



(b) Sûtram 1, 3, 24—25.

In the Kâthaka-Upanishad (4, 12—13) it is said:

“And in the midst, a thumb-breadth high,

“The Spirit (*purusha*) in the body dwells,

“Lord of the past, and what shall be,

“Therefore no fear approaches him,

“Verily, this is that.”

“The Spirit (*purusha*), but a thumb-breadth high,

“Is as a flame devoid of smoke,

“Lord of the past and what shall be,

“To-morrow even as to-day.

“Verily, this is that.”

Here, says Çaṅkara, where a certain measure is given, it would certainly be simplest to think of the individual soul, of which the Smṛiti, (Mahābh. 3, 16763) relates, that *Yama* (the god of death) “tore it forth, of the length of a thumb, by force from the body” of *Satyavant* (p. 276, 8); however, not it but Brahman is to be understood here, because it is said “the lord of all that was, and is to be,” and also because of the words *etad vai tad* “verily, this is that” [occurring as a refrain, and with the same meaning as the recurring *tat tvam asi* in Chând. VI], that is, this [the world, the soul] is that Brahman, of which thou hast asked me, in the words (Kâth. 2, 14):

“From good and evil free, free from effect and cause,

“From past and future free,—that tell me, what it is.”

The Paramâtman seems here limited, just as limitless space is, when anyone says: “the space in this tube is an ell long” (p. 277, 8); and this, because it is necessary to direct people’s attention to it (p. 278, 1). It is true that the Spirit thumb-breadth high is first of all the individual soul, but it is precisely the aim of the Vedânta to teach this,—on the one side, the being of Brahman, and, on the other, its identity with the individual soul (p. 279, 2). The latter doctrine occurs in the Kâthaka-Upanishad, as is to be seen from its concluding words (6, 17):

“A thumb-breadth high, in every creature’s heart,

“The Spirit ever dwells as inner soul;

“Then from the body draw it forth with care,



"As from the reed bank one draws forth a reed,
 "This know thou as the immortal, as the pure."

(c) Sûtram 1, 2, 24—32.

To the attempt to transform the names and cult of the old Vedic nature-gods into the religion of Brahman, belongs the Doctrine of *Âtman vaiçvânara* in Chândogya-Up. 5, 11—24. —*Vaiçvânarâ* "who dwells in all men" is originally an epithet of *Agni*, but here becomes a name of the all-animating Brahman, and, in conformity with this, in the place of the fire-sacrifice (*agni-hotram*) offered to *Agni* and through him to the gods, stands a sacramental feeding of one's own body, in which Brahman dwells.

Six rich and learned Brahmins are engaged on the question: "What is our soul, what is Brahman?" and go with it to king *Açvapati*, who, when he rises in the morning, can say:

"In all my kingdom not one thief,
 "None covetous, no drunkard dwells,
 "Not one who sacrifice or knowledge shuns,
 "And none who breaks the holy marriage vow."

He begins to teach his guests, who ask him to impart to them the doctrine of *Âtman vaiçvânara*, by asking what they imagine *Âtman* to be. The answers in order are, that *Âtman* is heaven, the sun, the wind, the ether, the water, the earth. After the king has pointed out the insufficiency of these ideas of *Âtman*, since heaven is only its head, the sun its eye, the wind its breath, the ether its body, the water its belly, the earth its feet, he says to all his six pupils: "As individual, as "it were (*prithag iva*), ye all know the *Âtman vaiçvânara*, "and eat your food; but he who knows this *Âtman* thus,—as "a span long,—and adores it as immeasurably great," he eats "food in all worlds, in all beings, in all bodies." Then after

⁷⁷ *Abhivimâna*; as the different attempts at explanation p. 223, 3 shew, the scholiasts themselves no longer knew what this word meant. The above explanation, suggested by the Petersburg Dictionary in accordance with the etymology, is acceptable from the habit of the Upanishads to emphasize the greatness side by side with the smallness of Brahman. Perhaps, as Weber suggests, we should read *ativimâna*. For a different opinion cf. our Upanishads, p. 145 ff.



the above named divisions of nature have further been mentioned as parts of the *Âtman* under mystical names, as also the sacrificial bed, the sacrificial grass, and the three sacrificial fires, there follows an interpretation which substitutes, for the cult of the fire-sacrifice, the feeding of the body as a sacrifice for the *Âtman*; this feeding is divided into five offerings, by which the five vital spirits, and through them the five organs of sense (the fifth is omitted), five pairs of nature-gods and nature-elements, with all that lies under their sovereignty, and lastly the person of the offerer, are satiated. "He who, not "knowing this, offers the fire-sacrifice, with him is it as though "he had raked the coals away, and sacrificed in the ashes; "but he who knowing this thus offers the fire-sacrifice [that "is, the substitute mentioned], he has sacrificed in all worlds, "in all beings, in all bodies. As the pith of a rush, thrown "into the fire, burns away, so burn away all the sins of him, "who, knowing this, consummates the fire-sacrifice. And should "he who knows this give what remains over even to a *Caṇḍāla*, "he [*asya*, by the Commentator less suitably joined to *âtmani* "vaiçvânare] would thereby have offered it in the *Âtman vaiçvânara*. This is said by the verse:

"As hungry children round their mother sit,
"All beings sit around the sacrifice."

It is true, says *Çaṅkara*, that the words *âtman* and *vaiçvânara* have many meanings. *Vaiçvânara* can mean fire, as in *Rigv.* X, 88, 12, or, as in *Rigv.* I, 98, 1, the God of fire, or, as in *Brih.* 5, 9, 1, the fire of digestion in the body; in the same way by *Âtman* can be understood as well the individual as the highest soul (p. 211—212). Here only the latter is to be understood by *Âtman vaiçvânara*, for the reason that to it only can apply the saying that heaven is its head, etc., and at the same time that it is the inner soul (p. 213, 1), and that the sins of him who knows it are burnt away (p. 213, 6); also it only is the subject of the question raised at the beginning (p. 213, 7). The fire-element cannot be thought of, because its being is limited to burning and lighting (p. 217, 4); nor the god of fire, because his power depends on that of the highest God (p. 217, 7). The fire of digestion also, as such,



cannot be meant, on account of the indication that heaven is its head (p. 216, 2), and because in the parallel passage Çatap. Br. 10, 6, 1, 11 the *Âtman vaiçvânara* is termed "the *Purusha* (spirit) in the inward part of the *Purusha* (man)," (p. 216, 6).—Therefore the highest *Âtman* is to be understood here, whether in the quality or under the symbol of the fire of digestion (p. 215, 13. 217, 10), or, with *Jaimini*, directly and without symbols. It is called *Vaiçvânara*, which means the same as *Viçvânara*, like *Râkshasa* and *Rakshas*, *Vâyasa* and *Vayas* (p. 219, 3), because He is common to all men, or all men are common to Him (p. 219, 1), in that He animates all. The Vedânta teachers are not at one as to why it is said to be "a span long;" *Âçmarathya* believes it is to indicate the heart as the place of the perception (p. 219, 11), *Bâdari*, because it is an object of memory for *Manas*, which dwells in the heart a span large (p. 220, 2); *Jaimini*, because it is true of it, that it is a span large, in that Çatap. Br. 10, 6, 1, 10—11 from the point of view of psychology (*adhyâtman*) compares its parts with those of the face, allegorically (p. 221, 1), as, lastly, the *Jâbâlas* (*Jâbâla*-Up. 2, p. 438ff., ed. Bibl. Ind.) give, as the dwelling place where it is enthroned, the point of union between the nose and eyebrows (p. 223, 1).

(d) Sûtram 1, 3, 14—18.

After the esoteric teaching has been put forward in the sixth and seventh parts of *Chândogya*-Up., there follows, at the beginning of the eighth part, a kind of direction for the teacher, as to how he is to help pupils who hold the exoteric standpoint. This is introduced by Çaṅkara in his Commentary on *Chândogya*-Up. with the following words:

"Even though Brahman has been recognised as free from "spatial, temporal and other distinctions, in the sixth and "seventh lectures, by the words: 'Being is it, One only and "'without a Second,' (*Chând.* 6, 2, 1)—'Soul only is all this "'world' (*Chând.* 7, 25, 2), yet the intellect (*buddhi*) of the "slow spirits is such that it perceives Being as affected with "differences of space etc., and cannot be brought immediately "to an intuition of the highest reality. Now as without know-



XI. The Brahman as Cosmic and at the same time Psychic Principle. 159

“ledge of Brahman the goal of man cannot be reached, there-
“fore Brahman, in order to be known, must be spatially
“pointed out in the lotus of the heart. For even if the essence
“of Âtman consists of Being, as it alone is object of the
“perfect knowledge and without attributes, yet, because the
“slow spirits demand that it shall be possessed of attributes,
“it is to be taught with the attributes ‘wishing truth’ etc.
“Further, even if the knowers of Brahman of themselves ab-
“stain from objects of sensual enjoyment, as women etc., yet
“the thirst (*trishnâ*) caused by being addicted to sensuality in
“different births cannot at once be converted, and therefore
“the different means, such as life as Brahman pupils [in a
“condition of chastity] etc., are to be applied. Further: if
“even for those who know the unity of the Âtman, no goer,
“or going, or object to which one goes, exists [cf. above p. 109],
“and on the other hand, after the cause for the persistence
“of a residuum of Ignorance etc. [in them] has been removed,
“liberation is only an entering into one’s own Self, like light-
“ning in atmosphere, or the wind which has risen [cf. Chând.
“8, 12, 2, translated above p. 51], or the fire, when the wood
“is burnt out, yet for those whose understanding is saturated
“with ideas of goer, going etc., and who adore Brahman as
“spatial in the heart, and possessed of attributes, a going to
“Brahman through the carotid artery (*mûrdhanyâ nâdî*) is to
“be taught. To this end serves this eighth part. For a
“Brahman that is free from space, attributes, going, rewards,
“and differences, in the highest sense Being and without a
“second, seems to the slow spirits no more than non-Being.
“Therefore the scripture thinks: let them first find themselves
“on the path of ‘the Existent,’ then I shall gradually bring
“them also to an understanding of ‘the Existent’ in the
“highest sense.”

With these words, in which perhaps more clearly than any-
where else, the motive of the exoteric teaching is disclosed,
Caṅkara goes on to consider the following passage (Chân-
dogya-Up. 8, 1):



The Master speaks:

"Here in this city of Brahman [the body] is a house, a small lotus-flower [the heart]; therein is a small space; what is in this must be investigated, this, verily, should one seek to know."

The Pupil speaks:

"Here in this city of Brahman is a house, a small lotus-flower; therein is a small space; what is then in this, that must be investigated, that one should seek to know?"

The Master speaks:

"Verily, as great as the Universe, so great is this space inwardly in the heart; in it both heaven and earth are included; both fire and wind, both sun and moon, the lightning and the stars, and what is in the world, and what is not in the world [past and future], all that is included therein."

The Pupil speaks:

"If all this is included in the city of Brahman, and all beings and all wishes,—if now old age overtakes it, or corruption, what then remains over from it?"

The Teacher speaks:

"This in us ages not with old age; nor is it reached by weapons; it is the true city of Brahman, in it are the wishes included; that is the Self (the soul), the sinless, free from age, free from death, free from suffering, without hunger and without thirst; its wish is true, true is its resolve."

"For just as mankind here below, as though by command, aim at the goal, that each one strives after, whether it be a kingdom or a field, and only live for that—[thus in striving after heavenly reward, are they also the slaves of their wishes;] and just as here below the enjoyment, which has been won by work, vanishes away, thus also in the Beyond vanishes away the reward that is won by good works."

"Therefore he who departs hence, without having known the soul and those true wishes, in all worlds his part is a life of unfreedom; but he who departs hence, after he has



"known the soul and those true wishes, in all worlds his part
"is a life of freedom."

As the context of this passage shews, the Ignorant is called unfree, because he is dependent on his wishes. In contrast to this heteronomy stands the autonomy of him who knows. He is free, because he knows in himself the Âtman, which embraces the world, and with it the totality of all desires. Therefore, as is stated more fully in the sequel (Chând. 8, 2) the sage possesses and enjoys within himself the fulfilment of every wish. Should he long for intercourse with the departed, with fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, friends, if his senses demand sweet savours and garlands, food and drink, song, music or women,—"whatsoever goal he longs for, whatever he may wish, that arises for him at his wish, and becomes his share, in which he rejoices."

In contrast with the nothingness of all satisfactions brought to men from without, the wishes of him who has become conscious of his "I" as the totality of all Being, are called "true" or "real" (*satya*). In reality this is true of all men, only that, with the exception of those who know, they are not conscious of it, since their true wishes are "covered up" by untruth, that is, by the outer world and the pursuit of it, as is profoundly developed in the sequel.

