



**DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl No.

R6

62

Ac. No.

20344

Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 5 Paise will be collected for each day the book is kept overtime.

A KṢARA
A FORGOTTEN CHAPTER
IN THE
HISTORY OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.

Inaugural—Dissertation
zur
ERLANGUNG DER DOCTORWÜRDE
der
HOHEN PHILOSOPHISCHEN FAKULTÄT
der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel

Vorgelegt von
P. M. MODI, M. A.
~~AUS BHAVNAGAR~~ (BRIT. INDIEN).

Printed at
THE BARODA STATE PRESS

BARODA
1932

Referent : Prof. Dr. F. OTTO SCHRADER

Korreferent : Prof. Dr. E. FRAENKEL.

Tag der mündlichen Prüfung : 14. Februar 1931.

Zum Druck genehmigt

Kiel,

den 14. Februar 1931. Der Dekan : Prof. Dr. Rosenberg.

MOTTO :

*Pañcaviṃśaṃ yad etat te proktaṃ Brāhmaṇasattama |
tathā tan na tathā c et tad bhavān vaktum arhati ||*

“ This Twentyfifth [of the Aupaniṣadas] (*i.e. akṣara*) which has been described by you, O best of Brahmins, pray tell me whether it is so or whether it is not so. ”

MBh. XII. 318. 58.

ERRATA.

Page.	Line.			
5,	2:	read	<i>maitra</i>	for <i>matira</i> .
11,	6:	read	<i>vaḍanti</i>	„ <i>vadnti</i> .
11,	27:	insert	a comma after (<i>amṛta</i>).	
24,	28:	read	<i>karman</i> or <i>yoga</i> instead of <i>karma</i> or <i>yogan</i> .	
25,	32	„	<i>Sāṃkhya</i>	for <i>Sāṃkhy</i> .
42,	40:	„	<i>avyakta</i>	„ <i>āvyakta</i> .
43,	1:	„	<i>budhyamāna</i>	„ <i>budhydmāna</i> .
44,	21:	„	<i>ā-vidyā</i>	„ <i>ā-vidya</i> .
44,	23:	insert a comma after <i>Iṣṇu</i> .		
55,	14:	read	“itself”	for “itsvlf”.
55,	14:	read	“there”	„ “rhere”.
55,	36:	„	“that”	„ “what”.
56,	16:	delete semicolon.		
59,	34	read	“L. Mahābhārata”	„ “Mahābhārata”.
62,	2:	read	<i>viddhi yogān</i>	„ <i>viddhu yogan</i> .
63,	24:	„	“invulnerable”	„ “invulnarale”.
63,	26:	„	“believed”	„ “belived”.
66,	24:	„	<i>buddhaka</i>	„ <i>buddhak</i> .
68,	23.	„	<i>eti</i>	„ <i>eh</i> .
71,	7	„	“not”	„ “note”.
71,	42:	„	<i>tattvasaṃyūṭaḥ</i>	„ <i>tattvasaṃyūṭaḥ</i> .
76,	10:	delete	“and”	after indentify.
78,	19:	read	“from”	for “for”.

Page.	Line.				
78,	39:	read	"(reference)"	for	"(refence)".
80,	8:	"	"differentiated"	"	"differentisted".
80,	11:	"	"twentyfive"	"	"Twentyfive".
80,	20:	"	"Twentyfifth"	"	"Twentifitth".
80,	11:	"	<i>tūlmabhāvana</i>	"	<i>tāmabhāvana</i> .
94,	19:	delete	"the" before	"more".	
96,	17:	"	"this".		
97,	7:	read	"throughout"	for	"throught".
99,	27:	"	<i>eṣa</i>	"	<i>esa</i> .
100,	15:	substitute	"The views of both"	for	"Both".
114,	23:	read	"offered"	for	"done".
123,	27:	"	"beings"	"	"begins".
138,	5:	delete	' the" before	"Knowledge"and	"not-Knowledge."
138,	36:	"	"the" before	"Bh. Gi."	
141,	6:	insert	"second" before	"Imperishable."	
143,	27:	read	"(8)"	for	"(6)"
144,	15:	"	<i>adhibhūta</i>	"	<i>adhibhūta</i> .
145,	5:	"	"would"	"	"will".
146,	6:	"	"penetrated"	"	"penitrated".
152,	5:	"	"their authors had"	"	"they have."
152,	7:	"	"to have found"	"	"that we have."
154,	27:	"	"need"	"	"would"
166,	29:	"	<i>Upalabdhi</i>	"	<i>Upalabahi</i> .
170,	31:	"	"moon, sun"	"	"Moon, Sun."
175,	7:	"	<i>akṣara</i>	"	<i>akṣara</i> .
177,	4:	"	"studied at"	"	"visited"

CONTENTS.

	PAGES.
INTRODUCTION.	1 - 9
The Problem	1
The term <i>akṣara</i>	1
Its meaning	1
The Present Situation	4
The Bhagavadgītā Terminology not very vague.	4
<i>Akṣara</i> in the Bhagavadgītā, a technical term.	5
Aids to interpret it	5
The Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads	6
The Mokṣadharmā Section in Mahābhārata XII.	6
The Brahmsūtras	7
Synonyms of <i>akṣara</i>	8
Results of the Author's Investigation	8
Editions and Translations used	9
Works and Articles consulted: their Abbreviations ...	10
CHAPTER I :— <i>Akṣara in the Upaniṣads</i>	11 - 16
✓ The Impersonal and the Personal in the Vedas.	11
In the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads	11
✓ The two Conceptions not yet connected	12
Earliest Solution of their Relation	12
✓ Further Development: The Impersonal lower than the Personal	12
✓ <i>Avyakta</i> , a Synonym of <i>akṣara</i>	13
Both eternal: both goals: both <i>vidyās</i>	13
✓ <i>Akṣara</i> , a Conscious Cosmic Principle also ...	14

	PAGES.
<i>Akṣara</i> , the Matrix (<i>yonī</i>)	14
<i>Akṣara</i> , the Power (<i>śakti</i>)	14
<i>Akṣara</i> , a <i>dharma</i> of <i>puruṣa</i>	14
The Doctrine of 'Dualistic Monism'	14
Two Natures in the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads.	15
Terms for the Higher Nature	15
Terms for the Lower Nature	15
Paths leading to <i>akṣara</i> and <i>puruṣa</i>	16
Progress during the Period of the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads	16
Idea of Trinity in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad ...	16
CHAPTER II :— <i>Akṣara in the Bhagavadgītā</i>	17 – 29
<i>Akṣara</i> and <i>puruṣa</i> , two "goals" as in the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads	17
<i>Puruṣa</i> , the Presiding Deity	17
<i>Akṣara</i> , the Abode	17
Brahman, a ' synonym of <i>akṣara</i>	17
Brahman, not identified with Kṛṣṇa or <i>puruṣa</i> ...	18
Brahman in Bhagavadgītā VIII	18
In Bhagavadgītā XIV	18
In Bhagavadgītā VI	18
In Bhagavadgītā XVIII... ..	18
Meaning of " <i>Vāsudevaḥ sarvaṃ</i> " in Bhagavad- gītā VII	19
Brahman in Bhagavadgītā X and XI... ..	19
In Bhagavadgītā V	19
In Bhagavadgītā IV	19
In Bhagavadgītā VI	20
Prof. Garbe's View untenable	20
The Bhagavadgītā's Distinction between the two Natures	20
<i>Akṣara</i> , the Higher Nature, a Living Spiritual Principle	20
The Lower Nature, an Effect of <i>akṣara</i>	20

	PAGES.
Synonyms of <i>akṣara</i>	20
The Bhagavadgītā's Theory of two <i>avyaktas</i> or two <i>prakṛtis</i>	21
The Higher Nature, eternal	21
The Lower Nature, a Material Principle ...	21
Difference between the Bhagavadgītā and the Later Mahābhārata	21
Progress during the Bhagavadgītā Period ...	21
The Three Great Paths of the Bhagavadgītā ...	22
<i>Sāṃkhya</i> , and <i>yoga</i> in the Bhagavadgītā, only two Paths, not two Schools... ..	23
<i>Sāṃkhya</i> , <i>Sannyāsa</i> rather than <i>jñāna</i> ..	23
<i>Jñāna</i> , the reverse of <i>karman</i> i.e. <i>sannyāsa</i> in the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads	23
<i>Yoga</i> in the Bhagavadgītā, inclusive of <i>jñāna</i> i.e. the Knowledge of Atman	24
<i>Yoga</i> , <i>jñāna</i> plus <i>karman</i>	24
<i>Sāṃkhya</i> , <i>jñāna</i> plus <i>sannyāsa</i>	25
Prof. Edgerton's View untenable	25
Meaning of " <i>Sāṃkhya</i> and <i>yoga</i> are one" in the Bhagavadgītā	25
Identity of Goals, not of Paths	25
Prof. Hopkins' View untenable	26
<i>Yoga</i> Path, the Bhagavadgītā's special contri- bution	26
Bhagavadgītā XVIII. 13, a Reference to <i>Sāṃkhya</i> as a School	26
Prof. Edgerton's View untenable	26
The Individual Soul, an Agent... ..	27
Survival of that view in the Later Mahābhārata	27
Dr. Dahlmann's View amplified	27
Two Technical Meanings of " <i>yoga</i> " in the Bhagavadgītā	27
The Path of Devotion and Meditation... ..	28
One Upaniṣada School with three Paths	28

	PAGES.
The Possible Re-edition of the Bhagavadgītā...	28
No Doctrinal Change in the Re-edition ...	29
CHAPTER III :— <i>Akṣara in the Later Mahābhārata</i> ...	30 – 91
Distinction between the Chapters of the Four Schools in the Later Mahābhārata necessary.	30
Prof. Edgerton	30
Prof Hopkins and Prof. Deussen	30
Dr. Frauwallner	31
Prof. Jacobī	31
The Series of Twentysix Principles older than their Enumeration and Numerical Designations	31
Numerical Designations adopted by all the four Schools of the Later Mahābhārata	32
Sāṃkhya, a School of only Twentyfive Principles	33
Yoga, a school of Twentysix Principles ...	33
Aupanīṣada, a School of Twentysix Principles...	33
Mistakes of Prof. Hopkins and Prof. Deussen ...	34
Pāñcarātra, a School of Twentyfive Principles...	34
1. The Aupanīṣada School....	35 – 41
Impressive Consistency of the “para-ladder” Accounts of the Aupanīṣada School	35
“Jñāna”, the Lower Nature	35
The akṣara-and-puruṣa Doctrine as in the Earlier Metrical Upanīṣads and the Bhagavadgītā	36
The Lower Nature as in the Earlier Metrical Upanīṣads and the Bhagavadgītā	36
Non-identity of the two Natures emphasised ...	36
Akṣara the Higher Living Nature	37
Akṣara designated jīva and kṣetra	37
Mistakes of Prof. Deussen and Prof. Hopkins...	37
Other Synonyms of akṣara in the Later Mahābhārata	38

	PAGES.
The Numerical Designations	38
Progress in the Aupaniṣada School during the Later Mahābhārata Period	39
The Doctrine of "Pluralistic Dualism" ...	40
The "Tetrad" of the Later Mahābhārata Aupaniṣadas	40
The Rise of another Aupaniṣada School in the Later Mahābhārata	40
Numerical Unity of the Lower and the Higher Natures	41
Numerical Unity of <i>akṣara</i> and <i>puruṣa</i> ...	41
The Doctrine of " <i>sthāna-bheda</i> " in " <i>akṣara-</i> <i>and-puruṣa</i> "	41
Further Proof of the Existence of the School of these "Saints"	41
2. The Sāṃkhya School	41-56
Sāṃkhya Chapters in the Later Mahābhārata ...	41
Sāṃkhyas' Rejection of " <i>avyakta budhyanāna</i> " i.e. the Higher Nature	42
Mistakes of Prof. Hopkins and Prof. Deussen...	42
Sāṃkhyas' Rejection of " <i>acyuta pañcaviṃśa</i> " ...	43
Sāṃkhyas' Rejection of " <i>śūśvata avyakta</i> " ...	43
Connection of the Sāṃkhya terms with those of the Aupaniṣadas	44
The terms <i>avidyā</i> and <i>vidyā</i>	44
Confusion of Prof. Hopkins	44
Prof. Deussen	44
The terms <i>kṣara</i> and <i>akṣara</i>	45
The term <i>jñāna</i>	46
The term <i>kṣetra</i>	46
Sāṃkhyas' Nature, a Combination of the two <i>prakṛtis</i> of the Aupaniṣadas	46
The Sāṃkhyas first to emphasise (but not to originate) the Theory of Evolution	47
Sāṃkhyas' Acceptance of the Aupaniṣada <i>puruṣa</i>	47

	PAGES.
Theistic Character of the Later Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya School	47
Explanation of “ <i>anīśvara</i> ” in MBh. XII. 300...	48
Prof. Edgerton’s View untenable	48
Terminology of the Later Mahābhārata Sāṃkhyas, a sure Witness of their Descent from the Aupaniṣadas	49
Difference between the Later Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya and the Classical Sāṃkhya Schools	50
Ignorance of the term “ <i>prakṛti-vikṛti</i> ” ...	50
Primitive Conception of the Mind	50
Prakṛti described as Male, not as Female ...	50
Terms unknown to the Classical Sāṃkhya School	51
Identity of Jīva and Īśvara. Theism	51
Primitive Conception of the Grounds for Puruṣa’s Existence	51
Puruṣa, an Agent	51
Absence of the Classical Sāṃkhya Idea of “ <i>viveka</i> ”	51
No Plurality of Souls	52
Prof. Hopkins’, Prof. Edgerton’s and Prof. Deussen’s Views untenable... ..	52
Dr. Frauwallner’s View amplified	52
The Later Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya much prior to the Classical Sāṃkhya School	53
Progress made by the Later Mahābhārata Sāṃkhyas	53
Complete Separation of Spirit and Matter ...	53
Contents of the Works of Āsuri and Pañcasikha:	
Rejection of the Higher Nature	54
Rise of the Later Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya School from the <i>sāṃkhya</i> Path of the Bhagavadgītā...	55
Resemblance between the <i>sāṃkhya</i> and <i>yoga</i> Paths of the Bhagavadgītā and the Later Mahābhārata Schools of those names ...	55

	PAGES.
3. The Yoga School.	56 - 84
Yoga an independent School of Thought in the Later Mahābhārata	- 56
Statements regarding the difference of Doctrines and Identity of Practice between the Later Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya and Yoga Schools ...	56
Prof. Hopkins' and Prof. Edgerton's Views untenable	57
Meaning of "Sāṃkhya and Yoga are one" in the Later Mahābhārata	57
The Twentysixth never said to be a Principle of the Sāṃkhya School	58
Comparison of the Statements with the actual Teaching	59
Rejection of the Higher Nature... ..	59
The Conception of Prakṛti	59
Prof. Hopkins' and Prof. Edgerton's Views un- tenable... ..	59
Prof. Deussen's Interpretation also incorrect	60
The Conception of <i>sumnum bonum</i>	61
Two Yoga Schools in the Later Mahābhārata...	61
The Germ of both present in the Bhagavadgītā.	62
Their Priority to the Classical Yoga School ...	62
Prof. Edgerton's and Prof. Hopkins' Views untenable	62
The Conception of the <i>sumnum bonum</i> different in the two Yoga Schools	63
The Yogas' Acceptance of the Twentysixth ...	63
The Conception of the Career of Life	64
The Later Mahābhārata Conception of Three <i>niṣṭhās</i> without Reference to Schools... ..	64
Terminology of the Later Mahābhārata Yoga Schools	65
Evidence for the same	66 - 68
Points of Doctrinal Difference between the Later Mahābhārata Yogas and Sāṃkhyas	68

	PAGES.
Distinction between Jīva and Paramātmān ...	69
Evidence for the same	69
The Sāṃkhyas criticised by the Yogas	70 – 74
The Conception of the <i>summum bonum</i> : the Jīva becomes like Paramātmān, not Paramātmān Himself	75
Evidence for the same	75
The Sāṃkhyas criticised by the Yogas... ..	76 – 78
No Identity of Jīva and Paramātmān in the Later Mahābhārata Yoga Schools	78
Further evidence... ..	79
No Plurality of Souls in the Yoga Schools ...	79
Mistaken Interpretation of MBh. XII. 308 by Prof. Deussen and Prof. Hopkins	79
The Twentyfifth never becomes the Twentysixth in the Later Mahābhārata Schools	80
Discovery of the Origin of the Classical Yoga Doctrine of Transcendent God: Abandonment of the Upaniṣadic Identity of Jīva and Brahman.	81
Historical Importance of MBh. XII. 308 ...	82
Adoption of the Later Mahābhārata Yoga Terminology by other contemporary Schools ...	82
The Conception of “ <i>budhyamāna</i> ” in all the Schools	83
Origin of the term “ <i>buddha</i> ” older than Buddhism	83
Progress made by the Later Mahābhārata Yogas.	83
The Doctrine of “Double Dualism of Spirit and Matter”	83
4. The Pāñcarātra School ...	84 – 91
Pāñcarātra Chapters in the Later Mahābhārata.	84
Identification of <i>akṣara</i> and <i>puṛuṣa</i>	84
Revival of the Oldest Description of <i>akṣara</i> ...	85
The term <i>vidyā</i>	85
Nārāyaṇa named the Twentyfifth	85

	PAGES.
The Nature, the Twentyfourth, "born" of Nārāyaṇa	86
The Individual Souls and their Relation to Nārāyaṇa	87
Progress made by the Pāñcarātra School ...	88
No Dualism	88
Comparison of the Pāñcarātra with other Schools.	88
The Doctrine of <i>coincidentia oppositorum</i> ...	89
Its Original Meaning	89
Its Meaning according to the Ācāryas	89
Origin of the Pāñcarātra School: Reconciliation or Revival of Vedic Religion under the Bhakti- teaching of the Bhagavadgītā	90
Pāñcarātra School also, a Path to the same Goal	91
Further Development, the Brahmasūtras ...	91
CHAPTER IV:— <i>Akṣara in the Brahmasūtras</i>	92-116
Claim for the Discovery of the Original Meaning of the Sūtras	92
Mutilation of the Original Sūtras	92
The Sūtrakāra's Discrimination between <i>akṣara</i> and <i>puṛuṣa</i>	93
Their Designations	94
Their Forms	94
"Collection" of their Thoughts	94
Their Functions... ..	94
Interchange of their Thoughts	95
Option of Choice between <i>akṣara</i> and <i>puṛuṣa</i> ...	95
Comparative Importance of <i>akṣara</i> and <i>puṛuṣa</i> ...	96
Discrimination of "Place" in the Supreme Being	96
The Sūtrakāra's Terminology	96
The term " <i>para</i> "... ..	96
The term " <i>pradhāna</i> "	97
The term " <i>akṣara</i> "	98

	PAGES.
"Akṣara" as a <i>pūrvapakṣa</i> in Br. Sū. I....	98
Dr. Thibaut and Prof. Deussen ...	98
<i>Vaiśvānara</i> in Chāndogya Upaniṣad V., <i>puruṣa</i> , not <i>akṣara</i>	98
<i>Antaryāmin</i> in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, <i>puruṣa</i> not <i>akṣara</i>	99
Thorough Distinction between <i>akṣara</i> and <i>puruṣa</i> in the Sūtras	100
Identification of the two Natures: <i>akṣara</i> or <i>puruṣa</i> is also the (only) Nature (<i>prakṛti</i>) ...	101
<i>Akṣara</i> , the Conscious <i>prakṛti</i>	101
Evidence of the <i>yoni</i> -passages	102
Evidence of " <i>jīvena ātmanā</i> " in Chāndogya Upaniṣad VI	102
Various forms of the Identification of the two Natures	103
The Sūtrakāra's Theory of <i>akṣara</i> as the Nature Br. Sū. I. 4. 1-7	103
Meaning of " <i>Puruṣa</i> is higher than <i>avyakta</i> " (Kaṭha Upaniṣad III. 11)	104
Rejection of the lower Nature, the Intellect and the Mind, as links in the Series of Evolution.	105
Two Aupaniṣada Schools criticised by the Sūtrakāra	105
The " <i>sthāna-bheda</i> " (?) View	106
The " <i>svarūpa-bheda</i> " (?) View	106
Identification of these two Aupaniṣada Schools with those of the Later Mahābhārata ...	106
The Sūtrakāra's Criticism of these	107
Problem of <i>coincidentia oppositorum</i>	107
History of its Beginning... ..	107
The Sūtrakāra's Rational Explanation of the Problem	109
The Sūtrakāra, the Restorer of Advaitism in the Aupaniṣada School	110

	PAGES.
Distinction between the Sūtrakāra and the Later Mahābhārata Pāncarātras	111
Compromising Character of the Sūtras... ..	111
The Oldest Upaniṣadic Schools... ..	112
The Younger Upaniṣadic Schools	113
Formation of the Vedānta School: Its First Text Book and its First Ācārya	114
Practical purpose of the Union: The Desire to oppose jointly the Sāṃkhya and other hostile Schools... ..	114
Invaluable Contribution of the Gītā Doctrine in the Formation of the First Vedānta School ...	115
RETROSPECT	117-121
<hr/>	
APPENDICES... ..	123-175
I:—INTERPRETATION OF THE UPANIṢADS	123-141
<i>A.—Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad.</i>	123-127
1. Mu. Up. II. 1. 1-2.	123
2. Mu. Up. III. 2. 8.	124
3. Mu. Up. I. 1. 7-9.	124-125
4. Mu. Up. I. 2. 13.	125-126
Conclusion... ..	126-127
<i>B.—Praśna Upaniṣad</i>	127-131
1. Pr. Up. IV. 9-11	127-128
2. Pr. Up. V. 2, 5, 7	128-131
Conclusion... ..	131
<i>C.—Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad</i>	131-141
1. Śve. Up. I. 7-12	132-137
2. Śve. Up. V. 1	138-139
Conclusion	139-141

	PAGES.
II:—INTERPRETATION OF THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ ...	142-151
1. Bh. Gī. III. 14d-15... ..	142
2. Bh. Gī. VII. 29-30, VIII. 1-5, 8 ...	142-145
3. Bh. Gī. XV. 16-18	146-147
4. Bh. Gī. XII. 1-4	147-148
5. Bh. Gī. VIII. 18-22... ..	148-150
6. Bh. Gī. XI. 18, 37c-d	150
Conclusion	150-151
III:—NO PLURALITY OF SOULS IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA.	152-154
1. MBh. XII. 315. 10 e-f, 11ff ...	152-153
2. MBh. XII. 350. 1-3, 7	153-154
IV:—INTERPRETATION OF THE BRAHMASŪTRAS.	155-171
1. Br. Sū. III. 3. 1-53	155-166
2. Br. Sū. III. 2	167
(a) Br. Sū. III 2. 11-21	167-169
(b) Br. Sū. III 2. 32-38	169-171
ADDITIONAL NOTES	173-175
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	177-178

INTRODUCTION.

Translations of the Bhagavadgītā abound, and their number is constantly increasing, but not so the help for interpreting that famous text, such as Colonel Jacob's "Concordance to the Principal Upaniṣads and Bhagavadgītā." It is curious, indeed, that even now, more than a century after the first translations and A. W. von Schlegel's critical edition of the Bhagavadgītā, the one work which ought to precede any translation, viz., the book on the terminology of the Gītā, has yet to be written. There exists so far but a single contribution to it, viz., Franklin Edgerton's Paper "The meaning of Sāṃkhya and Yoga," which appeared in 1924 in Vol. XLV of the American Journal of Philology.

Accepting Prof. Schrader's suggestion I, therefore, proposed to supply this want and began by examining what seemed to us the most puzzling of the metaphysical terms of the Gītā, viz., *akṣara*; and the inquiry on it grew to such an extent that it has become the sole subject of this Thesis.

The following table will give an idea of the present condition of our problem. There are altogether fourteen passages in the Gītā in which the word *akṣara* occurs. Three of these (viz., VIII. 13, X. 25, and X. 33) may be dismissed at once, because in them the meaning "letter" or "syllable" is incontestable. In the remaining eleven places (Bh. Gī. III. 15 b; VIII. 3a, 11a, 21a, XI. 18a, 37d, XII 1c, 3a; XV. 16b and d, 18b), where it may be supposed to mean a metaphysical principle or an adjective qualifying the same, it is understood as follows by the two best known Indian commentators and four European translators :—

Bh. Gī.	Śaṅkara.	Rāmāṇuja.	Garbe.
III. 15b	The Supreme Soul (m.).	The individual soul.	The Imperishable (cause of <i>prakṛti</i>).
VIII. 3a	Brahman (n.).	The One of the form of the aggregate of individual souls (<i>kṣetrajñasamaṣṭirūpa</i>).	Imperishable (adj.).
11a	„	The Immutable possessing the attributes “not-gross” etc.	„
21a	(Not explained.)	A liberated soul.	„ in VIII. 19 (adj. to <i>avyakta bhāva</i> i.e. <i>ṣurūṣa</i> in VIII. 22).
XI. 18a	Brahman (n.).	The Immutable.	Imperishable (adj.).
37d	(Not explained.)	The principle (called) the individual soul (<i>jīvātmatattva</i>).	The Imperishable.
XII. 1c	Brahman, the Supreme Atman.	The nature of the inner self (<i>pratyagātmavastarūpa</i>).	„ (=the impersonal Brahman).
3a	The One presiding over the power of Illusion.	„	Imperishable (adj.).
XV. 16b,d	The Lord's power of Illusion.	The liberated person.	The Imperishable (the individual soul).
18b	The seed of the world-tree (i.e. the power of Illusion).	The liberated soul.	„

Deussen.	Barnett.	Hill.	Bh. Gi.
The Imperishable (cause of Veda-Word).	The Imperishable (cause of "Word- Brahman").	The Imperish- able (cause of <i>prakṛati</i>).	III. 15b
The Imperishable.	The Imperishable (Vāsudeva).	The Imperish- able (Vāsudeva).	VIII. 3a
The Imperishable (also the Syllable Om).	The Imperishable (the Ābode).	The Imperishable (the Prāṇava).	11a
" <i>Akṣara</i> (imperishable)" (identical with <i>avyakta bhāva</i> in VIII. 19; adj. to <i>puruṣa</i> in VIII 22).	The Imperishable (identical with <i>puruṣa</i> in VIII 22).	The Imperish- able (identical with <i>puruṣa</i> in VIII 22).	21a
The Imperishable.	The Imperishable.	The Imperishable	XI. 18a
"	"	"	37d
"	(the "Absolute).	(the "Vāsudeva).	XII. 1c
"	The Imperishable.	(Do.)	3a
Imperishable (adj. to <i>puruṣa</i>).	(the World-Soul).	(the soul, in- dividual and universal).	XV. 16b, d
The Imperishable.	The Imperishable.	The Imperishable.	18b

It will be seen from the above that, while the Indians feel at liberty to understand, in each case, the word in the sense in which it fits best into their own philosophical Systems, the Europeans show a certain tendency towards giving the word so far as possible one consistent meaning. But it is clear that none of them, Indian or European, has endeavoured to study the word in the light of previous and later texts, not even Deussen who, having translated sixty Upaniṣads and most of the philosophical texts of the Mahābhārata, was best equipped for that study. The reason for this neglect is, of course, the supposed irreparable vagueness of the terminology of the Gītā.

The terminology of the Gītā is, however, not so vague as it is generally believed to be. There are certain words which are known to the Gītā as *saṃjñās* "technical terms," while there are others which are yet in the making. To the former class belong words like *kārmuṇ* (VIII. 3), *avyakta* (VIII. 18), *adhyātma* (XI. 1), *kṣetra*, *kṣetrājñā* (XIII. 2), *guṇātīta* (XIV. 25), *aśvattha* (XV. 1), *dvandva* (XV. 5), *pruṣottama* (XV. 18), *sad* (XVII. 26-27), *a-sad* (XVII. 28), *saṃyāsa*, *tyāga* (XVIII. 2, 11; VI. 2), *śhuta-prajñā* (II. 55, 56), *adhidāva*, *adhyaññā* (VII. 29-30, VIII. 1-4) and many others. There are some terms which the Gītā uses in two or more technical meanings, e. g., *yoga* (V. 4; VI. 23; II. 48), *sāṃkhya* (V. 4, XVIII. 13-14), etc. Moreover, *pravadamī* "they declare," *prāhuḥ* "they say," *ucyate* "it is called," *abhidhīyate* "it is named," *saṃjñitam* "called," *smṛtam* "known (in tradition)," *udāhṛtam* "illustrated (by people)," *prathitaḥ* "well-known," *proktam* "said to be"—all such expressions which often occur in the Gītā indicate the existence of a fixed terminology to which the author had recourse. But there are also a number of words which are used in two or more meanings without there being an indication of their having had at that time any technical sense. Such terms are *prakṛti*, *guṇa*, *māyā*, *mahad brahman*, *śvabhāva*,

nirvāṇa, buddhi, param, ajñāna, adhiṣṭhāna, mad-bhāva, mat-sādharmyam, aṇiṣa, matra, karuna, sāmya, siddhi, etc. It is to be noted that while expressions such as *saṃjñitam, proktam, prāluṭh*, etc. frequently accompany the words of the former class, they are not to be found in the passages where the words of the latter group occur. This shows that the *Gitā* had certain fixed terms at its disposal.

Was *akṣara* a technical term in the days of the *Gitā*? In III. 15, *akṣara* is introduced as if it were very well-known to the reader. In VIII. *Akṣara*, a technical term. 3, *akṣara* is given as the explanation of Brahman; this shows that its meaning was considered to be less ambiguous and better fixed than that of the term Brahman. In VIII. 11. *akṣara* is that one "which the Veda-knowers declare". In VIII. 21, *akṣara* is the designation of the higher *avyakta* otherwise "called" *paramā gati*. The Lord is said to be *akṣara* which is "the highest to be known" (XI. 18) and "*akṣara, sad, asad*, and whatever is beyond these" (XI. 37) In XII. 1, the contrast between the meditators on *akṣara* and on *Kṛṣṇa* (i. e. *puṇṣa*) is introduced as if the distinction between the two were quite well-known; the question is not whether both are objects of meditation, but it is, which of the two is better. The description of *akṣara* (in XII. 3) is given not because it is unknown, but because thereby the author wants to point out the difficulties that surround the *akṣara*-mediator (XII. 5). In XV. 16, *kṣara* and *akṣara* are contrasted (almost in the same way as in Śve. Up. I. 8) and *kūṭastha* is said to be the "designation" of *akṣara* (*kūṭastho Śkṣara ucyate*). So, it is quite clear that the author of the *Gitā* uses the term *akṣara* in the unambiguous sense of a technical expression. He has inherited it from very old traditions, viz., from the traditions of the Oldest Prose and the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads.

In addition to the internal evidence that the *Gitā* itself supplies to us, we have ample material to recover the meaning or meanings of the metaphysical terms of this work. First of all, we have the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads, to which the *Gitā* itself refers (XIII. 4). These are the

immediate predecessors of the Gītā. A glance at Colonel Jacob's

The Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads. "Concordance of the Principal Upaniṣads and Bhagavadgītā" will show that the terms *prakṛti*, *māyā* etc., which are not known to the Gītā as technical terms, occur not at all or rarely in these Upaniṣads, while the terms like *sāṃkhya*, *yoga* etc., which the Gītā knows as used in more than one technical sense are known to these Upaniṣads but not as technical. For the term *akṣara*, these Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads supply a good deal of information, as can be seen by referring to passages like Śve. Up. I. 8,10, Śve. Up. V. 1, and Mu. Up. II. 1. 2. The relation of *akṣara* and *puruṣa* in the Gītā is based upon the same in these Upaniṣads. The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad in particular has rendered an important service in this respect

The Mahābhārata philosophical texts, especially the chapters of the Mokṣadharmā Section of Book XII, show the stage immediately following that of the Gītā teaching, just as the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads record the preceding one. The terms like *sāṃkhya* and *yoga*, which have in the Gītā two or more technical meanings, have here only one, and the terms like *prakṛti* etc., for the exact sense of which in each verse of its occurrence in the Gītā we have to depend mainly on the context, are in the Mahābhārata fixed technical terms. The *akṣara*-doctrine of the Gītā has undergone a great development and in place of the one System of the Gītā, we have in the Mahābhārata at least four Schools, each of which has its own conception of *akṣara*. This latter deserves to be fully examined in order to make out the sense of the term *akṣara* in its later historical relations. In the course of my investigation it was found that the *akṣara*-*puruṣa* doctrine as embodied in these (four) Mahābhārata Schools which are the descendants of the Gītā doctrine had been misunderstood, in consequence of the Gītā doctrine itself having been previously misunderstood. So the laborious task devolved on me of reconstructing as best I could the several systems of those Schools, and thus the Chapter on "*Akṣara* in the Mahābhārata" in this Thesis has

come to be the largest one (though it is only the summary of a much bigger work to be published on a later occasion, if that should be desired). The Mahābhārata philosophical portions have proved to be specially useful, as they have preserved for us the history of the *akṣara*-doctrine of the Gītā in its development prior to Śaṅkara, the earliest commentator on the Gītā whose commentary is available to us.

The Brahmasūtras, though not a regular commentary on the Gītā, were intended to explain not only the Upaniṣads but also the Gītā in so far as it agrees or seemed to agree with them. They, thus, have a right to be examined for the present inquiry. It is well-known that “*apī ca smariyate*” and similar expressions in the Sūtras refer always to the Gītā. Though the verses of the Gītā are referred to in the Sūtras only as a witness for the view of the Sūtrakāra about the Upaniṣads, and though unlike the latter, they rarely form the *viśayavākya* of an entire *adlukaraṇa*, the Sūtras’ attempt to fix the meaning of the Upaniṣads which had greatly influenced the Gītā doctrine is really useful to us for our present purpose. The Sūtrakāra had to consider, among many others, the same terms with which we are confronted in the Gītā; *avyakta* (I.4.1–7, in Ka.Up.I.3.11), *akṣara* (I.2.21–23, in Mu.Up.I.1.5–6; and I.3.10–11, in Br.Up.III.8.7–8), *dhṛti* (I.3.16, in Bh.Gī.XIII.6), *prakṛti* (I.4.23), *yonī* (I.4.27, in Bh.Gī.VII.6, XIV.3–4), *samādhi* (II.3.39, in Bh.Gī.II.44.53), *para* (II.3.41, III.2.11 etc., in Bh.Gī.II.59, III.19), *avyakta* (III.2.23), *puruṣa* (I.2.26)—these and many other terms have been either discussed or are used during discussion by the Sūtrakāra. Among the many useful remarks that the Sūtrakāra makes regarding the terminology concerning *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, I may here point out Br. Sū.III.3.52 where he says that “*Akṣara* and *puruṣa* have the same designations in common, but the application of terms in each case to either of them is to be determined by the frequency of their occurrence” (Appendix IV). But what is more important is the *akṣara*-doctrine of the Sūtras in its relation to the *puruṣa*-doctrine. As one would expect from an author who lived some centuries after the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads, the Gītā and the Mahābhārata, (and

the Buddhist philosophy), we have in the Sūtras an independent view based upon these texts, revealing an age of criticism, that yet remembered the Gītā doctrine and was thus much earlier than that of Śaṅkara. When I discovered that the Sūtrakāra's *akṣara-or-puruṣa* doctrine was directly based upon the still unforgotten traditions of the *akṣara-and-puruṣa* doctrine of the Gītā (though the Sūtrakāra understands them in his own way), the difference between the Sūtrakāra's own teaching and that of his commentators appeared so great that I had to undertake an independent interpretation of the Sūtras concerned, leaving aside the question of criticising the other interpretations. Thus, the Sūtras have given an unexpected help in settling the sense of the term *akṣara* in the Gītā.

In this way it will be seen that for fixing the terminology of the Gītā we have an amount of useful materials coming to our aid.

I must here note that the Gītā uses a number of expressions in place of *akṣara*, such as *prakṛti*, *parā prakṛti*, *mahad brahman*, *kṣetra*, *yonu*, *avyakṣa*, *brahman*, *ātman*. A systematic account of these had to be postponed owing to the bulk that this dissertation reached already during the investigation of the term "*akṣara*", though almost all of these and also some of the terms for the lower Nature had to be indirectly dealt with in course of the study, not only in the light of the evidence of the Gītā but also in that of the other literature connected with the subject.

Regarding the results of my investigation I feel tempted to say with Kālidāsa: "*Balavad apī śikṣitā-nām ātmany apratyayaṇ cetali*" (Śakuntala I. 2). I confess, I really have such a feeling as regards some of the details of the interpretations I have given to the various texts. I think however, that my dissertation will show that till now we have either missed or not properly realised the significance of one very important Chapter in the History of Indian Philosophy. The history of the *akṣara-puruṣa* conception covers a very long period of metaphysical thought definitely beginning with the

age of the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads. The view of these was confirmed and amplified by the Gītā. This led to the origin and development of the four great philosophical Schools of the Mahābhārata, including the Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya School. These, in their turn, were responsible for the establishment of the Vedānta as a system in opposition to other Systems, the earliest account of which can be said to have come down to us in the Brahmasūtras, which, henceforth, became the philosophical Text Book of all the various Branches of the Veda. If my interpretations of these texts, taken in their entirety, are not wrong, that will prove not only the importance of the *akṣara-puruṣa* doctrine in Indian Metaphysics, but it will also explain the as yet unsolved question of the origin of the Classical Sāṃkhya, which should be ultimately traced to the Gītā theory of two Natures. Moreover, it has been here discovered that the idea of a transcendent God, as we have it in the Classical Yoga School, originated in the rejection of the Upaniṣadic identity of Jīva and Paramātmā. Regarding the texts here dealt with, it is hoped, that the new interpretation given to many verses of the Gītā and the reconstruction of the Schools of the later Mahābhārata made in this work will show that this "Great Epic of India" is a much more consistent and much more useful account of the philosophical movements of those days than it has been hitherto believed to be. Lastly, it is left to the reader how far the pioneer effort made here to present an independent explanation of parts of the Brahmasūtras is successful in its aim of discovering the original meaning of that aphoristic work.

In conclusion, it remains to be stated that I have as a rule used the Bombay edition of the Editions and Translations used. Mahābhārata; wherever the Kumbha-koṇam edition was used, it has been so stated. Similarly in case of numbering the Sūtras I have followed Śaṅkara's *pāṭha*; otherwise, I have made a note. A list of translations and interpretations of the various texts used by me is given overleaf. I am indebted to most of these for supplying me with a stimulating *pūrvapakṣa* on a fairly good number of passages.

Works and Articles consulted: their Abbreviations.

- P. Deussen: Sechzig Upaniṣad's des Veda, second ed. Leipzig 1905.
- P. Deussen } Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhārata,
and } Leipzig, 1906 (VPTM).
O. Strauss }
- F. Edgerton: "The Meaning of Sāṅkhya and Yoga," in The American Journal of Philology, Vol. XLV, 1924 (AJP).
- E. Frauwallner: "Untersuchungen zum Mokṣadharmā," viz, "Die sāmṁkhyistische Texte" (in W. Z. K. M., Vol. 32), and "Die nicht-sāmṁkhyistische Texte" (in J. A. O. S., Vol. 45).
- R. Garbe. Die Bhagavadgītā, Leipzig 1905.
- R. Garbe: Introduction to the Bhagavadgītā, Bombay, 1918. (IBG).
- E. W. Hopkins: The Great Epic of India, New York, 1902 (GEI).
- F. O. Schrader: Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā, Adyar 1916.
- The Bhagavadgītā (Bh. Gi.).
- The Brahmasūtras (Br. Sū.).
- The Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads (EMU).
- The Later Mahābhārata i.e. the Mahābhārata excluding the Bhagavadgītā (L. MBh.).
- The Mahābhārata (MBh.).
- The Oldest Prose Upaniṣads (OPU).

CHAPTER I.

AKṢARA IN THE UPANIṢADS.

The conception of the impersonal Absolute goes back to the Ṛgveda: "That which is one the wise speak of in various ways" (*ekam sad viprā bahudhā vadnti* RV. I. 164.47) and in the Vedas. "That one (n.) breathed by its own power in absence of air" * (*ānīd avātaṃ swadhayā tad ekam*—RV. X. 129. 2.). The idea of the personal is also to be traced to the same source: "*Puruṣa* alone is all this" (*ṣuṣa ev eḍaṃ sarvaṃ*—RV. X. 90. 2).

Again, the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads know both these conceptions "Across what then, pray, is the Ether woven, warp and woof ? (Bṛ. Up. III. 8. 7); He said: 'That, O Gārgī, the Brahman-philosophers call the Immutable (*akṣara*). It is not coarse, not fine, not short, not long,(Bṛ. Up. III. 8. 8). Verily, O Gārgī, at the command of that Immutable, the sun and the moon stand separately sustained (Bṛ. Up. III. 8. 9).....Verily, O Gārgī, that Immutable is the unseen seer, the unheard hearer, the unthought thinker, the ununderstood understander. Other than it there is naught that sees; other than it there is naught that hears; other than it there is naught that thinks; other than it there is naught that understands' " (Bṛ. Up. III. 3. 11). The personal *ātman* also is described in the same terms in Bṛ Up. III. 7. 23. About *ṣuṣa* we read: "So much is his greatness, yet *ṣuṣa* is greater than this, all beings are one-fourth of him; three-fourths of him, the Immortal (*amṛta*) is in heaven" (Chā. Up. III. 12. 6, RV. X. 90. 3) The *ṣuṣa* in the eye and in the sun are mentioned in Chā. Up. I. 7. 5 and I. 6. 6. The "Golden *ṣuṣa* " is found in Bṛ Up IV. 3. 11. Bṛ Up. also states "I am Brahman" (I. 4. 10.) and "He who is yonder, yonder *ṣuṣa*—I myself am he" (V. 15. 1).

Neither the R̥gveda nor these oldest Upaniṣads feel it necessary to consider whether the final reality is personal or impersonal. The two Conceptions not yet connected. Br. Up. even ascribes personal attributes like that of 'commanding' (*prāśāsana*) to the impersonal *akṣara*. Both the ideas of *akṣara* and *puruṣa* are mentioned here independently of each other. *Akṣara* is neither identified with *puruṣa*, nor is it lower than *puruṣa*. Each by itself is the highest object of human life. The direct effect of *akṣara* is the first element called Ether; and between *akṣara* and the Ether, there is no other principle.

But when we come to the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads, we find as if their authors were engaged in the problem: "Are *akṣara* and *puruṣa* two or one? In what relation do they stand?"

The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad in one place preserves an earliest effort aimed as if at solving this problem.

Earliest Solution of their Relation. It thinks it best to identify the two and thus to speak of *akṣara-puruṣa* "the Immutable [or] the Puruṣa" (Mu. Up. I.2. 13; Appendix I). The author of this passage was confronted only with the Oldest Prose Upaniṣad; he did not know the "Spiritual Dualism" contained in the "Pluralistic Dualism" of the Mahābhārata Aupaniṣads, of which we shall have to speak hereafter. He tried to answer the problem of his age: "Is the final reality personal or impersonal?" He acquiesced in simply putting the two conceptions side by side. He may have been encouraged in doing so by those who held that "This shining, immortal *puruṣa* who is in this earth is just this *ātman*, this Immortal (*amṛta*), this *Brahman*, this All" (Br. Up II. 5. 1).

But this identification did not satisfy the philosophers of the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads, who seem to have gone on reasoning "How

Further Development: The Impersonal lower than the Personal. could the personal and the impersonal be identified? Were they not both of them mentioned separately in the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads? If they should be kept separate, what could be their relation? Can the impersonal be

the master of the personal? No. The personal must be higher than the impersonal." This seem to have been the view prevalent during the age of the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads. All of them agree in placing *puruṣa* above *akṣara* (Mu. Up. II. 1. 1-2, III. 2. 8; Appendix I; Pr. Up. V. 5. 7; App. I; Śve. Up. I. 7-12, V. 1; App. I). The Kāṭha Up. says "*Puruṣa* is higher than *avyakta*" (Ka. Up. III. 11), and in Tai. Up. II. 5, we read: "Brahman is the tail (of the blissful *ātman* of the form of *puruṣa*)." Such a tendency is already found in Br. Up. where *ātman* (who is identical with *akṣara* in Br. Up. III. 8. 8-11) and *puruṣa* called "Aupanīṣada *Puruṣa*" are separately described in the same terms (Br. Up. III. 9. 26) and yet *puruṣa* is said to be the last resort (*parāyaṇa*) of *ātman* the All (Br. Up. III. 9. 10-17), and where *amṛta* (a synonym of *akṣara* as in Śve. Up. I. 10) is distinguished from *puruṣa* because it is his *devatā* (Br. Up. III. 9. 10).

But though the impersonal is thus definitely said to be lower than the personal, both of them Both eternal: both are the goals (*gati*, the *summum bonum*) goals: both *vidyās*. for those who desire to be free from the world (Mu. Up. III. 2. 8, I 1. 5, III 1. 1; App. I). The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (II and III) aims at teaching that both *akṣara* and *puruṣa* are objects to be independently pursued by men, though those who meditate on *puruṣa* go beyond "the bright one" i. e. *akṣara* (Mu. Up. III. 2. 1, App. I). The Pr. Up. says that "*jīvaghaṇa brahmaloka*" i. e. *akṣara* is the lower *brahman* and *puruṣa* is the higher *brahman* (Pr. Up. V. 2, 5-7 App. I). *Akṣara* and *puruṣa* are said to be the goals respectively in Śve. Up. IV. 18, I 11. Again, the teaching of *akṣara* as well as that of *puruṣa* is *vidyā* "the Lore" (Mu. Up. I. 1. 5, I. 2. 13, II. 1. 10, III. 2. 10). Moreover, both *akṣara* and *puruṣa* are eternal and unborn (Mu. Up. I 1. 6, II. 1. 2, Śve. Up. I. 9). To this conception of the impersonal and the personal is to be traced ultimately the earliest germ of the Mahābhārata and the Classical Sāṃkhya as we shall see later on. .

