CHAPTER - X

EARLY PHILOSOPHICAL VIEWS IN VEDAS AND UPANISADS.

We have seen above that the Nyāya Sūtras have refuted some prāvādūka- drṣṭis. The question that suggests itself to one's mind is: What could have been the source of these prāvādūka- drṣṭis and who could have held these views? The only early literature which we can look to for an answer, consists of the Vedas and the canonical works of the Buddhists and the Jainas as also some other early philosophical works pertaining to these different currents of thought.

So we may now proceed to examine whether the philosophical theories found in these Āgamic and other philosophical works agree in content and argument with the prāvādūkadrṣṭis of the Nyāya-Sūtra, and if so, to what extent, the latter can be related to the former; and if they differ, how the difference could be accounted for. In this chapter, therefore, we shall first of all discuss the Vedic and Upaniṣadic views.

The Vedas represent the most outstanding embodiment of the resplendent glory of the dawn of Indian Culture. As Indian tradition would have it, the inspired sages of the Vedas were the seers of the Vedic hymns and not mere composers or Versifiers.

1. Gt. साधनात्मकसमाधानः कथयोऽभिनुः ।
   - निःक्षणः, कृष्ण ।
It is generally observed that the Vedic poets or the sages, mostly praised the elements of nature, to wit: the Dawn (उष्ण), the Sun (सूर्य) etc. etc. They treated them as deities and offered prayers and even oblations to them with a view to gain worldly happiness and enjoyment. Thus, the religion of the Vedas appears, to a great extent, to be a religion of 'give and take'. All the same, upon a closer look, one cannot fail to notice that the desire for worldly pleasures was not the sole desire which appealed to the sages. Time and again, a tendency to raise philosophical questions about the origin of the world or the like is found therein. As M. Winternitz puts it. " .......... There are about a dozen hymns in the Rgveda, which can be designated as philosophical hymns, in which, along with the speculation on the universe and the creation of the universe, that great pantheistic idea of the Universal Soul, as being one with the entire universe, is presented, for the first time, an idea, which has dominated the whole of Indian philosophy.

Among the philosophical hymns of the Rgveda, those which need a special mention are RV. X. 72, RV. X 81,

RV. X 82, RV. X 90, RV. X 121 and RV. X 129. These hymns deal with the problems pertaining to the certain of the world, the primeval elements, the creator and the self. The ideas, though in quite a preliminary stage, give us a very good sketch of the rise and development of the philosophical thought of that age.

To quote Radhakrisnan, "Three strata of development are found in the thought of the hymns of the Rgveda: naturalistic polytheism, monotheism and monism".

The Vedic seers, in the beginning worshipped almost all the elements of nature as gods. But later, "dissatisfied with the old mythology and impelled by that longing for simplicity of explanation so natural to men, started upon seeking after not the causes of natural phenomena, but their first or ultimate cause. and strived to discover the one God that controls and rules over them all".

To praise and worship a single God as the highest of all is a tendency described as Henotheism by Max Muller. Thus there are passages in the hymns, where the natural elements

---

1. The translation occurring hereafter from the Rgvedic hymns is according to Macdonell except where mentioned.
like water, fire, sun, breath etc. are regarded as the
supreme elements and the evolution of the world is described
from these elements. Such is to start with Rv. x-121,
where, as Macdonell observes, "the water is in producing
Agni, regarded as bearing the germ of all life".

R.V. n 168.3 regards Air as the principle of
things (आधार); and the ruling force of the universe
(प्रमुख राजा). According to the seer of this hymn, air
is "the soul or the Vital spirit of Gods, and in air,
lies the very origin of all life.

But then the question naturally arises as to what
is the source of Air? The sage of the above Rgvedic hymn
does not answer that question and it is left as an unsolved
riddle. The Atharvaveda substitutes Vital Breath (Prāṇaḥ)
for Air (Vāyuḥ) and says. "Homage to breath (prāṇaḥ) in
whose control is this all, who hath been Lord of all, in
whom, all stands firm."

1. *A History of Sanskrit literature,* p. 114 -
by A. A. Macdonell.

It runs thus in RV. x 127. 7 -

\[ वापो क यद बृहरिक्रित्यमास गम्य दुधाना कायमति: अविनयी । 11 \]

2. *बाल्यां वेदानां मुनाश्च गम्यः । ( - के वेद १०.१०६.४)

3. *प्राणाय नमः यस्य सर्विनिमित्वाय वायुः यो मुनिविभेदवर्यः
वायस्मध्वयं प्रतिपित्तम् । - अथर्वेद, १०. ६. १."
It further describes the vital Breath as the Lord of all - of all that is animate and even inanimate, i.e., both what breathes and what does not; and regards it as the guiding power.

But this view also does not appear to account fully or even satisfactorily for the source of all things. So "in order to derive a philosophic abstraction from the world as experienced," the conception of the Sun is formed. According to RV. I. 115. 1., the Sun is the soul of all that is movable or immovable. In the view propounded in RV. I 164.12, all living beings rest and depend on the sun. The component substances of the Sun are here considered as three: Palita (a grey coloured substance), lightning and fire. Giving some more details, it is said in RV. I 164.46 that "the Being in fact is one which is called by many names by the sages."

This verse represents the monotheism of the Vedic philosophers. They, fed up with the crowding of many gods and goddesses in Vedic polytheism, started identifying one god with another or throwing all gods together;—a tendency

1. प्राण: सर्वस्वेष्वरो यज्ञ प्राणाति यज्ञ न। - अथविद, ११. ६. १

2. cf. एक्ष विविधस्व बहुवा कथिति।
simpler and more logical. And then the Vedic seer seems to
be impelled by a longing to discover the one God that controls
and rules over them all. So in RV.x.121, he gives vent to the
question, "What god shall we with sacrifices worship"?

The sage of this hymn, who as we have seen above,
regarded water as the germ of life, now strives to discover
some higher principle behind the water and hence asks: "Who
with his mighty power

Surveyed the waters, that intellect and
Sacrifice engendered, The one God over all the
Gods exalted, What God shall we
With sacrifices worship "?

We next come to that hymn of RV. (x.82) where, a
desire is expressed to find out the primeval germ which the
waters cherished. It is also asked in the same verse; "Who is
our father, parent and disposer, who knows all habitants
and all beings; who only to the Gods their name portions,
To him all other beings turn inquiring"?

The answer is provided in the next verse:

1. RV. x 121. 7 -
2. cf. RV. x 121. 8.
3. RV. x 82. 5 -
"That germ primeval did the waters cherish, wherein the Gods together all assembled, the one that in the goat's source is established within which all the worlds are comprehended."

Thus, the sage declares him to be the 'Viśvākarma', the 'God', who is the maker, the disposer, the most lofty presence. He is the unborn one in whom all the existing things abide; i.e. in which all the worlds are comprehended.

Thus, the world, here, is not simply regarded as created by God, but is regarded as evolving out of the Highest Principle. This is a highly important step in the development of the metaphysical thinking. As Barua rightly observes, "Viśvākarma's (the sage of this hymn) contribution to the Vedic thought was the abstract or metaphysical conception of God."

1. RV. x 82. 6.
2. cf. 12. विद्वान सत्य गयात्रां परमात च संस्कृतम्।
3. RV. x 82. 6 -

क्लेश नामाविभेदनपरिपूर्णः
यत्रित्व विभविभि मुक्तानि तस्माद च।।
4. "A History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy", p. 36.

- by Benimadhab Barua.
Besides giving some characteristics of God, the sage regards him as invisible and says that we cannot find him because something else has appeared before our eyes and that in itself has become a hindrance which obstructs the vision.

Questions were also raised regarding the material with which, and the place, standing on which, the Creator created the world. The sage asks; "What was the place on which he got a footing? Where found he anything or how to hold by?"

And also, "What was the wood and what the tree, pray tell us, from which they fashioned forth the earth and heaven?"

The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa has given the answer to this question: "Brahman is the wood and Brahman, the tree."

But of course, those who doubt the existence of the God described above, just wander around, says the sage,

1. RV. x 82.7
2. RV. x 81. 2.
3. RV. x 81. 4.
4. Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, 2.8.9.6.
Therefore, to apprehend him better, man must only inquire within his heart (X.81.4).

The later idea of the Upaniṣads that God is within us and no one can find him outside by searching him just in external elements, can be traced to such Vedic passages wherein he is described as the Creator of the universe.

In the Puruṣa Sūkta (RV.X.30), the visible Sun, whose diameter is ten fingers (Dasāṅgulam) is conceived as the Soul of the universe and that soul is the principle of all that is and that is to be. Here, the Sun is not merely described as the soul of the universe but also as the lord of immortality.

It is from this Puruṣa that the air, water, earth, fire, the sky, the sun, the moon, all animals and all the four classes of men are emanated. The sage says: "This much is his greatness. And still greater than that is Puruṣa. One fourth of him is all beings. The three fourths of him is the immortal in Heaven."