"These true wishes are covered up by untruth, [in the Ignorant]. They are there, in truth, but untruth covers them over; and when one of his friends departs hence, the man sees him no more. But [it is so in truth, that] all his friends, who are alive here, and those who have departed, and whatever else he longs for and reaches not,—all this he finds when he enters here [into his own heart]; for here his true wishes are, which untruth covered up.—But just as he who knows not the place, finds not a hidden treasure of gold, even though he should walk over it many times, so all these creatures find not this world of Brahman, although they daily enter it [in dreamless sleep]; for by untruth are they forced away.—Truly this Âtman is in the heart! And this is the interpretation of it: *hṛidi ayam* (in the heart is he) therefore it is called *hṛidayam* (the heart). Verily, he



"who knows this, daily enters into the heavenly world.—
 "And what this perfect peace is (*samprasāda*), that rises from
 "this body, ascends to the highest light, and appears in own
 "form; that is the soul,—thus the Master spoke,—that is the
 "immortal, the fearless, that is Brahman."

In what follows, Brahman is explained with reference to the name *Satyam* (the Real) in its etymological meaning, as that which binds the mortal and immortal together; then again as the bridge (the boundary, *setu*) which keeps asunder the two: "The Ātman is the bridge (the boundary), which keeps "these worlds asunder that they may not blend. This bridge "day and night traverse not, nor old age, nor death, nor "sorrow, nor good work, nor evil work, all sins turn back from "it, for sinless is that world of Brahman. Therefore, verily, "he who being blind has crossed over this bridge, regains his "sight, he who is maimed, becomes whole again, he who is "sick, becomes well. Therefore, verily, night, when it passes "this bridge, changes into day, for, once and for all, this "world of Brahman is light."

After this the different obligations of the Brahmans (sacrifice, offerings, the great Soma festival, silence, fasts, life in a hermitage) receive a new etymological interpretation in the sense of the Brahmanvidyā which leads to Brahmāloka and the renunciation (*brahmācāryam* = *strī-vishaya-trishṇā-tyāga*) connected with it, there follows at the end of the section the doctrine, indicated by Ṣaṅkara in the introduction to the section as wholly propaedeutic, of the entering of the soul of him who dies as *Saguna-vid* (knowing exoterically) into Brahman through the carotid artery and the sun, which are united by a sunbeam, as two cities by a road. Of this further in our last part (Chap. XXXIX, 2).

It might be thought, so Ṣaṅkara says in the Commentary to the Brahmasūtras, on this passage, that by the "small "space in the lotus of the heart," space properly so called is to be understood (p. 249, 12), or perhaps the individual soul, because to it belongs the "city of Brahman," that is the body, since it has acquired this body through its works (in an earlier existence), (p. 250, 6), because the heart is commonly held to

be the seat of *Manas*, which is a limitation of it (p. 250, 9), because it is called Qvet. 5, 8 "large as the point of an awl" (p. 250, 10), or because, what is in it is still distinguished from the space, that is, the highest soul is still different from the individual soul (p. 250, 13).—But the natural space is not to be thought of here, because making the space in the heart equivalent to cosmic space would not agree with this (p. 251, 10), and just as little would it suit the individual soul limited by Upâdhis (p. 253, 2). On the contrary everything points to the fact that, by the small space in the heart, the highest soul, and nothing else, should be understood. The description of God as space (ether) is also found elsewhere (p. 258, 11), while it never occurs in the case of the individual soul (p. 258, 13). It is true that God is also called "greater than space" (Çatap. Br. 10, 6, 3, 2), (p. 252, 4), but here it was only intended to accentuate His greatness in the universe in contrast with His smallness in the heart (p. 252, 6). Of Him alone can it rightly be said that he is sinless, without age, death, etc. (p. 252, 9), and the city of Brahman, the body, is, indeed, the dwelling in which he can be perceived (p. 253, 9), in which sense he is called (Prajna 5, 5. Brih. 2, 5, 18) the *purusha puriçaya* (p. 253, 10); with Him only, also, can truly be connected the promises, which, in our passage, are connected with a knowledge of Him (p. 254, 5). But concerning the subtle expression of the Opponent, that it is not the small space, but what is in it, that is enquired about, it is to be remarked that in it are in fact heaven and earth, but that it is not about these, but precisely about the small space that the question is raised (p. 254, 14). To Brahman we are also pointed by the expression, that all beings enter day by day the world of Brahman, to wit, in deep sleep; of whoever is in this condition it is said, even popularly: "he is with Brahman," is *brahmâbhûta*, *brahmatâm gata* (p. 256, 6). The "world of Brahman" is not the world of Brahman the popular god (*Kamalâsana*), but "Brahman as the world," for only of the latter can it be said that it is entered day by day (p. 256, 11). Also the term the bridge, which keeps asunder the world and its content, such as castes, Âçramas, etc., that they may



not blend, suits Brahman only (p. 258, 1). On the other hand, Perfect Peace (*samprasāda*) in our passage means, not the condition of deep sleep, but the individual soul when in that condition, and, thus, entering into the highest Brahman as into its own proper nature (p. 259, 6); but the individual soul, as already remarked, is not to be understood by space (p. 260, 1).

2. Brahman as Joy (*kam*) and as Amplitude (*kham*).

Sûtras 1, 2, 13—17.

Not gloomy asceticism characterises the knower of Brahman, but the joyous hopeful consciousness of unity with God.—This appears to be the fundamental thought of the *Upako-salavidyâ* in Chând. 4, 10—15, which runs as follows:

“Upakosala, the son of Kamala, lived as pupil (*brahma-cârin*) with Satyakâma, the son of Jabâlâ [cf. note 38]. “Twelve years had he tended for him the sacrificial fires; “then he dismissed the other pupils, but him he would not “dismiss. Then his wife said to him: ‘The pupil grieves; he “‘has tended the fires well; look to it, that the fires do not “‘speak to him instead of thee [Comm.: speak evil of thee], “‘teach him the doctrine.’—But he would not teach it to him, “but set out on a journey. Then the pupil fell ill, and would “not eat. Then the teacher’s wife said to him: ‘Eat, pupil; “why eatest thou not?’—But he said: ‘Alas! In men there “‘are so many desires! I am quite full of disease; I care “‘not to eat.’—Then the fires said among themselves: ‘The “‘pupil grieves, yet he has tended us well. Come then! let “‘us teach him the doctrine!’—And they said to him: ‘Brah- “‘man is Life, Brahman is Joy, Brahman is Amplitude.’— “But he said: ‘I know that Brahman is Life; but the Joy “‘and the Amplitude know I not.’—But they said: ‘Verily, “‘the Amplitude is the Joy, and the Joy is the Amplitude.’ “And they explained to him how Brahman was the Life and “wide space.

“Then the fire, that is called *Gârhapatya*, taught him: “‘The earth, fire, food, and the sun [are my forms]. But the



XI. The Brahman as Cosmic and at the same time Psychic Principle. 165

"'man who is seen in the sun, I am he, and he is I.' [Chorus of the Fires:] 'He who, knowing this, worships this [Fire], 'he puts away evil deeds, he becomes world-possessing, he 'comes to full age, he lives long, his race fails not, him help 'we in this world and in the other world, who, knowing this 'fire worships it.'

"Then the second fire, which is called *Anvâhâryapacana*, taught him: 'The water, the regions of the world, the stars 'and the moon [are my forms]. But the man who is seen 'in the moon, I am he, and he is I.' [Chorus of the Fires:] 'He who, knowing this fire worships it,' etc., as before.

"Then the third fire, which is called *Âhavanîya*, taught him: 'Breath, the ether, heaven, the lightning [are my forms]. 'But the man who is seen in the lightning, I am he, and he 'is I.' [Chorus of the Fires:] 'He who, knowing this fire 'worships it' etc., as before.

"And they said to him: 'Now knowest thou, Upakosala, 'dear one, the doctrine about us, and the doctrine about the 'Âtman. But the way to Him will the teacher point out 'to thee.'

"Now, his teacher when he returned, spoke thus to him: 'Upakosala!'—And he answered and said: 'Master!'—But he said: 'Thy face shines, dear one, as the face of one who 'knows Brahman. Who, then, has taught thee?'—And he answered evasively: 'Who should teach me? Of a truth 'these here look as they do, and also differently,' thus he spoke, pointing to the fires.—'What have they said to thee, 'dear one?'—And he answered him: 'Thus and thus.'—Then the teacher said: 'They have only told thee its dwelling- 'places; but I will tell thee its own self; as the water clings 'not to the lotus-petal, so no evil deed clings to him who 'knows this.'—And he said: 'Let the master teach it to me!' And he said to him: 'The man who is seen in the eye, he 'is the Âtman, said he, he is the immortal, the fearless, he 'is Brahman. Therefore also, when grease or water comes 'into the eye, it flows off to the edges. Him they call love's 'treasure, for he is a treasure of what is dear. He is a 'treasure of what is dear, who knows this. He is also called



“the prince of love [literally: the herald of love], for all that
“is dear, he leads; he leads all that is dear, who knows this.
“He is also called the prince of radiance, for he is radiant
“in all worlds; in all worlds is he radiant, who knows this.
“Therefore [when such as these die], whether funeral rites
“are performed or not, they enter into a flame [of the funeral
“fire], from the flame into the day, from the day into the
“light half of the month, from the light half of the month
“into the half-year in which the sun goes northwards, from
“that half-year into the year, from the year into the sun,
“from the sun into the moon, from the moon into the light-
“ning;—there is a man who is not as a human being; he
“leads them in to Brahman. That is the way of the Gods,
“the way of Brahman. They who go that way, for them
“thus is no returning to the earth, no returning.”

In this narrative, so explains Qaṅkara, by “the man who is seen in the eye,” neither a form mirrored in the eye, nor the individual soul, nor the god of light, but the highest Brahman is to be understood, for this only is, in a true sense, “the Âtman,” only this is “the immortal, the fearless,” who is spoken of here (p. 187, 8). To Brahman only can refer the unstained purity, which is expressed by the grease and water flowing to the edges (p. 187, 10), as also the names “love’s treasure,” “love’s herald,” “prince of radiance” (p. 187, 12ff.). We should not stumble at the fact that a place of Brahman is spoken of; this could only be objected to, if Brahman were said to be in this place only, and not, by other passages of scripture, in many other places as well (p. 188, 3). But as a matter of fact, to the end of the worship of the attribute-possessing Brahman, manifold places, names, and forms are ascribed to it, although it is in reality without attributes or any of these (p. 188, 10). This happens, in order to make it perceptible, like Vishṇu in a Çalagrâma stone (p. 188, 12). Also only in Brahman can be found the union of joy and amplitude. In the case of amplitude alone, it is true, we might think of space, as the symbol of Brahman (p. 189, 6), in the case of joy alone, of sensual pleasure (p. 189, 9), but in conjunction the two ideas mutually particularise each other



XI. The Brahman as Cosmic and at the same time Psychic Principle. 167

(*itara-itara-viçeshitau*) and mean that Brahman which in its own nature consists of pleasure (*sukham*), (p. 189, 12). Also the fact that the fires say that they have not only explained the teaching about themselves, but also that about Âtman (p. 190, 6), so that no sin attaches to him who knows this, as no water clings to the lotus-petal (p. 191, 1), can only apply to Brahman, the entering into which, for him who has heard the Upanishad, by the way of the gods, is set forth at the conclusion (p. 191, 6). In our passage, the form mirrored in the eye cannot be understood, because it is not always in it (p. 192, 13), and precisely at the time of worship, is not there (p. 192, 16), and because according to Chând. 8, 9, 2 it passes away with the body (p. 192, 18); nor the individual soul, either because it has its dwelling, not in the eye only, but in the whole body (p. 193, 3), because not it but the highest soul is "immortal and fearless," in that ignorance of it imposes mortality and fear (p. 193, 7), and because it does not possess lordship (*aiçvaryam*), so that the names "love's treasure," "love's herald," "prince of radiance" cannot apply to it (p. 193, 8); lastly it is also not the deity of the sun either although according to Brîh. 5, 5, 2 it rests in the eye by means of the rays (p. 193, 9), because it is not the Âtman, but an outer form (p. 193, 10), and because it is not immortal, for the immortality of the gods means only existence for a long time (p. 193, 12), just as their *aiçvaryam* is not self-dependent, but depends on the *Îçvara*, through fear of whom they perform their duties (p. 193, 14).

3. Brahman as the Light beyond Heaven and in the Heart.

Sûtras 1, 1, 24—27.

With strange allegorical embroidery the theme of the present chapter is treated in the section Chând. 3, 12—13, which compares the world, the macrocosm, to the body as microcosm, and this again to the heart, on the basis of the harmony ruling in all three, as which Brahman is regarded in all three, and that by means of the symbol of the *Gâyatrî*,



—a Vedic metre, consisting of three feet, to which, as we shall see, yet a fourth, imaginary foot is added. In order to grasp this glorification of Brahman as *Gâyatrî*, we must remember the eternity and original dignity of the Word of the Veda (discussed above p. 71). As this is, as it were, borne and controlled by the metre, as representative of which the *Gâyatrî* appears here, so Brahman, as the earth, hears and controls all beings, as the organs of sense (*prâṇa*) the body, as vital spirits (*prâṇa*, unless there is a mistake in the repetition of the same word) the heart (the principle of life).

