CHAPTER I

(Salutations unto the endless and infinite One,
Lord Krsna, the Ruler of Universe, the Propagator
of Samkhya-yoga, the Supreme Brahman and the
Praman.)

- SÅM KHYÅ -

Its original meaning in the light of Vedic Samhitås,
Brahmanas, Upanisads, Mahåbhårata, Bhagavadgîta and Bhågavata
Puråna.

Introduction:-

In modern works of scholars on Indian
Philosophy, the term SÅmhya has been most frequently used
to denote the dualistic system of Classical SÅmhya as
embodied in the Såmhya Karikås of Is'vara Krsna. Though
these works show their awareness of the existence of another
previous theistic Såmhya, which they designate as Epic
Såmhya, but adequate attention has not been paid to it.

Our studies of the use of the word and its theme in Bhågavata
Puråna leads us back far beyond the Epics, deep into the
Vedic literature itself. The following study is meant to show
how the monistic wisdom of antiquity has its beginnings in
the Vedic Samhitås themselves and how even the term Såmhya
was already familiar as its synonym in the Upanisadic period.
The tracing back of this Såmhya which is ascribed to the
hoary sages like Kapila, Sanat-Kumåra, Såmhya-Yana, Narada,
Asita-Devala, Maitreya and others and the venerable

1) नन्दी सहस्य त्रिचर नित्ये कृपाय धर्मसारस्य त्रिक्षस्य महाप्रभुस्य चित्ताय नि० धर्मानन्दे
BP X-85-39
personalities like Lord Kṛṣṇa is the highest testimony of tradition to its very great antiquity. Since this has not received adequate attention of scholars, a detailed examination of the relevant literature of antiquity is furnished in this chapter.

Sāṁkhya Philosophy is found to be the most 'ancient' Philosophy amongst all the systems of the Indian Philosophies - so much so that it has become very difficult to trace the origins of the system prior to the Classical Sāṁkhya. There are controversies about its origin, the implications of its teachings and even about the meaning of the term Sāṁkhya itself. Very often efforts are made by some of the scholars to connect the Classical Sāṁkhya with the Pre-Classical Sāṁkhya and to establish a line of descent between the former and the latter. Such attempts are found to lean more on imagination than fact in as much as no such relation of succession can be brought out between them, the two systems being basically and principally different from each other. The early Sāṁkhya purports to be emphatically theistic which aspect the Classical Sāṁkhya definitely denies, though some later commentators like Vijnānabhikṣu are not so eager to attribute atheism to the Classical Sāṁkhya. The early Sāṁkhya nowhere accepts the pluralistic Purusavāda which the Classical Sāṁkhya has made its central theme, in its keenness to present the system as a Realistic Philosophy. There are also similar other major differences between the two systems. The Sāṁkhya thought of S'rīmad Bhagavata is entirely that of early or
Pre-Classical Sāmkhya. The purport of this thesis is not however to settle or to discover the chronology of the early Pre-Classical Sāmkhya system, nor to trace its early history; not even to rebuild the system as a parallel to the classical system but to explain the principles and implications of the system as it is found in the Bhāgavata and in the earlier works upon which it is built. Nevertheless, efforts are being made wherever possible to give some glimpses of the antiquity of the system in general, so that in course of time it will be helpful or serve as a theme for further studies.

**The term 'Sāmkhya':—**

The term 'Sāmkhya' is found to have several meanings. This term is used in 'neuter gender' (Sāmkhyam) in the MB and elsewhere and its followers are called 'Sāmkhyas' in 'masculine gender'. Richard Garbe considers 'Sāmkhya' as 'the Philosophy of enumeration' and argues that it is derived from the word 'Sāmkhyā' meaning enumeration or number, since enumeration, like division, classification of the Guṇas into three categories, of the twenty-four or twenty-five Tattvas or principles etc., are the characteristics of this school. But since such categorisation is common to various other Hindu systems or Philosophies, there is no point in restricting, like Garbe, the Sāmkhya system only to 'number' or to 'enumeration' of the categories. This counting of numbers is common to Yoga, Jainism, Buddhism etc., which go much further than Sāmkhya, in using

---

(1) Garbe Philosophy of Ancient History, p. 44.
Jacobi, another great western writer on Indian Philosophy, explains it as "discussion, reflection"; but later on, as "the Philosophy of enumeration" in the sense of "determination of the sphere of understanding through the enumeration of its contents." Monier Williams in his Sanskrit-English Dictionary defines it as the name of one of the three great divisions of Hindu Philosophy, so called either from "discriminating" in general or more probably "reckoning up" or "recounting" twenty-five Tattvas or true entities. Winternitz also defines it in the same way. Keith, another great thinker, seems to have the same view in his work "Saṃkhya System." Franklin Edgerton, in his conclusive reply to the theory that "Saṃkhya meant 'System of numbered categories'" states, "Saṃkhya meant no metaphysical system at all, but a way of salvation by knowledge. Occasionally, but rarely, we may find what seems to be a punning use of the word with reference to the mathematical meaning of its contents. The fondness of Hindus for word-play makes this predictable." Radhakrishnan states; "This system takes its name from the fact that it arrives at the conclusion by means of theoretical investigation. In the early texts, "Saṃkhya" is used in the sense of philosophical reflection and not numerical reckoning. This particular system, which expounds by careful reflection the nature of 'Puruṣa' or Spirit and the other entities, acquired its significant title.

(1) HIL (SI), III, (Part II), p. 504.
(2) BIP, p. 36 n.
(3) IP, II, p. 249.
The Amara-Kosa explains the word 'Samkhya' on which Samkhya is said to be based as "Caro Samkhya Vicaraana" meaning thereby that the word is connected with "thinking and reasoning." Etymologically the word 'Samkhya' means "Samkhya buddhih; tannirvrttam Samkhyaam" sensing thereby knowledge or attainment of knowledge. This interpretation of the term 'Samkhya' as 'knowledge' may not be complete in itself as it would cover up all knowledges and even the religions of Buddhism and Jainism. The term 'Samkhya' means 'Samyak khyā' i.e. true knowledge. The Upanisads, MB, Purānas, and the BG use the word in the sense of 'true knowledge', leading the individual self to become Supreme Self by abolition of ignorance or Māyā which causes distinction between the two. The earliest use of the word 'Samkhya' is found in the SU VI-13. Though the systems of Samkhya and Yoga are mentioned in this verse as the ways for the realisation of the Supreme Reality and for getting liberation from all the bonds of ignorance, the exact meaning of the words 'Samkhya' and 'Yoga' is nowhere given in this Upanisad. From the absence of the use of this word in the Vedic Texts earlier to this Upanisad, it will not be, however, correct to presume that the use of the word Samkhya was not in vogue in earlier days. The MB gives more details about the Samkhya path in the Moksa-Dharma part of its S'antiParvan. The sage Vasistha, while explaining Samkhya-tattva to the King Karala Janaka mentions it to be "the philosophy of...

1) अमरा-कोशम् मांसक्ष्यविचारत् ||
2) सर्वं सङ्क्ष्या पूर्ववर्तः सांस्कृतम् ||
3) मीयो निष्ठागापचत्रात्मानाय कृद्वा तदं किं विद्विषार्थिनां नितिमाणः संस्कृतेभौदिशं शोधये हस्यवेदीः शर्वदायाः || SU VI-13
4) सांस्कृते भवद्यात्र गृहद्वारे परिरस्त्यन्त दृष्टिः म ३०४-२६
correct knowledge or analysis of reality," by stating "I will narrate to you the Saṁkhya—jnana which is the dars'ana (Philosophy) of correct knowledge or analysis of reality (Parisamkhyana)." This word Parisamkhyana need not be restricted to man only enumeration. It means true or correct knowledge or rationalistic thinking about the reality. Such sense is also made out in another Sloka of MB by stating that the Saṁkhya philosophy is the highest (uttamam) knowledge of the reality, knowing which the followers of Saṁkhya attained liberation (Kevalata). This very sense is repeated in the forty-second Sloka of three-hundred & sixth chapter of the MB. In all these uses of the word Saṁkhya, MB uses this word in the sense of true or highest Knowledge. As to the greatness or popularity which this path had attained earlier to the MB, it states emphatically:—

"There is no other knowledge which can be considered as equal to Saṁkhya." S'rimad Bhagavata also explains Saṁkhya as true knowledge. The sage Kapila who is claimed as the propounder of the Saṁkhya Philosophy declares in Bhagavata:— "My birth is meant for unfolding the mysteries of the Soul (Itma-dars'ana) to the deserving (Sammata), and for indicating the correct knowledge (Parisamkhyana) of Tattvas to the Munis who seek deliverance from their subtle body (Purasaya) and who meditate with that end." It also explains that the Saṁkhya is the decisive knowledge.

(1) सांस्कृतिक दृष्टिप्रेरित सन्तानो भविष्यति भविष्यति मालायः MB, 315-19
(2) सांस्कृतिक दृष्टिप्रेरित सन्तानो भविष्यति भविष्यति मालायः MB, 316-2
(3) सांस्कृतिक दृष्टिप्रेरित सन्तानो भविष्यति भविष्यति MB, 316-2
(4) सांस्कृतिक दृष्टिप्रेरित सन्तानो भविष्यति भविष्यति MB, 316-2
(5) सांस्कृतिक दृष्टिप्रेरित सन्तानो भविष्यति भविष्यति MB, 316-2
Samkhya is thus called the prime philosophy explaining the knowledge of Tattvas and the sage Kapila is personally identified as its first propagator. The commentator of Bhagavata, Sridharasvamin, makes this clear in his commentary. In another context the Bhagavata calls 'Samkhya' as the inculcator (Veda) of Tattvas. (Tattvanam Amnayah). This is further explained as knowledge by the sage Jada-Bharata by saying, "(Thou art one). Nobody is capable of enumerating all thy names, forms and shapes. Wise people (Kapila etc) have calculated and have assigned (some) number of forms, (Samkhya) to Thee. (But this is incomplete). Thou art the very Supreme Samkhya knowledge (Samkhya Nidarsana) under the influence of which the estimation of the number of forms also disappeareth. I bow down unto Thee." The alternate explanation of Samkhya is also the renunciation of actions. The Samkhya sage, Pancasikha, who is one of the foremost of the exponents of the Samkhya Philosophy explains it in the MB, "I will narrate to you the unparalleled Samkhya Philosophy which will completely destroy or annihilate (Samyag-vadha) ignorance, and which is therefore called the science of renunciation (Tyaga-Staastra)."

Another great sage Asita-Devala observes: "For destroying good and evil (Punya and papa), the Samkhya knowledge is prescribed."

1. Tattvajnanamkaranam Tattvamasya Pradasantrya /// BP Ait. 15-6
2. Tattvajnanamkanama Pradyuttram Sankalpa Pravajanyena Niyogam /// SS 5.1-3-10
3. Tattvajnanamkaranam Pradyuttram Sankalpa Pravajanyena Niyogam /// BP III-25-31
4. Samsarastetavasisyagamamakamukto karvidhiyakam saktiyo /// Sanskrita Veda 18-33
5. Antar Tattvabhyajam Samkhyanam Swastikam /// MB (BP) 219-16
6. Pauravyapaksastarhahi sankalpam vishayodhate tathastu Prastaha pada ghatena /// MB (BP) 219-16
upon their destruction, they see, in Him, the highest goal for becoming Brahman."

The BG uses this word 'Śāmkhya' in six or seven contexts but nowhere is the term Śāmkhya defined. In II-39, III-3, and V-4, Śāmkhya is associated with Jñāna and Saṁnyāsa. While commenting on III-3, S'ri S', mentions Śāmkhya as 'discriminative knowledge about soul and non-soul entities' and on V-5 he explains Śāmkhya as Saṁnyāsa devoted to knowledge. In the thirteenth verse of Chapter XVIII of BG it is stated: - "O Mighty armed! Learn from me these five factors for accomplishment of all actions, as stated in the Śāmkhya doctrine." S' explains this word 'Śāmkhya' used here, as 'Vedānta.' The word 'Maharai Kapilācārya' appears as a synonym for the name 'Vīṣṇu' in the Vīṣṇusahasranāma in Chapter 149 of Anuṣṭanaparvam of MB, while annotating the word 'Kapilācārya' states that the latter is the Ācārya of the Śāmkhya Philosophy which deals with the knowledge (Vijñāna) of the (supreme) pure self (Suddha Tattva). In support of this, he quotes from the Vyāsa Smṛti wherein Śāmkhya is defined as the knowledge of the pure Ātman i.e. Paramātman.

There is also another interpretation of the term Śāmkhya. Hall suggests in his Śāmkhya Sāra that the system has derived its

---

(1) पुरातन शक्षेत्र सर्वोदयः कुपट्टे - II-39, ब्रह्म योगेन सर्वातनां - III-3
(2) सार्यवाची प्रथमाकाशिका: प्रवर्तिते - V-4
(3) यदि आर्यवेदीप्रसादवर्ते स्थलाक - II-5. (2A) यद्य आर्यवेदीप्रसादवर्ते स्थलाक - III-3
(4) परमेष्ठी समाप्तहो काश्चिदन्ति निविष्टो न | सर्वातनो उपलब्धार्थी स्वर्णिनयं || SBh on III-3
(5) "श्रुतिः कपिलाचार्यः " MB(AP) 149-70 (6) कपिलाचार्य अस्स्तित्वध्वनेन श्रुतादि तत् सार्यवेदीप्रसादवर्ते- SBh on Vīṣṇu Sahasranāma
(7) Hall 'Śāmkhya Sāra', p. 3
---

...
name from its first founder the sage 'Saṃkhyā' but he has not given any evidence in support of it. But there are valid grounds for tracing the origination of Saṃkhya to the sage 'Saṃkhyā' who should not be taken as fictitious. Orthodox Brahmins while offering Tārpaṇas to the various Ācāryas during their Brahma-Yajña offer Tārpaṇa to the sage 'Saṃkhyāyana' by saying "My oblations to Saṃkhyāyana."² Gayatri, whose mantra of twentyfour letters we concentrate during our daily Saṃdhya performance belongs to the Gotra of Saṃkhyāyana.³ Sayana's commentary of the RV mentions the name of the sage Atri, son of the sage Saṃkhyā as the seer of the RV hymn X-11-143.⁴ Sayana's commentary of the RV hymns X-6-77 and 78 also shows that one sage, Syūmaras'mi of Bhṛgu Gotra is their seer. Chapters 268-270 of the Śānti-Parvam of MB shows that the sage Syūmaras'mi was influenced and advised by the sage Kapila. Since the sage Kapila is the contemporary of the sage Syūmaras'mi according to this evidence of the MB, we can also safely infer that the sage Saṃkhyā from whom the 'Saṃkhyā' system obtained its name and who is the father of the sage Atri existed during some period earlier to the sage Kapila; and when the Saṃkhyā system was in infancy or in declining stage, the sage Kapila brought life or rejuvenated this philosophy as stated in Śrīmad Bhāgavata.⁶

(1) This may be compared with the tradition of Vaiyākaranas, that says that the Sage Śpotoyana, is the founder of the Śpota theory as recorded by Śrī Nagojibhatta.

(2) Saṃrājya-nāma tarpāyī.²³ Saṃrājya-sūtraś mitra-iṣṭā-śpota-vyākaranāh or

(3) Tāvānīya তারাণাযুক্ত তারাণাযুক্ত তারাণাযুক্ত\n
(4) Tāvānīya তারাণাযুক্ত তারাণাযুক্ত
tārāṇāyaṁ svapna-sparśa-sūtraḥ saṃśaya-punyāyaḥ aṣṭāryaṁ nārayaṁ ṛṣi-śāstra
tārāṇāyaṁ svapna-sparśa-sūtraḥ saṃśaya-punyāyaḥ aṣṭāryaṁ nārayaṁ ṛṣi-śāstra

(5) RV 4, p. 652.

(6) ग्रह आत्मयोगो यथको नेष्कः काणेन भूक्षसि तय भवतिष्यते देहिनम् विद्यते भवन्ति धतुरः

BP III-24-37
It is also stated in another context by S'rimad Bhāgavata that the path of Jñāna or the Bhāgavata Dharma was first taught by the God Saṁkarsana to the great sage Sanatkumāra, the follower of Nivṛtti path, who then passed it on to the sage Saṁkhyāyana, the great Paramahāsa, who thereafter narrated it to the sages Parasāra and Brhaspati. This sage Saṁkhyāyana obviously belongs to the family of the sage Saṁkhyā. The philosophy of Saṁkhyā can, therefore, be traced to the sage Saṁkhyā due to whose knowledge Saṁkhyā became a second word to Jñāna.

Antiquity of the Saṁkhyai-

From the foregoing, it can be made out that the antiquity of the Saṁkhyā goes to the age of the Vedic Singers of the RV. But the important factor to be noticed in this connection is that the Saṁkhyā under reference is not the Classical Saṁkhyā, nor has the sage Kapila who related this Vedic Saṁkhyā, anything to do with the Classical Saṁkhyā and its Sūtras. The Pre-Classical Saṁkhyā which is theistic according to the MB has been attributed the highest antiquity and has been awarded the highest place in Philosophical thoughts even during the period of this epic. Bhīma while explaining the Saṁkhyā tattva to Yudhishṭhīra describes it as very extensive and the oldest one. In another context, the sage Vais'ampayana describes Saṁkhyā and Yoga as very ancient. If in the circumstances, the Bhāg traces it to the end of the Krta age.

---

1. Antiquity of the Saṁkhyai-

2. Bhīma while explaining the Saṁkhyā tattva to Yudhishṭhīra describes it as very extensive and the oldest one.

3. Vais'ampayana describes Saṁkhyā and Yoga as very ancient.
(कृतांते), it should not be mistaken as a surmise. This word 'कृतांते' appearing in S'loka 13 of eighteenth Chapter of BG has been interpreted by Radhakrishnan as 'at the end of Kṛta age.' With the exploration of the discoveries of the Indus Valley excavations, some historians and research workers have commenced urging that the Indus Valley Civilisation is pre-Vedic and that the writings or figures on some of the tablets and plates found during Mohenjo Daro or Harappa excavations, and as well as other excavation findings elsewhere, also have a close bearing on such pre-Vedic civilisation. But the most pertinent and outstanding problem, viz., that the Vedic period itself has not yet been finally fixed is escaping their searching minds. The great controversial problems about the composition of the earlier Vedic hymns and the later Vedic hymns, the compilation and division of the Vedas into four parts, the edition and revision of such composed Vedas into further sanctified forms with Anukramanis, padas and all grammatical and chandas restrictions are remaining still as unsolved and burning problems. These cannot be ignored or passed over easily. There is another and still more important factor which must not be forgotten; that some of the Vedic hymns had already disappeared even at the time of the composition or edition of the Vedas and that a complete and full picture of the civilization of the Vedic times cannot be thoroughly envisaged only from the extant Vedas. It is also worthy to be noted that the excavations of the Indus Valley have not brought to light all the relevant facts in full about the Indus Valley Civilization, since

(1) BGRK, p.355.
some of the tablets and plates of the Harappa and other neigh-
boursing ruins had been already removed by the then Railway
Contractors, at the time of quarrying and removing the materials,
prior to the excavations, for the laying of the Sind Railway line
in Sind and Punjab. The consistency of the relations of the coins
plates and tablets with each other is broken and lost due to the
ignorance of the excavators and many a missing link is caused
thereby. The writings or letters on the coins and tablets have not
yet been deciphered thoroughly, though some claim that they have
done so. From the fragments of what is discovered and from the
incomplete picture of the findings which are presented to us,
attains are being made by some of the historians to build a
civilization of the Indus Valley and to call it ' pre-Vedic ',
irrespective of the fact that the background for such presumption
is still incomplete and not thorough. Some writers like
Anima Sen Gupta, S.K. Ramachandra Rao, Zimmer, have been also making
efforts to trace the Sāmkhya system to a pre-Vedic age. Some of these
writers seem to be spinning a theory that the carvings of female
figures on some of the tablets of these excavations are indicative
of the worship of Prakṛti conceived by the early Sāmkhya thinkers.
Such wishful thinking deserves, no doubt, some appreciation, but
at the same time, it will have to be seriously considered whether
the high thinkers of the Sāmkhya Philosophy, which accepts the
Puruṣa or Brahman as Nirguna and Formless, and whose Absolute
Brahman is neither male nor female, could accept and accommodate

[(1) Kunhan Raja, SK, p. 4]  
[(2) Anima Sen Gupta, Sāmkhya and Advaita Vedanta, A Comparative
Study, p.
[(3) S.K. Ramachandra Rao, Origins of Indian Thought, p. 7
[(4) नेच स्वतः न गृहान्तः न जैवतः नृत्यं सुव-10; व 20-27; 89 उन-3-34]
such female Prakrti worship. The tablet carvings may, at the most or best, admit a female deity or so, but not definitely a deity which can fit in with Saamkhya theory. Tradition, as given in the Bhagavata, goes however to show that the idol worship was initiated at a later age like Treta age when human intellect began to deteriorate and showed signs of failure to grasp and concentrate upon the formless Absolute Brahman. Hence one cannot help but to express a doubt that in these attempts to fix up a pre-Vedic history for the Saamkhya, we are only placing the cart before the horse. In the absence of any conclusive and definite evidence of the remote past filled up with uncertainties, an attempt at building and establishing a pre-Vedic origin to the Saamkhya system will amount to be premature. It is enough, in the circumstances of the existing Vedic evidence, for making a conclusion that the pre-Classical Saamkhya was very old and that it had its roots in the Vedic Philosophy itself and it further matured and became the Upanisadic thought in due course of time. Such a view emerges from a close study of the Bhagavata.

Is Saamkhya UnBrahmanic?

There are also certain other scholars who want to posit an un-Brahmanic origin to the Saamkhya. Richard Garbe maintains a view that the Saamkhya is born outside the Vedic thought and had its origin in the same region as that of Buddha. Some thinkers seem to be giving great importance to such ideas. Winternitz seems to be also supporting this view, as he states:

"It is certain that unlike the Vedanta system, the Saamkhya system must be considered to be a pre-Vedic system."

References:
2. HIL(SL) III (Part II), p. 505.
was not originally, depending on the interpretation of the scriptures, but was later tugged to the Vedas and was admitted into Brahmanism. These thinkers seem to be advocating such a view, because of their thinking that the original pre-Classical Sāmkhya has taken shape as the Classical Sāmkhya without any alteration in its philosophic nature and that the originator of this Classical Sāmkhya is also the Vedic Sage Kapila. Such a view has not got any valid support, since the pre-Classical Sāmkhya is theistic, monistic and Vedic, whereas the Classical Sāmkhya is atheistic, dualistic and is against the Vedic or S'ruti texts. Garbe's view that the Sāmkhya of the BG or the epic got distorted at the hands of the Vedānta thinkers, while the pure Kapila Sāmkhya is quite different from the Vedānta Sāmkhya etc seems not very convincing. He seems to have entertained the view of Ksatriya origin of Sāmkhya relying on some of the instances in the Upanisad wherein some Brāhmaṇa thinkers approach Ksatriya thinkers for advice, but he seems to have failed to sense that what the Ksatriya kings were preaching was only the Vedic or Upanisadic thought, Jñāna or Sāmkhya has never been the exclusive privilege of Brāhmaṇas or Ksatriyas. The S'ruti and Vedic thinking was open to all Dvijas, or all the Brāhmaṇas, Ksatriyas and Vais'yas. It is also contrary to the Sāmkhya thinking that Sāmkhya or Jñāna arose as a reactionary or rival thought against the ritualism of the Vedic Brāhmaṇas. The great Sāmkhya propounder, the sage Kapila states, "One getting proficiency in Vedas (S'abda Brāhmaṇi) only will get qualified to attain Supreme Brahma-hood; Vedas stand as authorities to the

1) Garbe in his essay on "Sāmkhya" in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, or Kapila did not attempt to mean anything in every instance. He not only rejected the Brāhmaṇa, the six Vedas, the existence of God, the dogmatism of pre-Classical Sāmkhya, but also preferred the authority of Vedas or S'ruti, that the country is supported by these.

2) "Kapila, Sāmkhya and the Epics.

विधि महाध्वेवः द्विनिप्रयोगी द्विदिवस्य समाज्ञाती देवा समवधि निशाचतः न प्रेमविभावम् साक्षी || 28 (2) 270 - 1 and 2
people and hence one should not entertain any reactionary views against them. It should never be forgotten that the great sages like Yajñavalkya whose idealistic views of Ātman and Brahma are outstanding and form the very life of BU were occupying a more predominant position in the S'atapatha and other Brahmaṇas which are conveying the highly ritualistic Vidhis and Niyamas, rules and regulations. These are not the rare instances but the common features of the Vedic or Brahmaṇa period. Ritualism, austerities and ethics were never looked down by the Upanisad thinkers and were never viewed in a spirit of antagonism, as presumed by some writers; but they were considered as ancillary to the Śāmkhya or Jñāna path of the Upanisads. All Nitya or Naimittika Karmas were, to the Upanisad thinkers, the sacred duties which were essentially necessary as the background for preparing and training the mind to have fixity in Jñāna. Keith has correctly analysed and rejected Garbe's views by stating: "In any case, the arguments for the unbrahmanic character of Śāmkhya are wholly devoid of weight."

Similarly the views of Winteritz will have to be discountenanced for the above reasons, in as much as there was correlation between the Śāmkhya and the Brahmaṇa (or ritualistic) religion as will be explained later on. The various portions of Vedic and Brahmaṇa literature including the ritualistic parts contain and represent the high Śāmkhya thoughts, which should not be considered as impositions on the former or foreign to them. The Śāmkhya thoughts are not superfluous fixtures or additions to Vedic philosophy, as

(1) SS, p.50.
they form part and parcel of the same.

There are also some Indian thinkers who hold that the Sāṃkhya path is opposed to 'Vaidika' path. A great Purva Mimāṃsāaka like Kumārila regards Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pañcarātra and Pāśu-pata darsanās as 'A-vaidika'. He obviously seems to have held this opinion with reference to the Classical Sāṃkhya and Classical Yoga which were extant during his period. There are also some sectarian like Bhimācārya who consider even the monistic Vedānta as atheistic. These are only the views of some extreme sectorians. Such of these one sided views will have to be read with caution in general and not taken as authoritative.

As to the view of Garbe that Sāṃkhya had its origin in the same region as that of Buddha, it has no support of any valid authority, more especially when taken in connection with the Pre-Classical Sāṃkhya which had its origin in the Vedas and had its birth also in the Vedic geographical regions. This view is also being further touched later on.

Is Sāṃkhya a parallel thought to Vedānta?

There are also some views posed by modern scholars like Max Muller who says,

"The Vedānta and Sāṃkhya are parallel developments from a remote past and that to determine the anteriority of either Vedānta or Sāṃkhya would be useless." Another thinker Winternitz also considers "Notwithstanding that there is no doubt that the old

(1) मात्रवादकुस्ति नासिकम् द्रम पर्यायस्याने समुद्धतेः भिमाचार्याः, Nīyoga Kōsha.
(2) SSIP, p. 135
(3) HIL(SE), III Part II p. 504.
philosophical ideas of India are the teachings regarding Brahman and Ātman contained in the Veda, especially in the Upanisads, the oldest philosophical system, that is the oldest philosophy that has been systematically planned and presented is apparently Śāmkhya, the philosophy of Realism, that originated in express opposition to the idealism of the Upanisadic philosophy. This view not only amounts to credit the two systems of 'Vedānta' and 'Śāmkhya' as the two parallel systems like those of Max Muller but also purports to advocate a sense of divergence or disparity between each of these two systems. It may be true that the Classical Śāmkhya is antagonistic to the Vedānta on some of its points, both being basically different from each other. The great Vedāntin Śi, on the authority of the Brahma-Sūtras of Śri Badarayānacārya had to undertake to oppose and contradict the Classical Śāmkhya Philosophy because of its views being contrary to the Upanisadic or Vedāntic truths, But this contradiction by Ś will not apply to the Pre-Classical Śāmkhya Philosophy which was nothing but the Vedānta itself as posed by the Acārya while interpreting the term 'Śāmkhya' as 'Vedānta' in his Gītā Bhāṣya, as explained previously. The two systems - Vedānta and Pre-Classical Śāmkhya - have never been categorised as two parallel systems either in the epics or the Purāṇas or in the Vedas or Upanisads. The view of advocating parallelism between these two systems will have to be ruled out as meriting no consideration for want of evidence in the 'remote past' works. In the Pre-Classical period Śāmkhya was then Jñāna and so also was Vedānta which was nothing but Jñāna. The conception of 'Idealism' or 'Realism' as understood in the Western philosophy was and has always been
foreign to the Indian system of thought and there is no question of 'Vedanta' preaching Idealism or 'Sāṁkhya' preaching Realism. The mistake is with us who are colouring them with these concepts by tagging the Pre-Classical Sāṁkhya with the Realism of the Classical Sāṁkhya, whereas the Pre-Classical Sāṁkhya does never admit such 'Realism' anywhere in the remote past works. There is therefore no question of interdependence or independence of these two systems when both are one and the same.

There are also some scholars who seem to agree with A.B. Keith who believes in the Pre-Classical Sāṁkhya and who also maintains "While there are no arguments of any value for the view, that Sāṁkhya is a product of Un-Brahmanical circles, there is evidence that the system is a natural growth from the Philosophy of Upanisads! Upanisads are not considered in the traditional history of Indian Philosophy as a petty independent part of the Vedas, but they are considered in totality as the 'S'rutis' or 'Vedas' or the "Revealed scriptures, self evident, self-authoritative, not composed by any human authors." In case the term Upanisad is used by him in the widest sense of the Veda, such a view of Keith is welcome. If however the term 'Upanisad' is to be construed in the sense of works independent of the 'Vedas', the view of Keith for restricting the origin of the Sāṁkhya to Upanisads will have to be taken as incorrect in as much as the germs of the Sāṁkhya can be traced to the Pre-Upanisadic Sāṁhitas, Brāmanas or Aranyakas, as will be explained hereafter.

Greatness of Sāṁkhya which is an exposition of Vedic thoughts-

Thus Sāṁkhya is considered as nothing but the knowledge or

(1) SS, p.68, 51 (2) V.S. Ghatge, Lectures on Rg Veda, p.28.
Jñāna which occupies a very predominant part in the history of Indian Philosophy, and which is having precedence over all other paths from the Vedic times till to-day. The course of knowledge or philosophical reflection has never begun from the Upanisads in India as explained earlier, but it even extends to earlier times. It will be very pertinent to point out a saying from the MB which states that 'the Upanisat of Vedas is Truth;' the MB intends to use the term 'Upanisat' here in the sense of "conclusion" or "Summum bonum". With the interpretation of the term 'Upanisat' in the above sense or light, the Upanisadic literature can be taken as the very essence or Summum bonum of the Vedas or the S'rutis. This also implies that the Upanisads carry with them the essence of the Vedic thought. In the alternative the word 'Upanisad' in the above context can be also taken to mean 'Anta' and the sentence read as Vedasya Antam Satyam, since the word 'Anta' would also convey the meaning of 'conclusion', 'aim' or 'theme'. 'Vedasya Antam' represents 'Vedānta'. The ideas in the 'Upanisads' constitute the purport, conclusion, aim of the Vedas, according to this interpretation, and thus bring a synonymity between the Upanisads and Vedānta. Since 'Sāmkhya' and 'Vedānta' are identical in purport in the Pre-Classical period, no exception need be taken if Sāmkhya is awarded the very position of Upanisad. Not only the S'rutis but also the Smṛtis like the epic attribute a very high status to the Sāmkhya, but also MB in this connection states "The path of spiritual wisdom of Sāmkhya thinkers which imparts correct knowledge (of self) (Prabodhanakara) is being explained for the

1) वेदरथ उपनिषदात सत्यम्। मB(3P) २५१-१२.
2) अवस्थानकर्तव धार्मिक आचार्यानां आवमीयस्ती | किंवपैक्षि अभाधते न न शिष्याणि | विज्ञानकर्मया। मB(3P) ३६७-४५.
welfare of their followers." The path of Samkhya is explained in the MB as leading to salvation. In 301st Chapter of MB it is explained in explicit terms. "The great Samkhyas who are great seekers of knowledge (Maha Prayunjah) will attain salvation through knowledge of this (Samkhya). Hence there is no path equal to or greater than Samkhya." The great sage Yajnavalkya who is considered as a great Samkhya thinker by the MB explains the Samkhya philosophy as the Supreme Jnana Vidya of Upanishads leading to the fourth stage (Turiya or Caturthi) and states, "Salvation can be had through Jnana and not through Ajnana and therefore one should take to Jnana only by which one will get freedom from birth and death." The MB also wants to glorify the excellence of Samkhya knowledge on the ground that "it alone helps us to realise the Para Brahman who is immutable (Aksara), eternal (Dhruva), primal (Sanatana) and complete," and culminates it as the very essence of such Para Brahma by stating, "Samkhya is the very form of the formless Paramatman as stated by the Sutris themselves, because all such conceptions which are called Jnana (Abhijnana) accept Samkhya only as their root." Thus Samkhya is the knowledge of all knowledges. This view is amplified by the MB by stating "Whatever
kind of knowledge that is had from the Vedas, various kinds of
metaphysical Sāṁkhya and Yoga, whatever is perceived in the
Itihāsas, whatever is forthcoming in the science of polity(Artha
S'āstra) recognised by the scholars, whatever else exists as
being called by 'knowledge' in the world, all such knowledges can
be assumed to be covered by the great Sāṁkhya knowledge only."¹
Thus Sāṁkhya occupies a unique place in the history of Indian
thought, since all knowledge has been taken, as shown above in
detail, as having origination from Sāṁkhya only. It is for this
reason that MB calls² Sāṁkhya as the only real or correct
knowledge (Samyag-dars'ana) which alone leads to the Supreme and
with reference to which knowledge only, the S'rutis state³ 'Nānyah
panthā vidyate ayanāya.'

_Sāṁkhya and Yoga in epics, Purāṇas and Upanisads
not the Classical Sāṁkhya or the Classical Yoga_

The path

of Yoga has been also considered as ancient as the Sāṁkhya in
Indian Philosophy. The terms 'Sāṁkhya' and 'Yoga' are frequently
met in the epics and BG; but these terms do not signify the names
of the later Classical Sāṁkhya and Classical Yoga but mean
'reflection or knowledge' and 'concentration or meditation'
respectively in which sense they are used also when they first
occur in SU. These doctrines are equated with each other in the

---
¹ MB 301-108, 107
² MB (SP)-301-108, 107
³ MB (SP) 306-15
⁴ SU -31-15
⁵ SU -31-13
Aurobindo who is recognised as a great Indian Philosopher of the present days has explained the relations of Sānkhya and Yoga in his 'Essays on Gita' as follows: They (Sānkhya and Yoga) are certainly not the systems which have come down to us under these names as enunciated respectively in the Sānkhya Karika of Ishwar-Krishna and Yoga aphorisms of Patanjali. This Sānkhya (Gita) is not the system of the Karikas - at least as that is generally understood; for the Gita nowhere for a moment admits the multiplicity of Purushas as a primal truth of being and it affirms emphatically what the traditional Sānkhya strenuously denies, the one as Self and Purusha, the other again as the Lord Ishwara or Purushottama and Ishwara as the cause of the Universe. The traditional Sānkhya is, to use our modern distinctions, atheistic; the Sānkhya of the Gita admits and subtly reconciles the theistic, pantheistic and monistic views of the Universe. Nor is this Yoga the Yoga system of Patanjali. Its Sānkhya is catholic and Vedantic Sānkhya such as we find in its first principles and elements in the great Vedantic synthesis of the Upanishads and in the later developments of Puranas. Its idea of Yoga is that large idea of a principally subjective practice and inner change, necessarily for finding of the self or union with God.

... The Gita insists that Sānkhya and Yoga are not two different, incompatible and discordant systems, but one in their principle and aim; they differ only in their method and starting-point. The Sānkhya also is a yoga, but it proceeds by knowledge; it starts, that is to

(i) संदर्भाये व अर्थाये यथ: प्रयत्ने स प्रयत्निः \( bG \cdot v \cdot 5 \).

2) \( bG \), pp. 63 and 64.
say, by intellectual discrimination and analysis of the principle of our being and attains its aim through the vision and possession of truth. Yoga, on the other hand, proceeds by works; it is in its first principle Karma-Yoga; but it is evident from the whole teaching of the Gita and its later definitions that the word 'Karma' is used in a very wide sense and that by 'Yoga' is meant the selfless devotion of all the inner as well as the outer activities as a sacrifice to the Lord of all works... Yoga is the practice of the truth, of which knowledge gives the vision and its practice has for its motor power, a spirit of illumined devotion, of calm or fervent consecration to that which knowledge seems to be the Highest."

Radhakrishnan, while explaining the verses 2, 4 and 5 of Chapter V of the BG1 says:—"The renunciation of works and their unselfish performance of both lead to the soul's salvation.""The Sāṁkhya method involves the renunciation of works and the Yoga insists on their performance in the right spirit. They are at the bottom the same but the Yoga way comes more naturally to us. The two paths are not inconsistent. In Sāṁkhya, Jñāna or insight is emphasized. In Yoga, volitional effort is stressed. In one, we know the self by thinking away the alien elements; in the other, we will them away."... "Renunciation is a mental attitude, the casting off of all desire in work; true work is work with all desire renounced. There is not any opposition between the two."