2. RV. X.82.7
3. RV. X 90.2.
4. RV. X 90.2.
5. RV. X 90.3.
'Etāvān' here means "This much," and Puruṣa is said to be even greater than that. This only suggests that the Highest is not only immanent in the world, but is also transcendental.

This Puruṣa Sūkta also shows the process of creation. It explains how the head of the Puruṣa became the sky, the navel the air, and the legs, the earth. Moon was produced from his mind, the sun from his eyes, Indra and Agni from his mouth and air from his breath. Then it describes the origination of the four castes and concludes by saying that all that was and all that is, there but the Puruṣa.

Thus we can see that the tendency towards philosophical monotheism in the mind of the Vedic seers, revealed itself at its best in the Puruṣa Sūkta (RV. x 90); and also in the Hiraṇyagarbha Sūkta where Prajāpati is described as the highest element (RV. x 121).

But at a later stage the minds of the Vedic sages could not rest content with the idea of this personal God and were soon dissatisfied with the implication of duality in the monotheistic conception — duality, because as Hiriyanna says "It (monotheism) regards nature as set over against God and can therefore satisfy the longing for unity only in a qualified sense". So the vedic seer turned to a "higher

1. Outlines of Indian philosophy; p. 41 - by M. Hiriyanna.
conception of unity, viz. monism, which traces the whole of existence to a single source", the impersonal and unknowable one; a glorious expression of which is found in the Nasadiya Sūkta (RV. X.129). The conception therein is wholly impersonal and in an unique way, reveals the deep insight of the Vedic seer, who has tried to explain the creation not by an external agency but has regarded the world as spontaneously unfolded from that one (tad ekam).

The sage thus attempts to explain the origin of the world: "Non being then existed not nor being, there was no air, no heaven which is beyond it; ...... Death then existed not, nor life immortal, of neither night nor day was any semblence".

And then the sage, positively puts it thus:

The one breathed calm and windless by self impulse, 
There was not any other being beyond it, 
Darkness at first was covered up by darkness, 
This Universe was indistinct and fluid".

This obviously is an attempt to describe the primeval substance of this world and the origin of the

1. Ibid. 
2. RV. X 129. 1.2. 
3. तथो बापृत्ति तथा गुच्छस्त्रां अन्तः श्रवणित्वं सत्वः सत्वं श्रवणित्वं सत्त्वं \| कामदेव. १०. १२६. ३.
universe. There is introduced a philosophic riddle as to what there was in the beginning Was it 'Being' or 'Non-being'? And then it renders the answer thus.

"Non-being then existed not, nor being, there was no air nor heaven which is beyond it. What notion was there? Where? By whom directed was water there and fathomless abysses?" Further the poet says that there was neither death nor life immortal, neither night nor day. Everywhere there was darkness and undistinguished water.

(Aprakatamsalilam).

And the "the one was by the force of heat engendered, within whom the Desire arose". Hence followed the creation. Thus, according to the Vedic seer, "The bond of being in non-being sages, Discovered searching in their hearts with wisdom".

RV. X. 72.1, it may be noted, also expresses the same idea: Even as a smith, the Lord of prayer, Together forged this universe, In earliest ages of Gods, From what was not, arose what is." Having said all this,

1. RV. X 124.1.
2. तत्तो वन्यसति निरविन्द्र तव प्रतीत्या कव्यो मनोत्स भवेऽ - कविद. १०.२०६.४.
3. ब्रह्मप्राप्तिता, सं कर्मार हव आर्यनितूँ।
   देवानं पूर्वं युगे अन्तः सर्वायनं।
however, at the very next moment, the sage of the Nāsadīya sūkta voices a note of agnosticism:

"Who knows it truly? 
Who can here declare it? 
Whence was it born? 
Whence issued this creation?"

So also he says that even the Gods cannot solve the riddle, because they also came to exist after this creation sprang forth from "The One".

So much so that the poet is not sure that the creation has taken place at all. "May be", says he that -

"The one who is the Adhyakṣa, only he knows or even he does not know it."

We should not overlook a passage of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa which comments on this hymn of the Rgveda.

1. RV. X 129. 6.
2. Ibid.
3. एवं विश्वस्तैः ब्रह्मव 
 यदि वा दते यदि वा न।
 यो वातावरण: परमेव भौमि
 सो ब्रह्म केवल यदि वा न केवल।।

- RV. X 129. 7.
"In the beginning, this (universe) was, as it were, neither non-existent nor existent; in the beginning, this (universe) as it were existed and did not exist: there was then only the Mind. Wherefore, it has been declared by the Rishi: There was then neither the non-existent nor the existent, (RV. X 129.1), for Mind was as it were neither existent nor non-existent. This Mind, when created, wished to become manifest—more defined, more substantial: it sought after a self (a body) it practised austerity: it acquired consistency."

It is interesting to consider here another passage, also from the Satapatha Brähmana, (6.1.1.1):

Verily in the beginning, there was the non-existent. As to this, they say, "what was that non-existent?" The Rṣis; assuredly—it is they that were non-existent. As to this, they, "say; "who were the Rṣis?" The Rṣis, doubtless were the Vital Airs (प्राण्) inasmuch as before (the existence of) this universe, they, desiring it, were themselves out (रघ) with toil and austerity, therefore (they are called) Rṣis."

1. Satapatha Brähmana, X.5.3.1.
For the translation, See SBE; Vol. XLIII; pp. 374-375.
All these passages, obviously mention Desire (Kāmaḥ) and 'Austerity' (tapas). It is further said that these vital airs created a 'Puruṣa' who was Prajāpati. He then desired to be many and by means of austerity, became many (Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, 6.1.1.1.).

The Nāsadiya Sūkta also says:

Desire then at first arose within it,
Desire which was the earliest seed of Spirit.

Thus we find Desire and Tapas (heat or austerity) hypostatised in order to explain how the creation could have taken place out of the one which was undifferentiated and unborn.

Ṛgveda 10.190.1-3 also explain that from Tapas, Ṛta was born and then were born the night, the sea and the year. From thence, the creator (Dhātā) in the beginning, created the sun and the moon, the heaven, the earth, the firmament and the sky.

We may consider one more passage, which occurs in the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, 2.2.9.1. and according to which there was nothing in the beginning, neither sky, nor the

1. RV. X 129. 4.
earth, nor the firmament. Being non-existent as such, it 1
desired to be.

We will see later that, the 6hāṇdogya Upaniṣad
while explaining the emanation of the world, says: "In
the beginning, it was non-existent. It became existent.
It grew ..........." etc.

All these passages agree in the finding that there
was in the beginning that which is called non-existent; and
then it became existent. In the Upaniṣads (Chā. Up. 6.22),
a doubt is raised how that which is non-existent could come
to exist. But this will be referred to later on. Here it
would suffice to say, that along with such daring speculations,
a spirit of agnosticism also prevailed in so remote an age
and the sages were not satisfied with their speculations.

RV. X 137. 7 also expresses such a doubt regarding even the
Adhyakṣa having knowledge about the Creation. It is said,

"This world creation whence it has arisen, Or whether it
has been produced or has not, He who surveys it in the
highest heaven. He only knows or even he does not know it"

We may say that a powerful feeling of scepticism
(or agnosticism) has caught hold of the mind of the sage who
doubts thus. In philosophy, agnosticism undoubtedly proves
to be a sound base for knowledge.

1. cf. न बौराहित्वः | न पृथिवीः | न भौराहित्वः | तदस्यदेव मनोरुक्तः
स्वामिति |
Doubts as to the existence of even the gods are also raised. For example in RV. II. 12, which praises confidently the might of Indra with full faith, we hear of people who did not believe in Indra.

"Of whom, the terrible,

they ask where is he?
of him, indeed,

they also say, he is not.

and the poet has to lay stress on the powers of Indra:

"The foeman's wealth

like player's stakes he lessens,

Believe in him for he, O Men, is Indra"

(RV. II. 12.5).

It is interesting to note that a similar doubt occurs in RV. VIII. 100.3, "Where the priests are invited to offer a song of praise to Indra, a true one, if in truth, he is; for many say: 'There is no Indra, who has seen him? To whom are we to direct the song of praise?' Whereupon Indra personally appears in order to give assurance of his existence and greatness, 'There I am, singer, look at me here, in greatness, I tower above all beings', and so on".

1. प्रस्तु स्वामि मरत वाक्यन्ति
हन्नाय सत्यं यदि सत्यमस्ति।
नेन्द्रे असत्तिति नेन उ त्य वाह
कृतेन ददर्शे कमलिष्कवाम।।RV. VIII. 100.3.

2. Cf. 'A History of Indian Literature, pp. 85-86 by Winternitz.
Another sage, expressing a similar doubt, says:

"What thing I am,
I know not clearly,
Mysterious, fettered in
my mind, I wonder."