Thus we are to understand, when, in the text, on the basis of the common bearing and controlling of beings, sense-organs, and vital spirits, it is said: "What the earth is, the body is, "what the body is, the heart is." For this reason also the *Gâyatrî* is called *sixfold*, because it symbolically represents the three things named and their respective contents (cf. p. 149, 8 *bhûta-prithivî-çarîra-hridaya-vâk-prâṇa* and on Chândogya-Up. p. 184, 10: *vâg-bhûta-prithivî-çarîra-hridaya-prâṇa*). But further it has *four feet*, that is, the three actual and a fourth, imagined, which is also mentioned Brih. 5, 14.⁷⁸ For the rest, the Brihadâranyakam *loc. cit.* follows its own course; how, in our passage, the four feet are to be understood, must be deduced from the verse (Rîgv. X, 90, 3) quoted on this occasion:

"However great is Nature's majesty,
 "The Spirit is yet higher raised by far,
 "Of it, but one foot do all beings make,
 "Three feet are immortality in heaven."

It would be simple to conclude that, for the author of our Chândogya-passage, the three immortal feet or quarters of *Purusha* are represented by the three real feet of the *Gâyatrî*,

⁷⁸ As in this passage the right of each of the three first feet to the necessary eight syllables is vindicated, we must not with the "*apara*" (Brahmasûtra p. 150, 10) and Max Müller (Upanishads I, p. 45) divide the 24 syllables of the *Gâyatrî* into four times six, in order to explain the *catuspadâ shadvidhâ gâyatrî*.



the beingless phenomenal world, on the contrary, by its imaginary foot. With this agrees what immediately follows:

"Therefore, verily, that which is called Brahman, that is "certainly that which this space outside the man is; but the "space which is outside the man is certainly that which this "space inside the man is; but this space inside the man is "certainly that which this space inside the heart is: this is "that Perfect, Unchangeable [a definition, which Brih. 2, 1, 5 "is found to be inadequate]; perfect, unchangeable happiness "he gains, who knows this."

Further on, the five gates of the gods in the heart, or, as they later appear personified, "the five warriors of Brahman and doorkeepers of the heaven-world" are described, as which, corresponding to the triplicity running through the whole passage, appear five vital spirits, five sense-organs, and five nature-gods, of which one vital spirit, sense-organ and nature-god are always put as identical.⁷⁹ Then it is said further:

"Now, however, the light that gleams there beyond the "heavens, at the back of all, at the back of each, in the "highest world, the highest of all, that is certainly this light "inward here in man; its perception is, that when anyone "here in the body feels it, he perceives a warmness; its audition "is, that when anyone thus [note 12] closes his ears, he hears, "as it were, a humming, as though it were the noise of a "burning fire. This is to be honoured as its perception "and audition. He will be perceived and heard, who knows "this."

Against the objections of the Opponent, who wishes to understand by "the light beyond the heavens" the natural light (p. 142, 11), by "the light inwardly in man" the light of the belly (that is, probably, the fire of digestion), (p. 144, 7) Çaṅkara proves that the one and the other can only mean Brahman, on account of the feet, which cannot be attributed to any natural light (p. 145, 5), but, in harmony with the verse quoted from the R̥gveda, can be attributed to Brahman

⁷⁹ In the last Triad *ākāṣa* should be omitted and before *vāyu* an organ, probably *tvac*, inserted.



(p. 146, 1), who is likened to light, because, in virtue of His spirituality, He lightens the whole world (p. 147, 2); that a place beyond the heavens is ascribed to Him, is done for the purpose of worship (p. 147, 6), just as Brahman is elsewhere indicated locally in the sun, in the eye, in the heart, although He is spaceless (*nishpradeṣa*), (p. 147, 8); and He also is to be understood by the symbol of the light of the belly (p. 147, 14). That the fruits of this worship mentioned at the end are only slight, is no obstacle to its referring to Brahman; only the knowledge of the attributeless Brahman has, as its one fruit, liberation (p. 148, 4), while the fruit of worship by means of attributes or symbols is manifold, although limited to *Samsâra* (p. 148, 5). That Brahman is indicated as the *Gâyatrî* happens (so *Çaṅkara* says, departing from the interpretation which we have set forth above), in order to fix the thoughts on Him (p. 149, 16); the metre itself, as a mere grouping of syllables (p. 150, 1) is not to be thought of here, because it is said: "this world is the *Gâyatrî*" and because beings etc. are indicated as its feet,⁸⁰ and also because our passage expressly names Brahman and the warriors of Brahman (p. 152, 4). That it is first said *para divas* (beyond heaven) and then again *divi* (in heaven) is no contradiction: just as one can say of a falcon, which is sitting upon a tree, he is sitting "on the top of the tree," and he is sitting "on the tree" (p. 153, 4).

4. Brahman and the Soul dwelling together in the Heart.

Sûtras 1, 2, 11—12.

The transition to the Chapter which is to teach us to know Brahman as the Soul itself, may be formed by an isolated passage, in which the highest and the individual soul appear as united together in the heart; it is found in the *Kâṭhaka-Up.* 3, 1:

⁸⁰ The *Sûtram* 1, 1, 26 has *bhûta-âdi-pâda*, that is, beings and the three heavenly feet, while *Çaṅkara* (evidently falsely and not in conformity with p. 149, 8) understands: beings, earth, body and heart (p. 151, 8).



XI. The Brahman as Cosmic and at the same time Psychic Principle. 171

"Drinking fulfilment of their deeds in life,
 "The two have gone into the secret cave,
 "In the highest, that one half is of the highest [that is in the heart];
 "He calls these Light and Shade who Brahman knows."

For the theme of the Kâthaka-Up. Çāṅkara firstly infers that by "the two" here either the organs of knowledge with Buddhi at their head and the individual soul, or the individual and the highest soul are to be understood (p. 179—181), then, that only the latter is permissible; for that which drinks fulfilment for its previous deeds, is undoubtedly the individual soul; and side by side with it only a kindred nature, therefore the highest soul, could be mentioned (p. 182, 3); that this dwells in the heart, is so often said in other places (p. 182, 5); that of it also it is said, it drinks, must not be taken literally, just as if it were said: "the people are carrying a parasol," when only one of them is carrying it (p. 180, 12. 182, 9, and 3, 3, 34, p. 921, 7, where the subject is once more explained); they are called shadow and light, because the one is subject to Samsâra, the other being free from it, Samsâra itself existing only through Ignorance (p. 182, 11). The same contrast is found again not only in other passages of the Kâthaka-Up., but also in the verse [taken with changed meaning from Rîgv. 1, 164, 20] of the Muṇḍaka-Up. 3, 1, 1 (= Çvet. 4, 6. 7):

"Know thou two friends fair-feathered,
 "Tied to a single tree;
 "One eats at the sweet berry,
 "Not eating, one looks on."

Here, by the one that eats, the individual soul is to be understood, by the one that looks on, the highest soul (p. 183, 12), as also in the verse that follows:

"To such a tree sunk down, the spirit
 "Is perplexed and sorrowful, without a lord;
 "But when the lord is sought and found by him
 "In majesty, then sorrow flees away."

In conclusion Çāṅkara mentions a view of the *Pañḍi-rahasya-brâhmaṇam* (also quoted p. 889, 10, and, as *Pañḍi-Upanishad*, p. 232, 12) according to which by the two are to be understood the *sattvam* (that is, the *antahkaranam*) and the individual soul, the latter, however, so far as it is raised above Samsâra and has gained unity with Brahman (p. 184—185).

XII. The Brahman as Soul.

1. Brahman as the Self (*âtman*).

Sûtras 1, 4, 19—22.

No man, whatever he may do, can get out of his own Self; everything in the world can only arouse our interest, nay, only exists for us, in so far as, affecting us, it enters the sphere of our "I," and so, as it were, becomes a part of us. Therefore our own Self with its content is the first, and in a certain sense the only object of philosophical investigation.

This thought may prepare us for the consideration of one of the most remarkable passages in the Upanishads, the conversation between *Yājñavalkya* and his spouse *Maitreyî*, which exists in two recensions, Brih. 2, 4 and Brih. 4, 5, and in both according to the reading of the *Kânvas*, as well as (in Qatap. Br.) according to that of the *Mâdhyandinas*; in all, therefore, in four forms. Qaṅkara quotes, if we leave out of the question passages which are identical, sometimes the recension in Brih. 2, 4 (for example p. 385, 10. 392, 8), sometimes that in Brih. 4, 5; and the latter as well in the *Kânva* form (p. 199, 1. 11. 399, 4. 613, 2. 648, 6. 674, 9. 930, 5. 974, 7. 1142, 6) as in the *Mâdhyandina* form (p. 185, 15. 386, 7. 387, 3. 392, 10. 794, 14. 983, 4). Also the quotation 646, 9—647, 1 is according to the *Mâdhyandinas*, borrowing *imam*, however, instead of *idam* from the *Kânvas*; the quotation p. 388, 9 is divergent from both, and the same again in another form p. 391, 8;—this seems to shew, that Qaṅkara is wont to quote the Upanishads chiefly from memory, which might serve him here, where four recensions interfere with one another, less faithfully than usual. In what follows, we analyse the passage according to Brih. 2, 4 and



introduce the divergencies in Brih. 4, 5 only so far as seems interesting.

(Addition in Brih. 4, 5: "Yājñavalkya had two wives, Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī; of these Maitreyī was conversant with Brahman, Kātyāyanī on the contrary knew only what women know [cf. St. Luke X, 38—42]. Now Yājñavalkya wished to pass to the other condition of life [from the condition of householder to that of hermit]). Then said Yājñavalkya: "Maitreyī! I will now give up this condition [of householder]. "Therefore will I make partition between thee and Kātyāyanī."—Then spoke Maitreyī: 'If indeed to me, Master, this whole earth with all its riches belonged, should I thereby be immortal?'—'By no means!' said Yājñavalkya, 'but as the life of those who prosper, so would thy life be; but there is no hope of immortality through riches.'—Maitreyī spoke: 'What shall I do with that, whereby I become not immortal? Share with me rather, Master, the knowledge which thou possessest.'—Yājñavalkya spoke: 'Dear to us, verily, art thou, and dear is what thou sayest. Come, seat thyself, I will explain it to thee, but do thou mark well what I tell thee.'—

The teaching which now follows begins with the sentence: "Verily, not for the sake of the husband is the husband dear, but for the sake of the Self is the husband dear." What is here said of the husband, is further, with continual repetition of the same formula, declared of the wife, children, power, Brahmanhood, warriorship, worlds, gods, beings, and finally of all that exists;—all this is not dear for its own sake, but for the sake of the Self.—Apparently nothing more can be found than the thought expressed by us in introducing this chapter; Qaṅkara, on the other hand, on Brih. p. 448, 7 explains that here renunciation (*vairāgyam*) is taught as the means to immortality. And indeed, when everything only serves the purpose of gratifying the Self, it is further the question, what then is our true and real Self? And here the Indian consciousness is led quite of itself by the word *Ātman* (Self, Soul, God) to find in God our own real "I," and in a withdrawal to him the satisfaction which we seek in all relations of life.



Therefore the real *nervus probandi* lies here in the use of the word *Âtman* which arises from deeper philosophical insight:—what we long for, is everywhere and always only the satisfaction of our own Self; but our Self is identical with the highest Godhead and only apparently different from Him; he who sees the illusory nature of this appearance, who has become conscious of God as his own Self, has and possesses the perfect satisfaction, which he has sought in vain in striving after the outward. In this sense it is further said: “The Self, verily, o Maitreyî, is to be seen, heard, meditated on and investigated; he who sees, hears, meditates on and investigates the Self, has understood this whole world.”—He who has understood this, knows himself as one with all Being; he who has not understood it, for him all beings are foreign and hostile; this is expressed by the sequel, in which it is explained that Brahmans and warriors, worlds, gods, and beings, all abandon or exclude (*parâdât*) him who regards all these things as different from himself.—Not in its void appearances can the Self be grasped, but in that which produces these appearances; he who has understood this, has understood appearances along with it; this thought is contained in the following images: when a drum is beaten, a shell blown, a lute played, the tones going out from them cannot be grasped; but if the instrument or the player are grasped, then the tones are grasped at the same time.—As from damp wood, when it burns, clouds of smoke go forth, so from this great Being all Vedas and (as Bṛih. 4, 5 adds) all worlds and creatures are breathed forth.—The *Âtman* is the point of union (*ekâyanam*) for all beings, as the ocean for all waters, the skin for all sensations of touch, the tongue for all tastes, the nose for all smells, the eye for all forms, the ear for all tones, etc.—But why do we not see the *Âtman*, who alone really is, but only its void appearances? To this replies the following image guaranteed as genuine by Chând. 6, 13, but on account of its being dogmatically exceptionable, already quite altered in the late recension Bṛih. 4, 5: “As a lump of salt, thrown into water, dissolves in the water, so that it cannot be taken out, but wherever it is tasted, it is everywhere salt,—thus,



“verily, also this great, endless, shoreless Being which is
“knowledge through and through: from these creatures it
“rises [as knowing spirit] and with them it perishes again;
“after death there is no consciousness! thus verily I tell thee!”
Thus spoke Yājñavalkya. Then Maitreyī spoke: “By this, O
“Master, hast thou perplexed me, that thou sayest, there is
“no consciousness after death.” But Yājñavalkya spoke:
“Nothing bewildering truly speak I; what I said, suffices for
“the understanding, for where there is a duality, as it were,
“there the one sees the other, there the one smells, hears,
“speaks to, thinks of, knows the other; but where, for a man,
“all has become his own Self, how should he there see any-
“one, how should he there smell, hear, speak to, think of,
“know anyone? That through which he knows all this, how
“should he know that, how should he know the Knower?”—
(Addition in Brih. 4, 5: “Now knowest thou the doctrine, O
“Maitreyī; this truly suffices for immortality.” Thus spoke
“Yājñavalkya and departed.”)

