

CHAPTER III

SECTION I

In the second chapter all objections based on the Śruti and reasoning against the Vedāntic view have been refuted. It has been shown that all other views are incorrect, and that the so-called scriptural contradictions do not exist with respect to the Vedāntic view. Further, it has been shown that all entities different from the soul (like Prāṇa etc.) spring from Brahman and for the enjoyment of the soul. In this chapter the soul's travels to the different regions accompanied by those adjuncts are discussed to produce a spirit of dispassion.

Topic 1: The soul, when passing out of the body at death, is enveloped with fine particles of the gross elements.

तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ रंहति सम्परिष्वक्तः, प्रश्ननिरू-

पणाभ्याम् ॥ १ ॥

तदन्तरप्रतिपत्तौ With a view to obtaining a fresh body रंहति goes सम्परिष्वक्तः enveloped (with subtle parts of the elements) प्रश्ननिरूपणाभ्याम् (so it is known) from the question and answer.

1. (The soul) goes (out of the body) enveloped (with subtle parts of the elements) with a view to

obtaining a fresh body; (so it is known) from the question and answer (in the scripture).

The Sûtra discusses whether in transmigration the soul takes with it subtle parts of the gross elements as the seed, as it were, for the future body. The opponent holds that it does not take them, for it is useless, because the elements are easily available everywhere. Moreover, in the absence of a definite opinion to the contrary in the scriptures, we have to understand that the soul does not take subtle parts of the elements with it. This Sûtra refutes that view and says that the soul does take with it subtle parts of the elements; that this is a fact is known from the question and answer that occurs in the scriptures. "Do you know why in the fifth oblation water is called man?" (Ch. 5. 3. 3). This is the question, and the answer is given in the whole passage which after explaining how the five oblations in the form of Śraddhâ (liquid oblations in subtle form), Soma, rain, food, and seed are offered in the five 'fires' (i.e. objects imagined to be fires for the sake of Upâsanâ)—the heavens, Parjanya (rain-god), earth, man, and woman—ends, "For this reason is water in the fifth oblation called man." From this we understand that the soul goes enveloped with water (same as Śraddhâ). Moreover, though the elements are available everywhere, yet the seeds for a future body are not so easily available. Again the adjuncts of the individual soul, viz the organs etc. which go with it (Vide Br. 4. 2) cannot accompany it unless there is a material basis

आत्मकत्वात् भूयस्त्वात् ॥ २ ॥

त्र्यात्मकत्वात् On account of (water) consisting of three elements तु but भूयस्त्वात् on account of the preponderance (of water).

2. On account of (water) consisting of three elements (the soul goes enveloped by all these elements and not merely water); but (water alone is mentioned in the text) on account of its preponderance (in the human body).

An objection is raised that the text mentions only water, and not the other elements as accompanying the soul. The Sûtra says that in water are found the other two elements also according to the tripartite creation of the gross elements. Hence all the three elements accompany the soul. The mention of water is indicative and includes all the elements. With mere water no body can be formed. But as the watery portion in the body is preponderant, water only is mentioned in the text.

प्राणगतेश्च ॥ ३ ॥

प्राणगते: Because of the going of the sense-organs च and.

3. And because of the going of the organs (with the soul, the elements also accompany the soul).

“When it departs, the vital force follows. When the vital force departs, all the organs follow” (Br. 4. 4. 2). Since the organs go with the soul, they must

have a material base; hence also it is inferred that water and other elements follow the soul, thus forming a basis for the organs.

अग्न्यादिगतिश्रुतेरिति चेत्, न, भाक्तत्वात् ॥ ४ ॥

अग्न्यादिगति Entering into fire etc. श्रुते: from the scriptures इति चेत् if it be said न not so भाक्तत्वात् on account of its being so said in a secondary sense.

4. If it be said (that the organs do not follow the soul), for the scriptures declare their entering into fire etc., (we say) not so, on account of its being so said in a secondary sense.

“When the vocal organ of a man who dies is merged in the fire, the nose in the air,” etc. (Br. 3. 2. 13). This text shows that at the time of death the organs are resolved into their presiding deities, and hence it cannot be said that they accompany the soul. This Sûtra refutes that view and says that such interpretations would go against many texts which declare that they do accompany the soul, as for example: “When it departs, the vital force follows; when the vital force departs, all the organs follow” (Br. 4. 4. 2). Hence the text cited must be interpreted in a secondary sense like the words, “The hair on the body in the herbs” (Br. 3. 2. 13).

प्रथमेश्वरणादिति चेत्, न, ता एव हि, उपपत्ते: ॥ ५ ॥

प्रथमे In the first of the oblations अश्वरणात् not being mentioned इति चेत् if it be said न not so ता: एव that

only (*i.e.* water) हि because उपपत्तेः on account of the appropriateness.

5. If it be objected on account of (water) not being mentioned in the first of the oblations, (we say) not so, because that (*viz* water) only (is meant by the word 'Śraddhâ') on account of the appropriateness (of such an interpretation).

An objection is raised that as there is no mention of water in the first oblation: "On that altar the gods offer śraddhâ as oblation" (Ch. 5. 4. 2), but only śraddhâ (faith) is mentioned, to substitute water for śraddhâ will be arbitrary. So how can it be ascertained "that in the fifth oblation water is called man?" The Sûtra says that by 'śraddhâ' water is meant, for in that case alone syntactical unity of the whole passage remains undisturbed. Otherwise the question and answer would not agree. Moreover, faith (śraddhâ), which is a mental attribute, cannot be offered as an oblation. Water is also called śraddhâ in the Śruti texts: "śraddhâ indeed is water (Taittirīya Samhitā 1. 6. 8. 1).

अश्रुतत्वादिति चेत्, न, इष्टादिकारिणां प्रतीतिः ॥ ६ ॥

अश्रुतत्वात् On account of not being mentioned in the Śruti इति चेत् if it be said not so इष्टादिकारिणां the performers of sacrifices etc. प्रतीतिः being understood.

6. If it be said that on account of (the soul) not being mentioned in the text (the soul does not depart enveloped with water etc.), (we say) not so, for it is understood (from the scriptures)

that the Jîvas who perform sacrifices etc. (alone go to heaven).

An objection is raised that in the Chândogya text cited (5. 3. 3), there is mention of water only but no reference to the soul; and it is explained how this water becomes man. So how can it be taken that the soul departs enveloped with water and then is born again as man? This Sûtra refutes it and says that if we examine all the scriptural texts like, "But they who being in the village practise sacrifices and works of public utility and give alms, go to the (deity of) smoke...to the moon" (Ch. 5. 10. 3-4), which describe the journey to the moon, we find that only the Jîvas who perform such good acts go to heaven, and that in so doing they go enveloped with water, which is supplied by the materials like curds, etc. that are offered as oblations in sacrifices; these assume a subtle form called Apûrva and attach themselves to the sacrificer.

भाक्तं वानात्मवित्त्वात्, तथा हि दर्शयति ॥ ७ ॥

भाक्त In a secondary sense वा but अनात्मवित्त्वात् on account of their (souls) not knowing the Self तथा so हि because दर्शयति (Śruti) declares

7. But (the souls' being the food of the gods in heaven is used) in a secondary sense, on account of their not knowing the Self; because (the Śruti) declares like that.