To summarise, we see that in the Vedas, we have some theories which try to trace the origin of the world to some force like water or Agni or Breath or Sun (Light and Heat). But we naturally miss in these Śūktas precision of expression. Even while regarding Hiranyagarbha or Prajāpati or Viśvakarman as the original Being, the poet would refer to some substance like water without any explanation as to where this Water came from or we would be told that Water alone was there in the beginning and the Gods, danced on it raising dust (RV. 10.72) from which perhaps, the world was produced. Here again, the origin of the Gods from water is not shown. Perhaps the Vedic poets were trying in their mystical poetic way to arrive at one subtle primeval substance, to convey the dynamicity and force of which they used the image of Water; the dust signifying that when worked upon it assumed a slightly more concrete and stable form.

1. न विज्ञानामि यदि केदरस्त्रि
   निष्प्रि: संयोगो मनवा चरामि ||
   - कर्केद, X. 164.
We also find theories referring to just one Entity, but one who besides creating the world, rules over it; e.g. Purușa, who is attempted to be described as having a thousand feet, arms, etc. Not satisfied with even such descriptions, the thinker turned to more abstract thinking of the type of the Nāṣadiya Sūkta.

We now turn to the Upaniṣads with the hope of obtaining some success in detecting the formulation of philosophical problems which attracted the attention of later thinkers. We find that in the Upaniṣads, different types of philosophical problems are attempted to be posed. In the course of their philosophical discussions, the sages try to examine the problems from different points of view.
The main aim, according to the Upanisads, is the attainment of the knowledge of Atman or Brahman, which is the Supreme Reality. But before one tries to get acquainted with it, one has to go into the basic problems regarding the source of the world—the substratum and existence of the world. The question 'What was there before the world?', involves the question 'What would be there after the world?' Hence follow the ideas of Rebirth and of the other world which are intimately connected in Indian thought with the problem of Karma, that is to say, actions good and bad.

We are concerned here with (i) the Upanisadic theories regarding the origination and substratum of this world, (ii) idea of Karman, the other world and Rebirth, (iii) belief in Atman and Brahman.

We may note here that though 108 Upanisads are generally recognised, among them, "with the exception of thirteen Upanisads, most of them are of more or less later date. These thirteen Upanisads are: (1) Ṛṣā, (2) Kena, (3) Katha, (4) Prāṇa, (5) Mṇḍaka, (6) Mṇḍūkya, (7) Taittirīya, (8) Aitareya, (9) Chāndogya, (10) Brhadāraṇyaka (11) Śvetāsvetara, (12) Kauśitaki and (13) Maitreyī".

1. cf. History of Indian Philosophy; Vol. 1, p. 28- by S. Dasgupta.

2. History of Indian Philosophy; Vol. 1, p. 28- by S. Dasgupta.
Let us now examine the Upaniṣadic views regarding the above mentioned topics:—

(1) Theories regarding the origination and the substratum of this world:

R. D. Ranade in his "A Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy" (p. 75) divides these theories of the Upaniṣads into two main groups: the impersonalistic and the personalistic and then says: "Among the impersonalistic theories may be included the theories which regard either or all of the elements as the substratum of things, or even such abstract conceptions as not-being or being or life force as lying at the root of all things whatsoever. Among the personalistic theories are theories which try to account for the origin of the creation from the *Ātman* or God; and insist in various ways either on the dualistic aspect of creation or even the highly philosophical aspect implied in Theism proper".

According to the impersonalistic theories, the world has emanated from:

(i) Neither Being nor from Non-being and from Death;
(ii) Non-Being and Being;
(iii) Earth
(iv) Water
(v) Fire
Neither Being nor Non-Being and Death:

The Brhadaranyaka Upanisad gives the view that "there was nothing (to be perceived) here whatsoever. By Death indeed, all this was concealed - by hunger, for death is hunger".

We have seen above in the Nasadiya Sukta that "Non being then existed not, nor being......Death existed not nor life" immortal". The Nasadiya negates the existence of even Death which the Upanisad accepts.

In the later Upanisads, Subala, gives the same idea that "Whatever (we see in this world) did not, verily, exist at the beginning (of creation). So all these creatures became rootless, supportless".

1. नेवेह किंवत्नाग्य बासीव्रुतुच्येकाहृतसमासीवः।
   कलायतः। अश्वनया हि पृथुः।
   - ब्रह्मारण्यकुपनिषदः १, २, ४।
   - The translation of all the Upanisads, except where mentioned is according to that of Volumes of the SBE Series.

2. cf. नासदायण्डैसवासीवकथा। न पृथुरास्यवृत्तं न तथिः।
   - RV. x 129.1.2.

3. नेवेह किंवत्नाग्य बासीव्रुतुवसवासीव?
   ह्या: प्रजा: प्रजायते।
   - Subala, 6.
   Translation by Radhakrishnan, in "The Principal Upanisads", p. 875.
The Vedic sukta seems to give the negative view. The Upanisads also adopt the same negative trend and describe the nature of Brahman by mere negations - Neti, Neti, "It is not this, not this" and so on.

Here, of course, the sage speaks positively of Death as the first element, which alone was there in the beginning. Then how everything else was produced from this death is thus described there - "Death (the first element) thought, 'Let me have a body'. Then he moved about, worshipping. From him thus worshipping, water was produced......

And what was there as the flesh of the water, that was hardened and became the earth - on the earth (Death) rested; and from him thus resting and heated, Agni (वीर्य) proceeded; full of light......... That being divided three-fold- Āditya (the sun) as the third and Vāyu (the air) as the third....

He (the Heath) desired; 'Let a second body be born of me and he (death or hunger) embraced speech in his mind. Then the seed became the year...... He brought forth by that speech and by that body (the year), all whatsoever exists; the Rik, the Yajus, the Śāman, the metres; the sacrifices, men and animals."

(ii) Non-Being and Being :

There are some passages in the Upanisads where non-being is regarded as the primarily existent thing. The
Chāndogya Upaniṣad III. 19. 1. says that:

"Āditya (the sun) is Brahman; this is the doctrine, and this is the fuller account of it (Upavākyānam): In the beginning, it was non-existent. It became existent. It grew. It turned into an egg. The egg lay for the time of a year. The egg broke open. The two halves were one of Silver, the other of gold.

The Silver one became this earth, the golden one, the sky, the thick membrane (of the white) the mountains, the thin membrane (of the yoke), the mist with the clouds, the small veins, the rivers, the fluid the Sāj and what was born from it, that was Āditya".

Similarly, in a passage of the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, it is said: "In the beginning, this was non-existent. From it was born that which exists. That made itself its self. Therefore, it is called the Self-made".

It is remarkable that in both these passages, the existent is spoken of as springing from non-existence.

But there is still another passage of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad which states both the views, regarding sat and asat.

1. Taittirīya Upaniṣad—2. 7.
"In the beginning, there was the existent only" — is a view given first and then follows the question as to "how existence could possibly be brought forth from non-existence?"

Uddalaka Ārūṇī thus explains to his son Svetaketu:

"In the beginning, my dear, there was that only which is one only, one without a second. Others say: in the beginning there was that only which is not, one only, without a second, and from that which is not; that which is, was born.

"But how could it be thus, my dear?", the father continued, "How could that which is, be born of that which is not? No, my dear, only that which is, was in the beginning, one only, without a second."

And then it shows how the world came to be: "It thought, may I be many; may I grow forth. It sent forth fire."

---

1. Chandogya Upaniṣad. 6. 2. 1.
2. Ārdha- Brahma: Ārdha-Vākṣyāṃsī Upaniṣād.

-Ibid., 6.2.2.
That fire thought: "may I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth "Water". Water thought: "May I be many, may I grow forth". It sent forth earth (food)."

And thus, step by step was born the entire creation. The Upaniṣad then explains how each of these were made tripartite and the things were created.

This brings us to an important question. What could the Upaniṣadic thinkers have meant when they hypothesized 'asat' (non-being) or 'sat' (being) as the first entity. 'Asat', we can definitely say, was not meant to signify a state of total negation, nothing existed whatsoever, for this by itself could lead to nothing, whereas we are told that it became 'sat' (being). Moreover, when Uddālaka Āruni expresses his displeasure at the concept of 'asat' being the ultimate reality, he says, "how could 'sat' arise out of 'asat'". Uddālaka in his long sermon to his son Śvetaketu teaches, how on knowing one, everything can be known. He gives the illustration of the fruit of the Nyagrodha tree, which, being broken, shows itself as extremely fine seeds, and when any of these is broken, we find that nothing is seen. Uddālaka explains

1. cf. Sāṅkarabhāṣya on Taittirīya Upaniṣad - 2.7, where he says:

अदिति व्याक्तनामः पञ्चविश्वाविचारित-
रूपमिल्कर श्रद्धाप्रस्टीते।}

[Image of a stamp]
that it is from that subtle essence which is not seen that
the nyagrodha tree arises. This seems to suggest that
when he insists on calling the Primeval Reality 'sat', what
he wants to emphasise is that all that is to be later
produced from it is potentially existent in it. However,
when some thinkers regarded asat as ultimate reality,
perhaps they meant that something did exist, but it was
not what we are used to regard as existent as this or that.
No known form was found in it and all this later developed as a result of its desire to be many, to attain definite identity. Nevertheless, some thinkers might also have concerned asat, as that which has everything unmanifest in it as Šaṅkara would have us believe.

