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### KEY TO TRANSLITERATION AND PRONUNCIATION

#### Sounds like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a o in son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>ā a in master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i i in if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ī ī ēī in feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u u in full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ū oo in boot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ṭ somewhat between r and ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e a in evade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>āi y in my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>au ow in now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>क</td>
<td>k k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ख</td>
<td>kh ckh in blockhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ग</td>
<td>g g (hard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घ</td>
<td>gh gh in log-hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ङ</td>
<td>ṅ ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>च</td>
<td>c ch (not k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>छ</td>
<td>ch chh in catch him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज</td>
<td>j j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>झ</td>
<td>jh dgeh in hedgehog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ञ</td>
<td>ŋ n (somewhat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ट</td>
<td>ṭ t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ṭh th in ant-hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sounds like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ड</td>
<td>d d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ढ</td>
<td>dh dh in godhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ण</td>
<td>n n in under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त</td>
<td>T French t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>थ</td>
<td>th th in thumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ध</td>
<td>d th in then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न</td>
<td>dh theh in breathe here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फ</td>
<td>p p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भ</td>
<td>ph ph in loop-hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब</td>
<td>b b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भ</td>
<td>bh bh in abhor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>म</td>
<td>m m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>य</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>र</td>
<td>r r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ल</td>
<td>l l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व</td>
<td>v in avert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श</td>
<td>ś sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष</td>
<td>s sh in show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स</td>
<td>s s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ह</td>
<td>h h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ङ</td>
<td>ṅ ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>ḥ half h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aitereyā Upaniṣad
May my speech be based on (i.e. accord with) the mind; may my mind be based on speech. O Self-efficient 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 UPANIŚAD

PART I

CHAPTER I

Introduction: Earlier than this was finished karma along with the knowledge (i.e. meditation on) the inferior Brahman (i.e. Hiranyagarbha). The highest result, achievable through karma, as associated with meditation, was concluded with the meditation on Uktha. 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. Hiranyagarbha—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 Him 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 Brhati-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, 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 Brāhatī-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

\(^1\) First 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 Purusa”, 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" (Ṛ. I. cxv. I), 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" (Īs. 11) and "By doing karmas
indeed should one wish to live here for a hundred years” (Is 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 Āranyaka, “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 Āranyaka first points out that the *kastra* (hymn) called Brhati-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. Nor 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 disassociation 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:
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 (Bṛ. I. iv. 17), “Both these³ are indeed desires” (Bṛ. III. v. 1, IV. iv. 22). Renunciation is defined as the mere absence of well-established

¹ The metre called Paṅkti 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 *paṅkta*, 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

¹ He cannot consider himself a householder, nor can be 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 unillumined soul that hankers after emancipation. With regard to this matter, the sentence, “Therefore he who knows thus becomes self-controlled, calm” etc., (Br 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 Śvetāṣṭarata 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 Br III. v. l. etc.—“Knowing this very Self, the Brāhmaṇas renounce... and lead a mendicant life.”
"Some attained immortality not by \textit{karma}, not by progeny, not by wealth, but by renunciation."\footnote{The idea is that the few who ever realised, did so through renunciation.} And the \textit{Smṛti} says, "After attaining knowledge, one should have recourse to inactivity", and "He should continue in that order of life (\textit{Sannyāsa}) which is conducive to the attainment of \textit{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 \textit{karmas} pertaining to the householder’s life can lead, their highest result has been summed up as merger in the Deity (\textit{Hiranyagarbha}), and that is within the worldly state itself. If the knowledge of the \textit{Self} were possible for people engrossed in \textit{karma}, the conclusion there would not have been made with a result, (viz merger in Deity), very much within the worldly state.

\textit{Objection:} That is only the product of some subsidiary factor (associated with the higher knowledge).\footnote{e.g. the knowledge of Fire associated with the realisation of the \textit{Self}.}

\textit{Answer:} No, for the knowledge of the \textit{Self} relates to the Reality that is the \textit{Self} and that is entirely opposed to it (viz a subsidiary). The means to the attainment of immortality is the knowledge of the \textit{Self} which is the supreme Reality beyond all names, forms, and actions. If that knowledge remains asso-
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 Vājaśaneya 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 unilluminated 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 Kauśitakī branch, “So the ancient seers, the Kāvaśeyyas, 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” *(Ja. 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
person with regard to the same mother of pearl. For it is said in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad. "That which is known as ṣīḍyā (knowledge) and that which is known as aṣīḍyā (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" (Tāi. 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 aṣīḍyā (nescience), since they are the products of nescience. Producing ṣīḍyā (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 (Īśā) Upaniṣad says, "Crossing over death through aṣīḍyā, one attains immortality through ṣīḍyā" (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" (Īś 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
किंचन मिषत् । स ईक्षत लोकान्तु 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, asīt, was; ātmā ekaḥ 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.
ence 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 kīmeṣa_, there was nothing else whatsoever; _mīṣat_, winking, that was active. (Nor was there) anything else (that was inactive). Unlike the Pradāna of the Sāmkhyas which is an independent entity classed with the non-Selves, and unlike the atoms of the followers of Kaṇāḍa, there remained here nothing whatsoever apart from the Self. What existed then? The Self alone existed. This is the idea. _Saḥ_, 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 इमाल्लोकानसृजत्। अम्फो मरीचीर्मारामापोद्दोस-म्म: परेन दिवं चौ: प्रतिष्ठान्तरिक्ष मरीचयः पृथिवी मरो या अवस्थात्ता आपः।॥२॥

2. He created these worlds, viz ambhas, marici, mara, āpah. That which is beyond heaven is ambhas. Heaven is its support. The sky is marici. The earth is mara. 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, marīcīh, maram, āpah. Starting with space, he created in due order the cosmic egg, and then created the worlds—ambhas etc. As for these, the Upanisad itself explains the words ambhas etc. Adah, 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 marīcīh (or rather marīcayah) because of the diversity of the space covered by it. Or it is so used because of its association with the marīcayah, rays (of the sun). Prthivī, the earth, is marāh, 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, maricī, maram, āpah.

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 fruits\(^3\), for all creatures, sah, He, God; ikṣata, 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, sah, He: samuddhriya, 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; amūrchayati, (He)

\(^1\) Attained by the denizens of the nether worlds.
\(^2\) The word “water” is suggestive of marici 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.\footnote{He created Virāṭ.}

4. He deliberated with regard to Him (i.e. Virāṭ of the human form). As He (i.e. Virāṭ) was being deliberated on, His (i.e. Virāṭ’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.
three emerged in succession. Aksiśā, the two eyes; karṇaun, the two orifices of the ears; tvak, skin—(all these which are the seats of the organs), (and) hṛdayam, heart (which is the) seat of the internal organ; manah, mind, the internal organ, nābhiḥ, 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 mṛtyuḥ, Death. As in the other cases, so kiṃam, 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) āpah, Water.

CHAPTER II

ता एता देवता: सृष्टा अस्मिन्महत्यण्वे प्रापतत्।
तमशनायारिपासाभ्याभयामब्यवार्जेत्। ता एनमब्रुब्राय-तत्तनं न: प्रजानीहि यस्मिन् प्रतिषिठिता अन्तमदामेति॥ ११॥

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

Tāḥ etāḥ devatāḥ, these deities—Fire and others; sṛṣṭāḥ, 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) anvārjarat, 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-pipūsābhyām, 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 tāh, 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; pratisthitāh yasmin, staying where—and becoming able: annam adāma we can eat food.

ताभ्यो गामानयत्ता अब्रुव्य प्र नोश्यमल्लगितिः
ताभ्योस्वस्यमानयत्ता अब्रुव्य प्र नोश्यमल्लगितिः २२॥

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, tābhyaḥ, 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; āsvam, 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 पुष्पमानयत्ता अब्रुवन् सुक्रतं बतेति पुष्पो वाव सुक्रतम् । ता अब्रबीद्यायतनं प्रविष्टेति ॥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.⁴ Having seen that man, that was their source, they became free from misery, and tāḥ, they; abruvan, said; iti, this: “This abode is suktam bata, well created, to be sure.” As a result puruṣah vāva, man is indeed; suktam, virtue itself—he having thereby become the source of all virtuous deeds.² Or he is called suktā, (lit.) created by oneself, because God created man by Himself, through His own Māyā.³

¹ Who conformed in features to Virāt, their origin.
² Since they pronounced man as suktā, 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, tāḥ, to them; iti, this: “Praviśata, enter; yathāyatanam, into the respective abode — into the dwelling that suits each for such activities as speaking etc.”

अतिरिक्तभूत्वा मुखं प्राविशादायु: प्राणो भूत्वा नासिके प्राविशादादातित्रयुक्षंभूत्वाविष्किणी प्राविशाहितम: श्रोत्रं भूत्वा कर्णं प्राविशात्रोपस्तिवनस्पतयो लोमानि भूत्वा त्वचं प्राविशाश्चन्द्रमा मणो भूत्वा हृदयं प्राविशान्मृत्यु-रपानो भूतवा नाभिं प्राविशादापो रेतो भूतवा चिरवं प्राविशान् ॥ 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 Apana (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”, agniḥ, Fire, the deity that identifies himself with the organ of speech; bhūtvā, becoming, va' speech itself; prāvīṣat, entered; mukham, into the mouth, which was his source. Similarly are the rest to be explained. Yāyuḥ, Air, entered nūsike, into the nostrils. Ādityah, the Sun; aksīṁa, into the eyes; diśaḥ, the Directions; kāryau, into the ears; osadhi-vanaspatayāk, the Herbs and Trees; tvacam, into the skin; candraṁūḥ, the Moon; hṛdayam, into the heart; mṛtyuḥ, Death; nābhīm, into the navel (i.e. the root of the anus); ēpāḥ, Water, sīṣnam, into the generative organ.

	तत्तमानायापासे अब्तामावाभ्यामभिप्रजास्तीति। ते अब्तवीदेतास्वेव वा देवतास्वाभ्यामेव भागिन्यौ करोमीति। तत्समाययः कस्य च देवतायं हृदिगुहाते भागिन्यवेवाभ्यामशत्तमानायापासे भवतः।।५॥

इत्यतेरयोपनिषदात्र प्रथमाध्याये द्वितीय: खण्ड: ॥

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, āsanāyu-pipāše, Hunger and Thirst, being without abodes, ābrūtām, said, to that God: Āvābhyām, for us abhiprajānīhi, think of, i.e. provide; some abode.” God, having been told thus, ābravīt, 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 devatāyai, for whichever deity; havih, oblation—such as porridge, cake, etc.; grhyate, is taken up; asyām, in that deity; āsanāyu-pipāše, Hunger and Thirst; bhāginyau eva bhavatah, become sharers indeed.

CHAPTER III

स ईश्वरः नोऽकाश्च लोकपालाश्चावानमेव: सृजा

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

Saḥ, He, God; ikṣāta, thought. thus. How? “Ime nu, these then are; lokāh ca lokapālāh ca, the senses and
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 *sṛṣṭuṁ,* 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 *atyujghāmsut,* 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 ajīghṛksat,* tried to take up; *tat,* that food; *vācā,* through speech, through the act of speaking. *Na aśāknot,* He did not succeed, *graḥitum tat,* to take up that, *vācā,* through speech through speaking. *Yat,* if; *sali,* He, the First Born, the first embodied Being; *agruhaisyat,* had taken up; *enat,* this food; *vācā,* through speech; then everyone, being a product of the First Born; *atrapyatsat,* would have become satisfied; *abhi-nyāḥrītya 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.
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.

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.

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.
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.

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.

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.

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 eṣah, this Apāna air; annasya grahaḥ, (is) the devourer of food. Yat vāyuḥ (should be rather yah vāyuḥ), the vital energy that; is annāyuḥ vai, well known as dependent on food, for its subsistence; is eṣah, this one; Yat vāyuḥ, that is the vital energy, called Apāna.¹

स ईश्वर यद्य ध्वनेमान्यसभायतं यदु प्राणेविश्वाहितं यदु चक्षुषा दृष्टं यदु श्रोत्रेण भूतं यदु त्वचा स्पुष्टं यदु मनसा ध्यातं यथपानेनाभ्यापि यदु विस्मेन विस्मेतमथ कोश्चितं ॥ १ ॥

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, sah, He; iksāta, thought—like the ruler of the city, while cogitating thus: 'Katham mu, 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 abhīvyāḥṛtam, 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; kah 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, prapadyeyya), 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.
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.

*Sah, He, the Creator God; etam eva sīmōnam 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. *Sū eṣā dvāḥ,* this door; *vidṛtiḥ nūma,* 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 āvasathāḥ,
abode, the second is the mind inside; and the space
within the heart is the third. “Ayam āvasathāḥ, 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 भूतान्यभिन्नेियैः यत् किमिहान्यं वादिय-
दिति । स एतमेव पुरुषं ब्रह्म तत्तत्मपश्यत् । इत्तदर्श-
mिति ।

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 Him-
self thus: “I am a man”, “I am blind”, “I am happy”, etc.
thing else? He realised this very Purusa as Brahman, the most pervasive, thus: “I have realised this.”

Sah jatah, He being born, having entered into the body as the individual soul; abhivyakhyat, manifested; bhutani, the beings. When, by good luck, a teacher of supreme compassion beat near his ears the drum of the great sayings of the Upanisads whose notes were calculated to wake up the knowledge of the Self, then the individual apasyat, realised; etam eva, this very; purusam, Purusa (as Brahman)—the Purusa that is being discussed as the Lord of creation etc., who is called Purusa because of residence (sayana, 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 tatamam, the word means) the most pervasive, the fullest, like space. How (did he realise)? “I adarsam, have seen; idam, this one—this Brahman, that is the real nature of my Self.” The elongation (of i in iti) is in accordance with the rule that in the case of a word suggesting deliberation, the vowel gets lengthened.  

तस्मादिदल्ल्दो नामेदल्ल्दो हृ व नाम। तत्तमम तत्तमम इत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण। परोक्षप्रिया इव हि देवा: परोक्षप्रिया इव हि देवा: ॥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.
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 idandrah nāma, called Idandra. God is idandrah 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 iti, 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; devāḥ, 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 Fourth\(^1\) (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?

---

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

\(^2\)In 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 Śrīpitis 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 Upanisads) 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

\(^1\)The mind engages not in the Self but in things external to It.

\(^2\)The 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 Kāṇāda 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 eternality 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:

\[अऽ पुरुषे हि वा अयमादितो गर्भों भवति यदेत्वते:।
तदेत्तस्तर्वेभ्योज्ज्वल्यस्तेजः सङ्क्ततमात्मन्येवास्तमानं
विभति तद्वद स्विन्यां सिद्धवत्तेनज्जनयति तदर्थ
प्रथमं जन्म ॥१॥
\]

\(^1\) The 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. Puruse ha vai, in that man indeed; ayam, that, transmigrating soul; āditaḥ garbhaḥ 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 retah."

Yat etat retah, that which is this semen; sambhūtam, is accomplished, (extracted); as tejas, vigour, essence, of the body; sarvebhyaḥ aṅgebhyah, 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 ēva, 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 sīncati, sheds, while in union; tat, that semen; striyīṁ, 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)."

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; ātmabhūyam, 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 hinaasti, 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 ātmānām, 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.

Sa bhāvayitrī bhāvayitvā bhavati. Tāṃ śtrī gṛhāni
vibhṛatī. Sotāṃ āve kumāraṃ jñānādībhāvayati.
S atkumāraṃ jñānādībhāvayatvātmānanem eva tadhvaye
tyēpāṃ lokaanaṃ sattvā. Āve sattata hīme lokaśtat-
dasya drītīyāṃ jñam.

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.

Saṁ, 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; tāṃ gṛbhām, that foetus, by following the method of protecting the foetus mentioned earlier; agre, before its birth. Sah, he, the father; bhāvayati, protects; kumāram, the son; agre eva, at the very start, as soon as he is born;
Jannmanah adhi, after the birth; through natal rites etc. Yat, that; sak, he, the father; bhūvayati, protects; the kumāram, son; āgre jannmanah adhi, at the very start, just after the birth; through natal rites etc.; tat, thereby; he bhūvayati útmānam 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: esūm 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 dvitiyam janna, second birth, the manifestation of the second state, relatively to his form as semen.

Sōsthyamatma puṇyabhya: karmaḥ: pratiḍhīyate. 
Asthasyamitam aṭma krūṭkṛtyo vṛyoṇat: prati. S 
ḥt: pravṛtubuṇjāyate tadgaṃ śṛtīṃ yḤaṃ II.4.11

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.

Sah ayam ātmā, that self that is the son: asya, of his, of the father: punyebhyah karmabhyah, for the performance of virtuous deeds, as prescribed by the scriptures; pratidhiyate, 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 itarah ātmā, this other self, that is the father: asya, of this one, of the son; kṛtakṛtyah, becoming freed from duties, from the three debts (to gods, to seers, and to Manes) having all his duties fulfilled; vərogaṭah, having advanced in age being afflicted with decrepitude; praśīti, dies. Sah itah prayaṇ eva as soon as he departs from here, no sooner does he leave the body than; he punah jūgatah, 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 śrīśyam 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).
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; र्सुपाक, by the seer, by the (following) mantra; also: “Garbhe nusān, while still in the womb, of my mother. The (indeclinable) word nusān 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; eśūm devānām, of these gods—of Speech, Fire, etc. What a good luck! Śatam, a hundred, many; āyasīh (or rather āyasayah) purah, citadels made of iron, that is to say impenetrable bodies as though made of iron; arāksan mā, kept me guarded; adhāh, in the lower worlds; guarded me from getting freed from the meshes of the world. (Or adhāh, later on);1 śyenāh, like a hawk; javash, forcefully, through the power generated by the knowledge of the Self; niradīyam, I came out, by tearing through the net. O the wonder!” Vāmadevaḥ, Vāmadeva, the seer; garbhe eva śayānāh, while still lying in the womb; uvāca, said; etat, this; evam, in this way.

स एवं विद्वानस्माच्छरीरभेदादृढ्वं उत्क्रम्यामुर्जिमिन्

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

Saḥ, he, the seer Vāmadeva; evam vidvān, having known thus, known the Self as spoken of earlier; became ārdhvaḥ, uplifted, identified with the supreme Self; and asmūt 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 ārdhvaḥ (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; sarvāṁ kāmāṁ 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: "Kah ayam ātmā etc.—what is It that we worship as this Self?" How do they ask?

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 upāsmahe, we worship; directly ayam ātmā iti, as this Self; kah, 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, "Brahman 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 Brahmins 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. 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, śrṇoti, one hears sound; yena vā, that by which, transformed as the sense of smell, ājīghrati gandhān, one smells the odours; yena vā, that by which, transformed as the organ of speech, one vyākaroṭi 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, vijānti, one perceives svādu ca avādu ca, the sweet and the sour (tastes).

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

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; hrdayam manah ca. the heart and mind; 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 Kauśitaki 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 names 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 (Br. 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 Brahman 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; drṣṭih, perception, of all objects through the senses; dhrṣṭih, 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"; matiḥ, thinking; maniṣā, independent thinking (genius); jñātiḥ, mental suffering, owing to disease etc.; smṛtiḥ, memory; saṃkalpaḥ, ascertaining, of colours etc. as white, black etc.; kratuliḥ, 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; nāmadheyāṇi, the indirect names; praṇāṇasya, 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 सर्वं देवं इमानि
च पञ्च महाभूतानि पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो
ज्योतिषीत्यज्ञानस्मानि चक्षुद्रमिश्राणीवृ। बीजानीतराणि
चेतराणि चाण्डजाणि च जार्जानि च स्वेदजानि
चोद्रजानि चाश्वानि गावः पुष्पा हस्तिनो यत्किचेंद्र
प्राणि जलमं च पत्तित्रि च यथं स्थावरं सर्वं तत्रप्रजाना-
नेत्रम् प्रजाने प्रतिष्ठितं प्रजानेत्रो लोकः प्रजा प्रतिष्ठा
प्रजानां 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.

Eṣāḥ, 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). Eṣāḥ, 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. Eṣāḥ, this One; is
prajāpatiḥ, Prajāpati (Virāt) who is the first embodied Being. That Prajāpati, 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 devaḥ, all these gods, viz Fire and others, that there are, are but this One; ca, and; imāni pāṇca 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 kṣudramātrāni iva, mixed with small creatures, the word iva being meaningless; and that are hījāni, 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: Āṇḍajāni, born of eggs—birds and others: jārūjāni, born of wombs—men and others; svedajāni, born of moisture—lice etc.; udbhijjāni, born of earth—e.g. trees etc.; aśvāḥ, horses; gāvaḥ, cattle; puruṣāḥ, human beings; hastinaḥ, elephants; and yat kim ca idam, and whatever living creature there may be. Which are they? Whichever is jaṅgamāṁ, 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 praṇāīnetram, made to exist by Consciousness. (the phrase being derived thus): Prajñā 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.
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).

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.

Śaṅkara, 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 prajñena utmanā, through (i.e. in identification with) this (very) Self that is Consciousness; asmāt lokāt utkramya, 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 प्रति-षितमाविरावीं ऐधि वेदस्य म आणीस्थः श्रुतं मे मा प्रहासीर्नेनाधीतेनाहोरात्रां संदेशायुसं वदिद्यामि सत्यं वदिद्यामि तत्मामवतु तद्वक्तारमवतवतु मामवतु वक्तारमवतु वक्तारम् ॥

ॐ शान्ति: शान्ति: शान्ति: ॥
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 Garuda, the destroyer of evil, be well disposed towards us; may Bhṛṣpati ensure our welfare.

Om! Peace! Peace! Peace!
Introduction: The Upaniṣad, commencing with "Om brahma devanām" 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 Rg-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 Brahma with loving eagerness: or it is called so, since it leads to the supreme Brahma, and completely weakens or destroys (avasādāyati) 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 प्रथम: संवभव
विश्वस्य कर्ता भुवनस्य गोपैता ।
स ब्रह्मविद्या सर्वविद्याप्रतिपदा-
मथवर्यं ज्ञेष्ठपुनाय प्राह् ॥ ११ ॥

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 Brahmān 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; sambabhava, 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 Smrti, “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). Kartã, the creator; višvasya, of the whole universe; goptã, 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): Sah, He, Brahmã, whose fame is so well known: (prûha, imparted); the brahma vidyãm: the vidyã or knowledge of Brahman, the supreme Self, is the brahma vidyã, for it relates to the supreme Self, inasmuch as it is described as “that by which one realises the true and immutable Purusa” (Mu. 1. ii. 13); or it is called brahma vidyã, because the knowledge was imparted by Brahmã, the First Born. (He imparted) that knowledge that is sarva-vidyã-pratisthãm, 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) prûha, imparted, that knowledge; atharvāya jyesṭhaputrāya, to Atharvā, His eldest son. He is the eldest and he is also one among the sons of Brahmã. 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:

अथर्वेण यां प्रवदेत ब्रह्माः
थर्वा तां पुरोवाचाविज्ञे ब्रह्मविद्याम्।
स भारद्वाजाय सत्यवहाय प्राह
भारद्वाजोज्जित्से परावराम्।

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

Yām Brahmanādyām, that knowledge of Brahman, which; brāhma, Brahmā; pravadeta, said; atharvane, to Atharvā; tām, that very knowledge, received from Brahmā; atharvā, Atharvā; purā, in days of yore; uvāca, said; aṅgire, to one named Aṅgir. And sak, he, Aṅgir; prāha, said; satyavahāya bhāradvāja, to one named Satyavaha of the line of Bharadvāja. Bhāradvājal, he of the line of Bharadvāja; (imparted) aṅgirase, to Aṅgiras, 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.

¹ i.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.

