

Hindi / English / Gujarati

ऐतरेयोपनिषद्



The Ītareya Upaniṣhad.

SRI SANKARA'S INTRODUCTION.

OM TAT SAT.

Adoration to the Brahman. Karma has been ended with the Knowledge of the lower Brahman. The highest goal of Karma combined with Knowledge has thus been concluded with the Knowledge Uktha. It has been then said "This is the true Brahman called Prāna ; this is the only God. All the Dévas are only the various manifestations of this Prāna. He who attains oneness with this Prāna attains the Dévas." Some think that this becoming one with the Dévas is the highest object of human endeavour ; that this is emancipation ; that this is to be attained by the aid of Knowledge and Karma combined ; and that there is nothing beyond this. With a view to refute them the subsequent Upanishad beginning with 'A'tmâ vâ idam' is commenced to enjoin the Knowledge of the pure A'tman. How is it inferred that the subsequent portion of the book is intended to enjoin the Knowledge of the pure A'tman unconnected with Karma ? Because no other purpose can be inferred. Moreover, it will be shown by the text " It inflicted him with hunger and

thirst" etc., that the *Dēvas* previously mentioned such as *Agni* etc., are subject to *Samsāra*, being subject to faults, such as hunger. All that is subject to hunger etc., is only in *Samsāra*. But according to the *Srutis*, the highest *Brahman* is above hunger etc.

Very well, let thus the knowledge of the pure *A'tman* be the means to emancipation. But the non-performer of *Karma* alone is not entitled thereto; for no such distinction is declared and there is no mention of a distinct order of *Sanyāsins*. Again, it is after enjoining *Karma* described in the thousand *Brihatis* that the Knowledge of the *A'tman* is introduced: Therefore the performer of *Karma* alone is entitled. Nor is the Knowledge of the *A'tman* unconnected with *Karma*; for the summing up here is similar to that in the beginning. Just as in the first portion of this Upanishad, in the *Brāhmaṇa* * and the *Mantra*, * by the texts. "The sun is the *A'tman*" etc., the *Purusha* connected with *Karma*, i.e., the Sun, has been said to be the *A'tman* or soul of all living things immoveable, moveable, etc.; similarly, in the last portion, beginning with "the *Brahman* is this *Indra*," etc., the *Brahman* is said to be the *A'tman* of all living things and it will be concluded by saying all that is immoveable is guided by the *Brahman* named *Prājña*. Similarly it is said in the *Samhitopanishad* also. Having there stated that the *Brahman* is connected with *Karma* by the texts "It is this *Brahman* alone which the

Mantra portions of the Upanishads are pithy and condensed like aphorisms, whereas the *Brāhmaṇa* portions are explanatory to them.

followers of the Rig Veda seek in the great *uktha* or the thousand *Brihatis*"; it concludes by saying "they say that this *Brahman* is in all beings." Similarly, the identity is declared by saying "one should know that the *A'tman* indicated in the text 'He who is in the Sun' and the *A'tman* indicated in the text 'He who is this, bodiless *Prajñātman*' are one and the same." In this Upanishad also beginning with the question 'who is this *A'tman*,' it will be shown that he is the *Prajñātman* according to the text 'Knowledge is *Brahman*.' Therefore the Knowledge of the *A'tman* is not unconnected with *Karma*. It may be said that this refutation is mere repetition and therefore useless. For, in the *Brâhmana*, beginning with the question "how Oh sage, am I *Prâna* &c.," the Self has been determined to be the Sun (by the sage's reply). Here also in replying to the question "what is that Self" it is determined once again that the Self is all this. So it is mere needless tautology. To this we reply 'No.' There is no fault of tautology as it serves the purpose of ascertaining another aspect of the same *A'tman*. How? Either because it serves to ascertain, of the active *A'tman*, other aspects, *viz.*, the creation, the protection and the destruction of the universe, etc., or because it serves to lay down only the worship of the *A'tman*, or because the subsequent portion of the book beginning with "*A'tmâvâ*" etc., serves to show that even the active *A'tman* can be worshipped without the help of the action. As this fact has not been mentioned in connection with the *Karma-kāṇḍa*, so here, it is given that the one *A'tman* without a second is to be worshipped. The

A'tman can be worshipped as one with the worshipper, or different from him. The *A'tman*, though one, is in the performance of *Karma* looked upon as something distinct ; but the same can be worshipped as not different when *Karma* is not performed. So there is no fault of repetition.

It is said in the *I'sopanishad* " He who knows both *Vidyâ* and *Avidyâ* gets over death by *Avidyâ* and attains immortality by *Vidyâ*." " Only doing *Karma*, or one's own duty, one should like to live here a hundred years." Nor does the life of mortals extend beyond a hundred years, leaving the time during which one can worship the *A'tman* after renouncing *Karma*. It has been shown also that the life of men consists of as many thousands of days. The hundred years of life are taken up with *Karma*. The *Mantra* " only doing *Karma*, etc." has also just now been stated. Similarly also the texts "He performs *Agnihotra* for life," "One should perform sacrifices on the new moon and full moon days for life," etc.; also "They burn him with the sacrificial utensils." There is also the *Sruti* which declares that man is born with a three-fold obligation. Thus the injunction about *Sanyâsa* etc., according to the text "They then renounce and live as mendicants" is a statement intended to eulogise the Knowledge of the *A'tman* or applies to those who are disqualified to perform *Karma*, such as the blind and the lame, &c.

All such previous arguments are not sound; for there can be no motive to act, there being no use in performing *Karma*, when the highest truth is known. As for the statements, that the performer of *Karma* alone attains Knowledge of the *A'tman* and

that the Knowledge of the *A'tman* is connected with *Karma*, they are not maintainable. Action is inconsistent in one who having known the highest *Brahman* as his own *A'tman* and thus been perfect and free from all the faults of *Samsâra* does not find any benefit to his *A'tman*, either from what he had done or what he has to do. If it be said that he does it, because it is enjoined, although he sees no good in it, that cannot be; for he has realised the *A'tman* which is subject to no injunction. It has been seen in the world that he who seeks some benefit to himself—the attainment of something desirable or the averting of something not desired—and the means thereto is subject to injunctions; not he who sees that the *Brahman*, contrary to that and not subject to injunctions, is his *A'tman*. If even he, who sees that the *Brahman* is his *A'tman* and therefore is not subject to injunctions, can be commanded that all men should ever perform every *Karma*, this conclusion too is not desirable, nor could he be possibly commanded by any, because, even the Vedas are born of him. For none is said to be directed by his own words proceeding from his own wisdom; a wise master cannot be directed by an ignorant servant. Nor could it be urged that as the Vedas are eternal they have authority of themselves to command all men. For the fallacy here has already been pointed out. Even for the same reason, the fault in the assertion that 'all men will ever have to perform every *Karma*,' is also unavoidable. If it be said that the *Sâstra* itself enjoins it, i.e., as the necessity of performing *Karma* has been laid down by the *Sâstra*, so also the knowledge of the

A'tman is enjoined by it on the performer of *Karma* alone, we say 'no;' for it is impossible that the *Sâstra* could lay down contrary propositions. It is not possible to lay down that the same thing is unconnected with *Karma* performed and to be performed and also that it is the contrary of that, just as it is to postulate that fire is both hot and cold. Again the desire to attain what is desirable and the desire to avert what is not, are not produced by the *Sâstras*; for they are found in all living beings. If both of them were the products of the *Sâstras* they would not be found in cow-herds etc., as they are not acquainted with the *Sâstras*. It is well known that what is not self-evident, should be laid down by the *Sâstras*. If therefore the knowledge of the *A'tman* were made by the *Sâstra* to be inconsistent with past and future *Karmas* how could it again, contrariwise produce action in the Self as coldness in the fire, or darkness in the Sun? If it be said the *Sâstras* do not teach so, we say 'no;' because of the concluding text "One should know that That is his *A'tman* and that *Brahman* is intelligence," and also because the text "Therefore seek the *A'tman* alone," "Thou art That," etc., refer to the same idea. As the *Karma-kânda* of the Vedas, preaching an active Self, is merely a means to realise the real inactive Self and therefore not contradictory to *Ānanda-kânda*, so when the Knowledge of the real Self arises we cannot reasonably deny it or assert it to be false.

If it be urged that there is likewise, no use in the act of renunciation, we say 'no;' because the

Gita lays down that there is no need for a man being inactive. Hence those who say that 'knowing *Brahman*, a man should observe self-denial,' commit the same mistake. To this we reply 'No.' Because perfect self-denial means, cessation of all actions. •So long as a man is in ignorance, he feels want; whereas in reality he is full and perfect, and therefore has no need of being active. This ignorance is in all beings.

It is found that whenever one is prompted by a desire for something, he puts forth activity through speech, mind and body. For it has been clearly settled in the *Vâjasaṇeyi Brâhmana* that *Karma* for obtaining the five-fold object of son, wealth etc., springs from desire, as in the texts "Let me have a wife" and "These two, that is, the ideas of ends and means are certainly desires." As the activity of speech, mind and body originating in the faults of ignorance and desire and known as *pânktha*, i.e., five-fold (desires), is impossible in a Knower free from the faults of ignorance etc., the perfect self-denial, is mere passivity and not anything to be actively performed, such as sacrifice etc.; and such self-denial is the very nature of the Knower and therefore no idea of necessity is required. It is not fit to ask why a person travelling in darkness does not, when light dawns, fall into a pit, mire or brambles etc. If it be said that such self-abnegation being a matter of course is not fit to be the subject of an injunction and that if one in the householder's state acquires the knowledge of the highest *Brahman* he may remain in that state without doing *Karma* and need

not go elsewhere. To this we reply, 'it cannot be ; for the house-holder's state is based on desire, it being settled in the text that " Thus far is desire " and " Both these are certainly desires." Self-abnegation means the permanent cessation of all connection with objects of desire, such as son, wealth, etc., and not merely going to another order. Therefore, it is impossible for a Knower who has gone beyond all actions, to lead a house-holder's life.