In the scriptures it is stated that those who go to heaven become the food of the gods; so how could they

be enjoying the fruits of their good actions in heaven? "That is Soma, the king. He is the food of the gods. They eat him" (Ch. 5. 10. 4). This Sûtra says that the word 'food' is used not in a primary sense, but metaphorically, meaning an object of enjoyment. Otherwise, if this is the fate of souls who go to heaven, texts like, "Those who want to go to heaven shall perform sacrifices" are meaningless. Therefore what the text means is that they are objects of enjoyment to the gods even as wives, children, and cattle are to men. Thus the Jîvas, while giving enjoyment to the gods, are happy, and rejoice with them in their turn. That they are objects of enjoyment to the gods is known from texts like: "While he who worships another deity...He is like a beast to the gods. And as many beasts serve a man, so does every man serve the gods" (Br. 1. 4. 10).

Therefore it is decided that the soul goes enveloped with subtle parts of the elements when it goes to other spheres for enjoying the fruits of its good Karma.

Topic 2: The souls descending from heaven have a residual Karma, which determines their birth.

कृतात्ययेऽनुशयवान्, दृष्टस्मृतिभ्याम्, यथेतमनेवं च ॥ ८ ॥

कृतात्यये On the exhaustion of (good) work अनुशयवान् possessed of residual Karma दृष्टस्मृतिभ्याम् as is known from the Śruti and Smṛti यथा इतम् as (it) went अनेवं differently च and.

8. On the exhaustion of (good) work (the soul) with the residual Karma (descends to this

earth), as is known from the Śruti and Smṛti, along the path (it) went by (from here) and differently too.

A fresh topic is taken up for discussion—the descent of the soul from heaven. The question is raised whether it descends with any residual Karma or not. The opponent holds that there is no residual Karma, for Śruti says: "Having dwelt there till their work is consumed, they return again the way they went by" etc. Ch. 5. 10. 5), which means that all their Karma is exhausted and there is nothing left. Moreover, it is reasonable to think that Karma done in one life (as man) is worked out in the next as god.

The Sûtra, refuting this view, says that what is exhausted in heaven is only that Karma which gave the soul a birth as god in heaven, but on the exhaustion of this Karma the remaining Karma, good and bad, brings it back to earth. Otherwise it is difficult to explain the happiness or misery of a newborn child. Neither is it possible that in one life the entire Karma of the previous life is worked out. For a man might have done both good work like sacrifices, as a result of which he is born as a god, and bad work, which can be worked out in an animal body; and the working out of both kinds of Karma simultaneously in one birth is impossible. So though by the enjoyment of heaven the result of good work like sacrifices etc. is exhausted, there are other Karmas in store according to which a man is born again in good or bad environments. The Śruti says, "Those whose conduct has been good will quickly attain some good birth" etc. (*Ibid.* 5. 10. 7). The

Smṛti also says, "With the remainder of their Karma they are born in a noteworthy place, caste, and family, with becoming appearance, longevity, knowledge, wealth, happiness, and intellect." So the soul is born with residual Karma. By what way does it descend? Following the same way that it went by, but with some difference. That they follow the same way as they went by, is understood from the mention of smoke and ether in the path (*Vide* Ch. 5. 10. 5), and that there is some difference too is known from the fact that the text omits night etc. (*Vide* Ch. 5. 10. 3), but mist etc. are mentioned (*Vide* Ch. 5. 10. 6).

चरणादिति चेत्, न, उपलक्षणार्थेति काष्ण-
जिनिः ॥ ९ ॥

चरणात् On account of conduct इति चेत् if it be said न not so उपलक्षणार्था to denote indirectly इति thus काष्ण-
जिनिः (the sage) Kârṣṇâjini (thinks).

9. If it be said that on account of conduct (the assumption of residual Karma is not necessary for a rebirth on earth), (we say) not so, (for the word 'conduct' is used) to denote indirectly (the remaining Karma). So (thinks) Kârṣṇâjini.

In the text cited (Ch. 5. 10. 7) the Śruti says those of 'good conduct' get a good birth. Now conduct is one thing, and residual Karma quite another thing, even according to the Śruti (*Vide* Br 4. 4. 5). Since the Śruti does not mention residual Karma, the soul is not born with any Karma, conduct alone being the

cause of good birth. This is the main objection. This the Sûtra refutes and says that 'conduct' here is used to denote good Karma. It is a case of Ajahat Lakṣaṇâ, conduct standing for Karma which is dependent on good conduct. This is the view of the sage Kârṣṇâjini.

आनर्थक्यमिति चेत्, न, तदपेक्षत्वात् ॥ १० ॥

आनर्थक्यम् Irrelevancy इति चेत् if it be said न not so तदपेक्षत्वात् on account of dependence on that.

10. If it be said (by such interpretation of the word 'conduct' good conduct would become) purposeless, (we say) not so, on account of (Karma) being dependent on that (good conduct).

An objection is raised that if the word 'conduct' be interpreted indirectly to mean 'residual Karma', leaving its direct meaning, then good conduct would be purposeless in man's life, as it has no result of its own, not being a cause of the quality of the new birth. The Sûtra denies this on the ground that only those who are of good conduct are expected to perform Vedic sacrifices. "Him who is devoid of good conduct the Vedas do not purify." Thus good conduct is an aid to Karma and therefore has a purpose. So it is the view of Kârṣṇâjini that it is Karma and not conduct that is the cause of the new birth.

सुकृतदुष्कृते एवेति तु बादरिः ॥ ११ ॥

सुकृतदुष्कृते Good and evil work एव merely इति thus तु but बादरिः Bâdari.

11. But (conduct) is merely good and evil work; thus (the sage) Bâdari (thinks).

This Sûtra says that as a matter of fact there is no difference between conduct and Karma in common parlance, for people say of a person who performs sacrifices etc. "That man practises righteousness," showing thereby that 'conduct' is used in the general sense of action. Thus 'men of good conduct' means those whose actions (Karma) are praiseworthy.

Therefore it is settled that those who go to heaven performing sacrifices have residual Karma as the cause of a new birth on earth.

Topic 3: The fate after death of those souls whose actions do not entitle them to go to the lunar world:

अनिष्टादिकारिणामपि च श्रुतम् ॥ १२ ॥

अनिष्टादिकारिणाम् Of those who do not perform sacrifices etc. अपि even च also श्रुतम् is declared by the Śruti.

12. The Śruti declares (the going to the lunar world etc.) also of even those who do not perform sacrifices etc.

Now the question of those who do not perform sacrifices etc. is taken up for discussion. The opponent holds that even they go to heaven, though they may not enjoy there like the performers of sacrifices etc., because they too require the fifth oblation for a new birth, and also because the scriptures directly say that *all* go

to heaven: "All who depart from this world go to the moon" (Kau. 1. 2).

संयमने त्वनुभूयेतरेषामारोहावरोहौ, तद्गति-
दर्शनात् ॥ १३ ॥

संयमने In the abode of Yama तु but अनुभूय having experienced इतरेषाम् of others (than the performers of sacrifices etc.) आरोहावरोहौ the ascent and descent तद्गति-दर्शनात् such a passage being declared by the Śruti.

13. But of others (i.e. those who have not performed sacrifices etc.) the ascent is to the abode of Yama, and after having experienced (the result of their evil works) the descent (to the earth again takes place). On account of such a passage (for the evil-doer) being declared by the Śruti.

This Sûtra refutes the view of the last Sûtra and says that evil-doers go not to heaven, but to the world of Yama, where they suffer and then descend again to earth. "The hereafter never rises before an ignorant person... thus he falls again and again under my sway" (Ka. 1. 2. 6). The ascent to the moon is only for the enjoyment of the fruits of good works and not for any other purpose; so the evil-doers do not go there.

स्मरन्ति च ॥ १४ ॥

स्मरन्ति The Smṛtis declare च also.