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: mahāśālaḥ, a great householder: upasannah (san), having approached; vidhvīrat, duly, that is to say, in accordance with the scriptures; the teacher aṅgirasam. Aṅgiras, disciple of Bharadvāja: papračchha, 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: “Bhagavah, 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.
Tasmāi, 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; vadam, 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:

तत्तापरा ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोश्यर्वेदः शिखाने कल्पो व्याकरणं निर्द्वं छन्दो ज्योतिषमिति । अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते ॥ ५ ॥

5. Of these, the lower comprises the Ṛg-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. Śiksā, the science of pronunciation etc.; kalpaḥ, the code of rituals; nyākaranaṁ, grammar; niruktam, etymology; chandah, metre; jyotisam, astrology; — these are the six auxiliary parts (of the Vedas). These constitute the aparā (lower) knowledge. Ātha, now is being stated; the parā, higher knowledge: yayā, by which tat, that; aksaram, the Immutable, whose attributes will be stated hereafter; udhigamyate, 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, "Aiha katham pareti, how then is, it called the higher?"
wise realise...) that which cannot be perceived” etc.

yat tadādvesṣhyamgraśasthyamgoṣṭhīmaṃvarṇya
maṇḍukṣuṣṭhōtraṇaṃ taddaṇāṇipād 1
nityāṃ chṝṁśuṃ svargantāṃ suṣūkṣmāṃ
tadānyayā yuddhutayāṁ niṣpurṣṭyaṅpitāṁ dhiirā: 11611

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-perva-
sive, 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) adreyāṃ (should rather be adreyam), 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. Agrāhyāṃ, beyond one’s grasp, i.e. beyond the range of the organs of action. Agotraya: gotra is synonymous with connection or root; so agotram means unconnected, for it has no root with which it can get connected. Varnāḥ, (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 avarṇya, featureless. Ācakṣuḥśrotraṇāḥ; the cakṣuḥ, eye, and śrotraṇaḥ, ear, are the organs in all
beings for perceiving forms and names; that in which these two do not exist is *akṣuḥśrotram*, 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 *apānipādam*, 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:

यथोर्णनाभि: सृजते गृहते च
यथा पृथिव्यामोषथय: संभवति ।
यथा सत: पुर्षात् केषलोमानि
तथा आरात् 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; srjate, spreads out, the threads that are non-different from its own body; ca, and, again; grhṇate (should rather be grhṇāti), withdraws, those very threads—makes them one with itself; ca, and; yathā, as; prthivyām, on the earth; (grow) oṣadhyāḥ, 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 *aṅgaratī*, 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:

![Tvasion of two men](image)

- तपसा चीयते व्रह्म ततोज्ञामभिजायते ।
  अन्नात्प्राणो मनः सत्यं लोकः कर्मं चामृतम् ॥ ५॥

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.

*Tapasā*, 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; *ciyate*, 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-
knowledge of creation, preservation, and dissolution: abhijñayate, 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) prīyāh, Hiranyagarbha, who is common² to all the beings in the universe that are endowed 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 manāḥ, 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:

\[ \text{यः सर्वं: सर्वविद्या ज्ञानमयं तपः: ।} \\
\text{तस्मादेतद्व्रह्य नाम रूपमश्च जायते}।२१।।} \\
\text{इति मुण्डकोपनिषद् प्रथममुण्डके प्रथम: 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.

Yaḥ, He, the one called the Immutable, and answering to the foregoing definition; that is *sarvajñāḥ*, a knower of all things in general; (and) *sarvāvit*, a knower of all things in detail; *yasya*, whose; the *tapah*, austerity; is *jñānamayaḥ*, made up of knowledge—consists in omniscience, and not in effort; *tasmāt*, from that, from that omniscient Entity, as aforesaid; *jāyate*, is born; *etat brahmaḥ*, 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.; *rupam*, 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.
By the text starting with "Ṛg-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 wholly 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:

तदेवत्त सत्ये
मन्त्रेषु कर्माणि कवयो यान्यपचयं-
स्ताविन त्रेतायां बढ्या सन्ततानि।
तान्याचरथ नियतं सत्यकामा
एप व: पत्था: सुकृतस्य लोके।।११॥

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; _kavayāḥ_, the wise—Vasiṣṭha and others; _apāyana_, saw; _mantrēṣu_, 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 tāṇi, these, the karmas enjoined by the Vedas and visualised by the seers; santatāṇi, 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 tāṇi, accomplish them; nityam, for ever; satyakāmāḥ, with a desire for the true results of karma. Esah, this is vak, your; paṁthāḥ, path; sukrātya loke, for the result (of karma) accomplished by yourselves. The result of karma is called loku, the word being derived from the root lūk in the sense of that which is looked at or enjoyed (lokyaē) 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?

Yadā lelāyatē hṛṣīcī: samidhe hṛṣyavāhane ।
Tadā tatsyamāgāvatāntereraśanaḥ: pratisādayet ॥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; samiddhe havya-
vāhane, on the fire being set ablaze, by a good supply
of fuel; arciḥ, the flame; lelūyate, shoots up; tadh, then; into the blazing, dancing flame; āyyabhūgau (should be rather āyyabhūgayoh) antareṇa, in the midst of the two places where oblations are poured, and which is called the āvāpa-sthāṇa; one pratipādayet, should offer;¹ āhutiḥ, oblations; in honour of the gods. The word āhutiḥ 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?

यस्यानिनिहोत्रमदर्शंमर्पणासस्य-
मचातुर्मस्यमनाश्यणमतिथिवर्जितं च ।
अहुतमवेशवदेवमविधिना हुत-
मासद्वंतमास्तस्य लोकान हिन्सित ॥ १३ ॥

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

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-sthāṇa.

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. _Apaurṇa-māsam_, without the Pūrṇamāsa sacrifice. _Aṣṭur-māsyam_, devoid of the Cāturmāṣya¹ ritual. Āgrayaṇa rituals² are to be undertaken in autumn etc.; that Agnihotra in which these are not accomplished is _unāgrayaṇam_. So also _aitihivarjītam_, that in which guests are not served, day in and day out. _Aḥutam_, in which the Agnihotra itself remains unperformed at the proper time. Just like _adarśa_ etc., _avaiśvadēvaṃ_ means that in which the Vaiśvadeva rite remains unaccomplished. And although the Agnihotra is performed, it is _avidhiṇā hutaṃ_, 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. Vaiśvadeva, 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) hīnasū, destroys, āsaptamān lokān, the worlds up to and inclusive of the seventh; tasyā, 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 काराली च मनोजवा च
मुलोहिता या च मुधूभ्रवर्णा ।
स्फुलिन्नी विश्वरस्वी च देवी
नेलायमाना इति सष्टिजिवः ॥४॥

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

¹Bhūr, Bhuvār, Svar, Maha, Jana, Tapas, Satya.
²The sacrificer serves the three past generations by offering pīḍa, water etc., and the three living generations by feeding them. Thus the six generations get connected with himself as the seventh.
nām, of the gods; ekaḥ, alone; adhīvāsaḥ, dwells (presides), above all.

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

एह्येहीति तमाहुःतय: सुवर्चस:
सुर्यस्य राहिमभिर्यंजमानं वहन्ति।
प्रियां वाचमभिवदन्त्योसथयन्त्य
एष व: पुण्यं सुकुटो ब्रह्मालोकः।।६६।।

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 suvārcaśaḥ, scintillating (oblations); ehi ehi iti, welcoming (him) with the words “Come, come”; moreover, abhīvadantyaḥ, uttering; priyāṃ vācān, 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; punyāḥ, virtuous; suktāḥ, well-born, road to; brahma-lokaḥ, heaven, which is your result.” From the context it follows that brahma-loka (lit. the world of Brahma) 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:
7. Since these eighteen constituents of a sacrifice, on whom the inferior \textit{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.

\textit{Plavāḥ} means perishable. \textit{Hi}, since; \textit{ete}, these; \textit{vajñarūpāḥ}, the constituents of the sacrifice, the accomplishehrs of the sacrifice; (who are) \textit{aṣṭādāśa}, eighteen in number, viz the sixteen priests, the sacrificer, and his wife; \textit{yeśu uktam}, on whom, on which eighteen of these, it has been said, by scripture, as resting: the \textit{avaram karma}, the inferior \textit{karma}, mere \textit{karma}, without knowledge;—(these are perishable, because they are) \textit{adṛśthāḥ}, fragile, impermanent; therefore, the inferior \textit{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, \textit{ye}, those, the non-discerning, ignorant people, who \textit{abhinandanti}, delight with regard to this (\textit{karma}); thinking, "\textit{Etat sreyas}, this is good—the cause of bliss"; \textit{te}, they; after staying in heaven for some time; \textit{punar eva api}, over again; \textit{yanti}, undergo; \textit{jarāmṛtyum}, old age and death.
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, "vartamiḥ, existing; avidyāyām, within the fold of ignorance; being steeped in non-discrimination; and mā atāte, learned, conversant with all that is to be learned"—flattering themselves in this way: those "māttāḥ, fools; jagatguṇiyāmāḥ, while being buffeted, harried by hosts of evils like old age, disease, etc.; parivartate, as a result of their loss of vision, just as in the world andhiraḥ, the blind, deprived of eyes; fall into pits or brambles; iti, andhena eva, by the blind alone, by one who is himself without eyes. Moreover,
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; avidyāyāṃ, in the midst of ignorance; bāhudhā, in diverse ways; bālāḥ, the unenlightened; abhimanyanti, take airs by thinking, “Vayam kṛtārthāḥ, we alone have attained the fullest achievement.” Yat, since, in this manner; karmaniḥ, 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 (santaḥ), (becoming) afflicted with sorrow; they cyavante, get deprived, of heaven; kṣīvalokāḥ, on the exhaustion of their results of karma.

इघ्तापूर्त सत्यमाना वरिष्ठ
नाम्यच्छेयो वेदयते प्रमहा: ।

नाकस्य पृष्ठे ते सुक्रेतस्तुम्भवे-
म लोकं हीनतरं वा विशंति ॥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; īśam, sacrifice and other rites, enjoined by the Vedas; pūrtam, (digging of) pools, wells, tanks, etc. inculcated by the Smṛtis;—thinking these to be the varisṭham, 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 sreyas, the highest goal (liberation). And te, they: anubhūtvā (should rather be anubhāya), having enjoyed, the fruits of their karma; sukṛte, in the abode of enjoyment; nākasya prṣṭhe, on the heights of heaven; again; viśanti, enter; into imam lokam, this, human, world; vai hīnataram, or a world inferior to it. e.g. that of the beasts, or hell, etc., in accordance with the residual results of karma.

तपःअद्वेयं हृदप्रवसन्त्यरणं
शान्ता विद्वांसो भैष्यचया चरन्तः।
सूर्यद्वारेन ते विरजा: प्रयाति
यत्रामृतः स पुश्यो ह्यव्ययात्। ॥ ११॥

11. Those who live in the forest, while begging for alms—viz those (forest-dwellers and hermits\(^\text{1}\)) who resort to the duties of their

\(^{1}\text{The householders who repair to the forest in the third stage of their lives, or become monks in the fourth stage.}\)
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 aranye, in the forest; upavasanti, resort to; tapaḥ-sraddhe—tapas, the duties pertaining to that stage of life, and śraddhā, meditation on Hiraṇyaagarbha and others; and the śūntāḥ, self-controlled, who have their senses under control; vidvāṁsaḥ, the learned, that is to say, the householders, too, who are devoted chiefly to meditation; (go). (Upavasanti aranye) bhāskya-caryām carantah, (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; sūryadvūreṇa, 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 amṛtāḥ puruṣāḥ, that immortal Puruṣa, the first-born Hiraṇyaagarbha; 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?
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 Brāhmaṇa.

Parīksya, examining—all these (rites) that are included within the scope of the lower knowledge constituted by the Rg-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 Brähmana should renounce). The Brähmana 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 nih 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, sah, he, the dispassionate Brähmana; abhigacchet, 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-pañih, with a load of (sacrificial) faggots in hand; (to) śrotiyam brahmanishtham, (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 brahmanishthah just as it is in the case of the words japaniśthah absorbed in self-repetition, tapaniśthah, 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 Purusa (all-pervasive Reality).

तस्मै स विद्वानुपस्थाय सम्यक्
प्रशान्तचित्ताय शामान्विताय ।
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 Purusa.
Sah vidyān, that enlightened one, the teacher who has realised Brahman: (should say) tasmāi, to him; upasammōya, to the one who has approached; sanyāk, duly, that is to say, in accordance with the scriptures; prasāntacittīya, to one whose heart is calm, who has become free from such faults as pride; and śamānvitīya, to one who is endowed 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 brahma-vidyām, that knowledge of Brahman; tattvataḥ, adequately; yena, by which, by which higher knowledge; veda, one realises: aksaram, the Immutable, that is possessed of such attributes as being imperceptible etc. (Mu.I.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 aksaram (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.
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; sādīptat pāvakāt, from a fire well lighted up; visphulingah, sparks; sarūpāh, that are akin to the fire; prabhavante, fly off; sahasrasah, in their thousands, innumerably: tathā, similarly; somya. O good-looking (or amiable) one! aksarāt, from the Immutable, of the foregoing characteristics; (originate) vividhāh, bhūvāh, 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

\(^1\)Since 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 ह्यमूर्त: पुष्पः सवाह्यास्मय्तरो ह्यजः ।
अप्राणो ह्यमनः शुभ्रो ह्यक्षरात्परतः परः।

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).

Puruṣah. Puruṣa, who is so called because of (the derivative meaning of) all-pervasiveness or residence in all hearts; is divyāh, 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 sabāhyābhyantarāh, coextensive with all that is external or internal; ajah, 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 aprāṇaḥ, without the vital force, to those whose eyes are fixed on the supreme Reality. That is called aprāṇaḥ in which air, the principle of motion, does not exist in its diversity of the power of action. Similarly, amanūḥ, 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" (Br. IV. iii. 7). As the two limiting adjuncts are denied for It, so It is subhrah, pure. And hence (It is higher) parataḥ aksarūt, 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 *parah*, higher; *akṣarāt paratāḥ*, 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 *ākūśa*, 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

\(^1\)In 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.

\(^2\)Effects 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.

एतस्मात्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वन्त्रियाणि च ।
खं बायुंजयातिरप: 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; jñayate, 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 endowed 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 khaṃ, space; vāyuḥ, the air inside and outside, differentiated as āvaha (moving towards), pravaha (moving away from), etc.; jyotiḥ, fire; āpah, water;
pṛthivī, earth, that is viśvasya dhārinī, 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 transcendent, 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 an
the heart, and (It is He) from whose two feet emerged the earth.

Of whom mûrdhâ, head, the best limb; is agniḥ, (lit. fire, means here) heaven, in accordance with the Vedic text, “O Gautama, that world is surely fire” (Ch. V. iv. 1). Of whom caksusī, 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 “yasya, of whom”. Of whom dīsah, śrotre, the directions are the two ears; of whom vîrâtah vedāh, the revealed, well-known, Vedas; are the vîk, speech; of whom vāyuḥ prāyah, air is the vital force: asya, i.e. yasya, of whom; vîśvam, the whole universe; is hṛdayam, 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 padbhvīm, from the two feet; pritiḥvī, the earth, is born. Esaḥ, 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).
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) _agnīḥ_, 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 _osadhayaḥ_, the herbs and corns; _prthi-ṛyām_, on the earth (the third fire). _Pumān_, man that is (also) a (fourth) fire; _siṃcati_. sheds: the _retas_, semen, that originates from the herbs and corns when poured as an oblation into the fire that is man; _yośitāyām_ (should rather be _yośiti_), into the woman that is (the fifth) fire. In this order _bahvih_ (rather _bahvyah_), many; _prajāḥ_, creatures; _samprasūtāḥ_, have originated; _purusāt_, from the supreme Puruṣa.

Moreover, it is being said that the auxiliaries of _karmas_, as well as their fruits, emerge verily from Him. How?
6. From Him (emerges) the Rk, Sūma, 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) tcah, the (metrical) mantras that have their letters, feet, and lines well regulated and have such metres as the Gāyatrī and so on. Sūma is that which is divided into five parts or seven parts and is embellished with stobha etc. and tune.1 Yajūṁśī 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. Dikṣā, initiation, consisting in wearing a girdle etc., made of Muṇja 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). Kratavah, the sacrifices involving the use of a sacrificial stake. Ca daksināḥ, and the

1Consisting of five parts—hitakāra, prastāva,, udgītha, pratihāra, and nidhana; of the seven parts—the foregoing five and upadrava and ādi. Stobhas are chanted interjections in a Sūma song, such as hum, ho (Vide Ch. I. xiii—II. xxx).
offerings to priests and Brāhmaṇas, ranging from the giving of a cow to all one possesses. *Ca satyarat-
saraḥ*, and year, which, as time, forms a factor in a rite. *Ca yajamānaḥ*, 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.

तस्माचच देवा बहुधा संप्रभुता:
साध्या मनुष्या: पशुवो वयांसि ।
प्राणपानी व्रीहियव्रौ तपश्च
श्रद्धा सत्यं ब्रह्मचर्यं विविषिच् ॥७॥

7. And from Him duly emerged the gods in various groups, the Sādhya 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; *bahuḍhāḥ*, variously in different groups of Vasus etc.¹ *sādhyaḥ*, Sādhyas, a particular class of gods; *manuṣyaḥ*, human beings who are entitled to undertake rites; *pasavāḥ*, beasts—both domestic and wild;

¹Eight Vasus, twelve Ādityas, eleven Rudras, etc.
rayūṃsi, birds; and prāṇa-apāna, breathing in and out, constituting life; vṛṣhi-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.

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 arciṣāḥ, 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 lokah, these seven seats of the senses; yesu, in which caranti, move about; pramah, the sense-organs. The expression, “where move the sense-organs (pramah)” is an attribute of the pramah, so as to exclude Prana and Apa (the functions of exhaling and inhaling). (They are) guhāsayah; derived from the word guhō (cavity) and the root si (to sleep). guhāsayah, means the sleepers in (the cavity of) the body or the heart, during sleep. Nihitah, (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 Purusha 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.

अत: समुद्र गिरयद्वर-  
स्मात्स्यद्वन्दवेसिन्धवः सर्वहुपाः ।  
अतंश्च सर्वा अपभयो रसद्वः  
येनैष भूतस्तिष्ठतं ह्यान्तरात्मा ॥१६॥

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.

Atah, from this, Puruṣa, issue: surve, all; samudrāḥ, the oceans, of Salt etc.; ca girayāḥ, and the mountains—Himalayas etc.; all these emerge from this Puruṣa Himself. Astam, from this Puruṣa; svandante, flow out; sindhavaḥ, the rivers—Gaṅgā etc.; sarvarūpāḥ, of various forms. Ca atah, and from Him: sarvah oṣadhayaḥ, all corns—rice, barley, etc.: ca rasah, and the juice—that is of six kinds: yena, by virtue of which: hi, verily; tiśhate (rather tiśhati) exists; bhūtaik, surrounded by the elements, that 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 एवें विश्वं कर्म तपो बह्य परामृतम् 
एतथे वेद निवितं गुहायं सोश्चिदास्त्रानिन्यं 
विकिरतीह सोभय ॥१०१॥

इति मुण्डकोपनिषदिः द्वितीयमुण्डकेक चर्चम्: 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; viśvaṁ 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 Agni-hotra; tapas, knowledge and the separate fruit accruing from it; all these constitute this "all". And all that is but the product of Brahman. Therefore, yah, he who; āda, knows, the brahma parāmartam, Brahman the supremely immortal—knows, (Brahman) thus —"I indeed am all this", (knows) as nihitam guhāyīṁ, existing in the heart of every being; sah, 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 MUṆḌĀKA
CANTO II

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

आवि: सन्निहितं गुहाचरं नाम
महत्पदमन्त्रैतत् समर्पितम्।
एजत्प्राणगतिमिग्वयं यदेत-
उजानथ सदस्तुरेष्यं परं
विज्ञानास्वरूपिणम् प्रजानाम्॥ ॥

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.

Āvīḥ, self-effulgent, (and) saṁnihitam, 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 āvīḥ, effulgent and saṁnihitam, 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; samarpitaṁ, 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; yut nimisat, 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: jñānatha, 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 vareṇyaṁ, eligible, covetable to all—because of Its eternality; (and that is) param, distinct; vijnānaṁ, from the knowledge; prajānāṁ, of beings—this is how vijnānaṁ is connected with the remote prajānāṁ; that is to say, It is beyond the range of ordinary knowledge. (Know) yat varisṭham, that which is the highest; for that Brahman alone is the highest of all high things, by virtue of Its freedom from all defects.

यद्विघ्वद्यवद्धम्योऽणः
यस्मिन्लोकः निनिहिता लोकिनशः
तदेतदक्षरः ब्रह्म स प्राणस्तं वाहः
तदेतत्तस्तत्त्वं तदमृतं तद्विज्ञव्यं सोम्यं विद्ये ॥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 anu, subtle; anubhyah, as compared with the minute things, e.g. the grain called syūmūka. From the use of the word ca (and), it is implied that it is much bigger than the big earth etc. Yasmin, on which; nihitāh, are fixed; lokāh, worlds—earth etc.; ca lokinaḥ, and the dwellers of the worlds—men and others; for all are known as dependent on Consciousness. Tat etat aksaram brahmaḥ, 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 vān-manāh, 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:

धनुर्गृहीतवौपिनिपदं महास्त्रं
शरे द्युपासानिशितं संधयीत ।
आयम्य तद्द्रावगतेन वेतसा
लक्ष्यं तदेववाक्षरं 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.

Grhitvā, taking up; the dhamiḥ, bow; consisting in the mahāstraṃ aupaniṣadadī, the great weapon that occurs, i.e. is well known in the Upaniṣads; on that bow san-dhayaṭa, one should fix; a śaram, arrow. What kind of arrow? That is being stated: Upāsuniśitam, sharpened, that is to say purified by constant meditation. And after fixing the arrow, and ūyamyā, 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; cetasa tadbhāvaṅgatena, with the mind absorbed in the bhāva or bhāvanā, thought of that Brahman; viddhi, hit; somya, O good looking one; tat eva laksyaṃ aksarum. that very target that is the Immutable, described earlier.
The bow etc. that have been mentioned are being specified:

प्रणवो धनुः शरो ह्यात्मा ब्रह्म तत्त्वात्मक्यमुच्यते।
अप्रमतेन बेदव्यं शरवत्तनमयो भवेत्।

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 sarah*, 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, *tallaksyam*, 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, *saravat*, 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:

![Verse 5](https://example.com/verse5)

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 Purusa, on whom; _adyah_, heaven; _prithivi_, the earth; _ca antarikṣam_, and intermediate space; _otam_, are strung; _ca_, as also; _manas_, the mind; _saha sarvaih prānaih_, 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; vimuṇcatha (is the same as vimuṇ-cata), 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 esaḥ, this, this knowledge of the Self; is the setuh, 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” (Śv. III. 8, VI. 15).

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; araḥḥ iva, like the spokes; rathanābhau, fixed on the

1Or—“there is no other path for reaching (the goal)”.
hub of a chariot wheel; samhāṭaḥ, are pinned; nāḍyaḥ, the nerves, that spread over the whole body; in that heart, saḥ esaḥ, that aforesaid One, the Self under discussion that is the witness of all the ideas occurring to the intellect; antaḥ caraṭe, moves, exists, within. caraṭa being the same as caraṭī. (It exists) as though seeing, hearing, thinking, and knowing, and as though bahūdha jāyamāṇaḥ, 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 dhyāyatam, think; of that atmānam, 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 karmas, for they hanker after the knowledge of Brahman. The teacher utters his benediction so that they may realise Brahman without any obstacle: Svasti (asta), let there be no hindrance; rāh, for you; parāya, 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 “pāraṣṭya, for crossing over (to the shore)”. 
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 yah sarvajñah sarvavit was explained earlier (1.i.9). He being distinguished again: Yasya eṣah mahimā bhuvi, 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 esah, such; bhuvī, in the world; esaḥ, that One;—the sarvajñāḥ, omniscient (in general); the effulgent One of such glory;—is pratiṣṭhitah, seated: in the divye, luminous—illuminated by all the states of the intellect; brahmāpura, 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.

Sah, He, the Self, as seated there, is revealed variously through the mental states: and hence He is manomayāḥ, associated with the mind, being conditioned by it; prāṇa-sarīra-netāḥ, the carrier of the vital forces and the body, in the matter of transferring them from the gross body to the other (gross or finer) body; pratiṣṭhitah ānena, 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: sannidhāya, 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. Viśṇunena, 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; dhīrāḥ, the discriminating people; paripaśyanti, realise as existing in Its fullness everywhere; yat, that, that reality of the Self; 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:

भिन्ने हृदयप्रन$िथिहिस्तऽवलं सर्वसंशयाः।
क्षीयन्ते चास्य वर्णाणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे पराबे॥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-granthih, 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. Sarvasaṁśayāḥ, 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; kṣīyante, get
dissipated; \textit{karmāni}, 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 \textit{tasmiṇaśrīte parāvare}, when that One, the omniscient and transcendent—who is both \textit{para}, high, as the cause, and \textit{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:

\begin{center}
\textcolor{red}{

dhiramayā pare kośe virajā brahma nilkalam

tacchubhī jyotihāṁ jyotisthādātmavindah vidyā
dharmas ca svayam jayas ca jyotisthādātmavindah vidyā

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.