The remarks of Bādarāyaṇa and Ṣaṅkara on this passage are of special interest, in that they allow us to penetrate into certain differences of principle within the Vedānta school, in which Ācmarathya and Auḍulomi, each in his own way, represent the rationalistic, exoteric understanding, while Kāṣa-kṛitsna represents the mystical and esoteric.—As is usual, the question is raised, whether in the passage the individual or the highest soul is to be understood by the “Self” (p. 385, 13); what distinguishes the two, is only the limitations (*upādhi*), that is, the body, organs of sense and action, Manas and Buddhi, clothed in which the highest soul appears as the individual soul; on them it depends, that it is enjoyer (or sufferer, *bhoktar*) and actor (*kartar*), from both of which conditions the highest soul, that is, Brahman, is free. Now in our passage there are certain unmistakable features, which only suit the individual soul; thus the introduction, in which, the soul’s love of things is spoken of, which can only be understood of the enjoyer (p. 386, 5); thus too the doctrine that the soul rises out of these creatures and again perishes with them (p. 386, 9); thus finally, the expression “Knower,” which indicates

an actor (p. 386, 11). On the other hand, the whole context (p. 386, 15), compels us to think of the highest soul: a knowledge of it only, secures the immortality which Maitreyî strove after (p. 387, 4); only of it is it true, that, when it is known, all is known (p. 387, 6); so also the proposition, that all things exclude him, who believes them to be outside the soul, can only be understood of the highest soul which includes all (p. 387, 13); this is especially true of the similes of the drum and the rest (p. 387, 14) and of the passage, where the soul is indicated as the cause of the Veda etc. (p. 388, 1) and as the point of union of all that is (p. 388, 4). If consequently only the highest soul is to be understood, then we must ask, how are we to deal with the above mentioned features which only suit the individual soul? *Ācmarathya* sees in them a guarantee of the promise, that with the *Ātman* all is known; if he grasp all, he grasps the individual soul also (p. 388, 8ff. 390, 10. 391, 12). As this view, not quite clear in spite of repetitions, amounts to understanding the soul as a part of Brahman, and therefore the relation between them as spatial, so *Audulomi* sets up a temporal relation: because the soul is temporarily (in deep sleep) one with Brahman, therefore in the passage in question it appears as found in unity with Brahman (p. 389. 390, 12. 392, 1). In opposition to both, *Kāçakṛitsna*, whose view *Çaṅkara* adheres to, as being in conformity with scripture (p. 390, 14. 393, 11), establishes the doctrine of Identity, in virtue of which the highest soul exists whole and undivided in the form of the individual soul (p. 390, 2. 392, 3); the annihilation of knowledge after death means only that of individual knowledge (*viçesha-vijñānam*), (p. 392, 7) and the description of God as the "Knower" indicates no actorship, but only a consisting of the pure substance of consciousness (p. 393, 9), as also the reality of liberation consists in the irrefragable certainty of the knowledge that God and the soul are one, and the absolute satisfaction therefrom resulting (p. 395, 3).—

Similar considerations of the fact that the difference between God and the soul is a mere appearance, while liberation is a seeing through this appearance, will be met with many



times in the sequel; but all attempts of this kind to grasp liberation as a new form of knowledge, do not give, and cannot give, any satisfactory conclusion as to its nature (as it appeared to the Indian in examples and appears to us), so long as it is not supplemented by the idea of the moral transformation, which is so strongly accentuated by Christianity, but remained foreign to Indian thought. This seems to have been felt in the Vedânta schools also;—against those who could acquiesce in the solution of the question sought in the region of intellect only, the words of Çaṅkara at the end of our extract seem to be directed: “But those who are stubborn, and force the “sense of the scripture, therewith force also the perfect knowledge which leads to salvation, hold liberation to be something made and [therefore] transitory, and do not follow “after what is lawful” (p. 396, 3).

2. Brahman as *Prāṇa* (Breath, Life).

(a) Sûtras 1, 1, 28—31.

Brahman as the principle of life is the subject of the third Adhyâya of the Kaushîtaki-Upanishad, which in Cowell's edition exists in two recensions p. 73—102 and p. 129—134,⁸¹ and the actual contents of which are as follows:

1. *Pratardana* comes to the abode of *Indra*, who allows him to choose a boon. *Pratardana* begs the god to choose for him what he deems to be the best thing for mankind. After some hesitation *Indra* speaks: “Then know me; for this “I deem to be the best thing for a man, that he should “know me Who knows me, his place [in heaven] is not “diminished by any deed, neither by theft nor by slaying the

⁸¹ Çaṅkara appears, as we found above (p. 31) to follow a third recension whose readings in general agree with those of Cowell's first; yet he reads 3, 2 p. 76, 4 with the second *prajñâtma tam* (p. 154, 8); 3, 5 p. 89, 3 he has contrary both recensions, *adûduhat* (p. 164, 2); at 3, 3 p. 83, 1 he remarks that some read *imam çarîram* (p. 161, 6), which would be an instance of *çarîra* as masculine, as Çaṅkara's construction *imam* (*jîvam*), *parigrihya çarîram*, *utthâpayati* is hardly possible. Çaṅkara has a very noteworthy reading 3, 2 p. 82, 2, where he reads *astitve ca* instead of *asti tv eva* (p. 158, 7).



"fruit of the body, nor by matricide nor by parricide; and "even if he has committed (*cakrusho*) evil [previously, before "the knowledge of Brahman], yet the colour fades not from "his face [no fear makes him pale]."

2. "I am the breath (*prāna*), I am the Self of knowledge (*prajñātman*); as this, as immortal life worship me. Life is "breath and breath is life; for as long as the breath remains "in this body, so long remains the life; only through breath "is immortality [continuance of life] gained in this world, and "through knowledge, true wishes [wishes that are directed to "the Eternal, cf. above p. 161]. He who worships me as im- "mortal life, comes to full life in this world, he gains im- "mortality, imperishability in the heavenly world."—Further it is developed that all the life-organs (speech, ear, eye, etc.) go back to a unity (*ekabhūyam gacchanti*), through the power of which each organ performs its function, so that, in each special manifestation of life, all organs [in virtue of their centralisation in life] work together. "Thus it is," adds Indra, confirming the theory quoted, "and the well-being of the life- "organs lies in what they are [*astitve*, that is, in Brahman, "not in what they do]."

3. "The organs are not essential to life; for the dumb, "blind, deaf, imbecile (*bāla*) and crippled live; but verily the "life only, the Self of knowledge, surrounds the body and "supports it (*utthāpayati*, literally: raises it up), therefore it "is to be worshipped as the support (*uktham*, literally: hymn). "This is the penetration of all [organs] in the life. Verily, "life is knowledge, and knowledge is life."—According to this identification, carried out all through, of life (*prāna*) and knowledge (*prajñā*), which is based on the fact that Brahman, as the principle of life, as shewn above (p. 134ff.), must also be pure intelligence, are depicted the nature of deep sleep and death. In both, the life-organs (speech, eye, ear, etc.), along with the things and relations of the outer world dependent on them (name, form, tone, etc.), enter into the life; on awaking, as sparks arise from the fire, so the organs arise from the life, from them the gods (that is, the powers of nature), and from the gods the worlds, go forth again; in



death, on the contrary, life, with the organs merged in it, wanders forth from the body.

4. It is further shewn how all external relations are poured (*abhivisriyante*) into the life, by means of the life-organs (as speech, eye, ear, etc.).

5. The life-organs, as separate members or parts, are drawn out of the life [*udūḥam*; or with *Caṅkara adūduhat*, the organs each milk a part out of the life]; but the things of the outer world are only the element of being of the organs projected outwards (*parastāt prativīhitā bhūtamātrā*).

6. By means of intellect [*prajñā*, which was identified above with life] the man mounts the organs [like a car] and so reaches outer things.

7. For in themselves and without intellect (*prajñā*) the organs cannot know and notify outer things. (In this passage *prajñā* takes the place of *manas*, which elsewhere appears as the central organ of the life-organs, but is here ranged along with them.)

8. Not objects, but the subject, should be investigated, not speech, smell, form, tone, etc., but that which speaks, smells, sees, hears, etc.—“The ten elements of being are related to “Cognition, and the ten elements of Cognition to being; for “if the elements of being were not, then the elements of “Cognition also would not be, and if the elements of Cognition “were not, then the elements of being would not be either. “For through the one [without the other] no appearance “(*rūpam*) comes into existence; yet this is not a plurality [of “outer things and organs], but as, in the case of a car, the “felloes are fastened to the spokes, and the spokes to the “nave, so these elements of being are fastened to the elements “of Cognition, and the elements of Cognition to the *Prāṇa* “(Life). This *Prāṇa* alone is the self of Cognition (*prajñā-tman*), and bliss, it does not grow old and dies not. He “becomes not higher through good works, or lower through “evil [abstains from all works], for He alone causes him to “do good works, whom He will raise above these worlds, and “He alone causes him to do evil works, whom He will lead “downwards; He is the guardian of the worlds, the ruler of

"the worlds,—He is my soul, this is to be known, He is my "soul, this is to be known!"

In this section of the Kaushîtaki-Upanishad, as Çaṅkara develops it, by *Prâṇa* neither breath, nor the god Indra, nor the individual soul are to be understood, although there are characteristics which point to all three of them, but on the contrary the highest Brahman (p. 155, 2 read: *param brahma*), for of it only can it be said, that a knowledge of it is the highest good for man (p. 156, 2), and that he who has known it is stained by no sins, in that, after knowledge of Brahman, all works vanish away (p. 156, 7); only to Brahman applies the description as Self of Cognition,⁸² as bliss, as also that it does not grow old and dies not, performs no works and predestines the deeds of beings (p. 156, 8—17).—The god Indra, in whose mouth the whole dissertation is placed, is not to be thought of, because in this passage occur a mass of relations, those mentioned and many others, which compel us to understand the highest soul (p. 158, 2), with which Indra is here identified, just as Vâmadeva is with Manu and Sûrya (*Rîgv.* 4, 26, 1; cf. *Bṛih.* 1, 4, 10), in virtue of a gift of seership extending to the life before birth, occurring in the canon of scripture;⁸³ therefore also the heroic deeds of Indra are only mentioned to the end of glorifying the knowledge of Brahman, connected with them, because he who possesses this knowledge, remains unscathed like Indra in all his battles (p. 160, 5).—No more than Indra can the individual soul or the *Mukhya prâṇa* (the

⁸² As Kaush. 3, 2 so in Çaṅkara's work also *prajñâtman* means only the highest (p. 156, 8. 157, 12. 158, 5; on the other hand = *jîva* p. 161, 8 in the *Pûrvapaksha*), and *viññânâtman* means only the individual soul (p. 134, 7. 181, 12. 182, 13. 16. 183, 2. 12; 120, 15. 388, 14. 393, 11). In the same way, *prâjña*, for Bâdarâyana (1, 4, 5. 2, 3, 29) and Çaṅkara (p. 273, 7. 8. 275, 4. 331, 5. 9. 347, 4. 5. 14. 350, 10. 14. 351, 11. 12. 352, 1. 9. 353, 5. 13. 354, 2. 475, 1. 662, 12. 780, 5. 6. 10. 785, 1. 8. 793, 11. 828, 13. 829, 3. 8) and also *prâjña âtman* (p. 271, 12. 272, 7. 9) always means the highest soul.—This is the more to be accentuated, as in the *Vedântasâra*, § 53 ff., *prâjña* has become a term for the individual soul.

⁸³ *ârshena darçanena yathâçâstram*, as Çaṅkara p. 159, 9 explains the *çâstradrishṭi* of the Sûtram; cf. however *drishṭi* in the Sûtram 1, 2, 26 with Çaṅkara's interpretation p. 215, 11.

central organ of unconscious life) be understood, although to the former would apply the distinction between subject and object (p. 160, 13), to the latter, the support of the body (p. 161, 3), while the indication as Self of knowledge and the separation between *prāṇa* and *prajñā* would lend itself to this interpretation (p. 161, 8. 11). The most essential reason why not these but Brahman are to be understood, lies in the words of the Sūtram 1, 1, 31: *upāsātraividhyād, ācṛitatvād, iha tad-yogāt*, which either mean: "because, if *Jīva* and *Mukhya* "*prāṇa* as well as Brahman were to be understood, a triplicity "of worship would of necessity arise (p. 161, 15); because "elsewhere also the word *Prāṇa* refers to Brahman (p. 162, 7); "and because here it is connected with marks of Brahman "(p. 162, 8),"—or, according to another explanation of the Sūtram: "Brahman is to be understood, because a triplicity "of worship of Brahman, namely as *prāṇa*, as *prajñā*, and as "*brahman* is taught here (p. 164), because elsewhere also a "worship of Brahman is taught by means of limiting qualities "(*upādhi-dharma*) (p. 165, 5), and this is taking place here also "(p. 165, 6)."

