasonable to understand a word in its primary sense.

Answer: Not so, for we said earlier that creation in any other sense is not recognised (in our philosophy), and it serves no purpose. All talks of creation, in the primary or secondary sense, relate only to creation through ignorance, and not to creation in reality, as is denied in the Vedic text, “It is co-extensive with all

that is within and without, and has no birth" (Mu. II. i. 2). Therefore that which is *niscitam*, determined, by the Vedas as one without a second, birthless, and immortal; *ca*, and; is *yuktiyuktam*, supported by reasoning; *tat*, that, alone; *bhavati*, becomes, the meaning of the Vedic text, and not anything else. This is what we said in the earlier verses.

It is being shown as to what kind of Vedic categorical statements are met with:

नेह नानेति चाम्नायादिन्द्रो मायाभिरित्यपि ।

अजायमानो बहुधा मायया जायते तु सः ॥२४॥

24. Since it is stated (in the Vedas), "There is no diversity here," and "The Lord, on account of *Māyā*, (is perceived as manifold)", "(the Self) without being born (appears to be born in various ways)", it follows that He is born on account of *Māyā* alone.

If creation had taken place in reality, the diverse things should have been real and there should not have been any text showing their unreality. But, as a matter of fact, there is the text, "There is no diversity here whatsoever" (Ka. II. i. 11), which purports to deny the existence of duality. Therefore creation, that has been imagined as a help to the comprehension of non-duality, is as unreal as the interlogue of *Prāṇa* (vide *Kārikā*, III. 15); for this creation is referred to by the word *Māyā*, indicative of unreal things, in the passage, "The Lord, on account of *Māyā* (is perceived as manifold)" (Br. II. v. 19).

Objection: The word Māyā implies knowledge.

Answer: True. But even so it is nothing damaging, since sense-knowledge is accepted as a kind of Māyā, it being a product of ignorance. So *māyābhiḥ* (in Br., II. v. 19) means “through different kinds of sense-knowledge,” which are but forms of ignorance, as is proved by the Vedic text, “Though unborn, It appears to be born in diverse ways” (Y.XXXI. 19). Therefore *saḥ*, He, the Self; *jāyate māyayā tu*, takes birth through Māyā alone, the word *tu* being used to add emphasis, and to imply “through Māyā to be sure”; for (otherwise) birthlessness and birth in various ways cannot be reconciled in the same thing like heat and cold in fire. Besides, from the fact that the realisation of unity is a fruitful thing as mentioned in the Vedic text, “What sorrow and what delusion can there be in one who realises unity” etc. (Īś. 7), it follows that the unitive outlook is the definite conclusion of the Upaniṣads, and this view is supported by the fact that in such texts as “He goes from death to death who sees multiplicity, as it were, in It” (Ka. II. i. 11), the idea of heterogeneity, implied by creation etc., is condemned.

संभूतेरपवादाच्च संभवः प्रतिषिध्यते ।

को न्वेनं जनयेदिति कारणं प्रतिषिध्यते ॥२५॥

25. From the refutation of (the worship of) Hiranyagarbha, it follows that creation is negated. By the text, “who should bring him forth?” is ruled out any cause.

Sambhavaḥ pratiṣidhyate, creation (i.e. the created

things), is negated; *sāmbhūteḥ apavādāt*, because of the denial of the worship of the Majestic One¹ (Hiraṇyagarbha), in the text, “They enter into blinding darkness who worship Hiraṇyagarbha” (Īś. 12). For if Hiraṇyagarbha were absolutely real, there would not have been any denunciation of His (worship).

Objection: The denunciation of (the worship of) Hiraṇyagarbha is meant for bringing about the combination of worship with rites (*vināśa*), as is known from the text, “They enter into blinding darkness who are engaged in (mere) rites” (Īś. 9).

Answer: It is true that the condemnation of the meditation on (or worship of) Hiraṇyagarbha is meant for enjoining a combination of the meditation on the Deity, viz Hiraṇyagarbha, with rites, referred to by the word *vināśa* (lit. the destructible). Still, just as rites, called *vināśa*, are meant for transcending death consisting in the natural tendencies engendered by ignorance, so also the combination of the meditation on gods with the rites, that is enjoined for the purification of the human heart, is calculated to lead one beyond the death consisting in a twofold hankering for ends and means, into which the impulsion, engendered by the craving for the results of works, transforms itself. For thus alone will a man be sanctified from the impurity that is the death characterised by the twofold hankering. Therefore this *avidyā* (lit. ignorance), characterised by a combination of the meditation on gods with rites, aims at leading one beyond death. Thus indeed does the knowledge of the oneness of the supreme

¹ The Deity that is possessed of full majesty (*sam-bhūti*).

Self arise inevitably in one who becomes disgusted with the world, who is ever engaged in the discussion of the Upaniṣadic truths, and who goes beyond death that is but (a form of) *avidyā* (or ignorance) characterised by the dual desire (for ends and means). Thus, as compared with the pre-existing ignorance, the knowledge of Brahman, leading to immortality, comes as a successor to be related with the same person; and therefore (in this sense) the latter is said to be combined with the former. Accordingly, since the worship of Hiraṇyagarbha is meant to serve a purpose different from that of the knowledge of Brahman leading to immortality, the refutation of the worship of Hiraṇyagarbha is tantamount to its denunciation, and this is so because it has no direct bearing on emancipation, though it is a means of purification. Thus from the condemnation of the worship of Hiraṇyagarbha it follows that He has got only a relative existence; and hence creation, (as symbolised by Hiraṇyagarbha and) called immortality stands negated from the standpoint of the absolutely real oneness of the Self.

Thus since it is the individual soul itself, created by ignorance and existing through ignorance alone, that attains its natural stature on the eradication of ignorance, therefore "*Kaḥ nu enam janayet*, who should again bring him forth?" (Bṛ. III. ix. 28-7). For none indeed creates again a snake, superimposed on a rope, once it is removed through discrimination. Similarly none will create this individual. The words, "*kaḥ nu*, who indeed," being used with the force of a covert denial, *kāraṇaṁ pratiśidhyate*, is ruled out any cause. The

idea is that a thing that was created by ignorance and thus disappeared has no source of birth, in accordance with the Vedic text "From nothing did It come out, and nothing came out of It" (Ka. I. ii. 18).

स एष नेति नेतीति व्याख्यातं निह्नूते यतः ।
 सर्वमग्राह्यभावेन हेतुनाऽजं प्रकाशते ॥२६॥

26. Since by taking the help of incomprehensibility (of Brahman) as a reason, all that was explained earlier (as a means for the knowledge of Brahman) is negated by the text, "This Self is that which has been described as 'Not this, not this'", therefore the birthless Self becomes self-revealed.

The Upaniṣad thinks that the Self, presented through a negation of all attributes in the text, "Now, therefore, the description (of Brahman): 'Not this, not this'" (Br. II. iii. 6) is very difficult to understand; and from that point of view whatever was *vyākhyātam*, explained, as a means adopted again and for the sake of establishing that very Self—all that it again and again *nihnute*, negates.¹ By showing in the text, "This Self is that

¹ Vide Br. II. iii. 6, III. ix. 26, IV. ii. 4, IV. iv. 22, and IV. v. 15. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, II. iii, starts with, "Brahman has but two forms -- gross and subtle" etc. And at the end of the section it is stated, "Now, therefore, the description (of Brahman): 'Not this. Not this' ". But though explained once, the Self is very difficult to comprehend. Hence the Upaniṣad adopts other helps to present the same entity and then negates them with "not this, not this", so

which has been described as not this, not this" (Br. III. ix. 26) that the Self is imperceptible, the Upaniṣad negates, by implication, all that is perceptible, has origination, and is comprehended by the intellect.¹ Being afraid lest people, not cognisant of the fact that anything presented as a means for establishing something else has only that other thing as its goal, may jump to the conclusion that one must cling as firmly to the means as to the end itself, the Upaniṣad *nihnute*, refutes (the idea of the reality of the means); *agrāhyabhāvena hetunā*, by taking the help of the incomprehensibility (of the Self) as a reason. This is the purport. As a result of this, the reality of the Self that is co-extensive with all that is within and without and is *ajam*, birthless; *prakāṣate*, gets revealed, by Itself, to one who knows that the means only serves the purpose of the end and that the end has ever the same changeless nature.²

Thus the definite conclusion arrived at by hundreds of Vedic texts is that the reality of the Self that is co-extensive with all that exists within and without, and is birthless, is one without a second, and there is nothing

that the absolute Brahman alone may be comprehended as the only Reality.

¹ The imperceptible Brahman cannot be the supreme Reality if perceptible things too are equally real. Therefore the truth of Brahman implies the unreality of duality.

² A superimposed thing has no reality of its own just like a snake imagined on a rope. Similarly, all phenomenal things like specific attributes that are denied in Brahman, have no existence by the very fact of being negated. It is a mistake to think that the negated counterpart of this negation must also be true.

besides. It is now said that this very fact is established by reason as well:

सतो हि मायया जन्म युज्यते न तु तत्त्वतः ।

तत्त्वतो जायते यस्य जातं तस्य हि जायते ॥२७॥

27. Birth of a thing that (already) exists can reasonably be possible only through *Māyā* and not in reality. For one who holds that things take birth in a real sense, there can only be the birth of what is already born.

With regard to the Reality that is the Self, the apprehension may arise that, if It be incomprehensible for ever, It may as well be non-existent. But that is not correct, for Its effect is perceptible.' As the effect consisting in *janma*, birth (of things); *māyayā*, through magic; follows *satah*, from (the magician) who exists; so the effect in the form of the birth of the world, that is comprehended, leads one to assume a Self existing in the highest sense, that like the magician is the basis for the *Māyā* consisting in the origination of the world; for it is but reasonable to think that like such effects as elephants etc., produced with the help of magic, the creation of the universe proceeds *satah*, from some cause that has existence, and not from an unreal one. But it is not reasonable to say that from the birthless Self there can be any birth *tattvatah*, in reality. Or the meaning is this: As the *janma*, birth; as a snake etc.; *satah*, of an existing thing, a rope for instance; *yujyate*, can reasonably be; *māyayā*, through *Māyā*, but not *tattvatah*, in

reality; similarly, though the Self that exists is incomprehensible, It can reasonably have birth in the form of the universe through Māyā like the illusion of a snake on a rope; but the birthless Self cannot have any birth in the real sense. *Yasya*, as for the disputant, who holds that the unborn Self, the supreme Reality; *jāyate*, undergoes birth, as the universe, he cannot make such an absurd assertion that the birthless passes into birth since this involves a contradiction. Hence he has to admit perforce that *jātam*, what is already born; *jāyate*, takes birth, again; and from this predication of birth from what is born will follow an infinite regress. Therefore it is established that the Reality that is the Self, is birthless and one.

असतो मायया जन्म तत्त्वतो नैव युज्यते ।

बन्ध्यापुत्रो न तत्त्वेन मायया वाऽपि जायते ॥२८॥

28. There can be no birth for a non-existent object either through Māyā or in reality, for the son of a barren woman is born neither through Māyā nor in reality.

For those who think everything to be unreal, *janma na yujyate*, there can be no possibility of birth, in any way; *asataḥ*, of a non-existent object; *māyayā tattvataḥ vā*, either through Māyā or in reality, for such is never our experience. For *bandhyāputraḥ*, the son of a barren woman; *na jāyate*, never takes birth; either through Māyā or in reality. Hence the theory of nihilism is entirely out of place in the present context. This is the idea.

How, again, can there be birth for the existent through Māyā alone? That is being explained:

यथा स्वप्ने द्वयाभासं स्पन्दते मायया मनः ।

तथा जाग्रद्द्वयाभासं स्पन्दते मायया मनः ॥२९॥

29. As in dream the mind vibrates, as though having dual aspects, so in the waking state the mind vibrates as though with two facets.

As the snake imagined on a rope is true when seen as the rope, so *manas*, the mind, is true when seen as the Self, the supreme Consciousness. As like a snake appearing on a rope, the mind *spandate*, vibrates; *svapne*, in dream; *māyayā*, through Māyā; *dvayābhāsam*, as if possessed of two facets—the cogniser and the thing cognised; *tathā*, just like that; *jāgrat*, in the waking state; *manas*, the mind; *spandate*, vibrates. as though vibrates; *māyayā*, through Māyā.

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं मनः स्वप्ने न संशयः ।

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं तथा जाग्रन्न संशयः ॥३०॥

30. There is no doubt that in dream, the mind, though one, appears in dual aspects; so also in the waking state, the mind, though one, appears to have two aspects.

Na saṁśayaḥ, there is no doubt; that just as the snake is true in its aspect of the rope, so the *manas*, mind; that is but *advayam*, non-dual in its aspect of the Self from the highest standpoint; *dvayābhāsam*, appears to have two aspects; *svapne*, in dream. For apart from

Consciousness, there do not exist two things in dream—elephants and so on that are perceived and eyes and the rest that perceive them. The idea is that the case is similar in the waking state also; for in either state there exists only the supremely real Consciousness.¹

It has been that it is the mind alone which, like a snake on a rope, appears as an illusion, in dual roles. What proof is there as to that? The text advances (inferential) proof on the basis of agreement and difference. How?

मनोदृश्यमिदं द्वैतं यत्किञ्चित्सचराचरम् ।

मनसो ह्यमनीभावे द्वैतं नैवोपलभ्यते ॥३१॥

31. All this that there is—together with all that moves or does not move—is perceived by the mind (and therefore all this is but the mind); for when the mind ceases to be the mind, duality is no longer perceived.

“*Idam dvaitam*, this duality, as a whole; that is *mano-dṛśyam*, perceived by the mind; is nothing but the mind, which is itself imagined (on the Self)”—this is the proposition. For duality endures so long as the mind does, and duality disappears with the disappearance of the mind. *Hi*, for; *manasaḥ amanibhāve*, when the mind ceases to be the mind, when, like the illusory snake disappearing in the rope, the mind’s activity stops through the practice of discriminating insight and

¹The mind, fancied on Consciousness through ignorance, vibrates on the supremely real and constant Consciousness in either state.

renunciation, or when the mind gets absorbed in the state of sleep; *dvaitam na upalabhyate*, duality is not perceived. From this non-existence is proved the unreality of duality. This is the purport.

How does the mind cease to be the mind? This is being answered:

आत्मसत्यानुबोधेन न सङ्कल्पयते यदा ।

अमनस्तां तदा याति ग्राह्याभावे तदग्रहम् ॥३२॥

32. When, following the instruction of scriptures and the teacher, the mind ceases to think as a consequence of the realisation of the Truth that is the Self, then the mind attains the state of not being the mind; in the absence of things to be perceived, it becomes a non-perceiver.

Ātmasatya, the Truth that is the Self, that is comparable to the reality of earth as stated in the Vedic text, "All modification (of earth) exists in name only, having speech for its support. Earth alone is true" (Ch. VI. i. 4). *Ātmasatya-anubodha* is the realisation of that Truth of the Self that follows from the instruction of scriptures and the teacher. *Yadū*, when; as a consequence of that, there remains nothing to be thought of, and the mind *na samkalpayate*, does not think, as fire does not burn in the absence of combustible things; *tadū*, then, at that time; *yāti amanastūm*, it attains the state of ceasing to be the mind. *Grāhyābhāve*, in the absence of things to be perceived; *tat*, that mind; *agraham*, becomes free from all illusion of perceptions. This is the idea.

If this duality be false, how is the truth of one's own Self realised? The answer is:

अकल्पकमजं ज्ञानं ज्ञेयाभिन्नं प्रचक्षते ।

ब्रह्मज्ञेयमजं नित्यमजेनाजं विबुध्यते ॥३३॥

33. They say that the non-conceptual knowledge, that is birthless, is non-different from the knowable (Brahman). The knowledge that has Brahman for its content is birthless and everlasting. The birthless (Self) is known by the birthless (knowledge).

The knowers of Brahman *pracakṣate*, say; that absolute *jñānam*, knowledge; that is *akalpakam*, devoid of all imagination (non-conceptual); and is therefore *ajam*, birthless; is *jñeyābhinnam*, non-different from the knowable, identified with Brahman, the absolute Reality. And this is supported by such Vedic texts as "For the knower's function of knowing can never be lost" (Br. IV. iii. 30), like the heat of fire; "Knowledge, Bliss, Brahman" (Br. III. ix. 28. 7); "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tai. II. i. 1). The phrase *brahma-jñeyam* is an attribute of that very knowledge and means, that very knowledge of which Brahman Itself is the content and which is non-different from Brahman, as heat is from fire. By that *ajena*, unborn, knowledge, which is the very nature of the Self; *vibudhyate*, is known—It knows by Itself; the *ajam*, birthless Reality, that is the Self. The idea conveyed is that the Self being ever a homogeneous mass of Consciousness, like the sun that is by nature a constant

light, does not depend on any other knowledge (for its revelation).

It has been said that when the mind is divested of ideation by virtue of the realisation of the Truth that is Brahman, and when there is an absence of external objects (of perception), it becomes tranquil, controlled, and withdrawn like fire that has no fuel. And it has further been said that when the mind thus ceases to be the mind, duality also disappears.

निगृहीतस्य मनसो निर्विकल्पस्य धीमतः ।

प्रचारः स तु विज्ञेयः सुषुप्तेऽन्यो न तत्समः ॥३४॥

34. The behaviour that the mind has, when it is under control, free from all ideation, and full of discrimination, should be particularly noted. The behaviour of the mind in deep sleep is different and is not similar to that (of the controlled mind).

Pracārah, the behaviour; that there is; *manasah*, of that mind, *nigṛhītasya*, of that which is (thus) under control; *nirvikalpasya*, of that which is free from ideation of all kinds; *dhīmatah*, of that which is full of discrimination--*sah*, that behaviour; *viññeyah*, is to be particularly noted; by the Yogis.

Objection: In the absence of all kinds of awareness, the mind under control behaves in the same way as the mind in sleep. Hence the absence of awareness being the same, what is there to be particularly noted?

With regard to this the *answer* is: The objection is untenable, since the behaviour of the mind^s *susupte*, in deep sleep; is *anyah*, different; the mind being then

under the cover of the darkness of delusion arising from ignorance, and it being still possessed of the latent tendencies that are the seeds of many evil actions. And the behaviour of the mind under control is surely different, since ignorance, the seed of evil activities, has been burnt away from that mind by the fire of the realisation of the Truth that is the Self, and since from that mind has been removed the blemish of all afflictions. Hence (the sleeping mind's behaviour) *na tatsamaḥ*, is not like that behaviour (in the controlled state). Therefore it is fit to be known. This is the meaning.

The reason for the difference of behaviour is being stated:

लीयते हि सुषुप्ते तन्निगृहीतं न लीयते ।
तदेव निर्भयं ब्रह्म ज्ञानालोकं समन्ततः ॥३५॥

35. For that mind loses itself in sleep, but does not lose itself when under control. That very mind becomes the fearless Brahman, possessed of the light of Consciousness all around.

Hi, since; *suṣupte*,¹ in deep sleep; *tat*, that, the mind together with all its tendencies and impressions that are the seeds of all such mental modes as ignorance (egoism, attachment, etc.); *liyate*, loses itself, attains a seed state of potentiality that is a kind of darkness and non-differentiation; but when that mind is *nigrhātam*, withdrawn, through knowledge arising from discrimination; *na liyate*, it does not lose itself, it does not attain

¹ A different reading is *suṣuptau*.

the seed state of darkness; therefore it is reasonable that the behaviours of the sleeping and controlled minds should be different. *Tat eva*, that very mind; becomes the supreme non-dual *brahma*, Brahman Itself; when (in its absorption in Brahman) it is freed from the dual taint being the subject and the object that are the creations of ignorance. Since this is the case, therefore that very mind becomes *nirbhayam*, fearless; for then there is no perception of duality that causes fear (Br. I. iv. 2). Brahman is that quiescent and fearless entity, by knowing which one has no fear from anywhere (Tai. II. ix). That Brahman is being further distinguished; *Jñāna* means Knowledge, Consciousness, that is the very nature of the Self; and Brahman that has that Knowledge as Its *ālokaḥ*, light (expression), is *jñānālokaḥ*, possessed of the light of Knowledge. The meaning is that It is a homogeneous mass of Consciousness; *samantataḥ*, all around; the idea implied is that, like space, It is all-pervasive without a break.

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमनामकरूपकम् ।

सकृद्विभातं सर्वज्ञं नोपचारः कथञ्चन ॥३६॥

36. Brahman is birthless, sleepless, dreamless, nameless, formless, ever effulgent, everything, and a knower. (With regard to It) there is not the least possibility of ceremony.

Having no cause of birth, Brahman coexists with all that is inside and outside; and It is *ajam*, unborn; for we said that birth is caused by ignorance as in the case

of a snake on a rope; and that ignorance is stopped on the realisation of the truth of the Self according to instruction. As It is birthless, It is *anidram*, sleepless. Sleep is the beginningless *Māyā* characterised by ignorance. Since he (man) has awakened into his own real, non-dual nature that is the Self, therefore he is *asvapnam*, dreamless. And since his name and form are a creation of the state of non-waking, and they are destroyed on waking up like the illusion of a snake on a rope, therefore Brahman cannot be named by any word, nor can It be described as having any form in any way; thus It is also *anūmakam arūpakam*, without name and form, as is stated by the Vedic text, "From which speech turns back" (Tai. II. iv, II. ix). Moreover, It is *sakṛt yibhātam*, ever illumined, constant effulgence by nature, since It is devoid of non-manifestation, consequent on non-perception, and manifestation, contingent on wrong perception (as in the case of an individual¹). Realisation and non-realisation (of Brahman) are as day and night (of the sun²), and the darkness of nescience is ever the cause of non-manifestation. Since this is absent from Brahman, and since Brahman is by nature the light that is eternal Consciousness, it is but reasonable that

¹ In an individual, Brahman is said to be hidden when It is not perceived as "I". And when a false perception arises in the form "I am an agent" etc., Brahman is said to be manifest. When these two ideas are absent, Brahman remains as the self-effulgent Reality.

² True it is that non-realisation precedes and realisation succeeds instruction. But they do not belong to Brahman. The sun is supposed to be subject to day and night, because people fancy the sun to rise and set. But in reality the sun has no night or day. Similarly, Brahman has no realisation or non-realisation.

It should be constantly effulgent. Hence, too, It is *sarvajñam*: *sarva*, all, as well as, *jña*, a knower, by nature. With regard to this Brahman of such characteristics there can be *na upacārah*, no ceremony (practice), as others have, e.g. concentration of mind etc. that are different from the nature of the Self. The idea is this: As Brahman is by nature eternally pure, intelligent, and free, there can be no possibility of anything to be done *katham cana*, in any way whatsoever, after the destruction of ignorance.

The reason is being adduced for establishing namelessness etc. mentioned above:

सर्वाभिलापविगतः सर्वचिन्तासमुत्थितः ।

सुप्रशान्तः सकृज्ज्योतिः समाधिरचलोऽभयः ॥३७॥

37. The Self is free of all sense-organs, and is above all internal organs. It is supremely tranquil, eternal effulgence, divine absorption, immutable, and fearless.

The word *abhilāpah*, derived in the sense of that by which utterance is made, means the organ of speech expressing all kinds of words. That which is *vigatah*, devoid of that, is *sarvābhilāpavigatah*, devoid of the organ of speech. Speech is here used suggestively. So the meaning implied is that It is free of all organs. Similarly, *sarva-cintā-samutthitah*: The word *cintā* derived in the sense of that by which things are thought of, means the intellect; from that *samutthitah*, risen above; that is to say, devoid of the internal organ; for

the Vedic text declares, "Since It is without Prāṇa, without mind, pure, and superior to the high immutable" (Mu. II. i. 2). Being devoid of all objects, It is *supra-śāntaḥ*, absolutely tranquil; *sakṛjyotiḥ*, everlasting light, by virtue of being by nature the Consciousness that is the Self; *samādhiḥ*, divine absorption, being realisable through the insight arising out of the deepest Concentration (*samādhi*). Or It is called *samādhi*, because It is the object of concentration. *Acalaḥ*, immutable; and therefore *abhayaḥ*, fearless, since there is no mutation.

Since Brahman Itself has been described as divine absorption, immutable, and fearless, therefore,

ग्रहो न तत्र नोत्सर्गश्चिन्ता यत्र न विद्यते ।

आत्मसंस्थं तदा ज्ञानमजाति समतां गतम् ॥३८॥

38. There can be no acceptance or rejection where all mentation stops. Then knowledge becomes established in the Self, and is unborn and poised in equality.

Tatra, there, in that Brahman; *vidyate*, there exists; *na grahaḥ*, no acceptance; *na utsargaḥ*, no rejection; for acceptance or rejection is possible where mutability or the possibility of it exists. These two are incompatible here with Brahman, for nothing else exists in It to cause a change, and Brahman Itself is without parts. Therefore there is no acceptance or rejection. This is the idea. *Yatra*, where; *cintā*, thought (mentation) *na vidyate*, does not exist. How can there be acceptance and rejection where no mentation is possible in the

absence of the mind? This is the idea. As soon as there comes the realisation of the Truth that is the Self, *tadā*, then, in the absence of any object (to be known); *jñānam*, knowledge; becomes *ātmasaṁsthā*, established in Self, like the heat of fire in fire. It is then *ajāti*, birthless; *gatam samatām*, poised in equality.

The promise that was made earlier, "Hence I shall speak of Brahman which is free from limitation, is without birth, and is in a state of equipoise" (*Kārikā*, III. 2), and that has been fulfilled with the help of scripture and reasoning, is concluded here by saying, "unborn and poised in equality". Everything else, apart from this realisation of the Self, is within the sphere of misery, as is declared by the Vedic text, "O Gārgī, he, who departs from this world without knowing this Immutable, is miserable" (Bṛ. III. viii. 10). The meaning sought to be conveyed is that by knowing this, one becomes a Brahman (knower of Brahman) and has one's duties fulfilled.

Though the supreme Reality is such, yet

अस्पर्शयोगो वै नाम दुर्दर्शः सर्वयोगिभिः ।

योगिनो बिभ्यति ह्यस्मादभये भयदर्शिनः ॥३९॥

39. The Yoga that is familiarly referred to as without any touch with anything is difficult to be comprehended by anyone of the Yogis. For those Yogis, who apprehend fear where there is no fear, are afraid of it.

Asparśa-yogaḥ nāma, this is familiar as the Yoga without any touch, since it has no relation, indicated

by the word touch, with anything; *vai*, (this is how it is) referred to, well known in all the Upaniṣads. It is *durdarśaḥ*, hard to be seen; *sarvayogibhiḥ*, by all those Yogis, who are devoid of the knowledge imparted in the Upaniṣads. The idea is that it is attainable only through the effort involved in the realisation of the Self in accordance with instruction. *Yoginaḥ*, the Yogis; who are *bhayadarśinaḥ abhaye*, perceivers of fear in this fearless (Brahman), the non-discriminating ones who apprehend the destruction of their personality, which fact becomes the cause of their fear; (they) *asmāt bibhyati*, are afraid of it, thinking this Yoga to be the same as the disintegration of their own individuality, though in fact it is beyond all fear.

But for those to whom the mind and the sense-organs etc., that are imagined like a snake on a rope, have no existence in reality when considered apart from their essence that is Brahman—for those who have become identified with Brahman—comes fearlessness; and for them naturally is accomplished the everlasting peace called emancipation that is not dependent on any other factor, as we declared earlier in “there is not the least possibility of ceremony” (*Kārikā*, III, 36). But for the other Yogis who are still treading the path, who are endowed with inferior or medium outlook and think of the mind as something different from the Self, though associated with It—for those who are not possessed of the realisation of the Self that is the Truth—

मनुसो निग्रहायत्तमभयं सर्वयोगिनाम् ।

दुःखक्षयः प्रबोधश्चाप्यक्षया शान्तिरेव च ॥४०॥

40. For all these Yogis, fearlessness, the removal of misery, knowledge (of the Self), and everlasting peace are dependent on the control of the mind.

Sarvayoginām, for all Yogis; *abhayam*, fearlessness; is *manasaḥ nigrāhāyattam*, contingent on the control of the mind; and so also is *duḥkhakṣayaḥ*, the removal of misery. For there can be no extinction of sorrow for the non-discriminating people so long as the mind, brought into association with the Self, continues to be disturbed. Moreover, (for them) the knowledge of the Self, too, is contingent on the control of the mind. Similarly, *akṣayā śāntiḥ*, the everlasting peace, called liberation, is also certainly dependent on the control of the mind.

उत्सेक उदधेर्यद्वत्कुशाग्रेणैकबिन्दुना ।

मनसो निग्रहस्तद्वद्भवेदपरिखेदतः ॥४१॥

41. Just as an ocean can be emptied with the help of the tip of a blade of Kuśa grass that can hold just a drop, so also can the control of the mind be brought about by absence of depression.

Even the control of the mind comes about *aparikhedataḥ*, from the want of depression; for those Yogis who unrelentingly and without depression persist with a diligence like that involved in trying to empty an ocean; *kuśāgreṇa ekabindunā*, with the help of the

tip of a blade of Kuśa grass that can hold only a drop. This is the idea.

Is diligence alone, that knows no depression, the means for controlling the mind? The answer is being given negatively:

उपायेन निगृह्णीयाद्विक्षिप्तं कामभोगयोः ।

सुप्रसन्नं लये चैव यथा कामो लयस्तथा ॥४२॥

42. With the help of that proper process one should bring under discipline the mind that remains dispersed amidst objects of desire and enjoyment; and one should bring it under control even when it is in full peace in sleep, for sleep is as bad as desire.

Being armed with untiring effort, and taking for aid the means to be stated, *nigrhṇīyāt*, one should bring under discipline, concentrate on the Self Itself; the mind that remains *vikṣiptam*, dispersed; amidst objects of desire and their enjoyment. This is the meaning. Moreover, *laya* means that in which anything gets merged, i.e. sleep. Though the mind be *suprasannam*, very peaceful, i.e. free from effort; *laye*, in that sleep; still "it should be brought under discipline"—this much has to be supplied. Should it be asked, "If it is fully at peace, why should it be disciplined?" the answer is: "Since *layaḥ tathā*, sleep is as much, a source of evil; *yathā kāmah*, as desire is." So the idea implied is this: As the mind engaged in objects of desire is to be controlled, so also is the mind in sleep to be disciplined.

Which is that process? That is being stated:

दुःखं सर्वमनुस्मृत्य कामभोगान्निवर्तयेत् ।

अजं सर्वमनुस्मृत्य जातं नैव तु पश्यति ॥४३॥

43. Constantly remembering that everything is full of misery, one should withdraw the mind from the enjoyment arising out of desire. Remembering ever the fact that the birthless Brahman is everything, one does not surely perceive the born (viz the host of duality).

Anusmṛtya, remembering, the fact that; *sarvam*, everything, all duality that is created by ignorance; is *duḥkham*, full of sorrow; one *nivartayet*, should withdraw, the mind; *kāmabhogāt*, from enjoyment prompted by desire, from the objects of desire; one should withdraw with the help of ideas of renunciation—this is the meaning. *Anusmṛtya*, remembering the fact, from the instruction of scriptures and the teacher, that *ajam*, the birthless, Brahman; is *sarvam*, everything; *na eva tu paśyati*, one does not certainly perceive; the host of duality that is opposed to Brahman; for duality ceases then.

लये संबोधयेच्चित्तं विक्षिप्तं शमयेत्पुनः ।

सकषायं विजानीयात्समप्राप्तं न चालयेत् ॥४४॥

44. One should wake up the mind merged in deep sleep; one should bring the dispersed mind into tranquillity again; one should know when the mind is tinged with desire (and is in

a state of latency). One should not disturb the mind established in equipoise.

Thus with the help of the dual process of renunciation and practice of knowledge, one *sambodhayet*, should wake up, the mind; merged *laye*, in deep sleep; one should engage it in the discriminating perception of the transcendence of the Self. The word *citta* has the same meaning as *manas*, mind. *Śamayet punaḥ*, one should again make tranquil, the mind; that is *vikṣiptam*, dispersed, amidst desire and enjoyment. When the mind of a man, who is practising again and again, is awakened from deep sleep and is withdrawn from objects, but is not established in equipoise and continues in an intermediate state, then *vijūnīyāt*, one should know, that mind; to be *sakasūyam*, tinged with desire, in a state of latency. From that state, too, it should be diligently led to equipoise. But when the mind becomes *samaprāptam*, equipoised, that is to say, when it begins to move toward that goal; *na vicālayet*, one should not disturb it, from that course; or in other words, one should not turn it back toward objects.

नास्वादयेत्सुखं तत्र निःसङ्गः प्रज्ञया भवेत् ।

निश्चलं निश्चरच्चित्तमेकीकुर्यात्प्रयत्नतः ॥४५॥

45. One should not enjoy happiness in that state; but one should become unattached through the use of discrimination. When the mind, established in steadiness, wants to issue out, one should concentrate it with diligence.

The *sukham*, happiness; that a Yogi gets while trying to concentrate his mind, *na āsvādayet*, he should not enjoy; that is to say, he should not get attached *tatra*, there, to that state. How should he behave there? He should become *niḥsaṅgaḥ*, unattached; *prajñayā*, through the discriminating idea. He should think, "Whatever happiness is perceived is a creation of ignorance, and it is false." He should also withdraw his mind from that kind of attraction for joy—this is the purport. When having been withdrawn from the attraction for happiness, and having attained the state of steadiness, the mind becomes *niścaraḥ*, intent on going out; then withdrawing it from those objects with the help of the above-mentioned process, one *ekīkuryāt*, should concentrate it—in the Self Itself; *prayatnataḥ*, with diligence. The idea is that it should be made to attain its true nature of Consciousness alone.

यदा न लीयते चित्तं न च विक्षिप्यते पुनः ।

अनिङ्गनमनाभासं निष्पन्नं ब्रह्म तत्तदा ॥४६॥

46. When the mind does not become lost nor is scattered, when it is motionless and does not appear in the form of objects, then it becomes Brahman.

Yadā, when; the *cittam*, mind; brought under control through the aforesaid process; *na līyate*, does not become lost, in sleep; and also *na ca punaḥ vikṣipyate*, does not, again, become dispersed, amidst objects; and when the mind becomes *anīṅganam*, motionless, like a lamp in a windless place; *anābhāsam*, does not appear

in the form of any object, imagined outside; when the mind assumes such characteristics, then it *niṣpannam brahma*, becomes Brahman; or in other words, the mind then becomes identified with Brahman.

स्वस्थं शान्तं सनिर्वाणमकथ्यं सुखमुत्तमम् ।

अजमजेन ज्ञेयेन सर्वज्ञं परिचक्षते ॥४७॥

47. That highest Bliss is located in one's own Self. It is quiescent, coexistent with liberation, beyond description, and birthless. And since It is identical with the unborn knowable (Brahman), they call It the Omniscient (Brahman).

The above-mentioned Bliss, which is the highest Reality; and which consists in the realisation of the Truth that is the Self, is *svastham*, located in one's own Self; *sāntam*, quiescent, characterised by the absence of all evil, *sanirvāṇam*, coexistent with cessation, i.e. liberation; and it is *akathyam*, indescribable, as it relates to an absolutely unique entity; it is *uttamam sukhām*, the highest happiness, it being unsurpassable and open to the vision of the Yogis alone. It is *ajam*, unborn, unlike objective happiness. And since this happiness, in its true nature of omniscience, is identical *ajena*, with the unborn; *jñeyena*, with the thing to be known; therefore the knowers of Brahman *paricakṣate*, call it; *sarvajñam*, the omniscient one, Brahman Itself.

All such ideas—e.g. the control of the mind and so on, creation resembling the evolution of forms from earth and gold, and meditation—have been spoken of

as means leading to the realisation of the supreme Reality as It is in Itself; but these have not been spoken of as supremely true in themselves. The absolutely highest Truth, however, is:

न कश्चिज्जायते जीवः संभवोऽस्य न विद्यते ।

एतत्तदुत्तमं सत्यं यत्र किञ्चिन्न जायते ॥४८॥

48. No individual being, whichsoever, takes birth. It has no source (of birth). This (Brahman) is that highest Truth where nothing whatsoever takes birth.

Na jīvaḥ kaś cit, no individual being whichsoever; that is a doer or an enjoyer; *jāyate*, is born; by any means whatsoever. Hence for the Self that is naturally unborn and non-dual, *na vidyate*, there does not exist; any *sambhavaḥ*, source, cause (for undergoing birth). Since there does not exist for It any cause, therefore no individual being, whichsoever, undergoes birth. This is the meaning. As compared with the truths mentioned earlier as the means, *etat*, this one; is *uttamam satyam*, the highest Truth; *yatra*, where, in which Brahman, that is Truth by nature; *na kiñcit jāyate*, nothing whatsoever, not even a jot or tittle, is born.

CHAPTER IV

ALĀTAŚĀNTIPRAKARAṆA (ON QUENCHING THE FIRE BRAND)

Non-duality was advanced as a premiss in course of determining the meaning of *Om*; it was proved to be true on the basis of the fact that the differences found in things external are unreal; it was again directly determined with the help of scriptures and reason in the chapter on non-duality; and that non-duality was summed up in the concluding remark, "This is that highest truth" (*Kārikā*, III. 48). The realists and the nihilists are opposed to that unitive outlook that is the import of the scriptures. And it has been hinted that their philosophy is false, since their outlook is affected by such vitiating factors as attachment and aversion arising from mutual opposition. And the philosophy of non-duality is extolled inasmuch as it is not subject to such mental perversion. Now begins the chapter on quenching the fire-brand, in order to show in detail how those are partial philosophies owing to their mutual recrimination, and then, after rejecting them, to sum up by proving the truth of the philosophy of non-duality with the help of the method of difference (consisting in their rejection¹).

¹ Instances of the application of the methods of agreement and difference are: "Whatever is a product is impermanent", and "Whatever is not impermanent is not a product". When both the methods can be applied to a case, all doubts about the truth of

Now while on this subject, this first verse is meant as a salutation to the promulgator of the school of non-duality by identifying him with non-duality itself. For it is desirable to worship one's teacher at the commencement of a scripture so that the result aimed at may be achieved.

ज्ञानेनाकाशकल्पेन धमन्यो गगनोपमान् ।

ज्ञेयाभिन्नेन संबुद्धस्तं वन्दे द्विपदां वरम् ॥१॥

1. I bow down to the One who is the chief among all persons, who has known fully the souls resembling (infinite) sky, through his knowledge that is comparable to space and is non-different from the object of knowledge.

Akāśakalpa is that which is slightly different from space, that is to say, resembling space. So *jñānena ākāśakalpena* means by a knowledge that is comparable to (infinite) space. What purpose is served by it? (He knows) *dharmān*, the souls. Souls of what kind? The souls, that are *gagana-upamān*, comparable to the sky. There is another qualification of that very knowledge: The knowledge that is *jñeyābhinna*, non-different from the objects of knowledge, viz the souls —just as heat is from fire, or light is from the sun. He who *sambuddhaḥ*, has completely realised; *dharmān gaganopamān*, the entities that are comparable to

the general proposition is set at rest. In the present case, non-duality, presented by scripture and proved to be a possibility by logic, is confirmed by showing the hollowness of others.

the sky; *jñeyābhinnena jñānena*, through the knowledge that is non-different from the object of knowledge—that is comparable to space and is non-different from the Self that is to be known. He indeed is the Lord called Nārāyaṇa. *Tam vande*, Him I salute; *dvipadūm varam*, the best among the bipeds, that is to say, the supreme Person among all persons, that are suggested by the word “biped”. Under the garb of this salutation to the teacher, it is suggested that the purpose of this chapter is to establish, through a refutation of the opposite views, the philosophy of the supreme Reality that is devoid of the distinctions of knowledge, knowable, and knower.