\textit{Pare hiraṇmaya kośe}, 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 \textit{para}, supreme, being the inmost of all; and \textit{hiraṇmaya}, shining, being illumined with the intellectual perceptions. There exists \textit{brahma}, Brahman, so called because of being the greatest as well as the Self of all; (Brahman that is) \textit{virajam}, free from taints, from all taints of \textit{rajas}, defects, such as ignorance; (that is) \textit{nīśkalam}, without
\end{center}
any connection with parts, that is to say, partless. Since It is taintless and partless, therefore *tat*, It; is *subhram*, pure; *tat*, that; is *jyotih*, the illuminator; *jyotisām*, 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 *viduh*, know, who are *ātmavidah*, 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 viduh*, 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 विदुतो भाति कुतोश्रमगिनः ।
तमेव भात्तमनुभाति सर्वं
तस्य भासा सर्वसिद्ध विभाति ॥ १०१॥

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: sūryāḥ, 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 vidyutāḥ, nor these lightning flashes: bhūnti, shine; kutāḥ ayam agnīḥ, how can this fire, that is known to us? To cut short, this universe anubhūti, shines in accordance tam eva bhūntam, 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 bhūsā, by His light, sarvam idam, all this—the universe constituted by the sun etc., iśbhūti, 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:
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 _dakṣiṇatātaḥ_, on the right; _ca uttareṇa_, and on the left; similarly _adhah_, below; _ca ṛddhivam_, and above, all that is _prasaṃtam_, extended everywhere, in the shape of products, appears as different from Brahman, and is possessed of name and form. To be brief, _idam_, this; _visvam_, universe; is _varisīham_, 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.
That higher knowledge has been presented, by which is attained that immutable Truth, called Purusa, 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 the rest that are helpful auxiliaries to that truth and the subsequent text is begun. And though Reality was determined 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.

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.
Dvā (or rather dvau, means) two; suparṇī (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) sayujā (that is to say, sayujau), ever associated together; sakhiyā (or rather sakhiyau), bear the same names, and have the same cause of manifestation. Being of such characteristics, these two pariṣasvatāte, 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 commensurable dependence the former is related with the latter.

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

³Aśvattha, means a banyan; but derivatively it means transitory—whose existence tomorrow (āvah) is unpredictable.
ing in the experience of multifarious mental reactions. *Anāśman*, without tasting; *anyah*, 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.

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 vrksa*, in the same tree, in the body mentioned earlier; (there moans) *purusah*, the enjoying individual soul; being *nimagnah*, 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 anīṣayā, 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 socati, grieves, is smitten; muhyamānāh, 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, rādī, when, while engaged in meditation: (it) paśyati, sees; through diverse paths of Yoga and through karmas, jusṭam, the adored One; anyam, the One who is other—other than that conditioned by the limiting adjunct of the tree of the world; (sees) iśam, 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 mahimānām, His glory, constituted by the universe; iti, in this way: “This is my glory who am the supreme Lord”—when he sees thus, rādī, then; he becomes vītasokah, 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 पद्ध: पश्यते रुक्मवर्णः
कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोगिनम्।
तदा विभान्युष्णयपे विधूय
निरहः: परम् 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 pāśyāḥ, seer—the word, derived in the sense of one who sees, means the illumined aspirant; pāśyate (is the same as pāśyati), sees, in the manner described earlier; rukmavarnaṁ, the naturally self-effulgent One, or the (golden-hued) One whose light is indestructible like that of gold; kartaṇam, the creator; iśam, the lord, of the whole universe: puruṣam, Puruṣa; brahmaṇyonom, 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; vidhṛṣya, having completely shaken off, burnt away, together with their roots, both pūrayapīpe, virtue and vice—the two kinds of action that constitute bondage; and having become niraṇjanah, free from taint, free from
suffering: upaiti. achieves; paramam sāmyam, 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 ह्यो य: सर्वभूतैवभावि
विजानन्त्विद्धान्न्वेत नातिवादी।
आत्मक्रियेऽऽत्मरतिः क्रियावा-
नेष श्रद्धाविवेधं 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 eṣah, verily this One, the One under discussion; viz prāṇah, the Vital Force of the vital forces, who is the supreme Lord; vibhūti, shines divergently; sarvabhūtaiḥ, 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 vidvīn, an illumined soul; vijñānan, 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? Ātivādi, 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) ātmakriḍāḥ, disporter in the Self alone, and in nothing else, e.g. in sons, wife, and others. Similarly, (he is) ātmaraṭiḥ, he has his enjoyment, pleasure, in the Self alone. The distinction between the two is that kriḍā (disport) is dependent on external accessories, whereas ratiḥ (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 ātmarati 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 bahuvaśihi compound or the meaning of the suffix matup (i.e. vān in kriyāvān), (both indicating possession), becomes redundant.\(^1\)

\(^1\)The bahuvaśihi form should be simply ātmaratikriyeḥ, which conveys the same meaning, so that the suffix vān becomes
(From this single compound) some, however, aim at deriving a meaning conducive to the combination of \textit{karma}, like Agnihotra etc., with the knowledge of Brahman. But this runs counter to the statement of the primary idea in \textit{"esah brahmavidim varisthah}, 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 \textit{karma} is a vain rigmarole. 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” (\textit{kriyavān}) 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 \textit{brahmavidimm varisthah}, the chief among all the knowers of Brahman.

Now are being enjoined for the monk such disciplines as truth and the rest that are predominatingly useless. Or if the suffix is retained, the \textit{bahuvihi} loses its import.

\textsuperscript{1}Viz “disporting in the Self and performing \textit{karma}”. 
characterised by detachment and that are helpful to the fullest knowledge.

सत्येन लभ्यस्तपसा होप आत्मा
सम्यग्ज्ञानेन ब्रह्मचर्येण नित्यम्।
अन्तःशरीरे ज्योतिर्मयो हि शुभ्रोऽ
यं पश्यन्ति यत्यथः क्षीणदौष्टः। ॥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) labhyah, 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 Smṛti, “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. cūndrīyāṇa and the rest. The expression, “eṣāḥ ātmā labhyah—this Self is attainable”, is understood everywhere. (This self is attainable) samyag-śrūṇena, by complete knowledge, by the vision of the Self in Its reality;¹ brahma-

¹By samyak śrūṇa, 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
caryena, (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) antahsari, inside the body, in the space within the lotus of the heart; (which Self is) jyotirmayah, golden-hued (III. i. 3); and sbrhrah, holy; yam, which, which Self; yatayah, the monks who habitually strive for it; kṣīnadasya, whose mental defects—anger etc.—have become attenuated: pasyanti, 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.

सत्येव जयते नानृतं
सत्येन पत्था विततो देवयान: ।
येनाण्कमन्यपथो ह्याप्तकामा
यद्र तत्सत्यस्य परमं निधानम् ॥१६॥

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 antam, 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 devayīnāḥ, Devayāna, the Path of gods; is vitataḥ, spread, maintained for ever; yena, by which (path); ākramanti, ascend; the rṣayāḥ, 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) yatṛa, where: exists tṛt, that: paramam, best; nidhūnām, 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.
7. It is great and self-fulgent; 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 brhat, 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 sukhmataram, subtler, than the subtle things like space, for Its subtleness is unsurpassing, It being the cause of all; It vibhūti, shines variously as sun, moon, and the rest. Besides, tat, that, that Brahman: exists sudāre, 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; pasyatsu, 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:

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, caksusā, by the eye, by anybody, because of Its formlessness; na api, nor even is It encompassed vici, by speech, because of Its unutterability; na anyāih devaih, 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: karmaṇā 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: Jñanaprasādena, through the favourableness of knowledge (i.e. the intellect).\(^1\) Though the intellect in all

\(^1\)The 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 viśuddhasattrvāḥ, one who has become pure in mind, through that favourableness of the intellect, becomes fit for seeing Brahman: tatāh tu, therefore; paśyate (is the same as paśyati), one sees, realises, tam, that Self; (that is) niskalāṇaḥ, indivisible, devoid of all differentiation of limbs: dhyāyamānāḥ 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

एयोज्ञेऽरात्म चेतसा वेदितव्यो
यस्मिन्यश्राऽऽ तथच वा संबिबे ऽि
प्राणेश्चतं सिरोमोत प्रजानां
यस्मिन्यशुद्भे विभव्येयो 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: evah, this; aprah, subtle; atm, Self; veditavyah, is to be known through the pure cetasa, intelligence, only. Where is It to be realised? Yasmin, where, in the body in which; prana, the vital force; samvivesa, has entered well; paicadha, in five different forms, viz Prana, Apna, 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 citta, the whole mind, internal organ; prajnam, of creatures; pranaih 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 visuddhe, which having become pure, freed from the dirt of grief etc.: evah atm, 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:
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 whatsoever, such as the world of the Manes etc., that; _viṣuddhasattvaḥ_, the man of pure mind, the man freed from the mental afflictions (_kleśa_),¹ the knower of the Self; _sanivibhāti_, wishes for; _manasā_, with the mind, while thinking “Let this be mine or for somebody else”; _ca_, and; _yān kām̐īn_, those enjoyable things that; _kāma-yate_, (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; _arcatēt_, should worship, through washing of feet, service, salutation, etc.; _ātmajānam_, 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 MUṆḌĀKA

CANTO II

स वेदेतपरं ब्रह्म धाम
यत्र विश्वं निहितं भाति शुभ्रम्।
उपासते पुरुषं ये याकामानि
स्ते शुक्रमेतदत्वत्तति धीरा: ||11||

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; ādha, knows; the paramam dhāma, best abode, the resort of all desires; (that is) etat brahma, this Brahman, as defined before; yat, where in which Brahman, as the abode; viśvam nihitam, the whole universe is placed; and which bhūti, shines in Its own lustre; suḥram, purely, (holy); (therefore) ye, those people akūmāḥ, 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; ativartanti, transcend; etat sukram, 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 कामभिज्जयते तत्र तत्र ।
पर्यावृत्तकामस्य क्रृतात्मनस्तु
इत्येव सवं प्रविलीयन्ति कामः ॥१२॥

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.

Yaḥ, he who; kāmayaṁ, covets; kāmān, desirable things—seen or unseen; manyamānaḥ, while brooding, on them, on their good qualities; saḥ, he; jāyate, is born; kāmabhītiḥ, 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 realisation of the supreme Reality—paryūptaṁkāmasya, 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; kṛtātmānaḥ, 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; *pravīhyanti*, 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 शुनेन।
यमेवैप बृणुते तेन लभ्य-
स्तस्यैप आत्मा विवृणुते तनं स्वां। ॥ ३४ ॥

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 labhyah*, 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 bahunāśrutena*, 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; *esah*, this one, the man of knowledge; *vṛṇute*, seeks to reach; *tena*, by that fact of hankering;¹ (*esah*, this, the supreme Self); *labhyah*, 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: *esah ātmā*, this Self; *vṛṇute*, 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:

\[
\text{नायमात्मा बल्हीनेन तथो} \\
\text{न च प्रमादात्िपसो वास्त्विलिङ्गात्।} \\
\text{एतैंपार्यं तत्त्वस्तु विद्वां} \\
\text{स्तस्येष आत्मा विशेष ब्रह्मायम।।४।।}
\]

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 labhyah*, is not attainable; *bala-hinena*, 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 *tapasah*, from *tapas*; *aliṅgāt*, un-associated 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: *yah vidvān*, the man of knowledge, the discerning man, the knower of the Self, who; *yatate*, strives, with diligence; *etaih upāyaīh*, through such means—strength, absence of delusion, monasticism, and knowledge; *tusya*, of him, of that enlightened man: *esaḥ ātmā*, this Self; *visate*, enters into; the *brahmaidhūma*, abode that is Brahman.

How one enters into Brahman is being stated:

\[
\text{संप्रायणमृप्यो ज्ञातृप्त: ।}
\]
\[
\text{कृतार्थानो वीतराग: प्रशान्त: ।}
\]
\[
\text{ते सर्वं सर्वं: प्रायः धीरा ।}
\]
\[
\text{युक्तात्मान: सर्वेमेवाविशालं ॥ ॥ ॥}
\]

\(^1\)Śaṅkara is very emphatic that external renunciation is necessary (see introductions to this and Aitareya Upanisads). 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: _enaṁ_, this, the Self; the _ṛṣayaḥ_, seers; become _jñānamātrtrapūḥ_, satisfied with that very knowledge, and not with any external object that gratifies and leads to physical nourishment: _kṛtātmānaḥ_, established in identity with the supreme Self; _vātaraṇāḥ_, free from such drawbacks as attachment; _prasāntāḥ_, composed, with the senses withdrawn. _Tc_, those people, who become so; _prāpya_, having realised; _sarvakam_, 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: _dhīrūḥ_, the absolutely discriminating people; who are by nature _yuktātmānaḥ_, ever merged in deep contemplation; _āvīśanti_, 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.’
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-suniścitārthāḥ, 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, yatayah assiduous. (They) suddhasattvāh, have become purified in mind; sannyāsa-yogāt, by dint of the Yoga of monasticism, 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. Parānṛtāḥ, (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 parinucyanti, 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. Śa. 239.24), “Those who want to go beyond the courses of the world, do not tread on any path” (Itiḥāsa 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:

गता: कला: पञ्चदश प्रतिष्ठा
देवाश्च सर्वे प्रतिदेवतासुः।
कर्म्मणि विज्ञानमयिष्ठ आत्मा
परेऽव्यये सर्वे एकीभवति॥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 karman, 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; gatiḥ, 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 “pratishṭhāḥ, to the sources” is used in the plural number accusative case. (The constituents that are) pāñcadaśa, 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 karman, performed by the seeker after liberation that have not begun to bear fruit—not the active karman that have begun to bear fruit, since the latter get exhausted merely by being enjoyed; ca vijnānamayāḥ.
ätman, 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 viññānamaya means resembling the intellect. When the limiting adjunct is removed these karmas and the soul, resembling the intellect, sarve, all; ekābhāvanti, become indistinguishable, become unified; pare aryaye, 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.

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; nadiyaḥ, rivers—Gaṅgā and the rest; syandamōnāḥ, flowing down; gacchanti, attain; astam, invisibility, indistinguishable identity; samudre, in the sea, on reaching the sea; nama-rupe vihīya, by giving up (their) names and forms; tathā, similarly; vidvān, the illumined soul; nīma-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 हृ वै तत्तपरं ब्रह्म वेद
ब्रह्मविव भवति नास्याब्रह्मविविक्तकूले भवति ।
तर्कति शोकं तर्कि पाप्मानं
गुहाप्रस्थिभ्यो विमुक्तोभ्रति ॥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 aberra-
tions; and becoming freed from the knots of the heart, he attains immortality.

*Sah yah 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, *abhramavit,* anyone who does not know Brahman. Besides, even while he is alive, he *tarati sokam,* overcomes mental grief, caused by the loss of many desirable things. He *tarati pāpāṇam,* goes beyond aberrations, known as virtue and vice. *Guhāgranthishyah vinuktah,* 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, *amṛtaḥ,* 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:

क्रियावत्न: श्रोतियां ब्रह्मानिध्या:
स्वयं जूत्रत एकर्षि श्रद्ध्यान्तः ।
तेषां मवेशां ब्रह्मांवै वदेत
शिरोमानं विधिवचेस्तु चीर्मणम् ।१०१।
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 Ekarsi 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; *abhuyuktam*, is revealed; *reā*, by a mantra: Those who are *kriyāvantah*, engaged in the practice of disciplines, as mentioned earlier; *srotiyāḥ*, versed in Vedic studies and observances; *brahmanisthāḥ*, devoted to the inferior Brahman and seekers of the knowledge of the supreme Brahman: who *svayam*, by themselves: *juhvate* (is the same as *juhvatī*), sacrifice; *ekarıśīm*, to the fire named Ekarsi; *śraddhayāntah*, with faith; *teśām eva*, to them alone, who have become purified and fit recipients; *vadeta*, one should expound; *etām brahmavidhām*, this knowledge of Brahman. And to those alone one should expound *yaiḥ tu*, by whom moreover; *ciṟyam* 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.
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 Saunaka 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. Acirṇavrataḥ, 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-ṛṣibhyah, 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 कर्णेभि: श्रुण्याम् देवा
भद्रं पश्येमाक्षभिव्यज्ञतः ।
स्तिर्रर्जैस्तुष्टवास्तस्तनिभिः-
वर्षेमेवं देवविं यदरः ॥

ॐ शान्ति: शान्ति: शान्ति: ॥
MĀṆḌŪKYA UPAŅIṢAD
AND KĀRIKĀ
ॐ भद्रं करणभि: श्रुणयाम देवा
भद्रं पशयेमाक्षभियंजत्वा:।
स्थिरोर्जैस्तुष्ट्वा।सस्तनंभि-
व्यशेम देवविंदुं यदायु:॥

स्वस्ति न इन्द्रो वृद्धश्वा:
स्वस्ति न: पूषा विश्ववेदा:।
स्वस्ति नस्ताक्षरों अरिष्टनेमि:
स्वस्ति नो बृहस्पतिदं दिष्टातु॥

ॐ शान्ति: शान्ति: शान्ति:॥

(For translation see p. 78)
MĀṆḌŪKYA UPAṆIṢAD

CHAPTER I

ĀGAMA-PRAKARĀṆA (ON THE VEDIC TEXT)

Commentator's invocation: (1) I bow to that Brahman which after having enjoyed\(^1\) (during the waking state) the gross objects by pervading all the human objectives through a diffusion of Its rays\(^2\) of unchanging Consciousness that embraces all that moves or does not move; which again after having drunk\(^3\) (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 Fourth\(^5\) 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

---

\(^1\)Enjoyment consisting in witnessing the various mental moods of happiness, sorrow, etc.

\(^2\)The individual souls that are but reflections of Brahman on the intellect.

\(^3\)i.e. having merged all in the unrealised Self.

\(^4\)Existing only subjectively in the form of mental moods or impressions of past experience.

\(^5\)Not possessed of the three states of waking, dream, and sleep.

\(^6\)The cosmic gross body of Virāṭ.
created by virtue (and vice); which again (during the cosmic dream state\(^1\)) 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:

\(^1\)As identified with the cosmic subtle body \(^!\)of Hiranya-garbhā.

\(^2\)The present book comprising the Upaniṣadic text and the *Kārikā* of Gauḍapāda forms a sort of a treatise on the Vedānta; and hence the four *sambandhas* or interconnecting elements—viz *adhikāri*, the person competent for study, *sambandha*, connection, e.g. that between the book and the subject-matter, *viṣaya*, 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) (Ṛ. II. iv. 14); "When there is something else, as it were, then one can see something, one can know something" (Ṛ. 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? (Ṛ. II. iv. 14.)

That being so, the first chapter, devoted to a determination of the meaning of Ṣūktam, 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 proclaim, 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 aksaram idam sarvam—the letter Om is all this.”

¹Names make empirical dealings possible for objects.
that is the same as the supreme as well as the inferior Brahman; _upavyākhyaṇam_, 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; _bhavisyat_, the future; _iti_, these, that is to say, whatever is circumscribed by the three conceptions of time; _sārvaṃ oṅkāraḥ eva_, all this is but _Om_, in accordance with the reasons already advanced. _Ca yat trikālatītām_, 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; _tatt api_, that, too, is _oṅkāraḥ 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.

सर्वः हृदयायमात्मा तद्भव सोशयमात्मा
चतुष्पाटः १२।

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 Sah ayam ātmā, that Self that is such, that is signified by Om and exists as the higher and lower Brahman: is catuspātī, possessed of four quarters, like a (kārṣāpāya) 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 kārṣāpāya is divisible into sixteen smaller units. Four of these form a quarter, and eight form a half kārṣāpāya. The smaller coins lose their individuality in the bigger ones as it were. So Viśva merges in Taijasa, Taijasa in Prājñā, and Prājñā in Turiya. The word “quarter” is not used in any physical sense.
something is attained, whereas in the case of the Tuṁya 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:

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 jūgaritasthānah. He who has His prajñā, awareness, bāhiḥ, outside, directed to things other than Himself, is bahisprajñāḥ. 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 Agniḥotra 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 saptāṅgah. Similarly, He is ekonavimśatimukhalḥ, 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 sthūlablūk, an enjoyer of the gross. He is called vaiśvānarah, 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 pādaḥ, 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 Hiranya-garbhā, 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." (I\(s.\) 6). Otherwise, the indwelling Self, as circumscribed by one's own body, will alone be perceived, as It is by the Sāṅkhyaists and others; and in that case the specific statement, made by the Upaniṣads, that It is non-dual (Mā. 1. 7; Ch. VI. ii. 1), will have no distinctiveness, for there will be no difference from the philosophy of the Sāṅkhyaists 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. Vaiśvānar) 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).

\(^1\) Cf. सर्वभूतस्यमात्मम सर्वभूतानि चात्मिनि।
संपश्चात्मानां वेस्वाराज्यमित्वप्रवत्ति॥ — Manu

\(^2\) Six Brāhmaṇaś, who approached Asvapati, used to worship particular limbs of Vaiśvānar as Vaiśvānar Himself. Asvapati 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 Virāt 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 Brhadāraṇyaka 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.

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 svapnasthānāh. 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 antah, internal, in relation to the senses. He whose prajñā, awareness, in dream, takes the forms of the impressions in that (antah, internal) mind, is antah-prajñāh, 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 Viṣva 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.
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; supṭaḥ, the sleeping man; na paśyati, does not see; kam caṇa svāpnam, any dream; na kūmāyate, does not desire; kam caṇa kūmam, 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 susuptasthānāḥ. He is said to be ekābhūtah, 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 prajñānagahanah, 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 
\textit{eva}, merely, it follows that there is nothing of a separate class other than consciousness. And he is \textit{ānandamayāḥ}, 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 \textit{ānandabhuk}, an experiencer of joy, so this one, too, is called \textit{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 \textit{cetomukhaḥ}, since he is the doorway to the consciousness of the experiences in the dream and waking states. Or he is called \textit{cetomukhaḥ} because consciousness, appearing as empirical experience, is his doorway or entrance leading to the states of dream and waking. He is called \textit{prājñāḥ}, Prājñā, conscious \textit{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 Prājñā (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. Prājñā, as described, is the third quarter.

\begin{quote}
एष सर्वेष्वर एष सर्वज एषोऽत्सत्यामयेष योति: 
सर्वेष्य प्रभवाध्ययो हि भतानाम \textit{II.6 II}
\end{quote}
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.

Eśāḥ, this one (this Prājña), when in his natural state; is surely sarvēṣvāraḥ, 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 sarvajñāḥ, this one is Omniscient. Eśāḥ, 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-apyayaḥ, the place of origin and dissolution; bhūtānam, of all beings.

GAUḌAPĀDA’S KĀRIKĀ

अत्रेते 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 विभुविश्वो हन्तः प्रज्ञस्तु तैजसः ।
चन्द्रप्रज्ञस्तथा प्राज् एव 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 मनयन्तस्तस्तु तैजसः ।
आकाशे च हृदि प्राज्ञस्त्रिथा देवे 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” (Br. 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” (Br. 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 experienced\(^1\) in the *daksīṇa aksī*, 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:** Hiranyagarbha 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).\(^2\)

---

\(^1\)By the adepts in meditation.

\(^2\)Virāṭ is essentially identical with Hiranyagarbha and, so is the “knower” with them both.
Though Viṣva 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 āntah, 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 Viṣva. On the cessation of the activity called memory, Prājña, sitting ākāśe ca hṛdi, 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 Hiranyakarīgha 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 Viṣva and Taijasa are the same; for the same entity that sees as Viṣva, 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 Hiranyakarīgha by the cosmic mind. But the individual and cosmic minds are the same; and so Taijasa and Hiranyakarīgha, 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-

¹Hiranyagarbha, 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 Hiranyagarbha are the same.

²Hiranyagarbha 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. 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). 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 him (i.e. Prājña in deep sleep, identifying himself with Prāṇa). And there is also the reason adduced earlier.

**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).

1 Though 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.

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

3 Not 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.

4 The 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” (Br. 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” (Ke. 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, and 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, "Tridhiḥ dehe vyavasthitah—existing in three ways in the body".

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

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.