But, if *akṣara* and *puṁṣa* are both of them "goals," both of them "Lōres," and both of them eternal, why should the former be lower than the latter? The reason was more a cosmogonical one than either theological or ontological. Brahman or *akṣara* or *avyakta* which is lower than the *puṁṣa* (Mu. Up. II. 1. 2; Śve. Up. I. 1. 8; Ka. Up. III. 11) is a living principle (*jīva*ghanā-Pr. Up. V. 5, App. I; *prajñāna*-ghana-Br. Up. IV. 5. 13; *jīva ātman* Chā. Up. VI. 3. 2, VI. 11. 1.); and both *akṣara* and *puṁṣa* are jointly to produce the world (Mu. Up. II. 1. 5 c-d).

How can these animate and conscious principles produce the inanimate, the unconscious? Here *akṣara*, the Matrix (*yoni*). the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads contemplate on the nature of the relation between *akṣara* and *puṁṣa*. The Śve. Up. has gone further in solving this problem than either Muṇḍaka or Praśna Upaniṣad. The Mu. Up. said that *akṣara* is the matrix, *yoni*, in respect to *puṁṣa* (Mu. Up. III. 1. 3b), and that "the male pours seed into the female" (Mu. Up. II. 1. 5) The Śve. Up. confirms this idea of the relation (Śve. Up. I. 2; VI. 16a, V. 6), but explains it further: *akṣara* is a power of the Lord (Śve. Up. III. 3), an unborn female (I. 9); *akṣara* is the *māyā* or *prākṛti* and *puṁṣa* is 'the *māyin*' the possessor of *māyā* (IV. 10); and in this respect, not in so far as it is a "goal", *akṣara* is "the ruled" and *puṁṣa* is "the ruler" (while the *Jīva* is a "not-ruler", Śve. Up. I. 8).

akṣara, the Power (*śakti*). The Śve. Up. is the first to use these terms for explaining *akṣara*. To put it in the terms of Vedānta philosophy, *akṣara* is *dharma*, *puṁṣa* is *dharmin*. This seems to be the sense of the higher-ness (*paratva*) of the *puṁṣa*, and it is quite consistent with the statement that both *akṣara* and *puṁṣa* are eternal, that the knowledge of both is Brahmanāvidyā, and that both are goals. The *paratva* has to do with creation, not with absolution. The Doctrine of 'Dualistic Monism.' There is a "Spiritual Dualistic Monism"; together with the *Jīva*, *akṣara* and *puṁṣa* form a Triad, but not three principles (Śve. Up. I. 9, 12).

With the above relation, *akṣara* and *puṇṣa* set out to create the world. At this stage, a new conception enters the field of Indian the Earlier Metrical Philosophy. The authors of the EMU Upaniṣads. thought that the unconscious world (*jada jagat*) could only be produced out of an unconscious principle. They could not think that "the Ether" (*ākāśa*) was directly the effect of *akṣara*, as Yājñavalkya had really believed (Br. Up. III. 8. 11; see P. 12 above). They said, the unconscious Nature is an effect born of *akṣara* when this falls into pregnancy through *puṇṣa* (p. 14 above). This Nature is called *brahman* in Mu. Up. I. 1. 8-9. The Śve. Up. says that *pradhāna* is the Mutable (I. 10). The Ka. Up. meant the same when it placed *mahān ātmā* between *buddhi* and *avyakta* (III. 10-11, VI. 7). The Ka. Up. is the first to enumerate the principles making the world, in the form of an evolutionary series such as becomes common in later philosophy. This Nature from which the world is directly produced is inanimate, while *akṣara* is the animate Nature. As we shall see later on, this distinction between the two Natures continues to be maintained in the Aupanishada School during the period of the Gītā and the Mahābhārata.

There are many synonyms of *akṣara*, which rise up during this period of the EMU. The most important of these for the history of Higher Nature. Indian Philosophy are *avyakta* (Śve. Up. I. 8; Ka. Up. III. 11) and *vidyā* (Śve. Up. V. 1, App. I); "*prakṛti*" may also be noted here (Śve. Up. IV. 10).

The unconscious Nature was called the *brahman* which is born (Mu. Up. I. 1. 8-9), *avidyā* (Śve. Up. V. 1), *kṣara* (Śve. Up. I. 8, 10), and *pradhāna* (Śve. Up. I. 10). *Pradhāna* was so called because it was thought to be the first of the produced things. It had not become a technical term even in the days of the Mahābhārata and the Brahmasūtras where we find the word used by different schools in different meanings as it suited them. (See Ch. IV.)

The conception of the paths to reach *akṣara* or *puruṣa* has also advanced during this period.

Paths leading to *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. This is clear when we contrast the simple mention of "*jñāna*" and "*devayāna*" in the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads with the statements on the same topic in Mu. Up. III and Śve. Up. VI. 13. This shall be considered along with the teaching of the Gītā on the same subject.

If we compare the idea of *akṣara* in the EMU with that in the OPU, we find that, unlike the Progress during Br. Up. (III. 8.9) which makes *akṣara*, the EMU Period. the impersonal principle, "a ruler" or "a commander" sustaining by its command the world, the Śve. Up. definitely separates the functions of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, and makes only the latter the ruler and sustainer. Śve. Up. I. 8 says that the Lord, *akṣara* and the Jīva are the ruler, the ruled and not-ruler respectively. Śve. Up. I. 9 a-b and IV. 5 state that all these three are "unborn". Śve. Up. I. 12 explains the same three as "the inciter", *prentṛ*, "the object of enjoyment", *bhogyā*, and "the enjoyer", *bhoktr*. The lower Nature is *kṣara* or *pradhāna* (Śve. Up. I. 10) or *vyakta* (Śve. Up. I. 8); it is called *vyakta* because the Śve. Up. which mentions *akṣara* as the only *avyakta*, does not yet know the theory of two *avyaktas* of the Gītā (Bh. Gī. VIII. 19-21, App. I and II); but this lower Nature is not "unborn" and is not to be included in the Triad. The term "*brahmam*" seems to have been used here for the Triad specially to distinguish it as a whole from *akṣara*.

Idea of Trinity or *īśa* either of which could be called in the Śve. Up. Brahman (n.). Though the word "*brahmam*" may mean a Brahman-song elsewhere, such a sense cannot be reasonably attributed to the term here. "*Brahmam*" (Śve. Up. I. 9,12) is equivalent to "*paramam brahma*" in Śve. Up. I. 7. The three are *traya* or three (Śve. Up. I. 7,9), but they form a three-fold reality called "*trividham brahman*" (Śve. Up. I. 12). We shall see later on how the authors of the Mahābhārata (XII. 217) used this passage of the Śve. Up. to express their own idea of a Tetrad.

CHAPTER II.

AKṢARA IN THE BHAGAVADGĪTA.

The Gītā accepts the distinction between *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, taught originally in the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads. *Akṣara* is not to be identified with *puruṣa* (Bh. Gī. VIII. 3-4, 10-11, 21-22; XII. 1-4; XV. 16-18; App. II.); *puruṣa* is beyond (*para*) *akṣara* (VIII. 21-22; XV. 18;

Akṣara and *puruṣa* App. II); as an object of meditation and two "goals" as in as a "goal" *akṣara* is not dependent on EMU. *puruṣa* (VIII. 11; XII. 1). The *akṣara*-

meditators may even be said to reach the *puruṣa* (Bh. Gī. XII. 4), or else those who have reached *akṣara* or Brahman, make a further progress and reach the *puruṣa* (Bh. Gī. XVIII. 53-55; App. II). In this last point the Gītā seems to develop the earlier *akṣara*-doctrine. The Gītā prefers the meditation on *puruṣa* to that on *akṣara*, because the former is easier than the latter (Bh.

Puruṣa the Pre- Gī XII. 5). *Puruṣa* is the "presiding deity", *adhidaivata* (VIII. 4, 22; App. II),

and presides over *akṣara* which is his "abode" *dhāman* (Bh. Gī. VIII. 21, 3, 11). This idea of *dhāman* appears originally in the Mu. Up. (III. 2.

Akṣara, the abode. f-4; App. I) and the Gītā develops it. The word "*pada*" is used for "*dhāman*" in Bh. Gī. XV. 4 (as probably in Ka. Up. III. 11.)

One older word for *akṣara*, used in the Gītā is Brahman.

It should be here pointed out that the Brahman, a Syn- Gītā is always careful not to identify nonym of *akṣara*. *puruṣa* with Brahman, because the latter stands for *akṣara* which is different from and lower than *puruṣa*. Kṛṣṇa is identified with *puruṣa*, and

not with Brahman. Even Garbe finds that in reply to Arjuna's question: "What is that Brahman?"

Brahman, not identified with Kṛṣṇa or *puruṣa*. (Bh. Gī. VIII. 1), Kṛṣṇa does not say "I am that Brahman", but says that Brahman is *akṣara* (Bh. Gī. VIII. 3;

App. II). It would have been better if Garbe had accepted as genuine this position of the Gītā

Brahman in Gītā as regards the relations of Brahman or *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, as he actually found it in the Gītā itself. In Bh. Gī. XIV.

26-27, *puruṣa* or Kṛṣṇa who is identified with *puruṣa* is stated to be the foundation, *pratiṣṭhā*, of Brahman

In Gītā XIV. or *akṣara*. If we accept this statement of the Gītā that Kṛṣṇa or *puruṣa* is different from *akṣara* or Brahman, we can clearly understand the teaching of the Gītā. Bh. Gī. VI. 27-29 explains the method of *dhyāna* as applied to Brahman (the word

In Gītā VI. "*ātman*" was also used in those days for *akṣara* or Brahman, as in Mu. Up. II. 2.

3-5, see App. I), and the same is said also of Kṛṣṇa i.e. *puruṣa* in VI. 30-32. Bh. Gī. VI. 27-32 is no interpolation, because it does not say that "Kṛṣṇa is Brahman"; it distinguishes the two and only teaches the same method as to the attainment of both. In Bh. Gī. VIII. 1-4 Brahman is explained as *akṣara*, and *puruṣa* or Kṛṣṇa as the *adhidaivata*; the *adhyañjña* (VIII. 4c-d) is not "an answer by Kṛṣṇa regarding himself"; it refers to the Yajña-philosophy of the Gītā according to which every act of a man is a *yajña* and every man is the *puruṣa*. That the *puruṣa* mentioned in VIII. 4b is "the answer by Kṛṣṇa regarding himself" can be easily seen by a glance at VIII. 5-14 which verses speak of Kṛṣṇa as if he were identified with *puruṣa*. Kṛṣṇa's being *pratiṣṭhā* "the foundation" of Brahman (XIV. 26-27) means that *puruṣa* is the *adhidaivata* of *akṣara*. (VIII. 3-4): Kṛṣṇa is identified with *puruṣa*, not with "the God", or "a demi-god", or "the Impersonal". In XVIII. 50-53, 54-55, Kṛṣṇa is not identified

In Gītā XVIII. with Brahman; but it is said that after reaching Brahman one can by further development reach *puruṣa* who is higher than *akṣara*.

Vāsudevaḥ sarvaṁ (Bh. Gī. VIII. 19, XI. 40) is not different from *puruṣa ev edaṁ sarvaṁ* (RV. X.

Meaning of “*Vāsudevaḥ sarvaṁ*” in seventh Adhyāya of the Gītā will be explained without any difficulty, if we accept the Gītā’s own words that *puruṣa* is higher than *akṣara*, and if we remember that this *puruṣa* is the Aupanīṣada *puruṣa*, and that according to the Gītā both of them are “ goals ” to be reached by the same methods. In Bh. Gī. X. 12; XI. 18, 17; VII. 19; XI. 40 it is not that the re-editor has not “ shrunk from asserting out and out the identity of Kṛṣṇa with Brahman ” (Garbe, IBG, p. 7) as he had done in Bh. Gī. VIII. 1-4; but Kṛṣṇa is here said to be both Brahman or *akṣara* and *puruṣa* (X. 12; XI. 18; XI. 37-38); similarly he is also Vāyu, Yama, etc. etc. (XI. 39). When in the famous Ṛg-verse the one Being is identified with Agni, Varuṇa, Indra, etc., or when in Nārada’s prayer in MBh. XII. 338, Nārāyaṇa is said to be Puruṣa (8), Pradhāna (12), Sacrifice (67), Pāñcarātrika (67), Sāṃkhya, Yoga (78) etc., we should suppose that each of these passages was composed at different periods part by part as the different identifications arose, if we accept Prof. Garbe’s explanation of Bh. Gī. X 12 etc. A comparison of Bh. Gī. V. 14-17 with V. 18-26 will show that they teach the attainment of *puruṣa* and Brahman respectively through the same means viz., the path of Yoga; in V. 19 Brahman is said to be free from faults and impartial, while the same is said of *prabhu*, the Lord, in V. 14, as distinguished from the Yogas following the path of *puruṣa*, who dedicate their intellect and mind, and devote themselves to *puruṣa* or *prabhu* (17), the Yogas following the path of *akṣara* are here taught to turn their mind inward and find pleasure and peace and light within themselves (24 a-b, 21 lb). One can dedicate all his actions to Brahman (IV. 24, V. 10) or to *puruṣa* (IX. 16). Bh. Gī. IV. 35 and VI. 30 say that one can see all beings in Kṛṣṇa or *puruṣa* and *vice versa*; the same is said of

Brahman in Gītā and *puruṣa* (X. 12; XI. 18; XI. 37-38); X and XI. similarly he is also Vāyu, Yama, etc. etc. (XI. 39). When in the famous Ṛg-verse the one Being is identified with Agni, Varuṇa, Indra, etc., or when in Nārada’s prayer in MBh. XII. 338, Nārāyaṇa is said to be Puruṣa (8), Pradhāna (12), Sacrifice (67), Pāñcarātrika (67), Sāṃkhya, Yoga (78) etc., we should suppose that each of these passages was composed at different periods part by part as the different identifications arose, if we accept Prof. Garbe’s explanation of Bh. Gī. X 12 etc. A comparison of Bh. Gī. V. 14-17 with V. 18-26 will show that they teach the attainment of *puruṣa* and Brahman respectively through the same means viz., the path of Yoga; in V. 19 Brahman is said to be free from faults and impartial, while the same is said of *prabhu*, the Lord, in V. 14, as distinguished from the Yogas following the path of *puruṣa*, who dedicate their intellect and mind, and devote themselves to *puruṣa* or *prabhu* (17), the Yogas following the path of *akṣara* are here taught to turn their mind inward and find pleasure and peace and light within themselves (24 a-b, 21 lb). One can dedicate all his actions to Brahman (IV. 24, V. 10) or to

In Gītā V. *puruṣa* (IX. 16). Bh. Gī. IV. 35 and VI. 30 say that one can see all beings in Kṛṣṇa or *puruṣa* and *vice versa*; the same is said of

In Gītā IV. *puruṣa* (IX. 16). Bh. Gī. IV. 35 and VI. 30 say that one can see all beings in Kṛṣṇa or *puruṣa* and *vice versa*; the same is said of

In Gītā IV. *puruṣa* (IX. 16). Bh. Gī. IV. 35 and VI. 30 say that one can see all beings in Kṛṣṇa or *puruṣa* and *vice versa*; the same is said of

In Gītā IV. *puruṣa* (IX. 16). Bh. Gī. IV. 35 and VI. 30 say that one can see all beings in Kṛṣṇa or *puruṣa* and *vice versa*; the same is said of

akṣara or *ātman* in VI. 28-29 where the word *ātman* is used for Brahman. In fact there are two

In Gītā VI.

"goals": *akṣara* or Brahman and *puruṣa* or Kṛṣṇa; and there are many paths

to attain either of the two. If the Gītā offers any teaching regarding these two, it is that the two are never to be identified. Both can be reached by the same means, as said in XII. 1 and therefore the Gītā is against their identification. All the so-called Vedantic interpolations assumed by Prof.

Prof. Garbe's parts of the Gītā if we accept the Gītā's View untenable. own view regarding the relation of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. Kṛṣṇa is *puruṣa*, not *akṣara*.

Thus can be easily seen if we contrast the Gītā with the Pāñcārātra texts of the Mahābhārata (see Ch. III) or with the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.

Though, as a goal *akṣara* is independent of *puruṣa*, in the process of creation this is not the case. The Gītā's doctrine of *akṣara* as one of the two goals is the same as that of the EMU. What the Gītā particularly seems to contribute to the philosophy of those days is its teaching about *akṣara*

as a partner of the *puruṣa* in the act of creation, and this was done by distinguishing *akṣara* from the unconscious Nature or *brahman* of Mu. Up. I. 1. 9.

Let us therefore briefly notice the Gītā's contrast of the higher Nature with the lower one. *Akṣara* is

here also a conscious living Nature (VII. 5; *cetanā* in XIII. 6) as in Pr. Up. V. 5 (see p. 13) and the upholding (*dhṛti*) of the world is here also one of its functions (Bh. Gī. XIII. 6; VII. 5; Br. Up. III. 8. 9; Br. Sū. I. 3. 10, 16). For

this reason it would not be accepted as the direct cause of the world. So *akṣara* is in the Gītā the cause of *brahman* " the lower Nature ", as in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (Bh. Gī. III. 15; Mu. Up. 1. 1. 9); and this

The Lower Nature, an Effect of *akṣara*.

lower Nature becomes (through activity or *karman*) the

cause of the creation (III. 15; App. II). This relation of *akṣara* and this *brahman* is the same as that in Mu. Up. I. 1. 9 i. e. the latter is "born" of the former. *Akṣara* may be called *parā prakṛti*, and the *brahman* *aparā prakṛti* (VII. 4-5); in contrast with the latter which is called *brahman*

(III. 15) *akṣara* may be called *mahad brahman* (XIV. 3). The higher Nature may be called the *sanātana avyakta* or *akṣara* (VIII. 20-21); the lower Nature is *avyakta* technically so called (VIII. 18; XIII. 5; App. II).

The union of the higher Nature and the *puruṣa* leads to the birth of "all beings" (VII. 6, XIV. 3; XIII. 26) *Akṣara* is called also *kṣetra* (XIII. 6, 26) or simply *prakṛti* (XIII. 19) and is eternal (*anādi*

or *sanātana*, as in VIII. 20) like *puruṣa* (XIII 19). The Gītā associates the three *guṇas* only with the lower Nature (III. 27, etc.), and "*karman*" activity is the

latter's special attribute (III. 15). *Māyā* in here the lower Nature (Cf. III. 27 with VII. 14-15). But though the

Gītā thus makes a minute distinction between the lower Nature, the higher Nature and the *puruṣa*, it should be noticed that these three are not enumerated in the Gītā as three principles; the lower Nature is

twice said to be the effect of *akṣara* (III. 15, IX. 7-10), but the higher Nature is eternal like

puruṣa as we saw above, and the relation of these last two may not have been considered by the Gītā to be really more than that of *dharma* *madharma* *mubhāva*.

This is clear from the statement that even the *akṣara*-worshippers, in a sense, reach the *puruṣa*.

Unlike the Śvc. Up. (I. 8) and Ka. Up. (III. 11) the Gītā knows two *avyaktas* (VIII. 18-20,

XIII. 5), and while the Śvc. Up. understood *kṣara* to mean *pradhāna* and explained *kṣara* as *vyakta*; the Gītā says that *kṣara* consists of "all beings" (Bh. Gī. VIII. 18-19;

VIII. 4; III. 14-15; XV. 16) and that "all manifestations" *vyaktis* arise from the lower Unmanifest which is lower than the higher or "eternal" *avyakta* called *akṣara* (VIII. 18-21). Equally important with the mention of these two *avyaktas* is that of two *prakṛtis* in the *Gītā*, while the *Śve. Up.* (IV. 10) knew only one principle called *prakṛti* which is the higher one of the *Gītā*. These two *avyaktas* and two *prakṛtis* were the chief points round which, as we shall see in the next Chapter, the Mahābhārata philosophers centred their discussions.

Of greater historical worth than its contribution to the metaphysics of the day, was the *Gītā*'s ethical and religious teaching. This was its doctrine about the three great paths of absolution: the *sāṃkhya*, the *yoga*, and the *upāsana* or the *bhakti* paths. The *Gītā* says that *akṣara* or *puruṣa* can be reached by any one of the many paths

The Three Great Paths of the *Gītā*. (Bh. Gī. IV. 11, 25-30; IX. 15). Bh. Gī. XIII. 24-25 gives the names of these as *dhyānayoga*, *sāṃkhyayoga*, *karmayoga*, and the path of pure *upāsana* i.e. *upāsana* not accompanied by knowledge. The first three are also mentioned under the names of *dhyāna*, *jñāna* and *karmaphalatyāga* in Bh. Gī. XII. 12. The three paths of *bhakti*, *jñāna* and *karma* are also to be found in Bh. Gī. IX. 13-14, 15 and 16 respectively. The path of devotion is preached throughout the *Gītā* (XIII. 25; IV. 10; VII. 16; IX. 13-14, 32-33; XII. 1-2; XVIII. 55). The path of complete self-surrender and divine grace may have been meant in XVIII. 62, 64-66 and XI. 47-48, though the *Gītā* does not seem to distinguish it from the path of devotion, in the way it distinguishes between *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* or *jñāna* and *karma*. Each of these is not exclusive of the rest, but one particular idea is prominent in each. *Dhyāna* may have been helpful to all those who aspired after liberation.

Here we are concerned chiefly with *sāṃkhya* and *yoga*. These terms occur only once in *Śve. Up.* viz., VI. 13, where the context shows that they are names of paths to reach the goal; there is no word to indicate that they stand there for philosophical schools of those names; on the contrary it seems that in the *Śve. Up.* they are less sharply contrasted with each

other than in the Gītā. That the Gītā knows these terms only as paths can be proved from the fact that Arjuna is asked to follow either of the two paths *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* (II. 39; III. 3; V. 1-5; VI. 1-2, XIII. 24; XVIII. 1, 49-55, 56). If *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* had been two schools of those names at that time, the author of the Gītā who belonged to neither of these but to the Aupaniṣada School, would not have asked Arjuna to follow either of these. *Sāṃkhya* is a synonym for *sannyāsa* (V. 1-5; VI. 2; XVIII.1; XVIII. 50-55) or *jñāna* (III.3; IX. 15; XII. 12, XVIII. 50-55); and *yoga* means the path of action, the more complete name being *karmayoga* (III. 3; V. 1-2, 4-5; XIII 24d; XIII. 1e; XVIII. 56). If these terms had any other signification at that time, who could have profited by these explanations assigned to them in the Gītā?

I should here draw attention to the necessity of rendering "*sāṃkhya*" in the Gītā by "renunciation" rather than by "knowledge". The origin of the *sāṃkhya* path is to be traced to the belief in *jñāna* or *vidyā* as a means for absolution; and this word "*jñāna*" was originally used to imply renunciation of actions though the latter may have meant only sacrificial actions. "*Avidyā*" meant sacrificial rites (Kṛ. Up. II. 4-5; Cf. Mu.Up. I. 2. 8), and *vidyā* the Aupaniṣadic knowledge in contrast to these; when the term *parā vidyā* was used for the latter, *aparā vidyā* was used for the former, as in Mu. Up. I. 1. 4.

Sāṃkhya, sannyāsa rather than *jñāna*. *Sāṃkhya*, *sannyāsa* meant sacrificial rites (Kṛ. Up. II. 4-5; Cf. Mu.Up. I. 2. 8), and *vidyā* the Aupaniṣadic knowledge in contrast to these; when the term *parā vidyā* was used for the latter, *aparā vidyā* was used for the former, as in Mu. Up. I. 1. 4. *Jñāna*, the reverse of *karman* i.e. where *vidyā* is contrasted with the Vedic *sannyāsa* in the rites. But the contrast between these two careers for life (*nīsthā*) is brought out most clearly in Mu. Up. 1. 2. *Avidyā* (in Mu. Up. 1. 2. 9a) is explained as *karman* in "*Yat karmīṇah.....*" (Mu. Up. I. 2. 9c); and so the life of begging, *bhāikṣacaryā* (Mu. Up. I. 2. 11.), stands for *vidyā*. This passage of Mu. Up. is a record of the later form of a conflict between the followers of the Vedic path of actions and those of "renuncia-

tion".

tion of those actions" called *jñāna*, such as we read of in Chā. Up. V. 10 which uses the term "*pathas*" for the two paths (Chā. Up. V. 10. 8.), characterises them as "light" and "smoke" (Chā. Up. V. 10. 1 and 3) and calls them "*devayāna*" and "*pitryāna*" (Chā. Up. V. 10. 2, 4). The same two paths are described in Ka. Up. 1. 3. The words "in the forest" (*araṇye*-Chā. Up. V. 1. 1) and "the life of begging" (*bhaukṣacaryā*-Mu. Up. I. 2. 11) are indicative of "renunciation" *sannyāsa*, a word not known to these earlier Upaniṣads and therefore not to be expected therein. This latter term came into vogue for the first time in the days of the Gītā, which uses both the terms

jñāna and *sannyāsa* as synonyms (Bh. Gī. III. 4, V. 1-2). In the Gītā, *karman* inclusive of *jñāna* or *karmayoga* or *yoga*, as it is often called, is not unaccompanied by knowledge, as it was the case with the path of "*karman*" in the earlier Upaniṣads. Bh.

Gī. II. 53 says that the *śrūṭaprajñā* described in II. 54-72 is a follower of the *yoga* and a glance at his picture will show that he lacks no knowledge. Bh. Gī. III. 3-4 will show that *sāṃkhya* is primarily concerned with *sannyāsa*, and *yoga* with action, while neither is particularly a path of knowledge. Whenever Arjuna is asked to perform the actions of his life, he is advised to do so after having attained knowledge (IV. 15). The illustration of Janaka as follower of the path of *karman* proves the same (III. 20). *Karman* or *yoga* by itself attains the same fruit as *sāṃkhya* or *sannyāsa* (V. 4-5). Instead of *jñāna*, *sannyāsa* is opposed to *karma* or *yogan* in V. 1-2 and other places. It is well known that the predecessor of Śaṅkara had explained *jñānakarmasamuccaya* to be

Yoga, jñāna plus the teaching of the Gītā. If the Gītā *karman*.

opposed pure action (i.e. action without knowledge) to knowledge or renunciation and said that either of the two leads to the same goal, one fails to understand how it could teach such a doctrine. When the Gītā sometimes uses the term *jñāna* in place of the clearer term *sannyāsa*, it does so because it retains the older usage of the term while it admits or probably employs for the first time

the new expression. All these points show, that in the *Gītā*

Sāṃkhya, *jñāna* 1. e. *jñānasamuccitasannyāsa*, just as
plus *sannyāsa*. *yoga* is one of *kaṁman* 1. e. *jñānasamuc-*

citakaṁman. Lastly, if we look to the L.MBh. we find that the *Sāṃkhya* is specially associated with asceticism, and, as I shall show later on, the L.MBh. *Yoga* has its own metaphysical theories (Ch. III), which could not have developed if *yoga* in the *Gītā* had meant actions without knowledge. For these reasons, I believe, it would be more accurate to explain the term *sāṃkhya* in the *Gītā* as renunciation than as knowledge (Bh. Gī. III. 4; V. 1-2). In the *Gītā* "knowledge" does not imply renunciation (Prof. Edgerton, AJP. XLV, 1924), but it is renunciation itself. In the *Gītā* *sāṃkhya* differs from the *yoga* only so far as this renunciation of actions is concerned. There is hardly any other point of difference

Prof. Edgerton's View untenable. between the two paths, so far as the *Gītā* is concerned. The association of *sāṃkhya* with renunciation is not incidental but inherent (Edgerton, AJP p. 32). To say otherwise is to deprive the *Gītā* of its special contribution to the Indian religion and ethics.

The above discussion as regards the meanings of *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* shows that when the *Gītā* says:
Meaning of "*Sāṃ-* "*Sāṃkhya* and *yoga* are one" (V. 5c-d),
khyā and *yoga* are it means that both are independent paths
one" in the *Gītā*. to either of the two "goals" of the *Gītā*,
akṣara and *puṛuṣa*. A confusion has arisen

regarding the meaning of this and similar statements in the *Gītā*, because such statements are also made with regard to the *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* Schools of the L. MBh. and the Classical ones. It seems that at each of these three periods in Indian Philosophy, the saying about the unity or identity of the two had quite different meanings and therefore we must interpret

Identity of Goals, it always with reference to the context.
not of Paths. The *Gītā* explains it in the words : "The
same place (1.e. *akṣara* or *puṛuṣa*) as is
reached by the *sāṃkhya*-followers is also
reached by the *yoga*-followers " (V. 5 a-b), and "One who has

properly resorted to either of the two, gains the fruit of both" (V. 4 c-d). They are two independent paths, not two steps on the same path as Śaṅkara believes, nor does it mean that "the same system is both

Prof. Hopkins's Sāṃkhya and Yoga, the system being View untenable. double but the teaching being identical, " as Prof. Hopkins holds. As we have seen,

the path of *saṃnyāsa* accompanied by knowledge was already known before the Gītā was written, though under the names of *bhāikṣcaryā* etc., and the path of actions

Yoga Path, the not accompanied by knowledge was Gītā's special contribution. also well known (Mu. Up. I. 2. 9-11). The

Gītā was the first to put forth systematically a third path viz., the path of actions accompanied by knowledge and in doing so said that the first and the last are the only paths, the middle one being considered fit to be condemned (Bh. Gī. II. 41-45 and Mu. Up. I. 2. 1-9); and that out of the remaining two the latter was preferable (II. 40; III. 4; V. 2; VI. 1-2).

But the Gītā as we have it before us betrays more than the knowledge of *sāṃkhya* as a mere path. Though the expression "*guṇa-sāṃkhyāna*" cannot in itself suggest any reference to *sāṃkhya* as a school, because "the discrimination of the three constituents" seems to have originated in the Aupaniṣada School (of the Gītā) and to have been adopted later on by all the philosophical schools that followed it; yet "*sāṃkhye kṛtānte*" (Bh. Gī. XVIII. 13) is the one undoubted

Gītā XVIII. 13, reference in the Gītā to a philosophical school of the name of *sāṃkhya* which a Reference to Sāṃ- school of the name of *sāṃkhya* which khya as a School. could not be directly described as a

darśana or *śāstra* but only as the "*sāṃkhya* in which the teaching is settled" (*kṛtānta-siddhānta*). This expression, though not implying a complete system of philosophy, as is shown by its contents, goes against Prof. Edgerton's view that nowhere in the Gītā, the *sāṃ-*

Prof. Edgerton's *khya* has to do with the discussion of View untenable. philosophical truth (AJP. Vol. XLV. 1924). The followers of the path of *sāṃkhya* believed that "all action" belonged to *prakṛti*, the

lower Nature, as did also the followers of *yoga* and *bhakti*. But a few of the former who seem to have differed on the point, held that the individual soul is one of the five agents (XVIII. 15). While the Gītā as a whole objected

The Individual Soul, an Agent. to attributing any agency, *karṇṭva*, to the individual soul, these *sāṃkhya*-separatists, as we may aptly call them, objected to attributing the whole agency

to the individual soul. Both the followers of *sāṃkhya* and the *sāṃkhya*-separatists must have accepted *akṣara* and *puruṣa* as the "goals"—the then prevailing conceptions of *summum bonum*. The belief that the individual soul is an agent must have been originally the reason why the *Sāṃkhya*-followers insisted upon *sannyāsa*. Bh. Gī. XVIII. 12-16 only shows that some of the followers of the *sāṃkhya*-path of the Gītā had begun to take interest in philosophical discussions, especially in that on the origin of *karṇṭva*, the most burning question of the time when the Gītā was written. These *sāṃkhya*-separatists seem to have survived in the form of the later Mahābhārata *Sāṃkhyas*, who also held that the Atman

Survival of that View in L. MBh. is an agent (MBh. XII. 315. 7-9; see Ch. III). But the *sāṃkhya*-followers of the Gītā seem to have merged into the

Aupanishada School of the Mahābhārata, the question of *sannyāsa* having probably come to rest by the doctrine of the four *āśramas* or stages of life of which the Gītā knows little. Thus, as regards the Gītā, not only is the *sāṃkhya* to be understood as *brahmanavidyā* (Dahlmann, Nirvāṇa, P. 165), but even *yoga* and *bhakti* or

Dr. Dahlmann's View, amplified. *upāsana* are also *brahmanavidya* or rather! we should say, all the three are paths to *brahmanavidyā*, because in the Gītā as in the EMU, the *brahmanavidyā* deals with *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, and *sāṃkhya*, *yoga*, and *bhakti* are means to it.

Regarding *yoga*, the reader may be reminded that the Gītā knows two technical meanings of the term, viz., '*karṇmayoga*' and '*dhyāna-yoga*', both of which had no special metaphysical doctrines of their own (except that the "goal" was *akṣara* or *puruṣa*). In the days of

Two Technical Meanings of "yoga", in the Gītā.

the later Mahābhārata, they reach the status of philosophical Schools, as also do the *sāṃkhya*-followers.

The Gītā's path of *bhakti*, *upāsana*, grace or complete self-surrender (Bh. Gī. XI. 47-48; XVIII. 65-66; IX. 26; X. 9) arose from an earlier movement (Śve. Up. VI. 18, 23; Mu. Up. III. 2. 3-4). In the Gītā, *bhakti* leads to *akṣara* or to *puṇya* (see "*bhaktāḥ*" in Bh. Gī. XII. 1)

The Path of De- because *upāsana* is not yet completely
votion and Medita- separated from *bhakti*. But this *upāsana*
tion. or *bhakti* is according to the Gītā "one-
minded" (VIII. 22, IX. 22; XI. 54; IX.
30), and that of the personal *puṇya* is preferable because it
is easier than that of the impersonal *akṣara* (XII. 5).

The point to be noticed most of all is that the Aupan-
śadas of the Gītā admit the alternative of
O n e Aupan- *akṣara* and *puṇya*, so that the Gītā has
śada School with only o n e Aupanśada School, and not
t h r e e Paths. two. Moreover the *sāṃkhya*- *yoga*- and
bhakti-paths of the Gītā do not discuss
what are the final principles, what is their number, and
how they are mutually related These and other problems are
attempted for the first time in the later Mahābhārata. Thus,
the Gītā has only one philosophical school with three paths.

Lastly, if it be asked, whether there was a re-edition of
the "original" Gītā, I would venture to
The Possible Re- suggest that at first the Gītā taught the
edition of the Gītā. *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* paths to reach *akṣara*
or *puṇya*, and afterwards the path of
bhakti was added to these. We have already seen that the
path of pure *karman* and that of pure *jñāna* which must have
arisen from the Vedas-and-Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads res-
pectively, were supplanted by the Gītā's teaching about *yoga*
i.e. *jñānakarmasamuccaya*. This latter may have been in
course supplemented by the path of *bhakti*, which also admitted
the possibility of a compromise between pure action or
karman and pure knowledge or *sannyāsa* (see Bh. Gī. V. 29;
IX. 24, 27; cf. also the performance of sacrifices in the L.MBh.

Pāñcarātra School). And this was incorporated into the Gītā as a third alternative career (*mṣṭhā*) in addition to the two it had already, viz., *sāṃkhya* and *yoga*. During all these stages the philosophical theory inherited

No Doctrinal Change in the Re-edition. from the time of the EMU continued unaltered, and the *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* continued to be mere paths, and not

schools. Thus, when the *bhaktiyoga* was recognised as a path, it was a path to *akṣara* or *ṣuṣa* (Bh. Gī. XII. 1). *Puruṣottama* was substituted for *ṣuṣa*, but then *akṣara* and *ṣara* came to be described as *ṣuṣas* (Bh. Gī. XV. 16-18; App. II). This shows that the re-edition must have taken place long before the formation of the Mahābhārata Pāñcarātra School which identified *akṣara* and *ṣuṣa* (see Ch. III).

CHAPTER III.

AKṢARA IN THE LATER MAHĀBHĀRATA.

When one speaks of the later Mahābhārata philosophy, he must distinguish not only between four different Schools but also between the Chapters describing them. MBh. XII. 182-253, 302-317, 308, and 334-352 respectively deal with the MBh. Aupatiṣada, Sāṃkhya, Yoga and Pāñcarātra Schools. The words Sāṃkhya and Yoga are almost entirely wanting in 182-253 and if they occur they invariably

show that the author is referring to those Schools by way of explaining his own (i.e. Aupaniṣada) School. Thus, 234. 28-30 is found to be a cursory reference to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga Schools, if we look to what precedes and follows these verses.

Similarly, 210. 9-10 and 14 refer to the Pāñcarātra School by such words as "*viduḥ*" and "*vadanti*"; the doctrine contained in these verses is that which we find in the Nārāyaṇīya Section (MBh. XII. 334-352). On the contrary 302-307 and 309-317 give the principles which are common to both Sāṃkhya and Yoga, and also those which are peculiar to Sāṃkhya only, and even Prof. Hopkins says that 308 records the teaching of the Yoga School only. Prof. Edgerton's

contention that the principles described in 308 belong to both the Sāṃkhya and Yoga (Schools) is based upon the grave misunderstanding that the terms "*sāṃkhya*" and "*yoga*", even in the later Mahābhārata, denote only two paths of these names and in no way two Schools of philosophy. Prof. Deussen

and Prof. Hopkins have not admitted this four-fold division of the Chapters of MBh. XII; they have not distinguished the Aupaniṣada School (182-253) from the Sāṃkhya and Yoga

Schools (301-317); and this mistake has led them to a great confusion as regards the teaching of these Schools, as is evident from Prof. Hopkins' constant complaint that the author or authors of the Mahābhārata have tried to Vedanticise the Sāṃkhya doctrine, and also from the wrong interpretations of the MBh. philosophical texts given by Prof. Deussen in his Translation, which shall be pointed out in the following pages.

Even Dr. Frauwallner who deals with Dr. Frauwallner some of the Chapters (182-253) as "non-Sāṃkhyist texts" seems to understand these as containing a pre-Classical Sāṃkhya doctrine, but not an Aupaniṣada one (JAOS. Vol. 45, p. 201, p. 203, p. 204), though, as he himself points out in most of the cases, the verses (in Ch. 194, 219, 201-206) are closely connected with the Upaniṣads. Prof. Jacobi's belief that the basis of the Epic Sāṃkhya was the Classical Sāṃkhya is founded upon what he understands to be contradictory statements in the Mahābhārata, viz., that "the Sāṃkhya teaches only twentyfive principles" (MBh. XII. 307.47; 308.14; 318.35), and, again, that, "Brahman is the Twentysixth" (e. g. MBh. XII. 308). (See Prof. Jacobi, Ueber das urspruengliche Yogasystem, p. 4.) He thinks that the series of twentyfive principles was the original one and then Brahman was added as the Twentysixth. His chief reason is that Brahman stands as the Twentysixth. But if we look to the Earliest Metrical Upaniṣads and the Gītā, we learn that the series of

The Series of 26 Principles older than their Enumeration and Numerical Designations. twenty six principles was already known though the principles were then not counted and consequently the numerical designations Twentyfourth, Twentyfifth, and Twentysixth not given to the highest three principles. Thus, five (subtle) elements, five (gross elements or) "objects" (*viśayas* or *artha*s), ten organs of sense and action, the Mind, the Self-consciousness, the Intellect, the lower Nature, the higher Nature, and *puruṣa* make up a series of twenty six principles; and such a series, at least that including

the last six of these is already mentioned in Ka. Up.III. 10-11, Bh. Gī. VII.4-6; and the two Natures and *puruṣa* are also to be found in the numerous passages from the Gītā and the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads quoted in Ch. I. This shows that the series of evolution was known long before the number and numerical designations of the principles came into vogue. Neither the Ka. Up. nor the Gītā knows any thing about these latter. In this sense the series of the twenty-six principles was the original one and that of the twenty-five was arrived at by rejecting one (viz., the higher Nature) of the twenty-six, as we shall see. The Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya-s were the first philosophers to count the principles and at the same time to reject the higher Nature; but, then, at the same time the Mahābhārata Aupaniṣadas accepted the fashion of the day by counting their own principles including the higher Nature. It is always said in the Mahābhārata, as Prof. Jacobi himself notes, that the Sāṃkhya-s have twenty-five and only twenty-five principles; and I must add that when a twenty-sixth principle is mentioned, it is never said to belong to the Sāṃkhya School (see below). Thus, Prof. Jacobi's contention that the series of twenty-five was the original one is only partly right; it is right in so far as the counting is concerned, but not from the standpoint of the series itself. Therefore, I believe, my proposal to divide the Chapters of MBh. XII in the manner I have done above, will prove acceptable.

I have already said above that immediately after the Sāṃkhya-s started the mode of counting and numbering the metaphysical principles, the Aupaniṣadas adopted the fashion. It should be mentioned further that this was the case also

Numerical Designations adopted by all the Four L. MBh. Schools. with the Yogas and the Pāñcarātras of the days of the MBh. All the four Schools gave numerical designations to their more important principles. The Sāṃkhya-s had only twenty-five principles (MBh. XIII. 307. 47; 308. 14; 318. 35); they held that

the Nature, which for them is only one, is the Twentyfourth

Sāṃkhya, a School of only 25 Principles. and that the Lord or Viṣṇu who is identical with the Jīva is the Twentyfifth (302. 38, 39; 305. 37-39; 306. 36; 306. 39, 40, 42, 43-44; 307. 2, 8, 9, 40).

The Yogas called the Nature the Twentyfourth, the Jīva the Twentyfifth, and Brahman or the Lord the Twentysixth. This difference between the L.MBh. Sāṃkhya

Yoga, a School of 26 Principles. and Yoga Schools has been till now overlooked. The Yoga Chapter

in the MBh. (XII. 308) is emphatic in asserting that the Sāṃkhyas have only twentyfive principles (XII. 308. 14, 25; see also 307. 47) and the same chapter is equally emphatic in stating that from the Yoga-standpoint the Jīva is the Twentyfifth and Brahman the Twentysixth (308. 6, 7). MBh. XII. 308. 17 clearly says that " The *budhyamāna* (i. e. the Twentyfifth) is ' devoid of intellect (*buddhi*) ' (as compared) with the *prabuddha* the Twentysixth; this is said to be the difference (*nānātva*) of the Yoga School from the teaching of the Sāṃkhya Sruti". This very idea is given in verses 6-7 of the same Chapter where we read that " The Twentyfifth knows the Unmanifest (i. e. the Nature) but even he does not know the Twentysixth who eternally knows the Twntyfifth and the Twentyfourth (i. e. the Nature)". In my opinion this should leave no doubt that the Brahman which is described as the Twentysixth in this Chapter (308) is neither a Sāṃkhya nor an Aupanishada Twentysixth, but only a Yoga Twentysixth.

The non-admission of this evidently clear statement of the L. MBh. is one of the causes that have led my predecessors in the field to various curious theories such as those pointed out above. As we shall see later on, there was another Yoga School in the days of L. MBh., which regarded *puruṣa* as the Twentysixth. Another fact which we have to admit is that

Aupanishada, a School of 26 Principles. the Aupanishadas of the L. MBh. had also a Twentysixth principle; and this was naturally the *puruṣa*; they did not distinguish the Jīva from this *puruṣa*, and consequently they held the higher

Nature to be the Twntyfifth but called it the unfallen

Twentyfifth (*acyuta pañcaviṃśaka*—318. 57ff.) in order to distinguish it from the Twentyfifth of other Schools, specially the Sāṃkhya. According to these Aupanishadas, the lower Nature was the Twentyfourth. This nomenclature of the L.MBh. Aupanishadas has been preserved for us in MBh. 318. 55–82. The Chapter (318) as a whole states the Aupanishada doctrine and clearly says that the Twentyfifth (i.e. the higher Nature) of the Aupanishadas was rejected by the Sāṃkhya and the Yogas. Prof. Hopkins' explanation of "*acyuta pañcaviṃśa*" as denoting an attempt of the Aupanishadas to foist their own view that "the Jīva is destructible in Paramātmān" on the

Sāṃkhyas who rejected it, is quite unacceptable (Prof. Hopkins, GEI p. 137). Mistakes of Prof. Hopkins and Prof. Deussen. This is so because no Indian School of philosophy has ever said that the Jīva is destroyed in Paramātmān and also because the context (*śāśvata avyakta*—318. 56) clearly shows that the

"*acyuta pañcaviṃśa*" is the higher Nature of the Aupanishadas. The same has got to be said with regard to Prof. Deussen's translation of the verses in question (VPTM pp. 665 ff.). His interpretation of verses 318. 56 etc. seems to suggest that he himself had a doubt as regards what he was writing. Lastly I have to note that even the Pāñcarātras did not withhold themselves from following the usual

Pāñcarātra, a custom of the philosophical Schools of School of 25 Principles. They named their highest principle (i.e. *puruṣa* identified with

the higher Nature, as we shall see later on) the Twentyfifth (MBh. XII. 339. 24), and therefore their Twentyfourth would be the Nature which they regarded as "born" of the Twentyfifth (see Ch. III). If we do not lose sight of this fact of the nomenclature of those days, the number of the so-called inconsistent statements in the L. MBh. will be reduced a great deal.