S.N. Dasgupta while explaining the terms Sāṁkhya and Yoga as used in the BG states2 "In these passages Sāṁkhya and Yoga seem

(1) BGRK, p. 175-176.  
(2) HIF", II, p. 457.
from the context to refer respectively to Karma Sanyasa and Karma Yoga..... As in the case of different uses of the word Yoga so here also the word Samkhya which primarily means 'true knowledge' is also used to mean 'renunciation' and since Karma-Yoga means performance of one's duties in a spirit of renunciation, Samkhya and Yoga mean practically the same thing and are therefore identified here, and they are regarded as leading to the same results. This would be so, even if Yoga were used to denote communion, for the idea of performance of one's duties, has almost always communion with God as its indispensable correlate''. The philosophy of the Gita thus differs materially from the traditional Samkhya philosophy on almost every point."

Franklin Edgerton states "The principle alternative to the Samkhya way of Salvation in the Mahabharata is called Yoga. This word as all Sankritists know, is a fluid one, used in a variety of senses, philosophical and other..... Samkhya seeks salvation by KNOWING something, Yoga by DOING something."

Synthesis between Pre-Classical Samkhya and Pre-Classical Yoga:

From an examination of the above views, it can very well be seen that the Yoga which is the same as Karma or Bhakti is, at the bottom, the same as Samkhya in the Smrtis which clarify the purport of the Srutis. Samkhya and Yoga are internally related and connected with each other and are parts of the process for self-realisation. Yoga at one stage, preaches the renunciation of mental

(1) HLP, II, p. 477. (2) BIP, p. 37.
blemishes or alien entities through 'the power of Yoga';
Samkhya at another stage seeks the renunciation of these
blemishes through 'the power of knowledge and austerity.' Thus
the measures like Yama and Niyama of the Astanga Yoga which are
the preliminaries for withdrawal of mind from external objective
world appear as 'Tapo-danda' and Jnana-S'ashtra in the Samkhya
for the purification of the mind and qualifying it for the vision
of the Supreme. The BG also states¹ that Yajña, Dana and Tapas are
the basic requirements for the purification of the mind. As
expressed in the BG, Samkhya is all the while never antagonistic
towards the Yajña and the Tapas which supress the primordial
ignorance and its flaws, covering one's pure soul and knowledge.
MB therefore advises² that "the Seeker of Salvation should secure
self-knowledge through the Dharana of the Samkhya, and coupled
with it, attain the unity of his self with Paramatman through
Yoga, by which measures only he will conquer the death." This
teaching of the epic is based on the SU saying³ that the Ultimate
Reality is attainable by the path of Samkhya combined with Yoga.
In view of this inter-relation between Samkhya and Yoga, Keith
states⁴ "In the epic, the relation of Samkhya and Yoga is
precisely as in Upanisads, the two stand side by side as
Philosophy and Religion, as Theory and Practice."

(1) BG V.31-35 (2) SS, p. 55
(2) SS, p. 55
(3) Samkhya Yoga is sometimes interpreted by some as two S'astras Samkhya S'stra and Yoga S'stra, and by some as one S'stra Samkhya yoga S'stra
(4) SS, p. 55.
The above views also purport to show that neither the Pre-Classical Sāṃkhya nor the Pre-Classical Yoga which appear in the epics "precisely as in Upanisads "differ materially from each other - in the same way as the Classical Sāṃkhya does not differ from the Classical Yoga in the basic tenets.

Pre-Classical Sāṃkhya is purely monistic:-

The Pre-Classical Sāṃkhya which is the Vedic Sāṃkhya plays a very important role in the S'rutis. Sāṃkhya or knowledge which is the Upaniṣad of Veda, as pointed out previously, is the very life of the Upaniṣadic Philosophy. Harrison, a great writer on Hindu Philosophy has clearly shown that the main doctrine of the Upanisads is monistic and not dualistic. What Harrison has written about Upanisads, applies to Sāṃkhya also. S'rīmad Bhāgavata which is conveying the Kapila Sāṃkhya Philosophy and which is the ripened fruit of the Vedic tree of Philosophy is esteemed by Dasguptā as follows: "It may generally appear rather surprising to find such an extreme idealistic monism in the Bhāgavata." Thus the ancient Sāṃkhya which is the Upaniṣadic or Vedic knowledge, which is not different from the Vedānta and which the epics and the Bhāgavata propagate, is virtually identical with the Advaita or monism. Keith, the author of SS has no doubt stated about the ancient or epic Sāṃkhya " It is now clear in what way we must regard the Sāṃkhya of the epic. It is not a blurred version of the Classical Sāṃkhya nor is

(1) HMP, p.234.  (2) मिश्रवर्णवेदोपनिषदितपत्र ५० दृ प १-३
(3) HII, p.33.  (4) SS, p.53.
there any reason to believe that the Classical Saṃkhya had already been excogitated by this period," but his view that "On the other hand, it is not a Saṃkhya which recognises an absolute and merely denies a personal creator; it is, apart from efforts made by the epic to torture it into more orthodox pantheism, a system which denies an absolute and asserts instead a multiplicity of individual souls," is not cogent at all, in view of the fact that the Moksadharma parvan of MB which is the chief exponent of the Pre-Classical Saṃkhya presents the expositions of the purely monistic principles of the Upanisads. Here and there we may come across the aspects of the personal God and his characteristics or forms especially the Nārāyaniya section which presents Vasudeva or Nārāyaṇa or Kṛṣṇa or Visnu in glowing terms. But here the Personal God is nothing but the symbol of the Absolute. The Nārāyaniya section (Chap. 339 S'lokas 21-25) clearly indicates how the Personal God Vasudeva symbolises the Impersonal God. For helping the devotee in his practice of Dhyāna or Dīrghāna and attaining Samādhi, such symbols and forms are introduced by the sages, since it is hard to contemplate and to fix up the mind upon the Impersonal God in the early stage. The idealistic interpretation of Upanisads which construe the Impersonal Supreme Reality as the one underlying all such personal symbolisations is, however, borne out throughout by the Saṃkhya or Mokṣa Dharma which forms part of the MB. Multiplicity of individual Souls appears no doubt
in this epic Sāmkhya in two instances in this part, but it never corresponds with the plural puruṣa theory of the Classical Sāmkhya of Is'vara Kṛṣṇa. In chapter 315 of MB Shānti Parvan, it is stated:

"The Sages (Yatis) who are self equipped (Siddhas), free from worldly desires and are thorough knowers of Philosophy (Adhyātmajñānāḥ) consider the Supreme as absolute (Kevala), it being the witness (Upeksatvāt), non-dual (Ananyatvāt) and the substratum of all experiences (Abhimāna); and though eternal and unmodified, accept (as if) non-eternal and liable to modification (on account of conjunction with Prakṛti or Māyā). There are also some who preach ethics like compassion or non-violence and who give predominance to the Prakṛti-vāda. Such preachers sometimes speak of Prakṛti as one and the Puruṣa (under the influence of Prakṛti) as many. But Puruṣa is different from Prakṛti and eternal whereas the Avyakta (Prakṛti) is non-eternal. Multiple Purusas in this context refer only to the Individual Purusas or Jīvas. Multiplicity or Plurality in the Purusas arises only on account of the influence of the Prakṛti or Māyā only and will disappear when the Prakṛti or Māyā disappears. It is for this reason that the MB reiterates the non-eternity of Prakṛti. The theory of Plurality of Individual Purusas, more or less, resembles the Aneka-Jīva-Vāda of the recent Advaitins, and has nothing to do with the Bahu-Puruṣa (Plural Puruṣa) theory of the Classical Sāmkhyas. This appearance

\[\text{Note: There is a variant reading, Puṣparśa, for Puṣparatya, but in reading Puṣparśa appears more happy.}\]

\[\text{Vide MB (5) 318-40}\]
of plurality in the Individual or empirical Purusas or Jivas due to their connection with Prakrti or Maya; and the absoluteness and their becoming one with the Supreme Purusa and the Absolute, when Prakrti disappears, is emphasised in the various contexts of the MB (Cf. 306-33 to 35). There is also another context of MB which inquires regarding the plurality of Purusas:

"(Janamejaya asks)" O! Brahman! How many Purusas are there, one or many? Who amongst them is the foremost and who is the source of many (if there are many)?" (Vaisampayana replies)" O! the leader among Kurukulas! many of the Sāmkhya and Yoga thinkers do not consider the Purusa to be one in this world but many. I will explain to you about the Universal or transcendent Purusa who is the source of the Purusas and who transcends the Guṇas or Maya (Gunadhikam)... This is the summum bonum evidenced in the Purusa Sūkta in the Vedas. This is the Rta and Satya propounded by the Lord of the sages (Vyāsa). The sage Kapila and others have, by resorting to their self-experience (Adbhutma-cintanām), expounded this conception (Sāstra) generally and specifically. I will explain to you in brief how the sage Vyāsa purports to say the non-duality of the Purusa. This clearly makes out the Cosmic Purusa as the source of Individual Purusas who ultimately return back and get united with the Universal Purusa after the dispersal of the Maya or Prakrti. Reference to the Sage Kapila and his followers is very relevant, as it brings out the concordance between the Sāmkhya Sāstra of the Sage Kapila and the epic or Vedic Sāmkhya.
sense is brought out and further emphasised in the dialogue between the Karya Brahman and Lord S'iva in this Chapter of the MB wherein the Virat Purusa of the Purusa Súkta, who is the same as the Purusottama and who is described as Sanātana and Nirguna, is the substratum of the individual Purusas or Jīvātmans and in whom they merge back. We do not find, anywhere, in these two contexts the atheism of the classical Sāmkhya and the Plurality of Purusa as we find in the Kārikas or Sūtras of the Classical Sāmkhya.

The main theme of the epic, like that of Upanishads, is that due to the limitations created by the Prakr̥ti or Māyā and its three gunas and due to its super-imposition upon the Pratyagātman or the Absolute, the latter appears plural in the form of many Jīvātmans in crores and crores etc., as explained by the sage Yajñavalkya to the king Janaka in the MB. This is the view of the Sage Vasistha to Kārāla Janaka King stating that Ātman appears to be divided into manifold forms through Prakr̥ti. Thus we meet with a consistent theory of unity of souls posited by the various Sāmkhya thinkers of the Epic, instead of the plurality of Purusas of the Classical Sāmkhya; the plurality, wherever appearing, is due to Prakr̥ti only which is nothing but illusion, according to SU.

---

(1) अधारे नु स्व वास्य वै जागरणं पुरुषस्य तो। श्रुत्वा पुरुषस्य स विश्वासं विभीर्चते॥
तथा सं पुरुषों बिंबं परमं सुगृहस्याय निगुणं निगुणं मूढं स्वविश्वासं सनातनसमस्याय॥
MB CS P 350 - 264 and 87

(2) पुत्रें प्राधर्मिकं गुणालयं पुरुषस्याय॥ अवस्थाय भगवानु धार्मिकं सहस्रं धार्मिकं।
क्षत्रियः सर्वेऽर्थं देवं तथा क्षत्रियार्थं॥ कौटिल्यं करोढायेष प्रत्यागत्करोढायेष॥
MB CS P 314 - 1 to 3

(3) प्राक्षेत्रां स्वभावानां विचयं प्रत्यज्ज्ञानं॥ MB CS P 303 29

(4) भास्यं नु प्रकृत्य विश्रांति ॥ SU IV-10
The Prakrti has got the power of covering up, or of super-imposition (Avarana), which it gets from the sympathetic sight of the Lord Absolute, when it first approaches Him. With all its power which it gets, the Prakrti of the Vedic or Epic Samkhya is not independent. The Vedas, Upanisads and the Epics are all declaring the Purusa or Paramatman alone as absolute and transcendent. The Purusa Sukta cites that the Purusa is transcending the universe (Prakrti) by a span. Though the Prakrti is superimposing itself upon the Purusa, it cannot overpower the Purusa. The Prakrti is always finite and the Purusa infinite. The Prakrti can neither be infinite, nor the Purusa finite by any stretch of imagination. It would be relevant to quote Radhakrishnan in this connection who states: "To say that the infinite becomes the finite or manifests itself as finite is... utter nonsense. The limited cannot express or manifest the unlimited. The moment the unlimited manifests itself in the limited, it itself becomes limited. To say that the absolute degenerates or lapses into the empirical is to contradict its absoluteness. — No darkness can dwell in perfect light." This same sense is brought out by the Sage Yajnavalkya who states in MB: "It is never possible to convert the Nirguna into Saguna. Nor is it ever possible to transform the Saguna into Nirguna." The Prakrti can never be a Purusa, irrespective of its powers, and due to its imperfections.

---

(1) से भूमि विश्वते बृत्ता सत्यतिष्ठतु साक्ष्यनिः कवित्वात् किं द्वाके | बृः ॥ ४-७०-१
(2) निर्दृश्यं महत्त्वं विश्वनाथेऽविश्वस्त्वं | नान्द्वृत्तात्तवः पतिः सर्वज्ञ इति ।।
(3) मह (सप) ३१५-१
only, it functions under the superintendence of the Lord Purusa. The SU therefore describes the Lord as follows:— "This has been sung as the Supreme Brahman and in it is the triad. It is the firm support, the imperishable." "He is the Lord and Ruler. He is the great refuge of all." The Prakṛti is always dependent upon the Lord for its support and has not got any independent existence. The MB also repeats this by saying, "The Prakṛti is considered to be insentient. Taking its support upon the Lord, it functions towards evolution and dissolution."

In the circumstances, we can very well see that the argument of A.B. Keith for the establishment of the multiple or plural Purusas by the Sāṃkhya being not relevant, needs no further investigation. Nor is his view that the Upaniṣads have given an independent position to Nature or Prakṛti which is a distinct concession to realism, is convincing. The monistic tendency which regards all realistic dualities like Prakṛti and its evoluties as illusory, and which brings out unity between the individual Purusas and the prime Purusa, and which is the main tone of the Sāṃkhya of the Śṛutis, the Epics and Śrimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa is repeated so strongly by the latter that it allows no ground for the play of the Realistic theory or of the duality which is the main feature of the Classical Sāṃkhya. Now we proceed to show in detail how the ancient Sāṃkhya prior to the Classical Sāṃkhya was the Jñāna aspect only and formed itself the Vedic or

---

1. "सूत्रमेतापरं तु श्राक, तस्मिन्स्वयं सर्वाधिकारं व" || SU 1-7.
2. "सर्वस्य अभावाद द्वितीय शरणं बृहत्" || SU 3.2-17.
3. "अन्तः विवेकं धाम्मेत्तत्स्यान्तरमुः शाश्वतं विनाशितं वैषयं साधीतां सहुर्लब्धि" || N 8.68

314-15
SAMKHYA IN THE VEDAS

(a) In Rig Veda:

The culmination of the Samkhya conception, as the knowledge of all knowledges, and its enjoying the highest philosophic predominance in the Indian thought, is primarily due to its being the Vedic thought which further developed as Upanisadic thought and which, further in line with this Upanisadic thought, continued to be the main faith or view of the Epic, the BG and the Bhagavata and other Puranas. There may not be the vigorousness or the systematisation of the modern Philosophy in the Rig Veda or other Vedas but still these great hymns of the Vedas are the heart-pouring, unsophisticated, joyous prayers or songs of the ancient sages who are attributing divinity to the aspects of nature which present themselves daily in the course of their living. Some of these hymns may have been predominated with polytheistic or pantheistic ideas but it should be remembered that, at the same time, some of these songs contain the highest philosophic speculations. It is now being admitted generally that the attempts of some early scholars to turn the whole of the Vedas into pure priest-poetry are not justified. Notwithstanding the simple and naive meanings which present themselves to us on the first reading of these vedic songs praising the forces of Nature, we discover, on further closer study of some of these hymns, the subtle divine or sacred elements which are underlying the so-called forces of Nature and which represent the aspects of the highest Supreme Reality. These hymns
are not mere poems or lyrics of bards, or folk songs of the sentimental poets; but they are the revealed scriptures, self-evident and self-authoritative according to tradition. The Rsis of the hymns, whose names are shown against each hymn in the Anukramanikas or Brhad-devata portions, are only the Mantra-dstra, the seers of the Mantras. They are not at all responsible for the contents and thoughts of the hymns. The Vedic seers had to perform vigorous austerities to have the vision or glimpse of their Gods to whom the hymns pertained and had to identify themselves with the Gods of the hymns which ultimately symbolised the Ultimate Truth. It was only after the vision or the seeing of the Gods that they became able to sing the extra-ordinaries or the glories of their Gods, as revealed to them by the latter. These rapturous songs are the expositions of their mystic experiences, the expressions of their purity of thought and knowledge, and of the ecstatic feelings of the exalted stages, when in union with the Truth. Sri Abinash Chandra Bose says "It is 'dhi' or the higher intellect in man with its deep insight that leads the Vedic poet to a vision of Ultimate Reality and the hymn is said to have been revealed in his inner being." He quotes the following RV hymn:

When, O Brhaspati, the first of speech and the foremost,
The Sages uttered, giving the unnamed a name,
Which was their best and their most stainless, then they
With love revealed the Divine Secret in their Souls.

Much is made of the Ritualism or the Sacrifices of the Vedas by

(1) Abinash Chandra Bose, Hymns from the Vedas, p. 5.
(2) बृहस्पति प्रथम अवस्ते अत्र
ध्यात्मकृत नामकरणेण रश्याण।
पंधरस्य श्रेष्ठ अवदर्शितासीत
प्रेणाः पदेष्टा विहिते गुणाविष्टः। RV X-6-71-1
some of the scholars; but after all Ritualism was one way of
devotion or theism in the ancient days and it was considered as
one of the means to knowledge. The close connection between
Sāmkhya and Yoga or of knowledge and austerities was not
questionable at all in those days. When Ritualism was however,
resorted to and diverted for the attainment of selfish ends or
for worldly pleasures, the seekers of knowledge had to warn such
seekers to halt and to think or to pause and to proceed with
care. The knowledge-thinkers never hated Ritualism and its
realistic Karma ways. They, at the same time, wanted to impress
that all Karma should be performed in the spirit of self
sacrifice or with the view of sacrificing or surrendering its
ends at the altar of the Supreme, and that Karma or action
performed in the spirit, other than such spirit of sacrifice,
would lead to bondage. A true sacrifice in the right spirit
never hinders the path of knowledge. The performance of sacrifice
and the utterances of the Vedic Hymns in the same spirit in which
the Vedic Seers had seen them (Svādhyāya) is placed side by side
with austerity and worship of God as a Niyama i.e. as a Yogāṅgā.
Acts of charity etc. are always considered as helpful to enlighten
and purify the human mind. The Hymn Purusa-Sukta which forms the
very basis of the "Purusa" idea of Sāmkhya is considered by the
Religious theists as a hymn dignifying the performance of the
divine sacrifice by the celestials or even by the God Nārāyana
himself and is looked upon with great sanctity by all sects of

1) येनाधिकार्कमाणि ५००००० तदौक्ष तथा कर्मविनाशे | भृगु III-९
2) द्विंचन संतोऽहलभ्युदायसर्वभविषयातीतिनिषयाति नियमाः | ह्यू II-३२
Hindus, since no religious function in the Hindu system can be performed without uttering in part or full this Hymn. The Rg Veda and other Vedas are very sacred to the Hindu mind and simply because some of the modern thinkers unrealistically look upon them with prejudiced mind and consider them as idiosyncrasies of the Hindu priests, we cannot under-estimate them. There are still some thinkers who have changed their impressions about the Vedas and given high opinions about the Vedas. Rudolph Roth a German Writer, who undertook a Philological exegesis of Vedic words, without accepting Saivya's authority, considers the Vedic religion to be a monetheism, as maintained by Picte. The same is the view of Dayanand Saraswati who had revolting ideas against Hindu customs and who was the founder of the Arya Samaj. Ram Mohan Roy, who translated, into English a number of Upanisads between 1816 to 1820, considers "the Vedic Gods to be the allegorical representations of the Supreme deity." Max Muller states "The poets who proclaimed the great truth of the one, as the substance of all the gods, did not claim any inspiration ab extra, but strove to rise by their exertions out of the clouds of their foolishness towards the perception of a higher truth. All this represented an enormous progress... Still it was achieved; and whatever is the age when the collection of our Rgvedic Samhita was finished, it was before that age that the conviction had been formed that there is but one, one Being, neither male nor female, a Being raised high above all the conditions and limitations of personality and human nature and nevertheless the Being that

(1) IP, I, p.68. (2) SSIP, p.51.
really meant by such names as Indra etc." This view indicates how the Vedic Sages had arrived at the monistic philosophy during the remote Vedic period. These Vedas form the very basis of our culture and convey the heights and depths of the hearts of the Vedic Singers. They convey, in a very vital form, the germs or roots of our Philosophy, our knowledge, and our culture. Deussen who is a Western staunch Advaitin while explaining the monism of the RV writes "The Hindus arrive at this monism by a method essentially different from that of other countries. Monothelism was attained in Egypt by a mechanical identification of the various local Gods, in Palestine by proscriptions of other Gods and violent persecution of their worshippers for the benefit of their national God Jehovah. In India they reached monism, though not monotheism, on a more philosophical path, seeing through the veil of the manifold, the unity which underlies it."

All such applauding of the Vedas has been started, even without understanding the Vedas in full. Some of the Vedic hymns are not correctly or properly understood by us on account of the remotest antiquity of the Vedas, and also because of the allegorical sense underlying them. Even during the period prior to that of Yāsaka, the great ancient etymologist of India, a school of India headed by Kautsa maintained that the Vedas are not conveying any meaning. But Yāsaka replied to this school by clearly emphasizing that the Vedas are full of meaning and asserted that

1) OIPD, p.13
2) अनर्थका वहि मथास् || नृषिक्ष 1.15.2 (p.69)
3) अथवेतस्य शास्त्रमान्याद् || दास्य 1.16.1 (p.74)
it is no mistake of the pillar if the blind does not perceive it but definitely of the person. Macdonell says: "As a result of the labours of Vedic Scholars, the meaning of a considerable portion of the RV is clear, but of the remainder, many hymns and a great many single stanzas or passages are still obscure or unintelligible." The various Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads, Purāṇas, the Epics, the Nīrūkta, the Anukramanis, etc. have made attempts to explain the meanings of the Vedic words and if one reads the Vedas in a correct perspective, one will be able to grasp the spirit of the Vedas and its themes.

The first and foremost question that presents to us, before we proceed to know the meaning of the Vedas is: What is the meaning of the term 'Veda'? No logical meaning of the terms, free from any sort of flaws (Dosas) like Avyāpti etc., can be given. The very word 'Veda', being derived from the verb 'vid', to know, means knowledge. This may not be correctly, a logical demonstration, but it is still a demonstration for our purposes, since with this meaning of knowledge attributed to the term Veda, we can demonstrate that knowledge or wisdom is the theme of the Vedas. This will not, certainly, be a bold attempt, since the Vedas are considered by the Indian Vedic thinkers from ages long as the surest ways to self-realisation. The pivot of the Vedic hymns, in any case, is knowledge of the Ultimate Truth and the Supreme Reality which was attained by the Vedic Seers. The word 'Sāṃkhya' is similarly a synonym of such supreme knowledge. Therefore, the 'Veda' on this ground may be construed as the repository of

1) Śrī Śāntānanda Prasāda Ṭhākura, Ādrānanda-bhāratī, Prabhu-pātā, Śaṅkara-pātā, Śārāngadāsa, Nārāyaṇa 1-16-10 (p.78)

2) V R, pp. XXIX
knowledge or Sāmkhya. The Vedas have established that the Ultimate Reality is one and one only, that every thing else than this, like the universe is unreal or illusory caused through misapprehension or Māyā and that when the Absolute conceived the Māyā and became associated with it, the cosmology has set in. Such basic conceptions in the Vedas have been further developed and emphasised by the Upaniṣadic Sages. If we do not view this Vedic knowledge in this true sense, the mistake lies with us and not with the Vedas. This very idea is brought out in the 39th stanza of RV Hymn 164 which says:-

What will the hymns of Veda do to him,
Who does not know its theme, the eternal truth?
In the Supreme Region, in which the Devas dwell,
Only those who come to realises it, become perfect.

Thus knowledge is the paramount conception of the Vedas.

There are as many as 1017 hymns in the RV addressed to various deities. To arrange the chronology of these hymns is in fact a big sea-saw, as the composition of the hymns refers to a vast and long period of the remote past. With the polytheistic and henotheistic ideas, grew also the monotheistic or pantheistic ideas as expressed by the writers like Max Muller, Radhakrishnan, Hiriyanna, Keith and others. But the hymns had also, with these ideas, the conception of the non-dual Supreme Reality as the only Truth (Ekam Sat) which bears out monism, through and through, thus

1) अर्थात् अवश्यक दीवा अधि विभेद निर्भियः
अर्थात् दीवा अधि विभेद निर्भियः।
तथे इति रूपस्य इस्मे असमानम्।। RV I-164-39.
perceiving, through the veil of manifold existences, the Supreme Reality only which underlies them. The Seer Dirghatamas sings:

The Supreme Paramatman who is the divine ONE 'Sat'
Is called as Indra, Mitra, Varuna and Agni
The sages praise Him by different names;
They call Him as Indra, Yama and Matsaris'van.

It is noticed that the word 'Garutman' is translated into English by almost all the writers as the 'golden-winged' or 'fine-winged' and Suparna as the eagle or the bird. But S'rîmad Bhâgavata Purâna in XI-5-23 states that the term Suparna is a synonym of the term Paramatman. Bhâgavata uses the word in the same sense in VIII-5-23. The word 'Garutman' also which means attraction, attractive (Garita) may be taken also to mean as Supreme. This Supreme Paramatman (Suparno Garutman) is one and only 'Sat'. This is the sense conceived by the seer. Sat is taken here as the Reality or Satya by the seer. This is further so brought out in the CU and elsewhere. The word Matsaris'van is interpreted as Kârma Brahman (Saguna Brahman) by the Indian commentators while explaining this word which occurs in IU S'loka 4. The correct sense of this stanza as explained above has not been brought out by most of the thinkers. They are mostly satisfied in explaining the unity of multitudes of Gods, in one God. The meaning conveyed here in this S'loka exceeds this sense. The term Suparna is not here the

(1) इनसे भिखि कुण्यमागसिमाहुर
अथ दिश्यं स पुष्पोऽगुरुमानि।
प्रकृति सदे बिभा वरुषा नवुरुति
अभिन तथा मातिरिस्तमानि अतिर्थे॥ RV I-164-46

(2) इनेस भुपाषो भैरुकणाः थोषभो स्वरुपस्वमेवसः इस्वरुपोऽस्तहः परमात्मानि हृदये॥ । ६३१-५-२३

(3) ध प्रकृत्यां ततः संपरं तदंतत्त्वविकल्पनं तद अस्य तत्र पुष्पोऽस्तहस्तेन विवक्षिते । । ६३१-५-२९

(4) "for Samkaranaunda (Commentary on IU-4), Matsaris'van is 'Sutraman' (Same as Hiranyagarbha). PU, p 571. See p 44 next for further details on this word."
anthromorphic eagle god. The view of Max Muller calling this stanza as expressing Monotheistic aspect is not correct, since he seems to be carried away by the Monotheistic God represented by the eagle god. Here is the Supreme Paramātman who is Sat, Cit, and Ananda that is represented. To say in the words of Radhakrishnan: "This one is the soul of the world, the reason immanent in the universe, the source of all nature, the eternal energy. It is the Supreme Reality which lives in all beings and moves them all, the real one that blushes in the rose, breathes into beauty in the clouds, shows its strength in the storms and sets the stars in the sky. Here then we have the intuition of the true God, who of all the gods is the only God, --- In the presence of this one reality, the distinction between the Aryan and the Dravidian, the Jew and the heathen, the Hindu and Muslim, the pagan and Christian, - all fade away. We have here a momentary vision of an ideal where of all earthly religions are but shadows pointing to the perfect day. The one is called by many names. --- This is not to be viewed as any narrow accommodation to popular religion. It is a revelation of a profound - philosophic Truth."

This ' Ekam Sat ' emphasised here in this Sukta which is the Garutma-Suparna is the high monistic philosophy, echoed by the term ' Supreme Paramātman '. In view of the conception of the non-dual (Ekam Sat) Paramātman conveyed by this stanza who is the Supreme unity of all Souls and of all Gods, what more authority is required from the RV for proving the monism in the Vedas ?

(1) IP, I, p.95.
The sense of 'Paramatman' conveyed by the term Suparna is brought out not only in the above stanza, but also in another stanza of another Vais'vadeva Sūkta of the Sage Sadhri:

"Of the Paramatman (Suparnam) existing one only,
The wise sages conceive many in diverse words."

The word 'Suparna' is interpreted by Sayanācārya as Paramatman in his commentary on this S'lōka. Duality or Multiplicity is only a mode of speech in the context and not real in itself, the Paramatman being the only one Reality. The famous "Dvā-Suparna" hymn appears in the RV also:

"There are two birds (Ātmanas) companions, always united,
Both occupy the self same tree (body);
Of them one partakes sweet fruits of the tree,
Another, without eating sits simply looking on."

The word 'Suparna', though appears in the sense of bird, has the allegorical meaning of Paramatman and Jīvatman as interpreted by the great commentator Sayanācārya, while commenting on this verse. This is a relevant meaning of the term 'Suparna' in view of the Bhagavata meaning of this word as indicated previously. Sayanācārya also considers that there is no tinge of dualism and no sense of Bheda between the Jīvatman and Paramatman conveyed by this mantra and that the highest sense of monism is conveyed by words 'Sayujā' and 'Sakhāyā'. The conception of Jīvatman and Paramatman which is further developed in the Upanisads and especially the

1. Sūprāṇa kriyā kṛṣṇo vṛtaṁśihīreśe svaitanta bhūtāḥ kāntyamet RV X-10-114-5
2. RV S, IV, 1-721
3. RV S, I, 22-114-20
4. RV S, I, 19-710
SU and MU which have adopted and repeated this very verse verbatim, has thus its origination in the RV itself. This fact also signifies the passion of the Vedic thinkers for the knowledge (Sāmkhya) of the Paramātmā, who is unbound and free from worldly enjoyment, and also accounts for the profundity of Philosphic investigation on the part of these thinkers in establishing the conventional reality of the Jīvātmā by accepting its imperfections and limitations. The significance of monism conveyed by this Vedic S'loka is also brought out by the Bhāgavata not only by emphasising the term Hāmāsa or Suparna meaning Ītman in S'loka IV-28-54 but also by stressing the identity or unity of the Jīvātmā with the Paramātmā, which is very important.

The exposition of the meaning ' Paramātmā ' by the term Suparna is also brought out by another stanza of the RV 3-

"The non-dual Paramātmā entered the Samudra (Māyā);
Thereby he manifested the whole universe;
He is to be seen only with purified mind in one's heart"
Him the mother (Māyā) overpowers; He overpowers the mother."

The commentator Sayanācārya interprets the term Suparna here also as Paramātmā. Alternatively he also says that the term means life breath (Prāna-Vāyu) but this does not seem to be much appropriate. It is on the authority of this mantra, that the cosmologic mantra of TA like " Tat-sraṣṭvā tadevaṇūpāris'at " is

(1) तेषां च चले चाय शस्याये भानसायणे || भ ४-२८-५४.
(2) अर्थात् हभव श्री-शयंत्वाक समेताह ब्रह्म वर्णमोहवेगमं प्रसरिते कवयविधेष्य अतू मन्तयते ||
भ ४-२८-६२.
(3) You art identical with me and not separate, and I am also identical with thee. The wise do not observe even the slightest distinction or difference between us two.
(4) एकाः सुपरः तो भद्र ऐवरावह से एहूँ विक्रम ज्ञान विचारे ||
व महामहें मस्याः प्रवेशयानितत्त्वतो माता हैदेव सम्यक्ते हैदेव मातरः || र ४-१०-२४-४.
(5) तत् सुपरः तदेवाश्वास्याश्वाश्वास्याश्वाश्व ||
(4) RV S, प ४-१-७२७. (5) तत्सुपरः तदेवाश्वास्याश्वाश्वाश्वाश्व ||
(6) RV S, प ४-१-७२७.
based. The term 'Samudra' here is a term synonymous for
"Anta-rikša" or "Ijah" meaning Prakṛti or Maya as is being
explained hereafter. So also the term 'Mataram' also means Maya.
Prakṛti or Maya in the naive stage, is insentient and gets
sentiency, only when it appears before the Lord or when it
superimposes upon the Lord. The TDU explains: "Having entered it,
He became both the actual and the beyond, the defined and the
undefined, both the founded and the nonfounded, the intelligent
and the non-intelligent, the Reality and Unreality." This
explains the immanence and transcendence of the Paramātman who
is one and one only (Ekah). The Maya or Samudra has no reality
of its own, without the Paramātman who is the Adhīsthana or the
essence, and who makes it manifest as universe. Sāyānācārya also
interprets the word 'Samudra' as Sam-uddravanti which easily
becomes fluent i.e. which has no fixity of appearance, once
appearing and another time disappearing, and thus no reality,
being illusory. The last clause of this Sloka is translated by
Griffith as: "His mother kisses him and he returns her kiss." The
word 'Relhi' which he translates as 'Kiss' is not properly
interpreted by this scholar. This word is same as 'śedhi'
which is used by the Bhāgavata in the sense of overpower, in
III-28-38, which means "Those who are devoted to me (Matparah),

(1) The word 'Mātāriya' meaning Subrahman or Saguna Brahma is connected
with the word 'Mātā' which denotes the sense of Maya. S' while explaining
30-4, interprets 'Mātāriya' "सत्येवत्सति सत्येवत्सति सत्येवत्सति सत्येवत्सति भविष्यते महातम्या महायया
अनात्परे भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि
अनात्परे भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि
अनात्परे भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि
अनात्परे भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि
अनात्परे भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि भूष्टि
अनात्परे भूष्टि भूष्टि भू�
will not be overcome by my Kāla Cakra". Though one of the meaning of 'Relhi' or 'Ledhi' is 'kiss' or 'lick', it properly means 'overpower, destroy or eat (Grāsa)'. The Maya (Mātar), according to this mantra, overpowers the Jīva, and the Paramātmā overpowers the Maya. This is the correct meaning. Thus we have the highest idealistic philosophy here in the RV which is the ground stone of the later developed Vedānta. It is for this very reason that the Upaniṣads and other works look upon the Vedas as their authorities. Having explained the monistic Characteristics of Paramātmā, this mantra advises the Upāsakas to attain the Paramātmā after purifying the mind, by searching Him in heart of mind only.

Pantheism or Monotheism, which are necessary for explaining the Paramātmā, to satisfy the gross and empirical instincts of human beings, so long as the conventional reality of the Universe or Maya continues to exist, are not exclusively excluded from the RV. Monism, Pantheism and Monotheism are placed side by side in the RV due to which they cannot be separated. Saṃkhya in the RV and later even in the Upaniṣads, though idealistic, is also theistic, which is the exclusive peculiarity of Indian Philosophy. In view of this tendency, most important solicitations of the Rg-Vedic Seers from their Gods or Paramātmā is to seek that which purifies their mind and enables them to have the vision and the consequent union with the Lord. Such theistic prayer can be seen in the following hymn of the RV:-

"The Individual Souls (Suparnas) desirous to attain by knowledge, (Vidathā),
Union with the Immortal Paramātmā (Animesam) of whom they are parts,
Pray "O! The Supreme (Inah) who is the protector of the whole of the Universe,
May, He the immutable (Bhirah) enter into our purified heart."

(*Verse from the Rg-Veda, 5-22-164-21.*
Here are the clear indications of the unity between the Jīvatman and Paramātman and of 'Tad-Tvamasi' mantra as explained by Śaṅkara in his commentary.

The word 'Suparna' appears in as many as thirty-five or more cases in the RV and as the word does not seem to have been properly examined, the clear meaning of the mantras has not been made out by the modern scholars. This word Suparna has a great philosophic history behind it, but a few aspects of which are brought out above. So also is the Trisuparna hymn. The bet or stake between Kadru, mother of Nāgas and Vinata or Suparni, mother of Suparna, as indicated in SB III-6-2-2 and in the MB (Adi parvan 20 to 34 Chapters) has the highest allegorical philosophical truth behind it and is itself a theme for further investigation. A reference is given here, only for its connection with the philosophical theme, without indulging in further details.

The thought about the Supreme as the only Reality and all else as false is picturesquely portrayed in the Nasadiya Sūkta also. This Sūkta has been highly praised—"It is one of the most sublime and exalted hymns in the RV both from the philosophic and the literary stand-points and it is a true index to the early mystic thought of the Hindus." Deussen describes it as "the most remarkable monument of the oldest Philosophy" Radhakrishnan states "We find in this hymn a representation of the most advanced theory of creation." Some scholars like Macdonell

(1) RV, I, p.99. Śaṅkara says "सवेषण सदर्दं सवर्ध्यं भुक्तने मयात्मादित्वम्।
(2) Prabhu Dutt Shastri, "Doctrines of Maya", p.37.
(3) Deussen, "Outlines of Indian Philosophy", p.13.
(4) IP, p.101.
(5) HSL, p.117.
consider this as "the starting point of the natural philosophy which assumed shape in the evolutionary Samkhya system." But when the ancient Vedic knowledge is called as the Samkhya knowledge, there is no question of calling this Sukta as the starting point of Samkhya system. The same high thoughts about the idealistic Parmatman as in Suparna hymns are borne out and culminated in this "Nasadiya Sukta, " which is also extolled as "containing the flower of Indian thought."