Now for extolling the Yoga taught in the philosophy of non-dualism comes a salutation to it:

अस्पर्शयोगो वै नाम सर्वसत्त्वसुखो हितः ।

अविवादोऽविरुद्धश्च देशितस्तं नमाम्यहम् ॥२॥

2. I bow down to that Yoga that is well known as free from relationships, joyful to all beings, beneficial, free from dispute, non-contradictory, and set forth in the scriptures.

Asparśa-yogaḥ is that Yoga, which has no *sparsā*, touch, relationship, with anything at any time; it is of the very nature of Brahman. To the knowers of Brahman it is *vai nāma*, indeed so named; that is to say, it is well known as the Yoga, free from all relationships. And it becomes *sarva-sattva-sukhaḥ*, a bliss to all beings. Some Yoga, as for instance austerity, may itself be sorrowful, though it is distinguished as

a means leading to extreme happiness. But this one is not of that sort. What then? It is joyful to all beings. Similarly, in this world, a particular kind of enjoyment of objects may be joyful but not beneficial. But this one is joyful as well as *hitaḥ* beneficial, since its nature is ever unchanging. Moreover, it is *avivādaḥ*; that in which there is no dispute by embracing two sides, for and against, is *avivādaḥ*, free from dispute. Why? Because it is, in addition, *aviruddhaḥ*, non-contradictory. The Yoga of this kind that has been *deśitaḥ*, instructed, by the scriptures; *tam*, to that; *aham namāmi*, I make my salutation, I bow down.

How the dualists contradict each other is being stated:

भूतस्य जातिमिच्छन्ति वादिनः केचिदेव हि ।
अभूतस्यापरे धीरा विवदन्तः परस्परम् ॥३॥

3. For some disputants indeed postulate the birth of a (pre-) existing thing. Other wise ones, while disputing among themselves, postulate the birth of what does not pre-exist.

Kecit eva vādināḥ, some disputants, viz the *sāmkhyas*; *icchanti*, postulate; *jātim*, the birth; *bhūtasya*, of an existing thing; but not so do all the dualists, for there are *apare*, others, viz the *Vaiśeṣikas* and the *Naiyāyikas*; who are *dhīrāḥ*, wise, that is to say, proud of their wisdom; and who while *vivadantaḥ*, talking contrariwise; postulate the birth *abhūtasya*, of a non-existing thing. The idea is that they want to conquer each other through disputation.

Now is being shown what is virtually asserted by them as they refute each other's point of view by talking contrariwise:

भूतं न जायते किञ्चिदभूतं नैव जायते ।
विवदन्तोऽद्वया ह्येवमर्जातिं ख्यापयन्ति ते ॥४॥

4. A thing that already exists does not pass into birth; and a thing that does not pre-exist cannot pass into birth. These people, while disputing thus, are really non-dualists, and they thus reveal the absence of birth.

“*Kim cit*, anything; that is *bhūtam*, pre-existing; *na jāyate*, does not pass into birth, just because it exists, as it is in the case of the Self”—while speaking thus, the holder of the view that the effect does not exist before its birth,¹ refutes the view of the Sāṃkhya who says that the effect, pre-existing in the cause,² takes birth. Similarly, the Sāṃkhya, too, while speaking thus, “*Abhūtam*, the non-existing; *na eva jāyate*, can never, be born, because of the very fact that it does not exist”—refutes the birth of a non-existing thing as held by those who believe in the non-existence of the effect before production. While *vivadantaḥ*, talking contrariwise; these *advayāḥ*,³ non-dualists—for these really walk into the camp of the non-dualists by refuting each other's view about the birth of the pre-existing or the

¹ The Naiyāyika who would virtually subscribe to the view that something comes out of nothing.

² The effect remaining involved in the cause.

³ Another reading is “*dvayāḥ*, dualists”.

non-pre-existing; *khyāpayanti*, reveal, by implication; the *ajātim*, absence of birth itself.

ख्याप्यमानामजातिं तैरनुमोदामहे वयम् ।

विवदामो न तैः सार्धमविवादं निबोधत ॥५॥

5. We approve the birthlessness that is revealed by them; we do not quarrel with them. (O disciples), understand this (philosophy) that is free from dispute.

By saying "Let this be so", we simply *anumodāmahe*, approve; the *ajātim*, birthlessness; *taiḥ khyāpyamānām*, revealed by them, thus; we *na vivadāmaḥ*, do not quarrel; *taiḥ sārddham*, with them; by taking any side for or against, as they do in regard to each other. This is the idea. Therefore, O disciples, *nibodhata*, understand; that philosophy of the highest Reality that is *avivādam*, beyond dispute, and is approved by us.

अजातस्यैव धर्मस्य जातिमिच्छन्ति वादिनः ।

अजातो ह्यमृतो धर्मो मर्त्यतां कथमेष्यति ॥६॥

6. The talkers verily vouch for the birth of an unborn positive entity. But how can a positive entity that is unborn and immortal undergo mortality ?

Vādinah, the disputants—all of them, whether holding the view of the prior existence or non-existence of the effect. This verse was commented on earlier (*Kārikā*, III. 20).

न भवत्यमृतं मर्त्यं न मर्त्यममृतं तथा ।

प्रकृतेरन्यथाभावो न कथंचिद्भ्रविष्यति ॥७॥

7. The immortal cannot become mortal. Similarly, the mortal cannot become immortal. The mutation of one's nature will take place in no way whatsoever.

स्वभावेनामृतो यस्य धर्मो गच्छति मर्त्यताम् ।

कृतकेनामृतस्तस्य कथं स्थास्यति निश्चलः ॥८॥

8. How can the immortal entity continue to be changeless from the standpoint of one, according to whom, a positive immortal entity can naturally pass into birth, it being a product (according to him) ?

The verses already explained earlier (*Kārikā*, III. 21-22) are quoted here in order to show the confirmation of birthlessness that is revealed through the mutual dispute of other schools of thought.

Inasmuch as one's nature, even in the ordinary sense of the term, does not change, (far less can the supreme nature change itself). It is being shown what that nature is:

सांसिद्धिकी स्वाभाविकी सहजा अकृता च या ।

प्रकृतिः सेति विज्ञेया स्वभावं न जहाति या ॥९॥

9. By the word nature is to be understood that which is permanently acquired, or is intrinsic, instinctive, non-produced, or unchanging in its character.

Sāmsiddhiḥ means complete attainment, and anything resulting from that is *sāmsiddhikī*, as is the nature of the successful Yogis who are endowed with such occult powers as becoming at will subtle like atom and so on. In the case of the Yogis, that nature does not change either in the past or the future; it remains as it is. So also *svābhāvikī*, intrinsic, that which follows from the very nature of things, as for instance, such characteristics as heat or light in the case of fire etc. That nature also does not change according to place or time. Similarly, *sahajā*, instinctive, born with oneself, as for instance, such activities as flying in the sky in the case of birds. Any other behaviour, too, is natural, *yā akṛtā*, that is not produced, by anything else, as for instance the tendency of water to flow down. And anything else, *yā na jahāti svabhāvam*, that does not change its character; *sā*, all that; *vijñeyā*, is to be known, in this world; as *prakṛtiḥ*, nature. The idea sought to be conveyed is this: when the nature of empirical things, that are falsely imagined, does not change itself, what need can there be to point out that the natural immortality of the intrinsically birthless ultimate realities, is not subject to mutation?

What constitutes that nature, whose change is assumed by the disputants? And what is the defect in such an assumption? The answer is this:

जरामरणनिर्मुक्ताः सर्वे धर्माः स्वभावतः ।

जरामरणमिच्छन्तश्च्यवन्ते तन्मनीषया ॥१०॥

10. All souls are intrinsically free from old age and death. But by imagining senility and

death, and being engrossed in that thought, they deviate from their nature.

Jarā-maraṇa-nirmuktāḥ, free from all physical changes, starting with *jarā*, old age, and (ending with) *maraṇa*, death. Who are they? *Sarve dharmāḥ*, all entities, i.e. all the souls. *Svabhāvataḥ*, by nature. Although the souls are intrinsically so, yet *icchantaḥ*, thinking, as though thinking, imagining; *jarāmaraṇam*, old age and death, for the Self, like the imagining of a snake on a rope; they *cyavante*, fall, that is so say, deviate, from their own nature; *tanmanīṣayā*, because of that thought—thought of senility and death, that is to say, because of the defect of being engrossed in that kind of thought.

The Vaiśeṣika points out how the Sāṃkhyas, holding the view of the pre-existence of the effect in the cause, talk illogically:

कारणं यस्य वै कार्यं कारणं तस्य जायते ।

जायमानं कथमजं भिन्नं नित्यं कथं च तत् ॥११॥

11. The cause must undergo birth according to one who holds that the cause itself is the effect. How can a thing be birthless that takes birth, and how can it be eternal when it can be subject to (partial) disintegration ?

The disputant, *yasya*, according to whom; *kāraṇam*, the cause itself. (existing) in the form of materials like earth; is the *kāryam*, the effect, that is to say, evolves into the effect; *tasya*, from his point of view; *kāraṇam*, the cause, e.g. Pradhāna or (Primordial Nature), though

itself unborn; *jāyate*, undergoes birth, as the effects like Mahat and the rest. This is the idea. If Pradhāna is *jāyamānam*, born, as Mahat and the rest; *katham*, how, is it said by them; to be *ajam*, birthless? For it is a contradiction in terms to say that a thing is unborn and yet has birth. Moreover, they say that Pradhāna is eternal, at the same time that it is *bhinnam*, split up (transformed), partially. For a composite thing, a jar for instance, that is subject to partial disintegration, is not seen to be eternal in this world. This is the idea. The meaning sought to be imparted is that it involves a contradiction on their part to say that a thing may be broken up partially and yet be birthless and eternal.

For elucidating the same idea it is said:

कारणाद्यद्यनन्यत्वमतः कार्यमजं यदि ।

जायमानाद्धि वै कार्यात्कारणं ते कथं ध्रुवम् ॥१२॥

12. If (according to you) the effect be non-different from the cause, then on that account the effect, too, is birthless. And if that be so, how can your cause be still eternal, it being non-different from its effect which is subject to birth?

Yadi, if; it is your intention to hold that there is *ananyatvam*, non-difference, of the effect; *kāraṇāt*, from the cause, that is birthless; then from that a thing follows that *kāryam ajam*, the effect is birthless. This is a fresh contradiction in your view that a thing is a product and yet birthless. Besides, there is this additional contradiction. If the effect and the cause are non-different,

katham, how; can *te*, your; *kāraṇam*, cause; that is non-different *kāryāt jāyamānāt*, from the effect that is subject to birth; by yet *dhruvam*, eternal? For one half of a hen cannot be cooked, while the other half is reserved for laying eggs.

Moreover,

अजाद्वै जायते यस्य दृष्टान्तस्तस्य नास्ति वै ।

जाताच्च जायमानस्य न व्यवस्था प्रसज्यते ॥१३॥

13. That disputant has certainly no supporting illustration who holds that the effect is produced out of an unborn cause. If the produced effect is held to be born out of another born thing, that, too, leads to no solution.

That disputant, *yasya*, according to whom; the effect *jūyate*, is produced; *ajāt*, from an unborn thing; *tasya*, for him; *na asti vai dṛṣṭāntaḥ*, there is absolutely no illustration (in support). The idea is that, in the absence of any supporting illustration, it stands proved by implication that nothing is born of the unborn. On the other hand, if it is held *jāyamānasya*, with regard to the produced effect; that it comes *jātāt*, from a born thing; then since the latter must come out of another born thing and the last one, again, from another born thing, *na vyavasthā prasajyate*, there will be no solution at all; or in other words it will lead to an infinite regress.

By the Vedic text, "But when to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self (then what should one know and through what?)" (Bṛ, II. iv. 14), it has been said that from the highest standpoint there

is no duality. Taking its stand on this, the (next) verse says:

हेतोरादिः फलं येषामादिर्हेतुः फलस्य च ।

हेतोः फलस्य चानादिः कथं तैरुपवर्ण्यते ॥१४॥

14. How can beginninglessness be declared for cause and effect by those (disputants) according to whom the effect is the origin of the cause and the cause is the origin of the effect ?

The disputants, *yeṣām*, according to whom; the *phalam*, effect, the aggregate of body and senses; is the *ādiḥ*, source; *hetoḥ*, of the cause, of merit etc.; and similarly, the *hetuḥ*, cause, merit etc.; is the *ādiḥ*, source; *phalasya*, of the effect, of the aggregate of body and senses;— thus while positing a beginning for the cause and the effect by the very assertion that these are mutually the sources and products of each other;¹—*katham taiḥ upavarnyate*, how can it be asserted by these very people; that the cause and effect are beginningless? In other words, this is self-contradictory, for the Self that is eternal and unchanging can neither become the cause nor the effect.

How do they make a contradictory assertion? That is being shown:

हेतोरादिः फलं येषामादिर्हेतुः फलस्य च ।

तथा जन्म भवेत्तेषां पुत्राज्जन्म पितुर्यथा ॥१५॥

15. Just as a father may be born of a son, so also may birth be a possibility according to

¹ Merit and demerit result from embodiment; and embodiment results from merit and demerit.

those (disputants) who admit that the effect is the source of the cause and the cause is the source of the effect.

Those who assert that the cause originates from the effect, which is itself produced by the cause, get involved in a contradiction that is on a par with that implied in *pituh janma putrāt*, the birth of a father from a son.

If it be contended that the contradiction, pointed out above, cannot be reasonably advanced, we say,

संभवे हेतुफलयोरेषितव्यः क्रमस्त्वया ।

युगपत्संभवे यस्मादसंबन्धो विषाणवत् ॥१६॥

16. If there be a possibility of cause and effect, you should have to find out a sequence. For should they originate together, there can be no causal relation as between the two horns of a cow.

Sambhave, if there be a possibility; *hetu-phalayoḥ*, of cause and effect; then *trayā*, by you; *eṣitavyaḥ*, has to be found out; a *kramaḥ*, sequence, with regard to origination—viz that the cause precedes and the effect succeeds. This is necessary for this further reason: *yasmāt*, since; *yugapat sambhave*, should there be a simultaneous origin, of the cause and effect; there will be *asambandhaḥ*, want of relationship, through causality, as in the case of the two horns of a cow growing together on the right and the left.

How are they unrelated? That is being stated:

फलाद्दृत्पद्यमानः सन्न ते हेतुः प्रसिध्यति ।

अप्रसिद्धः कथं हेतुः फलमुत्पादयिष्यति ॥१७॥

17. If your cause has to come out of an effect, it can have no right to recognition. How will a cause, that is not established as such, produce a result?

Utpādyamānaḥ san, if it has to originate; *phalāt*, from an effect, that is still to be born, that is itself yet without any existence;—having been born from an effect that is non-existent like the horn of a hare; *hetuḥ*, the cause; *na prasidhyati*, has no right to recognition; does not have any birth. *Katham*, how; your *hetuḥ*, cause; that is yet to be endowed with substance, and *aprasiddhaḥ*, is not established as such, like the horn of a hare; *utpādayiṣyati phalam*, will produce a result? For it is not seen anywhere that two things that depend for existence on each other, and are analogous to the horns of a hare, are connected causally or in any other way. This is the idea.

यदि हेतोः फलात्सिद्धिः फलसिद्धिश्च हेतुतः ।

कतरत् पूर्वनिष्पन्नं यस्य सिद्धिरपेक्षया ॥१८॥

18. If the subsistence of the cause is dependent on the effect, and the subsistence of the effect is dependent on the cause, then which of the two has existence earlier, with relation to which the other may emerge?

If, even after the dismissal of any causal relation between the (so-called) cause and the (so-called) effect by pointing out the defect that they cannot be inter-related, it is contended by you that the cause and the effect subsist by mutual interdependence, then tell me

which one among the cause and the effect pre-exists, depending on which the succeeding one may emerge into being. This is the idea.

अशक्तिरपरिज्ञानं क्रमकोपोऽथवा पुनः ।

एवं हि सर्वथा बुद्धैरजातिः परिदीपिता ॥१९॥

19. Your inability to answer this will amount to your ignorance, or there will be a falsification of the sequence (asserted by you). Thus indeed is highlighted in every way the absence of birth by the learned ones.

If you think that you have no answer, then this *aśaktiḥ*, inability, of yours; will amount to the fallacy of *aparijñānam*, want of knowledge of reality, i.e. ignorance; *atha vā*, or there will be; *kramakopah*—*kopa*, reversal, falsification, of the *krama*, sequence, spoken of by you, consisting in mutual succession in the sense that the effect derives its subsistence from the cause, and the cause derives its subsistence from the effect. This is the meaning. *Evam*, thus, from the fact that any causal relation between the cause and the effect cannot be substantiated; *ajātiḥ*, the absence of birth, the non-emergence of everything; *paridīpitā*, has been highlighted; *buddhaiḥ*, by the learned people, the disputants who speak of the defects of each other's point of view.

Objection: We spoke of the causal relation existing between the cause and the effect, whereas you resorted to a mere quibble that it is like the birth of a son from a father; that there is no such connection between the two like the two horns of a cow, and so on. Not that

we asserted the production of an effect from a cause that did not exist or the derivation of a cause from a non-existing effect. What did we say then? It was admitted by us that causality is the kind of relation existing between the seed and the sprout.

With regard to this the *answer* is:

बीजाङ्कुराख्यो दृष्टान्तः सदा साध्यसमो हि सः ।
न हि साध्यसमो हेतुः सिद्धौ साध्यस्य युज्यते ॥२०॥

20. What is known as the illustration of the seed and the sprout is ever on an equal footing with the (unproved) major term. For an illustration that is as unproved as the major term is not applied for establishing the relation of the major term with the minor term.

(This is but begging the question, because the supporting) *dr̥ṣṭāntah*, illustration; that is *bijāṅkurākhyah*, known as that of the seed and the sprout; is *sādhyasamah*, on an equal footing with my major term (that has still to be proved), This is the idea.

Objection: Is it not a matter of experience that the causal relation between the seed and the sprout is without a beginning?

Answer: Not so, for it is admitted that the earlier ones have their beginning like the succeeding ones. Just as a new sprout born now out of a separate seed has a beginning and another seed born out of a separate sprout has also a beginning by the very fact of succession in birth, similarly the antecedent sprouts as well as the antecedent seeds must have a beginning. And thus since each one of the whole chain of seeds and sprouts

has a beginning, it is illogical to assert eternity for any one of them. So also is the case with regard to causes and effects. If now it is argued that the chain of causes and effects is without a beginning, we say, no; for any unity of such a series cannot be upheld. For apart from the causes and effects, even those who talk of the beginninglessness of such a series do not certainly vouch for a unitary entity called either a chain of seeds and sprouts or a procession of causes and effects. Therefore it has been well said, "How can beginninglessness be declared by them for cause and effect?" (*Kārikā*, IV. 14). Thus since your view involves an illogicality from a fresh point of view, we are not really avoiding the point at issue. This is the idea. Moreover, *hetuḥ*, an illustration; that is *sādhyasamaḥ*, as unproved as the major term; is not applied by those who are adepts in the use of the valid means of proof (i.e. inference); *sādhyasiddhau*, in the matter of establishing a relation between the major term and the minor term (in a syllogism). This is the meaning. The "illustration" is to be understood here by the term *hetuḥ* (lit. middle term), for an illustration substantiates the ground of inference, and the illustration is under discussion and not the middle term.

It is being shown how birthlessness is highlighted by the wise:

पूर्वापरापरिज्ञानमजातेः परिदीपकम् ।

जायमानाद्धि वै धर्मात् कथं पूर्वं न गृह्यते ॥२१॥

21. The ignorance of the precedence and succession is a pointer to beginninglessness it-

self. For if it be a fact that a thing takes birth, why is not its cause apprehended ?

And the fact that there is *pūrvāparīparijñānam*, ignorance of the precedence and succession, of the cause and the effect; is *paridīpakam*, a pointer; *ajñateḥ*, to birthlessness. If an entity takes birth, *katham*, why; its *pūrvam*, antecedent cause; *na grhyate*, is not grasped? By one who perceives a thing undergoing birth must also be perceived, as a matter of necessity, the originator of that thing; for the begetter and the begotten are inevitably inter-related. Therefore that is a pointer to birthlessness.

स्वतो वा परतो वाऽपि न किञ्चिद्वस्तु जायते ।

सदसत् सदसद्वाऽपि न किञ्चिद्वस्तु जायते ॥२२॥

22. A thing, whatsoever it may be, is born neither of itself, nor of something else, (nor of both together). Nothing whatsoever is born that (already) exists, does not exist, or both exists and does not exist.

For this further reason nothing whatsoever takes birth, since a thing that (supposedly) undergoes birth, *na jāyate*, is not born; *svataḥ*, of itself; *parataḥ*, of another; *vā*, or, of both. Nothing takes birth that is *sat*, existing; *asat*, non-existing; or *sat-asat*, existing and non-existing. There is no possibility of birth for it in any way. To illustrate: As a jar does not come out of that very jar, so nothing, that has not itself come into existence, can be born *svataḥ*, out of its own form by itself. Nor does it take birth *parataḥ*, from another, as

something different from that another, just as a cloth is not born of a pot or a cloth from another cloth. Similarly a thing is not born both out of itself and another, just as a jar or a cloth is not born out of a jar and a cloth, for this involves a contradiction.

Objection: Is not a jar produced from earth and a son born of a father?

Answer: True, the ignorant have such notions and use such words as "It exists", "It takes birth." Those very words and notions are examined by the discriminating people as to whether they are true or false, inasmuch as things called a jar, a son, and so on, which are contents of words and notions, are found on examination to be reduced to mere words, as is declared in the Vedic text, "(All modifications are but names) dependent on speech" (Ch. VI. i. 4). If a thing already exists, then just because it exists, it does not pass into birth like earth or a father. If a thing does not exist, then by the very fact of non-existence it does not undergo birth like the horn of a hare etc. If it is both existent and non-existent, then also it does not take birth, as it is impossible to have a thing that is self-contradictory. Hence it is established that nothing whatsoever is born. As for those (Buddhists) who assert that a product is nothing more than the mere act of birth, and by whom it is held accordingly that actions, accessories, and results are but the same identical entity and that things are momentary, they are far out of the reaches of reasonableness, because (according to this theory) a thing cannot be apprehended as "This is 'so'", since it ceases to exist for a second moment immediately after being perceived, and because

memory of a thing perceived earlier becomes impossible.¹

Besides, by asserting that the cause and the effect are without beginning, you admit perforce that the cause and effect are without birth. If you ask, "What do you mean?" the answer is:

हेतुर्न जायतेऽनादेः फलं चापि स्वभावतः ।

आदिर्न विद्यते यस्य तस्य ह्यादिर्न विद्यते ॥२३॥

23. A cause is not born of a beginningless effect; nor does an effect naturally come out (of a beginningless cause). (Cause and effect are thus birthless): for a thing that has no cause, has certainly no birth.

Anādeḥ, from the beginningless, effect; *hetuḥ na jāyate*, the cause is not born. For you do not certainly mean that from a beginningless effect, that is not born, the cause derives its birth. Nor do you mean that the *phalam*, effect; also gets its birth *svabhāvataḥ*, naturally, without any reason; *anādeḥ*, from an unborn cause that is beginningless. Accordingly, you virtually admit the birthlessness of cause and effect by asserting that they have no beginning. *Hi*, for; *yasya*, anything for which; *ādiḥ*, a cause; *na vidyate*, does not exist, in this world; *tasya*, for that thing; *na vidyate*, cannot exist; *ādiḥ*, the birth, mentioned earlier; for birth is admitted for a thing that has a cause and not for a causeless one.

¹ There is no possibility for either recognition or^o memory unless the idea of identity lasts for some moments.

An *objection* is being raised again in order to emphasise what has already been said:

प्रज्ञप्तेः सनिमित्तत्वमन्यथा द्वयनाशतः ।

संकलेशस्योपलब्धेश्च परतन्त्रास्तिता मता ॥२४॥

24. (We have to admit) that knowledge has its objects, since a contrary supposition leads to an annihilation of duality. And the existence of objects, as supported by the opposite systems of thought, is also admitted from the fact of the experience of pain.

Prajñapti means knowledge, perception of sound etc. That knowledge is possessed of a *nimitta*, cause, i.e. object. So *sanimittatvam* means the fact that it has an object—it has objective reference apart from its own subjective existence. This is what we admit. Perception of sound and the rest cannot be contentless, for it is related to objects. *Anyathā*, otherwise (in the absence of objects); there would result a void, *dvayanāśataḥ*, as a consequence of the annihilation of duality, consisting in a variety of experience of sound, touch, blueness, yellowness, redness, etc. This is the meaning. Nor can it be said that duality, consisting in a variety of experiences, does not exist, for this is a matter of direct perception. Accordingly, from the fact that duality is perceived, *paratantrāstitā*, existence as held by the scriptures of other schools, that is to say, existence of external objects, apart from their knowledge, as held by the books of opposite schools; *matā*, is admitted. For the nature of knowledge being essentially that of mere

illumination, it cannot have any variety amounting to a mere natural diversification within itself unless there is that variety in the corresponding objects, e.g. blueness, yellowness, etc., just as a crystal can have no variety unless it comes into relation with such limiting adjuncts as blueness etc. This is the idea. The external objects, as held by the opposite systems, have existence because of the further reason of *samkleśa*, (lit. suffering, which is the same as *samkleśana*, causing of suffering; so it means) pain. Pain arising from a burn etc. is a matter of experience. If, apart from knowledge, there were nothing externally present to cause a burn for instance, pain would not have been experienced. But, as a matter of fact, it is experienced. Therefore, from this fact, it is admitted that there is an external object. For there can be no pain in knowledge as such, since this is not the case elsewhere.¹

As to this the *reply* (of the subjectivist) is:

प्रज्ञप्तेः सनिमित्तत्वमिष्यते युक्तिदर्शनात् ।

निमित्तस्यानिमित्तत्वमिष्यते भूतदर्शनात् ॥२५॥

25. In accord with the perception of its cause, knowledge is supposed to be based on external objects. But from the standpoint of reality, it is held that the external cause is no cause.

It is true that *yuktidarśanāt*, in compliance with the perception of its cause, as for instance, the experience

¹e.g. where the body is not in actual contact with fire.

of duality and pain; *iṣyate*, it is posited, by you; that *sanimittatvam prajñāpteh*, there is an external object for knowledge. Now hold fast to your position that external objects are the basis of experience, since it is seen to have a cause.

Opponent: Tell me what follows from that.

The *answer* is: By us *iṣyate*, it is held; that *nimittasya animittatvam*, the cause—a jar or anything else that is assumed to be the basis of experience—is no cause at all; it is not the basis, the cause, of variety.

Objection: Why?

Answer: *Bhūtadarśanāt*, from the standpoint of reality, that is to say, of the ultimate Reality. For unlike the existence of a buffalo independently of a horse, a jar does not exist apart from clay after being recognised as clay that it really is, nor does a cloth exist apart from the yarns, nor the yarns apart from the fibres. Thus if the reality is pursued successively till words and notions cease, we do not perceive any external occasion for knowledge. This is the meaning.

Or the phrase may be *abhūtadarśanāt* (and not *bhūtadarśanāt*) in which case the meaning is: *Abhūtadarśanāt*, on account of finding the external object to be unreal; *animittatvam iṣyate*, it is not admitted to be the cause (of knowledge), just as a snake seen on a rope is not. Besides, the cause is not a cause, since it is the content of an erroneous perception; and as such, it ceases to be so when the error is removed. For to the people in deep sleep, divine absorption (*samādhi*), or liberation, where there is no erroneous perception, there can be no knowledge of any external object, except (the conscious-

ness of) the Self. Nor is a thing perceived by a madman perceived to be such by others who are in their senses. Hereby is demolished the arguments based on perception of duality and experience of pain.

चित्तं न संस्पृशत्यर्थं नार्थाभासं तथैव च ।

अभूतो हि यतश्चार्थो नार्थाभासस्ततः पृथक् ॥२६॥

26. Consciousness has no contact with objects; so also it has certainly no contact with appearances of objects. For according to the reasons adduced, an object has no existence, and an illusory object is not separate from the awareness.¹

As there is no external object, therefore the *cittam*, consciousness; *na spr̥śati*, does not come in contact with; *artham*, object, anything acting externally as a support; nor does it come in contact with *arthābhāsam*, any appearance of object, for it is as much a form of consciousness as a dream; *hi*, for; *yataḥ*, in accordance with the above reasoning, *arthah*, an object; is *abhūtaḥ*, non-existent, even in the waking state, just as a dream object is. *Na*, nor is; *arthābhāsaḥ*, an illusory object; *pr̥thak*, different, from the consciousness; it is con-

¹ We are dealing here with the Buddhist view. A.G. explains *citta* as *sphurana*, self-emanation, shining. The act of knowing implies an object to be known, but consciousness, thought of as shining like the sun, needs no object. Besides, the sun and its shining are the same, though in common parlance a distinction is made between them.

consciousness alone that appears as objects like the jar etc. as it does in a dream.

Objection: In that case, the appearance of consciousness, in the form of a jar for instance even when there is no jar etc., must be a false perception. And if this be the conclusion, you should point out the (corresponding) right knowledge somewhere (to make this error possible).

With regard to this, the *answer* (of the subjectivist) is:

निमित्तं न सदा चित्तं संस्पृश्यध्वसु त्रिषु ।
अनिमित्तो विपर्यासः कथं तस्य भविष्यति ॥२७॥

27. Consciousness does not ever come in contact with external objects in all the three states. There being no external objects how can there be any baseless false apprehension of it ?

Cittam, consciousness; *na sadā samśprśati*, does not ever touch; any *nimittam*, cause, external object; *triṣu adhvasu*, in all the three states (of past, present, and future). Should it come in contact with any object at any time, that will be the non-erroneous absolute reality, and in relation to that true perception, the illusive perception of a jar, where there is no jar, will be a false perception. But there is no contact of consciousness with any object at any time. Therefore *katham*, how; *bhaviṣyati*, will there be; *tasya*, for that consciousness; *viparyāsaḥ animittalḥ*, any false apprehension that has no object to support it? The idea implied is that there is no such thing as false knowledge at all. Rather it is

the nature of consciousness that even in the absence of jar etc. it appears like those things.¹

The text starting with, "In compliance with the perception of its cause, knowledge" (IV. 25) and ending with the previous verse, which represents the view of the subjective idealists among the Buddhists, is approved by the teacher (Gauḍapāda) in so far as it refutes the view of those who believe in external objects. Now he makes use of that very argument (of the idealists) as a ground of inference for demolishing their own points of view:

तस्मान्न जायते चित्तं चित्तदृश्यं न जायते ॥

तस्य पश्यन्ति ये जातिं खे वै पश्यन्ति ते पदम् ॥२८॥

28. Hence consciousness has no birth, and things perceived by it do not pass into birth. Those who perceive the birth of that consciousness, may as well see footmarks in space itself.

Since from the standpoint of reality, we also approve the view of the subjective idealists that consciousness appears as a jar even though there is no such jar etc., therefore it also stands to reason that consciousness appears to be born even though there is no such thing as birth. And therefore the *cittam*, consciousness; *na*

¹ Those who in a case of illusion, hold the theory of *anyathā-khyāti*, appearance of a real thing in a wrong way, believe that an illusion pre-supposes a true perception somewhere. But the subjectivists say that an error does not imply an earlier true knowledge, for an illusion and the objects in an illusion are all appearance of consciousness.

jāyate, does not pass into birth; just as much as *citta-dṛśyam na jāyate*, the things perceived by consciousness have no birth. Therefore *ye*, those, the idealists, who; *paśyanti*, perceive; the *jātim*, birth; *tasya*, of that consciousness, along with its momentariness, sorrowfulness, voidness, non-selfhood, etc.—thereby presuming to perceive through that very consciousness the nature of consciousness that defies all perception—*te*, they, those idealists; *paśyanti*, see; *padam*, the footprint, of birds etc.; *khe vai*, in space itself. That is to say, they are bolder even than the other dualists. As for the nihilists, who, while perceiving the non-existence of everything, assert thereby the voidness of their own philosophy, they are even bolder than the idealist,¹ inasmuch as they want to have the sky itself in their grasp.

Through the above reasons it is established that Brahman is one and has no birth. Now the present verse is meant for summing up, in the form of a result (of the discussion), what was presented in the beginning as a proposition:

अजातं जायते यस्मादजातिः प्रकृतिस्ततः ।

प्रकृतेरन्यथाभावो न कथंचिद्भविष्यति ॥२९॥

29. It is the birthless that (according to the disputants) takes birth. Since birthlessness is

¹ It is through perception that the all-round voidness is proved. But how will perception itself be annulled? Not that perception can annihilate itself, for the simple reason that perception and its negation cannot coexist. Besides, if you talk of absolute nihilism, you affirm the non-existence of your own view as well.

its very nature, therefore the transmutation of (this) nature can take place in no way whatsoever.

It is imagined by the disputants that the unborn consciousness, which is nothing but Brahman, takes birth; therefore it is the *ajātam*, unborn; that *jāyate*, takes birth. *Yasmāt*, since, *ajātiḥ*, birthlessness; is its very *prakṛtiḥ*, nature; *tataḥ*, therefore; *anyathābhāvaḥ*, transmutation, birth; *prakṛteḥ*, of that nature, which is essentially unborn; *na katham cit bhaviṣyati*, will not take place in any way.

Here is another loophole discovered in the view of those who hold that the soul has the worldly state (i.e. bondage) and liberation in any real sense:

अनादेरन्तवत्त्वं च संसारस्य न सेत्स्यति ।

अनन्तता चादिमतो मोक्षस्य न भविष्यति ॥३०॥

30. Moreover, if the world be beginningless, its termination will not be achieved. And there will be no eternality for liberation that has a beginning.

Saṁsārasya anādeḥ, of the world (i.e. bondage) that has no beginning, no definite non-existence in the past; *antavattvam*, termination; *na setsyati*, will not be achieved, with the help of reasoning; for, in common experience, nothing is seen to have an end that has no beginning.

Objection: It is seen that the continuity of the serial relation between the seed and the sprout breaks (though it has no beginning).

Answer: Not so, for this was refuted by pointing out that a series does not constitute a single substance (*Kārikā*, IV. 20).

Similarly, *na bhaviṣyati*, there will be no; *anantatā*, everlastingness; even *mokṣasya*, of liberation, that has a beginning, that originates at the time of the acquisition of illumination; for such is not the case with jars etc.

Objection: Since like non-existence brought about by the destruction of a jar etc., liberation, too, is not a substance, therefore our point of view is free from defect.¹

Answer: On that assumption² your proposition that liberation has existence from the standpoint of ultimate Reality will fall through. Besides, it will have no beginning just because it will be non-existent like the horn of a hare.

आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ।

वितथैः सदृशाः सन्तोऽवितथा इव लक्षिताः ॥३१॥

31. That which does not exist in the beginning and the end is equally so in the middle. Though they are similar to the unreal, yet they are seen as though real.

सप्रयोजनता तेषां स्वप्ने विप्रतिपद्यते ।

तस्मादाद्यन्तवत्त्वेन मिथ्यैव खलु ते स्मृताः ॥३२॥

¹ Non-existence brought about by destruction has a beginning but no end, and non-existence is not a substance just as much as liberation is not.

² If liberation is non-existent.

32. Their utility is contradicted in dream. Therefore from the fact of their having a beginning and an end, they are rightly held to be unreal.

These two verses, that were explained in the chapter 'On Unreality' (*Kārikā*, II. 6-7), are quoted here in connection with the non-existence of bondage and liberation.

सर्वे धर्मा मृषा स्वप्ने कायस्यान्तर्निदर्शनात् ।
संवृतेऽस्मिन् प्रदेशे वै भूतानां दर्शनं कुतः ॥३३॥

33. All entities are unreal in dream, since they are seen within the body. How can there be the vision of creatures within this narrow space here ?¹

The topic raised in "But from the standpoint of reality it is held that the external cause is no cause" (*Kārikā*, IV. 25), is being elaborated by these verses.

न युक्तं दर्शनं गत्वा कालस्यानियमाद्गतौ ।
प्रतिबुद्धश्च वै सर्वस्तस्मिन् देशे न विद्यते ॥३४॥

¹ In this way the verse indirectly aims at proving the falsity of all. If falsity in dream follows from the fact that things are seen inside the body, then all things even in the waking state must be false, since they are seen within the body of Virāṭ. And if falsity of dream objects follows from the fact of their being seen within a place that is not adequate for them, then things of the waking state must be false since they, though naturally associated with space and time, are still seen in Brahman that has no space and time.—A.G.

34. It is not proper to hold that dream objects are experienced by reaching them, since the requisite time involved in the journey is lacking. Moreover, nobody, when awake, continues in the place of dream.

The idea implied is that there is no going over to any other place in dream, for the time required for and the distance involved in coming and going, as validly settled in the waking state, *aniyamāt*, have no corresponding fixity, in the dream state.

मित्राद्यैः सह संमन्त्र्य संबुद्धो न प्रपद्यते ।

गृहीतं चापि यत्किञ्चित्प्रतिबुद्धो न पश्यति ॥३५॥

35. Having conferred with friends and others (in dream) one does not get confirmation when awake. And whatever one acquired in dream, one does not see it after waking up.

Sammantrya, having deliberated; *mitrādyaish saha*, with friends and others (in dream); one *na prapadyate*, does not get confirmation, of that very deliberation when *pratibuddhaḥ*, up from dream. And *yat kim cit*, whatever, gold etc., *grhītam*, was acquired; he does not get after waking.¹ For this reason, too, one does not go to a different place in dream.

¹ An alternative meaning is: To the man of illumination (*pratibuddhaḥ*) there is no consciousness of anything except Brahman. So what may appear to others as his eating, drinking, etc., does not appear to himself to be so, for he thinks, "I do not do anything" (G. V. 8).—A.G.

स्वप्ने चावस्तुकः कायः पृथगन्यस्य दर्शनात् ।

यथा कायस्तथा सर्वं चित्तदृश्यमवस्तुकम् ॥३६॥

36. Moreover, the body in a dream is unsubstantial, since another body is seen (to exist). As it is the case with the body, so is everything perceived through consciousness and is (therefore) unsubstantial.

And the *kāyah*, body; that is seen *svapne*, in dream; to be walking about; is *avastukah*, unsubstantial; *anyasya pṛthak darśanāt*, since another (sleeping) body, as distinguished from the one in the state of dream, is seen separately. As the body seen in dream is unreal, so all things seen through the mind even in the waking state are unreal, for they are all equally perceived through consciousness. The significance of the topic under discussion is that the waking state also is unreal, since it is similar to the dream state.

Things are unreal because of this further reason:

ग्रहणाज्जागरितवत्तद्वेतुः स्वप्न इष्यते ।

तद्वेतुत्वात् तस्यैव सज्जागरितमिष्यते ॥३७॥

37. Since a dream is experienced like the waking state, the former is held to be the result of the latter. In reality, however, the waking state is admitted to be true for that dreamer alone, it being the cause of his dream.