14. The Smṛtis also declare (thus).

Manu and others say that the evil-doers go to hell and suffer there.

अपि च सप्त ॥ १५ ॥

अपि च Moreover सप्त seven.

15. Moreover there are seven (hells).

There are seven hells mentioned in the Purāṇas, to which the evil-doers are cast to expiate their sins through suffering.

तत्रापि च तद्व्यापारादविरोधः ॥ १६ ॥

तत्र There अपि even च and तत्-व्यापारात् on account of his control अविरोधः there is no contradiction.

16. And on account of his (Yama's) control even there (in those hells), there is no contradiction.

An objection is raised that since according to the Śruti the evil-doers suffer at the hands of Yama how is this possible in the hell called Raurava, where Citragupta is the presiding deity. The Sūtra says that there is no contradiction, as Citragupta is directed by Yama.

विद्याकर्मणोरिति तु प्रकृतत्वात् ॥ १७ ॥

विद्याकर्मणोः Of knowledge and work इति thus तु but

प्रकृतत्वात् on account of their being the subject under discussion.

17. But (the reference is to the two roads) of knowledge and work; thus (we have to understand) on account of their being the subject under discussion.

“Now those who go along neither of these ways become those tiny, continually rotating creatures of which it may be said, ‘Be born and die’. This is the third place. That is why that world (heaven) never becomes full” (Ch. 5. 10. 8). The two ways mentioned in this text we have to take as referring to those of knowledge and work, on account of these being the subject under discussion. Knowledge and work are the means to go along the Devayāna and Pitṛyāna routes. For those who are not entitled to go through knowledge along the Devayāna, the route leading to the gods, or through sacrifices etc. to the Pitṛyāna, the route leading to the fathers, the Śruti declares a third place, distinct from the Brahmaloṇa and the Candraloṇa. That the evil-doers, who form a separate group, go to this third place, and not to heaven, is made all the more explicit by the words, “That is why that world (heaven) never becomes full” (Ch. 5. 10. 8). The word ‘but’ refutes a possible doubt arising from a text belonging to another Śākhā vide Kau. 1. 2. So the Kauṣītakī text which says that all go to the spheres of the moon, means all those who have performed good Karma of whatever kind, and does not include evil-doers.

न तृतीये, तथोपलब्धेः ॥ १८ ॥

न Not तृतीये in the third तथा so उपलब्धे: it being seen.

18. (The specification about five oblations does) not (apply) to the third (place), for so it is seen (from the scriptures).

It has been said in Ch. 5. 3. 3, which is quoted in the first Sûtra of this section, that the Jîva attains a new birth after five oblations. So at least for getting a new body the evil-doer will have to go to the moon, to complete the five oblations that cause the new birth. This Sûtra says that the rule about the five oblations does not apply in the case of evil-doers, for they are born irrespective of the oblations, because the Śruti says, "Be born and die." This is the third place." That rule applies only to the performers of sacrifices etc.

स्मर्यतेऽपि च लोके ॥ १९ ॥

स्मर्यते Are recorded अपि also च and लोके in the world.

19. And moreover (cases of birth without the completion of the five oblations) are recorded in the world.

A further argument is given to show that the five oblations are not absolutely necessary for a future birth, and hence the evil-doers need not go to heaven just for conforming to this rule. For in cases like that of Droṇa, who had no mother, and of Dhṛṣṭadyumna, who had neither father nor mother, the last two obla-

tions respectively were absent. Hence the rule about the five oblations is not universal, but applies only to those who perform sacrifices.

दर्शनाच्च ॥ २० ॥

दर्शनात् On account of observation च also.

20. Also on account of observation.

That this rule about the five oblations is not universal is also seen from the fact that of the four kinds of life, viviparous, oviparous, life springing from moisture, and plant life, the last two are born without any mating and consequently there is not the fifth oblation in their case.

तृतीयशब्दावरोधः संशोकजस्य ॥ २१ ॥

तृतीय-शब्द-अवरोधः Inclusion in the third term संशोकजस्य of that which springs from moisture.

21. The third term (*i.e.* plant life) includes that which springs from moisture.

There are four kinds of organic beings as described in the last Sûtra. But the Chândogya Upaniṣad 6. 3. 1 mentions only three kinds. This Sûtra says that it makes no difference for that which springs from moisture is included in plant life (Udbhid), since they both germinate, one from the earth and the other from water etc.

Hence it is a settled fact that the evil-doers do not go to heaven but only those who perform sacrifices.

Topic 4: The soul in its descent from the moon does not become identified with ether etc. but attains similarity of nature.

तत्साभाव्यापत्तिः, उपपत्तेः ॥ २२ ॥

तत्-साभाव्य-आपत्तिः Attainment of a similarity of nature with them उपपत्तेः being reasonable.

22. (The soul when descending from Candraloka) attains similarity of nature with them (i.e. with ether, air, etc.), (that alone) being reasonable.

It has been said that the righteous who descend from the moon descend by the same path as they ascended by, but with some differences. "They return again that way as they came by, to the ether, from the ether to the air; the sacrificer having become air, becomes smoke," etc. (Ch. 5. 10. 5). Now the question is whether the souls of such persons actually attain identity with ether, smoke, etc., or only attain a similar nature. The Sûtra says that the souls do not attain identity with them, for it is impossible. A thing cannot become another of a different nature. What the text means, therefore, is that it attains similarity of nature—becomes like ether, air, etc. The soul assumes a subtle form like ether, comes under the influence of air and is connected with smoke, etc. Therefore similarity of nature and not identity is meant.

Topic 5: The entire descent of the soul takes only a short time.

नातिचिरेण, विशेषात् ॥ २३ ॥

न Not अतिचिरेण in very long time विशेषात् on account of the special declaration.

23. (The soul's descent from the moon through the various stages up to the earth takes) not very long time, on account of a special declaration (of the Śrutis with respect to the stages after that as taking time).

The question is raised whether the descending soul, when it attains similarity of nature with ether, air, etc., remains in those stages pretty long, or attains the next stages quickly one after another. This Sûtra says that it passes through them quickly. "Then he is born as rice and corn, herbs and trees, sesamum and beans. From thence the escape is beset with many more difficulties" (Ch. 5. 10. 6). Thus the stages after coming down on earth through rain the Śruti particularly characterizes as hard to escape from, thereby hinting that the escape from the earlier stages is easy and attained quickly.

Topic 6: When the souls enter into plants etc. they only get connected with them and do not participate in their life.

अन्याधिष्ठिते पूर्ववत्, अभिलापात् ॥ २४ ॥

अन्य-अधिष्ठिते Into what is ruled by another पूर्ववत् as in the previous cases अभिलापात् for so the Śruti states.

24. (The descending soul enters) into what is ruled by another (Jîva or soul) as in the previous

cases (*viz* becoming ether etc.); for so the Śruti states.

A view is put forward that the soul's passage through the stages of corn etc. is not a mere connection with them, as the earlier stages with ether etc., but that it is actually born in the form of corn etc. For the Śruti says, "Then he is *born* as rice" etc. (Ch. 5. 10. 6). It also seems reasonable that those who fall from heaven after having exhausted their good deeds should be born as herbs, plants, etc., owing to their bad Karma such as the killing of animals that remains.