The two verses need no explanation.
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 dhūmasu, 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 prakīrtitaḥ, declared to be the one bhoktiṇa, 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 vedā, knows; etat ubhayam, both these, as diversified multifariously into enjoyers and the things of enjoyment; saḥ, he; na lipyate, does not become affected; bhuṇaṁjānah, 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 जनयिति प्राणश्रेतोशून्य 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).
Prabhavah, 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 he source of the phenomenal world. The question now is: "Is the 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” (Br. I. iv. 1). Prāṇah janayati, Prāṇa creates, sarvam, all. Puruṣah janayati. Puruṣa creates: prthak, separately; cetomśān, 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” (Br. II. i. 20).

विभूति प्रसवं त्वमे मन्यन्ते सृष्टिचिन्तका: ।
स्वयमायासहुपेयति सृष्टिरन्तिर्विकलिप्ता ॥५॥

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.

Sṛṣṭicintakāh, people steeped in the thought (or theories) of creation; manyante, consider; that creation is a vibhāti, 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 sight 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.\(^1\)

इच्छामात्र प्रभो: सृष्टिरिति सृष्टी विनिष्टिता: ।
कालात्प्रसूति भूतानां मन्यन्ते कालिन्तका: ॥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.

Srṣṭiḥ, 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.

भोगार्थ सृष्टिरित्यन्ये क्रीडार्थरितिष चापरे ।
देवस्येष्व 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, srṣṭiḥ, creation, is bhogārtham,

\(^1\)This 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) kṣīḥḥūrtham, for the sake of disport. These two views are refuted by “devasya 
esaḥ svabhāvah 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, “Āptakāmasya kā 
sprhā, 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 “nāntah-prajñām, not conscious of internal object” etc. Since It (i.e. Turīya) 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 Turīya 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 Turiya 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 Turiya 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

\(^1\)Since 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, “ङ्गतःप्रज्ञे न बहिःप्रज्ञे, नोभयतः प्रज्ञे न प्रज्ञानप्रथानं न प्रज्ञे नाप्रज्ञम्। अदृश्यमन्यात्मायमग्राहात्माकल्क्षणमचित्तमन्य्यपदेक्ष्मेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं प्रपञ्जोपश्चमं शान्तं शिवमं तृतेयं चतुर्थं मन्यते स आत्मा स विजेयः।”

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

\(^1\)By 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 Turiya 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 Turiya. 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

---
\(^1\)Since 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.

\(^2\)The 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), fulfills 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 Īśvara 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 Īśvara, 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 fulfills 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.”

1 Īśvara 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. 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, “mūntah-prajñā, not conscious of the internal world”, is eliminated Taijasa. By “na-bahiś-prajñā, not conscious of the outside world”, is eliminated Viśva. By “na ubhayataḥ-prajñā, 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 prajñā, not simple consciousness” is denied the awareness of everything simultaneously (by a single act of consciousness). By “na aprajñā, 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?

\[1\] If 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 adṛṣṭam, unseen.² Since it is unseen (i.e. unperceived), therefore it is avyāvahāryam, 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 avyapadesyam, indescribable, by words. It is eka-ātma-pratyaya-sūram, 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 sūra, valid proof, eka ātmapratyaya, the single belief in the Self, is the eka-ātmapratyaya-sūra. And this is in accord with

¹One 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.

²Not the object of any sense of knowledge.
the Vedic text: “It is to be meditated upon as the Self” (Br. 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 “prapaṇcopashamam, the one in whom all phenomena have ceased” etc. are being denied the attributes of the states. Hence It is śāntam, 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 vijñeyah, 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” (Br. III. vii. 23), “for the vision of the witness can never be lost” (Br. 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.
Here occur these verses (of Gauḍapāda):


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

*Nirṛtteh*, in the matter of the eradication; *sārva-duḥkhaṁ*, of all sorrows, represented by Viśva, Taijasa, and Prajña; the Self that is Turiya is *iśānaḥ*, the ordainer. The word *prabhuḥ*, Lord, is an explanation of *iśānaḥ*. 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) *avyayaḥ*, inexhaustible, that is to say, does not deviate from His nature. Why is this so? Because He is *advaitaḥ*, non-dual. He who is this *devaḥ*, effulgent One, who is so called because of His self-effulgence; who is *turyaḥ*, the Fourth; is *smṛtaḥ*, held to be; *vibhuḥ*, all-pervasive (source); *sārvabhūvānām*, of all entities.

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

**Kaṃkarṇabhandrī taṃkalīyate vishvetajysai** ।

**Prajaḥ: karṇabhandrsta dṛśi to tuḥ ni śiṣyata** । ॥ ॥

1Turiya is *vibhu*, because the different (*vividha*) states issue (*bhava-vanti*) 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.

Kūrya, derived in the sense of anything produced, means the state of being the effect. Kūraṇa, derived in the sense of anything that acts, means the causal state. Those two, viz viśva-taijasau, Viśva and Taijasa, as described earlier: isyete, are held to be; kūrya-kūraṇa-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 परामर्शेऽवं न सत्यं नाचि चानृतम्।
प्राज्ञ: किञ्चन संवेतिति तुयं तत् सर्वदृक्ष 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 saṁvetti, does not apprehend; kim ca na, 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; Turīya is sadā, for ever; sarva-drk, all (sarva) that there is as well as a witness (drk), there being nothing beside Turīya; therefore Turīya has not the seed consisting in non-perception of Reality. And just because of this there is absence in Turīya 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 Turīya is said to be the “sarva-drk, seer of everything” for ever, because it is but Turīya 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).

१३। Non-perception of duality is common to both Prājña and Turīya. Prājña is endued with sleep that is a causal state. But in Turīya 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 Turīya?”—this doubt that may arise
is being refuted. The reason is that Prājña is bija-nidrā-yutah: nidrā, sleep, consists in the non-perception of Reality, and that itself is the bija, seed of the birth of the cognition of varieties; and Prājña is yutah, endued by this bijanidrā, sleep that is a causal state. That sleep, consisting in the non-perception of Reality, na vidyate, does not exist; turye, in Turīya, because of his being by nature a constant witness. Therefore in Him there is no bondage of the causal state. This is the purport.

स्वप्ननिद्रायुतावाचि प्राज्ञस्तव्रस्वप्ननिद्राय ||
न निद्रां नैव च स्वप्नं तुयं पश्यति निष्ठित्वता: 11 ४ १ १

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 Turīya.

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 Taîjasa; 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. Niścitāh, those with firm conviction, the knowers of Brahman; na paśyanti, do not see, both these in Turīya, these being of an opposite nature, like darkness with regard to the sun. Therefore it has been said that Turīya is not conditioned by the states of cause and effect.
It is being shown when one becomes firmly rooted in Turiya:

अन्यथा गृह्नत: स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजाते।
विपर्ययः तयोः क्षीणे तुरियं पदमवते॥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 Turiya.

Svapnah, dream; comes to one grhnatah, cognising: anyathā, falsely; like the cognition of a snake on a rope, in the states of dream and waking. Nidrā, sleep;—belonging to one ajñanatah 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; viparyūṣa, the two errors, consisting in false perception and non-perception, and constituting the two bondages in the states of effect and cause; kṣīne, are eradicated on the cognition of the supreme Reality; then one aśnute, attains; turiyam padam, the state of Turiya. The idea is that, as he

¹Viśva 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 Turiya.

अनादिमयया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते।
अजमनिद्रास्वप्नमहैतं 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 (Turiya).

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. Yadiḥ, 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) ājam, 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 (Turiya), 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, tadd, then; budhyate, realises the birthless, non-dual Turiya as his Self.

प्रपण्वो यदि विद्धेत निष्वेत न संशयः।
मायामात्रमिदं हृतमद्वैतं परमार्थत:।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 samśayāḥ, 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 विनिवर्तैं कल्पितो यदि केनचित् ।
उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विच्छिन्ते ॥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.

UPANIŚAD

सोयमात्माऽथ्यक्षरमोहस्सय्यिन्त्रि पादा मात्रा
मात्राश्च पादा अकार उकारो मकार इति ॥१८॥

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 \( m \).

Sah 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: \( Oṅkūraḥ \), 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 \( m \).

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 \( vaiśvānaraḥ \), Vaiśvānara (Virāt); \( jāgaritaśthūnāḥ \), with His sphere (of activity) as the waking state:¹ is \( akūraḥ, a \);— \( prathamū mūtraḥ \), 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. Ṛ. 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 kūmān, he surely attains all desirable things; ca bhavati ādiḥ and he becomes the foremost, among the great; yah evam veda, who knows thus, knows the identity as stated.

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 mātrā, 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. Ubhayatvāt 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: Utkarṣāti 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; yah evam veda, who knows thus; na bhavati abrahmavit, none is born who is not a knower of Brahman.

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; susuptasthānaḥ, with the state of sleep as his sphere, is makāraḥ, the letter m;
which is \textit{trīyā mātrā}, the third letter; of the syllable \textit{Om}. By what analogy? That is being said: This is the analogy here—\textit{miteh}, because of measuring. \textit{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 \textit{Om} and at the time of its fresh pronunciation, the letters \textit{a} and \textit{u} seem to enter into the last letter \textit{m} to come out again from it. \textit{Vā apīteh}, or because of absorption. \textit{Apīti} means getting merged or united in. At the time of the pronunciation of \textit{Om}, \textit{a} and \textit{u} seem to get merged into the last letter \textit{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 \textit{m}. The result attained by the man of knowledge is stated: \textit{Minoti ha vai idam sarvam}, he measures all this; universe, that is to say, he knows its reality: \textit{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.

\textbf{Gauḍapāda's Kārika}

Here occur these verses (of Gauḍapāda):

\begin{quote}
विश्वस्यातविवक्ष्यायामादिसामान्यमुत्कतम् ।
मात्रासंप्रतिपत्ति स्यादाधिन्तिसामान्यमेव च ॥१९॥
\end{quote}

19. When the identity of Viśva with the letter \textit{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; sūmānyam, the similarity; of being the ādi, first; is seen as utkālam, obvious. This is the idea. The clause "when the identity with a is intended" is explained by mūtrāsaṁpratipattau, which means "when Viśva's identity with a alone is apprehended". After "āpti-sūmānyam eva ca, the similarity of all-pervasiveness", the word "utkālam, (is seen as) obvious" is understood because of the use of "ca, and".

तैजस्योत्तविज्ञान उत्कर्षों दृश्यते स्फुटम्।
मात्रासंप्रतिपत्तौ स्यांद्वुभयत्रं तथाविद्धम्॥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; utkāraṣṭaḥ, excellence; dṛṣyate, is seen; sphutam, clearly. This is the meaning. Ubhayatram, intermediacy, is also clear. All this is to be explained as before.
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.

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.

\(Sah\), he; who \(nīscitaḥ\), 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.

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 \(a\); \(nayaṭe\) 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 (*Virāṭ*). Similarly, *ukāraḥ*, the letter *u*; takes him *taajasam*, to Taijas. And *makāraḥ*, the letter *m*; *punah*, *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

**UPANIŚAD**

अमात्रभूतथौज्वयवहारः प्रपञ्चोपयशः शिवोद्वैत एवमोढ़ार आत्मेव संविश्वत्यात्मनाः सत्मानं य एवं वेद ||१२|| इति माण्डूक्योपनिष्ट 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 Taijas; 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.

_Amūtraḥ_, that which has no _mātrā_, part—the partless _Om_; becomes but the _caturthāḥ_, Fourth, _Turiya_, merely the absolute Self; which is _avyavahāryāḥ_, beyond empirical relations, because of the disappearance of names and nameables, that are but forms of speech and mind; _prapañcopapasmāḥ_, the culmination of phenomenal existence;¹ _śivāḥ_, the auspicious; _advaitāḥ_, non-dual. _Evaṃ_, 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. _Yaḥ evaṃ veda_, he who knows thus; _samvīśati_, enters; _ātmānam_, into (his own supreme) Self; _ātmanāḥ_, 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:

ओद्धारं पादशो विद्यातपादा मात्रा न संशयः ।
ओद्धारं पादशो ज्ञातवा न किचिद्रपि 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; pādaśah, 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.

युःजीत प्रणवेचेत: प्रणवो ब्रह्म निर्मभयम् ।
प्रणवेन नित्ययुक्तस्य न भयं विद्वते 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.
Yuñjita, one should concentrate; cetaḥ, the mind; 
prāṇave, on Om, as explained, which is essentially the 
supreme Reality; for prāṇavaḥ, 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 any-
thing” (Tai. II. ix).

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.

Prāṇavaḥ, 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 
apūrvvaḥ, without any cause preceding it. There is 
nothing inside it that is of a different class; therefore 
it is anantarāḥ, without inside. Similarly, there is 
nothing existing outside; therefore it is abāhyam, 
without outside. There is no aparāḥ, effect of it; 
therefore it is anaparāḥ, 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.
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 pranavam, 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.

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; pranavam, Om; as iśvaram, God; existing hṛdi, in the heart—the seat of memory and perception; of all living beings. Matvū, having meditated on (i.e. realised); the sarvavyāpinam, all-pervasive; oṅkāram, Om, that is the Self beyond...
the worldly state; *dhīrāḥ*, 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).

अमात्रोः जन्तमात्रश्च द्वैतस्योपशमः शिवः।
ओष्ठारो विदितो येन स मुनिनेतरो जनः।

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.

*Amūtraḥ*, (*Om*) beyond measures, is Turiya. *Mātraḥ*, derived in the sense of that by which anything is measured, signifies dimension; that which has infinite (*ananta*) dimension is *anantamūtraḥ*: 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; *ōṅkāraḥ*, *Om*, as explained; *viditaḥ*, is known; is a *muniḥ*, sage (lit. a mediator), because of his meditating on the supreme Reality; but *na itarāḥ janāḥ*, not any other man, though he may be learned in the scriptures. This is the idea.
CHAPTER II

VAITATHYA-PRAKARANA (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 सर्वभावानं स्वभं आहुर्मनीषिणः।
अन्तःस्थानातु भावानं संबृतत्वेन 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? Sarvabhaunām, of all objects, both external and internal; that are perceived svapne, in dream. (This is what) maniṣīnāḥ, the wise people, adept in the use of means of knowledge; āhuk, say. The ground of falsity is being stated: antah-sthānāt, because of existence inside; because of those (bhāvāḥ, things) having their sthāna, place antah, 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: samyntatvam has tatha, 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:

अदीर्घतावाच्च कालस्य गत्वा देशात्म पश्यति ।
प्रतिबुद्धशय वै सर्वस्तत्समदेशे न विद्यते ॥२॥

2. Besides, one does not see places by going there, for the time is not long enough. Moreover, every dreamer, when awoken, 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 adirghatvat ca kālasya, 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 sarvah*, 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 शूयते न्यायपूर्वकम्।

वैतथ्यां तेन वे प्राप्तं स्वप्न आहुः प्रकाशितम्।

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 *vaśathyam*, unreality;
prāptaṁ, arrived at; through such reasons as existence inside the body contraction etc.; is prakāśitaṁ, revealed by the Upaniṣad, that reiterates that fact while engaged in establishing (the soul's) self-effulgence; svapne, in dream.

अन्तःस्थानातू भेदानां तस्माज्जागरिते स्मृतम्।
यथा तत्र तथा स्वन्ते संवृत्तवेन भिज्यते॥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; antahsthanāt, because the former is confined within; and sāmvṛtatvena, because of being contracted. And the common features in both the states are the facts of being perceived and being false.
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; bheda-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.

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 pante 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 *vitathail 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 स्वच्छे विप्रतिपच्छते ।
तस्मादायत्वत्वचेन मिथ्येव खलु ते स्मृता: ॥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.

*Saprayojanaḥ*, 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.
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.

Aparvaṇ, the novel attribute: hi svādhiṣṭhānaḥ, is a mere quality (ākāra) of the man in a certain state, viz. the experiencer in the state of dream; pātiṣṭhānāni, 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, 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. Tām, these, the unique things of this kind that are creations of his mind: pārśvānāṁ, this one, the man in that state, the dreamer: pārśvaḥ, a man well informed about the way leading by going to the dream state. As ātma, in this world, by going 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 mere appearances of the dreamer. In that state; and therefore they are unreal. Accordingly, the analogy of the dream is not inapplicable.
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:

स्वप्नृत्ताविपि त्वन्तथेतत्सा कलिपितं त्वसत्।
बहिःश्चेतोगृहीतं सदृश्च वैतथ्यमेतयोः॥१९॥

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.

Svapnavrīttau api, even in the dream state; anything experienced antaścetasya, 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 grhitam, perceived; bahiścetasya, 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, vairāthyam drṣṭam, unreality is perceived, for both kinds of things, be they imagined by inner or outer consciousness.

जाप्रदृवृत्ताविपि त्वन्तथेतत्सा कलिपितं त्वसत्।
बहिःश्चेतोगृहीतं सदृश्च वैतथ्यमेतयोः॥१९॥

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:

उभयोर्पि वैत्थ्यं भेदान्त स्थानयोर्यंदी ।
क एतानं बृह्यते भेदान्त 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; bhedinam, for the objects; sthanayoh, in the two—waking and dream—states; then kah, who; is it that budhyate, cognises; etan, these, that are imagined inside and outside the mind; and kah vai te sam vikalpakah, 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):

कल्पयत्यात्मनाःसत्मानसत्मा देव: स्वमायया ।
स एव बृह्यते भेदानिति वेदान्तनिर्णयः ॥ 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 It Itself _budhyate_, cognises; those _bhedān_, objects; _iti_, such; is _vedāntaniścayah_, 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:

विकरोत्यपरान्भावानन्तरिच्चे व्यवस्थितान् ।
नियतांश्च बहिर्शिवच्छ एवं कल्पयते प्रभुः ॥१३१॥

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.

(Prabhūḥ, the Lord); _vikaroti_, diversifies; _aparān_, the non-transcendental, mundane; _bhāvān_, objects, such as sound and other unmanifested objects; _vyava-sthitāp_, existing, _antaścitte_, inside the mind, in the form of impressions and tendencies. And _bahiścittah_
(san), having the mind turned outward; (the Lord diversifies) niyatān, things well-defined, such as the earth etc., as also aniyatān, 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—

वित्तकालाः हि येन्तस्तु द्वयकालास्तो ये वचि: ।
कलिपता एव ते सर्वे विशेषं 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.

Ciṭṭakālaḥ 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 ciṭṭakālaḥ, existing as long as the thought lasts. The idea is that they are apprehended only during the time of their imagination. Dvayaśakālaḥ, 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.

अब्यक्ता एव येस्तस्तु स्फुटा एव च ये बहि: ।
कल्पिता एव ते सबैं विशेषस्तव्यंद्रियान्तरे ॥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:

रीवं कल्पयते पूर्वं ततो भावानं पृथ्विवधानं।
वाह्यानाध्यात्मिकांस्च यथाबिच्छस्तथास्मृतिः।

I. 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, yathāvidyāh, 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.

¹If 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:

अनिश्चित यथा रज्जुरन्थकारे विकल्पिता ।
सर्पधारार्दिबिक्षिणवैश्वद्वदात्म विकल्पित: ॥ 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 rajjuḥ, rope; that is aniscītā, not well ascertained, in its true reality as “This is so indeed”; is vikalpiṭā, imagined if eating and drinking are absent, satisfaction is wanting; from this the fancy follows that eating etc. are the causes of satisfaction.

\(^{1}\) From 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.

निश्चितायं यथा राज्ज्वान्विकल्पो विनिवतंते ।
राज्जुरेवेति चाहैति तद्वदात्मविनिविष्य: ||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” (Br. 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” (Br. 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:

प्राणादिभिः भावेरैंतैविकल्पितः ।
मायेषा 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.

Eṣā 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 प्राणविद्वे भूतानीति च तद्विद: ।
गुणा इति गुणविद्वत्त्वानीति च तद्विद: ॥२०॥

20. Those who know Prāṇa\(^1\) consider Prāṇa

\(^1\)Hiranyagarbha or immanent God. This is the view of the worshippers of Hiranyagarbha 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 (gunaš) cling to the qualities,² and the knowers of the categories swear by them.³

21. The knowers of the quarters (viz Viśva, Taijasa, and Prājñā) 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.

22. The Vedic scholars acribe 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 Saṁkhyas hold to Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas, that are the constituents (gunaš, 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 Baudhāyaṇa.
sacrifices. Those acquainted with the enjoyer consider it to be the reality,\(^1\) whereas those conversant with the enjoyable things\(^2\) consider them to be so.

\[\text{सूक्ष्म इति सूक्ष्मविदः स्थूल इति च तद्विदः} \]
\[\text{मूर्ति इति मूर्तिविदः सूर्य इति च तद्विदः} \]

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 formlessness\(^4\) call it a void.

\[\text{काल इति कालविदः दिश इति च तद्विदः} \]
\[\text{वादा इति वादविदः भूवनानीति तद्विदः} \]

24. The calculators of time (the astrologers) call it time. The knowers of the directions consider them real. The dabblers in theories\(^5\) accept these to be so. And the knowers of the universe consider the (fourteen) worlds to be so.

---

1. The Sàmkhya 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.
25. The knowers of the mind\(^1\) call it the Self, whereas the knowers of intelligence\(^2\) take it for the reality. The knowers of ideas\(^3\) consider them to be the reality. And the knowers of virtue and vice\(^4\) attribute reality to them.

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.

---

\(^1\) A class of materialists.

\(^2\) A class of Buddhists.

\(^3\) The Buddhists who swear by subjective ideas without corresponding external things.

\(^4\) The Mîmâṁsakas.

\(^5\) Puruṣa (the conscious individual soul), Pradhāna or Prakṛti (Nature), Mahat (intelligence), Ahamkāra (egoism), the five subtle elements, five senses of perception, five organs of action, five sense-objects, and mind. This is the Sāṁkhya 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 28.
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 त्य इति च तपदिद: ।
स्थितिरिति स्थितिविद: सब्ब चेह नु सब्बिा दा।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.
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, vasya, anyone to whom; a teacher or any other trustworthy person; darṣayet, 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”: saṁ, he (that instructed man); pasyati, sees; tam bhāvam, that object, by identifying it with himself either as “I am this” or “This is mine”. Ca, and; saṁ, that, that object that was shown; avayi, 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. Tadgrahāḥ, 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.

एतरेयोपूथग्मावः पृथग्भेविता लक्षितः ।
एवं यो वेद तत्त्वेन कल्पयेत् सोऽविशालितः || 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.

Etad, through these, viz Prāṇa, etc.; aprthaghbhāvaiḥ, through these things that are non-different, from the Self; esaḥ, this One, the Self; lakṣitaḥ, is pointed out, is believed in by the ignorant; prthak 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). Yath 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; avishāṅkitāḥ, 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 गत्ववर्नगर्यथा ।
तथा विश्वमिदं दृष्टं वेदान्तेषु विचारणे: ॥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; drṣṭe, that are visible to the eye; are unreal; tathā, similarly; idam viśvam, this whole universe, this entire duality; drṣṭam, is viewed; as unreal. Where? That is being stated. Vedāntaṇeṣu, 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) vicakṣanaṁ, 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 चोत्पत्ति बद्धो न च साधकः।
न मुमुक्षुनि वेन मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता।

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 nirodhaṁ, no dissolution, nirodha being the same as nirodhana, stoppage. Utpattih, origination. Baddhaṁ, 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 paramārthaṁ, 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 if 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 Prāṇa 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

¹The 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.\footnote{Consisting in presenting something not known otherwise and not sublated later.} 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.
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" (Br. IV. iv. 22), "Not gross" (Br. 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.; 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."  

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 Dravidaçarya. 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."
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. 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 pracaḷita, 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 पृथक् नापृथक् किचिदिदिति तत्त्वविदो विन्दुः ॥ 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 ātmabhāvena, 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 Brāhmaṇas, the knowers of the Self; viduḥ, 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:

वीतरागभयकोऽथः निर्भवेन्धपार्यः ।
निविकलपो हर्यं हृष्टः प्रपञ्चोपशमोहयः ॥ 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; drṣṭaḥ, is realised; ayam, this Self; which is nirvikalpaḥ, devoid of all imaginations; and which is prapañcopsaṃaḥ: 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 prapañcopsaṃa. 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 विदित्वेनसनम् गते योजयेत् स्मृतिम्।
अहृतं समनुप्रात्य जडवल्लोकमारेरेत् ॥ 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 ācareta, 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:

निस्तुतिनिन्मस्कारो निःस्वधाकार एव च ।
चलाचलनिकेतश्च यतियादृष्टिको 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 Brāhmaṇas 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 cala-calaniketa. And he bhavet, should be;
yādṛcchikāḥ, 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.