Grahaṇāt, since dream is experienced; *jāgaritavat*, like the waking state, as characterised by the subject-object relationship; therefore dream *iṣyate*, is held;

taddhetuh, as having that waking state as its source; that is to say, dream is a product of the waking state. *Taddhetutvāt*, since dream has that waking state as its cause; that *jāgaritam*, waking state; is *sat*, true; *tasya eva*, for that dreamer alone; but not so for the others, just like the dream itself. This is the implication. As a dream is true to a dreamer alone, so far as it appears like objects of common experience having existence, similarly the waking things that appear like existing objects of common experience are true to the dreamer alone as conceived of by him to be the cause of his dream. In reality, however, just like dream objects, the things of the waking state, too, are not objects of common experience to all, nor have they existence. This is the purport.

Objection: Even though the objects of the waking state be the prototypes of those of the dream state, they are not unsubstantial like dream; for dream is extremely changeful, whereas the waking state is seen to be steady.

Answer: This is truly so to the non-discriminating people, but to the men of discrimination nothing whatsoever is known to have origination. Therefore—

उत्पादस्याप्रसिद्धत्वादजं सर्वमुदाहृतम् ।

न च भूतादभूतस्य संभवोऽस्ति कथंचन ॥३८॥

38. Since origination is not a well-established fact, it is declared (by the Upaniṣads) that everything is birthless. Moreover, there is no origination, in any way whatsoever, of any non-existing thing from an existing one.

Utpādasya aprasiddhatvāt, as origination is not a well-established fact; so in the text, “co-extensive with everything within and without and birthless” (Mu. II. i. 2), it has been *udāhṛtam*, declared, by the Upaniṣad in effect that; *sarvam ajam*, everything is birthless; or in other words, the (birthless) Self is everything. And your further conjecture that the unreal dream originates from the real waking state is also untenable. For in this world *na asti sambhavaḥ abhūtasya*, there is no origination of a nonentity; *bhūtāt*, from a real thing; for a nonentity, like the horn of a hare, is not seen to originate in any way whatsoever.

Objection: Has it not been said by yourself that dream is a product of the waking state? So how is it said that origination is not a well-recognised fact?

Answer: As to that, listen to what we mean by the causal relation (between them):

असज्जागरिते दृष्ट्वा स्वप्ने पश्यति तन्मयः ।

असत्स्वप्नेऽपि दृष्ट्वा च प्रतिबुद्धो न पश्यति ॥३९॥

39. Having seen some unreal thing in the waking state and being emotionally affected, one sees it in dream also. And having even seen some unreal thing in dream, one does not see it in the waking state.

Dr̥ṣṭvā, having seen; *jāgarite*, in the waking state; *asat*, an unreal, illusory thing, like a snake imagined on a rope; and becoming *tanmayah*, emotionally affected by its thoughts; one *paśyati*, sees; *svapne*, in dream, also; by imagining the duality of subject and object as

in the waking state. Similarly, unless one resorts to imagination, one, *dr̥stvā*, after having seen; *asat*, an unreal thing; *svapne api*, even in dream; *na paśyati*, does not see (it); *pratibuddhaḥ*, when he is awake. From the use of the word “*ca*, and”, it follows that, in a similar way, one does not sometimes see in dream something that one had seen in the waking state. In this sense the waking state is said to be the cause of dream, but thereby it is not implied that the former is real.

In reality, however it cannot be established that anything has any causal relationship in any way whatsoever. How?

नास्त्यसद्वेतुकमसत्सदसद्वेतुकं तथा ।

सच्च सद्वेतुकं नास्ति सद्वेतुकमसत्कुतः ॥४०॥

40. There is no unreal thing that has an unreality as its cause, similarly there is no unreal thing that has a reality as its cause. Moreover, there is no existing thing that has another existing thing as its cause. How can there be an unreal thing that is produced out of something real ?

Na asti asat, there is no unreal thing; *asaddhetukam*; that has an unreal thing for its cause—e.g. an unreal thing like a castle in the air that has an unreal thing like a hare’s horn as its cause. Similarly, *na asti sat*, there is no such existing entity; a jar for instance; that is *asaddhetukam*, the product of an unreality—a hare’s horn for instance. *Tathā*, so also; *na asti sat*, there is

no existing thing, a pot for instance, that is a product of another existing thing; a jar for instance. How can there be any possibility of an unreality being produced out of a reality? Besides, there is no other kind of causal relationship possible or imaginable. So the idea implied is that, to the discriminating people, causal relationship of anything whatsoever is really an un-established fact.

Again it is said by way of removing any surmise about the causal relationship between the unreal waking and dream states:

विपर्यासाद्यथा जाग्रदचिन्त्यान् भूतवत् स्पृशेत् ।
तथा स्वप्ने विपर्यासाद्धर्मास्तत्रैव पश्यति ॥४१॥

41. As some one, owing to lack of discrimination, may, in the waking state, be in contact with unthinkable objects, fancying them to be real, so also in dream, one sees the objects in that dream alone, owing to want of discrimination.

Yathā, as; some one; *viparyāsāt*, owing to want of discrimination; may imagine *jāgrat*, in the waking state; as though one is in touch with *acintyān*, unthinkable, objects, like a snake etc. imagined on a rope etc.; *bhūtavat*, as if they were real; *tathā*, so also; *svapne*, in dream; *viparyāsāt*, owing to want of discrimination; he fancies as though visualising *dharmān*, objects, like elephants etc. that is to say, he sees them there in the dream alone, and not as the products of the waking state.

उपलम्भात्समाचारादस्तिवस्तुत्ववादिनाम् ।

जातिस्तु देशिता बुद्धैरजातेस्त्रसतां सदा ॥४२॥

42. Instruction about creation has been imparted by the wise for the sake of those who, from the facts of experience and adequate behaviour,¹ vouch for the existence of substantiality, and who are ever afraid of the birthless entity.

For those who *upalambhāt*, because of perception; and *samācūrāt*, adequate behaviour, e.g. proper observance of duties pertaining to castes and stages of life—for those who, because of these two reasons, *astivastutva-vādinām*, resort to the declaration of existence of substantiality—for the sake of those who are earnest in their effort, who are faithful, but who are possessed of an inferior kind of discrimination; that *jātiḥ*, birth (creation); *deśitā*, has been inculcated; *buddhaiḥ*, by the wise, by the non-dualists. That creation has been preached as a means to an end (for generating firm discrimination) under the idea: “Let them accept it for the time being. But in the course of practising Vedānta, the discriminating knowledge about the birthless and non-dual Self will arise in them spontaneously.” But they have not done so from the standpoint of ultimate truth. And this is so because those non-discriminating people (for whom such instruction is meant) are devoted to Vedic conduct, while, owing to their dull intellect, they are *sadā*, ever; afraid; *ajāteḥ*, of the birthless entity; apprehending that this will lead to their annihilation.

¹ Proper response to human situations.

This is the idea. It was said earlier, "that is merely by way of generating the idea (of oneness)" (*Kārikā*, III. 15).

अजातेस्त्रसतां तेषामुपलम्भाद्वियन्ति ये ।

जातिदोषा न सेत्स्यन्ति दोषोऽप्यल्पो भविष्यति ॥४३॥

43. For those who, being afraid of the Unborn, deviate from the true path by relying on their experience of duality, the faults arising from acceptance of creation will not bear fruit; and the fault, too, will be insignificant.

And *ye*, those, who thus; *upalambhāt*, relying on perception, as well as adequate behaviour; *ajāteḥ trasatām*, being afraid of the unborn entity (i.e. the Self); and declaring that duality exists, *viyanti*, deviate, from the non-dual Self, that is to say, they accept duality—in the case of those people who are afraid of the Unborn, but are faithful, and tread the righteous path, *jātidoṣāḥ*, the faults arising from the perception of origination; *na setsyanti*, will not attain fruition, for they are treading on the path of discrimination. *Doṣāḥ api*, should there be any *doṣaḥ*, defect that is calculated to debar their complete enlightenment; that *api*, even; *alpaḥ bhaviṣyati*, will be insignificant.

Objection: As perception and adequate behaviour are valid proofs, things comprised in duality do exist.

Answer: Not so, for perception and adequate behaviour are not universally true. How they are not so is being shown:

उपलम्भात्समाचारान्मायाहस्ती यथोच्यते ।

उपलम्भात्समाचारादस्ति वस्तु तथोच्यते ॥४४॥

44. As an elephant conjured up by magic is called an elephant by depending on perception and adequate behaviour, so from the facts of perception and adequate behaviour a thing is said to be existing.

As *māyāhastī*, an illusory elephant conjured up by magic; though non-existent in reality, is yet certainly perceived, just like a real elephant—people behave towards it in this world just as with a real elephant, and call it an elephant because of such attributes of an elephant as being capable of being bound, ridden upon, etc.—similarly *upalambhāt samācārāt*, because of perception and right conduct (with regard to them); *ucyate vastu asti*, it is said that duality, consisting of diversity, does exist. Therefore the purport is that the facts of being perceived and dealt with rightly cannot be the tests establishing the existence of a thing.

What again is the absolutely real thing that is the substratum of all unreal ideas of creation and the rest? The answer is:

जात्याभासं चलाभासं वस्त्वाभासं तथैव च ।

अजाचलमवस्तुत्वं विज्ञानं शान्तमद्वयम् ॥४५॥

45. It is Consciousness—birthless, motionless and non-material, as well as tranquil and non-dual—that has the semblance of birth, appears to move, and simulates a substance (possessed of qualities).

That which being birthless has the semblance of birth is *jātyābhāsam*, as for instance in the illustration,

“Devadatta has birth”. That which appears as though moving is *calābhāsam*, as in the case, “That very Devadatta goes”. *Vastu* is a substance that can have attributes; that which simulates that is *vastvābhāsam*, as for instance in the illustration, “That very Devadatta is fair or tall”. Devadatta appears as though taking birth, as though he moves, and as if he is fair or tall, though in reality he is birthless, changeless, and immaterial. What is it that answers to these characteristics? It is *vijñānam*, Consciousness. It is *sāntam*, quiescent, being devoid of birth etc. And therefore It is also *advayam*, without a second. This is the meaning.

एवं न जायते चित्तमेवं धर्मा अजाः स्मृताः ।

एवमेव विजानन्तो न पतन्ति विपर्यये ॥४६॥

46. Thus Consciousness has no birth, thus are the souls considered to be birthless. Those who know thus indeed do not fall into calamity.

Evam, thus, in accordance with the reasons adduced; *cittam na jāyate*, Consciousness¹ does not undergo birth; *evam*, thus; are *dharmāḥ*, the souls; *smṛtāḥ*, considered; *ajāḥ*, birthless; by the knowers of Brahman. The plural in *dharmāḥ* (souls) is used metaphorically, since the non-dual Self Itself appears to be different in accordance with the difference of bodies. Those who, after renouncing all cravings for external things, *vijñantaḥ evam eva*, know thus indeed; that the Consciousness, free from birth etc., is the non-dual reality that is the Self; *na patanti*, do not fall, again; *viparyaye*, into calamity, into the sea of the darkness of ignorance;

¹“*Citta* means Consciousness, i.e. Brahman.”—A.G.

as is confirmed by the text of the Vedic verse, "What delusion and what sorrow can there be to the one who realises unity?" (Īś 7).

In order to dilate upon the above-mentioned realisation of the Self, the text goes on:

ऋजुवक्रादिकाभासमलातस्पन्दितं यथा ।

ग्रहणग्राहकाभासं विज्ञानस्पन्दितं तथा ॥४७॥

47. As the movement of a fire-brand appears to be straight or crooked, so it is the vibration of Consciousness that appears to be the knower and the known.

Yathā, as; in common experience, it is seen that *alūta-spanditam*, the movement of a fire-brand; *ṛjuvkrādikābhāsam*, appears to be straight, curved, and so on; *tathā*, similar, is *grahaṇagrāhakābhāsam*, the appearance as the perception and the perceiver, that is to say, as the object and the subject. What is it that appears? *Vijñānaspanditam*, the vibration of Consciousness, as it were, it being set in motion by ignorance, for the unmoving Consciousness can have no vibration, as it was said earlier, "birthless, motionless" (*Kārikā*, IV. 45).

अस्पन्दमानमलातमनाभासमजं यथा ।

अस्पन्दमानं विज्ञानमनाभासमजं तथा ॥४८॥

48. As the fire-brand, when not in motion, becomes free from appearances and birth, so Consciousness, when not in vibration, will be free from appearances and birth. ♪

Yathā, as; that very *alātam*, fire-brand; *aspandamānam*, when not in motion, when it does not undergo birth to become straight etc. in shape, it remains *anābhāsam ajam*, free from appearances and birth; *tathā*, so; Consciousness, that vibrates through ignorance, will, on the cessation of ignorance, become *aspandamānam*, free from vibration, consisting in birth etc.—will remain free from appearances, birth, and vibration. This is the meaning.

Moreover,

अलाते स्पन्दमाने वै नाभासा अन्यतोभुवः ।

न ततोऽन्यत्र निस्पन्दान्नालातं प्रविशन्ति ते ॥४९॥

49. When the fire-brand is in motion, the appearances do not come to it from anywhere else. Neither do they go anywhere else from the fire-brand when it is at rest, nor do they (then) enter into it.

Alāte spandamāne, when that very fire-brand is in motion; the appearances of straightness, crookedness, etc. do not come to be in it; *anyatah*, from anywhere, outside the fire-brand; this is what is meant by *na anyatobhuvah*, non-adventitious. *Na*, nor; do they go out anywhere else; *tatah nisvandāt*, from that fire-brand when it is at rest. *Na te alātam praviśanti*, nor do they enter into the fire-brand, that is motionless.

Furthermore,

न निर्गता अलातात्ते द्रव्यत्वाभावयोगतः ।

विज्ञानेऽपि तथैव स्युराभासस्याविशेषतः १।५०॥

50. They did not issue out of the fire-brand by reason of their unsubstantiality. With regard to Consciousness also the appearances must be of a similar kind, for as appearance there is no distinction.

Te, they, the appearances; *na nirgatūḥ alūtāt*, do not issue out of the fire-brand, like something out of a house; *dravyatva-abhāva-yogataḥ*, because of their being devoid of substantiality, that is to say, because of unsubstantiality, the phrase being construed thus: The quality of a *dravya*, substance, is *dravyatva*; the absence of that is *dravyatvābhāva*; and *yogataḥ* means by reason of. Entry is possible for things and not for those that are not so. The appearances of birth etc. *vijñāne api tathaiva syuh*, in Consciousness also must be thus alone; *ābhāsasya aviśeṣataḥ*, for appearance is equally present.

It is being shown how they are similar:

विज्ञाने स्पन्दमाने वै नाभासा अन्यतोभुवः ।

न ततोऽन्यत्र निस्पन्दान्न विज्ञानं विशन्ति ते ॥५१॥

न निर्गतास्ते विज्ञानाद् द्रव्यत्वाभावयोगतः ।

कार्यकारणताऽभावाद्यतोऽचिन्त्याः सदैव ते ॥५२॥

51. When Consciousness is in vibration, the appearances do not come to It from anywhere else. Neither do they go anywhere else from Consciousness when It is at rest, nor do they (then) enter into It.

52. They did not issue out of Consciousness, by reason of their unsubstantiality; for they

are ever beyond comprehension, being without any relation of cause and effect (with Consciousness).

Everything with regard to Consciousness is similar to that of the fire-brand; Consciousness has this one distinction that It is ever unmoving. It is being pointed out as to what causes the appearances of creation etc. in the motionless Consciousness: *Yataḥ*, for; *te*, these; are *sadā eva acintyāḥ*, ever beyond comprehension; *kāryakūraṇatā-abhāvāt*, in consequence of the absence of any logical connection of cause and effect (between the appearances and Consciousness), they being of the nature of non-existence. Just as the ideas of straightness etc. are perceived in the fire-brand, although the appearances of straightness etc. are unreal, similarly the ideas of creation in the Self, that appear even though there are no creation etc., must be false. This is the purport as a whole (of the two verses).

It has been established that the Reality, that is the Self, is one and unborn. Now according to those who imagine causality,

द्रव्यं द्रव्यस्य हेतुः स्यादन्यदन्यस्य चैव हि ।

द्रव्यत्वमन्यभावो वा धर्माणां नोपपद्यते ॥५३॥

53. A substance can be the cause of a substance, and one thing can be the cause of another different from itself. But the souls can be considered neither as substances nor as something different from other things.

Dravyam, a substance, *syāt hetuḥ*, can be the cause; *dravyasya*, of a substance; *anyat anyasya*, one thing can be the cause of another; but that very thing cannot be its own cause. Nor is a non-substance seen in common experience to be independently a cause of anything.¹ *Na upapadyate*, nor is it logical, in anyway whatsoever; that *dharmāṅām dravyatvam anyabhāvaḥ vā*, the souls should be considered either as substances or as something different from other things, under which possibility alone could the Self become either a cause or an effect.² Thus since the Self is neither a substance nor different from anything,³ It is neither the cause nor the effect of anything. This is the meaning.

एवं न चित्तजा धर्माश्चित्तं वाऽपि न धर्मजम् ।

एवं हेतुफलाजार्तिं प्रविशन्ति मनीषिणः ॥५४॥

54. In this way, the external entities are not the products of Consciousness; nor is Consciousness a product of external entities. Thus the wise confirm the birthlessness of cause and effect.

Evam, thus, according to the reasons adduced; Consciousness is the very essence of the Self that is identical with Consciousness. Hence *dharmāḥ*, external entities; *na cittajāḥ*, are not the products of Con-

¹ Quality, action, genus, etc. can be causes through the substances in which they inhere.

² For causality presupposes difference.

³ The Self being all-pervasive and homogeneous.

sciousness;¹ *na cittam dharmajam*, nor is Consciousness a product of external entities. For all entities are the mere appearances of that which is essentially Consciousness. Consequently, an effect is not produced from a cause, nor is a cause from an effect. In this way the knowers of Brahman, *praviśanti*, enter into, affirm: *hetuphalājātim*, the birthlessness of cause and effect. The idea is that they arrive at the non-existence of cause and effect.

It is being pointed out as to what will happen to those who cling to cause and effect:

यावद्धेतुफलावेशस्तावद्धेतुफलोद्भवः ।

क्षीणे हेतुफलावेशे नास्ति हेतुफलोद्भवः ॥५५॥

55. Cause and effect spring into being so long as there is mental preoccupation with cause and effect. There is no origination of cause and effect when the engrossment with cause and effect becomes attenuated.

Yāvat, as long as; *hetuphalāveśah*, attention is riveted on cause and effect, under the idea, "I am the producer of the causes called virtue and vice; merit and demerit belong to me; and I shall enjoy their fruit by being born sometime and somewhere among the host of creatures"—as long as causality is superimposed on the Self, as long as the mind is preoccupied with it; *tāvat hetuphalodbhavaḥ*, so long do cause and effect, merit and demerit and their effect, arise—are active without a break. This is the meaning. When the engrossment

¹ A.G. equates *citta* with the supreme Self.

with cause and effect, that springs from ignorance, is removed through the realisation of non-duality as stated before, like the removal of the possession by an evil spirit through the power of incantation and medicines, then that engrossment *kṣīṇe*, being attenuated; *na asti hetuphalodbhavaḥ*, there is no origination of cause and effect.

What is the harm even if there is the origin of cause and effect? The answer is:

यावद्धेतुफलावेशः संसारस्तावदायतः ।

क्षीणे हेतुफलावेशे संसारं न प्रपद्यते ॥५६॥

56. As long as there is mental preoccupation with causality, so long does the worldly state continue. When the engrossment with causality is exhausted, one does not attain the worldly state.

Yāvat, as long as; the mental preoccupation with causality is not removed through perfect illumination; *tāvat*, so long; *saṁsārah*, the worldly state; persisting unimpaired, remains *āyataḥ*, outstretched, that is to say, continues for long. But again *hetuphalūveṣe kṣīṇe*, when the engrossment with causality is attenuated; *na prapadyate saṁsāram*, one does not attain the worldly state; for then there is no cause for it.

Objection: As there is nothing else apart from the unborn Self, how can it be said by you that there are such phenomena as the origin and destruction of cause and effect as well as of the world?

Answer: Listen:

संवृत्या जायते सर्वं शाश्वतं नास्ति तेन वै ।

सद्भावेन ह्यजं सर्वमुच्छेदस्तेन नास्ति वै ॥५७॥

57. Everything seems to be born because of the empirical outlook; therefore there is nothing that is eternal. From the standpoint of Reality, everything is the birthless Self; therefore there is no such thing as annihilation.

Sarvam jāyate, everything is produced; *saṁvṛtyā*, by *saṁvaraṇa*, concealment, consisting in empirical outlook within the domain of ignorance. *Tena*, therefore; within the range of ignorance, *na asti vai śāśvatam*, there is surely nothing that is eternal. Hence it has been said that the world, characterised by origin and destruction, remains outstretched; *hi*, because; *sadbhāvena*, from the standpoint of the highest Reality; *sarvam ajam*, everything is the birthless Self. Since there is no creation, *tena*, therefore; *na asti vai*, there is surely no; *ucchedaḥ*, annihilation, of any cause, effect etc. This is the meaning.

धर्मा य इति जायन्ते जायन्ते ते न तत्त्वतः ।

जन्म मायोपमं तेषां सा च माया न विद्यते ॥५८॥

58. The entities that are born thus are not born in reality. Their birth is as that of a thing through Māyā (magic). And that Māyā again has no reality.

Ye dharmāḥ, the entities, souls and other things, which; *jāyante*, are born, are imagined to be born; *te*, they; that are *iti*, of this kind;—the word “*iti*” of this

kind” indicates the empirical outlook mentioned earlier (IV. 57); so the meaning is, “The entities, that are of this kind, are born thus owing to (concealment through) the empirical outlook;”—*te*, they; *na jāyante*, are not born; *tattvataḥ*, in reality. And as for the *janma*, creation, through the covering of the empirical outlook; *teṣām*, of those—of those entities, mentioned above; the birth is to be understood *māyopaniam*, like that occurring through Māyā (magic). So it is to be understood as similar to magic.

Objection: Then there is an entity called Māyā.

Answer: Not so *Sā ca māyā na vidyate*, and that Māyā does not exist; the idea being that the term relates to something non-existing.

It is being shown how their birth can be compared to magical birth:

यथा मायामयाद् बीजाज्जायते तन्मयोऽङ्कुरः ।

नासौ नित्यो न चोच्छेदी तद्वद्धेषु योजना ॥५९॥

59. As from a magical seed grows a sprout equally illusory—it being neither eternal nor destructible—just so is the logic (of birth or death) applicable in the case of objects.

Yathā, as; *māyāmayāt bijāt*, from a magical seed, of a mango for instance; *jāyate*, grows, *aṅkuraḥ tanmayāḥ*, a sprout (of equal substance), equally illusory, *asau*, that one, the sprout; being *na nityāḥ*, not eternal; *na ca ucchedī*, nor destructible—simply because it has no existence; *tadvat*, just so; is the *yojanā*, reasoning; about birth and death, *dharmeṣu*, in the case of the objects.

The idea is that, from the standpoint of logic, there can be no real birth or death for the objects.

नाजेषु सर्वधर्मेषु शाश्वताशाश्वताभिधा ।

यत्र वर्णा न वर्तन्ते विवेकस्तत्र नोच्यते ॥६०॥

60. With regard to all the birthless entities there can be no application of the words eternal and non-eternal. No categorical statement can be made with regard to an entity where words do not apply.

But from the standpoint of absolute truth, *śūśvatā-sāśvatābhidhā*, the terms eternal or non-eternal; *na ajeṣu dharmeṣu*, do not apply to the birthless entities, the souls, whose essence consists in a mere eternal and homogeneous Consciousness. This is the meaning. The term *varṇāḥ*, derivatively means those by which things are described and it signifies words. *Yatra*, where with regard to which (souls), words do not apply, so far as their description or revelation is concerned; *tatra*, there; *na ucyate*, is not uttered; any *vivekaḥ*, categorical statement, that "This is so indeed", or in other words that "It is either eternal or non-eternal", as is declared in the Vedic text, "From where speech returns" (Tai. II. iv. 1).

यथा स्वप्ने द्वयाभासं चित्तं चलति मायया ।

तथा जाग्रद्द्वयाभासं चित्तं चलति मायया ॥६१॥

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं चित्तं स्वप्ने न संशयः ।

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं तथा जाग्रन्न संशयः ॥६२॥

61. As in dream Consciousness (*cittam*) vibrates as though having dual functions, so in the waking state Consciousness vibrates as though with two facets.

62. There is no doubt that Consciousness, though one, appears in dream in dual aspects; so also in the waking state, Consciousness, though one, appears to have two aspects.

That the absolute Consciousness, that is really non-dual, becomes an object of speech, is due only to the activities of the mind, but not so in reality. The verses were explained earlier¹ (*Kārikā*, III. 29-30).

For this further reason, duality, describable by words, does not exist:

स्वप्नदृक्प्रचरन् स्वप्ने दिक्षु वै दशसु स्थितान् ।
 अण्डजान् स्वेदजान् वाऽपि जीवान्पश्यति यान् सदा ॥६३॥
 स्वप्नदृक्चित्तदृश्यास्ते न विद्यन्ते ततः पृथक् ।
 तथा तद्दृश्यमेवेदं स्वप्नदृक्चित्तमिष्यते ॥६४॥

63-64. The creatures—be they born from eggs or from moisture—that the experiencer of dream sees for ever as existing in all the ten directions, while he is roaming in the dream-land, are but objects of perception to the consciousness of the dreamer, and they do not exist apart from that consciousness. Similarly,

¹The word *manah* is substituted here by *cittam* (meaning Consciousness in the Vedāntic, and not Buddhist, sense). In verses 64-67, *citta* means empirical consciousness.

this consciousness of the dreamer, is admitted to be only an object of perception to that dreamer.

Svapnadṛk, one who sees a dream; *caran*, while moving; *svapne*, in dream, in the place seen in a dream; *yān jīvān sadā paśyati*, all the creatures that he ever notices; *dikṣu vai daśasu sthitān*, as existing in all the ten directions; viz. *aṇḍajān*, those born from eggs; *svedajān*, those born from moisture.

Objection: Be that so. what follows therefrom?

The *answer* is: *Te*, those creatures; are the *svapnadṛk-cittadṛśyāḥ*, objects of perception to the consciousness of the experiencer of dream. Therefore *na vidyante*, they do not exist; *tataḥ pṛthak*, separately from the consciousness of the dreamer. It is consciousness alone that is imagined as the diverse creatures. *Tathā*, similarly; even *tat*, that; *svapnadṛkcittam*, the consciousness of the experiencer of dream; is *idam tad-dṛśyam eva*, merely an object of perception to that dreamer. Therefore there is no separate existence for such a thing as consciousness apart from the dreamer. This is the idea.

चरञ्जागरिते जाग्रद्दृक्षु वै दशसु स्थितान् ।

अण्डजान् स्वेदजान् वाऽपि जीवान्पश्यति यान्सदा ॥६५॥

जाग्रच्चित्तेक्षणीयास्ते न विद्यन्ते ततः पृथक् ।

तथा तद्दृश्यमेवेदं जाग्रतश्चित्तमिष्यते ॥६६॥

65-66. The creatures—be they born from eggs or from moisture—that the experiencer of the waking state sees for ever as existing in all the ten directions, while he is roaming in the

places of the waking state, are but objects of perception to the consciousness of the man in the waking state, and they do not exist separately from that consciousness. Similarly, this consciousness of the waking man is admitted to be only an object of perception to the waking man.

The creatures visible to a waking man are non-different from his consciousness, since they are perceived through consciousness, just like the creatures perceived by the consciousness of a dreamer. And that consciousness again, as engaged in the perception of creatures, is non-different from the experiencer, since it is perceived by the experiencer, like the consciousness in the dream state. The remaining portion has already been explained.

उभे ह्यन्योन्यदृश्ये ते किं तदस्तीति नोच्यते ।

लक्षणाशून्यमुभयं तन्मतेनैव गृह्यते ॥६७॥

67. They are both perceptible to each other. (If the question arises), "Does it exist?" the answer given is "No". Both of them lack valid proof, and each is perceived merely because of a prepossession with the other.

Te ubhe, both of them—consciousness and the creatures—knowledge and its modifications—these two; are *anyo-nyadrśye*, objects of perception to each other. For the thing that is called knowledge is what it is in relation to its objects such as the creatures; and the objects of perception, such as the creatures, are so in relation to

knowledge; consequently, their awareness is mutually determined. Hence it is also asserted that nothing whatsoever, be it knowledge or the things perceived through knowledge, exists. When it is asked, “*Kim tai asti iti*, does it exist?” *ucyate*, the answer made, by the discriminating man is, “*na*, no.” For in dream neither an elephant nor a knowledge having elephant as its content exists. So also, in this waking state, these do not exist in the eyes of the discriminating people. This is the idea implied. How? Since *ubhayam*, both knowledge and the objects of knowledge; are *lakṣaṇūśūnyam*, devoid of *lakṣaṇā*, anything whereby they can be established, that is to say, they are without valid proof. Either is *grhyate*, perceived; *tanmatena eva*, merely because of a prepossession with the other. There can be no knowledge of the pot by setting aside the idea of the pot, nor can there be any comprehension of the idea of the pot by discarding the pot. The meaning implied is that in the case under discussion no distinction, of one being the knowledge and the other its object, can be made between the two.

यथा स्वप्नमयो जीवो जायते म्रियतेऽपि च ।

तथा जीवा अमी सर्वे भवन्ति न भवन्ति च ॥६८॥

68. As a creature seen in a dream undergoes birth and death, so also do all these creatures appear and disappear.

यथा मायामयो जीवो जायते म्रियतेऽपि च ।

तथा जीवा अमी सर्वे भवन्ति न भवन्ति च ॥६९॥

69. As a creature conjured up by magic

undergoes birth and death, so also do all these creatures appear and disappear.

यथा निर्मितको जीवो जायते म्रियतेऽपि वा ।

तथा जीवा अमी सर्वे भवन्ति न भवन्ति च ॥७०॥

70. As a creature produced through medicines and charms undergoes birth and death, so also do all these creatures appear and disappear.

Māyūmayah, means one that is created by a magician; and *nirmitakah*, means created by medicines, charms etc. As egg-born creatures and others, created in dreams or by magic and incantation, take birth and die, so also do such creatures as human beings who are non-existent and are merely imagined on Consciousness. This is the idea.

न कश्चिज्जायते जीवः संभवोऽस्य न विद्यते ।

एतत्तदुत्तमं सत्यं यत्र किञ्चिन्न जायते ॥७१॥

71. No creature whatsoever has birth, there is no source for it. This is that highest truth where nothing whatsoever is born.

It has been said that the birth, death, etc. of creatures within the range of empirical existence are like those of the creatures in dream etc., and that the highest truth is that where no creature undergoes birth. The remaining portion was explained before (*Kārikā*, III. 48).

चित्तस्पन्दितमेवेदं ग्राह्यग्राहकवद्द्वयम् ।

चित्तं निर्विषयं नित्यमसङ्गं तेन कीर्तितम् ॥७२॥

72. This duality, possessed of subject and object, is a mere vibration of Consciousness. And Consciousness is objectless; hence It is declared to be eternally without relations.

All *dvayam*, duality; *grāhya-grāhakavat*, possessed of subject and object; is *cittaspanditam eva*, surely a vibration of Consciousness. But from the ultimate standpoint, *cittam*, Consciousness, that is nothing but the Self, and accordingly it is *nirviṣayam*, without objects. *Tena*, as a consequence of that, because of Its being without objects; It is *kīrtitam*, declared; to be *nityam asaṅgam*, ever without relations; as is known from the Vedic text, "For this infinite being is unattached" (Br. IV. iii. 15-16). Anything that has its objects becomes connected with those objects. As Consciousness is objectless, It is unrelated. This is the purport.

Objection: If the unrelatedness of Consciousness follows from the fact of Its being without objects, then there can be no freedom from relation, since there exist such objects as the teacher, the scripture, and the taught.

Answer: That is no defect.

Objection: Why?

The *answer* is:

योऽस्ति कल्पितसंवृत्या परमार्थेन नास्त्यसौ ।

परतन्त्राभिसंवृत्या स्यान्नास्ति परमार्थतः ॥७३॥

73. That which exists because of a fancied empirical outlook, does not do so from the standpoint of absolute Reality. Anything that may exist on the strength of the empirical

outlook, engendered by other systems of thought, does not really exist.

An object, a scripture for instance, *yaḥ*, which; exists *kalpitasamvṛtyā*, because of a fancied empirical outlook (i.e. on the strength of empirical experience), it being called so because it is *samvṛti*, an empirical outlook, that is *kalpita*, imagined, as a means for the attainment of the highest object. Anything that exists by virtue of this, *asau na asti*, that has no existence; *paramārthena*, from the standpoint of the absolute Reality. It was said earlier, "Duality ceases to exist after realisation" (*Kārikā*, I. 18). And anything that *syāt*, may exist; *paratantrābhīsamvṛtyā*, on the strength of the empirical outlook engendered by the other systems of thought; that thing *paramārthataḥ*, when considered from the standpoint of the highest Reality; *na asti*, does not exist, to be sure. Therefore it has been well said, "Hence it is declared to be without relations" (*Kārikā*, IV. 72).

Objection: On the assumption that scriptures etc. have only empirical existence, the idea itself that something is birthless will be equally empirical.

Answer: Truly so.

अजः कल्पितसंवृत्या परमार्थेन नाप्यजः ।

परतन्त्राभिनिष्पत्त्या संवृत्या जायते तु सः ॥७४॥

74. Since in accordance with the conclusion arrived at in the scriptures of the other schools, the soul undergoes birth from the empirical point of view, therefore in pursuance of that fancied empirical view (it is said by the non-

dualists that) the soul is birthless; but from the standpoint of absolute Reality, it is not even birthless.

Kalpitasamvṛtyā, in accordance with the empirical outlook, fostered with the help of scriptures etc., the Self is said to be *ajāḥ*, unborn. But *paramārthena*, from the standpoint of the highest Reality; *na api ajāḥ*, It is not even unborn. For what is birthless *paratantrābhiniṣpattyā*, from the standpoint of the conclusions arrived at by other schools of thought; (is said to be so because) *saḥ*, that thing; *jāyate*, undergoes birth; *samvṛtyā*, as a matter of empirical experience. Therefore the imagination that the Self is birthless does not pertain to the absolutely real Entity. This is the idea.

अभताभिनवेशोऽस्ति द्वयं तत्र न विद्यते ।

द्वयोभावं स बुद्धवैव निर्निमित्तो न जायते ॥७५॥

75. There is in evidence a (mere) craving for false objects, (though) no duality is in existence there. Realising the non-existence of duality, one becomes free from craving for false things, and one does not undergo birth.

Abhiniveśaḥ means persistent fondness. Since no object exists, therefore there is in evidence a mere persistent infatuation for duality that is non-existing. *Dvayam na vidyate tatra*, duality does not exist there. Since a fondness for unreality is alone the cause of birth, therefore *saḥ*, he; *na jāyate*, does not undergo birth who *buddhvā*, having realised; *dvayābhāvam*, the non-existence of duality; has become *nirnimittaḥ*, free from cause, divested of the craving for the unreal duality. •

यदा न लभते हेतूनुत्तमाधममध्यमान् ।

तदा न जायते चित्तं हेत्वभावे फलं कुतः ॥७६॥

76. When one does not perceive the superior, medium, and inferior causes, then Consciousness ceases to have births. For how can there be any result when there is no cause ?

The highest causes are those duties which are enjoined in relation to castes and stages of life, which are performed by people free from hankering for results, which lead to the attainment of the states of gods and others, and which are purely virtuous. Those that are mixed with irreligious practices and lead to birth among men etc., are the middling ones. And the inferior causes are those particular tendencies that are known as irreligious and lead to birth among animals etc. *Yadū*, when, after the realisation of the reality of the Self, that is one without a second and free from all imagination; one *na labhate*, does not perceive; all those causes—superior, intermediate, or inferior—that are fancied through ignorance, just as the dirt seen in the sky by children is not perceived there by a discriminating man; *tadū*, then; *cittam*, Consciousness; *na jāyate*, is not created, in the shape of gods and others, that constitute the superior, medium, and inferior results. For when there is no cause, no effect can be produced just as no corn will grow unless there are seeds.

It has been said that Consciousness has no birth in the absence of causes. Now is being stated in what the birthlessness of Consciousness consists:

अनिमित्तस्य चित्तस्य याऽनुत्पत्तिः समाऽद्वया ।

अजातस्यैव सर्वस्य चित्तदृश्यं हि तद्यतः ॥७७॥

77. The birthlessness that Consciousness attains when freed from causes is constant and absolute; for all this (viz duality and birth) was perceptible to Consciousness that had been birthless and non-dual (even before).

Anutpattiḥ, the birthlessness, called liberation, that comes; *cittasya animittasya*, to Consciousness that is causeless, that has become free from all the causes of birth called virtue and vice, as a consequence of the realisation of the ultimate Truth;—the birthlessness that is of this kind is for ever and under all circumstances *samā*, constant, without any distinction; and *advayā*, absolute. And this state *ajūtasya*, belongs to the birthless, to Consciousness that had been birthless even before; (it belongs) *sarvasya*, (to Consciousness) that had been all, that is to say, to the non-dual Consciousness. Since even before the rise of knowledge, *tat*, all that—viz duality and birth; was *cittadṛśyam*, an object of perception to Consciousness; therefore the causelessness of the unborn non-dual Consciousness is ever the same and absolute, not that sometimes it is subject to birth and sometimes not. It is ever of the same nature. This is the meaning.

बुद्ध्वाऽनिमित्ततां सत्यां हेतुं पृथगनाप्नुवन् ।

वीतशोकं तथाऽकाममभयं पदमश्नुते ॥७८॥

78. After realising the causelessness that is the truth, and not accepting any cause sep-

arately, one attains the state of fearlessness that is free from sorrow and devoid of desire.

Since duality does not exist in accordance with the reasons adduced, one *asnute*, attains; the *abhayam padam*, state of fearlessness, that is free from desire, sorrow, etc. and is without ignorance etc.; that is to say, one is never reborn; *buddhyā*, after having realised; *animittatām satyām*, causelessness as the truth, of the highest order; and *anāpnuvan*, (after) not getting, that is to say, not accepting; *prthak*, separately; any *hetum*, cause, that may lead to birth among the gods and others (that is to say), after having renounced the desire for all external things.

अभूताभिनिवेशाद्धि सदृशे तत्प्रवर्तते ।

वस्त्वभावं स बुद्धवैव निःसङ्गं विनिवर्तते ॥७९॥

79. Since owing to a belief in the existence of unrealities, Consciousness engages Itself in things that are equally so (i.e. unreal), therefore when one has realisation of the absence of objects, Consciousness becomes unattached and turns back.

Abhūtābhiniveśaḥ consists in a conviction that duality does exist even though there is no such thing. Since from this infatuation, which is a kind of delusion created by ignorance, *tat*, that Consciousness, that imitates the unreal; *pravartate*, engages; *sadr̥śe*, in a similar thing; therefore when *saḥ*, anyone; realises the non-existence of that object of duality, his Consciousness becomes *niḥsaṅgam*, unattached, to it; and It *vinivartate*, turns back, from the objects that are the contents of the belief in unrealities.