The Immutable Unmanifest, Nirguna Parmatman who is ancient and exists earlier to the creation of the Cosmos, is described as below:

(Earlier to creation of Universe)

"There was neither Time (Mrtyu), much less immortality; Nor of night nor of day, was there any indication; That (Reality) breathing airless was ONE with Svadha (in it). Beyond that Reality, there was not any other being."

In this stanza, we have the clear indication of the monistic truth, free from all relative dualities like mortality or (its another aspect of) immortality, Day and Night. This Truth is to be described only by negative terms, by 'Neti' 'Neti' of the BU. It is 'Tadekam'. The word 'Svadha' used in this Sloka is translated as 'Self-sustained' by J. Muir; 'Self-impulse' by Macdonell; 'By itself' by Max Muller; 'By its own nature' by Griffith. Sayanacarya equates Svadha with MayA, and explains 'Svadha-Tadekam' that MayA which is responsible for all duality lay merged in the Truth.' By merger in this Absolute Truth, MayA had
no separate existence and was not able to function. It should not be concluded by this that the Absolute with the merger of Maya in Him had not kept it separate in Him and not allowed it to function. The Lord, with the merging of Maya in Him, was as if in the "Praasupta State," which is the same as the one after the deluge or Pralaya. This is not exactly the Nirvikalpaka State, of the Lord, as the Maya is not completely annihilated here.

This monistic aspect is also further elaborated in the following Mantra of this hymn:

2. "There was neither 'Asat' nor 'Sat' then,
   Neither the Regions (Rajas) nor the Heaven beyond.
   What lay enveloped? Where? Who protected?
   Was Ambhas there, deep and unfathomable?"

Some of the thinkers interpret this mantra as purporting to nihilism. Radhakrishnan explains this mantra: "First of all there was no 'existent' or 'non-existent'. We cannot on this account call it the non-existent, for it is positive being from which the whole existence arrives. The (this) first line brings out the inadequacy of our categories. The absolute reality which is at the back of the whole world cannot be characterised by us as either existent or non-existent." 'Asat' is here 'avyakta' and not a void. This Mantra wants to state that in the earlier state, prior to creation, neither the manifest Prakrti nor the non-manifest (avyakta) Prakrti existed. There was Paramatman only then, who was Tat-Bekam, who was above the expression of limitations like the air, the Regions (Lokas), or Heaven or

(1) भूतरूपाकारीः सदासीत तद्वन्निनः नासीप्रेक्ष्ये नो ब्रह्म च परे यदृः।
किमभवाविविव: कुद्व वास्तं शरीरं किंच्छ ये मम किं भविष्यते गणिनेन॥

(2) गृंज, १, १०१

RV X-11-28-1
the vacuum space, and which, thus had no coverings to hold this positive entity or to allow it to rest. 'Ambhaḥ' which is so much unfathomable and wonderful and which is translated as 'water' by almost all scholars, can be taken as Māyā, as its existence is questioned by RV.

The Idealistic Monism indicated in the above stanza is further stressed by the following two stanzas:

"Tamas (Avidyā) was there; In the beginning concealed in this Tamas, This (Idā) was then non-manifest Salilam;
The germ that lay merged in the void (Tucchā), That one became manifest by the power of Tapas."²

"Desire, in the beginning, came upon That, Which (desire) was the primal germ of the mind, The Sages searching in their hearts with wisdom Found, in Asat, the bond of Sat."³

If there was no existence or non-existence before the creation of the Universe, then how did the Universe come forth? Instead of thinking creation as one appearing through an external agency, the

(1) 'Ambhaḥ' and 'Ambara' are synonymous terms representing Māyā, since 'Ambhaḥ' here is described as very wonderful or powerful (Gahanām Gabhīram). In describing the monistic state (Tat-Ekām) of the Supreme, the Vedic Seer denies reality to Māyā, questioning its existence, "Ambhaḥ Kimāsid gahanām gabhīram". It will not be very correct to translate 'Ambhaḥ' as 'Water' as done by some scholars. This 'Ambhaḥ' is connected with 'Tamah' which appears in the next (third) S'loka in the sense of Avidya or Māyā only.

(2) "तम आत्मित्वम् गुरुमाये अर्केतं सतः किं तिम विस्मयाः [sukṣ्माविभिः अश्वातिपतिस्तनिहिना अयायंते] RVX-11-129-3

(3) कामस्तदस्ये समविनान्धि मनोऽकः सेतुः प्रथमं यदासर्वेशि। सते बल्युगसारि निरविबंद्वृ हृदे अतिव्यः कल्याणं मन्तिषां। RVX-11-129-4
RV comes forth with the theory of admitting the inexplicability of the appearance of the 'Tamas' which is nothing but 'Maya.' This word 'Tamas' is translated by some scholars as 'Darkness' or 'Gloom,' which is not an adequate rendering of this word into English. The first line, translated by some as "Darkness covered by Darkness" has no meaning. The word 'Tamas' is interpreted by Śāyaṇācārya as Ajñāna which is same as 'Avidyā' or 'Maya.' The appearance of Maya here is the starting point of duality. It had no previous existence. When it appeared, it was there in the Karana state (Lil) and the world etc. lay merged in this Tamas (Tamasā Gūlḥam) which is also described as Tuccha or Mithyā. Tamas can also be taken as Tamo-guna which has been recognised in the Upanisads as inert and inactive. When this Tuccha (Mayā) appeared, it was then in non-manifest or indiscriminate form (Apraketa) or (Avyakta) (and thus a Bhava Padartha.) The universe was existing in this non-manifest entity, merged in it and inseparable from it (Ekam) and when the Tapas or Jñāna was imposed upon it (Yaḍa Asīt Tapasāḥ) it became manifest due to the influence or power of Jñāna(Mahīnā). The words Tapas, Jñāna and Chaitanya are synonymous. Maya which was insentient or ignorant got impressed by the sentiency of the Absolute and thus borrowed a sort of sentiency or knowledge from Jñāna when it came within the perview of the sentient or Jñāna-Svarūpa Lord. In this connection or creation, we have the aspect of Vivarta vāda and not Sat-Karya vāda. This is the same as

(1) RVs, IV, p.780. "सत्मेव भोवितानामधिभेः तयां सुवस्मिताम्" (2) If we take Tamas as Tamo-Guna we can trace Guna to Veda period. (3) ब्रह्म क्लोय प्राचार्य वर्णनचरणम्. (4) This is Vivarta because the unreal appears as real or sentient by borrowing reality or sentiency from the Supreme. The universe has no locus standi.
"Tat Srṣṭva Tadeva Anuprāvis'at" of TA or TU, or the disturbance of the equilibrium of the guṇas of Prakṛti by the Puruṣa; and in virtue of this (Tan-mahima), it became active or manifest. Kāma or Ikṣaṇa by the Paramātman for creation is the cause for the manifestation of the unmanifested and the origination of the Mahat-tattva which is called as Vyakta. This Mahat is also called as the 'Manaso Retah Prathamaṁ' and also the cosmic Hṛdaya or Antahkarana. It is on the basis of this Kāma of the RV the Upaniṣads say "He desired, Let me become many, Let me be born." (TU) "It thought, May I be many, May I grow forth" (CU). This aspect of the creation of the Universe by the Paramāvāra is tantamount to the Paramātman being "Mayā Upahita Chaitanya" or the Brahma becoming Saguna. The words Bandhum in 'Sato Bandhum Asati Nिरविन्दम' is translated by almost all scholars as bond or Bandham. This helps to trace the origination of 'Sat' from 'Asat' and the relation between Sat and Asat. The Upaniṣads therefore declare that this was 'Asat' in the beginning and from it Sat originated. The Sage Kapila in Śrīmad Bhāgavata has adopted this very S'loka, by explaining Sato Bandhum as 'Paramātman who is the adhisthāna of Sat (Prakṛti)' Sat is also interpreted as Jīvātman, and Paramātman is taken as the Sato Bandhum and thus as brother or friend of the Jīvātman. 'Asati' is taken as in the unreal world. According to these interpretations this S'loka will mean, 'One (wise) will attain, by searching in their heart with wisdom, the Paramātman who is illuminating or manifesting the

Asat (unreal world) by his (Sat-Rūpa) and who is the adhisthāna of Sat (Pradhāna) or (Prakṛti) or who is the friend of the Jīvatman. The interpretation of this S'loka by the Sage Kapila appears more plausible, relevant and correct. The Bhāgavata thus helps us much to interpret the Veda correctly. This S'loka brings us on the very threshold of the Upanisadic monism.

The theory of Māyā which is conceived in this cosmic process is further made out in the following two stanzas:-

"Who really knows? Who can here declare it? Whence was it (Māyā) born and whence came this creation? The Devas are later than this creation, then, who knows from where it came into being?"

"That from which this creation came into being, whether it held it together or it had not, the Supreme Lord who presides over this and the Vyoma, He truly knows it or, if not He, no one else knows it."

These stanzas of the RV establish the inexplicability of the appearance or birth of Māyā and the futility of human reasoning to explain or to investigate into the causes responsible for the creation of the universe, since there is no direct evidence about the creation, and also because even the presiding deities of the elements of creation are later to creation. The use of the word 'Adhyakṣa' in the seventh S'loka is very important and also pertinent, since it indicates the Supreme Reality as being the

(1) कौ मूर्ति तेष क इतं प्रोच्चायत्तुत्तमः कुतः यथं विसूचितः।
अविद्यैव अस्य विश्वमेत्वाधिन्यो को वेदः शुभ आशृवः ॥ RV X-11-129-6

(2) इत्य विसूचितं आशृवः यथा यथा धर्मं धर्मे न नवः।
यो अस्याधिकाः परमे आविष्काराः अंहुः बृहुः यथा यथा न बृहः ॥ RV X-11-129-7

(3) तू से देवं तामुरु क जातविन्यस्तिः संघित्व भागिनः।
कपिलसिद्धांस्य धार्मिकाः भागिनः ॥ RV VII-9-32.
Adhisthana of the Maya and the cosmos, and it being the only Reality and all else, which are dependent, having no Reality. By the sentence "He truly knows it and if He knows not, no one else knows it," the Seer is not questioning the omniscience of the Supreme Paramatman. It reflects, thereby, the thought of unreality of the dualistic Universe, and the Lord, as being above the conception of the relative subject and object. When there is no duality like Maya or its creation, there will subsist only the non-dual Reality with no object to know, in which case, who should be knowing whom? There will be no scope for anything to be known. The SU has depicted this thought, "He alone knows whatever is to be known; of Him there is none who knows," and BU states "(where there is no duality, and) where, verily, everything has become the self, then by what and whom should one understand? By what should one know that by which all this is known?" Kunhan Raja considers in his "SK of Isvara Krsna" that many of the doctrines of the Classical Samkhya are traceable to the Nasadiya Sukta. He also states "The idea behind (Seventh stanza of this Sukta) seems to be that there was no one who could be declared as a Creator and that the creation arose out of itself;" but this is not the purport of the Sukta. How can he say that there was then no Creator and that the creation arose out of itself? What is the evidence for this? When the sentient Gods cannot know it and say anything about the creation, how can the insentient Prakrti and its evolutes declare

---

1. Where he and she are not samadhi, be present in the lotus form of the eighth and the thirty-fourth forms. In the Sukta, II, 4-19
2. Where the creation is the self, the Lord, and the self is the Lord. In the Sukta, II, 4-14
that the creation arose out of itself? Radhakrishnan states: "The last phrase "Ko Veda" (in the sixth Sloka) brings out the mystery of creation which led later thinkers to call it Mayā." Keith also traces the Purusa of the Classical Sāṃkhya to this Sukta and considers this Sukta to be the most important in the History of Philosophy of India and nothing else equals it. We have in this Sukta a consistent and developed thought of Advaita Philosophy and not a mere "Unclear and self-contradictory train of thought" as remarked by Richard Garbe. In putting forth the fundamental Impersonal God, this Sukta does not fall behind the best thought of later times inside or outside India, as stated by Deussen.

An equally important hymn is the Purusa Sukta which conveys the high philosophical ideas about the Purusa who is considered as the Supreme Reality. Macdonnell states: "The Purusa hymn may be regarded as the oldest product of the panteistic literature of India." The view of Macdonnell is controverted by Hiriyanna who states "It is not right to adduce the Purusa-sukta, as it is the common practice to do, as an illustration of pantheism." The Sahāera S'īrā Purusa is the Nirguna Supreme Reality and he becomes Saguna or Virat Purusa on account of his connection with Mayā. Radhakrishnan explains: "The Supreme Reality becomes the active Purusa, for it is said 'From the Purusa Virat was born and from Virat again Purusa (Virāj).' Purusa is thus the begetter as well as the begotten. He is the Absolute as well as the self-conscious I".

This Nirguna Brahman, not only, underlies the whole creation, by being immanent, but also, transcends it. The hymns 1 to 4 read as follows:—

"Purusa of thousands of heads, thousands of eyes, thousands of feet,
Pervading the Universe on all sides, transcends it by ten fingers;"

"Purusa is indeed all this, what has been and what will be,
Transcending the mortal world, He is the Lord of immortality;"

"Such is his magnificence; Purusa is greater than this;
All this worldly region is fourth of Him, the three-fourths of Him lies in Heaven;"

"Three-fourth of the Purusa is eternally above; the fourth part
appears here again and again;
He excels Vidya and Avidya, which lead to Heaven and the world."

The note of unity conveyed by "Purusa Eva Idam Sarvam" is developed by the CU when it says "Sarvakhala eva Idam Brahma," by the MA when it says "Brahmā khalv idam vāva sarvaḥ" by the SB when it says "Sarvam hi ayam atma" and by BU when it says,

\[
1. \text{CU III-14-1} \\
2. \text{MA IV-6} \\
3. \text{SB IV-2-2-1}
\]
"Idam sarvam yadayamatma." The Upanisads never make any distinction between the Purusa, Atman and Brahman. The Sukta wants to establish that there is one Reality, call it 'Purusa' or 'Brahman,' or 'Atman.' The S'rimad Bhagavata highly respects the Purusa hymn, and this is the only Purana which explains in detail this Sukta by reserving one whole (the sixth) Chapter (in the Second Skandha) for it. It interprets the words 'Sās'ana' and 'Anas'ana' as Avidya and Vidya respectively. In view of this interpretation, the Purusa Sukta means to show that the aspects of heaven and earth are all unreal in the ultimate sense and that the Purusa is beyond Vidya and Avidya or Maya, being the only Reality. The Bhagavata, in another context, explains that the Lord is the Adhisthāna of the Vidya and Avidya. Vidya and Avidya are the aspects of Maya only and have no reality. The word 'Mahimā' in this Sukta can be taken as the Lord's glory or power or Maya and the Supreme Purusa is above this Maya (Ato Jyāyan). Thus we have here the absolute Monism explained by the Purusa Sukta. The fifth hymn of this Sukta explains:-

"From Him was born Virat; from Virat was born the Purusa,
As soon as born, He became distinct from Virat; then came forth earth, then bodies."

Here we have the explanation of Saguna Brahman, the Brahmanda (Virat), Hiranyagarbha Brahman and of the whole process of creation of the earth etc. Sayanacarya explains this "The Supreme
Lord created the Viśva by his Māyā and entered into it in the form
of Jīva and became the cosmic Jīvatman. The cosmic Jīvatman is
Hiranyagarbha. Further the act of creation is a sort of mental
sacrifice as explained by Sāyanaśārya. This Purusa Sukta has
become the basis of Pravṛttipara Bhāgavata Dharma and the
Nivṛttipara Bhāgavata Dharma, as will be explained later on. This
Cosmic Purusa is developed in the Brāhmaṇas and Aranyakas by
naming the Purusa as Nārāyana, who is also considered as a cosmic
classic in SB and as Viṣṇu in the Purāṇas and elsewhere.

The conception of Hiranyagarbha, taking to the creation of
the Universe, is further developed in another Sukta (RV X-10-121).
The first stanza of this runs as follows:

"In the beginning was the divinity Hiranyagarbha,
He manifested as the sole Lord of Creation;
He created this earth and heaven,
The deity 'Kam' we shall worship with offerings."

Keith says in this connection "In the RV itself the other efforts
to attain the conception of unity of the Universe are directed in
the main to setting up personal deities, who are credited with
the creation and government of the Universe. Of these the most
famous and enduring is Prajāpati. He it is who later at least is
the God who is first born, the golden germ, Hiranyagarbha, who
creates the whole universe, who gives life, who commands the gods
obey, whose shadow is death and immortality, who is the Lord of the

(1) सैद्ध सौदृष्ट सविक्षेपितः पश्चात्परं सत्यमेव सविक्षेपयम: भायत: विकारादिरुपः ॥ रूपं शुचिः तत्र अविकस्तः प्रविक्षेपः ब्रह्मणाक्षणिनी वेक्षति ॥ RV 4, p. 616.
(2) मानसं रथ्यं तत्भोजः ॥ RV 4, p. 616.
(3) पुरुषो न्याया सकाभयतः अतितिक्षेयं सर्वार्थं भूलतेन अस्मेवें ॥ SB 6.6.1
(4) हिरण्यगर्भेऽक्षमवतिः श्रृवः प्रातः पारीक्ष अस्तातः ॥
स दशकवर्षीये धामुतेषाः करस्मे देवस्य हरिवा विषेषः ॥ RVX-10-121-1
(5) RV 4, 32, p. 437
man and the beast, of the mountain and the sea." Some of the
scholars explain the word 'KA' as the short form of 'KE' and
import the sense of monism in this Sūkta. Most of the scholars
however identify 'KE' with Prajāpati and bring here the conception
of Saguna Brahman. This Prajāpati is further accepted as Kārya-
Brahman in the Purāṇas. Saguna Brahman is the Adhisthāna for all
dualities. Thus here we have monotheism also expounded.

This Sūkta is the basis on which the KU states "Through
fear of Him the wind blows and through fear of Him the Sun gives
heat; through fear both Indra and wind and the fifth Death speed
on their way."1 and the TU says "From fear of Him does the wind
blow, from fear of Him does the Sun rise, from fear of Him do Agni
and Indra (act) and death the fifth runs."

The purport of this hymn is to show that the Prakṛti or
Māyā and its evolutes have no reality or independence, and all
these act under His control (Adhisthāna), after taking life or
sentience from Him. Not only theism but also monism is brought
out by this Sūkta by expounding "Patireka Aṣīt."

The famous Hymn of Indra which is quoted very often by the
Advaita writers, is illustrated below.3-

" Each and every form is His manifestation,
His form it is that manifests everywhere;
Indra goes about in many forms by his Māyās,
To Him are united steeds hundreds and ten." RV.VI-4-47-18.

\[(1) ਭੀਕਾਰਕ ਵਿਭਵਾਤ ਮੰਨਿਆ ਕਰੇਂਦਰੀ ਅਕ ਸਰਿੱਧੀ ਹੀ ਵਿਭਵਾਤ ਵਿਭਵਾਤ ਕਰੇਂਦਰੀ ਅਕ ਸਰਿੱਧੀ ਹੀ \| KU-II-3-3\]
\[(2) ਭੀਕਾਰਕ ਵਿਭਵਾਤ ਵਿਭਵਾਤ ਵਿਭਵਾਤ ਵਿਭਵਾਤ ਕਰੇਂਦਰੀ ਅਕ ਸਰਿੱਧੀ ਹੀ ਚਰਿੱਤ ਕਰੇਂਦਰੀ ਅਕ ਸਰਿੱਧੀ ਹੀ \| TU-II-8-1\]
\[(3) ਕੁ ਕੁ ਦੁਰਮੁਕ ਕੁ ਕੁ ਦੁਰਮੁਕ ਦੁਰਮੁਕ ਕੁ ਕੁ ਦੁਰਮੁਕ ਦੁਰਮੁਕ ਦੁਰਮੁਕ ਕੁ ਕੁ ਦੁਰਮੁਕ \| RV.VII-4-47-18\]
Sayanacarya while commenting on this S'loka states that the word 'Indra' here means 'Paramatman'. The AU explains, etymologically 'Indra' as 'Idandra' importing the sense of Paramatman for the word Indra. S annotates Indra in this sentence as Paramatman.

Duality or Plurality of Souls is pleaded by the Advaitins as caused by Māyā, on the authority of this RV mantra. Some writers interpret the word 'Māyā' as meaning 'power' and some interpret it as 'illusion' or 'deception'. The word Māyā is used more than 80 times in RV. Prabhu Dutt Shastri after examining the sense of the word 'Māyā' in these contexts considers that "the two chief meanings of the word, are 'power' (Prajñā) and 'deception' (Kapaṭa)" and that "the idea of mystery being common to both these meanings, it is quite easy to understand the transition from the idea of 'Mysterious will power' to that of 'deception', the two ideas interpenetrating each other." H.G. Narahari interprets Māyā in this very way. Hence no objection can be taken to the interpretation of the word 'Māyā' as "illusion" or "deception" and to the tracing of monism or Māyāvāda to this S'loka. This RV mantra also occurs in SB XIV-5-5-19 (same as BU II-5-19) and JU Br.I-44-1. S interprets Māyā, while annotating this word occurring in BU as 'Prajñā'(Avidyā-Vṛttis) or false conception or unreality(Mithyā-abhimāna).

The Aditi Hymn of the RV is also interesting and its stanzas

(1) "इद्दे राज्यं वैरं धातृं ज्वाणुं निश्चितं इत्यद्र परमात्मा || RVIII,III, p.165.
(2) "स्व अति शून्यतं जीवविवृत्तं किं परिपूर्णं नानाविवेकते || S S 10.1.12 "किं भवति यथाविनिर्देशते स' " किं " किं भवति " तस्मादिरुपमेत्रा नात्मको वै वै नामाः तस्मादिरुपमेत्रा इत्याविनिर्देशते परमात्माः" वरोह्वसी सुंदर हेमको || AU I-3-13 and 14.
(3) "स्व अति शून्यतं जीवविवृत्तं किं परिपूर्णं नानाविवेकते || AU (SB), p. 63
(4) "स्व अति शून्यतं जीवविवृत्तं किं परिपूर्णं नानाविवेकते || AU (SB), p. 63
(5) "स्व अति शून्यतं जीवविवृत्तं किं परिपूर्णं नानाविवेकते || AU (SB), p. 63
(6) "स्व अति शून्यतं जीवविवृत्तं किं परिपूर्णं नानाविवेकते || BU (SB) p. 613."
are noted below as they are very often quoted:-

"In the ages of God, Sat was born out of Asat, then quarters, then Uttanapada; From Uttanapada sprang earth; of earth were the quarters born; Daksa was born of Aditi and of Daksa was Aditi born;

Yes, Aditi was born - She who, O Daksa, was a daughter of Thee;

After her came Devas, the blissful, the immortal fraternity." RV.X.6-72-3 to 5.

This hymn explains the origination of 'Sat' from 'Asat'. These words cannot be translated exactly as 'existence' and 'non-existence.' As explained under Nasadiya Sukta, these words represent the 'Vyakta' i.e. manifested, and 'Avyakta' i.e. unmanifested respectively. Asat is Avyakṛta or Maya. The unmanifested, known as karanavastha, is spoken as Asat - it does not mean the negation of Sat or being, while the manifested state is called 'Sat'. They do not stand in antithesis. Radhakrishnan explains "In X-72, the world ground is said to be 'Asat' or the non-existent with which is identified Aditi the infinite. All that exists is Diti or bounded, while the A-diti, the infinite is non-existent. From the infinite, Cosmic force arises, though the latter is sometimes said to be the source of the infinite itself."

While explaining 'Aditir devatāmayī' in KU, he says "Aditi is said to be the mother of the Gods; 'Sarva-devatā-mayī Sarva-devatmikā' S. The term is used herein the sense of mother-nature, Prakṛti, the source of all objectivity. S derives it from the root 'Ad' to eat and makes 'Aditi' the eater or experiencer of all

---

(1) देवनार्यो युक्ते मध्यम्रसवादः सर्दौवक्षस्व तदस्त्तः अन्वस्थितं यथूदातनमेवधिपरिवर्तति।
भूर्जस्तु उत्तानपादः भुवनामभीष्टां अवगतं अन्नवर्तः देवतासक्तिः परिवर्तते।
अतिरिक्त अन्तःभीष्ट दक्ष यथा कुक्षस्तथा। तो देवा अस्ववजयस्य भुवनां अन्मुखक्षयस्य। RV X-6-72-3.97

(2) RV, I, p. 99

(3) या भाज्यन संविक्षितो अदितिः देवतामेव। कुग्ययौ। (4) KU, p. 633
objects. Born from the highest Brahman, as prāna, i.e., in the form of Hiranyagarbha ' Hiranyagarbhasya eva vīsesamāntaram Āha. Anandagiri.' Macdonell calls this aspect of Aditi or Asat as somewhat confused account; but Yāska explains it as ' Itaretara Prakṛti '. There is no antithesis in the 'mantra' above; and the confusion, if any, disappears as soon as the real connotation is brought out. S.K. Ramachandra Rao rightly rounds up this position by stating" The apparently paradoxical statement (here) merely emphasises the involvement of Being in Becoming and Becoming in Being."

This Śūkta of 'Asat' and 'Sat' is further brought out by the TUK: "Asadvā idamagra āsittato vai sadajāyata " and CU5 "Katham asatasasajāyeta iti satyeva somyedamagra āśidekameva- dityam" and BU6 "Taddhedam tarhi avyakṣtamāsit " (Same as SB.14-4-2-15).

The Goddess Aditi is identified also in another RV hymn with all 'Being' and all 'Becoming' etc.

"Aditi is heaven, Aditi is atmosphere, Aditi mother, She father, She son; All the Gods are Aditi, the five races Aditi is all 'Being', Aditi is all 'Becoming' RV I-89-107

(1) HIL, p. 15.
(2) Nūrūkha, p. 793
(4) असाता इत्साध्य अस्तति || TUK II-7-1
(5) असाताः स्वाध्यायते तेन स्मरणोऽस्तति || CU V-2-2.
(6) नह तद्भवते अवेक्षणानां || BU I-4-7
(7) असाताः स्वाध्यायते सत्यत्तो श्रवणात् असाताः स्वाध्यायते || RV I-89-10
This very stanza appears in A.V. VII-6-1. Since all appearance or creation is the aspect of Māyā, there seems no obscurity, if everything is attributed to Aditi who is identified with Prakṛti, Māyā, Avyākta, Avyākṛta etc.

Similarly the Usas Sukta is also important. Stanza 1 of this Sukta runs as follows:

"When the Usas first dawned,
The great indestructible was manifest in the path of light,
Now the vratas of Devas shall be undertaken
The worshipful divinity of the Gods is one." RV III-55-1.

This, no doubt, appears as the hymn of the God 'Sun' and the Goddess 'Usas.' Usas can be taken also as 'knowledge' or 'Vidya'. When the knowledge dawns, it will take us to the self-illuminating and Aksara Parmātman who being the only Reality who will have to be worshipped with all observances. The term 'Aksara' is very relevant and fits more suitably with the aspect of the Supreme Reality than with the God 'Sun'. The quest after the attainment of the Supreme Reality was equally important with the Vedic Singers. All sacrifice was to them one mode of worship.

Apart from the above hymns, there are many other allegorical hymns in the RV where the names of the pantheistic or monotheistic Gods convey the meaning of 'Purusa' and 'Prakṛti.' In the conversation between the sage Yajñavalkya and the Vis'vavasu Gandharva, which is very important, the reply of the sage Yajñavalkya to the questions of the Gandharva discloses the

\[1\] अर्थात् देवानंनिके प्रभुस्मन्महदि द्वारानः सर्वायुक्ते॥ RV III-5-53-1
allegorical meanings conveyed by the Vedic terms. If the RV is examined in the light of the meaning ascribed to the Vedic words, in the epics and Bhagavata, we may discover still more philosophical ideas underlying the Vedic hymns.

(b) In Atharva Veda:-

The Philosophy of Unity or monism which is so patent in the Rg Veda is equally so in the Atharva Veda also. There is the famous AV Sukta X-8 which is often quoted by the writers on the subject:

"There is the nine-portal lotus, covered under three Guṇas,
In which lives the Yaksa-Atman, that the Veda knowers know
Desireless, serene, immortal, selfborn, contented with the essence, lacking nothing is He;
To Him will be no fear of death, who has known Him, the Atman - Serene, Ageless, Youthful."

1) Gandharva Vivasvan asked the sage Yajnavalkya about the meaning of the following 25 Vedic words:

2) Bhagawata Purana asks the rishis for the interpretation of the names of the Devas as explained by Bhishma in the Mahabharata.
Dasgupta says about these verses "We hear of a lotus with nine gates and covered with three gunas. This (lotus) is a very familiar word in later Sanskrit literature, as referring to the nine-doors of the senses; and the comparison of heart with a lotus is very common. But one of the most interesting points about the passage is that it seems to be a direct reference to the Guna theory, which received its elaborate exposition at the hands of the Sāmkhya writers; this is probably the earliest reference to the theory." Keith is not prepared to accept this interpretation, since he considers that "the meaning quality (Guna) is not proved for early Vedic literature, (it) occurring first in the Sūtras, and the sense must therefore be assumed to constituent or something similar, the reference being probably to the hair, skin and nails" (and that)" if the reference is to be taken as to the constituents in the sense of the 'Gunas' of the Sāmkhya Philosophy, it is clear that the expression is inaccurate, since the three constituents make up nature, and the passage would say that body was covered with nature, instead of consisting of nature."

Balkrishna in reply to this view states that "Dr. Keith's view is not correct, since in the language of the Bhagavadgīta, Gunas born of matter bind the indestructible Soul in the body... that the envelopment of the Gunas is the cause of the body and its actions according to Sāmkhya theory --- that the said Vedic verse contains an important truth of that system." Keith's interpretation of the Gunas as 'hair, skin and nail' is difficult

---

(1) HfK, II, § 292  (2) SS, p. 19
(3) Balkrishna, Hindu Philosophers on Evolution, p. 103
to be accepted, being farfetched and not borne by any authority.
Sāṃkhya Karika No 12 defined the Gunas as being subjugative, supportive, productive and co-operative. S'rīmad Bhāgavata also states that substance, space, time, knowledge, action, result, S'raddha, Avastha, form and observance, all these have the three Gunas. The Gunas therein even without combining with each other (A-sammis'ra) can cover up and subjugate each other Gunas of the Antahkarana, its Avastha, or form. Gunas are here 'reals' and not mere characteristics. It is not known why Keith is taking objection to the Hṛdaya Pundarīka being covered with the three Gunas individually or collectively, and twisting the word Gunas to mean 'Hair, skin and nails'. The Individual Jīvātman residing in this Antahkarana or the lotus of the heart is bound by the Gunas eternally, though he is above them and master of Māyā according to Bhāgavata. "His mind becomes covered with the three Gunas." The word 'Anuruddham' in the S'loka quoted here is the same as Āvrtam. The word Āvrtam need not be taken in the restricted sense of covering since it can also mean 'conjoined'. Daegupta is justified in tracing the Gunas to the Vedic times. In the case of Nāsadiya Sūkta of the RV it has been shown that the Tamas or Māyā at its initial state was predominated by Tamoguna and hence there are good grounds to take up the Gunas to the Vedic age. The description of the Ātman or Yakṣa given here bears out monism,

(1) अन्योऽयमानलमयज्ञानमभुजूतमयायो गुणम् | SK 12
(2) द्रव्यं द्वारं दृढत्वं अन्तर्द्वस्तं कर्म-यक्षां तरंगे अवस्थाः। कृतिविशेषं द्रव्य-गुणः सत्यं हि। 69 8-25-30
(3) कार्यं कारणं कृत्यं ज्ञातं क्रियायो अज्ञातं। वर्णनातिरिक्तं नित्यं मात्रं वर्णं गुणं। 69 8-5-19
(4) योजयेण रजस्वं स्थवर्यं अवैद्यं व तमसं महानुष्ठ। 69 8-11-4

(4) Keith restricting the 'lotus with nine doors' to mean a physical body only is incorrect, since the lotus here refers to the Hṛdaya or Antahkarana or the subtle body which has nine doors.
which is also made clear in the following stanza especially the last line:

"Undivided I am, Undivided my Soul,
Undivided my sight, Undivided my hearing;
Undivided my in-breathing, Undivided out-breathing,
Undivided my diffusive-breathing, Undivided all am I."

The famous Skambha Hymn I-7 is known for conveying high monistic ideas and for the glorification of the way of knowledge. The 40th stanza reads as follows:

"From Him, Tamas flees away,
He is never beset with distress,
He is with all effulgencies - of which,
Only three effulgencies are in Prajāpati."

This stanza shows that the Supreme Reality is beyond Māyā, which is described as Tamas. The Supreme Brahman which is thus beyond Māyā and is Nirguna, is self-effulgent, whereas Prajāpati who is limited has only three effulgencies and not all. S'loka 31 elucidates this:

"Prior to Sūrya, Prior to Uga, name starts with His naming,
When first the unnamed manifested, the dominion of duality was set in,
Beyond Him, there is no other Supreme Reality."

This explains how the Ultimate is supreme with no naming and no duality. This sense seems to be echoed in the CU which says:

"The modification, being only a name arising from speech, while the truth is that, it is just clay."

References:
1. AV XIX:1-15
2. AV IX:7-40
3. AV IX:7-31
4. AV IX:7-4
Another verse of this hymn is also important and it runs as follows:

"A conspicuous branch known as Asat, people have regarded it, as if supreme. Other people who worship that branch regard it as 'Sat'."

This is a hit against those who regard 'Asat'(Avyakta) only as the Supreme Reality, and who considered this 'Asat' as the original independent and eternal existence like the Classical Sāmkhya. and who consider it also as 'Sat', since 'Sat' came out of 'Asat'. But the AV does not accept it, as it accepts the truth of Nasadiya Sūkta that the Reality is beyond Sat and Asat. The same thought of Ṛg Veda is brought out by the Atharva Veda. The word 'Iva' used in this verse is also very important as it makes out that 'Asat' is not the 'Paramam' which is beyond 'Asat'. There are similar other philosophical passages in AV. Some RV mantras are repeated in the AV also. The seventeenth verse of the Skambha Hymn also explains Purusa as Brahman and that knowledge of Brahman leads to the knowledge of all:

"Those who cognise Purusa as Brahman, know the most exalted one; he who knows the most exalted one, he who knows Prajāpati, whoever knows the loftiest Brahman, he knows the truth (Skambha).

The AV gives the highest predominance to Brahman and its theology; and it is for this reason that the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa calls AV as Brahma-Veda. About this Skambha hymn of AV Radhakrishnan says: "Atharva Veda has certain elements in

1) अप्रकृताब्धम् प्रतिष्ठिताम् परामर्शिव अन्य विद्व: || AV न. 7-21 ||
2) ये पुरुषे प्रकृतेऽविद्व: परामर्शिनम् || AV न. 7-17 ||
3) H. S. L. p. 163
common with the Upanishads and the Brahmanas — The great of them all is Skambha.

(c) In Yajur Veda:

The Yajur Veda which deals with sacrificial views, has also some of the highlights of philosophy. The same rationalistic ideas which we come across in the RV and AV are also met in this Veda, though not so frequently. The first verse of VS 32 runs as follows:

"Agni is verily 'Tat'; Aditya is 'Tat'; Vayu is 'Tat'; Moon is 'Tat'; S'ukra is 'Tat'; Brahma is 'Tat'; Apah is 'Tat'; Prajāpati is He,"

All mortals (Nimeshāh) arose out of the radiant Purusa.

One should not cognise Him as having parts like 'above', 'across' or 'middle'."

We can see from this that the word 'Tat' representing the Impersonal Supreme' had already gained importance; and the pantheistic Gods are elevated and identified with 'Tat'. In the Upanishadic Philosophy, the word 'Tat' appears in the mantra 'Tat Tvam Asi' for identifying the individual soul with the Supreme Soul. So also the word 'Sa' in 'Sa Prajāpati' denotes the Supreme Absolute and appears later on in the Upanishads as in the mantra 'Sa Aham'. The second mantra brings out the idea of formlessness of the Supreme Reality which is always perfect, unmodified and unchanged, inspite of the creations of all the beings appearing out of Him. This 'Mantra' is a sort of prelude to the mantra of

1) तेषायक्षिता विषजययो युः युः च जन्मभवति न।

तेषाय शुचि तेषाय तात्क्षरं तथो भासस्य विद्यते॥ ॥

श्रेयं विवशति विशेषं विश्वं भुविष्यति ।

देवेणु तत्त्वं निदेशितं अद्यर्थं परिज्ञाशति। VS. 32-182
the IU "Pūrṇamadāḥ pūrṇamidam etc." Some of the thinkers conceive the Supreme as having a form and state that, after liberation, the liberated souls occupy a certain part of this Supreme. Here in this mantra of VS, we have the monistic conception establishing complete identity of individual soul becoming one with the Supreme Soul. With the removal of the illusion, which is a sort of limitation (Upādhi), all will become one with the Supreme as stated in MU.

Another verse of this Sukta runs as under:

"Before Him was nothing whatsoever born,
Who pervaded the entire world of created beings;
Prajāpati rejoices with his creatures,
He, possessed of sixteen parts, arranges three lights.