From this it follows that it is not necessary for a knower even to serve his preceptor or to perform *tapas*. Here some house-holders from fear of begging for bread and from fear of ridicule argue thus, displaying the subtlety of their intelligence. (They argue that) as there are injunctions binding upon the *Bhikshu* (*sanyâsin*) such as [begging for bread etc., even a householder wishing only to keep his body from falling, freed from the desire of both ends and means and seeking only food and raiment just to keep his body, may well remain in his house. This is unsound ; this argument has already been refuted on the ground that the resolution to live with a wife springs from desire. As in the absence of a wife, there is no necessity of hoarding wealth for a man who is only desirous of food and raiment for the support of his body, he is virtually a mendicant (*Bhikshu*). It may be urged that just as there are regulations binding upon the mendicant in the matter of begging for bread, etc., to support his body and in observing cleanliness, so even a house-holder having Knowledge and free from desire may, to prevent sin, be inclined to

perform always and in due form all obligatory *Karma*, being directed by the texts '*Yāvajjivam*,' 'a man should perform sacrifice all his life', etc. This has already been refuted on the ground that a Knower being liable to no commands cannot possibly be commanded. Nor could it be objected that the inviolable injunction to perform *Agnihotra* for life is thus rendered useless. For it serves its purpose by its applicability to the ignorant. As for the regulation about the activity of a *Bhikṣu* seeking only to support his body, that is not the cause of his activity. Just like the quenching of thirst to one engaged in *A'chamana* (sipping water from the palm of the hand before religious ceremonies), it must be understood not to be the motive to the act. But in the case of *Agnihotra* etc., it cannot similarly be argued that the tendency to perform them is a matter of course. If it be urged that even an injunction about an act which will be done as a matter of course is certainly useless as there is no benefit to accrue, we say 'no.' That injunction being the result of previous activity and it being a matter of great effort to deviate from that, 'the self-abnegation, which is a matter of course with the Knower, is repeatedly enjoined on him as obligatory, by the texts. Even one who is not a Knower but who is desirous of emancipation should enter the order of a *Sanyāsin*. On this point the text "The peaceful and self-controlled &c.," ("*Sāntodāntah* etc.,") is an authority; for the control of the external and the internal activities of the senses and other aids to the realisation of the *A'tman* are incompatible

with other orders of life. This we also learn from the *Svetâsvatâropanishad*. "To those past, all orders of life he taught well the highest and the holiest truth sought after by all the seers." In the *Kaival-yopanishad* we find "Not by *Karma*, not by offspring, not by wealth, but by renunciation alone, can men attain immortality." The *Smriti* also says "Having known the Self one should observe renunciation of *Karma*" also 'Let one live in that order of life which is a means to the knowledge of *Brahman*, i.e., *Sanyâsa*;' for it is only in one past, all the four orders of life, that *Brahmacharya* and other helps to knowledge can all co-exist, and these are impossible in a house-holder's life. When a means is not properly followed it can never accomplish any object. As for the *Karma*, proper to the order of a house-holder and auxiliary to knowledge, its highest truth has been summed up as the becoming one with the *Devas*, a fruit which is purely worldly. If the performer of *Karma* alone could acquire the knowledge of the *Paramâtman*, then the end of the results of his action is impossible which are worldly. But if to this you say, they are indirectly connected with him, we reply 'that cannot be;' for the knowledge of the *Âtman* has for its subject the *Âtman*, an entity opposed to them. The knowledge of the real nature of the *Âtman* which is beyond all name, form and *Karma* is the only means to immortality. If it were connected with attributes and fruits of *Karma* that knowledge cannot relate to the nature of the *Âtman* which is devoid of all attributes, and that is also not right; the

Vājasaneyi Brāhmaṇa, in the passage, "But where to him everything becomes the *A'tman* alone etc.," having denied that the Knower has any connection with activity, agency, fruit, &c., shows in the passage "But where he sees duality etc." that *Samsāra*, consisting of deed, doer and fruit, is the goal of one who, on the contrary, is ignorant; so, in this Upanishad also, having summed up the result which consists in becoming one with the *Devas*, who are subject to hunger, etc., it proceeds to explain for the sake of attaining immortality the knowledge which has for its subject the pure entity which is the *A'tman* of all.

The impediment raised by the three-fold debt is only in the case of the ignorant, in the attainment of the world of the mortals, the departed ancestors and the *Devas* and does not exist in the case of the Knower, according to the *Śruti*, which determines the means of attaining the three worlds, "This world of mortals, only by a son etc." The absence of the impediment owing to the three-fold debt in the case of the Knower wishing for the world of the *A'tman*, has been shown by the text "what shall we do with offspring etc." "So says the seer named *Kāvasheya* who knew the *Brahman* etc. Also the *Koushītaki Sākhā* says "The ancient sages who knew the *Brahman* did not perform the *Agnihotra*."

Therefore it may be then urged that the ignorant, seeing that their obligation is not discharged, cannot consistently turn *Sanyāsins*. This is not right; for there can be no obligation incurred before one enters the order of a house-

holder. If even he who is not competent to perform *Karma* can be under an obligation, then the undesirable result will follow, *viz.*, that all will remain under obligation. According to the text "Let one leave his home for the forest, and turn *Sanyāsin*, or otherwise even from the order of a bachelor, either from home or from the forest, let him turn a *Sanyāsin*, the order of a *Sanyāsin* is enjoined even on one in the house-holder's order, as an indirect aid to the realization of the *Ātman*. The *Srutis* '*Yāvajjivam*' etc., sufficiently fulfil their object by their applicability to the ignorant and those who do not long for emancipation. We read in the *Chhândogyopanishad* also that in the case of some, performance of *Agnihotra* for twelve days, and subsequent renunciation of *Karma*, are enjoined. As for the argument that the order of a *Sanyāsin* is only for those who are incompetent to perform *Karma* it is unsound; as in their case, there is the separate text of the *Sruti* "He who has discontinued the fire or never maintained it etc." also the *Smritis* make it well known that any one may without distinction enter any of the orders of life or go through them all. As for the argument that the self-abnegation being a matter of course in the case of the Knower, is not specifically enjoined by the *Sāstras* and that therefore there is no difference whether one stays in his house or in the forest, it is fallacious. For self-denial alone being a matter of course with him, he cannot stay in any other order; as we have already said that his staying in the other order is prompted by *Karma*

springing from desire and that the mere absence of it is what is denoted by perfect self-denial. Acting recklessly is entirely out of the question in a Knower, for that is understood to be the way of extremely ignorant persons. Even the performance of *Karma* enjoined by the *Sāstras* is considered not to be binding on the Knower of the *Ātman* as being a heavy burden, is it possible for him to lead a reckless life like an ignorant man? It is well known that a thing perceived by a frenzied or a diseased eye will not appear to be the same after the frenzy or disease is removed; for the former appearance had its origin only in the frenzied or diseased eye. Therefore it is settled that in the case of the Knower of the *Ātman* there can be no reckless action, or performance of any duty, except perfect self-abnegation. As for the text "He who knows both *Vidyā* and *Avidyā* together etc.," the meaning of it is not that in the case of the Knower, *Avidyā* exists along with *Vidyā*; but the meaning is that they may exist in the same man, not together at the same time, but at different times. Just as the perceptions of silver and the mother-of-pearl in a mother-of-pearl may exist in the same individual at different times; as the *Kāthaka* says "These two—what is known as *Avidyā* and what as *Vidyā*—travel apart and lead in different ways," therefore there can be no possibility of *Avidyā* where there is *Vidyā*. *Tapas* etc., are the means to the acquisition of *Vidyā*, according to the *Sruti* "By *tapas*, know the *Brahman*" etc. *Karmas* such as the worship of the preceptor etc., are also the means and called *Avidyā*, because they

are the outcome of ignorance. Having acquired knowledge by that, one crosses death, *i.e.*, desire. Then being free from desire and having renounced desire, one attains immortality by the knowledge of *Brahman*. This is the meaning of the text 'Having crossed death by *Avidyā*, one attains immortality by *Vidyā*. As for the argument that the whole of a mortal's life is taken up with *Karma* according to the text "Only doing *Karma* let one wish to live a hundred years," this has been refuted by showing that the text applies to the ignorant and that *Karma* cannot co-exist with knowledge. As for the argument that the sequel being similar to what has been already stated, the knowledge of the *A'tman* is not opposed to *Karma*, this has been already refuted by showing that what has been stated relates to the conditioned *A'tman* and the sequel to the unconditioned. We will also show this in the commentary. Therefore, the subsequent portion of the book is begun for the purpose of explaining the knowledge of the oneness of the *A'tman* pure and passive.

The Aitareya Upanishad.

KHANDA I.

हरिः ओम् ।

आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत् ।

नान्यत्किञ्चन मिथत् । स ईक्षत लोकान् सृजा इति ॥ १ ॥

(All) this was only one *A'tman* at first. There was nothing else active. He thought "I shall create worlds.