निवृत्तस्याप्रवृत्तस्य निश्चला हि तदा स्थितिः ।

विषयः स हि बुद्धानां तत्साम्यमजमद्वयम् ॥८०॥

80. For then to the Consciousness, that has got detached and does not engage (in duality), there follows the state of inactivity. Since that is the object realised by the wise, therefore that is the real equipoise, and that is birthless and non-dual.

Of the Consciousness *nivṛttasya*, that has desisted from objects of duality; and *apravṛttasya*, does not engage in any other object because of the realisation of the absence of any such thing; there follows *niścalā sthitiḥ*, a state of motionlessness, that is of the very nature of Brahman. *Hi*, since; *saḥ viśayaḥ* that is the object of vision—this state of continuance of knowledge as Brahman that is a non-dual mass of homogeneous Consciousness; *buddhānām*, to the wise, who realise the supreme Reality; therefore, *taḥ*, that state; is the highest *sāmyam*, equipoise, without any differentiation; and it is also *ajam advayam*, birthless and non-dual.

That which is the object of vision to the wise is being shown again:

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नं प्रभातं भवति स्वयम् ।

सकृद्विभातो ह्येवैष धर्मो धातुस्वभावतः ॥८१॥

81. This becomes birthless, sleepless, dreamless, and self-luminous. For this Entity is ever effulgent by Its very nature.

That becomes *prabhātam svayam*, fully illuminated by Itself, and It does not depend on the sun etc.; in other words, It is by nature self-effulgent. *Eṣaḥ*, this; *dharmatā*, entity, called the Self, that is possessed of such characteristics; is *sakṛt-vibhātaḥ*, shining once for all, that is to say, ever effulgent; *dhātusvabhāvataḥ*, by the very nature of the thing (that is the Self).

It is being shown why this supreme Reality, though spoken of thus, is not grasped by ordinary people:

सुखमाव्रियते नित्यं दुःखं विव्रियते सदा ।

यस्य कस्य च धर्मस्य ग्रहेण भगवानसौ ॥८२॥

82. Because of His passion for any object, whatever it be, that Lord becomes ever covered up easily, and He is at all times uncovered with difficulty.

Since *asau bhagavān*, that Lord, the non-dual Self, that is to say, the Deity; *sukham āvriyate*, is easily covered; *grahena yasya kasya ca dharmasya*, by the eagerness to grasp, because of the false belief in the reality of an object, whatever it be, that lies within duality—for the covering follows from the perception of duality, and it does not require any additional effort,—and since It is *vivriyate*, uncovered, revealed; *dulḥkham*, with difficulty, the knowledge of the supreme Reality being a rarity; therefore It is not easy to be understood, though spoken of by the Upaniṣads and the teachers in various ways, as is pointed out by the Vedic text, “The teacher is wonderful, and its receiver is wonderful” (Ka. I. ii. 7).

When the passionate attachment of the learned to even such subtle ideas as the existence of the Self or Its non-existence becomes a covering of the Lord—the supreme Self, what wonder is there that the passion in the shape of the intellectual preoccupation of the dull should be much more so? The next verse goes on to show this:

अस्ति नास्त्यस्ति नास्तीति नास्ति नास्तीति वा पुनः ।
चलस्थिरोभयाभावैरावृणोत्येव बालिशः ॥८३॥

83. By asserting that the Self “exists”, “does not exist”, “exists and does not exist”, or again “does not exist, does not exist”, the non-discriminating man does certainly cover It up through ideas of changeability, unchangeability, both changeability and unchangeability, and non-existence.

Some disputant accepts the idea that the Self *asti*, exists. Another, viz the believer in momentariness of things, avers *na asti*, It does not exist. Another half-believer in momentariness, the naked one (i.e. Jaina), who speaks of both existence and non-existence, asserts, *asti na asti*, It exists and does not exist. The absolute nihilist says, *na asti, na asti*, It does not exist, It does not exist. Of these states, that of existence is *calah*, changeable, it being different from such impermanent things as a jar,¹ and the state of non-existence is *sthiraḥ*,

¹ An object of perception is inconstant; the perceiving soul is different from it and reacts to it diversely, being, according to Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, sometimes happy and sometimes sorry with regard to the same object.

changeless, is being ever constant.¹ The state of both existence and non-existence, is *ubhayam*, of either kind, since it relates to both the changeable and the changeless.² And *abhāvaḥ*, relates to an absolute non-existence.³ *Bāliśaḥ*, means a fool, a non-discriminating man. Each one of the fools, whether calling the Self existing or not; *eva*, surely; *āvṛṇoti*, covers up, the Lord; *calasthira-ubhaya-abhāvaiḥ*, by ideas of changeability, unchangeability, both changeability and unchangeability, and non-existence—which all belong to the four alternatives. The idea implied is that when even a learned man who has not realised the supreme Truth is but a fool, nothing need be spoken of one who is naturally stupid.

Of what nature, then, is the supreme Reality, by knowing which one gets rid of stupidity and becomes enlightened? The answer is:

कोटचश्चतस्र एतास्तु ग्रहैर्यासां सदाऽऽवृतः ।

भगवानाभिरस्पृष्टो येन दृष्टः स सर्वदृक् ॥८४॥

84. These are the four alternative theories, through a passion for which the Lord remains ever hidden. He who sees the Lord as untouched by these is omniscient.

Etāḥ catasraḥ koṭyah, these four alternative theories, viz “It exists”, “It does not exist”, and so on, that have

¹ According to those who deny the existence of a perceiver apart from the intellect etc., the denial remains constant, for non-existence is changeless.

² The view of the Jainas.

³ The view of the nihilistic Buddhists.

been already mentioned and that are the conclusions arrived at by the scriptures of the dogmatic disputants; *grahaiḥ yāsām*, through the acceptance, through the conviction arising from the realisation, of which alternatives; *bhagavān*, the Lord; remains *sadū āvṛtaḥ*, ever covered; to those sophists alone. *Saḥ*, he, the reflective sage; *yena*, by whom; *dr̥ṣṭaḥ*, has been realised; that Lord who, though remaining covered to the sophists, is really *aspr̥ṣṭaḥ ābhīḥ*, untouched by these—these four alternative theories of existence, non-existence, etc.—he who has realised the all-pervasive Being found and presented in the Upaniṣads alone; *saḥ*, that sage; is *sarvadṛk*, omniscient; or to put it otherwise, he is the truly enlightened man.

प्राप्य सर्वज्ञतां कृत्स्नां ब्राह्मण्यं पदमद्वयम् ।

अनापन्नादिमध्यान्तं किमतः परमीहते ॥८५॥

85. Does one make any effort after having attained omniscience in its fullness and having reached the non-dual state of Brāhmaṇahood, that has no beginning, middle, and end ?

Prāpya, having attained; *sarvajñatām kṛtsnām*, omniscience in its fullness; and having reached the *advayam brāhmaṇyam padam*, non-dual state of Brāhmaṇahood, as indicated in the Vedic text, “He (who departs from this world after knowing this immutable Brahman) is a Brāhmaṇa (i.e. a knower of Brahman)” (Bṛ. III. viii. 10), “This is the eternal glory of a Brāhmaṇa (i.e. a knower of Brahman): (it neither increases nor decreases through work)” (Bṛ. IV. iv. 23); which (state) *anāpannādiṅmadhyān-*

tam, has no beginning, middle, or end—that is to say, origin, continuance, and dissolution; *kim īhate*, does one make any effort; *atah param*, after this, after this attainment of the Self? The idea is that any effort becomes useless in accordance with the Smṛiti text, “He has no end to achieve here either through activity or through inactivity” (G. III. 18).

विप्राणां विनयो ह्येष शमः प्राकृत उच्यते ।

दमः प्रकृतिदान्तत्वादेवं विद्वान्शमं व्रजेत् ॥८६॥

86. This is the modesty of the Brāhmaṇas, this is their tranquillity, and this is their natural self-restraint resulting from spontaneous poise. Having known thus, the illumined man gets established in tranquillity.

This continuance in the state of identity with the Self is the natural *vinayah*, modesty; *viprāṇām*, of the Brāhmaṇas. This is their humility, and this is also *ucyate*, called; their *prākṛtaḥ śamaḥ*, natural mental tranquillity. *Damaḥ*, self-restraint, too, is this only; *prakṛtidāntatvāt*, because of (their) spontaneous poise, Brahman being by nature quiescent. *Evam vidvān*, having known thus, known Brahman as naturally tranquil; the *vidvān*, enlightened man; *vrajat*, should attain, that is to say, remains established in; *śamam*, tranquillity, that is spontaneous and that is the very nature of Brahman.

Thus since the philosophies of the sophists are at conflict with each other, they lead to the worldly state, and they are the hot-houses for such drawbacks as

attraction and repulsion. Accordingly, they are false philosophies. After having proved this fact by their own logic, the conclusion arrived at was that, being free from all the four alternatives, the most perfect philosophy is the naturally tranquil philosophy of non-duality which does not engender such faults as attachment etc. Now the following text starts to show our own process of arriving at truth:

सवस्तु सोपलम्भं च द्वयं लौकिकमिष्यते ।

अवस्तु सोपलम्भं च शुद्धं लौकिकमिष्यते ॥८७॥

87. The ordinary (waking) state is admitted to be that duality, co-existing with things of empirical reality and fit to be experienced. The objectless ordinary (dream) state is admitted to be without any object and yet as though full of experience.

Savastu, empirical existence, is that which coexists with a real (empirical) thing; similarly *sopalambham*, is that which coexists with experience. This is *dvayam*, duality, that is the source of all behaviour, scriptural and other, and that is characterised by the subject-object relationship. It is *laukikam*, the ordinary state, or in other words, the state of waking. The waking state is *isyate*, admitted, to be such in the Upaniṣads. That which is *avastu*, unsubstantial, there being an absence of empirical existence as well; which is *sopalambham*, associated with experience of things, as it were, though in fact there is no object; that is *isyate*, admitted in the dream state; to

be *buddham*, pure, objectless, subtler than the gross objects of the waking state; and it is *laukikam*, ordinary, being common to all beings.

अवस्त्वनुपलम्भं च लोकोत्तरमिति स्मृतम् ।

ज्ञानं ज्ञेयं च विज्ञेयं सदा बुद्धैः प्रकीर्तितम् ॥८८॥

88. It is traditionally held that the extraordinary is without content and without experience. Knowledge, object, and the realisable thing are for ever declared by the wise.

That which is *avastu*, unsubstantial; *ca*, and; *anupalambham*, without experience, or in other words, that which is devoid of the subject and the object; is *smṛtam*, traditionally held, to be; *lokottaram*, beyond the ordinary, and therefore super-normal; for while the ordinary consists of the subject and the objects, in it there is an absence of these. It is the seed of all activity, that is to say, it is the state of deep sleep. That (mental state) is called *jñānam*, knowledge, by which is known in succession the supreme Reality together with Its means (of realisation), the ordinary, the objectless ordinary, and the extraordinary. The *jñeyam*, object of knowledge; comprises all these three states, for logically there is no object (of knowledge) over and above these, the objects fancied by all the sophists being verily included in them. *Vijñeyam*, the object of realisation, is the supreme Reality that is called the Fourth, that is to say, the non-dual and birthless Reality that is the self. All this, ranging from the ordinary to the realisable thing, *prakīrtitam*, is declared, *sarvadā*, for ever; *buddhaiḥ*, by

the wise, by the seers of the *summum bonum*, by the knowers of Brahman.

ज्ञाने च त्रिविधे ज्ञेये क्रमेण विदिते स्वयम् ।
सर्वज्ञता हि सर्वत्र भवतीह महाधियः ॥८९॥

89. When, after the acquisition of the knowledge (of the threefold object) and the knowledge of the objects in succession, the supreme Reality becomes self-revealed, then there emerges here, for the man of supreme intellect, the state of all-pervasiveness and omniscience for ever.

Jñāne (*vidite*), when (after) knowledge—knowledge of the ordinary etc.—is acquired; and *jñeye trividhe krameṇa* (*vidite*), when (after) the knowable things of three kinds are known in succession—viz first the gross ordinary, then when these are not present, the objectless ordinary, and in the absence of that again, the extraordinary; and then when the three states are eliminated and the supreme Reality, the Fourth, non-dual, birthless, fearless *vidite*, has become known; *svayam*, of Its own accord; then *mahādhiyaḥ*, for the man of great intellect; *bhavati*, there emerges; *iha*, here, 'in this world; *sarvajñatā*, the state of being all and the knower, *sarvatra*, for ever; since his realisation relates to what transcends all the universe; that is to say, if It is known once, It never leaves him. For unlike the knowledge of the sophists, there is no appearance or disappearance for the knowledge of the man who has realised the highest Truth.

From the fact that the ordinary state etc. have been presented as objects to be known successively, some one may conclude that they have real existence. Hence it is said:

हेयजेयाप्यपाक्चानि विज्ञेयान्यग्रयाणतः ।

तेषामन्यत्र विज्ञेयादुपलम्भस्त्रिषु स्मृतः ॥९०॥

90. Things to be rejected, realised, accepted, and made ineffective are to be known at the very beginning. From among them, the three, excepting the realisable, are traditionally held to be only fancies resulting from ignorance.

The *heya*, rejectable, are the three states counting from the ordinary. That is to say, just like the denial of an illusory snake on the rope, waking, dream, and sound sleep are to be denied as having any existence in the Self. The *jñeya*, thing to be known (realised), in this context, is the supreme Reality, free from the four alternatives (*Kūrikā*, IV. 83). The *āpya*, acceptable, are the disciplines, called scholarship, the strength arising from knowledge, and meditateness,¹ that are to be accepted by the monk after discarding the three kinds of desire (for progeny, property, and worlds). *Pākyāni*, those that are fit to be rendered ineffective—the blemishes viz attraction, repulsion, delusion, etc., called passions (*kaṣāyas*). All these, viz those that are to be rejected, known, accepted, and rendered ineffective, are to be

¹ Bṛ. III. v. 1: "Therefore the knower of Brahman, having known all about scholarship, should try to live upon the strength which comes of knowledge; having known all about this strength as well as scholarship, he becomes meditative."

viññeyāni, known well; by the monk; *agrayāñataḥ*, in the beginning as (his) means. *Teṣām*, among those, among the things to be rejected etc; *smṛtaḥ*, it is held traditionally, by the knowers of Brahman; that *viññeyāt anyatra*, apart from Brahman alone that is to be realised, that is the ultimate Reality; there is *upalambhaḥ*, a mere imagination of perception, owing to ignorance, with regard to all the three, that are rejectable, acceptable, and fit to be made ineffective. They are not, however, admitted to be true from the highest standpoint.

But from the ultimate standpoint:

प्रकृत्याऽऽकाशवज्ज्ञेयाः सर्वे धर्मा अनादयः ।

विद्यते न हि नानात्वं तेषां क्वचन किञ्चन ॥९१॥

91. All the souls should be known as naturally analogous to space and as eternal. There is no plurality among them anywhere, even by a jot or tittle.

Sarve dharmāḥ, all the souls; *jñeyāḥ*, are to be known; by those who hanker after liberation; to be *prakṛtyā*, by nature, *ākāśavat*, analogous to space, in point of subtleness, freedom from taints, and all-pervasiveness; and (to be) *anādayaḥ*, eternal. Lest any misconception of diversity be created by the use of the plural number, the text says by way of removing it, *nānūtvam*, plurality; *na vidyate*, does not exist; *teṣām*, among them; *kvacana*, anywhere; *kim cana*, even by a jot or tittle.

And as for the souls being objects of cognition, that, too, is merely in accord with empirical experience but not with Reality. This is being stated:

आदिबुद्धाः प्रकृत्यैव सर्वे धर्माः सुनिश्चिताः ।

यस्यैवं भवति क्षान्तिः सोऽमृतत्वाय कल्पते ॥९२॥

92. All the souls are, by their very nature, illumined from the very beginning, and their characteristics are well determined. He, to whom ensues in this way the freedom from the need of any further acquisition of knowledge, becomes fit for immortality.

Since just like the ever effulgent sun, *sarve dharmāḥ*, all the souls; are *prakṛtyā eva*, by their very nature; *ādibuddhāḥ*, illumined from the very beginning; that is to say, as the sun is ever shining, so are they ever of the nature of Consciousness, (therefore) there is no need for ascertaining their character; or in other words, their nature is ever well established, and it is not subject to such doubts as to "whether it is so or not so". As the sun is ever independent of any other light, for its own sake or for any other, so *yasya*, he, for whom, for which seeker after liberation, *bhavati*, there occurs, in his own soul *kṣāntiḥ*, a freedom from any need of further acquisition of knowledge—either for himself or for others; *evam*, thus, in the way described above; *sāḥ*, that man; *kalpate*, becomes fit; *amṛtatvāya*, for immortality; that is to say, he becomes able to attain liberation.

Similarly, there is no need for bringing about tranquillity in the Self. This is being pointed out:

आदिशान्ता ह्यनुत्पन्नाः प्रकृत्यैव सुनिर्वृताः ।

सर्वे धर्माः समाभिन्नाः अजं साम्यं विशारदम् ॥९३॥

93. Since the souls are, from the very beginning tranquil, unborn, and by their very nature completely unattached, equal, and non-different, and since Reality is (thus) birthless, uniform, and holy, (therefore there is no need for any acquisition etc.).

Since *sarve dharmāḥ*, all the souls; are *ādiśāntāḥ*, tranquil from the beginning, always peaceful; and *anutpannāḥ*, birthless; *prakṛtyā eva sunirvṛtāḥ*, completely detached by their very nature; *sama-abhinnāḥ*, equal and non-different; and since the reality of the Self is *ajam*, birthless, *sāmyam*, equipoised (uniform); *viśāradam*, holy; therefore there is no such thing as peace or liberation that has to be brought about. This is the idea. For anything done can have no meaning for one that is ever of the same nature.

Those who have grasped the ultimate Truth, as described, are the only people in the world who are not pitiable; but the others are to be pitied. This is being stated:

वैशारद्यं तु वै नास्ति भेदे विचरतां सदा ।

भेदनिम्नाः पृथग्वादास्तस्मात्ते कृपणाः स्मृताः ॥९४॥

94. There can be no perfection for people who have proclivity for multiplicity, tread for ever the path of duality, and talk of plurality. Hence they are traditionally held to be pitiable.

Since they are *bhedanimnāḥ*, they have a proclivity for duality, follow duality—that is to say, confine themselves to the world. Who are they? *Prthagvādāḥ*,

those who talk of a multiplicity of things, or in other words, the dualists. *Tasmāt*, therefore, they are *smṛtāḥ*, traditionally held to be; *krpaṇāḥ*, pitiable; since *na asti*, there is no; *vāiśāradyam*, perfection; *teṣāṃ sadū vicaratām bhede*, for those who are ever roaming about in duality, that is to say, for those who ever persist in the path of duality conjured up by ignorance. Consequently, it is proper that they should be objects of pity.

The next verse says that the nature of the supreme Truth is beyond the ken of those who have not the requisite expansion of heart, who are not learned, who are outside the pale of Vedānta, who are narrow-minded, and who are dull of intellect.

अजे साम्ये तु ये केचिद्भ्रुव्यन्ति सुनिश्चिताः ।

ते हि लोके महाज्ञानास्तच्च लोको न गाहते ॥९५॥

95. They alone will be possessed of unsurpassable knowledge in this world, who will be firm in their conviction with regard to that which is birthless and uniform. But the ordinary man cannot grasp that (Reality).

Ye kecit, those who, perchance; even though they be women; *bhaviṣyanti*, will become; *suniścītāḥ*, firm in conviction; with regard to the nature of the ultimate Reality, *aje sām्ये*, that is birthless and uniform; *te hi loke mahājñānāḥ*, they alone are possessed of great wisdom, or in other words, endowed with unsurpassing knowledge about Reality, in this world. *Cā na lokāḥ*, and nobody, no other man of ordinary intellect; *gāhate*,

can dip into, that is to say, grasp; *tat*, that thing, viz their path and their content of knowledge—the nature of the ultimate Reality. For it is stated in the Smṛti, “As it is not possible to sketch the flight of birds in the sky, so even the gods get puzzled in trying to trace the course of one who has become identified with the Self of all beings, who is a source of bliss to all, and who has no goal to reach” (Mbh. Śā. 239. 23-24).

The next verse says in what their great knowledge consists:

अजेष्वजमसंक्रान्तं धर्मेषु ज्ञानमिष्यते ।

यतो न क्रमते ज्ञानमसङ्गं तेन कीर्तितम् ॥९६॥

96. It is traditionally held that the knowledge inhering in the birthless souls is unborn and non-relational. Since the knowledge has no objective relation, it is said to be unattached.

Since *isyate*, it is traditionally held; that the *jñānam*, knowledge; *ajeṣu dharmeṣu*, inhering in the birthless, steady, souls; is *ajam*, birthless, steady; like light and heat in the sun; therefore that knowledge which is *asaṁkrāntam*, unassociated with any other object; *ajam isyate*, is said to be unborn. *Yataḥ*, since, *jñānam*, the knowledge; *na kramate*, does not relate, to any other object; *tena*, because of that reason; it is *kīrtitam asaṅgam*, proclaimed to be non-relational, like space.

अणुमात्रेऽपि वैधर्म्ये जायमानेऽविपश्चितः ।

असङ्गता सदा नास्ति किमृतावरणच्युतिः ॥९७॥

97. Should there be origination for anything, however slight it may be, there can never be any non-attachment for the non-discriminating man;¹ what need one speak of the destruction of covering for him?

If, in accordance with the other schools of disputants, *jāyamāne vaidharmye aṇumātre api*, it be admitted that there is origination for any object, inside or outside, however insignificant that origination be; then *na asti*, there can be no; *asaṅgatā*, non-attachment; *sadū*, for ever; *avipaścitaḥ*, for that non-discriminating man. *Kim uta*, should one say that there is no; *āvaraṇacyutiḥ*, destruction of covering?

Objection: By asserting that there is no removal of covering, you lay yourself open to the charge of accepting a covering for the souls as your own conclusion.

To this it is *answered*, "No."

अलब्धावरणाः सर्वे धर्माः प्रकृतिनिर्मलाः ।

आदौ बुद्धास्तथा मुक्ता बुध्यन्त इति नायकाः ॥९८॥

98. No soul ever came under any veil. They are by nature pure as well as illumined and free from the very beginning. Thus being endowed with the power (of knowledge¹), they are said to know.

Sarve dharmāḥ, all the souls; *alabdhāvaraṇāḥ*, never had any veil, any bondage of ignorance etc., that is to

¹ For the slightest idea of origination carries with it the idea of the subject-object relation i.e. duality.

say, they are free from bondage; and they are *prakṛti-nirmalāḥ* intrinsically pure; *buddhāḥ tathā muktūḥ*, illumined and also free; *ūdau*, from the beginning; since they are by nature ever pure, illumined, and free. If they are so, why is it said that they *budhyante*, know? The answer is: They are *nāyakāḥ*, masters, have the power, of learning; that is to say, they are by nature endowed with the power of knowledge. This is just like saying, "The sun shines", though the very nature of the sun is constant effulgence; or like saying, "The hills stand", though it is the very nature of the hills to be perpetually motionless.

क्रमते न हि बुद्धस्य ज्ञानं धर्मेषु तायिनः ।

सर्वे धर्मास्तथा ज्ञानं नैतद्बुद्धेन भाषितम् ॥९९॥

99. The knowledge of the enlightened man, who is all-pervasive, does not extend to objects; and so the souls, too, do not reach out to objects; This view was not expressed by Buddha.

Hi, since; *jñānam*, the knowledge; *buddhasya*, of the enlightened one, who has realised the ultimate Reality; *tāyinaḥ*, of the all-pervading one, of the one who has no interstices like space, or of the one who is either adorable or intelligent; *na kramate*, does not extend to other *dharmeṣu*, objects; that is to say, his knowledge is ever centred in (or identified with) the soul like light in the sun. *Tathā*, similarly, like knowledge itself; *sarve dharmaḥ*, all the souls; do not extend to other things whatsoever, the souls being analogous to (all-pervasive) space. This is the meaning. The knowledge that was introduced

in "through his knowledge that is comparable to space" (*Kārikā*, IV. 1), is this knowledge that is analogous to space, that does not reach out to other things, and that belongs to the enlightened one who is all-pervasive by virtue of his identity with knowledge itself. Like the reality of the Self that is but Brahman, they are unchanging, immutable, partless, eternal, non-dual, unattached, invisible, unthinkable, beyond hunger etc., as is said in the Vedic text, "for the vision of the witness can never be lost" (Br. IV. iii. 23). That the nature of the supreme Reality is free from the differences of the knowledge, the known, and the knower and is without a second, *etat*, this thing, *na bhāṣitam*, was not expressed, *buddhena*, by Buddha; though a near approach to non-dualism was implied in his negation of outer objects and his imagination of everything as mere consciousness. But this non-duality, the essence of the ultimate Reality, is to be known from the Upaniṣads only. This is the purport.

At the end of the treatise a salutation is uttered in praise of the knowledge of the supreme Reality:

दुर्दर्शमतिगम्भीरमजं साम्यं विशारदम् ।

बुद्ध्वा पदमनानात्वं नमस्कुर्मो यथाबलम् ॥१००॥

100. After realising that State (of Reality) that is inscrutable, profound, birthless, uniform, holy, and non-dual, we make our obeisance to It to the best of our ability.

Durdarśam, that which can be seen with difficulty, that is to say, inscrutable, It being devoid of the four

alternatives of existence, non-existence, etc. (*Kārikā*, IV. 83); and hence *atigambhīram*, profound, unfathomable like an ocean; to the people lacking in discrimination. *Ajam*, birthless; *sāmyam*, uniform, *visāradam*, holy. *Buddhvū*, having realised, having become identified with; this kind of *padam*, State; that is *anāmītyam*, non-duality; *namaskurmah*, we make our obeisance, to that State; *yathābalam*, to the best of our ability; by bringing It within the range of empirical dealings, though It defies all relative experience. This is the idea.

Salutation by the commentator:

1. I bow down to that Brahman which, though birthless, appears to be born through Its inscrutable power; which, though ever quiescent, appears to be in motion; which, though one, appears to be multiple to those whose vision has become perverted by the perception of diverse attributes of objects; and which destroys the fear of those who take shelter in It.

2. I salute by prostrating myself at the feet of that teacher of my teacher,¹ the most adorable among the adorable, who, on seeing the creatures drowned in the sea (of the world), infested with sea monsters undergoing incessant births and deaths, rescued, out of compassion for all beings, this nectar, which is difficult to be obtained even by gods and which lies in the depths of the ocean, called the Vedas, which (Vedas) he stirred up by inserting the churning rod of his illumined intellect.

¹ Gaudapāda, the teacher of Govindapāda who taught Śaṅkara.

3. I offer my obeisance with my whole being to those sanctifying feet—the dispellers of the fear of transmigration—(feet) of my own teacher, through the light of whose illumined intellect was dispelled the darkness of delusion enveloping my own mind, who destroyed for ever my fear of appearance and disappearance in this terrible sea of innumerable births, and having taken shelter at whose feet others also get unfailingly the knowledge of the Upaniṣads, self-control, and humility.

PRAŚNA UPANIṢAD

ॐ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवा
भद्रं पश्येमाक्षभिर्यजत्राः ।
स्थिरैरङ्गैस्तुष्टुवाꣳसस्तनूभि-
र्व्यशेम देवहितं यदायुः ॥
स्वस्ति न इन्द्रो वृद्धश्रवाः
स्वस्ति नः पूषा विश्ववेदाः ।
स्वस्ति नस्तार्क्ष्यो अरिष्टनेमिः
स्वस्ति नो बृहस्पतिर्दधातु ॥
ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

(For translation, see p. 78).

PRAŚNA UPANIṢAD

FIRST QUESTION

This *brāhmaṇa*¹, is begun as an elaborate reiteration of the subject matter already dealt with in the *mantra* portion.² The story in the form of questions and answers by the *ṛṣis* is meant for eulogising the knowledge. Knowledge is thus praised by showing that it can be acquired by those who are endowed with self-control and who undergo such disciplines as living in the teacher's house for a year under the vow of *brahmacarya*³ and that it can be imparted by people who are almost omniscient like Pippalāda and others but not by a non-descript person. Moreover, *brahmacarya* and other disciplines become obligatory from their reference (in the story):

¹i.e. this Upaniṣad, occurring as the *brāhmaṇa* or Vedic explanation of the *mantras* of the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad.

²i.e. in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad which presented the knowledge of the Self and talked of two kinds of knowledge—the higher and the lower. The latter relates to both rites and meditation. Of these two kinds of lower knowledge, the first is dealt with in the *sāṃhitā* portion of the Vedas, the second is elaborated in the Second and Third Questions of this Upaniṣad. The First Question clarifies the result of both rites and meditation so as to generate a dislike for them. The Fourth Question is meant as an elaboration of the two verses in the Muṇḍaka starting with "As from a blazing fire" (Mu. II. i. 1). The Fifth Question expands the meditation stated in the verse, "Om is the bow" etc. (Mu. II. ii. 4). The Sixth Question is for elucidating the remaining portion beginning with, "From this emerges Prāṇa" (Mu. II. i. 3)—A.G.

³ Celibacy and study of the Vedas with a pious attitude.

ॐ सुकेशा च भारद्वाजः शैब्यश्च सत्यकामः सौर्यायणी
 च गार्ग्यः कौसल्याश्चाश्वलायनो भार्गवो वैदर्भिः कबन्धी
 कात्यायनस्ते हैते ब्रह्मपरा ब्रह्मनिष्ठाः परं ब्रह्मान्वेष-
 माणा एष ह वै तत्सर्वं वक्ष्यतीति ते ह समित्पाणयो
 भगवन्तं पिप्पलादमुपसन्नाः ॥१॥

1. Sukeśā, son of Bharadvāja; Satyakāma, son of Śibi; the grandson of Sūrya, born of the family of Garga; Kausalya, son of Āśvala; a scion of the line of Bhṛgu, born in Vidarbha; and Kabandhī, descendant of Katya—all these, who were devoted to (the inferior) Brahman, engaged in realising (the inferior) Brahman, and intent on a search of the supreme Brahman, approached with faggots in hand, the venerable Pippalāda with the belief, “This one will certainly tell us all about It.”

Sukeśā by name, and (known as) *bhāradvājaḥ*, (because he was) the son of Bharadvāja. *Śaibyah*, the son of Śibi, who was Satyakāma by name. The son of Sūrya is Saurya, and Saurya’s son is Sauryāyaṇi, the lengthening of *i* in Sauryāyaṇi being a Vedic licence; (and he was a) Gārgya, born of the family of Garga. Kausalya by name (and called) Āśvalāyana (because he was) the son of Āśvala. Bhārgava is one who was a scion of the line of Bhṛgu; and he was Vaidarbhi, being born in Vidarbha. Kabandhī by name; and he was Kātyāyana, a descendant (i.e. great grandson) of Katya, and had

his great grandfather living, the suffix in the word being used to imply that sense. *Te ha ete*, these people who were such; were *brahmaparāḥ*, ever devoted to the inferior Brahman, mistaking that for the superior One; and they were *brahmanisthāḥ*, engaged in practices leading to Its attainment; and they were *param brahma anveṣamāṇāḥ*, intent on the search of supreme Brahman. What is that Brahman? That which is eternal and a thing to be realised. They, who searched for that Brahman with the idea, "For the sake of attaining It, we shall make efforts to our hearts content", approached a teacher for knowing about It, with the belief: "*Eṣaḥ ha vai tat sarvam vakṣyati*, this one will certainly tell us everything regarding It." How did they go? *Samit-pāṇayah*, with loads of faggot in hand; *te ha*, those people; *upasannāḥ*, approached; *bhagavantam pippalādam*, the venerable Pippalāda, the teacher.

तान् ह स ऋषिरुवाच भूय एव तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण
श्रद्धया संवत्सरं संवत्स्यथ यथाकामं प्रश्नान् पृच्छत
यदि विज्ञास्यामः सर्वं ह वो वक्ष्याम इति ॥२॥

2. To them the seer said, "Live (here) again for a year in a fitting manner, with control over the senses and with *brahmacarya* and faith. Then put questions as you please. If we know, we shall explain all your questions."

Tān, to them, who had approached (him) thus; *saḥ*, he; the *ṛṣiḥ*, seer; *uvāca ha*, said—"Although you have already practised control of the senses, still *bhūṅgḥ eva*,

over again; you *saṁvatsyatha*, dwell (here) in a fitting manner; serving your teacher; *saṁvatsaram*, for a year; *tapasā*, with control of the senses; and especially *brahmacaryeṇa*, with *brahmacarya*; and *śraddhayā*, with faith.¹ After that *pr̥cchata praśnān*, put questions, with regard to anything that anyone (of you) may desire to know; *yathākāmanam*, as you please, in accordance with the desire that each of you may entertain. *Yadi vijñūsyāmah*, if we happen to know, what you ask: *rakṣyāmah*, we shall explain: *sarvam ha*, all, that you ask. The word "if" is used to express the absence of conceit, but not to betray ignorance or doubt, which fact is obvious from the solution of the questions (by him).

अथ कबन्धी कात्यायन उपेत्य पप्रच्छ । भगवन्
कुतो ह वा इमाः प्रजाः प्रजायन्त इति ॥३॥

3. After that Kabandhī, descendant of Katya, having approached (him), asked, "Venerable sir from what indeed are all these beings born?"

Atha, after that, after the lapse of a year; *kabandhī-kātyāyanah*, Kabandhī, great grandson of Katya; *upetya*, having approached (him); *papraccha*, asked; "*Bhagavan*, venerable sir; *kutaḥ ha vai*, from what indeed; *imāḥ prajāḥ*, these beings, counting from the Brāhmanas; *prajāyante*, are born? The result obtained and the course merited, by following the rites and the lower knowledge in combination, have to be stated; and hence this question.

¹ Faith in the truth of the scriptures and the teacher's words.

तस्मै स होवाच प्रजाकामो वै प्रजापतिः स तपोऽ-
तप्यत स तपस्तप्त्वा स मिथुनमुत्पादयते । रयिं च
प्राणं चेत्येतौ मे बहुधा प्रजाः करिष्यत इति ॥४॥

4. To him he said: The Lord of all creatures became desirous of progeny. He deliberated on (past Vedic) knowledge. Having brooded on that knowledge, He created a couple—food and Prāṇa—under the idea, “These two will produce creatures for me in multifarious ways.”

Tasmai, to him, who had inquired thus; *saḥ ha uvāca*, he said; in order to solve that question. Having become *prajākāmah vai*, desirous of creating progeny, for Himself—being filled with the idea, “I shall create by becoming the soul of all”; *prajāpatiḥ*, the Lord of creatures, who having practised (meditation and rites conjointly in his earlier life) as already mentioned, and being full of that thought, evolved, at the commencement of a cycle (of creation), as Hiranyagarbha¹ by becoming the Lord of all moving and motionless creatures, that were being created. And having become Hiranyagarbha, *saḥ tapaḥ atapyata*, He practised, deliberated on, the *tapas*, consisting in the knowledge which was acquired in the past life and which related

¹ In His pervious life He was a human aspirant meditating on Prajāpati (Hiranyagarbha) with the belief, “I am Prajāpati, identified with all.” That intense meditation made Him Prajāpati at the beginning of the present cycle of creation. Even then the belief that He is Prajāpati persisted, and He had still in His mind all the Vedic knowledge acquired earlier.

to objects revealed by the Vedas. Then *tapas taptvā*, after having practised *tapas* in that way having revolved in His mind the Vedic knowledge; *saḥ*, He; *utpādayatē*, created; *mithunam*, a couple, that is instrumental to creation; (the couple, viz) *rayim ca*, the moon, the food; *prāṇam ca*, and Prāṇa, fire, the eater (the sun). After creating the cosmic egg, He created the sun and the moon, under the idea, “*Etau*, these two, viz fire and moon, which are the eater and the eaten; *prajāḥ*, *karisyataḥ*, will produce creatures; *bahudhā* multifariously; *me*, for me.”¹

आदित्यो ह वै प्राणो रयिरेव चन्द्रमा रयिर्वा एतत्
सर्वं यन्मूर्तं चामूर्तं च तस्मान्मूर्तिरेव रयिः ॥५॥

5. The sun is verily Prāṇa; and food is verily the moon. Whatever is gross or subtle is but food. The gross, as distinguished from that (subtle), is certainly food (of the subtle).

Of these *ādityaḥ ha vai*, the sun, verily; is *prāṇaḥ*, Prāṇa—the eater, fire; *rayiḥ eva*, the food is verily; *candramā*, the moon; *rayiḥ* is certainly the food and it is the moon. That which is the eater and that which is the food are but one; they are but Prajāpati who has become the couple, the distinction being made from the

¹ He projected the couple, the sun and the moon, and became identified with it. Then He created the year that is dependent on that couple, and became identified with the year. Thus successively He produced and became identified with the half year, month, fortnight, day and night; rice, barley, and other foodstuffs; semen and creatures. *Prāṇa* and *rayi* convey the ideas of energy and matter.

standpoint of superiority and inferiority. How? *Etat sarvam*, all this; *rayih vai*, is but food. All of what? *Yat mūrtam*, whatever is formed, gross; *ca amūrtam*, and whatever is formless, subtle; all gross and subtle things, which constitute the food and the eater, are but *rayih*, food. The *mūrtih*, gross; which is different *tasmāt*, from that, from the subtle, which is wholly distinct, is indeed *rayih*, food, since it is eaten up by the formless.¹

Similarly, the formless Prāṇa (Life), the eater, is also everything that is eaten, and hence it is all. How?

अथादित्य उदयन्यत्प्राचीं दिशं प्रविशति तेन प्राच्यान्
प्राणान् रश्मिषु संनिधत्ते । यद्दक्षिणां यत् प्रतीचीं यदुदीचीं
यदधो यदूर्ध्वं यदन्तरा दिशो यत् सर्वं प्रकाशयति तेन
सर्वान् प्राणान् रश्मिषु संनिधत्ते ॥६॥

6. Now then, the fact that the sun, while rising, enters into the eastern direction, thereby it absorbs into its rays all the creatures in the east. That it enters into the south, that it enters into the west, that it enters into the north, that it reaches the nadir and the zenith, that it enters the intermediate points of the zodiac, that it illumines all, thereby it absorbs all living things into its rays.

¹ When no distinction of superior or inferior is made, then everything may be classed as food, for everything is absorbed by something else. But when the distinction is made, the gross gets absorbed in the subtle and is to be considered as food.

Atha, now then; *yat*, the fact that; *ādityaḥ udayan*, the sun, as it rises up, as it comes within the vision of creatures; *praviśati*, enters, that is to say, pervades through its own light, *prācīm diśam*, the eastern quarter; *tena*, thereby, by that self-expansion—because these are pervaded by it; it *samnidhatte*, absorbs; *raśmiṣu*, into its rays, that are but its own pervasive light; *prācyān prāṇān*, all that lives in, all the creatures that happen to be included in, the eastern quarter, they being pervaded by its light; that is to say, it makes them one with itself. Similarly, *yat*, the fact; that it enters into the *dakṣiṇām*, southern direction; *yat pratīcīm*, that it enters into the western direction; *yat udīcīm*, that it enters into the northern direction; *yat*, that it enters into; *adhāḥ ūrdhvam*, the nadir, the zenith; *yat antarāḥ diśaḥ*, that it enters into the inter-spaces, other points of the zodiac; *yat ca prakāśayati*, and the fact that it illumines, *sarvam*, all other things; *tena*, thereby, by that pervasion through its own light; it *samnidhatte*, absorbs; *raśmiṣu*, into the rays; *sarvān prāṇān*, all that lives.