(b) Sūtras 1, 4, 16—18.

As a variation of the theme just treated of, we may consider the conversation between *Gārgya*, the son of *Balāka*, and *Ajātaśatru*, which forms the fourth Adhyāya of the Kaushītaki-Upanishad, and, with important divergencies in detail, recurs in Bṛih. 2, 1. Čaṅkara adheres to the Kaushītaki recension,⁸⁴ according to which the main contents are as follows.

Gārgya, a renowned authority on the Veda, comes to king *Ajātaśatru* and offers to explain Brahman to him. After he has determined Brahman in a series of sixteen definitions, as the spirit (*purusha*) in the sun, in the moon, in lightning, etc., and these explanations have one after the other been rejected

⁸⁴ Here also Čaṅkara's readings diverge in many ways from both forms in which the text is printed by Cowell; thus he reads (p. 380, 7) *saṃvadishthāḥ* instead of *saṃvādayishthāḥ* and *samavādayishthāḥ* Kaush. 4, 19, p. 117, 3 and 138, 20.



by *Ajâtaçatru* as inadequate, *Gârgya* becomes silent, and the king speaks to him: "In vain therefore hast thou challenged me to a disputation, in order to explain Brahman to me; for, verily, he who has made those spirits [named by thee], and whose work this [world] is, he, verily, is to be investigated."—Now *Ajâtaçatru* undertakes to teach *Gârgya*. He leads him to one in deep sleep, who does not wake when they speak to him, but only after they have pushed him with a stick. *Ajâtaçatru* asks *Gârgya*: "Where lay this spirit, where was he, whence did he come?"—As *Gârgya* does not know it, the king explains to him how, in deep sleep, all organs, together with the corresponding things of the outer world, enter into the life (*prâna*) and dwell with it in the arteries that go out from the heart and surround the pericardium; on awaking, as sparks rise from the fire, so from the *Âtman* the organs go forth, from them go forth the gods (who rule them), and from them the worlds. "This *Prâna*, the *Prajñâtman*, has entered into the body as into its Self, even to the hair, even to the nails. As a knife pushed into the sheath, or fire into a fire-vessel, so has the *Prajñâtman* entered into the body as into its own Self, even to the hair, even to the nails. On this Self depend those selves [the organs] as a people on their chief. As the chief nourishes himself (*bhuñkte*), through his people, as the people nourish (*bhuñjanti*) the chief, so does this Self of Cognition nourish itself through those selves, so do those selves nourish this Self of Cognition... All evil he puts away, chieftainship over all beings, independence, sovereignty does he gain, who knows thus."

In this passage, as Qaṅkara explains, not the *Mukhya prâna* or the individual soul, but Brahman is to be understood, since at the very beginning it is said: "I will explain Brahman to thee" (p. 380, 5); in harmony with this, in the case of the words "whose work this is," we are not to think of the nutrition of the body, which is the work of the *Mukhya prâna* (p. 378, 6), or of good and bad works, as they are performed by the individual soul (p. 379, 2), but of this world which was made by Brahman (p. 381, 5). To the objection that marks of the *Mukhya prâna* and *Jîva* (the individual



soul) are also met with, a reply is to be made in the words of the Sûtram 1, 1, 31: *upâsâtraividhyât* etc. (explained by us in the preceding section, above p. 181) (p. 382, 8). For that only Brahman can be meant, appears from the concluding words, and from the unsurpassable fruit promised in them (p. 382, 13).—To this is added, as *Jaimini* remarks, that in the passage concerning deep sleep, in both question and answer, the individual soul is distinguished from Brahman, into which it enters, and from which it comes forth again (p. 383, 10), and in the Vâjasaneyi recension (Brih. 2, 1, 16) on this occasion it is expressly indicated as the *viññānamayaḥ puruṣaḥ* (p. 384, 9); from this it is clear, that that from which it goes forth, must be something different from itself, namely the highest Brahman (p. 385, 4).

3. Brahman as the Soul in deep Sleep.

Sûtras 1, 3, 19—21 and 1, 3, 40.

The passage which we considered Chap. XI, 1, d (above p. 158 ff.) follows in Chând. 8, 7—12, the teaching of Indra by Prajâpati (a mythological personification of the creative force, which here stands for Brahman) concerning the nature of the Self.

“Prajâpati said: The Self, the sinless, free from old age, “free from death, and free from sorrow, without hunger and “without thirst, whose wishes are true, whose resolve is true, “this Self is to be investigated, this you should seek to know. “He wins all worlds and all wishes, who has found this Self “and knows it!”—In order to gain knowledge of the Self, the gods send Indra, the Asuras (Demons), Virocana, to Prajâpati. —The three successive answers, which Prajâpati gives to the question, what the Self is, represent three stages of knowledge, in virtue of which the Self is seen either in the body, or in the individual soul, or in the highest soul. The first answer to the question: “What is the Self?” runs thus: “The Self in “the body (literally, the person, *puruṣa*), as it is represented “in the reflection in the eye, in water, in a mirror.”—Whoever, like Virocana and the Asuras, is satisfied with this view,



will see in sensual enjoyment and in the care of the body the highest goal of being, and even after death will deck the corpse with all kinds of trumpery adornments (*bhikshā*), with garments and decorations,—in order to gain by this means a life in the Beyond.⁸⁵—Virocana is satisfied with this answer. But Indra, knowing that, if the Self be the body, then the Self must be equally affected by the injury and destruction of the body, returns to Prajâpati, who gives him the second answer: "The Self is the soul as it enjoys itself in dream." But this answer is also unsatisfying. The dream-soul is, it is true, free from the injury of the body, yet it is as though it were slain or persecuted, and is therefore not free from suffering. With this doubt Indra returns a second time to Prajâpati and now receives the third explanation: "When one has fallen asleep, and entered altogether wholly and completely into rest, so that he beholds no dream image,—that is the Self, that is the immortal, the fearless, Brahman."—To the objection of Indra, that in this condition consciousness of one's self, and of other things also, ceases, so that it is, as it were, an entering into nothingness, Prajâpati finally answers: "Mortal, verily, O mighty one is this body, possessed of death; it is the dwelling-place of that immortal, bodiless Self. The embodied is possessed by desire and pain; for because he is embodied, no turning away from desire and pain is possible. But the bodiless are not moved by desire and pain.—Bodyless is the wind; the clouds, the lightning, the thunder are bodiless. Therefore as these rise out of the universe [in which they are bound, as the soul is, in the body], and enter into the highest light, and thereby stand forth in their own form, so also this perfect peace [that is, the soul in deep sleep] rises out of this body, and enters into the highest light, and thereby stands forth in its own form: that is the highest spirit, which wanders there, sporting and playing and delighting himself, whether with women or with chariots or

⁸⁵ He who holds the body to be the Self, cannot believe in any life after death. Probably the passage, as also what goes before (*Asurânâṃ hi eshâ upanishad*) is to be understood ironically.—Çaṅkara's view, of which below, we cannot agree with.



"with friends [cf. above p. 161], and thinks no longer of this "servile body, to which the Prâṇa is yoked as a beast of draught to the car.—When the eye is directed to the universe, this [the Prâṇa] is the spirit in the eye, the eye [itself] is [only] the means; and he who wishes to smell, is the Âtman, the nose is only the means; and he who wishes to speak, is the Âtman, the voice is only the means; and he who wishes to hear, is the Âtman, the ear is only the means; and he who wishes to understand, is the Âtman, the understanding is his godlike eye [embracing past and future]; with this godlike eye, the understanding, he beholds those delights and enjoys them. Those gods [who were taught like Indra] in the world of Brahman worship him as the Self; therefore possess they all worlds and all wishes. He gains all worlds and all wishes, who has found this Self and knows it. Thus spoke Prajâpati."

In contrast with our view of this passage, which would recognise in the three chief answers of Prajâpati (at least, as they are understood by the questioners) the expression of three philosophical standpoints, the materialistic, for which the Self is the body, the realistic, for which it is the individual soul, and the idealistic, denying all plurality, for which it is the highest soul,—in contrast to this, the only view as it appears to us, which fits the whole context, Çāṅkara adheres to the view that, already in the first answer, the beholding, individual self which dwells in the eye is to be understood (p. 261, 2), so that "the man (or spirit), who is seen in the eye," becomes a man "who sees in the eye." He expressly rejects the view, that the picture mirrored in the eye is meant, because otherwise Prajâpati would not have told the truth (p. 266, 13); but it is not necessary to assume with him, "that Prajâpati, if in each answer we were to understand something different, would be an imposter" (p. 268, 8); for the formula with which he each time introduces his explanation: "this will I further explain to thee," suits well a view of the Self which grows deeper step by step.—In the third answer also, as Çāṅkara develops it, the individual soul is to be understood, yet as it passes over to another condition (p. 261, 5), namely, as, rising



out of the body, it becomes the highest spirit (p. 262, 3), so its true nature is revealed (p. 262, 6), according to which it is not individual, but the highest Brahman itself (p. 263, 2). "This in fact is, according to passages of scripture like 'that thou art' (Chând. 6, 8, 7), the real nature (*pāramārthikam* "*svarūpam*) of the individual soul, not the other, which is "formed through limitations (*upādhi*). So long, therefore, as "one does not put aside the Ignorance which affirms plurality, "which is like taking the trunk of a tree for a man [p. 263, "5; the same image p. 44, 2. 86, 12. 448, 2: cf. Platon, Phileb., "p. 38 D], so long as one has not reached the highest, eternal "Self, appearing according to its own nature, by the know- "ledge that 'I am Brahman' (Brih. 1, 4, 10), so long the in- "dividual soul is individual. But if a man rises above the "aggregate of body, senses, Manas and Buddhi and has been "taught, by the scripture, that man is not an aggregate of "body, senses, Manas and Buddhi, not a wandering soul, but "on the contrary that of which it is said (Chând. 6, 8, 7), "that is the real, that is the soul"—consisting of pure in- "telligence, 'that thou art,' then he knows the highest eternal "Self which appears according to its own nature; as by this "means he raises himself above the illusion of this [reading "*asmāt*] body etc., he goes to that very highest, eternal Self "which appears according to its own nature; for thus says "the scripture (Mund. 3, 2, 9): 'Verily, he who knows this "highest Brahman, himself becomes Brahman'" (p. 263, 4 to 264, 3). As such the soul stands forth "in its own form," as gold, when by corroding materials it is freed from the ad- dition of other substances (p. 264, 5), or as the stars, when the day which overpowered them is gone, stand forth by night in their own form (p. 264, 8). However the eternal, spiritual light is never overpowered by anything; on the contrary, like space, it does not come in contact with the sensual world, and stands in contradiction to it (p. 264, 10). The individual soul, so long as it has not been raised above the body [which is what happens in deep sleep], is seeing, hearing, thinking, knowing. Were it so also, after being lifted above the body, then the contradiction [just stated] would not exist [p. 265, 3;



I read *avirudhyeta*, optative with a *privativum*]. Therefore the position of things is such that we must distinguish between the condition of the soul *before* its separation from the limitations, body, senses, Manas, Buddhi, sensibility to pain and object, and its condition *after* separation from them. Before the separation it is apparently affected by the Upâdhis, as the crystal is by the colour outside it; after the separation, it stands forth in its own nature, as the crystal, after the colour is put away (p. 265). Thus the embodiment or bodilessness of the soul only depends on whether one does or does not distinguish it from the Upâdhis (p. 266, 2), and the distinction of the individual and the highest soul rests only on false knowledge, not on an action of things, which is not possible, because the soul, like space, does not adhere to them (p. 266, 8). Only the knowledge of these, only the (individual) knowledge of differences (*viśeṣa-vijñānam*) is removed in deep sleep, not knowledge in its entirety (p. 267, 7); for the scripture says (Brih. 4, 3, 30): "For the knower there is no interruption of knowing."—Some try to evade this identification of the individual with the highest soul, against the context of the passage; but rather is it the case that after the removal of Ignorance, as the imagined serpent becomes a rope, so also the not truly real individual soul, which is stained by doing and suffering, love and hate and other imperfections, and is subject to much that is evil, is transferred through wisdom to the sinless essence of the highest God, opposed to all these imperfections (p. 268, 10).—Yet others, and some of our Vedântins among them, (realistically) take the individual nature of the soul to be absolutely real; against these the *Çârîrakam* (Bâdarâyana's Sûtras) is directed, in order to shew, that "the alone, supreme, eternal, highest God, whose being "is knowledge, through the glamour (*mâyâ*) of Ignorance, like "a magician, appears manifold, and that there is no other "element of knowledge outside him" (p. 269, 1). Therefore it is true that God is different from the individual soul [so long as such a soul is spoken of], but the individual soul is not different from God [cf. p. 816, 7: the *prapañca* is *brahman*, but *brahman* is not the *prapañca*; and p. 1060, 2: the *samsârin*



is *îçvara*, but *îçvara* is not the *samsârin*], except from the standpoint of Ignorance (p. 269, 10). In waking, the soul is the onlooker in the cage of the body and organs, in dream it lingers in the arteries and looks at the dream-pictures built up of the ideas of the waking state; in deep sleep it enters into the highest light, that is, into Brahman (p. 270, 7). For that Brahman is the highest light, follows from the context (p. 327, 8) and from the above mentioned incorporeality, which belongs to Brahman alone (p. 328, 3), as also from the words "that is the highest spirit" (p. 328, 4).