Com—*A'tman* is from the root which means 'to obtain;' 'to eat,' or 'to enjoy;' or 'to pervade all.' The *A'tman* is the highest, omniscient, omnipotent, devoid of all the attributes of *Samsāra*, such as hunger etc., naturally eternal, pure, intelligent and free, unborn, undecaying, immortal, fearless and without a second. *Ilam*,—the universe already stated and diversified with the distinctions of name, form and *Karma*, was the one *A'tman* alone. *Agre*,—before the creation of the universe, Is he not now the same, the one entity? Not that he is not. Why then is it said *it was*? Though even now he is surely the one entity still there is a distinction. The distinction is that before the creation, the universe, with no manifested difference of name and form and one with the

A'tman, was denoted by the word '*A'tman*' alone ; but now, owing to the manifestation of the difference of name and form, it is denoted by many words and also by the one word *A'tman*. Just as foam, which, before the separate manifestation of its name and form, from that of water, was capable of being denoted only by the word '*water*:' but when it becomes manifested by its difference of form and name from that of water, the same substance, water, is denoted by more than one word, i.e., '*water*' and '*foam*', and foam is denoted by the one word '*foam*.' *Nānyatkinchana*,—nothing else, *Mishat*,—active; something else, like the *pradhāna* of the *Sāṅkhyas*, independent and material (not spiritual) and like the atoms of the followers of the school of *Kāṇāda*, there is not here any entity other than the *A'tman*. But there was the *A'tman* alone, this is the meaning. He, omniscient by nature, the one *A'tman*, thought '*I shall create worlds*.' How could he have *seen* (thought) before the creation, being devoid of the organs of activity? This is no fault; because of his being omniscient by nature; so the *Mantravarna* also says: "Having neither hands, nor feet, he is quick in his movements and grasps (things) etc." With what purpose is explained. — '*I shall create worlds, named Ambhah* etc., the places for the enjoyment of the fruits of *Karma* by living beings'.

स इमाँल्लोकानसृजत । अम्भो मरीचीर्मरमापोऽदोऽम्भः परेण
 दिवं द्यौः प्रतिष्ठाऽन्तरिक्षं मरीचयः । पृथिवीं मरो या अधस्तात्ता
 आपः ॥ २ ॥

He created these worlds—*Ambhah*, *Marīchih*, *Maram* and *A'pah*; the *Ambhah* beyond the *Dyuloka*, its support; *Marīchayah* (rays) being the *Antariksha*; *Mara*, the earth and below the earth the waters (*āpah*). (2)

Com.—Having thus thought over, he, the *Atman*, created these worlds. Just as an intelligent carpenter etc., constructs palaces etc., after having thought over within himself “I shall make them thus and thus.” Well, we can understand that a carpenter etc., furnished with materials, builds, palaces etc.; but how could it be said that the *A'tman* having no materials creates worlds? This is no objection; name and form, one with the unmanifested *A'tman*, and denoted by the same word *A'tman* can well be the material causes of the manifested universe, as water and foam in their unmanifested state being water alone become the causes of the manifested foam. Therefore, the Omniscient created the universe with name and form, one with himself, as the material causes. There is thus no inconsistency.

Or else, it may be more properly said, that just as an intelligent juggler without any other material cause creates himself in another form as travelling in the air, so the omniscient and the omnipotent *A'tman*, the great conjurer, creates himself as other than himself in the form of the universe. In this case, the theories maintaining the unreality of the cause or the effect or both, are untenable and are easily refuted. What worlds he created is next stated, *Ambhas* etc. Having created the globe in the order of the *A'kāsa* etc.,

he created the worlds, *Ambhas* etc. Here the *Sruti* itself declares what these worlds *Ambhās* etc., are. The world denoted by the word *Ambhas* is past the *Dyuloka*. It is denoted by the word *Ambhas* because it contains water that supports life. The *Dyuloka* is the support of the world known as *Ambhas*. The interspace below the *Dyuloka* is called *Mārīchayah*. On account of its permeating various localities, it is called *Marīchayah* in the plural, though being one (it should be singular). Or it may be because of its connection with the rays (*Marīchibhih*). The Earth is called *Mara* because all beings die (*Mriyante*) here. The worlds below the Earth are called *A'pah*, from the root *âp* meaning 'to obtain.' Although the worlds are composed of the "five elements, still from the preponderance of water, they are called by names meaning water such as *Ambhas* etc.

स ईक्षतेमे नु लोका लोकपालान्नु सृजा इति ।

सोऽद्वय एव पुरुषं समृद्ध्यामूर्च्छयत् ॥ ३ ॥

He thought "These indeed are the worlds : I shall create the protectors of the worlds." He gathered the *Purusha* from out of the waters only and fashioned him. (3)

Com.—Having thus created the four worlds, the places where all living beings were to enjoy the fruits of their action, He, the Lord, thought again, "Indeed these worlds, *Ambhas* etc., created by me would perish without protectors. Therefore I shall create protectors of the worlds for the protection of these.' Thus thinking, he from out of the waters alone, i.e., from the five elements

the most important of which was water and from which he created the worlds *Ambhas* etc., gathered the *Purusha*, i. e., one in the form of a man having head etc., just as a potter gathers a lump of clay from the earth, and fashions him by giving him the appropriate limbs.

तमभ्यतपत्तस्याभितप्तस्य मुखं निरभिद्यत यथाऽण्डम् । मुखा-
द्वाग्वाचोऽग्निर्नासिके निरभिद्येतां नासिकाभ्यां प्राणः प्राणाद्वायुरक्षि-
णी निरभिद्येतामक्षीभ्यां चक्षुश्चक्षुष आदित्यः कर्णौ निरभिद्येतां क-
र्णभ्यां श्रोत्रं श्रोत्रादिशस्त्वङ्निरभिद्यत त्वचो लोमानि लोमभ्य ओ-
षधिव्रनस्पतयो हृदयं निरभिद्यत हृदयान्मनो मनसश्चन्द्रमा नाभि-
र्निरभिद्यत नाभ्या अपानोऽपानान्मृत्युः शिश्नं निरभिद्यत शिश्नाद्रे-
तो रेतस आपः ॥ ४ ॥

He brooded over him. Of him so brooded over, the mouth came forth, just as is the case with an egg when it is hatched ; from his mouth, speech ; and from speech, fire. Then his nostrils came forth ; from his nostrils, *Prāna* ; and from *Prāna*, air. His eyes came forth ; from his eyes, sight ; from sight, the sun. His ears came forth ; from his ears, sound ; and from sound, the cardinal points (*disah*). His skin came forth ; from the skin, hair ; from the hair, herbs and big trees, the lords of the forests. His heart came forth ; from the heart, the mind ; and from the mind, the moon. The navel came forth ; from the navel, the *Apāna*, and from *Apāna*, death.* His generative organ came forth ; from the generative organ, semen ; and from semen, water.

Com.—He brooded over the lump intending to give it the form of a man, *i.e.*, he thought over it. According to the *Sruti* "His activity lies in knowing and thinking." Of the form so brooded over by the Lord, the mouth came out, *i.e.*, a cavity in the form of the mouth was produced; just as the egg of a bird bursts. Of the mouth so formed, the sense of speech was produced; and from thence, the fire, the presiding deity and the protector of speech. So the nostrils were formed; from the nostril, *Prâna* and from *Prâna*, air. Thus in all cases the organ, the sense, the deity, these three were gradually evolved; the eyes, the ears, the skin, the heart which is the seat of the mind, the mind, the navel which is the seat of all vital energies; the lower orifice of the bowels is called *Apâna*, because of its connection with the vital energy. *Apâna*: The presiding deity of this is death. As in the case of the other organs the generative organ, *i.e.*, the organ intended for procreating, was formed. Semen to be secreted from it and waters from the semen.

Here ends the first Part.

KHANDA II.

ता एतां देवताः सृष्टा अस्मिन्महत्पर्यवे प्रापतंस्तमशनापिपा-
साभ्यामन्ववार्जत् । ता एतमब्रुवन्नायतनं नः प्रजानीहि यस्मि-
न्प्रतिष्ठिता अन्नमदामेति ॥ १ ॥

These powers thus created fell into this great ocean ; that (first man), he subjected to hunger and thirst. They said to Him (the Creator) "Ordain for us a place where settled, we may eat food."

Com.—These powers, fire etc., created by the Lord as Protectors of the worlds fell into this great ocean of *Samsāra*, having for its waters the miseries resulting from ignorance, desire and *Karma*, full of the crocodiles of chronic diseases, old age and death, beginningless, endless, shoreless, affording no place for support, affording only the relief consisting in the small joy produced by the contact of the senses and their objects, full of the high waves of hundreds of evils produced by the agitation of the wind of desire for the objects of the five senses, roaring with the noise and cries of ha ! ha !! etc., proceeding from the numerous hells, such as, *mahârourava* etc., furnished with the raft of knowledge, which is stored with the provisions of the good qualities of the heart such as truth, simplicity, liberality, compassion, non-injury, control over the internal and external activities of the senses, determination etc., having good company and renunciation for its track and emancipation for its other shore. The meaning

intended to be conveyed here is therefore that even the attainment of that state, already explained, of becoming one with the deities such as fire etc.,—that state which is the result of the practice of knowledge and action combined—does not suffice to put an end to all the miseries of *Samsāra*. This being so, *i.e.*, having known this, one should know the highest *Brahman* to be his *A'tman* and the *A'tman* of all living things, now treated of and to be particularly described in the sequel as the cause of the creation, support and destruction of the universe, for the cessation of all the miseries of *Samsāra*. Therefore what is referred to in the passage "This is the road, this is the thing to be done, this is *Brahman*, this is truth" is the knowledge of the *Paramātman*, as we know from the *mantra* "there is no other road to emancipation." That *Purusha*, the first-born, the seed of place, sensory organs, and the deities, the self with a form; He, the Creator, subjected to hunger and thirst. Now, because this first-born was subjected to the faults of hunger etc., even the *Devas*, his progeny, were subject to hunger and thirst etc. The *Devas*, therefore, afflicted by hunger and thirst said to this father of their father, the Creator, "make for us an abode, sitting where, we shall, being able, eat food."