स एष वैश्वानरो विश्वरूपः प्राणोऽग्निरुदयते ।
तदेतदृचाऽभ्युक्तम् ॥७॥

7. That very one rises up who is Prāṇa and fire, who is identified with all creatures, and who is possessed of all forms. This very one, that has been referred to, is spoken of by the *mantra* :

Salḥ eṣaḥ, that very one, the eater (rises up); who is *prāṇaḥ vaiśvānaraḥ*, Prāṇa (life) identified with all

creatures: and who is *viśvarūpaḥ*, possessed of all forms, being embodied in the universe. That eater, again, that is Prāṇa and *agniḥ*, fire; *udayate*, rises, every day, absorbing into himself all the cardinal points. *Etat tat*, this very entity, that has been referred to above; is also *abhyuktam*, spoken of, *ṛcā*, by the (following) *mantra*:

विश्वरूपं हरिणं जातवेदसं
 परायणं ज्योतिरेकं तपन्तम् ।
 सहस्ररश्मिः शतधा वर्तमानः
 प्राणः प्रजानामुदयत्येष सूर्यः ॥८॥

8. (The realisers of Brahman knew the one that is) possessed of all forms, full of rays, endowed with illumination, the resort of all, the single light (of all), and the radiator of heat. It is the sun that rises—the sun that possesses a thousand rays, exists in a hundred forms, and is the life of all creatures.

The enlightened realisers of Brahman knew, as their own soul, that sun that is *viśvarūpam*, possessed of all forms; *hariṇam*, full of rays; *jātavedasam*, endowed with enlightenment;¹ *parāyaṇam*, the resort of all lives; *ekam jyotiḥ*, the only one light, the eye, of all beings; *tapantam*, the radiator of heat. Who is that whom they knew? *Eṣaḥ*, this is; *sūryaḥ*, the sun; that *udayati*, rises;—the sun that is *sahasraraśmiḥ*, possessed of a thousand rays, *śatadhā vartamānaḥ*, that exists in a

¹ The phrase may mean, "The knower of all that is born".

hundred (many) ways, in conformity with the difference of the creatures; and that is *prāṇaḥ prajānām*, the life of creatures.

It is being explained how this single pair—constituted by that which is the moon, the gross, the food (on the one hand), and that which is the formless Prāṇa, the eater, the sun (on the other)—could produce the creatures:

संवत्सरो वै प्रजापतिस्तस्यायने दक्षिणं चोत्तरं च । तद्ये
ह वै तदिष्टापूते कृतमित्युपासते ते चान्द्रमसमेव लोक-
मभिजयन्ते । त एव पुनरावर्तन्ते तस्मादेत ऋषयः प्रजा-
कामा दक्षिणं प्रतिपद्यन्ते । एष ह वै रयिर्यः पितृयाणः ॥९॥

9. The year is verily the Lord of creatures. Of Him there are two Courses, the Southern and the Northern. As to that, those, who follow, in that way, the sacrifices and public good etc. that are products of action, conquer the very world of the moon. It is they who come back. (Since this is so), hence these seers of heaven, who are desirous of progeny, attain the Southern Course. That which is the Course of the Manes is verily food.

That very couple is the time, called *saṁvatsarah*, the year; (and that again is) *prajāpatiḥ*, the Lord of creatures; for the year is brought about by that pair, the year being but a collection of the lunar days and solar days and nights, brought about by the moon and the sun.

Being non-different from the food and Prāṇa, the year is said to be identical with that couple. How is that so? *Tasya*, of that Lord of the creatures, that the year is; there are *ayane*, two Courses, *dakṣiṇam ca uttaram ca*, the Southern and the Northern. These are the two well-known Courses, consisting each of six months, along which the sun moves to the south and the north, ordaining the results for those who perform rites alone as well as for those who undertake rites along with meditation. How is that? *Tat*, as to that; *ye ha vai*, those who; from among people, counting from the Brāhmanas; *upāsate*, follow; *iṣṭāpūrte*, sacrifices and public good; *iti*, etc.; *tat*, in that way; that are *kṛtam*, product of action, but who do not follow the uncreated Eternal—the second *tat*, meaning “in that way”, being used adverbially:—(they) *abhijayante*, conquer; *cāndramasam eva lokam*, the very world of the moon, the world constituted by food which is a portion, called *rayi* (food), of the Lord of the creatures who comprises a pair. This is so because the moon is *kṛta*, a result of action. When the result of action is exhausted there, *te eva punaḥ āvartante*, it is they who come back again; for it has been said, “They enter into this or an inferior world” (Mu. I. ii. 10). Since in this way *ete*, these; *ṛṣayah*, seers of heaven; *prajākāmāḥ*, who are desirous of progeny, the householders; attain the world of the moon—the Lord of creatures, identified with food—as the result of their sacrificial and pious acts; *tasmāt*, therefore; they *pratipadyante*, attain; *dakṣiṇam*, the Southern Course, that is to say, the moon, suggested by the Southern Course, the moon being itself a result of action. *Eṣaḥ ha vai rayiḥ*, this indeed is food; *yah pitṛyānaḥ*,

that which is the Path of the Manes, that is to say, the world of the moon, that is suggested by the term Path of the Manes.

अथोत्तरेण तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण श्रद्धया विद्ययाऽऽत्मान-
मन्विष्यादित्यमभिजयन्ते । एतद्वै प्राणानामायतनमेतद-
मृतमभयमेतत् परायणमेतस्मान्न पुनरावर्तन्त इत्येष
निरोधस्तदेष श्लोकः ॥१०॥

10. Again, by searching for the Self through the control of the senses, *brahmacarya*, faith, and meditation, they conquer the sun (by proceeding) along the Northern Course. This is the resort of all that lives; this is indestructible; this is fearless; this is the highest goal, for from this they do not come back. This is unrealisable (to the ignorant). Pertaining to this here is a verse:

Atha, again *uttarena*, by proceeding along the Northern Course, they *abhijayante*, conquer; that part of the Lord of creatures which is *Prāṇa*, the eater, and the sun. Through what? *Anviṣya*, searching for, i.e. knowing; *ātmanam*, the Self, that is *Prāṇa*, the sun, the Self of the moving and unmoving; as "I am this *Prāṇa* that is the sun"; *tapasā*, through the control of the senses; and especially *brahmacaryeṇa*, through *brahmacarya*; *śraddhayā*, through faith; and *vidyayā*, through meditation, with the idea of the identity of oneself with the Lord of creatures; they *abhijayante*, conquer, attain;

ādityam, the sun. *Etat vai*, this indeed, is the common *āyatanam*, resort *prāṇānām*, of all that lives.¹ *Etat*, this one; is *amṛtam*, indestructible; and because of that fact, this is *abhayam*, free from fear, not subject to the fear of waxing and waning like the moon. *Etat parāyanam*, this one is the supreme goal, for the meditators as well as for the men who combine meditation with rites; *iti*, for; *etasmāt na punaḥ āvartate*, from this (they) do not return, like the others who perform rites alone. *Eṣaḥ*, this one; is *nirodhaḥ*, unrealisable; to the ignorant; for the ignorant are shut off from the sun. These people do not attain the year, the sun, the Self, which is Prāṇa. For that year, identical with time, proves an obstruction to the ignorant. *Tat*, pertaining to this idea; *eṣaḥ ślokaḥ*, here is a verse:

पञ्चपादं पितरं द्वादशाकृतिं

दिव आहुः परे अर्धे पुरीषिणम् ।

अथमे अन्य उ परे विचक्षणं

सप्तचक्रे षडर आहुरर्पितमिति ॥११॥

11. Some talk of (this sun) as possessed of five feet, as the father, as constituted by twelve limbs, and as full of water in the high place above the sky. But there are these others who call him the omniscient and say that on him, as possessed of seven wheels and six spokes, is fixed (the whole universe).

¹ Or "all the organs—eyes etc.," according to Śaṅkarānanda.

The calculators of time *āhuḥ*, call him; *pañcapūdam*, possessed of five feet, the five seasons being the feet, as it were, of the sun as identified with the year; for he revolves with those as his feet. In this imagery, late autumn and winter are taken as but one season. (They call him) *pitaram*, father. He is the father because he is the generator of all. (They call him) *dvādaśākṛtim*, possessed of twelve forms or limbs, or composed of twelve parts consisting of the twelve months. They call him *purīṣiṇam*, full of water;¹ *ardhe pare dive*, in the place above heaven, that is to say, in the third place above the sky.² *U*, but; *anye ime pare*, these others, other calculators of time; (*āhuḥ*, call) that very one, *vicakṣaṇam*, adept, omniscient. (And they) *āhuḥ*, say; that like spokes fixed on the nave of a wheel the whole universe is *arpitam*, fixed; on him, who, as the embodiment of time, is ever on the move—on him *saptacakre*, as possessed of seven wheels, in the form of seven horses; and *ṣaḍlare*, as endowed with six spokes, the six seasons. Whether he be possessed of five feet and twelve limbs or seven wheels and six spokes, from either point of view it is the year, the embodiment of time, the Lord of all creatures, constituted by the sun and the moon, which is the cause of the world.

He by whom the whole world is sustained is called the year, the Lord of all creatures; and He is wholly evolved into the twelve months which are His limbs:

¹ The sun causes clouds, from which rain comes.

² It is third counting from this earth, the second being the sky. Heaven in this context does not mean the dwelling place of the gods.—A.C.

मासो वै प्रजापतिस्तस्य कृष्णपक्ष एव रयिः शुक्लः
प्राणस्तस्मादेत ऋषयः शुक्ल इष्टं कुर्वन्तीतर इतर-
स्मिन् ॥१२॥

12. The month verily is the Lord of all creatures. The dark fortnight is His food, and the bright His Prāṇa. Therefore these seers perform the sacrifices in the bright fortnight. The others perform it in the other.

Māsaḥ vai, the month verily; which is also *prajāpatiḥ*, the Lord of all creatures, as described before; is constituted by a pair. *Tasya*, of Him, of that Lord of creatures. marked by the month; one part. viz *kṛṣṇapakṣaḥ*, the dark fortnight; is *rayiḥ*, food, the moon; the other part, viz *śuklapakṣaḥ*, the bright fortnight; is Prāṇa, the sun, the eater, fire. Since they look upon Prāṇa, identified with the bright fortnight, as everything, therefore, *ete ṛṣayaḥ*, these seers, who realise Prāṇa; *śukle iṣṭam kurvanti* perform their sacrifice (really) in the bright fortnight, even though they may be performing it in the dark half, since they do not perceive any dark fortnight existing apart from Prāṇa; whereas the others do not see Prāṇa, and as a result see only that which is marked by darkness and obstructs vision. Therefore *itare*, the others; *kurvanti*, perform; (their sacrifice really) *itarasmin*, in the other half, in the dark fortnight, although they may be doing so in the bright half.

अहोरात्रो वै प्रजापतिस्तस्याहरेव प्राणो रात्रिरेव
रयिः प्राणं वा एते प्रस्कन्दन्ति ये दिवा रत्या संयुज्यन्ते
ब्रह्मचर्यमेव तद्यद्रात्रौ रत्या संयुज्यन्ते ॥१३॥

13. Day and night are verily the Lord of all creatures. Day is surely His Prāṇa and night is certainly the food. Those who indulge in passion in the day, waste away Prāṇa. That they give play to passion at night is as good as celibacy.

That Lord of all creatures, marked by the month, gets again circumscribed by the day and night which are His own limbs. *Ahorātrah vai prajāpatiḥ*, day and night are verily the Lord of all creatures, just as before. *Tasya*, of Him; *ahar eva prāṇaḥ*, the day is surely Prāṇa, the eater and fire; *rātriḥ, eva rayiḥ*, night is certainly food, just as before. *Ete*, these people; *praskandanti*, eject, exhaust, waste away by separating from themselves; *prāṇam*, Prāṇa, identified with day. Who are they? *Ye*, those who, the fools who; *divā*, in the day time; *samyujyante ratyā*, indulge in passion, that is to say unite with women who cause passion. . . . Since this is so, therefore that should not be done. This is a prohibition enjoined by the way. The fact that they *samyujyante ratyā*, give play to passion; *rātrau*, in the night, in (the proper) season; *tat*, that; is *brahmacaryam eva*, as good as continence; since this is praiseworthy. This too is an injunction, enunciated in passing, that it is one's duty to live with one's wife in due time. As for the relevant topic, it is this: That Lord of all creatures, who has evolved into day and night, exists as identified with such food as rice and barley.

अन्नं वै प्रजापतिस्ततो ह वै तद्रेतस्तस्मादिमाः प्रजाः
प्रजायन्त इति ॥१४॥

14. Food is nothing but the Lord of all creatures. From that indeed issues that human seed. From that are born all these beings.

Evolving thus, *prajāpatiḥ*, the Lord of all creatures; became that *annam vai*, food to be sure. How? *Tataḥ ha vai*, from that food indeed, issues; *tat retas*, that human seed, that is the origin of creatures. *Tasmāt*, from that seed, as deposited in a woman; *prajāyante*, are born; *imāḥ prajāḥ*, all these creatures, such as men. The question that was raised, "From what indeed are all these beings born?" has thus been answered by saying that these creatures are born by passing in succession through the pairs starting with the sun and the moon and ending with day and night, and then by proceeding through food, blood, and semen.

तद्ये ह वै तत् प्रजापतिव्रतं चरन्ति ते मिथुनमुत्पाद-
यन्ते । तेषामेवैष ब्रह्मलोको येषां तपो ब्रह्मचर्यं येषु
सत्यं प्रतिष्ठितम् ॥१५॥

15. This being so, those who undertake the well-known vow of the Lord of all creatures, beget both sons and daughters. For them alone is this world of the moon in whom there are the vows and continence, and in whom is found for ever avoidance of falsehood.

Tat, this being so; *ye*, those, the householders who—*ha* and *vai* are two indeclinables calling up to mind some well-known fact—*caranti*, undertake; *tat prajā-pativratam*, that vow of the Lord of all creatures, consisting

in living with one's wife in the proper season; for them this is the visible result. What is that? *Te*, they; *utpādayante*, beget; *mithunam*, a pair, both son and daughter. *Teṣām eva*, for those people alone, for those who undertake sacrifices and public good and offer gifts, is this unseen result consisting in *eṣaḥ brahmalokaḥ*, this world of Brahman, the world of the moon, that is indicated by the Path of the Manes;—(for those) *yeṣām*, in whom; there are *tapas*, vows as for instance those vows undertaken by one who has completed his study; *brahmacaryam*, (continencc consisting in) not living with one's wife at times other than the proper season; *yeṣu*, in whom, again; *satyam*, truthfulness, avoidance of falsehood; *pratiṣṭhitam*, exists invariably for ever.

तेषामसौ विरजो ब्रह्मलोको न येषु जिह्ममनृतं न
माया चेति ॥१६॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषदि प्रथमः प्रश्नः ॥

16. For them is that taintless world of Brahman, in whom there is no crookedness, no falsehood, and no dissimulation.

As for the Northern Course, marked out by the sun, which consists of self-identification with Prāṇa; and is *virajaḥ*, pure, not tainted like the lunar Brahmaloka and not subject to waxing and waning; *asau*, that one; is *teṣām*, for them. For whom? That is being said. (For those) *na yeṣu jihmam*, in whom there is no fraud, no crookedness, unlike the householders in whom it becomes inevitable, owing to the exigencies of many contradictory

social situations. Moreover, those in whom *anṛtam*, falsehood, does not become unavoidable as it is in the case of householders in the course of play or merriment. Similarly, those in whom, unlike the householders, there does not exist any *māyā*. *Māyā*, dissimulation, is a kind of false behaviour consisting in showing oneself publicly in some way and acting quite contrariwise. For those competent persons—the *brahmacāris* (celibates) forest-dwellers, and mendicants—in whom faults do not exist, because there is no occasion for them; is this untainted world of Brahman, just in consonance with the disciplines they undertake. This is the goal for those who undertake rites in conjunction with meditation. As for the earlier Brahma-loka, indicated by the moon, it is for those who perform rites alone.

SECOND QUESTION

It has been said that Prāṇa is the eater and the Lord of all creatures. It has to be determined how He is the Lord of all creatures as well as the eater in this body. Hence is the Question begun.¹

अथ हैनं भार्गवो वैर्दाभिः पप्रच्छ । भगवन् कत्येव
देवाः प्रजां विधारयन्ते कतर एतत् प्रकाशयन्ते कः
पुनरेषां वरिष्ठ इति ॥१॥

1. Next a scion of the line of Bhṛgu, born in Vidarbha, asked him, "Sir, how many in fact are the deities that sustain a creature? Which among them exhibit this glory? Which again is the chief among them?"

Atha ha, next in order; *bhārgavaḥ vaidarbhīḥ*, a scion of the line of Bhṛgu, who was born in Vidarbha, *papraccha*, asked; *enam*, this one; *Bhagavan*, O adorable sir; *kati eva devāḥ*, how many deities indeed; *vidhārayante*, chiefly sustain; *prajāṃ*, a creature, so far as the body is concerned. *Katara*, which of them, which of those deities divided among the organs of sense and action; *prakāśayante*, exhibit; *etaḥ*, this, this manifestation of their own glory; *kaḥ puṇaḥ*, which again; is *variṣṭhaḥ*, the chief; *eṣāṃ*, among these, that exist as body and organs.

¹In this chapter it will be shown that Prāṇa is the chief, the eater, and the Lord of all creation. The next chapter will enjoin Hīṣ meditation.

तस्मै स होवाचाकाशो ह वा एष देवो वायुरग्निरापः
पृथिवी वाङ्मनश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं च । ते प्रकाश्याभिवदन्ति
वयमेतद्बाणमवष्टभ्य विधारयामः ॥२॥

2. To him he said: Space in fact is this deity, as also are air, fire, water, earth, the organ of speech, mind, eye, and ear. Exhibiting their glory they say, "Unquestionably it is we who hold together this body by not allowing it to disintegrate."

Tasmai, to him, who had asked thus; *śah*, he; *uvāca ha*, said: *Ākāśah ha vai eṣah devah*, space is in fact that deity; *vāyuh*, air; *agnih*, fire; *āpah*, water; *pṛthivī*, earth—these five elements that are the materials of the body; (and) *vāk*, speech; *manas*, mind; *cakṣuh*, eye; *śrotram*, ear—these and others that are the organs of action and knowledge—*te*, they (that is to say), the gods (presiding over these and) identifying themselves with the body and organs; *abhivadanti prakāśya*, speak by way of exhibiting their glory, while vying for pre-eminence. How do they speak? "It is *vayam*, we; who, like the pillars of a palace, *vidhārayāmah*, hold together unquestionably; *etat bāṇam*, this aggregate of body and senses; *avaṣṭabhya*, by holding it aloft, and not allowing it to be disintegrated." This is the idea.

तान् वरिष्ठः प्राण उवाच । मा मोहमापद्यथाहमे-
वैतत् पञ्चधाऽऽत्मानं प्रविभज्यैतद्बाणमवष्टभ्य विधार-
यामीति तेऽश्रद्धाना बभूवुः ॥३॥

3. To them the chief Prāṇa said, "Do not be deluded. It is I who do not allow it to disintegrate by sustaining it by dividing myself fivefold." They remained incredulous.

Tān, to them, to those who had such egotism; *variṣṭhaḥ prāṇaḥ*, the chief Prāṇa; *uvāca*, said; "*Mā ūpadyatha moham*, do not fall into delusion, do not cherish in this way any vanity resulting from non-discrimination; for *aham eva*, it is I who; *vīdhārayāmi etat bāṇam avaśtabhya*, sustain this aggregate of body and senses by not allowing it to disintegrate: I support it, *pañcadhā ūtmānam pravibhajya*, by dividing myself fivefold, by dividing my functions into those of the outgoing breath etc." Although Prāṇa said so, still *te*, they, *babhūvuh*, remained, *asraddadhānāḥ*, incredulous, thinking, "How can this be so?"

सोऽभिमानादूर्ध्वमुत्क्रमत इव तस्मिन्नुत्क्रामत्यथेतरे
सर्व एवोत्क्रामन्ते तस्मिंश्च प्रतिष्ठमाने सर्व एव प्राति-
ष्ठन्ते । तद्यथा मक्षिका मधुकरराजानमुत्क्रामन्तं सर्वा
एवोत्क्रामन्ते तस्मिंश्च प्रतिष्ठमाने सर्वा एव प्राति-
ष्ठन्त एवं वाङ्मनश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं च ते प्रीताः प्राणं
स्तुन्वन्ति ॥४॥

4. He appeared to be rising up (from the body) out of indignation. As He ascended, all the others, too, ascended immediately; and when He remained quiet, all others, too, remained in position. Just as in the world, all the bees take to flight in accordance as the king of

the bees to his wings, and they settle down as he does so, similarly, did speech, mind, eye, ear, etc. behave. Becoming delighted, they (began to) praise Prāṇa.

Noticing their incredulity, *saḥ*, that Prāṇa; on His part, became indifferent and *utkramate iva*, seemed to rise up (from the body); *abhimūnāt*, out of indignation. What followed his ascent is being made vivid with the help of an illustration. *Tasmin utkrūmati*, when He began to rise up; *atha*, then, immediately after; *itare sarve eva*, all others, all the organs such as the eye; *utkrūmante*, ascend (ed); *ca tasmin pratiṣṭhamāne*, and when He, Prāṇa, stayed on, remained quiet, did not rise up; *sarve eva prātiṣṭhante*, all of them remain(ed) quietly in position. *Tat*, with regard to this matter, the illustration is: *Yathā*, as; *loke*, in the world; *makṣikāḥ*, bees; *sarvāḥ eva*, all of them, *utkrūmante*, take to flight; *madhukara-rājānam utkrūmantam*, as the king of bees, their own king, takes to the wings; *ca sarvāḥ eva prātiṣṭhante*, and all settle down; *tasmin pratiṣṭhamāne*, as he settles down. As in this illustration, so did *vāk*, speech; *manaḥ*, mind; *caksuḥ*, eye; *śrotram*, ear; and others (behave). *Te*, they; having given up their lack of faith, and having realised the greatness of Prāṇa, and becoming *prīṭāḥ*, delighted; *stunvanti prāṇam*, praise Prāṇa.

How did they praise?

एषोऽग्निस्तपत्येष सूर्य

एष पर्जन्यो मघवानेष वायुः ।

एष पृथिवी रयिर्देवः

सदसच्चामृतं च यत ॥५॥

5. This one (i.e. Prāṇa) burns as fire, this one is the sun, this one is cloud, this one is Indra and air, this one is the earth and food. This god is the gross and the subtle, as well as that which is nectar.

Eṣaḥ, this one, this Prāṇa, in the form of *agniḥ*, fire; *tapati*, burns. Similarly, He shines as *sūryaḥ*, the sun. So also as *parjanyaḥ*, cloud; He *varṣati*, rains. Moreover, as *maghavān*, Indra; He protects the creatures and endeavours to kill the demons and ogres. *Eṣaḥ*, this one; is *vāyuḥ*, air, diversified as different currents like *āvaha*, *pravaha*. Furthermore, *eṣaḥ devaḥ*, this deity; is *pṛthivī*, the earth; (and) *rayiḥ*, food, of the whole world;¹ *sat*, the gross; *asat*, the subtle; *ca*, and; *yat amṛtam*, that which is nectar that ensures the sustenance of the gods. The point needs no further elaboration.

अरा इव रथनाभौ प्राणे सर्वं प्रतिष्ठितम् ।

ऋचो यजूंषि सामानि यज्ञः क्षत्रं ब्रह्म च ॥६॥

6. Like spokes on the hub of a chariot wheel, are fixed on Prāṇa all things—*rks*, *yajus*, *sāmas*, sacrifice, Kṣatriya, and Brāhmaṇa.

Arāḥ iva rathanābhau, as spokes are fixed on the hub of a chariot wheel; so *sarvam*, everything, starting from faith and ending with name (Pr. VI. 4); *pratiṣṭhitam*, is fixed; *prāṇe*, on Prāṇa, indeed; during the time of the existence of the world. Similarly, the three kinds of

¹ As the earth, He supports all; and as food, He nourishes all.

mantras—*ṛcaḥ*, *ṛks*; *yajūm̐si*, *yajus*; *sāmāni*, *sāmas*—(metrical, prose, and musical Vedic texts); and the *yajñalḥ*, sacrifice, that is performed with those *mantras*; and the *kṣatram*, Kṣatriya caste, that protects all; *ca*, and; *brahma*, the Brāhmaṇa caste, that is qualified for the performance of duties like sacrifice. This Prāṇa is all this.

प्रजापतिश्चरसि गर्भे त्वमेव प्रतिजायसे ।

तुभ्यं प्राण प्रजास्त्विमा बलिं हरन्ति

यः प्राणैः प्रतितिष्ठसि ॥७॥

7. It is you who move about in the womb as the Lord of creation, and it is you who take birth after the image of the parents. O Prāṇa, it is for you, who reside with the organs, that all these creatures carry presents.

Moreover, He who is called *prajāpatiḥ*, the Lord of creation; *tvam eva*, is but you. It is you who *carasi*, move; *garbhe*, in the womb—of the father (as seed) and of the mother (as child); and (it is you, again, who) *prati jāyase*, take birth after the image of (the parents). Since you are the Lord of creation, your parenthood is a pre-established fact. The purport is this: You, Prāṇa, are identical with all through your assumption of the form of all bodies and embodied beings. *Prāṇa*, O Prāṇa; it is *tubhyam*, to you; *yaḥ*, who; *prati tiṣṭhasi*, reside; *prāṇaiḥ*, with the organs, eyes etc., in all the bodies; that *imāḥ prajāḥ*, all these creatures, that there are, counting from human beings; *balim haranti*, carry presents, through the eyes etc. Since you reside in all bodies,

it is proper that they should carry presents to you; for you are in fact the eater, and all else is food for you only.

देवानामसि वह्नितमः पितॄणां प्रथमा स्वधा ।
ऋषीणां चरितं सत्यमथर्वाङ्गिरसामसि ॥८॥

8. You are the best transmitter (of libation) to the celestials. You are the food-offering to the Manes that precedes other offerings. You are the right conduct of the organs that constitute the essence of the body and are known as the *atharvas*.

Moreover, you *asi*, are; *vahnitamah*, the best carrier, the best transmitter of libations; *devānām*, to the celestials, beginning with Indra. The *svadhā*, food-offering, made; *pitṛīṇām*, to the Manes, in the obsequial rite called Nāndī-mukha; that is the *prathamā*, first, that takes precedence over the other offerings in which the deities dominate¹—of that food-offering also, you are the transmitter. This is the idea. Furthermore, it is you who *asi*, are; the *satyam caritam*, true, right, conduct, consisting in maintaining the body etc.; *ṛṣīṇām*, of the organs, such as the eyes etc.; *aṅgirasām*, of those (organs) which represent the essence of the body, and which are called the *atharvas*

¹ The readings are *deva-pradhāna* or *deva-pradāna*. The first reading is adopted in the translation. The second reading would give the meaning, "Over the offering to the gods". The Nāndī-mukha has to be performed before making the sacrifices to gods.

according to the Vedic Text, "Prāṇa is indeed *atharvā*."¹

इन्द्रस्त्वं प्राण तेजसा रुद्रोऽसि परिरक्षिता ।

त्वमन्तरिक्षे चरसि सूर्यस्त्वं ज्योतिषां पतिः ॥९॥

9. O Prāṇa you are Indra. Through your valour you are Rudra; and you are the preserver on all sides. You move in the sky—you are the sun, the lord of all luminaries.

Prāṇa, O Prāṇa; *tvam asi*, you are; *indraḥ*, Indra, the supreme Lord. *Tejasā*, by valour; you are *rudraḥ*, Rudra, engaged in destroying the world. Again, during the time of the existence of the world, you, in your benign aspect, are the *parirakṣitā*, preserver (of the universe) on every side. *Tvam*, you; *carasi*, revolve, for ever; *antarikṣe*, in the sky, through rising and setting. *Tvam*, you; are the *sūryaḥ*, sun; the *patiḥ*, lord; *jyotiṣām*, of the luminaries.

यदा त्वमभिवर्षस्यथेमाः प्राण ते प्रजाः ।

आनन्दरूपास्तिष्ठन्ति कामायान्नं भविष्यतीति ॥१०॥

10. O Prāṇa, when you pour down (as rain), then these creatures of yours continue to be in a happy mood under the belief, "Food will be produced to our hearts' content."

Yadā, when; *tvam*, you; *abhivarṣasi*, pour down, by becoming rain cloud; *atha*, then; getting food; *imāḥ*

¹ Though Prāṇa is *atharvā* according to this quotation, yet the sense-organs⁹ which are but manifestations of Prāṇa, are also *atharvā*.

prajāḥ, all these creatures; *prāṇate*, live, that is to say, resort to activities characteristic of vitality. Or (reading *prāṇa te* in place of *prāṇate*): *prāṇa*, O Prāṇa; *imāḥ prajāḥ te*, these creatures of yours—which are one with you and which are nourished by your food; at the very sight of the rain you pour down; *tiṣṭhanti*, continue to be; *ānandarūpāḥ*, like people possessed of happiness; their idea being this: “*Annam bhaviṣyati*, food will be produced; *kāmāya*, to our hearts’ content.”

व्रात्यस्त्वं प्राणैर्कर्षिरत्ता विश्वस्य सत्पतिः ।

वयमाद्यस्य दातारः पिता त्वं मातरिष्व नः ॥११॥

11. O Prāṇa, you are unpurified, you are the fire Ekarṣi, (you are) the eater, and you are the lord of all that exists. We are the givers of (your) food. O Mātariśvā, you are our father.

Besides, *prāṇa*, O Prāṇa; *tvam*, you, are; *vrātyaḥ*, unpurified—having been born first, you had none to baptise you; the idea is that you are naturally pure. As the fire called *ekarṣiḥ*, Ekarṣi, that is well known among the followers of the Atharva-Veda; you become the *attā*, eater, of all oblations. You are the *satpatiḥ viśvasya*, the lord of all that exists, *satpatiḥ*, being derived in the sense of the lord (*pati*) of what exists (*sat*). Or *satpatiḥ viśvasya*, may mean the holy lord of the universe. *Vayam*, we, again; are *dātāraḥ*, givers, to you; *ādyasya*, of food. *Mātariśva*, O Mātariśvā (Air); *tvam*, you; are *naḥ pitā*, our father, (the word *mātariśva* being taken as a Vedic use for *mātariśvan*). Or if the reading be *mātariśvaṇaḥ*, the meaning (of the sentence) will be;

Tvam, you; are the *pitā*, father; *mātariśvanah*, of *Mātariśvā* (Air).¹ Hence also is established your fatherhood of the whole universe.

या ते तनूर्वाचि प्रतिष्ठिता या श्रोत्रे या च चक्षुषि ।
या च मनसि सन्तता शिवां तां कुरु मोत्कमीः ॥१२॥

12. Make calm that aspect of yours that is lodged in speech, that which is in the ear, that which is in the eye, and that which permeates the mind. Do not rise up.

To be brief, *yā tanūḥ te*, that aspect of yours, which, is *pratiṣṭhitā*, lodged; *vāci*, in speech, which makes the effort of speaking as a speaker; *yā śrotre*, that which is in the ear; *ca yā cakṣuṣi*, and that which is in the eye; *ca yā*, and that which, the aspect that: is *santatā*, pervasive; *manasi*, in the mind, as acts of thinking etc.; *kuru*, make; *tām*, that (aspect); *śivām*, calm; *mā utkramiḥ*, do not ascend, that is to say, do not disturb it by ascending.

प्राणस्येदं वशे सर्वं त्रिदिवे यत् प्रतिष्ठितम् ।
मातेव पुत्रान् रक्षस्व श्रीश्च प्रजां च विधेहि
न इति ॥१३॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषदि द्वितीयः प्रश्नः ॥

¹ Since you are identified with *ākāśa* (space), the source of air.

13. All this (in this world), as also all that is in heaven is under the control of Prāṇa. Protect us just as a mother does her sons, and ordain for us splendour and intelligence.

In short, whatever enjoyable thing there is in this world, *sarvam idam*, all this; is verily *prāṇasya vaśe*, under the control of Prāṇa. And Prāṇa is even the ruler and protector of *yat*, whatever; is *pratiṣṭhitam*, located; *tridive*, in the third heaven, in the form of enjoyment for gods and others. Hence *rakṣasva*, protect us; *mātū iva putrān*, as a mother does her sons. Since all the glories, natural to the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas, are at your disposal, therefore *vidhehi nah*, ordain for us; *śrīḥ ca* (is the same as *śriyaḥ ca*), all splendour; *prajñām ca*, and intelligence; that accrue from your continuance. This is the meaning. Thus, in as much as the greatness of Prāṇa has been disclosed through His praise as the all-pervasive entity, by the organs such as speech, Prāṇa is ascertained as the Lord of creation and the eater.

THIRD QUESTION

अथ हैनं कौशल्यश्चाश्वलायनः पप्रच्छ । भगवन् कुत
एष प्राणो जायते कथमायात्यस्मिञ्शरीर आत्मानं वा
प्रविभज्य कथं प्रातिष्ठते केनोत्क्रमते कथं बाह्यमभिधत्ते
कथमध्यात्ममिति ॥१॥

1. Then Kausalya, son of Aśvala, asked him, "O venerable sir, from where is this Prāṇa born? How does He come into this body? How again does He dwell by dividing Himself? How does He depart? How does He support the external things and how the physical?"

Atha ha, next; *kausalyah ca āśvalāyanah* Kausalya, the son of Aśvala; *papraccha enam*, asked him, "Although the greatness of Prāṇa has thus been perceived by the organs which ascertained His true nature, yet He may still be an effect, inasmuch as He forms a part of a composite thing. Therefore I ask: *Bhagavan*, O venerable sir; *kutah*, from what source; *ēṣaḥ* this one, Prāṇa, *jāyate*, is born? And being born, *katham*, how, through what special function; does He *āyāti*, come; *asmin śarīre*, to this body? What is the cause of His being embodied? This is the idea. And having entered into the body, *katham*, how; does He *prātiṣṭhate*, dwell (in the body); *pravibhajya ātmānam*, by dividing Himself; *kena*, how, through what special function, does He *utkramate*, depart; *asmāt śarīrāt*, from this body? *Katham*, how; does He *abhidhatte*, support; the *bāhyam*,

external things, in the context of the elements and in the divine context; and how (does He support) *adhyāt-mam*, in the (individual) physical context?" The verb "support" has to be supplied.

तस्मै स होवाचातिप्रश्नान् पृच्छसि ब्रह्मिष्ठोऽसीति
तस्मात्तेऽहं ब्रवीमि ॥२॥

2. To him he said: You are putting super-normal questions, since you are pre-eminently a knower of Brahman. Hence I speak to you.

Being asked thus, *saḥ*, he, the teacher; *uvāca ha*, said: *tasmai*, to him: Prāṇa Himself, being inscrutable, is a subject-matter of intricate questioning. And you inquire about the birth etc. of the Prāṇa. Hence *pṛcchasi*, you ask, *atipraśnān*, supernormal questions;¹ *brahmiṣṭhaḥ asi iti*, for you are pre-eminently a knower of Brahman.² Thereby I am pleased. *Tasmāt*, hence; *aham bravīmi*, I speak; *te*, to you, what you ask for. Listen:

आत्मन एष प्राणो जायते । यथैषा पुरुषे छायैतस्मि-
न्नेतदाततं मनोकृतेनायात्यस्मिञ्शरीरे ॥३॥

3. From the Self is born this Prāṇa. Just as there can be shadow when a man is there, so this Prāṇa is fixed on the Self. He comes to this body owing to the actions of the mind.

¹ Question about transcendental verities.

² Know the supreme Brahman which transcends the inferior Brahman. This is only by way of encouragement.—A.G.

Ātmanah, from the Self—from Puruṣa, the Immutable, (or) Truth; *jāyate*, is born; *eṣah*, this Prāṇa spoken of before (Mu. II. i. 2-3). Here is an illustration to show how. *Yathā*, as, in the world; there issues a *chāyā*, shadow, as an effect; *puruṣe*, when a man, possessed of hands etc. is there as the cause; similarly, *etasmin*, on this, on Brahman, on Puruṣa that is Truth; *ātatam*, is spread, i.e. fixed; *etat*, this one, this principle that is false by nature, is analogous to a shadow, and is called Prāṇa, just as a shadow is linked to a body. He *āyāti*, comes; *asmīn śarīre*, to this body, *mano-kṛtena*, through the action of the mind, that is to say, as the result of action accomplished through the thought or wish of the mind, for the text will say later, "Virtue results from virtue" (III. 7); and there is another Vedic text (on this point): "Being attached, he, together with the work, attains (that result to which the subtle body or mind is attached)" (Br. IV. iv. 6).

यथा सम्राडेवाधिकृतान् विनियुङ्क्ते । एतान् ग्रामाने-
तान् ग्रामानधितिष्ठस्वेत्येवमेवैष प्राण इतरान् प्राणान्
पृथक् पृथगेव संनिधत्ते ॥४॥

4. As it is the king alone who employs the officers saying, "Rule over these villages, and those ones," just so Prāṇa engages the other organs separately.

In the world, *yathā*, as, in the way in which; *samrāt eva*, it is the king alone who; *vinīyunkte*, employs; *adhikṛtān*, the officers; in the villages, etc. How? By

ordering, “*Adhiṣṭhasva*, preside over; *etān grāmān*, these villages; *etān grāmān*, these villages”; *evam eva*, just so, as is the case in the illustration, so; *eṣaḥ prāṇaḥ*, this (Chief) Prāṇa; *samnidhatte*, places, engages; *pr̥thak pr̥thak eva*, separately, in the respective posts; *tarūn prāṇān*, the other organs, the eye etc. which are its own manifestations.

पायूपस्थेष्वपानं चक्षुःश्रोत्रे मुखनासिकाभ्यां प्राणः स्वयं प्रातिष्ठते मध्ये तु समानः । एष ह्येतद्भुतमन्नं समं नयति तस्मादेताः सप्तार्चिषो भवन्ति ॥५॥

5. He places Apāna in the two lower apertures. Prāṇa Himself, issuing out of the mouth and nostrils, resides in the eyes and ears. In the middle, however, is Samāna, for this one distributes equally all this food that is eaten. From that issue out these seven flames.

To turn now to the divisions. He places *apānam*, Apāna, that is a division of Himself (i.e. of Prāṇa); that exists, *pāyu-upasthe*, in the two lower apertures, as engaged in the work of ejecting faeces, urine, etc. So also *prāṇaḥ svayam*, Prāṇa Himself, who occupies the place of the sovereign; *pr̥tiṣṭhate*, resides *caḥṣuḥśrotre*, in the eyes and the ears; as issuing out through *mukha-nāsikā-bhyām*, mouth and nostrils. *Madhye tu*, in the middle, however, in between the places of Prāṇa and Apāna, in the navel; there is *samānaḥ*, Samāna, which is so called because it assimilates all that is eaten or drunk; *hi*, for; *eṣaḥ*, th’s one; *nayati samam*, distributes equally (in all

parts of the body), leads to digestion; *etat hutam annam*, all this, that is eaten or drunk, the food that is poured (as a libation) on one's bodily fire. *Tasmāt*, from that, from that fire in the stomach—when fed by the food and drink, it reaches the region of the heart:¹ *bhavanti*, there come into existence: *etāḥ sapta arcīṣaḥ* these seven flames, that are lodged in the head. The idea is that the revelation of objects like form (or colour) etc. that constitutes what is known as seeing, hearing, etc. is caused by Prāṇa.