(iii) Earth :-

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 1. 11. 9, Usasti Cākrāyaṇa, speaking about the deity, which belongs to the pratihāra, says: "Food (anna) (is the deity). For all these beings live when they partake of food."

We may note that in the Upaniṣads, we find references to 'anna' rather than पङ्धिवी. We interpret 'anna' as signifying पङ्धिवी in the light of Šaṅkarāchārya's commentary on the Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6. 2. 4.

1 see Bk. 3 of cha. up. N 5
Where he says:

They created Anna (food), of the nature of Earth. Food is earthy. Earth is referred to earlier, "They created food ", ...

The Taittiriya Upanishad also speaks of the Annamaya in these words: "From food are produced all creatures which dwell on earth. They live by food and in the end, they return to food. For food is the eldest of all beings and therefore it is called Sarvausadha i.e. consisting of all herbs, or quieting the heat of the body of all beings. From food, all creatures are produced, by food, when born, they grow. Because it is fed on or because it feeds on being, therefore it is called food (anna)"

In the Bhūguvallī of the Taittiriya Upanishad (3.2), Bhūgu, having performed penance, perceives that "Food is Brahman, for, from food, these beings are produced, by food when produced they live and into food, they enter at their death ".

If we consider Sāṅkara's view that the anna is the same as the earth, we can derive from this that the earth is here viewed as the cause of beings. Nevertheless, we
would not like to attach much importance to this passage, as it is meant for upāsanā and as a stepping stone to the understanding of the idea of Ānandamaya.

IV. Water:

Water, in the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad V. 5. 1, is regarded as the source of all things: "In the beginning, this (world) was water; water produced the true and the True is Brahman. Brahman produced Prajāpati, the Devas (Gods)."

Even though mention is made here only of water, Sāṅkarācārya thinks that all the five elemental substances viz. the earth, water, fire, air and ether are impliedly included here.

Sāṅkarācārya, in doing so, was justified, as in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, we learn about the process of Trīrūṭkaraṇa, according to which Fire, Water and Earth (Food) these are each made tripartite and then all things are created. Hence these three are always present in all things.

1. cf. ताहे वाप: शस्त्राक्तकित: स्व न वैकल: ।
   कर्मवैयत्वात् प्राणान्यथापालित: ।
   त्वापभित्येव पुत्रानि प्रागुप्तस्वलेख्याश्च ताक्षाक्ष: न क्षुद्धितानि
   निर्दिष्टान्ते वाप शति: ।
   - साकरामाः, क्रान्त्योग्य उपनिषद, V. 5. 1.
It is interesting to note that the above Brhadāraṇyaka passage regards water as the Ultimate Cause, and even Brahman and Prajāpati owe their existence to it. Can this be interpreted as showing that materialistic thought is as early as the Upaniṣads and even finds expression in them along with other views. Or can water be interpreted as just a symbol or image for a dynamic First Principle full of potentiality?

V. Fire:—(Tejas)

There are also passages which mention Fire as the cause even of water. In the Upaniṣads the word 'tejas' is used more frequently than Agni. A Chandogya passage (6.2.3) describes Tejas as the first to be created by Sat, Being.

It (Being) thought, 'May I grow forth.' It sent forth fire (tejas). Then the passage shows how fire, desiring to be many, created water and similarly, water the earth.

Fire, nevertheless, as it arises from Being is not the ultimate cause here, though it is prior to water. In the Chandogya Upaniṣad, 6. 3. 3, however Uddalaka asks his son to seek the root of water and this root is said to be fire.

1. Chandogya Upaniṣad; 6. 2. 3.
2. cf. also "तैना बाणस्या मूृि्यः । तैजसोऽपराणात्वागः । कृपापार्यत्वविधाय तेजः स्व तत्पराधीनत्वत्मानुदृढः दशीर्यवर्धा अधानन्तरस्यः । शुक्लः । तैजसोऽपराणात्वविधाय अन्वयस्यस्तः । ॥

— शिष्याग्नद्योग्य उपनिषद्, ६. ११. १.
To quote R. D. Ranade, here: "The theory of Fire as the origin of all things is not maintained very explicitly in the Upaniṣads but there is a passage in the Upaniṣads which tells us that Fire, having entered the universe, assumed all forms.

Fire is thus, at times, called the final cause, while sometimes the final cause is Being and it is the cause, even of Fire.

(VI)  
Air and Breath:—

According to Raikva, Air is the final absorbent of things. He says to King Jānaṣruti:

"Air is indeed the end of all. For, when fire goes, it goes into air; when the sun goes down, it goes into air. When the moon goes down, it goes into air. When water dries up, it goes into air. Air, indeed, consumes them all."

"This much is with reference to the Devas. (Adhidaivatam). But in respect of the body, the breath

1. क्रिणन्यथेष्कै जवन्न प्रविष्टो
रुपं रुपं प्रतिरूपाः ब्रूह ॥

-कालिणिनाथ, २. ४. ७.

'A Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy', p. 79.

2. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 4. 31.
"Pranah" is the end. Hence the Air and Breath are the ultimate entity from two different points of view, We have seen above that the Atharva Veda regards the Vital Breath as the ultimate entity. Thus we can say that Air; the Adhidayika form is identical with Breath, the Adhyatimka form. Therefore, speaking of breath as the end of all with reference to the body, Raikva says, "When a man sleeps, speech goes into breath, So do sight, hearing and mind. Breath indeed consumes them all. These are the two ends, air among the Devas, breath among the senses.

In the Chândogya Upanishad, I. 11.5, Uûasti Câkrâyana, imparting the knowledge of the deity, which belongs to the Prastâva, says, "Breath (is the Deity). For all these beings merge into breath, alone and from breath, they arise."

This view is very much allied to the view of Raikva which is noted above and both these sages hold Breath to be the substratum. Narada requests Sanatkumara to teach him the Final Truth. The latter then gives a list of fifteen elements, starting with Nâman and ending with Prâna, set out in a serial order, wherein each subsequent element excels in importance over the preceding one, and the last one, viz.

\[\text{Pranah} \]
the Prāṇa figuring therein, stands supreme and unsurpassed.

He then says: "As the spokes of a wheel hold to the nave, so does all this (beginning with name and ending in hope) hold to spirit. That spirit moves by the spirit, it gives spirit to the spirit . . . . . . "

The Taittirīya Upaniṣad, 2.2, speaks of a Prāṇa-maya Ātma, an inner self, constituted of Breath and of whom, "Prāṇa (up breathing) is the head, Vyāna (back-breathing) is the right arm, Ether is the trunk and earth the seat (the support). There is a verse to this effect:

"The Devas breathe after breath (Prāṇa), so do men and cattle. Breath is the life of all beings, therefore, it is called Sarvāyuṣa (all-enlightening).

"In the same Upaniṣad, Bhṛgu Vāruṇi says:

1. cf. Śānditīya Upaniṣad,

2. यथा वा प्राया नामोऽ समपिताः स्वस्थितिः प्राणोऽ सर्वस्रव अर्यप्राणं प्राणोऽ याति, प्राणं प्राणं वदाति, प्राणायां वदाति प्राणोऽ ह निर्विदा प्राणो नासा प्राणं प्राणं स्वस्था प्राणं: अवाययं: प्राणं ब्रह्मणः।

- Śānditīya Upaniṣad ७. १५. १।

3. Taittirīya Upaniṣad - २. २।
"Breath is Brahman, for from, breath, these beings are born, by breath, when born, they live, into breath, they enter at their death."

Udāndaka Saṃbhāyana told Janaka Vaideha that "Life (prāṇa) is Brahman. And Yājñavalkya, explaining the body (prāṇa) and the resting place of that Brahman, says that "Breath is its body and ether its place".

The Kauśitaki Upaniṣad, 2. 1, also propounds the doctrine of Prāṇa - "The breathing (living) spirit is Brahman; thus indeed Kauśitaki used to say, of the same breathing spirit which is Brahma, the mind verily is the messenger; the eye, the protector; the ear, the announcer; the speech, the house-keeper."

(VII) Ākāśa : - (Space or Ether).

Pravāhaṇa Jaivali mentions space as the Prime cause of all things:

"What is the origin of this world?" "Ether", he (Pravāhaṇa) replied; "For all these beings arise from ether,

1. Ibid. 3. 3.
2. प्राण एव आयतनपूर्व आकाश: प्रतिष्ठा ।
   - बृहस्पतिक उपनिषदः, ४. ३. ९.
3. Kauśitaki Upaniṣad 2. 1, Translation from "Principal Upaniṣads" by Radhakrishnan.
and return into the ether. Ether is greater than these, ether is their rest."

Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.12.1. says that Ether is greater than fire. Ether is higher than fire. For, in the ether exist both the sun and the moon, the lightning, stars and fire (agni). Through the ether, we hear, through the ether we answer...In the ether, everything is born and everything tends when it is born

Sankara's commentary on this passage is that ether is higher than fire because it is the cause of fire as well as of air, and it is seen that the cause is always superior to the effect.