३८।
तत्त्वमाध्यात्मिकं दृष्ट्वा तत्त्वं दृष्ट्वा तु बाह्यतः।
तत्त्वीभूतस्तदारामस्तत्त्वादप्रच्यूतो भवेत्।

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)—द्रष्टवाः, having seen, the Reality in this way; tattvibhāvatāḥ, (one should) become identified with Reality; tadārūmāḥ, (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 apracyutah, 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
ADVAYA PRAKARANA (ON NON-DUALITY)

In the course of determining the nature of Om (in Chap. 1) 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 धम्मो जाते ब्रह्माणि वत्तेति ।
प्रागुत्पत्तेर्जं सर्वं तेनासी कुषणः स्मृतः II.11

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).
Upāsanāśritaḥ, 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 jūte 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 jūte brahmaṇi, in the conditioned Brahman." The dharmaḥ, aspirant; upāsanāśritaḥ, who betakes himself to such devotional exercises; since he is cognisant of such as partial Brahman, tena, for that very reason; asau, that man; smṛtaḥ, is considered; kṛpanaḥ, pitiable, limited (Br. 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 वक्ष्यामयकार्यण्यमजाति समतां गतम् ।
यथा न जायते किंचित्ज्ञञ्जयमानं समन्तत: ॥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; *vaksyami*, I shall relate; *akārpanyam*, 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 *ajūti*, 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; *kimcīt*, anything, small though it be; *na jāyate*, 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”:

अत्मा ह्याकाशवज्जीविद्धं ताकासरीरिवदितः ।
घटादिवच्छ संघातं जरितावेलितिसिद्धातमम् ॥ ३१॥

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 ghatākāśaiḥ, 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 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 samghūtaih, 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.

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.”

न सर्वं संप्रभुज्यते तद्रूजीवः: सुखादिभः: ॥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.

Yathū, just as; ekasmin ghatakāše rajodhumādibhiḥ 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 Sāmkhyas. For a follower of the Sāmkhya 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 (Sāmkhya) 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 inhere in the souls separately, then the supposition of a single Self would run counter to the (Sāmkhya) 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 Sāmkhyas 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 Sāmkhyas 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 inheritance 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 inheritance.

¹ This refutes the view of those Sāṁkhyaś 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 inheritance 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 inheritance 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 inheritance 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 inheritance”, 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 gener-
ated 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:

रूपकार्यंसमास्थ्याश्च भिन्नते तत्र तत्र वै
आकाश्य न भेदोपस्तित तद्रज्ञवेषु निर्णयः । १६।

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 \( \text{ākāśasya na bhedah asti} \), 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 \( \text{jīvesu} \), 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 \( \text{nirnayah} \), definite conclusion, has been arrived at by the wise after examination.

\begin{quote}
नाकाशस्य घटाकाशो विकारावयवौ यथा \\
नैवात्मनः सदा जीवो विकारावयवौ तथा \text{11711}
\end{quote}

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.

\textit{Objection:} The experience of difference with regard to those spaces in the jars etc. follows a real pattern.

\textit{Answer:} This does not accord with, fact, since
ghatākāśaḥ, the space within a jar; na vikāraḥ, 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 sadya, 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 मले: ॥
तथा भवत्युद्धानामात्मांपि मलिनो मले: ॥ 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; malināḥ, 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 चौँ गत्यागमनयोरपि ।
स्थिती वर्षशरीरेषु आकाशोनाबिलक्षण: ॥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 स्वधनवत्सवे आत्मायाविसर्जिताः ।
अधिक्र्ष्ये सर्वसाम्ये वा नोपपर्तिः प्रेषते ॥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 ādhikya, 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 व्याख्यातास्तत्तैत्तिरीयके ।
तेषामात्मा परो जीवः संस्तुकाशितं ॥ 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 (soul) the sheaths come to have existence; is called jīvāḥ, the living being, since it is the source of animation. It is being said as to what it is. It is parah, the supreme Brahma Itself, that was introduced earlier in the text, “Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinity” (Tai. II. i)—the Brahma 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 samprakāśitaḥ, 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.

परं ब्रह्म प्रकाशितम् ।
पश्चिमव्यामदरे चैव यथास्त्काशः 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; dvayoḥ dvayoḥ, 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 Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad); in that Madhu-Brāhmaṇa. Like what? Yathā, as, in the world; the same ākāśah, space; is prakāśitaḥ, demonstrated to exist, through inference; prthīvyām udare ca eva, in the earth and the stomach; similar is the case here. This is the purport.

जीवात्मनोरतन्त्रत्वमभेदेन प्रश्नस्यते ।
नानात्मव निन्यते यज्ञ तदेवं हि समवसस्म।।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 \textit{ananyatvam jīvātmanah}, the non-difference of the individual soul and the supreme Self, ascertained through reasoning and the Vedas; is \textit{prasasyate}, praised, by the scriptures and Vyāsa and others; \textit{abhedena}, by a reference to (the result consisting in) the identity of the individual and the supreme Self;\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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), \textit{tat yat}, all that, has been said (thus); \textit{evam hi sāmañjasam}, 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.

\textbf{14. The separateness of the individual and the supreme Self that has been declared (in the Vedic texts) earlier than (the talk of)}

\footnote{“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; prthaktvam 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” (Ṛ. X. cxxi. 1), therefore, in case of a contradiction between the sentences of the portions on knowledge (i.e. Upaniṣads) and rites (i.e. Saṁhitā 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 prthaktvam, 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” (Br. 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 gaṇam, 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.”

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.

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.

*Sṛṣṭiḥ*, the creation; yā, which; *cōditā*, has been expounded, revealed; *anyathā*, in different ways; *mṛt-loha-visphuliṅga-ādyaiḥ*, with the help of such illustrations as earth, gold, sparks, etc.;¹ *sah*, that, all that

¹Ch. VI. i. 6; Mu. II. i. 1.
future result, as in the sentence, "He cooks food." 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.

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.

*Sṛṣṭiḥ,* 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 *sah,* that, all that

¹Ch. VI. i. 46; Mu. II. i. 1.
process of creation; is an upāyaḥ, 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 *bhedaḥ*, multiplicity, caused by creation etc.; *kathāmeṇaḥ*, 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:

आष्ठमास्तिंशविधा हीनमध्यमोत्कुष्तृष्टेयः
उपासनोपदिश्वेत्यं तदर्थमनुकम्या ॥ 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

¹The 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 trividhōḥ: of three kinds. How? Hīna-madhyaḥma-utkṛṣṭa-dṛṣṭayāḥ, people possessing inferior, medium, and superior power of vision; that is to say, they are endowed with dull, medium, and fine mental calibre. Iyam upāsanāḥ, this meditation, as well as rites; upadīṣṭāḥ, 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, anukampayāḥ, 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?

स्वसिद्धान्तग्यथवस्थामु द्वैतिनो निधिचित्ता दृष्टम्।
परस्परं विहृद्धयन्ते तैरयं न विहृद्धयन्ते ॥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.

Dvaitinah, the dualists—who follow the views of Kapila, Kānāda, Buddha, Arhat, and others; niṣcitāḥ, 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, parāśparam 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: tātāḥ, 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 परमाथों हि द्वैतं तद्रेद उच्चते ।
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 Sāṃkhya, Nyāya-Vaisēśikas, Buddhists, and Jainas.
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-bhedāḥ_, 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 _tēṣām_, 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:

अःत्तत्वतः भिघ्रयनामः विनियमसूरति व्रजेद्

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 kathān ca*, in no way whatsoever; *anyathā*, other than this. *Hi*, for; *tatvatah bhidyamāne*, should (It) become multiformed in reality; that which is naturally *amṛtam*, immortal; *ajam*, birthless; and non-dual; *vrajaṛ martyratām*, 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.

अजातस्येव भावस्य जातिसिद्धन्तां वादिनः।
अजातो ह्यमृतो भावो मर्यमतां 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 vādinaḥ, garrulous people, talking of Brahman; who, while interpreting the Upaniṣads, icchanti, vouch for; the jūtim, 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 esyati martyrātāṁ, will undergo mortality, of a certainty. But that Self being by nature a bhāvah, positive entity; that is ajūtah, unborn; amṛtah 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 भवत्यमृतम् मर्यम न मर्यममृतं तथा ।
प्रक्तेरस्यथाभावो न कथमिच्छु किष्मिति॥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; martyrām, mortāḥ; similarly,
the mortal does not become immortal. Accordingly, anyathābhāvah prakṛteḥ, the mutation of one’s nature, to become anything other than what one is; na katham cit bhavisyati, will not take place in any way whatsoever, just as fire cannot change its heat.

स्वभावेनामृतो यस्य भावो गच्छति मत्यत्ताम् ।
कृतकेनामृतस्तस्य कथं स्थास्यति निष्ठुलः ॥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; amṛṭah bhāvaḥ, an immortal positive object: gacchati martyatāṁ, 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 amṛṭah, immortal; tasya, for him; kṛtakena, inasmuch as it is a product? Being an effect, how will that immortal sthāsyati, continue to be; niścalah, 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:

भृततोभृततो वाक्य पृथ्वमाने समा श्रुतिः।
निश्चितं युज्ञयतं च यत्तज्ञवति नेतरतु ॥ १२३॥

23. Vedic texts are equally in evidence with regard to creation in reality and through Maya. That which is ascertained (by the Vedas) and is supported by reasoning can be the meaning, and nothing else.

Samā srutiḥ, (texts speaking of creation) are equally in evidence; srjyamāne, with regard to a thing being created; bhūtatah, in reality; vā, or; abhūtatah, through Maya, 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 denoted 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 nisćitam, determined, by
the Vedas as one without a second, birthless, and
immortal; ca, and; is yuktīyuktam, supported by reason-
ing; 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:

نةה नानेति चाम्नायादिन्द्रो मायाभिरिल्यपि ।
अजायमानो बहुधा मायया जायते तु सः ई॥२४॥

24. Since it is stated (in the Vedas), “There
is no diversity here,” and “The Lord, on ac-
count 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 mani-
fold)” (Br. II. v. 19).
The word Māyā implies knowledge.

Object: 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 māyābhājita (in Br. I. v. 19) means "through different kinds of sense-knowledge," which are but forms of ignorance, as is proved to be born in diverse ways" (Y. XXXI. 19). Therefore He, the Self, māyāya tvā, takes birth through Māyā alone, the word tvā being used to add emphasis, and to imply "through Māyā to be sure."; for otherwise (wise) 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 and to sorrow and what delusion can there be in one who realises unity? etc. (Kṣ. 7), it follows that the unitive outlook is the definite conclusion of the Upanisads, 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. I. i. 11), the idea of heterogeneity, implied by creation etc., is condemned.

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.
things), is negated; \textit{sambhūteḥ apavīḍāt}, because of the denial of the worship of the \textit{Majestic One} (Hiraṇyagarbha), in the text, “They enter into blinding darkness who worship Hiraṇyagarbha” (Ṭs. 12). For if Hiraṇyagarbha were absolutely real, there would not have been any denunciation of His (worship).

\textit{Objection:} The denunciation of (the worship of) Hiraṇyagarbha is meant for bringing about the combination of worship with rites (\textit{vināśa}), as is known from the text, “They enter into blinding darkness who are engaged in (mere) rites” (Ṭs. 9).

\textit{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 \textit{vināśa} (lit. the destructible). Still, just as rites, called \textit{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 \textit{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

\footnote{The Deity that is possessed of full majesty (\textit{san-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 Hiranyagarbha is meant to serve a purpose different from that of the knowledge of Brahman leading to immortality, the refutation of the worship of Hiranyagarbha 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 Hiranyagarbha it follows that He has got only a relative existence; and hence creation, (as symbolised by Hiranyagarbha 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 “Kah nu enam janayet, who should again bring him forth?” (Br. 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, “kah nu, who indeed,” being used with the force of a covert denial, kūraṇaṁ pratiṣidhyate, 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 निह्नुते यतः ।
सर्वंग्राह्यं भावेन हेतुनात् ज्ञं 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. Brhadāraṇyaka, 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 Ṛṣi 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.  

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 nihmūte, 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.  

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 sataḥ, 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 sataḥ, 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 tattvataḥ, in reality. Or the meaning is this: As the janma, birth; as a snake etc.; sataḥ, of an existing thing, a rope for instance; yujyate, can reasonably be; māyayā, through Māyā, but not tattvataḥ, 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 jītam, 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 तत्वेन नैव युज्यते ।  
बन्ध्यापुत्रो न तत्वेन मायया वासिपि 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 nā, 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 जाग्रद्वयाभासं 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; dvayābhāsasam, 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 जाग्रतं 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 samśayah, 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 हृतं यत्किंचित्सचराचरम्।
मनसे ह्यमनीभावे हृतं नैवोपलम्यते।१३१॥

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-drśyam, 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 upalabhya*, 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:

आत्मसत्यानुबोधने न संक्लपयते यदा ।
अमनस्तां तदा याति ग्रह्याभावे तद्ग्रहम् ॥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 saṁkalpayate*, 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 ज्ञेयाभित्रं प्रचक्षते ।
ब्रह्मज्ञेयमजं नित्यमजेनाजं विवुध्यते ॥ 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 pracākṣate, say; that absolute jñānam, knowledge; that is aklpakam, devoid of all imagination (non-conceptual); and is therefore ajam, birthless; is jñeyūbhinnam, 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 भीमतः।
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).

Pracūrah, the behaviour: that there is; manasah, of that mind, nighṛtasya, of that which is (thus) under control; nirvikalpasya, of that which is free from ideation of all kinds; dhīmatāḥ, of that which is full of discrimination—sah, that behaviour; vijñeyāḥ, 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 in untenable, since the behaviour of the mind 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 tatasmaḥ, 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 सुपुष्टे तत्र्गृहीतं न लीयते।
तदेव निर्मयं 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 nigrhītam, 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 *ālokāḥ*, light (expression), is *jñānālokām*, 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.

अजमनिद्रमस्वधनमनामकमशृङ्कम्

सक्रुद्धभातं सर्वशं नोपचारः कथञ्जन १३६॥

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 Māya characterised by ignorance. Since he (man) has awakened into his own real, non-dual nature that is the Self, therefore he is asrpnam, 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” (Tat. II. iv, II. ix). Moreover, It is sakṛt vibhātam, 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

¹In 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.

²True 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, jīna, a knower, by nature. With regard to this Brahman of such characteristics there can be na upacāraḥ, 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:

सर्वभिभापविगतः सर्वचिन्तासमुल्लितः ।
सुप्रशान्तः सक्रृज्ज्योति समाधिरचलोभयः ॥ 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 abhilāpaḥ, derived in the sense of that by which utterance is made, means the organ of speech expressing all kinds of words. That which is vigataḥ, devoid of that, is sarvābhilāpavigataḥ, 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-samutthitaḥ: The word cintā derived in the sense of that by which things are thought of, means the intellect; from that samutthitaḥ, risen above; that is to say, devoid of the internal organ; for
the Vedic text declares, “Since It is without Prāna, without mind, pure, and superior to the high immutable” (Mu. II. i. 2). Being devoid of all objects, It is suprasāntah, absolutely tranquil; sakṛjjyotiḥ, 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. Acalah, immutable; and therefore abhayah, fearless, since there is no mutation.

Since Brahman Itself has been described as divine absorption, immutable, and fearless, therefore,

ग्रहो न तत्र नोत्सर्गशिचन्तं यत्र न विवचते ।
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 grahah, no acceptance; na utsargah, 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, taddā, then, in the absence of any object (to be known); jñānam, knowledge; becomes ātmāsamtam, established in Self, like the heat of fire in fire. It is then ajñati, 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 Gārgi, he, who departs from this world without knowing this Immutable, is miserable” (Br. 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 दुर्दर्श: सर्वयोगिभि:।
योगिनो बिभयति हृस्मादभये भयदर्शिनः।

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-yogāḥ nāma, this is familiar as the Yoga without any touch, since it has no relation, indicated
by the word touch, with anything; \textit{vai}, (this is how it is) referred to, well known in all the \textsc{Upaniśads}. It is \textit{durdarsāḥ}, hard to be seen; \textit{sarvayogibhiḥ}, by all those Yogis, who are devoid of the knowledge imparted in the \textsc{Upaniśads}. The idea is that it is attainable only through the effort involved in the realisation of the Self in accordance with instruction. \textit{Yoginaḥ}, the Yogis: who are \textit{bhavadarśinaḥ 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) \textit{asmūt 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” (\textit{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—

\begin{quote}
\text{मनुसो निग्रहायतमभयं सर्वयोगिनाम्}
\text{दुःखक्षयोऽपि च वास्तविक्यम्}  
\text{चण्डिकायेन न्यायिनी राधी श्री}  
\end{quote}
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 manasāḥ nigrāhāyattam, contingent on the control of the mind: and so also is duḥkhabhāskārayaḥ, 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, aksayā śāntih, the everlasting peace, called liberation, is also certainly dependent on the control of the mind.

उत्सेक उदधेर्यंकुशाप्रेणकिबिन्दुना ।
मनसो नियस्तद्भवद्वेदपरिवेदत्: ॥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; kusāreṇa 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 निग्रहियाद्रिशिण्तं कामभोगोऽः।
सुप्रसर्वं 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, nigrhṛṇi-yā, one should bring under discipline, concentrate on the Self Itself; the mind that remains viśeśiptam, 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 kūmaḥ, 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:


du:khāṁ sarvamunussmṛtya kāmabhogaḥ bhūtivartayet.

ājan sarvamunussmṛtya jātān nēv tu paśyati. 114311

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.

लघे संवोधयेचिच्चतं विक्षिप्तं शमयेत्तुः।
सक्षायं विज्ञानीयतसमस्माप्तं न चालयेत्। 114411

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. *Samayet punah*, one should again make tranquil, the mind; that is *vikśiptam*, 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 *vijñāyat*, one should know, that mind; to be *sakṣāvam*, tinged with desire, in a state of latency. From that state, too, it should be diligently led to equipoise. But when the mind becomes *samāprāptam*, 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.

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 nihsaṅgah, unattached; praṭīdayaḥ, 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 niścarat, intent on going out; then withdrawing it from those objects with the help of the above-mentioned process, one ekākuryaḥ, 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 युनः।
अनिन्दनमनवभासं निष्प्रतं स्थिरं तत्तदः।

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 likyate, does not become lost, in sleep; and also na ca punah vikṣipyate, does not, again, become dispersed, amidst objects; and when the mind becomes aninganam, motionless, like a lamp in a windless place; anubhūsam, does not appear
in the form of any object, imagined outside; when the mind assumes such characteristics, then it \textit{nispannam brahma}, becomes Brahman; or in other words, the mind then becomes identified with Brahman.

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 \textit{svastham}, located in one's own Self; \textit{sāntam}, quiescent, characterised by the absence of all evil, \textit{sanirvāṇam}, coexistent with cessation, i.e. liberation; and it is \textit{akathyam}, indescribable, as it relates to an absolutely unique entity; it is \textit{uttamam sukham}, the highest happiness, it being unsurpassable and open to the vision of the Yogis alone. It is \textit{ajam}, unborn, unlike objective happiness. And since this happiness, in its true nature of omniscience, is identical \textit{ajena}, with the unborn; \textit{jñeyena}, with the thing to be known; therefore the knowers of Brahman \textit{paricaksate}, call it; \textit{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 कथित्वज्जायते जीवः सम्भवोऽस्य न विद्यते ।
एतत्तदत्तमं सत्यं यत्र किच्चिच्छ जायते ॥४८॥

48. No individual being, whichever, takes birth. It has no source (of birth). This (Brahman) is that highest Truth where nothing whatsoever takes birth.

Na jīvah kaḥ cit, no individual being whichever; 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 sambhavah, source, cause (for undergoing birth). Since there does not exist for It any cause, therefore no individual being, whichever, 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.
Whatever is not impermanent is not a product. When both the difference are: Whatever is a product is impermanent, and difference are: Whenever the method of difference (consisting in their reflection),

method of difference (consisting in their reflection) of non-duality with the help of the projectors, to sum up by providing of their mutual recognition, and then, after reflecting on inquiring the hierarchy, in order to show in the chapter to such mental perception, now begins the chapter of non-duality is expelled inasmuch as it is not subject arising from mutual opposition, and the philosophy by such vilifying factors as attachment and aversion their philosophy is false, since their outlook is affected. Their philosophy is opposed to that unique outlook that is the highest truth (Karma, III, 48). The realists and the higher truth (Karma, III, 48). The realists and the hierarchy summed up in the concluding remark, "This is that non-dualism was the chapter on non-dualism and that non-dualism was determined with the help of scriptures and reason in things external are unreal; it was again directly in things on the basis of the fact that the differences found true on the basis of the fact that the differences found to be the meaning of "om" was proved to be non-dualism was advanced as a premise in course of
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CHAPTER IV
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.

राजेनाभिनेन संबुद्धस्त वन्दे द्विपदं वरम् ॥१॥

1. 1 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.

Akāśa kalpa is that which is slightly different from space, that is to say, resembling space. So jñānena ākāśa kalpena 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; jñeyabhinnena 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:

अस्पर्श्योगो वेनाम सर्वसत्वसुखो हितः ।
अविवादोद्विद्वस्त्रच देशितस्तं नमाम्यहम् ॥ २१॥

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-yogah is that Yoga, which has no sparśa, 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 avivāḍaḥ; that in which there is no dispute by embracing two sides, for and against, is avivāḍaḥ, 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:

भृतस्य जातिमिच्छन्ति वादिन: केचिदेव हि ।
अभृतस्यापरे धीरा विवदन्त: परस्परम् ।

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 vādinaḥ, 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 dhirāḥ, 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 किचिदभूतं नैव जायते ।
विवद्विन्तेऽस्त्रयं हृद्मरजाति स्वापन्निति तेः ॥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 Sāmkhya who says that the effect, pre-existing in the cause,\(^2\) takes birth. Similarly, the Sāmkhya, 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.

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; tātā khyāpyamānum, revealed by them, thus; we na vīvādāmaḥ, do not quarrel; tātā sārdham, 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.

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?

Vādinaḥ, 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 मर्थं न मर्थममृतं तथा।
प्रक्तेरतन्यथाभावो न कथंचिद्वित्यति॥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.

स्वभावनामृतो यस्य धर्मं गच्छति मर्थतामृत्।
कुतकेनामृतस्तस्य कथं स्थायति 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:

सांसिद्धविकी स्वभावविकी सहजा अक्रूता च या।
प्रकृतिः सति 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 un-changing in its character.
Samṣiddhiḥ means complete attainment, and anything resulting from that is saṃsiddhiṅī, 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; sū, 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:

\[\text{Jarāmrṇnirūkta: sāvē dharmā: svabhāvāt: } 1\]
\[\text{Jarāmrṇnacchāntātacchāntā tannīśṭhā 111011}\]

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. _Svabhāvatāḥ_, by nature. Although the souls are intrinsically so, yet _icchantāḥ_, 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; _tanmāṇisayā_, 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 Vaiṣeṣika points out how the Sāṅkhya, 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 Pradāna 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 Pradāna 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:

कारणायाद्वन्यत्वमतेऽकार्यमजं यदि ।

dāyaṁānaṁ vā kāraṇāt kāraṇam te kathāḥ bhūvam ॥ 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; kūraṇam, cause; that is non-different kāryāt jāyaṁmaṇaṁ, from the effect that is subject to birth; by yet dhruvaṁ, eternal? For one half of a hen cannot be cooked, while the other half is reserved for laying eggs.

Moreover,

अजाद्वे जायते यस्य हृष्टान्तस्तस्तम् नास्ति वै ।

जाताच्छ जायमानस्य न व्यवस्था प्रसाज्याते ॥ 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 jāyate, is produced; ajāt, from an unborn thing; tasya, for him; na asti vai drṣṭāntaḥ, 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 jāyaṁmaṇasya, 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 prasajjyate, 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?)” (Br, 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:

हेतोरादि: फलं येषामादिहेतु: फलस्य च।
हेतो: फलस्य चानादि: कथं तैहपवण्ये।।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 phalaṇam, effect, the aggregate of body and senses; is the ādiḥ, source; hetoh, of the cause, of merit etc.; and similarly, the hetuh, 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:

हेतोरादि: फलं येषामादिहेतु: फलस्य च।
तथा जन्म भवेतेषां पुनःजन्म पिनुर्यथा।।१५।।

15. Just as a father may be born of a son, so also may birth be a possibility according to

¹Merit 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 pituḥ janma putrāḥ, the birth of a father from a son.

If it be contended that the contradiction, pointed out above, cannot be reasonably advanced, we say.

संभवेहेतुः फल्योरेषितव्यः क्रमस्तवया ।
युगपतसंभवेः यस्मादसंबन्धो विपाणवत् ॥ 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.