This verse speaks of Saguna Brahman i.e., Prajāpati who is engaged in the creation of Universe. He is also the Hiranyagarbha Brahman, who is connected with Brahmanda which is his gross body. Like the individual Jīvātman, he is also connected with the sixteen cosmic components of the Linga body (Sūkṣma S'arīra). The styling of Prajāpati as "Sodas'a", by this stanza, is very important as it conveys that the conception of the theory of 'Sūkṣma S'arīra' of sixteen elements has its origin in the Vedic period and that it is not an innovation of the Upaniṣads which have only further developed this idea. In SB also there is the mention of Sodas'a Kalā and further in BU, CU, Pr.U and elsewhere. This aspect of

(1) Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya
(2) Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya
(3) Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya Pūrṇabhāṣya
Linga-body is accepted by both the Classical Sāmkhya and Vedānta Philosophies. The three lights mentioned in this Sloka are referred to in the AV mantra mentioned previously.

Another verse of this Śloka further says:

"Vena (intelligent), beholding the Sat in his heart,
As cosmic 'Sat' becomes one with the Ultimate.
All this unites in that from which all issues forth,
He, the Omnipresent (Vibhuh), is warp and woof in beings."

This is a very beautiful stanza enunciating the monistic view, which is accepted by all Upaniṣads. The terms 'Atmah, Protas'ca' have been further elaborated in BU by the Sage Yājñavalkya in his conversations with the sages in the king Janaka's Court. The word 'Sat' in this above stanza means 'Satya' or 'Atman' and not worldly existence as in the RV Hymn I-164 mentioned previously.

Vena means intelligent upāsaka.

Another verse of this hymn reads as follows:

"Having encompassed all creatures, encompassing all worlds,
He covered up all the regions and directions,
And with the approach of the first-born (Māya) of eternal order,
Entered into it through Himself."

This explains how the Ultimate Reality becomes 'Māya Upahita Caitanya', as the word 'Upasthāya' would mean it, and how it became subject to the limitations (Upādhi) of the Māya. This corresponds with 'Tatsrastvā te devānuprāvis'at'.

---

1) केवल अपकलाशिक्षार्थ शुष्क सत्यज्ञिति विभूतेऽरेष्ट सत्यसेव किमं सत्यायनास्ति।
तत्तत्त्विवार्त संविर्यथि तत्त्त्वेण अति सत्य सविनयद्वैतवर्तमानं सत्यसेव न्युनस्य प्रमाणस्य।

2) दैवतीयं भूतानि परितृप्ति तपस्यायं दैवतीयं दैवतीयं परितृप्ति यथिर्देशायस्मां दैवतीयं भूतानि परितृप्ति दैवतीयां दैवतीयां।

VS 32-8 Vena means 'Intelligent' according to Nekckius, p. 238

VS 32-11
Now after explaining the Supreme Reality which represents the Advaita, this hymn further requests all the deities to bestow the Supreme knowledge (or Saṁkhya) by which the Supreme Reality can be realised by praying:

"The knowledge that the Devas and Fathers esteem,
With that knowledge, O! Agni! unite, make me possessor of knowledge, Hail.
May Varuna bestow me knowledge, may Agni and Prajāpati bestow knowledge.
May Indra and Vēyu grant me knowledge and may Dātr grant it to me, Hail."

This conception is further exalted in the next verse:

"I have known the mighty Purusa
Who is refulgent as the Sun beyond darkness;
By knowing Him alone, one transcends death
No other way than this is there to reach."

Thus we can very well see that there was no confused thinking on the part of the Vedic seers in their philosophical reflections. The misconceptions entertained by some thinkers to the effect that the Vedic thinkers were simply struck with admiration and wonder at the sight of the various phenomena of nature and they burst into songs in praise of the forces of Nature deserves to be brushed aside when we take into consideration such loftiness of philosophical ideas which they had developed. These singers were not primitive thinkers but had attained a high state of civilization. They had consistent and rationalised conceptions and had developed

(1) या मेधायां देववेदनां सिद्धोऽपहरस्ते
ṣत्या सार्ववेदे नेवचारणे मेधाविंतं करुस्वातः
मेठाम्योऽभुवध्यं जनने मेधाविंतेः अपरातः
मेठाम्योऽभुवध्यं जनने भातां देवां वेदां स्वातः
VS 32-14 & 15

(2) नेवचारणेत् पूर्वं महात्मर्
आचार्यवर्णी तस्मात् परस्पात्र्
तो तेषं किचिद्वरी वूढः पुरुस्ततः
नामधर्मिन्यो वेदां नयन्
VS 32-18
Yoga and Sāṃkhya ways or theistic methods of knowledge to attain the Supreme Reality. The unity of polytheistic Gods with pantheistic or monotheistic God and the ultimate transformation of theism into monism in those very ancient times is no small achievement.

Sāṃkhya in the Brāhmaṇas:

Now we shall pass on from the Vedic Samhitā literature to the Brāhmaṇa literature. The course of philosophical reflection or Sāṃkhya has begun in India much earlier than the Classical Sāṃkhya. We have seen so far as to how such speculative thinking is found in the Vedas. The Brāhmaṇas are the further stages in the progress of such speculative and analytical thought. In the history of Indian thought, the Śāhitas, Brāhmaṇas, Aranyakas and Upanisads together come under the term 'S'ruti'. The philosophical thoughts which were conceived in the Śāhitas are developed and further solidified in the Brāhmaṇas and Aranyakas or Upanisads. The ultimate Supreme Truth which the Vedic Seers had recognised as 'Tat Ekam' or Ekam Sat 'Puruṣa eva Idam Sarvam' has never been questioned by the thinkers of Brāhmaṇas, Aranyakas and Upanisads; but were accepted by them as the gospel truth or the Divine wisdom. The Supreme Reality continued to be worshipped with all sacrificial grandeur of the Vedic days during the Brāhmaṇa period with systematised or regularised ritualistic procedures; it was singularly concentrated upon during the Aranyaka period with mature thinking in peaceful atmosphere after having lived the prescribed modes of ethical conduct or Ās'rama dharman; and finally this Reality which was achieved in the Vedic
days was further rationalised and developed in the light of the experience of the Upanisadic thinkers by further analytical elimination by methods of 'Neti' and 'Neti' and set up with all positive monistic assertions like 'The Ātman is the only Reality' 'Ekameva Advitiyatam' 'Satyaṁ śānaṁ anantāṁ' etc. From the worship of Personal Gods with forms, accepted in the Brāhmaṇas through sacrifices or other such external modes of worship, we are led to the mental worship of Savikalpaka Brahman, by following the rigid life of Āranyakas; and from this worship of Savikalpaka we are further led through the Upanisadic knowledge to rise to the Nirvikalpaka Brahman, securing identity of the Jīvātman with the Parmātman. The sacrificial worships in the Brāhmaṇas may be construed as one of the ways of Upāsana of the Supreme which was long back considered, as one and only one and which continued to be so in the Brāhmaṇas also. Keith says "It is impossible to deny that the Ātman - Brahman doctrine has a long previous history in the Brāhmaṇas and is a logical development of the idea of unity in the RV." Deussen also says that "the Brāhmaṇas shade off unperceptibly into the Āranyakas and the Āranyakas shade off into the Upanisads without violent change of any kind." Radhakrishnan also says "We find in the Upanisads an advance of Sāhkīya mythology, Brāhmaṇa hair-splitting and even Āranyaka theology though all the stages are to be met with." He also says "These later works (Brahmaṇas and Upanisads) are a continuation and development of the views of the hymns." Thus the Sāhkīya or the rational analysis of the Supreme Truth which is the essence of the Veda has a continuity in the Brāhmaṇas, Āranyakas, or Upanisads.

(3) IP, I, p.138. (4) IP, I, p.70.
Before proceeding with the study of the Samkhya in the Brahmana, it is desirable to have a glimpse of the chronological distance or relation between the Vedas and the Brahmanas. The determination of such a chronology is far too difficult a task than anticipated for want of sufficient evidence. It is not, therefore, intended to trace a definite date for the chronological history of the Vedas, this being very polemical and confronted with uncertain and conflicting data. Some facts of Puranic tradition worth noting, are however indicated here. It may be noted that as the tradition goes, as shown in the various Puranas, there was originally one Veda in the earlier distant ages. It was then the exclusive or the privileged monopoly of the Vasistha clan and contained the hymns of that family only which did not allow the incorporation of the hymns of any other families. The Sage Vasistha and his successors were more highly respected than other sages, on account of this monopolistic connections with the Veda. The Veda was considered by this family as their 'Kamadhenu.' This is, certainly, likely to have created some heartburning in others and when the Vasistha family had gone less powerful in the course of time, other clans with Visvamitra came in the forefront and snatched away the Veda or Kamadhenu from the hands of Vasistha family. Many hymns were included thereafter in the Veda, so much so, that in course of time, it overgrew and it became difficult to preserve this enlarged and copious Veda which was highly respected. The Vayu Purana states that there was then one Veda and it was called Yajurveda.1 The Sage Parashara Vyasa of the Vasistha family, 

---

(1) "हूक अश्रित यजुर्वेदः" Vayu Purana
who had then come into prominence, divided this Veda into three
Samhitas. This Sage Parāśara Vyāsa is quite different from
Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa who is also a member of Vasistha family,
later than Parāśara Vyāsa. This Parāśara Vyāsa is referred to
in the Taittiriya Āraṇyaka. There are many Vyāsas and Lord Kṛṣṇa
in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says that 'Of all the Vyāsas, I am Śi
Dvaipāyana'. It is Śrī Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana who is credited with
dividing the Purāṇas into eighteen. To credit him with the
division of Vedas into three, as done by some Purāṇas, seems to
be unconvincing. The division of an important work like Veda which
was the very life of the Indians, was a difficult task which
required the sympathy of all clans, all tribes, all sages etc. This
could not be also done without Royal assistance. The Bhāgavata
Purāṇa attributes such division to the king Pururavas by stating
that there was one Veda called Pranava which was the source of all
literature, one God and none else, one Varna and one fire. It was
Pururavas who divided all these (Veda, God, Varna and Fire) into
three at the beginning of Satya Yuga, and through Agni so divided
into three, he went to Gandharva-loka. With the help of
Pururavas, Parāśara Vyāsa seems to have divided the Veda into three.
For the help given by the king Pururavas in the division of the
Vedas, the sages were very much pleased and blessed him Heaven.

The 95th Hymn of I Book of RV refers to the Urvasī - Pururavas

(1) यदृच्छ वेदुः सत्तावृत अवस्त्रः परात्मार्यः || ता॥स् प्रपाधः ॥ कानवाक्या. ॥
(2) बैराज्ञानी विभावोऽत्यते भैरविभावलट िसतंभम्॥ वप 63-28. ॥
(3) प्राकाञ्चे 4 सद्य आसाना ॥ बप XI-16-28
(4) तां दृष्टा भूता वेदुः अवपह वर्षभसंवट्टो वैश्वनारायणपचार्यः (कल्पनः कर्ण ॥
पुरुरवस प्रासादीस्तु कर्मी; नेतुनुबद्धे त्रुप्तं अभिन्ना अर्जुना राजा होकं गायनमेविवसल्लु ॥
बप IX-14-48 and 49.
(5) पुरुरवस्य सा जलोऽस्मिन् ज्वालद्रिपं घुरा | हेक्कः प्राप्तिसिद्धान्तस्य ब्रह्मासी महादेवदेवम् ॥
MB(Aue P) 6-31
dialogue which seems to have been included in the RV in recognition of the assistance given by the king Pururavas. The completion of the compilation, including edition and revision, of the Vedas must have taken a long time from the time of Parāś'ara Vyasa and must have lasted for ages. It is for this revision that in the RV we come with references, like the old Veda etc. The Puruṣa Sūkta of the RV mentions the three Vedas. Some sages must have devoted their lives to set up rules or Anukramanis (indices) etc. to preserve these Vedas in tact, with sanctity, without allowing any new additions or alterations after their revision once finally fixed.

The Yajurveda, after being separated from the RV and compiled separately, came to be split again under different recensions. Belvalkar describes recensions of 'Krṣṇa Yajurveda' as follows:— (1) Taittiriya (2) Maitrāyana (3) Katha (4) Kapishthala Katha (5) Svetāsvatara. Taittiriya is also called Āpastambha. The S'ukla Yajurveda which is also called Vajasaneyi Sāhita has two recensions (1) Kārṣṇa and (2) Mañḍhyamī. The Agnī Purāṇa mentions all these recensions and also adds another recension viz Vais'ampayana. The Sage Vais'ampayana who established the Yajurveda recension is the brother of the Sage Taittāri as stated in S'anti Parvan of MB. This Sage Vais'ampayana is quite different from the Paurāṇika Vais'ampayana who narrated MB to the king Janamejaya. The former lived much earlier and had unknowingly committed the death of a Brāhmaṇa boy according to MB² Bhāgavata

(1) HIR, II, pp. 32 to 34
(2) Ādhyātma-kārṣṇīyam Brāhmaṇa-purāṇam / kānābha eva bhūtā / eva deva-yaṇā / kākesvara / AIT IT 336-1
Sixteen sages including the above were the seers of the Upaniṣads. Vācā's sacrifice
(3) Aṣṭāmbadhya-Brāhmaṇa Hṛṣṭe śvetāsvatara Sāhita / Vais'ampayana Aitareya / kī ṛte vācā / MB (puruṣa) 8-37
Purāṇa further states that when the sage Vais'ampāyana was taking expiatory measures for redemption from the sin by worshipping the Sun God, his pupil Yājñavalkya interposed with arrogance for entrusting the work to him and for not relying on other pupils like Caraka, who were half educated, and that he would successfully carry out the work. (Skanda Purāṇa mentions that the Sage Vais'ampāyana was residing in Prabhāsa-Pattana and here he taught Yajurveda to Yājñavalkya). The Sage Vais'ampāyana was not satisfied with the attitude of Yājñavalkya and asked him to walk away after giving up what he had learnt from him. The Sage Yājñavalkya vomited the vidyā of Yajuveda which he had learnt, and the other sages picked it up by becoming sparrows (Tittiris). Obviously from this story, it becomes evident that the Yajurveda which was taught to Vais'ampāyana by the Sage Pārāśara Vyāsa was further divided into two parts Kṛṣṇa and S'ukla. Tatttiri was another sage, brother of Vais'ampāyana who established Tatttiriya recension. The story of Tittiris picking up the vomited portions seems to suggest superiority of Sage Yājñavalkya. There are grounds to assume that the Vajasaneya Sāhita or white Yajuveda was compiled much anterior to SB or BU and hence the Sage Yājñavalkya who compiled the Vajasaneya Sāhita is likely to be different from the Yājñavalkya mentioned in SB or BU. Yājñavalkya

---

(1) वैशास्यायनश्रीप्रथा वै-चर्कालिकविभवं भवेत् अवर्गेष्यसिद्धां पार्था: स्वज्ञतात्रिैत्रिः | यात्रनसम्मानस्ततिर्भवेत् अर्ह अते भवानु किंतृति-सिद्धां-साधारणोऽसिद्धां-साधारणोऽसिद्धां यात्रनसम्मानस्ततिर्भवेत् अर्ह अते भवानु किंतृति-सिद्धां-साधारणोऽसिद्धां-साधारणोऽसिद्धां

(2) वैशास्यायनसांहिती बिग्रहाद्वां अनुवृत्तिष्ठेन्दुर्मिथाः | केवलम् कैल-6-52
who compiled the $'ukla Yajurveda is mentioned by the Visnu Purana and Bhagavata Purana as the son of Brahmara or Devarata, whereas the MB mentions $'ajñavalkya to be the son of Kas'ypa. The Gandharva Vis'āvasu states to $'ajñavalkya that he acquired Saṁkhyā (knowledge) from his ($'ajñavalkya's) father Kas'ypa.

The Vālmīki Rāmāyana mentions that before Sri Rāmachandra proceeded to the forest from Ayodhya according to his father's orders, he instructed his brother Jāmaśmana to distribute alms, out of his earnings, to the followers of Taittirīya Saṁhitā, and the branches of Kathaka and Kalāpa Saṁhitās in Yajurveda; which obviously means that these S'ākhas stood established in those days.

The Vējāsaneṣī Saṁhitā of $'ajñavalkya was not very much later than the Taittirīya and other S'ākhas. Bhagavata and other Purānas further mention that in the family of Sri Rāmachandra, there was a king named Hiranyanābha (fifteenth successor) a famous Yogi, who was the pupil of the Sage Jaimini and that he taught to $'ajñavalkya of Kosal country the knowledge of self-realisation and Astāṅga Yoga which led to removal of Avidyā. The Pr.U however states that Hiranyanābha Kosala (of Kosala) had approached the Sage Sukes'a with one of the six questions of Pr.U for knowledge of Šodas'a Kalā Purusa. This Hiranyanābha, efficient in the knowledge of self realisation, is of Kosala country and he has been wrongly
identified with the Hiranyanabha of Iksvaku or Ramachandra's family. The SB mentions that one Kousalya king Para śāhṭara who is Hairanyanabha, performed As'vamedha sacrifice. He is in fact the son of Hiranyanabha Kosala. He was earlier than Sri Ramachandra. He was the preceptor of Yajñavalkya. If we are to identify the Hiranyanabha, the preceptor of Yajñavalkya with the one in Iksvaku family, after 15 generations after Sri Ramachandra it will upset the chronology of VS or SB. This king Hiranyanabha Kosala is referred to in the Harivams'a Purāṇa as the preceptor of the king 'Kṛta' who was the restorer of Saṃaveda which was lost.

During the Vedic period, there were various institutions or schools run by the sages, like Vasistha school, Viśvamitra school, Bharadvajā school, Kausitaki school, Yajñavalkya school, Kapila school, etc., which were named and continued in the name of their founders. Though the names of individuals who were managing them were changing from time to time, the names of founders of the schools or of personalities responsible for their foundation continued unchanged. So also the families or the successor members in the families were continued in the names of famous persons in the families. Thus recensions or families or schools maintained and continued the original names, without having rivalry or conflicts with others. They were having full co-operation with other families or schools. They were holding Jñāna- satras and had free discussions with each other and were getting

1) अधिनियंत्रित तिराज्ञस्तेन ह परस्पर संवेदनशीलो ग्रामता तदेष्टास्वामीर्गीतिनिर्देशस्य परि परि भये मोहे मेधमाल्यायते हृदय्याग्निः कोस्त्राही दिश्य नुः आः ्अस्तं तेतेरी || SB xiii-5-4-4.
2) Harivams'a Purāṇa 20-42, 43.
their doubts cleared without caring for false prestige etc. Such a healthy atmosphere was maintained even at the time of compilation of the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas etc. Thus the name of Vasiṣṭha continued long from the time of the original founder of the school or family; and all the successors of Vasiṣṭha family or the followers of Vasiṣṭha school and their successors were called Vasiṣṭhas, even though their individual names changed. For this reason the name of the original Vedic Seer of RV is Vasiṣṭha. A Vasiṣṭha is recognised as one of the Seven sages or Stars moving round the Dhruva Star. The name of the sage who enthroned the king Śanvarana who married Tapati, daughter of Sun God, the name of the sage who helped the king Soudasa to have progeny when his family was waning, after so many centuries after the king Śanvarana, the name of the sage who refused to deliver 'Kamadhenu' to Vis'vāmitra, the name of the sage who acted as the family priest of Sri Rāmačandra, the name of the sage who was attending the sacrifices of the Pāṇḍavas on occasions, is all the while mentioned as Vasiṣṭha in the Purāṇas. These incidents relate to a duration of good many centuries and no human imagination can be stretched to identify this personality of Vasiṣṭha as one individual. So also this applies to Vis'vāmitra, and Paras'urāma. The name of the sage who is one of the seven sages is Vis'vāmitra; the name of the sage who taught Astra Vidya to Rāmačandra and who took him to Śīta Svayāmvara is Vis'vāmitra; the name of the sage who created a separate heaven to Tris'anku is Vis'vāmitra; so also the name of the sage who teased Haraścandra is Vis'vāmitra. This also covers a long period of centuries for which reason we cannot conceive one Vis'vāmitra to have lived for such a long period.
also is the Sage Paras'urama, son of Jamadagni. This sage is known to have defeated the Kartavirya king and vanquished all the Ksatriyas. In Ramayana, we come across a story of Sri Ramachandra having defeated the famous Paras'urama. In MB we come with the story of Karna having learnt the Astra Vidya from the Sage Paras'urama. The MB also explains that all the kings in Janaka family had the name of Janaka, inspite of different personalities. We also see that the Sage Pañcas'ikha is also called Kapila in the MB. The continuance of the school name or the pedigree name has created difficulties to establish correctly the chronology of the Vedas by reference to the names of the sages only. Some of the modern historians have worked out wrong themes and arrived at wrong conclusions by being carried out only by individual names, without referring to the correct contexts. To illustrate, one Janamejaya Pārikaśit of SB has been wrongly identified with the Pauranik Janamejaya Pārikaśit. Similarly Janaka king of SB has been misread as the father-in-law of the epic Ramachandra. Similarly Dhararāstra is not correctly recognised.

We come across in the SB of Janamejaya Pārikaśit performing Asvamedha Yāga with the assistance of Indrota Devāpa S'aunakā. This king Janamejaya Pārikaśit was the ancestor of the Pāndavas. He has been wrongly taken by K.M. Munshi in his 'Early Aryans in Gujarat' as the Pāndavas' great grandson Janamejaya, who was also the son of Pārikaśit to whom S'ukacarya narrated the Bhāgavata

(1) गृहान देवोदेवेते देवेऽकुण्ड्रीकां अनंतं विशेषति याज्ञवल्क्य कार्येन षट्वन सबी भाषप्यो भां विश्वस्थानवधधान सर्ववै धर्मायं सर्ववै ज्ञानस्य अपहरणे श्रुतिः अथवेत इति । 188 युध्यो 13-5-4-1

(2) K.M. Munshi, 'Early Aryans in Gujarat', pp 80 and 84.
Purāna. There is no mention of Kuru-Pandava war in SB. For this reason, K.M. Munshi writes "In the absence of any corroborative evidence that in the line of the Pandavas there were two Parīkṣitās and that each of them had a son Janamejaya and that both sons had a similar glorious career, the inevitable conclusion is that the MB war did not take place and no such mighty figures like Arjuna, Kṛṣṇa etc. lived in fact."

Similar wrong conclusions have been arrived at by Macdonell. There can be little doubt that the original of the epic has as a historical background an ancient conflict between the Kūrus and Pañcālas. In the Kathaka Samhitā, king Dṛtarāstra Vaicitra-vīrya, one of the chief figures of the MB is mentioned as a well-known person. Hence the historical germ of the great epic is to be traced to a very early period, which cannot well be later than the tenth century B.C. These disconnected battle songs were, we must assume worked up by some poetic genius into a comparatively short epic, describing the tragic fate of the Kūru race, who with justice and virtue on their side perished through the treachery of the victorious sons of Pāndu with Kṛṣṇa at their head." It is easy to show the mistake of Macdonell who has wrongly presumed that the Dṛtarāstra in the Kathaka Samhitā is the same as the Dṛtarāstra, the brother of Pāndu in the MB epic. The former was a king of Benaras and he had performed an Ahavamādha sacrifice and his horse had been captured by Sattānīka, a king of Pañcāla. The latter king Dṛtarāstra was a Kūra king of

1) HSL, p. 239.
2) अथाश्वमेधयायमेव समतः समृद्धायुधग्रुवं यत्र चरराय गृहातिको गृहातिकेऽधिवः महाका। आनावत वास्तवान्यं गृहमयः गृहातिको गृहातिकेऽधिवः \text{हल्लु इति} अनुसारैः-५-४-८२.
Hastināvati who had not performed any Aśvamedha sacrifice.
Basing his assumptions on wrong facts, Macdonell should not have fixed, the Kuru Pāndava war to tenth century B.C.

The compilation of the Vedas took place much earlier than the period of the epic hero Śrī Rāma and the division of YV into various recensions including VS had already been established by his time. So also SV with various branches had been revived by his time. The SB and other Brāhmaṇaś were there much earlier to the incidents of the epic heroes Śrī Rāma and the Pāndavas. It will not be correct from the absence of their names in these works to come to a conclusion that these personalities did not exist at all and that some ingenious head had worked out these stories without any historical personalities. Such errors like those mentioned above will have to be avoided.

Now we will revert to the main point. There can be no doubt or dispute that the Brāhmaṇa portions contain a lot of literature about sacrifices. The need of the days had to be met with by the sages and could not be easily dispensed with by them. With the systematisation of the Vedas into four treatises, it was equally necessary to systematise the rules and procedures of sacrifices, especially, when there were so many recensions observing differences in the procedures of sacrifices. The rituals for which these Brāhmaṇaś framed regulations were, of course, the rituals of Vedas in the main, but the Brāhmaṇaś had to elaborate and perfect their methods and procedures fully. The Brāhmaṇaś were also now to face a new development of thought. They had to explain sometimes some of the old ritualistic and polytheistic ideas in the light of
pantheistic and monotheistic or monistic ideas, and to bring uniformity in their ideas. They were on the threshold of the highly Upanisadic thoughts which were already heralded in the Vedas, and with which they were to bring the ritualistic ideas in line. They were thus to bridge over the gulf that was there between the positive, traditional, inexplicable datum or prescriptions of the Vedic rituals on the one hand which were already current with the people in general including the kings and their officers, and the requirements of a rational or systematic view of the world which had developed, on the other hand, by this time. We see in the SB the high thinkers like Yajnavalkya explaining perfectly in a satisfactory manner all the sacrificial procedures and who is also answering the great philosophical questions of the great thinkers with explanations containing highly philosophical Upanisadic thoughts. The rationalistic thinking with which the Brahma thinkers were to sublimate the sacrificial thinking to the level of the Upanisadic thinking was responsible for welding the idealistic Upanisadic thoughts with theism and Upasana ways. It is here that we see how the Bhagavata Dharma was being developed towards Nivritti ways, even in the ancient days, with rationalistic ideas. It may be also noted that the development of ritualistic procedures with the ratiocination and speculative thought in the Brahmana period was responsible for the formulation of the sciences of grammar, metrics, mathematics, geometry, algebra, anatomy, biology, Sutra formations, religion, Smritis etc. The thinking of the Brahmana period should not be passed over as 'Shallow and insipid grandiloquence' by priestly conceit and antiquarian pedantry.
We have seen how the 'S'rūtis' are formed by combining the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas, Āranyakas and Upaniṣads. These were not the works pertaining to one school of thought but were pertaining to different schools. The Taittirīya Samhitā, the Taittirīya Br., the Taittirīya Āranyaka and the Taittirīya Upaniṣad contained the thoughts of Taittirīya school or recension. There is homogeneity of thought underlying these works with no departures from the main ideals or conceptions of the S'ākhās. The S'ākhās never forgot their affiliations to the Vedic thought. Further, the S'ākhās of the Vedas are, in general, close to each other and have not much of disagreement in material particulars.

The spirit of Speculative thinking was there with the Brāhmaṇa thinkers and it is for this reason that they had to explain all the sacrificial mantras, materials etc., with specific explanations and regulations. The sense of identification or symbolizing was also popular with the thinkers in the Brāhmaṇas since they had to explain all the ritualistic theories in the light of monotheistic ideas. These thinkers had the hard task of symbolizing the supreme truth as well with ritualistic mantras etc. The Vedas had already formulated that Indra, Agni, Mitra-Varuṇa were the names or symbols of the same One Supreme Truth, who was the same one Puruṣa with thousands of heads or forms and who was underlying the whole of the creation. Harrison has noticed this sense of identification or symbolisation and remarks "Thus in Ch. 1-6-7, we have seen a long series of identifications of the Rg. and Sāma Vedas. The Rg. Veda is earth, atmosphere, heaven, the lunar mansions or in the personal realm, speech, seeing, hearing

(1) HMP, p. 189.
etc. The Sāmañveda is fire, wind, breath, soul, mind and many other things. At the close of the section, the person who knows the Vedas thus, is promised the worlds and all desires. Now this delight in identifications is no new discovery of the Upanisads. Such identifications which had started with the Vedas, the Gods, and the materials are very common in the Brāhmaṇas.

The SB itself clearly indicates in a passage that the allegorical or symbolical saying is the main theme and is accepted by it, since the Gods are very much pleased with allegorical or symbolical ways — " Indra is identified with the senses (Prānas), which throw light on the objects of cognition like the fuel. This is the allegorical or symbolical meaning of the term 'Indra'. The Gods very much like only such allegorical sayings."

Similar explanation is given by the BU about the God Indra. " Indha by name is this person (Purusa) who is in the right eye. Him, verily, who is that Indha, people call it Indra, allegorically for the Gods are fond of the allegorical or symbolical sayings, as it were; they dislike explicit expressions". (Indha is self, identified with the physical self.) The BU and SB pertain to the S'ukla Y V S'ākha.

The Ai J of RV S'ākha explains " He perceived this very person Brahman, all pervading ' I have seen this ' he said. Therefore, his name is Idandra. Indeed, Idandra is the name of him who is Idandra, they speak allegorically as Indra. Gods appear indeed to be fond of allegorical or symbolical sayings."
Thus the allegorical or symbolical method of explanation is common to all recensions. S'rimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa repeats these ideas through the Sage Nārada by saying: "O! Barhisman! I have explained to you allegorically (through Purānjana story) the metaphysics, because the Lord Bhagavān is very much pleased with allegorical sayings."¹ It also emphatically states, that the main theme of the Veda is the identification of Atman with Brahman and the Vedic seers explain it in allegorical ways.²

"There are three subjects in the Vedas preaching Karma, Upāsana and Jñāna. They all deal with Brahman and Atman. The Vedic seers always preach in allegorical ways. I appreciate very much allegorical ways."²

In the Vedas, Lord Viṣṇu is identified with the Supreme God and His position has been identified with the Supreme Reality which could be attained by the Jñānins (Tryayat).³ This position of the Lord Viṣṇu is also accepted by the Brāhmaṇas.⁴ S.B identifies Lord Viṣṇu with the sacrifice⁵ while explaining the YV mantra "Viṣṇoh Sthanamasi". This is repeated by the SB in another context also.⁶ It is also stated in this Br.⁷ that it is Lord Viṣṇu who is the first to have been the successful end of the sacrifice. The Ai.B declares firmly that he is the highest deity. The Purāṇas and the Upanisads also assert the Lord Viṣṇu as the

---

¹ S'rimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 7.8.11
² S'rimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 7.8.12
³ S'rimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 7.8.13
⁴ S'rimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 7.8.14
⁵ S'rimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 7.8.15
⁶ S'rimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 7.8.16
⁷ S'rimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 7.8.17
Supreme especially the Katha Upanisad. In the Purāṇas we see that Lord Nārāyaṇa is none but Viṣṇu. In the Nārāyaṇiya section of MB Lord Nārāyaṇa accepts the Supreme self as the Reality and when asked by the Sage Nārada, He states that he is contemplating on the Supreme Self. Nārāyaṇa Tattva is recognised by the Brāhmaṇas as the Supreme being. In the TA Nārāyaṇa is described with all the attributes of the Supreme Soul which are usually found in the Upanisads. Nārāyaṇa is another name of the Purusa who is also etymologically explained by the SB. Thus Nārāyaṇa is identified with the Rg Vedic Purusa and it is He who desired to encompass the whole Universe. It is Purusa Nārāyaṇa who conceived the idea of Pañcarātra Satra. This Pañcarātra has further become the Bhāgavata Dharma as is being explained later on. SB wants to establish that by performing or following the Pañcarātra, one attains Supremacy and transcendence. It is further shown that it is Lord Nārāyaṇa who performed the Purusamedha sacrifice, as is made out in the Purusa Sūkta of the RV. This Pañcarātra or Bhāgavata conception is credited to explain the transcendence of the Supreme as explained in the Purusa Sūkta. This very sense is brought out by the SB in another Brāhmaṇa also in the dialogue between the Lord Prajāpati and Purusa Nārāyaṇa, wherein Purusa Nārāyaṇa explains that He is the Atman of the whole creation, He is the Atman of all deities, He is the Atman of the Vedas themselves. Thus we...
have here the ritualistic explanation of the Supreme Lord Narayana and the allusion to the Bhagavata or Pancharatra conception.

The conception of Prajapati which had gained predominance in the explanation of the creation of Universe by the Vedas appears predominantly in the SB. All the Gods, all sacrifices, all sacrificial materials, all hymns, all meters, all acts are personified in His name. He is the Chief Divinity, the Creator of the world and the Planner of all creations. Some of the important references are brought out as follows: "Prajapati is the Lord of elements; Usas his wife." "Prajapati is Mahan Deva." "Prajapati is all meters." "Prajapati is the moon." "Prajapati is these worlds and quarters." "Prajapati harnesses the mind." "Prajapati is immortal and the deities are his sons." "Prajapati is the sacrifice undefined." "Prajapati is the human mind." "Prajapati is both Gods and men." "Prajapati is food, so state the Gods." "Prajapati is the Creator of the earth." "KA is doubtless Prajapati. Let us carry oblations to Him." That Agni (fire altar) is Prajapati; Prajapati is all Brahman; All this is from Prajapati."
becomes Hiranyagarbha; Prajāpati is Purusa." 15 "Vis'va Karman is Prajāpati." 16 "Prajāpati is Vāyu, Agni and also the Yajamana, the sacrificer." 17 "Prajāpati the Supreme, has become the Lord of all." 18 "Prajāpati is Ocean's Kalah; He is Agni." 19 "Prajāpati is the Supreme Paramātman." 20 "Prajāpati is indeed the year." 21 "Prajāpati is the Lord of Citta." 22

There are many other such similar stanzas applauding Prajāpati, but the above are sufficient illustrations to show the supremacy of the Prajāpati. However the illustration of Prajāpati as "Suparna Garutman" and as Puruṣa is important to bring out the identity of Prajāpati with the Supreme Reality which is the same as Suparna as explained previously. The mention of the sixteen cosmic parts in the Linga body of Cosmic Jīvatman or Hiranyagarbha is also an important aspect as explained. The Lord Śiva who has been praised in the Yajurveda mantra in highest esteem (and which mantra is used in the worship (Abhiseka) of Rudra) has been also praised in the SB as the pantheistic God. 23

Apart from the BU which is a part of SB, there are also idealistic philosophical expositions even in the SB. Macdonell for this reason recognises SB as a mine of important data and of noteworthy narratives by stating 24 "We find (in SB) the idea of unity in the Universe more fully developed than in any other

(15) स प्रजापति सौरिकृति सर्वसंसारं भवति सुरेष्ठो विज्ञापति॥ ॥ ॥
(16) प्रजापतिर्विविधंकर्मिः ॥ SB VIII-2-1-20 (17) स स्वायत्ते स प्रजापतिः सौरिकृति सर्वसंसारं भवति॥
(18) प्रजापति सवर्गसम्बन्धितार्थी॥ SB VIII-3-4-15. (19) प्रजापतिः प्रजापतिर्विविधादिकृति॥ SB IX-4-3-19.
(20) प्रजापतिः प्रजापतिः प्रजापतिः ॥ SB IX-2-2-2. (21) वायुस्वायत्ते ॥ SB VIII-3-4-19.
(22) प्रजापतिः प्रजापतिः प्रजापतिः ॥ SB IX-2-2-4. (24) हस्ति, p. 183
Brāhmaṇa, — its Upaniṣad is the finest product in the Vedic philosophy. "The Śāndilya Vidyā which is narrated in Āgni gives an early and fairly comprehensive conception of the Ātman doctrine and of the Individual Self, identified with the Supreme Self. This is verily the aspect of absolute monism. This passage runs as follows:

"One should meditate upon Brahman as Satya.

Now verily, the Puruṣa consists of purpose (Krūtu). According to the purpose a person entertains, so he becomes on departing from here.

He should meditate upon the Self, who owns the mind, who has Prāna as (the subtle) body, whose form is light (Bhāṣcit), who is vast like the sky, who can assume forms as per desires, who is swifter than the mind, whose (final) resolve is Satya, whose existence (Dhūti) is eternal, who is cosmic smell, who is cosmic fluidity, who lords over all quarters, who encompasses all this, who is without speech, who is indifferent. This is Self within the heart— the Puruṣa—who is minute like a grain of rice or barley corn or dehusked mustard seed. The (Cosmic) Ātman is Hiranmaya Puruṣa (Brahman) who is greater than the smokeless light, greater than the atmosphere, greater than the

.................................................................

(1) सत्यं श्रेयस्युपासितं | अथ रबः क्रुम्बवेधं यं कुवशं ्| सदाप्राण्युगोऽस्मानं | कांस्यति सत्यं श्रेयस्युपासितं ||

सं अति विचित्रं अस्मात् | भवनिः प्राणस्वरूपं | ब्रह्मार्क्ष बश्यामालाणि | सत्यस्वरूपं न सत्यस्वरूपं तत्सिगमिः | ब्रह्मार्क्ष बश्यामालाणि | सत्यस्वरूपं न सत्यस्वरूपं तत्सिगमिः ||

यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च यथा क्रियापদश्च यथा क्रियापदश्च ॥ ॥
sky, greater than the earth. This he is the soul of all souls, all beings. This my soul, on departing from here shall enter into that Self. Verily who knows this with faith, will have no more doubts. Thus used to say Śāndilya."