How the things are produced from the Ākāśa, is thus stated in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad: "From the self sprang ether (ākāśa), from ether, air, from air fire, from fire water; from water earth. From earth herbs, from herbs food, from food seed, from seed, man."

1. अभ्य लोकस्य का गतिरिथ्याकाश हसि होवाच ।
वर्णिणि ह वा श्रवणि प्रेमानि आकाशादिव समुच्चोन्ते,
आकाशमुच्चोत्तरसंयति । आकाशो हि एव रम्यो ज्यायाद ।
आकाशः परायणम ।
- चान्दोग्य उपनिषद् १, ६, १.

2. आकाशो वाच तेऽको भूयाव ।
वायुभिन्नस्तु तेऽको वायुइञ्जित्व वाहमः ।
...... कारणं हि लोके कामावि भूयाय हृदयम ।
3. तैत्तिरीय उपनिषद, २, १.
Ether however is not the final cause here, the final cause being the Self (Brahman).

The later Ācāryas, in order to derive a single system from the Upaniṣads, presuppose Brahman as the highest reality; and trying to explain different Upaniṣadic passages which even seem to contradict one another; somehow interpret them as establishing that the only reality is Brahman.

Badarāyaṇa, the author of the Brahmasūtras has done the same when he says that Ākāśa, Jyotiṣa, Prāṇa, etc., all signify Brahman.

In fact, the Upaniṣads might be recording diverse views, accepting ether or the like as the final cause; and also the sentient Brahman as such. In attempting to extract a single system from the Upaniṣads, Bādarāyaṇa interpreted these Upaniṣadic passages as regarding the Non-śāṅkara Brahman as the Ultimate cause. But we can very well regard them as separate views regarding the origination of the world. And if the Brahman is the cause according to the Vedāntic view, ether or the like could have been regarded as the cause according to the materialistic view. In later Jaina, Bauddha and Nyāya works, such views are mentioned and ascribed to the Ācarvākas or the Lokāyatikas.

Belief in Ātman and Brahman:

The final goal according to the Upaniṣads is the attainment of the Ātman (Self). So, in order to establish it as superior to all, the sages say that everything that was, that is, and that will be is the soul or the Self alone and nothing else. So they talk of the creation of the whole world from the seed and then describe the seed in apparently contradictory terms.

We may first note the passages where beings are looked upon as having emanated from Ātman, that is to say, the Self.

In the Praśnoπaniṣad, 1. 3, Kabandhin Kātyāyana approached Pippalāda with the question: "Sir, whence are these creatures born?"

Pippalāda thus replied:

"Prajāpati, the lord of creation), was desirous of creations (prajāh). He performed penance and having performed penance, he produced a pair, matter (rayi) and spirit (prāṇa), thinking that they together should produce creatures for him in many ways. (Praśnoπaniṣad 1.4.)

Then the Upaniṣad says that the sun is spirit, the moon is the mother. Giving some more such pairs, it is said, that: "The year is Prajāpati, wherein the path of Gods is
spirit while the path of fathers is matter". "The month is Prajāpati, its bright half is spirit, dark half is matter;" "day and night are Prajāpati, its day is spirit, night is matter". And then at the end, food is said to be Prajāpati, whence proceeds the seed and from it all these creatures are born.

The Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1. 4. 1. 3) also gives an exposition of such a duality of existence. It is thus described: "In the beginning, there was self alone, in the shape of a person (Purāṇa). He, looking round, saw nothing; but his self.......... He wished for a second. He was so large as a man and wife together. He then made his self to fall in two (pat - पत्) and then arose husband (pati) and wife (patni).

It is then described how the various pairs, viz. cows and bulls, mares and stallions, male and female ass and all the other animals and insects- that exist in pairs - down to ants were created by him.

It further says: "Now all this was then undeveloped. It became developed by name and form so that one could say, 'He, called so and so, is such a one..........' He (Brahman

2. तद्विषें तदविष्याकृतिमनसीचि
or the Self, entered thither to the very tips of the fingernails, as a razor might be fitted in a razor case, or as fire in a fire-place".

A similar idea is repeated in the Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 1. 4. 17 also; "In the beginning there was Self alone, one only. He desired, "Let there be wife for me that I may have offspring and let there be wealth for me that I may offer sacrifices."

The Taittiriya Upanishad puts a question: "Does any one who knows it (Brahman) not, after he has departed this life, ever go to that world?"

The answer is obviously an attempt to prove the existence of Brahman and it shows that only from the "existent Brahman," (Sat Brahman), all the duality of the world is created. It is as follows:

"He (= Brahman), wished, 'May I be many, may I grow forth.' He brooded over himself (like a man performing penance). After he had thus brooded, he sent forth (created) all, whatever there is. Having sent forth, he entered into it: he became sat (what is manifest) and tyat (what is not manifest), defined and undefined, supported and not supported

1. Brhadaranyaka Upanishad. 1. 4. 7.
(endowed with ) knowledge and without knowledge, real and unreal. The Satya (true) became all this whatsoever, and therefore the wise call it (the Brahman) Sat-tya (the true)".

And a verse is here quoted: "In the beginning this was non-existent (not yet defined by form and name). From it was born what exists. That made itself its self—therefore it is called self-made".

The Aitareya Upanişad, 1. 1, describes Atman as the Primeval Substance: "verily in the beginning, all this was 'Self', one only, there was nothing else blinking whatsoever. He thought: 'Shall I send forth worlds?" He sent forth these worlds, Ambhas (water), Marici (light), mara (mortal) and Ap (water). That Ambhas (water) is above the heaven and heaven is the support. The Maricis (the lights) are the sky. The Mara (mortal) is the earth; and the waters under the earth are the Ap world ".

It is then described how for these deities, Agni and the rest, he created a man and how these deities entered in this man.

The Upanişad goes on to say, "He thought: 'How can all this be without me?' And then he thought, 'By what way shall I get there?' And then he thought: 'If speech

1. Taittirîya Upanişad. 2. 6. 7.
names, if scent smells, if the eye sees, if the mind thinks, if the off-breathing digests, if the organ sends for, then what am I?

Then, opening the suture of the skull, he got in by the door. That door is called Vidṛti; the Nandana (the place of bliss). There are three dwelling places for him, three dreams: this dwelling place (the eye), this dwelling place (the throat), this dwelling place (the heart).

"When born (that is to say, when the Highest self entered the body), he looked through all things in order to see whether anything wished to proclaim whether anything wished to proclaim here another (self). He saw this person only (himself); as the widely spread Brahmān. 'I saw it' thus he said. Therefore he was Idam-dra ('Seeing this').

All these passages though they occur in different Upaniṣads, introduce the uniform idea of a single creative Sentient element; known by more than one name, e.g. the Soul, the Self, Brahmān; or God. And the world phenomena is attempted to be explained in different ways, as also the relation of man to the Ultimate Reality and the Phenomenal reality.

We should bear in mind the basic characteristic of this element, and that is that it is 'existent' by its very nature.

So far, we have examined the passages where it is referred to by the word Atman. Now we may consider a passage or two where it is referred to as Brahman.

The Brhadaranyaka Upahigad 1. 4. 7. says

"This Self is the foot step of everything for through it, one knows everything". The view of some predecessor is then quoted, "Here, they say 'if men think that by knowledge of Brahm, they will become everything; what then did that Brahm know, from whence all this Sprang?" And thus is given the answer, "Verily, in the beginning, this was Brahman, one only. That being one, was not strong enough. It created still further the most excellent kṣatras (powers), viz. those Kṣatras (powers) among the Devas. Indra, Varuṇa, Soma.........etc. etc. 'But Brahman is (nevertheless) the birth place of the Kṣatra .......... He was not strong enough. He created the Viṣ (people) called, Vasus, Rudras, etc..... He created the Śūdra varṇa, as Pusan (as nourisher)...... He was not strong enough. He created still further the most excellent Law (dharma). There are then this Brahm, Kṣatra,

1. Brhadaranyaka, 1. 4. 9.
Viś and Śūdra. Among the Devas, that Brahman existed as Agni (fire) only, among men, as Brāhmaṇa, as Kṣatriya as Vaiśya through the (divine) Vaiśya, as Śūdra through the (divine) Śūdra ........ in these two forms, did Brahman exist. We have already seen above that the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad has given the name ‘Self’ to this very entity. And also the students of Upaniṣadic philosophy know very well that the Self is the same as Brahman and they cannot be distinguished as separate entities.

In the Bhṛguvallī of Taittirīya Upaniṣad, Bhṛgu wants to know about Brahman and Varuṇa, his father describes him as this, viz. “Food, breath, the eye, the ear, mind, speech.” And then giving the Characteristic of the Brahman, he says: "That from whence these beings are born, that by which, when born, they live, that into which they enter at their death, try to know that. That is Brahman." The rest of the portion describes Anna, Prāṇa, Manas, Vijnāna and Ānaha as Brahman, We may note here that production, maintenance and destruction are particularly shown from Brahman only and the Taittirīya upaniṣad, 2. 1. has explained the Upaniṣadic theory of the emanation of the world still more clearly. After quoting the verse (which praises a Brahmavid)

Thus: "He who knows Brahman, which is, which is conscious,

which is without end, as hidden in the depth (of the heart), in the highest ether, he enjoys all blessings at one with the omniscient Brahman", it explains the process of creation in these words: "From that self (Brahman) sprang ether, from ether, air, from air fire, from fire water, from water earth. From earth herbs, from herbs food, from food seed, from seed, man."