1. The Aupaniṣada School.

It is noteworthy that MBh. XII. 182-253 which gives the chief Aupaniṣada doctrine exhibits a complete unity of teaching if we examine it in the light of the EMU and the Gītā. This becomes evident if we try to understand the “*para*-ladders”

Impressive Consistency of the “*para*-ladder” Accounts of the Aupaniṣada School. so called by Prof. Hopkins. These are found in L. MBh. XII. 204. 10-11; 204. 19-20; 210. 14, 23, 26-28; 210. 35-39; 213. 12; 247. 3-4, 7. Most of these give

a complete list of all the steps in the ladder. The main difficulty that has till now been experienced by the various interpreters of these passages seems to

Jñāna, the Lower Nature. center in the term “*jñāna*” (204. 10c-d, 11 a, 19c-d, 213. 12c.). Prof. Hopkins

seems to confound this technical term of the Mahābhārata age with the word “*jñāna*” in the sense of knowledge leading to absolution (GEI. p. 136 and p. 131). Dr. Frauwallner ventures the conjecture that *jñānam* in these passages comes from or is an abbreviation of *jñānātmā* (see the footnote to p. 193, Band XXXII. “Wiener Zeitschrift fuer die Kunde des Morgenlandes”). Prof. Deussen translates *jñānam* as consciousness (VPTM p. 225) and does not explain why the intellect is here the effect of that consciousness (*jñānam*, as he understands it), in contradiction to the usual description according to which the latter is the effect of the former. As a matter of fact, all these conjectures are not necessary, if we do not lose sight of the text of the L. MBh. itself which describes the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya and says that “The Sāṃkhyas called the *jñāna* (of the Aupaniṣadas) *avyakta* (MBh. XII. 306. 40 and 307. 9) and *prakṛti*” (MBh. XII. 318. 40). These verses leave no doubt that the *jñānam* in 204. 10c-d, etc., is the lower Nature of the Aupaniṣadas, which the Sāṃkhyas adopted as their own Nature (*avyakta* or *prakṛti*). This meaning of the technical term *jñānam* together with the fact that the theory of two Natures given in these ladders (e.g. in 247. 3-4, 7) was already mentioned in the EMU and the Gītā, is a sufficient help for reconstructing the evolutionary series con-

tained in them, the last three numbers of which are the same as those in the earlier Aupaniṣada Schools viz., the lower Nature, the higher Nature and the *puruṣa*. The *para*-ladder passages are too numerous to be abandoned as "a loose exploiting of the Sāṃkhya in terms of Brahmaism" (Prof. Hopkins, GEI. p. 131).

These Aupaniṣadas, like those of the Gitā, accepted the *akṣara*-and-*buruṣa* doctrine of the EMU.

The *akṣara*-and-*puruṣa* Doctrine as in EMU and Bh.Gi. Both *akṣara* and *puruṣa* are "goals" for them. In XII. 211.15 *akṣara* is called *sat̥tva*, and *puruṣa* *kṣetrajñā*. 210. 23 mentions "*paraṃ brah̥ma*" and "*dhātā prabhūḥ*". In 213.2 Viṣṇu and *avyakṣa* or *akṣara*, His residence, are mentioned. 217.6-12 is an adaptation of Ka. Up. III. 11. According to 237.31-33 *sat̥tva* or *akṣara* and *kṣetrajñā* are two Atmans. The higher Nature and the Lord are found stated in 240. 16-23,28; 240. 31-32, 34; 241. 22, 36;243. 3,15, 18,19,20; 247. 3-4; 248.20-24; 249.1-2, 10-11; 285. 36-37; 301. 21-23. *Puruṣa* is said to be higher than *akṣara* in these passages and also in 210. 23, 36, 8. We have already

The lower Nature as in EMU and Bh. Gi. seen that the lower Nature called *jñāna* etc., is also mentioned in these texts. In all these respects the EMU, the Gitā and L. MBh. Aupaniṣadas can be said to have the same teaching.

But what is of particular interest to us, is the emphasis that this Aupaniṣada School of the L. MBh. lays on the non-identity of *akṣara* and *puruṣa* on the one hand and on that of *akṣara* and the lower Nature on the other. The latter point

is more vigorously put forth than the Non-identity of former. This was done in two ways, viz., the two Natures by showing that *akṣara* is a conscious emphasised. principle while the lower Nature is not so, and by explaining that it is eternal as distinguished from the non-eternal lower Nature.

The following statements emphasise the living nature of *akṣara* :—

- (1) "The Subtle (*sūkṣma*, i.e. the higher Nature) is able to see the lower Nature, *buddhi*, etc."

✓ *Akṣara* the Higher (MBh. XII. 204. 20).
Living Nature.

(2) "*Sattva* (i.e. *akṣara*) and *kṣetrajñā* are both of them Atmans" (MBh. XII. 237. 31-33). Prof. Deussen does not explain why *sattva* which he understands as *prakṛti* is called Atman (VPTM. p. 353). The same statement is found also in MBh. XII. 285. 36; 248, 20-24; 249. 1-2, 10-11.

(3) "*Puruṣa* has himself become *akṣara* and *kṣara*" (MBh. XII. 240. 31-32).

(4) MBh. XII. 213. 12-13, 242. 18-20 and 252. 10c-d say that *akṣara* is the Life-principle (Cf *jīva-bhūtā* in Bh. Gi. VII. 5). It acts and animates the All (XII. 242. 20b); its designation is *jīva*, and in company of *Akṣara* designated Time and Action it revolves the world *jīva* and *kṣetra* (XII. 213. 13); it is *jīva* and yet it is called *kṣetra* (XII. 249. 11 ff); it is the seed of all individual souls (XII. 213. 13).

(5) The fact that *akṣara* is "living" and is called "*kṣetra*" (XII. 249. 10. 11f; 252. 11 ff., 307. 14; 318. 111) agrees well with Bh. Gi. XIII. 6 which states that *kṣetra* includes *celanā* "consciousness" and *dhṛti* "the sustenance of the world."

(Cf. also *jīva-bhūtā* and *dhāryate* in Mistakes of Prof. Bh. Gi. VII. 5.) All these passages Deussen and Prof. mentioning *kṣetra*, which stands for *akṣara* Hopkins. as possessed of "life" *jīva* were not considered by Prof. Hopkins; and Prof. Deussen who translated the term "*jīva*" in this connection as "the seed of the embodied" and "the individual soul" (VPTM p. 256, 368, 398) did not notice the inconsistency involved in calling that "individual soul" *sattva* or *kṣetra*, and in saying that the "individual soul" is "the seed of the embodied".

(6) The lower Nature is "not-seeing", *a-paśya*, the higher Nature is "seeing", *paśya*, and *puruṣa* is "always seeing" *sadā-paśya* (XII. 318. 72, 73, 82).

NOTE.—As the terms *paśya* and *a-paśya* forming the compound *paśyāpaśya* occur in 318. 82 and also elsewhere in the MBh., I propose to read "*Paśyaṃ tathaiṣa c āpaśyaṃ paśyaty anyah sadūśnagha*"—in XII. 318. 72a-b. The meaning of the proposed reading given by me here will also testify to the correctness of my suggestion. For the same reasons I read "*paśyam*" in place of "*paśyan*" in 73 a of the same Chapter.

(7) To point out the consciousness of *akṣara*, it was called "the awakening Twentyfifth"

Other Synonyms *budhyamāna pañcaviṃśaka* (MBh. of *akṣara* in L.MBh. Kumb. ed. 323. 70) in contrast to the *abudhyamāna* "lower Nature"; and also

(8) "the awakening Unmanifest" *budhyamāna avyakta* (MBh. XII. 305. 34) as distinct from the "*apratibuddha avyakta*" the lower Nature.

(9) For the same purpose of distinguishing *akṣara* from the lower Nature, the former was called *śāśvata avyakta* "the eternal Unmanifest" (Cf. Bh. Gī. VIII. 20: *sanātana avyakta*), implying that the lower Nature (or the Nature of the Sāṃkhyas) was not eternal in so far as it did not eternally remain in the same condition (MBh. XII. 318.56);

(10) "*acyuta pañcaviṃśaka*", "the unfallen Twentyfifth", as distinguished from the Twentyfourth which was "fallen" (XII. 318.57);

(11) "the first deity" *ādya daivata* (XII. 318.83, not "the origin of gods," as Prof. Deussen says); and

(12) "the primeval Twentyfifth" *ādya pañcaviṃśa* (XII. 318.82).

(13) The same aim was desired to be served by giving numerical designations to these three

The Numerical important principles. Though the higher Designations. Nature was eternal and differed from the lower because the latter was not eternal and as such logically they could not have been counted

as two, yet they were said to be two. *Akṣara* and *puruṣa* were also numerically two, firstly because "He (i. e. a meditator) who sees the Twentysixth does not see "the seeing" (*paśyam*—see notes above), the Twentyfifth i. e. *akṣara*" (XII. 318.73a-b), and secondly because "The Twentyfifth (i. e. *akṣara*) can think that 'There is none higher than I," (XII. 318.73 c-d). *Kṣetra* which is a term for the living conscious Nature as we have already seen is said to be the Twentyfifth (MBh. XII. 307.14c-d, 15).

NOTE.—According to the reading in 72 a-b proposed above, the verse means, "The other (i.e. the Supreme Being) sees eternally *paśya* (i.e. *akṣara*) as well as *a-paśya* (i. e. the Twentyfourth). The Twentysixth sees (both) the Twentyfifth and the Twentyfourth". Thus the latter half of the verse expresses in numerical terms what the former half does in the terms of the attribute of consciousness or "seeing". Verse 73a-b says that the meditators of *akṣara* (*paśya*) and those of *puruṣa* (the Twentysixth of 72c referred to by "*enam*" in 73b) realise only the object of their meditation and not both the objects of meditation. 73 c-d asserts the self-consciousness of *akṣara* or the Twentyfifth and the fact that as a goal it is independent of *puruṣa*. The interpretations of Prof. Hopkins and Prof. Deussen, which are not discussed here, are based upon an incorrect reading and hence fail to present any consistent meaning.

The above-mentioned sharp distinction between *prakṛti* (above which "stands" *akṣara*—XII. 314. 10-11), *akṣara* and *puruṣa* was necessitated by the opposition of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga Schools with which the Aupanishadas found themselves confronted, as can be seen from the passages which mention that distinction given above. The latter

Progress in the thus made each of these three principles Aupanishada School an individual entity; they accepted during L. MBh. *vyaktibheda* between *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, Period. though *puruṣa* was above *akṣara* and in that sense the latter was yet subordinate to the former. The EMU and the Gītā had also distinguished

between these three but the mutual difference between them had never before been considered sufficient to justify their being enumerated as *three* principles, as we have seen in Chapters I and II. The EMU and the *Gitā* had maintained dualistic monism of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*.

The Doctrine of The MBh. Aupaniṣadas admitted a "Pluralistic Dualism". dualism of these, while, on the other hand, their doctrine was a non-pluralism

in so far as the lower Nature which was counted as an entity was not eternal like the other two, but was born of the higher Nature. Thus it is not possible to describe this system as a pluralism. It is very difficult to find out an accurate expression from Western Philosophy which would convey the exact sense of the metaphysical position of these Aupaniṣadas. Under the circumstances it would not be wrong to speak of it as "Pluralistic Dualism" of the L.MBh. Aupaniṣadas.

It should be specially noted that, just as in Sve. Up., so with the L. MBh. Aupaniṣadas the *dehin*, though counted separately, is not actually considered a different principle from the *puruṣa* (but somehow as an aspect of the latter). It is only the L. MBh. Yogas, as we shall see, who achieved the separation. The "tetrad" of the Aupaniṣadas is merely the "triad" or Sve. Up. with *vyakta* added to

The "Tetrad" of the L. MBh. Aupaniṣadas. it (Cf. Retrospect, foot-note) and with a less theistic conception of the highest principle which is here not so much the "ruler" as in Sve. Up.

On account of the above-mentioned position of the chief L. MBh. Aupaniṣadas, it is but natural that we find, in the same text a second Aupaniṣada School

The Rise of another Aupaniṣada School in L. MBh. which seceded from the former. These separatists were called "saints" *sūdhavaḥ* (MBh. XII. 318. 56, 78). They held that the two (eternal and non-eternal)

forms of the Unmanifest, *avyakta*, should be looked upon as one and the same end of the evolutionary series, or that the

eternal Unmanifest should be looked upon as the one end in so far as it stands above the (lower)

Numerical Unity of the Lower and the Higher Natures. *prakṛti*, which is non-eternal and an effect of the former (MBh. XII. 318. 56; see also the v. l. in the Kumb. ed.).

puruṣa these "saints" said that "One should look upon them as only one on account of their

Numerical Unity of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. (mutual) position" (MBh. XII. 318. 79), or that " One should look upon them as one and the same because the Twenty-

sixth resides in the Twentyfifth " (according to the v. l. in the Kumb. ed.). Thus the second Aupaniṣada School also believes that *akṣara* is the residence

"*sthāna*" of the *puruṣa*, and thus accepts

The Doctrine of "*sthānabheda* " in "*sthānabheda* " in *akṣara* and *puruṣa* and also in *akṣara* and *prakṛti*. Prof. Hopkins is not right in

identifying these "saints" with either the Sāṃkhyas or the Yogas who only quoted the " saints " in support of their own views. (His interpretations of verses 56, 78 are also misguided.)

The position of these Aupaniṣadas thus supported in a way the Sāṃkhya and Yoga Schools in

Further Proof of the Existence of the School of these "saints". their doctrines, and gave rise to such an Aupaniṣada School as the author of the

Brahmasūtras belonged to. In Brahmasūtras III. 2.11-21 and 32-38 both of these L. MBh. Aupaniṣada Schools are criticised by the Sūtrakāra (see Ch. IV; App. IV).

2. The Sāṃkhya School.

The doctrine of the Sāṃkhyas of the later Mahābhārata Age has been preserved to us in MBh.

Sāṃkhya Chapters in L. MBh. XII. 300-307 and 309-317. We can briefly summarise it under three headings.

(a) What the Sāṃkhyas are here said to have rejected, (b) What they are said to have accepted, and (c) How they differ from the Classical Sāṃkhyas.

(a) What these Sāṃkhyas are said to have rejected :—

(1) The Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas rejected "*budhyamāna avyakta*", (MBh. XII. 305. 32–35). This passage mentions two *avyaktas* and two *budhyamānas* and ironically says that if the enlightened Sāṃkhyas and Yogas understood the *budhyamāna avyakta*, they will equate

Sāṃkhyas' Rejection of "*avyakta budhyamāna*" i. e. the Higher Nature. [their doctrine to the Aupaniṣada one] (305. 34), and mentions three principles *avyakta*, *budhyamāna avyakta*, and *budhyamāna* (305. 32–35). The middle of these, which the enlightened did not

know (i. e. did not accept as a principle) is *akṣara* or the higher conscious Nature of the Aupaniṣadas, who invented this designation to distinguish the latter from *avyakta* the lower unconscious Nature and from *budhyamāna*, the Lord, both of

Mistakes of Prof. Hopkins and Prof. Deussen. which were accepted by their fellow-philosophers. Prof. Hopkins finds the plurality of souls in this passage ! (See GEI. p. 124–125.) He and Prof. Deussen

show utter ignorance of the L. MBh. terminology according to which all these terms are technical (see MBh. XII. 306–308; and also Ch. III.)

NOTE.—Prof. Hopkins, in finding in the passage in question (MBh. XII. 305. 32–35) a reference to the doctrine of plurality of souls, ignores that *aprabuddha* "the non-awakened" is in the MBh. a name for the Nature (305. 32, see Deussen, VPTM. p. 623), His interpretation of *aprabuddha* as "the conditioned soul" is based upon an ignorance of the L. MBh. terminology. In contrast to this *aprabuddha*, the soul was called *budhyamāna* (305. 31; 307–308). Again, Prof. Hopkins is not quite just to the text because he drops verse 34 and connects 33 with 35. As a matter of fact verse 34 is the most important of the whole group; it mentions *budhyamāna avyakta* and says that " If the enlightened (Sāṃkhyas and Yogas) know the *budhyamāna avyakta*, then they will equate their doctrine [to that of Aupaniṣadas] ". This *budhyamāna avyakta* was rejected by the Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas, as will be seen from the fact that the passage ironically asserts the ignorance of the "enlightened". This "*budhyamāna avyakta*" is different from the *avyakta* which is *aprabuddha*

(verse 32) and from the "*budhydmāna*" which is not *avyakta* (verse 31), i. e. in brief we have here three principles, *avyakta* (the lower Nature of the Aupanīśadas and) the Nature of the Sāṃkhya, *budhyamāna avyakta* or *akṣara* which the "enlightened" Sāṃkhya and Yogas did not know, and *budhyamāna*, the Supreme Soul not distinguished from the individual one; all these three are meant by the plural number of the compound "*budhyamānāprabudhānām*" (gen. plu., verse 35c). Prof. Deussen takes the verse (34) to mean: "When the enlightened know Prakṛti (i. e. the lower Nature), they will teach Brāhmaṇa". Is not this interpretation a strange one? Even Prof. Deussen shows complete ignorance of the L. MBh. terminology when he translates *budhyamāna* as the awakened ones and *aprabuddhas* as the unawakened ones, in verse 35 (VPTM. 623), this was the way he adopted to explain the plural number of the compound just noticed.

(2) The Sāṃkhya and the Yogas also rejected what the Aupanīśadas called *acyuta pañcaviṃśaka* Sāṃkhya's Re- "the unfallen Twentyfifth" (MBh. XII. 318. 56-57, 79; see p. 34 above where *pañcaviṃśa*". Prof. Hopkins' interpretation has been criticised). The Twentyfourth of the Aupanīśadas, the Sāṃkhya and the Yogas was a "fallen" (*cyuta*) Twentyfourth.

(3) The Sāṃkhya and the Yogas refused to admit *śāśvata avyakta* which corresponds to Sāṃkhya's Re- *sanātana avyakta* of the Gītā (VIII. 20) and which was a designation given by the *avyakta*". L. MBh. Aupanīśadas (see p. 38 above).

NOTE.—It should be noted that Prof. Deussen takes *acyuta* and *śāśvata* as independent designations of *pañcaviṃśaka* and *avyakta* and explains the *pañcaviṃśaka* (thus separated from *acyuta*) as the individual Soul, as if the topic of the discussion (in XII. 318) were the latter. Nowhere in the Indian Philosophy is *śāśvata* an independent designation, and never in the L. MBh. is *acyuta* used in that sense. Both Prof. Hopkins and Prof. Deussen have lost sight of the great problem that busied the philosophers of the Mahābhārata, who followed the Age of the Gītā.

All the passages referred to above show that the Sāṃkhya and the Yogas rejected the *akṣara* of the Aupaniṣadas in so far as it was a higher Nature different from their conception of the Nature.

(b). What the Sāṃkhya are said to have accepted:—

(1) The terminology of the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya betrays their descent and at the same time dissent from those who had the traditions of the EMU and the Gītā. If we study the Sāṃkhya terms in MBh. XII 302–307 and 309–317, we find that the Twentyfourth or the Nature of these Sāṃkhya bears the names which belonged originally to the lower Nature

and to *akṣara* (in its capacity as the higher Nature) of the Aupaniṣadas and that their Twentyfifth has such designations as had mainly belonged to the Aupaniṣada *puṣa* and *akṣara* (in its capacity as a “goal”). The former shows that the Sāṃkhya have identified the two Natures, and the latter that they have identified the two “goals” of the Aupaniṣadas. To the former class of terms are to be traced such words as *a-vidyā*, *ṣeṭra*, *avyakta*, *jñāna* and to the latter *vidyā*, *mṛguṇa*, *īśvara*, *Viṣṇu avyakta* (306. 34, 38). These occur too often in the Sāṃkhya and Yoga Chapters (XII. 302–317) to be specially pointed out here. A detailed list of them is given in the L. MBh. itself (XII. 318 37–47). As an illustration of my standpoint

I would draw the attention of the readers to two of the terms just mentioned, viz., *a-vidyā* and *vidyā*. *a-vidyā* and *vidyā* which the Sāṃkhya used for their Nature and *puṣa* respectively (XII. 307.2–3). Prof. Hopkins has expressed great surprise at this usage of the terms in question

(GEI. p. 136). The presence of these terms cannot be explained by referring them to the Knowledge and Ignorance taught in Sāṅkara’s theory of Illusion; because, as Prof. Hopkins correctly points out, the Māyāvāda is not

known to the Mahābhārata; and though Prof. Deussen adds no explanatory notes to his translation of these terms, I believe he would not have

differed from Prof. Hopkins on this point. The fact seems to be that these Sāṃkhyaas had got to explain the terms which the Aupaniṣadas used. In the terminology of the latter *a-vidyā* and *vidyā* stood for the lower Nature and the higher Nature respectively. They were used in that sense in Śve. Up. V. 1 (see App. I). The Sāṃkhyaas having used "*a-vidyā*" for their own Nature, had no other course but that of applying "*vi lyā*" to their *puṛuṣa* the Twentyfifth. In doing so they tried to give a new sense to these terms (307. 3-8). This was an effort similar to their effort to explain the Twentyfifth as both *kṣara* and *akṣara* (see below).

(2) The Sāṃkhyaas accepted "*kṣara*" and "*akṣara*" of the Aupaniṣadas, but explained these terms in their own way. They said that the same Nature is *akṣara* when it withdraws the manifestations within itself, and it is

The terms *kṣara* *kṣara* when it puts forth these manifesta-
and *akṣara*. tions (307. 10-17); in other words, *akṣara*

is Nature as o n e , *kṣara* is Nature as
m a n y (305. 36-39). This explanation of *kṣara* and *akṣara*
was necessitated by the fact that the Sāṃkhyaas identified the
two Natures of the Aupaniṣadas, who held that *kṣara* or *pra-*
dhāna was the lower Nature and *akṣara* was the higher Nature
(Cf. Śve. Up. 1. 7-11; App. 1). In extending the *kṣara-akṣara*
standpoint to the *puṛuṣa* (MBh. XII. 307. 18-19), the
Sāṃkhyaas sought a justification for their position regarding the
Nature.

NOTE.—Regarding MBh. XII. 305. 36 it should be noticed here that *ekatva* and *nānātva* in "*ekatvam akṣaram prāhuḥ nānātvam kṣaram ucyate*" (36c-d) are explained as what the soul sees and what it does not see when it proceeds on the right path having placed its belief in (the doctrine of) the twentyfive (37); and the same topic is continued in the following chapter where *ekatva* and *bahutva* are both said to belong to the Prakṛti only (306. 33) and it is said that *ekatva* comes into existence during the dissolution and *bahutva* when the

Nature creates the creation (306.33). Prof. Hopkins who says that a real plurality of souls is mentioned in these passages (GEI. p. 124) and Prof. Edgerton who would like to find here an empirical plurality (AJP) have no justification for their incorrect conjecture except that the words *ekatva* and *nānātva* or *bahūtva* occur here (though they do not refer at all to the plurality of souls). How can the "many" souls be called *kṣara* "perishable"? These interpreters have not considered the context at all. Prof. Deussen translates the terms, but suggests no explanation (VPTM. p. 623, p. 627).

(3) The Sāṃkhyas accepted *jñāna* "the lower Nature" of the Aupanīśadas and also the *avyakta* The term *jñāna*. of the latter; but they called these Prakṛti, and this was for them the one and only Prakṛti (XII. 318.40, 39).

(4) The Sāṃkhyas accepted *kṣetra*, the conscious Nature or the Twentyfifth of the Aupanīśadas (see p. 37 above); but identified it with their own Nature. MBh. 307.14c-d, 15 says, that "They (i. e. the Aupanīśadas) call The term *kṣetra*. (the *akṣara* mentioned in verse 13a-b) *kṣetra* because it is *adhiṣṭhāna*, the residence (of the *puruṣa*); this is that Twentyfifth (of the Aupanīśadas). But when it withdraws the net of constituents within its unmanifest self, then along with those constituents the Twentyfifth dissolves". Prof. Deussen does not note that the *kṣetra* is here said to be the Twentyfifth and that the dissolution of the Twentyfifth within itself is taught here (VPTM. p. 630).

(5) The Sāṃkhyas taught that Prakṛti is both "moving" and "unmoving", "changing" and "unchanging"; it is also "imperishable", "unborn" etc. They herewith intended to show that there is no necessity of accepting two *prakṛtis*. They combined the two *prakṛtis* of the Aupanīśadas into one and naturally rejected the view that the (lower) Nature is "born" as a distinct entity—the view of the EMU and the Gītā (MBh.

XII. 318. 37-47).

(6) Sāṃkhyas took the term *prakṛti* from the Aupaniṣadas but made it a technical term in their School. "The Sāṃkhyas hold the view of Evolution (lit. the Sāṃkhyas evolve) and speak to emphasise (but not to originate) the Theory of Evolution. The Sāṃkhyas first (lit. the Sāṃkhyas evolve) and speak of the Evolving Matter, *Prakṛti*". This idea is expressed in a very terse sentence: "*Sāṃkhyāḥ prakurvate prakṛtiṃ ca pracakṣate* (MBh. XII. 306.42). Although the Aupaniṣadas of the Gītā knew the Evolution and used the term *prakṛti*, the first philosophers in India to be called "Evolutionists" are these L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas. They are *prakṛtivādinaḥ* (306. 27). These Sāṃkhyas henceforth restricted in the above sense the application of the term "*prakṛti*" (318. 39-40).

(7) The Sāṃkhyas accepted the *puruṣa* of the Aupaniṣadas (318. 39, 42) and said that *puruṣa* alone is conscious (and not *aśani* also). Sāṃkhyas' Acceptance of the Aupaniṣada *puruṣa*. Their acceptance of the term *jñāna* for their Nature was only a technical matter; it did not mean that the Nature was a conscious principle.

(8) They accepted the *īśvara* of the Aupaniṣadas but called him "*nirguṇa*", a name of *aśara* in the MBh. Aupaniṣada School.

(9) If any positive proof is needed for the conclusion that the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas were not atheists, it will be found in MBh. XII 318. 79e-f, where it is said that the Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas accepted the Twentysixth of the Aupaniṣadas.

It would be unscientific to start with a presupposition that the Sāṃkhyā School of the L. MBh. was atheistic, and then to argue that MBh. XII. 318 is an interpolation or is influenced by Classical Sāṃkhyas. Theistic Character of the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas. It should be also remembered that though the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas admitted the Twentysixth of the Aupaniṣadas they called it the Twentyfifth, because they rejected the Aupaniṣada Twentyfifth. This is the sense of MBh. XII. 318. 79e-f, which has been noticed above. Prof. Hopkins' and Prof.

Jacobi's views about this verse have been mentioned and refuted in the beginning of this Chapter. So these Sāṃkhyas were theists, though not in the Western sense : they believed (as the Aupaniṣadas did) in one Supreme Being which somehow appears as an individual soul striving for liberation (i. e. self-realisation).

In MBh XII. 302. 138, it is clearly said that the Twenty-fifth of the Sāṃkhyas was Viṣṇu. But as said just above, the Sāṃkhyas did not distinguish it from the Jīva, and this accounts for the objection in MBh. XII 300. 3 " How can 'one without the Lord' (*anīśvara*) be freed ? " This refers to

one who does not believe in God as distinct from the Jīva. Explanation of "anīśvara" in MBh. XII. 300. This sense of XII. 300. 3 is clear from the fact that this objection (in MBh. XII. 300.) comes from the Yoga School;

while the statement that the Sāṃkhyas accept the Twenty-sixth (of the Aupaniṣadas) is from the Aupaniṣada School. In order to understand this one has to go a little deeper into the study of the L. MBh. Schools. In 308 where the Yoga doctrine is mentioned, it is explained that the L. MBh. Yogas for the first time separated Jīva and Īśvara, unlike the Sāṃkhyas who identified the two (see MBh. XII. 308 below). This will be fully dealt with in the next Section about the Yoga School. But it should be only stated here that MBh. XII. 300. 2-7 where the disputed words "*anīśvara*" and "*mokṣa*" occur, is explained nowhere except in MBh. XII. 308. 10-35, particularly 25-26 which undoubtedly refers to 300. 2-7, as the topic in both the passages shows. A comparison of these two passages will prove that *anīśvara* only means " one without a Lord separate from himself ". The Jīva who is the not-Lord (Śve. Up. I. 8) as compared with Paramātmān who is the Lord, has never had the term *anīśvara* applied to it as a designation; there is no passage where *anīśvara* is used as a synonym

Prof. Edgerton's for Jīva the individual soul; and there is View untenable. no text in the EMU, the Gītā or the L. MBh. where Jīva is said to be *anīśvara* in the sense "because there is no Īśvara above him" (Prof.

Edgerton, AJP. 1924), though the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyaas regarded the Jīva as ultimately one with the Supreme Soul. Even when the Gītā uses the term *īśvara* with reference to the Jīva it does so only in an etymological sense, viz., with regard to the Jīva's "ownership" of his subtle body (Bh. Gī. XV. 7-8). And as Prof. Schrader points out to me there are other words used with reference to the Jīva in the same sense as "*īśvara*"; thus the Sāṃkhyaas used the term "*svāmin*", according to Garbe (Sāṃkhya-Philosophie, p. 305, 287, etc.), for the soul in its connection with the Upādhis, i. e. as a Jīva; and in a similar use the term is also met with in MBh. XII. 311. 20; "*Indriyāṇaṃ tu sarveṣāṃ īśvaraṃ mana ucyate*", as compared with Bh. Gī. X. 22: "*Indriyāṇaṃ manaś c āsini*," also see Ahirbudhnya-Saṃhitā XII. 22 where *svāmin* is given as a Sāṃkhya term for *manas* (see Prof. Schrader in Z. D. M. G. for 1914). Moreover, MBh. XII. 300. 3 and Gītā XV. 7-8 describe the "bound" soul, and it would be to no purpose if the authors were using *anīśvara* or *īśvara* in the sense that the Jīva is identical with the Lord; on the contrary, such a statement would only lead to confusion. MBh. XII. 306. 41 refers to *īśvara* as a term for the higher Nature of the Aupaniṣadas, and therefore an equivalent of *kṣetra* and *sattva*, and says that the Sāṃkhyaas regarded it to be *anīśvara*. Thus, this passage refers to neither theism nor atheism in Sāṃkhya. For these reasons, I cannot accept the interpretation of *anīśvara* in MBh. XII. 300 as "having no-lord, supreme", given by Prof. Edgerton, though, of course, I do not deny that *anīśvara* elsewhere can mean *amūrtara* "supreme" (Prof. Edgerton AJP, pp. 8-12).

Thus, the terminology of the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyaas clearly shows that they accepted the lower Nature of the Aupaniṣadas, but identified with it the *akṣara* or the higher Nature of the latter and thus admitted only one Nature. It also indicates that these Sāṃkhyaas approved of the *puṛuṣa* or *īśvara* of the Aupaniṣadas but to him they attributed all such characteristics and designations of the Aupaniṣada *akṣara*, as could not be consistently assigned to their own Nature.

(c) How the later Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya differ from the Classical Sāṃkhya :—

The mere difference between these two Schools bearing the same name cannot in itself show that one is later than the other, though Prof. Hopkins would say the reverse. It should be examined carefully which of the two Schools has a more primitive form. If one of them is more primitive than the other and if the texts concerned have not the appearance of a dishonest report, then the possibility of the system described in them being the older form of the two cannot well be denied.

There may be many other points of difference between the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya and the Classical School of that name than those given below, and these may be found out by a more detailed enquiry into the Mahābhārata, than it was possible for the present writer to undertake; he simply collects here those points which seemed to him to be very striking during his enquiry for *akṣara* into the chapters concerned.

(1) This Sāṃkhya does not know the terms of the Classical Sāṃkhya, like *vikṛti*, *prakṛtivyikṛti*, etc. It mentions "eight *prakṛtis*"; and the term "*prakṛti-vikṛti*." Prakṛti is then called *parā prakṛti* (MBh. XII. 310. 10) a term which though used by the Aupanishadas for their *akṣara* (Bh. Gī. VII. 5) these Sāṃkhyas could apply only to their Nature.

(2) The Mind, not the *ahamkāra* as in the Classical Sāṃkhya, is here the cause of the five elements (XII. 306. 27-28).
Primitive Con-ception of the Mind.

(3) Instead of the more advanced view of regarding Prakṛti as the female and Puruṣa as the male, the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya has got the cumbrous classification (based on an agnostic scheme much in vogue at the Buddha's time) of "the male", "the non-male", "the male-and-non-male" and "the neither-male-

nor-non-male". "The male" is the Prakṛti and "the neither-male-nor-non-male" is the Puruṣa (of these Sāṃkhya) (MBh. XII. 305. 25-29).

(4) This Sāṃkhya uses the terms *abuddha* for its *prakṛti* and *budhyanāna* for its *puruṣa* who is Jīva and becomes *buddha*, the Lord, in the state of absolution (MBh. XII. 305.31). Terms, unknown to Classical Sāṃkhya. These form a part of the L. MBh. terminology; it would be wrong to explain them as having only the etymological sense, to the exclusion of the technical one as will be shown later on.

(5) The Twentyfifth of these Sāṃkhya is " the Lord ", Īśvara of the Aupaniṣadas, and not only Identity of Jīva of the Jīva as in the Classical Sāṃkhya and Īśvara. Theism. School (MBh. XII. 305.32-33a-b; see p. 48 above). Thus the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya is theistic, like the L. MBh. Aupaniṣadas.

(6) Not only is the conception of the grounds on which the existence of Puruṣa the Twentyfifth is supported in this Sāṃkhya, quite primitive when compared with the one given in Primitive Conception of the Grounds for Puruṣa's Existence. Sāṃkhya Kārikā 17; but it is also noteworthy that L. MBh Sāṃkhya has four instead of the five grounds of the Classical Sāṃkhya (MBh. XII. 315.9c-d, 10).

(7) One of the grounds for the existence of the Twentyfifth is that the Twentyfifth is "an agent" Puruṣa, an Agent. *kartr* (MBh. XII 315.7-9a-b). L. MBh. Sāṃkhya did not say that he is *bhoktr*, because they did not yet distinguish *karṭṛva* from *bhokṭṛva* as did the Sāṃkhya Kārikā (17). Thus these Sāṃkhya seem to be the descendants of the "sāṃkhya-separatists" of Bh. Gī. XVIII. 13-16 (see Ch. II. p. 27).

(8) The Classical Sāṃkhya idea of emphasising the non-identity of the Puruṣa and the Prakṛti is not found in the Mahābhārata, though all the Mahābhārata Schools taught that the Twentyfourth should be given up ("heya"). This is so because the Mahābhārata does

not know anything about the identity of these two, which the Classical Sāṃkhya treats of as the *a-viveka* "want of discrimination", though the former knows that the Prakṛti is of the nature of attachment (*sāsaṅgā*) and the Puruṣa is by nature devoid of attachment (*niḥsaṅga*) as is said in MBh. XII. 315. 13-16.

(9) The most important fact to be noticed in this connection is that the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya did not know the doctrine of the plurality of individual souls. I have examined and interpreted all the passages that Prof. Hopkins, Prof. Edgerton and Prof. Deussen have put forth in support of their views in this respect (see Appendix III, where even XII. 350.2 is discussed). They either refer to the doctrine of two Natures of the L. MBh. Aupaniṣadas, which the Sāṃkhyas criticised or they discuss the unity and diversity of the Twentyfourth and do not at all refer to a real (as Prof. Hopkins thinks) or an empirical (as Prof. Edgerton holds) plurality of individual souls. Even the L. MBh. Yogas who separated the Jīva and Paramātmā did not know of this plurality (MBh. XII. 308).

These points of difference between the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya and the Classical Sāṃkhya seem to me to bear witness to the historical priority of the former.

Dr. Frauwallner's View amplified. Dr. Frauwallner (Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 45, and Wiener Zeitschrift fuer die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Band XXXII) has shown the same on the ground of other similar points. But I must say that some of the passages used by him belong definitely to the L. MBh. Aupaniṣada School (see p. 31 above), while some others quoted by him would lose their strength if the author or authors of the Mahābhārata really attempted "a loose exploiting of Classical Sāṃkhya in terms of Brahmatism" (Prof. Hopkins, the Great Epic of India, p. 131). I have examined all such passages that have been pointed out by Prof Hopkins, and I must confess

that to me they appear to be only an honest attempt on the part of the Mahābhārata authors to preserve for us the then existing philosophical doctrines. The difference on most of the vital points like *karṣṭva* of the Jīva and the plurality of individual souls, and the child-like ingenuousness with which these views are placed

The L. MBh. before us in addition to the evidence of Sāṃkhya much the terminology and to that of the fact prior to the Classical Sāṃkhya. that these Sāṃkhyas rejected the higher Nature of the Aupaniṣdas, should be regarded as a sufficient proof of the great antiquity of the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya School.

The special contribution of the Mahābhārata Sāṃkhyas to the history of the Indian Philosophy lies in the fact that they are the first to separate Matter and Spirit

Progress made by the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas. as the Unconscious and the Conscious. The contrast between the (lower) Unmanifest and *puruṣa* is put forth in the Sāṃkhya chapters of the Mahābhārata as

emphatically as the distinction between *akṣara* (the higher or living Nature) and *puruṣa* was in the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads and the Gītā (MBh. XII. 318. 37-44). The one was *saguṇa*, the other was *nirguṇa*; the one was *ajña*, the other was *jña*; the one was *avedya*, the other was *vedya*; the one *jñāna*, the other *jñeya*; the one *avidyā*, the other *vidyā* (MBh. XII. 307. 2); the one a *tattva*, the other *nistattva*; the one *sāsaṅga*, the other *niḥsaṅga*; the one *abuddha*, the other *budhyamāna*. Such is the distinction between Matter and Spirit that one finds in the Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya for the first time in the history of the Indian Philosophy, and at a period much prior indeed to that of the Classical Sāṃkhya

Complete Separation of Spirit and Matter. School. The Aupaniṣadas of the EMU and the Gītā and even those of the L. MBh. had not realised this most striking

phenomenon in the every-day world, because they had believed in the higher Nature intervening between the pure Matter (i. e. the lower Nature) and *puruṣa*. The L. MBh. Aupaniṣadas could accept the inherited view

that Matter is an effect of Spirit and for this reason they accepted also the spiritual *akṣara* which connected the two viz., the lower Nature and the *puruṣa*. The great contrast itself between Spirit and Matter may have been the ground on which the Sāṃkhyas based their view and parted company with their fellow-thinkers. That this disentanglement of Spirit and Matter from the causal relation which the Aupanīśadas always believed in, was achieved through the rejection of *akṣara* "the higher Nature" is a fact which the Mahābhārata most emphatically teaches. This point cannot be insisted upon strongly enough. The *śāśvata avyakta* or *acyuta pañcaviṃśa* was flatly refused by the Sāṃkhyas. Most of the philosophers of the days of Mahābhārata were engaged in the discussion of this problem. The Mahābhārata credits Āsuri and Pāñcaśikha and also

Contents of the Works of Āsuri and Pāñcaśikha: Rejection of the Higher Nature.

Kapila with having expressed their views on this problem. From the context in which their names occur in the Mahābhārata, they seem to have been the pioneers in rejecting the distinction between the two Natures of the Aupanīśadas (MBh. XII. 318. 59 ff). The origin of the Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya and Yoga Schools should be traced to what they are expressly said in the Mahābhārata to have refused to accept (see pp. 42-43 above). Compare the "motto" at the beginning of this Thesis. To the followers of the EMU and the Gītā who accepted a Dualistic Monism of two Spirits, and to the Aupanīśadas of the Mahābhārata who believed in a Pluralistic Dualism of three principles (apart from the *Jīva*), one material and two spiritual, this purely dualistic attitude of the Sāṃkhya could not have come as a great surprise, because these latter did any how accept the Twentysixth of the Aupanīśadas, the *puruṣa* of the EMU, one of the two "goals". It is for this reason that the L. MBh. Aupanīśadas sympathised with the Sāṃkhyas and often praised them (MBh. XII. 318. 57, 79).

Finally, we have already seen that some followers of the *sāṃkhya*-path of the Gītā had begun taking interest

in doctrinal questions (see pp. 26–27 above). These *sāṃkhya*-separatists believed the Atman to be an agent (Bh. Gī. XVIII. 13–16), while the *sāṃkhya*-followers as a whole believed in two Natures the higher of which was not at all “active” while

the lower possessed “all the activities”, as did the followers of *yoga* and *bhakti* paths. From the fact that the *Sāṃkhya* School philosophers of the L. MBh. hold Atman to be an agent, I have already suggested that it were the *sāṃkhya*-separatists of the *Gītā* who are responsible for the *Sāṃkhya* School of the L. MBh. (p. 27). The latter’s rejection of the higher Nature seems to have been due to their belief in the Atman’s *karṣṭva*. When the Atman was itself an agent, there was no necessity of believing in two Natures, neither of which would be in this case an agent. Though a verbal statement expressive of this argument is wanting in the (later) *Mahābhārata* which starts with the very idea that the *Sāṃkhya* is an independent School, the period intervening between the *Gītā* and the L. MBh. must have seen the *sāṃkhya*-separatists reasoning as above. These latter, like other followers of the *sāṃkhya-niṣṭhā* were ascetics; the follower of the L. MBh. *Sāṃkhya* School were also ascetics as already emphasised by Prof. Hopkins. For these reasons the *sāṃkhya-niṣṭhā* of the *Gītā* is the ultimate origin of the *Sāṃkhya* School of the L. MBh.

But even then the L. MBh. *Sāṃkhya* did not entirely cease to be a path or *niṣṭhā* like the *sāṃkhya*-path of the *Gītā*, because both of these accept the *puruṣa* (and the latter, the *akṣara* also) as their “goal”. The same is true also of the L. MBh. *Yogas*, who like the *Rudrite Yogas*, accepted the *puruṣa*, or like the *Hiraṇyagarbha Yogas*, the *akṣara* of the *Aupanīśadas* as the “goal”, as we shall see in the next Section. From this standpoint one can say what the L. MBh. *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* Schools do share the Nature of being “paths” for the same goal as the L. MBh. *Aupanīśadas*. The statements in the L. MBh. that “the *Sāṃkhya* and the *Yogas* see the *puruṣa* or

the Twentysixth of the Aupaniṣadas" (XII. 318, 79) or that all these Schools are equally good for the attainment of liberation from this world, are expressive of what was then a real fact.

3. The Y o g a S c h o o l .

It is more necessary to point out that the Yoga in the L. MBh. forins a metaphysical system of its own than it was to do the same with regard to the Sāṃkhya. The problem is exceedingly important because, while

Yoga an inde- Prof. Edgerton, so far as I know, is the pendent School of only one to hold that in the (later) Mahā- Thought in L.MBh. bhārata, "Sāṃkhya" does not stand for a

School but only for a path of salvation, the view that in Mahābhārata at least the Twentysixth is a principle either foisted upon the Sāṃkhya or said any how to belong to them, and therefore in that sense the Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas of the L. MBh. have the same metaphysical principles; is held by almost all scholars who have worked in this field and is generally believed in all over India also. My study has led me to think that the metaphysical principles in both these Schools were identical neither in their number nor in their nature; on the contrary, there is evidence to believe that unlike the Classical Schools of these names, the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya and Yoga Schools agreed mostly as regards the non-philosophical matters.

There are striking statements in the L. MBh. itself on this point. Just as the Sāṃkhya is a Sāstra, so is Yoga a Darśana (XII. 307.44, 48d). Again, "Both the Systems have the same career of life" (*ekacaryāu tāv ubhau*-XII. 316 2c). "Purity, accompanied by penance and compassion for all beings are equally taught in both The observance of vows also is the same in both; but the doctrinal teaching is not the same in the two Schools", (*darśanam na samam tayohi*-XII. 300. 8-9). Moreover, "The Yogas and Sāṃkhyas who have made the definition

of the metaphysical principles according to their own individual Scriptures see that this (visible world) is the action of the Unmanifest and the Manifest" (MBh. XII. 310. 100c-d, 101 a-b). Whenever the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga are mentioned together in the Gītā, it was intended to show that they were concerned with "renunciation" and "action" respectively, but in the L. MBh. this is not the case at all; it aims at pointing out some philosophical differences and sometimes resemblances also between the two Schools (MBh. XII. 307. 47-48; 308. 1). In the Gītā an aspirant is advised to accept either of the two paths, *sāṃkhya* or *yoga*; the Mahābhārata, on the contrary, complains that the Sāṃkhyas and Yogas do not accept some philosophical principles of the Aupaniṣadas (MBh. XII. 318. 56-57, 79; 305. 32-35), and therefore no Aupaniṣada would be asked to follow either Sāṃkhya or Yoga.

These statement go againsts the view Prof. Hopkins' that "This system is both Yoga and and Prof. Edger- Sāṃkhya, the systems being double but ton's Views unten- the teaching being identical" (Prof. able. Hopkins, GEI. pp. 133-134) and also against the other view that "Nowhere is there any suggestion that the Sāṃkhya-or Yoga either-means any particular system of metaphysical truth" (Prof. Edgerton, AJP. p. 5 and p. 7). They had their own doctrines and these were recorded in writings not available to us now (XII. 307. 46a-b).

But while I emphasise the importance of the hitherto neglected statements regarding the Meaning of doctrinal differences between the Sāṃ- " Sāṃkhya and khyas and the Yogas, I should not ignore Yoga are one " in another type of sentences which say that L. MBh. "Whatever is the Scripture of the Sāṃ- khyas is also the teaching of the Yogas" (MBh. XII. 307. 44) or that "The two Schools are one" (MBh. XII. 305. 19; 316. 4; 305. 31; 310. 8, 26; 318. 71, 100-101). These passages are not in conflict with those noted in the above paragraph. For their meaning we have to depend upon the context, as we have done in the case of similar

statements in the *Gītā* (see. pp. 25–26). They generally refer to the theory of the Nature which was common to both the *Sāṃkhya*s and the *Yogas* (XII. 307. 44; 310. 8, 26, 71, 100–101; and also 311, 312, 313). It was this part of the doctrine which the *Sāṃkhya*s were the first to make their own and which the *Yogas* accepted exactly as the *Sāṃkhya*s taught (XII. 308. Id.). Otherwise, such statements refer to the sameness of the ‘goal’ in the two systems (XII. 300. 8–9). They never intend to say that the conception of the individual soul was the same in the two Schools; rather, as we shall see later on, this and as a corollary to it, the nature of absolution were the very points on which they differed. It is where the interpreters of the L. MBh. have extended the application of the statements concerning the unity or identity of the *Sāṃkhya* and the *Yoga* to such doctrinal matters as are not meant by the context, that they have actually gone beyond the text of the *Mahābhārata*.