ताभ्यो गामानयत्ता अब्रुवन् वै नोऽयमलमिति ।

ताभ्योऽश्वमानयत्ता अब्रुवन् वै नोऽयमलमिति ॥ २ ॥

He brought a cow to them. They said "This is not enough for us." He brought a horse to them. They said "This is not enough for us." (2)

Com.—Thus addressed, the Lord showed to them, the deities, a tangible body having the form of a cow, gathered as before from the waters. But they, seeing the form of the cow, said "This body is not enough for our abode and eating food." *Alam* means 'sufficient;' The meaning of the whole is 'unfit to eat.' When the cow was thus rejected, he brought a horse for them. They said as before "This is not enough for us."

ताभ्यः पुरुषमानयत्ता अब्रुन्वसुकृतं ब्रूतेति पुरुषो वाव सुकृतम् ।
ता अब्रवीद्यथायतनं प्रविशतेति ॥ ३ ॥

To them he brought a man. They said "Well done indeed. Man indeed is the abode of all good actions" He said to them "Enter into your respective abodes." (3)

Com.—When all were thus rejected, he brought to them the *Purusha*, their progenitor. Delighted at the sight of the *Purusha*, their cause, the deities said "This is indeed a beautiful abode." Therefore *Purusha* certainly, is righteousness itself being instrumental to all virtuous *Karma*; or he is said to be *Sukritam*, because he was created by his own self through his mysterious powers." Thinking that this abode was liked by them, as all like the causes from which they spring, the Lord said to them "Therefore enter each of you into the abode, suitable for his activity such as the mouth etc."

अग्निर्वाभूत्वा मुखं प्राविशद्वायुः प्राणो भूत्वा नासिके प्राविश-
दादित्यश्चक्षुर्भूत्वाऽक्षिणी प्राविशद्विशः श्रोत्रं भूत्वा कर्णौ प्राविश-
नोषधिवनस्पतयो लोमानि भूत्वा त्वचं प्राविशंश्चन्द्रमा मनो भूत्वा

हृदयं प्राविशन्मृत्युरपानो भूत्वा नाभिं प्राविशदापो रेतो भूत्वा
शिश्नं प्राविशन् ॥ ४ ॥

Fire becoming speech entered the mouth ; Air becoming *Prāna* entered the nostrils ; the Sun becoming sight entered the eyes ; the Cardinal Points becoming sound entered the ear ; Herbs and Lords of the forests becoming hair entered the skin ; the Moon becoming mind entered the heart ; Death becoming *A'pāna* entered the navel ; Water becoming semen entered the generative organ. (4)

Com.—As commanders enter into a town at the word of the sovereign, so having obtained the permission of the Lord and saying "Be it so" Fire the presiding deity of speech becoming speech itself entered the mouth, its source. Similarly the rest is explained. Air entered the nostrils ; the sun the eyes ; the cardinal points the ears ; herbs and lords of the forest the skin ; the Moon the heart ; the death the navel ; the waters the generative organ.

तमशनापिपासे अब्रूतामावाभ्यामभिप्रजानीहीति ते अब्रवीदेता-
स्वेव वां देवतास्वामजाम्येतासु भागिन्यौ करोमीति । तस्माद्यस्यै
कस्यै च देवतायै हविर्गृह्यते भागिन्यावेवास्यामशनापिपासे भवतः ॥

Hunger and Thirst said to him "Allot to us a station." To them he replied "I assign you a place in these deities and make you sharers with them. Therefore when oblations are offered to any deity whomsoever, Hunger and Thirst become sharers therein. (5)

Com.—When the deities had stations assigned to them, Hunger and Thirst to which stations had

not been assigned said to the Lord "Assign to us a station." Thus addressed, the Lord said to Hunger and Thirst "As you are but sensations, it is not possible for you to become eaters of food without your depending upon some intelligent being. Therefore I bless you by giving you a share with these deities, Fire etc., both in the body and the eternal world made up of the five elements, in their respective functions. I shall make you sharers in the shares allotted to these respective deities, such as oblations of clarified butter etc." As the Lord so ruled at the beginning of the creation, therefore, even now, Hunger and Thirst are sure to become sharers in the oblations of cooked rice and ground rice offered to propitiate any deity.

Here ends the second Part.

KHANDA III.

स ईक्षतेमे नु लोकाश्च लोकपालाश्चान्मेभ्यः सृजा इति ॥ १ ॥

He thought "these indeed are the worlds and the protectors of the worlds. Let me create food for these." (1)

Com.—The Lord thus thought: "These worlds and the protectors of the worlds have been created by me and subjected to Hunger and Thirst. Hence these cannot live without food. Therefore, I shall create food for the protectors of the worlds." The power of these Lords in this world in the matter of favouring and chastising their men is unimpeded. So also the power of the great Lord, the Lord of

all, in the matter of rewarding and chastising all, is surely boundless.

सोऽपोऽभ्यतपत्ताभ्योऽभितप्ताभ्यो मूर्तिरजायत । या वै सा मूर्तिरजायतानं वै तत् ॥ २ ॥

He brooded over the waters and from the waters so brooded over issued a form. The form that so issued is indeed, food. (2)

Com.—The Lord wishing to create food brooded over the waters already mentioned. From the waters so brooded over as the material cause, something having a form and solid and able to support both immoveable and moveable came out. The form which was so produced is verily food.

तदेनत्सृष्टं पराङ्मयजिघांसत्तद्वाचाऽजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशकनोद्वाचा ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्वैनद्वाचाऽग्रहैष्यदभिव्याहृत्य हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥ ३ ॥

तत्प्राणेनाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशकनोत्प्राणेन ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्वैनत्प्राणेनाग्रहैष्यदभिप्राणय हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥ ४ ॥

तच्चक्षुषाऽजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशकनोच्चक्षुषा ग्रहीतुम् ।
स यद्वैनच्चक्षुषाऽग्रहैष्यददृष्ट्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥ ५ ॥

तच्छ्रोत्रेणाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशकनोच्छ्रोत्रेण ग्रहीतुम् ।
स यद्वैनच्छ्रोत्रेणाग्रहैष्यच्छ्रुत्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥ ६ ॥

तत्त्वचाऽजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशकनोत्त्वचा ग्रहीतुम् ।
स यद्वैनत्त्वचाऽग्रहैष्यत्स्पृष्ट्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥ ७ ॥

तन्मनसाऽजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशकनोन्मनसा ग्रहीतुम् ।
स यद्वैनन्मनसाऽग्रहैष्यद्व्यात्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥ ८ ॥

तच्छिन्नेनाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशकनोच्छिन्नेन ग्रहीतुम् ।

स यद्वैनच्छिन्नेनाग्रहैष्यद्विसृज्य हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् ॥ ९ ॥

तदपानेनाजिघृक्षत्तदावयत् सैषोऽन्नस्य ग्रहो यद्वायुरन्नायुर्वा
एष यद्वायुः ॥ १० ॥

This food so created wished to run away. By speech he wished to catch it. By speech he could not catch it. If he had caught it by speech, then one would be satisfied by merely talking of food. (3)

By *Prāna* or breath he wished to catch it. By *Prāna* he could not catch it. If he had caught it by *Prāna*, then one would be satisfied by merely smelling food. (4)

By the eye he wished to catch it. By the eye he could not catch it. If he had caught it by the eye, then one would be satisfied by merely seeing food. (5)

By the ear he wished to catch it. By the ear he could not catch it. If he had caught it by the ear, then one would be satisfied by merely hearing of food. (6)

By touch he wished to catch it. By touch he could not catch it. If he had caught it by touch, then one would be satisfied by merely touching food. (7)

By mind he wished to catch it. By mind he could not catch it. If he had caught it by mind, then one would be satisfied by merely thinking of food. (8)

By the generative organ he wished to catch it. By the generative organ he could not catch it. If

he had caught it by the generative organ, one would be satisfied by excreting food. (9)

By the *Apâna* he would have caught it and he caught it. It is this *Apâna* which catches food. This *Apâna* it is which has its life in food. (10)

Com.—This food created for the worlds and the protectors of the worlds wished to go beyond their reach, i. e., began to run away from them, thinking they were its death as its devourer, just as rats etc., do at the sight of cats etc. Knowing this intention of the food, that tangible form the embodiment of worlds and their protectors, both cause and effect in itself, being the first-born, and seeing no other food-eaters wished to catch the food by the action of his mouth, but was not able to catch it by the action of the mouth. If that first-born embodied Being had caught it by speech, all the world, being its effect, would be satisfied by merely talking of food. But it is not so. Hence we infer that even the first-born was not able to catch it by speech. The subsequent portions are similarly explained. Being unable to catch it by *Prâna*, by the eye, by the ear, by touch, by mind and by the generative organ, with their respective activity, he at last wished to catch it by *Apâna* through the cavity of the mouth and thus ate the food. Therefore this *Apâna* is the catcher of the food. This is that vital energy which is well known as having its life in the food.