4. Brahman as the Soul in the State of Liberation.

Sûtras 1, 23, 42—43.

The section Brih. 4, 3—4 (p. 705—919), whose main theme, according to Qaṅkara, is the above, unfolds a picture of the condition of the soul before and after death, which for richness and warmth, is unique in the literature of India, and perhaps in the literature of the world. We translate the passage with some abbreviations and omissions, which will justify themselves, remarking, however, that much, especially in the first part, remains problematic.

(a) Introduction (4, 3, 1—9).

To *Janaka*, king of the *Videhas*, comes *Yājñavalkya*, in order to discourse with him.⁸⁶ The king raises the question: "What serves the man [*purusha*] as light?"—The first answer

⁸⁶ *Sam enena vadishya*, *iti*; this is not "an ingenious conjecture" of Regnaud in "his excellent work on the Upanishads" (as may appear from Max Müller, *Upanishads* I, p. LXXIII ff.), but a variant, which Dvivedagaṅga had already mentioned in his commentary (p. 1141, 13, ed. Weber); Weber adopted it in his edition of the *Çatapathabr.* (14, 7, 1, 1), and again recalled the fact in his critique of Regnaud's work (*Jenaer Literaturz.* 1878, 9. Feb., No. 6), to which Regnaud also refers at the beginning of the Errata.—What Max Müller observes as against this reading, can be explained quite as well in the opposite sense: precisely because *Yājñavalkya* intends to discourse with the king, the narrator finds it necessary to give a new motive for the fact that not he, but the king, speaks first. [For another view compare my *Sixty Upanishads* p. 463.]



runs thus: "The sun serves him as a light; for in the light
"of the sun he sits and moves about, carries on his work and
"returns home."—"But what serves him as light when the
"sun is set?"—"The moon."—"And when sun and moon are
"set?"—"Fire."—"And when sun and moon are set, and the
"fire has gone out?"—"Voice; therefore, when a man cannot
"distinguish his own hand, and a voice is raised [reading
"*uccarati*] somewhere, he goes towards it."—"But when sun
"and moon are set, and the fire is gone out, and the voice
"is dumb, what then serves the man as a light?"—"Then his
"own self (*âtman*) serves him as a light."—"What is, then,
"this Self?"—"It is that among the life-organs which con-
"sists of knowledge, as the spirit shining inwardly in the heart.
"This remaining the same, wanders through both worlds [this
"world in waking and in dream, the other in deep sleep and
"death]; it is as though he meditated, as though he wavering
"moved [in reality Brahman is without individual knowledge
"and motion]; for when he has become sleep (*svapno bhûtvâ*),
"then [in deep sleep] he transcends this world, the forms of
"death [all that is transitory, evil]. For, when this spirit is
"born, when he enters into the body, he is flooded with evil;
"but when he departs, when he dies, he leaves evil behind.
"Two conditions are there of this spirit: the present and that
"in the other world; a middle condition, as third, is that of
"sleep. While it lingers in this middle condition, it beholds
"both those conditions, the present [in dream] and that in the
"other world [in deep sleep]. And according as he has access
"to the condition in the other world, he proceeds and beholds
"both, evil [this world, in dream] and bliss [the other world,
"in deep sleep]."

(b) Dreamsleep (4, 3, 9—14. 16—18).

"But when he sinks to sleep, then he takes from this all-
"embracing world the wood (*mâtrâm, materiem*), fells it him-
"self and himself builds it, in virtue of his own radiance,
"his own light;—when he so sleeps, then this spirit serves
"as its own light. There are no chariots, nor teams, nor
"roads there, but he forms for himself chariots, and teams,



"and roads; there is neither bliss, joy, nor pleasure, but he
"creates for himself bliss, joy, and pleasure; there are no
"springs, and ponds, and rivers, and but he forms for himself
"springs, and ponds, and rivers,—for he is the Creator. On
"this subject are these verses:

"Putting aside in sleep the bodily (*çârîram*)
"Sleepless the sleeping organs he beholds;
"Then borrowing their light goes back again
"The golden Spirit, only wandering bird.
"He leaves the Life to guard the lower nest
"And soars immortal from the nest himself,
"Immortal, moving wheresoe'er he wills,
"The golden Spirit, only wandering bird.
"In dream, the Spirit upward, downward moves,
"And, as a God, creates Him many forms,
"Now with fair women sporting joyously,
"And now beholding sights that make him fear.
"His playground canst thou see, but not himself,"—

"therefore it is said: 'let him not be wakened suddenly,' for
"hard is one to heal, back to whom the Spirit does not find
"its way. Therefore it is said also: 'for him it [sleep] is
"only a state of waking,' for what he sees in waking, the
"same also he sees in sleep. Thus therefore this man serves
"as a light to itself... Thereon, after he has enjoyed him-
"self and wandered forth in dream, and beheld good and evil,
"he hastens back, according to his entrance, according to his
"place, to the condition of waking; and by all that he beholds
"in this he is not touched, for to this Spirit nothing adheres;
"—and again, after he has taken delight and wandered forth
"in the waking state, and after he has beheld good and evil,
"he hastens back, according to his entrance, according to his
"place, to the condition of dream. And like as a great fish
"glides along both banks, on this side and on that, so glides
"the Spirit along both conditions, that of dream and that of
"waking [without being touched there]."

(c) Deep Sleep (4, 3, 19. 21—33).

"But like as in yon space a falcon or an eagle, after he
"has hovered, wearily folds his pinions, and sinks to rest, thus
"also hastens the Spirit to that condition in which, sunk to



"sleep, he feels no more desire, nor beholds any more dreams. That is his form of being, wherein he is raised above longing, free from evil and from fear. For, like as one whom a beloved woman embraces, has no consciousness of what is without or what is within, so also the Spirit, embraced by the Self of knowledge [the Brahman], has no consciousness of what is without or what is within. That is his form of being, wherein his longing is stilled, himself is his longing, he is without longing, and freed from grief. Then the father is not father, nor the mother, mother, nor the worlds, worlds, nor the gods, gods, nor the Vedas, Vedas; then is the thief no thief, the murderer no murderer, the Cāṇḍāla no Cāṇḍāla, the Paulkasa no Paulkasa, the ascetic no ascetic, the penitent no penitent; then he is unmoved by good, unmoved by evil, then he has vanquished all the torments of the heart."

"If then he sees not, yet he is seeing though he does not see; since, there is no interruption of seeing for the seeing one, because he is imperishable; but there is then outside him no second, no other different from him whom he could see. So too if then he smells not, nor tastes, nor speaks, nor hears, nor thinks, nor feels, nor knows, yet is he a knower, even though he does not know; since, for the knower there is no interruption of knowing, because he is imperishable; but there is then no second outside him, no other different from him, whom he could understand. For only where, as it were, another is, can one see, smell, taste, address, hear, think of, feel and know another."

"He stands in the tumultuous ocean [cf. Qvet. 6, 15] as beholder, alone and without a second, he whose world is the Brahman. This is his highest goal, this is his highest joy, this is his highest world, this is his highest bliss; through a little part only of this bliss, other creatures have their life."

"When among men one is fortunate and rich, king over the others and loaded with all human enjoyments, that is the highest joy for man. But a hundred of these human joys are but one joy of the fathers, who have conquered heaven, and a hundred joys of the fathers who have con-

"quered heaven, are but one joy in the world of the Gandharvas, and a hundred joys in the world of the Gandharvas
"are but one joy of the Gods through works, who by their
"works have attained to godhead, and a hundred joys of the
"Gods through works are but one joy of the Gods by birth,
"and of one learned in the scripture and without falseness
"and free from desire; and a hundred joys of the Gods by
"birth are but one joy of Prajâpati's world and of one learned
"in the scripture and without falseness and free from desire;
"and a hundred joys of Prajâpati's world are but one joy of
"the Brahman-world, and of one learned in the scripture and
"without falseness and free from desire. And this is the
"highest joy, this is Brahman-world."

(d) Death (4, 3, 35—4, 4, 2).

"As a cart, when it is heavily laden, creaks as it goes, so
"also this bodily Self, burdened by the Self of knowledge,
"goes croaking [rattling], when one is lying at death's door.
"And when he falls into weakness, whether it be through old-
"age or sickness that he falls into weakness, then, as a mango-
"fruit, a fig, a berry, lets go its stalk, so the Spirit lets go
"the limbs and hastens backward, according to his entrance,
"according to his place, back into the Life... And like as
"to a king, when he will forth, the chiefs, and officers, and
"charioteers, and rulers of villages gather together, so also,
"at the time of his end, to the soul all life-organs come to-
"gether, when one is lying at death's door. When, therefore,
"the soul falls into swoon, and is as if it had lost all sense,
"even then these life-organs gather themselves together to the
"soul; and it takes up these force-elements into itself and
"withdraweth to the heart; but the Spirit, which dwells in
"the eye, returns outwards [to the sun, whence it descends,
"cf. above p. 66]; then recognises he no more forms. Because
"he has come to unity, therefore he sees not, thus it is said,
"because he has come to unity, therefore he smells not, tastes
"not, speaks not, hears not, thinks not, feels not, knows not.
"Then the point of the heart becomes luminous; from it, after
"it has become luminous, the Soul departs, whether it be



"through the eye, or through the skull, or through any other part of the body. As it departs, the Life also departs; as the Life departs, all the life-organs depart with it. It is of the nature of knowledge, and what is of the nature of knowledge, departs after it."

(e) The unliberated Soul after Death (4, 4, 2-6).

"Then knowledge and works take it [the soul] by the hand and their newly gained experience" [if we may read *apūrva-prajñā*].—

"As a caterpillar, after it has reached the end of the leaf, lays hold of another beginning and draws itself over to it, so also the soul, after it has shaken off the body and let Ignorance go, lays hold of another beginning, and draws itself over to it."

"As a goldsmith takes the material of one piece of work, and out of it hammers another, newer, more beautiful form,⁸⁷ so this soul also, after it has shaken off the body and let Ignorance go, shapes itself another, newer, more beautiful form, whether of the Fathers or the Gandharvas or the Gods or Prajâpati or the Brahman or other beings."

"Verily, this Self is the Brahman, consisting of Intelligence, of Manas, of Life, of eye, of ear, consisting of earth, of water, of wind, of ether, consisting of fire and not of fire, of pleasure and not of pleasure, of anger and not of anger, of righteousness and not of righteousness, consisting of all. And according as anyone consists of this or of that, according to his deeds and conduct, according to that is he born; he who does good will be born as a good man, he who does evil will be born as an evil man, holy he becomes through holy work, evil through evil. For verily it is said: 'Man is altogether formed of desire (*kâma*); and according as his desire is, so is his will (*kratu*), and according as his will

⁸⁷ Compare Pythagoras in Ovid. Met. XV, 169 seq.:

*Utque novis facilis signatur cera figuris,
Nec manet ut fuerat, nec formas servat easdem,
Sed tamen ipsa eadem est, animam sic semper eandem
Esse, sed in varias doceo migrare figuras.*



"is, so performs he the work (*karman*), according as he performs the work, so it befalls him."—Thereon is this verse:

"That he pursues, and strives by deeds to reach,
"Toward which his character and longing is.—

"After he has received reward
"For all that he has here performed,
"He comes back from that other world
"Into this world of deeds below."

"Thus is it with him who desires (*kāmayamāna*)."

(f) Liberation (4, 4, 6—23).

"Now as to him who desires not (*akāmayamāna*):"

"He who is without desire, free from desire, whose desire is stilled, who is himself his desire, his vital spirits do not depart; but Brahman is he and into Brahman he resolves himself. On this is this verse:

"When every passion utterly is gone,
"That lurks and nestles in the heart of man,
"Then finds this mortal immortality,
"Then has he reached the Brahman, the Supreme."

"As the slough of a snake lies dead and cast away on an ant-heap, so lies this body then; but the bodiless, the immortal, the Life is Brahman only, is light only."—

"On this are these verses:

"A narrow path and old it is, which I have found and trod;
"The sage, released, upon his way to heaven took this road. 5
"Whatever name you give to it, white, black, brown, red, or green,
"This is the only path for those who have the Brahman seen;
"On this he goes, who Brahman knows,
"And does the right, in form of light.