In this connection it would not be wrong once again to refer to the statements in the L. MBh. which always say that the *Sāṃkhya*s have only twentyfive principles (XII 302. 38, 306. 43–44; 305. 38. 307. 2, 47; 308. 14). The other Principle of the *Sāṃkhya* School. statements which mention the Twentysixth always refer either to the two *Yoga* Schools or to the *Aupanīṣada* School of the later *Mahābhārata*. There is no verse in the L. MBh. where it is said that the *Sāṃkhya*s had a Twentysixth principle. “The *Sāṃkhya*s see the Twentysixth” (XII. 318 79) means that they believe in the Twentysixth of the *Aupanīṣadas*, which they call the Twentysixth in their own System. Even XII. 308. 14–17 which refers to the Twentysixth of the *Yoga* is wonderfully accurate when it says that the *Sāṃkhya*s mention “twentyfive principles” (XII. 308 14). The *Sāṃkhya*s believed that the *budhyamāna* becomes the *buddha*, but they never said that the Twentysixth becomes the Twentysixth, because in their School the *budhyamāna* is always numerically identical with *buddha*.

Thus we have seen that, so far as the statements about the number and nature of the principles in the two Schools of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga are concerned, they do admit of doctrinal difference between them, though they also refer to the identity of some points of the teaching. Let us now see how far these statements are corroborated by the actual teaching itself.

The Yogas had rejected the higher Nature of the Aupaniṣadas, just as the Sāṃkhyas had done. Whenever the Sāṃkhyas are described as not having accepted the *budhyamāna avyakta, śāśvata avyakta* or *acyuta pañcaviṃśa*, the Yogas are always mentioned as their companions (see p. 42-43).

The second point of similarity between these two Schools is that they have the same view about Prakṛti or the Nature, and this follows as a natural consequence of their joint rejection of the higher Nature of the Aupaniṣadas.

The Conception just noticed above. The statement, "The same is the doctrinal teaching of both these Schools" (MBh. XII. 307. 44), is immediately followed by other statements : " I have narrated to you the highest principle of the Sāṃkhyas " (307. 47), and " The teaching of the Yoga is said to consist of *budhyamāna* and *buddha* " (307. 48). These sentences restrict the sense of 307. 44 and show that only the doctrine of the Nature, which has been given in the verses that precede 307. 44, is the same in the two Schools; thus we are not allowed to say that " The Systems are two but the teaching is the same," as Prof. Hopkins holds, or that the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga have no part in the discussion of philosophical teaching but are only two paths even in the Mahābhārata, as Prof. Edgerton believes. My interpretation of 307. 44 is proved by 308. 1, where we read :

Prof. Hopkins' and Prof. Edgerton's Views untenable.

"[The followers of the Yoga] making the Atman multiple (i.e. twofold, as we shall see below), relate the same (twentyfour) principles (*ātmānam bahudhā kṛtvā tāny eva pravicaṣate*)."

This is followed by : “ The *budhyamāna* transforming this (*etad* i.e. the *avyakta*) in this way (i. e., in the way taught by the Sāṃkhya in the preceding chapter) does not know (ceases to be a knower) ” (*etad evaṃ vikurvāṇo budhyamāno na budhyate* — 308. 2a-b) These two verses (308. 1-2) are to be taken with 307. 46 and 48, and 308. 1a-b which clearly say that the author describes the Yoga School in 308 with which we are concerned here. “ *Tāny eva pravicaṣate* ” and “ *etad evaṃ vikurvāṇaḥ* ” show that only the doctrine of the Nature is common to the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga, while “ *ātmānam bahudhā kṛtvā* ” establishes beyond any possibility of doubt my thesis that the Yogas differed from the Sāṃkhyas in so far as they (i.e. the Yogas) believed in the Jīva to be different from the Brahman or *puruṣa* (as we shall see below). Without giving here other passages (enumerated above) or explaining further the meanings of the above verses, I refer my reader to

the following note which will convince Prof. Deussen’s him that Prof. Hopkins and Prof. Deussen Interpretation also have failed to understand even the fundamental. incorrect. mentalities of this Yoga School. It is sufficient to say here that the Yogas accepted

the twentyfour principles, but unlike the Sāṃkhyas, said that the Jīva is the modifying agent of the Twentyfourth as distinct from the Supreme Soul.

NOTE.—As the whole of Chapter 308 is misunderstood by my predecessors, I must here say something to justify my interpretations. (1) “ *Ātmānam bahudhā kṛtvā* ” is explained by Prof. Hopkins as : “ The Lord-Spirit divides himself into many ” (GEI. p. 134, 136). This is quite wrong; *kṛtvā* can refer only to the subject of *pravicaṣate*, which must be in the plural number: it were the Yogas who “made the Atman multiple (i.e. two-fold).” It is indeed surprising to find that even Prof. Deussen has committed the same mistake (VPTM, p. 633). (2) It should also be pointed out that none of these scholars seems to have understood “ *tāny eva* ” in “ *tāny eva pravicaṣate* : ” the expression undoubtedly refers to the “twenty-four principles,” and explains 307. 44. (3) Prof. Hopkins explains *vikurvāṇa* (308. 2) as *vikṛti* and *budhyamāna* as Brahman ! I see no reason for not explaining *vikurvāṇaḥ* as nom. sing. of the present participle of *vi + kr*. According to

the Yoga School *budhyamāna* was the individual soul (see below) and is quite different from the Supreme Soul whom they called *buddha* , and therefore Prof. Hopkins' interpretation is due to a grave misunderstanding regarding the fundamental doctrines of this Yoga School. Prof. Deussen shares the same blunder (VPTM. p. 633).

The third point of similarity to be noticed here is the conception of the *summum bonum* in the two Schools, which they had in common of *summum bonum*. with the Aupaniṣadas and in a certain sense with the Pāñcarātras. To explain the situation of those days, *akṣara* and *puruṣa* were both of them regarded as the goals of life. This idea was inherited from the EMU and the Gītā. As a result, all philosophers who accepted either of these two singly (like the Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas) and also those who identified the two into one (like the Pāñcarātras, see Sec. 4 below) could be, in that sense, said to have recognised the same *summum bonum*. While describing the numerical designations in all the four Schools of the days of the later Mahābhārata (pp. 32–34), and also the doctrines which the Sāṃkhyas accepted from the Aupaniṣadas (pp. 44–47), while showing that the idea of God was the same in the Sāṃkhya as in the Aupaniṣada School and therefore the former was not atheistic (pp. 47–48), and lastly while pointing out that the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya is in a way like the *sāṃkhya*-path of the Gītā (p. 52), I had occasions to refer to the fact that the *puruṣa* (not to be distinguished from *akṣara* in its capacity as the “goal” and not yet to be identified with it) was the “goal” of the Sāṃkhyas. Now, I shall show that the “goal” of the Yogas was also not different from that of the Aupaniṣadas.

But before we can properly understand the “goal” in the L.MBh. Yoga, it is here necessary to point out that the L.MBh. mentions two Yoga Schools in L.MBh. two Yoga Schools. One was taught originally by Hiraṇyagarbha (XII. 308. 45), while the head of the other was Rudra (316. 5; 318. 52). “O you, controller of your enemies, know the

Yogas with Rudra at their head to be other Yogas" (*rudrapradhānān aparān viddhu yogan amṛdama*-316. 5a-b), and, "They move about in all the ten quarters with the self-same body till the dissolution of the world" (316. 6). "*Aparān yogān*" (316.5) refers to the distinction between these Rudrite Yogas and the Yogas described in the Chapter and the verses that precede 316.5. The origin of these two Schools of Yoga is undoubtedly to be trace to the Bh.

The Germ of Gī. which knows the term *yoga* to have both present in the two technical meanings (Bh. Gī. II. 48, Gītā. 50 and VI. 23; see Introduction, p. 4).

While the Gītā did not enumerate the Yoga Schools as two because they were then in their infancy, the definite statement in the later Mahābhārata noticed above is indicative of the progress of thought during the period intervening between the composition of the two works. It also shows that the L.MBh., as we have

Their Priority to it, is prior to the Classical period of the Classical Yoga. Indian Philosophy which knows only one Yoga School viz., the *dhyānayoga* which the Gītā explains as *duḥkhasaṃyogavivoga* (Bh. Gī. VI. 23) and the L. MBh. as *rudrapradhānayoga*. The Gītā uses the terms *yoga* and *karmayoga* for the other Yoga; the later Mahābhārata seems to refer to a later development of this Yoga when it mentions the Hiraṇyagarbha Yoga School (308. 45). In interpreting the Gītā and the L.MBh. we must not lose sight of these two meanings of the word (in the former) and two Schools having the same name (in the latter). When these texts themselves explain the term *yoga* to have two independent technical meanings recognised as such in the days of their composition, it is not reasonable to identify "*karmayoga*" with "*dhyānayoga*" (through the word *yogakṛtya* "practices or exercises of Yoga" used for

Prof. Edgerton's "*dhyānayoga*" in the L. MBh.), and to and prof. Hopkins' say that "there was only 'one method' Views untenable. called Yoga but the word had two interpretations", as Prof. Edgerton has done (AJP, pp. 40-46). Again Prof. Hopkins, and others who argue that the Mahābhārata (the Gītā included) is an

effort to render the Classical Sāṃkhya theistic on the analogy of the Classical Yoga, seem to have been led to such a conclusion, partly at least, on account of having overlooked the distinction between the two Yoga Schools of L. MBh. and therefore the notice I have here taken of this fact will not be deemed unnecessary.

Now, we shall not be surprised to find that these two Yoga Schools have two different conceptions of the final goal, both of which were recognised as equally good, at that time. Hiraṇyagarbha (308.45) is mentioned as the teacher of the Yogas described in 308, and verses 31-51 of that Chapter described *akṣara* to be their goal or highest principle which (*akṣara*) they called the Twentysixth (308.7-8). These Yogas rejected *akṣara* as the higher Nature but accepted it as the goal; and as the Gītā had already made this twofold distinction in the conception of *akṣara* it is quite natural that the same discrimination is made by these Yogas. Unlike these Hiraṇyagarbha Yogas, the Rudrite Yogas contemplated on *puruṣa*. "Having thus enumerated (their principles upto Prakṛti, as stated in the preceding verse), they meditate on the absolute eternal, infinite, pure, the woundless (*avaraṇa*), constant *puruṣa*, the invulnerable, ageless, deathless, eternal, unchanging Lord and the unchanging Brahman (316.16, 17, 25)". Thus, the two Yoga Schools respectively believed in *akṣara* and *puruṣa* as the goal.

Besides the two passages (308.31-52, 7-8 and 316.16-17, 25) we have to consider one more passage on this subject, viz., 318.79e-f. It says that "The Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas accept the Twentysixth". I have already explained how it describes the Sāṃkhya doctrine of those days (see p. 47

The Yogas' Acceptance of the Twentysixth. above). As regards its application to the two Yoga Systems I do not think we have any difficulty in understanding it. Chapter 318 mainly deals with the Aupaniṣada doctrine (see p. 34 above), and therefore the verse in question means "The Yogas see the Twentysixth of the Aupa-

niṣadas", and this applies easily to the Rudrite Yogas whose Twentysixth was the *puṇṣa*. But the verse can also mean "The Yogas see their own Twentysixth", and this would be correct with reference to both the Schools of the Yoga, because according to both the Twentysixth was the individual soul, and so the Twentysixth was *akṣara* (as the goal) with the Hiraṇyagarbha Yogas and *puṇṣa* with the Rudra Yogas. Thus, according to the verse (318.79 e-f) the Twentysixth of the Aupaniṣadas, viz., the *puṇṣa*, was accepted by the Sāṃkhyas (but as the Twentysixth in their System) and also by the Rudra Yogas (with whom the *puṇṣa* was the Twentysixth). As Rudra is mentioned in the list of the teachers in that Chapter (318.52) and as Hiraṇyagarbha is wanting in the same, I am inclined to believe that the author had in his mind the Rudrite Yogas (in 79e-f), though the verse applies also to the Hiraṇyagarbha Yogas if we construe the text in a way not uncommon to the Sanskrit literature. (The views of Professors Hopkins and Jacobi on "the Twentysixth" in 318. 79. and elsewhere in MBh. have been already discussed on p. 30 ff. above).

There is one more point in which the Yogas seem to have resembled the Sāṃkhyas. It is said that
 The Conception "The practice or observance (i.e. the
 of the Career of career of life) followed by the Sāṃkhyas
 Life. and the Yogas is the same" (*lā ubhāu
 ekacaryam*--MBh. XII. 316. 2c, quoted

above on p.50). In the L.MBh. though the Sāṃkhyas are said to be Yatis (ascetics), the Yogas are not said to be *karmayogins* which they are actually and most emphatically declared to be in the Gītā. Moreover, instead of con-

The L. MBh. trasting Sāṃkhya and Yoga on the basis
 Conception of of renunciation and action, the L. MBh.
 Three *niṣṭhās*, with- mentions three *niṣṭhās* "careers of life"
 out Reference to independently of any special reference to
 Schools. any philosophical Schools though, of

course, they can be traced to have been particularly favoured by one or other of these latter. They are called *śāśā jñāna* (traceable in the Sāṃkhya Schools, *keśala kumam* (most probably referring to the Pāṇcarātras who were

Yatis devoting themselves to big sacrifices offered to Nārāyaṇa), and *jñānakarmasamuccaya* followed by Janaka. These are described in MBh. XII. 320. 39-40 and 345. 92. It is most striking that, though Janaka himself refers to the Schools under the names of "*sāṃkhya-jñāna*", "*yoga*", and "*mahipāla-vidhi*" (i. e. the Path of Devotion, cf. *rājavidyā* and *raja-guhyā* in Bh. Gī. IX. 2) in 320. 25 and again to the three *niṣṭhās*, mentioned above, in 320. 39-40, still he does not connect them with each other; on the contrary, he says that Pañcaśikha taught the *jñānakarmasamuccaya niṣṭhā*, though he was himself a Sāṃkhya philosopher. Thus, in the days of the L. MBh. the careers of life were independent of the metaphysical doctrine. This, again, is in consistency with the progress of thought during the period intervening between the Gītā and the L. MBh, during which the *sāṃkhya* and the *yoga* paths became Schools of these names.

Before we begin to examine the points of difference between the L. MBh. Yogas and Sāṃkhyas, it is necessary to make a few remarks regarding the terminology of the Yogas. The Yogas seem to have specially favoured the designations *a-pratibuddha* or *a-prabuddha*, *budhyamāna*, and *buddha* (rather than the Twentyfourth, the Twentyfifth and the

Terminology of L. MBh. Yoga Schools. is probable that these expressions referring to the presence or absence of

"consciousness" in the philosophical principles were originated by the Yogas and accepted by the Sāṃkhyas and the Aupanishadas with such additions and alterations as would suit their own Systems. This fact should be carefully noted because as yet these terms have not been definitely recognised as technical terms by those who have interpreted the Mahābhārata. There is ample evidence that these (terms) are used in the L. MBh. in a conventional and not in the etymological sense, though the latter must have been the basis of the former. In 307. 47 the author brings to a close his description of the Sāṃkhya doctrine (*sāṃkhyānām*

tu param tattvam vathāvad anuvarṇitam—307.47c-d) and then thus begins the Yoga teaching: "*Buddha* and *budhyamāna*, because he (the latter, i. e. the soul) is not in reality the *prati*

Evidence for the *buddha*, *budhyamāna* and *buddha*, they declared to be the Yoga doctrine "

(307. 48). (The Kumbhakoṇam ed. reads "*buddham apratibuddham ca budhyamānam ca tattvataḥ*" in place of 307.48a-b of Bombay ed., which is intended to show that three principles of these three names are taught by the Yogas.) Now, hear the following *guṇavidhi* (classification of the principles?) [concerning] *buddha* and *abuddha*. [The Yogas] (see above 307.48) making the Atman multiple (*bahudhā*, i.e. twofold; see below) assert the same (*tāny eva*, i. e., the twentyfour principles of the Sāṃkhyas, described in 307) (308.1). The *budhyamāna* modifying this [Unmanifest or *abuddha* mentioned in verse 1] in this way does not know (i. e. ceases to be a knower of the Twentysixth?). He upholds the constituents, he creates and withdraws them. He does so continuously for the sake of mere sport (308.2,3a-b). And they call the *budhyamāna* [so] because he knows the Unmanifest (308.3c-d). But the Unmanifest being itself possessed of the constituents never (*na kadācit*) knows [the *budhyamāna* who is] the Constituentless, [therefore] they call it (n.) *apratibuddhak* (308. 4). But when this Twentysixth (n, sc. *tattvam*) knows the Unmanifest, the *budhyamāna* certainly becomes attached to the world; so says the Śruti (of the Yogas). For this reason [the Yogas] call the unfallen Unmanifest (*acyuta avyakta*) "*apratibuddha*" (308.5). And they call the Twentysixth "*budhyamāna*" because he knows the Unmanifest, but even he does not know the Great Atman (*mahātman*) (308.6). The Twentysixth (n.), the *buddha*, which is pure, incomprehensible, eternal, knows eternally (*satataṃ.....budhyate*), the Twentysixth and the Twentysixth (308. 7). Here, the Unmanifest (i. e. the Twentysixth), the absolute Brahman, which is by its very nature permeating the visible and the invisible, is, O friend of great lustre, the [sole] Knower in this world. The Twentysixth does not see the Absolute (*kevala*) and the Twentysixth" (308. 9a-b).

From this quotation it would appear that verse 307.48 associates *budhyamāna* and *buddha* and (according to the Kumbhakoṇam ed.) *apratibuddha* (also mentioned in 308.4) specially with the Yoga School. Secondly it is clear from the verbal forms *radanti* (308.3d, 6b) and *āhuh* (4d) that these are *saṃjñās* "technical names". If we look to what follows, we also find that *apratibuddha*, *budhyamāna* and *buddha* are the names of the principles (308.21c-d, 22a-b). It is also clear from the above that these Yogas called them respectively the Twentyfourth, the Twentyfifth and the Twentysixth. It is further evident that the three are defined here in such a way that the possibility of their being reduced to two at any stage of development is precluded. *Apṛatibuddha* is "never a knower" (4a, c), i. e. one which can never become *budhyamāna* or *buddha*. *Buddha* is "eternally a knower" (7c-d), so the *budhyamāna* can never become the *buddha*. The three must eternally remain three; and we shall see later on that this position is maintained throughout by the author of this Chapter. They are also numbered as t h r e e. The remarks concerning these terms made already (on pp. 42-43 and p. 51) and the following note will convince the reader that Professors Hopkins, Deussen and Edgerton have committed grave blunders in not interpreting these terms as technical.

NOTE.—The fact that the interpreters of the L. MBh. School have not till now recognised these three as three principles of these names becomes clear if we look to their interpretations. Prof. Edgerton translates 307.48 as follows: " 'The (soul) becoming-enlightened and that-is-enlightened is declared to be (also) the substance of Yoga teaching ' (so that there is, as stated, no difference in the Sāṃkhya and Yoga views of truth)". Besides other objections to be raised against this translation later on, I would here point out that Prof. Edgerton has failed to understand that *budhyamāna* and *buddha* are two principles of those names and not two conditions of the same soul. This is evident from the fact that he has done away with the repeated " ca " in 308.44c-d. While 307.48 clearly says that the *budhyamāna* is *budhyamāna* "because in reality it is not *pratibuddha* (or, to use the usual form, *buddha*) and while 308.3-7 distinguishes *budhyamāna* as a knower (of the Nature) and *buddha* as an eternal knower (of the other

two), Prof. Hopkins sees the identity of the individual spirit and the Lord-Spirit in verse 307.48. In doing so, he neglects the context. If the *budhyamāna* became the *buddha* (or, in other words, if the Twentysixth became identical with the Twentysixth), how could the Twentysixth be said to be "eternally knowing the Twentysixth and the Twentyfourth"? This shows that *budhyamāna* and *buddha* are here two principles and not conditions. (Prof. Hopkins, GEI. p. 134). I have already mentioned Prof. Hopkins' and Prof. Deussen's explanations of 308.1 above. Prof. Hopkins explains *apratibuddha* in 308.4, not as a name for the Unmanifest, but as that of the individual soul (GEI. p. 135). Prof. Deussen interprets "*etad* (n.) *evam vikurvāṇaḥ*" (308.2) as "As he changes himself in this way.....," and "*budhyamāna*" (in 308.5c) as "knowing" (i. e. as an adj.) though in 307.48 he interprets the same word as "the Awakening" (i.e. as a noun): this proves that even Prof. Deussen did not decide for himself whether these are technical terms or adjectives (VPTM. 633). 308.6a-b means according to Deussen: "Through him, the Prakṛti has not yet been [fully] known (*apratibuddha*—Prof. Deussen does not understand that according to the context *apratibuddh eḥ* stands for "*apratibuddha* — not *apratibuddhā*—+*iti*" i.e. for *aprabuddham iti*), so they say with reference to the Unmanifest, Imperturbable". No more examples will be necessary for proving that the terminology of the L. MBh. Yogas (and, in a sense, that of other L. MBh. Schools who also used the same terms with modifications) has been till now not correctly understood. Henceforth I shall restrict myself to giving a consistent interpretation of 308 as I believe it to be, and request the reader to compare it with those of Professors Deussen and Hopkins wherever these be available. (*Abuddha* in 308.1 is a short form of *apratibuddha* in 4 and 5 and also in 21, used metrical cause).

Now, we shall be able to understand how the L. MBh.

Points of Doctrinal Difference between L. MBh. Yogas and Sāṃkhyas.	Yogas differed from the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas. The most prominent point of difference was the distinction of the Jīva from the Paramātman, which these Yogas made for the first time in the history of Indian Philosophy, just as the Sāṃkhyas separated the Nature from the Puruṣa for the first time by the rejection of the higher Nature.
--	--

As we have seen (in 308. 1) the Yogas made the Atman "multiple" *bahudhā*. The meaning of

Distinction between *bahudhā* must depend upon the context between Jīva and which, as we can learn from the verses Paramātman. that follow 308. 1, shows that unlike the

Sāṃkhya, the Yogas have two Atmans, the *budhyamāna* and the *buddha*, the Twentyfifth and the Twentysixth. It will have been also noticed that the *budhyamāna* is here the creator and destroyer (308. 2-3) while the *buddha* is permeating the visible and the invisible world without taking any part in the creation. The *buddha* is (at first) not known even to the *budhyamāna* (308. 6c-d) and has apparently nothing to do with creation and destruction on account of its seeing the other two eternally. Thus, *bahudhā* is used for *dvīdhā* partly because of metrical reasons and partly because, as in those days when only one Atman was known to the Sāṃkhyas there was no possibility of its being confounded if the Yoga doctrine was contrasted with their view. Thus, there is no support to the interpretation of *bahudhā* as implying plurality of souls. (Moreover, as already said, it is not the "Lord-Spirit who makes himself many", as was interpreted by Prof. Hopkins, see p. 60 above.) The following verses (308. 9c-d, 17) bring out this fundamental difference between the two Schools quite distinctly:—

" When the *budhyamāna* thinks of himself that he is of a different nature [from the Twentysixth], then he is 'Unmanifest-eyed' *avyaktalokana* because he is possessed of Prakṛti (9c-d, 10a-b)¹. But when he knows the supreme knowledge pure and unimpure, he attains to 'the state of the *buddha*' (*buddhatva*) like the Twentysixth² (10c-d, 11a-b).

Then, he gives up the Unmanifest which is of the nature of creation and dissolution (11c-d). Then, he who is devoid

of the attributes knows the Nature (*prakṛti*) as possessed of attributes and as devoid of consciousness. Then, he comes to possess the attributes [*buddhatva* etc.] of the Absolute³ (i. e. the Twentysixth—

308. 8), because of his having seen the Unmanifest (i.e. Brahman, as said in 308. 8) (12). Having come into contact with the Absolute, the liberated soul will reach the Atman⁴ ” (13a-b). “This non-principle, ageless and deathless, they (i. e. the Sāṃkhya) call ‘ principle ’

The Sāṃkhya (*tattvam*)⁵ (13c-d). But it is not [to be criticised by the dealt with] as a principle (*tattvavat na*) Yogas. ‘ because it resorts to the principles ’

(*tattvasaṃśrayaṇāt*). Learned people (i. e., the Sāṃkhya) speak of twentyfive ‘principles’ (*tattvas*)⁶ (14). But he is not ‘ possessed of principles ’ (*tattvavān*)⁷; rather this intelligent one is a ‘ non-principle ’ (*nīlātva*)⁸. He leaves far behind (i. e. is entirely different from) the (Sāṃkhya) principle of which *buddhatva* is predicated (by the Sāṃkhya)⁹. The highly conscious one (*prājñā*), the ageless and deathless, the Twentysixth, when being conceived of [by the Twentyfifth or the Jiva] with the notion of ‘ I ’ (i. e. I am the *prājñā*) becomes identical [with the meditator] undoubtedly only through force (*kevalena balen eva*) [but not in reality]¹⁰ (16). By [the side of] the Twentysixth i. e. the *prabuddha*, even the *budhyamāna* (i. e. the Twentyfifth) is ignorant¹¹. This is said to be the distinction¹² [of the Yoga School] from the teaching of the Sāṃkhya Scripture (17).

NOTES.—1. These two verses (9c-d and 10a-b should be construed together (Prof. Hopkins, GEI. p. 135, differs). “ Of a different nature ” stands for *anyaḥ*, because, as said in verse 26ff, the liberation of the soul from the world lies in the Twentyfifth becoming like the Twentysixth. Prof. Hopkins’ translation : ‘ thinks that I am the other ’, is based upon a complete misunderstanding of the Yoga doctrine in this Chapter. ‘ *Avyakta-locana* ’ is confirmed by Kumbh. ed.; the reading proposed by Prof. Hopkins, viz., ‘ *vyakta-locana* ’ is not necessary; so also his proposed reading *aprakṛtumān* in place of *prakṛtumān*. “ *Avyakta-locana* ” means “ one who sees through the influence of the Unmanifest, the Nature ” and also “ one whose eyes are not annointed with collyrium (and therefore cannot see clearly) ”. 2. *Yathā śaḍvimsaḥ* gives the standard of comparison for *buddhatva*, the *sādharaṇa dharmā* which would then belong to both the *budhyamāna* and the *buddha*. Prof. Edgerton’s interpretation, “ the *budhyamāna*,

as the Twentysixth (*śaḍvimsaḥ yathā*) will attain to *budhatva*", is, besides being in itself meaningless, in disharmony with the context, which shows that the *budhyamāna* never becomes the *buddha* (see also Prof. Deussen VPTM. p. 634). 3. '*Kevaladharmā* and '*kevalena samāgamya*' in verse 13 shows that "*śaḍvimsaḥ yathā*" is the *upamāna* here, and that the Twentyfifth does not become the Twentysixth in the state of absolution. Prof. Deussen's translation of "*kevaladharmā bhavati*" as "and becomes the Absolute" is inaccurate; so, also his translation of *kevalena samāgamya* as "having become one with the Absolute". 4. *Ātmānam āpnuyāt* is an expression for the state of liberation; it cannot mean "reaches his real self" if such an expression implies any theory of Illusion (Prof. Deussen, VPTM. p. 634). "*Āhuh*" in 13 shows that a School other than that in 308 is probably referred to here and verse 14 shows that this other School is the Sāṃkhya School (see 307. 40, 47; 308. 43 etc. where the Sāṃkhya is said to have only twentyfive principles). *Etad nistat'tvam* in 13c-d refers to *kevala* in 13a. *Ajārāmaram* 13d—the Yogas would never allow that the Supreme Being becomes subject to old age and death, unlike the Sāṃkhyas who held that the Supreme Being itself is bound and again liberated. This position of the Yogas is quite consistent with their view that the *budhyamāna* (and not the *buddha*) is the creator and destroyer and that the Twentysixth knows the Twentyfifth and the Twentyfourth eternally (308. 2, 7). The *buddha* serves for the *budhyamāna* as an ideal as it were (308. 11). The *budhyamāna* becomes *kevaladharmā*, not *kevala* itself (12–13); he can come into contact with the *kevala* and hope to be thereby liberated only if the latter is eternally a b o v e bondage and liberation (13). 5. In my opinion we have here a protest of the Yogas against the custom of the Sāṃkhyas who called the Supreme Being (the Twentysixth of the Yogas) "*a tattva*" on the ground that it resorts to the *tattvas*. According to the Yogas, the Supreme One never resorts to the *tattvas* as we have seen in 308. 6–8, and therefore it can never be called a *tattva* even in the secondary sense. In other words, the Yogas do not admit that the *budhyamāna* becomes the *buddha* in liberation; the *buddha* never resorts to the principles at all during its eternal existence. The position of the Sāṃkhyas, "*tattvasaṃśrayaṇāt tattvam*", is often met with in the L. MBh. e. g. in 302. 38:

"Pañcaviṃśatīlamo Viṣṇur nistat'tvas tattvasaṃśrayāt |
tattvasaṃśrayaṇād etat tattvam āhuh maṇiṣṇah" ||

See also 306. 41; 307. 47; 306. 43; 302. 38; 6. "But he is not possessed of principles" amounts to "he never resorts to the principles". 7-8. Here the followers of the Yoga emphatically assert their view that the Supreme Being is in no sense a *tattva*, he is a *nistattva*. 9. i. e., He is not a 'principle with the characteristic *buddhatva*,' but is no principle at all, though he should be called the Twetysixth, as these Yogas do. The followers of the Yoga object to the term *tattva* being applied to the Supreme Being and, for this reason, are bound to reject the Supreme Being of the Sāṃkhyas whom they called "*buddha*" and also "*tattva*". Again, "*buddhatvalakṣaṇam tattvam*", "a principle (and again) called *buddha*", is to be found only in the Sāṃkhya School, not in the Yoga; the latter would accept *buddhatvalakṣaṇam nistattvam*. This seems to be the sense of verse 15. As regards the position of the Sāṃkhyas, 306. 44 when considered along with 307. 37 would mean that the Twentysixth who, when influenced by *prakṛti*, is called *budhyanāna*, becomes *kevala* (306. 44d) and *buddha* ("now I am *buddha*" 307. 37c) when he knows himself (306. 44c). The Yogas refused to accept the identity of the two. 10. The repetition of *ajārūṃśa* (in 13, 16) shows that it forms an important argument of the Yogas; the Jīva is subject to death and old age, the Supreme Being is according to Yoga eternally free from these; there is no possibility of there being complete identity between the two even after the former's absolution. *Aham iti grhyamāṇaḥ* refers to the method of meditation, in which the object of meditation is thought of as identical with the self of the meditator. "*Kevalena balena eva*" is a simple expression and means "only per force" i. e. "never in reality", the reason is, as explained above, that the *śadvimśa* is not like the *pañcaviṃśa*; there can be no real identity between the two; the identity achieved during the meditation is an unreal conjectural one, as it is based upon mere force and on no reasonable grounds. Prof. Hopkins has failed to notice the emphasis underlying the expression "*kevalena balen eva*" and then he comes to the conclusion quite contrary to the one given above (see GEI. p. 135) Prof. Edgerton interprets it as, "by the mere abstract power" and adds, by way of explanation, "the power of this knowledge"; I do not think "*balena*" should be here interpreted as "the power of knowledge"; the context shows that all identity of the individual soul with the Supreme One is denied here (Prof. Edgerton, AJP, Vol. XLV, 1924). Prof. Edgerton, seems to have followed Prof. Deussen (VPTM p. 635). All the three interpreters believe that in the present verse the

identity is taught by the Yogas. But the next verse solves the problem. 11. This seems to mean: The Twentyfifth never becomes identical with the Twentysixth because though the former is *budhymāna*, the latter is *prabuddha*. This was already said in verse 6: "Even he (i.e. the *budhymāna*) does not know the Great Atman". "*Prabuddha*" shows that the *buddha* eternally knows the *budhymāna* who knows the former only during liberation. 12. "*Nānātva*" in verse 17 refers to the difference between the Yogas and the Sāṃkhya Schools. In 13 and 14 the Sāṃkhya doctrine has been introduced as the view of an opponent; and the word "*tū*" in 13c shows the same. Again, the remarks, "it is not like *tattva*" (14b) and "That intelligent one is *nistattva*, and has no *tattva*" (15a-b) indicate that here the Sāṃkhya view has been rejected; because elsewhere in the Sāṃkhya text (302-307) it is always said that though the Twentyfifth (of the Sāṃkhyas, of course) is a non-principle, it is yet a principle because it resorts to principles. Moreover we are given here the facts that the *buddha* or the Twentysixth of the Yogas is "no principle characterised as *buddha*", that the identity of the Jīva and the Supreme Soul is a forced one; and that the *budhymāna*, as compared with the *buddha* is ignorant. All these arguments show that the difference between the Yoga and the Sāṃkhya Schools is meant here by the word "*nānātva*". In 308 1.c-d we are told that "the Yogas having made the Atman multiple (i. e. twofold, as already shown above) describe the same (n. plu.) (principles)"; and it is exactly in agreement with this statement that these verses (308. 9c-d-17) explain the difference between the two Schools on the problem of the Yoga view of Atman. The Yogas actually taught two Atmans, the Twentyfifth and the Twentysixth. Verse 14 has clearly said that the Sāṃkhyas accept only twentyfive *tattvas* including the Twentyfifth as *tattva* because it resorts to the *tattvas*, there is no indication here that the Sāṃkhyas accepted the Twentysixth. Prof. Deussen translates verse 17 as follows: "But when he has become awakened through the awake Twentysixth, he [still] continues being ignorant (so ist er weiter erkenntnislos, 17a-b which, however, has nothing like "weiter"), because this [opposition of the subject and the object in the act of knowing] is explained to be still a plurality according to the view of the Sāṃkhyas and the Scripture (17c-d)". And Prof. Hopkins (10c. cit. p. 135) explains the same in the following manner, "That separateness of spirits (*nānātva*, M.) which is part of the exposition of Sāṃkhya is really (explained by) the conditioned spirit (*budhymāna*? M.) when not fully (? M.

enlightened (*abuddhimān*, M) by the (fully) (? M.) enlightened Twentysixth".* Prof. Edgerton takes "*etan nānātvaṃ ity uktam*" (17c) to mean "This (consciousness) implies plurality" (Prof. Edgerton, AJP. Vol. XLV, 1924). It will be seen that all these interpreters have not realised the importance of the terms *budhyamāna* and *buddha* as names of metaphysical principles. It is difficult to understand what meaning Prof. Deussen makes out of 17a-b. Though the term *nānātva* can mean "plurality", it can also mean "difference", as in the present case. Moreover, I do not think that in 308 we have anywhere "the opposition of the subject and the object". As regards Prof. Hopkins' translation, I have shown that the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya knows nothing of the plurality of individual souls implied in his words "separateness of spirits". (There is a separateness of spirits here, viz., that of the Twentysixth and the Twentysixth; but this is far from Prof. Hopkins' meaning.) Moreover, his translation is too free to be of any value in understanding the text. There are other minor differences between my interpretation and those of others, these have not been noticed here. It will be seen that the second point of difference between the two Schools of L. MBh, to be presently noticed, will also prove the correctness of the interpretation proposed by me above.

The above translation of 308. 9c-d—17 and the notes added to it, which fully refute the incorrect interpretations of Prof. Hopkins and Prof. Deussen, prove that the L. MBh. Yoga differed from the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya as regards the Atman. The Yoga believed in two Atmans, the Twentysixth and the Twentysixth, while the Sāṃkhyas believed in only one viz., the Twentysixth. The Twentysixth of the Yoga is the creator and destroyer, and their Twentysixth has nothing to do with the world. The Yogas objected to calling the latter a *tattva* and rejected the Sāṃkhya view on that point.

As a natural consequence of the separation of the Jīva from the Supreme Being, which this Yoga School taught for

* Bracketed additions marked M. (Modi) are my own.

the first time in the history of the Indian Philosophy, they

The Conception of the *summum bonum*: the Jīva becomes like Paramātmā, not Paramātmā Himself.

were led to reject the then existing view about the nature of liberation or release from worldly existence. But as this Yoga School found itself confronted specially by the Sāṃkhya, the explanation of their teaching on this point, like that on the question of the separateness of the Jīva from the Lord, has assumed the form of a criticism of the Sāṃkhya view on the same topic. This has been already suggested in the verses translated above. The "bondage" was said to consist in the *budhyamāna* becoming attached to the world (308. 5). It was said that the *budhyamāna* does not know the Great Atman [during his bondage] (308. 6), and that when he thinks himself to be other [than the Twentysixth] he comes into possession of Prakṛti (308. 9c-d, 10a-b), and that when he "knows (i. e. acquires) the pure knowledge" he attains the *buddha*-state like (that of) the Twentysixth. The fact that he does not himself become the Twentysixth was made clear by stating that in absolution he becomes (not *kevala* but) *kevaladharmā* (308. 12c). This last one is the point emphatically stated in verses 18-30 to be now examined.

"The identity (*ekatva*) of this Twentyfifth united with the Conscious One (*cetanena samelasya*)¹, takes place, when he (i. e. the Twentyfifth) does not cognise [any longer] by means of the intellect² [and not when he merges himself into the Supreme being, the Twentysixth, as Prof. Hopkins implies] (18). When the *budhyamāna* attains equality (*samatām yāti*) with the *prabuddha*, he 'whose nature was attachment' (*saṃgaḍharmā*) becomes unattached³ (19). Having reached the unattached, the Twentysixth, the un-

Evidence for the same. [Jīva] abandons the Unmanifest, the

Twentyfourth, when he knows it to be worthless, through the knowledge of the Twentysixth (20-21a-b)⁴. Here the *aprabuddha*, the *budhyamāna* and the *buddha* have been to-day described to you in their proper way according

to the teaching in the [Yoga] Sruti (21c-d, 22a-b). The similarity and the dissimilarity (*ekatva* and *nānātva*)⁵ [of the *budhyamāna* and the *buddha*⁶] should be seen from the teaching in the [Yoga] Scripture as follows (*etāvad*) (22c-d): The dissimilarity (*anyatva*) between these two [the *budhyamāna* and the *buddha*] is like that between the fruit of the tree of Ficus Glomerata and the worm [residing in it]; the distinction (*anyatva*) between the two can be perceived also as that between the fish and the water⁷ (23). Only thus⁸ (*evam eva*) should be understood the non-identity and identity and of these two. This [knowledge of the identity and the non-identity]

together with the knowledge of the Unmanifest criticised by the (i. e. the Nature, the *apratibuddhika*, the Yogas. Twentyfourth) is called [in the

Yoga School] the liberation (24)⁹. They [i. e. the Sāṃkhyas] say that this one here, viz., the Twentyfifth who lives in the [various] bodies [by turn] is to be made free from the sphere (or power) of the Unmanifest (25)¹⁰. It is the decision [of the Yogas] that he [i. e. "the Twentyfifth in the body"]¹¹ might be released only in this way and not otherwise¹². Having associated¹³ with the Highest¹⁴ he comes to possess the attributes of the Highest (26). Having come into association ("sametya," occurring four times in 27-30) with the pure (*śuddha*), the Awakened (*buddha*), the [ever-] liberated (*mukta*) the one whose nature is [eternal] separation [from *prakṛti*], who possesses absolution, whose nature is pure, who is absolute and independent, - the Twentyfifth comes to possess as his attributes purity, awakening (*buddhi*), liberation, separation (Kumbh. ed.), purity..... and becomes independent" (308. 27-30)¹⁵.

NOTES.—1. Compare this with "*kevalena samāgamya*" in 13 above. 2. i. e., ceases to be "Unmanifest-eyed" (10b). "*Yada buddhyā na budhyate*" cannot here mean "has no longer any consciousness (of self)" (Prof. Hopkins, GEI. p. 135). 3. The liberation consists in the *samgātma* (5d) becoming *nihsamgātmā* (19d). 4. Verses 21c-d and 22a-b have been

already explained. They mention three independent principles and thus indirectly show that the preceding verses (18-21a-b) are not intended to mean that the *budhyamāna* becomes identical with the *buddha* even in liberation. 5. *Nānātva* and *ekatva* 22c-d cannot be other than those mentioned in 24h (see below). *Nānātva* is explained as *anyatva* in 23. 6. That the similarity and dissimilarity intended in 22c-d is that between the two viz., the *budhyamāna* and the *buddha*, is proved not only by my interpretation of 13-17a-b and by the fact that there can be no question of *apratibuddha* being compared with any of these two, but also from *elayoh* in 23b, d and 25b. 7. The Yoga Twentysixth (*buddha*) is here compared with the fruit itself and the Jīva (the *budhyamāna*, the Yoga Twentyfifth) with the worm within it. The Ficus Glomerata is never known to be without a worm or worms within it. The idea underlying these similes as given here seems to be that just as the fruit and the water are greater than the worm and the fish, so the *buddha* is greater than the *budhyamāna* and therefore the two are "never identical". The repetition of *anyatva* shows that here the non-identity of the two is emphasised as in 13-17 also. 8. "Only thus", *evam eva*, implies a protest against the Sāṃkhya s. It means that the *buddha* is like the *budhyamāna*, but is also greater than the latter. Both are knowing principles, but the *buddha*'s knowing is eternal, the *budhyamāna* knows the *buddha* only when he is liberated. 9. It should be noted that verse 24 gives the Yoga view of liberation. This view maintains the non-identity (though likeness also) of the Twentyfifth and the Twentysixth even during absolution. 10. After having stated their own view (24), it is just proper for the Yogas to mention the Sāṃkhya standpoint, which they wanted to refute. *Prāhuḥ* (25c) shows that the hostile view is mentioned here and the statements about the *pañcaviṃśatika* leave no doubt that the Sāṃkhya is meant here. 11. This expression, though used by the Sāṃkhyas, applies well to the Twentyfifth of the Yogas also and therefore they welcome it. 12. The emphatic expressions: *evam... nānyathā* (23), *iti viniścayaḥ* (26) and *evam eva* (24) are not meaningless, only if we suppose that the Sāṃkhya view is criticised here from the Yoga standpoint. So, the Yogas do not accept the Sāṃkhya view, that the *budhyamāna* becomes *buddha* in liberation or that the Twentyfifth is both the individual and the universal soul. 13. Note the Yogas' emphatic use of "*saṃeṭya*" (26). Cf. *saṃeṭasya* in 18 and *āsāḍya* in 20. 14. I follow the v. l. in the Kumbh. ed. which runs as follows:—"pareṇa paradharmā

ca bhavty eṣa sametya vai". The reading in the Bombay ed., *paraśca paradharmā ca bhavaty eṣa sametya vai*", is inconsistent with the word "*sametya*" in it and seems to have been introduced by some one who believed the Yoga to teach the identity of Jīva and Paramātmā. 15. After reading all the verses (18-30) it would appear clear that Prof. Deussen and Prof. Hopkins are not right in understanding *nānātva* (in 22,24) to refer to the doctrine of the plurality of individual souls (VPTM. p. 635, GEI. p. 135). It is evident that *nānātva* here (as invariably in all other places where Prof. Hopkins takes it to mean plurality of souls—see App. III) is explained by the text itself as *anyatva* (308.23) and both *nānātva* and *ekatva* of 22 refer to only two (and not to many) in 308.24. We have here (22-24) not "the two theories of separateness [of many souls] and unity [of two, the Jīva and the Lord], but only one theory of the identity and non-identity (*bhedābheda* in a sense) of the Jīva and Īśvara.

The above interpretation of 308.18-30 and the notes on the same will have shown that the Yogas differed for the Sāṃkhya on the point of the nature of liberation. Verses 13-17 show that the Twentyfifth and the Twentysixth of the Yogas (or, in other words the individual soul and the Supreme Being) are different in their very nature, thus they mean indirectly that the two are not identical during bondage (*saṃsāra*); and verses 18-30 aim at

No Identity of emphasizing their non-identity even after Jīva and Paramātmā—the liberation of the Jīva. According to man, in L. MBh. the Yogas, the Jīva never realises himself as the Supreme Being which is never Yoga. involved into bondage. So also their identity conceived of during meditation is a forced one (16). The liberated soul (the Twentyfifth in liberation) and the Supreme Being (the Twentysixth) are quantitatively two though, as regards their attributes they may be said to be qualitatively one.

That the Sāṃkhya is criticised here is proved not only by the Yogas' persistence on the method of salvation described here (24, 26) and by the reference to the Sāṃkhya method of the same (25) which (reference)

finds its parallel in 14, but also by another passage viz., XII.

300. 3-4 which unequivocally says that

Further evidence. the Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas differed in their method and idea of absolution.

The Yogas had said : “ *Anīśvuraḥ katham mucyeta* ” How could the soul be released if he had no God (apart from himself) ? The answer of the Sāṃkhyas, which did not admit of God as distinct from the Jīva, is given in 300. 4-5. It was the *mokṣadarśana* (300. 5) on which the two Schools differed. “ *Pratyakṣahetavo Yogāḥ Sāṃkhyāḥ śāstraviniscayaḥ* ” (300. 7) should therefore refer to the fact that the Yogas for the first time went against the Scriptures in separating the Jīva from Īśvara. They argued from direct cognition (*pratyakṣa*). To them, the idea that God has become bound or that the bound soul becomes God would have appeared most inconsistent. Yet both the Schools had a good number of followers (300. 8). To sum up : The L. MBh. Yogas had made the Atman “ multiple ” *bahudhā* i. e. twofold . the Jīva and the Īśvara, while they accepted the same twentyfour principles as the Sāṃkhyas (308. 1).

The above explanation of 308. 1-30 contains no indication that the Yogas knew the theory of the plurality of souls.

The expression *bahudhā* (308. 1) means

No Plurality of Souls in the Yoga Schools. *dvidhā* according to the context, as explained above. *Nānātva* in 308. 17

or in 308. 22 and 24 has no reference to

that theory, as is evident from my translation and notes. I have also shown that even the L. MBh. Sāṃkhya did not believe that the souls were many (except in 350. 2 for which see App. III). For all these reasons, both

Prof. Deussen (VPTM, p. 635) and Prof.

Mistaken Interpretation of L. MBh. XII. 308 by Prof. Deussen and Prof. Hopkins. Hopkins (GEI, p. 135) must be said to have failed in their efforts to explain *nānātva* (in 308. 17, 22 and 24) as plurality of souls. The latter's interpretation, according to which *nānātva* (22, 24)

refers to the plurality or separateness of

individual spirits and *ekatva* mentioned in the same breath

refers to the unity of the Twentyfifth and the Twentysixth looks absurd, even independently of the context which restricts both *nānātva* and *ekatva* to "the two" in 308. 24 (and not to "the many" of Prof. Hopkins).