This is purely an emanatory theory which is quite distinguishable from the theistic theory of the Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad. But the theory of creation given in the Mundāka Upaniṣad serves as a stepping stone in between. It thus gives an account of the creation:

"As from a blazing fire sparks, being like unto fire, fly, forth a thousand fold, thus are various beings brought forth from the Imperishable and return thither also.

That heavenly person is without body, he is both without and within, not produced, without breath and without mind; pure, higher than the high imperishable.

From him, (when entering on creation) is born breath, mind and all organs of sense, ether, air, light, water.

1. It would be quite interesting to compare this with the Gāndogya theory of the emanation of the world from 'Being' given above.
and the earth, the support of all.

Fire (the sky) is his head, his eyes the sun and the moon, the quarters his ears, his speech the vedas disclosed, the wind his breath, his heart, the universe, from his feet came the earth, he is, indeed, the inner self of all things.

From him comes Agni (fire), the sun being the fuel, from the moon (Soma) comes rain (Pārjanya), from the earth herbs, and man gives seed unto the woman. Thus many beings are begotten from the Person (Puruṣa).

From Him, come the Rik, the Sāman, the Yajus, the Dikṣā (initiatory rites), all sacrifices and offerings of animals and the fees bestowed on priests, the year too; the sacrificer, and the worlds in which the moon shines brightly and the sun.

From him, the many Devas, too are begotten, the Sādhyas (genii), man, cattle, birds, the up and down breathings, rice and corn (for sacrifices), penance, faith, truth, abstinence and law.

The seven senses (prāṇa), also sprang from him; the seven lights (acts of sensation), the seven kinds of fuel (objects by which the senses are lighted), the seven sacrifices
(results of sensation), these seven worlds, (the places of the senses, the worlds, determined by the senses) in which the senses move, which rest in the cave (of the heart), and are placed there seven and seven.

Hence come the seas and all the mountains, from him flow the rivers of every kind, hence come all herbs and the juice through which the inner self subsists with the elements.

The person is all this, sacrifice, penance, 1 Brahma, the highest immortal.

Instead of mentioning pure impersonalistic things viz. Atman, five elements, being, non-being, or death as the origin of things, the Mundakopanishad introduces a "Person" from whom all earthly and celestial things emerge (svandante); or are generated (jyante); and who is Divine at the same time Formless. The word 'created' is however not used here; and creation proper is not described. May be that the theistic idea of creator, which is the unique contribution of the Svetasveta Upanishad only, was not formed earlier.

In comparatively later Upanishads like the Svetasvata Upanishad, we find the theistic trend, where God is

1. cf. Mundaka Upanishad. 2. 1. 9-10.
regarded as the omnipotent, omniscient creator and Superintend­
tendent, ruling over souls and the inanimate world.

The Śvetāsvatara, 1. 2, enumerates various views
held by the different schools regarding the origin of the world".

"The Brahma - Students say; ' Is Brahman the cause ?
whence are we born ? Whereby do we live ? and whither do we
go ? O ye, who know Brahman, ( tell us ) at whose command
we abide whether, in pain or pleasure?

Should time, or nature or necessity or chance or
the elements be considered as the cause or he who is called the
person ( puruṣa ) ? It cannot be their union either; because
that is not self-dependent and that self is also powerless
because there is ( independent of him ) a cause of good and
evil."............ He being one superintends all those causes,
time, self and the rest."

And then it thus proceeds to describe the creator,
the god who is the cause of everything, and we may examine it
at length so that it could help us to have a clearer idea of
the theistic theory of the Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad;" It is he,
who, being one only, rules over every germ ( cause ), over
all forms, and over all germs, it is he who in the beginning,
bears in his thoughts, the wise son, the fiery, whom, he wishes
to look on while he is born."

1. Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad, 1. 1-3.
2. Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad, 5. 2.
He being one, rules over everything; so that the universal germ ripens its nature, diversifies all natures that can be ripened and determines all qualities."

.......... Who is to be grasped by the mind, who is not to be called the nest (the body), who makes existence and non-existence, the happy one (Siva), who also creates the elements..........'

So also, it says further: "Some wise men, deluded, speak of Nature and others of Time (as the cause of everything), but it is the greatness of God by which this Brahman wheel is made to turn.

It is at the command of Him, who always rules over this world, the knower, the time of time, who assumes qualities and all knowledge, it is at His command that this work (creation) unfolds itself, which is called earth, water, fire, air and ether........ in the absence of all these he has caused the destruction of the work, goes on, being in truth..........

.......... He is the beginning, producing the causes which unite (the soul with the body).

1. Ibid, 5. 5.
3. Ibid, 6. 1.
4. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, 6. 2-5.
There is no effect and no cause of him, no one is seen like unto him or better; his high power is revealed as manifold, as inherent, acting as force and knowledge.

There is no master of him in the world, no ruler of him, not even a sign of him. He is the cause, the lord of lords of the organs and there is of him, neither parent nor lord.

That only God who spontaneously covered himself, like a spider, with threads down from the first cause (pradhāna) grant us entrance into Brahman.

He is the one God, hidden in all beings, watching over all works, dwelling in all beings, the witness, the perceiver, the only one, free from qualities...... He is the eternal among eternals, the thinker among thinkers, who, though one, fulfils the desires of many...... He makes all, he knows all, the self-caused, the knower, the time of time (destroyer of time) who assumes qualities and knows everything, the master of nature and of man; the lord of the three qualities, and knows everything, the master of nature and of man, the lord of the three qualities (Guna), the cause of the bondage, the existence and the liberation of the world.

1. Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad, 6. 8-10.
2. Ibid; 6. 11-16.
We have considered above the various Vedic theories regarding the creation of the world. Some such theories are also found in the Buddhist and Jaina texts which we shall examine in the next two chapters separately and then compare all of these with those mentioned in the Nyāya Śūtras.

We may now note briefly the nature of Ātman or Brahman or Īśvara, as given by the Upaniṣads and then we shall deal with the Upaniṣadic idea of Karma, Rebirth and the other world.

In the Vedas as we noted in the beginning, we find the tendency to regard the deity which is praised, as superior to all others. "All the deities of the Vedic age were, each in turn, believed to be supreme and hence all were supposed to create the world, to protect the sages who prayed them and were looked upon as being omnipresent, omnipotent and omniscient, Henotheism or Kathenotheism is the name assigned by Max Muller to this peculiar trait.

We also saw that slowly and gradually, Monotheism took the place of Henotheism, and the sages came to that conclusion that "Various are the names given by the seers to the same existent element."

1. RV. I. 164. 46 - 

स्कं सचिवां प्रत्ययः कवमति।
The Upaniṣads always think of a single entity as the lord of all and that is Atman or Brahman. The Atman is described as both saguna (possessing qualities) and nirguna (qualityless). The later philosophers are not unanimous in the interpretation of such passages. Almost all would interpret them as showing that God or the Self possesses all auspicious qualities and is devoid of the bad qualities as all the phenomenal ones (like śūnes, etc.). The Absolutists would however interpret them as showing the uniform (ekamāna) nature of Reality as it is devoid of even the difference of the quality and the qualified.

We now consider some selected passages, from the Upaniṣadic texts.

The Muṇḍaka Up. describes two kinds of knowledge, the higher one (Parā Vidyā) and the lower one (Aparā Vidyā). In the Aparā Vidyā, all the Vedas and the six Vedāṅgas are included. But the higher knowledge is that by which the Indestructible (Brahman) is known. All the Upaniṣads throw ample light on the nature of this Indestructible (Aksara Brahman) and on the way by which it can be apprehended.

The Muṇḍaka Up. describes this Aksara thus: "That which cannot be seen, not raised, which has no family and caste (or which is without origin and qualities), no eyes, nor ears, no hands, nor feet, the eternal, the Omnipresent (all prevailing), infinitesimal that which is imperishable, that it is which the wise regard as the source
of all things. As the spider sends forth and draws in its thread, as plants grow on earth, as from every man, hairs spring forth on the head and the body, thus does everything arise here from the Indestructible". (Munḍaka Upaniṣad I.I.5-6.)

Yañavalkya, in the Brahadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad describes this Aksara to Gārgī thus: "O Gārgī, the Brāhmaṇas call it (that on which the ether is woven like wrap and woof,) the Aksara (the Imperishable). It is neither coarse, nor fine, neither short, nor long, neither red (like fire) nor fluid (like water), it is without air, without ether, without attachment, without taste, without smell, without eyes, without speech, without mind, without light (Vigour), without breath, without a mouth (or door), without measure, having no within and no without, it devours nothing, and no one devours it.