"The man who lives in Ignorance moves on to blindest gloom;
"To blinder still goes he who would by works escape his doom.
"Yea joyless is this world for man and hidden in black night:
"And to it after death he goes who hath not learned the right.

"But he whose mind the inner Self in Thought hath learned to grasp,
"Why should he longer seek to bear the body's pain and woe?
"For when a man in spite of all the stains of mortal sin,
"The great awakening to the Self hath won, and learned to see,
"Him as creator of the worlds, almighty shalt thou know,
"His is the universe, because the universe is he.



"And while we yet are here below, may we this knowledge gain,
"If not, illusion cleaves to us, brings ruin in its train.
"For they who have the knowledge are immortal though they die,
"But they who have not gained it must return to misery.

"He who God's very self in his own bosom sees—
"Lord of what was and is to come—no more he flees.

"Him 'neath whose feet the mighty tide of days and years rolls past,
"In whom the fivefold host of things and space itself stands fast,
"Whom gods as light of lights adore, as immortality,
"The Brahman know I as my deathless Self, for I am he.

"Breath of the breath and very mind of mind,
"Ear of the ear, and apple of the eye,
"Who knoweth him as this hath truly seen
"Old Brahman, who is from eternity.

"Musing in spirit shall ye see:
"That here is no plurality,
"Their never ending death they weave,
"Who here a manifold perceive.

"The Âtman is unchangeable, immense, a unity,
"High above space and stain of sin, unchanging, great is he.

"Muse upon him if thou wouldst wisdom find,
"Use but few words.—They're weariness of mind."

"Truly this great, unborn Self is that among the life-
"organs which consists of knowledge [as the spirit shining
"inwardly]! Here, inwardly in the heart is a space, therein
"he lies, the lord of the universe, the ruler of the universe,
"the prince of the universe; he grows not higher through
"good works, nor less through evil works; he is the lord of
"the universe, the ruler of beings, the guardian of beings; he
"is the bridge, which holds these worlds asunder, that they
"blend not [cf. above p. 162]."

"Him the Brahmans seek to know through Vedic studies,
"through offerings, alms, penances, and fasts; who knows him,
"becomes a *Muni*. To him the pilgrims go in pilgrimage,
"when they long for home (*loka*)."

"This knew those of old, when they longed not for descen-
"dants, and said: 'Why should we wish indeed for descendants,



"we whose self is this universe?' And they ceased from the
"longing after children, from the longing after possessions,
"from the longing after the world and wandered forth as
"beggars. For longing for children is longing for possessions,
"and longing for possessions is longing for the world; for one
"like the other is merely longing."

"But He, the Âtman, is not thus nor thus. He is incomprehen-
"sible, for He is not comprehended, indestructible, for He is
"not destroyed, unaffected, for nothing affects Him; He is
"unfettered, He trembles not, He suffers no hurt."

"[He who knows thus,] is overcome by neither, whether
"he has therefore [because he was in the body] done evil or
"whether he has done good; but he overcomes both; he is not
"burned by what he has done or not done. This also says
"the verse:

"This is the eternal majesty of Brahman's friend,
"He doth not rise by works, nor yet doth he descend.
"Then follow after this; who after this hath toiled,
"Will by his evil deed no more be stained and soiled."

"Therefore he who knows thus, is calm, subdued, resigned,
"patient and collected; in his own Self only he beholds the
"Self, he beholds all as the Self: evil doth not overcome
"him, he overcomes all evil, evil doth not burn him, he burns
"all evil; free from evil, free from passion, and free from
"doubt, he becomes a *Brâhmaṇa*, he whose world is the *Brah-*
"*man!*"—

"Thus spoke *Yājñavalkya*. Then said the king: 'O holy
"man, I give thee my people in servitude and myself also.'"

It might be thought, *Qaṅkara* remarks on this section,
that in it the individual soul is treated of, because towards
the beginning and towards the end (under *a* and *f*) "that
"among the life-organs which consists of knowledge" is spoken
of (p. 330, 9); but we are rather to think of the highest soul
all through, since in the passage concerning deep sleep and
death it is distinguished from the individual soul, in the case
of deep sleep, where it is said that the spirit is "embraced
"by the Self of knowledge" (p. 331, 2), in the moment of death,
where a burdening of the bodily self, that is, the individual



soul, by the Self of knowledge, is spoken of (p. 331, 7). For that which is "of the nature of knowledge" (*prājñā*) is [in direct contrast with the terminology of the Vedāntasāra, cf. note 82, p. 180] none other than the highest God, who is so called because he is eternally inseparable from omniscience (p. 331, 6). But with regard to the passage mentioned, at the beginning and the end, it is said there (under *a*): "it is as though it meditated, it is as though it wavering moved," and (under *f*): "truly this great, unborn Self is that among the "life-organs which consists of knowledge," clearly proving that the individual soul is mentioned here solely in order to teach its identity with the highest soul (p. 332, 1—6). Also the conditions of waking and sleep are mentioned only in order to shew the soul's freedom from them; for it is said (under *b* and *c*), that the Spirit is not troubled by the images in waking and dreaming, and again, that it is not troubled by good and evil (p. 332, 12), as also the king repeatedly breaks out into the exclamation [omitted by us]: "say what higher than this, makes for liberation" (p. 332, 11). Lastly, the passages (under *f*) "the Lord of the Universe" etc., and "he grows not higher through good works" etc., shew that we are to think, not of the individual, but of the highest soul (p. 333).



XIII. The Brahman as the highest Goal.

1. Brahman as Object of Meditation.

Sûtras 1, 3, 13.

THE Meditation on the Brahman can be more or less perfect and accordingly, as is known from the passages adduced in Chap. VI (above p. 102ff.), brings different fruit, namely, in part, earthly happiness, in part, heavenly though transitory felicity, in part, eternal union with Brahman. This thought is illustrated in the fifth section of the *Praçna-Upa-nishad* (p. 219ff.) by the doctrine that, in the word "om," the symbolical bearer of the meditation on the Brahman, the three metrical moments (*mâtrâ*), of which it is supposed to consist (*a-u-m*), are distinguished. The meditation is more perfect in proportion as it extends to one, two, or to all three elements of the word "om." The passage runs as follows:

"Verily, o Satyakâma, the sound 'om' is the higher and the 'lower Brahman. Therefore the wise, when he relies on it, 'gains the one or the other.'"

"If he meditates on one element, enlightened by it, he 'comes [after death] quickly to the state of the living. The 'Rig-hymns lead him to the world of men; there he comes 'to asceticism, pious life and faith and enjoys exaltation.'"

"When in his thought he attains two elements, then '[after death] he is borne by the *Yajus*-sentences upward into 'the air to the Soma-world [to the moon]. After he has enjoyed lordship in the Soma-world, he comes back again.'"

"But if, through all three elements of the sound 'om,' 'he meditates on the highest spirit, then, after he has entered 'into the light, into the sun, as a serpent is freed from its



"slough, so he is freed from evil; by the *Sâman*-songs he is "led upwards to the Brahman-world; then beholds he Him "who is higher than the highest complex of life, the spirit "who dwells in the city [the body] (*puri-çayam purusham*)."

It is a question, remarks Qaṅkara, which of the two Brahman, mentioned in the opening passage, is to be understood in the last paragraph, the higher or the lower? The spatial reference, which lies in the leading upward to the world of Brahman, speaks for the latter, and does not suit the higher Brahman (p. 245, 7; above p. 109). Nevertheless we must think of the higher Brahman because it is said "he beholds," which can only refer to a reality, to the highest Brahman, as it is the object of perfect knowledge (*samyag-darçanam*) (p. 246, 6), while by the "highest complex of life" Brahman in the form of the individual soul⁸⁸ must be understood (p. 247, 1). In conformity with this also, in what has gone before, by the highest spirit, which is to be meditated on, the highest Brahman is to be understood (p. 247, 10), for meditation on it only brings the further mentioned deliverance from evil (p. 248, 4). But as to the reference to place, which lies in the leading upwards to the Brahman-world, it must be assumed that gradual liberation (*kramamukti*) is here taught, and that perfect knowledge is only communicated after the introduction into the Brahman-world (p. 248, 8),—though this last view is not quite in accordance with the doctrine of the system; as here the highest Brahman is to be understood, while on the contrary as we shall see later (Chap. XXXIX, 4), gradual liberation applies only to the worshipper of the lower Brahman.

⁸⁸ Somebody whose opinion is introduced very abruptly p. 247, 3 wishes to refer the "highest complex of life" to the Brahman-world, a view which is neither approved of nor opposed in what follows, and has probably been interpolated into the text, so that the *tasmât* p. 247, 7 was originally connected immediately with 247, 2 (cf. above p. 29).



2. Brahman as the Place of the Liberated.

Sûtras 1, 3, 1—7.

In the Muṇḍaka-Upanishad 2, 2, 5 it is said:

"The place in which the heavens, and earth, and mind,
"The sky with all the senses are entwined,
"That place as nought but Âtman shall ye know,
"All other turns of speech shall ye forego"⁸⁹
"He is the bridge of immortality."

Here, says Qaṅkara, we might think of something other than Brahman, perhaps primordial matter, or the wind, or the individual soul, which in a certain sense could be called the place of things (p. 225), for the bridge mentioned seems to presuppose another shore (something outside it), which is not true of Brahman (p. 224, 8). But the place, in which the whole world is woven, can only be Brahman (p. 225, 10), as is shewn by the word *Âtman*, which in its full sense is only valid for Brahman (p. 226, 1). The world is, of course, not related to it as the roots, trunk and branches to the tree (p. 226, 7), but is only a product of Ignorance (p. 226, 11); for the scripture warns us against accepting unreal plurality (p. 227, 3), when it is said (Kâth. 4, 10. Brih. 4, 4, 19):

"Their never ending death they weave,
"Who here a manifold perceive."

What is said of the bridge, only means that Brahman keeps things asunder (cf. above p. 133. 162), not that He has another shore (p. 227, 10). But that Brahman alone can be the place, follows from the fact that He is afterwards indicated as the place to which the liberated go. For just this illusion that the I consists in the bodily nature, is Ignorance; the esteem of this body is Passion (*râga*), the despising of it is Hate, thoughts of injury to it are Fear, and so on according to the names of the host of the unreal (p. 228, 10). Liberation from all these defects is a going to the place which is here spoken of; it is further said concerning it (Muṇḍ. 2, 2, 8):

⁸⁹ In the text the indicative stands: *jānatha, vimuñcatha*.



"He who this highest, deepest views,
"For him the heart's knots are untied,
"For him his doubts are all resolved,
"His works all pass to nothingness;"

and again (Mund. 3, 2, 8):

"As rivers run, and in the deep,
"Lose name and form, are lost to sight,
"The sage released, from name and form,
"Enters the highest spirit of light."

Here neither primordial matter nor the wind can be spoken of (p. 230), nor yet the individual soul (p. 231, 1), which, by the words: "This place alone you know the Âtman is," is distinguished as subject from the highest soul as object (p. 231, 8).

3. Brahman as Attainment of absolute Unity.

Sûtras 1, 3, 8—9.

All knowledge, which is different from its object, is limited and not free; that knowledge only is unlimited and free, which knows itself as identical with the known.—This is the fundamental thought of the *Bhûma-vidyâ*, the seventh section of the Chândogya-Upanishad (p. 473—527), whose chief contents are as follows.

Nârada prays *Sanatkumâra* to teach him; and, in answer to the question: what he already knows, enumerates the four Vedas and a long series of other sciences. In the consciousness of their insufficiency, he adds: "I know, O venerable one, "the *Mantras* [here the whole practical theology], not the "Âtman [metaphysics]; for I have heard from those who are "like thee, that he who knows the Âtman is above sorrow; "but I, O Master, am sorrowful; lead thou me away from "sorrow!"

Sanatkumâra, in his teaching, takes the following course. All, he says, that thou hast learnt, is name, greater (*bhûyas*) than name is speech, than speech, understanding, than this, resolve, than this, thought, than this, knowledge, than this, force, than this, food, than this, water, than this, fire, than this, space, than this, memory, than this, hope, than this the

life (or the breath, *prāṇa*). "As the spokes are fastened in "the nave, so all this is fastened in the life. The life prospers "through the life (breath), the life (breath) gives life, gives it "to life. The life is father and mother, the life is brother "and sister, the life is teacher and Brahman. Therefore, "when anyone roughly uses a father or mother or brother or "sister or teacher or Brahman, it is said: Fie on thee! thou "art a parricide, matricide, fratricide, slayer of thy sister, "slayer of thy teacher, slayer of a Brahman [cf. I John III, "15 πᾶς ὁ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστίν]; but if, "after the life has fled, he pokes the same persons with the "pike [on the funeral pile] and burns them up, it is not said: "thou art a parricide, matricide, fratricide, slayer of thy sister, "slayer of thy teacher, slayer of a Brahman: for the life only "is this all.—Verily, he who thus sees and thinks and knows, "he is a conqueror in speech (*ativādin*); and if anyone should "say to him: thou art a conqueror in speech! he shall avow, "and not deny it."

