

Objection: It has been said, ‘reaching which they do not return’. Is it not well known that all goings end, verily, in returning, and unions are followed by separations? How is it said that there is no return for those who come to that Abode?

Reply: As to that, listen to the reason:

ममैवांशो जीवलोके जीवभूतः सनातनः ।
मनःषष्ठानीन्द्रियाणि प्रकृतिस्थानि कर्षति ॥७॥

7. It is verily a part of Mine which, becoming the eternal individual Ātman in the region of living beings, draws (to itself) the organs which have the mind as their sixth, and which abide in Nature.

It is *eva*, verily *aṁśah*, a part, portion, limb, fragment—these are all synonymous; *mama*, of mine, of the supreme Self; (160) which, *jīva-bhūtaḥ sanātanah*, becoming the eternal individual Ātman, well known as the enjoyer and agent; *jīva-loke*, in the region of living beings, (that is) in the world—.

As the sun (reflected) in water is a part of the (actual) sun, and goes to the sun itself and does not return when the water, the cause of the reflection, is removed, so also even this part becomes similarly united with that very Self; or, as space enclosed in a pot etc., delimited by such adjuncts as the pot etc., being a part of Space does not return after being united with Space when the cause (of limitation), viz. pot etc., is destroyed. This being so, it has been rightly stated, ‘by reaching which they do not return.’

Objection: How can the partless supreme Self have any limb, fragment or part? If it has limbs, then there arises the contingency of Its becoming destroyed through the dismemberment of the limbs!

Reply: This fault does not arise, since Its fragment, which is delimited by an adjunct arising out of ignorance, is imagined to be a part, as it were. And this idea has been fully explained in the chapter (13) dealing with the ‘field’.