स ईक्षत कथं न्विदं मृते स्यादिति स ईक्षत कतरेण प्रपद्या
इति । स ईक्षत यदि वाचाऽभिव्याहृतं यदि प्राणेनाभिप्राणितं यदि

चक्षुषा दृष्टं यदि श्रोत्रेण श्रुतं यदि त्वचा स्पृष्टं यदि मनसा ध्यातं
यद्यपानेनाभ्यपानितं यदि शिश्नेन विसृष्टमथ कोऽहमिति ॥ ११ ॥

He thought "how can this live without me?"
So he thought "by which (way) shall I enter it?"
He again thought "if speaking be conducted by
speech, living by *Prāna*, seeing by the eye, hearing
by the ear, touching by skin, thinking by mind,
eating by *Apāna*, and discharge by the generative
organ, then who am I?" (11).

Com.—Having thus made the combinations of
worlds and Lords of worlds to exist, depending
on food, like the existence of a city, inhabitants and
protectors, He like the ruler, thought. *Katham nu*,
means, 'thinking by which mode.' *Madrite* means,
'without me, the builder of the city.' How will this
combination of causes and effects, to be hereafter
described, be without me, existing, as it does, for
another? All this speaking by speech etc., will be
useless, like offerings and encomiums proffered by
subjects and court bards (*Vandi's*) on behalf of
the ruler of the city in his absence. Therefore, I
should, like the king of a town, be the supreme
ruler, the president, the witness of commissions,
omissions and their consequences, and the Enjoyer.
If this combination of effects can exist for another,
without me, the intelligent beneficiary, like the city
and its inhabitants without its master, then who
am I, of what nature, or lord of whom? If I do not,
enter into this combination of causes and effects,
and enjoy the fruit of what is spoken by speech etc.,
like the king entering into the town and taking
note of the commissions and omissions of the
officers of the city, none will know or care to know

me, as existing or as of such and such a nature. Otherwise, I shall be known as a being, who knows the nature of speech, and for whom the functions of speech etc., combined, exist; just as the pillars, the walls etc., combined to form palaces &c., exist for the benefit of something not connected with their parts. Having thus thought, he thought again 'how shall I enter it?' The fore-part of the foot and the crown of the head are the two ways of entrance into this body, the collection of several parts. By which of these two ways shall I enter this city, this bundle of causes and effects?

स एतमेव सीमानं विदार्येतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत सैषा विद्वतिर्नाम
द्वास्तदेतन्नानन्दनम् । तस्य त्रय आवसथास्त्रयः स्वप्ना अयमावसथो-
ऽयमावसथोऽयमावसथ इति ॥ १२ ॥

So having cleft this end, he entered by this door. This is the opening known as *vidriti*, or 'the cleft.' This is the place of bliss. He has three abodes (in the body)—three states of sleep,—this abode, this abode, and this. (12)

Com.—I shall not enter, by the fore-part of the feet, the ways by which my servant *Prāṇa* is authorized to act in my behalf in all matters; but I shall enter through the other gate of the head, as the only other alternative. So thinking, like one in the world who does what he has thought of, the Lord and the Creator, cleft the head where the hair ends, and entered into this bundle of causes and effects, by the way thus made. This entrance is well-known by the perception of taste &c., when the crown of the head is dipped in oil &c., (for

some time). This is the celebrated entrance known as *Vidriti* (the cleft.) The other entrances such as ear &c., being the common ways of those, occupying the position of servants, are not perfect and are not sources of delight. But this is the entrance of the one Lord of all. Therefore this is called *Nāndana*, (productive of joy). The elongation of the vowel 'a' is a Vedic license. This is called *Nāndana*, because one going through it, revels in the highest *Brahman*; of him, who thus created and entered the creation, as an individual soul (*jīva*), just as a king enters a city, there are three abodes—the right eye, during the waking state; the inner mind, during the dreaming state; and the cavity of the heart, during sound sleep. Or the following may be the three abodes—the body of the father, the womb of the mother and one's own body. The three states of sleep, means, the waking, the dreaming and the sleeping states. It may be urged, the waking state being the state of knowledge, cannot be dreamt. Not so. It is certainly a dream. How ? Because there is no realization of one's true *A'tman*, and because one sees there unreal things as in a dream. This abode, the right eye, is the first. Inside the mind, is the second; the cavity of the heart is the third. 'This abode' &c., is only a repetition of what has been already said. Living in these abodes alternately, as the *A'tman*, He sleeps long with his self-born consort Ignorance and does not awake, in spite of repeated experiences of heavy thrashings with the pestle of grief arising from many hundreds of thousands of calamities huddled together.

स जातो भूतान्यभिव्यैख्यत्किमिहान्यं वावदिषदिति । स एत-
मेव पुरुषं ब्रह्म ततममपश्यदिदमदर्शमिती ॥ १३ ॥

He being born knew and talked only of the *Bhûtas*. How should he speak of any other? Then did he see the *Purusha*, the *Brahman*, all-pervading. He said 'this have I seen.' (13)

Com.—He being born, *i.e.*, having entered the body in the form of *jîva* (the individual soul) knew and talked of the *Bhûtas*. When, however, some preceptor possessing great compassion beat at the root of his ears the kettle-drum of the *Mahāvākyas* or key notes of the *Vedānta*, whose sound wakes up the knowledge of the *A'tman*, he saw his Self as the *Brahman*, the Creator dwelling in the body, yet all-pervading like the *A'kās*. The word *tatamam*, having another letter *ta* dropped, should be *tatatamam*, meaning all-pervading. He cried "I have seen this *Brahman*, the real essence of my *A'tman*. Wonder! The elongation, in *itî* of the vowel is according to the *sûtra* "*Vichâranârtha plutih pûrvam*," *i.e.*, a word suggesting deep deliberation gets its vowel elongated.

तस्मादिदन्द्रो नामेदन्द्रो ह वै नाम तमिदन्द्रं सन्तमिन्द्र इत्या-
चक्षते परोक्षेण ! परोक्षप्रिया इव हि देवाः । परोक्षप्रिया इव हि
देवाः ॥ १४ ॥

Therefore he is called *Idandra*. *Idandra* is the well known name of God. Him, though *Idandra*, they call *Indra* indirectly, for the gods are fond of being incognito, as it were. (14)

Com.—As he saw the all-permeating *Brahman* directly as an object, as '*idam*' or this, therefore,

the *Paramâtman* is called *Idandra*. The Lord is well-known in the world as *Idandra*. The knowers of *Brahman* called the *Brahman* who is really *Idandra*, by the name *Indra*, a word denoting some object beyond the range of vision ; so that, it may be freely talked about, being afraid of calling him by his real name, as he is regarded as most venerable. For, the *Devas* (deities) are fond of assuming names denoting invisible objects. Much more so, should be, therefore, the Lord of all, the deity of all the deities. The repetition is to show that this chapter has its end here.

Here ends the third Part.

Sankara's summing up of the substance of the fourth Adhyâya.

The purport of this fourth chapter is this :— The *Brahman*, Creator, Supporter, and Destroyer of the Universe, not subject to *Samsâra*, Omnipresent Omnipotent, Knower of all, having created all this Universe beginning with the *A'kâs* in due order, without the aid of any other entity than itself entered for its own realization all the bodies having life, &c. And having so entered, it realized its own real Self directly thus : "I, *Brahman*, am all this." Therefore he alone is the one *A'tman* in all bodies and there is none else. Another text also says "He, *Brahman* is my Self, I am *Brahman*" and "all this was the *A'tman* alone in the beginning." It has also been said "*Brahman* is all-pervading." Similarly also elsewhere. If seeing

that there is not so much as the point of a hair unoccupied by the *Brahman* the all-pervading *Ātman* of all, it be asked how it entered cleaving the head as the ant enters a hole, we say, this is a small matter for question and there is much here worth questioning. That he saw, having no sensory organs, that he created the worlds unaided by anything else, that he gathered the Purusha from the waters and fashioned him, that from his contemplation, the mouth and other organs were distinctly formed, that from the mouth &c., the protectors of worlds, Fire &c., were produced that they were affected with hunger, thirst &c., that they asked for an abode, that the forms of a cow &c., were shewn to them, that they entered into their respective abodes, that the food created began to run away, that he desired to catch it by speech &c., all this is questionable, quite like the cleaving of the head and the entry by that way. If it be urged "Let all this be incongruous," we say 'No.' Here, as the only fact intended to be conveyed is the realization of the *Ātman*, all this is but attractive hyperbole and there is thus no fault, or it seems to be more reasonable that the Lord, Omniscient, Omnipotent, the great Conjurer, did, like a conjurer, do all this illusion to facilitate explanation, as well as, comprehension, as stories, although false, are easily explained and understood by all. It is well-known that there is no good to be attained by the knowledge of the narrative of the creation, (as it is false); and it is well established in all the Upanishads, that the end attained by the conception of the unity of the real Self is

immortality. This is also stated in the *Gita* and other *Smritis* by the text "the Lord of all seated alike in all living beings" etc.