हृदि ह्येष आत्मा । अत्रैतदेकशतं नाडीनां तासां शतं
शतमेकैकस्यां द्वासप्ततिर्द्वासप्ततिः प्रतिशाखानाडीसह-
स्राणि भवन्त्यासु व्यानश्चरति ॥६॥

6. This Self (i.e. the subtle body) is surely in the heart. There are a hundred and one of the (chief) nerves. Each of them has a hundred (division). Each branch is divided into seventy-two thousand sub-branches. Among them moves Vyāna.

Hi eṣaḥ ātmā, this Self--this subtle body associated with the Self—is in fact; *hṛdi*, in the heart, in the space circumscribed by the lump of flesh shaped like a lotus. *Atra*, in this heart; there are *etat ekaśatam*, this one hundred and one, in number; *nūḍīnam*, from among the

¹ The imagery is thus brought out: The digestive power in the stomach is the sacrificial fire; food is the oblation; and sense-knowledge is the flame. The seven organs in the head are: two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, and the mouth. These derive their capacity to act from the energy supplied by food.

nerves, among the chief ones. *Tāsām*, of those chief nerves; *ekaikasyāḥ*, each one has; *śatam śatam*, a hundred divisions. Again, *prati śākhānāḍī-sahasrāṇi*, the thousands of sub-branches into which each of the (one hundred of) branch nerves is sub-divided are, in each case; *dvāsaptatiḥ, dvāsaptatiḥ*, seventy-two, seventy-two. Each of the hundred branches of the main nerves becomes (seventy-two) thousand in number.¹ *Āsu*, among these nerves; *carati*, moves; the vital energy called *vyānaḥ*, *Vyāna*, the name being derived in the sense of pervasiveness. As rays issue from the sun, so do the nerves issue from the heart and proceed everywhere (in the body); moving through them *Vyāna* resides in the body, pervading it wholly; and by becoming particularly active in the joints, shoulders, and vital parts, and in the interim between the functioning of *Prāṇa* and *Apāna*, it becomes the performer of deeds requiring strength.

अथैकयोर्ध्वं उदानः पुण्येन पुण्यं लोकं नयति पापेन
पापमुभाभ्यामेव मनुष्यलोकम् ॥७॥

7. Now then *Udāna*, when it is in its upward trend, leads to a virtuous world as a result of virtue, to a sinful world as a result of sin, and to the human world as a result of both.

Atha, now then; among those one hundred and one nerves, *ekayā*, through that one, which proceeds upward

¹ To sum up: There are 101 main nerves; each is divided into one hundred branches; and each of these branches is sub-divided into 72,000 sub-branches. Thus the sub-branches are 727,200,000 and the total number of all the nerves is 727,210,201.

and is known as Suṣumnā; the vital force called *udānaḥ*, Udāna, which moves everywhere from the sole of the feet to the head; *ūrdhyaḥ* (*san*), when it has an upward trend; it *nayati*, leads; *puṇyam lokam*, to a virtuous world, such as the world of the gods; *puṇyena karmaṇā*, as a result of virtuous deeds; (it leads) *pāpam*, to a sinful world, hell, such as birth among beasts; *pāpena*, as a result of sin, which is opposed to that (virtuous world); (and it leads) *manuṣyalokam*, to the human world; *ubhābhyām eva*, as a result of both virtue and vice, when they predominate equally. The verb "leads" has to be supplied (everywhere).

आदित्यो ह वै बाह्यः प्राण उदयत्येष ह्येनं चाक्षुषं
प्राणमनुगृह्णानः । पृथिव्यां या देवता सैषा पुरुषस्यापान-
मवष्टभ्यान्तरा यदाकाशः स समानो वायुर्व्यनिः ॥८॥

8. The sun is indeed the external Prāṇa. It rises up favouring this Prāṇa in the eye. That deity, that is in the earth, favours by attracting Apāna in a human being. The space (i.e. air), that is within, is Samāna. The (common) air is Vyāna.

Ādityaḥ ha vai, it is the well-known sun indeed, in the divine context; that is the *bāhyaḥ prāṇaḥ*, external Prāṇa (i.e. Prāṇa in external manifestation). *Eṣaḥ*, this one, that is such; *udayati*, rises up; it is this one indeed (that rises) *anugrḥṇānaḥ*, favouring; *enam piṇam*, this Prāṇa; *cākṣuṣam*, that exists in the eye, in the bodily context; that is to say, it favours by vouchsafing light for the eye in the matter of its perception of colour.

Similarly, *yā devatā pṛthivyām*, the deity that is well known as identified with the earth; *sā eṣā*, that very one, exists by vouchsafing favour; *avaśtabhya*, by attracting, keeping under control—by the fact of pulling down; *apānam puruṣasya*, the vital function called Apāna of a human being; for otherwise the body would fall because of its weight or would fly up into the sky if left free. *Yat* (rather *yah*) *antarā*, that which is in the middle, the space that exists in between heaven and earth, the air there being referred to by the word space on the analogy of one sitting on a scaffolding;¹ *sah*, it, that air; which is *samānah*, Samāna—that exists there, helping the vital function called Samāna. This is the idea; for in common with the air (in interspace), Samāna has the similarity of existing in the space within.² *Vāyuh*, the air in general, that exists externally as a common factor; is Vyāna, because of the similarity of pervasiveness.³ That is to say, it stays there, helping the (vital function called) Vyāna.

तेजो ह वा उदानस्तस्मादुपशान्ततेजाः । पुनर्भवमिन्द्रियैर्मनसि सम्पद्यमानैः ॥९॥

9. That which is well known as luminosity, is Udāna. Therefore one who gets his light

¹ In the sentence, "The scaffolding is shouting," "scaffolding" stands for the men sitting on it. Similarly "space" here stands for the "air" in space.

² *Vāyu* resides in the space between the earth and heaven, and Samāna in the space within the body. The point of resemblance is residence within space.

³ Of the body and the world.

extinguished, attains rebirth together with the organs that enter into (his) mind.

That which is *tejaḥ ha vai*, well known as (common)¹ luminosity, outside; is *udānaḥ*, Udāna, in the body; that is to say, it favours the vital function, called Udāna, by its light. Since the agency (viz Udāna), that causes one's leaving the body, is of the nature of luminosity, and (while staying in the body) it is favoured by external light *tasmāt*, therefore: when an ordinary man *upaśāntatejāḥ*, gets his natural light extinguished; then it is to be understood that his life is exhausted and he is about to die. *Saḥ*, he, attains; *punarbhavam*, another body, (rebirth). How? *Saha indriyaiḥ*, together with the organs, counting from speech: *sampadyamānaiḥ manasi*, entering into the mind.

यच्चित्तस्तेनैष प्राणमायाति प्राणस्तेजसा युक्तः ।
सहात्मना यथासङ्कल्पितं लोकं नयति ॥१०॥

10. Together with whatever thought he had (at the time of death), he enters into Prāṇa. Prāṇa, in combination with Udāna and in association with the soul, leads him to the world desired by him.

Yaccittāḥ, whatever thought he might have had, at the time of death; *tena*, together with that idea, and together with the organs; *āyāti prāṇam*, he (the creature) enters into Prāṇa, the primary vital function. The purport is that at the time of death, the activities of the

¹ As distinguished from its special manifestation as the sun.

organs having declined, he continues to live only through the functioning of the chief Prāṇa (vital energy). Then the relatives say, "He still breathes", "He is still alive." That *prāṇah*, Prāṇa, again; *yuktaḥ tejasū*, as combined with the function called Udāna; *saha ātmanā*, and in association with the soul, the master that enjoys; *nayati*, leads,—that enjoyer (of the fruits of work)—makes him reach, under the influence of virtuous and vicious actions; *lokam yathāsankalpitam*, a world as was desired by him.¹

य एवं विद्वान् प्राणं वेद न हास्य प्रजा हीयतेऽमृतो
भवति तदेषः श्लोकः ॥११॥

11. The line of progeny of any man of knowledge who knows Prāṇa thus, sustains no break. He becomes immortal. Pertaining to this, there occurs this *mantra*:

Yah vidvān, any illumined man who; *veda*, knows; *prāṇam*, Prāṇa; *evam*, thus, as possessed of the descriptions set forth before, viz origin etc.; for that man is being stated this result accruing in this world and the next; *Asya*, for him; for that man of knowledge; *prajāḥ*, line of progeny, consisting of sons, grandsons, etc.; *na hīyate*, sustains no break. And when his body falls, he *bhavati*, becomes; *amṛtaḥ*, immortal, through his identity with Prāṇa. *Tat*, pertaining to this idea;

¹ As an aspirant, he had desired heaven etc. when engaged in sacrifices and meditation. That desire becomes again prominent at the time of death and results in the attainment of that very world.

bhavati, there occurs; *eṣaḥ ślokaḥ*, this *mantra*, expressive of this idea in the form of a brief statement:

उत्पत्तिमायति स्थानं विभुत्वं चैव पञ्चधा ।
 अध्यात्मं चैव प्राणस्य विज्ञायामृतमश्नुते
 विज्ञायामृतमश्नत इति ॥१२॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषदि तृतीयः प्रश्नः ॥

12. Having known the origin, coming, lodgment and fivefold overlordship and the physical existence of Prāṇa, one achieves immortality. Having known, one achieves immortality.

Vijñāya, having known; (thus) *utpattim*, the origin (of Prāṇa), from the supreme Self (Pr. III. 3); *āyatim*, (His) coming to this body, through the action of the mind (Pr. III. 3); *sthānam*, (His) lodgment, in such places as the lower apertures (Pr. III. 5); *ca pañcadhū vibhuttvam*, and (His) fivefold overlordship, (his) ordering of the different functions of Prāṇa in five ways like a sovereign (Pr. III. 4); His existence externally in the form of the sun etc., and *adhyātmam*, in the body, as the eye etc.—having known thus, (one) *aśnute*, achieves; *amṛtam*, immortality. The repetition of “*vijñāya amṛtam aśnute*, having known, he achieves immortality” is by way of concluding the Question.

FOURTH QUESTION

अथ हैनं सौर्यायणी गार्ग्यः पप्रच्छ । भगवन्नेतस्मिन्
पुरुषे कानि स्वपन्ति कान्यस्मिञ्जाग्रति कतर एष देवः
स्वप्नान् पश्यति कस्यैतत् सुखं भवति कस्मिन्नु सर्वे
सम्प्रतिष्ठिता भवन्तीति ॥१॥

1. Then the grandson of Sūrya, born of the family of Garga, asked him, "O adorable sir, which are the organs that go to sleep in this person? Which keep awake in him? Which is the deity who experiences dream? To whom occurs this happiness? In whom do all get merged?"

Atha, next, *sauryāyaṇī gārgyaḥ*, the grandson of Sūrya, born of the family of Garga; *papraccha ha*, asked; *enam*, this one. All about the impermanent, mundane existence, that relates to manifested things, that is comprised within the domain of lower knowledge (i.e. of ignorance), and that consists of ends and means, have been fully dealt with in the three (previous) Questions; now are begun the succeeding Questions, since it is necessary to speak about that auspicious, calm, unchanging, immutable Truth which is called Furuṣa, who cannot be thought of in terms of ends and means, is not subject to any means of proof, is beyond the mind and the senses, exists everywhere internally and externally, and is birthless and the subject-matter of superior knowledge. The

questions are now being raised with a view to telling what the characteristics of that Immutable are, from which, as stated in the second Muṇḍaka, all objects are born like sparks from a blazing fire, and into which they merge again (Mu. II. i. 1); which are all those things that emanate from the Immutable; and how they separate and how they merge there. *Bhagavan*, O adorable sir; *kāni* (*karaṇāni*), which organs; *asmin puruṣe*, in this person, possessed of head, hands, etc.; *svapanti*, go to sleep, desist from their own functions. And *kāni*, which; *asmin*, in this one; *jāgrati*, keep awake, continue in the state of sleeplessness, go on performing their functions? Among those, standing for the effect and cause,¹ *katarah eṣaḥ devaḥ*, which is this deity, who; *paśyati svapnān*, experiences dreams? Dream means the perception (of objects) within the body, like those in the waking state, by one who has ceased from the perception of the waking state. The idea is this: Is that activity performed by a deity identified with the effect (viz body or Prāṇa), or by someone identified with the senses (and mind)? *Kasya*, to whom: *bhavati* occurs; *etat sukham*, this happiness, that is calm (i.e. taintless), effortless (i.e. undisturbed), and unobstructed,² and that emerges on the cessation of the activities of the

¹ A different reading is *kārya - karaṇāni*, where *kārya*, effect, is the body or Prāṇa, and *karaṇāni*, the senses and organs, with the mind at their head. In the reading *kārya - kāraṇāni*, *kāraṇāni* means the elements from which the body etc. are produced.

² *Taintless*, untouched by external objects; *effortless*, expressing itself when all disturbances cease, as does a light in a windless place; *unobstructed*, unending, it being one with the supreme Bliss.

dream and waking states? At that time *kasmin u sarve sampratiṣṭhitāḥ bhavanti*, in whom do they all remain completely unified, after desisting from the activities of the dream and waking states? The idea is this: like the honeys (collected from various flowers) merging in (the same) honey (in the bee-hive), or the rivers entering into the sea, they *bhavanti*, become; *sampratiṣṭhitāḥ*, blended without the possibility of being distinguished.¹

Objection: Since on the analogy of a discarded implement, a scythe for instance, it can be held that the organs and the senses desist from their respective duties and rest separately, each in itself, during sleep, therefore whence can arise in the questioner the surmise that the senses and organs of the sleeping man get merged somewhere?

Answer: The surmise (of the questioner in the text) is quite reasonable. Since in relation to the objects of the waking state the senses and organs (are seen to) stand as a composite whole for the benefit of a master and are not independent, therefore in consonance with the fact that composite things are dependent on someone else, it is but reasonable to assume that they become unified in someone even in sleep. Hence this question is quite in keeping with that conjecture. In

¹ There are five questions: The first relates to the perceiver of the waking state. That entity whose cessation from activity leads to dream, must be the actor in the waking state. The second question is, "Whose function is it to maintain the body in all the three states?" The third relates to the perceiver of the dream; the fourth to the enjoyer of sleep. The fifth asks about the Turiya, the Fourth, the Self, free from the three states of wakefulness, dream, and sleep.

the present context the question, "In whom do they all remain completely unified," is meant to imply, "Who may he be?"—the question being put by one who wants to know something special about the entity in which all the effects and causes get merged during sleep and cosmic dissolution.¹

तस्मै स होवाच । यथा गार्ग्य मरीचयोऽर्कस्यास्तं
गच्छतः सर्वा एतस्मिंस्तेजोमण्डल एकी भवन्ति । ताः पुनः
पुनरुदयतः प्रचरन्त्येवं ह वै तत् सर्वं परे देवे मनस्येकी-
भवति । तेन तर्ह्येष पुरुषो न शृणोति न पश्यति न
जिघ्रति न रसयते न स्पृशते नाभिवदते नादत्ते नानन्द-
यते न विसृजते नेयायते स्वपितीत्याचक्षते ॥२॥

2. To him he said, O Gārgya, just as all the rays of the setting sun become unified in this orb of light, and they disperse from the sun as it rises up again, similarly all that becomes unified in the high deity, the mind. Hence this person does not then hear, does not see, does not smell, does not taste, does not touch, does not speak, does not grasp, does not enjoy, does not eject, does not move. People say, "He is sleeping."

Tasmai, to him; *saḥ*, he, the teacher; *uvāca ha*, said: "O Gārgya, hear what you asked about. *Yathā*, as; the *marīcayah*, rays; *arkasya*, of the sun; *astam gacchataḥ*,

¹ It is the absolute Self that the questioner wants to know, and not the conditioned Self that supports all.

that is setting down, becoming invisible; *sarvāḥ*, all, without exception; *ekī-bhavanti*, become unified, inseparable, indistinguishable; *etasmin tejomaṇḍale*, in this luminous orb, in this sun that is like a mass of light; *punah*, again; *tāḥ*, they, the rays of that very sun; *udayataḥ punah*, while it is rising up again; *pracaranti*, disperse;—as is this illustration, *evam ha vai*, in a similar way indeed; *sarvam tat*, all that—all the senses and their objects; *ekī-bhavati*, become unified, *pare deve manasi*, in the high deity, in the fully luminous, mind—since the deities of the eye etc. are dependent on that of the mind, the latter is their high deity—in that mind they become united, lose their distinction, during dream and sleep, like the rays in the solar orb. And when a man is about to wake up, they emanate—they proceed to their respective functions—from the mind itself just like the rays radiating from the sun. Since the ears etc., which are the organs of perception of sound etc., desist from their function as organs, and thus seem to be unified in the mind,¹ *tena*, therefore; *tarhi*, at that time, during the time of sleep; *eṣaḥ puruṣaḥ*, this person—to wit, a person named Devadatta: *na śrṇoti*, does not hear; *na paśyati*, does not see; *na jighrati*, does not smell; *na rasayate*, does not taste; *na sprśate*, does not touch; *na abhivadate*, does not converse; *na ādatte*, does not grasp; *na ānandayate*, does not enjoy; *na visrjate*, does not eject; *na iyāyate*, does not move; *ācakṣate*, they, the common people, say: *svapiti iti*, he is asleep.

¹ The senses cannot actually become identified with the mind, since the mind is not their material cause. They simply give up their activities and continue to exist in their dependence on the mind.

प्राणाग्नय एवैतस्मिन् पुरे जाग्रति । गार्हपत्यो ह वा
 एषोऽपानो व्यानोऽन्वाहार्यपचनो यद्गार्हपत्यात् प्रणीयते
 प्रणयनादाहवनीयः प्राणः ॥३॥

3. It is the fires (i.e. the functions resembling fire) of Prāṇa that really keep awake in this city of the body. That which is this Apāna really resembles the Gārhapatya fire, Vyāna resembles the fire Anvāhāryapacana. Since the Āhavanīya fire is obtained from Gārhapatya, which is the former's source of extraction, therefore Prāṇa conforms to Āhavanīya (because of its issuing out of Apāna¹).

When the organs, such as the ear, sleep *etasmin pure*, in this city, of the body, which is possessed of nine gates; *prāṇāgnayah*, the five divisions of vital function counting from Prāṇa, which are comparable to fires; *jāgrati*, keep awake. The resemblance with fire is being stated: *Eṣaḥ apānaḥ vai gārhapatyaḥ*, this Apāna is really (the sacrificial fire called) Gārhapatya. How that can be so is being stated: Since the other fire, called Āhavanīya, is *praṇīyate*, taken (extracted); *gārhapatyūt praṇayanāt*, from the Gārhapatya fire, standing as the source, from which (Āhavanīya fire) is extracted at the time of the Agnihotra sacrifice; therefore from the derivative sense of "that from which something is taken away", Gārhapatya fire is the *praṇayana*, the source of extraction. Similarly, for a man in sleep, Prāṇa seems to be moving

¹ Apāna draws in the breath and fills up the lungs; from that inner air Prāṇa comes out as the outgoing breath.

through the mouth and nostrils, having been extracted from Apāna. Therefore Prāṇa is comparable to Āhavanīya. As for *vyānaḥ*, Vyāna, since it moves out from the heart through the *dakṣiṇa*, right, orifice, and is thus associated with the *dakṣiṇa*, southern direction, therefore it is (the fire called) Dakṣiṇāgni, known otherwise as Anvāhāryapacana.

यदुच्छ्वासनिःश्वासावेतावाहुती समं नयतीति स
समानः । मनो ह वाव यजमानः । इष्टफलमेवोदानः ।
स एनं यजमानमहरहर्ब्रह्म गमयति ॥४॥

4. Samāna is the priest called Hotā, because it strikes a balance between exhalation and inhalation which are but (comparable to) two oblations. The mind is verily the sacrificer. The desired fruit is Udāna, which leads this sacrificer every day to Brahman.

The two oblations consisting of *ucchvāsa-niḥśvāsau*, inhaling and exhaling; are the *āhutī*, two oblations, of the Agnihotra sacrifice, as it were, just because of the similarity of being two in number. *Yat*, since; since these are oblations, and since that vital function (called Samāna) *samam nayati*, strikes a balance, for ever; between *etau āhutī*, these two oblations, so as to ensure the maintenance of the body; *iti*, therefore; it is here verily the priest called the Hotā, because of the similarity of carrying the oblations (like the priest), and this despite the fact that it is called a fire (in the earlier paragraph). Which is it? *Saḥ samānaḥ*, it is Samāna. Because of

this further reason, the sleep of an illumined man is verily a performance of the Agnihotra sacrifice. Therefore the idea implied is that the illumined man is not to be considered a non-performer of rites. It is thus that in the Vājasaneyaka it is said that all the component parts of the body and senses of this illumined man perform sacrifices even while he sleeps.¹ Such being the case, *manaḥ ha vāva yajamānaḥ*, it is the mind that is the sacrificer, who keeps awake after having poured (as oblation) the external organs and their objects into the wakeful fires of Prāṇa, and who is intent on going to Brahman, just as one would reach heaven as the result of the Agnihotra sacrifice. The mind is imagined to be the sacrificer, because, like the sacrificer, it acts as the chief among the aggregate of body and senses, and because it sets out for Brahman, just as the sacrificer does for heaven. *Iṣṭaphalam eva*, the result itself of the sacrifice; is *udānaḥ*, the vital function called Udāna, because the achievement of the result of a sacrifice depends on Udāna. How? *Saḥ*, he Udāna; *ahaḥ ahaḥ*, every day; *gamayati*, leads; *yajamānam*, the sacrificer, called the mind; to *brahma*, Brahman, the Immutable, as though to heaven, during the time of sleep, after causing the

¹ By the text "*Vāk citaḥ, prāṇaḥ citaḥ, cakṣuḥ citaḥ*" etc. in the Vājasaneyaka, it is enjoined that one should think of the activity of each function of the Prāṇa as a performance of sacrifice. And so it is pointed out that the organs of knowledge and action continue their sacrifices even during the sleep of a man who knows thus. The text there is meant as a praise of this knowledge. Similarly in the present context the purpose is not to enjoin a meditation, it being out of place under this topic of transcendental knowledge, but to eulogise illumination.

mind to cease even from the dream activities. Hence Udāna takes the place of the result of the sacrifice.

Thus is praised the illumination of the enlightened man by showing that, starting from the time of the cessation from activity of the ear etc., till the time that he rises up from sleep, he enjoys the fruit of all sacrifices, and his sleep is not a source of evil as it is in the case of an unenlightened man; (and all this is meant as a praise), for (on a contrary view) it cannot be held that in the enlightened man alone the ears etc. sleep, while the fires of the Prāṇas keep awake, or that his mind alone enjoys freedom in the dream and wakeful states and then goes to sleep every day; for the fact of passing through the three states of waking, dream, and sleep is similar for all creatures. Hence it is reasonable to say that this is only a eulogy of enlightenment. As for the question, "Which is the deity who experiences dream?"—that is being answered:

अत्रैष देवः स्वप्ने महिमानमनुभवति । यद्दृष्टं
दृष्टमनुपश्यति श्रुतं श्रुतमेवार्थमनुशृणोति देशदिगन्त-
रैश्च प्रत्यनुभूतं पुनः पुनः प्रत्यनुभवति दृष्टं चादृष्टं च
श्रुतं चाश्रुतं चानुभूतं चाननुभूतं च सच्चासच्च सर्वं
पश्यति सर्वः पश्यति ॥५॥

5. In this dream state this deity (i.e. the mind) experiences greatness. Whatever was seen, it sees again; whatever was heard, it hears again; whatever was perceived in the different

places and directions, it experiences again and again; it perceives all by becoming all that was seen or not seen, heard or not heard, perceived or not perceived, and whatever is real or unreal.

Atra svapne, in this state of dream, when the senses, such as that of hearing, cease to function, and the vital forces, counting from Prāṇa, keep awake for the maintenance of the body—in this intermediate state (between waking and sleep) before entering into deep sleep; *eṣaḥ devaḥ*, this deity (the mind), that has withdrawn into itself all the organs, such as the ear, like the rays of the setting sun; *anubhavati*, experiences, undergoes; *mahimānam*, greatness, consisting in assuming diverse forms of subject and object.

Objection: Mind is an instrument of the perceiver in the matter of experiencing greatness. Hence how is it said that the mind experiences independently? It is the soul, (conscious of the body), that can be free (in dream).

Answer: That is no defect, for that freedom of the soul is a result of its being conditioned by the mind, inasmuch as the soul by itself does not in reality either dream or wake. That its wakefulness and dream are caused by the limiting adjunct of the mind has been stated in the (following text of the) Vājasaneyaka Upaniṣad: “Being associated with the mind, and being identified with dream”, “it (i.e. the soul) thinks, as it were, and it shakes, as it were” (Br. IV. iii. 7). Therefore it is quite logical to speak of the independence of the mind in the matter of experiencing diverse manifestations. Some assert that if the soul is

conditioned by the mind in dream, its self-luminosity¹ will remain unestablished. But that is not so. That is a false notion of theirs, caused by their non-comprehension of the drift of the Upaniṣads, inasmuch as even all such talk about the Self—starting with (the texts dealing with) self-luminosity and ending with emancipation—is within the range of ignorance. It is caused by such conditioning factors as the mind. And this conclusion is arrived at according to such Vedic texts as: “When there is something else, as it were, then one can see something. . . .” (Bṛ. IV. iii. 31). “For him there is no contact with sense-objects”, “But when to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self, then what should one see and through what?” (Bṛ. II. iv. 14). Accordingly, this doubt arises only in those who have imperfect knowledge of Brahman, but not in those who have realised the non-dual Self.

Objection: If such be the explanation, the specific statement, “In this state (i.e. dream) he becomes self-effulgent” (Bṛ. IV. iii. 9), becomes meaningless.

The *answer* to this is being given: This objection of yours falls far short of your mark, since the self-effulgence will be much more meaningless if the Self is (really) delimited within the heart according to the

¹As shown in Bṛhadāraṇyaka, IV. iii. 14: “When he dreams, he takes away a little of the impressions of this all-embracing world (the waking state), he himself puts the body aside and himself creates (a dream body) revealing his own lustre by his own light. . . . In this state he becomes self-effulgent.” If the Self continues to be conditioned by the mind in dream, one may well suspect that the effulgence of knowledge revealed there does not belong to the Self.

Vedic Text, “lies in the space¹ that is within the heart” (Br. II. i. 17).

Objection: Though, as a matter of fact, that defect does arise from that point of view, yet half the weight (of this defect) is removed in dream by the fact that the Self becomes then self-effulgent in Its isolation (i.e. dissociation from the mind).²

Answer: Not so; for even there (in sleep), persists the association (of the Self) with the nerves extending up to the pericardium (i.e. the whole body) in accordance with the Vedic text, “(When it becomes fast asleep, . . . it comes back along the seventy-two thousand nerves, called Hitā, which extend from the heart to the pericardium), and sleeps (i.e. remains) in the body” (Br. II. i. 19); and therefore it is a vain effort to remove the (remaining) half weight even in sleep through your reliance on the argument of the self-effulgence of the man,

Objection: What then is meant by saying that “the person becomes self-effulgent in this state” (Br. IV. iii. 9)?

Tentative reply: That Vedic text has no application here, since it belongs to a different branch (of the Vedas).

Objection: Not so, since it is desirable that the Vedic texts should all lead to the identical conclusion, for it is the one Self that is the subject-matter of the Upaniṣads and that is sought to be taught and under-

¹ The “space” (*ākāśa*) here stands really for the supreme Self; but a literal interpretation leads us astray.

² The remaining defect will be removed in the state of sleep, where the Self alone exists—this is the implied idea.

stood. Hence it is necessary that the self-effulgence of the Self in dream should be upheld, for the Vedas serve to reveal the real truth.

Vedāntist's reply: In that case, hear the purport of the Vedic passage by giving up all conceit, for not through conceit can the meaning of the Vedas be mastered even in a hundred years by all the people who pose to be learned. As the Self, sleeping in the space within the heart and in the nerves, spreading from the heart to the pericardium, can be shown to be distinct from them, just because It has no (natural) association with them, and thus the Self's self-effulgence does not become negated, similarly, although the mind persists (in dream), together with the impressions activated by ignorance, desire, and past actions, yet the most arrogant sophist cannot deny then the self-effulgence of the Self which, while remaining totally dissociated from the entire group of causes and effects, witnesses through ignorance the mental impressions created by past actions like something different from Itself; for the witnessing Self then remains totally distinct from the impressions that form the objects visualised (by It). Hence it has been well said that when the senses merge into the mind which, however, remains unabsorbed, the Self, as identified with the mind, sees dreams.

How the mind experiences its diverse manifestations is being said: Being under the influence of the impressions of any object—be it a friend or a son etc.—*yat*, which; *dr̥ṣṭam pūrvam*, was seen earlier; it *paś-yati*, sees; it thinks through ignorance that it sees the visions resembling the son or the friend, called up by

those impressions of the son, friend, etc. So also *śrutam artham*, whatever was heard; *anuśṛṇoti*, it seems to hear thereafter, under the influence of its impressions. Similarly, whatever was *pratyanubhūtam deśadigan-taraiḥ*, perceived as belonging to the different places and quarters; it *pratyanubhavati*, experiences, appears to experience, through ignorance; *punaḥ punaḥ*, time and again. So also whatever was *dṛṣtam*, seen, in this birth; and *adrṣtam*, not seen, that is to say, seen in another birth, for no impression can be left by what is absolutely unseen. Similarly, with regard to *śrutam ca aśrutam ca*, whatever was heard and not heard; *anubhūtam*, what was perceived, in this life through the mind alone; *ananubhūtam ca*, and whatever was not perceived, that is to say, was perceived by the mind itself in another birth; *ca sat*, and what is true, for instance the real water etc.; *ca asat*, and what is false, for instance, water in a mirage. To be brief, it *paśyati*, sees; *sarvam*, all, enumerated or not; *sarvaḥ (san)*, by becoming all, by becoming conditioned by all the mental impressions. Thus the deity, called mind, sees dreams in its unification with all the senses.

स यदा तेजसाऽभिभूतो भवति । अत्रैष देवः स्वप्नान्न पश्यत्यथ तदैतस्मिञ्शरीर एतत्सुखं भवति ॥६॥

6. When that deity, (the mind), becomes overwhelmed by (solar) rays (called bile), then in this state the deity does not see dreams. Then, at that time, there occurs this kind of happiness in this body.

Yadū, when; *tejasū*, by light, by the solar light, called bile¹, that is lodged in the nerves; *saḥ*, the deity, called mind; *bhavati*, becomes; completely, *abhibhūtaḥ*, overwhelmed, when the doors² for its tendencies are closed down; then the rays of the mind, together with the senses, get collected in the heart. The mind is in sleep when, like fire in wood, it exists in the body, pervading it as a whole, in the form of general (as opposed to particularised) consciousness. *Atra*, at this time; *eṣaḥ*, this; *devaḥ*, deity (lit. the luminous one), called the mind; *na paśyati svapnān*, does not see dreams, the doors of vision having been closed by light. *Atha tadū*, then at that time; *etasmīn śarīre*, in this body; *bhavati*, occurs; *etat sukham*, this happiness, that is of the nature of unobstructed Consciousness; that is to say, the Bliss then pervades the whole body in a general way and it remains undisturbed.

At this time, the body and senses that depend on ignorance, desire, and the result of past actions, become inactive. When these become quiet, the nature of the Self, that appears distorted owing to the presence of limiting adjuncts, becomes non-dual, auspicious, and calm. In order to indicate this state through a process of (successively) merging into it the subtle forms of earth etc., that are the creations of ignorance, the text cites an illustration:

¹ As also by the Consciousness, called Brahman, where the mind merges.

² Impressions of past actions that can produce dream.

स यथा सोम्य वयांसि वासोवृक्षं संप्रतिष्ठन्ते । एवं
ह वै तत् सर्वं पर आत्मनि संप्रतिष्ठते ॥७॥

7. To illustrate the point: As the birds, O good-looking one, proceed towards the tree that provides lodging, just so all these proceed to the supreme Self.

Sah, that illustration, is this: *Yathā*, as; *somya*, O good-looking one; *vayāṁsi*, birds; *sampratiṣṭhante*, proceed towards; *vāsovrkṣam*, the tree that provides lodging; *evam ha vai*, just so, just as it is in the illustration; *sarvam*, all—everything that will be enumerated; *sampratiṣṭhate*, proceeds; *pare ātmani*, to the supreme Self, to the Immutable.

पृथिवी च पृथिवीमात्रा चाऽऽपश्चाऽऽपोमात्रा च
तेजश्च तेजोमात्रा च वायुश्च वायुमात्रा चाऽऽकाश-
श्चाऽऽकाशमात्रा च चक्षुश्च द्रष्टव्यं च श्रोत्रं च श्रोतव्यं
च घ्राणं च घ्रातव्यं च रसश्च रसयितव्यं च त्वक्च
स्पर्शयितव्यं च वाक्च वक्तव्यं च हस्तौ चाऽऽदातव्यं
चोपस्थश्चानन्दयितव्यं च पायुश्च विसर्जयितव्यं च
पादौ च गन्तव्यं च मनश्च मन्तव्यं च बुद्धिश्च बोद्धव्यं
चाहंकारश्चाहंकर्तव्यं च चित्तं च चेतयितव्यं च तेजश्च
विद्योतयितव्यं च प्राणश्च विधारयितव्यं च ॥८॥

8. Earth and the rudiment of earth, water and the rudiment of water, fire and the rudiment of fire, space and the rudiment of space, the organ and object of vision, the organ and object of hearing, the organ and object of smell,

the organ and object of taste, the organ and object of touch, the organ and content of speech the hands and the object grasped, sex and enjoyment, the organ of excretion and the excreta, the feet and the space trodden, the mind and the content of thought, understanding and the content of understanding, egoism and the content of egoism, awareness and the content of awareness, the shining skin and the object revealed by that, Prāṇa and all that has to be held by Prāṇa.

What are all those things? *Ṙṥthivī*, the gross earth, possessed of the five attributes;¹ *ca*, and; its cause, the *Ṙṥthivī-mātrā*, rudiment of earth, the fine form of smell. Similarly *āpaḥ ca āpo-mātrā ca*, water and the rudiment of water; *tejaḥ ca tejo-mātrā ca*, fire and the rudiment of fire; *vāyuh ca vāyu-mātrā ca*, air and the rudiment of air; *ākāśaḥ ca ākāśa-mātrā ca*, space and the rudiment of space. That is to say, all the gross and subtle elements. So also *cakṣuḥ*, eye, the organ; *ca rūpam*, and the object of sight; *śrottram ca śrotavyam ca*, ear and the object of hearing; *ghrāṇam ca ghrātavyam ca*, nose and the object of smell; *rasaḥ ca rasayitavyam ca*, the organ of taste and the object of taste; *tvak ca sparśayitavyam ca*, the organ and the object of touch; *vāk ca vaktavyam ca*,

¹Sound, touch, colour, taste, and smell, the last one being the essential attribute of earth. The four others are the essential qualities of space, air, fire and water respectively. These rudimentary elements combine to form the gross composite elements, the flame being given according to the predominance of one or the other.

speech and the content of speech; *hastau ca ūdūtavyam ca*, two hands and the objects to be grasped; *upasthaḥ ca ūnandayitavyam ca*, sex and what is enjoyed; *pāyuh ca visarjayitavyam ca*, the organ of excretion and what is excreted; *pādaū ca gantavyam ca*, two feet and the place walked over. Thus (it is to be understood) that the organs of knowledge and the organs of action have been enumerated. *Manah ca*, the mind, that has been already mentioned; *mantavyam ca*, and the object of the mind, (what is thought of); *buddhiḥ*, understanding, the faculty of ascertaining; *ca boddhavyam*, and the object to be ascertained. *Ahaṁkārah* is the internal organ characterised by egoism; *ca*, and; *ahaṁkartavyam*, the object of egoism. *Cittam*, the internal organ possessed of consciousness; *ca cetayitavyam*, and the object to be conscious of. *Tejah*, the skin, as distinct from the organ of touch and as possessed of lustre; the object revealed by it¹ is *vidyotayitavyam*. *Prāṇah* is what is called Sūtra (Hiraṇyagarbha, who strings together everything); *vidhārayitavyam*, all that is held, strung together by Him, for the entire range of body and senses, combining for the sake of some one else and consisting of name and form, extends thus far only.

Next in order is that reality of the Self that has entered here (in the body) as the enjoyer and the agent of action, like a reflection of the sun in water:

एष हि द्रष्टा स्प्रष्टा श्रोता घ्राता रसयिता मन्ता
बोद्धा कर्ता विज्ञानात्मा पुरुषः । स परेऽक्षर आत्मनि
संप्रतिष्ठते ॥९॥

¹ i.e. the skin itself that is the seat of the organ of touch.

9. And this one is the seer, feeler, hearer, smeller, taster, thinker, ascertainer, doer—the Puruṣa (pervading the body and senses), that is a knower by nature. This becomes wholly established in the supreme, immutable Self.

Hi, and;¹ *esaḥ*, this one (this Self); is the *draṣṭā*, seer; *spraṣṭā*, toucher (feeler); *śrotā*, hearer; *ghrātā*, smeller; *rasayitā*, taster; *mantā*, thinker; *boddhā*, ascertainer; *kartā*, doer. The word *viññāna*, when derived in the (instrumental) sense of “that by which anything is known” means such instruments as the intellect; but the word here is derived in the nominative sense of “that which knows”. So *viññānātmā* means the reality that has that nature or that is a knower by nature. He is *puruṣaḥ* because he fills up, in its entirety, the aggregate of the body and senses that has been spoken of as a limiting adjunct. And as the reflection of the sun in water enters into the sun (when the water is removed), so this Self gets wholly established *pare akṣare ātmani*, in the supreme immutable Self, that persists as the last resort of the universe.

The result achieved by one who realises his identity with that supreme Self is being stated:

परमेवाक्षरं प्रतिपद्यते स यो ह वै तदच्छायमशरीरम-
लोहितं शुभ्रमक्षरं वेदयते यस्तु सोम्य । स सर्वज्ञः सर्वो
भवति । तदेष श्लोकः ॥१०॥

10. He who realises that shadowless, bodiless, colourless, pure, Immutable attains the su-

¹ According to Ānanda Giri.

preme Immutable Itself. O amiable one, he, again, who realises, becomes omniscient and all. Illustrative of this there occurs this verse:

It is being stated that he *pratipadyate*, attains; *param eva akṣaram*, the supreme Immutable Itself, that is going to be described. *Saḥ*, he; (attains the Immutable): *yaḥ ha vai*, who perchance, having become free from all desires; *vedayate*, realises; *tat*, that which is; *acchāyam*, free from shadow, from ignorance; *aśarīram*, bodiless; *alohitam*, devoid of redness, free from all qualities starting from redness. Since this is so, therefore (It is) *śubhram*, pure, being free from all attributes; It is *akṣaram*, the Immutable, the True, called Puruṣa (all-pervading, indwelling entity), which is without Prāṇa, is not conceivable by the mind, and is auspicious, calm, coexisting with all that is within and without, and is birthless. *Tu*, again; *somya*, O amiable one; *yaḥ*, he, the renouncer of everything, who knows;¹ becomes *sarvajñah*, omniscient, nothing can possibly remain unknown to him. Formerly he was not omniscient owing to ignorance; again, when ignorance is removed by knowledge, *saḥ bhavati sarvaḥ*, he becomes all. *Tat*, with regard to that point; *bhavati eṣaḥ ślokaḥ*, there occurs this verse, which sums up the above idea.