It will have been noticed that throughout this Chapter (308) the Twentysixth is distinguished from the Twentyfifth (or, that the Jīva aspect of the Twentyfifth of the Sāṃkhyas has been fundamentally differentiated from the Īśvara and Mukta aspect of the same so as to make them numerically two). Again, the Sāṃkhyas are twice said to have only Twentyfive principles (308. 14, 25), these statements are exceedingly important because they occur in the midst of other statements mentioning the Twentysixth (308. 7 11, 16, 17, 20, 21). So, the Twentysixth mentioned here is that of the Yoga School, not that of the Sāṃkhya. Moreover, I have already shown that the Twentysixth in XII. 318. 79e-f is that of the Aupanīṣadas and does not belong to the Sāṃkhyas as their Twentysixth, though the Twentysixth of the Aupanīṣadas is not different from the Twentififth of the Sāṃkhyas. Finally,

The Twentififth as yet nobody has shown never becomes the Twentysixth in the any passage in the entire L.MBh. Schools. Mahābhārata stating that the Twentififth becomes the Twentysixth in the state of liberation. This was, indeed, impossible (a) in the Aupanīṣada School because their Twentififth and Twentysixth were respectively *akṣara* and *puuṣa*; (b) in the Yoga Schools because they denied that the Twentysixth, *akṣara* (with the Hiraṇyagarbha Yogas) or *puuṣa* (with the Rudra Yogas) and the Twentififth were numerically one; and lastly (c-d) in the Sāṃkhya and the Pāñcarātra Schools because they believed only in twentyfive principles. The effort of Prof. Hopkins to find the Twentysixth (of the Sāṃkhya School!) in 307 which nowhere mentions the name "Twentysixth" but on the contrary says that the Sāṃkhyas have no principle higher than the Twentififth (307. 47) is not a well guided one. The "friend" (*bandhu*) mentioned in 307. 27, who is neither

explicitly nor implicitly said to be the Twentysixth, should be construed like the two "friends" in Śve. Up. IV. 6, which knows nothing about the separation of the Jīva and Īśvara (see Prof. Hopkins, GEI. p. 133).

Just as the origin of the Classical Sāṃkhya is to be traced to the rejection of the higher Nature, so we find, according to the above interpretation of the LMBh., that the origin of the Classical Yoga lies in the rejection of the traditional identity of the Jīva and Īśvara inherited from the days of the Earliest Prose Upaniṣads. The idea of God in the Yoga System was not arrived at by

superimposing it on an atheistic Sāṃkhya System with twentyfive principles, but by distinguishing the Jīva from God on practical grounds, viz, (1) on the argument that the actual experience (*pratyakṣa*) shows that they should be always numerically two, though not qualitatively, and therefore the Scripture (*śāstra*) may be set aside on this point (300. 4-5); (2) on

the belief that God is eternally beyond old age and death, while the Jīva undergoes bondage (*saṃsāra*) (308. 16c.); (3) by making the Jīva (who is separate from God from the beginning) the creator and destroyer of the world (308. 2), and finally (4) by keeping him distinct from God both during bondage and liberation :—in short by the rejection of the identity of Jīva and God (i. e. *akṣara* or *puruṣa*, as the case may be) taught in the Oldest Prose and Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads and in the Gītā and inherited by the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas. Not only is this origin of the Yoga conception of a transcendent and supercosmic God supported by the text (308), but also there is nothing unreasonable in the process of its being obtained by the rejection of *jīveśvarayor abheda* instead of its being attributed, rather superficially, to a *nirīśvara* Sāṃkhya. It is probable that originally the word *nirīśvara* may have meant what the word *anīśvara* means in the L.MBh. ("one not having any God separate from the Jīva—

300. 3). Thus the Chapter (XII. 308) clearly shows that the idea of a supercosmic God who serves, as it were, only as an ideal for the Jīva, had been reached long before the theory of the plurality of souls was known.*

The importance of Chapter 308 of MBh. XII is as great as that of the passages which show that the Sāṃkhya and the Yogas rejected the higher Nature of the Aupanīṣadas. This

Chapter (308) clearly proves that the Historical Im- Yoga was one definite philosophical portance of MBh. School in the days of the L. MBh.; that it XII. 308. differed from the Sāṃkhya on the nature

of the Jīva and Īśvara; that the Yogas had a Twentysixth principle but the Sāṃkhya had only twentyfive; and lastly that the origin of the idea of God in the Classical Yoga is to be traced not to a superficial ascription of God to an atheistic Sāṃkhya System, but to the rejection of the Upaniṣadic oneness of God and the soul. If the importance of this Chapter (308) and the passages which refer to the rejection of the higher Nature had been realised, the four Schools of the later Mahābhārata would have been clearly distinguished from each other.

I have already suggested that the new terminology of *apratibuddha*, *budhyamāna* and *buddha*, which Adoption of the probably originated in the L. MBh Yoga L. MBh. Yoga School (307. 48), was also adopted by terminology by the other Schools. It would be therefore other contemporary interesting here to note the different Schools. conceptions of the principle called *budhyamāna* in the three different Schools with which we are here concerned. The Aupanīṣadas called

* The one soul of this L. MBh. Yoga was omnipresent (308. 20), and this must be the reason that when, in the later history of Sāṃkhya and Yoga Schools, the doctrine of the plurality of souls arose, the many souls were also taught to be omnipresent.

their higher Nature *budhyamāna avyakta* "the knowing Unmanifest" because their *akṣara* is a

The Conception of " *budhyamāna* " in all the Schools. *budhyamāna* to the bound soul which became

buddha in the liberated state (MBh. XII. 306. 44, 307. 37). This was their highest principle, the Twentyfifth (MBh. XII. 306. 43; 304. 9; 302. 32; 307. 47, 308. 14). The Yogas said that the *budhyamāna* obtains the state of the *buddha* (*buddhatva*) i.e. becomes like the *buddha*, but the two are eternally two, as we have seen above. (This was perhaps

Origin of the term " *buddha* " older than Buddhism. the origin of the term *buddha* which later on in the days of Buddhism became the property of the Buddhist School with a definite sense.)

Thus, the Yoga is a System of what may be appropriately termed a Double Dualism, viz., one dualism of Matter and Spirit, as that of the Sāṃkhya; and another of two Spirits, i.e., the Jīva and the impersonal Brahman

Progress made by the L. MBh. Yogas. or the personal *puruṣa*. The special contribution of this L. MBh. School of Yoga lies, as already stated, in the fact that it

consciously separated the individual from the Supreme Soul for the first time in the history of the Indian Philosophy. This Spiritual Dualism should be distinguished from the Spiritual Dualistic Monism of the EMU and the Gītā which consisted of the higher Nature and the *puruṣa* both of which are called Atmans. The L. MBh. Aupaniṣadas had a Pluralistic Dualism because they enumerated *akṣara*, *puruṣa* and the lower Nature as three principles, but the last was not considered to be eternal while these

The Doctrine of "Double Dualism of Spirit and Matter." Yogas who regard the Jīva as an independent principle like the Twentyfourth and the Twentysixth have really three eternal principles which, however, as explained above, stand to each other in the relation of a Double Dualism. The Oldest Prose Upaniṣads knew nothing about any dualism

or Dualistic Monism. They had said: "Brahman is one only, without a second". That was not yet the age of synthesis and antithesis but that of mere thesis. The Age of the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads, the Gītā, and the later Mahābhārata, although it started with the intention of providing a synthesis for the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads (Remember-Mu. Up. 1. 2 does nothing except placing *akṣara* and *puruṣa* side by side) is really an age of antithesis, when we compare it with that of the Brahmasūtras. But this latter had its forerunner in the L. MBh. Pāñcarātra School, which we shall examine in the next Section.

4. The Pāñcarātra School.

The text of the L. MBh. Pāñcarātras is the Nārāyaṇa Section (MBh. XII. 334-351). Whenever their views are quoted elsewhere in the Mahābhārata, the text

Pāñcarātra Chap- refers to these as belonging to another
ters in the L. MBh. School i.e. the School of the Pāñcarātra.

An example of the latter is found in MBh. XII. 210. 10-11 and 14 (see p. 30 above). The accuracy with which the views of the Pāñcarātra School are mentioned in the L. MBh. is a sufficient guide to distinguish its doctrines from those of other Schools.

The most striking phenomenon that we find in the Pāñcarātra School is its complete identification of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. "This (Nārāyaṇa) is the one

Identification of auspicious form of that which is the *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. I m m u t a b l e (*akṣara*), the U n m a n i f e s t (*avyakta*), the L o r d , the cause of the world, the Unchanging (*kūṭastha*), the Agent (*karṭṛ*), devoid of "the pairs" (*dvandvas*), whom they knew as the non-Agent (*akṛṭṛ*)....." (XII. 342. 125-126). In another passage Nārāyaṇa is "the unborn ancient *puruṣa*", "the Lord", and also the source of the world, the abode of the Immortal, "the Subtle" (*sukṣma*) (XII. 346. 21-22). There are many other passages of the same type, which identify the impersonal with the personal (XII. 334. 29-31a-b, 339.

29; 340. 44; 351. 17-18). The terms for *akṣara* in the EMU

Revival of the Oldest Description of *akṣara*. and the *Gitā* are thus included here in those of the *puruṣa*; as a result Nārāyaṇa could be described as he who is not to be seen with the eye, not to be touched

with the sense of touch etc., i.e. exactly in the fashion of the description of *akṣara* in Br. Up. IV. 5. 15. Especially noteworthy is the term *vidyā* which the Śve. Up.

(V. 1) used for *akṣara*, and the L. MBh. The term *vidyā*. Sāṃkhya for *puruṣa* or the Twentyfifth (307. 1-2; see pp. 44-45 above) and

which these Pāñcarātras could only use for an innate power of the *puruṣa*, always in his "company" though he is "alone" (MBh. XII. 339. 68, 72; 342. 95; 344. 12 c-d; 347, 19). If the historical development in the meaning of *vidyā* and *avidyā* is lost sight of, a great confusion is inevitable (Prof. Hopkins, GEI, p. 104 and p. 136). Its position in the L. MBh. Pāñcarātra School shows that the latter identified *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. Even the later development of the Pāñcarātra Sect also confirms this view (see Prof. Schrader, Introduction to the Pāñcarātra, pp. 62-64 and p. 78).

Nārāyaṇa, named This combination of *akṣara* and *puruṣa* the Twentyfifth. under the name of Nārāyaṇa was called by the Pāñcarātras "the Twentyfifth" (XII. 339. 43).

NOTE.—The three passages mentioning *vidyā* as conceived of in the three Schools may be quoted here for facilitating their comparison :—

(1) *Dve akṣare brahmapare tv anante vidyāvidye nilute*
yatra gūḍhe |

kṣaram tv avidyā hy amṛtaṃ tu vidyā vidyāvidye
īśate yas tu soṣṇyaḥ ||

(Śve. Up. V. 1)

(2) *Avidyām āhur avyaktam sargaḥpralayaḥ dharmā vai |*
sargaḥpralayaḥ muktām vidyām vai pañcaviṃśakāḥ ||

(MBh. 307. 2). Cf. also MBh. 307. 11a-b where we read about the same two : *Ubhāv ev ākṣarāv uktāv ubhāv etāv anakṣarau.*"

- (3) *Ekāki vidyayā sārddham viharīṣye jagat punaḥ |*
tato bhūyo jagat sarvaṁ kariṣyāmīha vidyayā || (339. 72)

Or

vidyāsahāyo yatrāste bhagavān havyakavyabhūk |
 (344. 12c-d).

If we remember that in its original conception this *vidyā* is a living, conscious principle (see p. 15 above), we can also understand the great religious movement of the Śākta Sect and also Sakti- or Devī-worship prevalent even now in some form or other all over India. It could not have originated from a personification of the dead, inanimate, unconscious Nature or *prakṛti* of the Classical or L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas. The first root of it is in the " *śakti* " of Śve. Up. I. 3 and the *jivabhūtā parā prakṛti* of the Gītā (VII. 5).

Another point in the doctrinal teaching of this School is that the Nature or *prakṛti* which should be regarded as the Twentyfourth of this School is said to be

The Nature, the "born of Nārāyaṇa". This is undoubtedly Twentyfourth, the natural result of the Pāñcarātras' "born" of Nārāyaṇa. conception of Nārāyaṇa who is *puruṣa* identified completely with *akṣara* (as the goal) and yet having as his "*sahāya*" *vidyā*, as said above. This Nature which is thus the lower Nature of the Aupaniṣadas (born of *akṣara* the higher Nature—Bh. Gī. III. 15, Mu. Up. I. 1. 9) is often described in the Nārāyaṇīya Section: 'From Him (i. e. *puruṣa* in 334. 30) is born the Unmanifest possessed of three *guṇas*" (334. 31); "The Unmanifest dissolves into the actionless *puruṣa*" (339. 29-31); "He whom the Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas call Paramātman.....From Him is born the Unmanifest which the wise know as *pradhāna* (340. 28c-d, 29c-d; see also 347. 16a-c).

Like Nature, the Jīva or individual soul is also described as emerging from and returning unto the *puṇṣa*. A reference to App. III. which discusses among others the two chapters of the Nārāyaṇīya Section on the plurality of souls would show that, the *puṇṣa* of the Pāñcarātras is called the *yoni* (i. e. "source", or "matrix") of the souls, and this agrees with other passages, such as 334. 42 and 335. 2 where an individual soul is said to have "come forth" (*prasṛta*) from the Atman (*ātma-
prabhava*). But though in one passage (343. 14) Nārāyaṇa is

The Individual Souls and their Relation to Nārāyaṇa. called the "creator of the self" (*sarvabhū-
tāmabhāvana*), we may justly doubt that this means an abandoning of the general Indian belief that transmigration, i. e. the individual soul, has no beginning. For, in another passage (350.23) even the God Brahman is said to have created and go on creating "many souls". And there can be but little doubt that here, as throughout in the later Pāñcarātra, the liberated are thought of as persons different from, though united with and similar to Nārāyaṇa. Such seemingly advaitic phrases like *māṃ praviśya* (339. 43) or *parumātinaḥ bhaviṣyati* (349. 48) should not mislead us (Cf. Schrader, Introduction to the Pāñcarātra, p. 91 fl.). For, the inhabitants of Śvetadvīpa are all of them "awakened", i. e., liberated (*prati-
buddhūs ca te sarvā*), and God is "pleased in their company" (*tauḥ sārddham nimate*) (343. 53-64). Indeed, Śvetadvīpa is nothing else than the place of the liberated (and, according to Prof. Schrader, identical *mutatis mutandis* with the umbrella-shaped "rock of the liberated" of the Jainas). And though a further progress from Śvetadvīpa to the "Thousand-rayed God" is indicated (339.129-130; cf. 339. 19-20), which presumably takes place when *pralaya* comes (cf. the *kramamukti* in Śaṅkara's Vedānta), we may safely assume that, as in the later Pāñcarātra, the difference between the liberated and the non-liberated continues even during the cosmic Night, and that, when the latter ends, it is the non-liberated who are "created", i. e., sent out again into the world. There would, indeed, be no sense in teaching liberation at all, if in *pralaya*

both the liberated and the non-liberated would get rid of individual existence.*

Thus, what the history of Indian Philosophy owes to these Pāñcarātras is the identification of *akṣara* and *puruṣa* into one goal. This identification

Progress made by the Pāñcarātra School. is not to be found in the whole of the Gītā, except in Bh. Gī. XIII. 12-17. What Gurbe has said about the

conception of the Supreme Being in the Gītā applies to this passage only out of the entire Gītā and to the entire Nārāyaṇīya Section of the Mahābhārata. In

the Pāñcarātra Doctrine we have no dualism of any kind whatsoever; No Dualism. because *akṣara* and *puruṣa* are not to be distinguished; and *prākṛti* is "born" of Nārāyaṇa.

Though both the Pāñcarātra and the Sāṃkhya are Systems recognising only twentyfive principles,

Comparison of the former has only one eternal principle the Pāñcarātra with (the individual souls, though eternal, not other Schools. being counted as different from the

Universal Spirit, but admitted as existing within that Spirit itself), while the Sāṃkhyas teach two eternal entities viz., Spirit and Matter. The Yoga Schools and the Aupaniṣada System differ from the Pāñcarātra in so far as each of them accepts twentysix principles while the latter has only twentyfive. The Pāñcarātra however is nearer to the Aupaniṣada than to the Yoga because the Pāñcarātra like the Aupaniṣada does not distinguish the Jīva as an independent and numerically one principle, and believes that the Nature is not eternal. Moreover, in so far as the Pāñcarātra identifies the *akṣara* with the *puruṣa*, it may be looked upon as more Upaniṣadic than the Yogas who gave up the *akṣara* as the higher Nature and also as the goal (as did the Rudra Yogas) or gave up the *puruṣa* (as was the case with the Hiraṇyagarbha Yogas).

* I am indebted to Professor Schrader for this information about the conception of the Jīva in the Pāñcarātra.

One result of this Pāñcarātra doctrine of the identity of *akṣara* and *ṣuṛuṣa* is that the Supreme Reality is now conceived to be possessed of contradictory attributes. It is both *saguṇa* and *nirguṇa*, *kartṛ* and *akartṛ*, etc.; that is to say: it is *saguṇa*, *kartṛ*, etc. like *ṣuṛuṣa*, and *nirguṇa*, *akartṛ*, etc., like *akṣara*. We may say that the Supreme Being is both *satyakāma*, *satyasamkalpa* (Chā. Up. VIII. 1. 5) and *anaṇu*, *ahrasva*, *adīrgha* (Bṛ. Up. III. 8. 8). As the Gītā puts it, it is possessed of feet etc. (like the *viśvarūpa ṣuṛuṣa* in Bh. Gī. XI) and it is also devoid of all senses (Bh. Gī. XII. 13-14).

It is important to notice this nature of the *akṣara=ṣuṛuṣa* doctrine here, because the explanation of this conception has become one of the chief problems in the later Indian Philosophy. Śaṅkara, who said that the positive attributes of Brahman are unreal and the negative ones are real, went against the historically correct view which regarded both of them as real, (and by "positive attributes" Śaṅkara, understands all attributes i. e., both those given in the Śrutis which refer to *ṣuṛuṣa* and those that are denied of *akṣara*). Rāmānuja who held that Brahman has all auspicious (*kalyāṇa*) and no objectionable (*heya*) attributes, or, in other words, that Brahman is full of compassion etc., and devoid of cruelty, etc., did not understand the original sense of passages like Bh. Gī. XIII. 13-16. Vallabha who explained the texts in question as implying that Brahman is possessed of all divine (*alaukika*) and devoid of all worldly (*laukika*) attributes seems to have come to that conclusion after examining exactly what is actually denied and asserted of the Supreme Being in the positive and negative texts of the Scriptures.

Is the Pāñcarātra a development of the Gītā doctrine like the later. Mahābhārata Sāṃkhya and Yoga, or is it

the protest raised by those who possessed the traditions of the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads? To me it

Origin of the Pāñcarātra School: appears that predominantly neither of these was the case. The Pāñcarātra Reconciliation or Revival of Vedic Religion under the Bhakti-teaching of the Gītā. was in reality a revival of, or a reconciliation of Asceticism with, the Ritualism of the Brāhmaṇas. This is clear from the importance of rites and ceremonies preached in the Nārāyaṇīya Section; but these were to be performed in the way in

which the Gītā had asked man to perform his worldly duties, i.e., as a dedication to the Supreme Being. The Gītā taught that acts can be dedicated to the impersonal as well to the personal (Bh. Gī. IV. 24 and IX. 16), and under the influence of this allegorical Yajña philosophy of the Gītā the Pāñcarātras revived the old Vedic cult. The traces of such a revival of or probably reconciliation with the Vedic religion are found in the Gītā itself (see p. 28 above). Also the same devotional spirit (*bhakti*) of the Gītā, which pervades throughout the Nārāyaṇīya Section) led them to the mystic identification of *aṁśara* and *puṁśa*. Their "one-mindedness" (*ananyatā* of Bh. Gī. VIII. 14, 22; IX. 30, 13, 22; XI. 54; XII. 6) was more intensive than that of the Gītā because in the latter it was either for *aṁśara* or for *puṁśa* (Bh. Gī. XII. 1), while the former could not think that there was the possibility of an option being given to a devotee as regards the choice of the object of his meditation or devotion, and therefore identified the two then known objects of reverence.

A similar rejection of the idea of "two goals" resulting in a similar admission of only one goal was achieved by the Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas on a quite rationalistic basis, as is clear from their rejection of the higher Nature. There is no wonder, therefore, that the text of the L. MBh. represents all these three and also the Aupaniṣada School as having been on friendly terms with one another. In a sense all of them felt to be on an equal level (MBh. XII. 348. 82-83; 249. 1 etc.).

That they had all of them the same goal is a fact repeatedly mentioned in the Nārāyaṇīya Section (XII 349. 68c-d—70, 73). As Pāñcarātra School also, a Path we have seen, the goal in all of them was to the same Goal. *akṣara*, or *puruṣa*, or both (see p. 55 above); and coming undoubtedly after the much revered Gītā which consistently taught either of these to be the goal, none of these four Schools was likely to quarrel with the others for the doctrine concerning the Supreme Being. In the light of the teaching of the Gītā they all felt that each of them and therefore all of them were in a way—and only in a way because they had their own doctrinal differences also—different paths to the same *sumum bonum*. Though in the days of the Ācāryas and in our own days this form of tolerance and sympathy may seem incomprehensible, it was not so in the Mahābhārata Age because the catholic spirit and teaching of the Gītā were not yet forgotten.

Under the influence of the Gītā, though much later than the Mahābhārata, a further philosophical movement also took place, which explained and in so doing modified the Further Development, the Brahmasūtras. Pāñcarātra doctrine of the identity of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. The result of this movement was recorded in the Brahmasūtras. The Pāñcarātras never discussed with their fellow-philosophers their doctrinal differences which we have noticed above. The Nārāyaṇīya Section unlike the other Sections of MBh. XII, avoids all arguments and reasonings. There is a kind of mysticism about the union of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. (The “Aniruddha-theology” is not any reasoned-out doctrine against any other School.) It is the author of the Brahmasūtras who gives reasons for the equality of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, and in doing so he acts like the “saints” mentioned in MBh. XII. 318. 56, 78 (see p. 40 above). This further development of the doctrine which came into existence with the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads we shall examine in the next Chapter.

CHAPTER IV.

AKṢARA IN THE BRAHMASŪTRAS.

The aphoristic language of the Brahmasūtras is a real obstacle to the right interpretation of the Sūtras and does not assure as much success as one may expect in the case of the Mahābhārata. Yet, if once the key of their proper explanation is found out, this very obstacle becomes a help because though aphoristic the Sūtras are arranged into certain groups of aphorisms which are connected with each other in a logical train of ideas. The writer of this Thesis believes to have

discovered this key and though he may not have—and he does feel that he has not—been able to understand correctly every one and every word of the aphorisms he has attempted to interpret, he thinks, the general sense of the Sūtras cannot, originally, have been very different from what he has suggested it to be. And thus it is that he has ventured to include their discussion in this work.

First of all it should be noticed that even Śaṅkara had not always the original readings or divisions (*adhikaraṇas*) of the Sūtras before him, and in most of such cases all the later Bhāṣyakāras too will be found to have shared the same fate. This will be seen from the suggestions made in Appendix IV, regarding Sūtras III. 3. 26, 38–39, 42,

Mutilation of the 43, 45–46, 50–51. One more example of this loss of the old tradition may be given here. Br. Sū. II. 3. 18 is “*jñosta eva*” which means “the Atman is possessed of consciousness (lit. is conscious), on account of the same reason (i. e. “because of the Śrutis”, as said in Br. Sū. II. 3. 17)”. Now, it is quite probable that the next two aphorisms formed only one and

meant, " And because out of [the three possible movements that he makes during his worldly life, viz.,] departure from the body, going to the other world, and coming back, the last two are to be made by himself alone " (Br. Sū. II. 3. 19-20). It is a well-known fact that at the time of the departure from the gross body, the God of death or his messengers are supposed to come and take away the Jiva from the body, according to the Scriptures. This leaves no room for the use of the soul's consciousness then. But in the other two cases, the soul exercises its power of knowing and itself directs its way to and from the other world. Thus, the Sūtrakāra supports his argument for *jñatva* " knowerness " of the Jiva. But the fact that Śaṅkara and his successors divide the originally one Sūtra into two and explain them as embodying a *pūrvapakṣa* on the topic of the size of the individual soul shows how far the meaning of the Sūtras had been already forgotten even at the time of the Bhāṣyakāras remembered by Śaṅkara. This is confirmed by some interpretations preserved by Śaṅkara of these predecessors of his. See particularly Br. Sū. I. 4. 1-3 (explained later on in this Chapter). So we see that a new interpretation need not be wrong because it differs widely from that of the commentators.

If we study the Sūtras, the most conspicuous point that immediately attracts our attention is a discrimination which the Sūtrakāra makes and which amounts to a dualism which he is not ready to call a dualism of metaphysical principles, but which he would have us understand as *saṃjñābheda* " a Non-identity of Names " (Br. Sū. III. 3. 8) in contrast to "*arthābheda*" "Identity of Goal" (Br. Sū. III. 3. 5). For the sake of convenience we may call this a dual method of meditation on the Highest One (*para*). This Duality of Names is the sole teaching of Br. Sū. III. 3. 1-55 (App. IV). An enumeration of some of the points on the strength of which this duality is put forth by the author of the Sūtras will bring home to the reader the first and foremost problem that the Sūtrakāra has discussed in his work :—

(1) First of all, as said above, the goal in all the Vedānta texts is one and the same, but a distinction in its names is admissible, and on this distinction the Sūtrakāra will base his teaching of two types of the method of meditation, the means to reach the goal (Br. Sū. III.

Their Designations. 3. 8, 10, 16, 33). These two names are *pradhāna* (III. 3. 11) and *akṣara* (III.

3.33). (For the terminology of the Sūtrakāra see (9) below.) By *pradhāna* is meant *puruṣa*. In Br. Sū. III. 2. 23 the Sūtrakāra says that the Highest One (*puruṣa*—Br. Sū. III. 2. 11) is the Unmanifest (*avyakta*) and in the same connection he says that “Because it has both the designations (i.e. *puruṣa* and *akṣara*), the case is like that of the words ‘*ah*’ (the name of a serpent without any reference to its posture) and ‘*kuṇḍala*’ (the name of a serpent with special reference to its posture of coil).

(2) Another discrimination between the two is that *pradhāna* has a form, *akṣara* is formless;

Their Forms. and because the latter is the more important than the former (Br. Sū. III. 3. 4), the Supreme Being itself is formless (Br. Sū. III. 2. 14). The fact that *pradhāna* or *puruṣa* has a form is used as an argument for deciding the topic of Mu. Up. II. 1 in Br. Sū. I. 2. 23.

(3) A third point of discrimination is that in the case of the meditation on *puruṣa* “the collection of thoughts” (*upasaṁhāra*) is obligatory, while in that on *akṣara* it is voluntary and is to be observed only in the case of those attributes of *akṣara* which are mentioned in the text of the particular School (“Branch”) to which the meditator belongs (Br. Sū. III. 3. 11, 33, 39, 40, 41).

(4) The Sūtrakāra differentiates between the functions (*kārya*) of *pradhāna* and *akṣara*. They are respectively “maintenance” or “sustenance of the world” *sambhṛti* and “heaven-pervasion” *dyuvyāpti* (Br. Sū. III. 3. 18, 23).

(5) The author of the Sūtras distinguishes between three kinds of thoughts or attributes: (a) those of the *ṣuṛuṣa* (b) those of the *akṣara* and (c) some of both of these which are interchangeable, i.e., which primarily

Interchange of belong to *ṣuṛuṣa* but which are mentioned their Thoughts. by the Śrutis with reference to *akṣara* also. The Sūtrakāra illustrates the last

by quoting Tai. Up. II. 1 (*satyaṃ jñānam anantaṃ brahma*) where, he says, *satya* and those that follow it, though really the attributes of *ṣuṛuṣa*, are however mentioned as those belonging to *akṣara*. The utility of all these attributes is mentioned above in (3). (See Br. Sū. III. 3. 37-43; App. IV.) Even in Br. Sū. I, where the author has given his explanations of the Śruti-texts, he has kept in mind this "Scriptural Interchange". It appears that in Br. Sū. I. 1-2 the Sūtrakāra has dealt with those texts which according to him refer to *ṣuṛuṣa* and in Br. Sū. I. 3-4 those which primarily deal with *akṣara* but ascribe to it such attributes as properly belong to *ṣuṛuṣa*. This original scheme of the Sūtras is suggested by the word "āyatana" in Br. Sū. III. 3. 39, which undoubtedly refers to *dyubhṛvādyāyatanaṃ* in Br. Sū. I. 3.1 (see App. IV).

(6) The dual method of meditation or, as the Sūtrakāra himself puts it, the option of *akṣara* and Option of Choice *ṣuṛuṣa* for the purpose of meditation is between *akṣara* and vigorously upheld by him. Liberation *ṣuṛuṣa* is achieved in either way. If this option of choice is not admitted, then the Scriptures would be violated (Br. Sū. III. 3. 28-30). Both *akṣara*- and *ṣuṛuṣa*-meditations are Vidyās "Lores leading to Salvation", as in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad which is referred to by the Sūtrakāra on this point (Br. Sū. III. 3. 47). The attainment of *ṣuṛuṣa* which results in the eternal enjoyment of all objects of desire by the liberated in the company of *ṣuṛuṣa* is not to be understood as the attainment of a world (*loka*, like the world of the moon etc.), though there is a common feature between the two (Br. Sū. III. 3. 51; App. IV).

(7) The sūtrakāra finds it necessary to give his opinion regarding the question: which of the two, Comparative Importance of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, is more important? and *puruṣa*. He says that the former is "the stronger" (*baliyaḥ*) because it is mentioned in more texts than *puruṣa* is. But at the same time the option of choice from either of the two, given to the meditator, is strongly maintained by him, as already said above (Br. Sū. III. 3. 44-45).

(8) I may here draw attention to Br. Sū. III. 2. 35 (*stihānaviśeṣāt prakāśādīvat*) which Discrimination of answers a *pūrvapakṣa* argument basing "Place" in the the distinction of *akṣara* and *puruṣa* (with Supreme Being. their individual attributes) as two principles on the fact that *akṣara* is connected on the one hand with *mahat* and on the other with *puruṣa* (as in Ka. Up. III. 11). The Sūtra (III. 2. 35) replies this by saying that this "connection" (of the two) refers to the "distinction of place" in the Supreme Being. The light is called the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars in connection with its presence in various places; the same is the case with the Supreme Being which is also like the Light as said in Br. Sū. III. 2. 26 (Br. Sū. III. 2. 32, 35; App. IV).

(9) The distinction that we have seen above is also visible in the Sūtrakāra's terminology. In The Sūtrakāra's Terminology. this connection I wish to point out particularly three terms *para*, *pradhāna* and *akṣara*, which are used by him respectively in the sense of the Supreme Being (irrespective of the personal or the impersonal aspect), the personal, and the impersonal. In using "*para*" for the Highest The term "*para*". One, the Sūtrakāra's intention seems to be to avoid a term which would suggest solely *akṣara* or solely *puruṣa*. This word occurs in Br. Sū. II. 3. 41 ("The Jīva derives his power of action from *para* 'the Highest One' ", II. 3. 46 ("The Jīva's being 'a part', *aṁśa*, [of the Supreme One] is like the case of the Light etc. 'The Highest One' *para* is not such "), III. 2. 11 ("The twofold

statements [containing the *coincidentia oppositorum*] cannot belong to ' the Highest One ', *para*, even from the standpoint of place....."), III. 2. 5 ("[The real nature of the Jīva] is concealed on account of the desire of the ' Highest One ' (*para*) [that it should be so]....."), and IV. 3. 12 ("Jaimini says that the liberated soul goes to the ' Highest One ' *para*....."). All these passages show that throughout the Sūtras " *para* " is used consistently for the " Highest One ", as said above. It is so used in Br. Sū III. 3. 54 (Appendix IV). The term *pradhāna* occurs in Br. Sū III. 3. 11 and (as I have suggested in Appendix IV) in III. 3. 43. In both these places

The term " *pradhāna* " where the term is used as a metaphysical principle, the context shows that it is contrasted (in III. 3. 11, III. 3. 33) or compared (III. 3. 43) with *akṣara* (see App. IV for the interpretation of the Sūtras). This fact shows that the word *pradhāna* is consistently used for *puruṣa*. In using this term in this sense, the Sūtrakāra seems to have adopted the terminology of his own days, as he does in the case of many terms like *sūkṣma* and others (Br. Sū. I. 4. 3; see below). " *Pradhāna* " was used in the days of the Mahābhārata exactly for the personal aspect of the Supreme Being as understood by the Sūtrakāra. "He, who is always thus ready and whose mind is pleased, reaches, without delay, that Brahman by seeing which one comes to know *pradhāna*. He is not to be seen with the eye, nor even with all the senses. The Great Atman is seen only by the lamp of the mind. He has the ends of his hands and feet on all sides, the eyes and faces in all directions; he possesses ears in all places in the world, and [thus] he stands pervading all" (MBh. XIV 19. 47-49 also see. 18.32). There can be no doubt as to the meaning of the term *pradhāna* in this passage. It is so used probably also in MBh. XII. 340. 39. The Sūtrakāra does not avoid using the older term for the personal aspect of the Supreme Being, I mean, the word *puruṣa* (Br. Sū. III 3.24; I. 2. 26, see below). This, by the way, is an instructive example for the totally different meanings which the same word as a technical term may have in different Schools (*pradhāna* = *prakṛti* esp. as *avyakta*, in the Classical Sāṃ-

khyā; =the lower Nature in Śve. Up. I. 10). As regards "akṣara", Sūtra III. 3. 33 clearly shows that the term 'akṣara'. Sūtrakāra restricts its usage only to the impersonal aspect. So, there can be no doubt that even the terminology of the aphorisms reveals the differentiation between akṣara and puruṣa.

(10) The last noteworthy point in the Sūtras in this respect is that in the first Adhyāya of the work certain Śrutis are explained as not referring not only to (the Sāṃkhya) Prakṛti and the Jīva but also to akṣara.

"Akṣara" as a Śāṅkara and other commentators could pūrvapakṣa in Br. Sū. I. not understand that akṣara could have been the pūrvapakṣa in the interpretation of certain Vedānta texts. In some cases,

if we cast a glance at the original viśayavākya it would at once appear that the pūrvapakṣa views stated by the commentators had never had the least possibility of having represented any hostile School. Such pūrvapakṣas look ridiculous; and the wonder is that they have not yet been questioned by any scholar and that they had

Dr. Thibaut and escaped the critical eyes even of Dr. Prof. Deussen. Thibaut and Prof. Deussen who were, so far as I know, the only persons to make a thorough study of the Brahmasūtras and commentaries on them.

Thus, Br. Sū. I. 2. 24 discusses the topic of the vaiśvānara Section of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (Chā. Up. V. 11ff.) The Section begins with the words: "Ko nu ātmā kiṃ brahmā" (Chā. Up. V. 11. 1) and the text is meant to teach the meditation on the vaiśvānara Atman. Śāṅkara's pūrvapakṣas are expressed in "Kiṃ vaiśvānaraśabdena (1)

Vaiśvānara in jātharognir upadiśyate uta (2) bhūtāgnir Chā. Up. V., puruṣa, alha (3) tadabhimūṇi devatā alhavā not akṣara. (4) śārīra āhosiit (5) paramaśvaralī" (Śā Bhā. Br. Sū. I. 2. 24).

It would at once appear that out of these the second and the third are the pūrvapakṣas discussed in Br. Sū. I. 2. 27, but not in I. 2. 24. The fourth seems to have been refuted in 26, not in 24-25.

There was not the least possibility of the "abdominal fire" having been one of the antagonistic views. The only *pūrvapakṣa* refuted in 24-25 seems to have been one about *akṣara* being the topic of Chā. Up. V. 11ff. This is clear from the fact that the Sūtrakāra refers to a text which mentions "*vaiṣvānara* even as *puruṣa*" (Br. Sū. I. 2. 26). Śaṅkara has hit upon the exact Śruti referred to in this Sūtra; but he did not understand why a text mentioning *puruṣa* was specially referred to by the Sūtrakāra. The Jīva is called *puruṣa*, but, as the Sūtra (26) shows, the Jīva is to be refuted; so the Śruti with the word *puruṣa* is used to refute *akṣara*. ("*Tathādīṣṭyupadeśāt*" and "*asambhavāt*" refute the Jīva view.) In the Gītā (Bh. Gī. XV. 14) *vaiṣvānara* is identified with Kṛṣṇa who stands for *puruṣa* and not for *akṣara*, so the Sūtrakāra is also right in referring to the Bhagavadgītā.

Let us take another example. Br. Sū. I. 2. 18-20 discusses the topic of the famous *antaryāmi brāhmaṇa* (Br. Up. III. 7. 3ff). Śaṅkara presents the various possible views in the words: "*Sa* (i.e. *antaryāmi*) (1) *kim adhidavādyabhinūnidevalātmā kaścīd* (2) *kuṁvū prāptānūmādyaiśvaryaḥ kaścīd yogī* (3) *kuṁvū parūnātmā* (4) *kuṁvārthāntaram kuṁcit.....*" (Śā Bhā. Br. Sū. I.

Antaryāmin in 2. 18.). The last supposition shows that Br. Up. III, *puruṣa*, even Śaṅkara felt doubtful if (1) and (2) not *akṣara*. could have been the *pūrvapakṣas* though he himself proposed them as such. A glance at the Śruti which repeats "*esa ta ātmāntaryāmy amṛtaḥ*" with every sentence will show that the possibility of Śaṅkara's *pūrvapakṣas* stands precluded even by the original Vedānta text. As is clear from the Sūtras and Śaṅkara's commentary on them, it is Śaṅkara who himself raises these objections and himself gives their refutations. As the "*śārīra*" is refuted in 20, he could not be the *pūrvapakṣa* in 18 and 19. Moreover, the Nature [of the Sāṃkhyas] is refuted in 19 and not in 18; and "*ca*" in *na ca smṛtam.....* " (19) shows that one view has been already refuted in 18. So, *akṣara* only (which is not the Nature of the Sāṃkhyas and not the *śārīra* also) is the *pūrvapakṣa* in 18. This is also suggested by the

word "*smārtam*" (19). The Sūtrakāra has in his mind *śrauta avyakta* and *smārta avyakta*: the Gītā mentions these two *avyaktas* and the word *smārta* may as well suggest the lower Nature of the Gītā which is called a Smṛti. The Sūtrakāra does not believe in this lower Nature. So, "*ca*" and "*smārtam*" (in 19) distinctly show that the "*śrauta avyakta*" i. e. *akṣara* is refuted in 18. The attribute (*dharmia*) referred to in 18 seems to be the one implied in "*yamayati*" i.e., the act of controlling; according to the Sūtrakāra the governing over the creation (*prāśāna*—Br. Sū. I. 3. 10–11; *sambhṛti*—Br. Sū. III. 3. 23) is a function of *puruṣa*, not of *akṣara*.

Br. Sū. III. 3. 18–24 discusses whether Tai. Up. II. 8 mentions *akṣara* or *puruṣa* (see App. IV).

The above examples will be, I believe, sufficient to prove that even in Br. Sū. I the Sūtrakāra distinguishes between *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. It is quite probable that even the Aupanishadas differed as to whether the topic of certain Śrutis was *akṣara* or *puruṣa*, because in those days both of these were accepted as the objects of meditation.

The foregoing points will show that the discrimination between *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, which the Sūtrakāra exhibits throughout his work is so explicit and is so unambiguously expressed that one cannot fail to observe it after the first three Chapters of this Dissertation have been written or read. This differentiation is always present in the mind of the author of the aphorisms

and serves him as the guiding principle whether he discusses (1) the names of the "goal", (2) its form or formlessness, (3) collection of its attributes, (4) its functions, (5) the "thoughts" about it (or attributes belonging to it), (6) the option of choice regarding the object of meditation, (7) the comparative importance of the two "names", (8) the doctrines of other Aupanishada Schools, (9) the question of the terminology or (10) the textual interpretation. This differentia-

tion of *akṣara* and *puruṣa* appears to me to be the most arresting point in the Sūtras and therefore it has been mentioned first and that too with some details.

We have seen above that the distinction between *akṣara* and *puruṣa* is known to the Sūtrakāra. Before trying to ascertain the exact nature of this differentiation, I wish to point out what seems to me to be an indication to the

Sūtrakāra's knowledge of the distinction between the two Natures of the EMU and the Gītā, though the Sūtrakāra himself does not accept it. This is also the (only) problem is discussed in Br. Sū. I. 4. Nature (*prakṛti*). 23-28. Having described *avyakta* or

akṣara (in I. 4. 1-23), the Sūtrakāra

says that " It is also *prakṛti* [the word used for the lower Nature by the Aupanīśadas of his time, and for the Nature by the Sāṃkhyaas] because the Proposition and the Illustrations [given in Chā. Up. VI. I. 3, VI. 1. 4-6] are not to be obstructed [in their sense]" (23). "Ca" (also) in the Sūtra shows that the author identifies *akṣara* understood in the previous Sūtras with *prakṛti*, so that according to him there is only one Nature viz., the higher Nature or, to speak more accurately, the Supreme Being, which may be called *akṣara* or *puruṣa*, is also the Nature of the creation. The Sṛuti referred to by him does not mention the lower Nature of the EMU and the Gītā, but describes the creation as directly taking place from "that by (hearing) which the unheard becomes heard....." (Chā. Up. VI. 1. 3).

" And [*akṣara* is also *prakṛti*] because 'thought' (*abhidhyā*) is predicated [of the Essential Cause of the Universe in the Scriptures]" (24). Here the author refers to a text like " *soṣkāmayata bahu syām*" (Tai. Up. II. 6. 1), which shows that the Nature of the world is a thinking one and therefore goes against *prakṛti* or the

Akṣara, the Conscious *prakṛti*. lower Nature which is devoid of consciousness according to the EMU and the

Gītā. "And [*akṣara* is also *prakṛti*] because both [the evolution and the dissolution of the world] are, in the Scriptures, stated as directly taking place [from

and into it]" (25). "Directly" (*sākṣāt*) is a clear proof that the Sūtrakāra rejects the lower Nature. For that purpose he refers to texts like " *Sarvāṇi ha va imāṃ bhūtāny ākāśād eva samutpadyante | ākāśam praty astam yānti* "—Chā. Up. I. 9. 1. The fact that "*ubhaya*" in the Sūtra (25) refers to the evolution and the dissolution of the world and that "*sākṣāt*" refers to "*eva*" in the Śruti, goes against Śaṅkara who holds that this Adhikaraṇa is intended to describe *akṣara* as the "*nimitta*" and at the same time the "*upādāna*" cause of the world. "[*Akṣara* is also *prakṛti*] because [the world is] a modification, *pariṇāma*, of *ātmakṛti* i.e. of Brahman or *akṣara* itself creating itself as the creation" (26). The *viśayavākya* is "*Tad ātmānam svayam akuruta*"—Tai.Up. II. 7. This Śruti says that the creation or what the creator has made is itself the self of the creator (*akṣara*). This is in agreement with Br. Sū. II. 1. 14 and 20. The modification (*pariṇāma*) cannot be the Atman of *akṣara* if it were to take place from the lower Nature. " And [*akṣara* is also *prakṛti*] because it is said to be the source, *yonī*, of the world in the metrical compositions, " (27). In this Adhikaraṇa

Evidence of the this is the only Sūtra where the author refers to the EMU and the Gītā, and in *yonī* passages. doing so he has hit upon a very important statement in these works which always describe *akṣara* as the *yonī* wherein the *puruṣa* lays the seed and from which " all beings " are born. Such passages are Kau. Br. Up. I. 6; Śve. Up. I. 2, VI. 16, V. 6; Mu. Up. I. 3; Bh. Gī. XIV. 3-4, VII. 6. In these, *ākāśa* (meaning Atman), *ātman*, *Brahman*, *mahad brahman*, or *jīvabhūtā parā prakṛti* is " the source " *yonī*. So, the lower Nature cannot be the *yonī* described in these words. And because *akṣara* is the *yonī*, it is also *prakṛti* (the lower Nature of the Aupaniṣadas or the Nature of the Sāṃkhyas). In Br. Sū. II. 1. 23, the author

Evidence of *ātmānānupraviśya nāmarūpe vyākara-* " *jīvena ātmanā* " in *vāṇi* " (Chā. Up. VI. 3. 2), "*jīva ātman*" Chā. Up. VI. refers to the living self of Brah-

man because the cause of the world is not devoid of consciousness and cannot be explained to be like inanimate objects e.g. a stone etc. All these Śūtras prove

that the Sūtrakāra knows the theory of the two Natures and rejects the lower Nature in so far as he identifies it with the higher one, which is for him the Supreme Being.*

The Sūtrakāra's rejection of the lower Nature was not a novel feature in the history of Indian philosophy. The "saints" (*sādhavaḥ*) in MBh. XII. 318. 56 are said to have held that "One should look upon the two forms of the eternal Unmanifest as one and the same end [of the series of evolution]."

The doctrine of these saints on this particular point seems to have been the same as that of the Sūtrakāra. More-
over, in identifying the lower Nature with the higher one, the author has gone exactly in the opposite direction of what the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyaś are found to have done (see above pp. 42-44). Both of them are the results of a movement of the same character, but their conclusions are quite different from each other. The Sūtrakāra says that the created world is a living, conscious modification (*pariṇāma*) of the Atman; the Sāṃkhyaś said that the world is devoid of consciousness.

In this connection we may examine the exact meaning of *akṣara* as the Nature, as taught in the Sūtras. *Avyakta* in the evolutionary series of Ka. Up. III. 10-11 is discussed in Br.