By the command of that Aksara, O Gārgī, Sun and moon stand apart and so also the earth and heaven. By the command of that Aksara, O Gārgī, what are called moments (nimeṣa), hours (muhūrta), days and nights, half-months, months, seasons, years, all stand apart.

.......... That Brahman, O Gārgī, is Unseen, but seeing; Unheard but hearing, Unperceived, but perceiving, Unknown but knowing. There is nothing that sees but it,
nothing that hears but it; nothing that perceives but it, nothing that knows but it. In that Akṣara then, O Gārgī, ether is woven like warp and woof!

Man has almost an instinctive thirst for knowledge of the ultimate reality and the Vedic seers were no exception to it, and their immense curiosity has found expression in questions like: "Who is he whom we meditate on as the self? which is the self? (Is it) that by which we see (form), that by which we hear (sound), that by which we perceive, smells, that by which we utter speech, that by which we distinguish sweet and not sweet and what comes from the heart and the mind, namely perception, command, understanding, knowledge, Wisdom, seeing, holding, thinking, considering, suffering, remembering, conceiving, breathing, loving, desiring."

And the answer given is: "No, all these are various names only of knowledge (the true self)."

In the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, Uṣāṣta Cākṛayāṇa asks Yājñavalkya, to tell him about Brahman which is visible, not visible, the self (atman), who saying that "it is thyself" is within all; and Yājñavalkya describes it thus: "He who breathes in the Upbreathing, he is thyself, and

1. Aitareya Upaniṣad. 5. 1.
within all. He who breathes in the down-breathing, he is
thyself and within all. He who breathes in the on-breathing,
he is thyself and within all. He, who breathes in the out-
breathing, he is thyself and within all. . . . . . . . . . . " Thou couldst
not see the (true) seer of sight, thou couldst not hear the
(true) hearer of hearing, nor perceive the perceiver of
perception, nor know the knower of knowledge. This is thyself,
who is within all."

The same question was asked also by Kahola Kauratak-
eya to Vājñavalkya and the latter replying to it says: "(This
is thyself; ) He who overcomes hunger and thirst sorrow,
passion, old age, death".

Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3. 4. 1-3. 5. 1.

We are told in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad that " Praci-
naśāla Aupamanyava, Sātyayana Paulusī, Indradyumna Bhāllavaya
Tāna Sārkarākṣya and Budila Āsvataraśvi, these five great house
holders and great theologians came once together and held a
discussion as to what ourself is and what Brhaman is."

They, in order to come to a decision, went to
Uddālaka Āruṇi, who, thinking himself to be unable to solve

1. cf. also -

"Antaryāmi Brāhmaṇa " of the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad;
3. 7. 3-23.
the riddle, points to Áśvapati Kekaya and all the six including, Uddālaka Āruni, go to Áśvapati. The latter, after holding a discussion with each of them; and finding their answers to be correct only in part, gives a comprehensive idea of that Vaiśvānara Ātman:

"Of that Vaiśvānara Self, the head is Sutejas (having good light), the eye Viśvarūpa, the breath Prthagvartmatman, the trunk Bahula, the bladder Rayi, the feet the earth, the chest the altar, the hairs the grass on the altar, the heart the Gārhapatya fire, the mind the Anvāhārya fire and the mouth the Āhavanīya fire".

It is often said in the Upaniṣads that this self cannot be gained by worldly means. The Mundako Upaniṣad, III. 2. 3. 4. puts it thus: "That self cannot be gained by the Veda, nor by understanding, nor by much learning. He whom the self chooses, by him, the self can be gained. The self chooses him as his own."

"Nor is that self to be gained by one who is destitute of strength, or without earnestness or without right meditation. But if a wise man strives after it by those means (by strength, earnestness and right meditation) then this self enters the home of Bhūman (Mundaka Upaniṣad III, 2.3.4)."

The Kathopanisad also says: "His form is not to be seen, no one beholds him with the eye............ He (the self) cannot be reached by speech, by mind or by the eye" (Kathopanisad 6. 9-10).

The first verse of the Kenopanisad asks:

"By whom willed and directed does the mind light on its objects? By whom commanded does life, the first, move? At whose will do people utter this speech? And what god is that prompts the eye and the ear?"

And in the next verse follows the reply:

"Because it is that which is the ear of the ear, the mind of the mind, the speech, indeed of the speech, the breath of the breath, the eye of eye, the wise, giving up and departing from this world, become immortal.

There, the eye goes not, speech goes not, nor the mind, we know not, we understand not how one can teach this. Other indeed is it than the known; and also if it is above the unknown. Thus have we heard from the ancients who have explained it to us" (Kenopanisad 1. 1. 4).

Similarly the Rṣi of the Kenopanisad says: "That which is not expressed through speech but that by which speech is expressed, that, verily know thou is Brahman, not what
(people) adore. That which is not thought by the mind but
by which they say, the mind is thought .........., that which
is not seen by the eye but by which the eyes are seen........
that which is not heard by the ear; but by which the ears are
heard..........., that which is not breathed by life, but by
which life breathes, that verily, know thou is Brahman".
(Kenopaniṣad 1. 5-8).

Describing the Characteristics and nature of that
self, the Kathopaniṣad (Kathopaniṣad I. 2. 20-21) says
that it is smaller than small, greater than great, is
hidden in the heart of that creature .......... though sitting
still, the self walks far;: though lying down, he goes
everywhere,.......... ( it is ) without sound, without touch,
without form, without decay, without taste, eternal,
without smell, without beginning, without end, beyond the
great and unchangable......... " (Kathopaniṣad 1. 2. 15).

Nārada, in order to know the self, approaches
Sanātkumāra and the latter explaining it to him says that
" the infinite ( Bhūman ) is bliss.......... The Infinite
indeed is below, above, behind, before, right, and left,
it is indeed all this ! " Now follows the explanation of the
Infinite as the I ; " Contānues Sanātkumāra, " I am below. I am
above, I am behind, before, right, and left & I am all
this. Next follows the explanation of the Infinite as the self:
Self is below, above, behind, before, right and left - Self is all this". (Chândogya Upaniṣad 7. 25. 1-2).

The Chândogya Upaniṣad VIII. 1. 5 also says:

"By the old age of the body, that ether or Brahman within it does not age, by the death of the body, that is not killed. That is the true Brahma City (Brahma-Puram). In it all desires are contained. It is the self, free from sin, free from old age, free from death and grief, from hunger and thirst which desires nothing but what it ought to desire, and imagines nothing but what it ought to imagine".

And Chândogya Upaniṣad VIII. 4. 1. says:

"That Self is a bank, a boundary, so that there worlds may not be confounded. Day and night do not pass that bank, nor old age, death and grief, neither good nor evil deeds. All evil-doers turn back from it, for the world of Brahman is free from all evil".

It is accepted by the Upaniṣads that the Self (i.e. the Ātman) and the Brahman are one and the same. The Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad says this at very outset "All this is verily, Brahman; this Self is Brahman" (Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad verse. 2). Then it establishes straightaway the unity of Ātman and Brahman.

1. कथ व ब्राह्म व सेतु:
   विषुवति: रज्जा लोकानामःसेवाय।
The Mundaka Upanishad 2. 2. 12 also says: thus:
"That immortal Brahman is before, that Brahman is behind, that Brahman is behind, that Brahman is right and left. It has gone forth below and above, Brahman alone is all this, it is the best."

The Taittiriya Upanishad, giving an idea of Brahman, explains as we have seen above, the emanation of the world from the Brahman. We may only add that taking into consideration the supremacy of the Brahman, the Taittiriya Upanishad lays down that one should worship Food as Brahman, Breath as Brahman, and so also Mind; and Understanding (Vijnanam.). And then says: "Different from this, which consists of Understanding, is the other innerself, which consists of bliss."

We may conclude with the description in Brhadaranyaka Upanisad "That self is indeed Brahman consisting of knowledge mind, life, sight, hearing, earth, Water, wind, ether, light and no light, desire and no desire, anger and no anger, right or wrong and all things." (Brhadaranyaka Upanisad IV. 4.5.).

We may however note, that Yajñavalkya taught Brahman by negation only, the negation of all the attributes: "Next follows the teaching (of Brahman), by No, no, for there is

---

1. अन्योन्तर शाल्मां शान्तसम्यः : ।
- तैत्तिरियं उपनिषां २. ५.
nothing else higher than this, (that's why it is not so.)
Then comes the name "the True of the True," the senses
being the True, and he (the Brahman) the true of them.
(Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad II. 3. 6).

(3) Theory of Karman and Rebirth :-

In the Chāndogyopaniṣad, 8. 3.6, five questions are put
to Śvetaketu Āruṇeya by Pravāḥaṇa Jaivali.

"Do you know, to what place, men go from here?"
"Do you know how they return again?"
"Do you know where the path of the Devas and path of
the fathers "diverge?"

"Do you know why that world never become full?"
"Do you know why in the fifth libation, water is
called Man?"