Samībhava, if there be a possibility; hetu-phaluryoh, of cause and effect; then tvayā, by you; esitayah, 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 samībhava, should there be a simultaneous origin, of the cause and effect; there will be asambandhah, 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:

फलादत्पदयानान् सन्ते हेतुः प्रसिद्धयति ।
अप्रसिद्धः कथं हेतुः फलमुप्यादयित्वयति ॥ 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?

Utpādyamāṇaḥ 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 endued with substance, and aprasiddhah, is not established as such, like the horn of a hare; utpādayisyati 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 हेतुः फलातिसिद्धः फलसिद्धिश्च हेतुतः ।
कतर्तः पूविष्पश्च यस्य सिद्धि रूप्यशया ।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 interrelated, 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 कमकोपस्यवचा पुनः
एवं हि सर्वथा बुद्धैरजाति: 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. _Evaṁ_, 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; _paridīpitaḥ_, has been highlighted; _buddhāḥ_, 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:

बीजाङ्कुरास्मे दृष्टान्तः सदा साध्वस्मो हि सः।
न हि साध्वस्मो हेतु: सिद्धो साध्वस्म्य 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) ďeśṭāntah, illustration; that is bijāṅkurākhyah, known as that of the seed and the sprout; is sādhya-samāh, 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 eternality 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 sādhvyasamah, 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:

पूर्वापरापरिज्ञानमजाते: परिदीपकम् ।
जायमानादिव वै धर्मत् कर्त्य 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 *purvāparāparijñānam*, ignorance of the precedence and succession, of the cause and the effect; is *paridīpakam*, a pointer: *ajūteḥ*, to birthlessness. If an entity takes birth, *katham*, why; its *purvam*, antecedent cause; *na gṛhyate*, 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.

स्वतः वा परतो वाजिपि न किचिदःस्तु जायते ।
सदस्तः सदस्त्राजिपि न किचिदःस्तु 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:

हेतु जायते नादेहः फल चापि स्वभावतः ।
आनिन विद्यते यस्य तस्य ह्यानिन 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; hetuh 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; ādīḥ, a cause; na vidyate, does not exist, in this world; tasya, for that thing; na vidyate, cannot exist; ādīḥ, the birth, mentioned earlier; for birth is admitted for a thing that has a cause and not for a causeless one.

¹There is no possibility for either recognition or 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:

प्रज्ञपते: सनिमित्तत्वमन्यथा द्वयनाशतः।
संक्लेषस्योपलोकष्ठ्यत्र परतन्त्रास्तिता मतः॥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, dravanāśatah, 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; mātā, 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 saṁklesa, (lit. suffering, which is the same as saṁklesana, 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:

प्रज्ञपतेः सनिमित्तत्वमिथ्यते युक्तिदर्शनात् ।
निमित्तस्यानि मित्तत्वमिथ्यते 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

¹ e.g. where the body is not in actual contact with fire.
of duality and pain; isyate, it is posited, by you; that sanimittatvam prajñāpateḥ, 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 isyate, 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 bhūta- darśanāt) in which case the meaning is: Abhūtadarśanāt, on account of finding the external object to be unreal; animittatvam isyate, 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 संस्पृशत्यथं नार्थ्यभासं तथैव च।
अभूतो हि यत्तिधार्यं नार्थ्यभासस्ततं: 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 spr̥ati, does not come in contact with; artham, object, anything acting externally as a support; nor does it come in contact with arthābhūsam, 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 abhūtah, non-existent, even in the waking state, just as a dream object is. Na, nor is; arthābhūsah, an illusory object; prthak, different, from the consciousness; it is con-

¹We are dealing here with the Buddhist view. A.G. explains citta as sphurāṇa, self-emnation, 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.
sciousness 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 संप्रृतत्यध्वसु त्रिषु।
अनिमित्तो विपयोः 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 *sādī* *saṃśpeśati,* does not ever touch; any *nimittam,* cause, external object; *trīṣu 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: *bhavīṣyati,* will there be; *tasya,* for that consciousness; *viparyṭaḥ animittāḥ,* 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 (Gaṅgāpāda) 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:

泰山满 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-
khyaṇi, 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 cittadṛṣṭyām 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, 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 यस्माद्जाति: प्रकृतिस्ततः ।
प्रकृतेर्म्यथाभावो न कथंचिद्भविष्यति ॥२९॥

29. It is the birthless that (according to the disputants) takes birth. Since birthlessness is

1It 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, ajātik, birthlessness; is its very prakṛtiḥ, nature; tataḥ, therefore; anyathābhāvah, 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:

अनादेन्तत्रवत्त्वं च संसारस्य न सेत्स्यति ।
अनन्ततां 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.

Samsārasya 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 bhavisyati, 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 assumption\(^2\) 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.

अादावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ।

वितथैः सदृशः सन्तोतविधः इव विक्षितः: । ॥ 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.

सप्रयोजनत् तेषां स्वप्ने विमोक्तिपचः ।

तस्मादाद्यतत्वत्त्वेन मिथ्यैव खलु ते स्मृता: ॥ ३२ ॥

\(^1\) Non-existence brought about by destruction has a beginning but no end, and non-existence is not a substance just 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.

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.

¹In 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 Virāt. 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.

मित्राद्व: सह संमन्त्य संबुद्धो न प्रपद्यते।
गृहीतं चापि चर्विकचित्रित्तिबुद्धो न पश्यति।१३५१।

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; *mitrādyaiḥ 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., *grhitam*, 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.
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 kāyāḥ, body; that is seen svapne, in dream; to be walking about; is avastukāḥ, unsubstantial; anyasya pṛthuk durśanāt, 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:

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.

Grahanāt, since dream is experienced; jāgaritavat, like the waking state, as characterised by the subject-object relationship; therefore dream isyate, 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—

उत्पादस्याप्रसिद्धत्वाद्रज सर्वमुदाहृतम् ।
न च भूतादभूतस्य संभवोऽस्ति कथं चन ॥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 aprasiddhatvā, 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 udāḥṛtam, 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 sambhavah 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):

असञ्जागरिते दृष्ट्वा स्वच्छन्ये पश्यति तत्नाभि:
असस्त्वनेन 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.

Drṣṭvā, having seen; jāgarite, in the waking state; asat, an unreal, illusory thing, like a snake imagined on a rope; and becoming tannayah, emotionally affected by its thoughts; one paṣyati, 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, \textit{drṣṭvā}, after having seen; \textit{asat}, an unreal thing; \textit{svapne api}, even in dream; \textit{na paśyati}, does not see (it); \textit{pratibuddhah}, when he is awake. From the use of the word \textit{“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?

\begin{quote}
\textit{नास्त्यसद्देतुकमसत्सद्देतुकश्चति} \textit{।}
\textit{सच्च सद्देतुकं नास्ति सद्देतुकमसत्कुं} \textit{॥४०॥}
\end{quote}

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?

\textit{Na asti asat}, there is no unreal thing; \textit{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, \textit{na asti sat}, there is no such existing entity; a jar for instance; that is \textit{usaddhetukam}, the product of an unreality—a hare's horn for instance. \textit{Tathā}, so also; \textit{na asti kāt}, 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:

विपर्ययोऽथा जागृदचिन्त्यान् भूतवत्त सूपृषेत् । तथा स्वप्ने विपर्ययोऽद्दृष्टंतञ्च 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.
42. Instruction about creation has been imparted by the wise for the sake of those who, from the facts of experience and adequate behaviour, vouch for the existence of substantiality, and who are ever afraid of the birthless entity.

For those who upalambhāt, because of perception; and samācārāt, adequate behaviour, e.g. proper observance of duties pertaining to castes and stages of life—for those who, because of these two reasons, astivastutvavādinām, 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 jātih, 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 Vedāṇta, 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 तेषांमपल्लभान्विन्ति ये ।
जातिदोषा न एतेन्त्यन्ति दोषोऽण्यते भविष्यति ॥ ४ ३ ॥

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, jātidosāḥ, the faults arising from the perception of origination; na setsyanti, will not attain fruition, for they are treading on the path of discrimination. Dosāḥ api, should there be any dosāḥ, defect that is calculated to debar their complete enlightenment; that api, even; alpaḥ bhaviṣyati, will be insignificant.

Objection: As perception and adequate behaviour are vaidh 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:

उपल्लभातसमाचारान्मायाहस्ती यथोच्चते ।
उपल्लभातसमाचारादस्तित वस्तु तथोच्चते ॥ ४ ४ ॥
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 upulambhāt samācārāt, because of perception and right conduct (with regard to them): ucyate vāstu 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 वस्तवाभासं तथैव च ।
अजाचलमवस्तुत्वं विज्ञान 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 viśuddham. Consciousness. It is śāntam, quiescent, being devoid of birth etc. And therefore It is also advayam, without a second. This is the meaning.

एवं न जायते चित्तमेवं धर्मं अजा: स्मुता: ।
एवेव विज्ञानत्तो न पतति 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, Consciousness\textsuperscript{1} 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, vijnānataḥ 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;

\textsuperscript{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:

\[\text{ऋजुव्रक्तसंकाष्टकम्} \text{भासमलतास्पंदितं यथा ।}  \\
\text{ग्रहणग्राहकाभासं विज्ञानस्पंदितं तथा } \text{॥४७॥}\]

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.

\[Yathā, \text{as; in common experience, it is seen that } \text{अलंकंस्पंदितम्, the movement of a fire-brand; } \text{ङ्जुवक्रीकुभशम्, appears to be straight, curved, and so on; } \text{तथय, similar, is } \text{ग्रहयाग्रहकुभशम्, the appearance as the perception and the perceiver, that is to say, as the object and the subject. What is it that appears? } \text{विज्ञानस्पंदितम्, the vibration of Consciousness, as it were, it being set in motion by ignorance, for the unmoving Consciousness can have no vibration, as it was said earlier, “birthless, motionless” (Kārikā, IV. 45).} \]

\[\text{अस्पन्दमानमलतामनाभासमजं यथा ।}  \\
\text{अस्पन्दमानं विज्ञानमानाभासमजं तथा } \text{॥४८॥}\]

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; aspandanam, when not in motion, when it does not undergo birth to become straight etc. in shape, it remains anabhāsam ajam, free from appearances and birth; tathā, so; Consciousness, that vibrates through ignorance, will, on the cessation of ignorance, become aspandanānam, free from vibration, consisting in birth etc.—will remain free from appearances, birth, and vibration. This is the meaning.

Moreover,

अलाते स्पन्दमाने वै नाभासा अन्यतोभवः ।

न ततोन्यत्र निस्पन्दाध्यालातं प्रविष्ट्विनि 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; anyataḥ, from anywhere, outside the fire-brand; this is what is meant by na anyatobhuvah, non-adventitious. Na, nor; do they go out anywhere else; tataḥ nispandāt, 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 निरंत्ति अलाताते प्रवयत्वाभासायोगः ।

विज्ञानेदिपि तथैव स्युराभासस्याविशेषः ॥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 nirgatih alatii, do not issue out of the fire-brand, like something out of a house; dravyatva-abhava-yogatah, 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 dravyatvabhava; and yogatah means by reason of. Entry is possible for things and not for those that are not so. The appearances of birth etc. vijñane api tathaiva syuh, in Consciousness also must be thus alone; abhhasasya avisekatah, for appearance is equally present.

It is being shown how they are similar:

विज्ञाने स्पन्दमाने वै नाभासा अन्यतोभवः।
न तत्तथ्यत्र निस्पद्वान्व विज्ञानः विशर्षिति ते॥२५१॥
न निर्गतास्ते विज्ञानाद्रन्यतवाभावयोगतः।
कार्यकारण्ताभावायवृत्तिं चिन्तया: सदैव ते॥२५२॥

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; kūryakūraṇata-abhāvāḥ, 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,

\[\text{हे} \text{तुः स्याद्द्वादन्द्वस्य} \text{ चैव हि} \]

\[\text{हे} \text{त्वमन्यभावो} \text{ वा धर्माणां} \text{ नोपपचते} \]

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, syūt hetuh, 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 dharmānāṃ dravyatvam anyabhāvah 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.

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.

Evan, 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;\textsuperscript{1} \textit{na cittaṁ dharmaṇaṁ}, 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, \textit{praviśanti}, enter into, affirm: \textit{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:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Yāvadnetupallavēśastābadnetupallavṛśv:} 1  
\textbf{Kṣīreṇa hṛṇtupallāvēśe nāsīti hṛṇtupallavṛśv:} 115,511
\end{quote}

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.

\textit{Yāvat}, as long as; \textit{hetuphalāvēśaḥ}, 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; \textit{nāvat 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

\textsuperscript{1} A.G. equates \textit{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 kṣīne, being attenuated; na asti hetupalodbhavah, 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:

यावद्येतुफलवेषः संसारस्तवदायतः ।
क्षीणे हेतुफलवेषे संसारं न प्रपचते ॥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; saṁsūraḥ, the worldly state; persisting unimpaired, remains āyataḥ, outstretched, that is to say, continues for long. But again hetupalāvese kṣīne, when the engrossment with causality is attenuated; na prapadyate saṁsūram, one does not attain the worldly state; for then there is no cause for it.

Objection: As there is nothing else apart from the unborne 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:
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 jñayate, everything is produced; saṁvṛtya, by saṁvarana, concealment, consisting in empirical outlook within the domain of ignorance. Tena, therefore; within the range of ignorance, naasti vai saśvatam, 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; naasti vai. there is surely no; ucchedah, annihilation, of any cause, effect etc. This is the meaning.

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; jñayante, 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 māyopanam, 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 तत्मयोऽद्वृत: ।
नासी नित्यो न चोच्छेदी तद्धन् पु 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; māyāmayaḥ bijaḥ, from a magical seed, of a mango for instance; jāyate, grows, aukuraḥ tanmayaḥ, a sprout (of equal substance), equally illusory, asau, that one, the sprout; being na nityaḥ, not eternal; na ca ucchedi, nor destructible—simply because it has no existence; tadyat, just so; is the yojanā, reasoning; about birth and death, dharmesu, 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.

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, śāśvatā-śāśvatābhidhā, the terms eternal or non-eternal; na ajeṣu dharmesu, 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” (Tait. II. iv. 1).
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 earlier\(^1\) (Kārikā, III. 29-30).

For this further reason, duality, describable by words, does not exist:

स्वप्नदृष्टिक्रयां स्वप्नैऽदिक्षा दशस्मु स्थिततान्।
अण्डजानै स्वेदजान वारीप जीवान्पख्यति यानं सदा॥ ६३॥
स्वप्नदृष्टिक्रयास्ते न विचारते तत्त: पृथक्।
तथा तद्दृष्टयमेवं स्वप्नदृष्टिक्रयामित्यते॥ 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,

\(^1\) The 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.

Svapnadbṛk, one who sees a dream; caran, while moving; svapna, in dream, in the place seen in a dream; yān jīvān sadā paśyati, all the creatures that he ever notices; dīkṣu vai daśasu sthitiṁ, as existing in all the ten directions; viz. aṇḍajīn, those born from eggs; svedajīn, those born from moisture.

Objection: Be that so. what follows therefrom?

The answer is: Te, those creatures; are the svapnadbṛkcittadṛṣyāḥ, objects of perception to the consciousness of the experiencer of dream. Therefore na vidyante, they do not exist; tathaḥ prthak, separately from the consciousness of the dreamer. It is consciousness alone that is imagined as the diverse creatures. Tathaḥ, similarly; even tat, that; svapnadbṛkcittam, the consciousness of the experiencer of dream; is idam tad-dṛṣyam 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.

चरणजागरिते जाग्रत्विक्षु वै दशासु स्थितान् ।
अण्डजानु स्वेदजानु वार्गिः जीवानपशयति यानसदा ॥ ६५॥
जाग्रत्विचित्तेक्षणीयस्ते न विद्यते तत्: पृथक् ।
तथा तद्वृक्षमेवेंदे जाग्रत्विचित्तमिष्ठते ॥ 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 हायोन्यदृश्ये ते किं तदस्तीति नोच्यते ।
रक्षणाचून्यमभयं तन्मतेनेनव 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-nyadriṣye, 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 tat asti iti, does it exist?" ucıate, 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 laksanāsūnyam, devoid of laksanā, anything whereby they can be established, that is to say, they are without valid proof. Either is grhyaite, 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.

68. As a creature seen in a dream undergoes birth and death, so also do all these creatures appear and disappear.

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 निर्मितेषुपि वा ।
तथा जीवा अमी सर्वं स्थविन्ति न स्थविन्ति च ||७०||

70. As a creature produced through medicines and charms undergoes birth and death, so also do all these creatures appear and disappear.

Māyāmayah, 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 करिच्छजायते जीवः संभवोस्य न विच्छते ।
एतत्तुतमं सत्यं यत्र विविष्क जायते ||७१||

71. No creature whichever 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).

चित्त्सपन्नित्तमोतेवं प्रात्यप्रात्यकव्वदिधं ।
चित्तं निर्विशेषं नित्यमसंज्जं तेन कृतितमं ||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; grūhy-grūhakavat, possessed of subject and object; is cittaspanditam eva, surely a vibration of Consciousness. But from the ultimate standpoint, cīttaṃ, Consciousness, that is nothing but the Self, and accordingly it is nirvīṣayam, 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:

योज्यति कल्पितसंबृत्या परमार्थोऽनन्तर नास्त्यसि ।
परतन्त्राभिसंबृत्या स्यास्बास्ति परमार्थल: ॥

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, \( yāḥ \), which; exists \( kalpita saṁvytāḥ \), because of a fancied empirical outlook (i.e. on the strength of empirical experience), it being called so because it is \( saṁvytī \), an empirical outlook, that is \( kalpita \), imagined, as a means for the attainment of the highest object. Anything that exists by virtue of this, \( asau na astī \), 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; \( paratāntarābhisaṁvytayā \), 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; \( na astī \), 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.

अज: कल्पितसंबृत्या परमार्थेन नाभ्यज़: ।
परत्तत्त्राभिनिप्पत्त्या संबृत्या जायते तु स: । ॥७४॥

74. Since in accordance with the conclusion arrived at in the scriptures of the others 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.

Kalpitasaṁvṛtyā, in accordance with the empirical outlook, fostered with the help of scriptures etc., the Self is said to be ajah, unborn. But paramārthena, from the standpoint of the highest Reality; na api ajah, It is not even unborn. For what is birthless paratantrābhini-spattyā, 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; saṁvṛtyā, 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.

अभिनिवेशशोधिनित्रयं तत्त्र न विद्यते ।
द्वयीभावं स बुद्धवैव निर्निमित्तो न जायने ॥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.

Abhinivesaḥ 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.
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., Yadû, 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; tadû, then; cittam, Consciousness; na jñyate, 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:
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).

Anupattiḥ, 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 advayū, absolute. And this state ajātasya, 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 cittadrśyam, 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.

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 *asānute*, 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; *buddhāti*, after having realised; *animitataṁ satyāṁ*, causelessness as the truth, of the highest order; and *anāpñuvan*, (after) not getting. that is to say, not accepting; *pṛthak*, 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.

अभितांभिनिवेशशालि सदशे तत्प्रवर्तते |
वस्तेवभावं 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.

*Abhūtābhiniṃvēśaḥ* 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; *sadrēse*, in a similar thing; therefore when *ṣaḥ*, 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.
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 niścalī sthitiḥ, a state of motionlessness, that is of the very nature of Brahman. Hi, since; saḥ viśayāḥ that is the object of vision—this state of continuance of knowledge as Brahman that is a non-dual mass of homogeneous Consciousness; buddhān, to the wise, who realise the supreme Reality; therefore, tat, 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:

अजमनिद्रस्ववनं प्रभातं भवति स्वयम् ।
सङ्कृद्विभातो होवेष धर्मों धातुवभावत: ॥८१॥

81. This becomes birthless, sleepless, dreamless, and self-luminous. For this Entity is ever effulgent by Its very nature.
That becomes prabhūtāṃ svayam, fully illuminated by Itself, and It does not depend on the sun etc.: in other words, It is by nature self-effulgent. Eṣāḥ, this; dharmaḥ, entity, called the Self, that is possessed of such characteristics: is sakṛtu-vibhūtah, shining once for all, that is to say, ever effulgent; dhūtusvabhūvataḥ, 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:

सुक्षमात्रिताये नित्यं दुःखं वित्तिताये सदा ।
यस्य कस्य च धर्मस्य ग्रहेण भवानसः ||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; graheṇa yasya kasya ca dharmaṣya, 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; dulbhkham, 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।
चलस्थिररोभ्याभावारावृषोत्स्वयेव बालिसः॥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 calaḥ, changeable, it being different from such impermanent things as a jar,¹ and the state of non-existence is sthirah,

¹An 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. The state of both existence and non-existence, is ubhayam, of either kind, since it relates to both the changeable and the changeless. And abhavanah, relates to an absolute non-existence. Bulisah, means a fool, a non-discriminating man. Each one of the fools, whether calling the Self existing or not: eva, surely; avyayotis, covers up, the Lord; calasthira-ubhaya-abhavaiaha, 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:

कोटचश्चत्तश सतास्तु हर्ष्याः सदास्तवृत: ।
भगवानारिंश्पृष्टो येन दृष्ट: स सर्वदृश्क: ॥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.

Etah catasrah kotya, 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; \textit{graha}h\textit{y}ūsām, through the acceptance, through the conviction arising from the realisation, of which alternatives; \textit{bhagavān}, the Lord; remains \textit{sād}ū \textit{āvṛtāh}, ever covered; to those sophists alone. \textit{Sah}, he, the reflective sage; \textit{yena}, by whom; \textit{drṣṭah}, has been realised; that Lord who, though remaining covered to the sophists, is really \textit{asprṣṭāh} \textit{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 \textit{Upaniṣads} alone; \textit{sah}, that sage; is \textit{sarva}drīk, omniscient; or to put it otherwise, he is the truly enlightened man.

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?

\textit{Prāpya}, having attained; \textit{sarvajñatām kṛṣṇām}, omniscience in its fullness; and having reached the \textit{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)" (Br. III. viii. 10), "This is the eternal glory of a Brāhmaṇa (i.e. a knower of Brahman): (it neither increases nor decreases through work)" (Br. IV. iv. 23); which (state) \textit{anāpanādihāvyān-}
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 Śrāti text, “He has no end to achieve here either through activity or through inactivity” (G. III. 18).

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; viprāyām, of the Brāhmaṇas. This is their humility, and this is also ucyate, called; their prākṛtaḥ samāh, natural mental tranquillity. Damaḥ, self-restraint, too, is this only; prakṛtidhāntatvāt, because of (their) spontaneous poise, Brahman being by nature quiescent. Evam vidvān, having known thus, known Brahman as naturally tranquil; the vidvān, enlightened man; vrajet, should attain, that is to say, remains established in; samam, 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:

\begin{quote}
सवस्तु सोपलम्भम् च द्रयं लौकिकमिष्यते ।
अवस्तु सोपलम्भम् च शुद्धं लौकिकमिष्यते ।
\end{quote}

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 drayam, 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 *suddham*, pure, objectless, subtler than the gross objects of the waking state; and it is *laukikam*, ordinary, being common to all beings.

अत्वस्त्वनुपलब्धेऽऽ लोकोत्तरमिति स्मृतम्।
ज्ञानं ज्ञेयं च विज्ञेयं सदा युढः: 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 *smrtam*, 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, *prak̄rtitam*, is declared, *sarvādā*, for ever; *buddhāḥ*, by
the wise, by the seers of the *summum bonum*, by the knowers of Brahman.