Sū. I. 4. 1ff. The Sūtrakāra says that it is not "the principle established by inference by the Sāṃkhyaś" (*ānumāṅka*) as the Nature: Br. because "its comprehension (*grahīti*, interpretation) is presented in the allegory of the body [and the chariot]" and that "the Śruti shows it." The "allegory" says that the end of the journey is the Highest Abode of Viṣṇu (Ka. Up. III. 9); so according to the Sūtrakāra "*avyakta*" is "*Viṣṇoḥ paramaṃ pad-*

* Though the Sūtrakāra's doctrine of the identity of the lower Nature with the higher one is not entirely different from Saṅkara's doctrine of "*abhinnanimittopādāna*" according to which he explains Br. Sū. I. 4. 23-28, the standpoint from which each of these two discusses the problem, reveals a contrast rather than a resemblance between the two views.

am" mentioned as the terminus of the journey in the allegory. "*Darśayati ca*" in the Sūtra refers to Ka. Up. III. 15 which describes what is said to be "beyond *mahat*" and *avyakta* is also "beyond *mahat*" in Ka. Up. III. 11a which is the *viśaya-vākya*. In the second Sūtra (I. 4. 2.), the same *avyakta* is said to be the *sūkṣma* because it can be properly so called. In the days of the Sūtrakāra "*sūkṣma*" was a synonym for *akṣara* ("The *sūkṣma* sees all these, the lower Nature "*jñāna*", the Intellect, etc. etc.—MBh. XII. 204. 20). So, he uses a current word to explain the Śrauta term. * Among his other arguments, he says that in the same passage "*mahat*" is stated to be lower than *avyakta* and higher than *buddhi*; and as according to the Sāṃkhya *buddhi* is the direct effect of their *avyakta*, this *mahat* (in Ka. Up. III. 11) cannot be a Sāṃkhya principle; so also *avyakta* (Br. Sū. I. 4. 7).

Now, the fact to be noticed here is the Sūtrakāra's view of *avyakta* or *akṣara* as the Nature, and this is given in the Adhikaraṇa discussed above. He says, *avyakta* is lower than *puruṣa* because the former is dependent on the latter, just as the objects of sense (*artha* in Ka. Up. III. 10.) are said to be lower than the mind because they are dependent on the latter for being perceived. The Sūtrakāra seems to reject a *pūrvapakṣa* view which regarded

Meaning of *avyakta* in the capacity of the higher "*Puruṣa* is higher Nature (in Ka. Up. III. 10-11) to be than *avyakta*" (Ka. lower than *puruṣa* from "the standpoint of Up. III. 11). the place" (*sthāna*—Br. Sū. III. 2. 11) of

the two. § Thus, according to the Sūtrakāra, *avyakta* as the subtle principle (*sūkṣma*) i. e. as the

* Śaṅkara's explanation of *sūkṣma* and *avyakta* as the subtle body as distinguished from the gross one is a proof that he had not an uninterrupted tradition. He depends upon his predecessor who, taking *avyakta* to refer to the gross body also, was in no better position than Śaṅkara himself.

§ Those who believed that *avyakta* is spatially lower than *puruṣa*, also believed that the *nirguṇa* texts refer to *avyakta* and *saguṇa* to *puruṣa*. The Sūtrakāra rejects their view (Br. Sū. III. 2. 11-21; see App. IV. 2).

(higher and only) Nature depends upon *ṣuṛuṣa*. In other words, in the Highest Being, the personal aspect governs the impersonal one as far as the act of creation is concerned (Br. Sū. I. 4. 3). This would be the Sūtrakāra's explanation of *avyākṭa* or *akṣara* in such texts as Ka. Up. III. 10-11.

As regards the evolution from *akṣara*, we have seen already (pp. 101-102 above) that the Sūtrakāra does not distinguish the lower Nature from the *akṣara*. This

Rejection of the lower Nature, the Intellect and the Mind, as links in the Series of Evolution. means that he does not accept the lower Nature. In the same way he rejects the creation of *buddhi* and *manas* (Br. Sū. II. 3. 15) and begins the evolution from *akṣara* with the direct creation of the

Ether (*vyat*—Br. Sū. II. 3. 1) from it.

He says that the world is identical with its cause (i. e. Atman) and gives as a proof of it the example of the vital breath (Br. Sū. II. 1. 14, 20). In dropping the three links, the lower Nature, the Intellect, and the Mind (—the problem of *ahamkāra* does not arise for him, as also for the authors of the Mahābhārata in many places—), the Sūtrakāra has directly set aside the teaching of the EMU, the Gītā and the L. MBh. Aupanishadas.

Before we summarise the Sūtrakāra's view about the nature of the Highest Being (*para*), it would be both interesting and instructive to note the doctrines of some Aupanishada (Vedanta?) Schools, which the Sūtrakāra has refuted. The adversaries of the Sūtrakāra were those who held that the Vedānta texts mention more "goals" than

Two Aupanishada Schools criticised by the Sūtrakāra. one (i. e. two) (Br. Sū. III. 3. 1-4) and that the (two) goals are not identical (Br. Sū. III. 3. 5-9). The former he confronted with such texts as Bh. Gī. VIII.

11 and Ka. Up. II. 15 which the Sūtrakāra could interpret as teaching unity of the goal of the Vedāntas (III. 3. 4). With the latter he argued that non-identity of the goals was inconsistent with the omnipresence of each of them taught in the Śruti (III. 3.9). He held that there was only one goal but it had two names, *pradhāna* and *akṣara*. The former of these

two hostile Schools seems to have regarded *puruṣa* and *akṣara* as two independent goals; the latter who said that the two were not identical may have thereby meant that *akṣara* is the Abode and *puruṣa* lives in it and therefore they are in that sense one, but they are not identical. The exact views of these opponents are not given in Br. Sū. III. 3. 1-9, yet they could be inferred to have held some such doctrines as we have described above. There are, however, two other groups of aphorisms, which come to our aid here. The first group is Br. Sū. III. 2. 11-21 (App. IV. 2. a). It records a hostile view which admitted a difference of place in the Highest Being, and went further by saying that the negative texts belong to one

“place” and the positive ones to another “place” in the Supreme Being. This The “*sthāna-bheda*” (?) View. seems to mean that *akṣara* and *puruṣa* are two places in the Supreme One and the negative and the positive texts respectively describe these two places (*sthāna*—Br. Sū. III. 2. 11). The other School is implied in “*api*” in Br. Sū. III. 2. 11 and is refuted in Br. Sū. III. 2. 32-37 (App. IV. 2 b). It believed that there was a goal beyond (or other than)

The “*svarūpa-bheda*” (?) View. the Unmanifest or *akṣara* (Br. Sū. III. 2. 23 and 32), because the Unmanifest was described as connected with the Supreme One (or *puruṣa*) beyond it and because the Śrūti asserted the difference (*bheda*) between the two (Br. Sū. III. 2. 32). According to this School *akṣara* and *puruṣa* are numerically two.

Although neither the commentators nor the modern interpreters like Dr. Thibaut and Prof. Deussen have even exhibited any curiosity as to who these opponents of the Sūtrakāra could have been, it is not difficult to identify them with some predecessors of the author of

Identification of the Sūtras. The view which believes in these two Aupanishada Schools with a difference of place (*sthāna*) in the Supreme Being which is numerically one those of the L.MBh. seems to be that of the L. MBh. “saints” (*tatsthānāc c ānuṣaṣyanti, eka ev eli sādhave*—MBh. XII. 318. 78; see Ch. III p.41 above),

who held that *akṣara* is the "place" of the Best One and therefore in that sense the two are one. The other doctrine according to which *akṣara* and *puruṣa* are different from each other (and therefore two in number) was the view of the L. MBh. Aupaniśadas who enumerated *akṣara* as the Twentyfifth and *puruṣa* as the Twentysixth (MBh. XII. 318. 47-8). According to the Sūtrakāra both these Schools

are dualistic. The latter asserted the difference between *akṣara* and *puruṣa* and was therefore undoubtedly dualistic. Criticism of these Views.

The unity of goal propounded by the former was superficial, because though they stated that the Supreme Being was one, yet not only did they say that in that one Being *akṣara* was spatially lower than *puruṣa*, but they also said that the negative sentences described only the lower place (*akṣara*) and the positive only the upper one (*puruṣa*) in the Supreme Being; so that all the attributes of the Highest Being did not belong to it wherever it was present (Br. Sū. III. 2. 11—note the word "*sarvatra*" in this Sūtra; App. IV. 2. a): The Sūtrakāra regarded such a distinction between the twofold attributes as an admission of duality, and therefore he opposed it, as will be clear from his view of the nature of the Supreme Being.

The most striking feature in the Sūtrakāra's view of the Highest Being (*para*), is the systematic and rational interpretation which he gives for the first time in the history of Indian Philosophy, to the twofold contradictory statements regarding the attributes of the Supreme One, the *coincidentia oppositorum*.

The historical position of the problem before the Sūtrakāra may be summed up in the following words: the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads which had thought of the impersonal (*akṣara*) and the personal (*puruṣa*) independently of each other, had regarded each of them as the Highest Being in itself. Therefore, the attributes of *akṣara* contained not only

the negative ones, but also some positive ones, such as the act of ruling (*praśāsana*—Br. Up. III. 8. 9). Similarly there was the custom of describing the personal principle negatively as was done in the case of the impersonal. The personal is described negatively in Br. Up. III. 9. 26 and III. 7. 23 (cf. the impersonal in Br. Up. III. 8. 11), Br. Up. IV. 4. 25 and Chā. Up. VIII. 7. 1 (cf. Pra. Up. V. 7); and the Gītā remembers this fact in II. 24. But a second stage was reached when the impersonal was placed below the personal (as the latter's Nature). Then the *akṣara* was no longer associated with such attributes as properly belong to the *puruṣa*. This is the case in Ka. Up. III. 15; Mu. Up. I. 1. 6; Pra. Up. V. 7; and Bh. Gī. XII. 3. In the third stage which is evident in the later Mahābhārata (and in Br. Sū. III. 2. 32–37), the distinction between *akṣara* and *puruṣa* and between the attributes of the two became very sharp, and, as we have seen, they have developed into numerically two metaphysical principles. In the fourth case, we find that the distinction between the attributes of these two is allowed to remain as it was, but the two were to be regarded as numerically one (MBh. XII. 318. 78; Br. Sū. III. 2. 11–21). On the fifth occasion, the tendency already visible in Śve. Up. III. 19–20, Ka. Up. II. 10, Īśa. Up. 5, Ka. Up. II. 20 and Bh. Gī. XII. 13–14 assumes a definite shape and the Pāñcarātra conception of one mystic principle springs up by the fusion of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*. This (principle) had both the negative and the positive attributes without any reference to the lower or the higher "place" in it. But at this stage no explanation for this mystic combination of the two hitherto distinct principles with distinct qualities is offered, nor it is realised that this conception is inconsistent with those already in vogue (see p. 91 above).

The author of the Sūtras who comes after all these stages definitely rejects the earlier views (2–4) except the first one, which he emphasises as an argument for his own view, and the last one which he adopts and systematises. According to him *akṣara* is not spatially lower than *puruṣa*; and again they are not two, but one. Whatever attributes, negative or positive, the one is said to have, also belong to the

other, because the Śruti itself makes such an interchange; their distinction is useful only for meditation (see p. 94 above). The Highest Being in its entirety is called *akṣara* or *puruṣa* and the negative and the positive statements are applicable to every part of it, to every place in it (*sarvatra*). The Śruti says that *akṣara* is the goal. It also says that *puruṣa* is the goal. Each of the the two are also individually said to be omnipresent. It is irrational to hold

The Sūtrakāra's that there are two goals and that each of Rational Explana- them is omnipresent. The Sūtrakāra tion of the Problem. makes use of this argument twice (Br.

Sū. III. 2. 38; III. 3. 9) Wherever *akṣara* is mentioned, it is said that there is none else than it; wherever *ātman* or *puruṣa* is mentioned, it is also said that there exists none else but him (Br. Sū. III. 2. 37). The Sūtras refer to Br. Up. IV. 5. 13, "It is—as is a mass of salt, without inside, without outside, entirely a mass of taste (*kṛtsno rasaghana eva*), even so, verily, is this Atman, without inside, without outside, entirely a mass of knowledge (*kṛtsnaḥ prajñānaghana eva*)", and especially to Bh. Gī. XIII. 12–16. "This has every where its hands and feet, every where its eyes, heads, and mouths, every where it is possessed of ears in the world, and remains having enveloped every [existing] thing" (Bh. Gī. XIII. 13). "*Sarvataḥ*" in the Gītā corresponds to "*sarvatra*" in Br. Su. III. 2–11. and therefore the Sūtrakāra refers to it. According to the Sūtrakāra, when any text says that the Supreme Being (*akṣara* or *puruṣa*) is devoid of hand and feet, it denies them of it in its entirety. This will be the sense of Śve. Up. III. 19 and Mu. Up. I. 1. 6. This is how he solves the problem of the *coincidentia oppositorum*. The same is perhaps meant also in Br. Sū. II. 1. 30 and 37 (*sarvopelā ca taddaiśanāt* and *sarvadharmopapaltesca* respectively). The Supreme Being as a whole ("*sarvatra*") is possessed of all, and therefore contradictory, attributes. The great teachers of Vedānta, that followed the Sūtrakāra busied themselves with interpreting this verdict of the author of the aphorisms (see p. 89*above).

The standpoint which the Sūtrakāra has taken up is guided by a historical insight into the development of the *akṣara-puruṣa* doctrine in those days. The Chāndogya and Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣads never taught that the *akṣara* was spatially lower than the *puruṣa*, nor did they think that the personal aspect was in conflict with the impersonal. The Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads did not mean that *akṣara* was a principle with so much share of individuality as to

The Sūtrakāra, be counted as a second principle by the Restorer of the side of the *puruṣa*. What they Advaitism in the implied by putting the *akṣara* below Aupaniṣada School. the *puruṣa* in the discussion of the evolution of the world (as in Ka. Up. III. 10-11) was perhaps that in the entire Brahman the personal aspect governs the impersonal during the act of creating the world, and we find that the Sūtrakāra does accept this meaning of the *paratva* of the *puruṣa* (Br. Sū. I. 4. 3; see p. 104 above). When the EMU and the Gītā said that the meditator on *puruṣa* when liberated “ went beyond *akṣara* (Mu. Up. III. 2. 1; Pra Up. V. 5, 7; Bh. Gī. VIII. 21-22, XV. 16-18, XVIII. 53-55), they did not mean that the meditators on *akṣara* reached the Twentyfifth and those on *puruṣa* the Twentysixth (see Bh. Gī. XII. 4). The Sūtrakāra feels himself bound to understand those statements as referring to different places in the entire Brahman which is like an omnipresent mass of light wherein one may differentiate between its parts as occupying different places, though each part has the same attributes. In brief, let not the historian of the Indian Philosophy forget that the Aupaniṣada or rather the Vedānta School owes its “ monistic monotheism ” (how else shall we name the union of the personal and the impersonal with the control of the former over the latter as regards the latter’s creative activity !) and therewith all the later monistic or monotheistic phases of the various Vedānta Schools, to the author of the Brahmasūtras. Henceforth the dualism and the pluralism to which the EMU, the Gītā and, more than either of these, the later Mahābhārata Aupaniṣadas had fallen a victim, is driven out of the Vedānta School once for all.

Most of the other notable features of the "*akṣara* or *puruṣa*" doctrine of the Sūtrakāra have been noticed in the beginning of this Chapter; Distinction between the Sūtrakāra and the L. MBh. Pāñcarātras. but one point in which the author has checked and corrected the turn of thought, into which the Pāñcarātras had already let themselves enter, requires to be mentioned here, so that the Sūtrakāra may not be mistaken for being more of the Pāñcarātras than he really is. The latter (as we find them in the L. MBh.) did not at all distinguish between *akṣara* and *puruṣa* and could think that the personal is at the same time the impersonal (see p. 84 above). But, for the Sūtrakāra these two are two for the practical purpose of meditation. They are two distinct names of the one object of meditation and indicate two distinct methods of meditation, though leading to one and the same goal. This difference between the Pāñcarātras and the Sūtrakāra, and the way in which the latter succeeded in purging the Aupanishada speculation of its dualistic character, and thereby establishing an option of choice as regards the object of meditation, lead us to consider what we may call the compromising nature of the aphorisms.

Although the Gītā never aimed at reconciling the various Schools of Indian Philosophy, the Brahmasūtras bear clear marks of the great sacrifices Compromising Character of the Sūtras. that the various Śākhās of the Śruti have made in the cause of maintaining the original monism or monotheism of their ancestors. First of all, each of the Vedic Schools agreed to honour the Revealed Texts of all others (Br. Sū. III 3. 44, 49). Secondly, if any one of the four requirements, *codanā*, *ākhyā*, etc. was the same in these texts, the same Brahman was to be understood as the topic in all of them (Br. Sū. III 3. 1, 6). But this did not mean that every School was henceforth to study all the texts, the rule of *svādhyāya* was taught in all the Śākhās and was not to be disturbed in the least by this union of the Schools. Thirdly,

since all the texts did not mention both *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, henceforth *akṣara* or *puruṣa* was the goal. We have already noticed the nature of this new teaching. The followers of the Chāndogya and the Brhadāranyaka could join the union only on this condition; while those whose

The Oldest Upan- texts taught both as the goals (i. e. the
iṣadic Schools. EMU and the Gītā) were in practice
pursuing only one of the two because

they were both of them not meant for one and the same man. Moreover, great appeal for unity was effected by such other arguments as the fact that every Revealed Text whether teaching the personal or the impersonal principle had taught it as omnipresent and there can be no two omnipresent principles. The followers of the EMU and the Gītā found that the idea of *akṣara* as the Nature of the *puruṣa* was inconsistent with their conception of it as an eternal goal; so, *akṣara* was allowed to remain as Prakṛti (Br. Sū. I. 4. 23) but not as a *prakṛti* belonging to *puruṣa*. The fact that the Chāndogya and the Brhadāranyaka Schools had already at various times taught the personal and the impersonal principles without reference to their mutual relations led them to accept the new standpoint. Henceforth those who believed in *akṣara* were to note that *puruṣa* was also a name of the same principle; and those who meditated on *puruṣa* were to accept that the *puruṣa* could also be designated *akṣara* (Br. Sū. III. 3. 8). "*Akṣara*" was only "a different thought" (*prthag dhū*—Br. Sū III 3 42; *prajñāntara*—Br. Sū III 3. 50; *upadeśantara*—Br. Sū III. 3. 37). *Akṣara* is "more powerful" (*baliyas*) than *puruṣa* because a majority of the combining parties believed in it; but, then, *puruṣa* is also sanctioned by the Sruti (Br. Sū. III. 3. 44–45) and both are equally good as the Vidyā (Br. Sū III. 3- 47) The followers of the oldest Schools were not to think that the attainment of *puruṣa* was that of a world (*loka*—Br. Sū. III. 3. 51). The fourth important condition to which all had to agree was that about " *upasaṃhāra* " or " the Rule of Collection of Thoughts " (Br.Sū. III. 3. 5). This was the most important and practical feature of this Syncretism. Till now, each School had meditated on God as He was described in its own individual text. But now a list of the thoughts on God was to be

prepared from the Revealed Texts of all the Schools. Each School was to accept what was common to all and to give to others what was peculiar to itself and consistent with the new doctrine of "*akṣara* or *puruṣa*." This syncretic "Rule of Collection" was obligatory for the meditation on the personal aspect, but not for that on the impersonal, because in this latter case the meditator was to deny all attributes of *akṣara* and the existing lists were found to contain a sufficiently exhaustive enumeration of these (Br. Sū. III. 3. 33). But if they found some attributes of *puruṣa* in the list of those of *akṣara*, they were not to reject them out of respect for the Śruti which (respect) was the background of their union (III. 3. 40), and if they wished to collect the attributes of *akṣara* from the various texts, there was no objection (III. 3. 39). Even in the case of the meditation on *puruṣa*, it was not possible that a meditator could meditate on Him as possessed of all the attributes in all the Revealed Texts; therefore the number of such attributes to be used in practical contemplation was not to be fixed (III. 3. 31). The younger Schools were to make a greater sacrifice and we find that they did it without any opposition. They were asked to give up such attributes of *puruṣa* as would show that *puruṣa* was different from *akṣara* (Br. Sū. III. 3. 12).

The Younger Upaniṣadic Schools. The Sūtrakāra says that *pratyakṣa*, *brahmapucchatva* etc. are not to be accepted as attributes of *puruṣa*, even though they are mentioned as such in the Śruti; and the wonder is that he finds none to oppose him. There is no *pūrvapakṣa* on this significant step he takes. The followers of the EMU and the Gītā also agreed to give up the lower Nature, the Intellect and the Mind as the created principles in the evolutionary series (1. 4. 23-28; II. 3. 15). This was done perhaps because all of them vigorously opposed the purely rational Sāṃkhyas or perhaps because it was necessary to appease the Vājasaneyins and the Bahvṛcs who were yet highly honoured by the philosophical thinkers. (Even the L. MBh. contains some descriptions of creation beginning with the Ether as in the Chāṇ. and Br. Upaniṣads.)

Thus, we find that all the Upaniṣadic Schools agreed in giving up minor though important differences for the purpose of forming a union of all the followers of the Revealed Texts. Formation of the Vedānta School: Its First Text Book and its First Acārya. A new book was to be prepared. The general points of agreement were to be recorded in a document for the future guidance of all the Śākhās who were to keep on studying their own *svādhyāya* but in the light of this agreement. The most important requirement was a list of the thoughts on the highest Being and a systematic account of the exact nature of the "sādhana" and "phala" agreeable to all the combining Schools. The task seems to have been handed over to Bādarāyaṇa and to some other renowned teachers who represented all these Schools. They composed a book and therein noted their views on the points where they differed (Br. Sū. I. 4. 21-23; IV. 3. 7-16; IV. 4. 5-7, IV. 4. 10-12; III. 2. 41-42). Henceforth this new work (on the teaching of Brahman as distinguished from Karma) became the chief text for this united body of the Vedic Śākhās, to be known now as the Vedānta School.

The great sacrifices, described above, which the uniting parties have done, sets one to think whether the purpose that made them sink their differences was only a theoretical one or whether this syncretism had a practical goal. Would anybody have advised the followers of the EMU and the Gītā, under normal circumstances, to give up the subordination of *akṣara* to *puruṣa* by abandoning some of the attributes of each of these about the meaning of which they had not the least doubt? And would such an advice have been accepted by them if it had been actually given? Do the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads and the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads show any signs of this union? Is not the theory of the two Natures a formidable hinderance in the way of such a proposal? It is not at all difficult to imagine the motive force of this union. We have

seen how the Gītā distinguished between the two Natures and how the L. MBh. Aupanīṣadas differed from the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas and Yogas, though all of them (as they are found in the later Mahābhārata) agreed, in a way, as regards the nature of the final goal. But the seed of their disunion and enmity is also present in the Mahābhārata. The Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas refused to accept *akṣara* either as the higher Nature or as a goal by the side of the *puṛuṣa* (i. e. optionally to be accepted in place of *puṛuṣa*) When later on these two Schools became more and more rationalistic and introduced philosophical changes of grave significance, which caused them to be ranked with atheists, the orthodox Aupanīṣadas of all Sākhās found it necessary to offer a combined opposition to these now entirely hostile Schools. Perhaps some more adversaries had freshly entered the field. It was under these circumstances that the descendants of the L. MBh. Aupanīṣadas who never before found it necessary to form themselves into a combined School, who speculated in a variety of ways on all points except the *akṣara-~~puṛuṣa~~* doctrine, and who understood by the word Vedānta any text or passage of the Upanīṣads, formed themselves into a School of their own distinguished from the hostile Schools, Sāṃkhya, Yoga and others. No wonder that from the beginning of the very first chapter, the Brahmasūtras criticise the Sāṃkhya and lose no opportunity of doing the same whenever possible.

But this achievement itself would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible, and the considerations, by which we find it to have been guided, would have been entirely different from what they really are, if the teaching of the Bhagavadgītā had been already forgotten at the time of

<p>Invaluable Contribution of the Gītā Doctrine in the Formation of the First Vedānta School.</p>	<p>the composition of the work which is intended to record it. It is impossible to think that the third point described above (p. 94) regarding the admission of the option of choice of one out of <i>akṣara</i> and <i>puṛuṣa</i> would have suggested itself or would have been accepted by the parties involved if they had not before them the correct</p>
---	---

interpretation of the EMU, the Gîtā and the L. MBh. Aupaniṣada doctrines, the last of which are criticised and rejected by the Sūtrakāra. On the contrary, the fact, as I have found it, is that the remembrance of the *akṣara-and-puruṣa* doctrine of the Gîtā (Bh Gî. XII. 1-5) had exceedingly facilitated the task of the author of the Sūtras who only transformed it into an *akṣara-or-puruṣa* doctrine. The boldness which the Sūtrakāra shows in rejecting those attributes of *puruṣa* which conveyed its distinction from *akṣara* (see p. 113 above) is unparalleled in the works of any of the Ācāryas whose only recourse was an hair-splitting method of interpretation* whenever they had to meet a passage contrary to what they taught. The Sūtrakāra could do what he has done, because he was sure of the support of those for whom he did it. (In this respect the Sūtrakāra is more reliable than the Ācāryas in the matter of the interpretation of the texts with which we are concerned.) In brief, the interpretation of the Sūtras offered in this Thesis will, it is hoped, show that the unique success which they achieved in their aim of combining all Aupaniṣadas against the purely rational Schools and giving the Vedānta texts a System called Vedānta Darśana, was greatly due to the teaching of the Bhagavadgîtā.† Therefore, the inclusion of the Brahmasūtras in the present Dissertation as an evidence for the meaning of the term *akṣara* will not be considered out of place.

* Saṅkara actually said that *priyaśīrastva*, *brahmapucchatva*, etc. refer to the "*ānandaḥ ātmā*" who is the *ānandamaya kośa* (Śā. Bhā. Br. Sū. I. 1. 19).

† Does not Bh. Gî. XIII. 4 which may be a later interpolation in the Gîtā, refer to the diversity (*bahudhā*) of the *akṣara-puruṣa* doctrine in the EMU, in the Gîtā and, in the Brahmasūtras? This Thesis has also produced ample evidence to show that *kṣetra* (Bh. Gî. XIII) was a term for *akṣara* and therefore *kṣetrajñā* a term for *puruṣa*.

RETROSPECT.

In the *R̥g v e d a*, the oldest literary monument of Aryan culture, we read already in those few hymns which herald the dawn of philosophy, that it is in reality but *o n e b e i n g* (*ekam sat*) named differently which is addressed in the hymns to the various deities (I. 164. 46); and that, before the world was created, "without air t h a t o n e breathed by its own power; for there was not beyond it anything whatever" (X. 129. 2).

Later, the *O l d e s t P r o s e U p a n i ṣ a d s* taught as their highest metaphysical principle either *akṣara* only, i. e., the (impersonal) Immutable or only *puruṣa* the "Person": it, or he, respectively, was declared to be "one only without a second" (*ekam eva a-dvītiyam*-Chā. Up. VI. 2. 1).

After that, we find in Chapter I of *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* a first attempt at reconciling the impersonal and the personal (*yen ākṣaram puruṣam veda satyam* I. 2. 13); but the prevailing view in the Age of these *E a r l i e r M e t r i c a l U p a n i ṣ a d s* is the one expressed in *Mu. Up. II* and *III*, placing *puruṣa* above *akṣara* (*Mu. Up. II. 1. 2*; *Pra. Up. V. 5, 7*; *Ka. Up. III. 11*). In the *Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad* this is summarized as follows : *Brahma* (not *Brahman*) is the one threefold being (*trīvidham brahman*), viz., a triad (not three !) consisting of the individual soul, the Immutable, and the Person, called here (I. 12), respectively, the Enjoyer, the Enjoyable, and the Inciter (or Lord in I. 8); the Immutable (i. e., the "Highest Immutable"; *Sve. Up. IV. 8*) being again twofold (V. 1) in so far as it has the unconscious Matter (the Manifest, Mutable, *pradhāna*, *avidyā*) as its periodical manifestation and is yet persisting as the Unmanifest; Immortal, Immutable, Light, Self, Knowledge

(*avyakta*, *amṛta*, *akṣara*, *haras*, *ātman*, *vidyā*) (I. 8, 10; V. 1). The Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, then, taught a triad foreshadowing a future tetrad.*

The Bhaḡavad gītā taught the very same doctrine, only with some new names, speaking of two Unmanifest ones or Natures (VIII. 20, VII. 5), viz., a higher one (*akṣara*, *mahad brahman*) and a lower one (*kṣara*, *brahman*) (XV. 16; XIV. 3; VIII. 3-4; III. 15; V. 10) of which the latter periodically emerges from the former (IX.7; III. 15); and we may suppose that its teaching the lower Unmanifest to produce the manifest universe (VIII. 18-19) is also in agreement with Śve. Up., as is undoubtedly its regarding the personal (*puruṣa*) as higher than the impersonal (*akṣara*) and yet not a distinct entity from it : they are not two, though they are not one either; i. e., they are so to speak, an internal difference only (*svagata bheda*) of one and the same being.

This doctrine we find again practically unchanged with the Mahābhārata Aupaniṣadas : they called the lower Nature (1), *akṣara* (2), and *puruṣa* (3), the Twenty-fourth, the Twentyfifth and the Twentysixth respectively and said (MBh. XII. 217. 1): "He who does not know the tetrad does not know the Supreme Brahman" (*na sa veda param brahman yo na veda catuṣṭayam*; XII. 217. 1), where the four are : (1) *vyakta*; (2) *avyakta* or *amṛta pada* XII. 217. 2), (3) *puruṣa* (XII. 217. 6), and (4) *dēhin*, the embodied soul (XII. 217. 12). But we see also another and, evidently, later School of the Mahābhārata Aupaniṣadas preparing already the ground for future developments by finding it necessary to explain—which was not really different, apart from its being expressly stated, from the view of both Śve. Up. and Bh. Gī.—that the two Natures are one and *akṣara* and *puruṣa* are one in that in either case the one is the "place" of the other (*tatsthatvāt*, XII. 318. 56. 78).

* This becomes quite clear, if we restore, as Prof. Schrader suggests, the strange reading *supraṭiṣṭhākṣaram ca* in Śv. Up. I. 7 to *supraṭiṣṭham kṣaram ca*.

The Sāṃkhya s and the Yogas of the Mahābhārata then actually did away with the theory of the two Natures, but in a different manner.

(1) The Sāṃkhya s abolished the *akṣara* or the higher Nature by simply distributing its attributes among the lower, i. e., their only Nature, and the Twentysixth of the Aupanīśadas whom they accepted as their Twentyfifth. [This was the origin of the dualism of Spirit and Matter which we find as an accomplished fact in the Classical Sāṃkhya.]

(2) The Rudrite Yogas, while accepting the Sāṃkhya Twentyfourth (and rejecting the higher Nature), could not admit the Sāṃkhya *puruṣa* who was both Jīva and Īśvara, for they (i. e. these Yogas) wanted a highest principle which was absolutely beyond bondage and liberation, i. e., had not even the semblance of being somehow (temporarily), viz., by creation etc., contaminated by the Prakṛti. Thus, they believed in two principles instead of the one *puruṣa* of the Sāṃkhyas, viz., the T w e n t y f i f t h, who was for them only a kind of world-soul, and the T w e n t y s i x t h, the Parmātman, who was placed above the Twentyfifth and the Twentyfourth (Prakṛti) and who was the absolutely transcendent, yet personal, highest being. [Thus, and not on the basis of an atheistic Sāṃkhya, has evolved the idea of a personal highest God in the Yoga System.] This School, then, may be looked upon as having evolved from the (like-wise Rudrite) Śvetāśvatara Upanīśad. For, its two Atmans are the two "friends" in Śve. Up. IV. 6-7. But in Śve. Up. the boundary between the two is still constantly obliterated; it has still a conscious *prakṛti* and its "Lord" is still, though not *bhoktr*, yet *karṇ* as regards creation etc., (V. 3; VI. 3-4).

(3) The Hiraṇyagarbha Yogas were at one with the Rudrite Yogas as regards their Twentyfourth and Twentyfifth, but went beyond them by positing an i m p e r s o n a l Twentysixth which they called *akṣara*. This *akṣara*, then, was like that of the Oldest Prose Upanīśads deprived of both its personality (cf. Br. Up. III. 8. 9) and materiality, the former being reserved for their Twentyfifth,

and the latter for their Twentyfourth. This is the acme of metaphysical abstraction reached in the Mahābhārata.

In all of these three Schools the Twentyfifth engaged (either really or apparently) in creation, etc., and transmigration etc., had so far been only *one*, who either had (as in the case of the Yogas) or had not (as with the Sāṃkhyas) a higher principle above him, and the empirical plurality of individuals must have been for them but a phenomenon of Nature, if they cared at all to explain it. We can understand this attitude if we realise that it was a Herculean task for Indian thinkers to free themselves from the grip of the ancient Aupanīṣada tradition with its one and only Ātman. It is a great pity, therefore, that the Mahābhārata has not preserved for us one or two documents showing the rise of the theory of plurality of souls. We are merely confronted, in one of the latest chapters of the Śāntiparvan (350. 1 fl.) with the fact that both the Sāṃkhyas and the Yogas had meanwhile taken to it, i. e., to the doctrine of one real highest soul and many empirical individual ones. [For the Sāṃkhyas now only one more step remained to be taken, viz., that of abolishing the *puruṣa*, just as formerly they had abolished the higher Nature, and establishing a real plurality of souls, but that is not heard of yet in the Mahābhārata; it came later, when Buddhism spread and atheism became fashionable.]

Some time after the origin of these three Schools, came the Mahābhārata Pāñcarātras who rather developed the religion (*dharma*) of the Bhagavadgītā, their most venerable authority: they emphasised the oneness of *akṣara* and *puruṣa* and did not allow either Matter or soul to be a distinct entity from it, but looked upon the former as periodically created and withdrawn and upon the latter also as emerging from and returning into their "source" the Puruṣa. In spite of this they did not renounce the *svagatabheda* standpoint of the Gītā, but spoke of an innate power of the Puruṣa which they called his *Ṛdyā* (and which was later identified with Viṣṇu's wife Lakṣmī) and also of the souls as somehow

being parts of God and continuing as such even during the period of cosmic rest. This, then, is the strictest monism taught in the Mahābhārata.

And, finally, Bāḍrāyaṇa, the author (or reviser ?) of the Brāhmin-sūtras, substituted the Mahābhārata Pāñcarātra view of the oneness of *akṣara* and *puruṣa* by his teaching that the same Supreme Being called *para* "the Highest" is to be meditated upon as *akṣara* or *puruṣa*.

But, while in Bāḍrāyaṇa's Sūtras (and also in the systems of the Vaiṣṇavite Ācāryas) the abandoned ancient position (of *puruṣa* being higher than *akṣara*) is still to some extent recognizable, even the traces of the latter will be found to have disappeared when we turn to the works of his most renowned successor, Śaṅkarācārya.

Thus it has happened that the history of *akṣara* has become what it has been called by us : a forgotten chapter. It undoubtedly covers a very long period when again and over again those very questions were asked which are echoed in the motto of this Thesis. The history of Indian Philosophy must, indeed, have essentially been for many centuries the history of *akṣara*.

APPENDIX I.

INTERPRETATION OF THE UPANIŠADS.

Scholars may want a more detailed demonstration of the right claimed by the author of this Thesis to use the U p a n i š a d s in the way he has done. He, therefore, submits to them the following translation of, and notes on, those passages of the Upaniṣads which testify most unambiguously to the correctness of his view of *akṣara* and at the same time can be shown to be in full agreement, in this respect, with his second source on *akṣara*, the Bhagavadgītā.

A.—*Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*.

1. Mu. Up. II. 1. 1-2.

(1) The following is the truth: Just as from a well-kindled fire sparks rise in thousands all alike, so, O gentle one, are the various things born of the Immutable and return into the same.

(2) That divine, formless *puruṣa* is both outside and inside, unborn, without breath, without a mind, shining, higher than the highest Immutable (*akṣarāt parataḥ parah*).

NOTES :—

1. These verses make it quite clear that the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad distinguishes between *akṣara* and *puruṣa* and places the latter above the former, as does the Gītā (e. g. in XV. 16-18).

2 It should, however, be noticed that this passage of the Upaniṣad (II. 1. 1) describes all things as originating from the Immutable. We know that in the Gītā also, the higher Nature is said to be either the origin of all beings (e. g. Bh. Gī. VII. 6, XIV. 4), or the origin of the lower Nature which is the direct origin of all beings (Bh. Gī. VIII 20-21, III. 14-15).

2. Mu. Up. III. 2. 8.

Just as the flowing rivers disappear into the ocean, having abandoned name and form, so the knower totally freed from name and form reaches the divine *ṣuruṣa* higher than the Highest (*ṣarāt ṣaram ṣuruṣam*).

NOTES :- -

1. *Ṣuruṣa* in this verse can be no other than *ṣuruṣa* above the highest Immutable in Mu. Up. II. 1. 2.

3. Mu. Up. I. 1. 7-9.

(7) Just as the spider creates and takes [back], just as herbs rise up on the earth, just as the hairs on the head and the hairs on the body (appear) from the living man, so does every thing here rise from 'the Immutable' (*akṣara*).

(8) The [lower] *brahman* develops on account of *tapas*, from that is the food born; from food, breath, mind, truth (*satya*), words, and, in the rites, 'the Immortal' (*amṛtam*.)

(9) From that [*ātman*] who is omniscient, who knows all, whose *tapas* consists of knowledge, is born this [lower] *brahman*, name, form, and food.

NOTES :—

1. The use of the masculine forms in I. 1. 9 should not lead us to suppose that the last verse is a later interpolation, because *akṣara ātmā* (Pr. Up. IV. 9) or *akṣarah ṣuruṣah* (Mu. Up. I. 2. 13), or rather simply *ātmā* (see *ātmā* in Mu. Up. II. 2. 5, and notes on Śve. Up. I. 7-12) could have been understood by the author of the Upaniṣad as the subject possessed of omniscience and other attributes mentioned in this Śruti. The occurrence of these masculine expressions in the sense of the impersonal Immutable shows nothing else than that though the idea in the mind of these writers was an impersonal one, they believed themselves to be entitled to make use of words that were of the masculine gender. Even in the oldest Upaniṣads like the Br. Up *ātmā* is the word used for what is described only negatively, e g. Br. Up. III. 9. 26. In the present instance, *brahman* is said to be the effect of the Immutable according to the interpretation we have proposed,

and this conclusion is justified by Bh. Gī. III. 15 (*brahmī ākṣara-rūpamudbhavam*). So *brahman* in Mu. Up. I. 1. 9 means the lower Nature. Moreover the expression 'yaḥ sarva-jñāḥ sarva-avid' (in I. 1. 9) is the same as in II. 2. 7 where undoubtedly it refers to *ākṣara* (see notes on *ātman* under Śve. Up. 1. 7-12). The author of the Brahmsūtras clearly says that *ātman*, Brahman, etc. are words used both for *ākṣara* and *puruṣa* (Br. Sū. III. 3. 52; see App. IV).

2. As already said, *brahman* in I. 1. 9 is the lower Nature, because it is the effect of the Immutable. This follows also from the fact that it is said to be 'growing' 'gathering' or 'developing' (*cīyate*) through *tapas* (I. 1. 8).

3. That *ākṣara* in this passage is of the same nature as that of the Bhagavadgītā is proved by the similarity of the attributes mentioned in Mu. Up. I. 1. 6 and those in Gītā XII. 2-3.

4. That the Immutable is said to be the goal in Mu. Up. II. 2. 3, while elsewhere in the same Upaniṣad, e. g. in III. 2. 8 *puruṣa* is said to be the goal, is no obstacle to our interpretation, because in the days of the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad both *ākṣara* and *puruṣa* were regarded as goals, as we find in the case of the Bhagavadgītā.

4. Mu. Up. I. 2. 13.

To him who had properly approached [him], whose mind was tranquil and who possessed control (of the senses), that knower (of Brahman) proclaimed in truth that Lore of Brahman so that he could know the real 'Immutable-puruṣa' (*ākṣara puruṣa*).

NOTE :—

'*Ākṣara puruṣa*', mentioned here, seems to be a crude attempt to explain the relation of *ākṣara* and *puruṣa*. The oldest Upaniṣads use both these terms separately, e. g. *ākṣara* in Br. Up. III. 8. 8-11, and *puruṣa* in Chā. Up. III. 12. 6, and Br. Up. III 9. 26. Each word denotes the highest reality known to the Upaniṣad. Both these words are placed together in the present passage: this seems to have been done consciously in order to reconcile the impersonal and the personal conceptions about the highest truth referred to above. The authors of the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣadas found that in the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads, sometimes, *ākṣara* was taught, and at other

times *ṣuṛuṣa* was taught, as is the case in the passages just mentioned. They were not confronted with an Aupanīṣada School teaching *akṣara* and *ṣuṛuṣa* as two philosophical principles, as was actually the case with the author of the Brahmasūtras who had before him the Mahābhārata Aupanīṣada School. So, the EMU try to reconcile the conception of the impersonal with that of the personal in Br. Up. and Chā. Up., but were not concerned with that spiritual dualism which was itself the result of the EMU and the Gītā. Thus, the first section of the Muṇḍaka Upanīṣad seems to be earlier than the other two sections, because this effort to reconcile *akṣara* and *ṣuṛuṣa* (in Mu. Up. I) is less successful than the same in II and III where the impersonal *akṣara* (e. g. in II. 1. 2, III. 1. 3 and III. 2. 1, 8) is clearly placed below the personal *ṣuṛuṣa*. The expression '*akṣara ṣuṛuṣa*' betrays the author's intention to convey the idea of the impersonal Immutable only, because he uses the simple term *akṣara* in Mu. Up. I. 1. and refers to *tapas* and *śraddhā* in I. 2. 11 which is evidently based upon Chā. Up. V. 10. 1-2. Both these Upanīṣadic passages describe the paths of gods and Pitṛs. Chā. Up. V. 10. 1-2 mentions the impersonal Brahman as the goal of *devayāna*, so it is quite probable that the Mu. Up. passage which draws upon that older text has the same goal in view. The words like *brahmaloka* (Mu. Up. I. 2. 6) and *amṛta ṣuṛuṣa* in Mu. Up. I. 2. 11 also point to the same. The expression *akṣara ṣuṛuṣa* is like the expression *akṣara ātman* in Pr. Up. IV. 9, which though masculine refers to the impersonal reality described in Pr. Up. IV. 10. The Immutable is designated as *akṣara ṣuṛuṣa* also in Bh. Gī. XV. 16: "There are these two *ṣuṛuṣas* in the world, viz., the Mutable and the Immutable"; but the Gītā does so, because it calls the *ṣuṛuṣa* (of Mu. Up.) "*ṣuṛuṣottama*" (Bh. Gī. XV. 18).

CONCLUSION :—

1. The Immutable in the Mu. Up. is the Impersonal One (I. 1. 6) as in Bh. Gī. XII. 3-4.
2. It is below *ṣuṛuṣa*, e. g. in II. 1. 2, III. 1. 2, III. 2. 8, as in Bh. Gī. XV. 16-18.
3. It is an independent goal just like the *ṣuṛuṣa* (I. 1. 5), as in Bh. Gī. XII. 1, VIII. 10.
4. It can be called *akṣara* (I. 1. 5, 7; II. 1. 2; II. 2. 2), *ātman* (possibly in I. 1. 9, II. 2. 5), *akṣara ṣuṛuṣa* (I. 2. 13),

amṛta puruṣa (I. 2. 11), *Brahman* (III. 1. 3), *yonu* (with reference to *puruṣa*) (III. 1. 3), *yonī* of all beings (I. 1. 6), *śukra* (III. 2. 1), *brahmadhāma* (III. 2. 2, 4).

5. From it, *brahman* or the lower Nature is “born” (I. 1. 8-9).

6. Specially noteworthy is the fact that in Mu. Up. 1. 2. we have an earlier effort to reconcile the impersonal and personal principles of Br. Up. and Chā. Up. than the one in Mu. Up. II. 1. 1-2.

B.—Praśna Upaniṣad.

Sections IV and V of the Praśna Upaniṣad mention the Immutable (*akṣara*) and *puruṣa* respectively, and, as we shall see presently, distinguish between the two, placing *puruṣa* above *akṣara*.

1. Pr. Up. IV. 9-11.

(9) For he, who sees, touches, hears, smells, tastes, fancies, knows, and acts, he is the person of the nature of knowledge (*viññānātmā puruṣaḥ*), [and] he has his stand in the highest Immutable Self (*pare śkṣare ātmam*).

(10) He, indeed, who knows the Immutable (*akṣara*) which is without shadow, without a body, without blood, and radiant, O gentle one, he, who knows this Immutable, reaches none else than the highest Immutable. He becomes omniscient and all-[embracing]. For that the following verse [is the authority].

(11) He who knows that Immutable in which the knowledge-self (*viññānātmā*), along with all the gods (i. e. senses), and all the vital airs and elements find rest—such a one having become omniscient, O gentle one, has certainly entered everything.

NOTES :—

1. The person of the nature of knowledge (*viññānātmā puruṣaḥ*) is the Jīva (individual soul) in whom all senses and all objects of sense rest during the dreamless sleep (Pr. Up. IV. 6-7).

2. The expression *para akṣara ātmān* (in verse IV. 9) for the highest Immutable, which is more complex than the usual word *akṣara* (e.g. in Mu. Up. I. 1. 5) may be compared with the similar expression *akṣara puruṣa*, 'the Immutable *puruṣa*', for the same, used in Mu. Up. I. 2. 13. see pp. 125-126).

3. The description of the Immutable in verse 10 makes it quite clear that *para akṣara ātmān* in the previous verse is to be identified with the *akṣara* of the Bhagavadgītā (see e. g. XII. 2-5).

4. Verse 11 makes the sense of *viññānātmā puruṣaḥ* in verse 9 quite clear. He is accompanied by the senses, the vital airs and the elements. He can be none else but the *Jīva*.