But here one may say, "there are three *A'tmans*. The first is the *Jiva*, the enjoyer, the doer, and subject to changes well-known to all the world and the *Sāstras*. The second *A'tman*, Intelligent, Lord of all, Omniscient, Creator of the Universe, is inferred from his creating worlds and animal bodies with numerous suitable places for the enjoyment of the fruits of *Karma* by divers beings, just as by seeing the construction of towns and palaces, the author thereof, having knowledge and capacity on that subject, such as carpenter &c., is inferred. The third, is the *Purusha*, spoken of in the *Upanishads* well-celebrated in the *Sāstras* as being 'not this, not this.' From whom speech falls back. Thus these three *A'tmans* are dissimilar to one another. How then could it be known that there is only one *Atman*, without a second and not subject to change? How, if so, is the *Jiva* (individual soul) known? Verily he is known as the hearer, seer, speaker of articulate speech and maker of inarticulate sound and having theoretical and practical knowledge. If so, is it not contradictory to say of him who is known as hearer &c., that he the thinker, is unthinkable; he, the knower is unknown? It is also said in the *Brutis*: "You should not try to know the thinker of thought and the knower of knowledge." To this we reply it is certainly contradictory, if he is directly perceived like joy &c., but it is such direct knowledge that is negatived by "don't try to think the thinker of thought &c." Hence as he is known

by such indicative marks as hearing &c., where then is the contradiction ? Again, it is asked how the *A'tman* is known by the indicative mark of hearing &c ? For, when the *A'tman* is hearing the sound to be heard, then being engaged solely in the act of hearing, there is no possibility of its thinking of, or knowing about itself or anything else ; similarly also as regards other thoughts &c. ; for, all activity of hearing etc., is directed only to its objects, (and not towards its source). It is not possible for the thinker to think of anything other than the thinkable. It may also be urged that everything (even the Self itself), should be thought of by means of the mind. To this we reply, 'it is perfectly right, but all that is thinkable cannot be thought of except by the thinker or the Self, mind being only an instrument in his hand. If so, what would be the result ? This would be the result. That which thinks of all will only be the thinker and never the thinkable and there is not another thinker of the thinker when the *A'tman* is to be thought of by the *A'tman*, then the thinker of the *A'tman* and he that is thinkable by the *A'tman*, will become two distinct *A'tmans* (which is absurd.) Or, the one and the same *A'tman* should be divided into two forms as the thinker and the thinkable, just as a bamboo is split into two ; in such a case the Self is to have a form, which is absurd. So inconsistency results in both cases. Just as of two lights, one cannot be the enlightened and the other the lightener, both being equally illumining, similarly here. Nor has the thinker any time left to think of himself as he is

always engaged in thinking of the thinkable. Even when the thinker thinks of himself by the indicative marks, still the result is what has been already stated i.e., that there are two *A'tmans*, one to be thought of by the indicative marks, and the other, the thinker of it. If it be said that the same *A'tman* divides himself into two, the inconsistency has been already pointed out. If the *A'tman* cannot be directly known, or known by inference, how is it said that one should know Him to be his Self or how that the *A'tman* is the hearer, the thinker etc.? It is well-known that the *A'tman* has the capacity of hearing and of not hearing etc. What is it you find inconsistent in it? At this the opponent replies 'It appears to me to be inconsistent, although to you there appears nothing inconsistent.' How is that? When he is the hearer he is not the thinker and when he is the thinker he is not the hearer. This being so, he is in one view both hearer and thinker and in another view neither hearer nor thinker. Similarly in respect of other attributes. If this be so, how do you find no inconsistency, when you are landed in doubt as to whether the *A'tman* has the capacity of hearing etc., or has not the capacity of hearing etc.? When Devadatta goes, he is going and not staying; when he stands still, he is staying and not going. Then alone he is going and staying alternately; but not always going and staying. Similarly here.

Here again the followers of Kanāda etc., argue thus. The *A'tman* is spoken of as the hearer, the thinker etc., only on account of its being the thinker and the hearer occasionally. They say that knowledge

is the product of the connection (between the mind and the sensory organs) and that is why there is no simultaneity of the knowledge of the impressions received through the various sensory organs. They also quote instances of men saying "My mind was elsewhere engaged. I did not see that" etc. It also stands to reason that the impossibility of this simultaneity of knowledge through various sensory organs is an indication of the existence of the mind. Let this be so, what do you lose? If this can be so, let it be so, if it pleases you; but the meaning, of the *Srutis* will be set at naught. Is it not then the meaning of the *Srutis*, that the *A'tman* is the hearer, the thinker etc. Not so; for the texts say also, he is not the hearer, thinker etc. But have you not replied to the argument by the theory that the *A'tman* is hearer and not hearer &c., alternately. No; for we hold that the *A'tman* is always the hearer etc., for the *Sruti* declares "The hearing of the hearer knows no destruction." If it be so, if it is held that he is always the hearer etc. then simultaneous knowledge through all the senses, a thing contradicted by experience, would result and the absence of ignorance in the *A'tman* would have to be admitted; and that is not real. Neither of these two faults would result; for the *Sruti* declares that the *A'tman* is both the hearing and the hearer. Just as the light of the fire depending on the contact with dried hay etc., is not eternal, so the sight etc., of the transient and gross senses such as the eye etc., having the capacity to come in contact with, and remain separate from objects, is transitory. But there is no possibility of

the *A'tman*, eternal, formless, and neither connected nor isolated, assuming transient attributes as the seeing produced by contact. So the *Sruti* declares "The sight of the seer knows no destruction etc." Thus there are two kinds of vision, that of the eye which is transient and that of the *A'tman* which is eternal. Similarly also two kinds of hearing, that of the ear which is transient and that of the *A'tman* which is eternal. Similarly two sorts of thought and knowledge, external and internal. It is only on this view that the *Sruti* "He is the seer of sight, hearer of the hearing etc" becomes explicable. The transient nature of the vision of the eye is well-known in the world, for during the disease of the eye and after removal of the disease, people say respectively "The sight is lost" and "the sight is gained." Such is also the case with hearing and thinking. The eternal nature of the vision &c., of the Self, is also well-known in the world. A person whose visual organ has been removed says "I just saw my brother in a dream." So one who is really deaf, says "I have heard to-day the mantra in a dream." If the eternal vision of the *A'tman* were produced by the contact of the eye with an object, it would be destroyed when the eye is destroyed. Then one whose visual organ has been removed would not see in a dream anything, blue, yellow etc. Also the *Sruti's* "The sight of the seer knows no destruction," "That is the eye in the *Purusha* by which he sees in dreams," would be contradicted. The eternal vision of the *A'tman* is the percipient of the external and transient vision. As the external vision, having the attributes of transient things, increases, decays

etc., it is perfectly reasonable, that its percipient, the vision of the *A'tman*, should also appear, through the mistaken notion of men transient like it, just as the sight of a whirling object, such as a fire brand, seems itself to whirl. Accordingly the *Sruti* also says "It seems to think and to move." Therefore the vision of the *A'tman* being eternal, there can be no simultaneity of impressions, or want of it. The false notion about the vision of the *A'tman*, is explicable, in the case of men of the world, by their subjecting themselves to the condition of the external and transient vision, and in the case of the nationalists, by their disregard of the *Sâstras* and traditional teachings. The supposition of difference among the *Jiva*, the *Isvara* and the *Paramâtman* is certainly due to that. Similarly also is the perception of difference in the eternal, illimitable vision of the *A'tman*, where all differences speakable and thinkable, such as "it is," "it is not," are merged into one entity. He who perceives any matter for differentiation in that entity which is beyond all speech and thought, as existent or non-existent, one or many, conditioned or unconditioned, intelligent or dull, active or passive, fruitful or fruitless, produced or causeless, happy or miserable, inside or outside, negative or positive, distinct or otherwise from me, would, indeed, get even the sky to cover his person, like the skin, climb up to the sky with his feet like a flight of steps, and trace the foot-prints of fish in water and of birds in the air for the *Srutis* declare : "It is not this," "It is not that," "From which all speech returns" and also "Who could know the *A'tman*?" How can it then be known

as my *A'tman*? Tell me by what means I can know that to be the *A'tman* in me. On this point there is an ancient anecdote. Some ignorant man, having committed a fault, was thus reviled by some. "Shame upon you! you are no man." He being ignorant, approached another man to make himself sure that he was a man and addressed him "Tell me who I am." The person addressed knowing him to be a stupid, said "I will enlighten you gradually." So having disproved that he was anything immoveable etc., he resumed silence after saying "you are not not-man;" The stupid man again asked him "you who set about enlightening me are silent. Why do you not enlighten me?" Quite like this, is what you say. He who being told that he is not not-man does not understand that he is a man, how could he know that he is a man, even though he be told that he is a man? So the *A'tman* can be known only in the manner inculcated by the *Sûstras* and not otherwise. It is well-known that dried hay etc., consumable by fire cannot be consumed by anything other than fire. Similarly therefore, only the *Sûstras* setting about inculcating the entity of the *A'tman* concluded with saying "It is not this," "It is not that" etc., as the anecdote concluded by teaching that he was not not-man. The *Sûstras* also say "This *A'tman* is neither internal, nor external," "This self is *Brahman*, the knower of all; this is the injunction," "Thou art that." But when to him all become his *A'tman*, then whom could he see and by whom?" etc. As long as a man does not know the *A'tman* thus described, so long he knows one, regarding the external and transient names and forms as the *A'tman*,

and regarding from ignorance the attributes of the conditions, as belonging to the *Ātman*, travels in *Samsāra* under the sway of ignorance, desire and Karma, rotating again and again in various grades of creation, from the *Brahman* down to the worm, such as the Devas, animals and men. Thus travelling in *Samsāra* he leaves the body and the sensory organs once assumed and takes others. What experiences does a person thus travelling in a continuous stream of births and deaths, as with the current of a stream, undergo? The *Sruti* now declares in order that men may get freedom from desire.