And when the former replies in the negative, he himself
answers them. Having given the details regarding the five
libations, among which, in the last, water is called man,
he says, "When born, the man lives whatever length of his
life, may be. When he has departed, his friends carry him
as appointed to the fire, from whence he came, from whence
he sprang." "Those who know this and who follow faith and
austerities go to light..... and then follow the path of the
Devas.

1. Chāndogya Upaniṣad. (5.9.2.).
Then it is continued: "But they, who living in a village, practise sacrifices, works of public utility and alms, they go to the smoke,... and thence following the path of fathers, they go from the worlds of fathers to the ether, from ether, to moon. Having dwelt there till, their (good) works are consumed, they return again that way as they came ......... Those whose conduct had been good, will quickly attain some good birth; the birth of a Brāhmaṇa or a Kṣatriya or a Vaiṣya. But those whose conduct had been evil, will quickly attain an evil birth, the birth of a dog or a hog or Cāntāla.

On neither of these two ways, are those small creatures (flies, worms etc.), they are continually returning of whom it may be said, "Live and Die". Theirs is a third place.

Therefore, that world never becomes full.

While introducing himself to Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, Śvetaketu said that he was "well-instructed", and then

1. Cf. also: Mundaka Upaniṣad, II, where it is said that "the brilliant oblations lead the sacrifice to the Brahma Loka, saying 'This is thy holy Brahman-world, (Svarga'), gained by thy good works.'"

2. Chāndogya Upaniṣad. (5. 10. 1-8).
Pravāhana asked him these questions. But when Svetaketu confessed, his lack of knowledge regarding it, Pravāhana says, "Then why did you say (you had been) instructed? How could anybody, who did not know these things, say that he had been instructed?"

This attitude of Pravāhana Jāivali is remarkably different from that of the Buddha. The latter, even if questions regarding the other world and the existence of the soul after death were raised, used to quietly put an end to such an inquiry as it was, to his mind, not at all helpful in evading pain.

But the Upaniṣads insist on tackling such problems and then to give a definite answer. They believe in Kārma, in Rebirth and also the other world.

In the Kāthopanisad, Naciketas also asks Yama, "There is that doubt when a man is dead—some say, 'he is,' others say 'he is not.' This I should like to know, taught by thee." And Yama tells him, "Well, then, O Gautama, I shall tell thee this mystery, the Brahman and what happens to the self, after reaching death. Some enter the womb in order to have a body as organic beings; others go into inorganic matter, according to their work and
The Praśnopaniṣad also records the questions of Kauśalya Āśvalāyana: "Whence is that Prāṇa (Spirit) born? How does it come into this body? And how does it abide after it has divided itself? How does it go out? How does it support what is without and how what is within?"

The answer is: "By the work of mind, does At come into this body... whatever his thought (at the time of death) with that he goes back to Prāṇa, and the Prāṇa, united with light, together with the self (the Jīvātmā) leads on to the world, as desired."

Yājñavalkya in the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad describes what happens to the soul or self after leaving this body: "And as a goldsmith, talking a piece of Gold, turns it into another and more beautiful shape, so does this self, after having thrown off this body and dispelled all ignorance, make unto himself another newer and more beautiful shape, whether it be like the Fathers or Like the Gandharvas or like the Devas or like Prajāpāti or like Brahman or like other beings.

1. Kaṭhopaniṣad, II. 5. 6-7.
   Cf. also. Paśnopaniṣad, I, 9-10.
2. Prāṇa Upaniṣad, III. 1.
3. Ibid, III. 3, 10.
That Self indeed is Brahman, consisting of knowledge, mind, life, sight, hearing, earth, water, wind, ether, light, and no light, desire and no desire, anger and no anger, right or wrong and all things. Now, as a man is like this or like that, according as he acts and according as he behaves, so will he be - a man of good acts will become good, a man of bad acts, bad. He becomes pure by pure deeds, bad by bad deeds.

And here they say that a person consists of desires. And as is his desire, so is his will, and as is his will, so is his deed and whatever deeds he does, that he will reap.

And here there is this verse, "To whatever objects a man's own mind is attached to, that he goes strenuously together with his deed, and having obtained the end, (the last results) of whatever deed he does here on earth, he returns again from that world (which is the temporary reward of his deed) to this world of action."

So much for the man who desires. But as to the man who does not desire, who, not desiring, freed from desires, is satisfied in his desires, or desires the Self only, his vital spirits do not depart elsewhere - being Brahman, he goes to Brahman. In respect of this, there is this verse: " When all desires which once entered his heart
Thus Yājñavalkya has here given two views, regarding the condition of the soul after death; firstly of the soul of an Abrahmavid and secondly of the Brahmavid.

The Mungaka Upaniṣad also describes in III. 2. 6-8 thus:

1. Having well ascertained the object of the knowledge of the Vedānta and having purified their nature by the Yoga or renunciation, all anchorites, enjoying the highest immortality, become free at the time of the great end (death) in the worlds of Brahma.

Their fifteen parts enter into their elements, their Devas (the Senses) into their (corresponding) Devas. Their deeds and their self with all his knowledge become all one in the Highest Imperishable.

As the flowing rivers disappear in the sea losing their name and their form, thus a wise man, freed from name and form, goes to the divine person, who is greater than the great.

But elsewhere in the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, Yājñavalkya gives quite a different view. He having explained the Ātman, the great being to Maitreyi at length, concludes his speech thus:

"As a lump of salt, when thrown into water, becomes dissolved into water and could not be taken out again, but whenever we taste (the water), it is salt; thus verily, does this great, Being endless, unlimited, consisting of nothing but knowledge, rise out from these elements and vanish again in them. When he has departed, there is no more knowledge (name), I say.

This is quite a different view which apparently savours of materialism as against the former two views. The Materialistics are known to hold that the soul remains only as long as the body, which is constituted of the five elemental substances; and does not outlast the body.

The above view of Yājñavalkya becomes clearer in Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 3. 2. 11. There, Jaratkārava Ārtabhāga asks Yājñavalkya: "When a sage dies, do the vital breaths (prāṇas) move out of him or not?"

"No," replies Yājñavalkya, "they are gathered up in him, he swells, he is inflated and thus inflated, the dead lies at rest." Again Jaratkārava asks him, "When the speech of this dead person enters into the fire, breath into
the air, the eye into the sun, the mind into the moon, the
hearing into the space; into the earth the body, into the
ether the self; into the shrubs the hairs of the body, into
the trees the hairs of the head; when the blood and the seed
are deposited in the water, where is then that person?"

Yājñavalkya said: "We two alone shall know of this,
let this question of ours not be (discussed) in public. Then
these two went out and what they expounded was karman (work),
what they praised was Karman, viz. that a man becomes good
by good work and bad by bad works.

A similar idea occurs in the Rgveda X. 16. 3; where
the eye of the dead man has been asked by the seer to move back
to the sun; which is its analogue, the prāna (ātman) w
analogue to the mind which
is its analogue, and the animus has been directed to go to the
heaven or to the earth, according to its qualities (dharma)
or else to move even to the waters, or the plants if it so
saited it".

Regarding this verse of the Rgveda, R. D. Ranade
says: "It is the earliest trace of a theory of Karman,
especially as the soul is asked to go to heaven or to earth
according to its qualities."

Yajñavalkya has thus introduced three views, one apparently seems to be absolutely materialistic; and among the two others, as we noted above, one concerns the Abrahmavid and the other about the Brahnavid. The last view would no doubt be the one acceptable to the Vedāntin as it concerns Brahnavidya.

Thus, Yajñavalkya's conclusion "न ब्रह्माञ्छन् विज्ञाति " confounded Maitreyī and it has continued to confound all later thinkers. The Lokāyata schools find in it a testimony for their own theory that consciousness has emerged out of the material elements, and departs as soon as they are separated from one-another. Even some logicians while presenting the Lokāyata view as the pūrvapakṣa, do not hesitate to quote this sentence. (See Nyāyamanjari). On the other hand, the Vedāntins interpret this as saying that when a person attains the knowledge of Brahman, his attachment and knowledge of the different things of the world ceases to exist, and his emancipated soul in its pure sentiancy is one with Brahman.

Thus we find in the Vedic literature, theories regarding the following philosophical topics which are relevant to the theme of our thesis:

(1) Creation from:
(i) fine elemental substances, (ii) Prajāpati, Hiranyagarbha, Viśvakarman, Puruṣa (iii) Ātman and Brahman, (2) Nature of Ātman and Brahman and (3) Theories
of Karma, the other world and Rebirth.

We have considered in this chapter and the two following ones some theories, mostly those considered as heretic, or those that were not sufficiently pursued in a later period, at least not in the original form. It is a very difficult task to select only a few such theories for special treatment from the vast mass of Vedic thought, and it is quite likely that much might have escaped our notice, or even have received undue attention, in view of our limited subject of research. Of course, we are conscious that these theories as found in the Vedic literature, or early Buddhist and Jaina literature are not wholly included among the 'Prāvāduka-dṛṣṭis'. Still it would be interesting to see what affinity these could have had to the latter, and how the prāvāduka-dṛṣṭis came to be presented in a particular way by the Nyāya-Sūtra.