2. Pr. Up. V. 2, 5, 7.

(2) Indeed, O Satyakāma, that which is the Syllable 'Om' is the Higher and the Lower Brahman (*param c āparam ca brahma*). Therefore the knower obtains either of the two (*ekataram*) by this same resort (viz., the Syllable Om).

x

x

x

(5) But he who meditates on the Supreme *puruṣa* (*parama puruṣa*) by means of this very Syllable, viz., 'Om' consisting of three parts, joins the Light, viz., the Sun. He being free from sin, just as the serpent is freed from slough, is carried by the Sāma-hymns to the world of Brahman (i. e. to the Immutable). From this [world] replete with Life (or from this solid Mass of Life-*jivaghana*), he sees *puruṣa*, higher than the Highest, residing in the City (*parāt param puriṣayaṁ puruṣam*). Regarding this, the following two verses are [the authority].

x

x

x

(7) He obtains this [human] world by means of the Rg-verses, the world of the atmosphere through the Yajus-verses, and through Sāmans he obtains that [Immutable] which the Wise proclaim. He, who knows what is quiet, without old age, immortal, without fear, and the Highest (*para*) obtains Him even by the same resort viz., the Syllable 'Om' [meditated upon as an entire Syllable].

NOTES :—

1. The conception of the Higher and Lower Brahman of this Upaniṣad is very important. Sentences 3 and 4 of this section describe how the meditator on one and two parts (*ekamātra* and *dvimātru*) of the Syllable 'Om', obtains the human world and the world of the moon. (Apparently these worlds are not to be counted as Brahman.) The world of the moon is the world from which the soul returns, according to V. 4. The sentence (V. 5), therefore, describes the world from which there is no return. This world is said to be the Brahman-world (*brahmaloka*). And the man who meditates on all the three parts of the Syllable (i. e. who meditates on the Syllable 'Om' as consisting of three parts, but not as a single Syllable, see note 9 below), goes to it after having joined [the rays of] the Light viz., the Sun. The description (*vinirmuktaṁ* etc. in V. 5) shows that this man is the liberated soul. Therefore, this must be the Lower Brahman (*aparam brahma*) mentioned in verse V. 2. This is "one of the two (goals)" stated in this Śruti (V. 2). The phrase *parāt param* (V. 5) is an epithet of the *puruṣa* "who is higher than this Mass of Life which is the Highest (*etasmāḥ jīvaḥ śānāt parāt param*).” This interpretation is supported by the description of the *puruṣa* in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad. There we read: the Brahman-knower being freed from 'name and form' reaches the divine *puruṣa* higher than the Highest (Mu. Up. III. 2. 8).

2. *Brahmaloka* in this passage is 'the Immutable *akṣara*', because (a) as pointed out in the note to the previous verse, according to this Upaniṣad there is no return from this Brahman-world, return being possible only if the meditator goes to the world of the moon as said in sentence 3 of this section; (b) it is said here that the liberated soul "sees" the *puruṣa* from this Brahman-world; no text tells us that one can "see" the *puruṣa* from the world of Brahman otherwise called Prajāpati; (c) even some of the Upaniṣads distinguish between the Brahman-world, i. e. the Immutable, and the world of Prajāpati, e. g. Kau. Up. I. 3, in which *brahmaloka* can only mean the Immutable; as the question of return and non-return is here (in Pra. Up. V) discussed according as the soul reaches the Moon or the Sun, we can associate this passage with Kau. Up. I. 3 where the same topic is met with; and (d) lastly this Brahman-world is said to be *jīvaḥ śānāt*, a solid Mass of Life; the soul that is "bound" including even Brahman could not have been so-called. The idea of '*jīvasamaṣṭi*' as the inter-

pretation of *jivaghana* is not acceptable because that idea is not known to the EMU and because "*jivaghana*" is not difficult to be explained, if we look to the literature of the Age of the EMU. This term "*jivaghana*" means the same as is called *prajñānaghana* "Mass of Consciousness" in Br. Up. IV. 5. 13 and in Māṇḍukya Up. 5, and "*jivabhūtā prakṛti*", the Life-element in Bh. Gī. VII. 5, and "*jīva ātman*" in Chā. Up. VI. 3. 2. (see Ch. IV. p. 102). In Chā. Up. VIII. 3. 2. (*brahmaloka* means *akṣara* the "Immutable"; so also in Chā. Up. VIII. 4. 1-3, VIII. 5. 3-4 and in Br. Up. IV. 3. 32.

3. It should also be emphasised that the liberated soul is here said to see *ṣuṣa* from the world of the Immutable, so that it is not meant here that the soul reaches the *ṣuṣa* by meditation on Him through the syllable 'Om' conceived of as consisting of three parts.

4. The world described as 'what the Wise (*kavayah* - cf. Ka. Up. III 14) proclaim,' is the Brahman-world of V. 5 or "the Lower Brahman" of V. 2, because both of these are said to be reached through the Sāman-hymns. And this description of the Brahman-world also justifies my interpretation of the term *brahmaloka* in V. 5. So, the expression "the Lower Brahman" has got quite a different meaning from what Śaṅkara would explain it to be.

5. Now, there should be no doubt regarding the explanation of "Him" (V. 7c), because this word stands for *ṣuṣa* who is mentioned in V. 5. Verse 7 is a quotation intended to explain sentence 5 (see note 8 below).

6. As it is said that even by the syllable 'Om' the Brahman-knower reaches *ṣuṣa*; it follows that 'Om' in this case is not conceived of as a syllable consisting of three parts, but as a self-complete single mystical symbol. This idea seems to be similar to that in the Bh. Gī. VIII. 13. 'Even' (*eva* in V.7c-d) is significant in this connection.

7. 'The quiet one' and the other epithets refer undoubtedly to *akṣara*. It is not unusual to describe the Immutable in these terms (see *śāntātman* in Ka. Up. III. 13). Moreover, *param* 'the Highest' mentioned here is to be distinguished from *parāt param* 'the higher than the Highest', the attribute of *ṣuṣa* in one of the sentences here (V. 5).

8. 'Him' (in V. 7c) must refer to *ṣuṛuṣa* as distinguished from the impersonal *akṣara* conveyed here by the neuter pronouns 'yat' and 'tat'. This *ṣuṛuṣa* is the one whom the liberated soul "sees" from the Brahman-world (V. 5).

9. The exact literal sense of this last verse must be noted. It states that one who knows *akṣara* attains to *ṣuṛuṣa* by means of the syllable "Om". This idea follows also from two verses in Bh. Gī. viz., VIII. 12, where it is said that 'he, who, repeating the Brahman consisting of the one syllable viz., 'Om' and remembering me, departs leaving off his body reaches the highest goal', and XII. 4 which says: 'Those who meditate on *akṣara* being attached to the good of all creatures, reach none but me'. This also agrees with Tai. Up. II. 1, which says 'The knower of Brahman obtains what is beyond [it]' (see also Bh. Gī. XVIII. 53-55 and XII. 4-5).

CONCLUSION :—

1. So, according to Praśna Upaniṣad IV and V, the Immutable (*akṣara*) is impersonal and can be described negatively (Pr. Up. IV. 10, V. 7d), as is also the case in Bh. Gī. XII. 3-4.

2. It is also called (a) *para akṣara ātman* 'the Highest Immutable Atman' (Pr. Up. IV. 9-11, the term *ātman* being used here without a reference to the self), (b) '*aṣara brahman*' the Lower Brahman, in contrast with the *ṣuṛuṣa* who is called '*para brahman*' the Higher Brahman (Pr. Up. V. 2), (c) '*brahmaloka*' the Brahman-world, (d) '*jivaghana*' a solid Mass of Life (Pr. Up. V. 5), meaning the same as *jīva bhūtā parā prakṛti* in Bh. Gī. VII. 5, and (e) 'that which the Wise proclaim' (*yat tat kavayo vedayante*—Pr. Up. V. 7).

3: The *ṣuṛuṣa* is higher than it (*parāt param ṣuṛiṣayaṃ ṣuṛuṣaṃ iṣate*—V. 5).

C.—*Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad*.

From the standpoint of terminology, this Upaniṣad is later than the two already examined. Two passages in it are specially important for our inquiry and will, therefore, be discussed here in extenso, viz., I. 7-9 and V. 1.

1. Śve. Up. I. 7-12.

(7) This is the Supreme Brahman (*paramam brahma*) celebrated in song. The three therein are well established and imperishable (*akṣara*). The Brahman-knowers having known the distinction between these are merged into Brahman, being devoted to it and freed from [all] forms of existence.

(8) The Lord (*īśa*) maintains (*bharate*) this all, the combined Mutable (*kṣara*) and Immutable (*akṣara*), the Manifest and the Unmanifest (*vyaktavyaktam*). And the Atman, the not-Lord (*aniśa*), is "bound" because of his being the enjoyer (*bhoktṛ*), and is released from all bonds after having known the divine One.

(9) The knower (*jñā*) and the not-knower (*ajñā*), the Lord and the not-Lord, are both "unborn". The one "female unborn" is associated with the enjoyer and the objects of enjoyment. And the infinite Atman is "of the form of the all" (*viśvarūpa*) and, indeed, no Agent. It is [the attainment of] Brahma, when one attains these three.

(10) The Mutable (*kṣara*) is the First Evolver (*pradhāna*); and the Immortal, the Immutable (*amṛtākṣaram*) is the Light (*haras*). Over the Mutable and the [Immutable] *ātman*, the One God rules. Through meditation on him, through applying oneself to him and [thus] becoming completely of his nature (*tatvabhāvāt, bhūyaḥ*) at the end [there results] the cessation of all deceit (*viśvamāyā*).

(11) For him who has known God [there follows] the relinquishment of all fetters, the cessation of birth and death because of the troubles being removed. Through meditation on him, [he gains] the third [of the triad] on the loss of the body [and thus] all-Lordliness (*viśvaisvarya*). He is then absolute (*kevala*) and has achieved all desires.

(12) This [triad] should be known as contained eternally in the Atman, since nothing higher remains to be known for him who has known the Enjoyer (*bhoktṛ*), the Enjoyable (*bhogyā*) and the Prompter (*preiṭṛ*); this is the entire Three-fold Brahma which has been proclaimed.

NOTES :-

1. The technical use of 'akṣara' in the sense of the Immutable should be distinguished from the ordinary sense of the word, viz., imperishable.

• 2. Verse 8 gives the explanation of the 'three' mentioned in the previous verse. They are (1) the Mutable and the Immutable combined together (*samyukta*) and thus forming one of the three, (2) the Lord (*īśa*) and (3) the not-Lord (*anīśa*) i.e. the Jīva.

3. If Sve. Up. I. 7b be interpreted to mean "The three are well established and are imperishable therein", then the three should be necessarily understood as (1) the Mutable, (2) the Immutable and (3) the not-Lord, the Supreme Brahman being the Lord (*īśa*) himself. In that case, verse 7 would regard also the Mutable (*kṣara*) as an imperishable (*akṣara*) principle, along with the Immutable and the Jīva. An explanation of this is found in Sve. Up. V. I (see note 2 on Sve. Up. V. I).

4. It should be noted here that the Mutable is called the Manifest and the Immutable the Unmanifest (*avyakta*). These terms are also used in the Gītā e.g. in VIII. 18-21 (see App. II). This use of the term *avyakta* for *akṣara* is a later one. The older Upaniṣads, e.g. the Muṇḍaka and the Praśna, do not use it. They use the word 'akṣara' which is met with in the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, e.g. in III. 8.8 (see note 13 below). The explanation of the Immutable as the Unmanifest in contrast with that of *kṣara* as the Manifest shows that *akṣara* cannot be here interpreted as the Jīva. This, also, follows from the fact that the not-Lord is one of the imperishable three, along with the Immutable also (see notes 2-3 above).

5. The distinction between the Immutable and the Lord is here definitely stated as that between the ruled and the ruler or the sustained and the sustainer (*bharate* in verse 8).

6. The first half of verse 8 finds an exact parallel in Bh. Gī. XV.16-18. The Upaniṣadic words *bharate* and *īśa* should be compared with *bibharti* and *īśvara* in the Gītā. The author of the Brahmasūtras makes 'sustenance' *sambhṛti* a distinct attribute of *puruṣa* (Br. Sū. III. 3. 23; App. IV).

7. As distinct from 'the ruled' i.e. the Immutable and the Mutable, and 'the ruler' the Lord, the Jīva is called 'the

not-ruler'. It should be noticed that he is here not counted as one of the ruled. The statement that the not-ruler Atman is "bound" through his characteristic as an enjoyer may be compared with Bh. Gi. XIII. 20-22 (see also Śve. U. IV. 5-7).

8. The one "unborn female" is the higher Nature or the Immutable because only the Immutable can be said to be united, on the one hand, with 'the enjoyer' the Jīva and, on the other, with 'the objects of enjoyment' which would constitute the Mutable, and because the Mutable is here 'the First Evolver' *pradhāna* and 'the Immutable' (*akṣara*) is said to be 'the Immortal' *amṛta* which ultimately means the same as *ajā* 'unborn' (see verse 10).

9. Thus, the three in verse 9 are the three unborn, viz., the Jīva, the higher Nature and the infinite Atman or the Lord. Verse 8 includes the Mutable along with the Immutable, but the triad is essentially the same in both the verses.

10. Verse 9 describing the infinite Atman or the Lord as 'of the form of the all' (*viśvaṇṛpa*) means that the Mutable and the Immutable which constitute 'the all', are contained in the Lord (see verse 8).

11. The word *amṛta* in verse I. 10 a is the one which is used as a synonym of *akṣara*, the Immutable. It is so used in the oldest Upaniṣads as well as in those which can be historically assigned to the same period as the Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad, e. g. "This is the Immutable, this is the Immortal, the Fearless (Chā. Up. I. 4. 4); "It alone is the Bright (*śukram*), it is Brahman, it alone is designated the Immortal" (Kāṭha Up. V. 8., VI. 1); see also Muṇḍaka Up. II. 2. 2, 11 and Kāṭha Up. VI. 17 (see note 1 on Śve. Up. V. 1).

12. The word *haras* (as Prof. Schrader points out to me) has been identified with Greek *theros* "heat [of the summer]" and traced back, together with *ghṛṇa*, *gharma*, etc., to the root *ghṛ*. Besides in the R̥gveda it also occurs in Yajurveda (Taitt. Samh. and Brāhm.) to which the Śve. Up. is said to belong. It is used especially for "energy" as of the eye or of a horse (cf. *harasvin* "fiery", "energetic"), and thus may be looked upon as a synonym of *tejas* and a precursor of the later term *śakti*. For *tejas* in the sense of a higher *prakṛti* compare e. g. Chā. Up. VI. 2. 3, 8. 4-6, 15. 2; Pra. Up. IV. 6.

13. The explanation of the Mutable as *pradhāna* 'the First Evolver' is very important. *Pradhāna* is here said to be *kṣara* (the Mutable) because in the days of the Earlier Metrical Upaniṣads (e. g. Mu. Up. I. 1. 9) and even later in Bh. Gī. (III. 15) and MBh. (see Ch 1. Section 1) the Aupaniṣada School thought the Nature (i. e. their lower Nature) to be an effect of the higher Nature viz., *akṣara*. The Mutable is not the Intellect and the other elements produced from the Intellect, but *prakṛi* 'the lower Nature' itself including all its effects (and capable of becoming manifest and therefore) called the Manifest (*vyakta*) in contrast with the Unmanifest (*avyakta*), the designation of the Immutable (Śve I. 8). The Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad seems to be the earliest to use the term "*avyakta*". It is absent in the Chā., Br., Mu., Pr. Upaniṣads. It occurs only once in Śve. Up. while thrice in Kaṭha Up., though both of these are of equal length. As we shall see later on, the history of *avyakta* is the history of some centuries of Indian philosophy. Here it should be noted that, the Śve. Up. which explains both *pradhāna* and *vyakta* as *kṣara*, has got a more primitive conception of *avyakta* than the Gītā which speaks of all manifestations (*vyakṛāṇi*) as born of *avyakta* (which stands there for *pradhāna*) and of the latter as 'lower than' another *avyakta* (which is '*akṣara avyakta*' of the Śve. Up.) (Bh. Gī. VIII. 18-21). The Śve. Up. understands *vyakta* to be *pradhāna*. Thus, the Śve. Up. uses these terms (*vyakta* and *avyakta*) in a very primitive way, and the Kaṭha Up. avoids *vyakta* but shows a special fondness for *avyakta* while the Gītā goes still further and puts forth the doctrine of *vyakti*s and two *avyakti*s, the lower and the higher, the first of which is *pradhāna* (Śve. Up.) or *mahat* (Kaṭha Up.) "the lower Nature" and the second of which is the *akṣara* of Śve. Up. and the *avyakta* of Śve. and Kaṭha Upaniṣads.

14. The term *ātman* in verse 10b evidently stands here for the Immutable mentioned along with the Mutable in 10a and 8a-b. In both these verses the Lord is the ruler over the Mutable and the Immutable, as is said also in this verse. As remarked already, the Jīva is here conceived as the not-ruler but not as one who is ruled over. The Śve. Up. uses the term *ātman* in the sense of the Immutable. Thus, in I. 3d *ātman* in *kālātmayuktāni* stands for the term "*yoni*" in 2 b, the term *kūla* being the first in the list of the causes mentioned in 2 a-b just as *ṣurūṣa*, to be here identified with *deva* in 3b, is the

last. *Ātman* (in 3d) cannot be the Jīva, because he (i.e. the Jīva) is positively denied to be a cause in 2 c-d. In Śve. Up. VI. 16, *puruṣa* is actually said to be *ātmayoni*, having *ātman* (the Immutable) as the womb (at his disposal for fructification). '*Ātmayoni*' is to be compared with *brahmayoni* in Śve. Up. V. 6. He who 'presides' (*adhiṣṭhātā*—I. 3) is the same as he who 'rules' (I. 10). It is highly probable that the word *ātman* in Śve. Up. I. 6 c-d means the Immutable. "The Jīva having known *ātman* (the Immutable) and the Prompter as distinct [from each other and also from him-elf] and then having become gratified with that [knowledge or with that Immutable, compare *juṣamāṇa* and *juṣta* in Śve. Up. IV. 5 and 7] attains to immortality" (Śve. Up. I. 6). Thus, this verse gives us the same idea of the 'Triad' as is given also in the verses that follow it.

The Śve. Up. is not the only one which uses the term *ātman* for the Immutable. Muṇḍika Upaniṣad II. 1 gives us the description of *puruṣa*, who is above the Immutable (II. 1. 2). In contrast with Mu. Up. II. 1. Mu. Up. II. 2 aims at teaching the Lore of the Immutable (II. 2. 2-3). The term Brahman in II. 2. 4b and the term *ātman* in II. 2. 5c are used for the Immutable, *akṣara*, of II. 2. 2-3. 'That *ātman* in which the sky, the earth, the atmosphere, the mind are sewn crosswise and lengthwise, along with all the vital airs' is the Immutable (*aṣara*) according to Br. Up. III. 8. 7-8, 11. The words *amṛta* (7) and Brahman (9, 11) make it quite clear that *ātman* (in 5, 6, 7) is used for *akṣara*.

So also Mu. Up. III. 1 is intended to explain the Lore of the Immutable and uses the term *ātman* (e. g. in verses 5, 10) for the Immutable, while III. 2 is intended to teach the doctrine of the *puruṣa*. The first verse of III. 2 is very important. 'He [the knower of *ātman*—III. 1. 10] knows this Highest Abode in the form of Brahman (*paramam brahmadhāma*). Those wise men who without a desire [for the fruit] worship *puruṣa* (described in III. 3) go beyond this bright one (*śukram etat*) (III. 2. 1). Here the terms *brahmadhāma* and *śukra* make it clear that *ātman* in III. 1 is used for Brahman, which is the womb for *puruṣa* (III. 1. 3). The term *śukra* 'the bright one' is so used in Kāṭha Up. V. 8, VI. 1, VI. 17, also in Śve. Up. IV. 2. 'This' (*etat*) in 'this bright one' (*śukram etat*) in verse 1 refers to *brahmadhāma* which is an explanation of *ātman* in III. 1. 10. But the term *ātman* in

III. 2. 3-4 is used for *puruṣa* mentioned in III. 2. 1. In III. 2. 3-4 it is said that *puruṣa* or *ātman* can be obtained by no other means than 'selection' (*varaṇa*), and the latter half of verse 4 says that "But this self of that knower who tries to obtain him by these means (Vedic study etc. mentioned in III. 3) enters the Brahman-abode (*brahmadhāma*) [but not *puruṣa*]"'. That III. 2 is intended to teach *puruṣa-vidyā* is proved by the mention of *puruṣa* higher than the Highest in III. 2. 8.

So, in the history of the term *ātman* we have to admit a period when it meant in some texts the Immutable and in others the *puruṣa*, especially, at the time when these two were actually distinguished from each other as in the Mu., Pr., and Śve Upaniṣads. This is quite natural because even when the term *ātman* was used with reference to the "self", as in the Chā. and Br. Upaniṣads, it was thought of as possessing those attributes and functions which are later on divided between *akṣara* and *puruṣa*.

In Chā. Up. IV. 15. 1. *puruṣa*, *ātman*, *amṛta* and Brahman are all identified, and *ātman* is not different from the impersonal Immortal. So also in Br. Up. IV. 4. 25 where *puruṣa* is absent.

In the Kāṭha Up. which seems to be later than the Svetāśvatara in as much as the latter does not know the evolutionary series which the former mentions twice, an effort is made to distinguish the various meanings of *ātman* by qualifying the term by such words as *jñāna*, *mahān*, *śānta* (II. 13) and *maṭhvada*, *jīva* (IV. 5). So also *akṣara ātman* in Pr. Up. IV. 9.

Thus *ātman* in Śve. Up. I. 10b means the Immutable (*akṣara*.)

15. The word *māyā* "deceit" in verse 10 is explained in verse 11 as the fetters. It does not seem to mean the illusion of the existence of the world, but it means the cause of the bondage and the bondage itself. In absolute the 'all' (*viśva*) does not cease to exist but the liberated gets the lordship over the all (I. 10-11).

16. The three mentioned in verse 12 are the same as those in verse 9. In 12 the names of these three are given from the standpoint of 'enjoyment'. So, the Enjoyable is the Immutable from which the Mutable or the First Evolver and the whole creation proceed.

2. Sve. Up. V. 1.'

There are, with Brahman above them (*brahmapare*) two infinite Imperishables, wherein Knowledge (*vidyā*) and not-Knowledge (*avidyā*) are placed concealed. Not-Knowledge is the Mutable (*kṣara*), Knowledge is the Immortal. He who rules over the Knowledge and the not-Knowledge is other than these two.

NOTES :—

1. In this verse the Supreme Brahman is said to be above 'two Imperishables'. One of these is the hiding place of 'Knowledge', *vidyā*, which is identified with 'the Immortal'. As said in note 11 on Sve. Up. I. 7-12 the Immortal means the Immutable. This conclusion will follow also from the fact that 'the not-Knowledge', the opposite of Knowledge, is identified with the Mutable (*kṣara*). These terms (*vidyā* and *avidyā*) with these meanings have played a great part in the Mahābhārata philosophical Schools.

2. The identification of 'Knowledge' with *amṛta* i. e. the Immutable, seems to be the identification of the means and the aim. In Kena Up. 12 we are told that 'one attains the Immortal through Knowledge'. So also in Īśā Up. 11. In the Pāñcārātra system, *vidyā* 'Knowledge' is a synonym for the higher Nature (i. e. the Immutable). See Prof. Schrader's Introduction to the Pāñcārātra and the Āturbudhnya Saṁhitā, P. 62).

3. The idea of 'two Imperishables' (*akṣaras*) one of which is (the place of) the Immutable and the other (that of) the Mutable is like that of two Unmanifests (*avyaklas*) in Bh. Gī. VIII. 20. According to the Gītā, all beings (called the Mutable in Bh. Gī. VIII. 4, XV. 16) rise from the lower Unmanifest, just as the Mutable in the form of "not-Knowledge" is to be traced to the Imperishable according to this verse of the Sve. Up.

The higher Unmanifest of the Gītā (VIII. 20-21) is, according to the terminology of the Gītā, *akṣara* "the Immutable" properly so called. Thus, the two Imperishables are also the same as the two *prakṛtis* in the Bh. Gī. VII. 4-6.

*See Additional Note.

The Mutable in the form of *pradhāna* is the second Imperishable (I. 10). The kind of vagueness in the sense of *kṣāra* ' the Mutable ' (used for *pradhāna* or the second Imperishable in I. 8, 10 and for " not-Knowledge " the effect of that Imperishable in V. 1.) is due to the fact that the Sve. Up. is the first Up. to use the term *kṣāra* in contrast to *akṣāra*. The Ruler of Knowledge and not-Knowledge or the two Imperishables is the same as the Ruler mentioned in Sve. Up. I. 8, and 10 and also in Bh. Gī. XV. 18.

CONCLUSION :—

This Upaniṣad is important from various standpoints, especially from that of the idea of Trinity. But here we are concerned only with its terminology the fixation of which will be facilitated by the following considerations :—

1. The Immutable is according to this Upaniṣad lower than Brahma (V. 1).

2. The highness or superiority of *puruṣa* to the Immutable is here interpreted as the Immutable's being ruled by *puruṣa* the Ruler (I. 8, 10 ; V. 1).

3. It is impersonal (I. 10.), but again it is described as a female (I. 9, IV. 5 – a female unborn). This idea seems to have arisen out of the conception of *akṣāra* as the "matrix" (*yoni*) for *puruṣa* (e. g. in Mu. Up. I. 3, Sve Up. V. 6). In this connection it may be noted that the Sve. Up. is the first Upaniṣad to use the terms *prakṛti*, *māyā* (IV. 10), and *śakti* (I. 3.) for the Immutable. When *puruṣa* was placed above the Immutable, the idea suggested itself naturally that the Immutable was the power of, or the "matrix" for, *puruṣa*, and this idea further developed into a number of words of the feminine gender invented for the Immutable (e. g. *vidyā*, *māyā*, *prakṛti*). The term *māyā* (Sve. Up. IV. 9–10) also shows that *māyā* was supposed to be a power belonging to *puruṣa*. The term *ajā* " the female unborn " was suggested by the term *aja* "unborn" for *puruṣa* and the Jīva and by the fact that the Immutable called either *akṣāra* or Brahman or *ānān* was considered to be the female generative organ (*yoni*) for *puruṣa* (VI. 16, I. 2, V. 6). This term *ajā* was also responsible for the invention of the term *prakṛti*.

4. This Immutable is unborn, just as in the Gītā (VIII. 20, XIII. 10).

5. The Immutable and the Mutable are joined together, i. e. as the cause and the effect; so *pradhāna* is the effect of the Immutable.

The terminology of Śve. Up. may, then, be summarised as follows :—

1. The Reality is threefold or a Triad and it is called *paramam brahina* (I. 7), *brahman*, (I. 9) or *trividham brahman* (I. 12).

2. *Puruṣa* is called *puruṣa* (I. 2), *īśa* — (I. 8, 9, 10 ; V. 1), *deva* (I. 8, 11), *jñā* (I. 9), *ātman* (I. 9), *preṇitṛ* (I. 12, 16), *Brahman* (V. 1).

3. The Immutable is called *akṣara* (I. 1, 10 ; V. 1), *Brahman* (I. 7, V. 6), *avyakta* (I. 8), *ajā* (I. 9), *ātman* (I. 3, 6, 10 ; VI. 16), *bhogyā* (I. 12), *haras* (I. 10), *amṛta* (I. 10 ; V. 1), (the abode of) *vidyā* (V. 1), (and also *māyā* and *prakṛti* in IV. 10).

4. The lower Nature is meant by the Imperishable (V. 1), (the abode of) *avidyā* (V. 1), *kṣara* (I. 8, 10), *vyakta* 'the Manifest' (I. 8).

5. The effects also of the lower Nature are called *kṣara* (V. 1) or *avidyā* (V. 1).

6. The individual soul is designated as *anīśa* (I. 8, 9), *bhokṛ* (I. 8, 9, 12), *ajñā* (I-9).

Let us, finally, see how the Trinity of the Śve. Up. is found in the Gītā :—

We should here compare the various forms of the Lord in Bh. Gī. VII. 29-30 and VIII. 1-4 with the members of the triad in Śve Up. I. 6-12. In the Gītā we are told that one should know the Lord with his Adhibhūta, Adhidaiva, Adhyajñā and Adhyātma forms, while in Śve. Up. we read : "It is [the attainment of] Brahma, when one attains the three" (I. 9). *Puruṣa* or the Adhidaiva of Bh. Gī. VIII. 4 is called

puruṣa in Śve. Up. I. 2, *īśa* and *deva* in Śve. Up. I. 8. The Immutable is called *akṣara* in both the texts (Bh. Gī. VIII. 3, and Śve. Up. I. 8, 10). The second Imperishable or *pradhāna* (Śve. Up. I. 10) which is the same as *kṣara* and *vyākṣa* is to be identified with *svabhāva* or Adhyātma in Bh. Gī. VIII. 3. *Kṣara* 'the effect of the Imperishable' (Śve. Up. V. 1) is the Adhībhūta (Bh. Gī. VIII. 4a). The *bhoktṛ* (Śve. Up. I. 9) is the Adhīyajña in Bh. Gī. VIII. 4. Besides these identifications, the Bh. Gī. speaks of the Immutable, the Jīva and *puruṣa* as 'eternal', *sanātana*, in IV. 31, VIII. 20, in II. 24, XV. 7 and in XI. 18, VII. 10 respectively. The higher Nature or the Immutable and *puruṣa* are called 'beginningless' *anādi* in XIII. 19 and X. 3; and the attribute *aja*, 'unborn', is applied to the Jīva in Bh. Gī. II. 21 and to the Lord in IV. 6, VII. 25, X. 3, 12. Thus, the Bhagavadgītā is also inclined to regard the three members of the Trinity of the Śve. Up. as eternal (see App. II).

APPENDIX II.

INTERPRETATION OF THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ.

It is intended here to explain from my standpoint the *akṣara*-passages of the Gītā. The meanings assigned by various ancient and modern authorities to the term *akṣara* in the verses concerned have been stated in a tabular form in the Introduction.

1. Bh. Gī. III. 14d-15.

Sacrifice is born of Activity (*karman*). Know Activity to be born of *brahman* [the lower Nature] and *brahman* as born of 'the Immutable' (*akṣara*); therefore [this *akṣara* which may be called] the omnipresent [and] eternal Brahman is to be found in Sacrifice (i. e., it is the final source to which Sacrifice can be traced).

NOTES :—

1. The term 'Brahman' when used for 'the Immutable' (*akṣara*) is qualified by the two epithets 'omnipresent' and 'eternal' in order to distinguish it from *brahman* which is born of 'the Immutable' and is not therefore eternal.

2. The lower Nature is here said to be "born" of the Immutable. This passage of the Gītā is very important on account of this clear and doubtless statement regarding the lower Nature. See notes, below, on Gītā XIII. 19. '*Brahman*', the lower Nature, is said to be 'born' also in Mu. Up: I. 1. 9. "*Brahman*" seems to have been used for the lower Nature in contrast with the higher Nature which is called *mahad brahman* in Bh. Gī. XIV. 3-4.

2. Bh. Gī. VII. 29-30, VIII. 1-5, 8.

(VII. 29) Those who, having resorted to me, endeavour for freedom from old age and death, know that Brahman, the whole spiritual form (*adhyātma*) and the whole Activity (*karman*).

(30) Those who know me with my material and divine forms (*adhibhūta* and *adhidaiva*), and with my form as the sacrificial agent (*adhiyajña*), will also, with their mind disciplined through Yoga, know me at the time of [their] departure [from this world].

ARJUNA SAID :—

(VIII. 1-2) What is that Brahman ? What is the spiritual form ? What, Oh Puruṣottama, is Activity ? What is said to be the material form ? How is the divine form [to be understood] ? And who in this body here is the sacrificial agent, O slayer of Madhu ? And how are you known [even] at the time of departure [from this world] by those who are self-disciplined ?

THE LORD SAID :—

(3) The Immutable (*akṣara*) is the Supreme Brahman (*prama brahman*); the [lower] Nature (*svabhāva*) is the spiritual form (*adhyātma*). The act of creating (*visarga*) causing the birth and existence of beings is [technically] named Activity (*karman*).

(4) The material form (*adhibhūta*) is the mutable existence (*kṣara bhāva*), and the divine form (*adhidaiva*) is *puruṣa*. O best of the embodied beings, I myself am the sacrificial agent (*adhiyajña*) in this body.

(5) And he who, while leaving the physical frame at the time of death, departs remembering me alone, attains to my state; there is no doubt as to this.

x

x

x

(6) He reaches the divine supreme *puruṣa*, meditating [on him] with a concentrated mind disciplined by the path of constant application (*abhyāsa-yoga*).

NOTES :—

1. This passage must be considered in connection with III. 14 c-d, 15. "The whole Activity" (VII. 29) shows that the topic of *karman* is here further discussed. *Brahman*,

karm in, *yajña* (in *adhivajña*) and *akṣara* are dealt with in both the places. VIII. 5 also reminds one of II. 72.

2. Brahman in VII. 29 and VIII. 1 is the omnipresent and eternal Brahman mentioned in III. 15.

3. As the term *adhyātma* seems to have been used in the Gītā always in the sense of 'spiritual' (vide Bh. Gī. XI. 1), we can distinguish between *adhibhūta* and *adhyātma* by translating them as 'material' and 'spiritual' forms. *Adhidaiva* may therefore be fitly translated as the 'divine form', so that it may be distinguished from *adhyātma*. As verse VII. 30 states that *adhibhūta*, *adhidaiva* and *adhiyajña* are the forms belonging to Kṛṣṇa, we should not hesitate in taking *adhyātma* (VII. 29) also as one of his forms. These three forms may also be called Kṛṣṇa's supernatural (*adhidaiva*), super-sensual (*adhyātma*), and sensual (*adhibhūta*) forms, thus implying the 'higher-ness', *paratva*, of each, which, as we shall see later on, is distinctly mentioned in the Gītā.

4. They may be regarded as the purely transcendent, the transcendent-and-immanent and the purely immanent forms. *Puruṣa* is only transcendent; therefore he is called 'divine', *adhidaiva* or *dīva* (VIII. 8, 10), or 'the highest', *para* (VIII. 10) or *parama* (VIII. 8). For the same reason he is also called *puruṣottama* (VIII. 1), because he 'is beyond the Mutable and higher than the Immutable' (XV. 18). The purely immanent or material form of Kṛṣṇa is 'the mutable existence' (VIII. 4). When the Gītā explains the immanence of the Lord e. g. in VII. 7-12, X. 20-42, XI. XV. 12-15, it is always with reference to this form of the Lord. Whatever is neither purely immanent nor purely transcendent, may be classified as constituting the transcendent-and-immanent or *adhyātma* form. Now, let us see what existences (*bhāvūḥ*) constitute 'adhyātma in its entirety', *kṛtsnam adhyātmam* (VII. 29). The Gītā clearly states that *svabhāva* 'the lower Nature', is *adhyātma* (VIII. 3). The Gītā also says that *karmaṇ* is born of *svabhāva* (e. g. in V. 14); and in III. 14 *karmaṇ* is said to be born of *brahman*. So *svabhāva* being identical with *brahman*, the immediate cause of *karmaṇ*, is born of the Immutable (III. 15b).

The fact that the Gītā understands the lower Nature (*svabhāva*, *brahman*, *prakṛti*, etc) to be *adhyātma* and explains the *adhibhūta* form as 'all beings' is noteworthy. The Gītā distinguishes between the two Natures, but does not make the

lower Nature *adhibhūta*. The Mahābhārata always understands *adhyātma* with reference only to *akṣara* and *puruṣa*, while the author of the Brahmasūtras identifies both the Natures (Br. Sū. I. 4. 23–28, see Chap. IV. p. 101) and according to him the Nature will be *adhyātma*.

‘The Immutable’ by its very nature stands above ‘the Mutable’ or *adhibhūta*. ‘The Immutable’ is quite distinct from, and lower than, *puruṣa* who is the highest; so *akṣara* seems to be one of the constituents of the ‘entire *adhyātma*’ mentioned in VII. 29. The Activity or *karman* (VIII. 3) as the effect of *brahman*, *svabhāva* or the lower *prakṛti* (III. 15, V. 14, III. 27) is also a constituent of the same, because ‘the material form’ consists only of “the beings”.

So, on the data of III. 14–15 and VII. 29–30 and VIII. 1–8 we arrive at the following table :—

parama divya puruṣa (VIII. 8)

= the supreme divine *puruṣa*

= *adhidaiva*

= the supernatural or the transcendent form.

|

akṣara “the Immutable” + *brahman* (III. 15a) or *svabhāva* (VIII. 3, V. 14) or the lower *prakṛti* (e. g. III. 27), + *karman* the “Activity” (III. 14, VIII 3 c-d, III. 27)

= *adhyātma*

= the supersensual or the transcendent-and-immanent form.

|

kṣara = the Mutable (VIII. 4), = “ all beings ”, *bhūtāni*, mentioned in III. 14 and VIII. 4

= the sensual or purely immanent form.

We find that this sequence of gradation arrived at from these two passages, is confirmed by XV. 16–18, which may therefore be next taken up for consideration.

3. Bh. Gī. XV. 16-18.

(16) There are these two *puruṣas* in the world: 'the Mutable' (*kṣara*) and 'the Immutable' (*akṣara*). 'The Mutable' consists of all beings; the Unchanging is called 'the Immutable'.

(17) The Highest *puruṣa*, however, is (yet) another; he is called 'the Highest Spirit' (*paramātmān*), the imperishable Lord who sustains the three worlds, having penetrated them.

(18) As I am beyond the Mutable and as I am higher even than the Immutable; hence am I well-known in the world and in the Veda as 'the Highest *puruṣa*' (*puruṣottama*).

NOTES:—

1. We have seen in the passages already examined that *puruṣa*, the Immutable and the Mutable are the three forms of Kṛṣṇa. The same is the idea of this passage. In VIII. 1 Kṛṣṇa was addressed by Arjuna as *puruṣottama*; here he calls himself "*puruṣottama* well-known in the world and in the Veda". The reason why the *puruṣa* of the other passages in the Gītā (e. g. VIII 4, 8, 10, 22; XI. 38; X. 12) is called here *puruṣottama* seems to be that his own other two forms have been here described as *puruṣas* which term is here used in a secondary sense ("principle"), the purpose being that of pointing out the inferiority of *kṣara* and *akṣara* to *puruṣa* mentioned also in VIII 3-4. *Puruṣottama* is a special term of the MBh. Pāñcarātras.

2. 'The Mutable' is lower than 'the Immutable'; this is the force of *apī* 'even' in *akṣarād apī c ottamaḥ*—XV. 18. It consists of all beings (XV. 16 c-d); so it is the same Mutable as is explained in VIII. 4a.

3. 'The Immutable' is naturally not different from the same mentioned in VIII. 1. It is above 'the Mutable' and is said to be in the world (XV. 16) because *puruṣa* or *puruṣottama* is higher even than 'the Immutable'. 'The Immutable' is described to be the Unchanging, *kūṭastha*, both here and in XII 3, where undoubtedly *akṣara* means the impersonal form of the Lord.

4. *Akṣara* cannot mean the individual soul (as the term is often understood) in the Gītā because in the Gītā the Jīva is never said to be lower than the Lord but is always regarded

as identical with him (being his own 'part'). Again, there is no passage in the Gītā, where the Jīva is given the designation ' *akṣara* '. Moreover, 'the Immutable' is according to the Gītā an object of meditation (XII. 3-4) and the goal of ascetics (VII.11); while the Jīva is never such an object nor such a goal. The term *akṣara*, is here used in contrast with the term *kṣara*, as in VIII 3-4, and therefore must have the same meaning here as in that verse (see notes 6-7 on Śve. Up. I. 7-12).

4. Bh. Gī. XII. 1-4.

ARJUN SAID:—

(1) Which of those devotees who thus worship you with constant devotion and those, on the other hand, who [worship] 'the Immutable' (*akṣara*), 'the Unmanifest' (*avyakta*), are the better learned in the [science of the various] paths?

THE LORD SAID :—

(2) Those who having fixed their mind on me, being always devoted [to me], and possessed of the highest belief [in me], worship me, are considered by me to be the best possessed of the [right] path.

(3-4) Those, however, who worship 'the Immutable' (*akṣara*) the ineffable, the unmanifest, the omnipresent, the unthinkable, the unchanging, the unmoving, and the firm, having controlled the group of the organs (of sense and action), having the same feeling towards everything, and rejoicing in the welfare of all beings, obtain none but me.

NOTES :—

1. The Gītā here, mentions the 'Immutable' and *puruṣa* as the goals reached by the released; so there are two kinds of worship or meditation and two independent paths. 'Yoga' in XIII. 1 means a path for salvation.

2. The worshippers of the Immutable are here contrasted with those of *puruṣa*. This contrast was already a burning question in the days of the Muṇḍaka, Praśna, and Svetāśvatara Upaniṣads (Vide App. I). Though the Immutable is not here

stated to be lower than *puruṣa*, it is 'lower' according to XV. 16-18 (and VIII. 21-22, as we shall just see). The worshippers of *puruṣa* are said to be better possessed of the right path than those of the Immutable because these latter choose a path more troublesome than that of the former (XII. 5).

3. The worshippers of 'the Immutable' are not generally said in the *Gītā* to reach *puruṣa*. As a rule they "enter the Immutable" (VIII. 11). So also in VII. 21; II. 72; V. 6, 24; VI. 28. Similarly the worshippers of *puruṣa* usually attain *puruṣa* (VIII. 10; VIII. 22; VI. 31; VII. 18, 19; VIII. 5, 16). In XVIII. 53-55, we are told that one who is devoid of the idea of 'mine' *mama* 'becomes Brahman' and then, having secured devotion to Kṛṣṇa, enters Kṛṣṇa. So, on the strength of these passages (XII. 4, VIII. 11, XV. 53-55), we may, without assigning a secondary or metaphorical sense, to any word or sentence in these verses, conclude that generally the meditators on 'the Immutable' reach 'the Immutable' and that some of them reach also Kṛṣṇa after having obtained devotion to him.

4. The verse under consideration (XII. 4) is important from the standpoint of the relation of the Immutable to *puruṣa*. As (some at least of) the *akṣara*-meditators are said to reach *puruṣa* just like the *puruṣa*-worshippers; the Immutable is not to be understood as a second independent entity by the side of *puruṣa*, though undoubtedly according to the *Gītā* the Immutable is to be distinguished from *puruṣa* and is in a way lower than *puruṣa*, as said above in note 2. The next passage which we have to examine throws further light on the present question.

5. Bh. Gī. VIII. 18-22.

(18) All manifestations arise at the advent of the Day of Brahmā from the [lower] Unmanifest (*avyakta*); they are absorbed at the advent of the Night into that same called [technically] the Unmanifest.

(19)—This same group of beings having repeatedly become [manifest] is dissolved [into its original source] at the advent of the Night, without a will of their own; O son of Pṛthā, it arises [also similarly] at the advent of the Day—

(20) However, beyond that Unmanifest [technically so called], there is another 'eternal Unmanifest Existence' (*sanātana avyakta bhāva*) which does not perish when all beings perish.

(21) This [latter] Unmanifest Existence is [technically] called the Immutable (*akṣara*); [the sages] call it the Highest Goal. That [Existence] [from which the liberated], after having reached it, do not return, is my Supreme Abode (*parama dhāman*).

(22) Higher (than the Immutable) is that *puruṣa* obtainable through undivided devotion, in the interior of whom [all] beings rest and by whom all this [visible world] is permeated.

NOTES :—

1. Verse 19 is a parenthetical one. The lower Unmanifest in 18 is the source of all beings mentioned in verse 10. Verse 20 mentions two Unmanifest Existences. One of them is withdrawn when all beings perish. The other, the higher one, is eternal. This is called 'the Immutable' (*akṣara*) in verse 21. It is the highest goal [of the worshippers of the Immutable].

2. I have followed the reading according to Śaṅkara's commentary. If we had to read *vyaktāt* in place of *a-vyaktāt* in 20 b, we lose the force of the contrast intended in the verse. Moreover, there is no difficulty in understanding the doctrine of the two Unmanifest Existences, as we have seen above. The lower Unmanifest is again mentioned in Bh.Gī. XIII. 5 where *avyakta* is the source of *buddhi* and therefore is the same as the lower *prakṛti* (Bh. Gī. VII. 4). This doctrine of two *avyaktas* became most important in the days of the LMBh., as will be seen from Ch. III.

3. That the word *dhāman* in verse 21 d means 'abode' can be shown on the strength of the passages in the Gītā in which the same or a similar word like *pada* or *sthāna* or a verb showing motion from one place to another (with reference to the movement of the released) is used. In this verse also the expressions, 'having reached' and 'do not return,' point to the correctness of the interpretation. So, *akṣara* is the 'abode' wherein Kṛṣṇa (or *puruṣa*) dwells, and perhaps we are to understand the *puruṣa* "being higher" than the Immutable in this sense also.

4. Verse 22 should be studied along with IX. 4. In the former that *puruṣa* in the interior of whom the beings rest and by whom "all this" is penetrated is mentioned, in the latter the same is said of Kṛṣṇa. So *puruṣa* of verse 22 is the *puruṣottama* of XV. 18, and *paraḥ* in the first quarter of verse 22 distinctly

means that *puruṣa* is higher (*para*) than the Immutable. *Puruṣa* is never identified with *akṣara* in the Gītā. In Bh. Gī. VIII. 3-4 both of them are clearly distinguished from each other.

6. Bh. Gī. XI. 18, 37 c-d.

(18) You are the Immutable (*akāṣa*) the highest worth knowing, you are the highest resting place of all this [world]. You are the imperishable eternal protector of Dharma. I believe you to be the eternal *puruṣa*.

(37 c-d) O Infinite One, Lord of the gods, abode of the world, you are 'the Immutable' (*akṣara*), the Being (i. e. the Manifest), the not-Being (i. e. the Unmanifest), and whatever is beyond that.