विज्ञानात्मा सह देवेश्च सर्वैः

प्राणा भूतानि संप्रतिष्ठन्ति यत्र ।

¹ Ānanda Gīri repeats the verb "knows" and splits up the first part of the text into two sentences.

तदक्षरं वेदयते यस्तु सोम्य
स सर्वज्ञः सर्वमेवाविवेशेति ॥११॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषदि चतुर्थः प्रश्नः ॥

11. O amiable one, he becomes all-knowing and enters into all who knows that Immutable wherein merges the cognising Self—the Puruṣa who is naturally a knower—as also do the organs and the elements together with all the deities.

Somya, O amiable (or good-looking) one, *yaḥ tu vedayate*, he who knows; *tat akṣaram*, that Immutable; *yatra*, into which; *saṁpratiṣṭhanti*, merge; *vijñānātmā*, the entity that is by nature a knower (IV. 9); and *prāṇāḥ*, the organs, such as the eye; *bhūtāni*, and the elements such as earth; *saha devaiḥ*, together with the deities, such as Fire etc.; *saḥ sarvajñaḥ*, that omniscient one; *āviveśa* (is the same as *āviśati*), enters; into *sarvam*, everything.

FIFTH QUESTION

अथ हैनं शैब्यः सत्यकामः पप्रच्छ । स यो ह वै
तद्भ्रुगवन्मनुष्येषु प्रायणान्तमोकारमभिध्यायीत । कतमं
वाव स तेन लोकं जयतीति । तस्मै स होवाच ॥१॥

1. Next, Satyakāma, son of Śibi, asked him, “O venerable sir, which world does he really win thereby, who, among men, intently meditates on *Om* in that wonderful way till death?” To him he said:

Atha ha, next; *satyakāmaḥ śaihyaḥ*, Satyakāma, son of Śibi; *papraccha enam*, asked him. Now then, this Question is begun in order to enjoin the meditation on *Om* as a means to the realisation of the inferior and superior Brahman. *Bhagavan*, O venerable sir; *saḥ yaḥ ha vai*, anyone, any rare person; *manuṣyeṣu*, among men; who, after withdrawing the internal organ from external objects and concentrating his mind on *Om*, on which he superimposes the idea of Brahman through devotion; *abhidhyāyīta*, should intently meditate; *omkāram*, on *Om*; *taḥ*, in that wonderful way; *prāyaṅ-āntam*, till death, that is to say, for the whole life; (which world does he conquer)? The meaning of the term “*abhidhyāna*, intense meditation” is to have such an unbroken current of the idea of self-identification (with the object of meditation) as is not vitiated by other states of consciousness of a different order, and which is comparable to the (unflickering) flame of a lamp in a windless place. There being many worlds

that can be achieved through meditation and rites, *katamam vāya lokam*, which of the worlds; *saḥ jayati tena*, does he conquer thereby, by that meditation on *Om*, who undertakes such a lifelong vow, aided by such multifarious forms of *yama* and *niyama* (i.e. control of body and senses and observance of moral injunctions) as truthfulness, abstinence from sexual pleasure, non-injury, non-acceptance of presents, dispassion, monasticism, cleanliness, contentment, absence of dissimulation etc. ? To him who had asked thus *saḥ*, he, Pippalāda; *uvāca ha*, said:

एतद्वै सत्यकाम परं चापरं च ब्रह्म यदोकारः । तस्मा-
द्विद्वानेतेनैवाऽऽयतनेनैकतरमन्वेति ॥२॥

2. O Satyakāma, this very Brahman, that is (known as) the inferior and superior, is but this *Om*. Therefore the illumined soul attains either of the two through this one means alone.

O Satyakāma, *etat brahma vai*, this very Brahman; *yat*, that is; *param ca aparam ca*, both superior and inferior—the superior being that which is Truth and Immutable and is called Puruṣa; and the inferior being the First Born, called Prāṇa; *omkāraḥ eva*, is but *Om*, being identical with *Om*, since *Om* is Its symbol.¹ As the supreme Brahman cannot be (directly) indicated by words etc. and is devoid of all distinctions created by attributes—and as It is (on that account) beyond the senses—therefore the mind cannot explore It. But to those who meditate on *Om*, which is comparable to the

¹ *Etat* and *yat*, being neuter, are construed with Brahman, rather than with *omkāraḥ* which is masculine.—A.G.

images of Viṣṇu and others and on which is fixed the idea of Brahman with devotion, that Brahman becomes favourable (and reveals Itself). This is understood on the authority of scriptures. Similar is the case with the inferior Brahman. Hence it is said in a secondary sense that, that Brahman which is both inferior and superior is but *Om*. *Tasmāt*, therefore; *vidvān*, one who knows, thus; *anveti*, attains; *ekataram*, either of the two—the superior or inferior Brahman; *etena āyatanena eva*, through this means alone, through this that is a means for the attainment of the Self, consisting in meditation on *Om*; for *Om* is the nearest symbol of Brahman.

स यद्येकमात्रमभिध्यायीत स तेनैव संवेदितस्तूर्णमेव
जगत्यामभिसंपद्यते । तमृचो मनुष्यलोकमुपनयन्ते स तत्र
तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण श्रद्धया संपन्नो महिमानमनुभवति ॥३॥

3. Should he meditate on *Om* as consisting of one letter, he becomes enlightened even by that and attains a human birth on the earth. The *Rk mantras* lead him to the human birth. Being endued there with self-control, continence, and faith he experiences greatness.

Yadi, even though; *saḥ*, he; may not know all the letters by which *Om* is constituted, still through the influence of the (partial) meditation on *Om*, he attains an excellent goal; one who resorts to *Om* does not fall into evil by being denied the fruits of both rites and meditation* as a consequence of the defect of such partial knowledge. What ensues then? Knowing only

one part consisting of one letter, *abhidhyāyīta*, should he meditate, constantly; on *Om* itself as comprising one letter; *saḥ*, he; *samveditaḥ*, becoming enlightened; *tena eva*, by that alone—that meditation on *Om* as possessed of one letter only; *tūrṇam eva*, very quickly; *abhi sampadyate*, attains; *jagatyām*, on the earth. What does he attain? *Manuṣyalokam*, the human birth (i.e. human body). As many kinds of birth are possible on this earth, so, among these, *ṛcaḥ*, the *Ṛk mantras*; *upanayante*, conduct; *tam*, him, that aspirant; to *manuṣyalokam*, human birth, on the earth; for the first single letter (viz *a*) of *Om* was meditated on (by him) as the *Ṛk mantras*, which stand for the *Ṛg-Veda*. Thereby, in that human birth, he becomes a prominent *Brāhmaṇa*, and being *sampannaḥ*, endued; *tapasū*, with self-control; *brahmacaryeṇa*, with continence; *śraddhayā*, with faith *anubhavati*, experiences; *mahimānam*, greatness; he does not become faithless or wilful in his action. He does not come to grief because of any deviation, (consisting in partial knowledge), from Yoga (i.e. application of his mind to Brahman).

अथ यदि द्विमात्रेण मनसि संपद्यते सोऽन्तरिक्षं
यजुर्भिरुन्नीयते सोमलोकम् । स सोमलोके विभूतिमनुभूय
पुनरावर्तते ॥४॥

4. Now again, if he meditates on *Om* with the help of the second letter, he becomes identified with the mind. By the *Yajur mantras* he is lifted to the intermediate space, the world

of the Moon. Having experienced greatness in the lunar world, he turns round again.

Atha, now again; *yadi*, if, anyone conversant with *Om* as constituted by its second letter (viz *u*), (*abhidhyāyīta*, should meditate on *Om*) *dvimātreṇa*, as possessed of the second letter; then as a result of that concentration, one *saṃpadyate*, becomes unified; *manasi*, in the mind of which the Moon is the presiding deity, which is conceived of as the state of dream, which is identified with the *Yajur mantras*, and which is the object of meditation. When *saḥ*, that man, who has become thus identified, dies; he is *unnīyate*, lifted; *yajurbhiḥ*, by the *Yajur mantras*, which are identical with the second letter; *antarikṣam*, to the intermediate space (between heaven and earth); that is to say, *somalokam*, to the world of the Moon, that is supported by intermediate space and is represented by the second letter. Or in other words, the *Yajur mantras*, lead him to a birth in the world of the Moon. *Saḥ*, he; *anubhūya vibhūtim*, having experienced greatness *somaloke*, in that world of the Moon; *āvartate punaḥ*, turns round again, towards the human world.¹

¹ According to Śaṅkarānanda, the first portion of the text means this: If anyone *manasi saṃpadyate*, resorts to the mind, that is, meditates; *dvimātreṇa*, for two moments or on the two letters *a* and *u* of *Om*. According to some, this text enjoins a meditation on Hiraṇyagarbha who embodies Himself in the subtle cosmos conceived of as a subtle dream state; the earlier text similarly enjoins a meditation on Virāṭ, embodying Himself in the gross universe, conceived of as the waking state.

यः पुनरेतं त्रिमात्रेणोमित्येतेनैवाक्षरेण परं पुरुष-
मभिध्यायीत स तेजसि सूर्ये संपन्नः । यथा पादोदरस्त्वचा
विनिर्मुच्यत एवं ह वै स पाप्मना विनिर्मुक्तः स सामभि-
रुन्नीयते ब्रह्मलोकं स एतस्माज्जीवघनात् परात्परं पुरिशयं
पुरुषमीक्षते । तदेतौ श्लोकौ भवतः ॥५॥

5. Again, anyone who meditates on the supreme Puruṣa with the help of this very syllable *Om*, as possessed of three letters, becomes unified in the Sun, consisting of light. As a snake becomes freed from its slough, exactly in a similar way, he becomes freed from sin, and he is lifted up to the world of Brahmā (Hiraṇyagarbha) by the *Sāma mantras*. From this total mass of creatures (that Hiraṇyagarbha is) he sees the supreme Puruṣa that penetrates every being and is higher than the higher One (viz Hiraṇyagarbha). Bearing on this, there occur two verses:

Punaḥ, again; *yaḥ abhidhyāyīta*, should anyone meditate; *etam*, on this—on *Om*; as *param puruṣam*, the supreme Puruṣa, residing within the solar orb; *Om iti etena eva akṣareṇa*, with the help of the very syllable *Om*; *trimātreṇa*, as associated with the knowledge of the three letters (*a, u, m*), and serving as a symbol; (he becomes unified in the Sun, as the result of that meditation). In this context *Om* is (presented ḥs) a symbol to aid (meditation), which conclusion is drawn from the

following Vedic text implying identity: "That which is known as the superior and inferior Brahman (is but *Om*)" (Pr. V. 2). Moreover, on any other supposition, the frequently used accusative case in *omkāram* in the text will become unjustifiable. Although from the use of the instrumental case (in *trimātreṇa*), an interpretation in the instrumental sense is quite in order, still in conformity with the context, *trimātreṇa* etc. should be converted to the accusative form¹ thus: "*trimātram param puruṣam*—(meditate) on *Om*, associated with the knowledge of the three letters, as the supreme Puruṣa", so as to accord with the adage, "The individual should be sacrificed for the family."² By that meditation, *sah*, he; becomes *saṁpannah*, absorbed—being engaged in meditation, he becomes identified with the third letter (*m*) and becomes unified,—*tejasi sūrye*, in the Sun consisting of light. Even after death he does not return from the Sun as one does from the lunar world; but he continues in his identity with the Sun. *Yathā*, just as; a *pūdodarah*, snake; *vinirmucyate tvacā*, is freed from its slough, the dead skin, to become new again; *evam ha vai*, exactly in the same way, as in the illustration, so; becoming *vinirmuktaḥ*, freed; *pāpmanā*, from sin, that is a kind of impurity comparable to the slough; *sah*, he; *unnīyate*, is lifted up; *sāmbhīḥ* by the *Sāma mantras*, that are identical with the third letter (*m* of *Om*); *brahmalokam*, to the world of Brahmā, i.e. of Hiranyagarbha, which is called Satya (Truth). That Hiranyagarbha, is identified with all the creatures that are subject to birth and death;

¹ One might object that the instrumental case indicates that *Om* is not a symbol (or icon); but Śaṅkara says, it is so.

² That is to say, for the sake of the majority.

for as (the sum total of all) the subtle bodies, He constitutes the inner soul of all; and in Him, as comprising the (cosmic) subtle body, are strung together all the creatures.¹ Hence He is *jīvaghanah*, a mass of creatures. *Etasmāt jīvaghanāt*, from this totality of creatures, that Hiranyagarbha is; *saḥ*, he, the enlightened man, who has known *Om* as possessed of the three letters; *īkṣate*, sees, through meditation; *puruṣam*, Puruṣa; *purīṣayam*, who has entered into all the bodies and who is called the supreme Self; being *param parāt*, superior to the higher One, that is to say, to Hiranyagarbha.² *Tat*, bearing on this, expressive of the foregoing idea; *bhavataḥ* there occur; *etau ślokaḥ*, these two verses:

तिस्रो मात्रा मृत्युमत्यः प्रयुक्ता

अन्योन्यसक्ता अनविप्रयुक्ताः ।

क्रियासु बाह्याभ्यन्तरमध्यमासु

सम्यक् प्रयुक्तासु न कम्पते ज्ञः ॥६॥

6. The three letters (by themselves) are within the range of death. But if they are closely joined, one to another, are not divergently applied to different objects, and are applied to the three courses of action—external, internal, and intermediate—that are properly resorted to, then the man of enlightenment does not shake (i.e. remains undisturbed).

¹ That identify themselves with their subtle bodies.

² Hiranyagarbha is higher than all other creatures.

Tisraḥ mātrāḥ, the three letters, viz *a, u, m*, of *Om*; *mṛtyumatyaḥ*, are encompassed by death, not outside the pale of death, that is to say, within the grasp of death.¹ But when they are *prayuktāḥ*, applied; *kriyāsu*, in actions, in the acts of meditation on the Self; moreover, (when they are) *anyonyasaktāḥ*, joined one to another; *anaviprayuktāḥ*, are not applied divergently to different objects; (then the Yogī does not shake). *Viprayuktāḥ*, are those that are specifically applied to a single object alone; those that are not applied thus are *aviprayuktāḥ*, (i.e. diversely used); those that are not so diversely applied are *anaviprayuktāḥ*. What follows from that? When (they are applied thus) specially at the time of a single (continuous) meditation during the three *kriyāsu*, courses of action—*bāhyūbhyantaramadhyamāsu*, the external, internal, and intermediate—in the course of the Yogic actions, consisting in the meditation on Puruṣas, as associated with the states of waking, dream, and sleep; *samyak prayuktāsu*, which processes are properly resorted to during the time of meditation; then the *jñāḥ*, enlightened one, that is to say, the Yogī who knows the divisions of *Om*, as aforesaid; *na kampate*, does not shake. For he who knows thus, cannot possibly be deflected, since the

¹ *Viśva*, the conscious Self in the waking state, is identical with *Vaiśvānara* (*Virāṭ*), and his residence is in the gross body and the waking state. *Taijasa*, identical with *Hiraṇyagarbha*, has his lodging in the subtle body and dream. *Prājña*, identical with *Īśvara*, has his locus in the Unmanifested and sleep. The Yogic processes consist in meditating on them in identification with *a, u, m* respectively. If these are resorted to separately, and without the idea of Brahman, they cannot lead one beyond death.

Puruṣa in the waking, dream, and sleep states, together with the states, has been seen by him as identical with the three letters and as identical with *Om*. Since a man, who is thus enlightened, has become the Self of all and one with *Om*, therefore from where can he deviate and to where?

The second verse is meant to sum up all the (foregoing) ideas:

ऋग्भिरेतं यजुर्भिरन्तरिक्षं
 सामभिर्यत् तत् कवयो वेदयन्ते ।
 तमोकारेणैवाऽऽयतनेनान्वेति विद्वान्
 यत्तच्छान्तमजरममृतमभयं परं चेति ॥७॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषदि पञ्चमः प्रश्नः ॥

7. The intelligent know this world that is attainable by the *Rk mantras*, the intermediate space achievable by the *Yajur mantras*, and that which is reached by the *Sāma mantras*. The enlightened man attains that (threefold) world through *Om* alone; and through *Om* as an aid, he reaches that also which is the supreme Reality that is quiet and beyond old age, death, and fear.

Only *kavayah*, the intelligent, enlightened ones, and not the ignorant; *vedayante*, know; *etam*, this, this world, associated with men; that is attainable *rgbhih*, through the *Rk mantras*; *antarikṣam*, the intermediate

space, presided over by the Moon; that is attainable *yajurbhiḥ*, by the *Yajur mantras*; and *tat*, that, that world of Brahṁā; *yat*, which; is attainable *sāmabhiḥ*, by the *Sāma mantras*. *Vidvān*, the enlightened one; *anveti*, reaches; *tam*, that, that threefold world, indicative of the inferior Brahman; *omkāreṇa*, through *Om*, with the aid of *Om*. And with the help of that very *Om*, he attains *tat*, that; *yat*, which; is *param*, supreme Brahman, which is immutable, true, and is called *Puruṣa*, the all-pervasive; which is *śāntam*, quiet, free, devoid of all such distinctions as waking, dream, and sleep, and is transcendental to the whole universe; and is therefore *ajaram*, free from old age; *amṛtam*, beyond death, since untouched by such changes as old age; and consequently *abhayam*, fearless; just because It is fearless, therefore *param*, unsurpassing. The idea is that, he reaches this One also *omkāreṇa āyatanena*, with the aid of *Om*, which is a vehicle of advance. The word “*iti*, this”, is used to imply the end of the sentence.

SIXTH QUESTION

अथ हैनं सुकेशा भारद्वाजः पप्रच्छ । भगवन् हिरण्य-
नाभः कौसल्यो राजपुत्रो मामुपेत्यैतं प्रश्नमपृच्छत ।
षोडशकलं भारद्वाज पुरुषं वेत्थ । तमहं कुमारमब्रुवं
नाहमिमं वेद । यद्यहमिममवेदिषं कथं ते नावक्ष्यमिति ।
समूलो वा एष परिशुष्यति योऽनृतमभिवदति तस्मा-
न्नाहर्मिनृतं वक्तुम् । स तूष्णीं रथमारुह्य प्रवव्राज ।
तं त्वा पृच्छामि क्वासौ पुरुष इति ॥१॥

1. Then Sukeśā, son of Bharadvāja, asked him, “Venerable sir, Hiraṇyanābha, a prince of Kosala, approached me and put this question, ‘Bhāradvāja, do you know the Puruṣa possessed of sixteen limbs?’ To that prince I said, ‘I do not know him. Had I known him, why should I not have told you? Anyone who utters a falsehood dries up root and all. Therefore I cannot afford to utter a falsehood. Silently he went away riding on the chariot. Of that Puruṣa I ask you, ‘Where does He exist?’”

Atha ha, next; *sukeśā bhāradvājaḥ*, Sukeśā, son of Bharadvāja; *papraccha*, asked; *enam*, him. It has been said that the entire world, consisting of cause and effect, together with the conscious soul, gets unified in the supreme Immutable during sleep (Pr. IV. 11). From the logic of circumstances it follows that even during cosmic dissolution, the world merges into that Immutable alone and originates from that alone; for

an effect cannot reasonably get absorbed into anything other than its origin. Besides, it has been said, "From the Self is born this Prāṇa" (Pr. III. 3). And it is the well ascertained purport of all the Upaniṣads that the highest good results from the full realisation of that which is the source of creation; and it has just been declared, "he becomes omniscient and all" (Pr. IV. 10). It remains now to point out, where that immutable, that Truth, called Puruṣa (the all-pervasive, indwelling entity) is to be realised. This question is begun for that purpose. And by pointing out the difficulty involved in acquiring the knowledge, the narration of the anecdote aims at inducing a special effort in those who hanker after freedom. *Bhagavan*, O revered sir; a *rājaputraḥ*, prince, Kṣatriya by caste, named Hiraṇyanābha; who was *kausalyaḥ*, born in Kosala; *upetya mām*, approaching me; *apṛcchata*, asked; *etaṃ praśnam*, this question, that is being stated: "*Bhūradvāja*, O son of Bharadvāja; *vettha*, do you know; the *puruṣam*, Puruṣa, (the Reality pervading the body); which is *ṣoḍaśakalam*, possessed of sixteen digits (limbs)?" That conscious Being, the soul, is *ṣoḍaśakalaḥ*, on which, through ignorance, are superimposed sixteen parts that appear like limbs. *Aham*, I; *abruvam*, said; *tam kumāram*, to that prince, who had put the question: "*Aham*, I; *na veda*, do not know; *imam*, this one; that you inquire about." As he thought it impossible that there could be any ignorance in me, despite that statement of mine, I told him as a proof of my ignorance; "*Yadi*, if perchance; *aham*, I; *avediṣam*, happened to know; *imam*, this one, the Puruṣa inquired about by you; *katham*, why; *na*

avakṣyam, should I not have told, that is to say should not tell you, inquisitive and eminently fitted as a disciple as you are. Noticing his disbelief over again, I said furthermore to carry conviction to him: “*Yah*, anyone who; *abhivadati*, utters; *anṛtam*, falsehood; speaks of himself as somewhat other than what he really is; *eṣah*, such a man; *pariśuṣyati*, dries up; *samūlah*, together with roots; he is deprived from this world and the next, he is destroyed. As I know this fact, *tasmāt*, therefore; *na arhāmi anṛtam vaktum*, I cannot afford to utter a falsehood; like an ignoramus.” *Sah*, he, the prince, who was thus convinced; *pravavrāja*, went away; to where he had come from; *āruhya ratham*, by riding on the chariot; *tūṣṇīm*, silently, with abashment. From this the conclusion is drawn that one who knows must impart the knowledge to a disciple who is competent and approaches duly, but one should not utter a falsehood under any condition whatsoever. *Tam puruṣam*, about that Puruṣa; *prcchāmi tvā*, I ask you;—which, as an object still unascertained, sticks to my heart like a thorn;—“*Kva asau puruṣah*, where does that Puruṣa (that is to be known) exist?”

तस्मै स होवाच । इहैवान्तःशरीरे सोम्य स पुरुषो
यस्मिन्नेताः षोडश कलाः प्रभवन्तीति ॥२॥

2. To him he (Pippalāda) said: O amiable one, here itself inside the body is that Puruṣa in whom originate these sixteen digits (or limbs).

Tasmāi, to him; *sah*, he; *uvāca ha*, said; *iha eva*, here itself; *antaḥśarīre*, inside the body, within the

space inside the lotus of the heart; *somya*, O amiable one; exists *saḥ puruṣaḥ*, that Puruṣa—and He is not to be sought somewhere else;—(Puruṣa) *yasmin*, in whom; *prabhavanti*, originate; *etāḥ ṣoḍaśa kalāḥ*, these sixteen parts—Prāṇa and the rest that are being enumerated. Puruṣa that is partless appears through ignorance to be possessed of limbs as a consequence of His association with the sixteen parts that are His limiting adjuncts. But this Puruṣa has to be shown as an absolute entity by eliminating, through knowledge, those parts that condition Him. That is why the parts are spoken of as originating from Puruṣa. Since no empirical pronouncement as to attainability and the means of attainment can be made unless there be the superimposition of Prāṇa and the rest on the attributeless, non-dual, pure principle; therefore, the origin, existence, and absorption of the parts, that are within the domain of ignorance, are superimposed (on Puruṣa); for the parts are always seen to exist in identity with Consciousness at the times of origin, continuation, and dissolution. And this is why some deluded people say, “Just as ghee (clarified butter) melts through contact with fire, so it is consciousness that originates every moment as pot etc. and gets destroyed.” Others (e.g. the nihilists) say, “When that consciousness stops, all things appear as void.” Still others (e.g. the logicians) say, “The knowledge of pot and the rest arises and gets destroyed as a temporary phenomenon on the Self that is eternal and that imparts the consciousness.” The materialists say, “Consciousness belongs to matter.” But Consciousness that knows no decrease or increase, and yet appears

diversely through the attributes of the limiting adjuncts, is nothing but the Self, which fact is borne out by such Vedic texts as "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tai. II. i. 1), "Brahman is Consciousness" (Ai. III. i. 3), "Knowledge, Bliss, Brahman" (Br. III. ix. 28.7), "Infinite Reality is but pure intelligence" (Br. II. iv. 12). Consciousness is proved to be invariable from the fact that Consciousness remains unchanged even when objects change in their essence, and because anything, that is known in any way, emerges to consciousness only as such an object of knowledge.¹ It does not stand to reason to say that some external thing may exist substantially and still be unknown, for this is like averring that colour is perceived while the eye is non-existent. A knowable thing may not exist at the time of its knowledge, but knowledge is never non-existent so long as there is an object, or knowledge persists in relation to some knowable thing even though some particular object may not be there; for nobody can have such a thing as an object unless he has knowledge.

¹ That things are apprehended to be what they are is owing to the fact of the apparent diversification of the underlying Consciousness by the limiting adjuncts; and things would cease to be known unless Consciousness lay behind them. This proves that things vary, while Consciousness remains unchanged. A pot may not exist even when there is consciousness of it, or objects may vary essentially, while knowledge persists; but there can be no object of knowledge without Consciousness. *Objection:* We have no knowledge of a jar at the time that we know a cloth; so knowledge also is variable. *Answer:* Knowledge may vary as coloured by its objects, but not essentially, whereas things vary essentially.

Objection: Since consciousness is not felt in sleep just because it does not exist there then, it follows that it too varies essentially just like its object.

Answer: No, for in so far as knowledge, that reveals its objects, is an illuminator of its object just like a light, the absence of knowledge cannot logically be inferred in sleep, just as the absence of light cannot be inferred from the absence of the thing to be lighted up. For the nihilist cannot imagine the absence of the eye when it fails to perceive colour in darkness.

Objection: The nihilist does, as a matter of fact, imagine the absence of knowledge where there is no knowable thing.

Answer: The nihilist should explain how he would argue away the presence of that knowledge by which he imagines the non-existence of that knowledge; for the non-existence of the knowledge being itself a knowable object, it cannot be cognised unless there is knowledge of it.

Objection: Since knowledge is non-different from the knowable, non-existence of knowledge follows from the non-existence of the knowable object.

Answer: Not so, because non-existence too is admitted as cognisable. By the (Buddhist) nihilists it is admitted that non-existence is also known and that it is everlasting. Now, if knowledge be non-different from (the knowable) non-existence, it also will become eternal *ex hypothesi*; and because the non-existence of knowledge becomes essentially a knowledge, non-existence (of knowledge) is reduced to a meaningless term. In reality, knowledge is neither a non-existence, nor is it non-eternal. Nor do we lose anything if the

mere epithet of non-existence is applied to knowledge that is (really) eternal.

If it be now argued that although non-existence is knowable, it is distinct from knowledge, then in that case, the non-existence of the knowable will not lead to the non-existence of knowledge.¹

Objection: The object is different from knowledge, but knowledge is not different from its object.

Answer: It is all mere talk that does not lead to any real distinction, for if it be held that the object and knowledge are identical, then it is meaningless talk to say that the knowable object is distinct from knowledge while knowledge is not distinct from its content, and it is comparable to the thesis that *vahni* (fire) is distinct from *agni* (fire), while *agni* is not distinct from *vahni*. If, however, knowledge be different from the content of knowledge, the conclusion arrived at is that the absence of any knowable object does not logically imply the absence of knowledge (as such).

Objection: Since there can be no awareness (of knowledge) when there is no object to be known, it follows that knowledge itself is absent in the absence of any object.

Answer: Not so, for awareness is admitted in sleep

¹ By such a theory you nullify your view that knowledge and the knowable are identical. Hence by depending on the assumptions that knowable objects are absent in sleep and that knowledge is non-different from the knowable, you cannot argue that knowledge is non-existent in sleep. Moreover, if the non-existing knowable thing be different from knowledge, why should not an existing knowable thing be different also?

inasmuch as it is held by the (Buddhist) nihilists that consciousness persists even in sleep.

Objection: Even there it is held that consciousness is known to itself.

Answer: No, since the distinction of the two (viz knowledge and object) is already postulated. Inasmuch as the knowledge that pertains to an object of the form of non-existence is different from that non-existent object, the difference between the knowable and the knowledge stands as an established fact. That fact having been proved, it cannot be revived like a dead man, nor can it be reversed by even a hundred nihilistic Buddhists.

Objection: In so far as knowledge is known by some other knowledge, there crops up an infinite regress from your point of view, since that knowledge must have another knowledge to know it, and that again another.

Answer: Not so, for a logical distinction between all (knowledge and objects) is possible. On the admission that everything is knowable to some knowledge, that knowledge which is different from its content remains what it is for ever.¹ This is a second category that is admitted by all who are not nihilists, and no third category to comprehend it is admitted. Thus there is no scope for infinite regress.

Objection: If knowledge remains unknown to itself, then omniscience becomes untenable.

Answer: That defect, too, should affect him (i.e.

¹ We hold that things knowable are objects of knowledge, but knowledge itself is not known. The knowable are ever knowable, and so is knowledge ever knowledge.

the Buddhist) alone. What need have we to remove it?¹ Besides, (for him) there is the fault of infinite regress arising from the admission that knowledge is an object of knowledge, for knowledge is certainly knowable according to the (Buddhist) nihilists. And because (a particular) knowledge cannot be known by itself, an infinite regress is inevitable.

Objection: This fault is equally in evidence (in your theory as well).

Answer: Not so, for Consciousness (according to us) can logically be shown to be but one. Since it is but one Consciousness, existing in all places, times, persons, etc., that appears diversely because of the differences in the multifarious limiting adjuncts constituted by name, form, etc., just like the reflections of the sun etc. on water etc.; therefore that objection has no force; and the statement that is under consideration here agrees with this.²

¹The Buddhist believes that knowledge is known. So if it can be proved that knowledge is unknowable, omniscience of Buddha, for instance, can no longer be sustained. But the Vedāntist is not open to that charge, as according to him knowledge can cognise only those things that are fit to be known, as otherwise non-omniscience would result from the non-comprehension of such an imaginary thing as the horn of a hare. The Vedāntist may also reply that since the very conception of omniscience is within the domain of ignorance, he is not under any obligation to prove its reality. Or he may argue that omniscience follows from the fact of one's possessing the capacity to know everything that exists, but not necessarily from the actual awareness of everything.

²On the strength of the fact that Consciousness as an eternal entity is the basis of all appearances, the Upaniṣad talks of the superimposition of the parts (or limbs) on that Consciousness.

Objection: From the Upaniṣadic text, ("here itself inside the body"—Pr. VI. 2), it follows that Puruṣa is contained here inside the body, like a jujube fruit in a vessel.

Answer: No, (this is wrong), because Puruṣa is the cause of such parts as Prāṇa, and because nobody will understand Puruṣa as the source of such parts as Prāṇa, faith, etc., if He be delimited by a mere body. And this follows from the further fact that the body is an effect of those parts; because the body, which is constituted by the parts—Prāṇa and the rest, which (in their turn) are the products of Puruṣa—cannot contain within itself, like a jujube in a vessel, Puruṣa who is the origin of its own source.

Objection: This is possible on the analogy of the seed and the tree. Just as a tree is the effect of a seed, and the effect of that tree is a fruit, a mango for instance, which holds within itself the (stone that is the) cause of its cause (viz the tree), similarly the body can contain within itself even Puruṣa, though He is the cause of its own cause (viz Prāṇa etc.).

Answer: This is untenable, because it implies difference and divisibility. In the analogy, the seeds contained in the fruits of the tree are different from the seed that produced the tree, whereas in the case to which the analogy applies, the very same Puruṣa, that is the cause of the causes of the body, is heard of in the Upaniṣad as confined within the body. Moreover, things like the tree and the seeds can be related by way of the container and the thing contained, because they are composite by nature, whereas Puruṣa is not divisible, though the parts (viz Prāṇa etc.) and the

body are. Hereby it is shown that inasmuch as even space cannot be contained within the body,¹ much less can Puruṣa, who is the cause of space, be confined within it. Therefore the illustration is inapt.

Objection: Leave alone the analogy. The point is born out by the text itself.

Answer: That cannot be, for texts cannot create things anew, since a text is not meant to reverse anything. What is its function then? It is concerned with expressing things as they are. Therefore the text "inside the body" is to be understood in the same sense as the statement that space exists within the cosmic egg.² Besides that text conforms only to empirical experience in so far as from such logical grounds as (the experiences of) seeing, hearing, thinking, knowing, etc., Puruṣa is assumed to be residing as a limited being within the body. And since it is within the body that He is realised, therefore it is said, "O amiable one, that Puruṣa is inside the body." When not even a fool can wish to conceive mentally that Puruṣa, who is the cause of space, can be encompassed by the body like a jujube in a vessel, much less can a Vedic text do so, which is a valid means of knowledge.

As a description of Puruṣa, it has been said, "that Puruṣa in whom originate those sixteen parts" (Pr. VI. 2).

¹ *Objection:* The body produced from indivisible space contains space within itself. *Answer:* There too space does not enter into the body, but seems to be existing in the shape of a body as pervading the pores and empty regions there.

² Space is the cause of the universe, but since space pervades everything, it is perceived as confined within the universe.

Though that origination of the parts was stated (there) in the Upaniṣad in another connection, still the present text (dealing with creation) is meant to recount the order in which the origination occurred as also to show that creation is preceded by intelligence.

स ईक्षांचक्रे। कस्मिन्नहमुत्क्रान्त उत्क्रान्तो भविष्यामि
कस्मिन्वा प्रतिष्ठिते प्रतिष्ठास्यामीति ॥३॥

3. He deliberated: "As a result of whose departure shall I rise up? And as a result of whose continuance shall I remain established?"

Sah, He, Puruṣa, endued with sixteen parts, about whom the son of Bharadvāja inquired; *īkṣām cakre*, made this deliberation on, that is to say, penetrated into, the subject of creation, result, order, etc.¹ How he did so is being stated: *Kasmin utkrānte*, which particular agent having risen up, from the body; *bhaviṣyāmi aham*, shall I become; *utkrāntaḥ*, separated? *Vā*, or; *kasmin pratiṣṭhite*, which continuing to be established; *pratiṣṭhāsyāmi aham*, shall I remain established, in the body?

Objection: Is it not a fact that the Self is not an agent of action, while Pradhāna (Primal Nature) is? Hence it is Pradhāna that evolves as Mahat (i.e. the principle of intelligence) and the rest by setting before itself the needs of Puruṣa (conscious soul). Therefore

¹ "Creation"—of Prāṇa etc.; "result"—such as their departure from the body; "Order"—emergence of faith from Prāṇa and so on; "etc."—the relation of container and the contained, as subsisting between the world and name, etc.

in the face of the facts that Pradhāna, existing in a state of balance of its (three) constituents of *sattva* etc., has to be assumed on valid authority to be the creator; that there exist the minutest atoms that act according to divine will; that the Self has not the wherewithal to create, It being non-dual; and that the Self cannot be the author of evil to Itself, because a conscious being that acts intelligently cannot do any evil to itself; it is unjustifiable to talk of any agentship of Puruṣa, preceded by independent deliberation. Accordingly, when, to serve the purposes of Puruṣa, insentient Pradhāna evolves in a regular order, as though out of deliberation, Pradhāna is figuratively spoken of as intelligent in the statement, "He deliberated" etc., just as one might say, "He is the king", with regard to an officer who does everything for the king.

Answer: No, since it is as logical to look upon the Self as the doer, as to conceive of It as the enjoyer. Just as from the Sāṅkhya standpoint the Self, that is mere changeless Consciousness, can still be the enjoyer, similarly, from the standpoint of the followers of the Vedas, Its creatorship of the world can be justified on the authority of the Vedas.

Objection: Any transformation, consisting in a change of (the essence of) the Self into a different category, causes Its impermanence, impurity, and multiplicity; but a mere variation within Its very nature of Consciousness is not such a transformation. Accordingly, if enjoyership is inherent in Puruṣa Himself, any change within that Consciousness (of

enjoyment)¹ is not open to any charge (of mutation of the Self), whereas from your standpoint, who are followers of the Vedas and admit that the Self is the creator, there does occur an essential mutation,² and therefore the Self becomes subject to all such faults as impermanence etc.

Answer: No, for it is held by us that though the Self is but one, still, in a state of ignorance, there occur to It apparent distinctions created by the presence or absence of the limiting adjuncts constituted by the names and forms of objects. The creation of some sort of distinction in the Self by ignorance is admitted as a concession, so that talk about the bondage and freedom of the Self in the scriptures may be possible. In reality, however, one should stand by the unconditioned Entity which is one without a second, which is beyond the reach of all sophists, and which is admitted as fearless and auspicious. There can be no agentship, no enjoyership, nor any action, instrument, or result, where everything is reduced to non-duality. The Sāṃkhya, however, first imagine that agentship, as well as action, instrument, and result, is superimposed on the Self; but as they are outside the pale of the Vedas, they recoil from such a (monistic) position and hold that enjoyership is a real characteristic of the Self. Again, fancying that Pradhāna is a real substance, essentially different from the Self, they fall into the snares woven by the

¹ Enjoyment (or suffering) consists in a direct experience of joy (or sorrow). This experience is the very nature of the soul, whereas action belongs to the intellect and the rest.

² By becoming the intellect etc. for the purposes of creation.

intellect of other (dualistic) sophists and lose their bearing. Similarly are the other sophists led astray by Sāṃkhya. Thus by postulating theories opposed to each other, like carnivores (fighting for a piece of flesh), they continually drift away from the supreme Reality owing to their proneness to discover such (distorted) interpretations of the conclusions arrived at by valid means of proof as may demolish each other's point of view. Therefore we disclose a few flaws in the theories of the sophists not in the spirit of the sophists, but in order that people desirous of freedom may become devoted to the true import of the Upaniṣads, viz the realisation of the non-duality of the Self, by ignoring those other theories. Thus has it been said in this connection: "Leaving the cause of the origination of all disputes¹ amongst the disputants themselves, and keeping his good sense well protected by their example,² the knower of the Vedas reposes happily."

Moreover, no distinction can be made between the two kinds of modification (in the Self) called enjoyership and agentship. What indeed is that modification characterised as enjoyership which belongs to a class by itself and is different from agentship, depending on which Puruṣa can be conceived of as merely the enjoyer and not the agent, while Pradhāna can be thought of as merely an agent and not an enjoyer?

Sāṃkhya: Did we not say that Puruṣa consists merely of intelligence and He changes internally in

¹ Apprehension of duality as true.

² Having this firm conviction, "Since the dualistic theories lead only to conflict, non-dualism alone is true."

the course of experience while still remaining what He is in essence? But He does not change by being transformed into some other category, whereas Pradhāna changes by being evolved into some other principle, and hence it is possessed of such attributes as multiplicity, impurity, insentience, etc. Puruṣa is opposed to it.

Vedāntist: That is a distinction that is not real but merely verbal. If to Puruṣa, who is (conceived of as) mere intelligence before the emergence of enjoyership, there accrues some special attribute called experience at the time of the occurrence of enjoyment, and if after the cessation of the enjoyment, Puruṣa is freed from that peculiarity and becomes pure intelligence again, (then one may argue that during enjoyment, the enjoying) Pradhāna also evolves as Mahat etc., and then reversing the process (after that experience) it exists in its own nature as Pradhāna. Hence the supposition does not serve to point out any difference. Accordingly, the distinction that is sought to be made between the transformations of Puruṣa and Pradhāna is merely a verbal one.