हरिः ॐ । पुरुषे ह वा अयमादितो गर्भो भवति । यदेतदेत-
स्तदेतत्सर्वेभ्योऽङ्गेभ्यस्तेजः संभूतमात्मन्येवाऽऽत्मानं विभर्ति तद्य-
दा स्त्रियां सिञ्चत्यथैनज्जनयति तदस्य प्रथमं जन्म ॥ १ ॥

First indeed the germ is in the man. That which is semen is the vigour drawn from all his limbs. His Self he bears in himself. When he sheds it into the woman he then gives it birth. That is its first birth. (1)

Com.—The same individual with his ignorance, desires and liking for *Karma* performs *Karma*, like sacrifices &c., reaches the moon, leaving this world, through the path of smoke, returns, after his *Karma* is exhausted, to this world, through rain etc., and becoming food is offered as an oblation in the fire of man. The text states that this traveller in *Samsāra* becomes incorporated with the man, first in the form of semen in him, through the *rasas* (i.e., blood, flesh etc.) and this semen is the essence drawn from all the component parts of this body, the outcome of

food. It is called the *A'tman*, because it is the essence of the man. He supports this *A'tman*, being himself conceived in the form of the semen, in his *A'tman*, i.e., body. Tat] semen. *Yadâ*] when, his wife arrives at the proper season. *Striyâm*] in the fire of the woman. *Śinchatî*] sheds uniting in love with her. Then the father gives birth to it, conceived by him in the form of semen. This coming out of its place in the form of semen at the time that the semen is shed, is the first birth of the person travelling in *Samsâra*, i.e., his first manifested state. This has been already stated by the texts "This *A'tman* (*purusha*), offers that *A'tman* (semen) to that *A'tman* (woman.)

तत्स्त्रिया आत्मभूयं गच्छति यथा स्वमङ्गं तथा । तस्मादेनां
न हिनस्ति साऽस्यैतमात्मानमत्र गतं भावयति ॥ २ ॥

It becomes one with the woman, as her own limb. Therefore it does not hurt her. She nourishes his (the husband's) Self come into her. (2)

Com.—The semen shed in the woman becomes indistinguishable from her as in the case of the father, like her own limb, such as her breast etc.; and for that reason, the fœtus does not injure the mother, as a carbuncle etc., would. The meaning is that because it becomes a part of herself like her limb such as her breast, it does not therefore hurt her. The pregnant woman, knowing that her husband's Self had entered her womb, nourishes it by rejecting foods etc., injurious to the fœtus and by taking such as are favorable to it.

सा भावयित्री भावयितव्या भवति तं स्त्रीगर्भं विभर्ति साऽग्र
एव कुमारं जन्मनोऽग्रेऽधिभावयति । स यत्कुमारं जन्मनोऽग्रेऽधि-

भावयत्यात्मानमेव तद्भावयत्येषां लोकानां संतत्या एवं संतता हीमे
लोकास्तदस्य द्वितीयं जन्म ॥ ३ ॥

She, being the nourisher should be nourished. The woman bears the fœtus. He nourishes it just before and after its birth. In nourishing the babe just before and after its birth he nourishes himself alone, for the continuation of these worlds; for, thus are the worlds continued. This is his second birth. (3)

Com.—She the nourisher of the husband's self-conceived in her womb, should be nourished by the husband; for no relation in this world between one person and another is possible, without reciprocity of benefits. The woman nourishes the fœtus by such means as are enjoined for the nourishment of the fœtus. *Agre* before birth. The father nourishes the child just before and after birth by the performance of natal ceremonies etc. The father in nourishing the child just before and after birth, by the performance of natal ceremonies (*Jâtakarma*) etc., nourishes only himself. For it is only the father's self that is born in the shape of the son. It is accordingly said "The husband enters the wife etc." If it is asked why he produces himself in the shape of the son and nourishes him, it is answered "for the continuation of these worlds;" for these worlds will not continue if none in the world procreates sons etc. Thus because these worlds continue as a stream, because of the continuance of such acts as the procreation of sons etc., therefore that should be done for their continuation, and not for emancipation. This

coming out of the mother's womb in the form of a babe of the person subject to *Samsâra* is his second birth, *i.e.*, his second manifested condition relatively to his form as semen.

सोऽस्यायमात्मा पुण्येभ्यः कर्मभ्यः प्रतिधीयते । अथायास्यमितर आत्मा कृतकृत्यो वयोमतः प्रैति स इतः प्रयत्नेव पुनर्जायते तदस्य तृतीयं जन्म ॥ ४ ॥

This *A'tman* of his, is made his substitute for doing virtuous deeds. Then the other self of his, (the father's self) having accomplished his purpose and reached old age, departs. Departing from hence, he is indeed born again. That is his third birth. (4)

Com.—The meaning is, that this *A'tman* of the father, *i.e.*, his son, is made by him a substitute in his stead for the performance of all virtuous deeds enjoined by the *Sâstras* and performable by him. Accordingly it is said in the *Vâjâsaneyika* also, in the portion treating of making the son the substitute for the father: "He admits I who am enjoined by my father, am *Brahman*, am sacrifice etc." Then having entrusted his burden to the son, the other self of the son, *i.e.*, the father, having accomplished its purpose, *i.e.*, being released from the three-fold debt incurred by him and having become spent with age, dies. Departing from this world, *i.e.*, leaving this body, he takes, like the caterpillar, another body formed by his *Karma* and is born again. The birth, which he is to take after his death, is his third birth. Now, the first birth of the person subject to *Samsâra* is

from the father; the second birth of the same person has been stated to be that from the mother in the form of a child. When the third birth of the same person has to be explained, how is it said that the re-birth of the father after his death is the son's third birth? This is no fault; for, it is intended to lay down that the father and the son are the same self. The son also having entrusted the burden to his son, departs and is born again, like the father. The *Sruti* means, that what is said in one place is in effect said in another place, the father and the son being one self.

तदुक्तमृषिणा । गर्भे नु सन्नन्वेषामवेदमहं देवानां जनिमानि
विश्वा । शतं मा पुर आयसीररक्षन्नधः श्येनो जवसा निरदीयमि-
ति गर्भे एवैतच्छयानो वामदेव एवमुवाच ॥ ५ ॥

Here it has been stated by the sage: "While in the womb, I knew all the births of the gods. A hundred strongholds, as if ironmade, guarded me; (Like) a hawk, I burst through them with speed." So spoke *Vāmadeva* while even lying in the womb. (5)

Com.—While thus travelling in *Samsāra* in rotation, in these three manifested conditions, subject to the bonds of birth and death, every one in the world, hurled into the ocean of *Samsāra*, does in some stage realise with effort the *A'tman*, as described in the *Srutis*. Then at once being freed from all the bonds of *Samsāra*, he becomes like one whose purpose is accomplished. This fact is explained in this *mantra* by the sage. While lying in the womb of the mother, I knew all the births of all the *Devas*, such as speech, fire

etc., because of the fructifying of my meditations in my many previous births. This is the meaning. *Hundred*] many. *Purah*] bodies impenetrable, like those made of iron, guarded me from extricating myself from the meshes of *Samsāra*. *Adha*] down. Like a hawk bursting down through the net, I have come out of it with speed by dint of the strength due to my knowledge of the *A'tman*. Wonder ! That *Vāmadeva*, even while living in the womb, spoke thus.

स एवं विद्वानस्माच्छरीरभेदादूर्ध्वं उत्क्रम्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके
सर्वान्क्रामान्नाप्त्वाऽमृतः समभवत्समभवत् ॥ ६ ॥

He thus knowing, and becoming one with the highest Self, soaring aloft, on the dissolution of the body, attained all desires in that world of heaven and became immortal, became immortal. (6)

Com.—He, *Vāmadeva*, the seer, having thus known the *A'tman* as described, on the dissolution of the body ; i.e., on the final ceasing of the continuity of the stream of embodied existence, created by ignorance, impenetrable like a thing of iron and infested by hundreds of various miseries such as births, deaths, etc., by dint of the strength acquired by drinking the nectar of the knowledge of the *Paramātman*, i.e., by the destruction of the body in consequence of the destruction of ignorance etc., the seed of embodied existence, becoming one with the *Paramātman*, soaring from below, i.e., from *Samsāra*, having attained oneness with the *A'tman* of all, enlightened and purified by knowledge, became immortal in his own self, i.e., became extinguished like a light in the self, already

described as undecaying, deathless, immortal, fearless, omniscient, beginningless, secondless, endless, all-pervasive, sweet with the unalloyed nectar of knowledge.

Having obtained all desires] that is, having, even while living, obtained all desires by the knowledge of the *A'tman*. The repetition is for the purpose of showing the end of the knowledge of the *A'tman* with its fruit and its illustration.

Here ends the commentary on the fourth Part.