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 *mahādhiyāḥ*, for the man of great intellect; *bhavati*, there emerges; *iha*, here, 'in this world; *sarvajñatāḥ*, 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:

हेयज्ञेयाध्यपाक्ष्यानि विज्ञेयाध्यग्रह्याणि: ।
तेषामन्यत्र विज्ञेयादुपलम्भस्त्रिषु स्मृत: ॥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 (Kārikā, IV. 83). The āpya, acceptable, are the disciplines, called scholarship, the strength arising from knowledge, and meditiveness,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 (kasāyas). All these, viz those that are to be rejected, known, accepted, and rendered ineffective, are to be

¹ Br. 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."
vijñeyāni, known well; by the monk; agrayunataḥ, 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 Brahmān; that vijñeyāt anyatra, apart from Brahmān alone that is to be realised, that is the ultimate Reality; there is upalambhah, 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:

प्रकृत्यांकाशकानृत्र्योः सब्ध मध्य अनादयः ।
विद्यते न हि नानात्वं तेषां कवचं किंचन ॥१९२॥

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, ākāsavit, analogous to space, in point of subtleness, freedom from taints, and all-pervasiveness; and (to be) anādayāḥ, eternal. Lest any misconception of diversity be created by the use of the plural number, the text says by way of removing it, nāṁśtvam, plurality; na vidyate, does not exist; teṣām, among them; kvaćaṇa, anywhere; kim caṇa, 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:
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 kṣántiḥ, a freedom from any need of further acquisition of knowledge—either for himself or for others; evam, thus, in the way described above; sāh, 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:

आदिशान्त्त: ब्यानुपत्त्या: प्रकृत्यैव सुनिश्चित:।
सर्वेण धर्मः समाभिभाः: अजं साम्यं विशारदः।।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 sunīrtāḥ, completely detached by their very nature: sama-abhināḥ, equal and non-different; and since the reality of the Self is ajam, birthless, śāmyam, 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:

वेशार्थे तु वै नास्ति भेदे विचरतां सदा ।
भेदनिम्ना: पृथ्विवादास्तस्माते कृषणा: स्मृता: ॥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— that is to say, confine themselves to the world. Who are they? Prāṇaḥvādāḥ,
those who talk of a multiplicity of things, or in other words, the dualists. Tasmāt, therefore, they are smṛtāh, traditionally held to be; kṛpaṇāh, pitiable; since na asti, there is no; vāśūradyam, perfection; teṣām sadā vicaraṇām 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 केचिदृविध्यति सुनिश्चित: ।
ते हि लोके महाज्ञानास्तच्छ 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; bhavisyanti, will become; suniścitāh, firm in conviction; with regard to the nature of the ultimate Reality, aje sūmye, that is birthless and uniform; te hi loke mahājñānānāh, they alone are possessed of great wisdom, or in other words, endowed with unsurpassing knowledge about Reality, in this world. Ca na locah, and nobody, no other man of ordinary intellect; gāhate,
can dip into, that is to say, grasp; \textit{tat}, that thing, viz their path and their content of knowledge—the nature of the ultimate Reality. For it is stated in the \textit{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. Śn. 239. 23-24).

The next verse says in what their great knowledge consists:

\begin{quote}
अजेष्वजमसंज्ञान्तं धर्मेषु ज्ञानमिथ्यते ।
यतो न कमते ज्ञानमस्त्तेन कीर्तितम् ।

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 \textit{isya\textit{te}}, it is traditionally held; that the \textit{jñānam}, knowledge; \textit{ajeśu dharmes\textit{u}}, inhering in the birthless, steady, souls; is \textit{a\textit{jam}}, birthless, steady; like light and heat in the sun; therefore that knowledge which is \textit{asa\textit{ṅkrān\textit{tam}}, unassociated with any other object; \textit{a\textit{jam isya\textit{te}}, is said to be unborn. \textit{Yatāḥ}, since, \textit{jñānam}, the knowledge; \textit{na krama\textit{te}}, does not relate, to any other object; \textit{tena}, because of that reason; it is \textit{kīrtita\textit{m asa\textit{ṅg\textit{am}}, proclaimed to be non-relational, like space.}
\end{quote}
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; sadā, for ever; avipāscitah, for that non-discriminating man. Kim uta, should one say that there is no; āvaraṇacyutih, 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.”

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 knowledge), they are said to know.

*Sarve dharmaḥ,* all the souls; *alabdha varanaḥ,* never had any veil, any bondage of ignorance etc., that is to

¹For 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-nirnāmaḥ intrinsically pure; buddhāḥ tathā muktaḥ, illuminated and also free; ādau, from the beginning; since they are by nature ever pure, illuminated, 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।
सर्वं धर्मस्तथा ज्ञानं नैतद्बुद्धेन भावितम् ॥ 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; tāyinah, 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 dharmaṇu, 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 dharmāḥ, 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 bhūṣitam, was not expressly, 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:

दुर्दर्शर्मितिग्म्भीरमभादुर्म साम्यं विष्ठारदम् ।
बुद्धो 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; sīmyam, uniform, viśūradam, holy. Buddhaḥ, having realised, having become identified with; this kind of padam, State; that is anānātvaṁ, non-duality; namaskurmaḥ, 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 Gauḍapāda, the teacher of Govindaḍa 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 forever 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 UPAonisAD
ॐ भद्रं कृष्णभि: भृगुयाम देवा
भद्रं पश्येमाक्षभिर्यजत्रा: ॥
स्त्रयेरैस्तुष्टुवासस्तनभि-
ञ्ज्ञानेन देवहिं यदायु: ॥
स्वस्तिन्न इन्द्रो वृद्धथवाः
स्वस्तिन् पूषा सिववेदा: ॥
स्वस्तिन्न नस्तास्यं अरिष्टनेमि:
स्वस्तिन्नो बृहस्पतिर्दिशातु ॥
ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

(For translation, see p. 78).
PRAŚNA UPAṆIṢAD
FIRST QUESTION

This brāhmaṇa¹, 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 gītas 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 brahmacarya³ 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):

¹ i.e. this Upaniṣad, occurring as the brāhmaṇa or Vedic explanation of the mantras of the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad.

² i.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 saṁhitā 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.
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 Bhrigu, 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. Śaibyāḥ, the son of Śibi, who was Satyakāma by name. The son of Sūrya is Saurya, and Saurya’s son is Sauryāyani, the lengthening of i in Sauryāyani 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 Bhrigu; and he was Vaidarbhi, being born in Vidarbha. Kabandhī by name; and he was Kātyāyana, a descendent (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 anveṣamānāḥ*, 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: “*Eṣāḥ ha vai tat sarvam vaksyati*, this one will certainly tell us everything regarding It.” How did they go? *Samit-pāñyayāḥ*, with loads of faggot in hand; *te ha*, those people; *upasannāḥ*, approached; *bhagavantam pippalādam*, the venerable Pippalāda, the teacher.

2. To them the seer said, “Live (here) again for a year in a fitting manner, with control over the senses and with *brahmaçarya* 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; *sah*, he; the *rśiḥ*, seer; *uvāca ha*, said—“Although you have already practised control of the senses, still *bhūyāh eva,*
over again; you samvatsyathā, dwell (here) in a fitting manner; serving your teacher; samvatsaram, for a year; tapasā, with control of the senses; and especially brahmaçaryena, with brahmaçarya; and śraddhayā, with faith.¹ After that prechata praśnīn, put questions, with regard to anything that anyone (of you) may desire to know; yathākāmam, as you please, in accordance with the desire that each of you may entertain. Yadi vijñāsyāmah, if we happen to know, what you ask: vaksyāmah, 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 प्रश्च। भगवन्
कुतो ह वा इमा: प्रजा: प्रजायन्त इति ॥३॥

3. After that Kabandhi, descendant of Katya, having approached (him), asked, “Venerable sir from what indeed are all these beings born?”

Athā, after that, after the lapse of a year; kabandhi-kūtyāyanah, Kabandhi, great grandson of Katya; upeta, having approached (him); papraccha, asked; “Bhagavan, venerable sir; kutah ha vai. from what indeed; imāh prajāh, these beings, counting from the Brāhmaṇas; 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.
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; sah ha uvāca, he said; in order to solve that question. Having become prajākāmaḥ 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, sah tapah 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* *taptwā*, after having practised *tapas* in that way having revolved in His mind the Vedic knowledge; *saḥ*, *He*; *utpadaayate*, 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, "*Etatu*, these two, viz fire and moon, which are the eater and the eaten: *prajāḥ*, *karisyataḥ*, will produce creatures; *bahudhā* multifarious-ly; *me*, for me."¹

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 *ādityah ha vai*, the sun, verily; is *prāṇah*, *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 foodstuff; semen and creatures. *Prāṇa* and *rayiḥ* convey the ideas of energy and matter.
standpoint of superiority and inferiority. How? \textit{Etat sarvam}, all this; \textit{rayiḥ vai}, is but food. All of what? \textit{Yat mūrtam}, whatever is formed, gross; \textit{ca amūrtam}, and whatever is formless, subtle; all gross and subtle things, which constitute the food and the eater, are but \textit{rayiḥ}, food. The \textit{mūrtiḥ}, gross; which is different \textit{tasmāt}, from that, from the subtle, which is wholly distinct, is indeed \textit{rayiḥ}, food, since it is eaten up by the formless.\textsuperscript{1}

Similarly, the formless \textit{Prāṇa} (Life), the eater, is also everything that is eaten, and hence it is all. How?

\begin{quote}
	extbf{अथादिर्थ उदयन्यतप्राची दिशं प्रविष्टति तेन प्राच्च्यान् प्राणान् रशिम्बु सनिधते। यदक्षिणां यत् प्रतीची यदुदीचीं यदधो यदृद्ध्व यदन्तरा दिशो यत् सर्वं प्रकाशयति तेन सर्वान् प्राणान् रशिम्बु सनिधते।}

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.

\textsuperscript{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.
Athä, 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, prācīṁ disāṁ, the eastern quarter; tene, thereby, by that self-expansion—because these are pervaded by it; it saṁnīdhatte, 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 daṁśiṅōṁ, southern direction; yat pratiṇiṁ, that it enters into the western direction; yat udicīṁ, that it enters into the northern direction; yat, that it enters into; adhaṁ śūrdhvam, the nadir, the zenith; yat antaraṁ disāṁ, that it enters into the inter-spaces, other points of the zodiac; yat ca prakūśayati, and the fact that it illumines, sarvam, all other things; tene, thereby, by that pervasion through its own light; it saṁnīdhatte, absorbs; raśmiṣu, into the rays; sarvān prāṇān, all that lives.

स एष वैश्वानरो विश्वरूपः प्राणोजिनिरहदयते ।
तदेततद्वृङ्गांभ्युक्तम् ॥१७॥

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:

Saṁ eṣāṁ, that very one, the eater (rises up); who is prāṇāḥ 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 abhyuk-tam, spoken of, reṇa, by the (following) mantra:

विश्वरूपं हरिं जातवेदसं
परायणं ज्योतिरीकं तपन्तम् ।
सहस्सारसिः शतधा वर्तमानः:
प्राणः प्रजानामुदयत्येष सूर्यः ॥ ॥

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 viśvarūpaḥ, possessed of all forms; harinam, 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; sauryaḥ, the sun; that udayati, rises;—the sun that is sahasraraṇaṁ, possessed of a thousand rays, satadhaḥ vartamanāḥ, 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 prāṇah prajānāṁ, 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:

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 samvatsaraḥ, the year; (and that again is) prajāpatih, 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? Tatya, of that Lord of the creatures, that the year is; there are ayane, two Courses, dakṣīṇam 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 Brāhmaṇas; upāsate, follow; īśāpūrte, 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 punah 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; ṛṣayaḥ, 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; dakṣīṇam, the Southern Course, that is to say, the moon, suggested by the Southern Course, the moon being itself a result of action. Eṣāḥ ha vai rayiḥ, this indeed is food; yah ājītryāṇah,
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 विद्यार्थ्यस्मान-
मन्विष्यादित्यमभिजयिते। एतद्र प्राणायामायतनमेतद-
मृतमभयमेतत् पराणमेतस्मान पुनरावर्तन्त इत्येष्नि
रोधस्तदेष श्लोकः। ११०१।

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 uttareṇa, 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? Anvīṣya, searching for, i.e. knowing; ātmānam, 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 brahmacaryena, 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 parāyaṇam*, this one is the supreme goal, for the meditators as well as for the men who combine meditation with rites; *iti*, for; *etasmāt na punah ōvartate*, from this (they) do not return, like the others who perform rites alone. Eṣañāḥ, this one; is nirodhah, 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 ślokah, here is a verse:

पञ्चपादं पितरं द्वादशाक्रंि
दिव आहु: परे अथे पुरीपिणम्।
अथोमे अन्य उ परे विच्छक्रणं
सप्तचक्रेष्ठार आहुरपितामिति।१११।

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).

¹Or “all the organs—eyes etc.,” according to Śaṅkarānanda.
The calculators of time āhuḥ, call him; paucapādum, 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) dvādasākṛtim, possessed of twelve forms or limbs, or composed of twelve parts consisting of the twelve months. They call him purīṣīṇam, 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, vicaksanam, 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 sadare, 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.
Māsāḥ vai, the month verily; which is also praśāpatiḥ, 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 rayīḥ, food, the moon; the other part, viz. sukla-pakṣaḥ, 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; sukla istic 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.

Ahorātrato vai praśāpatistasyāhreva Praṇo rātri-reva
Rāgah ātē praskandanta yē diva rātya sāmyujyante
Bṛhadāryametvā tadvrītrātri rātya sāmyujyante. 11. 1.
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. Ahorātraḥ vai praṇāpatiḥ, day and night are verily the Lord of all creatures, just as before. Tasya, of Him; ahar eva prāṇah, the day is surely Prāṇa, the eater and fire; rātrīḥ, eva rayiḥ, night is certainly food, just as before. Ete, these people; praskandanti, eject, exhaust, waste away by separating from themselves; praṇam, Prāṇa, identified with day. Who are they? Ye, those who, the fools who; divā, in the day time; samyuyjyante 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 samyuyjyante ratyā, give play to passion; rātri, 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.

अन्तं वै प्रजायन्त: दृष्ट: 11 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; imāh 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.

तथे है बै तत् प्रजापतिभ्रंति चरति ते मिथुनमुत्पाद-यते । तेषामेवेष ब्रह्मलोको येषां तपो ब्रह्मचर्य येषु सत्यं प्रतिपन्नम् ॥ 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; utpāda-
yante, beget; mithunam, a pair, both son and daughter. Teśam eva, for those people alone, for those who under-
take sacrifices and public good and offer gifts, is this unseen result consisting in eśāḥ brahmalo kaḥ, this world of Brahman, the world of the moon, that is indicated by the Path of the Manes;—(for those) yeśām, in whom; there are tapas, vows as for instance those vows undertaken by one who has completed his study; brahma- 
car-yam, (continence consisting in) not living with one's wife at times other than the proper season; yeśu, in whom, again; satyam, truthfulness, avoidance of false-
hood; pratiṣṭhitam, exists invariably for ever.

तेषामसी विरजो ब्रह्मलोको न येषु जिह्मनूतं न 
माया चेति ॥ १६॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषदि प्रथम: 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 teśām, for them. For whom? That is being said. (For those) na yeśu 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 brahma-cāris (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 हैं भार्गवो वैदर्भिः पप्रच्छ । भगवन् कत्येव देवा: प्रजां विधारयन्ते कतर एतत् प्रकाशयन्ते कः पुनरेषा वरिष्ठ हि ॥ 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 āha, next in order: bhārgavah vaidarbhīḥ, a scion of the line of Bhṛgu, who was born in Vidarbha, papraccha, asked; enam, this one: Bhagavan, O adorable sir; kati eva devīḥ, how many deities indeed; vidhārayante, chiefly sustain; prajām, a creature, so far as the body is concerned. Kātāre, which of them, which of those deities divided among the organs of sense and action; prakāśayante, exhibit; etat, this, this manifestation of their own glory; kaha puṇaha, which again; is varisthāḥ, the chief; eṣām, 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 Hīṃ meditation.
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; _sah_, he; _uvāca ha_, said: _ Akāśaḥ ha vai esah devaḥ_, space is in fact that deity; _vāyuḥ_, air; _agniḥ_, fire; _āpah_, water; _prthivī_, earth—these five elements that are the materials of the body; (and) _vāk_, speech; _manas_, mind; _cakṣuḥ_, eye; _srotram_, 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, _vidhārayāmaḥ_, hold together unquestionably; _etat bānām, this aggregate of body and senses; avaśṭabhyā_, by holding it aloft, and not allowing it to be disintegrated." This is the idea.

_तान्वरिष्टः प्राण उवाच। मा मोहमाफङ्खाहमे-वैतत्पद्धाःसत्त्मानं प्रविभज्ज्येतद्वाणमवष्टभ्य विधार-यमोति तेजशद्धाना वभूवः।_
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.

Ṭān, to them, to those who had such egotism; varisāhaḥ prāṇaḥ, the chief Prāṇa; uvāca, said: “Mā āpadyatha 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 būnam avastabhya, sustain this aggregate of body and senses by not allowing it to disintegrate: I support it, paṇcadvā ātmānam pravibhayya, by dividing myself fivefold, by dividing my functions into those of the outgoing breath etc.” Although Prāṇa said so, still te, they, babhūvaḥ, remained, aśraddadhānaḥ, incredulous, thinking, “How can this be so?”

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 tāke 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): abhimānāt, out of indignation. What followed his ascent is being made vivid with the help of an illustration. Tasmin utkramatī, when He began to rise up; atha, then, immediately after; itare sarve eva, all others, all the organs such as the eye: utkramante, ascend (ed); ca tasmin pratiṣṭhamāne, and when He, Prāṇa, stayed on, remained quiet, did not rise up; sarve eva pratiṣṭhante, 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, utkramante, take to flight: madhukara-rājōnam utkramantam, as the king of bees, their own king, takes to the wings; ca sarvāḥ eva pratiṣṭhante, and all settle down; tasmin pratiṣṭhamāne, as he settles down. As in this illustration, so did vāk, speech; manah, mind; caṅgah, eye; śrotam, ear; and others (behave). Te, they; having given up their lack of faith, and having realised the greatness of Prāṇa, and becoming prītiḥ, delighted; stunvanti prāṇam, praise Prāṇa.

How did they praise?

एषोद्विनस्तपत्येष सूर्य
एष पर्जन्यो मधवानेष वायुः।
एष पृथिवी रयिदैवः
सदस्तचामृतं च यत् ॥१५॥
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.

Eṣāḥ, 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. Eṣāḥ, this one; ādṛṣṭaḥ, air, diversified as different currents like ēpaha, pravaha. Furthermore, eṣāḥ devaḥ, this deity; is prthivi, the earth; (and) rayih, 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.

6. Like spokes on the hub of a chariot wheel, are fixed on Prāṇa all things—ṛks, yajus, sāmas, sacrifice, Kṣatriya, and Brāhmaṇa.

Arāḥ iva rathanaḥbhau, 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

¹As the earth, He supports all; and as food, He nourishes all.
mantras—ṛcuh, ṛks; yajūṃsi, yajus; sāmūni, sāmas—(metrical, prose, and musical Vedic texts); and the yajñaḥ, 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.

प्रजापतिश्वरसि गमं त्वमेव प्रतिज्ञायसे ।
तुभ्यं प्राण प्रजास्तिवमा बलिं हरति

य: प्राणि: प्रतितिष्ठति ॥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) pratijāyase, 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; yah, who; pratitiṣṭhasi, reside; praṇaiḥ, with the organs, eyes etc., in all the bodies; that imāḥ praṇaiḥ, 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.

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; *vaḥnitaṁah*, the best carrier, the best transmitter of libations; *devaṁaṁ*, to the celestials, beginning with Indra. The *svadhiḥ*, food-offering, made; *pitṛīṇāṁ*, to the Manes, in the obsequial rite called Nāndi-mukha; that is the *prathamāḥ*, first, that takes precedence over the other offerings in which the deities dominate; 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.; *ṛṣiṁaṁ*, of the organs, such as the eyes etc.; *aṅgirasāṁ*, 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 Nāndi-mukha has to be performed before making the sacrifices to gods.
according to the Vedic Text, "Prāṇa is indeed atharvā."¹

इन्द्रस्तः प्राण तेजसा रुद्रसिस परिशिष्टिता।
त्वमन्तरिख्ये चरसि सूर्यस्तं 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 sūryāḥ, sun; the patīḥ, lord; jyotisām, of the luminaries.

यदा त्वमभविर्बध्यथमसेः प्राण ते प्रजा: ।
आनन्दप्रभासत्तथिनि कामायाः भविष्यतीति ॥ ९ ॥

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-organs, which are but manifestations of Prāṇa, are also atharvā.
praṇah, all these creatures; praṇate, live, that is to say, resort to activities characteristic of vitality. Or (reading praṇa te in place of praṇate): praṇa, O Prāṇa; imāh prajāh 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."

न्यात्मस्त्वं प्राणीकपिरत्तা विश्वस्य सत्त्वति: ।
वय्यमादस्य दातारः पिता त्वं मातरिवन्न: ॥११॥

11. O Prāṇa, you are unpurified, you are the fire Ekarsī, (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, praṇa, O Prāṇa; tvam, you, are; vrātyāḥ, unpurified—having been born first, you had none to baptise you; the idea is that you are naturally pure. As the fire called ekarsīḥ, Ekarsī, that is well known among the followers of the Atharva-Veda; you become the attā, eater, of all oblations. You are the satpatih viśvasya, the lord of all that exists, satpatih, being derived in the sense of the lord (pati) of what exists (sat). Or satpatih viśvasya, may mean the holy lord of the universe. Vayam, we, again; are dātāraḥ, givers, to you; ādyasya, of food. Mātariśva, O Mātariśvā (Aīr); tvam, you; are nah pitā, our father, (the word mātariśva being taken as a Vedic use for mātariśvan). Or if the reading be mātariśvopah, the meaning (of the sentence) will be;
Tvam, you: are the [pi]tā, father; mātariśvānaḥ, of Mātariśvā (Air).¹ Hence also is established your fatherhood of the whole universe.

या ते तनृवाचि प्रतिचिठ्ठिता या श्रोत्रेः या च चक्षुषि ।
या च मनसि सन्तता शिवां तां कुरु मोक्षमीः। ॥ १ ॥

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 tanūh te, that aspect of yours, which, is pratiśhitā, 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 वरो सर्वं चिदिवेत् यत् प्रतिचिठ्ठितम्।
मातेव पुत्रान् रक्षस्व श्रीश्च प्रजां च विधेहि
न इति। ॥ १ ॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषदं द्वितीयः प्रश्नः। ॥

¹Since 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 pratisṭhitam,
located; tridive, in the third heaven, in the form of
enjoyment for gods and others. Hence rakṣasvā, protect
us; mūtā 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; śṛiḥ ca (is the same as śriyāḥ 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 हैन कौशल्यश्चारवल्लयन: प्रश्च। भगवन् कुते एष प्राणो जायते कथमात्मात्यसिद्धशरीर आत्मानं वा प्रविभाज्य कथं प्रातिपद्धते केनोतक्रमते कथं वाणमभिधते कथमध्यात्मर्मित ॥ १॥

1. Then Kausalya, son of Aśvāla, 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?”

Athaha, next: kausalyaḥ ca āśvalāyanaḥ 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; esah this one. Prāṇa, jāyate, is born? And being born, katham, how, through what special function; does He āyati, 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 pratiṣṭhate, dwell (in the body); pravibhajya utmānam, by dividing Himself; kena, how, through what special function, does He utkramate, depart; asmāt śarīrāt, from this body? Katham, how; does He abhidhatte, support; thobāhyam,
external things, in the context of the elements and in the divine context; and how (does He support) adhyātma, in the (individual) physical context?" The verb "support" has to be supplied.

तस्मै स होवाचारित्वश्च चृत्वं सब्रह्मिष्ठोस्तरी परस्मातेहूँ ब्रह्मि ॥ २॥

2. To him he said: You are putting supernormal questions, since you are pre-eminently a knower of Brahman. Hence I speak to you. Being asked thus, sak, 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 prcchasi, you ask, atipraśnān, supernormal questions:1 brahmīṣṭhah 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 । यथैष्टा पुरुषे चत्यतिमनोक्तलातात्त मनोक्तलातात्तायसिंहशरीरे ॥ 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.
Ātmanaḥ, from the Self—from Purusa, 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 Purusa 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; asmin śarīre, to this body, mano-krītena, 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).

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; viniyukte, employs; adhikṛtān, the officers; in the villages, etc. How? By
ordering, \textit{“Adhitisthasva, preside over; etun grāmān,}
these villages; \textit{etun grāmān, these villages”;} \textit{evam eva},
just so, as is the case in the illustration, so; \textit{esah prāṇah},
this (Chief) Prāṇa; \textit{samnidhatte}, places, engages; \textit{prthak}
\textit{prthak eva}, separately, in the respective posts; \textit{tarun}
\textit{prāṇān}, the other organs, the eye etc. which are its
own manifestations.

\begin{quote}
पायपस्थे आपाण चक्रुः श्रोते मुखनासिकाभ्यां प्राणः स्वयं 
प्रातिष्ठाते मध्ये तु समानः। एष होते दुःहतमश्च समं नयति 
तस्मादेता: सप्तार्चियो भवन्ति।।५\।।
\end{quote}

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 \textit{apānam,}
Apāna, that is a division of Himself (i.e. of Prāṇa); that
exists, \textit{pāyu-upasthe}, in the two lower apertures. as
engaged in the work of ejecting faeces, urine, etc. So also
\textit{prāṇah svayam,} Prāṇa Himself, who occupies the place
of the sovereign; \textit{prātiṣṭhate,} resides \textit{caksukārātote,} in
the eyes and the ears; as issuing out through \textit{mukha-nāśikā-
bhyām,} mouth and nostrils. \textit{Madhye tu,} in the middle,
however, in between the places of Prāṇa and Apāna, in
the navel; there is \textit{samānah}, Samāna, which is so called
because it assimilates all that is eaten or drunk; \textit{hi,} for;
esah, this one; \textit{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 arcīṣah* 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.