So the word 'born' is to be taken literally. The Sūtra refutes this view and says that the word 'born' implies mere connection with corn, herbs, etc., which are animated by other souls actually born as such. For in these stages there is no reference to their Karma, even as in the earlier stages of ether etc. They enter these plants etc. independently of their Karma, and while there, they do not experience the fruits at all. Where birth in the primary sense takes place and experience of the fruits of action begins, it is made clear by a reference to Karma, as in, "Those whose conduct has been good will quickly attain a good birth" (Ch. 5. 10. 7). Therefore the descending souls only dwell, as it were, in plants etc. animated by other souls till they get the opportunity for a new birth.

अशुद्धमिति चेत्, न, शब्दात् ॥ २५ ॥

अशुद्धम् Unholy इति चेत् if it be said न not so शब्दात् on account of scriptural authority.

25. If it be said (that sacrifices, which entail the killing of animals etc.) are unholy, (we say) not so, on account of scriptural authority.

This Sūtra refutes the point raised by the opponent in the previous Sūtra that the descending soul is enveloped by its bad Karma such as the killing of animals in sacrifices and so is born as herbs etc. The killing of animals etc. in sacrifices does not entail any bad Karma for the person, for it is sanctioned by the scriptures.

रेतःसिग्योगोऽथ ॥ २६ ॥

रेतः-सिक्-योगः Connection with one who performs the act of generation अथ then.

26. Then (the soul gets) connected with him who performs the act of generation.

"For whoever eats food and performs the act of generation, (the soul) becomes one with him" (Ch. 5. 10. 6). Here the soul's becoming literally identical with the person is impossible, and we have to understand that it gets connected with him. This further proves that the soul's becoming plants etc. in the immediately preceding stages is also mere connection with them and not actual birth as such.

योनेः शरीरम् ॥ २७ ॥

योनेः From the womb शरीरम् body.

27. From the womb a (new) body (results).

Finally the actual birth of the soul is referred to in this Sûtra. Till now it was only a connection with the successive stages, but now through its connection with a person performing the act of generation the soul enters the woman and there gets a new body fit for experiencing the results of its past residual Karma.

CHAPTER III

SECTION II

In the last section the passage of the soul to different spheres and its return have been explained. There are people who get disgusted with Karma or sacrifices leading to such a fate of the soul and become dispassionate. In order to make them grasp the true import of the Mahâvâkyas or the great Vedic dicta, this section sets itself to elucidate the true nature of 'That' and 'thou' contained in the Mahâvâkya, "That thou art". In the last section the waking state of the soul (the 'thou') has been fully described. Now its dream state is taken up for discussion, to show that the soul is self-luminous. In this way the three states of the soul, viz waking, dream, and deep sleep, will be shown to be merely illusory, and thus the consequent identity of the Jîva and Brahman will be established.

Topic 1: The soul in the dream state.

संध्ये सृष्टिराह हि ॥ १ ॥

संध्ये In the intermediate stage (between waking and deep-sleep, i.e. in the dream state) सृष्टिः (there is real) creation आह (Śruti) says so हि because.

1. In the intermediate stage (between waking and deep-sleep, there is a real) creation, because (the Śruti) says so.

The question is raised whether the creation which one experiences in the dream state is as real as this world of ours, or merely Mâyâ, false, as compared with this waking world. This Sûtra, which gives the view of the opponent, holds that it is just as real, for the Śruti declares, "There are no chariots, nor horses to be yoked to them, nor roads there, but he himself creates the chariots, horses, and roads. For he is the agent" (Br. 4. 3. 10). Moreover, we do not find any difference between the experience of the waking state and that of the dream state. A meal taken in dream has the effect of giving satisfaction even as in the waking state. Therefore the creation of the dream state is real and springs from the Lord Himself, even as He creates ether etc.

निर्मातारं चैके, पुत्रादयश्च ॥ २ ॥

निर्मातारं Creator च and एके some (the followers of particular Śākhâs of the Vedas) पुत्रादयः sons etc. च and.

2. And some (Śākhâs or recensions) (state the Self or the Supreme Lord to be) the creator (of objects of desires while we are asleep) and (objects of desires there stand for) sons etc.

A further argument is given by the opponent that the creation even in dreams is by the Lord Himself. "He who is awake in us shaping objects of desire while we are asleep... that is Brahman" (Ka. 2. 5. 8). Sons etc. are the objects of desire that He creates. So, as in the case of the waking state, even in dreams the Lord

Himself creates, and hence the world of dreams is also real. Therefore the dream world is not false but real like this Vyâvahârîka (phenomenal) world of ours.

मायामात्रं तु, कात्स्न्येनानभिव्यक्तस्वरूपत्वात् ॥ ३ ॥

मायामात्रं Mere illusion तु but कात्स्न्येन *in toto* अनभिव्यक्तस्वरूपत्वात् on account of its nature not being manifest.

3. But (the dream world is) mere illusion, on account of its nature not being manifest with the totality (of attributes of the waking state).

'But' discards the view expressed by the two previous Sûtras. The nature of the dream world does not agree *in toto* with that of the waking world with respect to time, place, cause, and non-contradiction, and as such that world is not real like the waking world. There can be no appropriate time, place or cause in the dream state. Inside the body, there is not enough space for objects like chariots, horses, etc., and in a dream the soul does not leave the body; for if it did, then one who dreams of having gone to America would find himself there on waking while he went to sleep in India. Nor is the midnight proper time for an eclipse of the sun seen in a dream, nor can we conceive a child's getting children in a dream to be real. Moreover, even in dreams we see objects seen being transformed, as for example, when we see a tree turn into a mountain. "He himself creates the chariots etc." (Br. 4. 3. 10), only means that objects which have no reality appear to exist in dreams just as silver does in a mother-of-pearl.

The argument that the dream world is real because it is also a creation of the Supreme Lord, like this waking world, is not true, for the dream world is not the creation of the Lord but of the individual soul. "When he dreams... himself puts the body aside and himself creates (a dream body in its place)" (Br. 4. 3. 9). This text clearly proves that it is the Jīva that creates in dreams and not the Lord.

सूचकश्च हि श्रुतेः, आचक्षते च तद्विदः ॥ ४ ॥

सूचकः Omen च but हि for श्रुतेः from the Śruti आचक्षते say च also तद्विदः experts in dream-reading.

4. But (though the dream-world is an illusion) yet it serves as an omen, for (so we find) in the Śruti, (and) expert dream-readers also say (thus).

Lest it be thought that because the dream-world is an illusion, even the results indicated by dreams are to be so regarded, this Sūtra says that these dreams are yet capable of forecasting events or good and bad fortune. The thing indicated by these dreams is real, though the dreams themselves are unreal, even as the appearance of silver in a mother-of-pearl, though false, produces joy in us, which is real. The Śruti also says so: "If in this dream he sees a woman, let him know this to be a sign that his sacrifice has succeeded" (Ch. 5. 2. 8).

पराभिध्यानात्तु तिरोहितम्, ततो ह्यस्य
बन्धविपर्ययौ ॥ ५ ॥

पराभिध्यानात् By meditation on the Supreme Lord तु but तिरोहितम् that which is covered (by ignorance) ततः from Him (the Lord) हि for अस्य of the soul बन्ध-विपर्ययौ bondage and its opposite, i.e. freedom.

5. But by meditation on the Supreme Lord, that which is covered (by ignorance, viz the similarity of the Lord and soul, becomes manifest); for from Him (the Lord) are its (the soul's) bondage and freedom.