हरिः ॐ । कोऽयमात्मेति वयमुपास्महे कतरः स आत्मा येन वा पश्यति येन वा शृणोति येन वा गन्वानाजिघ्रति येन वा वाचं व्याकरोति येन वा स्वादु चास्वादु च विजानाति ॥ १ ॥

Whom shall we worship as the *A'tman*? Who is the *A'tman*? Whether he by whom one sees, or he by whom one hears, or he by whom one smells the smell, or he by whom one speaks the speech or he by whom one discerns sweet and what is not sweet. (1)

Com.—The Bráhmīns of the present time desirous of emancipation, and wishing to acquire the fruit of becoming the *A'tman* of all; by means of the knowledge of *Brahman*, enlightened by the traditional teachings of the preceptors, *Vāmadeva* and the rest, wishing to know the *Brahman* and desirous of turning away from the bondage of *Samsāra*, ephemeral and characterised by causes and effects, ask each other to inquire 'who is this *A'tman*, and how shall we directly worship that

A'tman, as this *A'tman*, and who is that *A'tman*? We should like to worship the very *A'tman* whom *Vâmadeva* worshipped as the *A'tman* directly, and became immortal. Who may that *A'tman* be? In them, who thus questioned each other with a desire to know, arose the recollection, produced by the impression of teachings previously heard, respecting the two particular *A'tmans* already explained. "The *Brahman* entered the *Purusha* through the forepart of the feet." "He cleft the head and entered the *Purusha* by this passage." "Two *Brahmans* in opposition to each other have entered here." "They are both the *A'tman* of this body." One of them must be the *A'tman* to be worshipped. Thus they again questioned each other for the purpose of clearly determining who the *A'tman* was. In them, who thus inquired, arose another thought, respecting the differentiation of these two. How? Two entities are known to exist in this body. One, by whom, with the aid of various senses, differing in many ways, anything is perceived and another who is known as one who remembers the impressions of objects perceived with the aid of other senses. Here, that by which one knows cannot be the *A'tman*. By whom is it then known? We reply: that by which being the eye, one sees form, that by which being the ear, one hears sound, that by which being the nose, one smells the smell, that by which being the organ of speech, one utters speech, consisting of names such as cow, horse, good, bad, etc., or that by which being the tongue, one discerns what is sweet and what is not.

यदेतद्धृदयं मनश्चैतत् । संज्ञानमाज्ञानं विज्ञानं प्रज्ञानं मेधा इष्टि-
 र्धृतिर्मतिर्मनीषा जूतिः स्मृतिः संकल्पः क्रतुरसुः कामो वश इति
 सर्वाण्येवैतानि प्रज्ञानस्य नामधेयानि भवन्ति ॥ २ ॥

This which is known as the heart, this mind, consciousness, discrimination, wisdom, reason, perception, steadiness, thought, acuteness, quickness, memory, volition, decision, strength, desire and control, all these are indeed the names of wisdom. (2)

Com.—What is that sense which though one is variously differentiated, is now explained. What has been already stated "The essence of creatures is the heart, the essence of the heart is the mind ; by the mind is created the waters and *Varuna*, the Lord of Waters. From the heart comes the mind and from the mind, the moon." Such only is this heart and this mind, one appearing diverse. By this one mind becoming the eye, one sees form. By this becoming the ear, one hears. By this becoming the nose, one smells; by this becoming speech, one speaks; by this becoming the tongue, one tastes. In its deliberative aspects, it deliberates and in the form of heart it determines. Therefore this sense, having all other senses and objects for its play of activity, is the means whereby the knower knows everything. Accordingly also, the *Kaushîtaki* texts say "Reaching the organ of speech by wisdom, one obtains all names by speech. Reaching the eye by wisdom, one sees all forms by the eye" etc. It is said in the *Vâjasaneyika* also "One sees by the mind alone and hears by the mind, one knows forms by the heart" etc.

Therefore it is well-known that that which is named as the heart and the mind, is the means of the perception of all objects; and *Prâna* is essentially that. The *Brâhmana* says "what is called *Prâna* is wisdom and what is called wisdom is *Prâna*." In the beginning of the discussion about *Prâna* we have said that *Prâna* is the combination of the senses. Therefore the *Brahman* which entered by the feet cannot possibly be that entity, the *Brahman* to be worshipped, because it is an adjunct, being only a means of perception to the knower. The only other entity, *i.e.*, that knower, to whom the functions, hereafter described, of the sense called the heart or the mind, are the means of perception, can alone be the *A'tman* fit to be worshipped by us. So they decided. The functions of the mind, consisting of external and internal objects, and serving as a means of perception to the all-wise *Brahman*, the knower, resting upon the condition of the mind, are thus explained. *Samjñâna*] consciousness. *A'jñâna*] directing, the state of being the lord. *Vijñâna*] the acquirement of the different branches of knowledge &c. *Prajñâna*] wisdom. *Medhâ*] power of retaining the import of books. *Drishtih*] perception of all objects through the senses. *Dhritih*] steadiness by which the drooping body and the senses are kept up; for, they say "By steadiness, they support the body." *Matih*] thought. *Manishâ*] independent power of thinking. *Jâtih*] distress of mind under disease etc. *Smritih*] recollections. *Sankalpah*] the thinking of forms, as white, black etc. *Kratuh*] application. *Asuh*] any

pursuit for the maintenance of life etc. *Kāma*] desire for any objects not at hand. *Vasah*] desire for the company of women. These and the other functions of the mind, being the means of perception to the knower who is mere consciousness become conditions to the *Brahman*, with his pure consciousness; and *Samjñānam* and others, all these become the names of *Brahman*, the pure consciousness, when subjected to these conditions and not directly in its unconditioned state. Accordingly it has also been said "while only moving, it is called *Prāna*" etc.

एष ब्रह्मैष इन्द्र एष प्रजापतिरेते सर्वे देवा इमानि च पञ्चमहा-
भूतानि पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योतीषीत्येतानीमानि च क्षुद्र-
मिश्राणीव । बीजानीतराणि चेताराणि चाण्डजानि च जारुजानि च
स्वेदजानि चोद्भिज्जानि चाश्वा गावः पुरुषा हस्तिनो यक्तिचेदं
प्राणि जङ्गमं च पतत्रि च यच्च स्थावरम् । सर्वं तत्प्रज्ञानेत्रं प्रज्ञाने
प्रतिष्ठितं प्रज्ञानेत्रो लोकः प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठा प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म ॥ ३ ॥

This *Brahman*, this *Indra*, this Creator, all these gods, these five great elements, earth, air, ether, water, fire, and all these small creatures, these others, the seeds of creation and these egg-born, womb-born, sweat-born, sprout-born, horses, cows, men, elephants, and whatever else which breathes and moves and flies and is immoveable; all this is guided by wisdom and is supported by wisdom; the universe has wisdom for its guide; wisdom is the basis; wisdom is *Brahman*. (3)

Com.—This *Ātman* in the form of consciousness, is the lower *Brahman*, called *Hiranyagarbha*

or *Prâna*, the living principle of all bodies, that has entered into the conditions of the mind like the image of the Sun reflected on various waters. This is none else than *Indra*, according to his (previously-mentioned) characteristic, or the lord of the *Devas*. This is none else than the *Prajâpati*, the first born who has a body and from whom all the protectors of the world, fire etc., were born, from the cavity of the mouth etc. This is that *Prajâpati* and this also in all these gods, fire etc. These five great *Bhûtas* also, earth etc., the material causes of all bodies, known as the eatable and the eater; as also these creatures intermingled with small creatures such as serpents etc., (the word *iva* has no meaning); and these and these seeds of creation divided under two heads. What these are is explained: Egg-born] birds etc. Womb-born, born of the womb, such as men. Sweat-born] lice &c. Sprout-born] trees etc. Horses, cows, men, elephants and whatever other living thing; what is that? Which is moving] *i.e.*, which moves or goes by the feet; also which flies, *i.e.*, which is capable of flying in the air; as also all that is unmoving. All this is *Prajnâ-netram*. *Prajnâ* is consciousness, that is *Brahman*. *Netram* that by which it is guided. That which is guided by *Prajnâ-netram*. All this is attached to *Prajnâ*, *i.e.*, depends on *Brahman* during creation, preservation and destruction. *Prajnâ-netrolukah*] as already explained; or, it may mean all the universe has wisdom for its eye. Wisdom is the basis of all the universe. Therefore wisdom is *Brahman*. This (entity) being devoid of every sort of condition, unstained, untainted, passive, self

content, one without a second, knowable by eliminating all distinguishing attributes, as 'not this', 'not this' etc., and beyond all word and thought, becomes, by its connection with the condition of extremely pure wisdom, Omniscient, Lord of all, soul and guide of the common seed of the entire unmanifested universe and is called as *Antaryâmi*, being the (universal) controller. This also becomes what is called *Hiranyagarbha*, characterised by its notion of self in the intelligence, which is the seed of all the manifested universe. This also becomes the *Virât*, known as *Prajâpati*, who, springing from within the cosmic egg, first conditions himself with a body. This becomes what is known as *Devatâ*, the offspring of the same cosmic egg having the name of fire etc. Similarly, the *Brahman* receives diverse names and forms under conditions of different bodies from *Brahman* down to the worm. That one being, who is beyond all conditions, is known in all ways by all living beings as well as by the nationalist and is diversely thought of; as stated in the *Smriti*: "This, some call fire; others, Manu the Creator; others yet, *Indra*; others yet, *Prâna* and others the eternal *Brahman*," etc.

स एतेन प्रज्ञेनाऽऽत्मनाऽऽमाहोकादुत्क्रम्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके
सर्वान्कामानाप्त्वाऽमृतः समभवत्समभवत् ॥ ४ ॥

By means of this wisdom, i.e., self, he, soaring from this world, obtained in Heaven all desires and became immortal, became immortal. (4)

Com.—He, *Vâmadeva* or any other sage, knew *Brahman* in the way explained, by that wise self,

by which wise self, knowers previously became immortal. Similarly that sage too by means of the same wise self rising above this world (this has been already explained); going beyond this world, getting all desires fulfilled in that world of heaven, became immortal.

Here ends the commentary upon the fifth Part.

Thus ends the sixth Chapter of the Commentary upon the second A'ranyaka of the Aitareya Upanishad.