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: *hrdi*, in the heart, in the space circumscribed by the lump of flesh shaped like a lotus. *Aitra*, in this heart; there are *etat ekaśatam*, this one hundred and one, in number; *mūḍīnam*, from among the

¹The 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; satam satam, a hundred divisions. Again, prati śākhānūḍi-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.\footnote{1 \textit{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} \text{ and the total number of all the nerves is }^{727,210,201}.} \textit{Åsu}, among these nerves; carati, moves; the vital energy called vyānah, Vyāna, the name being derived in the sense of pervasive-ness. 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 Apāṇa, it becomes the performer of deeds requiring strength.

अर्थाकयोधव उदान: पुण्येन पुण्यं लोकं नयति पापेन
पापमुभाभ्योमेव मनुष्यलोकम् \textit{र० ७११}

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, \textit{ekayā}, through that one, which proceeds upward
and is known as Suśumna; the vital force called udānaḥ, Udāna, which moves everywhere from the sole of the feet to the head; ārdhvaḥ (san), when it has an upward trend; it nayati, leads; punyam lokam, to a virtuous world, such as the world of the gods; punyena karmāṇā, 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) manuṣya-lokam, to the human world; ubhābhyaṁ eva, as a result of both virtue and vice, when they predominate equally. The verb "leads" has to be supplied (everywhere).

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.

Ādityah ha vai, it is the well-known sun indeed, in the divine context; that is the bāhyah prāṇah, external Prāṇa (i.e. Prāṇa in external manifestation). Eṣah, this one, that is such; udayati, rises up; it is this one indeed (that rises) anugṛḥṣaṇaḥ, favouring; enam prāṇam, this Prāṇa; cākṣaṣaṁ, 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 prthivyām, the deity that is well known as identified with the earth; sā ēsā, that very one, exists by vouchsafing favour; avastabhya, 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) antarū, 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 samānaḥ, 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.\(^2\) Vāyuḥ, 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.

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 tejalḥ ha vai, well known as (common)1 luminosity, outside: is udānah, 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 tasmūt, therefore: when an ordinary man upasāntatejāḥ, gets his natural light extinguished; then it is to be understood that his life is exhausted and he is about to die. Sahā, he, attains; punarbhavam, another body, (rebirth). How? Saha indriyaiḥ, together with the organs, counting from speech: sampadyamānaiḥ manasi, entering into the mind.

यन्हिन्नन्तस्तेनाध्य प्राणमायाति प्राणस्तेजसा युक्तः ।
सहात्मना यथासंडुलिपतं लोकं नयति ॥११०॥

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; yuktah tejasā, as combined with the function called Udāna; saha āimanā, 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 yathāsāvajkalpitam, a world as was desired by him.¹

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; prajāh, 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 slokaḥ, this mantra, expressive of this idea in the form of a brief statement:

उत्पत्तिमार्यति स्थानं विभुतं चैव पढ़चधा ।
अध्यात्मं चैव प्राणस्य विज्ञायामृतमश्चन्ते
विज्ञायामृतमश्चन्तं इति ॥ १ ॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषद्वि 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.

Viṣṇūya, 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 pañcadhā vibhūtvam, 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 adhyātmanam, in the body, as the eye etc.—having known thus, (one) āśnute, achieves; amṛtam, immortality. The repetition of “viṣṇūya amṛtam āśnute,” having known, he achieves immortality” is by way of concluding the Question.
FOURTH QUESTION

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, sauryāyati 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 Puruṣa, 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 katarāḥ eṣaḥ devaḥ, which is this deity, who; pāṣyati 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-karaṇāni, karaṇāni 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 sampratisthitah 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; sampratisthitah, 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.

¹There 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. 

तस्मै स होवाच । यथा गार्ग्ययं मरीचयोऽक्षरस्यास्तं
गच्छत: सर्वं एतस्मस्तेजोमण्डल एकीभवति। ततः पुनः
पुनरङ्गदयत: प्रचरस्येवं ह वै तत् सर्वं परे देवेन मनस्येकी
भवति । तेन तद्यौप पुरुषो न श्रुत्तोति न पश्यति न
जिज्ञाति न रसयते न स्पृशते नामिन्धते नादते नानन्द
यते न विसृज्यते नेयायते स्वप्नित्यायान्यते ॥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
maricayāḥ, rays; arkasya, of the sun; astam gacchātah,

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 tejomandale, 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, parc 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; evaḥ puruṣāḥ, this person—to wit, a person named Devadatta: na śṛṇoti, does not hear; na paśyati, does not see; na jighrati, does not smell; na rasayate, does not taste; na sprātate, does not touch: na abhivadate, does not converse; na ēdatte, does not grasp; na ānandayate, does not enjoy; na visṛṣjate, 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.
Praśna Upaniṣad 11.3

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 Āhavaniya fire is obtained from Gārhapatya, which is the former’s source of extraction, therefore Prāna conforms to Āhavaniya (because of its issuing out of Apāna).

When the organs, such as the ear, sleep etasmin pure, in this city, of the body, which is possessed of nine gates; prāṇāgniyaḥ, the five divisions of vital function counting from Prāṇa, which are comparable to fires: jūgrati, keep awake. The resemblance with fire is being stated: Eṣah apānah vai gārhapatyāḥ, this Apāna is really (the sacrificial fire called) Gārhapatya. How that can be so is being stated: Since the other fire, called Āhavaniya, is praṇīyate, taken (extracted); gārhapatyāḥ praṇayanāt, from the Gārhapatya fire, standing as the source, from which (Āhavaniya 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.

1Apāna 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 Ṛpāna. Therefore Prāna is comparable to Āhavanīya. As for vyānaḥ, Vyāna, since it moves out from the heart through the daksīna, right, orifice, and is thus associated with the daksīna, southern direction, therefore it is (the fire called) Daksīṇāgni, known otherwise as Anvāhāryapacana.

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-nihāvāsau, inhaling and exhaling; are the āhūtī, 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 āhūtī, 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 samānah, 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, manah ha vāva yajamānah, 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. Īstaphalam eva, the result itself of the sacrifice; is udānah, 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 citah, prāṇah citah, cakṣuh citah” 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:

अत्रैष्ट देवः स्वप्ने महिमामनुभवति । यद्वृष्टं दृष्टमनुपश्यति श्रुतं श्रुतेवार्थमनुश्रुणोति देशदिगलतः-रैष्ट प्रत्यन्नभूतं पुनः पुनः प्रत्यन्नभवति दृष्टं चादृष्टं च श्रुतं चाश्रुतं चानुभूतं चानुन्नभूतं च सच्चासच्च सर्वं पश्यति सर्वं: 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; eṣah 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 a 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. . . .” (Br. 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?” (Br. 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” (Br. 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 Brhadāranyaka, 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 space\(^1\) 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; drṣṭam pūrṇam, was seen earlier; it pas-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; anuśrūtī, it seems to hear thereafter, under the influence of its impressions. Similarly, whatever was pratyānyabhūtām deśadigaṁ
taraṁ, perceived as belonging to the different places and quarters; it pratyānyabhavati, experiences, appears to experience, through ignorance; punah punah, time and again. So also whatever was drśtām, seen, in this birth; and adrśtām, 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; anubhūtām, what was perceived, in this life through the mind alone; ananubhūtām 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; sarvāḥ (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 तेजसाः भिभुतो भवति । अत्रोऽद्व: स्वप्नात्म
पवयत्यथ तद्विषमवेशरिर एतत्सुख 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.
Yadā, when; tejasā, by light, by the solar light, called bile, that is lodged in the nerves; sah, the deity, called mind; bhavati, becomes; completely, abhibhūtaḥ, overwhelmed, when the doors 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; esah, this; devah, deity (lit. the luminous one), called the mind; na pāśyati svapnān, does not see dreams, the doors of vision having been closed by light. Atha tadā, then at that time; etasmin sarīre, 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.
7. To illustrate the point: As the birds, O goodlooking 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; _rayaṇisi_, birds: _sampratisthante_, proceed towards; _vāsovyaksam_, the tree that provides lodging; _evam ha vai_, just so, just as it is in the illustration; _sarvam_, all—everything that will be enumerated; _sampratisthathe_, proceeds; _pare ātmani_, to the supreme Self, to the Immutable.

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? Prthivī, the gross earth, possessed of the five attributes;¹ ca, and; its cause, the Prthivī-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; vāyuḥ 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 caksuḥ, eye, the organ; ca rūpam, and the object of sight; śrotarṇam ca śrotavayam ca, ear and the object of hearing; ghrūṇaṃ ca ghrūtavayam ca, nose and the object of smell; rasāḥ 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 name being given according to the predominance of one or the other.
speech and the content of speech; hastau ca ādātavyam ca, two hands and the objects to be grasped; upasthaḥ ca ānandayitavyam ca, sex and what is enjoyed; pūryuḥ ca visarjayitavyam ca, the organ of excretion and what is excreted; pūdau 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. Ahamkāraḥ is the internal organ characterised by egoism; ca and; ahamkārtavyam, the object of egoism. Cittam, the internal organ possessed of consciousness; ca cetayitavyam, and the object to be conscious of. Tejaḥ, the skin, as distinct from the organ of touch and as possessed of lustre; the object revealed by it is vidyotayitavyam. Prāṇaḥ is what is called Sūtra (Hiranyagarbha, who strings together everything); vidhūrayitavyam, 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 दृष्टा स्पर्श्या श्रीता चाराता रसयिता मन्ता 
वोद्रा कर्ता विज्ञानात्मा पुरुषः। स परेश्वर 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, smells, 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 eṣaḥ, this one (this Self); is the draṣṭā, seer; spraṣṭā, toucher (feeler); śrotā, hearer; ghrātā, smeller; rasayitā, taster; māntā, thinker; bodhā, ascertainer; kartā, doer. The word vijñāna, 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 vijñānātmā means the reality that has that nature or that is a knower by nature. He is puruṣah 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:

परमेवाश्च प्रतिपद्धते स यो हृ वै तद्च्छायमश्रीरम्-लोहितं शुभ्रमक्षरं बद्यते यस्तु सोम्य । स सर्वेऽ शर्वो 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 aksaram*, the supreme Immutable Itself, that is going to be described. *Sah*, he; (attains the Immutable); *yah ha vai*, who perchance, having become free from all desires; *vadayate*, realises; *tat*, that which is; *acchāyam*, free from shadow, from ignorance; *asārīram*, bodiless; *alohitam*, devoid of redness, free from all qualities starting from redness. Since this is so, therefore (It is) *subham*, pure, being free from all attributes; It is *aksaram*, 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: *yah*, he, the renouncer of everything, who knows;¹ becomes *savrajñah*, omniscient, nothing can possibly remain unknown to him. Formerly he was not omniscient owing to ignorance; again, when ignorance is removed by knowledge, *sah bhavati sarvah*, he becomes all. *Tat*, with regard to that point; *bhavati eseḥ slokah*, there occurs this verse, which sums up the above idea.

¹ Ananda Giri repeats the verb “knows” and splits up the first part of the text into two sentences.
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, yah tu vedayate, he who knows; tat aksaram, that Immutable; yatra, into which; sampratisthanti, merge; vijnanatmā, the entity that is by nature a knower (IV. 9); and pranāh, the organs, such as the eye; bhūtāni, and the elements such as earth; saha devaṅh, together with the deities, such as Fire etc.; sah sarvajñah, that omniscient one; āvivesa (is the same as āviśati), enters into sarvam, everything._
FIFTH QUESTION

�थ हैनं श्रव्यः सत्यकामः प्रचछः । स यो हैं वै
तद्वगवन्मनुष्येषु प्रायणान्तेकारमभिध्यायः । कत्मं
वाब्स तेन लोकं जयतीति । तस्मां स होवाच ।।११।।

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: satyakāmāḥ saihyaḥ. 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
ho vai, anyone, any rare person; manusyeṣu, 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;
oṅkāram, on Om; tāt, in that wonderful way; prāyaṇa-
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, 
\textit{katamam vāya lokam}, which of the worlds; \textit{saḥ jayati tena},
does he conquer thereby, by that meditation on \textit{Om}, who undertakes such a lifelong vow, aided by such
multifarious forms of \textit{yama} and \textit{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, monas-
ticism, cleanliness, contentment, absence of dissimula-
tion etc.? To him who had asked thus \textit{saḥ}, he, Pippalāda:
\textit{uvāca ha}, said:

एतद्वै सत्यकाम परं चापरं च ब्रह्मा यदंकारः। तस्मादिव्हिद्यानेतेनेवाच्यतेनेनक्तरमन्वेति ॥ २॥

2. O Satyakāma, this very Brahman, that
is (known as) the inferior and superior, is but
this \textit{Om}. Therefore the illumined soul attains
either of the two through this one means alone.

O Satyakāma, \textit{etat brahma vai}, this very Brahman;
yat, that is; \textit{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; \textit{omkārah eva}, is but \textit{Om},
being identical with \textit{Om}, since \textit{Om} is Its symbol.\footnote{\textit{Etat} and \textit{yat}, being neuter, are construed with Brahman, rather than with \textit{omkārah} which is masculine.—A.G.} 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 \textit{Om}, which is comparable to the
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.

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 endowed there with self-control, continence, and faith he experiences greatnes.

Yadi, even though; sak, 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, \textit{abhidhyāyīta}, should he meditate, constantly; on \textit{Om} itself as comprising one letter; \textit{sak}, he; \textit{saṁveditaḥ}, becoming enlightened; \textit{tena eva}, by that alone—that meditation on \textit{Om} as possessed of one letter only; \textit{tūrṇam eva}, very quickly; \textit{abhi sampadyate}, attains; \textit{jagatyām}, on the earth. What does he attain? \textit{Manusya
dalokam}, the human birth (i.e. human body). As many kinds of birth are possible on this earth, so, among these, \textit{ṛcaḥ}, the \textit{Ṛk mantras}; \textit{upanayante}, conduct; \textit{tam}, him, that aspirant; to \textit{manusya
dalokam}, human birth, on the earth; for the first single letter (viz \textit{a}) of \textit{Om} was meditated on (by him) as the \textit{Ṛk mantras}, which stand for the \textit{Ṛg-Veda}. Thereby, in that human birth, he becomes a prominent Brāhmaṇa, and being \textit{sampannaḥ}, endued; \textit{tapasī}, with self-control; \textit{brahmacaryena}, with continence; \textit{śraddhayā}, with faith \textit{anubhayati}, experiences; \textit{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 \textit{Yoga} (i.e. application of his mind to Brahman).

अथ यदि द्विमात्रेण मनसि संपच्चते सोऽज्ञतारिष्टं यजुर्मिक्रृतीयते सोमलोकम्। स सोमलोके विभूतिमनुभूय पुनरावर्तते ॥४॥

4. Now again, if he meditates on \textit{Om} with the help of the second letter, he becomes identified with the mind. By the \textit{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*), (abhidhyāyita, should meditate on *Om*) *dvimātreṇa,* as possessed of the second letter; then as a result of that concentration, one *sampadyate,* 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 *sah,* 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. *Sah,* he; *anubhūya vibhūtim,* having experienced greatness *somaloke,* in that world of the Moon; *avartate punah,* turns round again, towards the human world.¹

¹ According to Śaṅkarāṇanda, the first portion of the text means this: If anyone *manasi sampadyate,* 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 Hiranyagarbha who embodies Himself in the subtle cosmos conceived of as a subtle dream state; the earlier text similarly enjoins a meditation on Virūṭ, embodying Himself in the gross universe, conceived of as the waking state.
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 (Hiranyagarbha) by the *Sāma mantras*. From this total mass of creatures (that Hiranya-garbha is) he sees the supreme Puruṣa that penetrates every being and is higher than the higher One (viz Hiranya-garbha). Bearing on this, there occur two verses:

*Punah*, again; *yah abhidhyāyita*, should anyone meditate; *etam*, on this—on *Om*; as *param puruṣam*, the supreme Puruṣa, residing within the solar orb; *Om iti etena eva aksareṇa*, with the help of the very syllable *Om*; *trimūtrena*, 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 as) 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 trimūtreṇa), an interpretation in the instrumental sense is quite in order, still in conformity with the context, trimūtreṇa etc. should be converted to the accusative form

\[ \text{trimūtram param puruṣam—(meditate) on Om, associated with the knowledge of the three letters, as the supreme Puruṣa"}, \]

so as to accord with the adage, “The individual should be sacrificed for the family.”

By that meditation, saḥ, he; becomes sāmpannah, absorbed—being engaged in meditation, he becomes identified with the third letter (m) and becomes unified,—tejasī 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 pūdodarāḥ, snake; vinirmyucyate tvacā, is freed from its slough, the dead skin, to become new again; evam hā 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; saḥ, he; unnīyate, is lifted up; sūmahbhīḥ by the Sūma mantras, that are identical with the third letter (m of Om): brahmaṅlokaḥ, 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: iksate, sees, through meditation; purusam, Puruṣa; puriṣayam, who has entered into all the bodies and who is called the supreme Self; being param paramāt, 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 ślokau, these two verses:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{तिन्नो मात्रा मृत्युमत्यः प्रयुक्ता} \\
\text{अत्योन्यसक्ता अनविप्रयुक्ता: } \text{I} \\
\text{क्रियामु बाह्याभ्यत्तरमध्यमासु} \\
\text{सम्यक् प्रयुक्तसामु न कम्पते } \text{व: } \text{II.6.II}
\end{align*}
\]

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.

\(^2\) Hirapyagarbha is higher than all other creatures.


Tisraḥ mātrāḥ, the three letters, viz a, u, m, of Om; mṛtyumatyah, are encompassed by death, not outside the pale of death, that is to say, within the grasp of death. 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 Yogi 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— bāhyābhhyantaramadhyamāsu, 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 jñānāḥ, enlightened one, that is to say, the Yogi 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 Hiranyagarbha, has his lodging in the subtle body and dream. Prājña, identical with Isvara, 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:

ऋषिपरिमत्य जयुमिरि तत्तत् कायो वेदयन्ते ।
तमोकारेः यजयतनान् ब्रह्मविद्वान्
यत्तच्छान्तमजरमृतम्भयं परं चेति ॥७॥

इति प्रश्नोपनिषिद्धि 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 kavyah, the intelligent, enlightened ones, and not the ignorant; vedayante, know; etam, this, this world, associated with men; that is attainable rghhik, through the Rk mantras; antarikṣam, the intermediate
space, presided over by the Moon; that is attainable yajurbhīh, by the Yajur mantras; and tat, that, that world of Brahmā; yat, which; is attainable sāmabhīh, 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

Then Sukeśā, son of Bharadvāja, asked him, “Venerable sir, Hiranyanābha, 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 rājaputrāḥ, prince, Kṣatriya by caste, named Hiranýanābhā; who was kausalyāḥ, born in Kosala; upetya mām, approaching me; aprcchāta, asked; etam 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 sōlasakalam, possessed of sixteen digits (limbs)?” That conscious Being, the soul, is sōlasakalāḥ, 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; avedīśam, 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: "Yeḥ, anyone who; abhivadati, utters; anṛtam, falsehood; speaks of himself as somewhat other than what he really is; eṣaḥ, such a man; paṁśuṣyasati, dries up; saṁvālaḥ, together with roots; he is deprived from this world and the next, he is destroyed. As I know this fact, tasmāt, therefore; na arhami anṛtam vaktum, I cannot afford to utter a falsehood; like an ignoramus." Saḥ, he, the prince, who was thus convinced; pravarāja, went away; to where he had come from; āruhya ratham, by riding on the chariot; tuṣṇīm, 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. Tampuruṣam, about that Puruṣa; prcchāmi tvā, I ask you;—which, as an object still unascertained, sticks to my heart like a thorn;—"Kva asau puruṣāḥ, where does that Puruṣa (that is to be known) exist?"

तस्मै स होवाच । इहैवान्त:शरीरे सोम्य स पुरुषो
यस्मिनेता: पोडश कला: प्रभवत्तीति ॥ 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; saḥ, he; uvāca ha, said; iha eva, here itself; antahsarire, inside the body, within the
space inside the lotus of the heart; somya, O amiable one; exists sah purusah, that Purusa—and He is not to be sought somewhere else;—(Purusa) yasmin, in whom; prabhavanti, originate; etah sodasha kaluh, these sixteen parts—Prana and the rest that are being enumerated. Purusa 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 Purusa 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 Purusa. Since no empirical pronouncement as to attainability and the means of attainment can be made unless there be the superimposition of Prana 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 Purusa); 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.\footnote{ 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. \textit{Objection:} We have no knowledge of a jar at the time that we know a cloth; so knowledge also is variable. \textit{Answer:} Knowledge may vary as coloured by its objects, but not essentially, whereas things vary essentially.} 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.
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 revivified 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 forever. 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.\(^2\)

\(^1\) The 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.

\(^2\) On 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 Upanishadic 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 Upanishad as confined within the body. Moreover, things like the tree and the seeds can be contained 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 space with space seems to be existing in the shape of a body as the body, bodies and empty regions there.

² Space is the cause of the universe, but since space pervades everything, it is perceived.
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.

3. He deliberated: “As a result of whose departure shall I rise up? And as a result of whose continuance shall I remain established?”

Saḥ, He, Puruṣa, endued with sixteen parts, about whom the son of Bhāradvāja inquired; iksām 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 utkṛnte, which particular agent having risen up, from the body; bhaviṣyāmi aham, shall I become; utkṛntaḥ, 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
e tc., 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 delib-
erated” 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 Śāṁkhya 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 Sāṁkhya, 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 Sāṁkhya. 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 disputes\(^1\) 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?

\(\textbf{Sāṁkhya:}\) 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.

Sāmkhya: 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.

Sāmkhya: 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.\footnote{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: Enjoyership may belong simultaneously to both Pradhāna and Puruṣa.

Vedāntist: No, since in that case the (Śāṅkhya) 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 lordship 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 (Śāṅkhya) scripture written as a means for emancipation?
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 Munṭaka, 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 hands\(^1\) 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 souls\(^1\) 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?

\begin{quote}
स प्राणसृजत प्राणाच्छद्वा सं वायुज्योतिरिपः पृथ्वीन्द्रियं मन: । अन्तमञ्चाहीयं तपो मन्त्रा: कर्म लोका लोकेषु च नाम च ॥४॥
\end{quote}

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, sah, He, Puruṣa; asṛjata, 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, "Īnvareṇa iva". An alternative reading is, "Īnvareṇa 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; vāyuḥ, air, possessed of two attributes, its own attribute of touch and the attribute (sound) of its source (space); similarly jyotih, fire, possessed of three qualities—its own quality of colour and the qualities of sound and touch belonging to the earlier two; similarly āpah, water, possessed of four attributes—its own individual quality of taste and the infusion of the three earlier qualities (sound, touch, colour); similarly prthivī, 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) manah, 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) *mantrāh*, mantras, comprising the *Rk*, *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 *lokāh*, 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?

¹ Taking them as His aid.
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; syandamānaḥ nadyāḥ, flowing rivers; samudṛyaṇāḥ, that have the sea as their goal, the place where they get absorbed; samudram pṛāpa, reaching the sea; gaccharti 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 śoḍāśa kalāḥ, these sixteen parts—the parts, counting from Prāṇa that have been mentioned; puruṣaṅgaṇaḥ, 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; āśam, 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; puruṣah 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:

अराइवरथनाभितकलायस्मिन्प्रतिष्ठिताः ।
तंवेदंपुरुषंवेदयथामावमृत्युःपरिव्रयथाइति॥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 vah pariṇyathāḥ, 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.

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. Athaḥ 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.
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; naḥ, 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. Namah, salutation:
parama-paribhaya, to the great seers, the originators
of the line of traditional transmission of the know-
ledge of Brahman. The repetition of namah, parama-
paribhaya, is for showing eagerness.
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