It has been shown that the dream-world is false. But an objection is raised against it. The individual soul is but a part of the Supreme Soul and therefore shares Its power of knowledge and rulership even as a spark and fire have alike the power of burning. As such it must also be able to create at will like the Lord. This Sūtra refutes it and says that that rulership is covered by ignorance in the Jīva state and gets manifested only when in the state of meditation on the Lord this ignorance is destroyed by the knowledge 'I am Brahman'. "When that god is known all fetters fall off.... From meditating on him there arises, on the dissolution of the body, the third state, that of universal Lordship" (Śv. 1. 11). Till then the Jīva cannot create at will anything real. Moreover, this does not come to man spontaneously, since the bondage and freedom of the individual soul come from the Lord. That is to say, ignorance of His true nature causes bondage, and the knowledge of it results in freedom.

देहयोगाद्वा सोऽपि ॥ ६ ॥

देहयोगात् From its connection with the body वा and सः that (the covering of its rulership) अपि also.

6. And that (the covering of the soul's rulership) also (results) from its connection with the body.

A cause for this covering up of the soul's rulership is given; and that is its connection with the body etc. Because of these limiting adjuncts, the results of nescience, its knowledge and rulership remain hidden, and this lasts so long as it erroneously thinks itself as the body etc. Hence though the soul is not different from the Lord, its powers remain hidden.

Topic 2: The soul in dreamless sleep.

Now the state of deep sleep or Suṣupti is taken up for discussion.

तदभावो नाडीषु, तच्छ्रुतेः, आत्मनि च ॥ ७ ॥

तत्-अभावः Absence of that (dreaming), in other words Suṣupti नाडीषु in the nerves आत्मनि च and in the Self तत्-श्रुतेः as it is known from the Śruti.

7. The absence of that (dreaming, i.e. dreamless sleep takes place) in the nerves and in the Self, as it is known from the Śruti.

In different texts Suṣupti (deep-sleep) is said to take place under different conditions. "And when a man is

asleep... so that he sees no dreams, then he has entered into those nerves (Nâdis)" (Ch. 8. 6. 3); "Through them he moves forth and rests in the pericardium, i.e. in the region of the heart" (Br. 2. 1. 19); "When this being full of consciousness is asleep... lies in the ether i.e. the real Self which is in the heart" (Br. 2. 1. 17). Now the question arises whether Suṣupti takes place in any one of these places, i.e. whether these are to be taken as alternatives or whether they are to be taken as standing in mutual relation so as to refer to one place only. The opponent holds that as all the words standing for the places enumerated are in the same case, viz the locative case, in the texts, they are co-ordinate and therefore alternatives. If mutual relation was meant, then different case-endings would be used by the Śruti. This Sūtra says that they are to be taken as standing in mutual relation denoting the same place.

There is no alternative here, for by allowing option between two Vedic statements we lessen the authority of the Veda, since the adoption of either alternative sublates for the time being the authority of the other alternative. Moreover, the same case is used where things serve different purposes and have to be combined, as, for example, when we say, "He sleeps in the palace, he sleeps on a couch," where we have to combine the two locatives into one as "He sleeps on a couch in the palace." Similarly here the different texts have to be combined, meaning that the soul goes through the nerves to the region of the heart and there rests in Brahman.

It may be questioned why, then, in deep-sleep we do not experience the relation of supporter and that which

is supported with respect to Brahman and the Jīva. It is because the individual soul covered with ignorance is lost in Brahman even as a pot of water in a lake and so has no separate existence. "He becomes united with the True, he is gone to his own (Self)" (Ch. 6. 8. 1). Moreover, in the following text the three places are mentioned together, "In these the person is when sleeping he sees no dreams. Then he becomes one with the Prāṇa (Brahman) alone" (Kau. 4. 19). Hence Brahman is the soul's place of rest in deep-sleep.

अतः प्रबोधोऽस्मात् ॥ ८ ॥

अतः Hence प्रबोधः awakening अस्मात् from this.

8. Hence the awakening from this (i.e. Brahman).

"In the same manner, my son, all these creatures, when they have come back from the True, know not that they have come back from the True" (Ch. 6. 10. 2). In this text the Śruti states that when the Jīva returns after deep-sleep to the waking state, it returns from the True or Brahman, thereby showing that in Suṣupti Jīva is merged in Brahman and not in the nerves Hitā etc. But as it is covered by ignorance it does not realize its identity with Brahman in Suṣupti.

Topic 3: The selfsame soul returns from Suṣupti.

स एव तु, कर्मानुस्मृति-शब्दविधिभ्यः ॥ ९ ॥

स एव The selfsame soul तु but कर्म-अनुस्मृति-शब्द-विधिभ्यः on account of Karma, memory, scriptural authority and precept.

9. But the selfsame soul (returns from Brahman after Suṣupti on account of work, memory, scriptural authority, and precept.

A question is raised here that just as when a drop of water has merged in the ocean it is difficult to pick it out again, so also when the Jīva has merged in Brahman it is difficult to say that the selfsame Jīva arises from It after Suṣupti. So we have to take that some soul arises after Suṣupti from Brahman. There can be no rule that the same soul arises from It. The Sūtra refutes this and says that the selfsame soul comes back after Suṣupti for the following reasons: (1) What has been partly done by a person before going to sleep, we find him finishing after he wakes up. If it were not the same soul, then the latter would have no interest in finishing what has been partly done by another. (2) From our experience of identity of personality before and after sleep. (3) From our memory of past events. (4) From scriptural authority as in texts like, "Whatever these creatures are here, whether a tiger, or a lion, or a wolf, or a boar... that they become again" (Ch. 6. 9. 3), we find that the selfsame soul returns from Brahman after Suṣupti. (5) If the person who goes to sleep and he who rises after it be different, then scriptural precepts either as regards work or knowledge would be meaningless. For if a person can attain identity for ever with Brahman by merely going to sleep, then scriptural instruction would be useless to attain liberation.

Therefore it is the selfsame soul that rises from Brahman after Suṣupti. The case of the drop of water

is not quite analogous, for a drop of water merges in the ocean without any adjuncts and so is lost for ever; but the Jīva merges in Brahman with its adjuncts. So the identical Jīva rises again from Brahman owing to its Karma and ignorance, which do not allow it to be lost in Brahman irrevocably.

Topic 4: The nature of a swoon.

मुग्धेऽर्धसंपत्तिः, परिशेषात् ॥ १० ॥

मुग्धे In a swoon अर्धसंपत्तिः partial attainment of the state of deep-sleep परिशेषात् as the only alternative left.

10. In a swoon (there is the) partial attainment of the state of deep-sleep, as that is the only alternative left.

The question of swoon is taken up for discussion. There are only three states of a soul while living in the body—waking, dream, and deep-sleep. Its fourth state is death. The condition of swoon cannot come in as a fifth state, as no such state is known. So what is it? Is it a separate state of the soul, or is it but one of these states? It cannot be waking or dream, for there is no consciousness or experience of anything. It is not deep-sleep, for that gives happiness, which swoon does not. Nor is it death, for the soul returns to life. So the only alternative left is that in a swoon the soul partially attains the state of deep-sleep, inasmuch as there is no consciousness in that state and it returns to life, and partially that of death, as is seen from the soul's experience of misery and pain in that state resulting in distorted face and limbs. It is a separate state, though it happens occasionally, and the reason why it is not con-

sidered a fifth state is because it is a mixture of the other two states.

Topic 5: The nature of the Supreme Brahman.

The preceding four topics deal with the nature of 'thou' or the apparent self. By proving that the creation in dreams is false, it has been shown that though the Jīva appears apparently to enjoy happiness and misery, yet in reality it is unattached. By its mergence in Brahman in deep-sleep that detachment has been firmly established. By saying that the selfsame Jīva returns from sleep the doubt as to its non-permanency has been refuted. By a reference to swoon it has been explained that though all expressions of life are extinct in that state still the Jīva is there, and hence one can be sure that even after death the soul continues to exist. Thus it has been shown that the soul is self-luminous, of the nature of consciousness, having pleasure in itself only, and beyond the various states. Having described the nature of 'thou', the nature of 'That' is taken up for discussion in the succeeding Sūtras.