Here we have the famous Śāndilya lore which conveys that the individual Soul is the same as the Universal Self with which one who meditates on this Ātman with a firm and composed mind and with firm conviction (Addha= S'raddha) will get identity. This is the same as the Upanisadic teaching 'Tat T'vam Asi' which Uddālaka Aruni teaches Śvetaketu:—" That which is the finest essence - this whole world has that as its soul, that is Reality. That is Ātman. That art thou, Śvetaketu". The CU which is a compilation of SV Śākhā has taken the lore of Śāndilya mostly verbatim. In fact it shares a number of passages from BU. Long before the compilation of the Upanisads, and even before the compilation of the Brāhmānas, there were funds of teachings from eminent teachers like Śāndilya, Yājñavalkya, Uddālaka, etc and the compilers of the Upanisads have drawn the best of the teaching without minding the recensions. It is for this reason that the thoughts of the Upanisad appear or recur in the other, and it goes very difficult to say which of the Upanisads say BU or CU is earlier. The Sages Śāndilya and Yājñavalkya were the great thinkers not only of Upanisadic thoughts but also of sacrificial knowledge. They lived earlier to the Brāhmānas. The CU states that the Sage Mahidasa Āitareya of Ai. U lived earlier. The teachings of these Sages Yājñavalkya

1) स य दुप्रेस जीनातकाभ्यामितुर्सर्वतस्य सत्यम तत्ततैरस्य श्रवणते क्षेत्र ॥
   CU VI-8-7, VI-9-4.
2) III-14 (CU)
3) IV-16-7 (CU)
S'andilya, and others have been picked up by SB etc. Books or Kandas VII, IX, X of SB are ascribed exclusively to S'andilya, and name of Yajñavalkya does not occur in these books. Here S'andilya is referred to as the chief authority in doctrinal matters. The Sage Yajñavalkya is referred to in the other parts of SB. We come across in SB or BU names of good many sages who participated in the Jñāna Satra of the king Janaka. These sages were all experts in Upaniṣadic thoughts. But on account of insufficient information about these personalities, it is difficult or even impossible to say exactly when such illustrious works like SB or BU were compiled. We will have to be satisfied that these works like SB bear the important thoughts of the matured thinkers and that they are not the works of unimportant person, simply because the Brāhmaṇas deal in major parts with the sacrificial or ritualistic theories, which were then very important, though insignificant to us. The Upaniṣadic thoughts have grown with the Brāhmaṇa fertility and to divorce the Brāhmaṇas from the Upaniṣads or the reverse would be dogmatic. The same speculative thinkings of the Sages, which were responsible for the creation of a vast literature of Brāhmaṇas are responsible for the origination of the Upaniṣads which we consider as 'The fountainhead of the Indian Philosophy.' It is for this reason that the Brāhmaṇas also contain the sparks of philosophical thoughts which the Upaniṣads have adopted.

A phase of S'andilya Vidya has been also adopted by the BG which states

"Thinking of whatever state (of being) he, at the
end, gives up his body, to that being does he attain, being ever absorbed in the thought thereof. A casual fancy will not shape into final or determined thinking, which will however come out after a deliberate and persistent endeavour and the life-long Upāsanā. Hence Lord Kṛṣṇa advises Arjuna to contemplate on Him always so that he will have His Dhyāna or Smarāṇa at the time of death which alone will take the departed soul to the Lord. This theme underlies the whole of Śrīmad Bhāgavata conception, wherein at the outset, king Parīkhṣit who is on the verge of death and who is on the brink of life, asks Śukacārya with respect as to what he should do to attain salvation at this stage? Bhagavata Purāṇa is narrated to him with the very background of this Sāndilya Vidya.

The Vaisvānara parable which is elaborated in the SB is also very interesting. The CU has adopted and glorified this whole parable with some alterations. The microcosm and macrocosm of the Vaisvānara fire are discussed in comparison with the Individual and Cosmic Puruṣa. Five renowned thinkers discussed among themselves about the reality of Vaisvānara fire but they could not come to any decision in respect of the significance of Vaisvānara fire even after elaborate discussion. They, thereafter, approached the king Keśava As'vapati who had thorough knowledge and was a reputed authority about Vaisvānara fire. On enquiry with these persons, the king made out that these

(1) अन्वेषके च भास्वेन स्मर्तनुबला कोर्भ्वमि [प्रियः प्रभाते संबुध्य यातिनास्यम् सर्वस्य] ।
BG प. 59

(2) अति अभिषिष्टे शास्त्रियो गौरवगुरुः सर्वप्रमाण स्वरूपसंवृत्ति ॥
BG प. 19-37
learned individuals were worshipping only limited or microcosmic aspects of the Vais'vanara Fire, identifying Him with the Earth, Vāyu, Water, Sky or Sun which was not correct. He explained to them that the deities in the heaven understood the Vais'vanara Fire as macrocosmic or Cosmic (Prādes'āmātram) and therefore, we should also accept Him as cosmic. Pointing to his own head, he said that the Vais'vanara is as important as the head and is the Atiśṭhā Vais'vanara; pointing to the eyes, he said that this Fire is Sutateja Vais'vanara like the eyes; pointing to the nose he said that this Vais'vanara is Pṛthag-Vartmā like the nose; pointing to the Ākāś'a in the mouth he said that it was Bāhula-Vais'vanara like the Ākāś'a of mouth; pointing to the water below the tongue he said that it was Raśi-Vais'vanara like the water below the tongue; and pointing to the Chubuka (chin), he said that it was Pratisthā-Vais'vanara like the chin. He finally said that the Vais'vanara is nothing but the cosmic Purusa (who is described as thousand headed etc. by the RV); the Agni in the person, (the individual Purusa) is the same as the macrocosm or the Cosmic Purusa and that he who realises this will attain eternity (Sarvam āyut) and will not meet with any adversities."

(1) तार चाप | इति वे दुर्योधन नृथेषु बैशस्त्रेयोऽस्मात् तु न उपदेशः किं च इत्यतोऽस्मात् तु न आदर्शकानां अर्थात् आदर्शकानां अर्थात् सामायिकायां स्थितिः स दुर्योधनः किं च इत्यतोऽस्मात् तु न आदर्शकानां अर्थात् आदर्शकानां अर्थात् सामायिकायां स्थितिः स दुर्योधनः किं च इत्यतोऽस्मात् तु न आदर्शकानां अर्थात् आदर्शकानां अर्थात् सामायिकायां स्थितिः स दुर्योधनः किं च इत्यतोऽस्मात् तु न आदर्शकानां अर्थात् आदर्शकानां अर्थात् सामायिकायां स्थितिः स दुर्योधनः किं च इत्यतोऽस्मात् तु न आदर्शकानां अर्थात् आदर्शकानां अर्थात् सामायिकायां स्थितिः स दुर्योधनः किं च इत्यतोऽस्मात् तु न आदर्शकानां अर्थात् आदर्शकानां अर्थात् सामायिकायां स्थितिः स दुर्योधनः किं च इत्यतोऽस्मात् तु न आदर्शकानां अर्थात् आदर्शकानां अर्थात् सामायिकायां स्थितिः स दुर्योधनः किं च इत्यतोऽस्मात् तु न आदर्शकानां अर्थात् आदर्शकानां अर्थात् सामायिकायां स्थितिः स दुर्योधनः किं च इत्यतोऽस्मात् तु न आदर्शकानां अर्थात् आदर्शकानां अर्थात् सामायिकायां स्थितिः स दुर्योध...
This is a very important passage explaining the essential correspondence or identity between the microcosm and macrocosm. This very sense is brought out by the CU by adopting this parable. The sense of 'Prādeśamātra' and 'Abhivimāna' appearing in the CU mantra have been however incorrectly construed in the *Constructive Survey of Upanisadic Philosophy* as 'measuring the span'. The 'Prādeś' has been correctly interpreted by S2 as the 'Cosmic one' covering all the cosmic regions from the heaven to the earth as one. Thus the correct meaning of 'Prādeśamātra' in CU can be made out, only by reference to the original context of SB as given above.

Similar philosophical conceptions appear in other Brāhmaṇas also. These Brāhmaṇas serve as 'Keys' or 'Guides' to the Śaṁhitās. What was implicit in the Śaṁhitās is sometimes made explicit by the Brāhmaṇas. Thus for example a question is asked in the RV4:-

"Which was the tree, which was the wood, of which they hewed the earth and heaven? So ask, the wise, questioning about the basis of the whole Universe."

The Taittariya Brāhmaṇa comes with the answer:-

"Brahman is the tree from which they hewed the earth and heaven."

The conception of Prajāpate of Puruṣa and of Brahman is developed by the Tai.B.

The conception of cosmology appears in the Brāhmaṇas also,

---

1. CU - V - 14
2. CSUP, p. 136
3. "प्राचः पञ्चमवेष यथोन्वध्यातं कथो तशैव इतिसाधिकः प्रावः पञ्चमवेष यथोन्वध्यातं कथो तशैव इतिसाधिकः"
   CS - 56, p 560
4. "किं सिद्धन्तं कं उ सुन्दर आसं तथा प्राचः पञ्चमवेषिः लिखितं?
   मन्त्रमाथा मन्त्रमाथा नुस्तनेतु कथ्यद्यथाकथितं वल्लभी दासस्य"
   RV X - 8 - 81 - 4.
mentioning two principal analogies, that of sacrifice, and that of procreation. SB comes forth by stating "Before creation of Universe, there was neither 'Asat' nor 'Sat'. That which appears now existing did not exist then. Then 'Manas' manifested." This 'Manas' need not be taken, as the technical word meaning 'human mind.' It is here, the 'Sat' or 'Mahat' or 'Hrdaya' which is known as 'Sutra - Atman' or 'Vyakta' aspect. This Mahat is also called in Upaniṣads as Prajāpati. It is also called Citta. The SB explains that 36000 fires exist in this Manas. This mind or Prajāpati created the Vāca. Vāca is identified with Sarasvati Goddess in Purānas. It can be also identified with 'I'ness (Aham). Mind and speech are found to be closely associated. (SB. 1-4-5-8-12) (II-2-3).

There is another passage in SB which is also interesting. While praising Vāyu, as Cosmic Vāyu, the SB identifies it with the Supreme and states "Contentment is its achievement. Thus when one gets contented with food, he feels that he has achieved it fully. Knowledge and bliss are (the essences of the) Self. All Gods are having bliss as their selves. This is the faithful Vidya of the Gods. A man who gets knowledge of this becomes one of them. The theory of bliss of human beings and of the Gods or celestials is further developed in BU and TV. The declaration of the SB that

(1) नेत्र वाकेऽपि सदासनीवेद सुदासात् आशीर्वादात् ब्रह्मणेव नेत्रावसीतः तत्त्वमसः पुनः SA X-5-3-1
(2) पुष्प प्रजापति अदृत् हृदयमेवत् -- BU VI-3-1
(3) निर्दर्शनं भूतं केनकम सत आत्मानेन्द्रियस्य मया कतर्कता सत्यतं प्रकटितं भूतात् -- SB X-5-3-3-8
(4) सब्रह्मन्ये आचारयुज्ञातः SB X-5-3-11. (5) सूर्यवर्गः गतिः तत्सत्सारस्य सूर्यवर्गः सर्वथा श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य श्रद्धास्य (6) स-स भूमिकण्याह वर्गम आत्मे यज्ञार्थं बाध्यं आहारार्थं आहारार्थं आहारार्थं आहारार्थं आहारार्थं -- BU IV-3-33. सत्रुक्को भानुपुष्पः आनंदकुमार -- TV II-8-1-4
one who gets knowledge of the Self becomes one of the celestials is very important as it bears out the greatness of knowledge. This striking excellence of knowledge is brought out by the SB in another context by stating: "The Soul is the end or theme of all this. The Self resides or abides in the midst of Maya (Apah). Here he (the Self) gets the fulfilment of desires; the Maya represents all desires. The Self (in its nature) is free from desires; being the owner of all desires, he is above it (Na Hyetam) and has no desires whatsoever. There is this verse saying: By knowledge (Vidya) men ascend to that condition from which desires (Maya) recede (Paragatan). Neither gifts do not reach, nor the ignorant nor those engaged in austerity reach it. The higher region (Loka) is not attained by mere gifts or austerity or ignorance but is attained by knowledge of it only." The word 'Apah' meaning 'Avidya' or 'Maya' is being explained later on.

This sense of the above passage is explained in BU 11-5-5. On the basis of this view, BG states: "Knowledge is enveloped by ignorance and thereby creatures are bewildered." Knowledge of the Supreme is enveloped by Añéna or Avidya or Maya.

Thus the Brähmanas establish the Supremacy of the monistic truth, though ritualism is introduced by it. Their speculative hair-splitting elaboration of ritualistic ideas which was then a necessity, signifies their passion for truth; and when these

(1) सौक्यपूज्य सर्वेऽक्षरायराज्यायन, सूत्रसाराय अश्वमन्त्रशासनं स्वर्गसृष्टिन वर्णसंगममिव समलका अपूर्व वे सौक्यकाचाय सूत्रसारायन हृदय कर्ष्यति व न कामातृ। ॥ ५॥-ब्रह्मवंशोऽभिः प्रतिज्ञा, विधिया तदर्शनः तथ्या कामातृ तत्वमातृ, न ते दश्यिष्ठी अपेक्षिता। भवेत तथा । इति न हैव तैहि दश्यिष्ठ्यभिनिर्मितं भुतं दृश्यिष्ठ्यभिनिर्मितं पुरुषार्थात् हैव य सकादकः। ॥ ॥5-4-15-16

(2) अन्विन्यवातुपीत हाम तेह भुक्तहिं जनतां प्रकूपते ॥ ॥5-15
conceptions are directed towards explaining the philosophical truth, it accounts for, at the same time, the profundity of their philosophical investigation. The Brāhmaṇa thinkers had highest regard for the Vedas and the spirit of veneration which they bore towards the Vedas can be seen from the fact that they always have their views supported by the authority of the Vedas. They have never been indifferent at the same time to the philosophical approach towards the Supreme Reality which the Vedic thinkers attained, and this can be seen from the vivid interpretations they are giving to the various mantras of the Vedas, by probing each and every part of it, in order to investigate the real truth. Their quest for the Supreme Truth is the same as the Upaniṣadic 'Neti! Neti!' doctrine for eliminating all non-Atman aspects. For this reason alone, they give the highest regard to the rationalistic knowledge or Sāṃkhya and declare that the attainers of such Supreme Knowledge or the torch-bearers of such Knowledge only are verily the celestials. Devānāṁ Haiva Sa Ṛkāh).BG also explains this very sense by stating that the Jñānī is the Atman i.e. Paramātman himself.

By these Brāhmaṇa thinkers, the efficacy of not only the physical sacrifice but also of the inner or internal sacrifice had been realised. It is for this reason, that the Gītā states

(1) ज्ञानी लोकोऽव्य भी मंत्रे || BG VII -13
(2) श्रद्धा व अखंधू तपोऽव्य तपतः। तद्भक्तं न व न तपस्याजन्यात्मानं हत्यां हुमाऔ भूतानां भूतानां श्रुष्णाँ श्रुष्णाँ सारायज्ञाधिपत्यः कर्षित || SB 7.1-1-1.
"Our real sacrifice consists in making oblations to the Prāṇa (Ātman) within us. One who does not know this inner sacrifice, even if he were to go for a formal (Agnihotra) sacrifice, throws oblations merely on ashes. On the other hand, he who knows this inner sacrifice is relieved of his sins as surely as wool is burnt in a flame of fire. Knowing this inner sacrifice, even if a man were to do acts of charity for a Cāndāla he may verily be regarded as having sacrificed to the Universal Soul (Vais'vānara)." The Ai. B states "He who sacrifices to the God does not gain so great a world by this sacrifice, as he who sacrifices to the Ātman." All such views have been culminated by the BG by stating "Sacrifice in the form of knowledge is greater than any material sacrifice." 0! Fārtha! All works without any exception end in knowledge."

SĀMKHYA IN ARANYAKAS AND UPANISADS

Now we proceed to the Aranyakas and Upanisads. We need not treat Aranyakas separately, since Brahādāranyaka which is an important Aranyaka is treated as an Upanisad. Religion and Philosophy may have independent developments in other nations; but in India, as stated by Hiriyanna, "The Religion and Philosophy do not stand sundered (divided) in India." Religion and Philosophy are centred together in the Vedas, due to which both take the Vedas as the authority. The aspect of Religion has taken
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higher precedence in the Brāhmaṇas and other allied works, whereas the Upaniṣads give preference to the Philosophical thoughts. But neither the Brāhmaṇas discard the Philosophical thoughts, as we have seen previously, nor do the Upaniṣads exclude the religious thoughts from their field. The Brāhmaṇas have also the precious gems of philosophical thoughts set in them, with the same decorations as they are in the Upaniṣads. The grandeur of these decorations may be said to be more elaborate in the Upaniṣads. But we should not forget that the Brāhmaṇas contain the religious or ritualistic thoughts of the same eminent Sages like Śaṅkilya, Vaiśnavaṅkya, Aitareya, Tītiria, Maitreya and others whose very philosophical thoughts have been formulated in the Upaniṣads or Áranyakas. It is therefore, difficult to agree with some of those thinkers who are of opinion that the Upaniṣads are developed as an antithesis to the Brāhmaṇas. Such a view is likely to give rise to misconceptions that the sages themselves were entertaining inconsistent or divergent opinions; and it cannot therefore be entertained at all. There can, therefore be no contradictions between the thoughts of the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads in general. Since the opinions of the same personalities or the same schools have been compiled either in the Brāhmaṇas or Upaniṣads, the compilation of these works either as Brāhmaṇas or Áranyakas or Upaniṣads is not likely to have involved long distances of time, especially the major ten Upaniṣads. The compilers are likely to have brought out the major Brāhmaṇas, Áranyakas and Upaniṣads even simultaneously with each other. Traditionally however the Sākhīs, Brāhmaṇas, Áranyakas and Upaniṣads together constitute 'S'rutis' and are never considered
as independent. This is the striking excellence of the Indian faith, which never makes any differentiation between Religion and Philosophy.

There are large numbers of Upaniṣads, say more than 100, the oldest being important. Ranade states\(^1\) that "a careful study of them will reduce to nought all frivolous notions that there is only one system of thought to be found in the Upaniṣads." Many thinkers do not agree with this view. Radhakrishnan states\(^2\) that "Notwithstanding the variety of authorship and the period of time covered by the composition of these — treatises, there is a unity of purpose, a vivid sense of spiritual reality in them all of which become clear and distinct as we descend the stream of time — and their philosophy and religion have satisfied some of the greatest thinkers and intensively spiritual souls." We may see here a reply to the view of Ranade. Radhakrishnan does not agree with the estimate of another writer Gough since he says\(^3\) "We do not agree with Gough's estimate that 'there is little that is spiritual in all this' or that 'this empty intellectual conception, void of spirituality, is the highest form that the Indian mind is capable of.'" Max Müller says\(^4\) "And however unsystematic these relics of childhood of philosophy may seem, there is really more system in them than appears at first sight."

It is for the unity and consistency of thought and for the high spiritual conceptions that these works command high respect from all classes of thinkers.

---

(1) CSUP, p.179.  
(2) and (3) IP, I, p.139.  
(4) SSIP, p.140.
According to the Upaniṣads, there are two kinds of knowledge viz. transcendental or higher knowledge (Para-Vidya) and empirical or lower knowledge (Apara-Vidya).

According to the Upaniṣads, the transcendental knowledge is that by which the Paramātman is realised. The Śruti makes a slight distinction by stating, “In the Imperishable Highest Brahman, the two—knowledge and ignorance—are placed hidden. Ignorance (Avidyā) is perishable (Kṣara), while knowledge (Vidyā) is immortal (Amṛta). And he who controls both knowledge and ignorance is another distinct.” Vidyā mentioned here is Para-Vidyā leading to salvation (Mokṣa-hetu) whereas Avidyā is the cause for worldly life. Śi while commenting on verse 1-4 of the Upaniṣad says that “Apara Vidyā is as well Avidyā.” The Apara-Vidyā is the metaphysical knowledge which is had by the mere verbal study of the Vedas etc., but the transcendental or higher knowledge is Brahma-Vidyā which is the foundation of all knowledges. Knowledge of Brahman cannot be had by the mere verbal study of the Vedas etc. The Sage Nārada when he approached the Sanatkumāra for the Ātma-Vidyā or Brahma-Vidyā and when the former was asked by the latter as to what he had studied so far, he (Nārada) replied that he had learnt verbally so far the Vedas and all branches of metaphysical knowledges etc., and that he was only the Knower of Mātrās or Sāstrās and not the Knower of Self. It follows from this that the so-called Sāstra or metaphysical knowledge is also on the level of ignorance being empiric (Apara), while the Brahma Vidyā is alone the true knowledge. This Brahma Vidyā is Upaniṣadic.
Vidyā or śāṅkhya or true knowledge. With the attainment of this knowledge all this becomes known; or the unhearable becomes heard, the unperceivable becomes perceived, the unknowable becomes known; or knowing which one becomes one with the deities or knowing which the Gods and Seers of old who came to know of that (Brahman), came to be of that nature and have verily become immortal.

Para Vidya:

The main or fundamental question is - 'How the Reality which is unhearable, unperceivable and unknowable becomes heard, perceived or known, when the Apara knowledge or physical knowledge cannot take us there? Does this Reality presume the knower, the unknown, the way of knowing or knowledge, as distinct entities? If Apara or physical knowledge cannot take us there, can the Para or Spiritual knowledge lead us to that? Affirmative is the reply to the last question.

The Supreme Reality is described in MU as "This Brahman verily is immortal. In front of those who are under influence of Avidya is Brahman; behind is Brahman; to the right and to the left is Brahman. It spreads forth below and above. Brahman, indeed, is this Universe. It is the greatest." The IU describes "It moves and It moves not. It is far and It is near; It is within all this..."
and it is also outside all this." This brings out the incomprehensible nature of the Supreme, which is beyond the categories of thought, which human mind cannot conceive except through the ways of negative descriptions. The Supreme or Absolute Brahman is the only Reality and all else is unreal. Though existing everywhere, He is not still cognised, Lord Kṛṣṇa who is identified as the Supreme Reality or Brahman states as Supreme " Since I am enveloped by my Māyā, I am not revealed to all." This clearly expresses that though Brahman is everywhere, he is beyond the comprehension of all. The devotee of Ila prays, " The face of the Reality is covered with the golden disc. O! Puṣan! Unveil it for enabling me, the devotee of Satya, to realise it."

Here the ' Hiranyāmaya Paṭra' is not the gold metal disc. It symbolises Avidyā or Māyā of which Vijnāna is the evolute or part and hence same as Avidyā or Ajñāna. This illusory Vijnāna or Ajñāna is the counterfeit Jñāna which, forming the human intelligence, or brain is very powerful and conceitful. It encompasses the Reality and misleads the beings towards the objective world.

The Reality which is all-pervasive and all-comprehensive according to the Upaniṣads is not the one to be attained by physical measures in the manner of a marketable commodity. This is beyond the reach of physical seeing, hearing, speech or mind.

1) तदेवं महात्मा तद्वैतं तदशरीरं | तदन्तरस्य सर्वस्य तु शरीरस्य वामः ।
2) साहं अनान्तं शर्मस्य योगाभावं सत्भक्तस्य । 69. प्र. 258
3) निरस्वचनेन पाणेन सतस्यायितं भुजद्वयं ।
   ततो पूर्वनायाम् सत्यर्थेन देखि देहोऽपि ॥ ३०. १५
The KU states:

"Since not by speech and not by thought,
Not by the eye can it be reached:
How else may it be understood?
But only when one says "it is"

This sense is also brought out by the TU by stating "Towards
that all speech recoils, along with mind, unable to reach it."

In fact, anatomically or psychologically, the senses including the
mind have been so constituted, while building the frame of the
human physical and psychic body that they function only within the
range of the phenomenal world. The KU states "The self is not to
be sought through the senses. The Swayambhu Creator has slighted
the senses for going outwards and therefore man looks outward and
not within oneself. Only a wise-man, however, seeking life eternal
with his physical eyes closed (with his internal vision turned
inwards) can see the self." All 'Aparā' or physical knowledge has
its connections with the senses including the mind and hence it
cannot be directed towards the self, it being incomplete or
fragmentary. It is not Vidya; Śi calls the Aparā Vidya as Avidyā
meaning thereby that Avidyā is not the true or complete knowledge.
It is the true or Parā Vidya alone that helps or leads to secure
the self-realisation. KU states "This Ātman lies hidden in all
beings and does not reveal to all. He is attained or seen(Drṣ'yate)
by the subtle seers with the help of the sharp and subtle

\[\text{(1) सैय नाचा न भवना भासु शाक्यो, न-वशुभा अश्वीति सुवसोक्ष्य कर्य तुरंतमेहते} \\
\text{KU II-3-12}\]

\[\text{(2) धृत नाचो निवर्तिन्ते | अभासी भवनो सह | तु I-4-1}\]

\[\text{(3) प्रसादथिर्वक अत्युत्तमस्य स्वरूपंते सत्त्वात् पति वेश्यादी लाभारामणि |} \\
\text{कार्यकीर्ति: अत्यगातमन्मैत्रांसिद्धाश्रुति पुरुषांदेहम् दुलनम्} \\
\text{KU II-1-1}\]

\[\text{(4) प्रश सर्वत्र पूर्वसु सूक्ष्मयात् प्रकाशते। देखते तु अभिधायो बुद्धिः सूक्ष्मया सूर्यायत्सर्वदेहरिः} \\
\text{KU I-3-12}\]
intelligence. This seeing is not the physical seeing by the occult eyes. It is the spiritual or intuitional vision of the Inner Reality, which presents itself when all knowledge or Vidyā finally ends. The Vidyā cannot stand before the Reality and point out directly 'Here is this Reality'. The Reality is beyond this Vidyā. It does not mean by this that the Reality cannot be attained by Vidyā. The main purport of explaining the Reality, as beyond Vidyā, is to state "We cannot know it but we can be that." It is to this means (of knowledge) leading to such a consumation that the name Vidyā is confined. Vidyā will sharpen the citta, by purifying it, by removing all the Rājasa or Tamasas Gunas; and this purified citta will help to eliminate all foreign or non-Atman constituents, through the 'Neti' 'Neti' methods. When the Ultimate or final monistic Stage is reached, the function of Vidyā ceases. The efficacy of this Vidyā is therefore in leading to this highest altitude.

The SU states," Vidyā and Avidyā are controlled by the Lord who is distinct from them." This clearly means, that the Supreme Reality is beyond the reach of Vidyā. Lord Kṛṣṇa says to Uddhava in Bhāgavatā that Vidyā and Avidyā are the creations of Māyā. This Vidyā ultimately merges in the Absolute and thus becomes Amrtam. Merging is the same as the annihilation. Vidyā is responsible for the annihilation of the Māyā or Avidyā or Ajñāna which envelops the Reality or Jñāna; and by the annihilation of the Māyā which is Vidyā's own root, Vidyā automatically gets lost.---------------------------------------------------------------

1. CRP, p 70.
2. Būkā, p 386. 3. SB Y-5.
Thus with the disappearance of the Upādhi of Māyā which is enveloping the Individual Soul and which is causing differentiation between the Individual Soul and Paramātman and causing distinction or Bheda, the Individual Ātman will be automatically Paramātman.

Here is the Vṛtti-ksaya or Jñāna Saṁnyāsa or Vidvat Saṁnyāsa.

The Vidyā or Spiritual wisdom demands rigorous Upāsana in the development of the intellect or the citta. The citta is fluent and will be taken away wherever the mind or the Vṛttis take it away. It requires to be harnessed and properly controlled by the Vidyā by which it becomes sharp (Agryā Budhi). This is done by Vidyā, which is knowledge-cum-upāsana. The MU tells that a spiritual teacher would impart the Brahma-Vidyā (which is the same as Vidyā) unto him whose mind is tranquil and who has attained peace, by which alone he will realise the Imperishable Reality. Vidyā is not to be made out to an idiot. KU states "Not he who has not desisted from evil ways, not he who is not tranquil, not he who has not a concentrated mind, not he whose mind is not composed, can attain this (Self). He is attained through right knowledge." Here Prajñāna is also Vidyā. The goal which is to be achieved through Vidyā is not attainable easily. SB states:

"Thither gifts do not reach. Neither the ignorant nor those engaged even in austerity reach it. Only Vidyā leads there when all desires are passed over." The KU states, "This self cannot be

(1) के सो ही तपस्या श्रवण श्रुति भवति। M.U. III-2-7
(2) न तस्मान श्रवणस्त्र्व प्रायत्नास्वद्यः साधनस्वरूपस्त्र्वपेतः किं क्रियाविवेचाय। M.U. 1-2-13
(3) नाशितस्य दृष्टियोपरिचितां नासाहितां नासामाहितां नासाशितां। विज्ञानस्वरूपम् ज्ञानस्वरूपम्। K.V. I-2-24
(4) विध्यानि तर्केऽपि तत्र कामप्रभावात् न हैव तत्। केदाराक्षिताः किं भित्रं विकृतिः। K.V. I-2-24
(5) नायाबधाः प्रस्तावनेन केभवेऽन्ति नैवेद्यनां भूयति। नैवेद्यनां भूयति। K.V. I-2-23
attained "by instruction, nor by intellectual power, nor even through much hearing. He is to be attained only by the one whom the Self chooses." To such a one the Self reveals its own nature. S' states about 'Yamevaiva Vypute' that "Him alone, whom the Sadhaka prays by his own Self ( for attainment ) is chosen and the self attained through his own self. The purport is that the Self reveals its true character to one that seeks it earnestly." MU also states in the same strain of KU "The self cannot be attained by one without the strength ( of his own self ), nor through heedlessness, nor through austerity, without Samnyasa ( of dualities 'Alinga'). But when one who strives by these ( prescribed ) means, becomes the Knower (Vidvan), then this self of his attains the status of Brahman." All outward signs are not enough for salutation. It is only through self contemplation (Vidyā) that one should try. Therefore, the KU bids:-

"Arise, Awake, Get knowledge approaching best teachers, That path is sharp as the edge of a razor, Hard to cross, difficult to tread, so declare sages."

The intelligence or Vijnana should be purified and this is the secret of the Vidyā. It is the intelligence which is the Guha or the secret place of residence of the Atman. The Atman always lives with the Vijnana; and with the proximity of the Atman alone, the Vijnana gets sentience or knowledge and becomes powerful or even over-powerful and misleads the Atman through its conceits.

In this connection the MU states "He is enveloped by mind

(1) सन्तान्तयां शरणमाऎवं संभोवाये गृहर्स्वते याध्युते तेष्मावलोकनाः वार्ता स्वप्नावर्त्तमाः स्वर्गीय महाकाव्यं न हृदयति || KU 58
(2) शान्तिभावं वन्ध्ये वनं न व भ्रात्यादं प्रभावमियं स्वप्नकिरुपं प्रतीत्यायते वसलिथुरथस्य वशताः श्रीकाकुल || मु 3-2-7
(3) सुधिनः आचर्य वरशिक्षिताः भक्त्रथाय भक्त्रथाय भक्त्रथाय भक्त्रथाय भक्त्रथाय भक्त्रथाय भक्त्रथाय भक्त्रथाय भक्त्रथाय || KU 73
(4) भक्तिभवं भावाश्रयं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं भक्तिभवं || मु 3-2-7
(intellect) and is the leader of the breath(senses) and body, and is seated in the body, controlling the heart. The wise perceive clearly by knowledge (Vijnanena) (Vidyā) the Immortal which is Ananda in essence and which is effulgent." "In the highest (Pare) sheath of Vijnāna (Hirepamaye) is Brahman without stain, without parts. Pure is it, the Light of Lights. That is what the Knowers of self know." Hiranyā is a term synonymous with Vijnāna. That is why the Creator Brahman (Kārya Brahman or Vijnanātman) is called Hiranyagarbha. IU uses, in the sense of Vijnāna, the term 'Hiranyamaya Patra' as explained previously. The deluded Atman resides in this Gūha of Vijnāna. It is one who gets freed from this Vijnāna, will attain his naive status. IU states " Liberated from the knots of the secret place (of the Vijnāna or the heart) he becomes Immortal." This Vijnāna forms the knot of the heart (Hṛdaya Grañthi). The IU also states "The knots of the heart or Vijnāna is cut, all doubts are dispelled and his karmas terminate, no sooner He (Brahman) is attained; He both the cause and effect." When this knot of the Self goes away, the Maya or the Avyakta also automatically disappears and the Vidyā will have no cause or basis to stay. The seeker of truth should, with deep contemplation and with the power of Vidyā or purity of intelligence earned therefrom, should weed out all dualities as stated by KU :-"The wise should merge or shade off his speech (Senses) in mind, the latter should be merged thereafter in the Buddhi. This Buddhi should be merged in the Citta or Vijnāna or Mahat. That he should
merge it in the tranquil Self." The KU in the earlier S'loka however states that next to the State of Mahat, there is another state of Avyakta or Mula-Prakrti (same as Anandmaya Kos'a). But the Avyakta in its prime state is insentient and inactive. When the Mahat which is a counterfeit Jnana or which is Sutra-Atman or Sutradhāra of the whole play is destroyed, then the Avyakta is easily crossed. The soul should get clearance from all the concepts, for its attaining its own status or getting one with the Brahman.

Thus the Vijnāna (Citta) is the most predominant element or hinge that is responsible for binding the Individual to the empirical world, through its evolute 'Ahankāra' and also for freeing the soul from the illusory Mayā, by offering itself as Sacrifice at the altar of the Supreme. If the Vijnāna adopts the gunas of Tamas or Rajas, it leads to Samsara and if it adopts Sattva and purifies itself, it leads to salvation. Lord Kṛṣṇa says:- "Even the Sattva guna is capable of misleading the Ātman. Sattva which annihilates Rajas and Tamas should be also destroyed only through Sattva alone. All these gunas constitute the very life of Citta." Its purification through Vidyā or intelligent upāsana amounts to its being filtered from all the gunas. The Subtle body or Liṅga S'arīra is the same as the Mahat Tattva. It is the first outcome of Māyā after the agitation of gunas. "This Subtle body or Mahat ceases or gets annihilated after destroying its own cause gunas (i.e. Māyā), just as the fire caused by the friction of bamboos burns away the forest of bamboos and gets extinguished itself.

---

1. The Bhaktisiddhāntikā of the Gopāla-bhakti school of thought. KU I-3-11
2. Bhṛ,R: प्रकृतिकर्मk1 I-3-13
3. Bhṛ,R: प्रकृतिकर्मकर्मकर्मकर्मकर्मकर्मk1 I-3-13
The Individual Soul is Paramatman alone; but due to the Upādhi of Māyā, it stands separate from the Paramatman.

When the Upādhi or Viṣṇams or Māyā goes away, the Individual becomes the Paramatman. The Individual Ātman is the Aupanisadic Puruṣa according to the MU, which is finely illustrated by citing the example of Bow and Arrow. The Bow or Dhanus is the Praṇava or contemplation. The arrow is Aupanisadic Puruṣa or Ātman. The target is Paramatman. The Ātman should be whetted or sharpened through Bhakti or contemplation, which frees it from all dualities or non-Ātman elements. Taking the bow (of Praṇava or Contemplation), one should place in it the Aupanisada Puruṣa sharpened or whetted by contemplation or Samādhi and by drawing the cord i.e. by withdrawing the Ātman from the Samādhi of Viṣṇams in which it is engaged, mark the Para-Brahman as the target. It is to be hit without making a mistake (so fixedly) that it (the arrow or Ātman) becomes united with it. The communion of Jīvatman with the Paramatman should be so much intense (Tanmaya) that they never get separated. This is a very fine simile which is very much appreciated by all the philosophers. About this Individual Ātman getting one with the Paramatman, the KU says: As pure water poured into the pure water becomes the very pure water, so the self of the Viṣṇams becomes verily the same. All this bears out the pure Advaita preached by the Upanisads through the theory.
of Vidyā. The BU states "In this connection when all this everything becomes Ātman only, then by what one should smell, see, talk, think, or understand which?" The IU also endorses this view in its seventh verse. This monistic view of the Upaniṣads may be described as idealistic, for there will be nothing left to be called as duality. The KU says "Not there the Sun shines nor the moon, nor the stars, nor these lightnings either, where then could this fire be? Everything shines only after the shining spirit; through Its light all this shines." This is the position in which all the greatest sky-masters end in nought before the Supreme Reality. There need not be any wonder if the Vidyā which leads beings to salvation is also found, at the Ultimate State of the Reality, to disappear with no power to face it.

