

genus; cooking or reading, through action; white or black, through quality; a rich person or an owner of cows, through relation. But Brahman does not belong to any genus. Hence it is not expressible by words like ‘being’ etc.; neither is It possessed of any quality with the help of which It could be expressed through qualifying words, for It is free from qualities; nor can It be expressed by a word implying action, It being free from actions—which accords with the Upanisadic text, ‘Partless, actionless, calm’ (Śv. 6.19). Nor has It any relation, since It is one, non-dual, not an object of the senses, and It is the Self.

Therefore it is logical that It cannot be expressed by any word. And this follows from such Upanisadic texts as, ‘From which, words turn back’ (Tai. 2.4.1), etc.

Since the Knowable (Brahman) is not an object of the word or thought of ‘being’, there arises the apprehension of Its non-existence. Hence, for dispelling that apprehension by establishing Its existence with the help of the adjuncts in the form of the organs of all creatures, the Bhagavān says:

सर्वतः पाणिपादं तत्सर्वतोऽक्षिशिरोमुखम् ।
सर्वतः श्रुतिमल्लोके सर्वमावृत्य तिष्ठति ॥१३॥

13. That (Knowable), which has hands and feet everywhere, which has eyes, heads and mouths everywhere, which has ears everywhere, exists in creatures by pervading them all.

Tat, That—the Knowable; *sarvatah-pāṇi-pādam*, which has hands and feet everywhere—.

The existence of the Knower of the field is revealed through the adjuncts in the form of the organs of all creatures. And the Knower of the field is spoken of as such because of the limiting adjuncts of the field. The field, too, is diversely differentiated as hands, feet, etc. All diversity in the Knower of the field, caused by the differences in the adjunct—the field—, is certainly unreal. Hence, by denying it, the nature of the Knowable has been stated in, ‘That is called neither