न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गम्, सर्वत्र हि ॥ ११ ॥

न Not स्थानतः from (difference of) place अपि even परस्य of Brahman उभयलिङ्गम् twofold characteristic हि because सर्वत्र throughout (the scriptures teach otherwise).

11. Even from (difference of) place a twofold characteristic cannot (be predicated) of Brahman, because throughout (the scriptures teach It to be otherwise i.e. without any qualities).

In the scriptures we find two kinds of description about Brahman. Some texts describe It as qualified and some as unqualified. "From whom all activities, all desires, all odours, and all tastes proceed" (Ch. 3. 14. 2) speak of attributes; again "It is neither gross nor minute, neither short nor long, neither redness nor moisture" etc. (Br. 3. 8. 8). Are we to take that both are true of Brahman according as It is or is not connected with adjuncts, or have we to take only one of them as true and the other as false, and if so, which, and on what grounds? The Sûtra says that both cannot be predicated of one and the same Brahman, for it is against experience. One and the same thing cannot have two contradictory natures at the same time. Nor does the mere connection of a thing with another change its nature, even as the redness of a flower reflected in a crystal does not change the nature of the crystal, which is colourless. The imputation of redness is due to ignorance and not real. Neither can a thing change its real nature: it means destruction. Even so in the case of Brahman. Its connection with adjuncts like earth etc. is a product of nescience. Hence between the two aspects of Brahman we have to accept that which is attributeless as Its true nature, for throughout the scriptures we find Brahman so described to the exclusion of Its qualified aspects. "It is without sound, without touch, form, and decay" etc. (Ka. 1. 3. 15). The other description of Brahman is only for the sake of Upâsanâ and is not Its real nature.

न भेदादिति चेत्, न, प्रत्येकमतद्वचनात् ॥ १२ ॥

न Not so भेदात् on account of difference (being

taught in the scriptures) इति चेत् if it be said न not so प्रत्येकम् with respect to each अतद्वचनात् because of the declaration of the opposite of that.

12. If it be said (that it is) not so on account of difference (being taught in the scriptures), (we reply) not so, because with respect to each (such form) the Śruti declares the opposite of that.

We find that the scripture declares Brahman as having different forms in different Vidyâs or meditations. In some It is described as having four feet, in some as of sixteen digits (Kalâs) or again as having for Its body the three worlds and being called Vaiśvânara, and so on. So we have to understand on scriptural authority that Brahman is also qualified. This Sûtra refutes it and says that every such form due to Upâdhi is denied of Brahman in texts like, "The shining, immortal being who is in this earth, and the shining, immortal, corporeal being in the body are but the Self" (Br. 2. 5. 1). Such texts show that in all Upâdhis like earth etc. the same Self is present, and hence there is only non-difference, oneness. It is not true that the Vedas inculcate the connection of Brahman with various forms. With regard to what we take as different, the Śruti explains at every instance that the form is not true, and that in reality there is only one formless principle.

अपि चैवमेके ॥ १३ ॥

अपि च Moreover एवम् thus एके some.

13. Moreover some (teach) thus.

Some Śākhas (recensions) of the Vedas directly teach that the manifoldness is not true, by passing strictures on those who see difference. "He goes from death to death, who sees difference, as it were, in It" (Ka. 1. 4. 11) also Br. 4. 4. 19.

अरूपवदेव हि, तत्प्रधानत्वात् ॥ १४ ॥

अरूपवत् Formless एव only हि verily तत्-प्रधानत्वात् on account of that being the main purport.

14. Verily Brahman is only formless on account of that being the main purport (of all texts about Brahman).

Brahman is only formless for all the texts that aim at teaching Brahman describe It as formless. If Brahman be understood to have a form, then texts which describe It as formless would become purportless, and such a contingency with respect to the scriptures is unimaginable, for the scriptures throughout have a purport. On the other hand, texts dealing with qualified Brahman seek not to establish It, but rather to enjoin meditations on Brahman. Therefore Brahman is formless.

प्रकाशवच्चावैयर्थ्यात् ॥ १५ ॥

प्रकाशवत् Like light च and अवैयर्थ्यात् not being purportless.

15. And like light (taking form in connection

with bodies having form, Brahman takes form in connection with Upâdhis), because (texts ascribing form to Brahman) are not purportless.

If Brahman is formless, what about the texts which describe It as having form? Are they superfluous? If Brahman is without form then all Upâsanâs of the Brahman with form would be futile, for how can the worship of such a false Brahman lead to Brahmaloka and other spheres? This Sûtra explains that they are not without a purpose. Just as light, which has no form, appears to be great or small according to the aperture through which it enters a room and yet has the virtue of removing the darkness in the room, even so the formless Brahman appears to have a form, as being limited by adjuncts like earth etc.; and the worship of such an illusory Brahman can help one to attain Brahmaloka etc., which are also illusory from the absolute standpoint. Hence these texts are not altogether purportless. This, however, does not contradict the position already established, viz that Brahman, though connected with limiting adjuncts, is not dual in character, because the effects of these cannot constitute attributes of a substance, and moreover these limiting adjuncts are all due to Nescience.

आह च तन्मात्रम् ॥ १६ ॥

आह Declares च and तत्-मात्रम् that (i.e. intelligence) only.

16. And (the scripture) declares (that Brahman is) that (i.e. intelligence) only.

Now what is the nature of that formless Brahman? "As a lump of salt is without interior or exterior, entire, and purely salt in taste, even so is the Self without interior or exterior, entire, and Pure Intelligence alone" (Br. 4. 5. 13). It is mere intelligence, self-effulgent, homogenous, and without attributes.

दर्शयति च, अथो अपि स्मर्यते ॥ १७ ॥

दर्शयति (Scripture) shows च also अथो thus अपि also स्मर्यते (it is) stated by the Smṛtis.

17. (The scripture) also shows (this, and) thus also (is it) stated by the Smṛtis.

That Brahman is without any attributes is also proved by the fact that the Śruti teaches about It by denying all characteristics to It. "Now therefore the description (of Brahman): 'Not this, not this.' Because there is no other and more appropriate description than this 'Not this'" (Br. 2. 3. 6). If Brahman had form, then it would be established by such texts, and there would be no necessity to deny everything and say 'Not this, not this'. So also the Smṛtis teach about Brahman: "The Highest Brahman without either beginning or end, which cannot be said either to be or not to be" (Gîtâ 13. 12); "It is unmanifest, unthinkable, and without modification, thus is It spoken of" (Gîtâ 2. 25).

अतएव चोपमा सूर्यकादिवत् ॥ १८ ॥

अतएव Therefore च also उपमा comparison सूर्यकादिवत् like the images of the sun etc.

18. Therefore also (with respect to Brahman we have) comparisons like the images of the sun etc.

That Brahman is formless is further established from the similes used with respect to it. Since this Brahman is mere intelligence, homogeneous, and formless, and everything else is denied in It, therefore we find that the scriptures explain the fact of Its having forms by saying that they are like reflections in water of the one sun, meaning thereby that these forms are unreal, being due only to limiting adjuncts.

अम्बुवदग्रहणात् तु न तथात्वम् ॥ १९ ॥

अम्बुवत् Like water अग्रहणात् not being experienced तु but न no तथात्वम् similarity.