By life (*prāṇa*) in this passage is to be understood, not as elsewhere frequently and also in the Chāndogya-Upanishad itself (cf. above p. 147. 164. 177. 182) the highest Brahman, but (perhaps in intentional polemic against this view) empirically "the life-principle (*prāṇa*) shaped to the complex "of the subtle body, the *Prajñātman* [*Brahman*, note 82] as "the central principle of the body, in which the highest god-head [*Brahman*] enters to the end of evolution in name and "form as the living self (as the individual soul, *jīva ātman*), "like the image in the mirror."⁹⁰—The result up to this is therefore only the highest point of the empirical view of the world, from which *Sanātkumāra* seeks to lift his pupil to the metaphysical view, proceeding as follows:

But he only is the true conqueror in speech, who conquers through the truth. The truth, therefore, must be investigated.

⁹⁰ Cañk. on Chānd. p. 505, 15. Here should be distinguished 1. that which is imaged (*brahman*, *ātman*), 2. the image of the mirror (*jīva*), 3. the mirror (*prāṇa*), which however are all three at bottom one in Brahman. However the sense of the above scholion is in part obscure and the translation uncertain.



Now the truth is based on knowledge, knowledge on thought, thought on faith, faith on certainty, certainty on action, action on pleasure [the inclination to do something, as determining the will].

Now pleasure, [thus the speaker continues, the idea of a single satisfaction, such as is felt after an action, leading him on to that of an absolute, final satisfaction] consists only in illimitation (*bhūman*), not in the limited (*alpa*m). Now what is illimitation?

"When one sees no other [outside himself], hears no other, "knows no other, that is illimitation; when he sees, hears, "knows another, that is the limited. Illimitation is the immortal, the limited is mortal."—"But on what is it based then, Master?"—"It is based on its own greatness, or, if you will, not on greatness. For by greatness in this world one "understands many cows and horses, elephants and gold, "slaves and women, fields and lands. But this I mean not, "for here one is always based on the other."

"But it [the illimitation] is below and above, in the west "and in the east, the south and the north; it is this whole "world."

"Hence follows for the consciousness of "I" (*ahamkāra*): "I (*aham*) am below and above, in the west and the east, the "south and the north; I am this whole world."

"Hence follows for the soul (*ātman*): the soul is below and "above, in the west and the east, the north and the south, the "soul is this whole world."

"He who sees and thinks and knows thus, rejoicing in the "soul, playing with it, uniting and delighting with it, he is "autonomous (*svarāj*), and freedom (*kāmacāra*) is his in all "worlds; but they who regard it otherwise than thus, they are "heteronomous (*anyarājan*), of transitory felicity, and unfreedom (*akāmacāra*) is theirs in all worlds."

"Thus," it is said in conclusion, "he shewed him, whose "darkness was worn away, the shore beyond the darkness, he, "the holy *Sanatkumāra*."

Çaṅkara's efforts, in connection with this passage, are directed to proving that, by illimitation Brahman is to be



understood, and not the previously mentioned life. For although nothing higher follows after life in the series (p. 235, 4), and who knows it is called a conqueror in speech (p. 235, 8), although the description, also, that one "sees no other outside himself," suits the life in the condition of deep sleep (p. 235, 14), as also the terms as pleasure, immortal, *Âtman*, could be understood of the life (p. 236), yet it is not the life; but only the highest Brahman which is to be understood by illimitation; for it is termed higher than deep sleep, that is, than the life in deep sleep (p. 237, 1) by the fact that from him who knows the life, we are directed to him "who through the truth conquers in speech" (p. 238, 10), while the first mentioned conquest is unjustified (p. 239, 8). And as the truth appears further illimitation, that is, the highest soul different from the life (p. 240, 3); for to Him alone can apply the passage concerning the destruction of sorrow (p. 240, 6), as also the phrase "the shore beyond the darkness," that is, Ignorance (p. 240, 10), and the immense greatness, which lies in the idea of illimitation, and is only applicable to the highest God as the cause of all (p. 240, 14). To it applies also the unity of subject and object, since the unity which arises in deep sleep is also to be reduced to it (p. 241, 6). Lastly, to it refers also the term pleasure, since by it no pleasure enduring for a time only (*sâmaya*) is to be understood (p. 241, 12); as also the expressions such as immortality, truth, being based on its own greatness, omnipresent, and all-animating (p. 241, 16).



XIV. Esoteric Theology.

Sûtras 3, 2, 11—37.

1. Preliminary Remark.

HOWEVER sublime are the ideas of the Brahman, which up to this we have gained from the Upanishads in pursuance of the selection made (not always quite happily) by Bâdarâyana and Çaṅkara, yet, in their figurative character, they fall short of satisfactorily fathoming to the full the being of the Godhead. Because this was felt, to the theological part of the Brahmasûtras is added a supplement, which has as its subject the esoteric Brahman, and, along with two other (psychological) supplements, is found in the second Pâda of the third Adhyâya, that is, after the Cosmology, Psychology and doctrine of transmigration. Even if here and there a greater intelligibility is thereby gained, yet this gain is more than counterbalanced by the disadvantages inseparable from the treatment of the same subject in two widely severed passages; for this reason, we here, as frequently, in our arrangement depart from that of the original work.

The fundamental thought of the esoteric theology (cf. above p. 102ff. 115) is this, that Brahman strictly taken is without all differences (*viśeṣa*), attributes (*guṇa*), limitations (*upâdhi*) and forms (*ākāra*).—This undifferentiated Brahman, as we may briefly call it, has, however, two contraries: first the *forms of the phenomenal world*, as which Brahman, conditioned by Upâdhis, appears; then the imperfect *figurative ideas*, which we form of the Godhead, in order to bring it nearer to our understanding and our worship (*upâsanâ*). It is strange that between these two contraries of the undifferen-



tiated Brahman, however wide apart they naturally are, Ćaṅkara draws no sharp distinction, and even if according to one passage (p. 807, 5) it seems as if he saw in the *phenomenal forms* the basis (*ālambanam*) of the *presentation-forms*, yet from the continual intermingling of the two, not only in the passage under consideration, but also in many other passages in the work⁹¹ it follows that our author never became clearly conscious of the difference between them. Perhaps this was done more by other Commentators, who, of the one Adhikaraṇam 3, 2, 11—21, make two, of which the first (3, 2, 11—14) seems to have been directed against the manifoldness of phenomenal forms, and the second (3, 2, 15—21) against the plurality of the characteristics of Brahman, which Ćaṅkara (p. 812) discards as aimless (*vyartha*), without our having been able completely to gather the opinion of the Opponent from his words.

Here, therefore, we are limited to reproducing Ćaṅkara's view, and the shortcoming indicated compels us to consider only from a certain distance the two contraries of the undifferentiated Brahman, which he confuses; this makes a clear insight into all details impossible. In other respects our course is such that we do not unnecessarily depart from the line of thought as arranged by our author.

2. The differentiated and undifferentiated Brahman.

Sūtras 3, 2, 11—21.

Concerning Brahman there are, so Ćaṅkara expresses himself, passages of scripture of two kinds; the passages of one kind teach Brahman as possessing differences, for example, when it is said: "All-working is he, all-wishing, all-smelling, all-tasting" (above p. 153), the others as devoid of differences, as in the passage: "That is not coarse nor fine, nor short nor long" (above p. 133). Now the highest Brahman in itself

⁹¹ Thus the same confusion is already found in the considerations which introduce the theological part (p. 110—114), and again very clearly p. 245, where in antithesis to the spaceless *param brahma* (p. 245, 7) appears as the *aparam brahma* the *prāṇa* which rules the body (p. 245, 10).



cannot be both, for it is not possible that one and the same thing in itself should be formed and formless (p. 803, 10). It is true that we might think that Brahman in itself is undifferentiated and becomes differentiated by Upâdhis (under which is to be understood everything which brings Brahman 1. to phenomenal existence, 2. to presentation in the mind). But one thing cannot become another, by the fact that it appears to be connected with limitations: the crystal remains clear, even when it is painted with red colour (p. 803, 14); as it is only an error if it is taken to be red in itself, so in the case of Brahman also the limitation rests only on Ignorance (p. 804, 1). Therefore it is to be firmly held, that Brahman is free from all differences and perfectly unchangeable and not the contrary (p. 804, 3).

How does it happen then, that, in many passages of scripture, manifold forms are attributed to Brahman, since He is called sometimes four-footed, sometimes of sixteen parts, sometimes dwarflike, sometimes having as body the three worlds, etc.? [p. 804, 9. Here and in what follows, the continual oscillation between phenomenal forms and forms of presentation should be noted.] Should we not perhaps admit that by the limitation a difference of form is actually brought about? For otherwise what is the purpose of the passages of scripture, which attribute differentiation to Brahman?—To this it is to be replied first, that every time that limitations appear, it is further said that Brahman is not affected by them [p. 805, 1: for this an isolated example is adduced; in reality it is most frequently not the case]; and that in many passages (Kâth. 4, 11. Brih. 4, 4, 19. Çvet. 1, 12) it is expressly asserted that there is no plurality, and that he who is predestined, what is predestined, and he who predestines are one in Brahman (p. 805, 13). At the same time it is to be noted that only the passages concerning the undifferentiated Brahman have as their aim, to teach the Being of God (p. 806, 7), while the passages concerning Brahman possessed of forms have another aim, namely worship (p. 806, 10).

A few similes may elucidate the relation of Brahman to His phenomenal forms. As the light of the sun or the moon,



when it falls on the finger, shares in the finger's limitations, and in conformity with this, seems crooked when it is crooked, straight when it is straight, without in itself being crooked or straight, so also Brahman, when it is united with the limitation of the world of appearances, for example, of the earth, assumes its form, and on this is based (p. 807, 5) the apprehension of Brahman under different forms, as it is taught for the purpose of worship. It is therefore by no means purposeless; for all the words of the Upanishads have a purpose and are authoritative (p. 807, 8). But this does not prevent this view from resting on Ignorance all the same; for on inborn Ignorance depends worldly action as well as that prescribed by the Vedas (p. 807, 12).

Another simile is found in the *Moksha-cāstras*:

"Like as this sun, whose being is the light,
"Appears as manifold, in many streams,
"By limitation multiplied in space,
"E'en so it is with the unborn Âtman."

And the following:

"One soul of beings dwells in every being,
"One and yet many, like the moon in waves."

It is true, that the sun and the moon are formed and separated in space from their mirrored images, the Âtman, on the contrary, is not formed (read *mûrto* p. 810, 7) and not spatially separated from the limitations, but omnipresent and identical with all (p. 810, 8), but no simile can be applied any longer, if we abandon the *tertium comparationis* (*vivakshitam aṅgam*); for if it were identical with the thing compared, there would be no more comparison (p. 810, 13). It only affirms that Brahman, which is in the true sense unchanging and a unity, when it enters into limitation like the body and the rest, takes part, as it were, in the qualities of these limitations (p. 811, 6).

But if Brahman in itself is so perfectly devoid of differences, how are we to explain the passages of scripture concerning Brahman as possessing differences (p. 813, 12)?—Some think they also teach the undifferentiated Brahman, since the required annihilation of the phenomenal world must also be applied to



the forms of Brahman taught by them (p. 814, 3). Yet this procedure is only permissible when they appear in a passage which treats of the esoteric teaching (*paravidyā*), (p. 814, 4), but not where precepts of worship are spoken of (p. 814, 8). The passages which teach the nature of Brahman and those which prescribe worship of Brahman, must be kept separate throughout (p. 815, 6). The former aim at liberation, the latter have as their fruit, according to the object, purification from sins, attainment of lordship, or gradual liberation (p. 815, 5). And while the latter passages belong to the canon of precept, the former exclude all imperative elements, and aim only at the knowledge of the subject (p. 815, 10).

What should the precept prescribe in the case of knowledge of Brahman? Perhaps, to annihilate plurality, as one is ordered, by illuminating an object, to drive away the darkness (p. 816, 6)?—Then it must be asked: how is this annihilation of plurality to be thought of? Is it a real process, something like annihilating the hardness of butter, by putting it on the fire (p. 816, 10)?—But such an actual annihilation cannot be brought about by a mere man, and therefore cannot be ordered (p. 816, 15). Moreover in this case the whole plurality of earth etc. would have been annihilated by the first man who reached liberation, and the Universe would stand empty (p. 817, 2).

It must therefore be assumed, that the purpose is only to annihilate Ignorance which attributes to the one Brahman the plurality of appearances. But Ignorance is got rid of through teaching alone and without command (p. 817, 6), while a hundred commands without the teaching cannot remove it (p. 817, 9). Therefore, neither for the knowledge of Brahman nor for the annihilation of plurality are commands of any use; on the contrary both are accomplished by teaching alone (p. 817, 12).

And for whom should the command to annihilate plurality hold good? For the individual soul? But it is annihilated along with it! Or the highest soul? But it cannot be commanded (p. 818, 1—4).

It is true that it is said in the higher knowledge also: "this is to be seen!" (above p. 174). But the command here