We come across the words Vidyā and Avidyā in the IU. These words have taxed the brains of all theological commentators (or even thinkers) over the interpretation of the philosophical texts. We need not enter into any of the polemics of these philosophers. Here the aspects of the two will have to be examined inter se. S'loka 9 of this Up, which is the same as BU reads "Into blinding darkness enter those who worship Avidyā and those who delight in Vidyā enter into still greater darkness as it were."
interprets Avidya as Karma and Vidya as Knowledge of the deity (Devata Jnanam). Karma is more or less the sacrificial acts like Agnihotra etc, which is very often in conflict with the Upanisadic true Knowledge! Vidya stands in this verse on the same level as of Karma, it being the Knowledge of deities and not the Brahma-Jnana, since the follower of this Vidya enter into greater darkness. While commenting on this S'loka, S' means by Vidya, the metaphysical knowledge i.e. the verbal knowledge of Veda connected with the Vidhis and Pratisedhas, without looking to the Upanisadic or true knowledge² (Upanisadartha Anapeksinah). This verse accordingly means that those who take to the path of Karma will be lost therein and so also those who are interested only in Devata knowledge or verbal knowledge by excluding Niskama Karma and by disregarding the true Upanisadic knowledge, will grope into still further darkness and get thus frustrated. The next verse of IU reads³, "We have heard from those wise one, whom we approached for advice that Vidya has its own distinct result and Avidya its own distinct result." Further next verse makes this position more clear by stating⁴, "Those who know both Vidya and Avidya together (and not independent of each other) cross death through Avidya (Karma) and attain eternal life (Krama Mukti) (through Vidya). Similar results are achieved by the Upasana of Asambhuti and Sambhuti as seen from S'lokas 12 to 14. S'loka 12

---

(1) वेदविषयां विद्याम् अथात् विढ्या द्वारा कर्मीयते । कर्मीणां विभाग्यनिरीक्षिताः । तासाधिकारे ।
(2) अभिभूताः अभिभूतोपराः कर्मीयते । कर्मीणाः वेदविषयान्यस्तं बोधिताम् ।
(3) अभिभूताः अभिभूतोपराः कर्मीयते । कर्मीणाः वेदविषयान्यस्तं बोधिताम् ।
(4) वेदविषयां अभिभूताः अभिभूतोपराः कर्मीयते । कर्मीणाः वेदविषयान्यस्तं बोधिताम् ।
reads, "Into blinding darkness enter those who worship the unmanifest (Asambhūti) (Avyākṛta Prakṛti according to S') and those who delight in the manifest (Sambhūti = Kārya Brahman) only enter into still greater darkness, as it were. " Next verse is the same as the tenth verse by substituting Sambhūti (Sambhava) for Vidyā and Asambhava for Avidyā. The next S'loka reads,"Those who know Sambhūti (Asambhūti) and Vinās'a (Sambhūti) together cross death through the upāsanā of Vinās'a (Sambhūti) and attain eternal life (Kramamukti) through Upāsanā of (Asambhūti).

'Asambhūti' is interpreted by S' as Avyākṛta Prakṛti as shown above and 'Sambhūti' is taken as Kārya Brahman or Vidyā. If the former is taken as the Avidyā the latter becomes Vidyā. SU states, "Avidyā is Kṣara and Vidyā is Amṛta." Slight confusion has occurred in the IU reading of S'loka 14 by the dropping of the word Asambhūti and introducing the word Vinās'a. Keith in his SS says "In Br IV-4-13, a verse found also in Is'a Up 12 S' sees a reference to the Sāmkhya doctrine in the term Asambhūti which he renders as Prakṛti, but this view has in itself no probability and the commentator, 'Uvata', declares that the polemic against the believers in Asambhūti destruction, is directed against the materialists." It is very difficult to accept this view of Keith.

It is only the Classical Sāmkhyas who hold that Prakṛti is independent and eternal. This is not so with Pre-Classical Sāmkhyas who are monistic, since according to them everything else

---

((1) Sū 13 12-1-3 (2) Sū 1.14 (3) Sū 12 12 (4) Sū 13 12 (5) Sū, p. 19.)
than Brahman is non-eternal. STJ supports this view. Thus if Prakṛti is held to be Kṣara, there is no inconsistency in S's view. There is also the Śāmkhya Kārikā 45 which reads, "By Vairāgya, there will be destruction of Prakṛti" and which suggests annihilation of Prakṛti. This is the plain meaning of the Kārikā, which was originally intended and accepted by the Śāmkhyas and which is later changed by the Classicals. It is only the commentators that have introduced variegated meanings for the phrase of "Prakṛtilaya" of the Kārikā.

We have thus so far seen the utility of Vidyā—or Śāmkhya in the attainment of salvation or in the union of Individual Soul with Paramātman, as detailed in the Upanisads. Further details of this Vidyā aspect are being given later on.

Apara Vidyā, Avidyā, Māyā or Prakṛti:

If Vidyā is knowledge, Avidyā is ignorance or incorrect knowledge. Apart from its being Apara knowledge, Avidyā is something more. Apara Vidyā is only a partial aspect of Māyā. Śrīmad Bhāgavata states that Vidyā and Avidyā are created by Māya. There is in fact no distinction made practically between Avidyā or Māyā. This Avidyā or Māyā has the power of Āvaraṇa and Vikṣepa. In its Vikṣepa phase, it projects the world by becoming the accessory cause. The function of Āvaraṇa is to obscure the unity of Being, and it hides even the Ātman from being cognised by all even though it is present everywhere and elsewhere. This sets a vast gulf between the Jīva and the Is'vāra. This Avidyā or Māyā, as the pervasive power or

(1) ज्ञानप्रमाणं — I SU I-10
(2) खण्डयज्ञवर्धितेः — SK 45
(3) Avidyā स्बस्तिः सदार्थव्यक्तिभिः सन्तु Vidyā जो मिल हिता।
the creative power of the Saguna Lord plays an important part in Advaita Philosophy. Avidyā or Māyā is the principle causing cosmic illusion and has no Satyatva. Though a negation of Vidyā the, Avidyā is still a positive or Bhāva Pādārtha since it serves as the cause of the visible universe. There is no absolute negation or Abhāva conveyed by the negative prefix 'Na' or 'A' of Avidyā. In connection with this Māyā, S' says, in his commentary, on Ku² "O! This Māyā is very mysterious, wonderful and inexplicable. Due to it only, all Jīvas in the world, though they are in reality Para-Brahman, in nature, and even though they are taught or advised explicitly by the S'āstras to that effect, are not prepared to accept that 'I am Brahman or Paramātmā'; but they on the other hand consider themselves as the non-self which is the conglomeration of senses, body etc. and which is perceived as an object like a pot etc. and even if they are not taught or guided by anybody, they go on stating that I am the son of so and so. Indeed the whole world is illusioned by the Māyā of Paramātmā.

For the presentation of the Māyā Tattva, which has the support of the Vedas or Upanisads at the back-ground as the authority, some thinkers of limited knowledge are not still convinced by the arguments of S'. They, with imperfect knowledge class him as Crypto-Nihilist or Buddhist and Advaita philosophy as agnostic. But S is neither an agnostic nor nihilist (S'yunyāvādin) nor Vijnāvādin of the Buddhistic school, since he criticises both the

---

(1) by the prefix of 'Na' to the word Vidyā or Sat, Avidyā or Asat need not be taken as absolutely 'non-existent' as the prefix 'Na' or 'A' to a word conveys such mode of meaning of which Abhāva is one way of expression. Avidyā is therefore here a positive of Abhāva Padaārtha.

(2) Hisr̥ dr̥ ेतत्त्वानां एवं धर्मां विवेकां भाष्यां च तद्यद्य च श्रव्योऽपि विभावर्षकार्तिकां यस्मात् शुद्धिः ।

\( \text{Anandgān} \) देवीदेवीस्य आत्मानिन्द्रानि देवविवेकार्थ वर्त्तित आत्मानायामेव संचित इनद्रायत्मानं शुद्धिः \( \text{Kuubh}\), p. 95.
schools very vehemently in his BS Bhāṣya (II-2-2S). To him, the universe is phenomenal Real, but it is unreal from the point of ultimate Reality according to which the Supreme Brahman is the only Reality. In view of this and in view of his realistic attitude towards the phenomenal world, it will not be correct to criticise him as an absolute nihilistic. His acceptance of phenomenal Reality brings him to the level of being a Realist also. These critics being not satisfied with this position sometimes even argue that the Māyāvāda of Ś has not the strong support of the Upanisads. Such a criticism is unfortunately very incorrect and mistaken, since Monism or Advaita is the philosophy of the Vedas and Upanisads, as understood by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.

The idea of Māyā is very old and appears in the Vedas as already explained and also in the Upanisads. This Māyā being a synonym for Prakṛti or Āvyakṛta appears fully in the Upanisads. The Pr.U clearly states that "we cannot reach the Brahman unless we have shaken off crookedness (Jihmān), the falsehood (Anṛtam) and illusion (Māyā)." Radhakrishnan says about the use of the word Māyā in this sentence that "this use of the word has led to the view that the world is deceptive in character." Ranade also says "It is important to remember that the word 'Māyā' is directly used in this passage and almost in the sense of an illusion." The famous quotation of the RV 'Indro Māyābhīh' is quoted by the BU in II-5-19 to support the Māyā theory. The Ś uses the word Māyā in the sense of illusion by stating "The
great world illusion will come to an end in the case of an
individual, only upon his constant meditation and realisation
of oneness with the Paramatman." The term 'Vis'va Māya' used
in this S'loka is a direct reference to the Māya theory. This Up
also states that "the Saguna Brahman, Is'vara, who is conjoined
with Māya (Māyā) creates the universe (by His Māya); and in that
Universe, the individual Soul is bound by it." The term 'Māya' is
directly used in other later Upanisads.

This term 'Māya' might have been used in some contexts as
power, but wherever it means 'power', it conveys the sense or
idea of mystery necessarily, and it does not mean any physical
power. It is only divine Samkalpa-Sakti or Icchā-Sakti (with no
Satyatva), which is not conceivable by the ordinary human under-
standing. Here there is the characteristic of Super-natural or
unnatural element which can overcome by 'deception' the inherent
natural limitations of the human mind. There is, therefore, not
much distinction between the conception of 'divine power' and
illusion as explained previously. The direct use of the word
'Māya' may be less frequent, but its idea is conveyed by other
words. The BU uses the words 'Asat' 'Tamas' or 'Mṛtyu' for
the word Māya in its famous quotation:-

"Lead me from the unreal to the Real;
Lead me from darkness to Light;
Lead me from death to Immortality."

The KU uses the word 'Adhrava' 'Unreal' for the word Māya by

(1) अहंसाभावी श्रृद्धवति विध्वंशात् तस्मिन् 'थुक्ताया सांस्कृतिकाCU IV-7
(2) असत्यस्य भा समुद्भवः तत्त्वस्तौ भा ज्योतिरिनिः भूत्योंमम अस्वतः नामसीHU 3-28
The wise, however, recognising the immortal do not seek the Real (Bhrūva) among things which are unreal (Aдрhrūva). The SU uses the word 'Prakṛti' or 'Pradhāna' for the word Māyā by stating: "Know that the Prakṛti is Māyā. Prakṛti is Pradhāna or A vyākṛta. In BU the word 'Āpah' is used for A vyākṛta or Māyā. It states: 'This (universe) in the beginning was Āpah. That Āpah created Satya; Brahman (Kārya Brhma) is Satya who is Prajāpati; Prajāpati created Devas." S' identifies Āpah which is the seed of universe, with A vyākṛta. It is out of this Āpah that the Kārya Brahman or Satya-Brahman originated. Āpah and 'Nārā' are synonymous terms according to MB. Hence 'Nārā' also means A vyākṛta or Māyā. God 'Nārāyana' is the one who resides in 'Nārā', Āpah or Māyā and from Him, Kārya Brahman or Prajāpati is born according to all mythologies and also according to the above Upanisadic theory. The IU also uses the word 'Āpah' in the sense of Māyā in the 4th S'loka; according to this, Āpah has its basis on the Ātman. The word 'Āpah' is used in this sense in the RV mantra: "At night, Agni becomes the head of the world; then he is born, in the morning, as the rising Sun. This Māyā (of Agni) is the divine (Yajñīyāma) illusion (Āpah) due to which he speedily (Tourī) pervades (carati) all spaces (Prāanan)." The IU uses the word 'Anṛta' in the sense of Māyā stating: "All our true desires or Vṛttis are covered by a covering of what is

---

1. (1) अथ ध्रुवस्य अन्नृतं विद्वेदनं ध्रुवं अधःवेदितं न आयृतं ॥ KU II-1-2
2. (2) आयृतं तु अनृतं विद्वेदं ॥ SU IV-10 (3) अथ अद्वेदितं अद्वेदितं अमृतं सृजनं अधिन्तं सर्वप्रकाशं अर्यवर्तसारं सर्वनाशं संस्यं अजानं अत्यन्तं सर्वकोणं सवर्गयं संस्यं ॥ ॥ BUV -2-165 (4) तत आपोर्वविद्वेदं अनुश्रवै विश्वाता स्थायितवमात्रं वर्गमयं सर्वकोणं सवर्गयं ॥ ॥ BUV (5) अत्यन्तं सर्वकोणं सवर्गयं ॥ ॥ M6 (6) ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ २-7-88-6
called Anyta. Even if such desires come out of Atman or Truth, they because of their covering by Anyta, will not have any Dars'ana (will not reach Him back because of their association with Anyta), just as a person departing (dying) will not get back the dars'ana of the departed (or will not be available for dars'ana). All our desires or Vrttis for objective world whether, for living objects or for departed objects or for any other article, will not be useful to attain Truth (even if they arise out of truth and are close to Him), since these desires are covered with untruth. One will attain the truth, only if the desires are merged in Him. Just as those who are ignorant of the hidden place of treasure walk again and again over the spot concealing the hidden treasure of gold, do not find it, even so all creatures in the world move to the region of Truth unconsciously each and every day and yet do not find Him, since verily they labour under the power of the untruth (Anyta) or Maya. The Hirapmaya Patra which hides the truth according to the Upanishad is Maya, the Vijnana or Ajñana being the aspect of Maya. In BU Avidya is directly referred to as follows: "As a goldsmith by taking a bit of gold moulds that gold into various newer and more beautiful forms, so the Atman creates through Avidya various forms such as Pitryaa, Gandharva, Gods, Prajapatyaa, Brahma etc." Here the Avidya presented is

1. BH 4.2-12
2. BH 4.15-16
3. BH 4.15-16
nothing but Māyā. The Tu explains that "Asat" was this in the beginning. Therefrom, verily, was 'Sat' produced. "Asat" which is Avyākṛta like 'Apah' is also Māyā. The famous Vācārmbhaṇa sentence of GU states that everything besides Ātman is merely a word, a mode, a name, by saying "just as, my dear, by one clod of clay, all that is made of clay becomes known, the modification, being only a name arising from mode of speech, while the truth is that, it is just clay." This represents that the origination of the Universe is due to Māyā only. These and other illustrations go to show that the conception of Māyā adopted by Ś is not his own innovation. The Māyā or Avidyā theory is borne out by the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads. It is also developed in the Epics and Purāṇas, especially the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa which is being further explained.

This conception of the Māyā doctrine either by the direct use of the word or by indirect forms of expression was felt essential for establishing the unreality of the phenomenal world and the unreality of the plurality of souls from the standpoint of the Absolute Truth which is the only one monistic Truth. We find in our daily experience that individuals differ from individuals and this mass of the phenomenal Universe which presents to us with diversities, represents to us its distinction from the subjective Soul. How to account for all this diversity, plurality or duality? Is this not to be accepted? The Vedas and Upaniṣads give a reply that all such diversities or manifestations do not exist.

1. अस्मात् इति आर्यश्रम्य आस्मात् कपिलस्य ततो वै संगमाभ्यत || TU II-7-1
2. अथा सत्यमेव कथाविश्वास्य सर्वे शुभर्सात्मा विनिर्गते || 89 II-1-4
of forms is due to Maya only, as explained in BU:-

"Each and every form is His manifestation:
His form it is that manifests everywhere."

The BU brings out the unreality of the Universe which is a form of the Atman, so to say, by stating: "Verily there are two aspects of Brahman - the Mūrta (one with a form) and other Amūrta (one without a form). That one which is the Mūrta (form) of this Purusa or Brahman is (flimsy) like a saffron-coloured robe (which is meaningful or decorative only when worn), like white wool (which flies with the air), like the Indra-gopa insect (which flickers and wanes), like the white lotus (whose life is momentary) like a sudden flash light of the lightening (which is momentary). S'rī or Maya, of the Lord is like the flash of the light... The Real on the other hand is the Satya of Satya." The DU comes forth by saying:

"As rivers flow and disappear at last
In ocean's waters, name and form renouncing,
So, too, the sage, released from name and form,
Is merged in the divine and highest spirit."

Here the rivers may be many but ultimately the end is one only. Thus the unity of creation is also indicated here. So also the Vācārambhana clause of DU just explained, points out this very view. The DU in another context explains, "They know that

1) स्तुः स्तुः प्रतिनिधिण मन्नुष तदस्य स्तुः प्रतिनिधिशाश्च || BU II-5-19
2) हृदे वा ब्रह्मणां स्तुः सूर्य प्रतिनिधिशः ||- । तस्य हृदेनस्तः पुरुषस्य रूपः || यथा
   माहंतज्ञनः अवस्तं यथा धार्मिकविशायी वधयायो यथो यथो यथो यथो यथो यथो यथो
   संस्कृतेऽत्तुत्तं संक्तेऽत्तुति तत्र कालस्तोतिः तव अस्य अतिमयिः || BU II-3-1 and 6
3) यथा नचे स्तुः स्तुः गणतन्त्रां गणतन्त्राः स्तुः प्रतिनिधिण मन्नुषः स्तुः प्रतिनिधिशाश्च || DU III-2-8
whatever appeared red was of the form of heat; they know that whatever appeared white was of the form of water; they know that whatever appeared dark was of the form of earth." The forms may be different in appearance but ultimately they are one. The three colours (Red, white, and black) which are taken as the three gunas may appear as different but they are ultimately one, their source being Prakrti. Similarly the presiding deities may be many, but ultimately they are one. The BU states: "As the air which is one, entering this world becomes varied in shape according to the object it enters, so also the one self within all beings becomes varied according to whatever it enters and also exists outside (them all)." This Up., also explains this by the illustration of fire. So also there is the illustration of Ghaṭa-Ākas'a or Pata-Ākas'a etc. This is about the physical diversity. Similarly this aspect of diversities in knowledge, literature is explained by the BU stating: "As from a lighted fire laid with damp fuel, various (clouds of) smoke issue forth, even so my dear, the RV, YV, SV, AV, history, ancient lore, sciences, Upaniṣads, verses, aphorisms, explanations, commentaries, indeed all these are breathed forth from this." These all end in the Unity, just like "the salt melts in the water." All this indicates that the diversity is the manifestation or form

1. Whatever appeared red was of the form of heat; they know that whatever appeared white was of the form of water; they know that whatever appeared dark was of the form of earth. The forms may be different in appearance but ultimately they are one. The three colours (Red, white, and black) which are taken as the three gunas may appear as different but they are ultimately one, their source being Prakrti. Similarly the presiding deities may be many, but ultimately they are one. The BU states: "As the air which is one, entering this world becomes varied in shape according to the object it enters, so also the one self within all beings becomes varied according to whatever it enters and also exists outside (them all)." This Up., also explains this by the illustration of fire. So also there is the illustration of Ghaṭa-Ākas'a or Pata-Ākas'a etc. This is about the physical diversity. Similarly this aspect of diversities in knowledge, literature is explained by the BU stating: "As from a lighted fire laid with damp fuel, various (clouds of) smoke issue forth, even so my dear, the RV, YV, SV, AV, history, ancient lore, sciences, Upaniṣads, verses, aphorisms, explanations, commentaries, indeed all these are breathed forth from this." These all end in the Unity, just like "the salt melts in the water." All this indicates that the diversity is the manifestation or form

2. This Up. also explains this by the illustration of fire. So also there is the illustration of Ghaṭa-Ākas'a or Pata-Ākas'a etc. This is about the physical diversity. Similarly this aspect of diversities in knowledge, literature is explained by the BU stating: "As from a lighted fire laid with damp fuel, various (clouds of) smoke issue forth, even so my dear, the RV, YV, SV, AV, history, ancient lore, sciences, Upaniṣads, verses, aphorisms, explanations, commentaries, indeed all these are breathed forth from this." These all end in the Unity, just like "the salt melts in the water." All this indicates that the diversity is the manifestation or form

3. This Up. also explains this by the illustration of fire. So also there is the illustration of Ghaṭa-Ākas'a or Pata-Ākas'a etc. This is about the physical diversity. Similarly this aspect of diversities in knowledge, literature is explained by the BU stating: "As from a lighted fire laid with damp fuel, various (clouds of) smoke issue forth, even so my dear, the RV, YV, SV, AV, history, ancient lore, sciences, Upaniṣads, verses, aphorisms, explanations, commentaries, indeed all these are breathed forth from this." These all end in the Unity, just like "the salt melts in the water." All this indicates that the diversity is the manifestation or form
of the Unity. The purport of the Upanisadic thought is that the
diversity is there, only by name and form; but the underlying
reality on which this diversified creation or universe is
superimposed is one only. The diversity is caused by the Maya
and has not any locus standi of its own; but is standing on the
ultimate reality which serves as its basis. The BU explains this
position which is in line with that of Vācārāmbhāṇa of GU by
stating: "At that time, this existed as the Āvyākta. It became
manifest and got names and forms, (so that it is said) he has
such a name, such a form. Therefore, even to-day, this (Universe)
is differentiated by name and shape (so that it is said) he has
such a name, such a form. He (the self) entered here even to the
tips of the names, as a sword is (hidden) in its sheath, or as
fire in the fire-source. Him they see not. That (which appears
as visible) is not his (real) full aspect; when breathing, he
bears the name Prāṇa, when speaking voice, when seeing the eye,
when hearing the ear, when thinking the mind. These are merely
the names of his actions (but not himself). He who meditates one
or another of these (his actions) - he does not know (him), for
he (in the above actions or in appearances) is the (unreal)
incomplete. This would be meditating upon (the unreal) one or
another part. Only the (inner) self is to be meditated upon, for

in It(self), all these become one. This self is the foot-trace of all this, for by It, one knows all this, just as one can find again by foot prints (what was lost). He who knows this finds fame and praise." The Supreme Reality is thus the one and one on which the Awyākṛta is centered and there is no diversity. So also the plurality which appears in the form of individual souls is the one caused by Māyā. The KU states, "Whatever is here is there; whatever is there is here. Whoever perceives anything like manyness here, goes from death to death. By mind alone is this to be obtained. There is nothing like plurality or multiplicity here. Whoever perceives anything like plurality or multiplicity here, goes from death to death." Thus the Supreme is devoid of any difference. The multiplicity seen in the soul or in the Universe is only a figmentation of the mind and does not touch or affect the unity of the Supreme. The identity between the self within and the Brahman is more strongly emphasised by the BU by stating2 "Vāmadeva declared 'I have been Ṛṣava and the Sun too. This is so even. Whoever knows 'Aham Brahma' is this all. Even the Gods cannot prevent his becoming thus, for He becomes their self (also). So whoever worships another diversity (than his self) thinking that he is one and (Brahman) another, he knows not. He is like an animal to the Gods, 'Īśām āvasām sa devaḥām'. The instinct which cannot understand the identity between the individual soul and the

(1) अप्येष तद्युज्ज्व यत्स्नम तद्युज्जवः। युज्वः स सूर्यज्वालयोति य तद्युज्ञ ज्वालयोति।
कु ० ४-११
(2) अप्येष भादिकसु भादिकसु भादिकसु भादिकसु। भादिकसु भादिकसु भादिकसु भादिकसु।
कु ० ४-११
Brahman, inspite of the Veda saying the same, is according to this Up, that of a beast only. The BU elaborates this identity of individual soul with Paramatman or Brahman by also stating, "It is due to what appears 'as if' or 'as it were' duality (there being no disparity or duality in fact), that 'dvaita' is seen like this or that." Keith stresses the word 'as if' (Iva) used in this sentence by saying "The phrase, which he (Yajnavalkya) uses in this contention is...'as it were' (Iva) and it may be deduced, not unfairly, from the addition of the qualification (Iva), that he is not prepared to admit as absolutely certain, the existence of duality." The monistic view of the Sage is further strengthened by him by stating "where, verily, everything has become self then by what and whom should one smell, then by what and whom, one should see, by what should one know and by which all this known? By what, should one know the Knower?" The deduction from this, of the idealistic monistic view is that when the Absolute High State of identity with Brahman is attained, there will be no scope for the duality of seeing or seen, thinker or thought and there will be nothing other than or outside the Atman, that every thing besides Him is an appearance and that it is only when one becomes entangled in the so-called conventional Reality or Dvaita Prapanca, which is only a seeming, that one may be said to perceive and know and ultimately the truth is however that he does not perceive and 

(1) यदि एकार्यांभिष्ठातः तदेष्ठे इति आत्मांभिष्ठते इति परमात्मांभिष्ठते इति -- इति ब्राह्मणीक्रयै॥ ५-४-११

(2) रूपव, भ ३२, प्र ३१९

(3) वेदं काम्ब्र अर्थः सर्वार्थं भास्त्रकृत्यं कं कर्मसङ्केतं कं भिज्ञानिभिः। यथायं सर्वं विज्ञानिते केन विज्ञानं विज्ञानिभिः॥ ६४-५-१४॥
know this phenomenal world. The Ātman is the only entity to
exist and there is naught besides Him. As seen by scholars like
Deussen, this view of the Sage points to the existence in the
Upanisads of the idea that the world or Universe is an aspect
of Māyā or appearance. The view of the BU mentioned above is
also expressed in the CU by stating " Where one sees nothing
else, hears nothing else that is the Infinite (Absolute) (Bhūman).
But where one sees something else, hears something else,
understands something else etc. that is finite (individual) (Alpa).
Verily the Infinite (Absolute) is the same as the Immortal; the
finite (individual) the same as the mortal (human) or perishable."

When the nature of Alpa or duality is realised to be perishable
or false and thus ceases to exist then only the Bhūman will shine
in his everlasting luminosity. Therefore, the CU insists " That
which is the Bhūman is happiness, there is no happiness in the
finite. Only the Bhūman is happiness. The Bhūman is, therefore,
to be realised." The CU also says in another context that " He is
one, He becomes threefold, fivefold, sevenfold and also ninefold.
Then again he is called elevenfold, also a hundred and elevenfold
and twenty thousand fold." So also the IU urges the monistic
thought in its 7th verse. The TU states " For truly when he

1 Deussen, Philosophy of Upanisads, p 228
2 यत् तत्त्वस्यति नात्त्वस्यत्वम् नात्त्वस्यत्वम् नात्त्वस्यत्वम् सत्यत्वस्यत्वम् सत्यत्वस्यत्वम् सत्यत्वस्यत्वम् | CU शा० २४-१
3 तद्भवम् तद्भवम् तद्भवम् तद्भवम् तद्भवम् | CU शा० २३-१
4 एवलक्ष्यम् एवलक्ष्यम् एवलक्ष्यम् एवलक्ष्यम् एवलक्ष्यम् | CU शा० २६-२
5 तत् को बन्धा? कै: शौचि पुणात्मकमन्मकम् | U-७.

attains the Supreme who is invisible, bodiless, undefined, without support, he attains fearlessness; when, however, one makes in this Supreme (and his own) even the smallest distinction then for him there is fear. That verily, is the fear of the Knower, who makes such distinction. CU therefore, epitomizes by stating 'Sarvam khalu idam brahma' Ekam eva Advitiyam. "Self is below, above, behind, before, right and left; Self is all this." BU also states in the same strain,

"The Brahmāṇa ignores one who knows him as different from the Self. The Ksatriya ignores one who knows him as different from the Self,... All ignore one who knows it as different from the Self. This Brahmāṇa, this Ksatriya, these worlds these Gods, these beings and all this is this (Supreme) Self." It also epitomizes by stating 'Brahmaiveda Sarvaṁ.' "Brahmāṇi Sarvaṁ.' "Ayaṁ va Atma sarvaṁ bhūtānāṁ lokāḥḥ. " Tātmāni eve śtānāṁ pas' yatī sarvaṁ ātmanāṁ pas' yatī." TU also summarizes

"Om iti brahma Om iti idam sarvaṁ." KU too has the following

"Tasmin lokāḥ s'rītah sarve." So also the MU "Brahmaivedaṁ Vis'vamidām varis' tham" Parśavaye sarva ekabhavanti."
The SU in the theistic tone describes "Sarvavyāpinaḥ ātmanam." Thus the authorities preaching Monism by the Upanisads are not rare. There is no scope either in the Vedas or the Brahmanas or the Upanisads for the Classical dualistic Sāmkhya to seek support for dualism or pluralism. Nor can we see any germ of the dualistic Classical Sāmkhya in this Monistic Sāmkhya which is purely Advaita, which upholds the oneness of the Ātman who is the same as Purusa and all else is nothing but unreal, illusion or Māyā or Avidya. In view of the theme of Monism persistently conveyed by the Upanisads, Harrison has correctly stated that "the main doctrine of the Upanisads is monistic and not dualistic." So also Hiriyanna states, "The most prominent and best developed teaching (of Upanisads) if we overlook for the moment minor details may be described as monistic and idealistic." Max Muller also states, "We must remember that the orthodox view of the Vedānta (Upanisads) is not what we should call evolution, but illusion (Māyā)." He purports to state by this 'monism'.

Purusa:

The 'Gūpa' species are noticed in the Vedas themselves and they pertain to the Māyā or Prakṛti. The Purusa who is Nirguṇa and who is the same as the Ātman or Brahman appears in the Vedas. The Purusa Sukta of the RV will have to be commended for the origination of the concept of Purusa. The Brahmanas have

1) सच्चारुक्तम् आरंभम् II SU I-16
2) CDP, p. 234
3) OP, p. 37
4) Max Muller, "Sacred Books of the Hindus" XI, p. xxvii
accepted this, since the Purusa was to them the basis for the conception of Prajapati which is very popular with them. Purusa served the purposes of the cosmic originator or the Saguna Isa'wara. In the Upanisads also the cosmological concept of Purusa survives, in view of the Atman and Brahman, being Purusa-vidhah. In the Upanisads Purusa is both the Paramatman and the individual Soul.

The concept of Purusa conveyed in the RV vers 1, "Purusa is indeed all this, what has been and what will be" underlies the monistic ideas of BU, CU and other major Upanisads. In the CU and BU 2 which have illustrated the S'andilya Vidyā we have seen the fuller version of Purusa representing Atman. The BU conveys 3 the synonymity of the terms Atman, Brahman & Purusa by bringing out parity in the concepts of these terms, by stating "This Atman is (like) honey for all beings, and all beings are (like) honey for this self. This shining, immortal Purusa who is in this self, and the shining, immortal Purusa who is in this (individual) self, he is just this Self, this is Immortal, this is Brahman, this is All." The Svayam Jyoti or the Self illumination and the Reality of the Purusa is brought out by BU by stating 4. Every one sees his Sport, but Him no one sees.

Therefore they say that one should not wake Him (the sleeping

(1) kuru purusā svabhavām | RV X-10-2 Set SU III-15 alia.
(2) CU III-4; BU IV-6
(3) Ādhyātma sarvāṁ shravanāṁ mānunām asrāyaścānām: sarvāṁ shravanāṁ mānunām, sarvāyaṁmabhāgānāṁ prakāśānāṁ tājāsāyān, ātmāntām, puruṣāḥ: adhyātmatām, ātma-mānunām, puruṣāḥ, prakāśānāṁ tā jātāyāk: Puruṣaḥ: yathā bhavaḥ stōtyam ātmātām sarvāṁ śreṣṭha prabālo: BU II-5-14
(4) Ādhyātma prabhāvatā nā tai prabhaṁ kashchate. tātaṁ vā yāṁ bhūyaṁ dhīyate. konaṁ sanātanaṁ jñānātmakāṁ, ameṣaṁ prabhāvatā nā tāti pravartitaṁ tātāṁ śāntaqudratāṁ puruṣāṁ vàśyāṁ tāti prabhaṁ kashchate. BU IV-3-14 aṁ āṁbuḥ vṛddhāṁ kāmoḥ bhū IV-2-6
person) suddenly; for it is difficult to cure if he does not get back (rightly to his body). Others, however, say that the state of sleep is just his waking state for whatever objects he sees when awake, those too, he sees, when asleep; in this state, the 'Purusa' is Svayam Jyoti — Self-illuminating — (and does not require any help or light for cognition of objects.)

The BU explains the term 'Purusa' etymologically, in the same way of SB, as one lying in the 'Purita'. The whole dialogue between the king Ajāta S'atru and the Sages in BU II-1 gives predominance to the explanation of Purusa. In 1-4-1 the term 'Purusa' is alternatively described by BU by stating, "In the beginning, there was only this self, in the shape of Purusa. Looking around, he saw nothing else than (Him) Self. He first said 'I am'; therefore arose the name 'I' — Because before all this (Pūrva), he burnt (Oṣat) all sins, 'Pāpas', he is (known as) "Purusa." Ś in his commentary on this sentence identifies the Atman with the Prajāpati Brahman as he was having the shape of Purusa who is, described as Virāṭ Purusa. The specific etymology given here for the term 'Purusa' is noteworthy.

BU describes the Prajāpati Purusa as one with sixteen parts (Ṣadās'a Kalāṇ). The CU also describe the Purusa with sixteen parts (Ṣadās'a Kalāṇ). The Āu explains about these sixteen kalās "In whom these (sixteen) parts are well-established, being like spokes in the centre of the wheel, know..."
Him as Purusa to be known so that death may not afflict you."

Thus the conception of Purusa with Sodas'a Kalv had gained popularity during the Brâhma or Upanisadic period, its origin being in the Vedas as explained previously.

The Sû has devoted many of its S'lokas to the description of the Purusa, both as the individual soul as well as the Supreme Soul and conceives Unity in the two. The IU states, "Whatsoever is that Purusa (yonder), that also am I." This is the same as, "Aham Brahmaasmi." The KU describes "Beyond the Mahat Tatva (Vijñâna or intellect or Hiranya or Vyakta), there is Avyakta (Mûla Pra-kriti, or Mâyâ or Avyâkta). Beyond the Avyakta is the (Supreme) Purusa. Beyond the Purusa there is nothing. That is the final limit. That is the goal."

The MU describes the Purusa, "Divine and formless is the Purusa. He is within and without, unborn, without breath and without mind, pure and higher than the highest Aksara." This concept of the Purusa as explained by this verse corresponds with the Absolute monistic Brahman. The Upanisads therefore describe the Purusa as "Sa evameva puruso brahma." The SU states that "He alone knows whatever is to be known. There is no knower of Him, the Supreme Purusa who is earlier to everything." This does not mean that the Purusa is not totally unknowable. This only means that the Purusa is not an object of

---

1. UU III-6
2. IU 3-3
3. VU 3-11
4. KU 3-2
5. SU III-19
6. SU III-16

---
knowledge. The idea underlying this verse is the same as conveyed by the BU text: "He is never seen, but is the Seer; He is never heard but is the hearer; He is never perceived but is the perceiver; He is never thought but is the thinker; there is no other seer but He; there is no other hearer but He; there is no other perceiver but He, there is no other thinker but He. He is your Self, the inner Controller, the Immortal. Everything else is unreal." The Ken. U has brought out this idea of the Atman or Purusa being beyond 'Knowing' & 'Known' by saying: "If you think that you have understood Brahman, well, you know it but slightly, whether it refers to you (the individual self) or to the Gods. So there is to be investigated by you again, even though (you consider) 'It is known', (as) I think." "To whomsoever it is not known, to him it is known; to whomsoever it is known, he does not know. It is not understood by those who understand it; it is understood by those who do not understand it." Thus it is indicated that Atman or Brahman or Purusa cannot be apprehended directly like an object of knowledge. This aspect of incomprehensibility of Atman or Brahman or Purusa is better cast, than any other Upanisad, in an Upanisad to which S' refers to in his commentary on the BS. Here the sage Badhva, being asked by Vasuki to apprehend the nature of Brahman, explained it to
him by silence. He said to him, 'Learn Brahman, O friend,' and became silent. He prayed, 'Teach me.' The other was silent, and when addressed a second and third time he replied, 'I am teaching you, indeed, but you do not follow it. That self is silence (Upanishad Atma). The Supreme Purusa or Atman is one to be intuitively realised. The very purpose of Upanishads is to realise Him. The SU states, 'This cosmic or Universal Divinity is attainable through Sankhya Yoga'(Same as Vidyā)." One realising this Purusa gets freed from name and form, (Avidya or Mayā):

As rivers flow and disappear at last
In ocean's water, name and form renouncing,
So, too, the knower released from name and form,
Is merged in the divine and highest purusa." 3

The monistic Purusa, if to be rightly realised, is to be seen beyond the state of Susupti or the Avyakta state. He is there where even dreams cannot go, nay even the absence of dreams cannot reach Him. The brand-maya Kos'a will have to be transgressed, since He is Nirguna and free from duality. He is nirvis'esa.' There the Avidya goes not, nor does the Vidyā goes.

He has no gunas for characterisation and is therefore neither this, nor that. He is, still, not a negative entity nor a nonentity. He is still a positive " Satyam, Jnanam and Anantam." This positive state is to be comprehended, by a negative process of elimination of all dualities 'Neti' 'Neti', since the Lord is
above human knowledge or thoughts or approaches. This Upaniṣadic transcendental state of 'EITHER OR' which is beyond any definite description, will have to be thus ascended from the negative stage of 'NEITHER NOR' or 'NETI NETI' or the state of even the silence 'Upas'anta'.