19. But (there is) no similarity (in the case of Brahman, any second thing) not being experienced like water.

An objection is raised that the comparison of the last Sûtra is not correct. In the case of the sun, which has a form, water, which is different and at a distance from it, catches its image but Brahman is formless and all-pervading, and there can be nothing else different and at a distance from It, to serve as an Upâdhi, that can catch Its reflection. So the comparison is defective.

वृद्धिहासभाक्त्वमन्तर्भावात्, उभयसामञ्जस्यादेवम् ॥ २० ॥

वृद्धि-हास-भाक्त्वम् Participating in the increase and

decrease अन्तर्भावात् on account of its being inside उभय-
सामञ्जस्यात् on account of the similarity in the two cases
एवम् thus.

20. On account of Brahman being inside (Its adjuncts) (It appears) to participate in their increase and decrease. On account of this similarity in the two cases (mentioned in Sûtra 18) it is thus (*i.e.* the comparison is not defective).

The comparison with the reflection of the sun is to be taken not on all fours but only with respect to a particular feature. Just as the reflected sun is distorted, trembles, or varies in size as the water shakes, expands, or contracts, while the real sun remains unchanged; so also Brahman participates, as it were, in the attributes of the Upâdhis; it grows with them, decreases with them, suffers with them, and so on, but not in reality. Hence on account of this similarity in the two cases the comparison is not defective.

दर्शनाच्च ॥ २१ ॥

दर्शनात् On account of scriptural instruction च and.

21. And on account of scriptural instruction.

The scripture also teaches that Brahman enters into the body and other limiting adjuncts. "He made bodies with two feet and bodies with four feet. That Supreme Being first entered the bodies as a bird. He on account of his dwelling in all bodies is called the Puruṣa" (Br. 2. 5. 18). Thus also the comparison in Sûtra 18 is not defective.

Therefore it is established that Brahman is formless, of the nature of intelligence, and homogenous—without any difference.

Topic 6: 'Not this, not this' in Br. 2.3.6 denies the gross and subtle forms of Brahman given in Br. 2.3.1 and not Brahman Itself.

प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति, ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः ॥ २२ ॥

प्रकृत-एतावत्त्वं What has been mentioned up to this प्रतिषेधति denies ततः than that भूयः something more ब्रवीति says च and.

22. What has been mentioned up to this is denied (by the words 'Not this, not this'), and (the Śruti) says something more than that (afterwards).

"Brahman has but two forms—gross and subtle, mortal and immortal, limited and unlimited, Sat (defined) and Tyat (undefined)" (Br. 2. 3. 1). Thus describing the two forms of Brahman, the gross, consisting of earth, water, and fire, and the subtle, consisting of air and ether, the Śruti says finally, "Now therefore the description (of Brahman): 'Not this, not this' etc. (Br. 2. 3. 6). Now the question is whether the double denial in 'Not this, not this' negates both the world and Brahman, or only one of them. The opponent holds that both are denied, and consequently Brahman, which is false, cannot be the substratum for a world, which is also false. In other words, it leads us to Sûnyavâda, the theory of Void. If one only is denied it is proper that Brahman is denied, for It is not

seen and therefore Its existence is doubtful, and not the world, since we experience it. The Sûtra refutes this view and says that what has been described till now, viz the two forms of Brahman, gross and subtle, is denied by the words 'Not this, not this', the double mention of these words of denial applying to the two forms of Brahman. The word 'Iti' refers to what has been mentioned immediately before, i.e. the two forms of Brahman, the subject-matter of the discussion, and therefore cannot refer to Brahman Itself, which is not the main topic of the preceding texts. Moreover, after denying the world the Śruti says something more than that about Brahman, viz 'The Truth of truth' meaning thereby that Brahman alone is the one reality that exists and is the substratum of the world, which is illusory. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that the Śruti, professing to teach about Brahman, will deny it. It is the Truth of truth, i.e. the reality behind 'Sat', or earth, water, and fire, and 'Tyat' or air and ether, the definite and indefinite forms in nature. There is no contradiction to perception in this denial of the world, for it denies only the transcendental reality of the world and not its Vyāvahārika or phenomenal reality, which remains intact. The objection, viz that Brahman is not experienced, and therefore it is Brahman that is denied, is baseless; for the object of the Śruti is to teach about something which is not ordinarily experienced by us; otherwise its teaching would be redundant.

तदव्यक्तम्, आह हि ॥ २३ ॥

तत् That (Brahman) अव्यक्तम् is not manifest आह (so the scripture) says हि for.

23. That (Brahman) is not manifest, for (so the scripture) says.

If Brahman exists, then why is It not perceived? The Śruti says that Brahman is unmanifest on account of our being covered with ignorance. Therefore It is not perceived by us: "He is not apprehended by the eye, nor by the other senses, nor by penance" etc. (Mu. 3. 1. 8).

अपि च संराधने, प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम् ॥ २४ ॥

अपि च And moreover संराधने in perfect meditation (It is experienced) प्रत्यक्ष-अनुमानाभ्याम् from the Śruti and Smṛti.

24. And moreover (Brahman is experienced) in perfect meditation, (as we know) from the Śruti and Smṛti.

If Brahman is not manifest to us, then we can never know It, and therefore there will be no Freedom. This Sûtra says that Brahman is not known only to those whose heart is not purified, but those who are purified realize It in the state of Samādhi when ignorance is destroyed. That this is so is known from the Śruti: "Some wise man, however, with his eyes turned inside and wishing for immortality saw the Self within" (Ka. 2. 4. 1); also Mu. 3. 1. 8. The Smṛti also says the same thing: "He who is seen as Light by the Yogins meditating on Him sleeplessly, with suspended breath, contented minds, and subdued senses" etc.

प्रकाशादिवच्चावैशेष्यं प्रकाशश्च कर्मणि, अभ्यासात् ॥ २५ ॥

प्रकाशादिवत् Like light etc. च and अवैशेष्यं (there is) no difference प्रकाशः Brahman च also कर्मणि in work अभ्यासात् on account of repeated mention (in the Śruti).

25. And as in the case of light etc. there is no difference, (so) also between Brahman (and its manifestation) in activity; on account of the repeated instruction (of the Śruti to that effect).

The nature of the Jīva and Brahman has been described. Now their identity is being explained.

If according to the last Sūtra Brahman is the object of meditation and the Jīva is the meditator, it means that there is duality, and not the unity of Brahman. This Sūtra explains it. Even as between the sun and its reflection in water etc. there is in reality no difference, the image being unreal, so also the one Brahman manifests as many in the limiting adjuncts of activity like meditation etc. Through ignorance the meditating self thinks it is different from Brahman; but in reality it is identical with Brahman. That it is so is known from repeated instruction of the Śruti in texts like, "That thou art", "I am Brahman", which deny difference.

अतो अनन्तेन, तथा हि लिङ्गम् ॥ २६ ॥

अतः Therefore अनन्तेन with the Infinite तथा thus हि for लिङ्गम् (the scripture) indicates.

26. Therefore (the individual soul becomes

one) with the Infinite; for thus (the scripture) indicates.

The Jīva attains identity with Brahman on the dawning of Knowledge, when ignorance with all its limiting adjuncts disappears. "He who knows that Supreme Brahman becomes Brahman Itself" (Mu. 3. 2. 9). If the difference were real, then one could not become Brahman Itself. Knowledge may destroy ignorance, but not what is real. Now, since the Jīva becomes Brahman, its individuality was not real, and hence it was destroyed by Knowledge, leaving only Brahman. So the difference is unreal, the identity real.

उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वहिकुण्डलवत् ॥ २७ ॥

उभयव्यपदेशात् On account of both being taught तु but अहिकुण्डलवत् like that between a serpent and its coils.

27. But on account of both (*i.e.* difference and non-difference) being taught (by the Śruti) (the relation of the Jīva and Brahman is to be taken) like that between a serpent and its coils.

Having established the identity of the Jīva and Brahman, the author proceeds to elucidate it further by examining the theory of difference and non-difference. In the scriptures we find also texts like, "Two birds of beautiful plumage" etc. (Mu. 3. 1. 1), which speak of difference between the Jīva and Brahman. So we have to understand that the difference between them prior to Liberation is real, though when it is destroyed by Knowledge they attain identity. Hence we have to take

that their relation is one of difference and non-difference, as between a serpent and its coils. As a snake it is one but if we look at the coils, hood, etc. there is difference. Similarly between the Jîva and Brahman there is difference as well as non-difference.

प्रकाशाश्रयवद्वा, तेजस्त्वात् ॥ २८ ॥

प्रकाश-आश्रयवत् Like light and its substratum वा or तेजस्त्वात् on account of both being luminous.

28. Or like (the relation of) light and its substratum, on account of both being luminous.

Another example is given to establish the theory of difference and non-difference. The relation between the Jîva and Brahman may be taken to be like that between light and its orb. Both being luminous are non-different; yet on account of their varying extensity they are spoken of as different. So is the relation between the Jîva and Brahman one of difference and non-difference, the one being limited and the other all-pervading.

पूर्ववद्वा ॥ २९ ॥

पूर्ववत् As before वा or.

29. Or (the relation between the two, i.e. Jîva and Brahman) is as given before.

Having given in the two previous Sûtras the view of Bhedâbhedavâdins, the upholders of difference and

non-difference, this Sûtra refutes it and establishes as the final truth what has been stated in Sûtra 25, viz that the difference is merely illusory and non-difference is the reality. For if the difference is also real, it can never cease to be, and all the instruction of the Śruti with respect to Liberation will be useless, for bondage is nothing but this idea of separateness, and if this is real, there can be no Liberation at all. But if the difference is due to ignorance, then Knowledge can destroy it and the reality, the non-difference may be realized. So the views given in Sûtra 27 and 28, which later on were developed by Kumârila and Bhâskara, are not correct, and the view given in Sûtra 25 alone is correct.

प्रतिषेधाच्च ॥ ३० ॥

प्रतिषेधात् On account of the denial च and.

30. And on account of the denial.

Form the Śruti texts like, "There is no other witness but He" (Br. 3. 7. 23), which deny that there exists any other intelligent being apart from Brahman, and from the denial of the world by, "Not this, not this", it follows that there is no other entity but Brahman. Therefore there is only one Brahman without any difference whatsoever.

Topic 7: Brahman is one without a second, and expressions which apparently imply something else as existing are only metaphorical.

परमतः सेतून्मानसंबन्धभेदव्यपदेशेभ्यः ॥ ३१ ॥

परम् Greater अतः than this (Brahman) सेतु-उन्मान-संबन्ध-भेद-व्यपदेशेभ्यः on account of terms denoting a bank, measure, connection, and difference.

31. (There is something) superior to this (Brahman), on account of terms denoting a bank, measure, connection, and difference (used with respect to It).

To say that there is nothing except Brahman is objectionable, for we find that there is something besides Brahman on account of its being designated as a bank separating things other than Itself in texts like, "That self is a bank, a boundary" etc. (Ch. 8. 4. 1); as having size and therefore limited in texts like, "That Brahman has four feet" (Ch. 3. 18. 2)—it is well known that whatever is limited is limited by some other object; as being connected with other objects: "The embodied self when embraced by the Supreme Self" (Br. 4. 3. 21), which shows that there is something else than Brahman; and as being different: "The Ātman is to be seen"; thereby hinting a seer and seen. All these show that Brahman is not one without a second.

सामान्यात्तु ॥ ३२ ॥

तु But सामान्यात् on account of similarity.

32. But (Brahman is called a bank) on account of similarity.

'But' refutes the position taken in the previous Sūtra. There can exist nothing different from Brahman. It is

called a bank, not because there exists something beyond It, as in the case of a bank, but on account of a similarity. The similarity is this: Just as a bank keeps back water and marks the boundary of adjacent fields, even so Brahman maintains the world and its boundaries. "Having passed the bank" (Ch. 8. 4. 2) means, having attained Brahman fully and not having crossed it, even as we say he has passed in Grammar, meaning thereby that he has mastered it.

बुद्धयर्थः पादवत् ॥ ३३ ॥

बुद्धयर्थः For the sake of easy comprehension पादवत् just like (four) feet.

33. (Brahman is depicted as having size) for the sake of easy comprehension (*i.e.* Upâsanâ); just like four feet.

The statements as to the size of Brahman, 'Brahman has four feet,' 'It has sixteen digits,' etc. are meant for the sake of Upâsanâ; for it is difficult to comprehend the Infinite, all-pervading Brahman. Just as mind conceived as the personal manifestation of Brahman is imagined to have the organ of speech, nose, eyes, and ears as its four feet, so also Brahman is imagined as having size etc. for the sake of Upâsanâ, but not in reality.

स्थानविशेषात्, प्रकाशादिवत् ॥ ३४ ॥

स्थानविशेषात् On account of special places प्रकाशादिवत् like light etc.

34. (The statements about connection and difference with respect to Brahman) are on account of special places; as in the case of light etc.

The statements regarding difference are made with reference to limiting adjuncts only and not to any difference in Brahman's nature. We speak of light inside a chamber and light outside it, though in reality light is one, the distinction being due to limiting adjuncts. So also all statements about connection are made with reference to the removal of the adjuncts, when connection with the Supreme Self is said to take place metaphorically, even as on the destruction of the chamber the light inside it may be said to be united with light in general.

उपपत्तेश्च ॥ ३५ ॥

उपपत्तेः From reasoning च and.

35. And it is reasonable.

This Sûtra explains further that connection and difference are not to be taken as real, but only metaphorically. The connection of the Jîva with Brahman in deep-sleep cannot be real. "It merges in its Self" (Ch. 6. 8. 1), shows that the connection of the soul with Brahman is a natural, inherent identity, and not as between two things. Similarly the difference referred to is not real, but due to ignorance, as can be gathered from hundreds of texts.

तथान्यप्रतिषेधात् ॥ ३६ ॥

तथा Similarly अन्य-प्रतिषेधात् on account of the express denial of all other things.

36. Similarly on account of the express denial of all other things (there is nothing but Brahman).

A further reason is given to show that there is nothing but Brahman. "The Self is all this" (Ch. 7. 25. 2); "All this is Brahman alone" (Mu. 2. 2. 11) etc. deny the existence of anything else besides Brahman. Therefore Brahman is one without a second.

अनेन सर्वगतत्वमायामशब्दादिभ्यः ॥ ३७ ॥

अनेन By this सर्वगतत्वम् all-pervadingness आयामशब्दादिभ्यः as is known from scriptural statements etc. regarding (Brahman's) extent.

37. By this (is established) the all-pervadingness (of Brahman), as is known from scriptural statements etc. regarding (Brahman's) extent.

This Sûtra explains the all-pervadingness of Brahman which follows from the fact that It is one without a second. By saying that texts describing Brahman as a bank etc. are not to be taken literally, and by denying all other things, it is proved that Brahman is all-pervading. If they were taken literally, then Brahman would be limited and not all-pervading and consequently not eternal. That Brahman is all-pervading is known from