NOTES :—

1. First, it should be noted that these are the words of Arjuna who out of his homage to Kṛṣṇa identifies him by turn with all the various gods and yet places him above all of them. Secondly, in verse 18, Kṛṣṇa is identified with the Immutable and also with *puruṣa*. The same is also the sense of verse 37, where Kṛṣṇa is said to be the Immutable and what is beyond it. This last expression 'what is beyond the Immutable', refers to *puruṣa*. So, according to these verses also *puruṣa* is above *akṣara*.

CONCLUSION :—

On the strength of the above passages in which *akṣara* is mentioned expressly the conception of the Immutable in the Gītā may be summarised as follows:—

(1) The Immutable in the Gītā is described (e. g. in XII. 3) in the same negative terms in which the Upaniṣads describe *akṣara* (e. g. Br. Up. III. 8. 8; Mu. Up. I. 1. 6) or *avyakta* (e. g. Kaṭha Up. III. 15). The Gītā says that it describes the same *akṣara* as is described by the knowers of the Vedā (VIII. 11).

2. It is distinct from *puruṣa* or *puruṣottama* (VIII. 3-4, 10-11, 21-22; XII 1-4; XV. 16-18).

3. It is lower than *puruṣa* or *puruṣottama* (VIII. 21-22, XV. 18).

4. It is other than the lower Nature called *svabhāva* (VIII. 3), or the lower *avyakta* (VIII. 18-20), or *brahman* " the immediate cause of Activity " (III. 15).

5. It is above this lower Nature (VIII. 20-21), or in other words the lower Nature is "born" of the Immutable (III. 15).

6. It is above the Mutable (XV. 18.) or all beings (VIII. 18-19; VIII. 4; III. 14-15).

7. In relation to *puruṣa*, the Immutable may be described as ' the supreme abode ' of the *puruṣa* (*dhīma paramaṁ mama*-VIII. 21-22; and *pāda*-VIII. 11).

8. It is the ultimate source of all ' Activity ' (*karman*) (III. 14-15) and all beings (III. 14-15, VIII. 18-19).

9. It is like *puruṣa* an independent object of meditation and a goal (XII. 1-4, VIII. 21). Particularly it is the goal of ascetics (VIII. 11).

10. Some meditators of the Immutable reach *puruṣa* (XII. 4, XVIII. 53-55).

11. It may be called *parama akṣara* (VIII. 3), *paramā gati* (VIII. 21), *parama dhāman* (VIII. 21), *avyakta* (VIII. 20-21, XII 1, 3), *kūṭastha* (XII 3, XV. 17).

12. Though both the Immutable and the *puruṣa* are independently objects and goals of meditation, the author of the *Gītā* thinks the latter to be the better of the two because it can be understood and reached with less trouble (XII. 5).

13. The Immutable is one of the three eternal (*sanātana*) principles in the *Gītā* (VIII. 20) and it does not perish even when all beings including the lower Unmanifest perish. So, *akṣara* is unborn, unlike the lower *avyakta*, its effect (VIII. 18, III. 15). It is also *kūṭastha* ' unchanging '.

APPENDIX III.

NO PLURALITY OF SOULS IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA.

Most of the passages in the Mahābhārata which Prof. Hopkins, Prof. Deussen and Prof. Edgerton have explained as referring to the doctrine of the plurality of souls have been already discussed in Chapter III of the Thesis and it has been shown that they have not the least knowledge of this doctrine (see Ch. III. Sec. 2). Only two passages where Prof. Hopkins believes that we have the mention of the plurality of souls remain to be considered here, viz., MBh. XII. 315. 10e-f, 11ff, and MBh. XII. 350. 1-3, 7.

1. MBh. XII. 315. 10e-f, 11ff.

These verses can be easily translated as follows :—

(10e-f) The Unmanifest is eternal; the Manifest, non-eternal. Thus we have learnt.

(11) Men, who have compassion for all beings and who have resorted to *kevala jñāna* ('the knowledge of the Absolute'), say that the Unmanifest is one and also many.

(12) Different [from the Unmanifest] is the Puruṣa; but the Unmanifest called the Unchangeable * is [in reality] not unchangeable. Just as stalks [issue] in the rush, so is this [Unmanifest] born [as the Manifest].

* Cf. Cūlikā Upaniṣad : "*aṣṭarūpām ajām dhruvām*" and Bh. Gī. "*kūṭasīhoṣkṣara ucyate*" (Bh. Gī. XV. 16). This verse of the MBh. (XII. 315. 12. a-b) also proves my point that the L. MBh. Sāṃkhyas have identified the two Natures of the Aupanishadas. (I am thankful to Prof. Schrader for the above interpretation of MBh. XII. 315. 12 and for drawing my attention to the passages from Cū. Up. and Bh. Gī.).

It should be noted that these verses use the terms *vyakta* and *avyakta* for the two metaphysical principles of the Sāṃkhya of those names. This is apparent from the context. Prof. Hopkins' translation of 10 a-b must appear queer to any reader: "Puruṣa is eternal and non-eternal, manifest and unmanifest". (GEI. p. 123). Such an interpretation requires no refutation. Then, in the case of verse 11, Prof. Hopkins removes *ṣuṣāḥ* from its grammatical connection as subject of *āhuḥ* in "avyaktaikatvān ily āhur nānātvaṃ ṣuṣās tathā" (11 a-b). He wants to show that this sentence teaches the doctrine of the plurality of souls and therefore makes an independent sentence of "nānātvaṃ ṣuṣās tathā" (GEI. p. 123). In fact *ekatva* and *nānātva* in 11 refer to the eternal Unmanifest and to the non-eternal Manifest in 10 e-f. In this sense they have been used very often in L. MBh, e. g. in XII. 305. 36 (see pp. 45, 74, 76). *Avyakta* means the Sāṃkhya Nature, and therefore Prof. Edgerton is also wrong when he explains *avyakta-ekatva* as 'the esoteric unity of souls' and '*nānātva*' as 'the empirical plurality' and quotes examples where '*avyakta*' is used of Brahman or the Lord, but does not trouble himself about what it could have meant throughout in these Sāṃkhya chapters of the L. MBh. (AJP. Vol XLV, 1924, p. 26) Prof. Deussen is quite right here when he explains *ṣuṣāḥ* in 11 b as human beings and as the subject to *āhuḥ* in 11a (VPTM p. 653).

2. MBh. XII. 350. 1-3, 7.

The second and last passage which remains to be examined in this connection is found in chapter 350 of MBh. XII, which teaches indeed a plurality of souls, but without reference to the Classical Sāṃkhya and in a different sense. The first fact to be borne in mind in interpreting the verses in question is that they are, like the whole of the Nārāyaṇīa,* much later than the chapters describing the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga Schools of the Mahābhārata (XII. 302-317), and that the two chapters (350-351) dealing with the problem, never before raised, of *ṣuṣa-bahutva* form the very last section of

* This is evident from its general character, but also e. g. from the statement (343, 11 fl.) that "the nectar of the story about Nārāyaṇa" has been won by churning the ocean of the "Bhārata of one hundred thousand (verses)".

the Nārāyaṇīya. Secondly, the verses state that the philosophers of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga Schools believed in many souls "in the world" (*bāhavaḥ puruṣā loke**—MBh. XII. 350. 2). Thus the passage mentions an empirical plurality of souls, and not a real one which came to be believed in perhaps only when the Sāṃkhya became atheistic. Moreover, in verse 350. 7, the interpolator of these chapters (350–351) himself admits that "Vyāsa" did not teach plurality of souls, but only "unity of *puruṣa*" (*puruṣaikatva*). This is a frank admission that in the Mahābhārata we have always "unity of soul", since "Vyāsa" can refer only to the "author" of the Mahābhārata. And lastly, as regards the explanation of the problem given here, it is not the desire of the interpolator to misrepresent the (Classical) Sāṃkhya view, as Prof. Hopkins charges him with having done, but the interpolator admitting that the Sāṃkhyas teach an empirical plurality of souls, tries to explain it from his own standpoint (350. 7) which is that of a Pāñcarātra, as Prof. Schrader rightly points out to me. The doctrine of one Puruṣa as the "Source" (*yonī*) of many souls (*bahūnāṃ puruṣānāṃ yathā aikā yonih*—XII. 350. 3) represents the position of the Pāñcarātras who admitted a real internal difference (*svagatabheda*) in one sole Being.

Thus, even this last passage goes directly against Prof. Hopkins' conclusions, and on the contrary, admits positively that in the Mahābhārata "Vyāsa" has taught 'unity of *puruṣa*' (350. 7).

I would not repeat here the other passages discussed already in the text (see Ch. III. pp. 42, 45, 74, 78) where I have shown that Professors Hopkins, Deussen and Edgerton were wrong in referring them to plurality of souls. Thus, in the Mahābhārata we have no plurality of souls and the only passage where an empirical plurality of souls is mentioned without expressly excluding a real world-soul and a Supreme Lord is also a witness for the "unity of *puruṣa*" in the Mahābhārata.

*"*loke*" means "in the world", as opposed to '*Vede*' "in the Scripture;" compare "*loke Vede ca prallītaḥ Puruṣottamaḥ*" (Bh. Gī. XV. 18), and also "*lokavat*" in Br. Sū II. 1. 13, 33, etc. and "*loke*" in Br. Sū. II. 1. 25, where also "*loke*" is contrasted with what is stated "in the Śruti".

APPENDIX IV.

INTERPRETATION OF THE BRAHMASŪTRAS.

This appendix has been prompted by two considerations: firstly, I felt it to be my duty to the reader of Chapter IV to justify in a more extensive way the unusual method applied there in the interpretation of the Sūtras; and, secondly, I wish to invite criticism of my method with a view to undertaking if encouraged to do so, an independent interpretation of the whole of the Brahmasūtras. The contrast between my interpretation and those of the Ācāryas is the necessary result of my conviction that these, including even Śaṅkara, were not in possession of an unbroken tradition. How the latter got lost, I am at present unable to explain; but the fact of its having been broken long before Śaṅkara will, I believe, become evident from the consistency of my interpretation in the following pages as against the farfetchedness and often palpable impossibility of those of the Ācāryas.

1. Br. Sū. III.3.1-53.

SECTION* 1.

Oneness of Goal.

(1) [Brahman] is such that the [very same] idea thereof is [to be had] from all the Vedānta texts, because of the absence of any difference in the scriptural injunction, etc.

(2) If it be argued: "No. [All the Vedānta texts do not teach the same Brahman] because of the difference [in scriptural injunction, etc.]", we reply: "No. [If the Vedānta texts are similar] even in one [out of the scriptural injunction, name, etc.] [we would say that all of them teach the same Brahman]."

*The division of the Sections (*adhikaraṇas*) followed here is my own.

(3) [Although the same Brahman is taught in all the Vedānta texts, one learns only one of these and not all] because [the rule of studying] the text of one's own Vedic Branch is indeed such, and one is religiously qualified for [the study of] the customary text (only). And that rule is like that of [taking] the water [from one particular well, although one can take it from any other watering place as well]¹

(4) And [there is a text which] also shows it².

NOTES :—

1. The reading "*savavacca*" in place of *sahlavacca* will give the following interpretation . " And that rule is like that of the *sava*-sacrifices [where complete option is given]."

2. e. g. Bh. Gī. VIII. 11, as Śaṅkara rightly says. Note that the problem in this Section is whether all the Vedānta texts teach one and the same Brahman, or two, or many.

SECTION 2.

*Collection of Thoughts**

(5) A Collection [of all the attributes of the object of meditation, mentioned in all the Vedānta texts] [should be made], because of the non-difference (i.e. identity) of the goal, as [is done] in the case of [the rites] which are subordinate to *vidhū* (the Vedic precept), and [the collection should be made only] in so far as the context is similar¹ [in the Vedāntas concerned].

(6) If it be said : " The difference [of goals]² does exist because [of the authority] of the Word," we reply : " No, because of non-distinction [in the Word]."

(7) " Nor [can the view of the difference of goals be maintained] on the strength of a difference of ' the context ' (*prakaraṇa*) as in the case of *parovariyastva* " etc.

(8) If it be said : " [There is a difference of goals] because of ' the designations ' (*saṃjñā*) [like *akṣara* and *puruṣa*]," we reply : " It has been already explained, and that is even admitted here (by us)."

* *this*, as in Br. Sū. III.3.33

(9) And [the difference of goals] is inconsistent³ because of the omnipresence (of both the so-called goals).

NOTES :—

1. i. e., the Sūtrakāra allows the “collection” of the attributes of *puruṣa* only from the *puruṣa*-texts and not from the *akṣara*-texts also, when one meditates on *puruṣa*.

2. Note that the opponent seems to have in his mind the two goals : *akṣara* and *puruṣa*.

3. Śaṅkara reads ‘*samañjasam*,’ but I follow the reading accepted by most of the other Ācāryas.

SECTION 3.

Two Names of the Goal.

(10) Because there is no difference in all (other points), these two (designations) are (to be understood) otherwise¹.

Note :—

The Sūtrakāra agrees to a difference of two *saṃjñās*, not to that of goals, the goal being in all Upaniṣads (and the Gītā) the same because all other points, *codanā* etc. are the same everywhere.

SECTION 4.

Attributes of puruṣa.

(11) The attributes, beginning with “bliss” (*ānanda*) belong to *pradhāna*² [and should be collected for the meditation on the same, as said in Sūtra 5 above].

(12) The attributes, such as ‘having *prīya* for the head’ (*prīyaśiraśva*) do not come up for consideration because [these attributes show] an accumulation and a diminution which are [possible only] in case of there being a difference [in the “goals” to be achieved]³.

(13) But the other [attributes] [should be collected] because of the sameness of the object [of meditation].

(14) [The attributes such as ‘having *prīya* for the head’ are not to be collected] because of their non-utility in meditation.

(15) And because of the word *ātman*⁴ [used as predicate of *ānanda* in the Śruti].

NOTES:--

1. This is probably a reference to Br. Sū. I. 1. 12, because no Śruti gives a list beginning with bliss, as is required by the Sūtra, not even Tai. Up. II 1 which is referred to in Br. Sū I. 1. 12 and indirectly in the present Sūtra.

2. '*Pradhāna*' is a word used for *ṣuṣa* even according to Śaṅkara (Śā. Bhā. Br. Sū. III. 3. 33). In the days of the Sūtrakāra *pradhāna* was used for the personal *ṣuṣa* e. g. in MBh XIV. 19. 47-48, XIV. 18. 32 (see Chapter IV).

3. Note that the Sūtrakāra rejects such attributes of *ṣuṣa* (in Tai. Up. II. 5) as do not agree with his standpoint that *akṣara* and *ṣuṣa* are only two names for the same goal (Br. Sū. III. 3.8). He would reject also *brahma-ṣucchatva* of *ṣuṣa* in "*brahma ṣucchaṃ pratiṣṭhā*" (Tai. Up. II. 5).

4. "*Ānanda ātmā*" (Tai. Up. II. 5) may have meant : "*Ānanda* is the Atman of the *ṣuṣa* [just as *jīva* is the Atman of *akṣara* or Brahman, Chā. Up. VI. 3. 3]"; but the Sūtrakāra understands it to mean "*Ānanda* is the Atman" i. e. "*Ānanda* is the Paramātmā or *pradhāna*".

SECTION 5.

Method of ṣuṣa-meditation.

(16) *Pradhāna* should be grasped [in the meditation] as [identical with] the Self (*ātman*) [of the meditator], as is the case in [the meditation of] the other [i. e. *akṣara*], because of what follows.

(17) If it be said; "[*Pradhāna* should be so comprehended] because of the 'invariable concomitance' (*anvaya*)" we reply: "[Still] it may be because of the 'affirmation' *avadhāraṇa*)²"

NOTES :--

1. *Anvaya* is 'the invariable co-existence' (opp. of *vya-tireka*) ; here, that of the Jīva and *ṣuṣa* in the human heart (?)

2. *Avadhāraṇa* is "*eva*" in "*ātm ety ev opasīta*" Br. Up. I. 4. 7.

SECTION 6.

The Functions of akṣara and puruṣa.

(18) [The topic (*prakaraṇa*) in Tai. Up. II. 8] is not the same as that which has preceded, because of the description of the function [of *akṣara* in this passage].

(19–20) “(The functions of ‘delighting’ and ‘awing’) are the same; and this is so because of the non-difference (of the topic in these sections of the Vedānta). Even in other places it is so because of the connection (between the two functions)¹”.

(21) Not, indeed, because of the difference [between the two functions of ‘delighting’² and ‘awing’].

(22) And [the Śruti] shows it.

(23) Moreover on this ground [we distinguish between] ‘maintenance’ (or sustenance) (*saṃbhṛti*)³ and ‘heaven-pervasion’ *dyuṣṭyāpti*⁴ [as the functions of *puruṣa* and *akṣara* respectively].

(24) And [the topic in Tai. Up. II. 8. is not the same as in the preceding sections i.e. Tai. Up. II. 1–7] because the other attributes are not herein mentioned as they are in the sections of *puruṣa*-lore⁵.

(25) “[‘No, aksara is not mentioned in Tai. Up. II. 8’, or ‘No, the topic of Tai. Up. II. 8 is not different from that in the preceding sections’] because the objects, viz., penetration and others [mentioned here] are different [from those usually mentioned with respect to *akṣara*, e. g. those in Mu. Up. II. 2. 3–4]⁶”.

(26) [No], but in case of any one of these objects missing (*hām*) one should take it over (*upāyanam*)⁷ [from any other text where it is not missing], because of the subordination [of such objects] to the [express] Word, as is done in the case [of the non-mention of one or more] of *kūśa* grass, a piece of cloth (*ācchandās* – a seat?), a hymn and a by-song; this has been already explained.

27. (One must take in the objects not mentioned in his text from other texts where they are mentioned,) because there remains nothing to be accomplished hereafter (by the liberated), for so say the followers of a certain Branch.

NOTES :—

1. As 'vā' in Sūtra 21 shows, these two Sūtras (19-20) are *pūrvapakṣa* Sūtras.

2. According to the Sūtrakāra, "delighting," *anandana* (in Tai. Up. II. 7) and "awing" (in *blīṣā asmāt vātaḥ pavate* Tai. Up. II. 8) are respectively the functions of *puruṣa* and *akṣara*.

3. Cf. *bībharti* in Bh. Gī.XV.17, *bharate* in Śve. Up. I. 8.

4. Cf. *divi* in *tripād asy āmṛtaṁ divi*—Chā. Up. III. 12.6 also Chā. Up. III. 13.7.

5. This shows that *pradhāna* is, according to the Sūtrakāra, *puruṣa*, and that the Sūtrakāra makes a distinction between *puruṣa-vidyā* and *akṣara-vidyā*.

6. Note that the Ācāryas do not know the Śruti to which this Sūtra must refer.

7. Instead of *upāyanaśabdaseśatvāt* I propose to read *upāyanam śabdaseśatvāt*. I believe this was the original reading as is suggested by the context, by the presence of the word 'hānau', and by the fact that the Ācāryas could not give any satisfactory meaning to the Sutra as they found it.

SECTION 7.

Option of the Name for Meditation.

(28) [One may meditate on either of the two, *puruṣa* and *akṣara*] in accordance with his own wish, because both of them are not in disagreement [with the Scriptures].

(29) The goal (*gati*) is fulfilled in either way, because otherwise [there would be] an inconsistency [in the Scriptures].

(30) [Such a statement that one may meditate on either of the two according to his own wish] is quite proper because we find an object of such a nature [in the Scripture] as we find such a one in the world.

SECTION 8.

*Number of Thoughts to be collected for
Meditation on puruṣa.*

•(31) There is no obligation (*niyama*) that all the thoughts on *pradhāna* should be collected for meditation on it; [but] there is no opposition [to such a collection] because of the Word¹ and of Inference.

NOTE :—

The collection of the thoughts was taught for the first time by the Sūtrakāra; the Srutis, whenever they described the meditation on *puruṣa*, enumerated a few of these attributes and said that the meditator on *puruṣa* so far described would thereby reach his goal.

SECTION 9.

No Collection of the Thoughts during adhikāra.

(32) [The thoughts¹] which belong to the religious qualification (*adhikāra*) should [be allowed to] remain [in the meditation] only so long as the qualification lasts.

[Or, the collection of *ādhikārika* thoughts should be restricted to as many of them as are in accordance with the meditator's qualification].

NOTE :—

“ *Ādhikārikāṇām* ” in the Sūtra suggests that *dhiyām* is understood; and this is further confirmed by *dhiyām* in the next Sūtra.

SECTION 10.

Meditation on 'akṣara'.

(33) But [to collect] the thoughts on *akṣara* for the purpose of meditation on it is discountenanced (*avarodhaḥ*) because of [their] common [negative] character¹ and because of [the meditator's] becoming that (i. e. *akṣara*); the case is similar to that of the *aupāsada* rite; this has been already said².

(34) Because of the Scripture stating (that) “ so many³ ” are the attributes of *akṣara*.

NOTES :—

1. The word “*sāmānya*”, which is variously interpreted by the commentators seems to have in fact only the simple sense of “common character” and this common character of the *akṣara*-passages is their negative nature, which renders the collection of the thoughts on *akṣara* unnecessary.

2. A reference to Br. Sū. III. 3. 8 and 10, or to Br. Sū. III. 3. 11.

3. The Sūtrakāra seems to refer to the fact that the *akṣara* texts mention the attributes of *akṣara* in such a way as if they intended to exhaust all the attributes in that single list. See e. g. Br. Up. III. 8. 3-11.

SECTION 11.

Method of Meditation on akṣara (see Sec. 13).

(35) The meditator on *akṣara* is to think of *akṣara* as [present] within his own self, as in the case of [meditation on] the group of *bhūtas*¹.

(36) If it be said : “ [*Akṣara* is to be thought of as within the meditator's self because] otherwise the difference [between *akṣara* and *pradhāna*] will remain unexplained ”, we reply : “ No. The case is like that of a second precept².

NOTES :—

1. The five elements of the body and their deities.

2. According to the Sūtrakāra, *puruṣa* and *akṣara* form the basis of two precepts for the same goal.

SECTION 12.

Interchange of Thoughts on puruṣa and akṣara.

(37) [In the texts about *akṣara* and *puruṣa* we find] an interchange [of (some of) the attributes or thoughts of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*], because [the Śrutis] distinguish (*akṣara*) as they do the other (*puruṣa*).

(38) [For example, we may point out that] that same [Śruti which describes *puruṣa* as *ānanda*¹ etc. distinguishes *akṣara* with such distinctions as properly belong to *puruṣa*]².

(39) The attributes *satya*¹ and others⁴ may be, at the wish of the meditator, taken in the meditation on the other [than that with reference to which they are mentioned in Tai. Up. II. 1] (i. e. in the meditation on *puruṣa*), and in that [with reference to which *satya* and others are mentioned] (i. e. in the meditation on *akṣara*) [the meditator, may, at his will, collect attributes] from “*āyatana*” and those that follow⁵.

(40) [The attributes of *puruṣa* when mentioned by the Śruti with reference to *akṣara*⁶ should, out of respect [for the Śruti] not be dropped [in the meditation on *akṣara*].

(41) [This rule of non-dropping or “interchange” applies to an attribute of *puruṣa*] when it is present [in an *akṣara*-text]. [This is done] out of this [respect for the Śruti] because it is the word of the Śruti⁷.

(42) There is no rule for deciding [which are] those [interchangeable attributes]; the fruit of such a standpoint is that there is no objection [from the side of the Scripture] to (*akṣara* and *puruṣa*) being thought of separately (*pr̥thag dhā*)⁸.

NOTES :—

1. Tai. Up. II. describes *puruṣa* in II. 7 and *akṣara* or Brahman in II. 1.

2. The Sūtrakāra has in his mind “*Satyam jñānam anantam brahma*”—Tai. Up. II. 1, as is evident from the word *satyādayaḥ* in the next Sūtra (according to my suggestion). He thinks that *satya*, *jñāna*, *ananta* are properly speaking the attributes of *puruṣa*, but by way of “interchange of attributes”, the Śruti assigns them to *akṣara*.

3. I have divided the words in Sūtras 38–39 in a different way from that in which they are found in all existing *pāṭhas*; and in place of ‘*kāmādītaratra*’ (in 41) I have substituted ‘*kāmād itaratra*’ which is the reading according to Madhva; thus, Sūtra 38 is ‘*saiva hi*’ and Sūtra 39 reads “*satyādayaḥ kāmād itaratra tatra c āyatanādibhyaḥ*.”

4. No commentator has been able to quote as *viśaya-vākya* a Śruti which gives a list of attributes beginning with *satya*, as is required by the Sūtra. All the conjectures of Śaṅkara and others seem to me unnecessary; they are a proof of the loss of tradition.

5. *Āyatanādibhyaḥ* is explained by no interpreter in a satisfactory way. I believe, the Sūtrakāra refers to the attributes that he has enumerated in Br. Sū. I. 3-4 which begins with *dyubhivādyāyatanam svasabdāt* (Br. Sū. I. 3. 1). This also shows that in Br Sū I. 3-4 the Sūtrakāra has discussed such texts as primarily refer to *akṣara*. •

6. “ *Prasāsana* ” in Bṛ. Up. III. 8. 9 (Br. Sū. I. 3. 11) is an example.

7. This sounds rather tautological and tautology was strictly avoided in the Sūtra literature. A better explanation if suggested by any scholar will be welcomed.

8. Śaṅkara reads “ *prthag hi* ”, but others have the reading which I have followed. Sūtra 50 (*prajñāntara*) confirms the correctness of the latter.

SECTION 13.

Method of Meditation on akṣara (contd.).

(43) [During meditation, *akṣara* is to be conceived of] in that very way in which *pradhāna*¹ is comprehended for the same purpose; this has been already said.²

NOTES:—

1. Here, again, all the available recensions read *pradhānavat* the meaning of which none has been able to explain satisfactorily; I have taken “ *pradhānavat* ” to have been the original reading. (See the notes below.)

2. This refers to ‘ *itaravad* ’ in Br. Sū. III. 3. 16, and it also proves the correctness of the change in reading I have proposed above.

SECTION 14.

Superiority of akṣara to puruṣa.

(44) Because of the majority of the texts [describing *akṣara*], that (i.e. *akṣara*) is more important [as an object of meditation] (than *pradhāna*).

(45) Even then¹, the option already stated [holds good] because of the context of the texts [describing it]; so it may be as is the case with (optional) rites and with the mind of man.

(46) And [the former option holds good also] because of the transference [of the attributes of the one to the other in case of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*].

(47) But, [the meditation on *puruṣa* is] nothing else but *vidyā* (the doctrine of liberation), because of the affirmation [in the *Sruti*]².

(48) And because we see a text [to the effect].

(49) And there is no objection [to *puruṣa-upāsanā*] because of the superiority of the evidence of the *Sruti* text and other proofs [to that of pure reason].

(50) And this ('option' *pūrvavikalpaḥ*) is seen from [the evidence of] the theme (or 'introductory remarks') etc. to have the difference (*pr̥thaktvavat*) of another (way of) understanding ; this has been already said³.

(51) Though there is an analogy [between the *puruṣa*-attainment and a world⁴ like the worlds of Indra, Āditya, etc. mentioned e. g. in Br. Sū. IV. 3], there arises no " fault of *puruṣa* being regarded as a world " (*lokāpatī*), because [the idea of *puruṣa* as the goal in absolution in the form in which we have to understand it] is found [in the Scripture, and the Scripture is the highest authority], nor indeed [is there any possibility of *puruṣa* being looked upon as 'a world' *loka*] just as there is no possibility of Death [in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* being looked upon as the death known in the human world].

(52) And [the former option holds good because both *akṣara* and *puruṣa* have] a similarity of words⁵ with *para* (the Highest), but the application [of a term particularly to either of the two] is based upon the frequency (of usage).

NOTES :—

1. "*Tad api*" should be transferred to this *Sūtra* from the preceding one where it stands according to all the commentators.

2. This is a reference to Mu. Up. I. 2. 13.

3. This is a reference to Br. Sū. III. 3. 42 (*pr̥thag dhī*).

4. Tai. Up. II. 1 says that the liberated soul enjoys all objects of desire in company of the intelligent Brahman; this sounds as if the liberated soul were to reside in a world (*loka*) like the worlds of Indra, Prajāpati, etc., where also similar enjoyment of desires is described as taking place.

5. The Sūtrakāra seems to mean that words like *ātman*, *jyotiḥ*, Brahman, etc. which are used for the Highest Being (*para*) can be used for either of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*; he means also that even the words *akṣara*, *puruṣa* etc. may have been used interchangeably, but the frequency of usage helps us in deciding the sense of any particular passage.

SECTION 15.

Choice of One only out of the Two.

(53) One [of the two options should be accepted for meditation, because that one which is accepted is to be meditated upon as identical with the self of the meditator, and] because the self [of the meditator] exists [already] in the body [and the meditation involves the identity of two only, not that of three].

SECTION 16.

No Invariable Co-existence of the Object of Meditation and the Meditator.

(54) There is a logical non-co-existence [of *akṣara* or *puruṣa* and the *jīva*], because [the first two] do not [necessarily] exist where the [last] one exists; but the case is different from what we find¹ [in Śruti and Smṛti]².

NOTES:—

1. *Upalabhi*, in the Sūtras, means “the finding of a statement in the Śruti” e. g. in Br. Sū. II. 1. 36. Bh. Gī. XVIII 61 says that Īśvara (not “*jīva*” who does, of necessity, reside in the human body) resides in the heart of all beings. The Sūtrakāra says that it is not so in meditation. He seems to think that *akṣara* or *puruṣa* does not reside in the heart by nature, but one of the two may manifest itself therein after the meditation is carried out.

2. The Sūtras (54 ff) refer to *aṅgopāsanā* and therefore are not discussed here. •

2. Br. Sū. III. 2 (partly).

Two Aupaniṣada views are here criticised by the Sūtrakāra.

(a) Br. Sū. III. 2. 11-21.

These Sūtras embody a refutation of the view that in the Highest there is a "distinction of place" (*sthānabheda*):

(11) [It can] not [be said that] [the two sets of characteristics mentioned in] the two-fold texts¹ are those of the Highest One² even³ with regard to [different] places (*sthānataḥ*) [within the Highest One], for, [they belong to it] everywhere.

(12) If it be said: "No [i. e. the two-fold attributes do not belong to *para* 'in every part of it' *sarvatra*], because there is a difference [in *para* itself, viz., the difference of space or place-*sthāna*⁴]"; we reply: "Not so, because a statement about that (i. e. about the difference of space) is not found in each text⁵ " or " In each text there is a reverse statement⁶ ".

(13) Moreover, the followers of one Branch of the Vedas [really say] so⁷.

(14) For, it (the Highest) is certainly, formless, that [formlessness] being its chief [aspect]⁸.

(15) And it is like the Light⁹, because [its description] cannot be futile.

(16) And the Śruti does describe it (i. e. *para*) as "only that" (*tanmātra*)¹⁰.

(17) And the Śruti¹¹ shows [that the " whole " of *para* has all the attributes that belong to it], and the Smṛti does the same.

(18) And for this very reason, [we have in the Śruti¹² *para brahman's*] comparison like that of the Sun and water (*kam*)¹³ and others.

(19) But, in so far as (*para brahman*) cannot be reflected as [the Sun] in the water, (Brahman) is not like that (i. e. the Sun) [in becoming " many "]¹⁴.

(20) [*Para brahman's*] participating in increase and decrease is explicable on the ground of that characteristic being included [in the *coincidentia oppositorum*]; it is so because both the [mutually contrary] attributes are reconcilable [in *para brahman*].

(21) And because the Scriptures show it¹⁵.

NOTES :—

1. The texts giving separately the *coincidentia oppositorum*.

2. Note that *para* is used by the Sūtrakāra when he speaks of the Supreme Being, without any particular reference to it as *pradhāna* or *aṣṣara*. *Para* was so used in III. 3. 52.

3. 'Even' *api* implies the Sūtrakāra's rejection of the view that the two-fold texts can be explained as describing two forms (*rūpas*) of the Highest or as describing *aṣṣara* and *puruṣa* as two separate entities instead of two places (*sthāna*) in the Highest.

4. This *pūrvapakṣa* seems to state that *aṣṣara* and *puruṣa* are numerically one, but *aṣṣara* is the lower place and *puruṣa* is the higher place in the Highest One which has got this spatial distinction within itself; so that the negative sentences (*anāṇu*, *ahrasva* etc.) and the positive ones (*satyakāma*, *satyasamkalpa*) should respectively be applied to these two. The opponent seems to have referred to such texts as Mu. Up. II. 1. 2 which says that *puruṣa* is above *aṣṣara*.

5. The Sūtrakāra means two texts which describe only *puruṣa* or only *aṣṣara*.

6. Here the Sūtrakāra may refer to the attributes of *puruṣa* (*praśāsana* etc.) mentioned with reference to *aṣṣara* (e. g. in Br. Up. III. 8. 9) or *vice versa*.

7. Probably the Sūtrakāra refers to Mu. Up. I. 2. 13 where "*aṣṣara puruṣa*" is mentioned so that there is no difference of place in the two as is mentioned in Mu. Up. II. 1. 3 where *puruṣa* is said to be above *aṣṣara*.

8. According to the Sūtrakāra, *puruṣa* and *aṣṣara* are, as it were, two aspects for meditation. The former has a form (Br. Sū. I. 2. 23); the latter has none. *Aṣṣara* is more important than *puruṣa* (Br. Sū. III. 3. 44).

9. The *pūrvapakṣin* seems to have pointed to such texts as Mu. Up. II. 1. 4. The Sūtrakāra says that the description in II. 1. 4 is not futile because the *para* is itself like the Light.

10. "He is like a solid mass of salt, which is without an inward and without an outward, a mass of juice, the whole of it (*kṛtsna rasaghana eva*)" Br. Up. III. 2. 16.

11. The Sūtrakāra refers to such texts as describe *para brahman* to be possessed of contrary attributes e. g. Sve. Up. III. 19, 20; Kaṭha Up. II. 10, 20; Īśa Up. 5; and Bh. Gī. XIII. 12-13.

12. The reference is to the Brahmabindu Upaniṣad as quoted by Śaṅkara and other commentators.

13. *Kam*, is used in the sense of water in the Maitrāyaṇīya Saṃhitā, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and even in the Yājñavalkya Smṛti. The word *ambu* in the next Sūtra also shows that *kam* in this Sūtra stands for 'water'.

14. i. e. the manner in which *para* becomes many is not that in which the Sun, the Moon etc. become many. This restricts the comparison of *para* with the Sun etc.

(15) See e. g. Sve. Up. III. 20., Bh. Gī. XIII. 16.

(b) Br. Sū. III. 2. 32-38.

These Sūtras embody a refutation of the view that there are two goals :—

(31) "[The Supreme One¹ is] higher than this [*avyakta*, as described in Br. Sū. III. 2. 23], because of the designations of a bridge², measure³, connection⁴, and difference⁵ [which are applied to *avyakta*]"

(32) But [it is not so] because [the designation "bridge" is] due to the common characteristic⁶.

(33) [Because the designation of measure is] for the ease of understanding, like [the designation of] its [four] feet [which cannot mean that the *para* is a quadruped].

(34) [The designation of the connection of the Unmanifest with *puruṣa*] is due to the mention of a particular place in the Supreme One⁷; [otherwise everything is *para* and those with

which *avyakta* is connected are different places in *para*; it is similar to the case of the Light⁸ etc.

(35) And because [in the case of the difference of *akṣara* and *puruṣa*] there is the possibility of an explanation⁹.

(36) And, because the Śruti negatives the existence of any other principle [besides *akṣara*¹⁰.]

(37) Hence the omnipresence¹¹ [of *avyakta*] which is established in the texts which mention the extent (of Brahman) and in others.

NOTES :—

1. As *tu* in the next Sūtra shows, this is a *pūrvapakṣa* Sūtra.

2. Chā. Up. VIII. 4. 1—*avyakta* or *ātman* is a bridge.

3. Chā. Up. III. 18. 2—Brahman has four feet; therefore it is limited; the unlimited must be beyond it.

4. *Avyakta* is connected with *puruṣa* on the one side and *mahad* or the lower Nature on the other e. g. in Kāṭha Up. III. 11.

5. *Akṣara* is different from *puruṣa* e. g. in Mu. Up. II. 2, Bh. Gī. XV. 18, Sve. Up. 1. 6.

6. The Sūtrakāra does not admit that *puruṣa* is higher or other than *akṣara*, and that therefore there are two goals. *Atman* is called a bridge because like a bridge which helps in crossing a river, *ātman* helps in crossing the sea of worldly existence.

7. The Sūtrakāra does not believe that the twofold contradictory attributes belong to different parts or places in the *para*; they belong to every place in the Supreme Being; but he admits the distinction of place as such in *para* without reference to its attributes. So there is no inconsistency in the Sūtrakāra's position in III. 2. 11 and in this Sūtra.

8. The Light is called star, Moon, Sun, fire, flame, with reference to its presence in different places, so the *para* is called *puruṣa*, *akṣara* etc. with reference to its presence in various places,

9. In Br. Sū. I. 4. 3. *avyakṭa* (in Kāṭha Up. III. 11) is explained to be lower than *puruṣa*, because as the Nature it is dependent on the latter. This seems to be the *upapatti* in the Sūtra.

10. The Sūtrakāra, naturally, refers to such texts as deny the existence of any principle other than *akṣara* e. g. Br. Up. III. 8. 11.

11. There cannot be two omnipresent goals like *akṣara* and *puruṣa* both of which are omnipresent according to the texts; so they are the names of one and the same goal. Cf. Br. Sū. III. 3. 9.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

Other and perhaps better explanations of Śve. Up. I. 7a-b and V. 1 (than those given in App. I. C) can be given as follows:—

(I.7a-b) This is the Supreme Brahman (*paramam brahma*) celebrated in song. The three and the Mutable are well established in it.

(V.1) There are, with Brahma above them (*brahmapare*) two infinite Immutable Ones, wherein Knowledge (*vidyā*) and not-Knowledge (*avidyā*) are placed concealed. Not-Knowledge is the Mutable (*kṣara*), Knowledge is the Immortal. He who rules over the Knowledge and not-Knowledge is other than these two.

NOTE:—

1. I accept Prof. Schrader's suggestion to read *supraṭiṣṭhākṣaram ca* as *supraṭiṣṭham kṣaram ca* instead of dividing the compound as *supraṭiṣṭham akṣaram ca* as I have done in App. I. C. The advantages of accepting this suggestion are obvious. Firstly, *trayaṃ* (the three) in I. 7b are, in this case, the same as the three in I. 9 and 12, viz., the Lord, the Immutable, and the Jīva, since *kṣara* is, according to this suggested reading, to be counted separately (see note 3 in App. I. C. 1). Secondly, *supraṭiṣṭham akṣaram ca*, the division of the compound, that I had proposed, required " *akṣaram* " to be applied to *kṣaram* and in a secondary sense, viz., "imperishable" instead of the usual sense, viz., "the Immutable". Thirdly, the construction of " *ca* " (and) at the end of I. 7b had to be left out of account in my rendering of the verse, since, the compound *supraṭiṣṭhākṣaram* could itself be explained as *supraṭiṣṭham akṣaram ca*, according to the rules of *saṁāsa*. As a matter of fact, the *ca* at the end of I. 7b requires the splitting up of *supraṭiṣṭhākṣaram* into " *supraṭiṣṭham kṣaram* " and this confirms Prof. Schrader's suggestion. And lastly, *etat* in Śve. Up. I. 8a requires *kṣara* and *akṣara* to have been mentioned in I. 7

and this requirement can be best fulfilled according to the suggested correction of the text.

2. *Paramam brahma* (*Śve. Up. I. 7a*) is, in this case, the Triad as a whole as distinguished from the *traya* or the three taken singly. Thus, *paramam brahma* is equivalent to *brahmam* in I. 9 and 12.

3. *Brahma* in *brahmaṇare* (in *Śve. Up. V. 1a*) seems to be *brahmam* mentioned in *Śve. Up. I. 9* and *12* (see 1. on p. 140). *Brahmam* is the Triad (*Śve. Up. I. 9, 12*) which is certainly higher than, or above, the two Immutable Ones, to be explained in the next note.

4. The two Immutable Ones (*dve akṣare*) seem to be the two *ajas*, viz., *Īśa* and the Immutable (*akṣara*) mentioned in *Śve. Up. I. 8a-b*, the *jñā* and the *ajā* in *Śve. Up. I. 9a-b*, the *deva* and the *akṣara* or *ātman* in *Śve. Up. I. 10a-b*, and the *prentṛ* and *bhogya* in *Śve. Up. I. 12c-d*. Only these two can be properly said to be *akṣaras* or the Immutable Ones among the principles mentioned in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*. Moreover, *V. 1b* can be consistently explained only with this interpretation of *dve akṣare* (see note 5 below). And again if *brahma* in *brahmaṇare* is *brahmam* or the Triad, *dve akṣare* must mean the Lord and the *akṣara* or the Immutable. So, *Śve. Up. V. 1* is to be noted because it calls the *Īśa* (or *puruṣa*) *akṣara*, besides designating the usual *akṣara* as such.

5. *Śve. Up. V. 1b* states that in the two *akṣaras vidyā* and *avidyā* are placed concealed. Thus, the two *akṣaras* are the hiding places of *vidyā* and *avidyā* and as such cannot be identical with *vidyā* and *avidyā*. *Vidyā* is explained as *amṛta* or *akṣara* (see note 11 on *Śve. Up. I. 7-12* in App. I) in *Śve. Up. V. 1c*, and *vidyā* is said to be placed concealed in one of the two *akṣaras* in *V. 1 a-b*. This can only mean that the *akṣara* called both *amṛta* and *vidyā* is lower than, or to be traced to, another *akṣara*, which *akṣara*, again, can be none else but the *puruṣa* or *Īśa* as the *Śve. Up.* likes to call him (*Śve. Up. I. 8-9*). This meaning of *V. 1* justifies the explanation of *dve akṣare* in *V. 1a* as the Lord and the Immutable.

6. *Avidyā* is placed in one of the two *akṣaras* (*V. 1b*); it is also explained as *kṣara* (*V. 1c*); so the *akṣara* in which *avidyā* is concealed is the Immutable or *akṣara* properly so called.

7. Thus, the order of the principles mentioned in V. 1 is as follows: (1) *brahmam* or the Triad, (2) *akṣara*, the hiding place of *vidyā* otherwise called *akṣara* also, i. e. *puruṣa* or *īśa*, (3) *akṣara* the hiding place of *avidyā*, (4) *avidyā* or *kṣara*. So, this is a preparatory stage towards the evolutionary series of the Kāṭha Upaniṣad (Ka. Up. III. 11).

8. *Dve* in *dve akṣara* (V. 1a) should be noticed. It is the first definite departure from the "*ekam eva advītiyam*" of the Oldest Prose Upaniṣads (e. g. Chā. Up. VI. 2. 1); as is also the expression *trivīdham brahmam*. Such a statement about the dualism (in this case, the spiritual dualism) of *puruṣa* and *akṣara* is quite consistent with the sharp distinction between these two principles met with in the Gītā, and the yet sharper one found in the later Mahābhārata.

9. As the Knowledge (along with the not-Knowledge) is said to be ruled over by the *Īśa* (Sve. Up. V. 1. c-d), it cannot be the *Jīva* who is declared to be the not-ruler (*anīśa*) in Sve. Up. I. 9.

CONCLUSION :—

It must be admitted that the explanation of Sve. Up. V.1 proposed above is more in harmony with that of Sve. Up. I. 7-12, than the one given in App. I; because thereby the same principles as are mentioned in Sve. Up. I, are to be found in Sve. Up. V. Moreover, to understand the two *akṣaras* in V. 1 as referring to *puruṣa* or *īśa* and *akṣara* is besides being consistent with the teaching of the verse (V. 1) itself, far better than taking the term *akṣara* to mean "imperishable" and referring one *akṣara* to what is called *kṣara*.

The above interpretation further supports the reconstruction of the meaning of the term *akṣara* proposed in this Thesis as a whole.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

I, Prataprai M. Modi, was born on the 9th February 1898 in Bhavnagar (Br. India). I am a Hindu by religion and a Bania by caste. My first lessons I had for two years from a private teacher in Bhavnagar. Then I visited the Sanātana Dharma High School at Bhavnagar for seven years and passed the Matriculation Examination of the Bombay University in 1916. After having studied for four years in the Samaldas College (Bhavnagar), the Bahauddin College (Junagadh), and the Gujarat College (Ahmedabad) I passed the B.A. Examination of the Bombay University from the last mentioned College, with Honours in Sanskrit in 1920. During 1920-21 I worked as the Dakṣiṇā Fellow in Sanskrit in the Gujarat College. Then for further two years I studied at the Central Hindu College and at the College of Oriental Learning of the Benares Hindu University and passed the M.A. Examination in the Second Division with Sanskrit as my subject and Vedānta as my Special Group in July 1923. In September of the same year I was appointed Assistant Professor of Sanskrit at the Samaldas College, Bhavnagar and was made the Senior Professor after two years. In 1926 I won the Zala Vedānta Prize of the Bombay University in an All-India competition for a work on Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's Siddhāntahindu (a philosophical Sanskrit work) which has been published in 1929. Being enabled by the Council of Administration, Bhavnagar State, Bhavnagar to prosecute my studies in Oriental Research in Germany, I left India in June 1929 and after four months' study of the German language in Goettingen I joined the Kiel University, where since

23

then I have studied Sanskrit, English, and History of Religion. I have attended the lectures of Prof. Dr. F. O. Schrader, Prof. Dr. K. Wildhagen, and Prof. Dr. H. Mandel. I heartily thank all my teachers of this place. I am particularly indebted to Prof. Dr. F. O. Schrader whose never failing help and invaluable advice in the important questions of technical and philosophical nature I urgently needed and readily secured for the interpretation of the various texts I had to deal with during the preparation of this Work. Above all, what I shall always value most is the great joy and inspiration which I derived when I had the privilege of discussing with him various crucial points of Indian Philosophy. It often reminded me of the cordial relations which existed between the disciple and the teacher in the happy days of Ancient India. My bow to him.