PRAKṛTI:-

Now we proceed to the term 'Praḳṛti'. This word occurs very rarely in the Ṣrutis. We have already dealt with Mayā concept which is synonymous with this word, but still since the term Praḳṛti plays an important role in the Epic or Bhāgavata, Sāmkhya, and later on in the Classical Sāmkhya, some more consideration will have to be given to this concept of Praḳṛti also. The term Purusa, with which the concept of Praḳṛti is connected occurs frequently in the Ṣrutis as we have seen above, but the absence of the term Praḳṛti in the Ṣrutis, especially in the earlier parts, is greatly conspicuous. The Su is the first to mention the term Praḳṛti by stating "Know then the Praḳṛti as Mayā and the Lord as Mayin." The alternative word for this Praḳṛti is Pradhana, which also we come across in Su, three times 1-10, 6-10 and 6-16. It will be a great error, however, if a decision is taken from the absence of the use of these terms in the Ṣrutis, that the theory of Praḳṛti was unknown to the Ṣrutis. The thought of Praḳṛti was conveyed by various terms like Ājā, Asat, Āvyākṛta, Āpah, Nāra, Hiraṇya, Mayā, Mātar, Viś'va etc. The list of synonymous terms given by the Sage Yañjayalkya for this word in

(1) सत्या सभूषणं बिधिधानादिर तु महत्त्वत्र | Su ॥ ॥-20
(2) द्वितीय प्रत्ययं || Su ॥ ॥-10
(3) तत्त्व प्रत्ययं प्रभावितं || Su ॥ ॥-10
(4) त्यशस्त्रप्रत्ययं चुप्पतः || Su ॥ ॥-16
the epic is already given. The Upanisads state that in the
beginning, this was Asat, Apah, Avyakta etc. The CU comes forth
however with the statement that "In the beginning, my dear, this
was only 'Sat' alone, one only without a second. Some state 'in
the beginning this was Asat alone, one only without a second. From
that Asat, Sat was produced.' But how, indeed, my dear, could be
thus? How could 'Sat' be produced from 'Asat'? On the contrary,
in the beginning this was 'Sat' alone, one only without a second."
This 'Sat' is explained as one without form and name which is the
same as the unmanifested or Avyakta. 'Asat' is also explained as
Avyakta. No difference is seen between this 'Sat' of CU and
'Avyakta' used in other Upanisads. While explaining the TU verse
'Asad̐vā idamagrama ānīt,' S's states that this Asat should not be
construed as a complete non-entity or blank, since it gives birth
to Sat. The Mait. states that in the beginning this was Tamas.
Tamas is not darkness here but Ajñāna or Asat.

'Asat' or 'Sat' are also taken as relative terms. The Supreme
Truth is construed as beyond Asat or Sat. The Nasadiya Sukta,
states therefore, in connection with this Reality, that there was
then neither 'Asat' nor 'Sat', and means thereby that the Supreme
was in the absolute state beyond 'Asat' or 'Sat'. This is
described as the state of 'Kevala' by the SU. The TU states that

(1) P., 63.
"Non-existent, verily does one become if he considers Brahman (Supreme) as Asat (non-existent). If one knows Him all-existent then the wise men treat him 'as existent' (or to be 'a right person')."

The Absolute, when he became desirous of cosmology, he became associated with Maya. The Upanisads never accept Maya or Prakrti independently as the material or the efficient cause of the creation of Universe. This Maya or Prakrti has not got its own independence. It has got its substratum on the Is'vara, either in its Avyakrta form or in its manifested form as described by SU. The one who is the support of all aspects (of Maya) and in whom all this dissolves (at the end) and comes together ((at the beginning of creation), the bestower of the blessing, the adorable God; by discerning Him, one for ever goes to peace." SU annotates "Yonim Yonim" appearing in this verse as the Mula Prakrti and the Avantara (evolving) Prakrti." It can be also taken as Apara Prakrti as mentioned in the BG. The Prakrti or Maya is the Atma-S'akti of the Parames'vara or Saguna Brahman without a locus standi of its own. The SU describes "Those who followed Dhyana and Yoga saw the Deva-Atma-S'akti with its attributes who, one only, rules over all these causes from Kala to Atman, (as

1) अध्येत आदि भवति । असदुप्रस्तली देवु-देवता । आत्मि आत्मसंपस्त च । सति ततो विवेचिती ॥
2) ये योगी योगिनी अध्येतिन्येको आत्मसंपती संसार विवेचिते सर्वस्त।
3) ताहिः समयं कस्मू देवमीथरं निसिद्धं भविष्यं भाविष्यं महत्त्ववत् नेत्रसंगति ॥ SU ट्रू-५।
4) ये योगिनिः ये भात्यमहत्त्ववत्स्यानं वैहृत्यं परस्परतः योगिनि योगिनिः विवेचितरी वैश्वस्तवः सुरुक्ष्यते शुद्धभूत्यो तिर्थंकरं आक्षेपकार्य विश्वाय विश्वमानात्मकार्यं ॥ SU (सद), p 197।
5) से ध्यानोपयोगशमनः अपभ्रस्ते देवतादिकं व्यापकं भ्रजून भ्रजूनं ॥
   अः आत्मान्ति निरंतरात्मनि तानि कालायेव कालायेव भ्रजूनात्मकार्यं ॥ SU ट्रू-३।
stated in the Second verse). This verse is a reply to the cosmological questions (verses 1 and 2) asking "What is the (Cosmological) cause? (Is it) Brahman? Whence are we born? By what we live? And on what are we established? Are the Time (Kāla), Inherent Nature (Svabhāva), Necessity (Niyati), Chance (Yadṛcchā), the Elements (Bhūtāni), Prakṛti (Yoni), Purusa to be considered as the causes? (None of these can independently be the cause.) Is it due to a combination of these? No, because of the existence of the Ātman (as their cause). Even the powerless Ātman (i.e. the Jīvātman) cannot be the cause, because of (his) pleasure and pain. (The Jīvātman cannot be the cause because he is himself steeped in pleasure and pain.)" The Sū, in reply, attributes the cause to Him who is the controller of all these factors. The element Prakṛti which is synonymous with the term 'Yoni', as explained above, and which is insentient (without Ātman) cannot be recognised as the independent (Nimitta) cause of the universe because of there being another controller of it. S' while explaining this third S'loka explicitly states, "that the Prakṛti of the Classical Sāmkhya which is an independent category and separate from the Ātman is not contemplated as the cause. The expression 'Deva-Ātma-S'akti' will have to be taken as the 'S'akti or Māyā-yuktā-Parames'vara' or Saguḍa Brahman only. Such Lord is called 'Māyin' (Māyinam to Mābes'varam). This verse is further

(1) केवल करण बुध कुटु भ ध- गतवी भिक्षा कै न क च संज्ञाक्षराः — 1111
कालं सरयते स्मरणिः निम्नाविन्दव भूतार्थी धोरणी गुरुभुजं हति नि भितरणाः
सरणेषो गुरुनाः न त्यतदाभद्वो नाध्यनीश्रीं सङ्ग्रहेः सकेतस्ती ।
(2) न सांख्यसूत्रिकमेव अस्वादित्यमञ्चकः भूतार्थं स्वतन्त्रं शार्यति कारणमप्रका ।
(3) 15.98 on Sū pp. 78 and 79
(4) Sū 14-10
clarified in another S'loka of this Up. by stating: "The Mayin (Parame'svara) creates this world and in this world, the other (Jivatman) gets entangled on account of Maya." This Mayin, as the cause, is emphasised by this Upanisad by stating: "Tat karaṇaṁ sāmkhya-yogadhyam-devaṁ." The 'Deva' here who is enjoined with his Ātma-S'akti-Mayā will have to be construed as the cause in view of the explanations mentioned above. The S'akti is essential for the creation of universe as the Jivatman who is Anīsa or powerless and who gets entangled in the empirical world after coming under the control of Mayā is excluded by the Upanisad from being the cause of the Universe. The Lord who is the Lord of the Mayā and who is the Pradhāna - kṣetrajña-pati is alone construed as the cause. S' states that the Supreme Absolute who is above Mayā, who is neither the cause nor the non-cause nor both, nor non-both (and hence) nor the nimitta nor the Upādāna nor both does not come into the picture. Since He is the Absolute, no duality like the universe appears in His purview. The reason for the Upanisad to attribute the creation to the Lord with Maya is as good as attributing it to Mayā, since the creation does not proceed from the Lord without the Mayā. Mayā also cannot do it of its own accord without the Lord. Mayā or Prakṛti cannot function without the substratum of the Lord at the basis. Mayā is an unreality playing with the blessings of the Saguna Brahman.

This Mayā is described as 'Ajā' (unborn) in the Upanisads.

(1) अति भारे खरी सुग्रे विभागति सभी साधुः भाग्यं संगीतक्रजा। SU IV-9.
(2) सत्करणं आर्यश्रोणिधामञ्ज्ञानं काला देवं || SU VI-13
(3) अत्याधिको धामकालेण हृ || SU VI-16.
(4) न कालार्थकारणं न चौधर्य नासाध्यं नव-प्रियिन्ते न चौधर्यम् || अज्ञेयस्य परमार्थं प्राप्तसनाति न चराणः च च च | SAT (SB) 14.8.
The SU describes 'The one unborn, red, white and black, produces manifold offsprings similar in form; there lies also the one unborn (male) delighting; another unborn gives her up, having had his enjoyment.' The Lohita, S'ukla and Krsna represent the three guṇas of Āja — Prakṛti. The delighting second Āja is the Jīvatman, and the third is the Lord who has overcome Māya and is its controller. The Jīva is mentioned in the next S'loka as Anīś'a. Thus there are in all three unborn (Āja) elements (Prakṛti) (Jīva) and (the Lord). This aspect is further made clear in another verse which reads as follows: "There are two unborn ones, the knowing and unknowing, the one Īś'a (Paraṃes'vara) and the other powerless (Jīva). Still there is (another) unborn meant to serve as object of enjoyment for the enjoyer (Jīva). The Lord (Atman) is infinite, non-doer one with the universal form. When one finds out this triad (in true colours), he becomes Brahman." Here we have the conventional reality of the Māya which is responsible for the creation of all objects of enjoyments, all distinctions like enjoyer and enjoyed, by becoming the mother of the Universe, by wielding all her powers and at the same time by being subordinate to the Lord (Kīmkurvara). It is on account of this Māya only that the Lord appears as divided as Lord and Jīvatman, though he is undivided or united one. There is no such distinction in truth; and when once the Māya or Avidyā or ignorance disappears through the true knowledge of the Knower, the latter attains or

1) Anātadānya khetvād bhūtātāṁ puruṣottamaṁ sarvāyaṁ
tyājateva 'sūkṣmaḥ sākṣamāyōhi. Sū 4.5
2) Adbhuta dvāparaśānyaśaktiśraddhaś ca sa eva twitchāvyabhicāryo. Anātadaśa kāyaścaryo 'cyas tathā caṁ kriyate. Sū 5.9
becomes Brahman. If the Upādi of Maya causing distinction between the Absolute and Jīva goes away, the Jīva will be the same as Brahman. This does not amount to an acceptance of Dvaitvāda, or the ultimate reality of dualities or pluralities. Maya is never a reality, though appearing so. Here is the inexplicability of Maya causing so many distinctions and disparities by her illusion. Since Maya is thus a faked or counterfeit Reality, and since it, even though known as Avyākṛta or Asat, is called as 'Sat', bears the name of 'Sat' according to GU as explained previously. It also gets the name of 'Satya' for all conventional purposes. This Satya or Maya has no status of its own and is entirely dependent upon the Supreme Parames'vara. Hence the latter alone is called as 'Satyasaya Satyan' in the BU and GU meaning the only Reality who is in essence Satyam Jñānam and Anantam. There is no doctrine of two independent eternal Satyas in the Upaniṣads.

**GUNAS:**

The Guṇas are traced to the Vedas, the term appearing in the Atharva Veda as explained previously. The Guṇas in the Upaniṣads represent as 'reals' and not as one of the Seven Pādārthas of the Nyāya Vaiśeṣika school. These are the powers of Maya (SVaGuṇaIh NiGaṇdhāh). When the Supreme is conjoined with Maya and its Guṇas, He is called Saguna Brahman, but He, being always above the same, in His true characteristics, is always

(1) विश्वामर्नी देवताश्रयस्तुपेवा स्त्रविषेयश्रृवत भोज्योऽध्यक्ष्योऽध्यक्षेद्युक्तर्तात्त्विकेन्द्रियोऽवलोकिते ।
(2) तत्सत्ततासि वि भानी प्रतिभासि भाष्यप्रचारसिद्धान्तोऽत्तथानिवाचनात्
(3) तत्सत्ततासि श्रीचार्यां सरीरोऽस्मादि अटदेवोऽर्थमाध्यक्षका ।
(4) भाष्यप्रचारसिद्धान्तोऽत्तथानिवाचनात्

116

(1) विश्वामर्नी देवताश्रयस्तुपेवा स्त्रविषेयश्रृवत भोज्योऽध्यक्ष्योऽध्यक्षेद्युक्तर्तात्त्विकेन्द्रियोऽवलोकिते ।
(2) तत्सत्ततासि वि भानी प्रतिभासि भाष्यप्रचारसिद्धान्तोऽत्तथानिवाचनात्
(3) तत्सत्ततासि श्रीचार्यां सरीरोऽस्मादि अटदेवोऽर्थमाध्यक्षका ।
(4) भाष्यप्रचारसिद्धान्तोऽत्तथानिवाचनात्

116

(1) सत्यस्य सत्यम् || 80 II-3-1.6
(2) सत्यस्य सत्यम् || 80 II-3-1-6
(3) TII II-1-1. (4) SU-I-3
called Nirguna. In the CU and SU the names of the three Gunas appear as Lohita, Sukla, and Krsna. The Lord who is the controller of Pradhana and Ksetrajna is also described in the SU as "Gunes'at.

The specific mention of the Gunas with the names as Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas, along with the further particular powers of each, is made out in the Mait. U in III-5 etc. The Mait. U also explains that the Lords - Karya Brahman, Rudra or S'va and Viṣṇu - are the Guna-descendants of the Paramesvara (V-2) according to the preponderance of the Gunas, Rajas, Tamas and Satva.

Hiranyagarbha or Prajāpati or Mahat tattva:—

Lord Hiranyagarbha also occupies a very predominant position in the Vedas, Brahmāṇas and Upanisads. The Absolute Brahman is the Supreme Truth, whereas Lord Hiranyagarbha is the creative God in some of the hymns of the RV. The Hiranyagarbha hymn comes forth saying,

"In the beginning was the deity Hiranyagarbha, He manifested as the Sole Lord of creation."

He is the first God that became manifest. He is often identified with Prajāpati God. In the Upanisads, He is the first Lord, coming out of A vyākrta or Asat or Ḍaṇḍa. Dāsgupta states, 

"Of the three sheaths, Vijnānamaya, Manomaya, Prānā maya, the Vijnānamaya sheath plays the part of the active agent. These three sheaths make up together the Subtle body. Hiranyagarbha (also called Śūtrātman or Prāṇa) is the God who presides over the cosmic Subtle body of all beings."

This is exactly what the Vedānta-Sūtra states in

1) SU-16. 2) Hirānagabhija sambandhakā śāstra-sāra śāstra-āghata: 541, 21-1
2) 519, II, p. 76
3) Hiranagabhiḥ śāstrasārasāstrāḥ śāstra-āghataḥ Vedānta-śāstra, p. 20
connection with the Samaṣṭi Sūkṣma S'arīra. Radhakrishnan says,
"We thus get the four poises or the statuses of Reality ..."

(1) Absolute Brahman (2) The Creative Spirit (Is'vara) (3) The world Spirit (Hiranyagarbha) and (4) The World. This is the way in which the Hindu thinkers interpret the integral nature of the Supreme truth. The world-spirit is the 'First Jīvatman' as presented by the Vedānta Paribhāṣa. Keith says, "The development of consciousness must therefore, it would appear be cosmic, and the Mahān or Buddhi would thus correspond to the Hiranyagarbha of the later Upaniṣads and the Vedānta."

The first product of Āpah is 'Satya' or 'Sat'. This Satya is Brahman, according to the BU5 S while explaining this mantra says, "From Āpah came out Satya-Brahman who is the first born. He is the Hiranyagarbha who is known as Sūtrātman and from whom this Universe came forth." The BU also identifies the Hiranyagarbha with the Lord Āditya. The Sūtrātman is the same as Mahat Tattva which is also Vijnāna or Citta. Hiranyagarbha is known as Vijnānatman and the Absolute Reality is known as Parama Vijnānam. This is the difference between the Para-Brahman and Hiranyagarbha Brahman. The term Vijnāna may be taken as a synonym of Hirāya also. On this analogy, the Hiranyagarbha is Vijnānatman. Hiranyagarbha Brahman is the Lord of Vijnāna or

(1) Ved., p. 20
(2) Pu., p. 65
(3) Hind., p. 55
(4) Par., p. 53
(5) AP, p. 65
(6) BU, p. 1195
(7) See p. 119 also. "Hiranyagāraha is shown here as a synonym of Sūtrātman. Since Mahat or Vijnāna is the first manifestation of Śrṣrīna, Vijnāna may be also taken as a synonym of Hiranyagāraha."

I hope this helps!
Sarasvati capable of leading the seekers of knowledge towards the Infinite. The ITJ describes "Tasmin Apo Mātāris'va dadhāti." Here 'Apah' is A vyākṛta and Mātāris'van is Sūtrātman i.e. Hiranyagarbha.

**TATTVĀH (Categories):**

The Upaniṣads recognise Āhāmkāra, Manas, and Buddhī and the five gross elements and the organs. They also propound the theory of five Prānas which further seem to have been replaced by the Tammātrās. The Tammātras appear in Pr. U and Mait. U. The SU refers to various categories with allegorical terminologies by stating "We understand Him (the Lord) (as a wheel) with one felly (Nemi), with three tyres (trīvṛtām), sixteen ends (Saḍās'a Anta) fifty spokes, (S'atārdham Āraṇ), twenty counter spokes (Vims'atī-Pratyarābhīḥ) and six sets of eights, whose one rope is manifold, which has three different paths, whose one delusion (Moham) arises from two causes." This leads to the assumption that these various categories were recognised by the Upaniṣads. The Lord according to this mantra is the root cause of the whole world and is, therefore, called the 'Nemi' on which all other elements have their basis. The 'Trīvṛtām' alludes to the three Guṇas. 'Saḍās'a' refers to the Linga body which we have previously explained and the Saḍās'aka is the Individual Soul. The fifty (half of S'ata) spokes represent the 50 Bhedas to which the

---

(1) सत्तत्त्वं अपे महात्मिक्या दृष्टांति || ५०-४ ||
(2) See p. 44 (vii)
(3) त्रृप्तिश्री-व त्रृप्तिदर्शा-व्रतप्राप्तीवस्ता-व तेजचन्द्रसंवतस्ता वायुभवं भावाभवं बृहुद्रवण अवकाशार् || Pr. IV-8.
(4) प्रवचनीयेक हृद्यकरः ५० अवकाशार्याः || Hal. VIII-2
(5) समस्यके नेत्रस्वरूपन्तत्रा रेषत्यात् विद्यात्तप्रकाराभिः ||

अष्टकं प्रदन्तिविभव्यैकपां संज्ञाणमेवैं (दृष्टिज्ञातिकां महत्रः || SU-I-4
Classical Samkhyas later on have referred to in the Is'vara-Krsna's Samkhyā Karikas 46 to 47. The twenty counter spokes relate to 10 organs of perception and action, and the corresponding ten objects (Pr. U IV-8). The six sets of eights are connected with (1) Eight Dhātus, (2) Eight Prakṛtis, (3) Eight Ais'varyas, (4) Eight Bhāvas, (5) Eight Devas, and (6) Eight Ātmagunas. The rope called "Vis'varūpa eka pās'a" is explained as 'Kāma' with three parts of Dharma, Adharma, and Jñāna. The 'Eka Moha' arising from two Nimittas or causes is the 'Moha' arising from Virtue (Pupya) and Vice (Pāpa). The next S'loka of SU reads:— "We meditate on Him as a river of five streams, with five sources.—fierce and crooked, whose waves are the five vital breaths, the root of five perceptions with five whirlpools, an impetuous flood of five pains, divided into fifty kinds with five branches." The five rivers referred to in this S'loka are the five organs of action or the five organs of perception. The five 'yonis' are the five elements either gross or subtle (fierce or crooked), the five breaths are the Prānas forming the waves; the root of five perceptions is Mind, the five whirlpools are five objects, the five pairs are Garbha-duḥkha, Janma-duḥkha, Jarā-duḥkha, Vyādi-duḥkha, and maraṇa-duḥkha. The fifty Bhedas are those as referred to above which have five branches of five Kles'as.

(1) गुणोपूर्वकार्यविभक्ति: तस्य च मयोपर्यं पद्योक्तः

कथा: विपर्ययः मया भवत्तांशितेश्वर करण-वैकल्यादि

अर्द्ध-विशिष्टाः मया, सूक्ष्म-विशिष्टाः, अप्सर्स्सिद्धाः || 8.क. - 46 एवं 47

(2) प्रयोज्यते तथा पध्यायिने उत्तरकां प्रयोज्यातिः पश्चात्भूताः पृथक-भूताः || प्रयोगान्त्यं पश्चात्तु: सौंड्रेनां पवित्रां पवित्र-विभिन्नाः || सू. I-5
Another important S'loka connected with the Tattvas reads as follows:- Having created the cosmos (Karma) and rested again, having through his own self (Tattva) entered into the other, say one Tattva, or two, or three, or eight Tattvas, by accepting the medium of Kāla or the subtle svarūpa of the Ātman etc (unfolds it). The words "Ekena dvabhyaṁ, tribhiraśtabhirvāṁ" are important, since they indicate the different number of tattvas responsible for the cosmology like one Tattva viz Purusa, or two Tattvas—Purusa and Prakṛti, or three tattvas—three guṇas, or the eight Prakṛtis (tattvas) like Prakṛti, five elements, manas, and Buddhi. The Upaniṣad is not very particular to say or confirm conclusively the definite number of Tattvas responsible for the cosmology, as can be made out by the use of the word 'Va'. There were then different views or schools, at the time of the Upaniṣad, holding one Tattva, two tattvas, three tattvas or eight tattvas or the sādāśa (sixteen) tattvas as responsible for the creation of the Universe or even Kāla, Niyati, Svabhāva, Yadraçōha, Bhūtās, Purusa, Prakṛti (as mentioned in verses 1-1 and 2 of the Upaniṣad), to which a causal reference is made by it. These schools are also mentioned by the Bhāgavata in 22nd Chapter of eleventh Skandha to which Dasgupta refers in his 'A History of Indian Philosophy' and Johnston refers in his 'Early Sāṁkhya'. The Upaniṣad upheld the view that these Tattvas, left to themselves are not able to proceed with the evolution of the Universe and that the hand of

(1) तत्काम्यक्रमे विभिन्नत्वस्वरूपस्तत्त्वं तत्त्वं समस्तत्वं भोगम् |
पुरुसायुगस्ताद्विनिरंजितोऽकलेभिः पुरुषावपायेन ||

(2) भूमिस्वरूपयोऽन्यसंसारात् जग मनो जीवविकासः ||
आठकार इतिविच मेघा अनुकृतिनिर्देशः ||

(3) दीर्घ. त्व. ५, ४५। (4) Johnston "Early Sāṁkhya" दीर्घ. ५, २।
God (Atma Tattva) is essential to enliven them and to proceed with the creation. (Tat gradtvā tadeva anupraviṣ'at) is the main theme of the Upanisad in saying "Tattvasya tattvena sametya yogam" in this S'loka. It ultimately says, "It is the greatness or Māyā of God by which the Brahma-cakra is made to turn." In view of the indirect acceptance of Māyā of God, as responsible for the cosmology, and in view of the ultimate falsity or unreality of creation, there was no point for the Upanisad in insisting on the number of unreal Tattvas as essential for cosmology. It is for this reason that in this Upanisad the instrumentality of Kāla or Svabhāva for creation is not also stressed.

THEISM IN UPAṆIṢĀDS—

Thus from an examination of all the major Upanisads, it is significant to say that the main theme of the Upanisads is Advaita and the way of attainment of the monistic Absolute is through Sāṁkhya or Upanisadic knowledge. The exposition of the impersonal aspects of the God as presented by the Sages of Upanisads, especially by the Sage Yājñavalkya in BU has led to a belief among some of the Western thinkers that the Upanisadic monism "abolished God, as an unreality and substitutes an impersonal"; and a warning is given by them by saying "It is most essential for the student of Vedānta to bear in mind, that according to Advaitvādins God is as unreal as the Universe with which they identify him. There is no such thing

(1) स्वभावसमस्तत्र केवले क्योंमुख तस्मिन्न परमहम्मस्त्र।
देवस्यवें महीवा तु कौनै भगवान स्वभावसंगमं॥ SU VI-1

(2) Ved., 5, 1.12
therefore as a personal God; yet they imagine that there is, and ascribe attributes to Him.\(^1\) Such a view seems to have been developed by these thinkers on the misconceptions entertained about the connotation or the implications of the term God. These thinkers consider that the human or individual souls are the creations of God, that the personal God is the only Real God and that the God has his own kingdom etc. If the individual souls are ultimately the Absolute Supreme according to the Upanisadic Philosophy, the fear is that "the essence of God is called into question. For if souls are ultimate and eternal reality, the only function left for God is to be the Creator of material world," and "this becomes unnecessary if it is assumed that the world is eternal; we are then left with the atheism of the Classical Samkhya System."\(^2\) The highest importance given by the Western thinkers to the Personal God and the banishment of all impersonal conceptions of the Supreme as 'idealistic' from their concept of 'God' is the main cause for their fears towards the Upanisadic Advaita. But there is no reason for such fear.

The Upanisadic ideals of BU and others which are highly monistic and thus also advocating the idealistic monism, and at the same time, the ideals of some later Upanisads like SU which are also advocating the idealistic monism by elevating Personal Gods to that of Impersonal Absolute have set up a long controversy between Deussen and Keith. Deussen considers that the later Upanisads like SU, KU, and MU are falling away from the original idealism of BU by introducing pantheistic leniencies. Keith has refuted the views of Deussen that there is no swerving from the path of idealistic monism and there is a continuity of thought in

---

\(^1\) Ved.S, p.146.  \(^2\) HMP, pp.91 and 92.
them all. Since these writers have also introduced some aspects of cosmology or chronology in their controversies, we need not go into detail about their disputes. Harrison has dealt in detail with this controversy and this is sufficient reply to their disputes. Ranade states, "Advaitism does not negate such a conception of God. It requires God for the sake of the purposes (for the purposes of religion and for the explanation of the phenomenal existence of the world); but higher than God philosophically, it regards the conception of the Absolute. God to the Advaitist is the personal aspect of the Absolute and the Absolute the impersonal aspect of God."

Max Muller who has fully analysed this problem also states, "Their (Hindu) idea of the Supreme cause of the Universe (i.e. the Absolute) went far beyond what is meant by God, the creator and ruler of the world." If we thus examine and understand the Upanisads in this light, there is an end to this controversy. The Personal Gods who are called 'Suras' are never the highest Gods to the Hindus. The impersonal God is the highest God to all thinkers of Indian Philosophy.

No doubts need, therefore, be entertained about the fundamentals of the Upanisads conveying respect to the Supreme God and His absoluteness. It should also be noted that there is the same consistency of thought underlying the concept of the Absolute Brahman as brought out by all of these Upanisads. The BU describes the Absolute "That, O Gargi, the Knowers of

(1) HMP, pp. 95 to 100. (2)CSUP, p.219. (3)SSIP, p.12?

BU IV, 8-8
Brahman call the Imperishable, 'It is neither gross nor subtle, neither short nor long, neither glowing red nor adhesive, neither shadow nor darkness, neither air nor space, unattached (Asangam), without taste, without smell, without eyes, without ears, without voice, without mind, without radiance, without breath, without a mouth, without measure, without any Ins or Outs, neither eater nor being eaten.' The TU describes Him as "Immanent and Transcendent, the Defined and Undefined, both the Founded and the Unfounded, the Intelligent and the Non-intelligent, the True and the Untrue." The KU describes the Self without sound, without touch, without form, undecaying, is likewise without taste, eternal, without smell, without beginning, without end, beyond the Mahat, the Dhruvam, by discerning whom, one is freed from the face of death. The SU describes the Paramatman as 'who is without parts, without activity, tranquil, irreproachable, without blemish, the highest bridge to Immortality like a fire with its fuel burnt,' and also as 'It is neither female, nor is it male; nor yet is this neuter. Whatever the body it takes to itself, by that it is held.' The IU describes the (Supreme) is unmoving, ONE, swifter than the mind, the Gods (even) do not reach it, as it is ever ahead of them. Though itself standing stable or unmoved, it outstrips those who run. On it the Apah (Māyā or Āvākta) and the Sutrātman (Mataris'van) (Vyakta) have their basis."
The MU of AY is also, in line with these Upanisads of YV as seen from its descriptions of the Supreme, which are as follows: — "That which is unperceivable, ungraspable, without family, without caste, without sight or hearing, without hands or feet, eternal, all pervading, omnipresent, exceedingly subtle; that is the undecaying which the wise perceive as the source of beings." The Man. U also describes "That the Supreme (Turiya) is unseen, incapable of being spoken of, ungraspable, without any distinctive marks, unthinkable, unnameable, the essence of the knowledge of the one-self, that into which the world gets annihilated, the peaceful, the benign, the non-dual (Advaitam) — He is the Self; He should be realised." The CU of SY also praises the Absolute, "The self which is free from evil, free from oldage, free from grief, free from hunger and thirst, whose desire is the real, He should be sought; Him, one should desire to understand." The purport of all these passages read together is the establishment of uniformity in the Upanisads in their explanation of the Supreme God, as beyond any personal characteristics. All the negative delineations borne out here are intended to indicate the Idealistic Absolute free from all attributes or Gunas, and to establish the Nirgunatva of the Para-Brahman all the while, and never to suggest that the Ultimate is a sheer blank or pure nothing. It is not meant to abolish the God, since it is never the theme of Upanisads to

1) अन्तर्द्वस्तमः अवस्मात्मानां वाचस्पतिः श्रीकुलकारामुद्धाराणाम्। भीतिः विश्रूंतं सर्वकृतं सुधारकम् नासुक्कषणं परिपुष्टि विधीयते।। MU-I-6
(2) अद्वैतमयः द्वितीयास्तमात्रस्याश्च किं प्रकारम् सर्वप्रक्षणार्यः अग्न्याश्च स्वाधिश्च मन्त्रानुक्रमः।
शास्त्रां विश्रूंतं अबुचिन्वथं सहवले से आदेश से विधायते।। Man. U. 7.
(3) यं अवस्मात्माः स्वतं विभृत्युपादित्योऽविभृत्योऽबुचिन्वथं सत्याश्च सत्यसंघहः से हन्तेश्वरः से विमोचितः। CU III-7-1.
preach atheism or agnosticism. The positive connotations expounded in the above passages are intended to bring out the existence of the Absolute as a positive entity. The dualistic aspects which appear and disappear on account of their unreality are imperfect, and are not able to throw sufficient light on the Absolute who stands beyond any predication or definition. It is for this reason alone, that the Supreme does not get sufficient verbal expression. All our thoughts or knowledge end in their inability to reach the Supreme, since before this monistic Absolute Supreme no dualism can stand.

When all is one, where is the scope for dualism? The IU therefore asks, "When to one who knows, all beings have become one with his own Self, then what sorrow and what delusion can be to him who has seen oneness?" Unless we rise to this high altitude of monism, we fall short of conceiving the real aspects of the Supreme God who is above all imperfect conceptions.

It is never the case that the Upaniṣadic monistic conception banishes the divine aspects of God from the Absolute and divorces theism from its purview. The BU is never antagonistic towards theism however idealistic its philosophy may be. To this Upaniṣad, the Ātman or Brahman which is characterless and unmanifested (Avyakta) is the Supreme God and is prayed in theistic or beseeching terms:

"Lead me from unreality to Reality,
Lead me from darkness to Light,
Lead me from death to Immortality."
This voices the sentiments of the spiritual aspirant who wishes to rid himself from the fears of the empiric mortality. The BU considers all non-ātman aspects as incomplete or unreal and recommends the Upāsanā or worship of the Ātman who is Āvyakta, as follows:\(^1\) "He who meditates on one or another of the non-Ātman aspects, he does not know, for such aspect is incomplete, having only one or another (partial) of these characteristics. The Self is to be meditated upon, for in it all these aspects become one and united." This form of worship is Āvyaktopāsanā, which is the highest form of Upāsanā or worship or theism. The personal form, which is incomplete is not the ultimate form of the Ātman; and the attainment of the Absolute Supreme is through the teaching of Neti Neti i.e. at the annihilation of all these non-Ātman or unreal elements, and through the realisation that\(^2\) "There is nothing higher than this Absolute and that he is not this non-Ātman." With the banishment or annihilation of all non-Ātman elements, by the BU by Neti Neti on the one hand, it cannot recommend at the same time all such personal aspects as the forms to be meditated finally, on the other hand, for attainment of the Absolute. Hence the Upanisad stresses the need of Āvyakta Upasana. The other Upaniṣads also never hesitate to accept the Idealistic Absolute. Some of these Upaniṣads find the Āvyakta Upasana as very rigorous and difficult to be followed in the initial stage especially for a common man. The BG

\(^1\) स शैलो गुप्तेश्वर बालूकमुखस्य, न स बहु, अनु-चतुर्भूतिः स्वातन्त्र्यात्माकैर उन्नतिः अन्तः यथा शरीराक्षतः भवेऽति । ६२ १-४-७

\(^2\) अश्चर्यार्थेन आदेश्य नैति नैति छैतंशाहिदिति नैतंशाहिदिः नैतंशाहिदिः । ६२ १-३-६
therefore, recommends the worship of the personal form of the Lord for the training or purification or development of the mind of the common person, so as to grasp the Absolute and to concentrate upon the Absolute. The worship of Savikalpaka Brahman is recommended for attaining the Nirvikalpaka. Thus this transformation of Impersonal Brahman into a Personal God, being meant only for the purposes of worship or Upāsana should not be construed as a departure from the faith of idealistic Absolute Supreme. For example, the MU which considers the Puruṣa or Supreme Ātman "as Divine and formless, within and without and higher than the highest, immutable, and thus the Idealistic Absolute," assigns at the same time to Him, a form of Virāt Puruṣa and describes Him for the purpose of worship, "Fire is His head, His eyes are the Sun and the Moon, the quarters are His ears, His speech the revealed Vedas, air is His breath, His heart, the world; from His feet the earth is there; He is the Antarātman of all beings." Since the conception of the Form is for the worship of the Absolute such thoughts of Form need not be taken as contradictory to the idea of Absolute. It is relevant to note that they, both sorts of description appear in the same context also. The Supreme cannot be taken both-wise consistently, in view of the BS III-2-31. The Supreme has the greatness of his Impersonality III-2-14. Śrī explains in this Prakārana of the SB
that the transformation or difference in appearances like Mūrta or Amūrta is only for purposes of worship and not in reality. That God which we worship in mental or physical forms, which we adore, which we extol, which we hold in high esteem, is nothing but the Pratīka or the symbol of the Idealistic Absolute which is the Ultimate Truth. If Lord Kṛṣṇa or his Virūḍh form is the symbol of the Absolute in the BG, then Rudra or Maheśvara or Śiva is the symbol of the Absolute in SU, Viṣṇu in KU, and Prajāpati in MU. There is thus the least difference in these conceptions of forms, when the Absolute Truth which they represent is the same one Reality. Mait U states, "He verily is the Self within the heart very subtle, kindled like fire, endowed with multiple forms (Viśvarūpa). Of Him, all this is Annām (Aavyākṛta). In Him are woven creatures. He is the Self which is free from evils, ageless, deathless, griefless, free from uncertainty, free from fetters, whose conception is the Real, whose desire is the Real. He is the Supreme Lord; He is the Ruler of Bhūtas; He is the protector of the Bhūtas; He is the bridge and the substratum. This Self verily is the Lord, the beneficent Śambhu, Bhava, Rudra, Prajāpati, Viśvarūpa, Hiranyagarbha, Satya, Prāṇa, Bṛhma, S'asta, Achyuta, Viṣṇu, and Nārāyana. He who is there in the fire, He who is here in the yonder Sun; (all) He is One. To thee who are thus representing (1) Bhedaśya Utpāsanaṁvāt, Abheda tataśyaṁ || BS 558) III - 2-5-12.