If now it is held that Puruṣa continues to be pure intelligence even during enjoyment, then there is no experience by Puruṣa in the real sense.

Sāṃkhya: During enjoyment there occurs a real change in Puruṣa, and so Puruṣa can enjoy.

Vedāntist: That cannot be. Since Pradhāna too undergoes change during enjoyment, it may as well become the enjoyer.

Sāṃkhya: Change in pure intelligence alone constitutes experience.

Vedāntist: In that case there is no valid reason why fire and the rest that are possessed of distinct attributes like heat etc. should not be enjoyers.¹

Objection: Enjoyership may belong simultaneously to both Pradhāna and Puruṣa.

Vedāntist: No, since in that case the (Sāṅkhya) theory that Pradhāna acts for the benefit of another (viz Puruṣa) falls through; for among two co-enjoyers there can be no such relationship as overlordship and subordination, just as two lights cannot be so related by way of illuminating each other.

Objection: The enjoyment of the unchanging Puruṣa consists in the production of a reflection of Puruṣa on the mind-stuff in which the *sattva* quality predominates and which is by nature an enjoyer.

Vedāntist: It cannot be so; for if Puruṣa is not affected thereby in any way, it is meaningless to posit an enjoyership for Him. If Puruṣa has no evil in the form of experience, He being ever without attributes, then for removing what (evil) is the (Sāṅkhya) scripture written as a means for emancipation?

¹“Change in pure intelligence alone” may mean two things: (1) change in intelligence irrespective of any change in any other substance; (2) some uncommon change in intelligence alone. The first position is untenable, since Puruṣa cannot enjoy unless there be corresponding changes in the form of happiness etc. in Pradhāna. As for the second alternative, there is no special reason why an uncommon change in an uncommon factor, viz intelligence, should be called enjoyment; for if enjoyment is defined as “an uncommon change within the thing itself,” the definition becomes too wide; and thus fire may also become an enjoyer by a mere uncommon change within its uncommon quality of heat.

Objection: The scripture is written for the sake of removing the evil superimposed through ignorance.

Answer: In that case the hypotheses that Puruṣa is only an enjoyer and not an agent, that Pradhāna is only a doer and not an enjoyer, and that Pradhāna is a supreme Reality different from Puruṣa—which (suppositions) are outside the Vedic pale—are useless and unwarranted, and hence need not be taken into consideration by people craving for freedom.

Objection: Even from the standpoint of non-duality, such activity as the compilation of scriptures is futile.

Answer: No, for no such thing is possible in the state of non-duality. The conflicting thought as to whether the compilation of scriptures is useful or useless can arise only when there are the compilers of the scriptures and others who want to derive some benefit from them; but if the Self is the only reality, then apart from the Self there can be no compiler of the scriptures, nor anyone else. And in their absence, this kind of hypothesis is altogether unjustifiable. From the very fact of your firm affirmation of the unity of the Self it is admitted by you *pari passu* (from your personal experience) that scriptures serve the valid purpose of revealing the non-duality of the Self. And the following scriptural text declares with regard to that unity of the Self, to which you subscribe, that when the conviction arises, there is no scope for doubt: “When to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self, then what should one see and through what?” (Br. II. iv. 14). Similarly in

the Vājasaneyaka Upaniṣad it is shown elaborately how it is possible to do such things as the compilation of scriptures in the domain of ignorance, which comprises things other than the supreme Reality: "Because when there is duality, as it were, (then one sees something)" etc. (*ibid*). Here again, at the very commencement (of the Upaniṣad of the Atharva-Veda, viz Muṇḍaka, I. i. 4), knowledge and ignorance have been separated by calling them higher and lower. Accordingly, the army at the command of sophistic theories cannot enter here into this domain of the non-duality of the Self that is protected by the hands¹ of the king who is none other than the valid proof adduced by Vedānta. It is to be understood that hereby is refuted the fault imputed by others that Brahman lacks the necessary equipment etc. for becoming an agent in the matter of creation etc.; for Brahman can (be imagined to) be associated with differences created by diverse powers and accessories that emerge from the limiting adjuncts created through name and form which are called up by ignorance. And so also is set aside the other objection raised by others that the Self (of the non-dualists) becomes the originator of Its own misery.²

As for the illustration of an officer who does everything for the king and is called by courtesy a king or a master, that has no application here because it

¹ The reasoning found in Vedānta.

² For God is fancied to be the creator of a world ignorantly superimposed on Him, and He is fancied to ordain good and evil for the souls which have no real separate existence.

runs counter to the (obvious) primary meaning of the Vedic text, "He deliberated", which is meant to impart valid knowledge; for a secondary meaning of a word is called for only where the primary meaning is inadmissible. But here it does not stand to reason that an insentient entity (e.g. Pradhāna) should engage in well-regulated activity in relation to Puruṣa, keeping in view the difference between bound and freed souls¹ and taking note of such distinctions as of subject, object, space, time, and causation, whereas this becomes justifiable from the standpoint already stated that omniscient God is the creator.

By Puruṣa alone, as by a king,² is created Prāṇa the director of all. How?

स प्राणमसृजत प्राणाच्छ्रद्धां खं वायुज्ज्योतिरापः
पृथिवीन्द्रियं मनः । अन्नमन्नाद्वीर्यं तपो मन्त्राः कर्म
लोका लोकेषु च नाम च ॥४॥

4. He created Prāṇa; from Prāṇa (He created) faith, space, air, fire, water, earth, organs, mind, food; from food (He created) vigour, self-control, *mantras*, rites, worlds, and name in the worlds.

Having deliberated in the way stated before, *saḥ*, He, Puruṣa; *asrjata*, created; *prāṇam*, Prāṇa,³ the sum

¹ The free souls are to be left apart, and actions are to relate to the bound ones alone.

² This is according to the reading, "*Īsvareṇa iya*". An alternative reading is, "*Īsvareṇa eva*, by God Himself (who is Puruṣa)."

³ Energy, both mental (i.e. intellectual) and physical.

total of all Prāṇas, called Hiranyagarbha,¹ that is the repository of the organs of all beings, and is the inner soul of all.² From this Prāṇa, He created *śraddhām*, faith, that is the source of stimulus for all beings for good action. From that He created the great elements that support by becoming the material constituents of the (physical body that is the) vehicle of enjoyment of the fruits of actions. (He created) *kham*, space, possessed of the quality of sound; *vāyuh*, air, possessed of two attributes, its own attribute of touch and the attribute (sound) of its source (space); similarly *jyotiḥ*, fire, possessed of three qualities—its own quality of colour and the qualities of sound and touch belonging to the earlier two; similarly *āpaḥ*, water, possessed of four attributes—its own individual quality of taste and the infusion of the three earlier qualities (sound, touch, colour); similarly *pṛthivī*, earth, endowed with five qualities by virtue of its possession of smell, and the permeation of the four earlier qualities (sound, touch, colour, taste). So also (He created) *indriyam*, the organs, constituted by those elements themselves, which are of two kinds and are ten in number for the purposes of perception and action; and (He created) *manaḥ*, mind, the lord of those organs, which resides inside and is characterised by doubt and thought. Having thus created the causes

¹ That is to say, the limiting adjunct through which the Self appears to be individualised and comes to be known as Hiranyagarbha—A. G.

² As the sum total of all the subtle bodies, this limiting adjunct, called Hiranyagarbha, resides inside the gross bodies and is thought of as one's self. Hence it is *antar*, inside and *ātman*, self.

(i.e. senses) and effects (i.e. objects) for the creatures, He created for their sustenance *annam*, food, constituted by paddy, barley, etc. *Annāt*, from that food, when eaten; (He created) *vīryam*, ability, vigour that is at the root of engaging in all works. After that (He created) *tapah*, self-control, for the sake of the purification of those strong creatures who get involved in sin. Then (He created) *mantrāḥ*, mantras, comprising the *Ṛk*, *Yajur*, *Sāma*, and *Atharva* texts, which are the means for (religious) activities for those who have purified their internal and external organs with the help of self-control; then *karma*, rites, such as Agni-hotra; then *lokāḥ*, the worlds, the results of rites. And in these worlds He created *nāma*, name, for instance Devadatta or Yajñadatta, of the created beings. Thus these parts were created in conformity with¹ the seeds constituted by such defects of the creatures as ignorance—like two moons, mosquitoes, bees, etc. created by the blurred vision of a man suffering from the disease called Timira, or like all sorts of things created by a dreamer; and these again merge into that very Puruṣa by giving up such distinctions of name, form, etc.

How?

स यथेमा नद्यः स्यन्दमानाः समुद्रायणाः समुद्रं प्राप्यास्तं गच्छन्ति भिद्येते तासां नामरूपे समुद्र इत्येवं प्रोच्यते । एवमेवास्य परिद्रष्टुरिमाः षोडश कलाः पुरुषायणाः पुरुषं प्राप्यास्तं गच्छन्ति भिद्येते चासां

¹ Taking them as His aid.

नामरूपे पुरुष इत्येवं प्रोच्यते स एषोऽकलोऽमृतो भवति तदेष श्लोकः ॥५॥

5. The illustration is this: Just as these flowing rivers that have the sea as their goal, get absorbed after reaching the sea, and their names and forms are destroyed, and they are called merely the sea, so also these sixteen parts (i.e. constituents) of the all-seeing Puruṣa, that have Puruṣa as their goal, disappear on reaching Puruṣa, when their names and forms are destroyed and they are simply called Puruṣa. Such a man of realisation becomes free from the parts and is immortal. On this point there occurs this verse:

Saḥ, the illustration is this: *Yathā*, as; *imāḥ*, these; *syandamānāḥ nadyaḥ*, flowing rivers; *samudrāyaṅāḥ*, that have the sea as their goal, the place where they get absorbed; *samudram prāpya*, reaching the sea; *gacchanti astam*, court disappearance, lose their name and form;—*tāsām nāma-rūpe*, their name and form, for instance, Gaṅgā, Yamunā, etc.; *bhidyete*, get eliminated; owing to their absorption; and when the identification is established, their substance that is water, *samudraḥ iti evam procyate*, is called merely by the word sea;—*evam*, similarly, as is this illustration, so; *asya*, of that Puruṣa, who is possessed of the attributes mentioned before, and who is being considered here; *paridraṣṭuḥ*, of Him who 'is the seer on all sides, who is the agent of a vision that is

identical with His real nature, just as the sun is the revealer everywhere of the light that is identical with itself; *imāḥ ṣoḍaśa kalāḥ*, these sixteen parts—the parts, counting from Prāṇa that have been mentioned; *puruṣāyanāḥ*, which have Puruṣa as their goal, the place where they get identified, as the sea is with relation to the rivers; *prāpya puruṣam*, reaching Puruṣa, getting identified with Puruṣa; *astam gacchanti*, disappear; *ca*, and; *āsām*, of them, of the parts; the respective *nāmarūpe*, name such as Prāṇa, as well as form; *bhidyete*, get destroyed. When name and form are eliminated, the entity that remains undestroyed, *procyate*, is called, by the knowers of Brahman; *puruṣaḥ iti evam*, as Puruṣa. *Saḥ*, he, who has become thus enlightened after being shown by his teacher the process of the absorption of the parts; *bhavati*, becomes; *akalāḥ*, free from parts, when the parts, viz Prāṇa and the rest that are the creation of ignorance, desire, and action, are absorbed through knowledge; and he becomes *amṛtaḥ*, immortal. Death is a creation of the parts originating from nescience. When those parts are gone, one becomes immortal just because of one's partlessness. *Tat*, with regard to this matter; *bhavati*, there occurs; *eṣaḥ ślokaḥ*, this verse:

अरा इव रथनाभौ कला यस्मिन्प्रतिष्ठिताः ।

तं वेद्यं पुरुषं वेद यथा मा वो मृत्युः परिव्यथा इति ॥६॥

6. You should know that Puruṣa who is worthy to be known and in whom are transfixed the parts like spokes in the nave of a chariot wheel, so that death may not afflict you anywhere.

Iva, as; *arāḥ*, spokes, which are, as it were, the dependants of a chariot wheel; *pratiṣṭhitāḥ*, are transfixed; *rathanābhau*, in the nave of a chariot wheel; that is to say, as they are dependent on the hub, so; *veda*, one should know; *tam vedyam puruṣam*, that knowable Puruṣa, who is the self of the parts (limbs) and who is called Puruṣa because of all-pervasiveness or existence in the city (i.e. *pur* of the body); *yasmin*, in whom, in which Puruṣa; *pratiṣṭhitāḥ*, are transfixed; the *kalāḥ*, parts (limbs), during the states of origin, continuance, and dissolution. (You know Him) *yathā*, so that; O disciples; *mṛtyuḥ*, death; *mā vaḥ parivyathāḥ*, may not afflict you on any side. If Puruṣa remains unknown, you will continue to be miserable under pain inflicted by death. Hence may that not fall to your lot. This is the idea.

तान् होवाचैतावदेवाहमेतम् परं ब्रह्म वेद । नातः
परमस्तीति ॥७॥

7. To them he said, "I know this supreme Brahman thus far only. Beyond this there is nothing."

Having thus instructed them (i.e. the disciples), Pippalāda *uvāca ha*, said; *tān*, to them, to those disciples, "Veda, I know; *etāvat eva*, thus far only; *etat*, this; *param brahma*, supreme Brahman, that is worthy to be known. *Ataḥ param*, beyond this; *na asti*, there is not—anything higher to be known." Thus did he say this in order to remove from the disciples any doubt that there might still remain something unknown; and also in order to generate in them the conviction that they had attained final achievement.

It is being stated what those disciples did when they found no recompense for their knowledge after being taught by the teacher and getting their purposes fulfilled:

ते तमर्चयन्तस्त्वं हि नः पिता योऽस्माकमविद्यायाः
परं पारं तारयसीति । नमः परमऋषिभ्यो नमः
परमऋषिभ्यः ॥८॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषदि षष्ठः प्रश्नः ॥

8. While worshipping him they said, “You indeed are our father who have ferried us across nescience to the other shore. Salutation to the great seers. Salutation to the great seers.”

It is being stated what they said while *te*, they; *arcayantah*, were worshipping his feet, by offering handfuls of flowers and saluting him with their heads: “*Tvam hi*, you indeed are; *nah*, our; *pitā*, father; since you have generated through knowledge (a fresh) birth in Brahman that is eternal, ageless, deathless, and fearless. Since it is you who, with the help of the raft of knowledge, have ferried us *avidyāyāḥ param pāram*, across ignorance or false knowledge, to the other shore of the boundless ocean of nescience, called emancipation, consisting in absolute cessation of rebirth—(ferried us) as though across an ocean itself, infested with birth, old age, death, disease, sorrow, etc., which are like sea animals;—therefore your fatherhood

towards us is more justifiable than that of the others (i.e. our real fathers). The other father, who begets the body alone, is yet the most worshipful in the world: what to speak of one who guarantees absolute fearlessness? This is the purport. *Namaḥ*, salutation; *parama-ṛṣibhyaḥ*, to the great seers, the originators of the line of traditional transmission of the knowledge of Brahman. The repetition of *namaḥ parama-ṛṣibhyaḥ*, is for showing eagerness.

ॐ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवा
 भद्रं पश्येमाक्षभिर्यजत्राः ।
 स्थिरैरङ्गैस्तुष्टुवाꣳसस्तनूभि-
 व्यंशेम देवहितं यदायुः ॥
 ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

INDEX TO TEXTS I

(UPANIṢADS)

अग्निर्मूर्धा चक्षुषी	Mu. II. i. 4	आकाशो ह वा	Pr. II. 2
अग्निर्वाग्भूत्वा	Ai. I. ii. 4	आत्मन एष प्राणो	Pr. III. 3
अतः समुद्रा	Mu. II. i. 9	आत्मा वा इदमेक	Ai. I. i. 1
अतिप्रश्नान् पृच्छसि	Pr. III. 2	आदित्यो ह वै	Pr. I. 5, III. 8
अत्रैष देवः स्वप्ने	Pr. IV. 5	आविः सन्निहितं	Mu. II. ii. 1
अथ कबन्धी	Pr. I. 3	इन्द्रस्त्वं प्राण	Pr. II. 9
अथ यदि द्विमात्रेण	Pr. V. 4	इष्टापूतं	Mu. I. ii. 10
अथर्वणे यां	Mu. I. i. 2	इहैवान्तःशरीरे	Pr. VI. 2
अथ हैनं कौसत्य	Pr. III. 1	उत्पत्तिमार्यति	Pr. III. 12
अथ हैनं भार्गवो	Pr. II. 1	ऋग्भिरेतं यजुर्भिः	Pr. V. 7
अथ हैनं शैब्यः	Pr. V. 1	एतद्वै सत्यकाम	Pr. V. 2
अथ हैनं सुकेशा	Pr. VI. 1	एतस्माज्जायते	Mu. II. i. 3
अथ हैनं सौर्यायणी	Pr. IV. 1	एतेषु यश्चरते	Mu. I. ii. 5
अथादित्य उदयन्	Pr. I. 6	एष ब्रह्मैष इन्द्र	Ai. III. i. 3
अथैकयोध्वं	Pr. III. 7	एष सर्वेश्वर एष सर्वज्ञ	Mā. 6
अथोत्तरेण तपसा	Pr. I. 10	एष हि द्रष्टा स्पृष्टा	Pr. IV. 9
अन्नं वै प्रजापतिः	Pr. I. 14	एषोऽग्निस्तपत्येष	Pr. II. 5
अमात्रश्चतुर्थो	Mā. 12	एषोऽणुरात्मा	Mu. III. i. 9
अरा इव रथनाभौ	Pr. II. 6, VI. 6	एह्येहीति तम्	Mu. I. ii. 6
„	Mu. II. ii. 6	ओमित्येतदक्षरम्	Mā. 1
अविद्यायामन्तरे	Mu. I. ii. 8	कामान्यः कामयते	Mu. III. ii. 2
अविद्यायां बहुधा	Mu. I. ii. 9	काली कराली च	Mu. I. ii. 4
अहोरात्रो वै	Pr. I. 13	कोऽयमात्मेति वयम्	Ai. III. i. 1

क्रियावन्तः श्रोत्रिया	Mu. III. ii. 10	तस्मादग्निः समिधो	Mu. II. i. 5
गताः कलाः पञ्चदश	Mu. III. ii. 7	तस्मादिदन्द्रो नाम	Ai. I. iii. 14
गर्भे नु सन्नन्वेषाम्	Ai. II. i. 5	तस्मादृचः साम	Mu. II. i. 6
जागरितस्थानो बहि-	Mā. 3	तस्मै स विद्वान्	Mu. I. ii. 13
„ वैश्वानरः	Mā. 9	तस्मै स होवाच	Pr. I. 4, II. 2,
तच्चक्षुषाजिघृक्षत्	Ai. I. iii. 5	III. 2, IV. 2, VI. 2; Mu. I. i. 4	
तच्छिश्नेनाजिघृक्षत्	Ai. I. iii. 9	ता एता देवताः	Ai. I. ii. 1
तच्छ्रोत्रेणाजिघृक्षत्	Ai. I. iii. 6	तान् वरिष्ठः प्राण	Pr. II. 3
तत्त्वचाजिघृक्षत्	Ai. I. iii. 7	तान् होवाच	Pr. VI. 7
तत्प्राणेनाजिघृक्षत्	Ai. I. iii. 4	तान् ह स ऋषिरुवाच	Pr. I. 2
तत् स्त्रिया आत्म-	Ai. II. i. 2	ताभ्यो पुरुषमानयत्	Ai. I. ii. 3
तत्रापरा ऋग्वेदो	Mu. I. i. 5	ताभ्यो गामानयत्	Ai. I. ii. 2
तदपानेनाजिघृक्षत्	Ai. I. iii. 10	तिस्रो मात्रा मृत्युमत्यः	Pr. V. 6
तदुक्तमृषिणा	Ai. II. i. 5	तेषामसौ विरजो	Pr. I. 16
तदेतत्प्राणेनाजिघृक्षत्	Ai. I. iii. 4	तेजो ह वा उदान	Pr. III. 9
तदेतत् सत्यमृषि-	Mu. III. ii. 11	ते तमर्चयन्तस्त्वं	Pr. VI. 8
तदेतत् सत्यं मन्त्रेषु	Mu. I. ii. 1	दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः	Mu. II. i. 2
„ यथा	Mu. II. i. 1	देवानामसि बह्वितमः	Pr. II. 8
तदेनत्सृष्टं	Ai. I. iii. 3	द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा	Mu. III. i. 1
तदेतद्दृचाऽभ्युक्तं	Mu. III. ii. 10	द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये	Mu. I. i. 4
तद्ये ह वै तत्	Pr. I. 15	धनुर्गृहीत्वौपनिषदं	Mu. II. ii. 3
तन्मनसाऽजिघृक्षत्	Ai. I. iii. 8	न चक्षुषा गृह्यते	Mu. III. i. 8
तपः श्रद्धे ये	Mu. I. ii. 11	न तत्र सूर्यो भाति	Mu. II. ii. 10
तपसा चीयते ब्रह्म	Mu. I. i. 8	नान्तःप्रज्ञं न बहिःप्रज्ञं	Mā. 7
तमभ्यतपत्तस्या-	Ai. I. i. 4	नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन	Mu. III. ii. 3
तमशानायापिपासे	Ai. I. ii. 5	नायमात्मा बलहीनेन	Mu. III. ii. 4
तं स्त्री गर्भं बिभर्ति	Ai. II. i. 3	पञ्चपादं पितरं	Pr. I. 11
तस्माच्च देवा बहुधा	Mu. II. i. 7	परमेवाक्षरं प्रतिपद्यते	Pr. IV. 10

परीक्ष्य लोकान्	Mu. I. ii. 12	यदा पश्यः पश्यते	Mu. III. i. 3
पायूपस्थेषानं	Pr. III. 5	यदा लेलायते ह्यर्चिः	Mu. I. ii. 2
पुरुष एवेदं विश्वं	Mu. II. i. 10	यदुच्छ्वासनिःश्वासा-	Pr. IV. 4
पुरुषेह वा अयम्	Ai. II. i. 1	यदेतद्दृष्टयं मन-	Ai. III. i. 2
पृथिवी च पृथिवीमात्रा	Pr. IV. 8	यं यं लोकं मनसा	Mu. III. i. 10
प्रजाकामो वै प्रजापतिः	Pr. I. 4	यः पुनरेतं त्रिमात्रेण	Pr. V. 5
प्रजापतिश्चरसि गर्भे	Pr. II. 7	यस्मिन् द्यौः पृथिवी	Mu. II. ii. 5
प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म	Ai. III. i. 3	यस्याग्निहोत्रमदर्शम्	Mu. I. ii. 3
प्रणवो वनुःशरो	Mu. II. ii. 4	यः सर्वज्ञः सर्वविद्	Mu. I. i. 9, II. ii. 7
प्राणस्येदं वशे	Pr. II. 13	या ते तनूर्वाचि	Pr. II. 12
प्राणाग्नय एवैतस्मिन्	Pr. IV. 3	विज्ञानात्मा सह देवैश्च	Pr. IV. 11
प्राणो ह्येष यः सर्व-	Mu. III. i. 4	विश्वरूपं हरिणं	Pr. I. 8
प्लवा ह्येते अदृढा	Mu. I. ii. 7	वेदान्तविज्ञान-	Mu. III. ii. 6
बृहच्च तद्विव्यम्	Mu. III. i. 7	त्रात्यस्त्वं प्राणैक-	Pr. II. 11
ब्रह्मा देवानां प्रथमः	Mu. I. i. 1	शौनको ह वै महा-	Mu. I. i. 3
ब्रह्मो वेदममृतं पुरस्तात्	Mu. II. ii. 11	स इमाँल्लोकान्	Ai. I. i. 2
भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिः	Mu. II. ii. 8	स ईक्षत कथं न्विदं	Ai. I. iii. 11
मासो वै प्रजापतिः	Pr. I. 12	स ईक्षत लोकान्नु	Ai. I. i. 1
य एवं विद्वान्प्राणं	Pr. III. 11	स ईक्षतेमे नु लोका	Ai. I. i. 3
यच्चित्तस्तेनैष प्राणम्	Pr. III. 10	स ईक्षतेमे नु लोकाश्च	Ai. I. iii. 1
यत्तदद्रेश्यमग्राह्यम्	Mu. I. i. 6	स ईक्षां चक्रे	Pr. VI. 3
यत्र सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं	Mā 5	स एतमेव सीमानं	Ai. I. iii. 12
यथा सम्राडेवाधिकृतान्	Pr. III. 4	स एतेन प्राज्ञेनात्मना	Ai. III. i. 4
यथा नद्यः स्यन्दमानाः	Mu. III. ii. 8	स एवं विद्वानस्मात्	Ai. II. i. 6
यथा सुदीप्तात्	Mu. II. i. 1	स एष वैश्वानरो	Pr. I. 7
यथोर्णनाभिः सृजते	Mu. I. i. 7	स जातो भूतान्यभि-	Ai. I. iii. 13
यदर्चिमद्यदणुभ्योऽणु	Mu. II. ii. 2	सत्यमेव जयते	Mu. III. i. 6
यदा त्वमभिवर्षस्यथे-	Pr. II. 10	सत्येन लभ्यस्तपसा	Mu. III. i. 5

स प्राणमसृजत	Pr. VI.	4	सर्वं ह्येतद्ब्रह्मायमात्मा	Mā.	2
सप्तप्राणाः प्रभवन्ति	Mu. II. i.	8	सा भावयित्री	Ai. II. i.	3
समाने वृक्षे	Mu. III. i.	2	सुकेशा च भारद्वाजः	Pr. I.	1
सम्प्राप्यैनमृषयो	Mu. III. ii.	5	सुषुप्तस्थानः प्राज्ञो	Mā.	1
संवत्सरो वै प्रजापतिः	Pr. I.	9	सोऽपोऽभ्यतपत्	Ai. I. iii.	2
यथा सौम्य वयांसि	Pr. IV.	7	सोऽभिमानादूर्ध्वम्	Pr. II.	4
स यथेमा नद्यः	Pr. VI.	5	सोऽयमात्माध्यक्षरम्	Mā.	8
स यदा तेजसा-	Pr. IV.	6	सोऽस्यायमात्मा	Ai II. i.	4
स यद्येकमात्रम्	Pr. V.	3	स्वप्नस्थानस्तैजस	Mā.	10
स यो ह वै तत्परमं	Mu. III. ii.	9	स्वप्नस्थानोऽन्तःप्रज्ञः	Mā.	4
स वेदैतत्परमं	Mu. III. ii.	1	हिरण्मये परे कोशे	Mu. II. ii.	9
सर्वं तत्प्रज्ञानेत्रं	Ai. III. i.	3	हृदि ह्येष आत्मा	Pr. III.	6

INDEX TO TEXTS II

(GAUDAPĀDA'S KĀRIKĀ)

अकल्पकमजं ज्ञानं	III. 33	अन्यथा गृह्णतः स्वप्नः	I. 15
अकारो नयते विश्वम्	I. 23	अपूर्वं स्थानिधर्मो हि	II. 8
अजः कल्पितसंवृत्या	IV. 74	अभावश्च रथादीनां	II. 3
अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नम्	III. 36	अभूताभिनिवेशाद्धि	IV. 79
”	IV. 81	अभूताभिनिवेशोऽस्ति	IV. 75
अजातेस्त्रसतां तेषाम्	IV. 43	अमात्रोऽनन्तमात्रश्च	I. 29
अजातस्यैव धर्मस्य	IV. 6	अलब्धावरणाः सर्वे	IV. 98
अजातस्यैव भावस्य	III. 20	अलाते स्पन्दमाने वै	IV. 49
अजातं जायते यस्मात्	IV. 29	अवस्त्वनुपलम्भं च	IV. 88
अजाद्वै जायते यस्य	IV. 13	अव्यक्ता एव येऽन्तस्तु	II. 15
अजेष्वजमसंक्रान्तं	IV. 96	अशक्तिरपरिज्ञानं	IV. 19
अजे साम्ये तु ये	IV. 95	असज्जागरिते दृष्ट्वा	IV. 39
अणुमात्रेऽपि वैधर्म्ये	IV. 97	असतो मायया जन्म	III. 28
अतो वक्ष्याम्यकार्पण्यम्	III. 2	अस्ति नास्त्यस्ति	IV. 83
अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं	III. 30	अस्पन्दमानमलातं	IV. 48
”	IV. 62	अस्पर्शयोगो वै नाम	III. 39
अदीर्घत्वाच्च कालस्य	II. 2	”	IV. 2
अद्वैतं परमार्थो हि	III. 18	आत्मसत्यानुबोधेन	III. 32
अनादिमायया सुप्तः	I. 16	आत्मा ह्याकाशवज्	III. 3
अनादेरन्तवत्त्वं च	IV. 30	आदावन्ते च यद्वास्ति	II. 6
अनिमित्तस्य चित्तस्य	IV. 77	”	IV. 31
अनिश्चिता यथा द्रज्जुः	II. 17	आदिबुद्धाः प्रकृत्यैव	IV. 92
अन्तःस्थानात्तु भेदानां	II. 4	आदिशान्ता ह्यनुत्पन्नाः	IV. 93

आश्रमास्त्रिविधा	III. 16	चित्तं न संपृशत्यर्थं	IV. 26
इच्छामात्रं प्रभोः सृष्टिः	I. 8	चित्तस्पन्दितमेवेदं	IV. 72
उत्पादस्याप्रसिद्धत्वात्	IV. 38	जरामरणनिर्मुक्ताः	IV. 10
उत्सेक उदधेर्यद्वत्	III. 41	जाग्रच्चित्तेक्षणीयास्ते	IV. 66
उपलम्भात् समाचारात्	IV. 42	जाग्रद्वृत्तावपि त्वन्तः	II. 10
”	IV. 44	जात्याभासं चलाभासं	IV. 45
उपायेन निगृह्णीयात्	III. 42	जीवात्मनोः पृथक्त्वं यत्	III. 14
उपासनाश्रितो धर्मो	III. 1	जीवात्मनोरनन्यत्वम्	III. 13
उभयोरपि वैतथ्यं	II. 11	जीवं कल्पयते पूर्वं	II. 16
उभे ह्यन्योन्यदृश्ये ते	IV. 67	ज्ञाने च त्रिविधे ज्ञेये	IV. 89
ऋजूवक्रादिकाभासम्	IV. 47	ज्ञानेनाकाशकल्पेन	IV. 1
एतैरेषोऽपृथग्भावैः	II. 30	तत्त्वमाध्यात्मिकं दृष्ट्वा	II. 38
एवं न चित्तजा धर्मा	IV. 54	तस्मादेवं विदित्वैनं	II. 36
एवं न जायते चित्तम्	IV. 46	तस्मान्न जायते चित्तं	IV. 28
ओंकारं पादशो विद्यात्	I. 24	तैजसस्योत्वविज्ञान	I. 20
कल्पयत्यात्मनात्मानम्	II. 12	त्रिषु धामसु यत्तुल्यं	I. 22
कार्यकारणबद्धौ ताविष्येते	I. 11	त्रिषु धामसु यद्भोज्यं	I. 5
कारणाद्यनन्यत्वं	IV. 12	दक्षिणाक्षिमुखे विश्वः	I. 2
कारणं यस्य वै कार्यं	IV. 11	दुःखं सर्वमनुस्मृत्य	III. 43
काल इति कालविदः	II. 24	दुर्दर्शमतिगम्भीरं	IV. 100
कोट्यश्चतस्र एतास्तु	IV. 84	द्रव्यं द्रव्यस्य हेतुः	IV. 53
क्रमते न हि बुद्धस्य	IV. 99	द्वयोर्द्वयोर्मधुज्ञाने	III. 12
ख्याप्यमानामजातिं	IV. 5	द्वैतास्याग्रहणं तुल्यं	I. 13
ग्रहणाज्जागरितवत्	IV. 37	धर्मा य इति जायन्ते	IV. 58
ग्रहो न तत्र नोत्सर्गः	III. 38	न कश्चिज्जायते जीवः	III. 48
घटादिषु प्रलीनेषु	III. 4	”	IV. 71
चरञ्जागरिते जाग्रद्	IV. 65	न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिः	II. 32
चित्तकाला हि ये	II. 14	न निर्गता अलाताते	IV. 50

न निर्गतास्ते विज्ञानात्	IV. 52	प्राणादिभिरनन्तैश्च	II. 19
न भवत्यमृतं मर्त्यं	III. 21	प्राप्य सर्वज्ञतां कृत्स्नां	IV. 85
”	IV. 7	फलादुत्पाद्यमानः सन्	IV. 17
न युक्तं दर्शनं गत्वा	IV. 34	बहिष्प्रज्ञो विभुर्विश्वः	I. 1
नाकाशस्य घटाकाशो	III. 7	बीजाङ्कुराख्यो दृष्टान्तः	IV. 20
नाजेषु सर्वधर्मेषु	IV. 60	बुद्ध्वानिमित्तां सत्यां	IV. 78
नात्मभावेन नानेदं	II. 34	भावैरसद्भिरेवायं	II. 33
नात्मानं न परां	I. 12	भूततोऽभूततो वाऽपि	III. 23
नास्त्यसद्धेतुकमसत्	IV. 40	भूतस्य जातिमिच्छन्ति	IV. 3
नास्वादयेत्सुखं तत्र	III. 45	भूतं न जायते किञ्चित्	IV. 4
निगृहीतस्य मनसः	III. 34	भोगार्थं सृष्टिरित्यन्ये	I. 9
निमित्तं न सदा चित्तं	IV. 27	मकारभावे प्राज्ञस्य	I. 21
निवृत्तस्याप्रवृत्तस्य	IV. 80	मन इति मनोविदः	II. 25
निवृत्तेः सर्वदुःखाना	I. 10	मनसो निग्रहायात्तं	III. 40
निश्चितायां यथा रज्ज्वां	II. 18	मनोदृश्यमिदं द्वैतं	III. 31
निस्तुतिर्निर्मस्कारः	II. 37	मरणं संभवे चैव	III. 9
नेह नानेति चाम्नायात्	III. 24	मायया भिद्यते ह्येतत्	III. 19
पञ्चविंशक इत्येके	II. 26	मित्राद्यैः सह संमन्थ्य	IV. 35
पादा इति पादविदः	II. 21	मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः	III. 15
पूर्वापरापरिज्ञानं	IV. 21	यथा निर्मितको जीवः	IV. 70
प्रकृत्याकाशवज्ज्ञेयाः	IV. 91	यथा भवति बालानां	III. 8
प्रज्ञप्तेः सनिमित्तत्वं	IV. 24	यथा मायामयाद् बीजात्	IV. 59
”	IV. 25	यथा मायामयो जीवः	IV. 69
प्रणवं हीश्वरं विद्यात्	I. 28	यथा स्वप्नमयो जीवः	IV. 68
प्रणवो ह्यपरं ब्रह्म	I. 26	यथा स्वप्ने द्वयाभासं	III. 29
प्रपञ्चो यदि विद्येत	I. 17	”	IV. 61
प्रभवः सर्वभावानां	I. 6	यथैकस्मिन् घटाकाशे	III. 5
प्राण इति प्राणविदः	II. 20	यदा न लभते हेतून्	IV. 76

यदा न लीयते चित्तं	III. 46	संघाताः स्वप्नवत्सर्वे	III. 10
यदि हेतोः फलात् सिद्धिः	IV. 18	संभवे हेतुफलयोः	IV. 16
यावद्धेतुफलावेशः	IV. 55	संभूतेरपवादाच्च	III. 25
”	IV. 56	संवृत्या जायते सर्वं	IV. 57
युञ्जीत प्रणवे चेतः	I. 25	सर्वस्य प्रणवो ह्यादि	I. 27
योऽस्ति कल्पितसंवृत्या	IV. 73	सर्वाभिलापविगतः	III. 37
यं भावं दर्शयेद्यस्य	II. 29	सर्वे धर्मा मृषा स्वप्ने	IV. 33
रसादयो हि ये कोशा	III. 11	सवस्तु सोपलम्भं च	IV. 87
रूपकार्यसमाख्याश्च	III. 6	सांसिद्धिकी स्वाभाविकी	IV. 9
लये संबोधयेच्चित्तं	III. 44	सुखमात्रियते नित्यं	IV. 82
लीयते ही सुषुप्ते तत्	III. 35	सूक्ष्म इति सूक्ष्मविदः	II. 23.
लोकाल्लोकविदः प्राहुः	II. 27	सृष्टिरिति सृष्टिविदः	II. 28
विकरोत्यपरान् भावान्	II. 13	स्थूलं तर्पयते विश्वं	I. 4
विकल्पो द्विनिवर्तत	I. 18	स्वतो वा परतो वापि	IV. 22
विज्ञाने स्पन्दमाने वै	IV. 51	स्वप्नजागरितस्थाने	II. 5
विपर्यासाद्यथा जाग्रत्	IV. 41	स्वप्नदृक्चित्तदृश्यास्ते	IV. 64
विप्राणां विनयो ह्येष	IV. 86	स्वप्नदृक् प्रचरन् स्वप्ने	IV. 63
विभूर्ति प्रसवं त्वन्ये	I. 7	स्वप्ननिद्रायुतावाद्यौ	I. 14
विश्वास्यात्वविक्षायां	I. 19	स्वप्नमाये यथा दृष्टे	II. 31
विश्वो हि स्थूलभुङ्क्ते नित्यं	I. 3	स्वप्नवृत्तावपि त्वन्त	II. 9
वीतरागभयक्रोधैः	II. 35	स्वप्ने चावस्तुकः कायः	IV. 36
वेदा इति वेदविदः	II. 22	स्वभावेनामृतो यस्य	III. 22, IV. 8
वैतथ्यं सर्वभावानां	II. 1	स्वसिद्धान्तव्यवस्थासु	III. 17
वैशारद्यं तु वै नास्ति	IV. 94	स्वस्थं शान्तं सनिर्वाणं	III. 47
स एष नेति नेतीति	III. 26	हेतुर्न जायतेऽनादेः	IV. 23
सतो हि मायया जन्म	III. 27	हेतोरिति फलं येषां	IV. 14
सप्रयोजनता तेषां	II. 7	”	IV. 15
”	IV. 32	हेयज्ञेयाप्यपाक्यानि	IV. 90

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A.G.	..	Ānanda Giri
Ai.	..	Aitareya Upaniṣad
Ai.Ā.	..	Aitareya Āraṇyaka
Āp.	..	Āpastamba Dharma-Sūtras
Bṛ.	..	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad
Ch.	..	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
G.	..	Bhagavad Gītā
Īś.	..	Īśā Upaniṣad
Jā.	..	Jābāla Upaniṣad
Ka.	..	Kaṭha Upaniṣad
Kau.	..	Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad
Ke.	..	Kena Upaniṣad
M.	..	Manu Saṁhitā
Mā.	..	Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad
Mbh.	..	Mahābhārata
Mu.	..	Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad
Muk.	..	Muktika Upaniṣad
Pr.	..	Praśna Upaniṣad
Śv.	..	Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad
Tai.	..	Taittirīya Upaniṣad
Tai. Ā.	..	Taittirīya Āraṇyaka
Tai. B.	..	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa
Tai. S.	..	Taittirīya Saṁhitā
Y.	..	Yajur-Veda