(2) Puṣṭa hi avatāraṁbhūtas tiṣṭānaṁ ēkhoṁ jñānena vimśaḥpuṣṭaṁ svāstīvaṁ bhūyaṁ ēkhoṁ savākāśyaṁbhāyaṁ khaṁ śaśāyaṁ bhūyaṁ khaṁ śaśāyaṁ bhūyaṁ ēkhoṁ śaśāyaṁ bhūya centres of high esteem. If Lord Kṛṣṇa or his Virūḍh form is the symbol of the Absolute in the BG, then Rudra or Maheśvara or Śiva is the symbol of the Absolute in SU, Viṣṇu in KU, and Prajāpati in MU. There is thus the least difference in these conceptions of forms, when the Absolute Truth which they represent is the same one Reality. Mait U states, "He verily is the Self within the heart very subtle, kindled like fire, endowed with multiple forms (Viśvarūpa). Of Him, all this is Annām (Aavyākṛta). In Him are woven creatures. He is the Self which is free from evils, ageless, deathless, griefless, free from uncertainty, free from fetters, whose conception is the Real, whose desire is the Real. He is the Supreme Lord; He is the Ruler of Bhūtas; He is the protector of the Bhūtas; He is the bridge and the substratum. This Self verily is the Lord, the beneficent Śambhu, Bhava, Rudra, Prajāpati, Viśvarūpa, Hiranyagarbha, Satya, Prāṇa, Bṛhma, S'asta, Achyuta, Viṣṇu, and Nārāyana. He who is there in the fire, He who is here in the yonder Sun; (all) He is One. To thee who are thus representing (1) Bhedaśya Utpāsanaṁvāt, Abheda tataśyaṁ || BS 558) III - 2-5-12.
all forms and who are hidden in the space as Reality, my salutations". To be brief, according to BG, "whatever form any devotee desires to worship with faith, I recognize that faith of the particular devotee (and appear to him) in that very form." Thus the monistic Reality is SIVAM ADVATAN, S'IVAebraevala 3 . This is the Summum bonum; the Upanisads, therefore, stress the importance of the Upanisadic knowledge to attain this Monistic Reality by stating: "The Atman in the body, which is of the nature of light and pure, is attainable by Satya, Tapas and the Samyag-jñana, when the ascetics get free from all imperfections." "That God which is the Supreme Cause, is to be apprehended by the Śāṁskṛta Yoga, by knowing whom one is freed from the fetters (of dualities.)." The correct (Samyak) knowledge or the rational apprehension which is the same as Śāṁskṛta is thus found to be the main doctrine set in the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas and Upanisads and consistently developed with a progressive and continuous exposition. The Brāhmaṇas or Upanisads have literally and logically accepted the Vedic thoughts as their basis and authority, and ingeniously coated and gilded or enlarged the very Vedic views, with further castings, deliberations and systematic developments; and presented them in artistic and picturesque forms, with still more beautiful touchings. We thus find in the Upanisads the advance of Vedic knowledge blended with the rational and analytical methods and the Upāsanā or theism wedded to it as ancillary for the development of the mind—all meant for the attainment of the Upanisadic Purusa. Deussen

(1) अथ वो भि भि नृत्तु भि भि अऽहिः प्रिृति एवति। तस्य तथापि कृष्ण नित्योऽदिव विद्वद्वामयः॥
(2) MaU 7 (3) Su Ⅳ 18
(4) सर्वेन कर्मस्तपसा श्रेष्ठ आऽभि संचासानेन व्रजवर्धेन अत्यन्। MU Ⅳ 5
(5) तत्कालाप्नं सर्वेनोऽविषये सिद्धम् हि सुविचारः। Su Ⅳ 13
remark: "The sparks of philosophic light appearing in the RV (and other Vedas too) shine out brighter and brighter until at last in the Upaniṣads, they burst out in that bright flame which is able to light and warm us to-day." Sāmkhya or knowledge which was in a budding stage in the Vedas and which still appears green or raw fruit in the Brāhmanas has grown into a beautiful 'fruit' in the Upaniṣad. When we go to the Bhāgavata, we find it as a still more ripened fruit (Gālita Phala).

SĀMKHYA IN SMRĪTIS

The Smṛtis also play the same important part like the S'rutis in the history of Indian Philosophy. The Smṛtis are mentioned by the side of S'rutis and are therefore equally important. The S'rutis are called the revealed texts whereas the Smṛtis are those of human origin, which are meant to explain the S'rutis, taking them as authorities. The Smṛtis cover up the Itiḥāsas, Purāṇas, S'āstras etc.

The Artha-S'āstra of Kautilya mentions the Sāmkhya and Yoga as the regular philosophical systems as existing in its days. It does not mean by this that the Vedānta did not exist then at that time as a Philosophy. Sāmkhya and Vedānta had not still separated as distinct S'āstras. In view of the fact that Sāmkhya meant then Vedānta also, the reference to Sāmkhya included the Vedānta also and there was no need to make an independent reference to Vedānta. Very often the modern chronologists mistake this Sāmkhya of Artha S'āstra as the Classical Sāmkhya and introduce unexplainable difficulties and
confusions.

The MB is treated as Itiḥāsā in Indian Thought as against the Purāṇas which are mythologies. It contains at the same time the best pieces of Indian Philosophy which appear in the Sanat-Sujāṭīya and Mokṣa-dharma parts of S'āntiparvan, the BG in the Bhīṣma Parvan and the Anuģīta in the As'vamedha Parvan.

The Sanat-Sujāṭīya part of the MB is the one connected with the philosophical advice given by the Sanat-Kumāra to Dūrtaraśtra on the eve of the Kuru-Pāṇḍava war, at the request of Vidura to the former. The Sanat-Kumāras are the primary promoters of Indian Philosophy, who had mastered the same even from their very birth. When they remained true to philosophy and declined to take interest in worldly life, by resorting to creation work, even though so requested by the Kārya Brahman, the latter had to create other Prajāpatis for this purpose. The Sanat-Kumāras are mentioned in the MB as the great preachers of the Sāṃkhya. They are referred to in Cū Chapter VII as the sages whom the sage Narada approached for teaching the Ātmā Vidyā (Sāṃkhya Vidyā). They are also referred to in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa for having explained the Sāṃkhya or knowledge to the king Prthu. The Sāṃkhya of the Sanat-Kumāras which is preached in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa to the king Prthu, is covered by Bhakti or Bhāgavata principles.

The Sanat-Sujāṭīya is mostly connected with the expounding of the Upanisadic principles, upholding the greatness of knowledge in as much as it alone leads one to passover death, there being no other path other than this. Its main theme is Advaita Philosophy.
and S* has written a commentary on this Sanat-Sujātīya. This part comprises of three or four chapters. There is not much to be taken over from this episode for explaining here the Sāmkhya.

The Mokṣa-dharma Parvan of the MB has been previously dealt with while explaining the term "Sāmkhya" and its implications. Hence no necessity is felt to invoke this Parvan again, for furtherance of Sāmkhya thought. However, the Nārāyanīya portion of this Parvan will be taken up later on for explaining Bhagavata Dharma.

Now coming to the Bhagavadgītā, there are many volumes written by the ancient and recent thinkers, the Eastern and Western Writers, for explaining its preachings in their own ways. The Gīta Press of Gorakhpur have stated that in their Gīta Library there are 1300 collections of works on the BG published in 32 languages including eight foreign languages. There may be other works which may not have reached this Press. In view of such voluminous publications on the BG it seems unnecessary to elaborate on 'Sāmkhya in Bhagavadgītā' in great detail. We shall draw attention only to a few important points.

The term Sāmkhya is met with in some places in BG, and in the colophon of the second chapter of the Gītā it is called Sāmkhya-Yoga Adhārya. It has been previously explained by giving the quotation of Aurobindo that the Sāmkhya of the BG is not the Sāmkhya of the Classical Sāmkhya Kārikā and the Sāmkhya Sūtra. Sāmkhya in the BG means Upaniṣadic or Vedic knowledge or Jñāna and this purports to be its main theme. BG explains that "the path of Sāmkhya followers is that of Jñāna and that of Yogins"
is Karma-Yoga."¹ and obviously means by this that Śāńkhya means Jñāna. In another context it states² "This is the wisdom or knowledge (Buddhi) of Śāńkhya, explained to you. Listen now to that of Yoga. Resorting to the knowledge or wisdom of which you will be able to cast away the bondage of Karma." The BG is particular in establishing concordance or synthesis between Jñāna and Karma or Śāńkhya and Yoga by showing that the end of both the paths is one and the same. In view of its concentration on monism, it is called Īś'vara Smṛti. It preaches that if Karma is performed renouncing attachment and the desire for fruit, the way to knowledge will be available to such people, and that only under the favour of Jñāna, the Supreme reality will be realised. The BG stresses the predominance of Jñāna path by stating³, "The Jñānin is extremely dear to the God and extremely dear is the God to him." It however states⁴ that "the true followers of Jñāna are very rare." The greatness of the path of knowledge is also praised by stating, "He whose Karmas are burnt away by Jñāna is called as wise."⁵ The sense of annihilation of Karma is brought out by stating, "The fire of knowledge reduces all karmas to ashes." The BG further states⁶, "Cutting asunder by the sword of Jñāna, the doubt of ignorance or Avidya in your heart, stand up and resort to work (of fighting)." It epitomizes monistically the whole conception.
of Jñāna or Jñānin by stating that "the Jñānin is the Soul himself" and that "nothing is so pure as Jñāna or knowledge" and that even if one is the most sinful among all sinners, he will cross over all sins by the raft of knowledge." With this exaltation or greatness in the background, Jñāna is defined:

"Stabilisation in self-knowledge and the insight into the end of knowledge or God or Tattva is declared to be knowledge; what is contrary to this is called ignorance." The fruit or result of such Jñāna is explained by it, "By acquiring knowledge, you will no more be subjected to delusion like this, and through it only you will be able to perceive all beings in your own self and then in me."

The BG has based all its views on the Upanisads. Its theories of Jñāna as explained above, its view of the Absolute, and of the Godhood, and its outlook of Prakṛti or Maya are all based on the Upanisadic principles. The BG is therefore, correctly described as the cream or essence (Amrta) of the milk, milked by the Lord for the calf Arjuna from the cows of Upanisads. There is thus a continuity of thought between the BG and the Upanisads and no departure from the same can be noticed therein.

Sometimes some interpreters, without reading between the lines, do not interpret the BG correctly. The BG metamorphoses the Absolute or the Impersonal God as Lord Kṛṣṇa, the personal

(1) Ṛgveda 1.162.18 (2) Ṛgveda 1.162.38 (3) Ṛgveda 1.162.38 (4) Ṛgveda 1.162.38 (5) Ṛgveda 1.162.38 (6) Ṛgveda 1.162.38
God, but this is never done by it with a view to underrate the Absolute. There is no idea of degradation of the Absolute contemplated by the Bhagavad Gita, while expounding its philosophy, through the 'I-ness' or personal aspect of Lord Krishna. Lord Krishna elevates or exalts himself to the status of the Absolute and by symbolizing himself as the Absolute, He propounds or exposes the greatness of the Absolute, like the Vāc-Ambhaṛati in the Hymn RV IX-125 or the Vāmadeva in the Hymn IV-26. There are some thinkers, who however hold in higher esteem the Personal God as the sublime and consider the Impersonal God as powerless, actionless and unrealistic and lower in rank than the Personal. The greatness of the Impersonal idealistic Absolute (Nirvis'esa) is not given any place by them and is made subordinate to that of Personal or Realistic Lord (Savis'esa). The controversies over "Idealism" and Realism" have made some of the thinkers to wrangle over the establishment of the superiority of the Personal God to that of the Impersonal. Such thinkers are carried away by the Western concepts of Idealism and Realism in which they want to fix the Indian concepts of Idealism and Realism, though they differ materially from each other. To the Western thinkers, Realism is higher than Idealism in conception. The Indian theme of Reality or "Satya" while establishing "Satyasya Satyaṁ" cannot be identified with the Western Reality as defined by the Western thinkers and brought within the framework of their Reality. This ultimate Satya or Realism of 'Up' is the highest idealistic Absolute Truth which cannot correspond with the Western Realism. We need not, therefore, fall under the influence of the concept of Western Realism and throw away our idealism in
the background as a mere ideal or idea. Without being led away by the Western Idealism or Realism, we will have to approach the aspects of Personal and Impersonal God of the BG and the Upanisads.

Dasgupta states in his "Indian Idealism,"1 "Read in the light of this idea, God is not only immanent and transcendent as well. The immanent part which forms a cosmic universe is no illusion or mirage but is an emanation, a development from God... The transcendent part, which may be said to be the root high up, which is the basis of all that has grown in this lower world, is thus the differenceless Reality, the Brahman; but though the Brahman, is again and again referred to as being the highest abode of the ultimate realisation, the absolute essence, yet God in his Super-personality, transcends even Brahman in the sense that Brahman, however great it may be, is only a constitutive essence in the complex personality of God. The all-perceiving nature and the fact that he is the essence and upholder of all things in this world are again and again emphasised in the Geeta in various ways." In this connection Dasgupta relies and quotes BG S'lokas IX-4 & 5 by translating them, "In MY MANIFESTED FORMS I am pervading the whole world; all beings exist completely in me but I do not exist in them. Yet so, do I transcend them that none of the beings exist in 'ME'... I am the upholder of all beings. I do not exist in them and yet I am their procreator." It is not known how Dasgupta has translated "Auyakta-Murtina" of these S'lokas as 'Manifested Forms', inspite  

---

(1) Dasgupta, "Indian Idealism", p. 57.

(2) भग्न तत्तन्तत्वपूर्वनामभूतात्पूर्वतीति भास्करानि सर्वभूतानि श्रुतानि श्रुतिभूतानि व योगमेयार्गम् भूतानि भूतानि भूतानि भूतानि भूतानि भूतानि भूतानि भूतानि भूतानि भूतानि

BG IX-4 and 5.
of its clear meaning "Unmanifested Forms." The Creator God, in his unmanifested form, covers up the entire Universe. Th BG wants to expound that all this Universe, all these beings, are the 'Brahman' itself and have the God behind, above and before it. But the world or the beings are all limited by Maya and if the limitations of beings which are Mayā creations, are taken into consideration, the Lord is above the beings and cannot be a limited being and hence the Lord says "I am not in them."

This explains the transcendency of the Absolute, its being above Mayā or Yoga-Mayā, the Mayā limitations and that the Mayā and the beings limited by it do not dwell in the Lord and limit the Absolute. This purports to depict the Absolute as being free from Mayā or its Guṇas, and His Nirguṇatva. It must also be noted that the Saguna Brahman, the Lord by becoming Saguna does not lose his "Unmanifestedness." The Guṇas or Mayā which is accepted by the Lord for purposes of creation, will not, however, reduce the greatness or the status of the Absolute. The creation is not a complete manifestation of the Lord. The word 'Avyakta' used here is very relevant, since the creation through Mayā does not exhaust the Lord. The creation is only a 'Mayā' or illusory expression i.e. an unreal appearance. How can unreality blur the Reality? 'Never' is the reply. The Sagunatva is an unreal appearance, and hence the personal characteristics of creations etc. are presented in Him as an unreal phase. These verses of the BG, it may be noted, do not anywhere imply the greatness of the Personal God or his superiority over the Absolute Impersonal God. It should be noted that the relative expressions 'immanence' or 'transcendence'

1) श्रेष्ठ वैदिक मूर्ति, पुराणार्थः, पञ्चायत्नं, विभिन्न नामावलीं न |
     अध्यात्मिकः प्रत्येकं श्रेष्ठवैदिक विभिन्न बोधविषयम् || HU 13-2-11 ||
as can be seen from the TU saying (Sacca tyacca abhavat) are consequent to the Lord involving in creation and are connected with the Personal God, and Dasgupta is considering them as different aspects of the Personal God and Impersonal God respectively. The aspect of Māyā which is necessary for creation has nothing to do with the Impersonal God. The Lord makes the Māyā or Avidya powerful. Due to this Māyā only, the Lord appears as if distributed in the creation. It would be unupaśadic to state that the Saguna or Personal Brahman is transcending Nirguna or Impersonal Brahman and to state that the Sagunatva is an additional qualification for culmination of the Nirguna Brahman. Dasgupta also relies on BG verses VII-7,8 by translating them,

"There is nothing greater than 'I'. All things are held in 'ME' like pearls in the thread of a pearl garland;" The first clause "Mattah Parataram" is not properly translated here. These verses will have to be read together with the previous verse which reads,

"I am the Source or Cause for the entire creation and dissolution (of the Universe)" "Mattah Parataram Nanyat Kīncidasti" , read with this verse, means (for this creation) there is nothing else (as the cause or source) besides me." By straining or twisting this clause "Mattah Parataram," Dasgupta is stating "There is nothing else greater than 'I', meaning thereby," "There is no other reality (even the Absolute Impersonal) greater than the Saguna or Personal creating God."

This is obviously a misconstruction and an incorrect presentation of the true spirit of the Bhāgavata BG or the Upanisads.

(1) taudabhātikāya saṁca uṣhaabhavat | TU II-6-1
(2) Bhataḥ pratara nabhakākhyatiśva dhananjayaṁ bhimaya sarvapitāṁ bhitantaṁ tatas tuñJam bhāgīganva ṇavaṁ | BG VII-7
(3) pracaśitaṁ bhūtanāṁ svarācaśūpaśvāpaṁ | ahaṁ kūtastya viṇāsya prabhavaṁ bhūtastathaṁ | BG VII-6
Maharsi Aurobindo, perhaps relying on such translations states in his 'Essays on the Gita', "It is hinted but not yet expressly stated that this Divine exceeds even the immutable Self (Impersonal)". No quotations from the BG are indicated to support such a direct or indirect view of the 'Divine exceeding the Immutable Absolute.' The BG on the other hand states in VII-24 "Men of no understanding think of Me who am the Unmanifest as having manifestation, not knowing the Absolute Reality (Param Bhavaṃ) Changeless and Supreme." This very spirit is also conveyed in a like verse IX-11. This authority itself conveys that the Absolute Reality or the Impersonal Godhood which is the Ultimate Reality, as stated by the Lord, is not properly construed. To add to this it may be noted that the Creator God 'Is'vara', the G‎uropean Gods - (Brahman, Viṣṇu and S'īva) - Kṣetraṇa, Hiranyagarbha, Aksara Brahman, Kūtastha, etc who are endowed with Māyā are all synonymous terms. They have the glories or the greatness of creations etc. In another context in Chapter XV, the Lord Kṛṣṇa states, "There are two kinds of Puruṣas viz Ksara Puruṣa and the Aksara Puruṣa. The Ksara Puruṣa means all these Bhūtas (creatures) and the Aksara is the Kūtastha Puruṣa." The next verse of BG reads, "But other than these, there is the highest Puruṣa (Puruṣottama) who is (also) called Paramatman, who as the undying Lord, (Avyaya Is'vara),

(1) EG, pp. 234-235
(2) अविाते भविशयातुर्मण्ये भवन्ते मामपद्युप्ये पर्भावेऽज्ञर्ती भवेऽद्यपद्यास्तमम् भगवद्गीता ६.४४
(3) पर्भावेऽज्ञर्ती भवेऽद्यपद्यास्तमम् भगवद्गीता ६.४४-११
(4) क्षेत्रनां हि पुरुषाः कोदन्ते कर्मसंस्कृतां वृजन् प्रथमोऽवितिः स्वरूपायाम् कृतस्थायां उच्छयते॥ भगवद्गीता ६.३५-१६
(5) उस्मां पुरुषसन्यासं परस्मार्कोर्भुवं का वृहद्धकार्यान्तरमक्ष्यभवितो यथायते॥ भगवद्गीता ६.३५-२५

interpenetrating the three worlds, sustains them (by his essence as existence) (Svarūpasadbhāvamātreṇa). The personal God is equated with Akṣara Brahman or Kṛṣṭastha Brahman. (These terms appear in verses VII-21 and XV-16). In all these aspects He is associated with Māya. But the Lord in his naive state or the Supreme is free from Māya and its Upādhis. Such Impersonal Supreme Truth, or Reality is Puruṣottama. He is mentioned by the MU, as "Divya Puruṣa"II-1-2 " Parama Puruṣa" (III-2-3) and by the SU, "Agryaṃ Puruṣam Mahāntam " (III-19). The KU states "Beyond this (Supreme) Puruṣa there is nothing. That is the end; that is the goal."1 This Puruṣottama is Nitya S'uddha Buddhamukta, in the native state, and the absolute essence (Svarūpā) 'Nirātis'aya Paramātman ' who is Nirguna, Nirdvandva. He is described2 "I, the Uttama Puruṣa, am beyond the Ksara Puruṣa and Superior to the Akṣara Puruṣa. Hence it is that I am known in the world as well as in the Veda as the Puruṣottama." The next verse further reads that he who realises or knows this will become 'Sarva-Vit.' It is often confused by some by holding that the Puruṣottama is the Personal God or the Saguṇa Virat Puruṣa, which is against the spirit of the BG. In the case of Puruṣottama to which the 'I-ness' of the Lord Kṛṣṇa is elevated, there is no question of comparative or Superlative greatness, all greatness being one and the same here. The Puruṣottama, the unparallel non-dualistic or Advaitya Paramātman who is free from Guṇas, admits no aspects of relative Knower or Knowing or Knowledge even. The assumption of all attributes by the Saguṇa Brahman and the denial of all Guṇas

1 KU I-3-11
2 KU XV-18
3 BG XV-19
in the Ultimate will explain the immensity of the Absolute who in his essence is self-sufficient and self-complete (Pūrgat Pūrpaṃ) and Self-luminous (Svayājyotī) and Satyam Jñānam Anantam and Ananda as explained by the Upaniṣads. To attribute any inferiority to such Absolute (by characterising Him) is against the tenets of the BG. Radhakrishnan states, "It is therefore, wrong to argue that according to the Gita, the Impersonal Ātman is lower in reality than the Personal Is'vara." This Absolute is delineated also in the BG2, in tune with the Nāsadiya Sūkta of the RV3. The Supreme Absolute Brahman is beginningless and is neither 'Sat' nor 'Asat'. The BG further with a view to avert any misapprehension of categorising Him, as a non-entity or Śūnya describes Him as a transcending God in the manner of the Pūrpa-Sūkta. While explaining the greatness of the Absolute, the CU clearly states "Its (Saguna Brahman) greatness is to this much extent, yet the Absolute Pūrpa is greater still." In the circumstances, it will not be appropriate to consider the Impersonal Absolute Brahman as lower to the Personal Saguna Brahman.

There is however a verse in the BG which reads "I am the Pratisthā of Brahman, I am the immortal and the imperishable, of eternal law and of absolute bliss." S' interprets the word 'Pratisthā' as the manifester or exhibitor of the power of Brahman. He

---

(1) Pāṇini, I, p.544.  (2) अनादिक्षितं परं गृहं न स्वं न अर्थसत् उच्यते | Bg XIII-12.
(3) RV X-12-1
(4) सत्यत्वं प्राचीनत्वं चतुर्वित्ति च स्थिरत्वं सुरत्वं स्वतंत्रत्वं स्वतंत्रत्वं नासादिया सुक्तं | Bg XIII-13
(5) गृहतिमः ब्रह्माः, नसादियाः ब्रह्माः | Bg XIII-12-6
(6) ब्रह्मणोऽहिता नासादियोऽहिता वर्णनस्य स्वप्रतिष्ठानां त्र्यमुद्ध्वतिः सूक्ते पुराणोऽहिता | Bg XIV-2.7

---
alternatively explains the term 'Brahman' as the Savikalpaka Brahman. R interprets Brahman as the emancipated Soul and M interprets it as 'Māyā'. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī means thereby the Personal God, while Nīlkanṭha takes it as 'Veda'. But Brahman is not interpreted by any as the Nirvikalpaka Brahman, meaning thereby that "'I' am the abode or the Adhisthāna of the Nirvikalpaka Brahman," and thus giving scope to the view that 'I' am greater than the Impersonal Brahman", which is not the sense of this Sloka according to any of the three great Ācāryas.

BG uses the word 'Prakṛti' more frequently than the Upanisads. Dasgupta understands Prakṛti of BG as follows, "Three Prakṛtis of God are referred to in the BG— the Prakṛti of God as Cosmic matter, Prakṛti as the nature of God from which all life and spirit have emanated, and Prakṛti as Māyā or the power of God from which the three guṇas have emanated."

BG divides Prakṛti in two ways; (1) Apara Prakṛti i.e., lower Prakṛti consisting of eight elements and (2) Para Prakṛti i.e., Chaitanya Prakṛti of the Lord which exists in the form of Jīva by which the whole world is upheld. The Apara Prakṛti itself can be equated with Māyā, since it includes the Buddhi or citta. Dasgupta however recognises Māyā as a distinct category instead of bringing it under Lower Prakṛti or Apara Prakṛti. Māyā is described in BG as follows:— "This wonderful illusion

(i) Dasgupta, 'Indian Idealism', p. 58
(ii) Bhūmikāpādaṃ बामुं द्व भक्तेव वर्णितं अन्तर्कार इतीये ये भिक्षु मृत्तिरंपरिधाये। अपरेद्धीतित्वां प्रकृति विद्वेदे मे परमे अवगुण्डेव महाबाहुं यथेऽञ्च भृतिः अगुण्डै। ब्रव भा-४ एवं ५।
(iii) तैत्तिरीय गुणाभावी मम भायं दुर्लक्षया। नामेव ये प्राप्यां भायामेवं स्वर्णेऽद्य। भगवान दिव। ब्रह्मचारिणया यज्ञ रूपमेव। ब्रह्मचारिणया यज्ञ रूपमेव।
of mine consisting of three guṇas, is extremely difficult to be got over; those, however, who take refuge in ME alone cross it."

Here Maya is one having three guṇas and is also called Guṇamayī like Prakṛti. These guṇas are born of Nature according to verse XIII-15. Hence no distinction need be made between Apara Prakṛti and Maya. Apara Prakṛti which is illusory (Mohini) and which is with predominance of 'Tamas' may be also taken as Rākṣasī or Jāsūri Prakṛti and that same one, with the predominance of Sattva, as Daivi Prakṛti. Daivi Maya in IX-13 and Daivi Prakṛti in XIII-12 are not distinct. Prakṛti or Maya even with Sattva Guṇa is illusory (XIV-5). The Maya which is also called Yoga Maya or Daivi Maya, because of its closeness with the Lord does not allow the free cognition of the Lord by all. BG reads, "I am not revealed to all, since I am veiled by the Yoga Maya".

The Lord is the controller of Maya in the BG which has no reality or basis of its own. S'loka 10 of IX reads, "Under my prevdence, the Prakṛti gives birth to all things moving and unmoving and by this means, the world revolves." This clearly establishes the unreality of the Maya, which is all dependent upon the Lord. The world, which has its origination or Hetu from the Maya, is also therefore unreal. The Lord is above the Guṇas, (Ehyāḥ param avyāyam) and the Sākṣi of the

(1) विभिन्नाश्च द्वोषेऽविशेषः सर्वसिद्धि नागर्जुनायः सत्सन्निधिः भोजेत्वा परमविधयः। बग धीमास्ते ॥ ८४-१३ ।
(2) दिनां दिनां तथापि गुणोद्वादिति सत्सन्ति समाभवतोऽविशेषः। बग धीमास्ते ॥ ८४-१५। --तुपः अपूर्तिसम्भवः। बग धीमास्ते ॥ ८४-१५।
(3) राजसीयायुरार्थज्ञातिः वै अपूर्तिः कृत्तिः सत्सन्तिः। बग धीमास्ते ॥ ८४-१५।
(4) अपूर्तिसम्भवसः, भत्तस्य प्रकृतिः ज्ञातिः। बग धीमास्ते ॥ ८४-१५।
(5) अपूर्तिसम्भवसः, त्रिनेत्रायुरार्थज्ञातिः। बग धीमास्ते ॥ ८४-१५।
(6) अपूर्तिसम्भवसः, त्रिनेत्रायुरार्थज्ञातिः। बग धीमास्ते ॥ ८४-१५।
(7) बग धीमास्ते ॥ ८४-१५। (Noted at 1 above)
performances of Māyā. The Prakṛti thus, in the BG, is a source of delusion and a reality, the reality being only the Absolute. This Apara Prakṛti is insentient and acts under the guidance of the Lord, having no reality of its own. As against this, there is the Para Prakṛti which is sentient.

Maharsi Aurobindo considers this 'Para Prakṛti' "as the will and executive power of the Purusa, his activity of being, not a separate entity, but Himself in power." He wants to explain the Prakṛti as not a separate entity but his inseparable part. He also further states, "The Supreme Prakṛti is not merely a presence of the power of spiritual being immanent in cosmic activities. For then it might be only the inactive presence of the all-pervading self, immanent in all things or containing them, compelling in a way the world action but not itself active. Nor is this highest Prakṛti the avyakta of the Sākhyaśa, the primary unmanifest seed-state of the manifest active eight-fold nature of things, the one productive original force of Prakṛti out of which her many instrumental and executive powers evolve, but it is much more - - it is the integral conscious - power of the Supreme Being, 'Cit-S'akti', which is behind the self and the cosmos." The Advaitins do not accept any S'akti in the Absolute while Maharsi Aurobindo treats Para Prakṛti as 'Cit-S'akti'. There is a great polemic on this point of Aurobindo, in which we do not want to indulge in great details.

The Apara Prakṛti has in it the Buddhī or Vijnāna element which is active in appearance, and is not a mere insentient shadow. The Māyā is the highest power in itself, with the

[1] See also p. 384 and 484, 2 for further details of Cit-S'akti

[2] See also p. 278, 3 for further details of Cit-S'akti
Avarana and Viksepana powers, but the 'Maya' or 'Apara Prakrti' is not the 'Cit-Svarupa' or the essence of the Supreme. 'Cit' to the Advaitin is the essence of the Supreme and not the power of the Supreme. 'Maya' or 'Apara Prakrti' according to the view of those who call it as 'Cit-S'akti' would be raised to the level of sentient Supreme by becoming an indivisible essence or Cit-Svarupa of the Supreme, but it is not so here. It is taken only as a power of the Creative or Saguna Lord or Is'vara. It has no reality according to BG but still it is not, as false as the hare's horns. It is not false "Tucchha" like 'Vandhyā Prātra' but it is only mithyā. It is a positive element but having its existence always dependent on the Supreme. It moves under the superintendence of the Lord (Maya adhyakṣa). If it were the 'Cit', where was the necessity for Lord Kṛṣṇa to introduce the 'Lord's superintendence.'?

The Parā Prakṛti is the life of the Universe. It is the Kṣetrajña, whereas Apara Prakṛti is the Kṣetra. The next verse of BG reads," Know that all 'Bhūtas' or beings have their origin in these two Prakṛtis. I am thus the source of entire creation (of the two prakṛtis) and in me again it dissolves." The opening word 'Etad' of this couplet refers to both the Prakṛti (Kṣetra) and Kṣetrajña as interpreted by Ś and not to Parā Prakṛti only as interpreted by Aurobindo. The two together Parā and 'Apara' belong to one spiritual whole Is'vara who is the cause.

(1) सत्यार्थ्योपेयं अवृत्तिः सूक्ते संपवचवरम् || BG IX-10
(2) प्रृत्यक्षविद्युताणि सांवयनीपुप्पात्या अहुँ कृत्तस्य जगते अभवे प्रत्यक्षकाला || BG VII-6
(3) प्रृत्यक्षविद्युताणि पुरात पच्छिरे हस्तहो ज्ञातकः प्रकृती || प्रृत्यक्षविद्युताणि पुरात पच्छिरे हस्तहो ज्ञातकः प्रकृती | BG (58), pp 198-199. (4) G1 p. 238
of the Universe and therefore, both Kṣetra and Kṣetrajña belong to the Lord. Thus the purport of the whole saying is that Lord Kṛṣṇa is Purusottama; Parā Prakṛti is the Kṣetrajña; and Aparā Prakṛti is the physical nature or Kṣetra. Radhakrishnan states, "Both of them form the nature of the one Supreme. They are the constitutive stuff of the world. That is why the Lord is said to be support of the world."

Ranade, while explaining the development of Māyā in BG states, "It must be remembered that here (in BG) we have to investigate the doctrine of Māyā in ideas rather than words." The Aparā Prakṛti or the Avyakta Prakṛti allows sufficient ground to convey the unreality of Māyā, though its phenomenal reality is accepted. If the Phenomenal Reality of the Samsāra or Jagat had not been preached to Arjuna by the Lord, his philosophy for Arjuna to fight would have failed. This background should be understood as to why Māyā theory does not directly and predominantly appear in detail in BG, but its aspects of unreality are very often expounded.

The BG treats in detail the Guna theory and has specified like the Mait. U the characteristics and powers of each of the three Gunas. Further details of Gunas will appear under the Bhāgavata Chapter.

Thus the BG is an adaptation of Upaniṣadic ideals synthesising, in brief, both Sāmkhya and Yoga. It has incorporated or fused the Bhāgavata or Bhakti or theistic ideals with Jñāna by weaving them closely with the Upaniṣadic ideals, as can be seen from the very title "Bhagavadgītā". Like

(1) Jf. I, p. 541
(2) CSUP, p. 223
the STI, it has elevated the Personal God Lord Kṛṣṇa to the state of the Absolute Ātman by stating "I am the Ātman seated in the heart of all beings."¹ "I am known in the world as well as in the Vedas as Puruṣottama"² "The Paramātman even dwelling in the body is the Parā Puruṣa (Puruṣottama)³" Veiled by my Yoga Māyā, I am not manifest to all. Hence the ignorant folk do not recognize me as the unborn and imperishable (Paramātman).⁴ "It also preaches "My devotees (Bhaktas) in the end attain me."⁵ "At the end of many births the man of knowledge attains me, knowing that Vāsudeva is all that is. Such a great soul is difficult to be found."⁶ "Fix your mind on 'ME'. Be my devotee; worship me; Revere me; To 'ME' shalt thou come"⁷ "Abandoning all faiths (Dharma) come to 'ME' alone for shelter."⁸ The main theme of BG is to identify one's self with that of the Lord by surrendering one's mind entirely to the Personal God, which is the Impersonal. The Bhāgavata cult preaches the Bhakti path as an easy method for the attainment of the Supreme. Bhagavad-Gītā in furtherance of this Bhakti or Bhāgavata cult has devoted Chapter XII entirely for preaching the Bhakti path in addition to picking together verses blended in other Chapters.

Bhāgavata Dharma was already in vogue prior to Lord Kṛṣṇa's period, as is being explained later on. The cult of Nārāyaṇa was there earlier to Lord Kṛṣṇa, reference...

¹ निम्नलिखित नायना म स्वातः सत्संसारम् ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
² एवं गौतमप्रथम परमेश्वरम् ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
³ पारमात्मनं नाम यथा ज्ञातं स्वरूपं ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
⁴ आभलदानम् नाम भवति नामो विवर्धनं ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
⁵ जय हरियोहाय स्वयं श्रीमान्यं स्वयं महाराजं ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
⁶ श्रीमानं श्रीमानं श्रीमानं श्रीमानं श्रीमानं ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
⁷ तस्मात् भक्तिपरिवर्त्यं तस्मानं कृपाप्रियं तस्मात् भक्तिपरिवर्त्यं ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
⁸ तत्तद्वितीयप्रथमं तस्मात् भक्तिपरिवर्त्यं ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥
being made to it in the SB and Ait. etc. The Viṣṇu cult is mentioned in the RV and 'Viṣṇu' is identified with the Supreme Puruṣa of the Puruṣa Sūkta and with all sacrifices etc. Lord Kṛṣṇa had become popular during his own life period, because of his service to the public, his lofty ideals, his high philosophical conceptions, his successes and attainments in his life. If Lord Kṛṣṇa was recognised as the embodiment of 'Vāsudeva' Tattva in his life period on account of his great personality, why should we hesitate to accept it simply because there are no so-called extraneous evidences in support of it? Why should we hesitate to take MB work to the period of Lord Kṛṣṇa? We go up to Panini age or earlier, but why should we not go still further and accept the MB etc. as sufficient authority for its antiquity? Lord Kṛṣṇa was traditionally known as the great preacher of the Bhāgavata Tattva. The "BHAGAVADGĪTĀ" is the master piece of his own philosophical ideals, which are responsible for immortalising Him as the descent of God. Why should we not accept this and ascribe historically BG to Lord Kṛṣṇa? We do not hesitate to accept the personality of Lord Christ or Lord Buddha; but why hesitate to accept Lord Kṛṣṇa? Why should one raise the question of antiquity for this only? There need not be any sufficient ground for disbelieving the personality of the Lord. Are not these lofty gospels like "Worship any God, (any creed) that will come to me (Supreme)"? "Be all, all will become thee"? "Surrender to the God; God will present to thee, by being thy Saviour, sufficient to touch one's heart?"

(1) वैदिक्यातिक भक्ति महान कल्याण्का अनुवादकीति | तेषानि समस्या कौशिकैव व्याकरणविद्याभिनवकृतां | १२ ॥ २३.
(2) स्पर्शसातात्सूतात्मका | १२ ॥ ७ - ७
(3) संदर्भात्मक परिकल्पनाय कथनेकं स्वरूपम् क्रजां | अहं तिवं सर्वदेहायं मोक्षाध्येतिमि भगवान् हृद-प्रवा | १२ अष्टि - ६६.
Madhusūdan Sarasvati, who is the staunch Advaitin clearly explains Bhakti as a mental state in which the mind moved by an ecastasy of love towards the Lord assumes the shape of God. When we lose our mind by our intense surrender or love towards the God or by the Tanmayatā on account of our attachment to Him and reach the high altitude of identity of our own Self to be the Supreme Self, what is there to be attained by the devotee? This is exactly what the BG preaches; and this is the Bhakti cult or the Bhāgavata cult in essence. When the devotion culminates in this high ecstatic level, there will be spontaneous light of wisdom. The message of the BG is more mystic than classical or metaphysical. It is for us to grasp it and to raise our selves to the highest status. The attainment of such status is itself the reward. To a perfect devotee or Bhāgavata, the vision of Viśrāta Svarūpa is not a high attainment, since the ambition of his is to be Himself the Viśrā or the Supreme Self, or the 'ME' of Lord Kṛṣṇa. This is what the Bhakti or Sāmkhya of the BG aims at.

The Anu Gītā of MB is a later work than BG as stated in the work itself. It is a sort of a refresher course of BG; and when the BG aspects are already covered here, there is no need to go into Anu Gītā at length.